JAN 28 1947

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 92—PART 6

JUNE 13, 1946, TO JULY 1, 1946
(PAGES 6771 TO 8090)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1946

Copy 2

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in hours of exhausting strain which drain away our strength, we give Thee thanks for the daily pause at this wayside well of peace and prayer.

Again in this storied Chamber an empty desk so long filled with probity and honor is reminding us that to each day must come the end, when the silver cord is loosed and the golden bowl and the pitcher are broken at the fountain and the mourners are in the streets, as a man goeth to his everlasting home. In the sadness of farewell, we give Thee thanks for one who was the embodiment of the gentle chivalry of the Southland, but whose understanding sympathy encompassed the Nation with all its varied needs. It is with grateful remembrance this day we recall his long career as he followed in public service the footprints of a worthy sire. In an age of blatant Babel towers, Thou didst give him discerning eyes to see that the eternal springs of renewal gush from the good earth, whose broad fields hold the sacrament of seedtime and harvest.

"Now the laborer's task is o'er,
Now the battle-day is past;
Now upon the farther shore
Lands the voyager at last;
Father, in Thy gracious keeping
Leave we now Thy servant sleeping."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, June 12, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

THE LATE SENATOR JOHN H. BANKHEAD

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, due to my absence from the Senate yesterday, I was unable to join my colleagues in their fitting and deserved tributes to the late Senator Bankhead. At this time, I wish to add a personal word to what has already been said.

By the laws which bear his name, by innumerable statutes which bear the mark of his influence and his wisdom, by the loyal and steadfast assistance and counsel which he gave freely to all of us, by the integrity which he brought to bear upon every public question, he has established his name and fame for all time upon the records of the Senate.

He died in the heat of battle, no less than a soldier dies from the wounds of war.

It was my privilege to serve with him since the day he came to this body. Always I felt keenly the strength and purpose, the integrity and ability with which he grappled with a succession of difficult problems. He never spared himself; and whatever the issue, all of us knew the depth of character and sincerity which motivated his every move, thought, and word.

My sincere condolence and sympathy goes out to his family in this tragic hour.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 13, 1946, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1978) to authorize the restoration of Philip Neikum, Jr., to the active list of the United States Navy with appropriate rank and restoration of pay and allowances.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. John H. Bankhead, late a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 164. An act to provide safety in aviation and to direct an investigation of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms;

H. R. 6030. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to improve international collaboration with respect to meteorology; and

H. R. 6739. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE SENATOR BANKHEAD

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under authority of Senate Resolution 284, the Chair appoints the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] as the committee to attend the funeral of the late Senator Bankhead, of Alabama.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE CEREMONIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to House Joint Resolution 360, the Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies on July 4, 1946, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

REPORT OF JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 6855.)

REPORTS OF GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying reports, referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals:

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 6854.)

MILITARY ADVICE AND ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide military advice and assistance to the Republic of China to aid it in modernizing its armed forces for the fulfillment of obligations which may devolve upon it under the Charter of the United Nations, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 12, 1946, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1163) to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of California.

TERMINAL LEAVE PAY FOR ENLISTED MEN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Young Republicans of the Fourth District at Emporia, Kans., relating to terminal leave pay for enlisted men.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved by the Young Republicans of the Fourth Congressional District in convention assembled, That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact legislation which would give to enlisted men the same rights and privileges of terminal leave pay as that enjoyed by officers of the armed forces.

DEL ROSKAM, *Chairman.*

Attest:

W. G. LEONARD, *Secretary.*

ABOLITION OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Young Republicans of the Fourth District at Emporia, Kans., relating to the Office of Price Administration.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is brought to the attention of the Fourth District Young Republican meeting at Emporia, Kans., on the 5th day of May 1946, that legislation extending the OPA is before the Congress of the United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Young Republicans of the Fourth District go on record as opposing legislation tending to extend price controls in this country for an unlimited length of time.

That when items reach a point in production where their removal from price control would not incur danger of inflation, they be removed from price control.

That amendments which tend to relieve gross inequities in price structure and that would further encourage increased production of commodities needed by consumers of this country be incorporated in any legislation affecting extension of OPA.

DEL ROSKAM, *Chairman.*

Attest:

W. G. LEONARD, *Secretary.*

OPA AND SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached a memorial signed by 69 citizens of Furley, Kans., remonstrating against continuing the OPA beyond June 30, 1946. They also register their protest against socialized medicine.

There being no objection, the memorial was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

We, the voters, citizens of Furley, Kans., do hereby register our protest against continuing OPA after June 30, 1946, because it has, we believe, retarded our return to normal, and has not promoted it as claimed by Chester, the Prophet of Doom. We also register our protest against socialized medicine.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1150. A bill for the relief of John Leberman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1475);

H. R. 2315. A bill for the relief of Adele Nahas; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1476);

H. R. 4118. A bill for the relief of Axel H. Peterson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1477); and

H. R. 4373. A bill for the relief of Carl and Naomi Fitzwater; without amendment (Rept. No. 1478).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3512. A bill for the relief of Willie Lam and Edgar Lam; without amendment (Rept. No. 1479);

H. R. 4600. A bill for the relief of the estate of Patsy Ann Maheux, deceased; without amendment (Rept No. 1480);

H. R. 4997. A bill for the relief of Ernest I. Wade and Alma Wade; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1481);

H. R. 5071. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dora Foster; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1482); and

H. R. 5208. A bill for the relief of Michael J. Keaveney and Mary C. Keaveney; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1483).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1517. A bill for the relief of Lofts & Son; without amendment (Rept. No. 1484);

H. R. 797. A bill for the relief of William W. Willett, Jr., without amendment (Rept. No. 1485);

H. R. 1258. A bill for the relief of Cecil Atkinson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1486);

H. R. 2772. A bill for the relief of Juan Calcano; without amendment (Rept. No. 1487);

H. R. 2785. A bill for the relief of Will O'Brien, Mrs. Bessie O'Brien, and the legal guardian of Jane O'Brien; without amendment (Rept. No. 1488);

H. R. 3359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Belk; without amendment (Rept. No. 1489);

H. R. 3399. A bill for the relief of Philibert L. Bergeron, Alfred Quist, and Astrid Quist; without amendment (Rept. No. 1490);

H. R. 3401. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hattie Main Babcock, Chester N. Main, and Mr. and Mrs. Earl Norman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1491);

H. R. 4353. A bill for the relief of Amy Mary Richter; without amendment (Rept. No. 1492);

H. R. 4479. A bill for the relief of William E. Robertson and Estelle Robertson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1493); and

H. R. 4888. A bill for the relief of Gustav F. Doscher; without amendment (Rept. No. 1494).

By Mr. HUFFMAN, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2107. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 1495).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2108. A bill to provide for the payment of members of the military and naval forces of the United States who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia while in military pay status prior to assignment to active duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 1496).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 181. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and public secondary schools; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1497).

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 5508. A bill to authorize the return of the Grand River Dam project to the Grand River Dam Authority and the adjustment and settlement of accounts between the Authority and the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1500).

By Mr. HATCH:

From the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution approving agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the investigation through the Department of State and with Canada of the feasibility of making the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes, together with minority views of Mr. White; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1499).

From the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. R. 3533. A bill to authorize revisions in the boundary of the Hopewell Village National Historic Site, Pa., and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1498); and

S. Res. 281. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys; without amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. R. 5676. A bill to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real estate in Converse County, Wyo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1501).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 2330. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain functions under the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, from the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2331. A bill for the relief of William M. Graham and Mrs. Mary M. Graham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 2332. A bill to provide that the unexpended proceeds from the sale of 50-cent pieces coined in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Albany, N. Y., may be paid into the general fund of such city; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 2333. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for the permissible area of collaboration among carriers for the making and filing of rates, fares, charges, and classifications for the transportation of persons or property; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 2334. A bill for the relief of Miss Minnie Doherty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2335. A bill to excuse employees of the Government from work on July 5, 1946; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 2336. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the heirs of William H. Peters and Washington Reed; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEORGE (by request):

S. 2337. A bill to provide military advice and assistance to the Republic of China to aid it in modernizing its armed forces for the fulfillment of obligations which may devolve upon it under the Charter of the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MORSE:

S 2338. A bill for the relief of Wilma E. Baker; and

S. 2339. A bill for the relief of Irving W. Learned; to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING ACT OF 1937 RELATING TO WOOL

Mr. WALSH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2033) to provide support for wool, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 by including wool as a basic commodity to which orders under such act are applicable, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to fix wool standards, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 164. An act to provide safety in aviation and to direct an investigation of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms; and

H. R. 6030. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to improve international collaboration with respect to meteorology; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 6739. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PREPARATION AND PRINTING OF SENATE RULES AND MANUAL FOR EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Rules, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 285), which was referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eightieth Congress, and that 1,500 additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the Senate, 200 copies for the use of the Committee on Rules, and the remaining 300 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR SHIPSTEAD TO THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him to the Military Order of the Purple Heart at Minneapolis, Minn., on February 21, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

A TIME FOR ACTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Time For Action" delivered by him at Madison Square Garden under auspices of American Zionists Emergency Committee, June 12, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHALLENGE TO FREEMEN—COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY EUGENE HOLMAN

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Challenge to Freemen, delivered by Mr. Eugene Holman to the graduating class of Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Tex., on June 3, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTER-AMERICAN PEACE AND COOPERATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE BIRMINGHAM AGE-HERALD

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Forces of Right and Justice," from the Birmingham Age-Herald of May 13, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION — EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Piracy of the Treasury," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 9, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

CARTER GLASS— EDITORIAL FROM LYNCHBURG NEWS

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Carter Glass" from the Lynchburg News, which appears in the Appendix.]

HIGH PLACE FOR AN ARKANSAN—EDITORIAL FROM ARKANSAS DEMOCRAT

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "High Place for an Arkansan" from the Arkansas Democrat of June 8, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yesterday it was ordered, by unanimous consent, that during the further consideration of the pending bill, H. R. 6042, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on the bill or any amendment proposed thereto.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] as a substitute for subdivisions (A) and (B) of paragraph 3, on page 20, lines 13 to 21.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Andrews	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hayden	Overton
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Barkley	Hill	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hoey	Reed
Brewster	Huffman	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Burch	Knowland	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stanfill
Byrd	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Carville	McClellan	Taylor
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McMahon	Tobey
Donnell	Magnuson	Tunnell
Downey	Maybank	Tydings
Eastland	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Walsh
George	Moore	Wheeler
Gerry	Morse	Wherry
Guffey	Murdock	White
Gurney	Murray	Wilson
Hart	Myers	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business, attending the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in Bermuda.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate as members of the committee appointed by the United States Senate to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I shall discuss only briefly the pending amendment, certainly for not over 30 minutes, and I hope for a lesser time than that.

First I want to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma on the presentation of his argument. As always, the distinguished Senator has fortified himself with the statistical proof of his allegation. I think

he has done a favor to us who are opposing the emasculation of price control, because he has put into the RECORD the figures clearly indicating that we are successfully and very bountifully producing most of the commodities necessary for our existence. Complaint has been made that the action of the OPA is curtailing production. On the contrary, as the figures of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma clearly show, we now have a far greater national income, a far greater production, than ever before.

The Senator from Oklahoma, having established that we are now generally producing in far greater quantities than we did in 1940 and before that, argues from his statement that since we are now in large production, we therefore should remove price control on all these articles in which there is a greater production now than there was before the war. The distinguished Senator presented the chart which is in front of Senators, and his amendment would seek to remove price control from all the items contained on that chart, as well as wool, which is not on the chart, and all the products made from these different items. If the amendment of the distinguished Senator should be adopted there would be practically nothing left subject to price control. Apparently there would be left under price control steel, iron, furs, some of the building materials, cement and gravel, but speaking very generally, under the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma price control would be almost universally removed.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the figures submitted by my colleague from Oklahoma show that production now is of such volume as practically to meet the demand for the products included in the schedule on the chart in front of Senators, presented by my colleague from Oklahoma?

Mr. DOWNEY. No, Mr. President, I did not make that statement. The statement I made was that the senior Senator from Oklahoma had clearly proved that production now is far greater than it was before the war.

Mr. MOORE. Does the Senator then contend that to the fact that they are under control can be attributed stimulation of production?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; Mr. President, I would not say production has been stimulated by price control but I do say that it seems clear that price control has not in any way handicapped the development of the national income and most effective production. Where I differ with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is in this respect: he does not consider as a factor in our problem the tremendously increased buying power in the Nation. Take for instance meat—and I am going to discuss meat because that is the item which has been the most prominent in the public eye. But first I want to say that there are able and distinguished Senators on the floor who have very different ideas than I have respecting meat, and those able and distinguished Senators, I am free to admit, know more about meat production and meat conditions than I do. Nevertheless, I differ radically from them in their conclusion that price control should be lifted from meat.

While, in the interest of brevity, I shall restrict myself to a discussion of what will be the result of removing price control from meats, I want to say that generally speaking I think the same principles and facts would apply, and the same results will probably accrue, from the removal of price control from other products as will accrue from decontrolling meat.

I think the Senator from Oklahoma is at least consistent and that every Senator on the Committee on Banking and Currency who can find reason and logic for removing price controls on June 30 from meat, poultry, and dairy products, by that same reasoning and those same facts should go along with the senior Senator from Oklahoma and generally remove price control. I think the Senator from Oklahoma is forthright and logical in making his amendment cover everything, while the Senators who reported out the bill are illogical because they are only mutilating the act in part, when the same logic should call for its destruction.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Then, am I to understand the Senator to mean that notwithstanding supply is equal to and in excess of demand, the Senator would still oppose removing the product by statute from price control?

Mr. DOWNEY. The junior Senator from Oklahoma is placing words in my mouth, I know inadvertently, that I have not said. I do not concede that our present meat production, or what it could potentially be built up to in the next year or two, would equal our demand. What I am admitting is, of course, the accuracy of the figures of the senior Senator from Oklahoma that we have a far greater production now of meat and these other commodities than we had before the war.

Mr. MOORE. If proof exists now that the production of a commodity is in excess of demand, then does the Senator from California object to removing it from control?

Mr. DOWNEY. Oh, no, Mr. President. I should say that whenever it appears that production is in excess of demand, then a different rule should be applied.

I want to say to the distinguished Senator that I think his argument, so far as it relates to petroleum, is logical and sound, because I do think in petroleum we can make production exceed demand, and perhaps are right now. I want to say to the distinguished Senator that the OPA has already stated that it is its intention to remove price control from petroleum products, and that it would have done it before this except for the threatened maritime strike. If that maritime strike takes place there will be a great shortage of petroleum products on the Atlantic seaboard, and many other places in the country, and the OPA felt, and I think they are right, that its action in removing price control from petroleum products should be postponed until we know what is going to happen in the matter of the maritime strike. I am assured by the OPA that if that strike is settled and the threat of the strike disappears, price control will be removed from petroleum products.

However, I want to make plain that decontrolling petroleum will force up its price perhaps around 20 or 25 percent. The distinguished Senator would be a better judge of that than I, and, of course, such an increase will further decrease the real purchasing power of the great masses of our people. So while removing price control from petroleum may be advisable, even here unhappy results will accrue.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. My time is limited, but I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate what the Senator says about the petroleum situation, and I share his view. Of course, it will not be an unmixed blessing when the control is taken off petroleum. There is now a subsidy of 35 cents a barrel on crude oil. When the controls are taken off that subsidy will cease. It is not certain that the producers of certain qualities of oil will receive the equivalent of the subsidy in the increased price of oil, because they must depend upon what the purchasers of oil are willing to pay. In my State, which produces a grade of oil which is called Somerset Light, which compares favorably with Pennsylvania in everything except price, the subsidy of 35 cents will come off. Of course, if controls are taken off, the producers will be dependent upon the willingness of the purchasers of the oil—which are the large refineries—to increase the price of oil to an amount equal to the present price plus the subsidy.

I do not advocate perpetuation of the subsidy for that reason; but I mention the fact that the producers have called to my attention a situation in which they have no power to compel the increase of their price up to the level of the price which they are now receiving, including the subsidy, unless the purchasers—and that means the large refiners—are willing to pay that increase in price for what we call Somerset Light, a classification of oil in Kentucky. So the removal of price control and all the other controls would not be an unmixed blessing, even within the oil industry itself.

Mr. DOWNEY. I agree with that statement. I do not know enough about conditions in the petroleum industry to form an independent judgment. I am merely stating the opinion of the OPA as it was stated to me. As I understand, it was the intention of OPA to remove price controls if and when the maritime strike was settled. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has just called to my attention the fact that the subsidy mentioned by the Senator from Kentucky is very much limited so far as the production it covers is concerned.

I should be glad to yield to either of the Senators from Oklahoma to explain conditions.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the fact that it is limited with respect to the types of oil which it covers, but it does happen to cover the type produced in my State.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is not limited with respect to types of oil. It is limited with respect to the character and amount of production. It is limited to the owners and producers of oil from what are called stripper wells, wells producing less than 10 barrels per well.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; and that encompasses most of the oil produced in my State.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I shall now address myself to the meat issue. I start with the facts stated by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma as to a much greater production of meat, potentially and during the past year, than in the period before the war.

Up to a time within the past few weeks our production of meats was about 40 percent greater than in the base period from 1935 to 1939. During the past 2 months, and ever since the Committee on Banking and Currency indicated that it intended to recommend removal of controls from meat, stockmen have not been selling their stock. The slaughterhouses could not get it, and there has been a great falling off, particularly within the past 6 weeks.

I think we should state additional facts beyond what the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has stated. While it is true that roughly we now have 40 percent more meat in the country than before the war, we must bear in mind that we have more than double the national income that we had in 1939. In other words, there is double the purchasing power to buy farm and factory products while the production of meat has increased only 40 percent. I think it must be admitted by everyone who has talked with his wife, or otherwise informed himself, that there is a shortage of meat. I cannot understand how anyone could believe that a black market could exist—and everyone admits that it does exist to a greater or lesser extent—unless there were a shortage. If there were plenty of meat in the Nation to satisfy all demands, so that purchasers would not be competing against one another, how could there be a black market?

In addition to a tremendously augmented national income competing for purchases of meat, the United States Government is diverting a larger proportion to foreign lands to help feed the hungry of the world; and in addition the demands by the Federal Government are increased because of the fact that we have a larger Army and Navy than we had before the war.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I attended with some degree of regularity the hearings which were held before the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of which I was a member. The hearings extended over a period of approximately 3 weeks. It was almost conclusively shown during those hearings that there was perhaps as large a cattle population as we have ever known. I believe some witnesses stated that it was larger than it has ever been. The Senator from Oklahoma tells us that there are 81,000,000 head of cattle. I was about to say approximately 80,000,000. At any rate, the number is as large as this country has ever known, if not larger. I do not understand that the OPA seriously disputes that fact.

Mr. DOWNEY. The distinguished Senator is undoubtedly correct when he states that we have a larger number of domestic animals for slaughter than we have ever had in the United States. Also we have the greatest slaughtering and the greatest production. I have the figures, which I shall place in the RECORD. The number of animals has increased perhaps 40 percent, and production has also increased by that percent over prewar years.

Mr. STEWART. I understand the Senator's argument to be that there must be a meat shortage or there would not be a black market.

Mr. DOWNEY. That depends upon the definition of a meat shortage. There certainly are not enough animals on the ranges, unless they are prematurely slaughtered, to meet the enhanced buying power of the Nation. Herds are increased and production is up 40 percent but we are eating far more meat than we have ever eaten.

What was the condition in 1939? We had 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 unemployed, who could not buy meat oftener than once a week or once a month. We had 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 part-time workers. Those workers are now fully engaged. They have become used to having meat, and they want it. We have had an increase of 8,000,000 in the national population. The national income has doubled. If we allocate to meat purchases the same proportion of the national income as we did in 1939, we shall require double the amount of meat to satisfy the demand. I have no doubt that twice as much meat as we had in 1939 would be necessary to fully satisfy the demand whereas meat production has increased only about 40 percent. While we have the greatest animal population on the ranges we have ever had, during the last year, we have decreased their number by 9,000,000. The shortage of meat does not occur because of any shortage on the ranges or because of any shortage in the slaughterhouses comparable to prewar days. Meat production has increased 40, 50, or even 55 percent over what it was in 1939. But the demand has almost doubled. So we still have a great shortage.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator to another point. I have been very much interested in this matter, because beginning in last December our subcommittee of the Small Business Committee held hearings for several days, and subsequently we filed a report recommending that a small and orderly decontrol of meat be studied, and that possibly by the fall of this year the complete decontrol of meat might be hoped for. Later, when a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was appointed to study this question, the evidence before it showed conclusively that the black market had advanced so rapidly and had become so serious as to give greater reason for concern.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Senator knows that my time is limited, and I have used almost half of it in yielding.

Mr. STEWART. I beg the Senator's pardon; I had forgotten about that. I shall take my seat after making this observation: At the hearing, representatives of the small independent meat dealers who slaughter and process meat, as the Senator knows, testified that although they had been in the habit, for example, of slaughtering 100 head of hogs or cattle or both a day, now they are able to obtain only about 10 percent of that number, in many cases. So I think the situation is that if the demand is being met, evidently it is being met through the black market.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I wish to say that I think his statements are inaccurate.

Mr. STEWART. I say to the Senator that I base them on the statements and evidence which were presented to the subcommittee on which I served. That is all I can base them upon.

Mr. DOWNEY. Well, Mr. President, I have made a rather careful study of the subject in the last few days. The more I study it, the more serious, I believe, is the mistake which the Congress is making. I think we are going to let loose factors which within 60 or 90 days will have the most serious effect. I hope I am wrong; but I likewise hope the Senate will not pass such a bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say that the situation 60 days from now could not be more demoralized than the situation at the present time, when small meat shops are closing from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the reason the slaughterhouses are not slaughtering to their capacity is that the stock growers are holding back their stock. Every federally inspected slaughterhouse is begging the stock growers to bring their stock in.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I shall not yield any more. I have only a limited amount of time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not true that each Senator has 30 minutes on the bill and 30 minutes on each amendment offered to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. So the Senator from California has plenty of time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if I stood here listening for 5 hours to other Senators talk, I would not have time to say anything.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not know whether the Senator from California was in the Chamber when the arrangement was made.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not complaining at all. I was only trying to do the Senator a service by informing him that he may have 30 minutes on the bill and 30 minutes on each amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. I appreciate the suggestion. Although I have been happy to yield for questions, I should like to have the opportunity to proceed.

Mr. President, I wish to say that we have what are known as federally inspected slaughterhouses. According to indisputable evidence of the American Meat Institute, as well as evidence from other sources, those institutions handle approximately 72 percent of the meat. That figure is supplied by the American Meat Institute, as well as by the OPA. I have heard no statement made that the federally inspected slaughterhouses, which generally are owned by great corporations, are subject to any charge of engaging in black-market operations.

We also have the nonfederally inspected slaughterhouses, and their capacity comprises approximately 30 percent of the total capacity of all slaughterhouses. Some of them have doubled and some have trebled their production, and some have increased their production 10 times over. Undoubtedly there is a great deal of black-market operation among them.

On the basis of my definition of black-market operations, I believe that the figures which have been stated several times on this floor in regard to the extent of black-market operations in meat are grossly exaggerated. The figures which distinguished Senators have recited several times on the floor of the Senate are taken from the American Meat Institute. I shall read those figures to see what they consider to be black-market operations. The American Meat Institute made a survey of retail meat prices in February, March, and April, 1946. The survey covered 1,803 stores in 11 cities. The findings which were reported as a result of the survey were as follows:

Percentage of stores selling one or more cuts at above ceiling prices, 83 percent.

Percentage of meat sold at above ceiling prices, 68 percent.

Percentage of overcharges on violation cases, 29 percent.

Percentage of overcharges on all purchases, 20 percent.

I wish to say that the OPA made its own investigation, and the findings it reached as a result of that investigation are of a less extreme nature. But I shall not enter into a discussion as to whether the American Meat Institute was correct or whether the OPA was correct. What I wish to point out is that when distinguished Senators say that 80 percent of the meat sold in the United States is sold in the black market, I think that statement is not correct. The true statement is that the American Meat Institute found that approximately 80 percent of the retail stores were overcharging on certain of their sales.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOWNEY. I should prefer not to yield.

Let me say that the overcharging to which I have referred is common and habitual. When I was in California, practicing law there, I engaged in many cases, both for and against retail stores. In many cases such stores were chiseling and were charging too much and were selling improper amounts and kinds. I have absolutely no doubt in my own mind that the great proportion of retail stores have taken advantage of the great demand for meat and often have overcharged the housewife for it even when their meats did not come from the black market. I myself would not call that a black-market operation, but someone else might define the term differently.

According to the American Meat Institute, overcharges figured over all sales equaled 20 percent of the sale price. I believe that the great portion of the 20 percent went to the retail stores, not to the slaughterhouses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator on this amendment has expired.

Mr. DOWNEY. Very well; I shall take my time on the bill.

However, I know that there have been large black-market operations in the nonfederally inspected meat plants, and, of course, some of those operations have found their way into the retail stores, hotels, restaurants, and directly into many homes. But, in any event, what makes the black-market operations possible is the fact that when our wives and the representatives of the hotels and restaurants go to buy meat they find a shortage of that commodity. The reason for the shortage is not that the production of meat is less than it was in 1939, because there is being actually sold 40 percent more meat than was sold in 1939. The reason is that the demand for meat has almost doubled what it was in 1939, principally because of a doubled national income, and the fact, also, that millions of people want meat who could not obtain it in the unhappy depression days.

Mr. President, before leaving the discussion of this issue I wish to consider one other factor which is involved. In January, February, March, and, I believe, during a part of April of this year, except when the meat strike was on, the production of meat in the federally inspected slaughterhouses was about 100 percent of what it had been in the year before. Let us remember that those federally inspected plants handled more than 70 percent of the meat. We believe that meat in the other packing plants was about in the same volume as in the prior year.

About 2 months ago the Banking and Currency Committee indicated, at least, the possibility of all price controls being removed from meats. Since then, in my opinion, the stock growers of this Nation have been holding back about one-third of what they would otherwise have sold. That has not been always true, but to a great extent, they have curtailed their sales.

Why has this been done? First, because the spring season is upon them and they have the grass and can feed extra stock. Furthermore, they hope and believe that when the OPA bill is passed they will receive from 20 to 30 percent more money for their meat. In that assumption, I believe they are correct. I do not blame the stockmen. I would do the same thing.

Beyond any increase the stockmen will receive, the elimination of the subsidy will increase prices another 20 percent. Within 30 days after the passage of this bill we may see the price of meat increase 40 percent or more. I hope I am wrong, but I do not believe I am. With regard to the question of subsidies, I may say that during the past fiscal year we have paid out approximately $825,000,000 in meat subsidies. That amount will be passed along to the consumer when the subsidy is no longer paid. Beyond the slaughterers who receive the subsidy, there is a mark-up of about one-third. That will be added to the $825,000,000. Because of the loss of subsidies, just as sure as the sun is shining, that increase will be approximately $1,150,000,000, or $1,250,000,000, which is about 20 percent of the total amount annually paid for meat in the United States.

Mr. President, let us see what occurred during the last 6 weeks since our committee apparently showed its intention to give the green light to the meat producers. Production in the federally inspected plants, instead of being 100 percent of what it was last year, at least during the early months of last year, is now down to approximately 70 percent, and is still sinking. Of that 70 percent the Government takes a substantial amount because of foreign demands and for the Army and the Navy, and as always, the large hotels, restaurants, and public institutions are also taken care of. So probably there is not coming into the retail stores at the present time, and will not, in my opinion, until after this bill has been disposed of, more than one-third as much meat as came in during the war and during the first part of this year.

Mr. President, on July 1 the committee amendment would take off the price control of meat, dairy, and poultry products. We also pay substantial subsidies on dairy products. I look to see the prices of dairy products aviate as much as 25 to 50 percent. That statemant applies also to poultry products. What will happen if that condition eventuates? Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma knows about the great and bountiful grain crops which the country has. Of course, we have them. But why did he not say that we are so cruelly and crucially short in grain that we cannot even meet our solemn obligations to the starving people of Europe? What has happened on the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards? Dairyman and poultrymen are so short of grain and proteins that they are now beginning the curtailment and destruction of flocks and

herds which took decades to build up. The Middle West is still in fairly good condition. Why? Because that part of the country is the granary of the world. The middle western farmer is holding his grain to feed his animals, because he knows that he will receive a large price for them. That means that we of the Pacific coast and those of the Atlantic coast face a most critical and unhappy feed situation.

Mr. President, what do we propose doing? We propose to remove price control from poultry, dairy products, and meat. The increase in prices of such products which will take place will undoubtedly result in the owners of cattle, poultry, and dairy herds going into the grain market and bidding up the price of grain. Under these conditions I fear no ceiling can be held on feeds. When grains and proteins begin to increase in price what will happen to bread and cereals? I do not see how we can prevent their sharply increasing cost to our consumers.

Mr. President, I have made an examination and investigation of hundreds of budgets of workers of America, and I have talked to thousands of them. I know in the first place that more than 80 percent of our wage earners get less than $200 a month—$125, $150, $175, $200. Most of them get around $150 and $175. I think every Senator must realize that no man can feed himself, his wife and one, two or three children for less than a hundred dollars a month; it cannot be done. I am referring to the city dweller, not to the man on the farm or in the small town. The worker in the city very often has to buy his own lunches; his children may have to have money for their high-school lunches; and if any man with the ordinary average-size family undertakes to feed himself and his family on less than a hundred dollars a month, according to every standard, he and his family are not being properly fed.

Now, Mr. President, put on top of the food bill of $100 a month, $50 a month which is the average rent for homes and apartments in the great cities, and you have $150. Add $10 for income tax or other legal deductions, and you have $160; then add $15 for bus or railroad fare for the family and you have $175 a month; and yet you have not started to clothe the family of the worker or give him medical attention or telephone, gas, electric, and other facilities and necessities. I say to you, Mr. President, that every man with a family who is struggling to support it in one of our large cities on wages of $175 or $200 a month is always on the abyss of financial insolvency. Let the price of food increase 20 or 30 or 50 percent and see what will happen in this Nation. Right now I do not want to discuss it.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I think his amendment only carries to the logical conclusion the amendment reported by the committee to this bill, for I do not believe that we can release price control from poultry and dairy products and meats without carrying with them grain, cereals, and bread, and when that has been done practically all the food items of families in the lower income brackets have been covered. Can we then continue to retain price control on other items?

Individuals owning property, in many cases, are in a difficult position, because their rents have not been raised. Can we allow an increase of 25 or 50 percent in great segments of our economy and still hold rent control? What will happen if the landlord makes such a case as to demonstrate that he cannot possibly operate his property on the present rents and they, too, go up?

Mr. President, at least during this year or 2 years of uncertainty and controversy and until we can better stabilize the financial and industrial factors in this Nation and bring about full production, I would have preferred to see an increase in subsidies rather than their elimination. I am thoroughly familiar with that, to me fallacious, argument that, since we are now indulging in deficit spending, three or four billion dollars for subsidies would increase the deficit and increase the inflation. That, however, is not what bothers people. What is it? Our income tax and most of our other taxes are paid by the 20 percent of fortunate people of this land. The food will probably be eaten by the other 80 percent, and, so far as I am concerned, I would rather see increased burdens by subsidies upon the wealthy and the well-to-do than to set loose in this Nation an inflation that will deprive people of the ordinary means of existence.

Mr. President, I wish to say that nothing that I have said here today implies any criticism of the sincerity, and the ability of men who take the opposite position. I could not attend very often the Banking and Currency Committee hearings on this bill because of other obligations, but I know that all the Senators who participated there did so courteously, fairly, sincerely, and earnestly. Many of them know more about this subject than I do and it may be that their views are right and mine are wrong. But I think we will soon find out if we emasculate and mutilate the OPA and turn loose inflation. Time will tell us about that.

Mr. President, much has been said about the increased wages of workers during the last 3 or 4 years. Generally speaking, the increase in wages has been just about equal to the increased cost of living, which, taking all factors, is 35 or 40 percent. We recently have had strife and chaos and controversy that brought us almost to the abyss of national disaster; and now what will happen if we say to a man who has a family of four or five and only a hundred dollars a month for food, that we are going to make that same amount of food cost him $125 or $150? Before Senators pass upon this bill, I think they should place themselves in the position of men living on the desperate brink of uncertainty, with hardly enough money for medical and dental attention for their wives and children. I think Senators should consider what may happen if by the elimination of subsidies and the release of price control the cost of living should be increased by 25, 30, or 40 percent.

Personally I find myself in a very unhappy situation with regard to this bill. In the form in which it probably will be when it is finally voted upon, I believe I shall have to vote against it. I hate to place myself in a position voting against an OPA bill, even though I believe it to be destructive, because I know how misunderstood such a position may become. I already find myself in a rather difficult position with the dairy farmers, many of whose leaders are my dear friends, and meat growers and poultry producers, and by a vote against the bill I suppose I will aline many other people against me. But if the bill to be voted on by the Senate is as I fear it will be, I shall be compelled to vote against it.

Mr. President, my vote shall be cast to support OPA. I think it has performed a mighty service to the Nation. I shall oppose every effort to weaken or destroy it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the conclusion of my remarks a memorandum by the OPA dated May 1946, headed "Should meat controls be abolished?" The statement contains some of the figures I was using in my discussion.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD MEAT CONTROLS BE ABOLISHED?

(Prepared for the Senate Banking and Currency Committee by the Office of Price Administration, Paul A. Porter, Administrator, May 1946)

Congress is being asked to abolish price control of meat.

The argument is that there is an abundant supply of livestock but that distribution of meat has gotten into the hands of black marketeers. As a result—

1. The public's meat bill is increased by billions of dollars.

2. Thousands of men and women in packing plants are unemployed.

3. Hundreds of legitimate slaughterers and dealers in meat are unable to stay in business.

Because of the importance of this matter to the Nation, we have chosen this means to present to Congress the views of the Office of Price Administration.

It is true, as stated, that we have more livestock in this country than we had before the war (all figures from the Department of Agriculture):

Cattle:	
Average, 1935–39	66,814,000
Jan. 1, 1946 (up 19 percent)	79,791,000
Beef cattle:	
Average, 1935–39	31,402,000
Jan. 1, 1946 (gain, 30 percent)	40,931,000
Dairy cattle:	
Average, 1935–39	35,412,000
Jan. 1, 1946 (gain, 10 percent)	38,860,000
Hogs:	
Average, 1935–39	43,932,000
Jan. 1, 1946 (gain, 42 percent)	62,344,000

It is not true, however, that meat production is failing.

MEAT PRODUCTION

Meat production is up 40 percent from average output for 1935–39.

	Billion pounds
Average, 1935–39	16.2
1946 (estimated)	22.7

Beef production has far outrun the gain in cattle population (1946 (estimated) over average 1935–39):

	Percent gain
All cattle	19
Beef cattle	30
Beef (estimated)	[1] 41
Hogs	42
Pork (estimated pounds)	45

[1] The principal black market has been in cattle and beef.

There is not the slightest evidence in these figures that ceiling prices or the black market are preventing production of meat, or that elimination of meat controls would increase the public's meat supply, or employment in the meat-packing industry.

INCREASED MEAT DEMAND

The existing meat shortage is due wholly to increased meat demand. This comes from three sources:

1. Feeding our allies: We have committed ourselves to export 7 percent of our meat production in 1946.

2. Military needs: Our still substantial armed forces will take 10 percent of our two highest grades of beef in 1946.

3. Increased civilian demand: There has been a vast increase in civilian demand resulting from a doubling of the public's spendable income and an 8,000,000 increase in population.

Public's spendable income

	Billions
1939	$68
1946 (annual rate based on estimate for first quarter)	139

This is the main reason for the greatly increased demand for meat. Many families that before the war could afford meat only once or twice a week now can afford it every day.

Because of this largely increased demand for meat and in spite of the fact that meat production is over 40 percent above prewar 1936–39 levels, there is a severe meat shortage.

Evidence of this is existence of the black market in meat.

We have black markets only when the price level that would be fixed on a commodity by demand and supply is substantially above existing ceiling prices.

Black markets prove the existence of shortages; substantial black markets prove the existence of severe shortages.

Since price control is needed only when demand and supply would lift prices above existing ceilings—and since black markets exist only under such circumstances—it is a strange argument that we should get rid of price control of a commodity because there is a black market.

If we accept the argument, we shall retain price control whenever it is not needed; abolish it whenever the public really needs protection.

RISE IN PRICES IF CONTROLS REMOVED

It is universally agreed that meat prices would go up were meat controls lifted. Estimates of the rise range all the way from 20 to 70 percent.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics, on a statistical calculation, estimates probable increases at from 15 to 20 percent; more on better grades and especially desirable cuts.

Mr. Robert J. Eggert, of the American Meat Institute, stated that prices after decontrol would approximate present black-market prices, which he estimated at 29 percent above present ceiling prices.

OPA does not venture to make a prediction, but offers these facts:

FACTORS AFFECTING PRICE RISE

1. Meat subsidies would have to end were ceiling prices on meat abolished.

2. That alone would increase meat prices to consumers approximately 20 percent.

3. There is a substantial black market in meat.

4. Leading packers are complaining that live cattle are selling at above legitimate prices.

5. How much above the 20-percent rise resulting from subsidy termination, meat prices would go, no one can predict with accuracy.

6. Whatever price rise took place upon removal of controls, in all probability would be increased when livestock liquidation, due to higher grain prices, ends and meat shortages are intensified.

EFFECT OF PRICE RISE

The public is spending approximately $6,500,000,000 for meat.

Various increases would affect the consumer's meat bill as follows:

Meat price rise:	Increase in consumer meat bill
20 percent	$1,300,000,000
30 percent	1,950,000,000
50 percent	3,250,000,000

In any case the increases in the consumer's cost of meat would be substantial.

Meat prices comprise 7.7 percent of the cost of living.

	Percent
Meat costs	7.7
All food costs	40
Other costs	60

A 35-percent rise in meat prices would therefore, increase living costs by 2.7 percent.

But increases in living costs resulting from dropping of meat-price controls would not end there.

Any idea that meat-price ceilings could be lifted and other food controls retained is completely erroneous.

Meat, cereals, poultry, dairy products, and many other prices are inseparably linked through grain prices.

If meat prices go up, there will be serious interference with production unless many other prices of grain-using products follow suit. They just won't get needed grain.

Here is a partial list of products in the cost of producing which grain costs are an important part: Milk, butter, cheese, ice cream, poultry, eggs, flour, bread, cereals, corn meal, corn starch, corn sirup, grain alcohol, beer and spirits, corn oil, macaroni and spaghetti.

A list of products made from corn alone are shown on the following chart (omitted).

Instead of affecting only 19 percent of total food costs, meat price control removal would directly affect more than 60 percent.

Food costs

	Percent
Meats	19
Dairy products	19
Poultry and eggs	9
Cereals	13

Instead of affecting only 7.7 percent of all living costs, it would affect at least 24 percent.

Living costs

	Percent
Meat	7.7
Dairy products	7.5
Cereal and bakery products	5.2
Poultry and eggs	3.6

NEW WAGE DEMANDS

It is highly unlikely that price increases can be allowed in the three basic foods—meat, milk, bread—and in other commodities that together make up 60 percent of all food costs and 24 percent of living costs, without efforts on the part of labor to win compensating wage adjustments.

Elimination of meat controls, with necessary correlary effects, in all probability would initiate a new round of work stoppages, just when industrial peace appears to lie ahead.

It is inconceivable that anyone would consider that to be in the public interest.

FOOD FOR THE STARVING

A principal reason for the difficulties of the Government in buying wheat to make good on its commitments abroad is the great profitability of producing meat, poultry, and dairy products. Even a Government offer of 30 cents per bushel above ceiling prices failed to produce needed wheat.

Seeking to divert grains away from meat production the Government raised grain prices without raising livestock prices.

Lifting meat price ceilings would nullify the effect of this order.

It would make it still harder for the Government to get grain for starving people abroad.

MORE SEVERE SHORTAGES AHEAD

This recent order increasing the price of grains without increasing meat, poultry, and egg prices was intended to bring about a partial liquidation of our animal and poultry population, to make it fit the feed supply that will remain after we keep our commitments abroad.

When this liquidation sets in there will be a temporary increase in meat and poultry supplies. Inevitably, this will result in claims that there is plenty of meat and that controls no longer are necessary.

When liquidation of livestock ends, however, our meat supplies will be reduced well below present levels. That will put still greater pressures upon meat prices, make maintenance of controls that much more necessary.

THE BLACK MARKET

That there is a substantial black market in meat no one will deny. Its extent, however, has been greatly exaggerated.

Black marketeers, it is claimed, offer prices for cattle which do not permit the sale of meat at ceiling prices. Legitimate packers, being restricted by OPA's live cattle regulation in the prices they can offer, do not get cattle. Up to 90 percent of all meat, it is alleged, is being sold in the black market.

What are the facts?

The live cattle regulation went into effect in January 1945.

According to the Department of Agriculture slaughter of cattle in federally inspected plants last year reached an all-time high of 14,538,000 head.

Certainly that does not suggest that the regulation drove cattle into the black market.

The same conclusion may be drawn from these facts.

Percent of cattle killed by federally inspected plants

	Percent
Average 1936–39	66
1944	72.1
1945	71.7

Indications of the extent of noncompliance is provided also by a study of payments made for cattle, as shown on records certified by slaughterers and filed with the Government as a basis for subsidy claims. Falsification in these cases is a violation of the statutes against fraud.

These records show that slaughterers paid for cattle on an average 14 cents per 100 pounds below maximum permissible prices in December 1945, 15 cents below them in January 1946.

The claim is that conditions have grown worse since the first of the year; that legitimate slaughterers have been unable to buy cattle.

Every steer or cow killed by a federally inspected plant is inspected by the Department of Agriculture, which keeps careful records of the kill.

Here is the weekly production of meat in federally inspected plants this year and last year.

Week ended—	*Percent of 1945*
Jan. 5	97.8
Jan. 12	108.7
Jan. 19	[1] 49.1
Jan. 26	[1] 43.9
Feb. 2	113.6
Feb. 9	122.4
Feb. 16	111.6
Feb. 23	101.2
Mar. 2	111.9
Mar. 9	92.1
Mar. 16	90.8
Mar. 23	85.7
Mar. 30	92.4
Apr. 6	92.4
Apr. 13	89.0
Apr. 20	83.3
Apr. 27	88.8
May 4	[2] 98.6
May 11	98.0

[1] Strike in big packing plants. Note high kill in following weeks.

[2] Slaughter-control program went into effect on Apr. 28.

Federally inspected slaughter in the first quarter of 1946 has exceeded that of any first quarter prior to 1944.

Meat produced in Federally inspected plants

[First quarter, each year, in pounds]

1939	2,188,000,000
1940	2,263,000,000
1941	2,374,000,000
1942	2,877,000,000
1943	2,705,000,000
1944	3,241,000,000
1945	3,646,000,000
1946	2,931,000,000

Certainly this reflects no run-away trend to the black market.

The American Meat Institute made a survey of retail meat prices in February, March, and April, 1946. It covered 1,803 stores in 11 cities. Findings reported were:

Percent of stores selling 1 or more cuts at above ceiling prices	83
Percent of meat sold at above ceiling prices	68
Percent of overcharges on violation cases	29
Percent of overcharges on all purchases	20

There is such a wide discrepancy between these findings and OPA compliance checks that we question the methods used in the survey, particularly the attempt to distinguish between grades of cut meat (i. e., AA or A).

Shortly after the Meat Institute survey, OPA's enforcement department made a careful compliance check by meat purchases in Washington, D. C., where the institute had reported bad conditions:

Charges above ceiling prices—all purchases

	Percent
AMI reported	19
OPA found	3½

A March 1946 OPA survey covering 857 stores in 27 representative cities showed 83.2 percent of 4,473 meat cuts priced to sell at ceiling prices.

The record in any case is not good; but not as bad as claimed.

Even if one accepts the American Meat Institute findings at their face value, which we do not for one minute admit, existing price ceilings clearly are giving the public worth-while protection.

Mr. Robert Egbert, of the institute, before the Committee on Agriculture, stated that if meat controls were removed prices in his opinion would rise to the level of black market prices reported by AMI at 29 percent above ceiling prices.

Their survey showed 32 percent of all meat being sold at ceiling prices. Buyers of that meat got full price control protection.

The average charge above ceilings was reported at 20 percent. That is 9 percent below reported black-market prices.

Nine percent of $6,500,000,000—annual meat expenditures of the public—is $585,000,000.

CUSTOM SLAUGHTER RESTRICTION

Instead of surrendering to the black market, OPA set out to check overpricing on the live cattle market.

More and more retailers, wholesalers and club, restaurant and hotel owners were buying cattle and having them custom slaughtered.

These inexperienced buyers, frequently lacking both the skill and inclination to buy cattle in compliance with regulations, put extra pressure on the live cattle market; made it more difficult for law-abiding packers to obtain normal supplies of cattle.

On April 1, OPA restricted custom slaughter to packers who had had licenses for custom slaughtering in 1945 under Control Order No. 1.

SLAUGHTER-CONTROL PROGRAM

In 1945 there was urgent need to channel more cattle and hogs to federally inspected slaughter houses.

They alone were supplying the armed services with needed meat. They alone could legally ship meat across State lines to meet the needs of populous nonproducing areas.

To achieve the needed result a slaughter-control program was adopted. It held packers to quotas based upon their 1944 kill.

Incidentally, it struck a heavy blow against packers who met civilian needs only, but had largely increased their kill by paying above ceiling prices for cattle.

The slaughter-control program of 1945 was abandoned shortly after VJ-day; with reduced meat needs for the armed services.

On April 28, 1946, the program was reestablished to curtail the expanded operations of black marketeers.

It cuts back the cattle and calf kill of all slaughterers to that in the corresponding month of 1944. Hog quotas are set at 90 percent of the corresponding monthly 1944 kill.

The kill of federally inspected plants rose at once from 89 to 99 percent of their 1945 kill, the highest level reached in a 2-month period.

AID TO ENFORCEMENT

The slaughter-control program will greatly aid in the enforcement of ceiling-price regulations.

Detecting on-side payments for cattle has been a time-consuming and difficult task. Under the slaughter-control program investigators will be able to detect violations simply by checking cattle receipts at packing plants.

The new program also limits each slaughterer's subsidy payments to the amount of meat he is entitled to produce. This will strike a body blow to any violators who now claim subsidies.

ENLARGED ENFORCEMENT STAFF

By pushing 350 meat enforcement investigators to the limit from January 1 to April 12, 1946, OPA instituted 1,803 lawsuits against violators of preretail meat and livestock regulations.

Now 400 additional investigators are being added for meat enforcement.

This should more than double the effectiveness of the fight on the black market.

AID FROM OTHER AGENCIES

More than ever before, we have been assured energetic cooperation of other agencies of the Government:

The Department of Agriculture—in the slaughter-control administration in federally inspected plants.

The Treasury department—in tax collections from black marketeers.

The Attorney General's Office—in vigorous prosecution of violators.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation—withholding subsidies from violators.

THE BATTLE IS UNDER WAY

By these steps we are restoring the flow of cattle to legitimate slaughterers.

We are curtailing the growing purchase of cattle by clubs, hotels, restaurants, retailers, and wholesalers, thus relieving pressure on the live-cattle market.

We are making detection of black-market operations far easier.

We are enlarging the army fighting the black market.

Black marketeers will be with us so long as demand and supply would fix meat prices above existing ceiling prices. But we are driving black marketeers to cover and shall pursue them relentlessly so long as meat controls are retained.

The problem is anything but hopeless. It is being solved.

TEST DECONTROL

Some Members of Congress may have been impressed by the suggestion that Congress decontrol meat for a 60- or 90-day test period, restoring controls if meat prices rise excessively.

These serious objections should bar consideration of such a proposal:

1. It would create chaos in milk, butter, cheese, flour, bread, cereal, poultry, and egg production.

2. Temporary price increases would have to be given these products to enable them to compete with meat for grain supplies.

3. Granting and later withdrawing temporary price increases on these products would upset markets; result in excessive speculation.

4. It would make fulfillment of our grain commitments abroad impossible; quite probably result in widespread starvation in famine areas.

5. It would make continuation of meat subsidies impossible, insuring a 20-percent meat price increase apart from any other increases.

6. It would result in dissipation of OPA's administrative and enforcement staff, making restoration of controls difficult and relatively ineffective.

7. Temporary liquidation of livestock resulting from the grain price increase, followed by a more severe meat shortage when liquidation ends, would bar any sound judgment of the long-range effects of decontrol.

8. Even a 60-day test would cost consumers millions of dollars.

HARDSHIP CLAIMS UNJUSTIFIED

Claims that "hundreds of legitimate slaughterers and dealers in meat are unable to stay in business" are unsupported by facts.

Following are earnings of 59 identical companies, representing 70 percent of the volume in the meat-packing industry:

Percent returns before income taxes

Average:	*Sales*	*Net worth*
1936–39	1.0	4.1
1942	2.4	16.4
1943	2.7	19.7
1944	3.3	24.9
1945	1.7	[1] 10.2

[1] Estimated from available returns of 39 companies.

Data on 900 packing companies obtained from the Treasury Department indicate earnings for 1936–39 were essentially the same as for the longer period 1926–39.

Figures below show earnings on separate species and indicate compliance by OPA with the Barkley-Bates amendment.

Return as percentage of sales

July–October 1945:	
Cattle and calves	1.5
Hogs	1.7
Sheep and lambs	1.7
November–December 1945:	
Cattle and calves	1.6
Hogs	0.6
Sheep and lambs	0.9

Facts are lacking on earnings on separate species in the base period. Consequently, we have felt that requirements were met if the return on each species equalled the overall rate of return in the base period.

Because of volume increase, 0.7 percent on sales will return base-period earnings of 4.1 percent on net worth.

All separate species earnings considerably exceed 0.7 percent on sales, save those on hogs in the November to December period, which fell slightly below that figure.

No separate figures are available showing business failures among packing houses or wholesale or retail meat dealers. Total business failures, and failures by manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers are so small, however, as to indicate no serious hardship area in our whole economy.

Business failures:[1]	*1939*	*1945*
Manufacturing and mining	2,919	280
Wholesale trade (all types)	1,534	61
Retail trade (all types)	9,050	300
All failures	14,768	810
Failures first 19 weeks:		
1945		363
1946		384

[1] Dun & Bradstreet figures.

NO SUGGESTION OF HARDSHIP

Early returns on earnings of packing companies for the first quarter of 1946, shows three-quarters of those whose reports are in, earning more than they earned before taxes last year both on sales and on net worth. None reporting to date were in a loss position.

We lack information so far on independent food store operations for 1946; but early returns from retail food store chains show all of them earning substantially more before taxes than they earned last year.

There is not the slightest indication coming in to OPA that packers, wholesalers, and retailers of meat are experiencing financial hardship.

CONCLUSION

Decontrol of meat would—

1. Cause a substantial rise in existing retail meat prices over existing ceiling prices, with no substantial increase in meat supply.
2. Require corresponding increases in the prices of milk, butter, cheese, poultry, eggs, cereals, flour, bread, and many other products.
3. Cause increases affecting 60 percent of all food and 25 percent of all living costs.
4. Make control of fixed price meals in restaurants difficult or impossible.
5. Almost certainly start a new round of wage demands and work stoppages.
6. Make difficult or impossible fulfillment of United States food commitments to save starving people abroad.
7. Bring an end to effective price control.

OPA will never surrender to the black market.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I wish to direct a question to the Senator from Oklahoma, and suggest an amendment to his amendment. The dairy industry and the livestock industry are a little apprehensive about the wording of the amendment, as they think it might affect the Agricultural Marketing Act and the Stockyards and Packers Act. I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment, which I suggest for clarification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, on page 1, after the parentheses, it is proposed to insert "for the purpose of establishing, implementing, or maintaining maximum prices."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the representatives of the dairy interests have consulted me with respect to a clarification of my amendment. It is feared by some that if the amendment should be agreed to and become the law as written, it might interfere with the dairy program with respect to the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937, and also with respect to the Commodity Credit Corporation Act. There is no purpose on my part to interfere with either of those laws. All the amendment intends to do, from my viewpoint, is to take business out from under OPA control. The intent is not to interfere with any law, but take out from under the control of the Office of Price Administration the commodities covered by the amendment. So I am very glad to accept the amendment as a modification of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma accepts the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota as a modification of his amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, yesterday it was suggested that I add the term "sheep and wool" to the amendment. The amendment already refers to livestock. I am clear in my own mind that livestock covers sheep, and sheep, of course, are very closely allied to wool, because wool is a product of sheep; that is, as we understand wool.

In order to make this so clear that it cannot be misconstrued, I shall suggest a modification. When Congress employs a term covering a group of commodities, and thereafter enumerates some of the commodities, the courts hold that the makers of the law intended to include only the items mentioned. For fear that some court might hold that "livestock" was meant by the Congress to include only cattle, which is not true, as the intention is to cover all livestock animals, I wish further to modify my amendment offered yesterday by adding the word "including" before the words "sheep and wool," so that it will read "livestock, including sheep and wool."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has presented a comprehensive list of products to be decontrolled by act of Congress. I think it is well to say that this list of products encompasses much of the foodstuff of the Nation. It includes other materials as well very vital and fundamental to the forward progress of a reconverted American economy.

Anyone who heard the presentation by the Senator from Oklahoma yesterday of the reasons why he proposes decontrol of each of these commodities is bound to admit, because it has not been controverted, as yet, at least, that the test of decontrol has been met at the present time in our recovery, as announced by all the high Government officials in times past when controls were set up in our economy.

Beginning in 1941, when controls were instituted, we find a statement of Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, as follows:

> Our objective, therefore, must be to see that inflation arising from the abuse of power to increase prices because the supply is limited and the demand inflexible, does not occur during the present emergency.

He made further statements, and I quote one more:

> When the war is won, the powers under which I act automatically revert to the people—to whom they belong.

From the time of that statement, at the inception of OPA and price control, down to the present time, we have seen a strange transition of attitude. I say, Mr. President, that from price control as conceived at the beginning of the war as an emergency matter; to prevent runaway inflation, the philosophy which now permeates the bureaus and departments of the Government is that they should resist any release of price control, and they are in fact advocating control of the American economy for an indefinite period in the future.

The final proof of that, in my judgment, was had before the Committee on Banking and Currency on the last day of its hearings. One of the very last statements made by the officials of the OPA seems to be convincing. Let me read the statement. On the last day of the hearing, in answer to a question of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], Mr. Porter, the present Administrator of OPA, following a long line of questioning on the philosophy of OPA, said:

> I would say that we are in the business of keeping the law of supply and demand from working. There is no question about that.

Mr. President, I have here a compilation of statements of Government officials with respect to price control, giving verbatim quotations from such statements from time to time during the emergency, beginning with the statement of President Roosevelt in 1941 and ending with the ominous statement of Mr. Porter just a few days ago. Since I have only 30 minutes, in order to conserve my time, I ask unanimous consent that this compilation of statements be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> President Roosevelt, on July 30, 1941, transmitted to Congress a message setting forth the necessity for, and requesting the enactment by Congress of, legislation providing for the control of prices.

The message said, in part:

"Our objective, therefore, must be to see that inflation arising from the abuse of power to increase prices because the supply is limited and the demand inflexible, does not occur during the present emergency.

"Legislation should include authority to establish ceilings for prices and rents.

"Like other defense legislation, it should expire with the passing of the need, within a limited time after the end of the emergency."

President Roosevelt, on September 7, 1941, transmitted to Congress a message setting forth the urgent necessity of providing for the further control of prices and the authorization of the President to stabilize the cost of living, including the prices on all farm commodities. This message, which discussed the urgent war needs, price controls and production, was set forth in the report of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to aid in stabilizing the cost of living, recommending that the joint resolution do pass.

The President's message, set forth on page 5 of the report, said in part:

"When the war is won, the powers under which I act automatically revert to the people—to whom they belong."

Chester Bowles, in a letter to all members of OPA advisory committees (October 1944), part of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 11, 1945:

"We have always looked upon price control as a stopgap, a stabilizing wartime control, to be dropped as soon as production brings supply and demand reasonably in balance."

Chester Bowles, in letter to Senator BARKLEY, June 16, 1945:

"Price controls were developed solely to meet wartime conditions. We are pledged to remove these controls just as soon as the production of civilian goods and services eliminates the inflationary dangers and permits our return to a free market."

Chester Bowles, before Senate Committee on Small Business, December 4, 1945:

"We shall remove them (price ceilings), product by product, as soon as it can be done without inflation."

Chester Bowles, in testimony on OPA bill before House committee, February 20, 1946:

"Mr. CRAWFORD. Would you care to go on record * * * that when supply reaches balance with demand, that you feel there would no longer be a material necessity for the Office of Price Administration?

"Mr. BOWLES. Generally, when supply and demand is in balance, I believe that is correct.

"Mr. CRAWFORD. Remove controls at that time?

"Mr. BOWLES. Yes; and I think that point will certainly come, area by area, at different periods."

Chester Bowles, in speech before New Council of American Business, December 1945:

We need to "maintain firm price controls on all commodities * * * until the dangers of inflation in each commodity field * * * is over. * * * In determining the time at which controls should be removed there are no magic dates * * * it depends upon the speed with which supply comes into balance with demand * * * we should remove controls * * * in one commodity field and rental area after another as soon as it is safe to do so."

Decontrol Order 68 of the Office of Economic Stabilization provides for—

Suspension of price control of any commodity is authorized when in the Price Administrator's judgment the price will not go up.

Termination of control is later authorized if the price in fact does not go up, or threatens to do so.

Decontrol may also be adopted when (1) a commodity does not enter significantly into the cost of living or into business costs; (2) when the administrative difficulties are disproportionate to the effect of this control or to the contributing or contribution of stabilization; and (3) when there is no threat to substantial diversion of materials, facilities, or manpower from production of other commodities.

Secretary Anderson before the House committee on the OPA bill testified on March 7, in part:

"Mr. BROWN. But do you not agree with me now that when the supply of any commodity equals the demand, that the ceilings should be taken off that particular commodity?

"Secretary ANDERSON. I would normally do that. But I want to say that there have been a lot of food conditions developing recently which make it hard to calculate what the real supply is. I know of no one who can calculate for me what the demand for food is in the United States at this time."

In the afternoon session of the committee, James F. Brownlee, Deputy Administrator of Economic Stabilization testified:

"Mr. FOLGER. I believe Mr. Bowles said—and I may be mistaken—that the policy would be that we would remove price controls and price ceilings as supply came substantially in balance with demand. That is what you say?

"Mr. BROWNLEE. That is right, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you as a practical matter, Mr. Brownlee, how is that to be determined? Is that easily to be arrived at?

"Mr. BROWNLEE. Not too easy, as the Secretary said this morning, because you are never quite sure what the demand is. That is why we feel there is some possibility of telling when they are relatively in balance at the ceiling-price level. When your pressure is not great against the ceiling, it would indicate you are relatively in balance."

Secretary Anderson in testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture, April 5, 1946:

"Chairman FLANNAGAN. Several months ago Mr. Bowles assured us that when the supply level reached the demand level ceilings would come off; would you favor that?

"Secretary ANDERSON. If there was a reasonable closeness of supply and demand on other types of food as well—not all of them, but something reasonably along that line, yes, I would."

Marriner Eccles, Chairman, Federal Reserve Board, before House Committee on Banking and Currency, February 25, 1946:

"I think we should maintain controls until the supply comes into balance, or reasonable balance, with the demand."

Fred M. Vinson, Secretary of the Treasury, House committee March 27, 1946:

"I would say that if supply were in balance with demand controls could well be taken off. * * * I think you should know that the supply was equal to the demand—industry by industry."

John W. Snyder, Director of Reconversion, House committee, February 27, 1946:

"They [price controls] should be dropped on each product as soon as supply is in reasonable balance with demand."

Zenas L. Potter, Special Assistant to the Price Administrator, in a speech before Marketing Conference, United States Chamber of Commerce, February 25, 1946:

"The demand we must balance to get rid of controls, without inflation is not the demand of 1939, but demand on a new and much higher level * * * if all we had to do was to balance the 1939 demand for goods, we would be out of many controls by now, for in November 1945 we produced goods at a greater rate than ever was reached when the Nation was not actively at war. * * * Our task obviously is not to produce goods enough to balance the 1939 demand. We must instead enlarge our output to meet a new high level of buying power." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 14, 1946, p. A1420.)

Paul A. Porter, Price Administrator, before House committee, March 29, 1946:

"The CHAIRMAN. Do you think there can be any definite policy written into the law with reference to decontrol that will not impair the usefulness of the continued operation of price control?

"Mr. PORTER. If it were possible to put into legislative form the policies to which I undertook to give expression here today we, in the agency have no quarrel with that, but * * * if you take some mathematical standard or some relationship between supply and demand, * * * I think we are in trouble, and quite naturally, it is an old bureaucratic custom to say that we would prefer to do it administratively.

"The CHAIRMAN. When supply comes into balance with demand the ceilings will automatically become ineffective, will they not?

"Mr. PORTER. * * * with the pressures and purchasing power that now exists * * * the cumulative demand of 4 years of war * * * if you take a 1939 standard or 1936–39 and say when production got to that level * * * in some particular items, * * * you run into grave difficulty.

"Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, if we meet the demand, if we brought supply into balance with demand, then of course we recognize that there would be no longer any necessity for price control or subsidies or anything else. I think we can agree on that. Everybody else has.

"Mr. PORTER. Well, I would like to take a look at the situation 6 months from now when this production gets going and see—

"Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, now, wait a minute, Mr. Porter. If you do not believe that, do you believe in perpetuating price control?

"Mr. PORTER. No; I do not."

Paul Porter and Arvil Erikson of OPA in testimony before Senate committee record pages 1812–1813:

"Senator MILLIKEN. In this instance (meat livestock), supply and demand can be in balance, but you will not permit it to be in balance, because if you do permit it to be in balance the price will rise?

"Mr. ERIKSON. I think that is true of any commodity.

"Mr. PORTER. It is the same situation as if a manufacturer were withholding goods.

"Senator MILLIKEN. And it is perfectly apparent that you will never decontrol if you do not allow enough supply to balance demand.

"Mr. ERIKSON. Correct. It is a question of time.

"Senator MILLIKEN. It seems to me that there is a vast difference between inflation and a rise in price which is controlled and is realistic. It does follow that when you maintain a fictitious price level which is not up with the realities of the situation you are not maintaining price control; you are maintaining a fiction.

"Mr. PORTER. I would say that we are in the business of keeping the law of supply and demand from working. There is no question about that."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] pointed out yesterday that supply is in excess of prewar figures in the commodities and in the fields he proposes to decontrol. If so, the time is either rapidly approaching or it is now on hand in the American economy when the law of supply and demand should, in these fields of food and necessities, begin to operate. I take it that that is the

object of the amendment and the decontrols proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma. With his ambition to return the American economy to a system of free competitive enterprise, to permit the law of supply and demand to operate, to let commodities and consumers' goods find their own level in a free working economy, I find myself in sympathy.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] a moment ago made an impassioned plea in connection with which he made a number of statements with which I am bound to take issue. I have the utmost faith in the personal sincerity of the Senator from California. I quarrel with his statement because I quarrel with the sources from which I believe he obtained his information and the sources upon which he relied. I do not criticize him for his reliance, but I disagree with the accuracy of the statements of his informers, and therefore I should like to address myself briefly to a few of those matters.

In the first place, the Senator from California, I am sure with sincerity, said that the livestock producers are holding back their livestock from the market. On Tuesday of this week I placed in the RECORD the latest figures of cattle receipts, for instance, in the 12 most important public markets in the United States. Those figures begin with the week ending April 6 and end with the week ending June 8 of this year. The figures show that for the week ending June 8, last Saturday, in the 12 most important public markets in the United States, a total of 156,500 cattle had been received, which was a greater number of cattle than was received in 3 out of the 4 weeks in May last. There is no evidence there, Mr. President, that the stock feeder is holding back his cattle off the market for an anticipated raise.

I placed in the RECORD last Tuesday figures showing what is happening to the cattle market, for instance, because in the meat field it is the beef production that is causing the most trouble. Those figures show, beginning in January and ending on June 8, that consistently the price of beef cattle on the central market has been substantially above the maximum price that a legitimate packer can pay and stay in compliance with OPA regulations. The figures as they are produced and analyzed show that the legitimate packer cannot buy on today's market and sell under OPA price regulations and stay in business. They show that the overriding ceiling, that is the average ceiling price of the market, is in excess of his legitimate authority to pay. That is an anomalous situation apparently, but this is how it comes about: OPA has a ceiling on cattle, for instance. They say to a legitimate packer or to any packer who wants subsidies from the American Government, and who must have them if he operates within the regulations, "The adjusted average yield price is $16.70 per hundredweight for double A grade steers." The packer can pay more than that, but if he buys one steer for more than $16.70 he must thereafter buy another steer for at least as much below $16.70 as he exceeded the price on the first steer. He must maintain that level average or he is out of compliance under Government regulations, and thereby has his subsidy withdrawn.

The black market operator or the federally inspected operator who is not concerned with Federal subsidy, who does not have to have it, apparently, because he is dealing in devious ways in the channel of meat distribution, can pay $18 for cattle. He is not concerned with the subsidy because he is not concerned with the price at which he sells. The black marketeer may be a federally inspected packer, and often is, so far as inspection is concerned, but that ends the Federal supervision. His sale and distribution of meat are under no Federal inspection, and that is why such meat is sold at high prices and why it gets into the black market.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] put a most significant article into the RECORD. I shall not read it. It is contained in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I shall not ask to have it reprinted in today's RECORD, but I want to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the significant statements contained in this newspaper story, which appears on page 6708 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is a news story from last Sunday's edition of the Boston Sunday Post, that of June 9. It is entitled "Black Market Corners Meat." The headlines in this story are as follows:

Black market corners meat—Legitimate butcher shops experience worst day in Hub history—No beef, lamb, or pork in them—Black marketers supply beef at $1.25 a pound—No relief in sight this week—Hospitals appeal to officials, but turned down flat.

Then follows a quotation of the black-market prices which the newspaper has found in Boston. The article proceeds:

With the legitimate markets cleaned out of all meats and with only a little poultry and prepared meats left, black marketers picked the purses of everyone who bought meat yesterday for Sunday dinner, getting as high as $1.25 a pound for beef.

Another statement is:

Boston market men who have avoided black market operations declared that last week was the worst week in the history of the Boston market, and that yesterday was the worst day.

Further on the article says:

It was made plain in Boston that the only market left is the black market, and that the only market men getting meat are paying black-market prices to get it and selling it at black-market mark-ups.

Mr. President, I urge every Member of the Senate to read that article, because it is typical of the findings of newspapers and fact hunters throughout the United States today. The black market has taken over the most important field of human food, that of meat and the products that go into its preparation and that are allied with it.

Mr. President, my time is short, but I should like to call attention to one or two other most ominous things. I shall have later in the day an up-to-date report on one of the most serious situations that confronts the country as a result of the mishandling and the maladministration of the food problem by OPA, and that is the situation which exists with respect to pharmaceuticals needed for maintaining public health.

It is reliably stated, in my opinion, that today the black market, through its surreptitious practices, its concealment of its operations, and its general activities, is wasting in the neighborhood of 15 percent of the food meat which it handles. We know that through black-market operations we are losing the hides for shoes. They are thrown away or buried. We know that through black-market operations we are losing what is called the offal, the refuse from the meat, which was formerly made into proteins and stock feeds. But the most ominous thing is that the great remedies for serious human ills which are made from the glands of the animals and the other byproducts of legitimate slaughtering operations have practically disappeared from the American market, because the black market throws such byproducts away.

I call attention to the fact that the insulin bank is scraping the bottom. I call attention to the fact that those who are suffering from Addison's disease cannot get the necessary medicines, which come from animal products, to combat that disease. I call attention to the fact that those who are suffering from anemia in its various forms cannot get liver extract, which comes from animal products.

I have reason to believe that these facts are known to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of Agriculture. I know from my own knowledge that they have been pointedly called to the attention of OPA officials, and that they have never been denied or controverted by those officials.

Later in the day I expect to have an up-to-the-minute report from various pharmaceutical houses. I have before me a sheaf of telegrams about 10 days old, from pharmaceutical manufacturers who make about 40 percent of the pharmaceuticals to which I have referred. They point out the ominous shortage which is facing us. That shortage is the direct result of OPA's mishandling of the meat situation. I shall not take the time, in this limited period, to read these telegrams, but I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams from the pharmaceutical houses be placed in the RECORD; and as soon as I receive the other telegrams containing today's report, I should like to have them placed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH CHICAGO, ILL., *May 14, 1946.*

Hon. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,

Senate Office Building, Washington D. C.:

For many months we have found it impossible to satisfy essential pharmaceutical products purchased from the packing industry, such as glandular products, liver, thyroid, pancreas, pituitaries, parathyroids, suprarenals, bile, ovarian, also pepsin, and numerous other items because of their drastically curtailed production owing to their inability to purchase livestock currently most acute

traceable to black-market operations and urge that all OPA controls be removed from livestock and meat so that the packing industry can obtain needed raw material to make essential medicinals required to protect national health. Varied industries are largely dependent on legitimate meat-packing companies for innumerable items; shortage becoming alarmingly acute.

ABBOTT LABORATORIES,
E. L. DRACH,
Director of Purchases.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *May 14, 1946.*
Hon. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Our supplies of animal glands for essential drugs are not adequate. During past 2 years have had almost constant decline of receipts which has accelerated recently and is especially acute in beef glands. Our principal suppliers of long standing almost universally advise reason is because of inability to handle normal beef slaughter and stay in compliance with present regulations. The general feeling we gather is that removal of OPA restrictions would correct situation. Unless something is done very soon suffering will result and this causes us to recommend prompt action of some sort so that legitimate meat-packing industry can supply nor-

ELI LILLY & CO.,
I. J. KLINGAMAN.

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 14, 1946.*
Hon. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

As a manufacturer of medicinal products for physicians' use we have been unable to obtain even a small portion of the supplies we normally get from the meat packers of this country and, as a consequence, have had to shut down our production most of the time and deny the physicians the products they use to maintain the Nation's health. We believe this is entirely due to black-market operations and that the only solution is the removal of OPA control of livestock. We hope you will act to this end so that essential medicinals will be available to the doctors of this country.

G. D. SEARLE & CO.,
JOHN G. SEARLE,
President.

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 14, 1946.*
Hon. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington D. C.:

As a member of the pharmaceutical industry whose business is partially dependent upon a supply of material from the packing industry, we exhort you to take all necessary steps, including removal of OPA control, should that be necessary, to secure an adequate supply of livestock for the legitimate packing industry which is penalized under current black-market operations. Unless an adequate supply of livestock is secured a great many American lives will be lost due to lack of therapeutic agents developed from special tissues of animal origin for which there is no substitute.

BAXTER LABS, INC.,
N. M. NESSETT,
Vice President.

NORWICH, CONN., *May 16, 1946.*
Hon. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:

We strongly urge that all OPA controls be removed from livestock and meat so that we can obtain raw materials to make essential medicines. This is most important for the welfare and health of all citizens.

M. C. EATON,
President, the Norwich Pharmacal Co.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 17, 1946.*
Hon. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In interest of national health relief is necessary to overcome very serious shortage of medicinal glandular products such as liver, bile, and pancreas obtained from livestock now not obtainable due to black-market operations.

PHILADELPHIA DRUG EXCHANGE,
J. MERVIN ROSENBERGER, *Secretary.*

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In the field of public health and the medicinal treatment of those afflicted with certain diseases, the officials of the Government who permit the black market in animal products to continue to operate, who continue to deny to the American people the relief which medical science has brought to those who heretofore had no hope, will have upon their own heads the blood of those who suffer. They have been forewarned before this. This is not the first time they have known this. The facts have been proved, and are incontrovertible.

Why is there a shortage of meat in legitimate channels? We have meat. There is no one in Washington who cannot buy meat if he is willing to contribute to law violation. There are black markets in this city, as there are black markets in every town of any size in the United States. A great many people do not deal with black-market stores. Many stores attempt to operate on a legitimate basis and refuse to operate longer if they must deal with the black market. A thousand stores in the city of Brooklyn took this position 2 weeks ago.

We do not have meat, Mr. President, for several reasons. In the first place, no legitimate packer who is dependent upon subsidies for his existence can buy at OPA ceilings and sell at OPA ceilings and survive. That is amply shown by the records. Let me call attention to some figures. The latest figures I have are for the week ending June 8. They show the operations of the 10 leading packers in this country who prior to the war slaughtered, processed, and sold commercially over the United States more than 75 percent of all the meat eaten by the American people. During the week ending June 8 they were able to buy and process only 24 percent of the total slaughter.

Traditionally between 75 and 78 percent of the cattle shipped to central markets in the United States were slaughtered at the point of sale. Today, only approximately one-fourth of the cattle shipped to central markets are slaughtered there, the remainder being sent out on the purchases of so-called order buyers, who buy at the central markets and then mysteriously ship the cattle to some unknown destination where presumably—and I think it is a sound presumption—the cattle are slaughtered in the black market and sold to the American people at high prices.

The fact is that cattle shipments to the central markets have not fallen off appreciably. The shipment of hogs has not fallen off to any degree which would account for the meat shortage. The meat shortage is confined to legitimate outlets, and not to black-market outlets. I believe that as firmly as I believe anything in this whole controversy.

I believe that our objective should be to get food and necessities to the average American citizen. If he has buying power today, and must pay from $1.25 to $1.50 a pound for better cuts of beefsteak, and if the ceiling is 50 cents a pound, he had better pay 60 or 65 cents a pound through a legitimate uncontrolled market, without OPA regulation and strangulation, than to pay twice that amount in the black market in order to get the products he needs to sustain his own life and the lives of members of his family. If he needs a cheap shirt he had better pay $2 for what he used to get for $1.50 than be compelled to buy a sport shirt for $5 or $8 in order to get a shirt to put on his back. His wife had better pay $2.50 for a house dress for which she used to pay $1.80, than be compelled to pay $8 for a house dress which does her no more good than the $1.80 house dress bought before the war.

Our obligation and our job is to bring about the distribution of the necessities of life for the American people, at reasonable prices based upon costs. Our job is to prevent the activities of the black market in all fields of necessities for the common man and the common woman, and to establish a reasonable and decent balance of exchange under the law of supply and demand.

I believe that the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma is not unreasonable. I think some of the things he has covered have already been covered. But, by and large, as I see it, his amendment touches the every-day necessities of our average American economy.

A moment ago the Senator from California called attention to a pamphlet issued by the OPA. The pamphlet is interesting. I have a copy of it, and I have examined it with care. It has been referred to in the debate and it has been placed in the RECORD. The title page contains the statement, "Prepared for the Senate Banking and Currency Committee by the Office of Price Administration, Paul A. Porter, Administrator, May 1946." I should be glad to have every Member of the Senate examine the pamphlet. It is one of the most startling things I have seen. Let me say first that it is printed in very large type, either in anticipation of myopia on the part of the Members who would read it, or for some other peculiar reason. As I have gone through the pamphlet, I have found that it is printed in greatly exaggerated letters, and there are only a few statements on each page. I took the trouble to examine the pamphlet carefully, to see what the OPA is doing by way of propaganda.

In the first place, let me say that Mr. Porter never submitted himself to cross examination on the statements and conclusions which he has placed in this pamphlet. I find that there are 42 pages in the pamphlet; and by counting the number of words on the 42 pages, I have found that the average number of words on each page is from 75 to 80. This new technique of saying things in "loud"

figures and "loud" letters can only be explained, to my mind, by recalling one of the sayings of a famous man, to the effect that if you say a certain thing loud enough and long enough, people will believe you.

Mr. President, I say that the pamphlet, to which the Senator from California referred, and upon which he relies, and I do not blame him for relying upon it unless he further investigates as to the facts—is full of inaccuracies and is not sustained by the facts. I have attempted to analyze the pamphlet. I now hold in my hand an analysis of it. In the analysis, I have placed on the left-hand side of the page the statements made in the pamphlet, and I have placed on the right-hand side of the page the facts in relation to the statements. I ask unanimous consent that the analysis, together with an attached preliminary statement, may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis and preliminary statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD MEAT CONTROLS BE ABOLISHED?

On May 25, 1946, the Office of Price Administration prepared and distributed to members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and Members of Congress a document titled "Should Meat Controls Be Abolished?"

Apparently this document is the agency's reply to testimony of numerous livestock producers, livestock feeders, meat packers, distributors, and retail dealers given before the House Banking and Currency Committee, the House Committee on Agriculture, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency establishing the existence of a country-wide, scandalous, and growing black market in meat.

All the witnesses agreed and both agricultural committees found that the only way to eliminate the black market was to remove subsidies and all ceilings and controls from livestock and meat.

If the Office of Price Administration believed that the testimony given by the livestock and meat industry was not true or that the remedy proposed (removal of controls) not proper, it had the opportunity and the duty to present contrary evidence to one or all of the four congressional committees. In fact, it was expressly requested to do so by both Agriculture Committees and members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Instead of producing witnesses and other evidence to the committees, the Office of Price Administration has elected to stand upon this document, which is answered as follows:

ANSWER TO OPA STATEMENT OF MAY 25, 1946, "SHOULD MEAT PRICE CONTROLS BE ABOLISHED?"

Livestock producers and feeders, marketing agencies, meat processors, and retailers the country over are asking the Congress to remove all controls on the livestock and meat industry. They believe the following statement by high Government officials very well applies to the present meat situation:

"The interests of the American people would be better served by eliminating price control entirely rather than encouraging the false sense of security which would result from a mere illusion of price control." (From annual report to the President of the United States, April 18, 1946, signed by Messrs. Bowles, Porter, Wirz, Small, and Anderson.)

The OPA says it "will never surrender to the black market."

The livestock and meat industry has shown through facts presented to congressional committees and to the public that:

The OPA has already surrendered to the black market in meat.

After hearing and investigating these facts fully, the Senate Agriculture Committee found:

"Four years of experience with Government controls, culminating in the present scandalous situation, shows conclusively the impossibility of controlling livestock and meat prices and meat distribution through Government laws, regulations, and directives, and any new or reinstated controls on the livestock and meat industry can only create greater confusion and further impede maximum production and legitimate slaughtering and distribution.

"Removal of price controls and subsidies from livestock and meat will stimulate the marketing of livestock and the production of meat, drive the black-market operators out of business, save untold waste, safeguard the public health, and make a large supply of meat available to all at a competitive price which will be lower than consumers are now paying as a result of the black market and subsidies."

And concluded by answering the OPA question as follows:

"This committee recommends that all price controls and subsidies on livestock and edible products derived therefrom be removed at once." (Interim Report No. 1295, May 2, 1946.)

Answers to specific points made in this OPA statement follow:

OPA says: 1. "It is not true * * * that meat production is failing" (p. 2).

The facts are: Meat production is at a high level but it would have been greater except for the confusion and uncertainty arising from price and subsidy controls and changes, and the black market:

(a) Black-market waste of variety meats, fats, protein feeds, hides, and other by-products would have been avoided.

(b) Beef calves in great numbers would not have been slaughtered, but grown on grass and roughage and fed out to make a much larger tonnage of beef. Slaughter of veal calves increased from 9.1 million head in 1940 to 13.6 in 1944.

(c) More cattle would have been fed and for more normal, longer periods to make more beef with a more efficient use of grain.

(d) More meat would have been produced if extremely heavy hogs had not been encouraged by OPA ceilings, for the corn would have to be used to feed more hogs to a medium weight, or to produce beef.

OPA says: 2. "Meat production figures on increase 1946 over 1935–39" (p. 3).

The facts are: These figures show the increase that occurred despite controls, but give no indication of what production might have been * * * nor can it be inferred from such data that elimination of controls would not help production.

OPA says: 3. "The existing meat shortage is due wholly to increased meat demand" (p. 4).

The facts are: Of course the demand has increased but the shortage is no more due to a high demand than to a failure of supply to increase with the demand * * * which it could have done more nearly except for production discouragement under OPA.

OPA says: 4. "Black markets prove the existence of shortages; substantial black markets prove the existence of severe shortages" (p. 5).

The facts are: Black markets prove price ceilings are not protecting the public; substantial black markets as in meat prove that controls are unenforceable, have broken down and are pure fiction.

OPA says: 5. "It is a strange argument that we should get rid of price control of a commodity because there is a black market" (p. 7).

The facts are: It is not strange when the black market is as bad as in meat—it is realistic. Meat price ceilings are not protecting the public. Four years of experience, and the present critical situation, show that livestock and meat prices cannot be controlled. Therefore, controls should be removed.

OPA says: 6. "It is universally agreed that meat prices would go up were meat controls lifted" (p. 8).

The facts are: It is not agreed that prices being paid by consumers for meat would go up if controls were eliminated. The best evidence shows that without controls the public would pay no more for meat than it is now paying on the average, including the black market. The subsidy of about 5 cents a pound, which the public must pay, therefore would be saved. Only so-called reported prices would go up.

OPA says: 7. "The Bureau of Agricultural Economics, on a statistical calculation, estimates probable increases at from 15 to 20 percent; more on better grades and especially desirable cuts" (p. 8).

The facts are: More recently the BAE of USDA in April 1946 Demand and Price Situation, said:

"Current forecasts of disposable consumer income and prospective civilian meat supplies for the second half of 1946 indicate that prices of meat at retail for that period would average 15 to 20 percent above present reported levels if price ceilings on meat and live animals were removed."

This means 15 to 20 percent above ceilings, since reported (BLS) prices are essentially at ceiling levels.

OPA says: 8. "Mr. Robert J. Eggert of the American Meat Institute stated that prices after decontrol would approximate present black market prices which he estimated at 29 percent above present ceiling levels" (p. 8).

The facts are: Mr. Eggert stated that after decontrol meat prices during the last 6 months of 1946 would approximate present actual prices being paid for meat on the average, including meat selling under the ceiling, at the ceiling, and over the ceiling, which in late February was found to be 8 cents a pound or 20 percent above OPA ceilings—not 29 percent which was the overcharge on only the meat selling over the ceiling. This statement was based on the following important factors:

1. Government reports showing largest per capita civilian meat supply in 35 years.
2. Increasing supply of durable goods.
3. Near record supplies of poultry and eggs.
4. Some kinds of meat already below ceilings.
5. Elimination of inefficiency and waste of black market and resulting better distribution of meat.
6. Price consciousness and more careful, competitive shopping by housewives.
7. United States Department of Agriculture official statements on meat prices.
8. High livestock population making large potential supply of meat available.

OPA says: 9. "Meat subsidies would have to end were ceiling prices abolished. That alone would increase meat prices to consumers approximately 20 percent" (p. 9).

The facts are: Eliminating meat subsidies would not increase the real cost of meat. The price might go up as an offset, but the taxpayers' burden would be decreased proportionately. The actual price of meat is already at least 20 percent above ceiling and the United States Department of Agriculture estimates the meat subsidy at only 10 to 15 percent.

Subsidies on livestock and meat are now about $750,000,000, annual basis, which would be only 12 percent of the OPA's estimated $6,500,000,000 annual public spending for meat (p. 10).

OPA says: 10. "There is a substantial black market in meat" (p. 9).

The facts are: True, but a conservative statement, considering all evidence. More important, it is beyond control.

OPA says: 11. "Leading packers are complaining that live cattle are selling at above legitimate prices" (p. 9).

The facts are: Yes, live cattle are selling at above legitimate prices—and after 4 weeks of the OPA's last ineffective effort to control the black market in cattle and beef—Slaughter Control Order No. 2—10 legitimate national packers in the week ending May 25, 1946, were able to buy and slaughter only 37 percent as many cattle as a year earlier and only 33 percent of their quota under the order. The situation was no better than in the last week of April before the control order.

OPA says: 12. "Whatever price rise took place upon removal of controls, in all probability would be increased when livestock liquidation, due to higher grain prices, end and meat shortages are intensified" (p. 9).

The facts are: Regardless of grain prices, cattle will not be marketed in large numbers or liquidated until the end of the grass season—and the feed and price situation then (not now or this summer) will determine production plans.

It would appear the OPA is hazarding to predict, if not create, another meat crisis next spring in the face of optimistic prospects for hay, roughage, and other livestock feed production—notwithstanding its demonstrated inability to control the price or distribution of meat.

Only a good fall pig crop and a good volume of efficient, normal-period cattle feeding can produce a reasonable supply of meat in the spring. Removal of controls would encourage maximum production consistent with feed supplies.

OPA says: 13. "A meat price rise of 20 percent would increase the consumer meat bill by $1,300,000,000" (p. 10).

The facts are: This checks closely with the statement of the American Meat Institute that consumers are paying $1,250,000,000 over ceilings for meat per annum as a result of meat prices averaging 20 percent over ceilings as shown by surveys made for them by reliable independent market research agencies.

OPA says: 14. "A 35 percent rise in meat prices would therefore increase living costs by 2.7 percent" (p. 11).

The facts are: But OPA says "No one can predict with accuracy" how much prices would rise (p. 9), yet it proceeds to illustrate with the high figure of 35 percent.

Secondly, the rise would not affect the actual cost of living unless it exceeded the present actual price of meat, including black-market meat.

As a matter of fact, an increase of 35 percent in reported or ceiling meat prices, would not increase the cost of meat to the public. The subsidy amounts to 12 percent and consumers are already paying in excess of 20 percent over the ceilings—a total of over 32 percent.

OPA says: 15. "Any idea that meat price ceilings could be lifted and other food controls retained is completely erroneous" (p. 12).

The facts are: This assumes there now is effective price control on meat, but actually price controls on meat have completely broken down and the black market has taken over. Meat is already competing with other foods on a black market meat price basis. Therefore, removal of meat price controls would not disrupt the relationship of meat and other things as it really exists.

OPA says 16. "Meat, cereal, poultry, dairy products, and many other prices are inseparably linked through grain prices" (p. 12).

The facts are: Inseparability of this kind certainly was not recognized when ceilings on these various products were established at different times and at different levels compared with normal.

OPA shows: 17. Charts showing so-called inseparable link between meat prices and other products (pp. 13, 14).

The facts are: It is unreasonable to say for example that if meat controls are lifted the price of eggs would have to rise—especially considering the egg surplus situation.

It is fantastic to even suggest that if meat controls are lifted, taxi rates or gun-cotton production would be affected.

OPA says: 18. "Elimination of meat controls with necessary correlary effects in all probability would initiate a new round of work stoppages; just when industrial peace appears to lie ahead" (p. 16).

The facts are: Again, this incorrectly assumes that meat prices would rise above present actual levels, and fails to recognize the rampant black-market prices and waste that would be eliminated with the lifting of controls.

Furthermore, one week's wage income of industrial workers, according to Government statistics, in 1945, would buy 56 percent more pork chops, 69 percent more round steak, and 79 percent more sliced ham than in 1939. This shows that meat is cheap relative to wages. This would still be true at black-market meat prices.

Finally, it is questionable if May 25, 1946, was "just when industrial peace appears to lie ahead."

OPA says: 19. "Food for the starving" (p. 17).

The facts are: OPA cleverly confuses the use of an important food grain (wheat) with feed grains principally used for livestock feed (corn, oats, grain, sorghums). Only small amounts of wheat are normally used for feed and if the OPA had been realistic and raised the wheat price last fall, instead of belatedly, much of the wheat feeding that did occur could have been avoided. OPA also overlooks the effect that a $2,000,000,000 food subsidy program has actually encouraged food consumption.

OPA says: 20. "Seeking to divert grains away from meat production the Government raised grain prices without raising livestock prices" (p. 17).

The facts are: Yes; locked the door after the horse was stolen. After many months of excessive use of corn in feeding hogs to heavy weights, 40 pounds above prewar, the OPA raised corn prices and started a meat scarcity program in the face of good prospects for a large feed crop production in 1946.

This policy overlooks completely the experience after World War I when the great need was for building proteins as soon as the immediate emergency, such as now exists was passed.

It also overlooks the use that cattle can make of grass and roughage with the addition of very small amounts of grain, and that hogs produce 201 nutritive units from a unit of land resource compared with only 181 for corn meal and 123 for white flour, according to the United States Department of Agriculture, May 1943, "using resources to meet food needs."

OPA says: 21. "Lifting meat price ceilings would nullify the effect of this order. It would make it still harder for the Government to get grain for starving people abroad" (p. 17).

The facts are: Wheat is wanted for relief. It is to be obtained, apparently, by Government order rather than through prices. The price increase on corn is generally thought to have about matched the black-market price already existing on corn, 90 percent of which was reported to have been moving only at black-market prices.

OPA says: 22. "More severe shortages ahead" (p. 18).

The facts are: If OPA could run the production of the Nation as this suggests, it would be permanently necessary, unless it should decide to promote more feed production instead of less meat.

Because of the situation created by OPA farmers planned to plant only 93,000,000 corn acres this year compared with 113,000,000 in 1932.

OPA says: 23. "When liquidation of livestock ends, however, our meat supplies will be well below present levels (and) * * * make maintenance of controls that much more necessary" (p. 18).

The facts are: Looks like OPA is preparing another meat crisis for 1947 instead of realizing they cannot control the crisis now existing.

This must not go on. The only answer is to eliminate meat controls, and let feed production and its efficient utilization be encouraged rather than confused and discouraged.

OPA says: 24. "Slaughter of cattle in federally inspected plants last year reached an all-time high.

"Certainly that does not suggest that the regulation (live cattle) drove cattle into the black market" (p. 20).

The facts are: This conclusion is based on the widespread but false assumption that Federal inspection is synonymous with compliance with OPA regulations. Facts have been presented to the Congress clearly disproving this.

Ten legitimate national packers in April and May 1946 have slaughtered only one-third of all cattle slaughtered under Federal inspection compared with 70 to 75 percent in 1941. For the week ending May 25, 1946, they slaughtered only 30 percent of the total and the situation was just as serious as before the control order was instituted.

No doubt the meat black market is most serious in noninspected slaughtering, but it is not confined to that and, furthermore, federally inspected cattle slaughter had decreased sharply in 1946 compared with 1945 by about 20 percent. For the week ending May 25, 1946, federally inspected cattle slaughter was reported to be down 38 percent from the previous year.

OPA says: 25. "Indications of the extent of noncompliance is provided by a study of payments made for cattle, as shown on records certified by slaughterers and filed with the Government as a basis for subsidy claims. Falsification in these cases is a violation of the statutes against fraud" (p. 21).

The facts are: Obviously slaughterers do not report their figures out of compliance when they file for subsidy. Study of their reports would only prove this. Has OPA checked and fully investigated the validity of the reports? Certainly not, for it is a practical impossibility after the cattle are killed, weighed, and graded and the beef sold. This illustrates the impossible enforcement problem.

Violation of statutes against fraud means nothing if they are not enforced or enforceable. Thousands and thousands of cattle are being purchased at prices which cannot possibly be in compliance, yet how many violators have been prosecuted and put in jail?

OPA says: 26. "The claim is that conditions have grown worse since the first of the year; that legitimate slaughterers have been unable to buy cattle" (p. 22).

The facts are: The OPA talks about cattle but shows the production of all meat including increased pork production under Federal inspection due to the increased pig crops in the spring and fall of 1945.

The following table shows the increasing seriousness of the situation in 1946 over 1945. It must be remembered there was also a serious beef black market in 1945—the figures

show how much worse it is this year—not the true extent of the black market.

	Percent decrease, 1946 from 1945	
	Federally inspected cattle slaughter	Slaughter by 10 national packers
By months:		
January	−21	−47
February	−12	−29
March	−25	−44
April	−27	−58
By weeks:		
May 4	−31	−52
May 11	−24	−47
May 18	−33	−55
May 25	−38	−63

OPA says: 27. "Certainly this reflects no runaway trend of the black market" (p. 23).

The facts are: Facts in the table above clearly reflect a very serious trend to the black market in 1946 and show that it has consistently grown within the federally inspected group of slaughterers as well.

They also show that the slaughter control order has been ineffective.

OPA says: 28. "There is such a widespread discrepancy between these findings (American Meat Institute survey of retail meat prices) and OPA compliance checks that we question the methods used in the survey, particularly the attempt to distinguish between grades of cut meat (i. e. AA or A)" (p. 24).

The facts are: The American Meat Institute did not make the survey but employed well-known, reliable, independent market research agencies to do the job on the basis of professionally accepted survey principles and practices.

The OPA had full opportunity to debate or question the institute surveys before congressional committees but declined to comment except in general slandering statements. Congressional committees accepted the surveys as reliable and conservative, based on their hearings of the explanation of methods used.

OPA questions particularly the grading. How does OPA check compliance as to grades? It is important if difficult—either for the survey agencies or the housewife. The agencies who made the surveys for the institute hired the best available meat grading experts from the United States Army. Does the OPA have better meat graders?

Significantly, over two-thirds of the beef cuts and over 85 percent of the lamb cuts were graded AA or A by the United States Army graders employed by the research agencies, proving conclusively that the meat was not undergraded (which would have the effect of increasing the overceiling charges). Overcharges were found to be very serious on meat sold and also graded AA where obviously the meat was not undergraded.

Finally, hamburger, where no grading is required by the OPA, was 23 percent over ceilings and, likewise, ham and pork chops were 21 percent over ceiling in the coast-to-coast survey of 11 cities.

OPA says: 29. "Shortly after the Meat Institute survey, OPA's Enforcement Department made a careful compliance check by meat purchases in Washington, D. C., where the institute had reported bad conditions" (p. 25).

The facts are: Did the OPA send housewife shoppers, who would not raise suspicion, to as many as 241 representative stores throughout Washington and buy as much as 456 cuts of meat and have it carefully weighed and graded by experts—like the independent research agencies did for the institute?

The institute published and explained fully its survey details and methods—the OPA should provide similar information so that Congress could judge for itself whether the OPA survey is reliable.

Why did not the OPA also employ an independent market research agency? They have used such agencies on other occasions.

OPA says: 30. "A March 1946 OPA survey covering 857 stores in 27 representative cities showed 83.2 percent of 4,473 meat cuts priced to sell at ceiling prices" (p. 25).

The facts are: On April 5, 1946, Mr. Arvil Erikson testified for the OPA as head of the Meat Price Division, before the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, said:

"OPA hasn't made any detailed survey of the extent of the over-ceiling prices in retail stores."

It is important to note this survey in 857 stores is based on "meat cuts priced to sell." The question is, What does the meat cost? This cannot be determined by asking prices or looking at price tags.

OPA has made other surveys not mentioned in this statement. The Philadelphia Inquirer, April 25, 1946, reported:

"A city-wide black market in meat was disclosed yesterday by OPA following a 2-day survey of independent and chain stores here.

"The survey, made by 30 paid agents, was concentrated on 59 stores with previous records of price-ceiling violations.

"Three of the fifty-nine were out of meat, indicating, according to an OPA spokesman, that they have gone honest.

"The other 56 had abundant supplies of all kinds of meat. Irregularities were found in every store.

"In each store, the agents made purchases and paid as much as 30 cents a pound over ceiling."

A study made under the supervision of J. A. Thornton, an OPA official, in January and February 1944 in 10 cities in the Corn Belt showed that from 80 to 100 percent of the retail stores were violating OPA meat regulations.

In the eleventh report of the OPA to the Congress, covering the period ending September 30, 1944, and transmitted on January 5, 1945, Mr. Bowles stated the following in connection with enforcement on meat, on page 76:

"Upgrading had long been prevalent also at the retail level, frequently resulting in overcharges of 50 percent or more. Although enforcement at this level was generally the responsibility of the price panels, at the end of the quarter a Nation-wide enforcement program designed to combat this type of violation was being prepared."

Copy of this page follows:

"In the field of litigation, the summer quarter was one of the busiest since the inception of wartime price control, owing largely to the numerous new legal issues created by the Stabilization Extension Act.

"Court proceedings were instituted in almost 6,000 cases, consisting of more than 3,700 injunction suits, 900 administrator's treble-damage suits, and 1,200 criminal cases. In the 3,279 civil and criminal proceedings which were completed during July, August, and September, 3,175 decisions, or 96.9 percent of the total, were in favor of the Office of Price Administration. The proportion of decisions favorable to the Office was about 97.4 percent in civil cases and 95.1 percent in criminal cases.

"ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS

"Enforcement operations are conducted on a commodity program basis. Since these programs are drawn up only after the inflationary pressures present in an industry have been carefully analyzed, the programs have in general been successful in meeting the enforcement problems that arise over a period of many months. Most of the commodity programs have been described in previous quarterly reports to the Congress. A few significant developments in various commodities during the quarter are set forth herein.

"MEAT

"The shortage of beef, especially of the better grades, which began to develop in earlier months, was accentuated during this reporting period. Prices of quality cattle rose to record levels as slaughterers throughout the country competed for the small supply that was available. The program inaugurated during the preceding quarter of reporting purchases of cattle at excessively high prices was continued. Chief violators of the beef regulation became known before the end of the quarter, and investigations high prices was continued. Chief violators Because of the extreme cunning with which many of the illegal transactions are consummated, however, investigation was difficult and time consuming.

"In the Southwest meat violations for some time had taken the form of upgrading. By use of Department of Agriculture meat graders, hundreds of these violations were uncovered during the quarter, and many sanctions were imposed.

"Upgrading had long been prevalent also at the retail level, frequently resulting in overcharges of 50 percent or more. Although enforcement at this level was generally the responsibility of the price panels, at the end of the quarter a Nation-wide enforcement program designed to combat this type of violation was being prepared." (Source: The Eleventh Report of the Office of Price Administration, 79th Cong., 1st sess., House Doc. No. 21, January 8, 1945.)

OPA says: 31. "Mr. Robert Eggert stated that if meat controls were removed prices in his opinion would rise to the level of black-market prices reported by AMI at 29 percent above ceiling prices" (p. 26).

The facts are: Mr. Eggert did not say this, but said the actual price of meat would be about the same without controls, that is, quotations might rise 20 percent—by the amount of the average overcharge including all meat—but this would not affect the actual cost of meat. (See No. 8 above.) This is merely another way of saying, as has been shown, that meat price controls have completely broken down and are pure fiction.

OPA says: 32. "Their survey showed 32 percent of all meat being sold at ceiling prices. Buyers of that meat got full price protection" (p. 26).

The facts are: Price control cannot be given credit for the 32 percent that did not sell over ceilings.

Several items in good supply were actually selling below ceilings. For example, pork sausage which constituted 9 percent of all cuts purchased in the 11 cities actually averaged below the ceiling in several of the cities. This was likewise true of many of the sliced bacon, leg of lamb, and lamb chop purchases.

Altogether, 16 percent of the total cuts purchased were below ceilings because the demand would not buy the supply at ceiling prices. Almost as many cuts were purchased below the ceilings as at the ceilings.

OPA says: 33. "The average charge above ceilings was reported at 20 percent. That is 9 percent below reported black-market prices. Nine percent of $6,500,000,000 is $585,000,000" (p. 26).

The facts are: Yes; 9 percent of $6,500,000,000 is $585,000,000, but this is a ridiculous and indefensible way to figure the protection of meat-price control.

The meat that sold at ceilings and below ceilings would not sell for 29 percent over ceilings without price control, as this calculation assumes. They sold at, or below ceilings principally because of supply and demand balance on those items at that price.

The price of the meat cuts ranged far from ceilings, 16 percent were below, 16 per-

cent were at ceilings, and the rest were above ceilings to as high as four times the ceiling price, depending upon relative supply and demand and the amount the black market gouged the consumer for special items.

OPA says: 34. "Instead of surrendering to the black market, OPA set out to check overpricing on the live-cattle market.

"On April 1, 1946, the OPA restricted custom slaughter to packers who had had licenses for custom slaughtering in 1945 under Control Order No. 1" (p. 27).

The facts are: But cattle prices continued out of compliance, diversion of cattle to the black market continued to increase throughout April, the black market got worse and worse, the Custom Slaughter Control had no apparent effect whatsoever.

OPA says: 35. "Slaughter control program in 1945" (p. 28).

The facts are: OPA implies in this statement that this program worked in 1945 and so testified before congressional committees, but the facts are there was a very serious black market in the spring of 1945 and slaughter control did not cure or correct it.

After the control order went in on April 30, 1945, the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, said:

"Meat counters were empty more often during the first 4 days of the week of May 15 than in the corresponding period in any month since March 1944. Approximately 85 percent of the stores had no veal, more than four-fifths were without pork loins, hams, or bacon, and almost 7 out of every 10 had no beef or lamb."

Reflecting further the black-market situation before and after the 1945 slaughter-control program, shipments of slaughter cattle from the Chicago stockyards steadily increased and were relatively twice as large as normal, because legitimate slaughterers in the Chicago area could not buy the cattle in compliance with OPA ceilings.

Percent of total receipts of cattle at Chicago shipped for slaughter

	1945	*1941*
March	40	23
April	45	22
May	43	22
June	42	21
July	47	21

On June 28, 1945, the city of New York submitted to Congress a survey of black-market operations in New York State saying:

"The inspectors visited 105 retail stores in 43 towns scattered throughout black-market area. They found that 48 of the stores had no meat. Of the remaining 57 stores with meat only 7 were in full compliance with OPA regulations.

"Fifty of the fifty-seven stores with meat, or 88 percent, were found to be violating one or more OPA regulations. A total of 105 violations was found in the 50 stores."

OPA says: 36. "Slaughter control program in 1946.

"On April 28, 1946 the program was reestablished to curtail the expanded operations of black marketeers.

"The kill of federally inspected plants rose at once from 89 to 99 percent of their 1945 kill, the highest level reached in a 2-month period" (p. 29).

The facts are: Here again OPA shifts from the most acute black market beef situation to the citation of total meat production data—and measures only 2 weeks after the order became effective, during which period it seemed to have a slight but unimportant salutory effect—and incorrectly measures the black market by using total federally inspected slaughter.

Federally inspected meat production, decrease 1946 from 1945

Before control order:	*Beef*	*All meat*
Apr. 6	−25	−8
Apr. 13	−31	−11
Apr. 20	−28	−17
Apr. 27	−36	−11
After control order:		
May 4	−30	−1
May 11	−22	−2
May 18	−31	−12
May 25	−37	−18

The slaughter-control order never had much effect and in the fourth week had lost completely its original punch, even on all federally inspected production.

Ten legitimate packers with national distribution in the week of May 25, 1946, killed 63 percent less cattle than in the corresponding week of 1945, which was the same decrease as in the week of April 27, 1946, before the control order became effective.

OPA's Joint Advisory Cattle, Hog, Beef, and Pork Committees, in a unanimous resolution on April 15, 1945 said the control order would not work when submitted to them by OPA, and said:

"Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the OPA Industry Cattle, Hog, Beef, and Pork Advisory Committees are unanimously opposed to the proposal that has been submitted today to the advisory committees and recommend that subsidies and price controls be immediately removed from the livestock and meat industry."

It obviously is not working!

OPA says: 37. "Aid to enforcement. The slaughter-control program will greatly aid in the enforcement of ceiling-price regulations" (p. 30).

The facts are: It has not, as shown above.

OPA says: 38. "The new program also limits each slaughterer's subsidy payments to the amount of meat he is entitled to produce. This will strike a body blow to any violators who now claim subsidies" (p. 30).

The facts are: Of course reports can still be falsified and the black-market operators continue to "fix" their reports, flaunting an unenforced regulation the same as they overcharge on meat.

OPA says: 39. "By pushing 350 meat-enforcement investigators to the limit from January 1 to April 12, 1946, OPA instituted 1,803 lawsuits against violators of preretail meat and livestock regulations" (p. 31).

The facts are: There were over 27,000 registered slaughterers in the United States in 1945 when the control order was then in effect. The black market was rampant and widespread in January to April 1946 but the OPA had but 350 investigators and instituted but 1,803 lawsuits. The OPA does not say how many were put out of business or in jail.

OPA says: 40. "Now 400 additional investigators are being added for meat enforcement. This should more than double the effectiveness of the fight on the black market" (p. 31).

The facts are: Insignificant when we consider there are thousands of slaughterers in the black market and, according to OPA: "Some 300,000 stores selling meat at retail and about 350,000 restaurants." Further, according to this OPA testimony by Mr. Thomas I. Emerson, Deputy Administrator for Enforcement, before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, April 10, 1945: "Obviously no enforcement staff available to OPA could attempt to maintain regular checks at these levels."

Doubling the effectiveness of the fight on the meat black market is almost like doubling nothing, considering the present state of unenforcement and the magnitude of the job.

OPA says: 41. "Aid from other agencies on enforcement" (p. 32).

The facts are: These agencies have cooperated before, but adequate enforcement has never been obtained in livestock and meat. Fundamentally the product and its processing and distribution is simply too complex to control by laws, directives, or regulations when the majority of the people of the Nation don't care as much "what they pay for meat" as "whether they get it." Enthusiasm for price control, since the war is over, just does not go so far as to do without meat rather than to patronize the black market.

OPA says: 42. "The battle is under way.

"By these steps we are restoring the flow of cattle to legitimate slaughterers.

"Relieving pressure on the live cattle market.

"Driving black marketeers to cover.

"The problem is anything but hopeless. It is being solved" (p. 33).

The facts are: These statements cannot be substantiated by OPA. Such statements, without positive proof, can only be considered as reckless propaganda.

Facts presented above show that the flow of cattle is not being restored to legitimate slaughterers. Ten legitimate packers with national distribution, slaughtered 63 percent less cattle in the week ending May 25, 1946, than a year earlier—70 percent less than in 1941. They were able to buy, in compliance with OPA regulations, only 33 percent of their so-called slaughter quota, which is 100 percent of 1944.

Second, pressure on the live cattle market has not been relieved. The Livestock Market Review, USDA, for week ended May 18, 1946, said with reference to cattle:

"Prices are now about as far out of reach as they have been at any time" (p. 366).

The Chicago Daily Livestock Market Report, Tuesday, May 28, 1946, said:

"Better than 80 percent of Monday's total cattle receipts were shipped out mainly for slaughter at eastern points, and today it was the same story all over again, with eastern order buyers acquiring the big end of the crop at prices that stood unevenly 15 to 40 cents higher for the week to date on all classes and most grades of slaughter cattle."

The black market evidently is not being driven to cover.

Facts—not opinions—show the problem is not being solved.

Consequently the entire livestock and meat industry says:

"OPA controls in the livestock and meat industry are hopeless—the only solution is to eliminate them."

OPA says: 43. "Test decontrol" (p. 34).

The facts are: Controls of livestock and meat prices have been demonstrated to be impractical and unenforceable.

Decontrol, completely and permanently, is the only rational solution.

Decontrol, as a test or permanently, as already shown would not:

"Create chaos."

"Quite probably result in widespread starvation."

"Cost consumers millions of dollars."

On the contrary, the evidence shows there would be:

Order instead of the present chaos.

More food, more equitably distributed, available to all.

Less cost to consumers through the elimination of black market wastes and extortion.

OPA says: 44. "Hardship claims unjustified" (p. 36).

"Figures below * * * indicate compliance by OPA with the Barkley-Bates amendment.

"We have felt that requirements were met if the return on each species equaled the over-all rate of return in the base period" (p. 37).

The facts are: These figures and statements show that OPA is still thinking in

terms of its over-all profit theory. In pursuing this theory throughout, OPA itself caused a squeeze on packers that created the beginning of the black market.

The industry thought it would be protected by the Barkley-Bates amendment of June 7, 1945, which provided "for a reasonable margin of profit to the processing industry" on each species of livestock, cattle and calves, lambs and sheep, and hogs.

Directive 90 of December 4, 1945, has provided the only relief granted since the amendment was enacted. Testimony before congressional committees has shown that this relief was wholly inadequate and that OPA is still thinking in terms of its over-all profit theory, as also indicated by the quotation from page 37 of this May 24 statement to Congress.

Financial reports submitted to OPA by 78 companies, small, medium, and large, located in all parts of the country, equaling more than 67 percent of all federally inspected slaughter, show net profits (before taxes) per hundredweight alive of only the following amounts:

For the fiscal year through October 1945: Cattle and calves, 2 cents; hogs, 4 cents; sheep and lambs, 7 cents.

These are obviously not "a reasonable margin of profit."

OPA says: 45. "No separate figures are available showing business failures among packing houses or wholesale or retail meat dealers. Total business failures and failures by manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers are so small, however, as to indicate no serious hardship area in our whole economy" (p. 38).

The facts are: OPA must know of many individual packing plants, meat wholesalers, and meat retailers that have been forced out of business or to drastically curtail their business under OPA regulations—they have hidden behind generalized Government statistics, rather than "look at their files."

And OPA must have heard of the hardships in many areas caused by the closing and curtailment of operations in long-established packing plants who were not willing to violate OPA regulations.

It is general knowledge. For example, the monthly letter on economic conditions, etc., of the National City Bank of New York, in May 1946, says:

"Within the past few months a number of the smaller packing companies have completely suspended operations and many others have had to curtail sharply, either because of losing money under existing price ceilings or because of inability to obtain livestock in competition with unlicensed slaughterhouses buying and selling in the black market.'

OPA says: 46. "Early returns on earnings of packing companies for the first quarter of 1946 show three-quarters of those whose reports are in, earning more than they earned before taxes last year both on sales and on net worth. None reporting to date were in a loss position" (p. 39).

The facts are: The test on earnings under the Barley-Bates amendment is a reasonable margin of profit on each species of livestock—not over-all earnings, and not whether 1946 is better than 1945 (particularly when 1945 was not reasonable)—and not whether some companies are "in a loss position."

How many companies have reported? What have their earnings actually been, by species?

Again, where are the OPA facts?

OPA says: 47. "There is not the slightest indication coming in to OPA that packers, wholesalers, and retailers of meat are experiencing financial hardship" (p. 39).

The facts are: Does OPA require "financial hardship"—near bankruptcy—before it affords relief? This is profit control—not price control—the same old theory.

How can beef operations of legitimate slaughterers running at one-fifth to one-half of normal thus far in 1946 possibly return a "reasonable margin of profit"?

The OPA is receiving reports regularly from packers. What do they actually show?

OPA concludes: 48. "Decontrol of meat would—

"Increase the price 60 percent of all food;

"Start strikes;

"Starve people abroad; and

"Bring to an end effective price control" (p. 40).

The entire livestock and meat industry concludes:

(Points made by OPA in "Conclusion" have already been answered above.)

Decontrol of livestock and meat is the only possible way to stop the black market—an unprecedented national scandal—which is undermining public morals, endangering public health, wasting vital foods and materials, discouraging production, creating shortages, causing unemployment, ruining legitimate business, gouging the people, and confusing the Nation.

The facts show that OPA livestock and meat controls are a fiction, an illusion, impossible.

OPA says: 49. "OPA will never surrender to the black market" (p. 40).

The facts are: The black market in livestock and meat has whipped the OPA.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a statement?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill, as it now is before us, on page 20 calls for the release of controls on livestock, poultry, eggs, food and feed products, and dairy products. The Senator from Iowa has stated that he is in favor of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], which includes timber and tobacco, in addition to food products. Yesterday the Senate adopted the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, which applies to nonagricultural products and certain profits.

There are in Massachusetts, the State from which I come, many small businesses. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Is it fair to those small businesses to restrict profits in the manner suggested by the Senator from Ohio, whose amendment I voted for, if we release controls on all the products mentioned in the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In my opinion, the theory of the Senator from Oklahoma is that he has established in the case of each item mentioned in his amendment, that production or supply is in reasonable relation to the demand therefor, so far as utility is concerned, and therefore, under his theory, they should be decontrolled. As I understand, the question is not one of the profit which would be obtained from a commodity in short supply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa on the amendment has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator on the amendment has expired. The Senator may take time on the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not care to take time on the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not care to take time on the bill. Perhaps I can whisper to the Senator. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of some Senator who has the time to answer it. I wish to know whether the effect of adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma would be to nullify the amendment of the Senator from Ohio which was adopted yesterday, insofar as industrial products manufactured in whole or in part from the products enumerated in the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma are concerned. That would mean food and clothing.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, speaking in the time of the Senator from Vermont, I shall be glad to answer.

Mr AIKEN. Very well.

Mr. TAFT. The general effect of the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, if adopted, would be to remove from control nearly everything I can think of, except, perhaps, steel products. My amendment then would be applicable to steel products and to whatever else might not be covered by the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Of course, if the controls are taken off altogether, there no longer will be any question about how controls should be fixed.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, as I understand the matter from reading the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, if his amendment is adopted, practically nothing will be left under controls except heavy metals and their products, such as steel products. I think that point should be brought out before we vote on the amendment. I think it should also be said that, so far as I can see, all clothing and also all food products would be removed from control, if the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma were adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	McMahon
Andrews	Gerry	Magnuson
Austin	Gurney	Maybank
Ball	Hart	Mead
Barkley	Hatch	Millikin
Bilbo	Hawkes	Moore
Brewster	Hayden	Morse
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murdock
Brooks	Hill	Murray
Buck	Hoey	Myers
Burch	Huffman	O'Daniel
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Overton
Capper	Kilgore	Pepper
Carville	Knowland	Radcliffe
Chavez	La Follette	Reed
Cordon	Lucas	Revercomb
Donnell	McCarran	Robertson
Downey	McClellan	Saltonstall
Eastland	McFarland	Shipstead
Ellender	McKellar	Smith

Stanfill	Thomas, Utah	Walsh
Stewart	Tobey	Wheeler
Taft	Tunnell	Wherry
Taylor	Tydings	White
Thomas, Okla.	Wagner	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish very briefly to discuss the amendment, because I cannot support it. It is inconceivable to me that the Senate will adopt it. The effect of the amendment would be to take from under price control practically everything in the United States except metals and a few other products which cannot be described as being agricultural in character. The adoption of the amendment would be the equivalent of destroying completely the structure of price control. I wish to discuss these products as they are set forth in the amendment.

The amendment reads:

Notwithstanding any provision of this act or any provision of title III of the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended, or any other law, Executive order or directive, no regulation, order, directive, or allocation shall be issued, made, or maintained (including directives for distribution or price schedules) with respect to timber, petroleum, cotton, milk, livestock, tobacco, poultry, fish and shellfish, grain, peanuts, fruits and vegetables, or any product processed in whole or substantial part therefrom.

That means all kinds and categories of lumber.

Mr. President, we passed, and the President signed, I believe, on the 22d of May of this year the emergency veterans' housing bill in order to bring about the construction of houses for veterans. In that bill we authorized the Federal Housing Expediter to order the Price Administrator to do certain things which, in the judgment of the Expediter, he believed to be necessary in order to bring about the production of lumber and building materials for the construction of veterans' houses. This amendment would repeal that provision of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act. Possibly the Senate is willing to repeal it within less than a month after enacting it, but I doubt it.

Petroleum. Under the amendment adopted yesterday, offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Price Administrator is directed in effect to decontrol petroleum and everything else whenever the supply and demand are in balance. As the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] said earlier, I think petroleum would already have been decontrolled except for the threat of the maritime strike, which would embarrass certain sections of the country in the receipt of oil and oil products by ships. Large quantities are transported by water from the Gulf of Mexico to the Atlantic coast, and so long as that threat hangs over the country, it may be that in the interest of caution oil ought not to be decontrolled. Regardless, however, of that situation, if in the Nation as a whole under the amendment agreed to yesterday, there is a supply in excess of demand, or approximately balancing demand, the OPA must decontrol. That is true of every other commodity. So that the pending amendment is not necessary so far as petroleum is concerned.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator who is to determine when production is equal to demand?

Mr. BARKLEY. The OPA, of course.

Mr. BROOKS. Can the Senator tell us any major product which has ever been decontrolled since OPA has been in existence?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think a good many products have been decontrolled. I have not a list of them in my memory at the present time. Of course, the Senator's inquiry is intended to be a reflection on the OPA by intimating that, even if the commodities were in balance, OPA still would not decontrol.

Mr. BROOKS. It was not a reflection. It was a direct charge that, in my opinion, OPA will not decontrol so long as it has discretion.

Mr. BARKLEY. I amend my statement to make it conform with the Senator's that it is not simply an intimation but is a direct charge. However, be that as it may, I am talking for the moment about the petroleum situation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator probably forgot that the decontrol of agricultural products is placed by the bill, once it goes into effect, in the Secretary of Agriculture

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that.

Mr. TAFT. And that on nonagricultural products there is an appeal from the Price Administrator to the Decontrol Board, the members of which have to be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Now with respect to cotton, the bill already contains provisions with respect to cotton and cotton goods. So the amendment is not necessary so far as cotton is concerned.

Milk. By the terms of the bill milk is already ordered to be decontrolled in toto on the 30th of the present month, and I assume that provision will remain in the bill as it finally passes the Senate.

The same thing is true of livestock and all products of livestock, which includes meat.

Now as to tobacco, I am from the second largest tobacco growing State in the Union. I never thought that tobacco ought to be put under control in the first place, and that ceilings should not have been imposed on tobacco. I protested to OPA from the very beginning against the imposition of ceilings on tobacco in any form, but they were imposed and they have existed. There is no shortage of tobacco; tobacco is in supply; so much so that the price went down from December when the market fell in my State from an average of 52 cents a pound to around 21 cents a pound; and the average for the year, as reported only a few days ago, was 39 cents a pound. But tobacco would be decontrolled under the language of the bill as it is now written. So, I do not assume that it is necessary to include tobacco, and I do not feel that because I come from a tobacco-producing State that I ought to single out a product of my State and have it decontrolled, when in the committee I voted against the decontrol of all products which are now covered by the bill, including livestock, poultry, and dairy products.

Poultry is already taken care of in the bill. It comes out in toto on the 30th of June, if this bill is enacted into law as it is now written.

Fish and shellfish. I can imagine why there might be some good reason for including fish, but I do not quite understand the reason as to shellfish.

Grain, peanuts, fruits and vegetables or any products processed therefrom. So nothing made out of any of these commodities included in the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma would be subject to price control or regulation.

Mr. President, we might as well stop here and think for a moment about what we are doing. In this morning's Washington Post, which, in my opinion, has become one of the great newspapers of the country and which contains as much valuable information in each issue, I think, as any newspaper I know anything about, there is an article on the front page, which is taken from the report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, with reference to the increase in the cost of living since 1939. It might be interesting to call attention to some of these items. Since 1939 food costs for the average family have already gone up 51.1 percent, which is more than half. Notwithstanding all the effort made to hold down prices and notwithstanding the charge made against OPA that they have held down prices to such an extent that many people could not make any money on the production of things upon which OPA has imposed prices, food prices have gone up since 1939 51.1 percent. How much higher will they go if all the products involved in the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma are taken out from any control or any price regulation whatever?

Clothing prices have gone up since 1939 69.2 percent. If anybody does not believe that, let him go down town and buy a suit of clothes and compare the price he now pays with what he paid in 1939. I have gone through that experience. I bought two or three new suits this spring—and I have been complimented by my colleagues here upon my better appearance in the last few weeks [laughter]—but the clothes I bought cost me nearly twice as much as the same type of clothes cost me in 1939, and I did not get as good quality of goods, either.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, is the Senator speaking for or against OPA?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator can draw his own conclusions. The Senator from Minnesota is such an able and brilliant man that it did not seem to me to be necessary to draw a blueprint in order that he might understand what I am talking about. But without regard to all the efforts made by OPA to keep down the price of clothing, clothing has gone up in the last 6 years 69.2 percent. How much would the price have gone up if it had not been for OPA nobody knows;

it is speculative, but it certainly would have gone up more.

Rents. Well, rents have been pretty well controlled; they have gone up since 1939 only one-tenth of one percent, which is pretty fair control over rents. Suppose there had been no control over rents in the District of Columbia, for instance, suppose there had been no control over rents in areas certified by the Government as areas under the law in which the OPA could control rents, what would have been the result? Someone has suggested that it has been tough on the landlords, and probably it has. I do not know how much tougher it would have been on the tenants if there had not been any control at all. In either case it might have justified the old couplet engraved on a tombstone in an old cemetery:

Here lies the body of Mary Ann,
She is now in the bosom of Abraham;
'Twas a wonderful thing for Mary Ann,
But a terrible thing for Abraham.

[Laughter.]

Next we find that costs of fuel, electricity, and ice have risen 15.6 percent.

Housefurnishings costs have risen 43.9 percent.

Miscellaneous costs have risen 30.5 percent.

On the average, the prices of all items have risen 33.5 percent since 1939, with all the controls. With all the things which have been charged against OPA on the part of manufacturers and producers, the cost of living, on the average, has risen 33.5 percent.

If we are to take off all controls—as the amendment would—I think we may assume that the prices of foodstuffs may rise in the next 6 months as much as they have risen in the last 6 years, at least for a period of time.

Mr. President, that poses the problem with which we are faced here. We are in a dilemma. I admit it. No one is more anxious than I to eliminate controls over everything. We are all harassed by correspondence and by people who have real grievances in one way or another, whether they are consumers or producers. Not only questions relating to the cost of living, but social matters are involved, and it may be there are political matters involved in what we are going to do with respect to the question before us.

I saw in this morning's Washington Post, under the heading "Letters to the editor," and the subheading "If OPA is emasculated," two or three letters which I think the Senate of the United States might well ponder. I shall read one of them. I do not know the man who wrote it. It is signed by L. V. Blake, of Washington, and I do not know who Mr. Blake is. He says:

There seems to be a considerable possibility that we are headed for an economic disaster of the 1929 variety. The chance of averting such a disaster by congressional action seems mainly to be hampered by the efforts of various commercial interests, who assert their constitutional right to conduct free enterprice. Apparently, these interests do not fear the possibility of serious inflation; one can only surmise that if they have thought at all about consequences they must have made some sort of assumption that the wonderful profits in sight for the immediate future (if only the OPA can be suppressed) will more than carry them over any subsequent period of depression.

I wonder if Congressmen have really considered the seriousness of the possible consequences if they take the wrong course. The potentially disastrous effects of a mistake are unfortunately no respecters of honest intention. If we have another "boom and bust" cycle in the United States, it may well spell the end of free enterprise as we have known it. I call attention to an article The Specter That Haunts the World, by Granville Hicks in the current issue of Harper's.

He quotes a paragraph from it:

"* * * the driving force (of communism) in every land is dissatisfaction with the status quo. Millions of people do live in insecurity or downright poverty, and whether capitalism (i. e., free enterprise) is responsible or not does not matter so long as it is on capitalism that they put the blame. Today communism is one of the two principal alternatives to capitalism, its only rival (since the downfall of fascism) being socialism."

That is the end of the quotation. He proceeds:

In the United States we have less "insecurity and downright poverty" than anywhere else in the world. As long as this remains true, and as long as we make visible progress toward elimination of what insecurity and poverty we do have, the prospects for continuation of our system of (reasonably) free enterprise are, it seems to me, excellent. But if we have an inflation and subsequent depression, with the same widespread suffering and insecurity experienced in the thirties, then I truly believe that what one writer calls the conservatives' beloved American way of life may undergo some startling changes.

I recommend these thoughts to the Senate for consideration in connection with the debate on price control. It may well be that those Senators (and others) who are most vociferous about the rights of business to make a reasonable profit may be unconsciously advocating a policy which will ultimately result for the United States in the thing they fear above all else: some form of outright socialist economy in which the "rights" of business will be nonexistent.

Thus, paradoxically (and it is almost an amusing thought), the retention of a strong OPA may well be the NAM's best chance to escape the fate of the famed dodo bird—extinction, that is. And that's no joke, son.

Mr. President, I read that because, in my judgment, it has in it food for serious thought. We all know that the new nostrums, political and social, which are propagated anywhere in the world, grow out of discontent, out of insecurity, out of want, out of a hopelessness with respect to what we call the status quo. We have less of it in America, and we will have less of it in America, because insecurity and want are, on the whole, less existent in this country than elsewhere. But it is not inconceivable that we might bring about a situation which might duplicate or excel that which took place after the last war, when we might not so easily escape from the consequences which have ensued in other countries of the world.

Mr. President, I think it would be a serious mistake by this bill to remove all controls from the commodities and products which are mentioned in the Senator's amendment. I think, as a matter of fact, that if the amendment should be agreed to, we might as well not pass any bill at all, but say honestly that we do not think there should be any controls after June 30, and take them off. Or, if we are in such a hurry about it that we cannot wait 2 weeks longer, let us take them off now, immediately after the bill is signed by the President, or any bill is signed by the President, because that would be the effect of it.

Mr. President, I do not like to do that. I do not like the bill as it has been brought to the floor of the Senate. I voted against most of the amendments which were added to it fixing a date upon which any commodity should be decontrolled. I am not going to make any motion to eliminate them. They are in the bill, and I think the chances are the Senate would not eliminate them anyway, even if the effort were made, and it might be better not to contest the matter but let the bill go to conference and get the best we can out of conference without embarrassment or handicap so far as the conferees are concerned.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is not my intention, and I have urged other Senators, not to move to strike out the provisions with respect to meat, poultry, or dairy products, because the whole bill must go to conference, and the freer the conferees are the better bill I think we may be able to bring back to the Senate.

Mr. President, I am against the pending amendment because I think it is fatal to any pretense at price control in the future, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not sure that I previously asked to have printed in the RECORD the report made by the Union Stockyards Co. of Omaha of receipts and disposition of cattle for the month ending May 31, 1946, and also for the same month in 1941. The two figures furnish a complete answer to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] relative to the farmers or the meat producers holding back cattle. That argument is entirely beside the question.

I want to call attention to two sets of figures. In the month of May 1941 all the cattle received in the Omaha market totaled 466,199 head. In the same month in 1946 the receipt of cattle nearly doubled, the receipt being 732,168 head.

Now with respect to the disposition of the cattle. Going back to the month of May 1941, of the 466,199 head of cattle received, the packers and processors in Omaha killed 325,212, or about 75 percent of the number received. If we contrast that with the same period in 1946 we find that of the 732,168 head of cattle received in the Omaha market only 292,981 head of cattle were killed there. Those figures show that there is no withholding of cattle. Nearly twice as many cattle went to the market in May 1946 as went to the market in May 1941, but the figures prove that 80 percent of those now coming to market are going into the black market.

Mr. President, I have much faith and confidence in Mr. Albert Goss, master of the National Grange. I know him personally. I have appealed to him and

asked for his judgment, because the Grange has its own statisticians who gather the figures completely month by month and year by year on which the Grange arrives at its conclusions with respect to legislation in which it is interested. The distinguished Senator from California said that he would stake the whole case respecting the Thomas amendment on what happened to meat, if I heard him correctly. I did not hear all he said, but I am satisfied he made that statement, or used words to that effect. In other words, if we should decontrol meat we should decontrol with respect to all the agricultural products covered by the Thomas amendment.

I have a letter from the Grange dated June 12, and this is what it says respecting the decontrol of meat:

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: You have asked in regard to the position of the National Grange on the present Senate bill extending the life of OPA. You pointed out that the Grange recommended that unless the OPA could give Congress adequate assurance that it would adjust its price ceiling program so as to assure recognition of production costs, the agency should be abolished.

You ask if "in the light of the failure of OPA to give any such assurance with reference to meat, dairy, and poultry products" we would support abolishment of the agency, or would prefer to see its control over these particular products abolished.

Our position in regard to the extension of OPA has not changed. We believe some types of controls should be continued where, because of war-created or other abnormal shortages, production has not yet caught up with demand. Where production is being hindered by controls, we believe in an early and orderly removal of those controls.

The Grange had hoped that the Congress would develop a formula which would compel the OPA to comply with the spirit and the letter of the law and encourage maximum production as the most effective means of combatting inflation. No such provision has been included in the measure as it passed the House or has been reported to the Senate.

We have sought assurances from the OPA of a price policy which would encourage rather than discourage production and have had no satisfactory assurances that such a policy would be followed. It is, therefore, our conclusion that Congress should remove from control those items:

And here they are:

1. Where control has hopelessly broken down or is retarding production.

That covers the meat situation completely, and it covers the other items of agriculture which the Senator from Oklahoma is asking be decontrolled. I would much rather use Mr. Goss as authority for what should be decontrolled than the unnamed authority quoted by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky whose letter he read as published in this morning's Washington Post. I have never heard of that individual. I do not know on what he bases his conclusions, or where he gathered his information. But here is the letter of a man who speaks with authority.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The figures quoted in the article published in the Washington Post, which I read, were taken from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. WHERRY. There was one thing I noticed about the figures, and now that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky is on his feet, I wish to ask him a question about them. I think the Senator said that there was an increase of 15 percent in the cost of electricity and ice.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The price of electricity is not controlled by OPA. The price of electricity is controlled by the States. I am satisfied that if the States could have control over many of the products now controlled by OPA we would not have the difficulty we now have by reason of OPA being in the picture.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are many matters connected with electricity, ice, and other things that are controlled by OPA. The price of electric current is not under the control of OPA, but nearly everything connected with its use in some way comes under OPA control.

Mr. WHERRY. If the things to which the Senator from Kentucky refers were decontrolled, the chances are that we would have the same situation respecting them as we do now with electricity. I do not wish to argue that point with the Senator, but since he made mention of that particular item it seemed to me that apparently the very thing that showed the smallest increase in price was not under control of OPA.

Mr. BARKLEY. The lowest increase was in connection with rents.

Mr. WHERRY. Rents, yes. If the Senator will permit me I will correct my remarks in that respect. I could not hear clearly all he said. He was reading from the newspaper. I do not want to reflect upon that statement, because the distinguished Senator from Kentucky speaks with conviction, but I am rather confused by what he says. He has wandered a long way off to find authority for opposition to decontrol of prices.

Mr. BARKLEY. If when the Senator says I speak with conviction he means that I convince myself, I am in agreement with him.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sure the Senator does convince himself. But I suggest to the distinguished Senator, for whom I have the highest regard, and who is a most affable gentleman, that when it comes to choosing an authority I would rather choose Albert Goss, of the Grange, than the unnamed authority quoted by the Senator from Kentucky. When I quote from a letter written by Albert Goss I quote from one who speaks with the authority of an institution, an organization, which is, I think, quite generally recognized by Members of the Senate to be an authority in this particular field.

The first proposition is:

1. Where control has hopelessly broken down or is retarding production.

The Grange favors decontrol.

2. Where the OPA has given no adequate assurance that it can restore workable controls.

Certainly there has not been in the past 4 years anything to show that there has been any increase of workable controls established in the case of meat. The situation with respect to meat has gone from bad to worse. The meat situation is worse today than it has ever been. Even the Secretary of Agriculture said that if, after 5 weeks' trial in putting back the meat quotas, that did not work, then there was only one thing to do, and that was to remove controls from meat. That is the statement made by Secretary Anderson of the Department of Agriculture. And here we find the Grange saying that when OPA has given no adequate assurance that it can restore workable controls, meat should be decontrolled. That is the argument being advanced by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

The next point is:

3. Where the black markets resulting from such break-down are resulting in unsanitary conditions or loss of needed products.

It is unnecessary for me to go further in respect to that particular recommendation, because the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] very dramatically pointed out the need for the offal and for the parts of animals from which are made pharmaceutical products which will preserve the lives and health of men and women in the United States, who are not now getting the pharmaceutical products needed because of the black market in meat. The public is beginning to learn about that situation, and it fears what may happen. In spite of the propaganda and the iron curtains that exist, the people are beginning to realize that production is always paramount to prices and if we do not have sufficient production we must get it, and the prices will take care of themselves.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I listened to the statement made by the senior Senator from California earlier today respecting the black market. I happen to be a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture which investigated the black market in meat. We went to Pittsburgh and had hearings there. We found that the black market was running rampant in Pittsburgh; that the legitimate packers were not getting the cattle, but that the cattle were going into the black market. They were being killed in barns and sheds. The hides were being thrown into the river. One could go down to the river and see where the hides had been thrown. The animals were being killed in sheds and barns, and all the byproducts were being destroyed or thrown away, because the carcasses could be sold at such high prices that the slaughterers could afford to throw away the byproducts.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. WHEELER. The result was that the legitimate packer and the legitimate dealer were not getting meat. At one of the great hotels in Pittsburgh we were told, "We cannot get any meat because we will not buy in the black market. But you can go to a certain part of town and get all the meat you want in restaurants." I went there, where I was not known, and found that one could get roast beef, steaks, or anything he wanted.

But he could not go to a restaurant which was trying to comply with the regulations and get meat of any kind.

I have received letters from my home State showing that small markets all over the State of Montana are being closed because of the fact that they cannot get meat to sell. They cannot pay prices for it which would compete with the black market, nor can the small packers in my State—and there are quite a number of them—compete with the black-market buyers of cattle.

The fact is that from one end of the country to the other the people are enraged because the OPA officials in Washington have been so stupid in administering the act. As the OPA Act was written, it was a good thing at the time. It was intended to keep prices down. But the trouble has been that some of those in the OPA have not been as much interested in keeping prices down as they have been in keeping profits down and regulating business generally. Every merchant from one end of the country to the other is outraged at what this group has done. In my judgment it has been incompetent. Many of those in OPA know nothing about business and nothing about law. They know nothing about anything else, but they seek to regulate all kinds of business.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana for his contribution. I distinctly remember the very fine work which his subcommittee did in the investigation of the meat question. As I recall, that investigation was made more than a year ago. Is that correct?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator believe that conditions are better now than they were then?

Mr. WHEELER. No. In my judgment conditions are worse today than they were when we made the investigation. I have received telegrams and letters from the operators of legitimate stores and small markets all over the State of Montana, who are being compelled to close because they cannot get meat unless they go into the black market and buy it, and they do not wish to do that. The OPA is making criminals out of the people of this country by its operations, because of the fact that OPA officials will not listen to common, ordinary horse sense.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator again for answering my question.

The fourth recommendation of the Grange is clearly in line with what the Senator from Montana has just said. I am still reading from the letter from the Grange. The fourth recommendation is that we should have decontrol—

where producers are forced either to patronize black markets or go out of business.

The concluding paragraph is as follows:

In considering the amendment for decontrol of livestock, dairy, and poultry products, we must forego wishful thinking and be realistic. Conviction that controls on those items have hopelessly broken down should carry with it the courage to act decisively.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT S. GOSS,
Master, the National Grange.

That is a complete recommendation so far as concerns meats, dairy products, poultry, and poultry products. According to the recommendations of the Grange, the time has come to decontrol those products. Based upon the premise of the distinguished Senator from California, the same thing would apply to all the other agricultural products which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is asking to have decontrolled.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska if he has read the testimony of Mr. R. G. Haynie, vice president of Wilson & Co., at Chicago, which begins on page 1114 of volume 1 of the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency on the OPA Extension Act.

Mr. WHERRY. I have.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I specifically call attention to the fact that in this testimony is a complete factual study of the entire meat situation, as regards both purchase and sale, showing graphically, by charts and otherwise, exactly what is happening, and how the black market has grown during the past 4 years. It is a most illuminating discussion, and it is borne out by facts from the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa for his suggestion. I know Mr. Haynie. He is a Nebraska boy. He grew up on a butcher's wagon. He married a girl from my own home town. I have talked with him in our own feed lots, and I have discussed the meat situation with him many times. He is one of our fine Nebraska boys who is making good. He not only knows the problems of the packer, but also the problems of the cattle feeder, from the time the calf is born until the meat is on the table. I would rather take him as an authority than the unnamed authority to whom the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] referred earlier, who wandered all over the block to discuss socialism and many other things which have no relation to the acute situation in which we find ourselves today because of the OPA.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator called this authority unnamed. I named him. I said the letter was signed by L. V. Blake, of Washington.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate. I thought the arguments of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] should be answered. He based his argument on the premise that what we do in the case of meat should be done in the case of all other products.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement with relation to the grain situation under OPA.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAIN SITUATION UNDER OPA

The correction of the grain problem today is a real test of the sincerity of whether the Congress wants OPA decontrols and a return to free markets. Or, instead, whether the Congress wants an extension of the bread lines now forming in America.

Production of grains is already ahead of any normal demand. It will meet any formula on requirements set forth as a yardstick.

And yet, with the war over, the Government now considers it necessary to issue orders that provide for the forced sale of wheat as it moves from the farm.

These conditions do not arise from shortages. And they are not here because of any amount of breadstuffs that have been shipped out of this country to the needy of the world.

They exist because our markets have been strangulated, normal distribution has been disrupted, and grains have been wasted by improper use created directly by OPA pricing policies.

Let me emphasize: We do not face grain shortages because of our humanitarian efforts. We face them because the farmers and the distributing trades of this country cannot continue to perform their hisoric functions successfully under artificial OPA pricing conditions.

In fact, the best and probably the only chance that we have of meeting our future humanitarian commitments and still successfully feed our own people at the same time is to take these price ceilings off of grains, stop the wastage, and let grains move in normal channels to proper and historic uses.

This country is headed for another season of record-breaking crops for grain. The Department of Agriculture, in its monthly report on crop conditions for the major grains, issued on Monday, indicated a wheat crop this year of 1,025,509,000 bushels, against a 10-year average of 843,692,000 bushels.

The oats crop was indicated at 1,492,783,000 against the 10-year average of 1,129,441,000 bushels.

It is too early to cite figures on the corn crop, but known intentions to plant forecast another bumper production.

There are no natural shortages of grains. There is no excuse for their prices being shackled, creating man-made shortages.

A recent editorial in the Saturday Evening Post shows strikingly what is involved in all of this. I quote it as follows:

"UNCLE SAM IS A CLUMSY GRAIN TRADER

"The urgent need for grain to relieve famine conditions abroad undoubtedly explains the Government's recent jittery price policies on wheat and corn. But the record of these policies does not put Uncle Sam in a favorable light either as a trader or as a dependable regulator of farming.

"Price ceilings had been stoutly maintained on wheat and corn during the months in which a major part of each crop had moved to market in one way or another. OPA stated last December 13 that ceiling prices on corn would not be raised, and added: 'In case the Department of Agriculture should at some later date institute a corn-buying program, purchases will be made at not more than established ceilings.' Again, in February, OPA declared that ceilings would not be raised. Yet a few weeks later ceilings were raised 3 cents a bushel on both grains. Then, in April, a 30-cent bonus on each, if delivered to the Government, was announced. The bonus on wheat was to run until May 25; that on corn until 50,000,000 bushels had been obtained.

"This bonus was described by some cynical critics as a concession to the black market.

In effect, it put the Government in a position of doing something that would be unlawful if done by one of its own citizens.

"But hardly did farmers have time to think it over when the bonus on corn was suspended. Then, a day later, the Government raised its ceilings on grains again—25 cents on corn, 15 cents on wheat, and various amounts on other feed grains. The wheat bonus remained on top of the new ceiling, which was made retroactive for those who had already cashed in on the bonus offer.

"The effect of this shenanigan on the farmers' confidence in the Administration's policies was summed up by a competent observer in the northern Wheat Belt thus: 'Many farmers are becoming suspicious of whatever the Government says, and those who sold out early feel that they have been treated unfairly.' Farmers have contended that prices were being fixed to achieve certain Government purposes rather than on the basis of real values. The bonus and the subsequent jump in ceiling prices confirm this feeling and deepen the skepticism as to the stability of the Administration's price policies.

"It is not politically fashionable right now to say anything favorable about a free-market system. But if such a system had been in operation, the Government could have gradually accumulated, through purchases on the open market, enough grain to meet its foreign-relief needs. The price might have been somewhat higher than the original OPA ceilings, but probably no more than was finally paid. There would have been less disruption of markets, less interagency squabbling, less loss of money by farmers and loss of face by the Government. Furthermore, the world's hungry would have got the grain on time."

This is but part of the story. More of it tells of shocking wastages of wheat, the human-consumption grain, as it has been lavished as animal food on an inefficient basis due to unnatural and fictitious prices. The tightness in wheat today is the result of the depletion of our surplus stocks, our normal stocks, of this grain because of the immense supplies which were channeled into animal consumption at distorted bargain prices. Contributing to this shortage are stocks of this grain locked up on the farms due to the terrible position that the farmers have been put in as the result of crazy-quilt pricing policies.

More of this story tells of the incredible situation that exists in the black markets for grains which are making lawbreakers on a scale that makes the evil of the prohibition era look puny, as our honest citizens throughout the length and breadth of the land fight to keep their heads above water and their families, farms, and businesses intact in the face of Office of Price Administration edicts.

The greatest grain crop of our country is corn. Production last year of this grain was over 3,000,000,000 bushels.

I want to say seriously to you that conditions that may rule in other commodities fade in importance when you consider that testimony has been given before the committees of the Congress that shows that three out of every four cars of corn that move in commercial channels move in the black market. Think what is involved when from $500 to $1,000 per car of black-market money changes hands on these cars, somewhere along the line before market.

Of the balance, not 1 car in 100 changes hands but that there is some extra or special consideration than the price involved.

The grain farmer and the grain trades are the basis of our American agricultural economy. These conditions cannot continue, or our entire country will be undermined.

Corruption stalks our land, farmers are resentful, established businesses decades old face failure, empty breadbaskets threaten, our Government proposes seizure of property of our citizens.

Price ceilings on grains must come off.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is not a question of production. It is a question of maladministration of OPA, which has resulted in the confusion in which we find ourselves, and in bread lines all over the country.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in opposition to the amendment which is pending before the Senate. The arguments made by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are convincing. They are so convincing that they convinced me many weeks ago, and I voted for the decontrol of meat. I believe that meat must be decontrolled. But meat would be decontrolled under the terms of the committee amendment without the adoption of any other amendment. It is wholly unnecessary to adopt the amendment pending before the Senate in order to decontrol meat or dairy products.

I think it is fair to point out that the arguments made by Mr. Goss, head of the National Grange, relate to meat and dairy products. He is approving the committee amendment. The principles which he lays down may apply to some of the other products named in the pending amendment, but it is not at all clear that they do. Certainly the National Grange does not say that those principles apply to any products except meat and dairy products.

The pending amendment would decontrol practically everything in the way of food and clothing that the ordinary person could possibly buy. It would decontrol timber, petroleum, cotton, milk, livestock, sheep, wool, tobacco, fish, shellfish, grain, peanuts, fruits and vegetables, or any product processed in whole or substantial part therefrom. I should say that would include 90 percent of everything that the ordinary American family buys. The only things which are not included are things which are primarily processed from metals, and rents. Otherwise, it seems to me that this is a declaration that OPA should be abolished now.

I am quite willing to admit that there is an argument for immediately stopping all control. We heard the arguments on both sides. I am certainly in favor of the abandonment of government regulation so far as possible. But I come to the conclusion that, if we were to remove all controls today, probably we would see an increase in prices which would be more harmful than the continuation of the regulations. That might not occur as to some products; but, by and large, Mr. President, if all controls were removed, I believe we would have a serious increase in prices, a greater increase than is justified by the present increases in costs; and I believe that such an increase in prices would result in a higher price level, which probably would lead, then, to a collapse and to a possible depression. At least, it seems to me we would be taking a serious chance if we were to remove all controls, and I do not think that would be a wise policy.

I believe we should pursue a moderate course. I admit that it is hard to pursue a moderate course in behalf of the Office of Price Administration, because Mr. Bowles has not made one concession, he has not been willing to move one inch, toward a decontrol or toward a relaxation of the regulations which he has imposed during the war. Perhaps my statement is an exaggeration, for I believe he has removed controls from 5 percent of the products which have been controlled, but they are products of little importance to anyone or to the national economy. It would be much easier to pursue a moderate course if Mr. Bowles himself did not demand that we must continue "as is" and if he did not oppose the mildest and the most reasonable amendments as strenuously as he opposes complete decontrol. Mr. Bowles has cried "Wolf! Wolf!" so often in regard to every amendment, no matter how reasonable it might be, that he can no longer hope that his cries will be listened to with confidence by Congress or by the people of the United States.

Yet we ought to pursue a moderate course. We ought to relax price controls so as to encourage production. But on the other hand we should not, it seems to me, remove all controls and make it possible for what will amount to a speculative increase in prices. After the First World War it took nearly 18 months to get back to anywhere near normal conditions. I think we are now in a similar position. After this period, I shall never again vote for price controls, but I think we are now in a period in which the demand greatly exceeds the supply.

The whole field of imports from foreign countries is still tied up. Today imports of tin and of other metals and metal products which must be imported are not sufficient. They cannot be purchased in the quantities in which they are needed.

Likewise, in the United States, production has not yet resumed normal proportions. I think we are still in a period in which there is danger that if we were to remove all controls we would see a speculative price increase which could lead only to trouble, and later could lead only to a collapse and probably a further depression.

So I plead very strongly that we continue a moderate course. I think it is perfectly logical to remove controls from some things and leave them on others. I think it is perfectly logical to remove controls from meat. As a matter of fact, meat itself was not controlled for many months. Livestock, at least, was not controlled for many months after controls were established for other products. I think the testimony and the evidence show that there is hardly anything that is as difficult to control as livestock. The control of livestock and meat is almost an impossible task, and, of course, the failure to control it properly has become a national scandal. Regardless of the difficulty of the task, the control of livestock and meat has not been successfully performed by the Office of Price Administration. Whether the supply

equals the demand, I do not know. But that is not the ground on which we propose the decontrol of meat. We are decontrolling it because the present situation is a national scandal, as I have said. It is obvious that the Office of Price Administration cannot control meat. Even though the result of decontrolling meat may be an increase in the price of meat—although I doubt very much whether the prices, as thus increased, will be as high as the prices which exist today in the black market—I believe it is obvious that any such increase in the price of meat will be preferable to the present condition. The same situation exists in the case of dairy products. I think it is logical to pick out for decontrol one or two products as to which control has been ineffective and has led to the elimination of such products from the tables of the American people. Of course, it is important to control prices. But today the housewives cannot buy meat in Washington, except tag ends of meat, and they cannot buy any butter in the stores in Washington. Certainly there could be no more complete failure. After all, Mr. President, the problem of price administration is not simply one of holding prices. The problem of price administration is to enable the people to purchase the articles they need at prices which are reasonable and fair, considering the costs of production.

So I think it is entirely logical to eliminate controls from the articles as to which there has been a complete failure to control; and I think it is logical to say that as to other controls we wish to pursue a moderate course, and we wish to make sure that the increase in prices does not amount to more than the increase in cost of production, and we wish to make sure that there will be no speculative price increase because of the great demand. Then I think we should stop right there.

So I believe it would be a great mistake to go beyond the decontrol of meat and dairy products, and thus practically put an end to all controls at the present moment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, it seems to me that some persons prefer sure, swift, speedy death for OPA, while others prefer a slower process of strangulation. The present occasion might be an amusing and humorous one, except for the very tragic results which will flow from our action here today.

Within the last few days, much has been said here about the law of supply and demand. However, I believe that what the Senate proposes to do today will substitute the law of the jungle for the law of supply and demand. During the last few days we have heard much about free enterprise and the system of free competitive economy. But I believe that what is proposed to be done here today will substitute the theory of the survival of the fittest for the American system of free enterprise. We have heard a great deal about the black market. Nothing is proposed as a means of curtailing the black market. Nothing is proposed as a means of destroying the black market. But what we are asked to do today will whitewash and whiten the black market; and, Mr. President, in my judgment the black market prices of today will become the floor rather than the ceiling prices in the months ahead.

In January 1942, the Congress enacted legislation intended, among other purposes, "to protect consumers." In October of that year the Congress enacted further legislation specifically designed for "stabilizing prices affecting the cost of living." In 1944 and 1945 that basic policy of stabilization, after a review of its administration, was renewed by the Congress.

Today the Senate proposes that the cost of living shall be cut loose from the moorings established under authority of those stabilization statutes. Such action would torpedo our economic stability, and with it, would torpedo our hope for successful transition to economic operations yielding sustained prosperity for all groups in the Nation.

Mr. President, when the calamity comes, whether it be 3 months, 6 months, 9 months, or 12 months from now, I want to be recorded in black and white with those who are fighting against the emasculation and destruction of price control. I want to be recorded as one who foresaw the danger ahead and strove to avoid it.

I prophesy and predict, Mr. President, that within a relatively short period of time the American people will desire to know who were responsible for runaway prices, and I want my name to be listed among those who were not responsible.

Mr. President, I have no other choice than to vote against this bill. The enactment of the bill would reverse completely the present policy of the Congress of the United States. Can it be that the danger which threatened us in 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945 has entirely passed? Hardly so, Mr. President. No one questions for a moment that present inflationary pressures could result in greatly increased prices of all commodities. If price control is removed, within a short time, there will be substantial rises in prices. Can it be that we have found our fears of inflation to be ill grounded, and that we have no hesitation in opening the floodgates to the rushing waters of rising prices? I do not believe so. No one has wiped away the record which we made during and following World War I when inflation carried the economy up and up, and then let it drop over the cliff of deflation to the tune of thousands of bankruptcies, hundreds of thousands of farm mortgage foreclosures, and millions of unemployed.

Do we believe that we have yet emerged from the period of inflationary prices which the war, and shortages caused by the war, created? We all see evidence on every hand that these pressures are still at a peak. No Senator can deny that, following World War I, our policy of removing such controls as had been imposed, put us through the cycle of boom and bust in short and tragic order. Yet, many Members of this body can quote statistics and figures, but they have forgotten history. The truth of that statement is one which neither the committee itself, nor other Members of the Senate can deny. We ignore the lessons of history altogether and say that, beginning next July 1, all controls must be removed from the prices of meats, dairy products, and clothing. With a straight face, the Senate selects the most critical segment of the family food budget and the entire clothing bill, and proposes their decontrol, as though they had little or nothing to do with the cost of living of American families, or with their welfare and that of their country.

Mr. President, allow me briefly to examine what this proposal really amounts to. Let me start by going back not to the outbreak of World War II, not to the initial establishment of price control, but only 3 years to the spring of 1943. That was when the dangers of wartime inflation finally were fully recognized and a policy was adopted of firmly holding the line against price increases. Let me remind Senators what led to the adoption of that policy. There had been a continued and rapid rise of the prices, food prices in particular, paid by American families during the preceding winter and spring. Food prices were rising at the rate of nearly 30 percent a year. That rise was what made hold-the-line necessary. And under hold-the-line, that rise was halted. Indeed, food prices were reduced, and, with the help of a well designed subsidy program they have been held during the past 3 years slightly below the May 1943 level.

Thirty percent a year! That was how fast food prices were rising before the hold-the-line order. Today supplies are still short and incomes are far above 1943 levels. Indeed they are close to the wartime peak. If we take off ceilings on meats and dairy products, that 30 percent increase of food prices will not require a year to occur—it will be here in a matter of weeks.

The same statement holds true with regard to clothing. Everyone knows how great the shortages are, particularly in view of the extra demand by the 9,000,000 men and women who have been demobilized since VJ-day. When we removed controls after World War I clothing prices climbed 50 percent before the economic collapse brought them tumbling down. That is what we must look forward to now if we adopt the committee's amendment. A rise of 50 percent or more will take place followed by a collapse which will ruin thousands of businessmen through inventory losses.

Does anyone suppose that we can have increases of such magnitude in key living costs without utterly destroying the entire stabilization program? How can other prices be controlled anywhere near present levels if food and clothing prices shoot up? How long can landlords be held to rent ceilings while food and clothing merchants are free to charge what the traffic will bear?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I am sure that the Senator has touched upon one of the things which must be emphasized over and over again. As I said the other day, I believe that one of the cruelest deceptions which can be perpetrated on the American public is to tell them that

they may have controls exercised over rents at the present levels—they are being so told by the manufacturers' associations—and have no controls exercised over food prices or manufactured products. The people will finally wake up to the fact that the continuance of a situation of that kind will result in either bankrupting the landlords, or no taxes being collected by the municipalities.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator is absolutely correct. A moment ago the Senator from Kentucky read some figures which indicated that rents have increased only a fraction of 1 percent. I wish to point out what has happened to commercial rents which were never subject to ceilings. Commercial properties and office buildings are short in supply and the demand is great. Rents on such properties have in many instances trebled and quadrupled. I should like to point out what happened on the New Jersey shore 60 miles from my home. The rents on summer cottages in that locality have increased as much as 600 percent in many instances. Only God knows what will happen to residential rents if this bill is passed in its present form.

Mr. President, what kind of a wage situation will we have if workers find 20, or 30, or 40 cents being taken out of every wage dollar by skyrocketing living costs?

The bill is a guaranty of turmoil and confusion, of greedy grabbing by many, and of desperate scrambling by everyone else. And this bill for economic chaos is proposed at a time when we desperately need to get back to productive teamwork. I question whether, in the light of history, any proposal made upon this floor will be found, as contrary to public interest as this one that comes before us with the recommendation of a majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

But the decontrol of food and clothing prices would do even greater damage than I have indicated. When the Emergency Price Control Act was enacted 4 years ago, the Congress expressly recognized the need to prevent inflation, not only to protect war production from speculative disruption and our people from profiteering, but also as an essential step toward preventing a disastrous collapse of values such as followed our last wartime inflation. Thus far that policy has succeeded. The price increases that have occurred have been moderate, averaging less than half as great as those occurring during the last war and only one-third as great as took place at the peak of that inflation. As we all know, under that stability of prices, production soared to greater heights than ever before achieved. Furthermore, because the price rise has been restrained and gradual, it has been possible to adjust incomes at least part of the distance they must rise if the present level of prices—or something close to it—is to be sustained after the present pent-up demand has been satisfied.

We have kept prices and wages manageable with respect to each other and they are still manageable today. But if we now let prices spurt upward, there will be no managed prices and no managed wages. The inflationary spiral will promptly go into a jolting climb. Not only will production be hindered and held back by hoarding and speculation, but the whole wage issue will be opened up wide.

Wages will again become unsettled and a new wave of strikes is sure to develop if prices begin their steep climb. But if history teaches us anything, it teaches us that in such a race wages always lag behind. Wage increases take negotiating—take time. Prices, on the other hand, go up overnight, with little or no notice. And today thousands of contracts are being written with escalator clauses that guarantee automatic price increases the moment controls are lifted.

Wages will rise, but prices will rise faster still. The cost of living will steadily get further and further beyond the reach of the average family. We will soon arrive at what in 1921 was called a "consumers' strike." People's incomes just will not be big enough to take the goods off the market at the inflated prices. Then will come the crash, the crash that today can still be averted if we here have the courage to avert it. The crash will begin with a sagging of prices that will soon turn to a downward rush.

Farmers will see their income cut in half, just as they were after the last war. Inventory losses alone will wipe out thousands of businessmen just as after the last war. Shrinking sales will mean the cutting back of production and the discharge of millions of workers, just as after the last war. Unemployment will mount week after week, just as after the last war. Once again and this time with our eyes open, we shall have gone up the dizzy heights of inflation and over the precipice into economic depression. For the first time in history, a representative national legislature will have knowingly plunged its country into economic chaos.

That is the prospect the country faces if we here in the Senate follow the advice of the majority of the committee and knock the heart out of control over the cost of living.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The advice of the majority of the committee and the advice of the National Association of Manufacturers, I may add. That is whose advice we are taking.

Mr. MYERS. That might well be added—the Senate is accepting the advice of all the other pressure groups who are descending upon Washington.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is not saying, is he, that the farmers of the country want to continue OPA? He is not speaking for the farmers of the country, is he?

Mr. MYERS. I say God help the farmers of the country if the Senator and those supporting his position should be successful today on the floor of the United States Senate in emasculating the OPA.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the distinguished Senator answer my question?

Mr. MYERS. I think I speak for more farmers than does the Senator from Nebraska. We have more farmers in one corner of Pennsylvania than the Senator has in his entire State.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MYERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If there are so many farmers in Pennsylvania, I should like to ask the question once again, Is the Senator speaking for the farmers in stating on the floor of the Senate that there are pressure groups that ask the Senator to come here and support OPA?

Mr. MYERS. I am speaking for the people of America, I believe, and for the people of Pennsylvania. I am not speaking for any group, and the farmers have not come to me. A few people have, but the farmers have not come to me. The Senator from Nebraska may represent the farmers, but the Senator from Nebraska seems to represent all the other groups, because we hear of the various things he has been waving in front of the people of America, from platforms and on radio forums.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean I am representing the groups that are selling in the black market? Does the Senator think I am supporting their contentions?

Mr. MYERS. Of course not. I think the Senator is sincere.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator says I am waving the flag. I am waving the flag of the man who is just as interested in preserving the standards of living as is the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. Of course, I am sure of that.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, of the man who wants to get meat out of the legitimate market, at a reduced price.

Mr. MYERS. I am sure the Senator is sincere; I am sure he is acting from the best of motives, but I think he is misguided, and I prophesy that in a few short months it will be evident to all the people of America.

Mr. President, I have outlined what I believe to be the danger the country faces if we here in the Senate follow the advice of the majority of the committee, and, I may add, as has been suggested by my distinguished friend from Connecticut, the National Association of Manufacturers; and knock the heart out of control over the cost of living. If, despite the plain lessons of history, of experience, and of common sense, we take that step, the American people will know how to judge the wisdom, the competence, and the patriotism of Senators whose votes here have determined the issue.

Mr. President, I wish to be recorded as opposed to the bill in its present form, because I think it will bring to America economic disaster, just as bombs from the Land of the Rising Sun almost brought military disaster to America on December 7, 1941.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] as modified.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Overton
Andrews	Hill	Pepper
Austin	Hoey	Radcliffe
Ball	Huffman	Reed
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bilbo	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Brewster	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Bridges	Knowland	Shipstead
Brooks	La Follette	Smith
Buck	Lucas	Stanfill
Bushfield	McCarran	Stewart
Byrd	McClellan	Taft
Capper	McFarland	Taylor
Carville	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Magnuson	Tobey
Donnell	Maybank	Tunnell
Downey	Mead	Tydings
Eastland	Millikin	Wagner
Ellender	Moore	Walsh
Gerry	Morse	Wheeler
Gurney	Murdock	Wherry
Hart	Murray	White
Hatch	Myers	Wilson
Hawkes	O'Daniel	
Hayden	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], as modified.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD (when his name was called). I ask to be excused from voting on this amendment, as it may affect my own personal interest.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator will be excused from voting.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BURCH], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business, attending the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in Bermuda.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

I also announce that on this question the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

I announce further that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is paired on this question with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

I also announce the following general pairs: The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]; and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

I announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BURCH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate as members of the committee appointed by the United States Senate to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is unavoidably detained. He would vote "yea" if present. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], who would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—21

Andrews	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hoey	Reed
Bilbo	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Bridges	McClellan	Stewart
Brooks	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Maybank	Wherry
Eastland	Moore	Wilson

NAYS—51

Aiken	Huffman	Pepper
Austin	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Barkley	Kilgore	Revercomb
Brewster	Knowland	Saltonstall
Buck	La Follette	Shipstead
Carville	Lucas	Smith
Cordon	McCarran	Stanfill
Donnell	McFarland	Taft
Downey	McMahon	Taylor
Ellender	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Gerry	Mead	Tobey
Gurney	Millikin	Tunnell
Hart	Morse	Tydings
Hatch	Murdock	Wagner
Hawkes	Murray	Walsh
Hayden	Myers	Wheeler
Hill	O'Mahoney	White

NOT VOTING—23

Bailey	Connally	Mitchell
Briggs	Ferguson	Overton
Burch	Fulbright	Russell
Butler	George	Vandenberg
Byrd	Gossett	Wiley
Capehart	Green	Willis
Capper	Guffey	Young
Chavez	Langer	

So the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to advise Senators with reference to the immediate program, and I take advantage of this opportunity because there is a full attendance.

Following the disposition of the pending bill, I hope the Senate will proceed to the call of the calendar. It has been some time since the calendar was called, except for claims bills. By calling the calendar at once we can ascertain what bills can be passed on the call and what bills cannot be passed on the call, so that we may know what bills must be taken up separately.

Four or five appropriation bills are ready for action. There are two or three urgent matters which need to be acted upon at once. One is a bill in which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is interested, authorizing the use of the old ships which are now on their way to the Pacific to be shot at, but there is no authority yet to fire on them. In order that that may be legally done, it is necessary to consider the bill, which will not require very long.

The conferees on the draft bill have run into a situation in which the pay schedule which we included in the bill must be dealt with separately. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] have a proposal to iron out that difficulty, which will not take long.

There is a deficiency bill in which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is interested, and on which he wishes to obtain action, if possible, before he leaves.

It seems to me that all those things are subservient to the desire to feel out the situation and see what bills on the calendar can be passed on the call of the calendar. I hope we can arrange to take up the other matters this afternoon after we complete consideration of the pending bill, or perhaps even during the call of the calendar.

I make that statement in order that Senators may understand that during the remainder of the week the call of the calendar and consideration of other urgent measures, and possibly appropriation bills, will be the schedule.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question. The Chair has announced the personnel of the funeral committee to accompany the body of the late Senator Bankhead, of Alabama. The train leaves at 4:30 this afternoon. I wish to inquire whether the Senator can tell me what prospect there is of completing consideration of the pending legislation before that time.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are only one or two other amendments that I know of, except probably two amendments which

are mere clarifying amendments, to which I am sure there will be no objection. I certainly hope that we can conclude consideration of the bill and have a final vote upon it before the committee leaves to attend the funeral. Of course, the Senator realizes that I have no way of guaranteeing that. It depends upon the amount of discussion, which I hope will be kept to a minimum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to say a word in addition to what the distinguished majority leader has said about the pending bill. Twelve Senators have been appointed on the funeral committee. We all loved Senator Bankhead. The Chair does not believe that there was a Member of this body who did not love him. The pending bill is a very important measure. The Chair hopes that the Senate can vote on it before 4 o'clock. The Chair appeals to Senators to view the situation as though they themselves were concerned, and see if consideration of the bill cannot be completed.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated and taken up for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 36, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "in the preceding quarter of 1946 and 1947" and insert in lieu thereof "in the first quarter of 1946."

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I should like to know what the amendment proposes.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, this amendment is really nothing more in its essence than a perfecting amendment, I do not know of any Senator familiar with the situation who objects to it.

On page 36 of the pending bill there is a provision to the effect in substance that the mark-ups or discounts in certain industries shall not be reduced under stated conditions. The concluding lines of the paragraph beginning on page 36 provide that there shall not be any reduction in rate if the volume of business for any preceding quarter during 1946 and 1947 is less than for the corresponding period in 1945. The only effect of this amendment is to substitute the word "first" for "preceding." The result would tend to crystallize the whole situation as to rate of discount during 1946 and 1947. Without this amendment it is quite possible that the rate of discount or mark-up might vary from quarter to quarter during 1946 and 1947. I am quite sure that no one would want that to be the case. I consider this to be a clarifying amendment protecting against fitful and unbusinesslike changes from time to time in rate of discounts or mark-ups, easily leading to a vast amount of extra work in accounting and probably much uncertainty and confusion.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What this amendment does is simply to select the first quarter of 1946 as a base period.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Exactly. It stabilizes the situation for 1946 and 1947.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So the mark-ups and discounts would not fluctuate from quarter to quarter.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. They could not under this amendment fluctuate from quarter to quarter, which, of course, would be a very undesirable shifting in business arrangements.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. This section relates primarily to dealers in farm implements.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that this particular provision is more satisfactory to them than the provision in the bill?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is my understanding that the amendment which I have just offered is much more satisfactory than the language now in the bill.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me to be a logical amendment, if it does not change the entire basis of the provision.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is indeed a logical change; and I cannot see how it would affect adversely in any way the general purport of the provision of the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18 it is proposed to strike out paragraph (3) of subparagraph (d) commencing with line 15 and continuing through to line 24, inclusive, and substitute the following:

(3) Whenever, after a reasonable test period, it appears that the supply of a nonagricultural commodity which has been decontrolled pursuant to this section is no longer consistent with the applicable decontrol standard, the Administrator, with the advance consent in writing of the Price Decontrol Board established under subsection (h), shall reestablish such maximum prices for the commodity, consistent with applicable provisions of law, as in his judgment may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, this is a perfecting amendment. Under the theory of the bill as it now stands, the test for decontrol is whether the supply of the nonagricultural commodity is in balance with the demand. It is assumed under that formula that when supply and demand are in balance the price is right. The paragraph (3) which we propose to amend has some price theory in it which is inconsistent with the decontrol theory which has already been approved. By this perfecting amendment we simply have the same formula for recontrol that we have for decontrol. If a commodity is in balance, it will be decontrolled. If after a reasonable period of test it becomes out of balance, it will be recontrolled. I do not believe there is any objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

(C) Price controls with respect to leaf tobacco and tobacco products manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom shall be removed not later than June 30, 1946.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I offer this amendment on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BURCH], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL], and myself. The amendment is based upon the fundamental proposition that there is an abundant supply of tobacco, both leaf tobacco and manufactured products of tobacco. That is admitted by everyone. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture have testified before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that there is a sufficient supply to meet the demand. There is also a sufficient storage supply. So fundamentally there is no reason why controls on tobacco should be retained.

It may be argued that under the pending bill it would be very easy to have tobacco decontrolled. The emergency in the matter, and the reason for offering the amendment, is that it would take some time for the OPA to decide whether to decontrol tobacco. If it were not decontrolled, an appeal would have to be made to the decontrol board, and that would take additional time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand the matter, the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to decontrol, and he will be able to do it tomorrow, the moment the bill is passed.

Mr. HOEY. If that provision of the bill covers the decontrolling of tobacco, the question would go to the Secretary of Agriculture, of course. But the difficulty in that connection is that unless tobacco is decontrolled immediately, the tobacco growers of the 1946 crop will receive no benefit, for tobacco goes on the market at an early date.

The importance of the amendment lies in its effect of enabling the tobacco farmers to obtain the benefit of the tobacco they grow, according to the grade of the tobacco. The agricultural specialists testified before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that under the present system the farmer receives no benefit for any superior grades of tobacco which he grows.

Certainly no harm at all will be done to any one by decontrolling tobacco, because no one maintains that there is any shortage of tobacco or tobacco products. If tobacco is decontrolled now, the farmers who put their tobacco on the market within the next two or three weeks will receive the benefit of an open market.

In this connection, I may say that tobacco and tobacco products constitute the one group of commodities which has received no appreciable benefit in the way of an increase of price during the war. The increase has been insignificant. The Government receives 7 cents as excise taxes for every package of cigarettes that is sold. The farmers who grow the tobacco and those who use it in manufactures and the wholesalers and retailers all combined receive only 6 cents for each package of cigarettes. However, I do not apprehend that the price of tobacco will advance as a result of the adoption of the amendment. But the amendment, if adopted, would enable the tobacco farmers to receive the benefits to which they are entitled because of the particular grades of tobacco they grow, rather than to have all grades of tobacco lumped together in connection with establishing the price. When the price is established on the basis of lumping all the grades together, the result has been that the aggregate price has drifted toward the price of the lower grades of tobacco.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word about this matter. As I said earlier in the day in discussing the Thomas amendment, I have believed from the very beginning that tobacco is one of the commodities which should not have been placed under price control. Tobacco is a luxury, not a necessity, except insofar as it is a necessity for the producer, in the sense that it is a necessity for him to produce it in order to make a living. But no one eats it or wears it. When the OPA first proposed to put leaf tobacco under price control, I protested that that should not be done. But it was done, and operations were conducted on that basis.

I did not offer the pending amendment in the committee, for the reason that I did not feel I would be justified in picking out a product of my own State and attempting to decontrol it, when I was opposing decontrol for products produced in other States. Therefore, I did not feel that it would be consistent on my part to offer an amendment to decontrol a particular product simply because my State produced it.

However, the bill as now prepared will decontrol a large part of the food products of the Nation which are a necessity. The bill will decontrol livestock and all livestock and meat products and dairy products and poultry. Also the formula for decontrol has been modified in such a way as probably to remove cotton and wool controls at an early stage.

So I see no reason why tobacco any longer should be retained under control, and I certainly shall not object to the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate. But having had some brief contact with tobacco controls during the war, I wish to endorse what has been so ably said by the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Kentucky.

As the Senator from North Carolina has pointed out, when the price ceiling was placed on tobacco it was imposed without regard to the fact that there may be 10 or 12 or 15 different grades. That means that the best grade is penalized, for many of the grades sell away under the ceilings. The farmers who raise very good grades of tobacco have been penalized, as a result, all during the war.

Moreover, tobacco is an agricultural product which is forced to bear a tax of 7 cents on a package of cigarettes. It seems to me that when we are raising approximately $600,000,000 a year in revenue from tobacco, the farmers who raise tobacco have contributed their just share to the wherewithal with which the Government is operated.

In view of that situation in regard to tobacco and in view of the particular facts relating to it, I certainly believe tobacco should be freed from OPA controls.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks of the distinguished Senators from North Carolina, Kentucky, and Maryland, I simply wish to say that I sincerely trust that the amendment will be adopted. I take that position for the reasons the distingushed Senator from North Carolina has so ably stated, and also for the reasons which the Senator from Maryland has called to the attention of this august body.

In the first place, Mr. President, only a comparatively small portion of the total production of tobacco goes into cigarettes. In the second place, when the ceilings were placed on tobacco in 1941 or 1942, no distinction was made as between the various grades, and because of that, the farmers who have labored long and arduously to produce superior grades of tobacco have been punished by the OPA regulations.

Mr. RADCLIFFE I am strongly of the opinion that the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] providing for the decontrol of tobacco is very timely. The position of the Senator from North Carolina is sound and his arguments for such decontrol are convincing and persuasive, and I hope decontrol of tobacco will become quickly effective; but I shall not delay the Senate at this hour by a statement of the reasons for my conclusion that these controls should now be eliminated. The tobacco industry has been obliged to sustain burdens unusually heavy, and the removal of control regulations by the OPA over tobacco will not be inflationary to any appreciable extent, if at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 33, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

(e) Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions of this section 5, 1946 and 1947 crop program operations with respect to sugar, may, while maximum prices are in effect with respect to sugar, be continued until such crops are processed and distributed, and the cost of 1946 crop program operations with respect to sugar may be charged to the funds authorized by Public Law 30, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended by Public Law 328, Seventy-ninth Congress. For the purpose of this section 5, no subsidy program operation on sugar shall be considered to be a new subsidy.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, this amendment is submitted for the Department of Agriculture, for the purpose of clarifying the language of the bill which we are now considering. I have submitted the amendment to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who helped to draw it up or to correct it so that it would conform to his ideas. I have also submitted it to the majority leader. So far as I can determine, there is no objection to it. The amendment merely clarifies the language and removes certain ambiguities.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 33, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

(f) Nothing in this act shall be construed as a limitation upon operations authorized by the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946 (Public Law 388, 79th Cong.).

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this amendment is offered merely to make sure that nothing in the bill will interfere in any way with the making of premium payments under the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of May 22.

In subsection (d), on page 32, and going over to the top of page 33, the bill now provides:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect the provisions of Public Laws 30, 88, 164, and 328—

Which provide, in one form or another, for the payment of subsidies under other acts.

This amendment merely adds the Housing Act as one of the acts which shall not be affected by the terms of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. MOORE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who was first on his feet.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Wisconsin

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. The Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding after section 5 thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, whenever there exists a shortage of animal and poultry feed which seriously affects any area within the United States, to institute and carry out a program (1) to direct the flow of animal and poultry feed to areas which the Secretary determines to be surplus feed areas into those which he determines to be deficit feed areas, and (2) to provide for the distribution of animal and poultry feed within deficit feed areas. The Secretary is authorized to carry out such program through purchase and sale operations and through the exercise of such priority, allocation, and other powers as may be vested in him by or pursuant to other provisions of law.

"(b) In carrying out programs under this section, primary consideration shall be given to the maintenance of foundation herds of dairy cattle and other livestock and foundation flocks of poultry, and preference shall be given in the distribution of feed supplies to those farmers whose herds and flocks are in danger of forced liquidation as a result of the shortage of feed. In order to assure that such preference will be given, the Secretary shall provide for the issuance by State and county production and marketing administration committees, upon application to such committees, of priority certificates to farmers whose flocks or herds are in danger of liquidation as the result of the shortage of feed; and the Secretary shall provide that, in the distribution of available feed, a priority shall be given to the holders of such certificates.

"(c) In administering programs under this section, the Secretary shall, insofar as possible, provide for equality of treatment for all producers of grains and other agricultural commodities which are acquired or used in furtherance of such program. To this end, the Secretary shall provide for extending to all such producers, as nearly as possible, the same rights and privileges with respect to the acquisition from them of grains and other agricultural commodities for the purposes of such programs.

"(d) The Secretary is authorized to utilize the funds and facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purposes of this section, and to incur monetary losses with respect to transactions carried out for the purposes of this section."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I may say briefly that the amendment would authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to do for certain areas of the United States what he is now authorized to do for almost every other part of the world. I believe that it is well known that there are in the United States today certain sections which are suffering from a grain famine, and that the depletion of foundation stocks of poultry, cattle, and possibly other animals, has been very great.

I wish to read only one telegram of many which I have received recently which indicate the seriousness of the situation. The telegram is from the Commissioner of Agriculture, at Montpelier, Vt., my own State, and reads as follows:

Following conclusions of New England commissioners of agriculture—

I believe that he sent this telegram in behalf of all New England commissioners of agriculture—

MONTPELIER, VT., *June 11, 1946.*

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Three million two hundred thousand hens slaughtered January 1 to May 1. Over 2,000,000 in May. Egg receipts down 42 percent since May 1. Replacement stock reduced 20 percent. Maintenance of replacements depends upon feed being made available. New England needs 3,000 carloads of feed to hold present livestock and poultry numbers for 30 days. Suggestions for relief: (1) Loan of Government-owned corn; (2) subsidy on corn, oats, barley, and other available grains except milo either on Government or private basis; (3) direct Government purchase of grain for shipment to deficit areas. Urge New England congressional feed committee to continue every possible effort to secure immediate relief.

STANLEY JUDD,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

While New England is perhaps somewhat worse off than is any of the other areas of the country, very serious conditions exist in the Northwest, and, I believe, in all the Pacific coast States, as well as in such States as New Jersey, New York, eastern Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and, to a lesser extent, further down the Atlantic coast.

It appears that the Department of Agriculture maintains that it does not have the authority today to deal with the situation. They are diverting some byproducts from the processing mills to the Pacific coast States and Northwest, and to the Northeast, but not in sufficient quantities. A few days ago a delegation from both Houses of Congress called upon some of the principal officials of the Department of Agriculture and asked them to do something to relieve the situation. We were advised that they lacked, perhaps, the power to do here in the United States what they are already doing in many other parts of the world. The purpose of this amendment is to give them the necessary authority.

As will be observed, the amendment provides that grain may be secured only from surplus areas. We know that not many such areas exist. But the Department of Agriculture was able to buy 34,000,000 bushels of corn, and approximately 70,000,000 bushels of wheat for shipment abroad. I do not know what are the requirements for the grain famine areas in the United States. I have seen one estimate to the effect that approximately 4,000,000 bushels would tide us over until the next harvest. But even if 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 bushels were required, thousands of farmers in the Northwest and in the Northeast would be saved from being set back years during which they have worked hard to build up their foundation flocks and herds. Right now the shortage areas are located in the Northeast and in the Pacific Northwest. A few years ago the shortage was in the North Central States. We do not know where it will be next spring. But wherever it is or will be, I believe that the Department of Agriculture should have the same authority in relieving the situation to the best of their ability that they now have in connection with the relief of famine conditions in other parts of the world.

Mr. President, I say frankly that I do not know whether the amendment is in the best possible phraseology, but I do know that if it is allowed to go to conference the committee of conference will properly word the amendment if it needs improvement. If there is any error in phraseology, I know that the Conference Committee will correct it before allowing the amendment to become law. I hope that the Senate will adopt the amendment so that something may be done in the immediate future to relieve the desperate situation which now confronts tens of thousands of farmers on both the western and eastern coasts of the United States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish heartily to endorse the amendment which has just been offered by the Senator from Vermont. The matter covered by the amendment has concerned several of us for several weeks. The shortage situation within the areas which have been referred to by the Senator from Vermont is becoming desperate. As the Senator has said, the language of the amendment may not be exactly correct, but something must be done, and I hope the Senate will allow us to give the Department of Agriculture authority to do something along the lines which have been suggested in order to relieve the almost intolerable situation in the Northwestern and New England States.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice of approval to what the Senator from Vermont has said.

During the past week I was in my State of Maine. A meeting was held at which there were present more than 250 persons from all sections of the State, representing the dairy and poultry industry. Never was there a more critical situation than that which now prevails in connection the feed situation. Flocks have been reduced to approximately 25 percent of normal. One grower there had at one time approximately 50,000 birds and his flock is now reduced to about 7,000 birds, and it is being rapidly eliminated.

It is apparent that the Department of Agriculture questioned its authority to buy grain for domestic use. However, it would seem that the citizens of our own country, particularly in the northwestern and in the northeastern areas, are entitled to the same character of consideration which it is deemed proper to give to those living outside our country.

Much of the grain may not be fit for human consumption, yet it is valuable to the farmers who are dependent upon dairy and poultry products. Unless they are allowed to preserve their foundation stocks and keep up their cattle and poultry production, the situation will increase chronically.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont will be agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Washington in endorsing the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. It is a step in the direction of helping save the poultry industry, particularly in our section of the country, and to a degree the dairy industry in our section, which is on the verge of total collapse.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, with my colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and my colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I rise to support the amendment. This is a matter which has been on the hearts of us Senators from the Northwest and New England districts for a long time.

I took it upon myself to make a trip by car through the great poultry section of the southern part of my State, to talk with the man on the farm, and to know first-hand conditions there. We have a splendid committee which has been operating 2 or 3 years, called the Small Business Committee. These poultry and dairy farmers who are in distress are truly small businessmen of this country. Their stock in trade is their poultry or their cattle. That is all they have with which to make a living. The whole family joins and cooperates in getting the results to carry the family through.

When they have raw materials, livestock, which needs feeding three times a day, and sometimes more in the case of growing stock, and when that is threatened with extinction, and birds are dying on the range, because men do not know where feed is to come from, and there is no supply in the stores, it is a tragic and grievous situation, so everything that possibly can be done to afford relief should be done, and I join with my colleague from Vermont in presenting this amendment.

Mr. President, I wrote a letter to the President, and sent him a telegram, 3 weeks ago, regarding this matter, stressing the urgency and the need of it, voicing a Macedonian cry, but I will say no more about the reply than to say that I had a reply, which I shall not read and mention publicly, but which disappointed me grievously, in the import of the letter and the matter of it.

This is so serious a matter that I challenge anyone to question it. It is a Macedonian cry, and we cry as did John Hay in the famous lines where he said:

> Wherever man oppresses man,
> Beneath the liberal sun,
> O Lord, be there, Thine arm make bare,
> Thy righteous will be done.

Let us paraphrase it. Wherever conditions threaten the very lifeblood and continuance of the industry of agriculture, the home life on our farms, then our job is to respond to the call for help.

So, Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to get behind the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, and put it through unanimously, and we will take care of any discrepancy there may be in the verbiage when we consider the bill in conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me say one more word from New England on behalf of the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. We try to raise in New England a great part of the food we eat; the milk we drink, the eggs we consume, the poultry we eat. Our poultry and our dairy herds are being killed off, and we will have less milk and less food in the coming months and next winter.

I know of no greater need that has been presented to me since I have been in the Senate than the need of grain in New England today. If the pending amendment will help get it, I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment, and that the conference committee will work it out in a suitable form, fair to everyone, so that it will help to get a little more grain into New England.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in reading the amendment hastily, it does not seem to me to give the Secretary of Agriculture power he does not now have with reference to the requisition of grain. If it does not give him that power, it is acceptable to me, but if I should be on the conference committee I should like to have the assurance of the Senator from Vermont that he does not consider or intend that the Secretary of Agriculture be given any power he has not already in relation to the requisition of grain from farmers.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not intended to give him the power of requisition of grain from the farmers.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am very happy to join with the Senator from Vermont as one of the sponsors of the amendment. I can assure the Senator from Ohio for the RECORD that it is not the contemplation of the authors of the amendment that the Secretary of Agriculture shall be given the power of seizure or requisition.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I could not hear all the Senator said. Does he say the amendment does not give the power of seizure?

Mr. MORSE. It does not, or of requisition.

Mr. WHERRY. What does it do, then, that is different? Is any additional power granted?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, it gives the Secretary of Agriculture what he says he does not now have, the power to purchase grain and transport it to areas in this country in which there is a need for it because of a shortage. That is true now in the Pacific Northwest and in the Northwest.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean to say this gives the Secretary of Agriculture the power to buy the grain that is now being set aside under the new order, when the producer brings it in to the elevator?

Mr. MORSE. It gives him the power to purchase grain for domestic use, just as he has power to purchase grain for foreign shipment and on the same terms.

Mr. WHERRY. Where does he get his power—under the Second War Powers Act?

Mr. MORSE. I so understand and that is what he is complaining about.

Mr. WHERRY. This would give him the power to do domestically what he has the power to do as to foreign shipments?

Mr. MORSE. It has been held that he has it so far as the foreign food problem is concerned. The basic problem is, after all, a national grain problem, and the administration has been approaching it from the standpoint of purely a wheat problem. As a result of the wheat order, and the functioning of the Secretary of Agriculture under the wheat order, there has been a great deficiency or scarcity of grain in certain parts of the country, particularly the Atlantic States and the Pacific Northwest. The Secretary under the wheat order has siphoned off all available wheat in those two sections of the country but failed to supply our farmers with any substitute feed. As a result great financial loss and suffering is being visited upon thousands of American farmers. It is an economic cruelty which this administration can never justify. Believe me the farmers of my State will not forget it. However, in justice to them this administration should proceed at once to correct the great wrong which it has done to our farmers.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment would authorize the Secretary to purchase from those areas which he may determine have grain in surplus. In other words, he could not go into an area which had barely enough grain for itself, and distribute the grain from that area to other areas. The amendment would authorize him to purchase from areas which he determines have surplus grain, and allocate that grain among areas where there is a grain famine.

Mr. WHERRY. That is a question of administration, I suppose, or of authority he now has, or which might be given him under the proposed amendment. It is my understanding of the new order which has just been issued that the producer of wheat takes it to the elevator, and when he takes it there he is compelled to sell. Under the wheat order he has to sell half of it to the Government. Is that so?

Mr. MORSE. Whatever the percentage is, 25 or 50 percent.

Mr. WHERRY. Fifty percent. It is my understanding there is no way to enforce that. Under the Wheat Act the miller is supposed to buy, but of course if the farmer does not sell, there is no way to force the miller to buy, and this authority, if granted, would give the Department of Agriculture the right to buy grain. Is that the purpose?

Mr. MORSE. Whatever powers the Secretary now has in regard to grain for foreign shipment, he would have with regard to grain for domestic shipment.

Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska and the other Senators that all we are seeking to do by the amendment is to meet the arguments the Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants put up to us when we seek to get the relief which

is so sorely needed in the grain deficiency areas today. He keeps saying that he does not have the type of power we seek to give him under the amendment. I think he should have it. I think any and all alibis should be removed from the Department of Agriculture. They should not be given any basis whatsoever for continuing this great hardship which their bungling in handling the grain problem has resulted in.

Let me also make clear that those from the Midwest need not fear they are going to suffer, because they are protected in that the Secretary's powers would be limited to any surplus grain that exists which otherwise would go into foreign shipments. We want him to have it within his power to supply grain for shortages in this country, too.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment I shall yield. The reason why we want that power has been pointed out on the floor of the Senate in the past 3 or 4 weeks. I am sure Senators do not realize the tremendous loss that has occurred in the Atlantic States and the Pacific Northwest to our farmers. Not only have there been great losses so far as livestock and poultry that ordinarily would go to the market are concerned but there has been great sacrifice of the basic breeding stock. As the farmers lose their breeding herds and their breeding flocks it means that the losses will accumulate 2, 3, and 4 years hence.

We think the Senate should be cognizant of the very serious situation which exists, and should give to the Secretary of Agriculture the authority in behalf of the Government to purchase the surplus feed and prevent tremendous losses to farmers.

My colleague the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and I have been busy on the problem. I do not see how anyone could work harder on a problem than has my colleague worked on this one, along with the Senators from the State of Washington, in conference with the Secretary of Agriculture and on the telephone, trying to prevent this tremendous loss to the farmers of the Northwest. The Secretary of Agriculture has cooperated splendidly with us, but he runs right up against what he tells us, at least, is his lack of power to do more than he has been doing. It has not been enough. He does not have the power of purchase we seek to give him, and he is not able to supply our area and the Atlantic area with enough grain to prevent losses to our farmers.

The real trouble goes back to the fact that he proceeded on an order that was not sufficiently planned with relation to the total grain problem of the country. Had it been worked out in terms of the total grain problem of the country, I think the wheat order would have been different in its composition. At least there was an obligation on the part of the Government, it seems to me, to see to it that before it issued the order it had made a survey and checked up on the minimum grain needs of the country. Had that check been made, it would have taken other steps, I am sure, in order to have avoided the great injury that has been done to the farmers in the two sections of the country to which I have referred.

I close, Mr. President, by also pointing out to the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Ohio that such modification of the language of the amendment as may need to be accomplished can be done in the conference committee. The important thing now, although I think the amendment in its present wording is perfectly proper, is to approve of the principle which we are seeking to put into law, and then work the matter out in conference.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon, what exactly will the Secretary of Agriculture do to send into New England wheat which, we will say, is in Kansas or in Illinois?

Mr. MORSE. He would have the power under this amendment to purchase it and use Federal money to purchase it, and ship it to New England and the Pacific Northwest and there it will be made available to the farmers of New England and the Pacific Northwest for their breeding stock.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In other words, he will have the power in his own discretion to allocate the distribution of that wheat which otherwise would find its own channels?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What channels will be deprived of the wheat that would be moved into, let us say, New England?

Mr. MORSE. The Secretary would have pretty wide discretion. I suppose part of it would be taken from wheat that otherwise, at that particular time, would go into foreign markets, and part of it would be taken from the supply of wheat that otherwise would go into the ordinary channels of trade in the domestic market.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture would have the power to look over the United States, see where wheat is needed, go to the surplus areas and purchase wheat, and reallocate it in his own discretion?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. It might have a little effect I may say to the Senator from Colorado, for at least a year or two on wheat speculation, but it would simply mean that the Department of Agriculture, to the extent that the wheat was needed in order to save the livestock, would have the power to make the purchase.

May I add this before I yield further. I think it very important, I may say to my good friend the Senator from Colorado, to keep in mind that we are dealing here really with a 2-year problem. That is, this grain problem that confronts us now is a problem for the next 2 years. It is going to take the 1946 crop and the 1947 crop to meet the human food problem of the world, and we are not sure that we can end our contribution by the end of 1947. But at least for the next year it seems to me the Secretary of Agriculture should have the right to purchase off of the top of the surplus level such feed for animal production as is necessary for these two great areas of the country or any other area that may develop a feed shortage. Our farmers are entitled to that protection instead of being driven int bankruptcy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I add further that the Secretary could not distribute any grain in any area that had not previously been determined to be a famine area, such as the Dust Bowl was in the Dakotas a few years ago, and New England and the Pacific Northwest are today.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What at the present time is the impediment which operates against those in, let us say, New England, who want to buy grain? Why can they not buy it?

Mr. MORSE. They cannot buy it for several reasons. First, they cannot buy it apparently because of the ceiling prices with which they are confronted. The holders of the grain simply will not release it under these ceiling prices.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it the intention to compel the owner to yield it at a price that does not satisfy him?

Mr. MORSE. Not at all, but I think that under this act the Secretary of Agriculture would have the right, in order to relieve the situation, to pay the farmers, if necessary, above the ceiling price in order to get the grain to the famine areas in this country as well as foreign nations. That is a matter, I think, he should be allowed to work out in accordance with the regulations that now apply to purchase for foreign relief.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I understood the Senator's answer in response to my question as to what is the present impediment to the movement of this grain into, let us say, New England, is that the New Englanders cannot find the grain at a price that is satisfactory to them. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So that this amendment is designed to move the grain at a price that is satisfactory to them?

Mr. MORSE. Into the famine area.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Into the famine area.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I will say that our feed mixers have been complaining of their inability to buy grain. When the Government started its grain-purchase program and purchased about 34,000,000 bushels of corn and nearly 70,000,000 bushels of wheat, we asked them why they could not purchase four or five million bushels more so long as our dealers themselves said they could not get it, and distribute it in the famine area on the Atlantic coast and the Pacific coast. Then they told us that they lacked authority to do so. As I said, a delegation from both

Houses of Congress—the members of the delegation happened to be from the Northeast—went to the Department of Agriculture about 4 or 5 weeks ago and met with Mr. Ed Dodds, the Under Secretary, Carl Farrington, and Mr. LeRoy Smith, the head of the Grain Division. They reiterated that they lacked the power to do anything for us in the way of purchasing grain. They have managed to allocate 40 or 50 cars a day of corn byproducts which is divided between the Northwest and the Northeast, but they claim that they could not go into the market and buy the four or five million bushels needed to help us get through, although they did have authority to buy 100,000,000 bushels to ship to other parts of the world.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the first power of the Secretary of Agriculture attach at the elevator level?

Mr. MORSE. I think that would be at the discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Could he go to the farm?

Mr. MORSE. I think he could go to the farm. I think he should be allowed to go to the farm.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Could he compel a sale at the farm?

Mr. MORSE. No; he could not. That is the point I want to make clear, that there is no intention on our part to compel a sale or to seize or requisition.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then, may I ask the Senator, if the Secretary would not have the power to compel a sale at a price, why could not the individual who wants grain get the grain on the same terms? What exactly could the Secretary do that the individual could not do, except allocate?

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary did so anyway. He got the grain. He got it for Europe when he could not get it for the United States.

Mr. MORSE. He can find the grain which the poor Northeast and Pacific Northwest have had such a hard time to find. The Secretary of Agriculture is pretty well informed as to where the grain is. He can go to the source of the grain. The individual farmer in New England or in the Pacific Northwest does not know where to turn to get the grain. Further, he cannot buy in sufficient quantity to enable him to get it. The Agriculture Department can buy in trainload lots.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. May I point out to my colleague from Colorado an example of concentrated irony? I live in New Hampshire. Boston is our main port in New England. To Boston have come millions upon millions of bushels of grain, grain that would make the mouth of the New England dairyman or poultryman water if he saw it, grain he could use to feed his stock. There it comes into Boston, and there it goes across the sea to Europe, and the New England dairymen and poultrymen have to sit back and see their birds dying and their cows go dry because of lack of nutrition. That is irony in concentrated form.

The question is asked, "What can we do?" We raised the price of wheat 30 cents a bushel in order to take care of the European needs. I say, let the price of wheat be raised another 30 cents a bushel to take care of the famine needs of New England and the Pacific Northwest. I said that in my telegram to the President of the United States of some weeks ago. If the Senator from Colorado lived in Boston or Vermont or Connecticut and saw millions upon millions of bushels of grain pouring into Boston and out across the sea he would feel a little bit as we do now.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am sure that would break a New Englander's heart; and it would break mine.

Mr. AIKEN. And it would break their bank accounts.

Mr. TOBEY. I am sure it would break the Senator's heart. We have much in common.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have obtained an answer to my question, but I have not obtained it to my entire satisfaction. Exactly what could the Secretary do in the way of price that the individual could not do?

Mr. MORSE. I think that by way of price he should be allowed, in order to relieve the famine areas, to apply the same price standard for the purchase of domestic grain that he is allowed to apply to the purchase of foreign grain.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And sell the grain at the same price that he pays for it?

Mr. MORSE. Sell it on the same basis as he sells foreign grain.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Assume that the price angle is satisfactory, the Secretary then would have the power to upset whatever may be the normal channels of distribution from surplus areas?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. He would have that power?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; and I think he should have it. I think unless he has that power adequate relief is not going to be brought to these domestic famine-stricken areas. Let us get down to an illustration of our needs. What we have needed so much in the Pacific Northwest is some substitute feed to take the place of the wheat that they have taken out of our granaries out there for foreign shipment, the so-called Commodity Credit wheat. We have tried to work out with the Secretary of Agriculture a loan of enough bushels of wheat to carry over these poultry producers and dairymen until the wheat from the Southwest can come in, because the Southwest crop now coming on to the market is not going to be shipped abroad for many months. The Government could have loaned us in Portland, Oreg., and other places in Oregon, enough of the Commodity Credit wheat to tide us over until our crop comes in next fall, and thus it could have prevented this emergency. Then it could have taken more than 25 percent from our crop next fall for foreign shipment. However we could not work that out with the Secretary of Agriculture because he claimed he did not have the power to do it. Apparently he felt bound by the President's foreign commitments.

Then we said, "Can you not buy some oats and some barley and some rye and some corn and get it out to us?" That is where we run into the stone wall that we seek to get over by this amendment, because he answers us by saying, in effect, "I lack the power to do that." I can assure Senators that the amendment we have proposed will at least remove that excuse from the Secretary of Agriculture, an excuse which I am sure he makes in good faith.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Secretary of Agriculture will have to study the available supply and he will find that in the surplus areas, and he will also have to study the starvation areas, and I assume he will try to make some equitable apportionment of what is available in the starvation areas.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We in Colorado, for example, have had starvation conditions with respect to corn but we are adjacent to great corn-producing areas. A State in that position would lose the benefit of its proximity to supply in the event of the kind of allocation we are talking about?

Mr. MORSE. To the extent that the Secretary took away from them corn that otherwise would go to them in the normal course of trade.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has been purchasing grain, for instance wheat, for shipment abroad at a price 30 cents a bushel above what is called ceiling level?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is it the purpose of the amendment to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase at a premium price—for example, 30 cents above the ceiling price—for redistribution for domestic use?

Mr. MORSE. It is my judgment that if that were found necessary to relieve a famine area in this country, he should have the same right to make premium payments for domestic needs as for foreign needs.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Naturally he will find that to be necessary if he is paying such a premium for wheat to be shipped abroad.

Mr. MORSE. We ought to be as fair to our own people as to people abroad.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The real thing that will induce the sale of wheat is the increased price which the Secretary of Agriculture pays.

Mr. MORSE. I suppose that will be very conducive to obtaining grain.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is another thing which the amendment does. It is a little difficult for the average small feed dealer to locate this feed, whereas with

the facilities of the Department of Agriculture, the Department has its fingers on the various areas.

Mr. MORSE. It knows where the feed is at all times.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It knows where the feed is at all times. The dealers could serve as distributing agencies. There are surplus areas; but if a feed dealer in New England or in the Pacific Northwest cannot find them the situation becomes more difficult. Under this amendment they would not try to locate those things. They would not have to pay more than the ceiling price.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Let me say to my colleague [Mr. MILLIKIN] that I was interested in the questions which he propounded, but the answers left out one step. The first step in this program is to place a ceiling, and then permit the Government to buy at prices above the ceiling. If that is the free-enterprise system then I do not know what the free-enterprise system is.

The Senator from Washington says that the Government knows better than does the buyer where the grain is. Grain will find a market. If there is a free market the grain will go to that market, but the regular users of the grain in our territory in Colorado were troubled with a shortage of corn. A ceiling had been placed on the price, and they were not allowed to pay more than the ceiling, but the Government could buy at prices above the ceiling and took the corn. It can take the corn and ship it wherever it wishes. That kind of a system will not work. It will result in dislocations of every kind in the areas where we feed corn and where we produce corn, and where we feed wheat and produce wheat. This is only another step along the same road. The system simply will not work. It will throw everything out of joint.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to my good friend from Colorado that if the free-enterprise system encompasses the starving out of the farmers in the Atlantic States and the Pacific Northwest States because of their inability to get grain with Government aid, while at the same time the Government provides the necessary grain for foreign use, then the free-enterprise system surely is in danger.

I see nothing in this amendment at all inconsistent with the free-enterprise system. On the contrary, the purpose of this amendment is to protect the free-enterprise system in the field of American agriculture, and to see that the Government takes the necessary steps to provide a little relief for some very unfortunate farmers in this country who are caught in a squeeze play because of this administration's bungling grain program. The Government program, so far as its wheat order was concerned, did not take into account sufficient planning so far as the over-all grain problem of the country is concerned. Hence the suffering against which we complain. On the other hand, there are surplus grain areas, in which there is a great deal of grain, but the farmers in the small areas to which we have been referring found it impossible to pay prices which would enable them to get the grain from the surplus regions to ship to their farms.

It seems to me that there is a clear duty on the part of the Government to protect the farmers who have been done this injustice. It is true—and I do not believe the Senator from Colorado will deny it—that their plight is caused by the Government's own grain program. I think that the first duty of the Government under those circumstances is to take the necessary steps to bring relief to the farmers who have so suffered. That is all the amendment seeks to do. It gives to the Department of Agriculture the same power to bring relief to our own fellow Americans—in this case farmers—as it is bringing to people abroad.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, what the Senator says is true to a certain extent. The mischief is in having one price for the Government and another price for the normal users. I do not want the Senator from Oregon to think that his feeders and the feeders in New England are the only sufferers under this kind of a program. We have feeders in Colorado, Nebraska, and other regions where grain and feed are produced. Their stock are starving also. They cannot buy feed because they must buy feed in the black market or they cannot get it. They do not want to buy it in the black market. They do not want to become criminals. If a ceiling is established at a low level, and the Government buys at prices higher than the ceiling, I cannot see how that kind of system will ever work equitably to the American people.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to point out to our colleagues from Colorado that at the present time they are very great beneficiaries of one of the Government's programs, namely, the allocation program. I refer to the Government's program which distributes protein feeds in areas where they are needed, in an equitable manner. This is possible because it is done on a voluntary basis. It is necessary to deal with only a limited number of processing plants, located largely in the area from Iowa east and south. I refer to the soybean processing plants and the cottonseed processing plants. The Government took over this program on January 16, when the situation became really serious. The voluntary system was possible because of the limited number of plants involved. Protein feeds have been allocated in a manner which I think has been satisfactory to every part of the country. No part of the country has received all it wanted, but no part of the country complained that it did not receive its just share. If the Senators from Colorado fear that we might get their cheap corn away from them—if there is such a thing as cheap corn—or grain in surplus areas, I hope they realize that if it were not for the Government program in the distribution of protein feeds the South and East would be using a very large percentage of the protein feeds today. I hope the Senators from Colorado will not object to a program which would equitably distribute other surplus grains in areas where there is genuine distress today.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very grateful for the observations of the Senator from Vermont regarding the protein feed situation. For a time we operated under rigid Government allocation. Then we came out from under that regulation. Coming out from under it meant some hardship in Colorado. We have subscribed to the voluntary system. I favor the voluntary system in this instance. I felt that a great burden had been taken off us when rigid allocation by law of protein feeds was removed. I certainly cannot approve that program, and then approve stepping into a much larger program in respect to the basic grains.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is claimed that the voluntary program works in the matter of routine feeds because of the small number of plants involved, whereas the purchase of corn, oats, and barley involves dealing with hundreds of thousands of farmers. I much prefer to see everything done on a voluntary basis. I do not like to see the Government buying and distributing. But I will say that what it has distributed so far in New England it has allocated among the regular channels of trade. I do not think it has interfered in any way with the regular channels of trade, but it has helped them to do more business than they otherwise would have been able to do.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in answer to the statement of the Senator from Vermont I wish to suggest that I believe he is not accurate in his statement that Government purchases of grain for foreign shipment and the invasion of the market by the 30 percent increase has not disrupted the domestic markets. Almost without exception every breakfast food mill in the United States of any size will be closed by the 30th of this month because of the invasion of the Government in the corn market at a 30-cent increase in price, which those mills cannot pay. The Government, in its program for foreign shipment, went into eastern Nebraska, Ohio, and certain other areas where there was No. 2 and No. 3 corn. It bought some of the finest corn that has ever been put into the commercial markets, and it is now cracking it into grits and meals for shipment overseas.

I again say, as I said the other day, that the Government did not go into the commercial market to relieve commercial corn processors, as it originally promised it would. The corn will go overseas as grits and meal. It will walk off the docks. The weevils will carry it off. There will be no need for "dock wallopers" over there to take it off. Corn cannot be shipped in that way. If there is the slightest delay, it will be fed to the hogs, or whatever other animals they have over there.

The commercial corn processors of the country, for whose relief that program was originally established, have not received the corn. It is the price that brings the grain out. There is only one thing that will make this amendment work, and that is price, unless we wish to institute Government seizure and allocation of private property.

I am not out of sympathy with the New England States and with the Atlantic seaboard area, the Pacific Northwest, and other areas that are in a starvation situation so far as feed is concerned.

But I assert that the only way any surplus grain will move is on a basis of price. Apparently this amendment proposes to again let the Government go in as a purchaser who can violate price ceilings which have been rigidly held, and who can pay more than I, as a private individual and purchaser, can pay. As a result, the Government will be able to preempt grain for allocation and, as the Senator from Colorado said a moment ago, the Government will not keep within the confines of the free-economy system. That is where we are heading, Mr. President. We are heading toward violation of the principles of the free-economy system.

I have read the amendment rather hurriedly, inasmuch as it has been offered from the floor and has not been printed. I am very much disappointed that its authors did not see fit to have it printed, so that Senators could study it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I intended to submit it yesterday for printing, but the Senate took a recess hurriedly when the news of the death of Senator Bankhead came to us.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand.

However, let me say that there is much in the amendment which needs correction.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from Iowa trust the conference committee to make any necessary corrections?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I hesitate to give the Senator a direct answer to that question.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I am in thorough sympathy with what the Senator from Vermont and other Senators are attempting to do. But the amendment proposes broad powers. I certainly do not want Government agencies of the United States to be in a position to preempt or seize private property.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not know where the Senator from Iowa got the idea that I said that the Government purchase of grain at 30 cents above the ceiling prices did not disrupt the market, because it did.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then, I beg the Senator's pardon, because that is exactly what I understood him to say.

Mr. AIKEN. But does the Senator say that if the Government is permitted to buy grain at 30 cents above the ceiling price, to send it all over the world, it should not be permitted to buy it and send it to New England, where it will be needed next spring?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, that is not the question.

Mr. AIKEN. It certainly is. If there is a right to purchase grain for people in Bulgaria or Greece, certainly there is a right to purchase it for our own people at home.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is becoming unduly exercised about a matter which is not entitled to such consideration. Certainly we have tremendous human obligations to those abroad who are in need. I would not for a moment vote to give preferential treatment to any foreign nation, as compared to our own.

In my judgment we made one mistake by the purchase of grain for use abroad. That may be a precedent, but it is no excuse or reason for making another mistake in the very vital field of food and feed products.

I do not think this amendment has any business being in this bill, in the first place. I do not think it has received proper consideration. Certainly I am not opposed to working out quickly and reasonably some means of permitting Government allocation and Government assistance in allocating surplus grains to needy areas in the United States, and I think that should be done, and I think it should have been done weeks ago, as some of my colleagues can testify. I think there has been too long a delay in providing and setting into motion administrative machinery to take care of the very situation which now confronts my colleague's State. But I do not think this amendment will do it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, what would the Senator suggest? We are confronted with a situation which must be met within the next 30 days. What else would the Senator suggest? The two areas which have been mentioned are famine stricken so far as feed is concerned. We are open to suggestions. All we wish to do is to clear up the situation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understood the Senator to say the other day, in speaking on the floor of the Senate—although my recollection may be wrong, of course—that the situation in the State of Washington was relieved by the acquisition of a number of carloads of corn.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I said nothing of the kind. I said that the Department attempted to bring about some relief by doing five things, and I also said that the Department attempted to help by means of the use of Commodity Credit Corporation wheat. We did receive a few carloads, but that would last only a few days in my State and in the State of Oregon. We must get wheat to those areas, and I know of no other way to do it than by means of the amendment which has been proposed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that up until this hour there has not been transported into the States of Oregon and Washington enough grain to take care of the needs there for a single day. The grain that has been sent there has not met the needs of the farmers there for a single day. A few carloads of grain do not last even a day, in view of the great needs which exist out there.

What the Senator from Washington has said is quite correct. We are confronted with an immediate problem, a problem which must be solved within the next few days, because since we last talked about this matter on the floor of the Senate, there has been a tremendous slaughtering of poultry out there; and that slaughtering has constituted a great waste of food. That is true because there are no facilities to take care of the poultry which has been slaughtered. Also the breeding flocks will be destroyed within the next 30 days, as well as the breeding stocks of other types of livestock, unless this administration starts doing something about it. Its record to date is downright unjust to our farmers in Oregon. I hope that the farmers of my State will take note of who is responsible for their plight. The Senators from Oregon have pleaded with the President of the United States about this serious injustice to our farmers in Oregon, but as yet he has not done a single, solitary thing to really relieve this situation. Responsibility for this great wrong now rests squarely with the President of the United States. The amendment we propose would do justice to our farmers and save them from bankruptcy.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am not at all out of sympathy with the stated objectives of the authors of the amendment. I am not in the least out of sympathy with them. I wish to do everything I can do to help get feed into their areas. But I am objecting because I, together with some of the other Members of the Senate, come from a very concentrated food and feed producing area which, incidentally, Mr. President, consumes the overwhelming portion, right in its own area, of the feed it produces, and the utilization of that feed is a most vital matter to those great food and feed producing areas.

As I said a moment ago, I object to the filing at the desk, at the last moment, of an amendment of the length and complexity of this one, when no copies of the amendment are on the desks of the Members of the Senate and when there is no opportunity for Senators to read and analyze the amendment. I do not distrust my colleagues who have submitted the amendment; that is not the point at all. But it is a fact that we are asked to vote upon a most important and vital principle, and I have simply been taken by surprise, inasmuch as the amendment was suddenly read from the desk. After I have hurriedly read the amendment myself, I still am not fully satisfied. I think perhaps I shall have to take the word of the sponsors of the amendment—as I am happy to do, from a personal standpoint—that it does not, in their intention or in their contemplation, create any authority in the Secretary or in any governmental agency or department to seize private property or preempt private property or bring compulsion upon anyone to dispose of grain which some Government official might in his own opinion regard as surplus.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt, let me say that it is not our intention to permit the seizure of a single bushel of grain from any farmer of the United States, against his will; and I would disapprove of such seizure from a farmer in Iowa, just as much as I would object to it in the case of a farmer in New England or in any other section of the United States.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course, I think the Senator is entirely sincere in taking that view.

Mr. AIKEN. If there is in the amendment anything which might be interpreted as authorizing seizure, I not only would expect, but I would request, the conference committee to see to it that the amendment was put into proper form. I do not see anything of that sort in the amendment now; but, if it should be found to exist in it, I would make that request of the conference committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me say to the Senator that there is in the amendment language which, under a strained interpretation by a court, might be regarded as justifying an interpretation of the sort I have mentioned.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, is there anything that is not subject to a strained interpretation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course there is not. Let me also point out that, of course, it will be argued that any such strained interpretation would apply for only a temporary period, and that sooner or later such an interpretation would be corrected; but I suggest a rope is put around a man's neck sometimes for only a temporary period.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The debate has been going on so long on that side of the Chamber that I wish to place a little emphasis on this side.

The Senator from Iowa has said that in his belief the amendment contains language which might give the Secretary of Agriculture power to preempt grain. It seems to me there can be no doubt that that would be the precise result of the language of the amendment.

We have been spending 2 or 3 days here in an effort to decontrol the commodities which the people of the United States produce. We have been spending weeks in denouncing the expansion of Government power. Most of the denunciation, I may say, has been coming from the same side of the aisle from which now have come the speeches in which we have been urged to make this extension of Government power.

Let me read the language which I am sure the Senator from Iowa will interpret as I do. The following is a new section which it is proposed to add to the bill:

> The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed—

There can be no doubt that that is a direction from Congress, if the amendment is adopted—

> whenever there exists a shortage of animal and poultry feed which seriously affects any area within the United States—

Mr. President, will someone tell me who is going to control the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, whose judgment will be used? Does the Congress provide any standard? There is not a word, not a line. The amendment is a complete delegation of power to the Secretary of Agriculture, whenever a shortage of animal or poultry feed seriously affects any area in the United States.

I ask Senators to remember that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, when he finds a certain condition to exist, to do what? To institute and carry out a program which will direct the flow of animal and poultry feed from areas which the Secretary determines to be surplus feed areas into those which he determines to be deficit feed areas. Is there any description of the kind of a program which may be put into effect? None at all. There is to be given to the Secretary of Agriculture merely carte blanche authority to draw up a program for the diversion of grain from one area to another.

Mr. President, allow me to invite the attention of the Senate to what seems to me to be a perfect absurdity in this amendment. I read subsection (c):

> In administering programs under this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, insofar as possible, provide for equality of treatment for all producers of grain.

I do not wonder that Senators from a grain-producing area would rise to protest against a broad grant of power of this kind, which is couched in such language as to make it clear that the authors of the amendment were confident that it could not be enforced equitably.

Mr. President, this is carrying government by Executive order to the *n*th degree, and I certainly trust that the Senate of the United States will not add it at the present time to the pending bill without the committee first holding a hearing and giving an opportunity for Members of the Senate to analyze it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will yield to the Senator from Kansas in just a minute. I am under the 30-minute rule, and I wish to make a short statement.

Mr. President, I wish to make my position clear that while I am apprehensive with reference to the amendment, and especially with reference to the pattern it may set, I believe that if we could obtain a slight delay of a short time, say a half an hour or so, we could work together with the Members of the Senate who come from the devastated feed areas, and arrive at some solution. I am not unsympathetic with the objective of the amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, within a very few minutes I must leave for the Union Station to meet Mrs. Bankhead, widow of our late colleague, and bid her good-by. I am a member of the funeral party which will attend the funeral services of Senator Bankhead, but because of the present legislative situation I shall be unable to join it.

I wish to say to the Senator from Iowa that, in the first place, this amendment has no business in the pending bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. REED. The amendment does not deal with a price-control matter; it deals with a distribution-of-grain matter.

Secondly, as the Senator from Wyoming has so earnestly and eloquently stated, we are struggling to decontrol. I ask the Senator from Iowa if, in his judgment, this amendment would not give to the Secretary of Agriculture absolute power to distribute within his discretion all the grain produced in the United States?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would not go that far. I believe that the amendment would give to the Secretary of Agriculture tremendous power over at least a portion of the grain, and it would represent a rather ominous step toward full control.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am familiar with the operation of the present program of the Secretary of Agriculture in obtaining grain for famine relief. If any Senator has an idea that the farmers in the grain-growing sections of the country do not believe that their grain is being taken from them, they are mistaken. That is the general belief of the farmers, and it is a fact that grain is being taken from them. We may call it requisitioning or whatever we please, but the fact remains that when a wheat farmer takes grain from his farm for storage, he is required under the order of the Secretary of Agriculture to sell 50 percent of it within 15 days after it goes into storage. The elevator operator, or the storage operator, is then under compulsion of the order to turn over 50 percent of what he buys, which is 25 percent of the farmer's crop, for famine-relief purposes.

Mr. President, I have a great deal of sympathy for the New England and Northwestern States. Their problem is a difficult one, although it is not quite so difficult as a few minutes ago it was established to be. It was said that the grain feeder in the Northeast does not know where to turn for grain. The Senator from Vermont is well aware of the fact that the largest grain consumer in the United States is located at Buffalo, N. Y., with membership all over New York State and, I believe, in the Senator's State of Vermont.

Mr. President, I realize that I am trespassing upon the time of the Senator from Iowa, but I must leave within a very few minutes. As I have already said, I believe that this amendment has no business in the pending bill. Secondly, as it has been pointed out, in an atmosphere of undertaking to decontrol we are really extending control beyond the original thoughts of any Member of this body, as the Senator from Iowa clearly indicated. I believe that the amendment should have been brought before the Senate under different circumstances. We should not be confronted with an amendment so far-reaching at a time when extensive debate and consideration of the bill is drawing to a conclusion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I must say to the Senator from Wyoming that there is nothing at all absurd about the language which was read from subsection (c). The language seeks to do fairness and equity to the grain producers. When the Secretary of Agriculture proceeds to purchase under the program called for in the proposed amendment, he will, under the terms of the amendment, see to it that equality of treatment is extended, so far as possible, to all grain producers. Therefore, an equal distribution would be made to all famine areas.

Mr. President, the second point which I wish to make is that all the arguments which have been advanced against the amendment fall to the ground unless those who so argue wish to take a position that the power we have given to the Secretary of Agriculture to exercise in the purchase of grain and in connection with the grain program for the relief of famine areas abroad, should not likewise be exercised at home. All we are seeking to do in this amendment—I do not propose to let the Senator get away from this point—is to give to the Secretary of Agriculture the same power and authority to relieve distress at home that he is now allowed to exercise in relieving distress abroad. I assert that to be a fair and equitable type of treatment.

Of course, Mr. President, the amendment does belong in the pending bill. It is definitely related to the entire price-fixing program, and I know of no other bill to which the amendment could be more appropriately attached than the pending bill.

Furthermore, the record is perfectly clear that several of us have discussed this problem for several days. I believe that the Senate is fully familiar with the problem which now confronts us. I agree with the Senator that perhaps we should take half an hour to perfect the amendment to the satisfaction of all concerned, but, nevertheless, that can be done in the committee on conference, and that is where it should be done.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Iowa. Would not a direct solution of the problem be in not disturbing the present ceilings on the 1945 crop, or what is left of it, of wheat, barley, rye, and oats?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not care to get into the field of price discussion at this moment. I am not prepared to discuss the matter generally. But the entire present situation as it relates to the feed and food catastrophe in this country, and in certain shortage areas, in particular, started a long time ago with the illogical and unsound price-control policy which was inaugurated. That was what got us into our present confused situation. Our feed, meat, and production ceilings have become entirely out of balance. It will require some heroic methods to get them back into balance. The origin of the trouble was long ago, and it was largely an OPA trouble in their refusal to recognize sound economic principles of price control. But that is beside the point at the present time. I think that had the OPA recognized the situation which existed, and had allowed the normal balance of feed and food prices within a sound economic system to dovetail with each other, there would now be no difficulty with reference to food and feed shortages. Corn and wheat are not flowing into channels of use because of an inequitable price.

I do not intend to read all these communications, but I have two letters which were circulated on the floor of the Chicago Stock Exchange a few days ago, one on Saturday, June 8, from one commission house, giving a list of all the things they will trade for a carload of corn. It runs all the way from sheets and pillow cases to cotton dresses, baby-crib sheets, rugs and carpets, sodium nitrate, fertilizer, fish meal, meat scraps, refrigerators, and radios. That is what they will trade as a bonus. Black market? Of course it is a black market, but it still spells price.

Here is another from the Chicago Board of Trade. They will trade a car of meat scraps for three cars of corn, a car of mill feed for one car of corn, one car of gluten meal for two cars of corn, a car of fish meal for four cars of corn, two cars of duck manure for one car of mill feed, four cars of duck manure for one car of corn.

Mr. President, that is the way it goes. That is what people have to pay, on top of the ceiling prices OPA has frozen on agricultural products, in their foolish and inexplicable attempt to control, by men, the immutable laws of economics that nothing but society in this country can work out.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I think what has transpired in the last few moments has almost dramatically and humorously pointed out to us where this program is going when the bill is finally passed.

I am thoroughly in accord with the decontrol of meats, but we cannot decontrol meats unless we decontrol dairy products and poultry, for the moment we take the ceiling off meats, there will be competition for grain, and the minute we take the ceiling off dairy products and poultry, as I think we should do, there will be competition by the producers of both for grain, and not a load of corn will go through the legitimate market.

The Government having the right to go in whenever it desires and put a 30-cent premium on corn completely destroys the faith of the farmer in observing the law. When our Government went in recently and put a 30-cent premium on corn, I received any number of letters from men who said they had held their corn, then when the Government asked them to sell it, they sold it, not on the black market, for trucks on end had come into their yards trying to buy up 2,000 bushels of corn, when there were only 1,800 bushels in the crib. All sorts of inducements were used to get farmers to go into the black market with their produce, but they did not do so. When the Government appealed to them to release it, they did sell it. Then think of the Government offering 30 cents a bushel premium more than they got because they observed the law.

I have sympathy with men in the deficit areas. I am very sympathetic with the men who see thousands upon thousands of bushels roll into their ports and then go overseas. I remind some of them, however, that they stood here and wanted to beat down any opposition to giving away America to all the rest of the world, but now it is rolling by their doors, and they do not like to see it go.

Mr. President, I can give them the answer, if they want a suggestion. Decontrol grain in this country. If we are to decontrol meat, dairy products and poultry, let us decontrol grain, and let the grain find its own level, and let people bid for the grain in legitimate channels. If we do not, we are going to do what has already been almost done, destroy every legitimate packing company in the country, make criminals out of the black market operators, destroy the faith of the country in the integrity of the Government, and wind up with one instance after another where there is a desire to give the Government more control. We should decontrol, and decontrol fast.

I will join with the Senators from the deficiency areas if they will offer an amendment now to decontrol grain. That is the way to bring back private enterprise, that is the way to decontrol legitimately, and stop giving more power to the Government. That will meet the problem, and no other means will meet it.

Mr. CORDON obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me a moment?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am obliged to leave the Chamber at this hour for reasons well known to all Senators, and I wish to say that if I were present, as I cannot be, I should certainly vote for the bill as it is written up to date.

I also wish to say that I am opposed to the pending amendment. I do not know whether I will have a pair or not. I understand the bill will be overwhelmingly passed, and it is not necessary for any particular Senator to be present.

I merely wanted to put my position in the RECORD before I left. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I realize that the debate has taken some time, and I know Senators would like to get ahead with the bill. I understand the majority leader desires to get final action this evening. I regret that he feels there is a necessity that that be done. I believe the interests of the country are sufficient to warrant taking whatever time is necessary carefully to consider the provisions of the bill and the provisions of the amendment now pending.

Mr. President, the pending amendment is too important to too many people merely to pass it by with a wave of the hand. When we discuss the situation which exists in the New England area, in New Jersey and Delaware, through the Carolinas, on the Pacific coast, and in the Pacific Northwest, when we consider

the condition which exists there, we must consider it in terms of people, in terms of women and children, of men who have spent their lives building up an industry to take care of their families, and now see that industry being swept away, see their life's savings gone, and in many instances faced at this minute with bankruptcy, with the necessity of picking up the scattered pieces and trying to start to build again along some other line. That is the condition which exists at this time in these sections of the United States, and that cannot be laughed off.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Secretary of Agriculture would make allocations in different places, such as the ports of Portland, Seattle, and Boston, of the stored grain there that cannot be moved overseas or used for some period of time, as was suggested a moment ago by several other Senators, is the Senator of the opinion that would relieve the situation, that is, take the allocations for shipment abroad, and replace them from the crops coming in from the Southwest?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is satisfied that to a very great extent the critical condition now existing in the United States can be handled by the Government of the United States through its present agencies, without having to change its present purchasing program. I do not think this amendment will do any more than that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am glad to hear the Senator say that, because I am of the same opinion. But in view of the fact also that I have the deepest sympathy with those who live in the distressed areas, and would like to see them get feed grain, I wondered if the question would not be fully answered if we adopted a rather simple amendment—I am not prepared to suggest the language—authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture, or directing him, if you please, or any agency having charge of the grain shipped in and stored in our seaports for foreign shipment, to determine certain surpluses which are not needed for immediate shipment and lend them in the distressed areas, to be replaced by later acquisitions from the new crops.

I wonder if that would not solve the problem. That grain is now on hand, I understand, in these most distressed areas in storage, but the difficulty is the people cannot use it to feed their animals.

I call attention to another fact. If we wait until the machinery of Government begins to suck the grain in from the Middle West and ship it to the distressed areas, the stock is going to be starved to death.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator from Iowa. I think there is nothing in the amendment which need startle anybody. There is nothing in the amendment which any Senator need shy from or misunderstand. There is not a word in the amendment which grants any power to the Government of the United States in the field of seizure or condemnation—not a word.

I call the attention of my colleagues now to the pertinent provisions of the amendment.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed—

That is mandatory, Mr. President. There is no question about it.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, whenever there exists a shortage of animal and poultry feed which seriously affects any area within the United States—

I digress at this point to suggest to the senior Senator from Wyoming that there is his standard—

to institute and carry out a program.

What program?

1. To direct the flow of animal and poultry feed from areas which the Secretary determines to be surplus feed areas into those which he determines to be deficit feed areas; and (2) to provide for the distribution of animal and poultry feed within deficit feed areas.

The Secretary is authorized to carry out such program through purchase and sale operations and through the exercise of such priority, allocation, and other powers as may be vested in him by or pursuant to other provisions of law.

If I can read the English language that is authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to act in this instance toward certain ends within his presently given statutory powers, and it grants no other power. There is no question about there being any grant of the right of seizure in the amendment.

Let us take paragraph (b).

In carrying out programs under this section, primary consideration shall be given to the maintenance of foundation herds of dairy cattle and other livestock and foundation flocks of poultry.

What does that mean, Mr. President? It means that grains, what we have, shall be distributed as well as may be, so that the man operating his dairy farm or his poultry farm, may be able to maintain enough of his breeding stock so that next year and the year after his children will not be on charity. That is what that language means.

And preference shall be given in the distribution of feed supplies to those farmers whose herds and flocks are in danger of forced liquidation as a result of the shortage of feed.

That means, to relieve famine. First, famine in poultry and livestock, and through them tomorrow's famine among the people who make their living raising livestock and poultry.

In order to assure that such preference will be given, the Secretary shall provide for the issuance by State and county production and markett administration committees, upon application to such committees, of priority certificates to farmers whose flocks or herds are in danger of liquidation as the result of the shortage of feed.

That means, Mr. President, that the Secretary of Agriculture shall do what he can to provide equity among those whose flocks and herds are faced with starvation and scarcity tomorrow.

And the Secretary shall provide that, in the distribution of available feed, a priority shall be given to the holders of such certificates.

That is perfectly plain. That is simply a rational provision for distribution of available supplies so they will be evenly distributed, and will do the most good in the places where need is the greatest. There is no ambiguity in that language.

(c) In administering programs under this section, the Secretary shall, insofar as possible, provide for equality of treatment for all producers of grains and other agricultural commodities which are acquired or used in furtherance of such program.

One of my colleagues a while ago shied away from that provision. If I understand what it means, Mr. President, the Members of the Senate who come from the grain areas should stand solidly behind this amendment. It says to the Government of the United States "Never again shall you go out and say to the farmers: 'Bring in your grain; we will pay you the ceiling and going price for it; we want it to feed starving people'." and when that has been done, raise the price of wheat 30 cents a bushel to those who had not responded. That is what that language means. I think with a proper understanding of this provision the amendment will have the complete support of the grain State Senators and other Senators.

The next provision is:

To this end, the Secretary shall provide for extending to all such producers, as nearly as possible, the same rights and privileges with respect to the acquisition from them of grains and other agricultural commodities for the purposes of such programs.

That merely completes the direction that from now on Government acquisition must be equitable; that equity shall be done as between the Government and all grain producers, and that special prices and premiums shall not be given to those who hold back and fail to pull their share of the load.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to utilize the funds and facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purposes of this section, and to incur monetary losses with respect to transactions carried out for the purposes of the section.

The meaning of that language is perfectly apparent.

The whole amendment, Mr. President, means, as my colleague from Oregon said, that the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to take into consideration, as he acquires grain, the needs of our own country as well as the needs of those to whom we are furnishing grains in foreign lands.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator does not construe that last language to mean the imposition of additional subsidies, does he, over and above those authorized in the bill?

Mr. CORDON. I cannot read any such meaning as that into the language. The losses quite evidently would come about if the Government was required to go into a market and pay the going price; if it were to purchase grain at a price

in excess of what it can reasonably be distributed for. By the amendment the Government is authorized to take that loss, which it has done on substantially all it has purchased for years.

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not think it has done that very often, I will say, with all due respect to the Senator from Oregon. What I should like to know is this: The authors of the amendment do not intend, do they, that there shall be any general subsidy, but only the payment of incidental costs, perhaps of transportation?

Mr. CORDON. I will read the language again, because I am just as anxious as the Senator from Ohio is to avoid subsidy payments.

Mr. TAFT. I only ask the Senator the question because of the suggestion that the conference committee would have the power, so to speak, to say how this program shall be worked out, if the amendment were adopted, and I wanted to be sure that it was not contemplated that any general subsidy should be imposed for the benefit of the feeders.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am not the author of the amendment. I should like to ask the author of it to give direct assurance for the benefit of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. AIKEN. I am only one of three sponsors of the amendment, but I can assure the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, it is not intended to be a subsidy program. But when the Government undertakes a program of this kind, it naturally costs some money, and the Government is authorized by the amendment to absorb such cost.

Other sections of the country from time to time have been beneficiaries of programs authorized by specific law, and if I am not mistaken, some sections from which, apparently, there is opposition to this amendment, have been the beneficiaries of such programs in the past. I am a little amazed that anyone from any part of the country, from Wyoming or Colorado or any other States, should oppose this proposal for relief for the famine areas of the Northeast and the Northwest at the present time, when I recall that they have come to me time after time and asked me to help relieve distress in the wool industry or some other industry affecting their areas. I do not understand why such Senators oppose this amendment which would keep perhaps 100,000 farmers in these two areas of the United States in production, and enable them to keep their homes and their herds, which perhaps they have been 15 or 20 years in building up. I certainly do not understand that position at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say, in response to the question raised by the Senator from Ohio, that there is no intention on the part of the authors of the measure to enlarge the subsidy program.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to join in making the statement that there was no intention to enlarge the subsidy.

Mr. CORDON. I wish to say a few more words and then I shall have concluded. The Government has been engaged for months past in acquiring grain for shipment overseas to the famine areas. Certainly all of us have been in favor of that program, which kept men and women and children from starving. It may be beside the point, but those of us who have had occasion to inquire into the operation of the program have reached the considered conclusion that the program has been most miserably handled; that it could have been handled with wisdom, and as a result as much grain could have been sent overseas as has gone overseas, and we would not have faced the disjointed and abnormal situation we have in this country.

Mr. President, at the present time there is a program covering the disposition by overseas shipment of the grain already purchased by the Government.

That program, of course, contemplates only the cereals grown in the crop year 1945. The crop year 1946 is now producing grain which is being harvested in some portions of Texas and other sections of the South, including California, and within the next 30 or 90 days will have been harvested in the great breadbasket area of the Mississippi and the Columbia Basin.

There is in prospect an extraordinarily good crop of cereals. There is now in the hands of the Government a heavy volume of cereals being prepared for shipment. That shipment will necessarily be now delayed, and some of the grain must go forward after the first of July, and in August. That is due to loss of shipments resulting from the rail strike to some extent, and other disturbances of a different character. The program has not moved as it was planned. There has been less grain shipped than was available to be shipped. At this time, if the Congress gives the direction to the administration, the grain presently available can be diverted in sufficient amounts at least to alleviate the present critical condition and without any material slowing down of the foreign-relief program, because by the time shipping would be available for these grains, grains from the 1946 crop would be available for substitution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am curious to know why the move here is not a simple provision directing the Secretary of Agriculture, or whoever has charge of the grain, to divert a certain number of bushels to the starvation areas, instead of going the route of uncontrolled grants of new power to the Secretary of Agriculture. Why was not that approach taken?

Mr. CORDON. I am unable to answer the question. I did not prepare the amendment. I am not in agreement with the Senator that this is a grant of new power to the Secretary. It is a directive to the Secretary to act within the fabric of existing power. I think perhaps the amendment could have been drawn with less language. It was probably not as carefully considered as it might have been. But its meaning is plain. Its purpose is certainly one to be highly commended and one which should be supported by the United States Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think the purpose sought to be achieved is highly commendable. I wish we had something before us which proceeded in a straight line between where the grain is and where the grain should be, namely, some sort of mandatory direction to take so many bushels and move them into certain areas. That would meet the emergency situation which it is claimed is the basis for the provision.

Mr. CORDON. The suggestion would be impossible to meet, of course, at this time, because of the fact that knowledge is not present as to the number of bushels available in the various sections. Conditions may change from time to time. I believe, after a careful reading of the amendment, that it does exactly what the Senator from Colorado suggests should be done, what I believe should be done, and what I hope the Senate will join in requiring to be done.

Mr. President, the amendment is in the interest of equity among our people and should prevail.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall have to ask unanimous consent to be excused from further attendance on sessions of the Senate this week, in order that I may attend the funeral of a very close friend in Wisconsin.

I should like to make this brief statement: As I understand, there is to be a record vote on the final passage of this bill. If I were present, I would vote to pass the bill and send it to conference, although the measure is not satisfactory to me in a great many respects. However, it seems to me that to vote against its passage would be to prevent the legislative process from functioning, and thereby to bring about the complete liquidation of the OPA on the 1st of July. So I wish to have the RECORD show that if I were present I would vote to pass the bill and send it to conference.

I ask unanimous consent to be excused from further attendance on sessions of the Senate this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hesitate to delay the Senate in voting on this amendment, but I cannot consent to a vote on it without at least a few words with reference to what I think of it.

I deeply appreciate the situation in New England to which attention has been called.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is contemplated that a substitute amendment may be offered which will meet the objections which have been raised from the Middle West area. I wonder whether the Senator would wish to consider that possibility in connection with his discussion.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am considering the amendment which is now before the Senate. It is impossible for me to believe that any substitute could be drawn that would be worth the paper on which

it was written, or which I could support in connection with this proposal.

I was about to say that I deeply sympathize with the situation in New England and the Pacific Northwest, but it is not a situation which was created yesterday. It is a condition which has existed for at least 2 or 3 weeks, and one with which the Secretary of Agriculture has been attempting to deal. He has been doing the best he could to bring about the distribution of grain in such a way as to afford relief to those regions—so much so that some of the regions from which grain was taken in order to send it to them have protested vigorously against being denied the grain which they needed, or thought they needed, or of which they were deprived.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator speaks of what the Secretary of Agriculture has been doing. He talks as though he knew he has been doing something. If he has done something, specifically what has he done?

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator does not know that the Secretary of Agriculture assisted in directing that at least 50 carloads of grain be sent to New England within the past week, he is not so well informed as he usually is.

Mr. BRIDGES. Fifty carloads of grain are nothing.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know how much more. I know that he sent that much. That is something.

As I was about to say, this situation was not created yesterday. It has been in existence for at least 2 or 3 weeks, or perhaps longer. Notwithstanding that fact, no independent resolution or bill has been introduced or referred to any committee authorized to deal with the problem. No committee has discussed it or considered it at all. This proposal was not offered in the Committee on Banking and Currency. No member of the Committee on Banking and Currency heard of it until it was brought here this afternoon.

I agree with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] that this is not the place for an amendment of this sort. The statement has been made that it ought to be accepted and sent to conference. Mr. President, if this bill is to be loaded down with much more extraneous material, or many more problems, it will be difficult to get anyone to serve on the conference committee to deal with it. "Take it to conference." The conferees, whoever they may be, have been dealing for weeks, and even months, with price control and regulations pertaining to price control. They have not been dealing with the distribution of agricultural products or feeds and foods from one section of the country to another. The Secretary of Agriculture has not heard anything about this proposed amendment. While the debate was in progress I rushed to the cloakroom and telephoned the Secretary of Agriculture and read the amendment to him.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to remark first that I do not think it is necessary to obtain the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture to offer an amendment on the floor of the Senate.

In the second place, I wish to say that this amendment was offered as a last resort, because we have not received the sympathy, encouragement, or the grain from the Secretary of Agriculture to which we felt we were entitled.

Mr. BARKLEY. I deny that statement categorically. The Secretary of Agriculture not only has expressed sympathy, but he has done everything he could to help to relieve the situation to which the Senator has called attention. I did not suggest that it was necessary to obtain the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. I disagree with the Senator from Kentucky completely. Enough grain was sent to the Northwest to last 1 day, and enough was sent to New England to last a day and a half.

Mr. BARKLEY. Unless the Secretary had authority to seize it, he sent all that he could send. The Senator is not in favor of authorizing the Secretary to seize grain.

Mr. AIKEN. He obtained 100,000,000 bushels to send to other countries of the world, but he could not get 3,000,000 bushels for the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have heard all about that. Feeding hungry people all over the world is a nefarious occupation. Feeding hungry children who are starving to death is not to be compared to feeding cattle.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think that that is a fair comparison of the situation which we are seeking to remedy.

Mr. BARKLEY. The criticism was made by the Senator from Vermont, and has been made by other Senators, that because we are sending grain to feed starving people——

Mr. AIKEN. That is not so.

Mr. BARKLEY. What was the meaning of the Senator's objection?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not object to sending grain to Europe to feed starving people; I said that the Government could buy all the grain they wanted to send to Europe, but when we asked for the purchase of three or four million bushels more to help out the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture had no encouragement whatsoever for such a program. At least 25 Members of Congress met with him and heard him make that statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. I dispute that statement.

Mr. AIKEN. I heard it.

Mr. BARKLEY. He has been very sympathetic toward the program, and has done all he had the power to do. He cannot seize grain and send it from one section of the country to the other.

Mr. AIKEN. He was asked to buy it, not seize it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Kentucky wishes to be fair. He has always been fair with the Senator from Oregon. I am sure that he does not want this RECORD to serve as a basis for the implication that those of us who favor the amendment prefer to feed cattle rather than hungry people in Europe.

I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky that what we are trying to do is to get some of the feed allocated in such a way that our American farmers will not go bankrupt, and so that next year they will be able to raise more food to feed the hungry people of Europe. We wish to have some of the grain handled in that way, because we know that all the feed that has piled up in the ports of this country cannot be shipped to Europe, to feed the hungry people there, for many months. By the time that it can be shipped our 1946 crops will be ready for shipment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I did not cast any reflection in the direction of the Senator from Oregon. I did not even refer to anything he has said. But there has been an implication here, and it has been a sarcastic implication, that whereas we are doing things to keep the hungry people of Europe from starving, we are not doing anything to help our own people. However, Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture cannot say to some of our people, "You are feeding your cattle or your geese or your turkeys too much grain, so you must let me have some of the grain to send elsewhere."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield this time, but I shall not yield any more, because I wish to continue with my statement.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, the Secretary of Agriculture has been highly cooperative and he has endeavored to help me and the other Senators from the Northwest solve this problem. But I say to the Senator from Kentucky that the Secretary of Agriculture does say to us that he simply lacks the authority to do more than he is trying to do.

Accordingly, by this amendment we are seeking to give him the authority to do for the people of the United States the same thing that he is doing for the people of Europe.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let us see what the amendment would do. The Senator from Oregon says the Secretary of Agriculture does not have enough authority, and that the amendment would confer more authority upon him. I read from the amendment:

> The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, whenever there exists a shortage of animal and poultry feed which seriously affects any area within the United States—

And the Secretary of Agriculture is to be the sole judge of that—

> to initiate and carry out a program—

And so forth. Mr. President, there are two horns to the program. One is to direct the flow of anima and poultry feed. How is the Secretary of Agriculture to do that unless he has the power to go into one community and say to

people there, "You must send that feed somewhere else; you are using too much of it here; I am the judge, and I say that you are feeding too much feed to your cattle and your poultry here"?

If the amendment does not mean that, what does it mean? It means that he can change the normal flow of feed in commerce. He might even find a trainload of corn or some other kind of grain headed in one direction, and he might turn it around and send it in another direction, because if he has the power to direct the flow of grain, he would have the power to do that. If he did not have the power to do that, this amendment would not be worth anything, anyway.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I modify the statement I previously made, that I would not yield again, and I now yield to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the Senator's consideration. I merely wish to make this comment: If there is lodged in the amendment such power as the Senator from Kentucky has described, it is more power than we have ever given any OPA official. The very thing we are attempting to do by the pending bill, as stated throughout all the debate, is to take power away from the OPA officials. Yet the amendment would give power which we have never heretofore delegated, if it would do what the Senator from Kentucky has said it would do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, Mr. President, if the word "directed" does not mean a command to him to direct the flow of shipments of grain, I do not know what else it means. If it means anything it means that the Secretary of Agriculture can go to Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Missouri, Nebraska, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa and say to the farmers there, "You have a surplus of grain. You are feeding more grain to your livestock and to your poultry than you should be feeding. Therefore, I am going to direct that some of it go somewhere else."

Mr. LUCAS. I hope he does not try to do that.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what the amendment means, if it means anything. It means that he might even go to the elevators which are accumulating grain and loading it on to trains, and he might send that grain to some place other than where the owners of the grain intended it to be sent. So, if the amendment means anything, it means that more power is to be conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture.

Not only that, Mr. President; not only is the Secretary of Agriculture authorized and directed to institute a program by which the grain shall be sent from one section of the country to another, but he is authorized to provide a program for the distribution of animal feed and food. After he changes its transportation, he is to follow it up and to supervise the distribution of it to those who will use it after it arrives at its destination. We talk about bureaucracy, but that would mean the setting up by the Secretary of Agriculture of an agency in every community to decide which dairymen and which feeder of cattle and poultry should receive the grain after it had been shipped to that place from some other section of the country.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is the Senator from Kentucky aware of the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation has purchased grain and, in that connection, has used committees throughout the United States for years?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I realize that. That is what Senators complain of now—namely, that the Commodity Credit Corporation has set up committees all over the country. But the pending amendment would have the Secretary of Agriculture set up other committees.

The Senator from Ohio asked whether this program involves a subsidy. Probably it is not called that, but it does involve a subsidy because it provides for the use of the present power to take losses and to take money out of the Treasury to sustain those losses. I do not know how much there would be in the way of losses; I do not know whether the Government would purchase grain at a certain price and would sell it at a loss in sections of the country where there might be shortages, or whether the Government would pay the transportation costs or other costs. But certainly there would be a charge which would have to be met out of the Treasury, and that is a procedure to which objection has been made before now.

Mr. President, as I said a while ago, while the debate on this amendment was going on, I telephoned the Secretary of Agriculture, because the amendment was suddenly offered from the floor, without being studied by Senators generally. So far as I knew, the amendment had not been considered by a committee. It had not even been printed. So I telephoned the Secretary of Agriculture, while this debate was going on, and I called him from an important committee meeting to ask him whether he thought the amendment should be modified or whether he thought it should be adopted in the form in which it was offered. I was not going to be controlled by his views, but I thought I was entitled to the benefit of them. He said frankly that he had not been consulted about the amendment and had not recommended it, and that he would wish to consider its details very carefully before he would recommend its adoption. He said it was not something he was seeking or wished to have.

Of course, Mr. President, I think the Members of the Senate are authorized to vote without regard to the views of the Secretary of Agriculture; but inasmuch as the amendment directs the Secretary of Agriculture to do certain things, I think it is not improper to ascertain his views regarding it.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this amendment should not be adopted to this bill. If the situation is such as to indicate that the amendment deserves independent consideration by a committee, the Senator from Vermont is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I believe, and other Senators who are interested in the matter are members of that committee or other committees. So if there is a desire to have such a matter considered, it could be brought up in one of the committees, for consideration there. But it seems to me it would be extremely unwise to incorporate this wholly independent and extraneous matter into the price-control bill. Therefore, I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. The situation in New England and in the Northwest, as I understand, is what inspired the offering of the amendment. I should like to ask a question or two. First of all, how are grain and other foodstuffs procured for shipment overseas? Are they purchased by Government authorities?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; they are purchased. For instance, if a farmer takes his grain to an elevator for sale—let us say that he takes a thousand bushels of grain there—he is required to sell half of it to the Government. The Government pays him the market price.

Mr. STEWART. Is he paid anything above the market price for it?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at that particular time. But the Government does provide for the possible payment of 30 cents a bushel above the ceiling price to those who have not brought or do not bring their grain voluntarily and freely to the market. That provision is made in order to loosen up the market and to obtain the grain.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wonder whether something along that line could be worked out in this case. The Senator spoke of the possibility of a substitute.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know what is in anyone's mind in regard to a substitute. But that very suggestion indicates the folly of attempting to deal with a matter of this kind in connection with the price-control bill, at the last moment before a vote on the bill, when all Members of the Senate are ready to vote either one way or another on the bill itself.

If any matter of that kind should be worked out, it should be worked out by a committee which might be authorized to deal with the problem. It should not be brought up on the floor of the Senate at the last moment before a vote on an important bill, when there is no opportunity to consider the amendment thoroughly or wisely, in my judgment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the force of what the majority leader has said. On the other hand, I have come freshly from an area where there was brought to my attention with tremendous force the difficulty which we are facing in connection with feed shortages in the Northeast and in the Northwest.

I have also discussed the situation with friends from the Midwest, and in an effort to accommodate the views of the various Senators I have drafted a substitute amendment which I should like to have considered by the Senator from

Vermont in order that he may ascertain whether he will accept it. The substitute is designed merely to put domestic need on a parity with foreign supplies. I shall read the amendment and then send it to the desk. It reads as follows:

The Secretary of Agriculture or other governmental agency having control of supplies of grain or feedstuffs for shipment overseas is hereby authorized and directed to make such diversions of such supplies thereof as he shall deem necessary to relieve feed shortage, to such domestic areas, for sale therein to feeders of livestock and poultry, as he may determine to be in an emergency condition with respect to animal and poultry feed, and he is authorized to replace such diverted supplies by further purchases for foreign shipment.

I ask the Senator from Vermont whether he will accept the language of the substitute which I have read.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, some of us have discussed the substitute amendment, and I will say that it is acceptable to those who offered the original amendment.

Moreover, I wish to say with regard to the suggestion that the amendment be sent to the committee that to do so would require several days, and we cannot wait to have it done. We have waited until the very last minute before taking any step of this kind, hoping that the Department of Agriculture would find some way by which to get grain to the so-called famine areas. Up to the present time, only about 400 cars have been started on their way to New England, New York, and New Jersey. I expect that a similar amount has been started to the Pacific Northwest.

However, that amount will meet the requirements of only about a day in the Northeast, and about a day or possibly a little more in the Northwest. The amount is totally inadequate. In the meantime, the men and women who have built up their flocks are finding that they must dispose of them. Day after day we hear of it being done. Only day before yesterday we heard that the poultry crop of Maine had been reduced by 50 percent, and that it is being reduced still further. When I was at home over the weekend I found that my neighbors who had spent years building up their flocks were being required to dispose of them. Cattle also are being liquidated, but not to the same extent. At the present time pastures are at their best, and it is not necessary to liquidate cattle to the same extent that poultry is being liquidated. The liquidation of cattle will follow ultimately unless something is done to make it unnecessary.

We had inserted in the amendment the words "and other livestock" with the express purpose of covering the sheep growers of the Midwestern States. We were endeavoring to provide that those growers be allowed to continue in business and not see their herds destroyed because of inability to obtain feed for the next 50 or 60 days.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again read his substitute?

Mr. BREWSTER. It reads as follows:

The Secretary of Agriculture or other governmental agency having control of supplies of grain or feedstuffs for shipment overseas is hereby authorized and directed to make such diversions of such supplies thereof as he shall deem necessary to relieve feed shortage, to such domestic areas, for sale therein to feeders of livestock and poultry, as he may determine to be in an emergency condition with respect to animal and poultry feed, and he is authorized to replace such diverted supplies by further purchases for foreign shipment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a few minutes ago I had an opportunity to examine the proposed substitute. So far as I am concerned, I will say that it answers all the objections which I have to the original amendment. It does two or three fundamental things. First, it authorizes the immediate diversion of certain portions of grain already on the eastern and western seaboards in the areas of famine. Secondly, it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the emergency areas, to divert the grain temporarily, and later to repurchase and replace for foreign shipment when the new crop matures. The wheat crop is now maturing in the Southwest, and will move north within a very short time. The surplus wheat will be coming along very soon. In my opinion, Mr. President, the substitute which has been offered by the Senator from Maine will afford immediate and almost instant relief to the famine areas, and will authorize replacement to our own people on a basis of equality with emergency foreign conditions. I shall support the substitute amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I wish to say that the substitute meets the objections which I had to the original amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I may say that, as one of the sponsors of the original amendment, the substitute is perfectly satisfactory.

I wish to make clear one point, because I think it goes to the essence of the entire argument which has been made. Adoption of the substitute as offered by the Senator from Maine will not take away a single bushel of grain that can be shipped to Europe during the period of time any wheat will be diverted for domestic use. I wish to make that particularly clear to the majority leader, because I want him to understand that not even the Secretary of Agriculture himself can deny the fact that there is now in storage in the great ports of this country more grain than can be shipped during the next several months. What the substitute seeks to do is to divert grain which otherwise cannot be shipped prior to the harvest of the new 1946 crop, and by such diversion thousands of farmers will be saved from bankruptcy. I should like to see the Secretary of Agriculture deny that fact, or justify any opposition to the substitute. The time has come for this administration to demonstrate that it wants to act in good faith toward our American farmers, who are suffering from the great injustice that the administration's poorly thought out grain order has visited upon them. Our amendment gives the administration such an opportunity.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the substitute which has been offered by the Senator from Maine is an improvement over the original amendment. The danger which I see in it, if adopted in the form in which it has been proposed, is that it might authorize the Secretary of Agriculture—I do not know that he would do so—to interfere with the shipments of grain already contracted for by UNRRA, which is an international agency and which constantly purchases foodstuffs and sends them into the areas over which it has jurisdiction in supervising relief. However, because of the fact that the substitute will go to conference and an opportunity will there be afforded to investigate its implications, I am willing that it be accepted.

Mr. BREWSTER. I deeply appreciate the statement of the majority leader.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, is the Senator from Maine familiar with the statement which was made publicly a few days ago by the commissioners of agriculture of Northeastern States?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Would he object to having the statement printed in the RECORD?

Mr. BREWSTER. No; I believe that it would be informative.

Mr. WALSH. The statement is probably more authentic than individual statements of Senators, or even individual telegrams, because it is a review of the situation as those commissioners saw it a few days ago. It is a powerful argument in favor of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe that it would be well to have it printed in the RECORD. Will the Senator ask that it be printed?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask that the statement to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The commissioners of agriculture of New England met at the State House, Boston, Mass., in conference with representatives of the State colleges and dairy and poultry industries to consider the feed situation in New England.

The following situation was found to exist:

1. Laying hens have been cut to 50 percent of the January 1 number; 3,200,000 hens were slaughtered between January 1 and May 1; 2,200,000 hens were slaughtered during the month of May. This rate is 250 percent of normal, with present rate of slaughter more than 300 percent of normal. The rate of liquidation is increasing daily.

2. Present replacement flocks are down 15 to 25 percent from last year. Some pullets have already been slaughtered due to lack of feed. Farmers are trying to hold replacement stock. Ultimate size of replacement flocks depends upon available grain.

3. Broiler production is down 60 to 75 percent from last year.

4. Egg receipts at four major egg-marketing cooperatives (Hartford, Conn., Springfield, Mass., Brockton, Mass., Derry, N. H.) were 42 percent less during the first week of June than in the first week of May this year.

5. Considered estimates indicate the grain supply for June will be less than 50 percent of last year. More than 3,000 carloads of grain are needed to hold present livestock and poultry numbers for 30 days.

This means a milk shortage greater than last year and a shortage of eggs and poultry this fall and winter as well as serious damage to farm businesses.

Suggested solutions of this grievous problem to both consumers and producers are:

1. Loan of Government-owned corn (2,000,000 bushels).

2. Subsidy on corn, oats, barley, and other available grains, except milo, either on Government or private basis.

3. Direct Government purchase of grain for shipment to deficit areas.

NEW ENGLAND COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE,
FREDERICK E. COLE, *Massachusetts.*
A. K. GARDNER, *Maine.*
STANLEY JUDD, *Vermont.*
FRANK H. PEET, *Connecticut.*
ANDREW L. FELKER, *New Hampshire.*
RAYMOND G. BRESSLER, *Rhode Island.*
JUNE 7, 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] offered in the nature of a substitute to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in behalf of himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have on the desk an amendment which I call up and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 36 of the bill, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

(t) No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any commodity below a price which will return to distributors, wholesalers, or retailers of such commodity their prewar trade discount or the sum of (1) total current costs of acquisition plus the prewar mark-up. The prewar mark-up shall be the average mark-up of such distributors or wholesalers or retailers of such commodity for the period between October 1 and October 15, 1941.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this amendment is acceptable to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. It is best known, I suppose, as the original Wherry and Capehart amendment.

The Members of the Senate will recall that when the Senator from Ohio addressed the Senate yesterday the amendment he offered was designed to afford relief only to the manufacturer and the processor. In answer to a question by someone on the floor of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Ohio said that the so-called cost-absorption amendment which would be offered would do for the distributors, the wholesalers and the retailers what his amendment would do for the manufacturers.

The amendment I now offer is not exactly the Capehart amendment, because the Capehart amendment would strike out on page 34 all of section Q starting in line 22, and would strike out all of subsection (r) and all of subsection (s). This amendment does not strike out those subsections, but it adds a new section after line 18, page 36, which would do for the distributor, the wholesaler, and the retailer what the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio would do for the manufacturer and the processor.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio is not on the floor at present, but he stated he would be here, and would say to the Senate that he would accept the amendment and would vote for it. I think the amendment is self-explanatory. The Taft formula is included in the amendment now offered, although we have added to the Taft formula the words:

The prewar mark-up shall be the average mark-up of such distributors or wholesalers or retailers of such commodity for the period between October 1 and October 15, 1941.

So if the wholesalers, distributors, and retailers are to get any relief, they will get it exactly as the manufacturer and the processor get relief under the Taft formula.

I should like to say that the amendment is offered in behalf of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART].

Some Senators have received telegrams from retailers from all over the country, and this is the amendment in which they are interested.

I do not care to detain the Senate longer, but I should like to have a record vote on the amendment, so I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, when the bill was in the committee the question of the formula for the producers was one of the points on which the committee found most difficulty in acting. The formula adopted in the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] deliberately left out retailers and distributors, on the acknowledged ground that what he was seeking to do was to encourage production. The entire argument in the committee and out of the committee with respect to that sort of a formula was in the interest of encouraging production of goods in order that production might be brought into balance with demand and consumption.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska fixing the same formula and the same standard for retailers would mean that every department store in the United States, in the sale of every article it sells over its counters, would have the same standard, the same encouragement, and the same incentive that was originally intended to be given producers in order that production might increase, and thereby bring about a balance of the two, so that demand and supply would fix the price, as it does in the normal channels of trade. It was never contemplated by the committee and never contemplated by the Senator from Ohio in any discussion in the committee, and he specifically objected to including retailers for the very reasons I have stated.

I do not intend to detain the Senate any longer. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announced that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business, attending the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in Bermuda.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] are members of the committee on the part of the Senate attending the funeral services of the late Senator John H. Bankhead, of Alabama.

I also announce that on this question the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

I also announce the following general pairs: The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]; and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

I announce that on this question the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

I also announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are

absent by leave of the Senate as members of the committee appointed by the United States Senate to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Bankhead.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—42

Austin	Hawkes	Robertson
Ball	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bilbo	Hoey	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Bridges	Kilgore	Taft
Brooks	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Maybank	Tobey
Bushfield	Mead	Tunnell
Capper	Moore	Tydings
Cordon	Murray	Walsh
Eastland	O'Daniel	Wheeler
George	Overton	Wherry
Gurney	Reed	White
Hart	Revercomb	Wilson

NAYS—25

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Knowland	Pepper
Barkley	Lucas	Radcliffe
Burch	McClellan	Smith
Carville	McMahon	Taylor
Chavez	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Hayden	Morse	
Huffman	Myers	

NOT VOTING—28

Bailey	Gerry	Mitchell
Briggs	Gossett	Murdock
Butler	Green	Russell
Byrd	Guffey	Stanfill
Capehart	Hatch	Vandenberg
Connally	Hill	Wiley
Donnell	La Follette	Willis
Ellender	Langer	Young
Ferguson	McFarland	
Fulbright	McKellar	

So Mr. WHERRY's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 39, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. Section 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) No proceedings may be instituted by the Administrator under this section in any State, Territorial, or Federal court, unless the institution of such proceedings is approved by the district attorney of the United States for the district within which such proceedings are brought."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the beginning I have been a firm believer in the Emergency Price Control Act which Congress passed in 1942. I still believe in the basic and fundamental principle of price control in this reconversion period. I do not believe that we have yet reached the point in the period of reconstruction following the war when we can remove all controls upon everything. Therefore I have voted against all amendments which have been presented to the bill, believing that the bill as it came from the Committee on Banking and Currency was in reality not a price control bill, but a bill which would guarantee inflation for the country in the very near future. I hope I am wrong. I certainly trust that the country will never experience another boom-and-bust-and-bankruptcy period such as it went through following World War I.

Mr. President, everyone to whom we talk says that as a result of what the Congress of the United States now proposes to do prices are going to rise. No one can tell how much they will rise. The rise depends upon how much the individual desires to pay for the particular product he wishes to have, and how much money he has in his pocketbook, and what the competition is for a particular article. In my humble judgment, and I say again I hope I am wrong, within a period of 6 to 9 months, as the result of what we are doing here at this particular time in passing this price control measure with its crippling amendment, there will be chaos and disorder in the country compared to which what we are now suffering under a control act will be infinitesimal.

Mr. President, I have seen the figures that have been presented from time to time by representatives of all classes of industry, and no one will deny the fact that every class of our citizens today, including the farmers, the laboring men, the bankers, the industrial groups, are in better financial condition at this moment than they have ever been in their entire history. I am sure no Senator on this floor will challenge that statement.

I know that the price-control program is far from perfect. I know that the administration of the Price Control Act has been maladministration instead of the kind of administration to which the American people were entitled. In the maladministration of the Price Control Act passed by Congress in 1942 lies the evil of what is happening in the Senate at this moment.

Some time ago on the floor of the Senate, in discussing the administration of this act, I said that those in the Office of Price Administration, in the enforcement division, were making it difficult for men who honestly believe in the basic principles of price control to go along. It was at the time when Mr. Paul Porter came in as Director that I made my remarks in the Senate concerning the faulty administration and the un-American directives being issued at that time.

Mr. Porter is a gentleman of the old school. He is an individual who understands human beings and public relationships. But he does not have the slightest chance to do what ought to be done with respect to changing or removing certain individuals who have been in the OPA from the beginning, who have absolutely no understanding of public relations. That group of individuals went into OPA under Leon Henderson, and they are still there, and the policy pursued by those individuals is the policy which has in my humble opinion defeated the legitimate aims of OPA. I do not want to be misunderstood by that statement. There are many fine, patriotic, able, and well-intentioned men and women in the OPA organization. I do not direct my criticism at them. It applies only to those individuals who have used their power in such a ruthless and arrogant manner that they have aroused the anger of so many good American citizens and the results are now being reaped in the action of the Congress in connection with the pending legislation. In spite of all this, I still favor OPA.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I compliment the Senator from Illinois on the remarks he has just made. I think he is definitely striking at an evil which obtains in this country today. I will say that in my humble judgment if we could obtain a practical and sensible administration of the price-control law it would serve our best interests in the reconversion period. But the administration we have had of OPA continues to create chaos, and brings OPA into disrepute with our people.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Illinois in praise of Mr. Paul Porter. I also wish to join in the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I believe everyone thoroughly concurs in it. It is not the OPA which has brought about the present distressing situation. It is the administration of the law which has done it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I merely have risen in the last moments of the debate to state my considered opinion as to why the Congress at this time is taking the action now about to be taken. With all its faults, I dislike to see OPA go out of existence. With all its bad administration, with all the troubles connected with it, we are still better off with OPA than we would be without it. OPA is better than nothing, and in my humble opinion the country and the Congress in 9 months' time will be sorry for what the Congress is now doing with respect to OPA. They will be sorry that OPA was massacred, that OPA was crucified. They will be sorry to see the buying power which exists in America today, the like of which no country has ever seen, turned loose, to the point where many people will suffer. Those who will suffer most will be the older people who live on pensions, those who are on a definite

pay roll with no opportunity to get an increase. Those people, some twelve to fourteen million of them, are going to suffer because OPA will be made ineffective. The individual with money, who is now violating the law by operating in the black market, will continue to be a black marketeer, regardless of whether we do or do not repeal the OPA law.

Mr. President, I cannot do anything worse to OPA by my amendment than what has already been done to it. In my humble opinion my amendment will take care of a few of the enforcement policies which have been put into practice by individuals, many of whom have never tried a lawsuit. A number of them take the position which some of the courts have recently taken, that they are going to do what they want to do regardless of what the precedent has been in the past, and regardless of what the conditions are in the community where the alleged violation takes place. That is a dangerous practice in American jurisprudence. I know of individuals in the enforcement agency of the OPA who have disregarded instructions, and who on their own initiative have done things that were not in keeping with the best interests of American society and jurisprudence.

All I wish to do is to say to the OPA individual who is enforcing this act, "Before you file a suit of any kind you must get the permission of the United States district attorney in the district where the alleged offense is presumed to have been committed." I believe that that will cure many of the evils which exist, if we are to continue the OPA for another year. I sincerely trust the amendment will be adopted. It is offered in good faith, with a sincere hope that some constructive good may come from a better and more humane administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. SHIPSTEAD addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to further interrupt the able Senator from Illinois in his remarks, but I do wish to commend him for what he has said. His amendment should be agreed to.

I invite attention to a very appropriate editorial published in today's Washington News. I wish to quote a part of it, and then I shall ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. In line with what the able Senator from Illinois has been saying, I quote from the editorial, which I think is very apropos in connection with the discussion and consideration of the pending measure:

> Under present circumstances Government's efforts to do that job (control prices) tend more and more to be self-defeating. That's the real reason why Congress is so cold to the OPA. It's easy—too easy—to accuse Congress of serving "the forces of greed."

That is what the OPA has been preaching to the people, that their representatives in Congress are yielding to the pressure of big business and special interests. When the present Economic Stabilizer Chester Bowles was Administrator of OPA and since occupying his present position, he has taken the air almost every other night to abuse and villify Congress. The truth is that the blame lies at his own door, because of the policies which the OPA under his administration has pursued. This editorial further states:

> The fact is that many if not most Members of Congress are honestly convinced that the Administration has made its own price-control policy unworkable; that the OPA, given all the power Chester Bowles and Paul Porter want for it, would do more harm than good.

That is the very reason why we are having these decontrol amendments that are being offered in the Congress today. We have no other alternative if we are to protect the people against the vicious black-market inflation.

> The Administration's phony theory that it could hold prices down while wage rates were forced rapidly upward invited the great strikes. The strikes have delayed reconversion by many months and prevented production of billions of dollars worth of desperately needed goods. Bungling labor policies are encouraging more strikes to put wage gains ahead of price increases, although nobody can win that leap-frog race. And falsely optimistic Administration propaganda to the effect that our postwar problems are just about solved has given the public an impression that now is the time to spend and buy.

This editorial is entitled "Be Wise in Buying." I think it gives a very timely admonition to the American public with regard to buying unneeded goods or goods that they can possibly do without, at inflationary prices. I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BE WISE IN BUYING

Business journals report that in many cities consumers are becoming less eager to buy almost anything offered for sale at almost any price.

This is a hopeful sign if it means that, instead of relying wholly on Government to protect them from an inflationary boom bust, people are beginning to think sensibly about protecting themselves.

Even in wartime, Government could not do that job alone. Price control succeeded as well as it did then because so many people saw the wisdom of saving a good part of their incomes, of not bidding against each other for scarce goods, and of submitting with reasonably good grace to wage controls.

Under present circumstances, Government's efforts to do that job tend more and more to be self-defeating. That's the real reason why Congress is so cold to the OPA. It's easy—too easy—to accuse Congress of serving "the forces of greed." The fact is that many, if not most, Members of Congress are honestly convinced that the administration has made its own price-control policy unworkable; that the OPA, given all the power Chester Bowles and Paul Porter want for it, would do more harm than good.

The administration's phony theory that it could hold prices down while wage rates were forced rapidly upward invited great strikes. The strikes have delayed reconversion by many months and prevented production of billions of dollars' worth of desperately needed goods. Bungling labor policies are encouraging more strikes to put wage gains ahead of price increases, although nobody can win that leap-frog race. And falsely optimistic administration propaganda, to the effect that our postwar problems are just about solved, has given the public an impression that now is the time to spend and buy.

So the black markets are booming, the price ceilings are bulging, and the OPA's efforts to hold them down against the upward thrust of wages and other costs are, in countless cases, further discouraging production.

If that continues, the value of wage increases and of wartime savings will be destroyed by an inevitable break-through of prices. Those who have been able to save least, or to get only small wage increases if any, will be hurt first and most. But everybody, except perhaps a few slick profiteers, will be hurt.

We think this is emphatically a time to be wise in buying; to refrain from frenzied scrambling for scarce goods; to avoid spending for its own sake; to shop for values instead of grabbing for gewgaws; to do without rather than pay high prices for nonessential things; to save money, not to toss it away.

Enough people with that spirit might do more than the OPA bureaucrats to restore real competition among producers and sellers, reverse the upward trend of prices, remove the excuse for more strikes, and hasten the day when a plentiful supply of goods can make it possible for purchasing power to be used most profitably.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in my judgment, if we had and could have an honest, sensible, and practical administration of the Price Control Act there would certainly be no occasion for spending all the time we are now devoting to an effort to decontrol and to take away some of the power which has been so flagrantly abused and misused simply because the OPA officials have arbitrarily and wantonly disregarded established practices and considerations that simple justice require.

I hope that the pending amendment will be adopted. In my State only recently one of the representatives of the OPA, because there had not been more charges made by a local enforcement panel against the citizens within its jurisdiction and more penalties and convictions, wrote that local board, complaining that it was not sending in enough complaints, and that he was getting a black eye because the State and his territory were not measuring up to the number of charges and convictions in other States. I have his original letter in my files. I reported this to the State or regional director, also to the Administrator here in Washington. Do you think this OPA representative was discharged? No; he is still in the employ of the OPA. Probably will soon be promoted. That is the sort of policy and practices which are making honest and patriotic citizens skeptical of the integrity of government and in the enforcement of the Price Control Act.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I merely wish to invite attention to the fact that the regional office in Denver sent word to a local board in my State, saying that there was not a sufficient number of convictions. A quota was established, and the

regional office wanted that little community to meet its quota of convictions of merchants. The board resigned. I brought the matter to the attention of the OPA in Washington, but instead of firing anyone, as should have been done, the OPA did nothing about it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. They do absolutely nothing about such conduct on the part of enforcement officials, and such conduct and policy is incompatible with honest administration.

Mr. WHEELER. I entirely agree with what the Senator from Illinois has said. What is happening to the OPA today is purely the result of the actions of the OPA officials and those who have been administering the law in Washington, as well as the various regional officers throughout the country. No one is to blame except the administrators of the OPA. They are responsible for the condition which exists, and they are responsible for what is happening in Congress today.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. The fault is not by any means altogether with those in the regional offices and those in the States who are charged with the enforcement. They get their instructions from Washington. If one goes to the OPA with a case and presents it, no matter how meritorious it may be, some inexperienced man or boy who does not know anything about the merits of the issues involved, and cares less, will say "No." Reason, logic, merit, and justice have no persuasion or influence with them.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Arkansas for his statement. In the Southeast we have the most terrible administration that could possibly be imagined. We are under the regional office in Atlanta, Ga., which sends into North and South Carolina children who know nothing about the law. We have some respectable and able people in our State. We have district attorneys who have been approved by this body. Half of the cases which are brought into the courts are denied.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to. The time has come when the honest American citizen needs some protection. I have faith in the Federal district attorneys. If we require them to approve prosecutions under this law before they are instituted, I do not believe we shall have such flagrant abuses with respect to enforcement as we have had in the past.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am in a rather embarrassing situation——

Mr. BALL and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. [Putting the question.] The amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] were trying to obtain the floor while the vote was being taken, and before the vote was completed the Senator from Minnesota made it clear to the Chair that he desired recognition. I understand that the result of the vote on the amendment has not been announced and that the Senator from Minnesota is therefore entitled to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announced that the amendment had been agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say with all due respect to the Chair that I did not hear such an announcement. I think the Chair should recognize the Senator from Minnesota, inasmuch as he was seeking recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to be heard on the amendment, the Chair will recognize him now.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was what the Chair understood. The Chair announced that the amendment had been adopted. The Senator from Florida had addressed the Chair, thinking that the amendment had already been disposed of. At that time it had not been. So it appears that the Senator from Florida is entitled to be recognized now.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That section 1 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1946" and substituting "February 1, 1947"; and by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the President is authorized, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the public interest, to eliminate or modify any regulation, order, price schedule, or other control imposed by or under the authority of this act or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1946" and substituting "February 1, 1947."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall say only a word or two, because I find myself in an embarrassing situation in which we often find ourselves; namely, I have made an engagement which contemplates my leaving on a 6 o'clock plane.

This amendment is proposed as a substitute for the bill as reported by the committee, as it is now before the Senate. The amendment would extend the present OPA laws to February 1, 1947, meanwhile giving the President authority to decontrol any item between now and that date.

In view of the shortness of time, I have been wondering whether I might be able to obtain a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment, and not detain the Senate by an elucidation of the amendment, because it speaks for itself.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement as to my position regarding the bill and, incidentally, my opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida. In order to save time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement which I have used in answer to mail which I have received from constituents in regard to extension of the OPA.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOSEPH H. BALL, REPUBLICAN, OF MINNESOTA, ON EXTENSION OF OPA

I supported price control throughout the war. I believe that continuance of wisely administered, selective price control on goods still in short supply would be of great help in checking inflationary pressures during the next few months. I was on the committee which helped write the original law and since then have had many opportunities to observe OPA's work in the Appropriations Committee and through contacts on behalf of literally hundreds of constituents who became bogged down in the agency's red tape.

OPA is, without question, the worst-run Federal agency with which I have come into contact. Here are a few OPA policies and attitudes which are hindering rather than helping reconversion and civilian production:

1. Insistence on considering a manufacturer's over-all costs and profits instead of costs on individual items in fixing ceilings, even though the items are made at a loss. Result has been to drive out of production many items usually in the low-price range. This has happened in clothing and building materials.

2. OPA's cost-absorption policy, forcing manufacturers, jobbers, and retailers to absorb cost increases due to higher wages and higher material prices. This is a squeeze play which tends to drive out of production in any field all but the most efficient or best-situated producers, and overall production again is reduced.

3. OPA's deliberate policy of delaying and stalling petitions for needed price adjustments. I have had many cases of firms making new items where OPA stalled for 6 and 8 months before fixing any kind of price so the goods could be made and sold. Meantime, production lagged.

4. The hostility to, as well as lack of any practical knowledge of, business by the OPA underlings who really exercise the vast power of this agency. Every businessman seems to be considered guilty until he proves himself innocent, which is a Nazi and not a democratic concept. Any businessman can tell you how often OPA regulations have had to be revised simply because lawyers and theorists who knew nothing of the way in which a given industry operated insisted on writing complicated control regulations without even consulting people in the industry who did know.

Abandonment by the administration of wage stabilization after VJ-day while attempting to hold prices rigid has, of course, greatly intensified this problem. The economic impossibility of the administration's original position has already been demonstrated in the steel and meat-packing cases,

where it has had to consider price increases to meet wage-increase demands it had invited.

Wage stabilization was delayed for nearly a year after price control was legalized in 1942, and as a result the administration never was able to really hold the line and did as well as it did only by putting a terrific squeeze on many producers and distributors of civilian goods. Why the administration insisted on making the same economic mistake after VJ-day by lifting wage control while trying to hold the price line, is beyond me, but it very obviously is not working.

If the issue as it finally comes to a vote in the Senate is whether we extend the price-control law as is for another year, thereby in effect approving present OPA policies, I shall vote "No." I am convinced that we would suffer less in the long run from removal of all controls than from a continuation of the present scarcity-breeding policy. I believe the amendments proposed by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee are sound and shall support these and other amendments which would simply require OPA to recognize and conform to economic realities. If these amendments stay in the bill I may vote for it.

The following excerpt from an address I gave at Atlantic City, N. J., May 10, further expresses my fundamental objection to OPA:

"Our emphasis as liberals, therefore, in seeking greater opportunities and freedoms for individuals, should be on measures and policies which will strengthen the individual and free his mind from fear by giving him knowledge, training, and health. Only thus can individuals win the most precious freedom of all, freedom from fear—the confidence that he can and will measure up to any test that may come and remain true to his own inner creed. Under that policy, the Government has an obligation to see to it that in health and training, all individuals start as nearly equal as possible in our society. That, in turn, means that whatever excess funds are available when we finally achieve a balanced budget should be earmarked first for programs and projects which will in the long run raise the health and educational standards of the Nation and which particularly will give those who are less fortunate economically a better chance at healthy bodies and trained minds.

"A great many domestic proposals which are clearly authoritarian when measured by this yardstick of liberalism nevertheless have wide popular support because their professed objectives are appealing to large groups. One of these was the so-called full-employment bill as it was originally proposed. Another is the current proposal to extend the Price Control Act for another year 'without crippling amendments.'

"As I have stated before, we adopted many authoritarian controls in order to fight the war. Price control was one of them. I supported it during the war, but I recognized it as authoritarian rather than liberal. Price control was one of the devices by which the Nazis controlled the German economy. Government power to fix prices is the power of life or death over every business enterprise and is clearly authoritarian in nature.

"Government attempts to control prices and otherwise substitute Government edicts for the economic laws which adjust supply and demand in a free economy are nothing new. They, along with consumer subsidies which are equally corruptive of a free economy, have been tried repeatedly for thousands of years by governments which were afraid to face economic realities. Such attempts have always failed.

"During the war our Government's price control policy was bolstered by a rationing program which at least tended to adjust demand to supply. We also had wage stabilization of a sort during the war, so that the violation of economic law by Government was not so violent. However, rationing was abandoned nearly a year ago, and the Government deliberately pushed wages upward. To promise to hold the price line in view of those policies, regardless of what Congress may do to the law, is an economic absurdity, and every honest economist in or out of Government knows it.

"Some price increases are inevitable. Whether they occur legitimately or in a black market will depend on what Congress does to OPA. But price increases which are essential to achieve a balance between supply and demand are not uncontrolled inflation. The two elements which must be present to create a runaway inflation—printing-press money and lack of production—are not present in the United States and there is no real danger of either.

"Price control, like other controls, was a wartime measure. Production is now close to or above 1941 levels in nearly all civilian goods. Of course, there will be some price increases and some confusion when we change from a controlled economy to a free economy. That is inevitable whether we make the change today or wait another year, or 2 years or 10 years. Personally, as a liberal, I believe in a free economy. I think it is worth the risks involved and the way to achieve it is to get rid of these controls now.

"In passing, I might add that the present campaign for OPA by Chester Bowles and his supporters is as thoroughly totalitarian in method as is that agency. As an expert advertising man, Mr. Bowles knows there are probably 100 consumers for every producer or distributor of goods. Basically, he is telling the large group of the consumers that the Government through OPA will run our economy for the exclusive benefit of the consumers, and that all businessmen are just greedy profiteers anyhow A certain paperhanger from Austria sold the German people very much the same kind of phony economics. They did not wake up until it was too late, but I think the American consumers are intelligent enough to figure out that artificial ceilings on butter, meat, shirts, and lumber that cannot be bought at any price do not make sense."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I have supported all amendments which in my judgment will curtail the powers of the OPA. I have done so because of my conviction that the more we cripple the OPA, so to speak, the better it will be for the country. I shall vote against the bill to extend the OPA because of my conviction that the best thing we could do for the country would be to liquidate that agency altogether.

During the war I supported price control. I recognized in doing so that it was a totalitarian control completely opposed to our concept of a free economy, but I realized that we had to adopt many totalitarian controls in order to fight the war and in order to channel all production into the war effort. During the war we had rationing of scarce commodities and wage control; and those controls, together with the patriotic desire of the people to channel all possible production into winning the war, made the system a reasonably effective one.

However, on VJ-day, the Government abandoned rationing and virtually abandoned wage control. In fact, the Government has contributed to establishing a wage pattern which is 18½ cents above the level at the end of the war. Then the Government tells us that it expects to hold the line rigidly on prices. Mr. President, I submit that is an economic impossibility. I do not believe it is possible to run the economy of the United States for the sole benefit of one group, the consumer, without any regard for the problems of producers and distributors.

I think the amendments which have been adopted in connection with this bill have helped it considerably, but I still intend to vote against the bill, for two reasons: First, as I have already stated, the OPA has shown by its actions and by the contacts I have had with it that it does not pay much attention to what is in the law. If the OPA obtains an extension of power for 1 year, I doubt whether it will pay much attention to the policies which the Senate writes into this measure today.

In the second place, as I have observed the enforcement activities of OPA, whenever any businessman gets into difficulties with the OPA, it proceeds on the assumption that he is guilty until he proves himself innocent. Mr. President, that is a totalitarian concept of the way to administer justice, not a democratic concept. I am not willing to trust an agency that is imbued with that kind of philosophy with any power whatever.

I recognize, as I think all of us do, that the lifting of all controls will involve a period of perhaps weeks or perhaps months of some chaotic conditions. I think we cannot have freedom and we cannot have a free economy without running some risks. I believe enough in freedom to take those risks.

Mr. AIKEN subsequently said:

Mr. President, I wish to say a word with regard to the amendment of the Senator from Florida. I would have made this statement previous to the taking of the vote had I been in the Chamber.

I believe, Mr. President, that in the absence of adequate price control we will be more in danger of inflation in this country during the next 12 months than we were at any time during the war. Nevertheless, I could not vote for the amendment of the Senator from Florida which would have extended the present act until February 1 of next year. If price control is to be discontinued either through failure to renew the act, or by passing an emasculated act, then let such control end now. It would be nothing less than a national calamity if price control were to end in the middle of the winter. I have repeatedly said that I would prefer the ending of price control on July 1, rather than have it end in the middle of the winter, as provided by the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida, or in March, as was advocated by the other House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida, which is offered as a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business, attending the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in Bermuda.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] are members of the committee on the part of the Senate attending the funeral services of the late Senator John H. Bankhead, of Alabama.

I also announce that on this question the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

I announce that on this question the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

I also announce the following general pairs: The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]; and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

I announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate as members of the committee appointed by the United States Senate to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Bankhead.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—17

Chavez	McMahon	O'Mahoney
Downey	Magnuson	Pepper
Huffman	Mead	Taylor
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	Thomas, Utah
Kilgore	Murray	Wagner
Lucas	Myers	

NAYS—52

Aiken	Gurney	Revercomb
Andrews	Hart	Robertson
Austin	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Ball	Hickenlooper	Shipstead
Barkley	Hoey	Smith
Bilbo	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Brewster	Knowland	Taft
Bridges	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	McClellan	Tobey
Burch	McFarland	Tunnell
Bushfield	Maybank	Tydings
Byrd	Millikin	Walsh
Capper	Moore	Wheeler
Carville	Murdock	Wherry
Cordon	O'Daniel	White
Eastland	Overton	Wilson
George	Radcliffe	
Gerry	Reed	

NOT VOTING—26

Bailey	Fulbright	McKellar
Briggs	Gossett	Mitchell
Brooks	Green	Russell
Butler	Guffey	Stanfill
Capehart	Hatch	Vandenberg
Connally	Hayden	Wiley
Donnell	Hill	Willis
Ellender	La Follette	Young
Ferguson	Langer	

So Mr. PEPPER'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, following paragraph (3) of subsection (d), it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

(4) Price controls with respect to petroleum, and petroleum products processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from petroleum, shall be removed not later than June 30, 1946.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I again express the hope that the Senate will be willing to remain until consideration of this bill has been concluded. I do not know of more than one or two further amendments. I hope that the discussion of them will not be extensive. Of course, it is too late to carry out the program which I expressed hope earlier in the day of carrying out, namely, that we would complete consideration of the pending bill and then take up the calendar. It is obviously too late to do that, but I hope that Senators will remain until we have disposed of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, after line 24, it is proposed to insert the following:

(4) Price controls with respect to petroleum, and petroleum products processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from petroleum, shall be removed not later than June 30, 1946.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, it is not my intention to present any more facts than have already been presented with reference to the supply of crude oil and crude oil products. Such facts were presented yesterday by my colleague. He presented such facts in connection with his discussion of the amendment with reference to crude oil.

It is well known, and not disputed in any of the departments of government—the Army, the Navy, or even the OPA itself—that the supply of crude oil and of the products therefrom has been adequate, and that we now have a surplus in excess of the demands.

For the sake of the record I should like to state the daily average of production for the week ending June 8, 1946. The average was 4,895,000 barrels, and the estimated daily demand for the second quarter of this year is 4,710,000 barrels, which leaves a surplus over demand of 185,000 barrels.

The crude oil storage at the present time is 222,000,000 barrels. We have a productive capacity in excess of 5,000,000 barrels a day.

The products of crude oil today in storage amount to 94,146,000 barrels, as against 87,000,000 barrels last year, or an increase in storage over a year ago.

The total volume of products in storage at the present time is 187,000,000 barrels, as against 165,000,000 barrels a year ago, or an increase of 22,000,000 barrels.

I do not know of any reason in the world why, when the supply equals the demand, and production in the country is being curtailed because of a supply which exceeds the demand, price control should be maintained over petroleum and petroleum products; and therefore I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator would accomplish the same purpose which he has in view if, instead of adding a new paragraph to the bill he would simply insert the word "petroleum" in connection with the commodities which are to be decontrolled on the 3rd of June, including livestock, poultry, and dairy products. All he needs to do is to insert the word "petroleum", and his purpose will be served just as well as by adding a new paragraph. To do so would be in the interest of good draftsmanship.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Kentucky——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma modify his amendment?

Mr. MOORE. No; I do not modify it. I do not agree that it shall be modified.

In the first instance, I drafted the amendment in the way which the Senator from Kentucky has suggested, and subsequently changed my mind, believing that I would prefer to offer the amendment as it has been drafted.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a matter of fact, there are two paragraphs in the bill dealing with the petroleum and items which could be taken care of in one paragraph.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as one of the Members associated in the presentation of this amendment, I wish to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I hope he will maintain his amendment as a separate and distinct paragraph in the bill. There may occur more or less argument whether decontrol should be applied to some of the items; but there could be no logical argument advanced for not taking control off petroleum and its products. Those of us who come from the petroleum-producing States have for months talked with the OPA and have been told that some day in the near future, 2 or 3 weeks, or 2 or 3 months or so, they would take control off petroleum.

The fact has not been disputed anywhere that in this country more petroleum is coming out of the ground every day than we are using. The OPA has stalled along, has deceived us, and almost, I might say, double-crossed us; and I hope that the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Oklahome will be agreed to in the form of a separate paragraph to the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] left the Chamber as a member of the delegation of Senators which was appointed to attend the funeral of our late colleague, Senator Bankhead, he requested me to state for the RECORD that, as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, he is in entire accord with the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Oklahoma. He is, of course, one of its supporters. Likewise, for myself, as chairman of the Special Senate Committee on Petroleum, I can say to the Senate that the evidence before that committee, like the evidence before the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, indicates beyond any question whatsoever that we have a larger supply of crude oil at the present time than can be absorbed by the current demand. The controls should be lifted.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, yesterday I made some comment in favor of removing controls from petroleum. Of course, I am in favor of the pending amendment, and in support of what I have said I submit some data which show that at the present time we have an excess of supply in petroleum products. I ask that the table to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Petroleum supply and productive capacity exceeds demand—Supply and demand for 1946 for all oils as reported by the U. S. Bureau of Mines

[Daily averages in barrels]

	First quarter (actual)	Second quarter (partly estimated)	Third quarter (estimated)	Fourth quarter (estimated)
Demand, all oils:				
Domestic (civilian and military)	4,860,000	4,710,000	4,710,000	4,830,000
Exports and shipments	400,000	490,000	510,000	430,000
Total demand	5,260,000	5,200,000	5,220,000	5,260,000
Supply, all oils:				
Production, domestic	4,910,000	4,690,000	4,910,000	4,870,000
Imports	360,000	360,000	360,000	360,000
Changes in stocks	+10,000	+150,000	+50,000	−30,000
Total supply	5,260,000	5,200,000	5,220,000	5,260,000

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines release dated June 5, 1946.

Comparative stocks—Major petroleum products

	June 8, 1946	June 9, 1945	Increase
	Barrels	*Barrels*	*Barrels*
Gasoline	94,146,000	87,486,000	6,660,000
Kerosene	13,013,000	8,703,000	4,310,000
Distillate (light) fuel oils	33,958,000	30,176,000	3,782,000
Residual (heavy) fuel oils	45,938,000	39,376,000	6,562,000
Total of major products	187,055,000	165,741,000	21,314,000

Source: American Petroleum Institute.

Productive capacity: Crude petroleum production for the week ending June 8 averaged 4,895,650 barrels daily. Over 215,000 barrels daily in excess of current daily crude requirements reported by U. S. Bureau of Mines.

Refinery throughout is currently running between 90 and 95 percent of capacity.

Compiled by the Independent Petroleum Association of America, June 12, 1946.

Mr. MEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. To what amendment does the present discussion relate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

Does the Senator from New York wish to speak before the amendment is voted upon?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the amendment which has been offered by my colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the bill in its present form is not at all a price control bill, but, as I see it, it is a bill to control the price controllers so that they may not control prices.

I believe that fact to be generally admitted on both sides of the aisle, and I shall vote against the bill in the form in which it has been amended. For that reason I wish to express my thoughts in connection with the matter, and my opinion as to what might result from the hasty action which we are asked to take this afternoon.

The issue of price control is one of the most important issues of our day. The decision which we make today will, I believe, determine whether we can make the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy in an orderly manner and therefore to a stable, prosperous economy, or whether, as Chester Bowles has so aptly put it, we are to enter upon a period of boom and bust, a period of dizzy spiralling prices and frantic speculation, to be followed inevitably by collapse and depression.

It is difficult for me to conceive of any group so unaware of the facts that it could possibly ask for the elimination of price controls at this time.

The pressures on our economy are at the greatest peak in the history of the country. Tremendous backlogs of savings, high employment, unprecedented demand, coupled with shortages of goods, leave us sitting on the top of an economic powder keg. The removal of general price controls at this time would provide a spark that would blow the whole structure sky high.

One need not be an economist or a financial wizard to understand the simple truth, that when people have a lot of money with which to buy goods which they want, and too few goods are available, then there is a sellers' market. In a sellers' market prices invariably rise. Prices will then be forced upward, retailers will bid frantically against each other for inventories, manufacturers will fight for raw materials at any price, and the inevitable spiral of inflation will be off to a flying start.

We know, here in this country, what inflation and collapse can mean. The memory of what happened after the First World War is still green. Prices rose too rapidly after the last war. With these increases in general prices, the cost of living rose, which led to the demand on the part of labor for higher wages. This in turn led to strikes in many industries, including railroads, clothing, steel, and many other industries. In fact, the prices got so high that there was a general buyers' strike. This led to a depression which lasted for about a year in 1920–21. We do not want to repeat this experience.

The people of this Nation have not forgotten. They are deeply concerned. They are alarmed. Every poll, every town meeting, the mail we are receiving, all testify eloquently to this alarm. Why, then, is there any hesitancy whatever about extending the Price Control Act immediately, and without crippling

amendments? The answer is that certain powerful business groups, selfishly interested in their own immediate welfare rather than the welfare of the Nation as a whole, have launched an unprecedented campaign, backed by virtually unlimited funds, against the OPA and price control.

I believe that the membership of these large business groups is not wholly in accord with the policies of their leaders. Nowhere have I seen any poll taken by the leaders of these groups of their membership on the question of continuing price control. I suspect that these big business leaders are well aware of the possibility that such polls might not support them in their heedless attempt to unleash the whirlwind of inflation. On the other hand, such outstanding stores as R. H. Macy Co., the City Store Chain, and others, are strongly opposed to the elimination or crippling of price control. There are others in this class, and they are all to be commended.

Let us look at some of the charges these big business groups are making against price control. The one most frequently heard is that price control is hampering production, that if only price controls were removed there would be an immediate flood of goods on the market. As Chester Bowles has pointed out, the record clearly proves that this is not the case. During the war, industrial and farm production, under price control, rose fully five times as much as during World War I. Today, production is at the highest point ever achieved in peacetime. Rather than hindering production, price control has helped it by enabling manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers accurately to estimate their costs of doing business. They are not being whipsawed in an inflationary situation where they cannot tell from one day to the next what their next shipment of goods will cost.

True, goods are short today. The unprecedented consumer demand, and the time necessary to make the change-over from a wartime to a peacetime economy, is responsible for that, not price control. It takes time to fill empty pipe lines. There is certain to be a period in which accumulated consumer demand cannot be met. Meanwhile, the only effect of removing price controls, or so weakening them as to make them inoperative, would be to shoot prices to blue-sky levels.

Another favorite charge of these big business groups is that OPA controls are keeping goods off the market. Goods are being kept off the market, but not because of OPA controls. They are being kept off the market deliberately, in some instances, by a small group of manufacturers who are hoping that controls will be removed and that they will then be able to write their own price ticket. They care little that veterans need the clothing and equipment they are hoarding. The quick extension of OPA with full powers would blast that hope, and these goods would rapidly reappear on the market. The longer we delay OPA's extension, the longer those goods will stay in hiding.

OPA, these prophets of doom tell us, does not permit manufacturers to make a profit. This statement simply has no basis in fact. Corporation profits are at an all-time peak, and with elimination of excess profit taxes, 1946 profits will soar even higher. Profits for 1945, before taxes, were $22,000,000,000, as compared with $5,300,000,000 for prewar 1939. The American people will find it hard to share in the torrent of crocodile tears these men are shedding for their lost profits.

Of all the inane charges hurled against the OPA, probably the weakest is that price control makes black markets. Black markets are the result of high demand and scarce goods. They exist in spite of OPA, not because of it. The answer to the black-market problem lies in an aroused public opinion and more funds for OPA enforcement, not in removing controls. To cure the black market by eliminating price control would be just like killing the patient in order to cure his disease.

Some contend that relaxation of price control would not mean inflation. Try to tell that to a disabled veteran living on a small pension. Try to tell that to a widow living off an insurance policy. Certainly there is nothing in the history of those items which have been removed from control which would lend support to this theory. In most cases prices have shot upward immediately?

What would happen to rents if rent controls were lifted? We know what has happened to commercial rents where there were no ceilings. Those rents in many communities have gone sky high, and have driven a lot of small businessmen out of business. Wherever ceilings were lifted on specific items, where shortages still existed, prices invariably rose, which placed a great burden on the consuming public. It is not hard to imagine what would happen to the prices of any of the necessary articles which are in short supply and in so great demand if the lid were taken off.

Still another highly emotional but utterly false charge is that price control is un-American, communistic, or socialistic. That, of course, is the same old red herring that is so frequently dragged out to confuse the issue and obscure the real aims of those making the charge.

Speaking now of those "patriots" who have charged that price control is un-American. It might interest them to know that during the Revolutionary War a number of the States put price controls into effect, and that George Washington himself on several occasions uttered vehement denunciations of black marketeers and profiteers. In a letter to John Jay, Washington said:

> A wagonload of money will scarcely purchase a wagonload of provisions. Unless that most infamous practice of raising prices of the necessaries of life can be stopped, it will be impossible for any funds to subsist the Army.

Black markets flourished then, too. Of these operators, General Washington wrote: "No punishment in my opinion is too great for the man who can build his greatness upon his country's ruin."

There are other charges, such as the contention that OPA ceilings are inflexible, that wage increases cannot be taken into account in fixing prices. These are patently false. Under the new wage-price regulations, manufacturers are assured of prompt adjustments wherever they are necessary to relieve hardship, whether resulting from wage increases or any other cause.

That OPA, through its cost-absorption policy, is trying to control profits, is another frequently heard complaint. The fact is that OPA has placed a floor under profits rather than to curb profits. Any businessman can get an adjustment in his prices if he can demonstrate that he is not making at least as much as his peacetime earnings. To guarantee to every businessman a profit on each and every phase of his operation, as is done by one of the amendments adopted in the House, would result in skyrocketing prices.

Of course, OPA has made some mistakes. There have been cases where injustices have occurred. Some items should have been decontrolled before this. In an operation of the magnitude of OPA it would be miraculous indeed if they did not make mistakes. But whenever one of these occasional instances does crop up, the critics immediately pounce on it, dress it up, and parade it in paid advertisements as a typical example of OPA bungling instead of the exception it actually is. They usually manage to mix a few vitamins of fact into their highly seasoned stew of falsifications in order to deceive all but the most experienced palates.

Many of these critics are honestly misguided; but some of them know what they are doing. They know, for instance, that to remove price control now would result in inflation, and that inflation in turn would lead to depression. But alarmed for their own secure position at the head of our economic life, they seem determined to pull the house down in the hope that, out of the resulting confusion, they can seize economic power again.

These men are now alarmed at the wave of public protest which followed the passage of restrictive amendments in the House; they know that the public is awake to the danger of weakening the Price Control Act, and they are now piously proclaiming that they were for price control all the time, that they only want to tag on a few amendments to make it work more efficiently.

But Mr. President, the amendments that have been tacked onto the bill in the Senate committee and on the Senate floor make the bill unworkable, and would make OPA inefficient. The American people will not be fooled by such deception. They know that OPA has worked and is working and they do not want it crippled or repealed until such time as supply and demand come into reasonable balance and the danger of inflation is passed.

The question now before us is whether we are to heed the voice of our farmers, our veterans, our housewives, our laborers, our little businessmen, and pass a just price control law, fair to them all, or whether we are to heed the voices of a few high-pressure business groups and

let loose the flood gates of disastrous inflation.

Mr. President, it is my opinion that the bill, unless it can be improved very materially—and I doubt whether that can happen—should receive the veto of the President. I hope it will. I hope it will come back to us and that we will attempt to perfect a workable bill, a bill which will really do justice to the economic situation that prevails at this time. We must choose between the Golden Rule and the rule of gold. There can be only one just decision, and that is the extension of a strong price control law.

Mr. President, I have said that the situation in the country was reaching the proportions of national alarm. I have here to prove that statement a great number of editorials. One is from the Washington Post, another from the Vindicator of Youngstown, Ohio, another from the Gazette of Charleston, W. Va., another from the Des Moines Register. All these editorials present very strong arguments for a real constructive, efficient OPA.

I have another editorial from the Tribune of Salt Lake City, Utah. Another is from the News of Springfield, Mass. One from the Tribune of Great Falls, Mont. Another from the Sacramento, Calif., Bee. One from the Star-Times of St. Louis, Mo. One from the Times of Watertown, N. Y. One from the Sun of Chicago, Ill. One from the Herald of Lexington, Ky. One from the Times-Picayune of New Orleans. Another from the Times of Louisville, Ky. One from the Louisville Courier-Journal, which is entitled "Actually Price Control Helps Production." Another from the News of Newark, N. J. Another from the Bulletin of Philadelphia, Pa.

I have selected these editorials from all over the country, particularly from conservative newspapers, and they all represent an appeal to the Congress for a workable price control bill. I fear, Mr. President, if we pass the bill which has been so emasculated by the Senate in the last few days, which has been so filled up with crippling amendments by the other body, and if the bill were to become law, or if any bill were to take the place of the present OPA law, that widespread ruinous inflation would follow, and the chaos which would result would be prolonged, and bring about great injury to our economy.

Mr. President, I think there will be an awakening immediately after our action tonight. There will be a demand coming from all over the country for the President to veto the legislation unless we take heed with respect to the situation and perfect the bill before it is too late.

As I said in the beginning of my remarks, Mr. President, I took the floor to explain that I could not vote for the pending bill; that I would vote for a reasonable measure, and that if the bill passes as it is now amended it will result in great harm to our economy.

I now ask unanimous consent that the editorials to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of June 10, 1946]

IRRESISTIBLE FORCE

The Senate cannot work both sides of the street here any more than it could on selective service. Either we have effective price control or we have inflation. We cannot expect rent control to work if other controls are allowed to evaporate and the consequent spiral of price and wage increases to intensify. There is only one answer satisfactory to the great majority of fixed-income Americans who must pay the bills. A vote to emasculate the other portions of the OPA would knock rent control into a cocked hat. It would be a vote against the people.

[From the Youngstown Vindicator of May 1, 1946]

BUSINESS SEES THE LIGHT

Against the foolish proposal of the National Association of Manufacturers to end price control next month, and the more moderate but also ill-considered plan of the United States Chamber of Commerce to terminate the OPA's major powers next October, Eric Johnston, the chamber's president, yesterday warned the chamber in its annual convention that to end the OPA in the immediate future would put American business in the "national doghouse."

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of May 6, 1946]

HAMSTRINGING THE OPA

The issue is plainly whether Congress shall serve the interests of the people or the interests of the National Association of Manufacturers.

* * * * *

The people know that the OPA has been the only bulwark against runaway inflation. They know that if restrictions were lifted prices would soar overnight, ruinous prices that would trail disaster in their wake. Now they are putting up a loud and sustained howl that the Senate save the OPA.

* * * * *

Not from the housewife, not from the renter, not from the head of the family who pays the bills, not from the retailer who is close to the people. If they got it anywhere it was from the rent hogs, the rapacious large interests who see a chance to gouge the consumers outrageously, the crooked speculators who want to make a quick killing.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of May 6, 1946]

THE HOUSE BILL GOES TOO FAR

In normal times, no businessman makes a profit on every item. Perhaps he is installing new equipment; perhaps he is meeting competition; perhaps he is promoting a line of goods. Moreover only 15 percent of American companies even have cost-accounting systems whose results can be checked. Thus the House bill would mean, in practice, self-pricing for about 85 percent of all firms.

Under this self-pricing amendment, the only check on what is the cost of production and what is a reasonable profit is the authority of OPA to sue in court. But there are millions of items and hundreds of thousands of businesses! And court processes are slow. Policing would obviously be an impossible task.

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune of May 6, 1946]

MANY BUSINESS LEADERS FAVOR PRICE CONTROL

Other financiers and businessmen are planning to sound similar warnings, but the more they do to awaken the people to an impending peril of inflation the more vociferous and energetic the opponents of price control become. They have hired radio commentators, purchased publications, issued pamphlets and sent missionaries over the Republic to convince people that consumers' interests are safe with the profiteers who hope to confine price control to the judgment of their own experts.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) News of May 7, 1946]

BUSINESS RALLIES TO SUPPORT OF OPA

NAM advertising has carried a subtle appeal by maintaining butter and juicy roasts will be available to the public if price controls are thrown out the window. What NAM neglects to add is what butter and juicy roasts will cost with price controls abandoned. Actually, black-market prices might seem small by comparison.

* * * * *

The callous greed of the elements, which hope to overthrow price control, is an interesting commentary upon the indifference with with many segments of the national life view the welfare of the public and the Nation's economy.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of May 9, 1946]

REACTION TO REACTION

When Edward O'Neal, president of the Farm Bureau Federation, and Albert Goss, master of the National Grange, are willing to join with those who believe the House of Representatives went too far in trying to scrap the OPA, it is pretty good proof that the House misjudged public sentiment.

* * * * *

David Lawrence, who has long been regarded as an able spokesman for the conservative—though by no means always reactionary—viewpoint, remarks in the current issue of the United States News that an end to controls would lead to conditions far worse—"to a boom, a bust and then an inevitable demand for a super-new deal. Will it be moderate controls today or severe and extreme controls for everything 5 years hence?" Mr. Lawrence asks.

The Senate has heard a lot about that "boom-and-bust" apprehension and there is good reason to hope that it will not be ignored.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee of May 14, 1946]

WHAT HARDSHIP?

If the case of the OPA is to rest on the question of hardship, then the real hardship would come if all price controls were removed now—first to the consumer, then to everyone, as the spiral of inflation zoomed upward toward the big bust.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times of May 16, 1946]

NO COMPROMISE ON OPA

The wave of public indignation which swept the country following the House's amending orgy 4 weeks ago has had time to subside a bit. Meanwhile, the National Association of Manufacturers and other anti-price-control lobbyists have been busily organizing a counterattack.

* * * * *

Anything but a clear-cut extension of the powers of OPA will be so demoralizing to OPA personnel and the public generally that whatever controls remain will be little better than no controls at all.

Senators should be reminded again that the people are counting on them to stand firm against the House amendments.

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of May 22, 1946]

LET BOWLES RUN PRICE CONTROL

Chester Bowles is not popular among the inflationists and the pressure groups which are trying to end price control in this country. That is because they cannot move him an inch. But Bowles, for this very reason, has the confidence of the great mass of the American people. They want price control and they want Bowles to operate it.

We hope the influence of Senator WAGNER, chairman of the Banking Committee, and a proved friend of price control, will be exerted to keep price control in the hands of Bowles and out of the hands of Anderson.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun of May 22, 1946]

NO STRAIT-JACKET FOR OPA

It is always bad legislation to write into law detailed decisions which lie within the proper sphere of administrative discretion. * * * The responsibility of Congress is to decide whether we are to have control, for how long, and under what broad lines of policy. Congress exceeds these bounds whenever it directly or indirectly exempts certain interests, sets up elaborate formulas for decontrol, or imposes rigid procedures.

* * * * *

If the OPA is told to do its work while wrapped in a strait-jacket, it might as well be told to go out of business altogether.

[From the Lexington (Ky.) Herald of May 24, 1946]

THE LAST STAND

It is almost impossible by legislation to determine in advance wher the emergency will cease and exactly what will be needed to meet it, but the fact is apparent that the land stand is now being made by the American people to hold the line against inflation.

* * * * *

Another thing to remember is that last June the crises that are now developing all occurred the same way in the effort to kill OPA.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune of May 27, 1946]

REVISING THE OPA

The Senate committee could do the country a great service by voting to continue the OPA a year as an antiprofiteering agency, directing it to wind up its price-control and subsidy spending according to an agreed schedule within that time.

But when it undertakes to disperse control authority and state in detail what formulas the OPA shall use to effect controls within the remaining year of its allotted life, it is inviting a great breakdown of all control.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times of May 27, 1946]

EVERYONE MUST EAT

The committee's action strikes hardest at low-income families already struggling to buy groceries. So far as they are concerned, Senator TAYLOR, Idaho, does not exaggerate when he says it has "killed price control."

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of June 2, 1946]

ACTUALLY PRICE CONTROL HELPS PRODUCTION

What the Senate's Banking Committee has done, by adding inflationary amendments to the price-control bill, is to stir anew the force which has been more effective than any other in the last 5 months in preventing even higher production—the force, this is, of industrial unrest and strikes over wage demands supported by increases in costs of living.

* * * * *

Price control actually helps production, under present circumstances, rather than the contrary result of the political theory. It keeps costs steady and predictable. It prevents hoarding of supplies and parts. It protects markets by preventing buyers' strikes against inflated prices. (How many will pay $1 a pound for butter?)

[From the Newark (N. J.) News of June 4, 1946]

PRICES AND STRIKES

The administration believes that sustained production is the best offset to inflation. Until sustained production is achieved, prices must be controlled. That is the basic argument for continuation of OPA.

* * * * *

There isn't much question that if OPA were removed tomorrow a vast flood of goods would be released for sale. But at what prices?

* * * * *

It is impossible to believe that the organized fight against OPA—intensive, bitter, and well financed—is motivated from altruism, or that all this impassioned campaign has no other purpose than the shaving off of a quick 3 months' profit, after which prices will come down.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin of June 7, 1946]

IGNORING THE CONSUMER

Stabilization Chief Bowles terms the Senate committee version of the bill a "joy ride to inflation." It may be just that. The effect would be to lift the prices of necessities, as well as luxuries, to the point where any gains resulting from recent wage increases would be wiped out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, is there an amendment now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. CORDON. On behalf of my colleague, Mr. MORSE, and myself, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 39, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. Section 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h) There shall be created in each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto in each State and Territory and the District of Columbia one or more local price-control boards to aid in the administration and enforcement of this act. Each such local board shall consist of three or more members appointed by the Administrator from among the residents of the county or political subdivision in which such board has jurisdiction upon recommendation of the respective governors or comparable executive officials. Such local boards, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator, shall have power within their respective jurisdictions to investigate alleged violations of this act, or regulations, orders, or price schedules prescribed thereunder. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Administrator shall not institute any action under this section with respect to any such violation by any seller of goods at retail or any retail service establishment unless the institution of such action has been recommended by the local price control board within the jurisdiction of which the violation occurred, and no such action shall be instituted for the imposition of any greater penalty or for the recovery of any greater sum than that recommended by such board. No such board shall recommend the institution of such an action unless the person charged with the violation has been given an opportunity to be heard before the board. The board may propose a settlement in the case of any such violation, and upon the acceptance of the proposal by the person charged with the violation and his compliance with its terms, he shall not be subject to any further liability with respect to such violation.'"

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the most glaring failure made by the Office of Price Administration in the administration of the Price Control Act has been in the field of enforcement. During the last 3 years from time to time Members of the Senate have arisen on the floor to protest action taken by the agents of the Office of Price Administration and the strong arm methods which have been practiced in connection with the alleged enforcement of price control.

Mr. President, this amendment does not extend to any group except the retailers, who perhaps more than any others have honestly and faithfully tried to abide by the prices set by OPA. Heretofore the law has provided that the penalty for violation of prices was either three times the amount of the overcharges or $25, which ever was greater. In the enforcement of price control through the courts the persons charged have had an opportunity to be heard. They have been called into court and have been given their day in court. But, Mr. President, for every prosecution handled in the courts there have been literally thousands of cases in which collections have been made from the alleged violators without any court action whatever.

I dislike to take the time of the Senate at this late hour, but I believe that 90 percent of the complaints which have been heard over the United States in connection with the administration of the Price Control Act have resulted from the activities of untrained individuals in the field who have forced payments by threats of prosecution in cases of the most minor violations. The situation became so acute out in the State of Oregon that I took occasion to look into the matter and determine just what the practice was. During a period of less than a month I received 65 or 70 telegrams from two areas. Those telegrams were not directed at price control. They were not directed at the orderly procedure of enforcement. They were directed at what was termed the gestapo action of field representatives in haling the small retailer before a price panel and there threatening him with prosecution and so forcing him to a settlement.

It is readily understandable, Mr. President, that the average individual called into court for a minor violation and

LAW LIBRARY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

given an opportunity to pay $25 or $50 would immediately determine that it was to his best interest to make the payment, even though he were innocent, because he could not get an ordinary defense in court for that amount of money. He would be faced with the choice of either paying the required amount or paying more than that and going to the additional trouble and expense of actual trial.

When these telegrams arrived it was clear that there was something more than a simple complaint at enforcement. When I received a letter from an individual outlining what had happened it seemed to me that it was time to determine just what the facts were.

On January 15 of this year, with this flood of telegrams, I received a letter which I shall read to the Senate because it typifies what is happening. Then I shall follow it with a brief statement as to the facts in that case, and I shall document it from OPA itself. The letter is as follows:

CAMPUS SUPER MARKET,
Corvallis, Oreg., January 15, 1946.

Hon. GUY CORDON,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GUY: You will remember me from the 15 years I spent in Riddle in the general store.

This letter comes from Corvallis, Oreg., and the reference is to a small town near my home in Oregon.

I continue the quotation:

I just got handed a $50 fine by OPA which I have not paid yet but expect I will tomorrow, likely.

A checker spent 4 hours in my place. He charged me with nine items alleging I was over ceiling.

I dug out invoices and other evidence and took it to OPA. What it all boiled down to was this: I had an error in computation on C. H. B. catsup and was 1 cent bottle high. Other than that no merchandise was sold over ceiling and of that less than four cases.

This is the truth as near as I know it.

This store does about $200,000 a year.

I cannot help some errors creeping in both ways, for while turn-over of help was terrific and I had to hire people that never worked in a store.

Up to lately OPA seemed to be as helpful as they could and I have honestly tried to give them my fullest cooperation. Now they seem to be out for penalties.

GUY, that fine was never coming to me. I could send you copy of the charges and my reply to same. GUY, this is not America. OPA has made mistakes and put too high prices on the community ceiling at times that I can point out to you—prices that I never did charge.

Why is it that I cannot work with my Government as best I can and they with me, each knowing the other is human and liable to error?

They are penalizing many and I am utterly convinced that 98 percent are honestly trying to cooperate to the best of their ability.

Woody Jones, whom you may know, a 28-year-old veteran, and I believe a splendid boy, wanted me to take an interest with him and buy the Lebanon Food. I planned to do it but I am writing him what happened to me and telling him not at this time.

I canceled an order for a new frozen-food cabinet for I do not know if I want to continue or not. I am 55 years old and have followed this business all my life. I love it.

Nothing like this ever happened to me before.

Is this Germany?

My attorney told me when I showed him the charges if I wanted to fight it not to answer, and he figured I could beat it.

He said, though, this was a time of expediency and the smart thing to do was to pay.

I told him they were a part of my Government, or should be, and were entitled to the truth as I knew it. I gave it to them and got the $50 penalty.

It is really a terrible thing.

FRANK BRADSTREET.

When that letter arrived I sent it to the Office of Price Administration and asked them to comment on it and give me the facts. I received a letter from the chief enforcement officer attempting to justify it. I ask unanimous consent at this time to place that letter in the RECORD. Then I shall continue with my documentation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 6, 1946.

The Honorable GUY CORDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CORDON: This is in further reference to Mr. Frank Bradstreet of Corvallis, Oreg.

We have received a report from our Portland, Oreg., office which I believe accurately reflects what actually occurred in this matter. I quote:

"The files of Frank Bradstreet, d. b. a. Campus Super Market, 2007 Monroe Street, Corvallis, Oreg., discloses that he was examined on October 31, 1945, by O. G. Rosenlund, an investigator of the Portland district office. Mr. Rosenlund is an investigator far above the average who has been in the grocery business all his life. He is conscientious, sincere, and extremely accurate. We believe he is one of the best operators we have in the office.

"His investigation covered a check of 20 items, of which 9 were found to be over the ceiling, one for 4 cents, 2 for 2 cents, and the balance for 1 cent. All of them were ordinary staple commodities. His report was sent to the local panel for hearing and the minutes of their hearing show that Mr. Bradstreet admitted that he had in his employ an elderly man who had been making a number of mistakes, and that he had found the goods had been put upon the shelf wrongly marked without his noticing it. In a letter to the board he admitted, 'I realize that errors have occurred from time to time and can only say that they were errors in facts and as soon as discovered, many times by me on check, they were properly corrected.'

"As a result of their investigation, the local panel assessed an administrator's claim in the amount of $50 which Mr. Bradstreet has paid. All proceedings apparently were conducted in due form and Mr. Bradstreet was given every opportunity to present his side of the matter.

"In view of the record of extreme reliability of Mr. Rosenlund's work and the finding of the Corvallis price panel, Mr. Bradstreet's contention that he had only one error of 1 cent cannot be supported."

I should like to point out that the report shows that the OPA district office after conducting the investigation turned the investigator's findings over to the local price panel for their consideration. It was the price panel who after conference with Mr. Bradstreet and consideration of the facts before it decided that he had violated and that an administrator's claim should be asserted and settled for $50. Mr. Bradstreet, of course, could have refused to settle and could have contested the claim in court at such time as suit might have been brought on account of the violations.

Price panels, as you know, are composed of representative local citizens, who serve without pay and are familiar with local problems. These panels have been delegated authority to confer with retailers regarding alleged overcharges, to negotiate voluntary settlements of the Government's claim on account of overcharges, and to recommend to the OPA district offices acceptance of such settlements.

I am pleased to make this report to you.

Sincerely,

HERMAN A. GREENBERG,
Director, Food Enforcement Division.

Mr. CORDON. I then telegraphed the regional representative of OPA in Portland, Oreg., and asked him to advise me as to what the facts were in that case. I wish to read the answer, because it is a part of the case. The enforcement officer inquired about the facts, and the following letter came back:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Portland, Oreg., March 27, 1946.

Memorandum to: Mr. Lewis J. Bronaugh, district price board executive.

From: Frances V. Dobyns, docket control supervisor.

Subject: Campus Super Market, Corvallis, Oreg.

In compliance with your memorandum requesting the minutes of hearing of subject case, we submit the following:

Copies, T-805, dated December 5, 1945.

Minutes of hearing, dated December 13, 1945.

Minutes of hearing, dated January 10, 1946.

Letter to Mr. Bradstreet, dated January 11, 1946.

This case resulted from a district office investigation which was made October 31, 1945 in which 20 items were checked. Nine were found in price violation, which is 45 percent of the items checked.

Mr. Bradstreet had once before been called before the board, to discuss with them the alleged minor violations found in the June 1945 meat check. The case was dismissed at that time.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
WAR PRICE AND RATIONING BOARD 85.2.1,
Corvallis, Oreg., December 5, 1945.

CAMPUS SUPER MARKET,
2007 Monroe Street, City.

DEAR MR. BRADSTREET: You are requested to appear before the price panel of your local War Price and Rationing Board at Courthouse, Corvallis, Oreg., at 8:30 p. m. on Thursday, December 13, 1945. We would like to discuss with you the selling prices and methods of making ceiling prices known to your customers for the following items:

Orange juice (Fargo): Selling price, 24 cents; ceiling price, 31 cents.

Prune juice (Lakeshore): Selling price, 33 cents; ceiling price, 31 cents.

S & W sliced beets: Selling price, 17 cents; ceiling price, 16 cents.

Tomatoes, peeled (C. H. B.): Selling price, 25 cents; ceiling price, 24 cents.

Catsup (C. H. B.): Selling price, 23 cents; ceiling price, 22 cents.

Chili con carne (Dennisol): Selling price, 28 cents; ceiling price, 24 cents.

Waffle mix (Duff): Selling price, 29 cents; ceiling price, 27 cents.

Peanut butter (Hoody): Selling price, 59 cents; ceiling price, 58 cents.

Asparagus (Hunt) spears, colossal: Selling price, 53 cents; ceiling price, 52 cents.

Please bring with you all information necessary to demonstrate to your price panel the method you used for figuring out your ceiling prices on these items, and also invoices covering your most recent purchases of these items.

Very truly yours,

H. B., *Price Clerk.*

Thereafter Mr. Bradstreet came before the board and presented the following written statement with reference to each of those alleged violations:

CAMPUS SUPER MARKET,
Corvallis, Oreg., December 18, 1945.
WAR PRICE AND RATIONING BOARD 85.2.1,
Corvallis, Oreg.

GENTLEMEN: At your direction, I appeared before the price panel of the local War Price and Rationing Board in the Courthouse, Corvallis, Oreg., on Thursday evening, December 13, 1945, at 8:30 p. m. I was directed to appear at that time and place in a letter dated December 5, 1945, wherein certain alleged violations of the price ceiling on my part were set forth. The alleged violations are as follows:

Orange juice (Fargo): Selling price, 24 cents; ceiling price, 23 cents.

Prune juice (Lakeshore): Selling price, 33 cents; ceiling price, 31 cents.

S & W sliced beets: Selling price, 17 cents; ceiling price, 16 cents.

Tomatoes, peeled (C. H. B.): Selling price, 25 cents; ceiling price, 24 cents.

Catsup (C. H. B.): Selling price, 23 cents; ceiling price, 22 cents.

Chili con carne (Dennison's): Selling price, 28 cents; ceiling price, 24 cents.

Waffle mix (Duff's): Selling price, 29 cents; ceiling price, 27 cents.

Peanut butter (Hoody): Selling price, 59 cents; ceiling price, 58 cents.

Asparagus (Hunt), spears Colossal: Selling price, 53 cents; ceiling price, 52 cents.

Discussing these items in the order in which they are set forth in said letter, I desire to state the following:

1. Fargo orange juice: It is my contention that the price clerk is in error in determining the ceiling price to be 23 cents. The cost of this juice f. o. b. my store is $4.49 per case. I am allowed a mark-up of $1.26, and as I compute it the correct ceiling price on this item is 24 cents.

2. Lakeshore prune juice: This item was delivered to my store on the 19th day of October 1945. It had been out of stock for some time due to inability to obtain. It cost $2.90 per dozen; the mark-up is $1.26. The correct ceiling price is 30 cents per bottle, the marked price of 33 cents was in error, and none had been sold because we counted it when we changed the price.

3. S & W sliced beets: It is my contention that my ceiling price of 17 cents per can is correct. These beets cost me $3.03 per case f. o. b. my store, and I am entitled to a mark-up of $1.31, which, as I compute it, figures a ceiling price of 17 cents per can. Regarding items 1 and 3: In all due respect to the gentleman who checked these items in my store, I wish to state that I personally gave him the cost as marked on the cases on the Fargo orange juice and S & W sliced beets. Whoever put the cost on these items was in error because the prices as herein set forth were taken directly from the invoices.

4. C. H. B. peeled tomatoes: In the short time allotted to me I have been unable to locate my invoices on this item and have been unable to get the price from the local wholesaler. It is my firm conviction that the price of 25 cents per can as marked was correct. The last invoice which I was able to locate for these tomatoes when computed, arrived at a ceiling price of 23 cents per can rather than the 24 cents ceiling price indicated in your letter of December 5. I immediately priced these tomatoes at 23 cents per can.

5. C. H. B. catsup: According to my present calculations, the ceiling price of 22 cents per bottle is correct and our ceiling price was in error. I have checked my invoices and I am satisfied that not more than four cases of 24 bottles per case were sold at the 23 cents price.

6. Chili con carne (Dennison's): My contention here is that my ceiling price is correct. This chili con carne cost me $5.48 per case f. o. b., my store. I am entitled to a mark-up of $1.21, making the correct ceiling price 28 cents.

7. Duff waffle mix: The 27 cents ceiling price indicated is correct. This item was on the shelves adjacent to three other Duff mixes that I carried, all of which should sell for the same price. The price marked was clearly in error but none of this waffle mix had been sold at the erroneous ceiling price.

8. Hoody peanut butter: This brand of peanut butter comes in two compositions, one creamy and the other crunchy. They were on the shelf side by side and should have been marked at the same ceiling price. However, through an error, one of the items was priced at 59 cents and the other at the correct ceiling price of 58 cents. None of this peanut butter priced at 59 cents per jar was sold at 59 cents.

Regarding items 7 and 8: I have learned from the checkers at the counter that they knew the shelvers had made an error on the marked price of these two items. They were selling them at the correct ceiling price of 27 cents and 58 cents respectively, and were disregarding the prices marked.

9. Hunt asparagus: This asparagus cost me $9.73 per case, f. o. b. my store. I am entitled to a mark-up of $1.31, making the correct ceiling price 53 cents.

I desire to repeat my representations made to the panel board at its meeting Thursday evening, December 13, 1945: In the first place, prior to October 1945, I was in partnership with Mrs. Marion Trafton and because of the ill health of the members of her family it was necessary for her to return to California and I took over her interest in the Campus Super Market. The result has been that I have simply had more work than I have been able to do and some of the details have escaped my attention. I did rely, to a considerable extent, for my pricing, on the services of a man well advanced in years whose services were not too satisfactory but were the best obtainable under the circumstances.

I am convinced that I have more than 2,000 items in my store under price regulations. I have tried my very best to comply with all regulations and will continue to do so. I realize that errors have occurred from time to time and I can only say that they were errors in facts and as soon as they were discovered, many times by our own check, they were promptly corrected.

In one recent month, 15 different people were on our pay roll, some of whom had never worked in a grocery store. Labor turnover has been terrific. I think it will be better from now on.

As I have pointed out in the foregoing letter on four of the alleged nine violations, we were correct in our ceilings and the price clerk was in error. We are satisfied that we were correct on the peeled tomatoes but at this time are unable to substantiate that fact definitely. I found an invoice of Ball tomatoes at $4.87 per case and I recall buying the CHB tomatoes just about that time, and thinking that the price of both were terrible. I shall inquire from more jobbers about this item and see if I can develop further information. The other four items were simply priced in error, not by me, but by my help. The catsup and prune juice represented simply were errors in calculation.

We are satisfied, based upon a careful investigation of our invoices and inventory that the overcharge on account of the alleged violations of the ceiling prices did not exceed $1 in the aggregate.

Sometime back, we were selling C. H. B. catsup for 20 cents per bottle. The particular jobber we were buying it of ran out of stock, and we had to obtain it from a jobber who got a price of $3.96 per case. Whoever figured that item, erroneously figured the ceiling price at 23 cents per bottle. I found invoices for four cases at this price. Not all of it had been sold when your checker discovered the error.

Perhaps, more than most folk now in business, I hope the program of OPA will be successful. I am one of those who sold sugar that cost more than 27 cents per pound for 8 cents per pound. Lard that cost me 40 cents per pound, I sold for 16 cents. This happened in the merchandise panic of 1920. I have no desire that such losses be repeated. Nothing has ever left my store marked above ceiling price, except by uncontrollable error. It never will. I shall work with OPA to the best of my ability, as long as I am in business.

Yours very truly,
CAMPUS SUPER MARKET,
By FRANK BRADSTREET, *Owner.*

After he has shown that of the violations alleged only one represented the pricing of an item which had been sold, and that that was less than four cases of catsup in respect to which the overcharge had been 1 cent a bottle, according to the minutes of the meeting, the following action was had:

FORM DO-3—MINUTES OF HEARING

District docket No. P-132. Date of hearing, December 13, 1945. Firm name, Campus Super Market. Board No. 85.2.1. Street address, 2007 Monroe Street. Time, 8:30 p. m. Owner, Frank Bradstreet.

(NOTE.—If partnership, list all partners; if corporation, list principal officers and State in which incorporated.)

Persons present: George King, board supervisor; M. L. Reese, panel chairman; Jay Mill, panel member; E. L. Forsyth, panel member; H. W. Cameron, panel member.

Details of hearing: Mr. Reese opened the meeting and explained the operation of the board to Mr. Frank Bradstreet as this was his first appearance before the board. Mr. Bradstreet uses the percentage mark-up only after he has thoroughly checked the community ceiling price list. He seemed very sincere and had most of his invoices with him. Explaining peanut butter, few jars were marked 59 cents, most marked 58 cents, he couldn't explain this and claims none were sold for 59 cents. Duff's Waffle Mix, one kind was marked 29 cents and the other three kinds marked 27 cents, always sold for 27 cents. He recently had to release from his employ an elderly man who he has had with him for a number of years. He stated since he lost his son overseas he has been making a number of mistakes. He felt he was right on some of items and the others they had been marked wrong and placed on the shelf without his noticing them. He went into a very lengthy discussion on the difference in the wholesaler's prices and for instance he stated they varied as much as $2 a case on tuna.

Conclusion of panel: Given T-806, retailer's compliance statement and asked to fill out as a self audit, and to check all items he has overcharged on and give the approximate number of items, audit to be from July 1944 and returned to this office by the 18 of December 1945.

Prepared by:

H. B., *Price Clerk.*

FORM DO-3—MINUTES OF HEARING

District docket No. P-132. Board No. 85.2.1. Firm name, Campus Super Market. Date of hearing, January 10, 1946. Street address, 2007 Monroe Street. Time, 7:30 p. m. Owner, Frank Bradstreet.

(NOTE.—If partnership, list all partners; if corporation, list principal officers and State in which incorporated.)

Persons present: M. L. Leese, price panel chairman; E. L. Forsyth, price panel member; Jay Mill, price panel member; Hazel Blanchard, price clerk; Donna Malstrom, price clerk.

Details of hearing: The board reviewed the letter submitted by Mr. Bradstreet as he had been advised by his attorney not to sign the T-806, Retailer's Compliance Statement. All the present board members had been present at the time when Mr. Bradstreet was personally interviewed and it was the general opinion of the board that he should be given an administrator's claim in the amount of $50.

Conclusion of panel: The clerk was instructed to notify Mr. Bradstreet that he was to settle an administrator's claim in the amount of $50. This remittance to be returned to this office not later than January 14, 1946.

Prepared by:

H. B., *Price Clerk.*

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Corvallis, Oreg., January 11, 1946.

Mr. FRANK BRADSTREET,
Campus Super Market,
Corvallis, Oreg.

DEAR MR. BRADSTREET: At the meeting of the price panel last night they reviewed the letter you submitted to this office explaining apparent overcharges on Fargo orange juice, Lakeshore prune juice, S. & W. sliced beets, CHB peeled tomatoes, CHB catsup, Dennison's chili con carne, Duff's waffle mix, Hoody peanut butter, and Hunt's asparagus spears. After careful consideration of the evidence, it is the opinion of the board that you be asked to settle an administrator's claim in the amount of $50.

This remittance is to be made in the form of a certified check, cashier's check, or postal money order made payable to the Treasurer of the United States. If it was possible for you to know of each person who purchased these articles at above the ceiling price, there is a provision whereby you could make refunds to them. But inasmuch as there is no way that these consumers can be determined, it is provided that the United States Treasury be made the recipient so that in some way we all will benefit by this settlement.

We would appreciate it if we could receive your check, or your answer, by Monday, January 14, 1946, in order that we can inform our district office as to the disposition of this case.

Very truly yours,

HAZEL BLANCHARD,
Chief Price Clerk, 85.2.1.

Mr. President, that is the OPA's way of saying that they forced him to pay $50.

This case is a sample of how the enforcement, so-called, has been made in the field. The charges here represent allegations of overcharges, none of which was more than 3 cents on any item. There were nine alleged overcharges, and the checker spent over 4 hours in that little grocery store trying to find an overcharge. The total amount of overcharges shown and admitted represented in money less than $1. This man, Frank Bradstreet, paid his $50. That was one case.

Mr. President, I should like to refer to one other case, and then I shall not detain the Senate by going into the others. The other case to which I wish to refer is that of Mr. Grant Pyatt, of Corvallis, Oreg. I read his letter showing his trouble:

GRANT'S QUALITY MEATS,
Corvallis, Oreg., April 20, 1946.

Mr. M. E. WOODCOCK,
Commander, Corvallis Post No. 11,
American Legion, Corvallis, Oreg.

DEAR MR. WOODCOCK: Re our recent conversation, I enlisted in the Marine Corps during September of 1942. I hired my retail meat-market manager to take charge of the business while I was in the service. He followed OPA regulations to the very best of his ability.

OPA determines the retail-price ceilings in food stores by classifying them into groups. Groups 1 and 2, and groups 3 and 4, A merchant operating under groups 1 and 2 ceilings can get more for his merchandise than a retailer who is operating under groups 3 and 4. These groups are determined by the volume of sales. Any store or retail meat market doing less than $250,000 per year is classified as a group 1 or 2 market or store. Over that volume, the independent merchant is in group 4.

Since our volume ranges between $65,000 and $75,000 per year, my manager naturally assumed that we were to be in group 2. He sold our meat at group 2 prices, and when I returned from the service on April 1, 1945, I continued to sell at group 2 prices. As the owner of this market, I assumed complete charge from that date on.

On or about July 5, 1945, an OPA checker came into our market. He was from the main office of OPA for this territory. After a routine check, he informed me that my market should be in group 4, because we were in the same building with a grocery store. I told him that I was not aware of this ruling, and at his suggestion, I called our local price panel to find out. They informed me that they knew of no such ruling, and they thought that we were correct by being in group 2. Acting on the suggestion of the local board, I wrote to the OPA district office at Portland, and went along, selling meat at group 2 prices, pending an answer from the Portland office, for the checker had not told me to change. He said that he thought I was in the wrong group.

On or about July 30, 1945, I was asked to pay $750 to the Portland office, to avoid an OPA suit of treble damages, which was explained to me as quite likely to run $10,000 or more. A few days later I receivd a telephone call from the Portland OPA office asking me if I were going to pay the $750. I told him that I could not afford it, having recently been discharged from the service and just getting started again. He asked me if I could stand $500. When I told him I could not, he wanted to know what I could pay. We finally agreed on $150. On file I have a release from this damage suit sent to me after the OPA office had received my check for $150. I have been forced to sell at group 4 prices ever since.

Now, I feel that the provision of MPR 336 and 355, which I violated, is unfair and unjust. My business is entirely independently owned, and I believe that I should enjoy group 2 prices as well as any other meat retailer doing the same amount of business. It is not fair that I should be forced to sell my merchandise at approximately 7 percent less than my competitors, just because I happen to be in the same building with another business.

I also resent paying the $150 refund on the so-called "overcharges." Since the OPA checker was not sure of my proper group, and the local OPA board did not know, I think a warning would have been sufficient, especially since I am penalized by being placed in group 4 with less profit. My discharge pay was $200, and I hated to spend $150 of it that fast and in that manner.

Very truly yours,

GRANT PYATT.

Mr. President, I have given two examples of what is taking place on the retail store level. It is not prosecution; it is a species of persecution verging on black markets.

Mr. President, I can understand that the OPA has been faced with great difficulty in trying to enforce price regulations. I do not believe that they could ever be enforced. I can understand, also, that the OPA has been compelled to accept many untrained persons in making up its personnel. However, I examined the rules and regulations of the OPA which govern their price panel channels, and if the price panel does what it is directed to do, as it did in the case which I have cited, it is no longer subject to criticism. Instead, the criticism should be directed to the highest level. The price control panel in this case had no other alternative to follow than the course which it followed.

Among other things, Mr. President, I may say that a price control panel, as it is set up at the moment, cannot make any decision; it can only recommend a decision, and the final decision must be made by the boss of the man who made the investigation and filed the charges. The result, in substance, is, Mr. President, that, first, there is a sleuth who, having unearthed what he claims to be a violation, enters the picture as a prosecutor, files his complaint, and acts as a judge and as a jury, and finally executes the sentence. It is all done without recourse to law. It is all done under rules and regulations with no opportunity being afforded the defendant to be heard in his own defense under the ordinary rules of trial practice. It is true that a man may plead his case. But the panel is instructed, in that event, to go far beyond the charges. The rules and regulations provide that the panel shall inquire not only into the alleged violation, but shall go further and endeavor to ascertain what other violations, if any, the individual has committed. The defendant is called into a gestapo, into an inquisition. When the panel has made out whatever case it can, and it feels, perhaps, that it has obtained an admission upon which it can predicate further charges, it may be in position further to mulct the poor devil out of a fine of a minimum of $25.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have the same complaint to make with regard to the suburban boards as does the Senator from Oregon. However, I do not see that they are in any way to be abolished by the Senator's amendment. The Senator's amendment provides for establishing in each county, or political subdivision corresponding thereto, one or more local price-control boards. If one of those boards is set up in the city of Cincinnati, for example, what would be the result? There is already such a board in the city of Cincinnati. Yet there are several dozen suburban boards which would not, it seems to me, be abolished by the amendment. They would continue as they are. I do not see what the

Senator would accomplish by the amendment in carrying out the purpose he is seeking to carry out.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will read the rules and regulations under which price panels are established at the present time, he will realize that those boards do not have authority to do anything. They only recommend what may be done. My amendment would give them the authority to do something. Under the rules and regulations as they are in effect at the present time, the boards are limited even in the recommendation which they may make. Under the amendment they will have authority, after a hearing has been granted to the individual, to determine themselves what shall be done in the particular case. If it is an aggravated case the board may recommend action. If the case is not an aggravated one, they may recommend a compromise settlement. If that proves to be satisfactory, the case is ended. It cannot be taken any further. In my opinion, the enactment of this amendment would for the first time permit the price control board in the local area to exercise its own independent judgment. Heretofore those boards have not been permitted to exercise their own judgment. They have had no standing except that which was given to them by virtue of the regulations of the OPA.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I should like to add one more statement, and then I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Moreover, Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will carefully read the language of the amendment he will see that it provides for a local price control board to be appointed from among local citizens upon the recommendation of the Governor, or some comparable executive officer. In many cases, price control boards which were appointed have resigned in disgust because of what they were required to do. If we may start on the basis of a new act and have appointed boards on the recommendation of the Governors of the several States, and give to those boards authority under the law, I believe that the result will be a reasonable and equitable enforcement of the rules. If that can be accomplished, we will go far in putting an end to the present type of domination and duress which is rampant throughout the United States.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see anything in the Senator's amendment which would prevent the Administrator from appointing one board in the city of Cincinnati, for example, and maintaining all his other boards. No prohibition of that kind is incorporated in the amendment. There is no prohibition with respect to the kind of board which now exists and which has no legal power. The board is purely an extralegal one. It seems to me that if the Senator wishes to accomplish his purpose he will have to provide that there shall be no other type of board than the one which will be set up under his amendment. That is the suggestion which I wanted to make.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I still feel that the Office of Price Administration will at least strive to administer the law according to its plain wording. This is the only board which will have the authority to act, and certainly if those who may be investigated and against whom violations may be charged are not enough interested in their own welfare to require the case to come before the appropriate board, then they are not in a position to complain at the result.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator on the amendment has expired.

Mr. CORDON. I shall take the balance of my time on the bill, and will have some time left over. If I may just refer briefly to the amendment itself, so that we may see its application, I shall conclude.

At the present time, as I have said, we have this type of duress, of forced settlement. This amendment provides a method by which there can be local boards with power to investigate and make settlement. The provision for the appointment of the boards on recommendation of the several governors is a provision which now appears in the selective service law, and was in the selective service law in 1917 and 1918. It has worked with reference to local selective service boards; I am satisfied it will work with the Office of Price Administration, if it is given a chance.

The board is appointed upon recommendation of the governor, or other like authority. The board acts under rules and regulations, and, Mr. President if we are to assume anything, we must assume that at least there is an intention on the part of the Government agency to administer the law according to its wording. The boards will have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to investigate alleged violations of the act or regulations, orders or price schedules prescribed thereunder. Of course, in operation the actual investigation in the field will be done by the Office of Price Administration, except in extraordinary cases.

Mr. President, this is the meat of the amendment:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Administrator shall not institute any action under this section with respect to any such violation by any seller of goods at retail or any retail service establishment, unless the institution of such action has been recommended by the local price control board within the jurisdiction of which the violation occurred, and no such action shall be instituted for the imposition of any greater penalty or for the recovery of any greater sum than that recommended by such board. No such board shall recommend the institution of such an action unless the person charged with the violation has been given an opportunity to be heard before the board. The board may propose a settlement in the case of any such violation and upon the acceptance of the proposal by the person charged with the violation and his compliance with its terms, he shall not be subject to any further liability with respect to such violation.

Mr. President, in concluding, I desire to say only that my purpose in submitting the amendment is that we may, for such time as price control to any degree is necessary, afford throughout the United States an opportunity for the average American citizen to be heard before his own neighbors in cases of unintentional and minor violations at the retail level. I believe that the adoption of the amendment and its incorportation in the Price Control Act will go far to make that act at least palatable to the American people, and will at the same time in no wise lower the observance by the people themselves of price control.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to support every word my senior colleague, Mr. CORDON, has spoken in support of the amendment. As one of the coauthors of the amendment, I wish to make a few brief remarks in its support. I think it is a very important amendment. I think it is an amendment which seeks to correct one of the most serious allegations of the OPA abuse.

Certainly no one on this floor can question my support of the principles of price control, because I think during this debate on OPA legislation I have demonstrated rather clearly by the votes I have cast that I am a stanch supporter of the objectives of OPA. The Members of this body are also aware that for more than a year on numerous occasions I have sought on this floor to get the Senate to take what I consider to be necessary steps to correct OPA abuses, particularly in the realm of enforcement.

I venture the suggestion that if more than a year ago the Senate had been willing to adopt the resolution which I offered at that time, seeking to set up a committee of the Senate through which we could channelize the criticisms of the OPA as they came to us as Senators, a committee which, working in cooperation with OPA, could have separated the true charges from the false charges, OPA would not find itself in the plight in which it finds itself tonight.

I do not think the Senate of the United States can escape its share of responsibility for the storm of public criticism which has been raised during the past year against OPA, because the fact remains that in regard to the resolution I offered more than a year ago I could not even get hearings on it before the Committee on Banking and Currency, let alone a report of that committee of the resolution to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I think it is also true that OPA, too, has itself to blame for much of the public criticism which has resulted, I think, in the emasculation of the OPA Act by the Senate. I do not think that criticism justifies the emasculation of the act, and the jeopardizing of the sound principles of OPA. It is a matter of judgment, of course, and we can have honest differences of opinion and variances in judgment among us as to what to do in regard to OPA. But I wish to say for the RECORD that I think future events will show that the Senate of the United States tonight is sentencing the American people to the cruelties of inflation. I am convinced that if this bill in its emasculated form becomes a

law for the 12 months' period ahead, wild inflation will prevail in this country.

I am glad to note that there are a great many businessmen in this country who, although somewhat late, are nevertheless beginning to open their eyes to the potential inflation dangers ahead. They are beginning to recognize that some of the great pressure groups in this country which have been insisting on the emasculating of OPA are really endangering the value of the American dollar. They are beginning to recognize that if that dollar is deflated in value as the result of inflation in prices, there will be a day of reckoning so far as our private property economy itself is concerned.

I was interested, for example, to read in this morning's New York Times a very small item, tucked away on the inside pages, but nevertheless an item which I think is one of great import. It is dated June 12, coming out of Chicago, and reads as follows:

Retail grocers were warned today that "we are nowhere near the end of acute food shortages" and that food rationing, including bread, may be restored in August. The warning was issued by—

Not by OPA, Mr. President.

The warning was issued by Tyre Taylor, general counsel for the National Association of Retail Grocers, in a letter to members of the group.

Mr. Taylor said that Washington information indicated that large scale food shipments abroad might continue "for an indefinite period" and that Herbert Morrison, Lord President of the British Council, had planned to visit Washington to aid in reinstating food rationing.

The only point I wish to make in connection with the article, Mr. President, is that I think that all over this land tonight there are a great many manufacturers, a great many leaders in the retail trade, a great many wholesalers, as well as millions and millions of consumers, who are mighty uncomfortable as they think of the potentialities and the effects of our action in the Senate, with respect to inflation in this country. If inflation comes, Mr. President, as I think it is bound to come to a much greater degree than it would have come had we not emasculated the OPA, the responsibility in part must be shared by the Members of this body.

As an indication of the point of view of many sound and wise businessmen I submit the contents of a letter from a substantial businessman in my State. In fact he is one of the most substantial businessmen in my State. Without taking the time of the Senate to read it, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD a letter which I have received under date of May 9, in support of OPA in which this very prominent and substantial businessman of my State issues a warning as to the effect upon the Nation of what we are doing tonight in connection with OPA. He warns what the effects of our crippling of OPA will have not only on consumers, not only on farmers and workers, but upon American businessmen, many of whom have been clamoring for an opportunity to ride roughshod over the consumers of the country on their horse of selfish interests and pure greed.

In asking for permission to insert the letter in the RECORD, Mr. President, I ask that the name of the writer not be printed, because I do not have his consent to use his name. I do think the points of view he expresses in the letter should, however, be made a matter of record, but I do not want to violate his confidence by making use of his name. I do wish to assure the Senate that he is one of the most substantial businessmen in the entire State of Oregon.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 9, 1946.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Pursuant to conversation today over the telephone with reference to the controversy between NAM—particularly Mr. Wason and yourself, regarding your position on the continuance of OPA, I frankly cannot understand their position. Any business or person that survived the 1921–22 panic either has a lapse of memory or would support your stand. OPA has been a stop-inflation measure. The arguments in its favor have always carried the theme of keeping down the cost of living, and therefore of benefit to consumers and helpful in controlling wage advances. That probably has been justifiable up to this point, but from my viewpoint, with plenty of costly experience, the main beneficiaries from here on will be manufacturers, packers, wholesalers, and retailers. If OPA is terminated, everyone should agree that there will naturally be material advances in prices of all raw products and manufactured items. Supply and demand would govern, and therefore the level would be raised on all items grown or manufactured in 1946 because of local and international requirements.

With the coming of the 1947 crop year, we would start buying raw products based on the 1946 level of prices. Everyone must realize that it will require at least two crop or manufacturing years to catch up with necessary warehouse stocks of all items in order to place manufacturers, packers, wholesalers, and retailers in a selling position. The 1947 base prices would therefore advance considerably over 1946 prices, again because of local and international requirements.

With the coming of the 1948 crop year, the same conditions would repeat themselves and we would be in an extremely high level of prices for all raw products, and with stocks finally becoming in a selling position, we would begin to experience declines.

Now, the point I want to make is that consumers buy an item at a time, therefore their loss, individually, is limited. The wholesaler, manufacturer, packer, and retailer must have stocks on hand sufficient to transact business regardless of cost, therefore they will be obliged to absorb the major losses. These losses make it impossible for them to pay bank loans, also dividends and interest payments are passed, which causes the banks to suffer, tightens everything and ultimately a panic is the natural result. In the case of most all manufacturers of nationally advertised products—they even protect floor stocks in jobbers' and retailers' warehouses against decline. In the 1921–22 panic this condition alone caused many manufacturers and packers to lose the bulk of their capital and in numerous cases made it necessary for them to operate under receivership for many years. I don't claim that OPA is working perfectly—neither is any business or an undertaking of any kind. The percentage is strictly in OPA's favor, and if it ultimately will partially stop a repetition of the panic of 1921–22, it will have served its purpose well, and inasmuch as the manufacturer, wholesaler, packer, and retailer absorb the losses, then I therefore feel that NAM representing these elements, should be in favor of retaining OPA and that no item, grown or manufactured, should be released by OPA until grown crops, stocks on hand, and manufactured items are sufficient to take care of the demand, then prices will adjust themselves.

Of course, the big argument is the black market. There is on point here that should be taken into consideration as the main reason for the so-called black market; that is, every item is either grown or manufactured. If the farmer, wholesaler, packer, and retailer cooperated, there would be no source of supply for these particular types of operators and in any event, the percentage of black markets, as compared to total business, would not be altogether out of line with any other similar transaction. Some slight changes in OPA would straighten out the major part of this type of operation.

Yours very truly.

Mr. MORSE. As I said, Mr. President, not only must we assume our fair share of responsibility for the emasculating of OPA, but OPA itself must assume its share of responsibility, too. A good many of us in past months have found that it was almost impossible to get anywhere with certain officials of OPA as we brought to them legitimate complaint after legitimate complaint for correction. That was one reason why so many times I have pleaded for the adoption of my resolution so that we could by way of a Senate investigation lay the foundation for necessary reforms in OPA procedure. I think the most needed reform, the most needed reform certainly of the past year, although I think there has been need for such reform since the inception of OPA, has been in the enforcement procedure of that Agency. That is why I was very happy to join with my colleague the senior Senator from Oregon and work out with him the amendment now pending before the Senate. In fact, Mr. President, for many months the two Senators from Oregon have assured their constituents in letter after letter that if the Committee on Banking and Currency did not bring out recommendations for modifications in the enforcement procedures of OPA we would.

I wish to say also that I should like to associate myself here and now with the commendable remarks made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] this afternoon when he puts his finger on part of the same problem. He pointed out, as does the junior Senator from Oregon, that we ought to support and stand by the objectives and the principles of OPA, but that it is our duty to the American people to do what we can to improve the enforcement procedures of that body. That is exactly what the amendment which the Senators from Oregon now propose will accomplish.

Mr. President, let me say that the enforcement methods of the OPA can rightly be characterized as being too frequently curbstone trials, compromises by duress, and kangaroo court procedures. I do not think any fair investigation would fail to disclose the fact that the OPA enforcement officers all over the country, because of the relatively small amounts of money involved sometimes, have been able to get perfectly honest and patriotic American citizens to agree to accept the penalties that OPA has offered

by way of compromises in order to avoid further unfavorable publicity being heaped upon those honest and law respecting citizens. Frequently honest citizens, to avoid the costs of litigation in carrying the matter to higher courts, and to save themselves very valuable time, have yielded to OPA claims of violations although the alleged violations were innocent mistakes. I know in my own State and I am satisfied, on the basis of the mail I have received from many other States, that it has been a typical practice and procedure of OPA all over this country.

What has happened, Mr. President? There has been a growing revolt, and that is the proper term I think to use—there has been a growing revolt on the part of very substantial businessmen and other citizens who ordinarily would not even entertain for a moment the thought that they should defy the law. But that revolt has taken on many of the characteristics of the revolt that developed in the days of the Volstead Act, when law enforcement simply broke down because the people became entirely out of sympathy with the methods of the Government in enforcing the law.

I have in my hand, for example, an interesting exhibit which I could call exhibit A, showing this revolt on the part of substantial and patriotic citizens, prepared by one of the finest citizens in the capital city of my State. I shall ask that it be inserted in the RECORD. I will not take the time to read it in full.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALEM, OREG., *May 3, 1946.*

Re notification to appear before the panel May 6 to discuss three violations of 1 cent each.

MARION COUNTY OPA PRICE PANEL,
Salem, Oreg.

GENTLEMEN: To remove any doubt in your minds as to our attitude I might say immediately: We don't intend to be there.

We don't say this with the sole intention of defying the local price panel. So far as we know, the local panel has conducted all its investigations in a fair and impartial manner, considering its indoctrination, training, and instructions. But why, we ask why, in the name of democracy, would any group of solid citizens continue to serve, on a volunteer basis, without pay, this many months after the actual shooting is over, in a program that is so un-American in its every aspect? If one is to concede that you are, as individuals, good democratic citizens, it can only be assumed that you are too busy, too blinded by OPA propaganda, or then too indifferent to think this thing through to a realistic conclusion.

The scramble to continue OPA, the struggle to perpetuate controlled economy, very obviously implies a desire on the part of someone, or some faction, to change the very nature and form of our Government.

The Vancouver price panel is to be commended for being the first panel that had the guts to admit the OPA is wrong. These men resigned in a body in protest to the policy of the Portland district office of dropping all pretense of working for compliance and concentrating exclusively on fines and penalties. It would be the best thing that's happened to our country this year if every panel in Oregon, and in the Nation, would follow their lead this coming week.

As many know and many more have forgotten, the price-control program was fathered by Leon Henderson, whose political coloring is held in question by numerous people. At any rate, his long-range political philosophy is beyond the depth of most plain Americans. His motives and intentions have been questioned by many substantial, old-fashioned, dyed-in-the-wool patriots. Mr. Henderson had this pet program well launched in 1941, but a reluctant Senate showed little enthusiasm for approval of it until the Pearl Harbor debacle. Then in the excitement of the first days of the war, the Senate did approve, as a strictly emergency war measure, and we all hesitantly swallowed it as a possible necessary wartime evil. But hostilities have ceased. We should be now, immediately, and forever rid of this unnatural and unwelcome war baby. This pinkish monster of a war-baby should not be tolerated in our midst for another day, to say nothing of another year, or longer.

"Divide and conquer" has been the war-cry of some political ideologies, and we are too far down that road in America today. Divide the casual-thinking consumer and doers in business. Then divide small business and big business. Guide all business into monopolies. That's what we're heading for and it's high time we put up some organized resistance. It's not too late, but it's late enough!

The results of this (divide-and-conquer program) as it affects individual cases is sad. To get down to personal and individual cases. Now: Ours is a small business, started 5 years ago, just before the war. With scarcely any money ($600 cash) and some help from friends, relatives, and firms wherever we could muster it, we built a shed and started selling groceries. We sold groceries beside the road where no trading dollar had ever changed hands before. Our volume grew steadily and continues to do so. We made the best of it when our right-hand man left at the start of hostilities, and when our butcher joined the Navy. We despaired of ever getting a meat cutter, so I took that over too. I had never cut any meat but I had to learn by trial and error. At the same time I continued buying for, and managing the grocery department.

There were some weeks we took care of volume (my wife in the groceries and I in the meat) that any experienced grocer would tell you no two people could possibly handle. We should have had at least two to three extra people. But no help was available—not even women nor children in the busy harvest season.

We waded through it some way until August 1944, when I suffered a serious heart attack. I was able to do nothing for over a year. All the load was then on Mrs. Dickson's shoulders. It has been only in the last 4 to 6 months that I have been able to take any active part in the operation of our business without threatening recurrence of the heart condition. Now we do have help again. Three returned veterans are back on the job and one other who spent the war years in a large aircraft plant.

Our worst troubles should be over. But they're not.

Now, we're faced with having to defend ourselves against a charge of violating OPA price ceilings—charges that are brought and handled in a way designed to alienate a merchant from the good-will of his customers. It is this good-will that he has worked so hard to deserve and hold. We must defend ourselves, or plead guilty. If we choose the latter course we shall be placed in the light of a culprit confessing to his customers that he has been robbing them, and that he is, therefore, unworthy of the loyalty they have given him.

The panel charge us with three 1-cent violations. The Portland Office charges us with a much longer list of violations, ferreted out on April 18 by Investigator Thorington of the Portland district OPA enforcement division.

There were several violations according to Mr. Thorington's investigation. The day following Mr. Thorington's investigation and my refusal to dig up all the old invoices to check the costs on his 40 items, we closed our store all day (Friday, April 19). We had the entire crew on hand and called in another store owner to spend the entire day checking the ceiling prices on, as nearly as we could check, every single item in stock. Since that day we have found any number of prices, dozens of them far below ceiling, none of which I would think of raising to full ceiling in our type of store.

Last year we sold close to $150,000 worth of food. While that's a small business, any man who has had any experience in the grocery business will assure you that no one can build up that much business in a new roadside location by charging prices that are too high. We have to be and are quite competitive on everything. Our balance sheet for the year 1945 would prove this. Our gross profit for the year was almost 1½ percent below that of a group of stores of our same type in the Portland area for the first half of 1945. But is the OPA interested in that? I doubt if a single one of their men ever once thought of that as a guide to determine if any individual merchant was inclined to profiteering practices. All they desire is a survey by a good investigator who can, with his practiced-snooper's eye, spot over half of all the violations in a large food store in less than 30 minutes' time.

Mr. Thorington did that. He did just that, and then demanded invoices on all these 40 items. We refused to take time that busy day to hunt invoices, but offered to, in fact expressed a desire to, change prices that were too high, immediately, if he would only point them out. But Snooper Thorington informed me threateningly that "that's not the way we do it."

We're mad. Not angry; just plain good old-fashioned, western-style mad. We have a deep feeling of resentment—and rebellion.

And we're ashamed. Not ashamed of any thing we've done, but rather of having done so little. We regret our lack of political activity for the protection of our country and our Government against the brain trusters who have wormed their way into positions of responsibility and power. We regret our hesitation to fight against their sinister activities in the making over of our Government into something very much different from the democracy that most of us like to think we inhabit.

We rebel. And we propose to launch at least the first blast of publicity ourselves.

We don't feel guilty of anything wrong. Our policy is to be below the average prices. If we always had at hand the information that the OPA checking squads could render us if they would, I know we would always be below the average prices of our competitors. But we are determined never in the future to subject ourselves to the humiliation and strain of discussing any 1-cent ceiling violations with the OPA inquisitors, behind their closed doors where the accuser is the prosecutor, the judge, and the jury combined. If we are forced into court, then so be it. We will at least be assured of a fair-minded referee in the person of the presiding judge, whether we defend our position or plead guilty.

We repeat, the OPA price panel of Vancouver is to be congratulated for at last rebelling against OPA district policy of busying themselves only with fines and penalties. OPA has repeatedly maintained in print and on the air that their sole aim was to strive for compliance and not to persecute. But that is a violation of the truth. They are furnishing proof every day that their aim is to incriminate every single petty violator they can find, give those violators such publicity in the daily newspapers as to imply that they are common gangsters, gougers, and crooks. The aim is to convince the

American housewife and consumer that they can do but one thing to protect themselves, and that is to rally to the support of their "champion and protector," the OPA.

If the OPA wins this fight for perpetuation, there is good reason to believe this may be the end of free enterprise as we know it; not only for this year and possibly next year but for all time.

Remember, the shooting is over. Those who like regimentation and centralized government are as busy as bees. The only good thing that can be said for them is that they are persistent. Undoubtedly they are clever.

Those of us who like free government by and for the people had better do something about it—and do it now. Make it known that we're aroused and that we won't forget who is for and who is against. Write letters, send wires, make phone calls to any Senator you may know, especially if he is on the Banking and Currency Committee, before which hearings are in progress this week and next on the OPA extension bill. Do it now. A week or 10 days from now may be too late to do any good.

DICKSON'S MARKET,
ELBERT E. DICKSON.

Mr. MORSE. Here is a substantial merchant—and I want to say that no one can justly accuse him of not being a fine citizen. He is one of the civic leaders of one of the important cities of my State, but so completely disgusted, so angered by what he considers to be most unjust methods practiced by OPA, that he sent an open letter to OPA when he was served with notice to appear in an enforcement case. Just listen to the first sentence of that letter. Here is no criminal. Here is no willful violator. Here is an American citizen of just as high standing as any Member of this body. But after all there is a limit to patience, and when these gestapo methods on the enforcement level of OPA are pressed down upon the people of my State as they have in all other States of this country it is to be expected that many fine citizens will finally defy the OPA. Here was one fine citizen who said in effect, "I have stood all I propose to stand." What did he say:

To remove any doubt in your minds as to our attitude I might say immediately—we don't intend to be there!

That is pretty serious, Mr. President. What were they calling him in for? For three violations in his market amounting to 1 cent per violation. He was perfectly willing, as the letter shows, to work the matter out. The violations were innocent violations. They were not willful. They were mistakes. He had been harassed by OPA. Their snoopers had been in his shop time and time again, until finally his patience was exhausted and he openly defied them.

Mr. President, I say that that is not a healthy state of affairs. He is no exception. That has been the growing attitude of thousands of law-abiding American citizens. I think it is most sad and unfortunate that we have not been able to work out voluntarily with OPA some such enforcement procedure as the two Senators from Oregon now offer in this amendment.

I invite attention to another case. Incidentally, it comes from the city from which the senior Senator from Oregon comes, Roseburg, Oreg. One of the finest merchants of that city, a man with whom I have worked in a civic capacity in civic bodies for many years, a man who had a son in the armed forces in this war, happened to sell in his store apparel for Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts. It seems that the clerk put the higher price of one of the Girl Scout suits on a Boy Scout suit by mistake. It so happened that instead of putting down on the sales slip a price of $1.37, as I recall the figure, the clerk charged $1.65, overlooking the fact that instead of selling a Girl Scout suit she was in fact selling a Boy Scout suit. It was a clear mistake of hand, made perfectly clear to the customer before the customer ever got out of the store, but the customer took the matter up with OPA, and this fine citizen was prosecuted for the error made by his clerk.

I cite that case as a typical case, Mr. President. I here and now allege, without any fear whatsoever of successful contradiction, examples of prosecutions for innocent mistakes could be multiplied by the thousands throughout the United States. Is that government by law? Is that American justice? That is the rankest type of arbitrary and capricious practice characteristic of gestapo methods and trial by curbstone.

Let me cite another case which is set forth in the following letter, which I read:

EUGENE, OREG., *May 3, 1946.*

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For some little time I have been going to write you a letter regarding practices of OPA—all of which you are undoubtedly keenly aware—and I know from newspaper articles and interviews that you do not approve of the practices that they are inflicting on the merchants throughout the country.

About 2 months ago I was notified to come to Portland and appear before the OPA to explain why we should sell dresses that cost between $29.75 and $39.75 due to the fact that in 1942, when our price sheet was filed, we did not have dresses between these two prices. The OPA contention was that if the dress cost $37.50 we were to drop back to the $29.75 cost to figure our margin of profit on that basis. Naturally, our competitors do sell dresses in these price ranges at a profitable mark-up, and we consider it very unfair to be compelled to sell our dresses without a profit. When I asked the young lady why we should be penalized, she turned to me and said, "If you would rather not pay us this amount (which was around $200), perhaps we can come back to Eugene and check your store further because, after all, we only checked a portion of the year." If this is not pure, unadulterated blackmail, I give up.

Knowing you as well as I know you, I know that you will agree that this was not right; however, rather than keep on arguing with them, our company did send them the check to cover this amount.

I have had no more trouble until today. The incident today was that the local OPA office came to us and said some lady had complained that we had sold her a dress at $10.95, and she had bought one similar at $8.30 in Salem that was pretickeled. She also said that we refused to give her a sales slip, which was not true, and our dresses were not pretickeled, so consequently we did not break any law. The mere fact that the lady who had charge of the local office comes in with the attitude that you have committed a crime and treats you accordingly is definitely not the American way of living.

This morning when I opened the mail I received a communication from the local Office of Price Administration notifying me of a price-control-panel conference. It says that you are requested to appear on such an hour and on such a day to explain why you sold a girdle for $11 when the ceiling price is $10.95. Of all the damn monkey business, this seems to climax our dealings with the OPA.

I know you are a very busy man and I sympathize with you for having to take care of all of the complaints that arise from the stupidity of the directors of OPA, but anything that can be done to rid the country of an organization which is doing so much unfair, unsatisfactory work would be a big help to everyone.

I could go through every department in my store with you or anyone else and prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the departments which have not been affected by OPA rulings in any way, shape, or form are departments that maintain prices and have run through the war without the shortages that were caused in price controlled departments.

After you have read this letter, you have my permission to throw it in the wastebasket and not bother about answering it, but at least I have gotten something off my mind that I have been wanting to get off for some time. At least we can look forward to some day seeing the United States return to a normal United States.

My kindest regards to Mrs. Morse and the children.

Sincerely yours,

MILLER'S,
J. E. HAYWARD,
Manager.

Let me cite one further case. In one of the large department stores in Portland an error was made by a clerk. It was not a case of confusing two items. The clerk simply made a mistake in reading the price label on the goods. The mistake was a mistake of a few cents, and it was caught by the time the customer got to the cashier's window. The management of the store attempted to correct the mistake at that point, but the customer demanded the original slip and OPA prosecuted.

Is it any wonder that such revolt against the unfair enforcement procedures of OPA has arisen in this land? It is most unfortunate, because it has done great harm to the legitimate objectives and the sound principles of price control. Let the RECORD speak for itself. It is the need for correction in enforcement procedure for which the Senators from Oregon have been pleading during the past year on the floor of the Senate. But we have been unable to get any cooperation from OPA, and we have been unable to get any help from Senators on the other side of the aisle when we have pleaded to get our resolution out of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I do not think that there is any justification at this late hour for emasculating OPA. Rather I think there is a solemn duty upon us, even at this eleventh hour, to do what we can to improve the bill, to eliminate the type of bad enforcement practice and procedure of which we complain, and to send to conference the best possible bill. I do not share the views of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] recently expressed upon this floor, that because the bill is so bad in his opinion he must vote against it

in its entirety. I agree with him that the bill is a bad bill in its present form; but it is better than no price control bill at all, and there is still hope that in the conference committee the bill can be strengthened. At least I think it is our duty, up to the last moment, to do everything we can to send to conference the best bill possible. Therefore I shall vote for this bill. On that point I differ with the Senator from New York; but I wish to vote for a bill which seeks at least to eliminate the bad enforcement practices which my distinguished colleague, Mr. CORDON, has pointed out, and which I have tried by way of supplement to emphasize.

I close by saying that we should keep in mind that what this amendment does is to say that the local pricing panels, appointed by the governors of the States to serve in the various communities or counties of the States—very similar, so far as pattern is concerned, to the selection of local selective-service boards—shall be granted jurisdiction, in the case of retail enforcement cases, to pass judgment upon any violation. They should be authorized as provided in this amendment to go into the alleged violation and give the retailer a hearing, to offer a compromise in settlement if in their opinion some settlement should be made by the retailer; and then, if he refuses such settlement, to authorize, within the discretion of the local board, a prosecution of the retailer. This plan has the great virtue of accomplishing one of the things that I think we need so much to do in the administration of our Federal Government.

In my opinion it illustrates one of the greatest differences in philosophy between my point of view and the point of view of those who wish to build up an all-powerful centralized Government in Washington. It looks toward the regionalization of administrative functions of our Government, and the granting of more and more power of decision with finality to fellow American citizens on the local level. In other words it involves recognition that men in Washington on the Federal level are no greater in ability, and no more competent than our fellow citizens at the local level. If we are to keep democratic government sound, if we are to preserve representative government in this country, its preservation and its strength will be largely dependent upon our regionalizing at the local level, because our Government at the Federal level can be no stronger and no more effective than our government at the local level.

What is happening in America, at a great loss to self-government, is that our people, subject of course to the great weakness of wishful thinking and the tendency to pass the buck, are more and more sending to us at the Federal level functions of government which should be performed at the local level. Mr. President, in my judgment only to the extent that we can start the trend back to local government and have the functionings of government administered more and more at the local level will there be any hope of stemming this serious tide toward the development of an all-powerful Federal Government at Washington which will lead to the next step—and let us not mince words about it, Mr. President—which will be a form of totalitarian government in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator on the amendment has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I will take some of my time on the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to say that unless I suffer from some form of myopia, I think it is perfectly clear to those who will read that the great struggle in the America of the next decade will be the struggle between self-government by the people of the United States at the local level where they can best assume their responsibilities of citizenship, where they can best carry out their function of freemen in a democratic government, and this tendency to centralize more and more the power and rights of the people at the Federal level.

So I offer this amendment, with my senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], as another effort on the part of the Senate of the United States not only to help check the enforcement abuses of OPA, but to give the people down at the local level another opportunity to assume their responsibilities of self-government.

Lastly, Mr. President, I would point out that this amendment is consonant with an extension of a very well-established principle of American jurisprudence, namely, that when one is accused of violation of the law, he should have an opportunity to be judged by his peers. I wish to point out that because of the particular features of the OPA and its methods of administration, I can think of no better amendment which would give to the retailers of this country an opportunity to be judged by their neighbors, than an amendment to vest in the local pricing panels an opportunity to pass judgment upon their alleged transgressions. Thus the amendment gives to the neighbors of an alleged violator a chance to decide, on the basis of the evidence which will be presented to those panels, the question as to whether or not the retailer is in fact the horrible law offender that the OPA has been inclined to make out of so many thousands of honest, law-abiding, patriotic American citizens. The amendment is a needed check against the maladministration of OPA in the field of enforcement of the pricing act. I think it is only fair to adopt such an amendment. I think it is the decent thing to do. Mr. President, if the Senate of the United States will adopt this amendment, I think it will give renewed assurance to a great many people that they can have fair and just enforcement of the OPA Act.

But they will never believe it, on the basis of their sad experience, if we permit to remain vested in the OPA enforcement department what amounts—and I use the term advisedly—to arbitrary and most unfair and unjust and capricious power. Here is a chance to decide whether we wish to be fair to a great many retailers who, because of innocent mistakes, are being labeled law violators.

Mr. President, you know what will happen. If a body of neighbors is brought in on any one of the cases which I have used for illustrative purposes in my remarks, what do you think the result will be? Do you think any body of neighbors would have prosecuted my Roseburg merchant for that mistake on the Girl Scout suit? Do you think any body of neighbors would have prosecuted that Portland merchant for the mistake he made, which he sought to correct even before the customer left the cashier's window? Mr. President, if this amendment had been in operation since the beginning of the OPA, it would have brought sense and justice to the enforcement program of OPA. It would have eliminated much of the criticism which has been heaped upon OPA. It would have resulted in the administration of the Price Control Act in accordance with American law and the basic concepts of American justice, rather than the arbitrary and capricious acts of the members of the staff of the OPA, many of whom have been drunk with power, many of whom in their reports boast about the thousands of dollars they have returned to the Treasury of the United States through fines imposed upon merchants. Of course, a willful violation of the OPA Act should be prosecuted. But I say, and I say it advisedly, Mr. President, that the OPA has never drawn a clear-cut line of demarcation between willful violations and innocent violations and unintentional mistakes. It was exactly that type of problem, I repeat—and then I shall close—which I sought to correct more than a year ago when I introduced my resolution calling for an investigation of the OPA. That resolution called for remedies which should have been adopted then.

I say I think it most unfortunate that those of us who have been motivated by the best of intentions toward OPA and a desire to strengthen OPA and to make it an effective weapon in checking the cruelties which I think are bound to be imposed upon the American people as a result of this emasculated act were not supported by the Administration forces in this Senate when we called for an investigation of OPA more than 1 year ago.

I close, Mr. President, with the prayer—yes; I will use the word—as well as the plea that the Senate will see fit at this late hour to attempt to remedy the unfair enforcement practices of OPA by adopting the amendment which the two Senators from Oregon have offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] on behalf of himself and his colleague [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. WAGNER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Buck	Downey
Austin	Burch	Eastland
Barkley	Bushfield	George
Bilbo	Eyrd	Gerry
Brewster	Capper	Gurney
Bridges	Carville	Hart
Brooks	Cordon	Hawkes

Hayden	Millikin	Stewart
Hickenlooper	Moore	Taft
Hoey	Morse	Taylor
Huffman	Murdock	Thomas, Okla.
Johnson, Colo.	Myers	Thomas, Utah
Johnston, S. C.	O'Daniel	Tobey
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	Tunnell
Knowland	Overton	Tydings
Lucas	Radcliffe	Wagner
McCarran	Reed	Walsh
McClellan	Revercomb	Wheeler
McFarland	Robertson	Wherry
McMahon	Saltonstall	White
Magnuson	Shipstead	Wilson
Maybank	Smith	
Mead	Stanfill	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. I shall vote for the bill, though I feel that it is absolutely inadequate and will lead to inflation. The persons who have purchased war bonds will eventually receive perhaps only 50 cents on the dollar. The bill will not tend to promote full production, because of the strikes which it will foment. I believe that we are due for another boom and bust, and if we get into that condition again we will be in no position to start once more priming the pump. I feel that if we fail to enact a good OPA bill the resultant upheaval may lead to the end of our private-enterprise system. The American people have lived well during the past few years and they are in no mood to go through another 1929 or worse. Mr. President, as I have said, I shall vote for the bill, but with the hope that the conference will agree on some form of a measure which will be workable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say a word concerning this amendment. It provides that the Administrator shall appoint in each county, or similar subdivision of the State, a board to consist of three members who must be represented by the governor of the State. It seems to me that the amendment presents an impracticable situation. There will be a division of responsibility of enforcement between the Administrator and the governor of each State; and the responsibility of the governor to recommend to the Administration, a State officer, and determine whom the Federal officer shall appoint to assist in enforcing the statute, represents an entirely new theory in the enforcement of Federal law.

We have already agreed to an amendment which was offered by the Senator from Illinois that no legal proceeding shall be instituted against any person except with the approval of the United States district attorney.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that this amendment would require the governor to recommend to the Administrator three or more persons in each county or political unit thereof. As one who went through the selection of the selective-service boards, and as one who tried to help obtain men to fill positions on the various rationing boards in my State during wartime, I may say that I believe that, while the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon was offered with sincerity, it will be very impractical. To require the governor to select all these boards, the members of whom would act without pay and with no expense account, would be very unsatisfactory and, I may say, impractical.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I may point out to the Senator from Massachusetts that at the present time price panels exist in practically every community of the country, and the people have demonstrated very clearly their willingness to cooperate in connection with such price panels.

Mr. BARKLEY. Rationing boards were appointed all over the country, but they have been disbanded and have gone out of business. As I have already said on two or three former occasions in regard to this bill, we are going down hill with it. We are tapering it off, as we used to say, when we would swing on a grapevine and it would gradually slow down and die. As time progresses, decontrol will be accelerated very much. Senators do not need to worry about that, so far as the pending bill is concerned. Whether the House version, the Senate version, or any mixture of the two is considered, there will be an accelerated decontrol all over the country. I anticipate that by the 1st of January next year only those commodities which are in extreme shortage will still be under control.

The pending amendment provides for the appointment of a new board in every county. The Federal Administrator may not appoint any person to the board unless such person has been recommended by the Governor. I believe that delay would be caused in setting up the board, even if such a board were necessary at a time when we are abandoning almost altogether the OPA.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have understood from what the Senator from Kentucky has said that the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Illinois provides that appointment shall be recommended by the district attorney.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois provides that no legal proceedings can be instituted against anyone for violation of any order of the OPA without the approval of the district attorney of the district in which the offense was alleged to have been committed.

Mr. WHITE. The pending proposal is that they may not be instituted except with the approval of the board. Which one is the Administrator going to follow, the recommendation of the district attorney, or the recommendation of the local board?

Mr. BARKLEY. If both provisions are kept in the bill, he would have to secure the consent of both before he could institute any sort of proceeding. In other words, the district attorney, after investigating the facts in any case, might decide that there should not be a legal proceeding, but if the local board decided there should be, then whose advice would the Administrator take, or would he have to have the consent of both of them? Is it really necessary or advisable, or is it practicable, during the last year of the operation of this law, for the Administrator to have to get the consent of the district attorney and the local board, which he would have to do, in order to institute any legal proceeding whatever? It seems to me utterly unworkable and impracticable and unnecessary.

If we had provided in the beginning that local boards should be set up and should determine whether any sort of proceeding should be instituted and that procedure had been prescribed, the amendment might have been appropriate, but now that we are nearly out of price control, it seems to me to be very inadvisable to set up this new organization in every county in the United States, so that the Administrator would be required to appoint, on the recommendation of the Governor, and, if the Governor did not recommend anybody, no one could be appointed. If that were done we would have a very spotty administration of the law all over the United States. It occurs to me that this is another one of the amendments which no one has thought anything about, which has not been considered, which has not even been printed, and which no Senator has had a chance to study. It seems to me it should not be adopted.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I merely wish to suggest that the Senator indicated that he thought there were no price control boards, that they had gone out of fashion.

Mr. BARKLEY. I said the rationing boards were set up, and that they have all been disintegrated.

Mr. CORDON. The price boards now exist, and regulations governing them, and governing their handling of this type of jurisdiction, have been promulgated as late as January and February of the current year. I have copies of the regulations in my hand.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no regulation I know anything about that sets up in every county in the United States such a board as is included in the Senator's amendment. Even if there were, they probably would not be able to function, under the Senator's amendment, because they had not been recommended by the governor.

Mr. CORDON. On that point I suggest to the Senator that the most successful emergency legislation which we have ever known in this country, and which has operated through two emergencies and two world wars, was the Selective Service Act, under which the local boards were recommended for appointment by the governors.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Selective Service Act provided for local county boards at the very beginning of the law. We did not wait until a year ago to set those boards up; we did not wait until the Selective Service Act was about to expire, and then set up the boards. We started

the boards at the very beginning, and they did a good job, and received no compensation for it, and they have not ever received the acknowledgment to which they were entitled. But they were a part of the machinery which was created at the very inception of the selective service, not after it was over.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for purposes of verification I wish to supplement what my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], has said, to the effect that there are hundreds of pricing boards and panels in existence all over this country, and it is taken for granted that the Governor in most instances sanctioned the boards. The amendment does provide a check.

I wish to say further, inasmuch as the Senator from Kentucky has referred to it, that the amendment is in no way inconsistent with the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. The amendment seeks to correct enforcement abuses on the retail level. It gives the pricing panels an opportunity to make the first judgment on whether or not they should proceed with prosecution. It gives them an opportunity to offer a compromise. If the retailer does not accept the compromise, it is at that point, in this type of case, that the provision of the Senator from Illinois as to the United States district attorneys would become applicable. So there is nothing inconsistent in it. In fact, it would go right along with the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to say there has been a good deal of discussion of the fact that the Committee on Banking and Currency did not report a resolution to investigate the OPA. The OPA has been steadily investigated for the past 12 months. The Small Business Committee has had frequent hearings. We had quite a hearing with Mr. Bowles. We started on the pending bill 2 months ago, and we have been having all sorts of complaints against the OPA.

The pending amendment was never presented to the committee. This particular matter was not urged before the committee. We had no opportunity to determine whether this particular set-up is practical under existing conditions or not, and frankly I do not know. The fact is that price panels exist today, and they do present an abuse. Price panels exist in many suburban districts and throughout the counties of the United States. Men are brought before the panels, and they do what they are authorized to do in the amendment, as I read it, but with legal authority instead of extra legal authority. They call in people, they investigate, they make settlements. This amendment particularly authorizes them to make settlements.

What kind of a board is it that will call a man before it for a criminal violation, and then make a settlement with him? I do not know any such legal procedure.

I think we should outlaw the present extra legal procedure, but this amendment does not do that. It may be 6 months before the Governor gets around to finding the right kind of people for the boards. These extra legal boards will function. They are not abolished in the amendment. I see nothing in the amendment that would prevent the Governor appointing one board for the city of Cincinnati, and the Price Administration retaining the price panels which exist, and proceeding without legal authority and without acting under the amendment.

There is an abuse, but we have not had opportunity to study the abuse, we have not had opportunity to have the OPA say what their set-up is, and how it can be best adjusted, and I do not think at this late date we should be asked to adopt a plan when we do not know whether it would be a good plan or not. I am sure it would have to be extensively amended before it became a workable plan.

Like the Senator from Massachusetts, merely from reading the amendment offhand, I do not think it proposes a practicable plan.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Ohio. In the case which he cited of his own home city of Cincinnati, where there is a board in existence and another would have to be appointed, there would be utter confusion in that metropolitan region.

Now, just a word about what we did today when we adopted the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. The district attorneys are all good lawyers, they know the law, they are outstanding men in the legal profession, everyone has been confirmed by the Senate of the United States. We have put upon them the stamp of our approval, and certainly there is sufficient protection in the amendment against illegal proceeding to justify us in not adding to the confusion by providing as this amendment does, for the creation of a lot of miscellaneous boards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business, attending the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in Bermuda.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], are members of the committee on the part of the Senate attending the funeral services of the late Senator John H. Bankhead, of Alabama.

I also announce the following general pairs: The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]; and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate as members of the committee appointed by the United States Senate to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Bankhead.

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—15

Aiken	Capper	Morse
Austin	Cordon	O'Daniel
Brewster	Gurney	Revercomb
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Shipstead
Brooks	Moore	Wilson

NAYS—52

Barkley	Huffman	Myers
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Overton
Burch	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Bushfield	Knowland	Reed
Byrd	Lucas	Robertson
Carville	McCarran	Saltonstall
Downey	McClellan	Smith
Eastland	McFarland	Stanfill
George	McMahon	Stewart
Gerry	Magnuson	Taft
Hart	Maybank	Taylor
Hawkes	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Hoey	Murdock	Tobey

Tunnell	Walsh	White
Tydings	Wheeler	
Wagner	Wherry	

NOT VOTING—28

Andrews	Ferguson	Mitchell
Bailey	Fulbright	Murray
Ball	Gossett	Pepper
Briggs	Green	Russell
Butler	Guffey	Vandenberg
Capehart	Hatch	Wiley
Chavez	Hill	Willis
Connally	La Follette	Young
Donnell	Langer	
Ellender	McKellar	

So the amendment offered by Mr. CORDON, for himself and Mr. MORSE, was rejected.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I have a short amendment to offer which will take only about 5 minutes to explain. My amendment is on page 22, in line 11, after the word "issued", to insert "and was in effect", so as to read "had been issued and was in effect under this act prior to April 1, 1946."

Last winter, rye was selling in Chicago at $2.07 a bushel. OPA issued a regulation cutting the price, effective on June 1, to $1.37 a bushel. The effect of that on the crop of 1945 was this: The American farmer would have to sell the crop of 1945 this year at the ceiling price, and the speculators can buy it here and send it to Canada, pay an import duty on it, and sell the rye today for $2.82 a bushel. The effect of my amendment would be to eliminate the ceiling placed by OPA on rye in order that the price shall seek the level that it has in the world market.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the price levels now under OPA ruling in the various States where rye is grown. But the effect of the OPA ruling is a swindle on the American farmer. The price for rye in Canada is $2.82 a bushel. The ceiling price, for instance, in California is $1.42. In Colorado it is $1.43. In Connecticut $1.51, in Arkansas $1.33, and in the Northwestern States it hangs around $1.35.

Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be adopted in order to protect the producers of rye in the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? I do not quite understand what he proposes to accomplish by his amendment. Subsection (7), beginning in line 5, on page 22, provides as follows:

> (7) No maximum price and no regulation or order under this act or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, shall be applicable with respect to any agricultural commodity, or any service rendered with respect to any agricultural commodity, unless a regulation or order establishing a maximum price with respect to such commodity had been issued under this act prior to April 1, 1946.

The plain intention of that subsection is to abolish and nullify the order of the OPA with reference to margin requirements in the purchase of cotton on the cotton market. That is all it was intended to do. It was not intended to relieve any commodity which was already under a price ceiling of that ceiling if the order had been issued prior to April 1, 1946. What the Senator would apparently do would be to lift the ceiling or remove the ceiling from rye, and perhaps other products which would be covered by the amendment, if the order had been issued prior to April 1, but was not in effect on April 1. Is that it?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It was not in effect on rye on April 1.

Mr. BARKLEY. When did it take effect?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The 1st of June.

Mr. BARKLEY. The same situation might apply with regard to other matters. OPA always issues orders with respect to price ceilings in advance of their effective date. What the Senator is doing is—we might as well understand it—to take the ceiling off of rye; to single out rye as one agricultural product on which we will legislate the ceiling now as soon as the law is passed. Is that true?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator from Kentucky think it is just to put that ceiling on American rye so that the speculators who buy it and export it to Canada can sell it there for $2.82?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not very familiar with the rye situation, but I do not see any difference in equity between a ceiling on rye and a ceiling on any other agricultural product. The fact that it may be sent to Canada and sold at a profit may be incidental. That certainly was not the object of putting the ceiling on it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That may not have been the object, but that was the effect of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may apply to any other agricultural product on which a ceiling was fixed. It might be sent anywhere in the world and sold at a profit. I do not see what that has to do with it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It is plain what happens to the American citizen who raises rye. If there is any other commodity in the same category that is treated in the same way, I do not know what it is.

Mr. BARKLEY. There has been a ceiling on tobacco. We decontrolled it under the amendment which we adopted today. There has been a ceiling price on tobacco ever since 1942. It was bought in this country and shipped abroad, and those who bought it and sold it abroad made a profit on it. It was not the object of the ceiling to make that possible, but, of course, they did. In the very nature of things they would not buy American tobacco or anything else and send it abroad unless they made a profit on it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator from Kentucky believe that there is justice in that kind of a transaction?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think there is any greater injustice than might exist with respect to any other agricultural product. The mere fact that it happens to be rye does not seem to me to create any different situation from what would exist in regard to any other agricultural product.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It is difficult for me to believe that any other agricultural product could be exported abroad and sold at such a terrific profit.

Mr. BARKLEY. All agricultural products which are bought here for overseas sale and shipment are sold at a profit. I do not know whether they bring as great a profit as does rye. It may be that the purposes for which the rye is to be used have something to do with the amount of profit that may be obtained from it. I do not see any difference in principle between rye and any other agricultural products. The whole thing may not be worth talking about, but it seems to me that it is dealing with one agricultural product in a different way from that in which we have dealt with any other agricultural products.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. This is the only product with respect to which this kind of a transaction has been shown to exist. This is a special case in which the OPA seems to have made it possible for the speculator to farm the farmer.

Mr. BARKLEY. The OPA is the legitimate whipping boy for everyone who has a complaint. I suppose there is no way to avoid that. I have not the facts as to why the OPA imposed a ceiling on rye. I do not know what the OPA would say as to the reason why it did so. I am quite sure that it would say—and I think it would be true—that it did not do so in order that speculators might make a profit. There must have been some legitimate reason. We do not know what it was. We do not know what the facts are.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am telling the Senator the facts. I have them from the records. I have the records taken from the market reports at Winnipeg.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not questioning the figures as to what rye brought in Winnipeg, and the price in Minnesota. But the OPA must have had some legitimate reason for imposing a ceiling on rye. I do not know what it was. We have not gone into this question. We did not go into it in the committee. We did not ask the OPA. I do not know.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am telling the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know the Senator is attempting to do so. It may be that due to my obtuseness I cannot understand what he is driving at.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am giving the Senator the figures as to the cost in the United States, due to regulations of the OPA, and showing that the rye could be sold abroad for more than twice what the American farmer gets for it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I had the time to scrape up some figures, perhaps I could show that some of our tobacco was sold under a price ceiling, and shipped abroad for twice as much as was paid for it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator might render a service to his constituents in Kentucky if he did so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not the time to scrape up the figures.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have scraped up some figures for the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. BUTLER] and myself I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. (a) In the event producers of wheat are required by an order issued pursuant to the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, to sell all or any part of wheat delivered to an elevator prior to April 1, 1947, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall offer to purchase the wheat so required to be sold at a price determined as follows: The purchase price paid for the wheat shall be the market price at the point of delivery as of any date the producer may elect between the date of delivery and March 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided, however,* That only one election may be made for each lot of wheat: *And provided further,* That the producer may not elect a date prior to the date on which he mails a written notice to Commodity Credit Corporation of his election. In the event the producer does not notify Commodity Credit Corporation in writing by March 31, 1947, of his election of a date for determining the market price, such date shall be deemed to be March 31, 1947.

(b) Any producer of wheat who, prior to the date of enactment of this act, has sold any wheat pursuant to the requirements of paragraph (ee) (1) of War Food Order No. 144, may, at any time within 30 days after the date of enactment of this act, pay to the Commodity Credit Corporation a sum equal to the amount for which he sold such wheat. Any producer paying any such sum to the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be deemed to have sold and delivered to the Commodity Credit Corporation as of the date he pays such sum a quantity of wheat equal in grade and quality to the quantity sold by him pursuant to such requirements and the purchase price to be paid to him for such wheat shall be determined in the same manner as in the case of a sale of wheat to the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the main part of the amendment which I think should be called to the attention of the Senate is subsection (a), which requires the producer of wheat of the new crop to elect a date for the determination of the price of the wheat which he may be compelled to set aside by an order issued pursuant to the Second War Powers Act of 1942. In a moment I shall read the order which shows what is required to be set aside. The date elected must be between the date of delivery and March 31, 1947.

The amendment is offered on behalf of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and myself.

The wheat order which was issued, and which requires this legislation, was issued by Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, on the 22d of May 1946. I shall read the important section of the order, and I ask that the entire order be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[WFO 144, Amendment 8]

PART 1468—GRAIN

WHEAT AND FLOUR

War Food Order No. 144 (11 F. R. 2501, 3243, 3392, 4289, 4323, 4445) is further amended as follows:

1. By deleting paragraph (g) and substituting in lieu thereof the following:

(g) 1946 crop wheat exemptions: The provisions of this order with reference to supply certificates, preference orders, and inventory restrictions shall not apply to wheat of the 1946 crop.

2. By deleting paragraph (bb) and substituting in lieu thereof the following:

(bb) Use of wheat by millers: (1) Except for export purposes or for delivery to the Commodity Credit Corporation, no miller shall, during May 1946, process wheat into flour in excess of the quantity of wheat necessary to produce 75 percent of the quantity of flour distributed by such miller for domestic use or consumption during the month of May 1945.

(2) Except for export purposes or for delivery to Commodity Credit Corporation, no miller shall during the month of June 1946 process wheat into flour in excess of the quantity of wheat necessary to produce 75 percent of the monthly average quantity of flour distributed by such miller for domestic use or consumption during 1945.

(3) Except for export purposes or for delivery to Commodity Credit Corporation, no miller shall, during any calendar month beginning July 1946, process wheat into flour in excess of the quantity of wheat necessary to produce 85 percent of the monthly average quantity of flour distributed by such miller for domestic use or consumption during 1945.

3. By adding, immediately after paragraph (dd), the new paragraph:

(ee) Set-aside requirements. (1) The requirements of this paragraph (ee) shall apply only to wheat grading No. 3 or better, or grading No. 4 or No. 5 on test weight, produced in the following States: California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wyoming. No producer shall deliver such wheat to a country elevator, or by truck, wagon, or water to a subterminal elevator, terminal elevator, or mill elevator unless, within 15 days from the time of delivery, not less than one-half of all such wheat shall be sold to such country elevator, subterminal elevator, terminal elevator, mill elevator, or to a merchandiser, miller, or other processor: *Provided, however,* That this provision shall not apply to wheat delivered for the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

(2) No merchandiser, miller, or other processor, and no owner or operator of a country elevator, subterminal elevator, terminal elevator, or mill elevator shall purchase or accept delivery of wheat unless he shall:

(i) Set aside, reserve, and hold for delivery to the Commodity Credit Corporation not less than one-half of all wheat purchased by him from producers.

(ii) Deliver to Commodity Credit Corporation, in the form of either wheat or flour, all wheat set aside, reserved, and held under paragraph (ee) (2) (i) hereof. Such delivery shall be made as directed by Commodity Credit Corporation.

This amendment shall become effective at 12:01 a. m., e. s. t., May 24, 1946. With respect to violations, rights accrued, liabilities incurred, or appeals taken, prior to said date, under War Food Order No. 144, as amended, all provisions of said order shall be deemed to remain in full force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action or other proceeding with respect to any such violation, right, liability, or appeal. (E. O. 9280, 7 F. R. 10179; E. O. 9577, 10 F. R. 8087.)

Issued this 22d day of May 1946.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. This is the set-aside order:

The requirements of this paragraph (ee) shall apply only to wheat grading No. 3 or better or grading No. 4 or No. 5 on test weight, produced in the following States: California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakato, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

Those are the States which raise this particular type of wheat, and produce the grades mentioned in the order.

This is the part of the order for which we are asking consideration:

No producer shall deliver such wheat to a country elevator or mill elevator unless, within 15 days from the time of delivery, not less than one-half of all such wheat shall be sold to such country elevator, subterminal elevator, terminal elevator, mill elevator, or to a merchandiser, miller or other processor.

There are some further provisos which we do not need to consider. I am quite satisfied that it is because of this order that the Department of Agriculture asked for the authority to buy this wheat. The order applies only to the new wheat crop. It does not involve any bonus for what has happened.

Senators from large wheat-producing sections know that farmers store their wheat in elevators. They pay a cent a bushel a month for storage. Then they elect to sell it whenever they choose. This order provides that they must sell one-half of the wheat when it is delivered to the elevator. Within 15 days they must sell half of the wheat which they put in the elevator to the local miller, the terminal miller, or someone else.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MOORE. Where does the Secretary of Agriculture get the authority to make such an order?

Mr. WHERRY. In the hearings before the food subcommittee of the Small Business Committee, during the past 3 days, they claimed they get the power under the Second War Powers Act. Then I said, "How do you get the power to police the bill? Assume that I am a farmer and that I put the wheat in an elevator and refuse to sell you one-half of it. How can you compel me to sell one-half of it to you?" They said, "The millers do it."

I asked, "What do you do if they refuse?"

They replied, "Well, we have to get some additional authority."

And, Mr. President, as surely as I am standing on my feet here now, the authority they have asked for this afternoon is the authority they wish to have in order to require the millers to sell them the wheat. I do not challenge the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, but I think it is seizure. I think it is forcing the farmers to sell the wheat at that price.

The wheat farmers could withhold the wheat; they could say, "We will not store

it in an elevator." But that would defeat the very program the Secretary is trying to carry out now, which is to get wheat and to get it immediately.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand the situation, no producer is required to take his wheat to an elevator.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. He can keep it on the farm as long as he wants to.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. But let us assume that he takes 1,000 bushels of wheat to an elevator, to sell it at the market price then prevailing, and let us assume that the Government says to him, "We are going to have half of it." He will sell the other 500 bushels to the elevator company, or to whoever is therc to purchase it, at the price which prevails on that day. But under the provisions of this amendment he would have the right to elect to receive for the 500 bushels he sold to the Government a price existing on some day between the date when he delivered the wheat and the 31st of March 1947. He would have the right to say, "I think wheat is going to increase in price. I will turn this 500 bushels of wheat over to the Government, and I will select a day some time in the future, some time between now and March 31, and the price prevailing on that day will be the price I will get for the 500 bushels I sell to the Government." That would be the case, although he would have accepted for the one-half of the wheat which the elevator company or someone else bought at that time the price which existed on the day when he took the wheat to the elevator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not agree with the last statement the Senator has made, because the wheat producer might place the wheat in the elevator for storage. He might leave the wheat on the farm. To assume that the farmer who places a thousand bushels of wheat in an elevator is going to sell one-half of it to the elevator man is an assumption which is not justified.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, a farmer who takes wheat to an elevator may place it there for storage or he may sell it.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Many of those who take it there sell it at once.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; particularly the poor men who need the money most. They are very likely to sell it in that way.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. Of course, a man can simply store his wheat there. But if he sells it then, he takes the market price, the price existing on that day, for the one-half which he sells to the elevator; but under the amendment he would select the price existing on a future day as the price which he would be paid for the wheat the Government would take, and under the amendment the Government would be compelled to pay him the price as of a day, for instance, 6 months later, or the price on whatever day the farmer might select.

Mr. WHERRY. No; the amendment would require him to make an election.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. If the farmer does not write a letter and make an election, he will have to take the price existing on whatever date the Government chooses.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. But if he writes them a letter and says, "I choose the price on October 20 as the price which I wish to receive," and if that price is 15 or 20 cents a bushel higher than the price on the day when he delivered the wheat to the elevator, the Government will pay him the increase of 15 or 20 cents a bushel.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I think the Senator from Kentucky understands the amendment perfectly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I think perhaps I do understand it. In the case I have mentioned, the Government would pay the farmer more for the wheat which it took than the farmer would be paid by the private person or the elevator man who purchased the other half of the wheat on the day when all of the wheat was delivered at the elevator.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield, if the Senator from Kentucky is through.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am through.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has only touched the surface of the problem. Let me say to him that the Department of Agriculture is greatly concerned as to whether it will be able to get sufficient wheat offered freely to fill its commitments for relief export. I speak advisedly because just this week I have discussed this question with those in authority in the Department of Agriculture. I have also discussed the question of marketing wheat in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas with the grain trade and the millers, over the long-distance telephone and by telegraph.

If I may have the attention of the Senate for a few minutes, I wish to describe what is one of the most important situations confronting the Government, namely, the need to obtain wheat to fill our commitments throughout the world.

Let me refer to last December, when I went home to Kansas. I stopped over in Kansas City for several days, as I usually do, for although Kansas City is located partly in Missouri, nevertheless it is the market and the commercial center and commercial capital of Kansas. There I spent parts of 2 days in consultation with the millers. Let me say that Kansas raises more wheat than does any other State of the Union. Kansas has the largest milling capacity of any State. Approximately between 20 and 25 percent of all the wheat grown in the United States is grown in Kansas, and about the same percentage of wheat is ground into flour in the mills in Kansas and along the Missouri River on the Kansas side. I talked to those millers, who then were unable to get wheat. The farmers were not letting go of the wheat. We had two conferences on two different days, and the conferences took most of each day. The millers had been relying upon the Commodity Credit Corporation for wheat. The Commodity Credit Corporation, in order to fill the commitments for export, had cut the millers off from wheat. The result was that their supply of wheat available for milling purposes was no more than 3 weeks ahead, except in a very few cases.

We discussed the matter. There was some telegraphic communication on the part of both myself and the millers with the production and marketing administration of the Department of Agriculture. The millers made the point that the farmer in Kansas was feeling bullish; he did not have to sell his wheat, because he could borrow money from his bank. So he was holding up his wheat and he would not sell it. They said, "He will not sell his wheat unless there is an official statement from the OPA that the ceiling price of wheat will not be raised for the rest of the crop for this year." I smiled at the gentleman who said that, and I said to him, "You do not expect me to tell the OPA to tell the wheat farmers that they cannot get any higher price than they can get now; do you?" He said he did not.

But in the latter part of December or the first part of January the OPA made an official statement that there would be no further increase in the ceiling price of wheat. The milling trade thought that statement was necessary, and I assume they requested the OPA to make that statement. At any rate, it was made.

What happened? Later, the ceiling price on wheat was increased 3 cents because of the increase in the parity price. Later, the Commodity Credit Corporation adopted the very plan which is contained in this amendment, and offered to buy wheat and issue a certificate to the effect that the farmer might choose the time when he would sell his wheat. Still later a premium of 30 cents a bushel was paid for wheat during a given period. I believe that the period expired on April 25. Later, there was an increase in the ceiling price of wheat by 15 cents a bushel. Mr. President, I ask you to consider the frame of mind of the average wheat farmer who was told where would be no further increase in the price of wheat, and on the basis of that statement sold his wheat. The frame of mind of the average farmer in the Wheat Belt is that of believing no one in the Department of Agriculture or the OPA.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Was the recent differential occasioned by law or by a rule in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. REED. It was the result purely of a change in the regulations of the Production and Marketing Administration, I would say, but it was done with the approval of the OPA.

Mr. KILGORE. Then, the differential did not result entirely from a change in law. That is what I am trying to say.

Mr. REED. As the Senator from West Virginia knows, the change in connection with parity is automatic.

Mr. KILGORE. That is the reason I asked the question. Some slight changes have been made in the parity rule. I was wondering if the 3-cent change to which the Senator referred was occasioned by legislative action or some other action.

Mr. REED. I do not recall any legislative action with regard to the parity rule.

Mr. President, during the past week I talked with representatives of the grain trade and millers. I had telephone conversations with them. I have received thousands of letters from my farmer friends who grow wheat. I have received many letters and telegrams from operators of country elevators. The general trend of all information which reaches me is that, in the light of their disheartening experience during the first 6 months of this year, the wheat farmers will not sell their wheat if they can avoid doing so. I ask Senators not to underrate the importance of that fact. The Department of Agriculture does not.

In what I am about to say, I do not commit the Department of Agriculture with reference to anything. I am not speaking for it formally or informally. But I have discussed this problem, just as I have discussed all similar problems, with the Department of Agriculture. I discussed what they might do to offset the sad experience which the farmers suffered during the first 6 months of this year. I was told that until the Congress disposed of this bill so that the Department of Agriculture would know what rule, if any, Congress would lay down to correct the situation, the Department of Agriculture would do nothing.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Do I understand the Senator from Kansas to urge the argument that unless this amendment is adopted, most of the wheat farmers will not take their wheat to the grain elevators?

Mr. REED. I was about to come to that point. I cannot dispose of the situation as easily as the Senator from Maryland has stated it.

Mr. President, I have received the impression that the Department of Agriculture, fully appreciating the embarrassment to which it, as well as all wheat purchasing agencies are subjected, would be satisfied to have this amendment agreed to, and that if the amendment is not agreed to it will probably be necessary for the Department of Agriculture to place in its regulations virtually the amendment which the Senator from Nebraska has offered. That statement is not official. I am not committing the Department of Agriculture, but because of long contact for many years with this question, I am familiar with it and I have discussed it with the Department of Agriculture on many occasions.

In answering the Senator from Maryland, I may say that the chief individualists of this country are the farmers. As a class there is no group of men who are so highly developed individually as are the farmers. The wheat farmer had a sad experience. He was told that he might as well sell his wheat as to hold it, because its price would not be increased. Then the price was increased 3 cents a bushel, later 30 cents a bushel, and then increased permanently 15 cents a bushel. The result was that bills were introduced in both Houses of Congress—I introduced one in the Senate—for the purpose of taking care of the wheat-marketing situation between January 1 and May 26, if I remember correctly the dates.

In the light of such experience, there was issued by the Department of Agriculture the order to which I have referred. If a farmer can store his wheat on the farm, very well. He may put it in a building or store it on the ground. But when he does that, no one gets any of it. If he takes it to a commercial storage place, under the order of the Department of Agriculture, he must sell to the elevator within 15 days 50 percent of the wheat. In turn, the elevator operator or the storage operator must sell one-half of it to the Government.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Allow me to complete this statement.

I have discussed all these matters with officials of the Department of Agriculture. The Department—I am speaking of it as the responsible representative of the Government—wants 250,000,000 bushels of wheat for export. This year we will produce probably about a billion bushels. The present estimate is a little more than that. So, Mr. President, can we conceive of farmers taking all their wheat and placing it in storage? If they sold 500,000,000 bushels to the elevator, the elevator would have to sell one-half of it, which would be 250,000,000 bushels, and that is the way the Government expects to get its 250,000,000 bushels of wheat.

I now yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I concur with what the Senator from Kansas has said. Many farm organizations and others in my State have written to me. I have in my hand a resolution which was adopted by the Yellowstone County Farmers' Union. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the farmers are patriotic people and have produced to the utmost; and

Whereas the Government sent out an urgent call asking for wheat for starving people of foreign countries; and

Whereas through the urgent appeal from our Government, the same farmers emptied their granaries in support of this appeal; and

Whereas the facts stated in the general letter from the AAA and CCC led the producers to believe that the price of wheat had reached its top; and

Whereas the price of wheat had been increased 3 cents within a week, later a 30-cent bonus, and finally an increase of 15 cents on ceiling on wheat not sold: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting go on record urging this price increase be retroactive to January 1, 1946.

Mr. President, what happened is that the Government sent out word that the price of wheat would not be increased. It made a patriotic appeal to the farmers. What was the result? The small, patriotic farmer delivered his wheat. Later the Government increased the price of wheat by 3 cents, then by 30 cents, and later on it increased the wheat permanently by 15 cents. Who profited by it? In my State the Campbell Corp. and one or two other large producers of wheat operate. The farmers of Montana saw that those big fellows had inside information, and I am not sure that they did not have it, with reference to what was about to take place. But each small farmer in that State who was patriotic enough to sell his wheat was gypped because the Government had told him to deliver his wheat and that the price would not be increased. However, the big fellow held his wheat. When the little fellow had brought in his wheat and sold it to the Government, the price was increased by something like 48 cents a bushel.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from Kansas who yielded to the Senator from Montana for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. REED. Let me answer the question of the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to say to the Senator from Nebraska that his 30 minutes on the amendment has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to take 30 minutes on the bill.

Mr. REED. The 3-cent increase was a permanent increase, because it was a parity increase. The 30 cents was a temporary increase for a given period. I have forgotten the date it started, but I think it ended on May 25. Then the 15-cent increase was a permanent increase so far as the crop harvested this year was concerned, and continues over into next year.

I shall be glad to answer the question of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I see the force of the idea behind the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, and he has evidently devoted a great deal of thought to the subject of how to break this unfortunate situation. I was wondering if he had considered a proposition in this general vein: Suppose the Department of Agriculture were to say that during the 90-day period, for example, or the 60-day period, covering the general harvest, when the wheat of the whole country would be harvested—we will say, merely for the sake of the illustration, from the 15th of July until the 15th of September—if the farmer who had stored his wheat in the elevator would sell half of the wheat to the Government, half the wheat which is in the elevator during that period, he would receive a premium of 5 cents a bushel. I ask whether or not that would be a simpler thing than prolonging the formula, so to speak, until the 31st of March, with all the fluctuations, with all the bookkeeping that would be involved, with all the chances for fraud, and with all the chances of exploitation of someone who might buy the rights of the seller and then pyramid those rights into a good profit. Has the Senator considered that approach?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to state to the Senator from Kansas that if he wishes to answer the question, he may do so. Then I should like to reply myself. The Senator from Kansas is one of the leaders in the wheat business, and I should like to have him reply.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me say again, I talk back and forth over the telephone with the men in the Department of Agriculture on the days when I talk to them about some method of reaching the situation we are discussing. I have suggested to them over the telephone what is substantially provided in the amendment.

Their answer to me was that they were not going to do anything with it until Congress finished its work on this bill, which I told them was a good thing, because we might repeal the whole act. I said, "What would you do if you were a Kansas wheat farmer?" I know the man I was talking to was grinning at the other end of the telephone. He said, "If I were a Kansas wheat farmer, I would hold my wheat and see what would happen."

Mr. TYDINGS. Why not adopt my idea?

Mr. REED. There is this difference in the way to proceed. I think the Department of Agriculture, while it will never officially say so, would be very glad to have us adopt this amendment, for the reason that there is a general disbelief in the wheat section about any promise made by the OPA as to the wheat crop. The farmers were solemnly assured that there would be no increase, and then there were three different increases.

If the Congress of the United States lays down a rule as to what we are going to do, and the rule is to govern through the marketing of the 1946 wheat crop up to June 30, 1947, the farmer will take it, and the Department of Agriculture will have to take it.

Therefore, from the standpoint of the psychology of the farmer, it is much better for us to legislate on this subject, because the Department of Agriculture is going to have to do something of that kind anyway.

Mr. President, I shall ask recognition in my own right later.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wonder if I have an understanding of just what the amendment provides. Under a free economy the farmer can keep his wheat on the farm, he can keep part of it, he can take part of it to the elevator, he can sell it today, he can store it on the farm or in the elevator, and he can keep it for a year if he wants to.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. He can sell it whenever he pleases at the price available to him.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. It is.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Through the processes of Government which the Senator from Nebraska has described, the Government interferes with these rights of the farmer as to one-half of the wheat he takes to the elevator.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator's amendment provides a method for putting the farmer in the same position as to the one-half of his wheat which he must sell to the Government that he would have been in had the Government not interfered with his free right of choice. Is that the essence of it?

Mr. WHERRY. That is absolutely the essence of it.

I am perfectly willing to take a vote. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and will vote. I vote "aye."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BURCH], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business, attending the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in Bermuda.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are members of the committee on the part of the Senate attending the funeral services of the late Senator John H. Bankhead, of Alabama.

I also announce the following general pairs: The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]; and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

I announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate as members of the committee appointed by the United States Senate to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Bankhead.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—48

Ball	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Brewster	Huffman	Saltonstall
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Buck	McCarran	Stanfill
Bushfield	McClellan	Stewart
Byrd	Magnuson	Taft
Capper	Millikin	Taylor
Carville	Moore	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Morse	Tobey
Downey	Murdock	Tydings
Eastland	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Gurney	Radcliffe	White
Hart	Reed	Wilson

NAYS—15

Barkley	Knowland	Mead
George	Lucas	Myers
Hayden	McFarland	Overton
Hoey	McMahon	Wagner
Kilgore	Maybank	Walsh

NOT VOTING—32

Aiken	Ellender	Mitchell
Andrews	Ferguson	Murray
Austin	Fulbright	Pepper
Bailey	Gossett	Russell
Briggs	Green	Thomas, Utah
Burch	Guffey	Tunnell
Butler	Hatch	Vandenberg
Capehart	Hill	Wiley
Chavez	La Follette	Willis
Connally	Langer	Young
Donnell	McKellar	

So the amendment offered by Mr. WHERRY, for Mr. BUTLER and himself, was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY's amendment, as agreed to, is as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. (a) In the event producers of wheat are required by an order issued pursuant to the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, to sell all or any part of wheat delivered to an elevator prior to April 1, 1947, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall offer to purchase the wheat so required to be sold at a price determined as follows: The purchase price paid for the wheat shall be the market price at the point of delivery as of any date the producer may elect between the date of delivery and March 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided, however,* That only one election may be made for each lot of wheat: *And provided further,* That the producer may not elect a date prior to the date on which he mails a written notice to Commodity Credit Corporation of his election. In the event the producer does not notify Commodity Credit Corporation in writing by March 31, 1947, of his election of a date for determining the market price, such date shall be deemed to be March 31, 1947.

"(b) Any producer of wheat who, prior to the date of enactment of this act, has sold any wheat pursuant to the requirements of paragraph (ee) (1) of War Food Order No.

144, may, at any time within 30 days after the date of enactment of this act, pay to the Commodity Credit Corporation a sum equal to the amount for which he sold such wheat. Any producer paying any such sum to the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be deemed to have sold and delivered to the Commodity Credit Corporation as of the date he pays such sum a quantity of wheat equal in grade and quality to the quantity sold by him pursuant to such requirements and the purchase price to be paid to him for such wheat shall be determined in the same manner as in the case of a sale of wheat to the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in connection with my remarks on the meat situation made earlier in the day, I wish to place in the RECORD certain telegrams. Earlier I said I would report the results of certain inquiries made by me with respect to pharmaceuticals. I now ask to place in the RECORD six or seven telegrams I have just received from some of the prominent pharmaceutical houses in the United States indicating the conditions with respect to pharmaceuticals as the result of the meat shortage.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 13, 1946.*
Senator B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Present situation acute because of the fact that the various glands from animals have been in short supply due to small kill. We oppose a recent suggestions to increase prices for glands because we know a higher price for glands will not make more glands available for pharmaceutical products, since the packers now recover practically all glands. On the other hand it is important that legitimate packing houses handle kill inasmuch as they have the facilities and personnel for collecting animal glands.

E. R. SQUIBB & SONS.

BOSTON, MASS., *June 13, 1946.*
Hon. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senate:

Your telegram 13th: Liver products supplies for pharmaceuticals not too plentiful, however, other gland-product derivatives very scarce.

UNITED-REXALL DRUG CO.,
F. J. HAILER, *Vice President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 13, 1946.*
Hon. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senator, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Re your wire today to J. C. Chilcott, present situation unchanged since wiring you May 15. Look for no improvement in the future supply of necessary materials derived from animal sources for pharmaceutical manufacturing unless decided changes are made in OPA control. We strongly urge immediate correction of this legislation.

THE MALTINE CO.,
E. R. JANES, *Vice President.*

RICHMOND HILL, N. Y., *June 13, 1946.*
Hon. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Reply your telegram. Greater livestock killed in regular channels at controlled ceiling prices needed to meet demand for granular and other livestock products for medicinal manufacturing. Manufacturing here virtually stopped because of unavailability ox-bile due to small cattle kill and uncontrolled price bidding for available supplies ox-bile.

O PRODUCTS, INC.,
SAMUEL M. GORDON, *Vice President.*

NORTH CHICAGO, ILL., *June 13, 1496.*
Hon. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senate Office,
Washington, D. C.:

Re your telegram June 13, situation worse. Raw materials from livestock virtually unavailable. No prospects in sight for improvement under present regulations. Situation critical on the entire group. Unless raw material can be provided for pharmaceutical industry many individuals in this country will suffer for failure to get proper medication. This may even result in death.

ABBOT LABORATORIES,
E. L. DRACH,
Director of Purchases.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 13, 1496.*
Hon. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As has been true in the past and is a fact now and we believe will maintain for the future unless OPA ceilings are removed from livestock and meat products, it is practically impossible to obtain materials in this country to produce pharmaceuticals. Our stocks of some items are exhausted and there is no prospect of receiving materials to continue manufacture.

JOHN G. SEARLE.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I would be very reluctant in taking the time of the Senate at this late hour if I had not sat here very patiently for 4 days and listened to other Senators elucidate the subject before us. I feel, however, I should make a few remarks.

One thing that has impressed me as much as anything in the debate which has taken place in the Senate for the past 4 days is the fact that there has been no ill will, there has been very little crimination or recrimination in the debate, and from that it seems to me, after a life of experience that practically every Member of the Senate feels as I do, that is, he does not know positively the answer to this question. I think we are all trying to return to the American way. I think we are all trying to get out from under controls. I believe that nearly every Senator feels that he would like to get rid of all the controls tomorrow if that could safely be done. I know, so far as I am concerned, that I have never yet been able to convince myself that we should get rid of rent controls, though I know a great injustice has been done and is being done to those individuals who have saved their money and put it into homes and apartments and are using that method to make their living.

We have heard many dire predictions made. Again I say no one knows what will happen. I shall not make any predictions, except to say that the reactions of the Senate mean to me that the people are revolting—not the Senate, but the people—are revolting against the things that have happened.

The black market is thriving. That has been said many times. There is nothing new in the statement. But the people are revolting because the black market is thriving, and the people by the millions in this country know that ceiling prices of themselves mean nothing if they cannot get the things they need. They know very well that one cannot eat price lists or ceiling price lists, and one cannot be nourished by them. We have got to get production, and we have got to get materials, the things we need and some of the things we may just want.

Notwithstanding all the statistics which have been presented here the people know very definitely that production is not what it should be. Regardless of comparisons with the past, they know that production is on a low level. I know it, for in the business in which I was interested, and in which 1,800 men were formerly employed, 600 men are now working, because of OPA and because of regulations which have taken away raw materials and let them go abroad, from South America to other places. I am merely attempting to show that production is not what it ought to be. It is not what it can be if we get the kind of cooperation we must have in this country between worker and capital—honest, decent cooperation based upon decent wages. But when we talk about decent wages let us remember that under our American system we cannot continue to pay decent wages unless a decent full day's service is rendered in return for decent wages. This is a reciprocal arrangement. We must all do our part. The system cannot be regulated by law. The main part of the program about which we are talking must depend upon voluntary cooperation and understanding. I believe that every Member of the Senate knows that no matter what the ceiling prices may be, whether we keep OPA or not, if we do not get production we shall face the danger of inflation.

I shall not detain the Senate much longer, but I wish to read something which I have found in the books of history of the past. I think it applies to what we are doing today; and I think the causes which made this thing happen are the same causes which are making us change our feelings with regard to regulation and the extension of OPA.

This statement is entitled "The Law of the Maximum":

The tragic collapse of public and private prosperity in France at the close of the eighteenth century is familiar to any student of the period. Historians of the times invariably point to the excessive issuance of paper money secured by the confiscated lands of emigrants, royalty, and the church as the basic cause for this economic disaster.

Closer inspection of the period, however, reveals it to be one in which many economic experiments were attempted by the "planners" of the French socialistic revolutionists in an effort to meet the difficulties which arose not only as a result of a cheap currency but also because of diminished production consequent upon the interruptions of industry and general disorder due to the War of Revolution.

One of the most important and disastrous of these experiments was the attempt to fix a maximum beyond which the prices of the necessities of life could not advance.

Mark this, because to me this is very important. Human nature is pretty much the same today as it was then.

In 1793 the law of the maximum was enacted with the sponsorship of St. Just the

Terrorist, associate of Robespierre. Prices were established for grain, meat, fuel, clothing, vegetables, tobacco, beer, and many kinds of raw materials—in all, about 39 items.

Though high-handed this was not careless legislation and its enactment was preceded by studies by committees of experts—

The same kind of experts we now have—

who reviewed distribution systems, commodity supplies, and consumer demands. A base period was selected (1790) and the price for each necessity controlled was established at 1⅓ of its price in that year.

They selected a base period, just as we did.

To the base price was added an allowance for transportation and fixed wholesale and retail mark-ups. The new law was reported to the people with great fanfare. Barrére, a great orator of the Revolutionists, said—

I digress to remark that we have had some very great orators here who have been elucidating the problem. Barrére said:

"Monarchial commerce * * * sought only wealth"—France, to revive, needed "Republican commerce—a commerce of moderate profits and virtuous. France alone enjoys such a commerce."

Immediately upon the announcement of the law it was violated and scarcities increased. Tickets were issued to the people to entitle them to buy necessities at official prices. This was followed by increasingly stringent penalties in an effort to support the law—to prevent private sales and hoarding. Finally a death-penalty law was passed to punish those who possessed stocks of the controlled commodities and refused to sell them at the legal price and on the daily guillotine lists of 1793–94 appear the names of violators of the law of the maximum.

Mark how far they went and failed.

In spite of all the evasions, the law brought agriculture, manufacturing, and commerce practically to a standstill. Farmers and peasants soon produced little more than sufficed for their own consumption. Hardly anything was produced for sale. Many crops remained unharvested; factories were closed; fishermen refused to go to sea. People would not work if they saw no chance of getting remunerative prices for their produce. Many people were imprisoned for the crime of refusing to pursue trades in which they were not allowed to make profits, or of selling at prices which purchasers were glad to pay, but, which were often 200 percent above legal maximum.

Frightful distress followed, especially in cities and other areas where people could not produce sufficient food supplies for their own support.

That refers to areas such as our cities. When I read the next sentence I am reminded of the insertion made yesterday in the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. When we read it we see that the people of this country are already trampling on one another and injuring one another in seeking the things they need. Mark this:

Many were crushed in the scramble at the bakers' shops. Many, especially the children, were literally starved. After the fall of Robespierre (July 1794) the law was openly broken. Fortunately, it had neglected to take into cognizance live cattle and sheep, and, consequently, though bread was scarce, meat became tolerably plentiful when it could be sold at a fair price. Agriculture and manufacturing began to revive, especially after the maximum law had been formally repealed (December 1794).

Mr. President, I wish very much to leave a thought with this body tonight. I want every American to understand what I am talking about. There is no way from where we have gone, back to where we must go, that does not involve injustices, trials, and tribulations. If I could do one thing tonight to help solve this very difficult problem, it would be to try to ask the American people not to be quite so critical about everything as they have been, and to ask myself not to be quite so critical about everything as I have been. Let us see if we cannot unite. Let us understand what is in front of us.

Let us believe in the American system, which made this country the greatest Nation on the face of the earth. Certainly we may have trouble. Certainly prices may go up for two or three months or longer. Certainly the people may make them go still higher if they reach into the black market and bid against each other for the things they do not need. Our great job is to work together and understand the problem which we have before us. If we believe in this great system, let us make every sacrifice within our power to teach the other fellow what is necessary in order that we may work together harmoniously in trying to go through this unknown land until we reach the other side where we shall find the real America again.

If we are to throw everything overboard, if each of us is to act selfishly, if no one has any regard for the preservation of sacred things, if no one has a decent sense of intelligent selfishness to help the other fellow and to bring back voluntary cooperation, harmony, production, and competition, which has always controlled the price of everything for us and which has made us a great people, then all I have to say is, God help America.

I know one thing as I vote tonight. I am going to vote for this bill as it is, even though it may not be exactly as I would have it. I know very definitely, as I prepare to vote on the bill tonight, that no one can go through the situation in which we find ourselves to the goal we are striving to reach, without being a good American and without being prepared to carry his full share of the load that lies ahead of us, so that we may come out in the "tomorrow" to the sunrise of prosperity which belongs to the American system of freemen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it would have been my purpose to resist any effort to have stricken from the price control bill the so-called Bankhead-Brown amendment, but inasmuch as no effort was made to strike that provision from the bill it was unnecessary for me to make any statement to the Senate.

However, I have a statement of the history of the Bankhead-Brown amendment which is very brief, and which I understand had the full approval of our late colleague, Senator Bankhead. I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD prior to the final vote on the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HISTORY OF THE BANKHEAD-BROWN AMENDMENT

The present difficulty in requiring OPA to allow the current cost of cotton in textile ceilings is not new. We have had trouble in this regard since the beginning of the price-stabilization program. In 1944, just about 2 years ago, OPA's attention was called to the fact that cotton prices had advanced around 2 cents a pound since the ceiling prices were fixed in April 1942 and that an adjustment in prices was necessary. At that time cotton was still considerably below parity, when most major farm commodities were at or above parity, and though cotton had increased slightly the textile ceilings were prohibiting cotton reaching parity. The OPA, however, flatly refused to make adjustments of any consequence in cotton textile ceilings. Production had already fallen off about 1,500,000,000 yards.

To stop any further decrease in production, Congress passed what came to be known as the Bankhead-Brown amendment to the Stabilization Act of 1944, which was intended to provide a practical formula for determining ceilings on major cotton textile items to encourage production. Object of the amendment was to require that ceilings on any major item should not be less than the sum of the following three factors: First, the cost of the cotton used in making the item, computed at not less than the parity price for that grade and staple of cotton delivered to the mill; second, a weighted average of the cost of manufacturing that item; and, third, a reasonable profit on that item. Certainly no sensible person could believe that any manufacturer would produce a piece of goods if the ceiling price on that goods was any less than the actual cost, plus a reasonable profit.

But the intent of the Bankhead-Brown amendment was not carried out. The OPA maintained a constant attitude of resentment toward carrying out the intent of the law. They had fought it bitterly when it was before Congress and then used all tactics at their command including the most-effective measure of delay. When Mr. Bowles appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on March 1, 1945, to ask for another extension of the price-stabilization law, he had to admit there were still ceilings on cotton-textile items that had not been adjusted. All this time costs were continually increasing.

To require the OPA to follow the spirit and intent of the original Bankhead-Brown amendment, an interpretation of the amendment was included in the June 27, 1945, conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 30 extending the Emergency Price Control Act to 1946. The report, signed by the managers on the part of the House on the cotton-textile amendment, reads as follows:

"The conferees have given consideration to the operation of the Bankhead-Brown amendment to the Stabilization Act of 1942, relating to the pricing of cotton textiles. The

conferees are in agreement with the conclusion of the Senate and House committees, that the purpose of that amendment will not be carried out unless the maximum price for each major cotton-textile item is fixed and maintained at not less than the sum of the following:

"1. The cotton cost (which must be computed at not less than the landed mill parity equivalent for the grade and staple of cotton used; except that, after the initial adjustments required under the amendment have been made, the amendment does not require the continued use of a cotton cost figure which is, and for a representative period has been, above or below the actual cotton cost);

"2. A weighted average of mill conversion costs; and

"3. A reasonable profit."

The conferees are advised that the Price Administrator has informed the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that the policy which he intends to follow in administering the amendment will be in full accord with this opinion as to its requirements.

The significant language in this report is that contained in the last phrase of the paragraph No. 1, "above or below the actual cotton cost." To the conferees this meant that the OPA would allow the current cost of cotton. However, Mr. Chester Bowles still refuses to follow the intent of the act by arguing that the law does not require him to allow the current cost of cotton above parity.

The amendment in the price-control bill which passed the House was an attempt to write into law the spirit and intent of the conference report of June 27, 1945. This House amendment reads as follows:

"On and after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, it shall be unlawful to establish, or maintain, any maximum price, applicable to manufacturers or processors, for any major item in the case of products made in whole or major part from cotton or cotton yarn or wool or wool yarn, unless the maximum price for such major item is fixed and maintained at not less than the sum of the following:

"(1) The cotton or wool cost (which must be computed at not less than the parity price or the current cost, whichever is greater, of the grade and staple of cotton or wool used in such item, delivered at the mill);

"(2) A weighted average of mill conversion costs; and

"(3) A reasonable profit."

Wool was included in the amendment because representatives of the wool growers and wool manufacturers in the House committee felt their problem was the same as that of the cotton people and asked to be included.

The definition of a reasonable profit as the profit per unit of production in the base period 1939–41 and the incentive plan to increase production, both of which are now embodied in the amendments introduced by the late Senator Bankhead, developed as a result of the investigation into the shortage of cotton goods conducted by the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The testimony from various witnesses during the hearings, which lasted almost 2 weeks, pointed specifically to the need for changing from the industry-earning standard for calculating profits to a per unit basis in order to permit manufacturers to realize a profit on each unit of production. Textile-industry earnings as determined by OPA included the production and finishing not only of cotton-textile production but the production of rayon fabrics which have been shown to be more profitable than cotton and also dyeing and finishing. In other words, over-all profits are no indication that the manufacturers can make a profit on low-cost work clothes, for instance, in which the margin of profit is very small. The investigation also indicated the need for the over-all incentive plan to compensate for payment of premium wages for third shifts and overtime in order to get all-out production.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I sent to the Secretary of Agriculture concerning the latest control order, and regarding the black market in meat.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 12, 1946.*

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Recent news stories purporting to contain statements of OES and OPA charge:

1. That the latest control order is stopping the black market and channeling livestock through legitimate slaughterers which is shown by an alleged increase of 9 percent in federally inspected slaughter from April to May 1946, and

2. That we have a meat famine caused by farmers withholding livestock from market and packers hoarding meat, both producers and packers hoping to profit from removal of controls on livestock and meat an June 30.

Figures in my possession from the Department of Agriculture show that both of these statements are untrue. As to the alleged increase of federally inspected slaughter for May over April, the increase is only three-tenths of 1 percent, not 9 percent, and was due to a seasonal increase of hog slaughter, whereas federally inspected cattle slaughter declined sharply and representative legitimate packers found it more difficult to buy cattle at legal prices. As to the withholding of livestock by farmers, while it is true that there is a decline of cattle marketed at central markets from May to April from 714,727 to 613,210 or 101,517 fewer, this is no proof that producers are holding back cattle, but is clear evidence that the bootleggers are now buying livestock at the farms and auctions, the latter which you know is growing and flourishing all over the country. As to the packers' hoarding meat, the amount of cattle which legitimate slaughterer's are able to buy is so limited that if all of it were hoarded it would not appreciably affect the amount available at retail levels. Furthermore, of the small numbers of cattle slaughtered federally inspected slaughterers are required to set aside for the Government 55 percent of the lower grades and 60 percent of all canned meat. In the case of hogs these slaughterers must set aside for the Government 40 percent of their weekly production of pork and nearly 50 percent of their lard. Since these facts are readily available to you please advise by return wire if it is not true that the current meat shortage is mainly attributable to black-market diversion of livestock and maldistribution of meat and that you have no evidence that farmers are withholding livestock or packers are hoarding meat. Also please advise if it is not a fact that slaughter-control program is failing "to direct these cattle back into decent channels. To persuade people that they have got to buy in compliance. To get food for the American people at decent prices."

Regards.

TOM STEWART,
United States Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, Senators who worked for this bill are, in my opinion, largely motivated by the idea that the OPA is interfering with our system of private enterprise and because they resent what they choose to call State authoritarianism. In my opinion they will be the very Senators who will try to sink the hooks the deepest into labor when it protests by strikes against the increased prices which will come about as the result of this bill. Then they will go all out for State authoritarianism in the field of labor relations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word. I am sure many Senators have been perturbed with respect to what they should do on the question of the final passage of this bill. I can very well understand that, because I myself have endured the same sort of perturbation.

The President sent a letter to the Committee on Banking and Currency during its consideration of this measure. In that letter the President stated that if a bill such as the one which was passed by the House of Representatives came to him, he would be compelled to veto it. I had hoped that the deliberations in the Senate committee and in this Chamber might result in improvement of the bill as it was passed by the House; and regardless of that, I had hoped that out of the conference committee might come legislation which would be substantially satisfactory to the American people. Whether the Senate version of the bill is better or worse than the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives, I pass no judgment upon at this time.

The bill is not what I wanted nor what I sought to obtain both in the committee and on the floor of the Senate. It falls so far short of being what I had hoped for that I had hesitated to vote for it at all, and I expressed that hesitation and also my hesitation to become one of the conferees on the bill, which I would be entitled to be in view of my rank on the committee, when the bill has passed the Senate and goes to conference.

But, Mr. President, the failure to pass this bill would mean the end of all price controls on the 30th day of June, 2 weeks from next Saturday. Inadequate as many of its provisions seem to me to be, and short as it falls of the aspirations which many of us had at the time of the inception of the measure, nevertheless it seems to me it would be an inexcusable mistake for the Senate not to pass the bill, however unsatisfactory it is in its present form. Also I have given consideration to whether I owe any duty and whether other Members of the Senate who would be conferees owe any duty to the Senate and to the country with respect to this measure, notwithstanding our dissatisfaction with some of its provisions.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to say that I shall vote for the bill. The chairman of the committee indicated that he would suggest my name as one of the conferees to meet with the conferees on the part of the House to see what can be done with the measure. I shall vote for the bill because I am unwilling to see price control end on the 30th of June and to see all price regulations and controls end at that time, and because I believe the defeat of this bill in the Senate would not facilitate the obtaining in the next few weeks of any better legislation which we might hope for, so that we could feel any happier regarding the situation

or so that we might hope that the President would be given a bill which would be better than the one we have now completed.

Therefore, I feel it my duty as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency which worked on the bill for 2 or 3 months, and worked very assiduously and industriously, and I also feel it my duty as a Senator, independently of my position on the committee, to vote for the bill, in the hope that out of the conferees' deliberations which will take place, inasmuch as we have eliminated all of the House bill and have substituted a new bill, the conference committee may arrive at a bill which will be more satisfactory than the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives and more satisfactory than the bill as passed by the Senate.

Therefore, I shall vote for the bill, and I shall do the best I can, insofar as I shall be in a position to do anything about it, to work out the best possible bill in the light of all the considerations involved, in the hope that it may be approved by the Chief Executive and may become the law and may extend the price-control system for another year, and in the hope that when that year has expired it will no longer be necessary for any price control or other similar regulations to be imposed upon commodities, and that long before the year expires, in the gradual process which has been worked out here, most of the controls may be lifted without any serious injury to the economy of our Nation or to the people as a whole.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words. I think this bill preserves an effective control of many prices and a generally effective protection against the kind of inflationary rise which we might face if we passed no bill at all. Again I wish to call attention to the fact that I think it would be entirely reasonable to abolish all price control. There is an argument to be made for that. It would not be something which would be out of the question.

However, we have chosen a policy partly between that and complete continuation of the present power. But the amendment offered by the majority leader himself, which is incorporated in the bill, says very clearly that—

> Therefore, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the Office of Price Administration, and other agencies of the Government, shall use their price, subsidy, and other powers to promote the earliest practicable balance between production and the demand therefor of commodities under their control, and that the general control of prices and the use of subsidy powers shall, subject to other specific provisions of this act, be terminated as rapidly as possible consistent with the policies and purposes set forth in this section and in no event later than June 30, 1947, and on that date the Office of Price Administration shall be abolished.

Everyone agrees to that policy. There is no difference of opinion, except with regard to Mr. Bowles, as to the general theory of progressive decontrol. We have chosen to decontrol perhaps 25 to 30 percent of the commodities which go into the ordinary cost of living. We permit the OPA to retain control on 70 to 75 percent of those commodities. So we are merely beginning, perhaps somewhat more quickly than some believe to be wise, the decontrol policy which has been agreed to by everyone who has participated in a consideration of the subject. So this proposal is not a departure from the general policy. It merely represents a more rapid approach, perhaps, than some persons think we should take.

The various other amendments are merely provisions to make the enforcement of control more reasonable, and to emphasize to the Price Administration that they must be liberal in price fixing in order to encourage the production of articles which are not to be decontrolled. So I would say that the bill preserves a substantial part of the price control which now exists, that it is in full accord with the policies which we all agree to, and that there is no reason why we should not pass the bill and make it the final guide for the Price Administration during the next 12 months.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in fairness to Mr. Bowles, I do not believe the implication should be left that he has objected to the termination of price control. So far as I recall, he expressed no objection to the provision of the amendment which I offered in the committee, terminating the Office of Price Administration by June 30, 1947. He did disagree, and does disagree, with some of the rapid decontrols which are provided for specifically in the bill. There is a difference of opinion, and an honest difference, in respect to that matter. The Senate has accepted the decontrols, and has provided for them more rapidly than Mr. Bowles felt would be wise. But I do not wish the implication to be left unnoticed which might lead to the belief that Mr. Bowles objected to the termination on June 30, 1947, of price controls, because he did not object so far as I know, and does not object today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am glad to accept Mr. Bowles within the ranks of the rest of us who feel that during the next year intelligent and progressive decontrol should take place as rapidly as possible, consistent with the policies and purposes of the act. If Mr. Bowles joins with us he can hardly say that we differ with him in principle by passing the bill which is before us. He can say only that any difference in opinion which may exist between us is one of degree.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, in view of the remarks which I have made and the position which I have taken with regard to this bill, I wish the RECORD to show that when I vote I shall do so solely for the reasons which motivated the majority leader, as stated by him a few minutes ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays having been demanded and ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if present and voting, he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] requested me to state that he had arranged to deliver an address over the radio at 9 o'clock and that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business, attending the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], are members of the committee on the part of the Senate attending the funeral services of the late Senator John H. Bankhead of Alabama.

I also announce that on this question the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

I announce further that on this question the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

I also announce the following general pairs: The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]; and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate as members of the committee appointed by the United States Senate to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea." The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Bankhead.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is unavoidably detained. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 11, as follows:

YEAS—53

Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hoey	Reed
Brewster	Huffman	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Knowland	Shipstead
Burch	Lucas	Smith
Byrd	McCarran	Stanfill
Capper	McClellan	Stewart
Carville	McFarland	Taft
Cordon	McMahon	Taylor
Eastland	Magnuson	Tobey
George	Maybank	Tydings
Gerry	Millikin	Walsh
Gurney	Morse	Wheeler
Hart	Murdock	White
Hawkes	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Hayden	Overton	

NAYS—11

Ball	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Moore	Wagner
Downey	Myers	Wherry
Kilgore	O'Daniel	

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken	Ferguson	Murray
Andrews	Fulbright	Pepper
Austin	Gossett	Russell
Bailey	Green	Thomas, Utah
Briggs	Guffey	Tunnell
Butler	Hatch	Vandenberg
Capehart	Hill	Wiley
Chavez	La Follette	Willis
Connally	Langer	Young
Donnell	McKellar	
Ellender	Mitchell	

So the bill (H. R. 6042) was passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. MILLIKIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the order I send to the desk be entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. Ordered by unanimous consent that House bill 6042, the price-control bill, be printed showing the Senate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think it is necessary, although if it is necessary I ask that the Legislative Drafting Service show the House and Senate bills in comparative columns as nearly as possible so that when the conferees meet they can compare the identical or similar provisions in the two bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is my purpose, when we conclude our business, to ask that the Senate recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

I ask unanimous consent that immediately upon the assembling of the Senate tomorrow the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection. I make the request in order that we might clear the calendar of a large number of bills which may be passed on the call so as to know what bills are left which will have to be dealt with in another fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator include in his request that the call of the calendar begin at the point where the call was concluded on April 12?

Mr. BARKLEY. Beginning with the April 12 call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator if it is his plan, when the calendar of unopposed bills has been disposed of, to take up the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope to be able to do that. I will say to the Senator from Maryland, however, that there are several bills of an emergent nature which will take very little time. The Senator from Massachussets [Mr. WALSH] has a bill in regard to the authority to use the old ships which are on their way to the Pacific to be used as targets. There are three or four other small matters which will take a little time, but I think that after we finish the calendar tomorrow we can very easily consider the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I ask Senators to remain in the Chamber. The Senator from South Dakota has a matter of urgent importance which he wants to dispose of and which will take very little time. It involves the ability of the conferees on the extension of the Selective Service Act to come to an agreement with respect to the bill the Senate passed on that subject. I hope Senators will remain.

INCREASE IN PAY FOR PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, ETC.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the conferees on the selective service bill met day before yesterday and by unanimous consent of the Senate conferees the chairman of the Senate conferees has been asked to present a request of the conferees to take up this matter tonight.

We are about at a stone wall in going ahead with the conference, for the reason that the House conferees are not completely empowered to consider all the provisions of the Pay Act because the Senate did not cover all the categories of officers and men in Senate bill 2057.

What I want to do tonight is take up the House bill which is on our calendar as order of business 1202, strike out all after the enacting clause in the House bill, and substitute the pay sections of the selective-service measure which we passed a few days ago, without change. Then the two bills will be in conference, the provisions at the front end of the bill, then the other House bill, with the identical provisions which were adopted affecting pay and retirement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6084) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6084, to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health; that the bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof that part of the Senate amendment to H. R. 6064, to-wit: Sections 8 to 12 inclusive, extending the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940, as amended, which fixes the monthly base pay of certain enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and members of the band of the United States Marine Corps; and the retired or retirement pay of persons whose names are borne on the emergency officers retired list; that the bill as so amended be considered as having been read the third time and passed; that the Senate insist upon its amendments to the said bill, and ask a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair appoints the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks, the resolution I introduced on June 4 in regard to the investigation of the events leading up to the railroad strike, and certain newspaper articles which I think adequately support the investigation.

There being no objection, the resolution and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States request its Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation forthwith of the events of Saturday, May 25, and prior thereto, leading up to the settlement of the railroad strike, said investigation to include an investigation of all charges that the administration knew, or should have known several hours before the President's speech, that the strike would not continue after 4 p. m. Further that said investigation includes the examination by the order of the committee of not only the representatives of the brotherhoods but also of the President's advisers and such members of the Congress as well as others who can offer testimony and evidence based on their knowledge of the surrounding facts and circumstances of events that occurred on Saturday, May 25, and prior thereto, in relation to the railroad strike. Further, that all testimony shall be taken by the committee from witnesses under oath.

[From PM of May 30, 1946]

STARTING TODAY—THE SECRET RECORDS ON TRUMAN'S HANDLING OF RAIL CRISIS

(By John P. Lewis)

This is the first installment of the story of the recent railroad-strike crisis, and President Truman's crack-down on labor as it is revealed in the secret files of the two great brotherhoods, the Railway Trainmen and the Locomotive Engineers.

It is the story of President Truman's heretofore unpublished conversations with the brotherhood leaders and of their conversations with the President's aides in the strike crisis, John R. Steelman and Secretary of States Byrnes.

It is the story of what Truman has done and how he did it, through the eyes of the men on the receiving end.

The President has told his side directly in two addresses—the first, his Nation-wide address to the people last Friday night, and the second, his address to Congress last Saturday demanding legislation to throw workingmen into the Army if they strike on a property temporarily operated by the Government.

This is the workers' side of the events leading up to that time. It was given to PM by A. F. Whitney, the venerable president of the railroad trainmen, whose right to speak as a railroad man is attested by the missing tips of two fingers from one hand, and Alvanley Johnston, grand chief engineer of the locomotive engineers, a heavy-set, gray-headed man, who delights more than anything else in being known as an "eagle-eye"—an engineer.

Seated together in Whitney's walnut-paneled office in the brotherhood-owned Standard Building in Cleveland, they took out all of their secret files and records and laid them on the table. For hours they collaborated with each other in going through the files and in calling on their recollections to piece together in one chronology the things that had happened to them since it became apparent about 3 weeks ago that their membership (approximately 300,000 railroad men) were facing a life-and-death struggle in their efforts to get an adjustment on their grievances with the American railroads.

Whitney sat at his glass-topped desk, an American flag on a standard behind his left shoulder, a miniature flag, together with a British emblem, stuck on his desk with such paraphernalia as a miniature train coupler and a pair of metallic horses.

OPERATE AS A TEAM

Johnston lounged his ample frame on a couch at one side. It was obvious that, by long association, the two had come to operate as a team. Whitney did most of the talking, but Johnston would break in from time to time. The net effect was as coherent as if a single man were speaking.

Their secret files and their words pieced together to tell a story which, from the viewpoint of the workers, was one of frustration, of a double-cross by the administration at Washington, of a deliberate and planned setting up of the railroad brotherhoods into a position for the cracking-down by Truman, which came last Friday and Saturday.

The evidence is not conclusive that it was intended by the administration to be a double-cross or to be a cynical plan to build a stage from which the President could launch his attack on labor.

But from where the strikers' representatives sat the record adds up either to that or to a colossal ineptness of handling which kept the strikers deceived as to where they stood all the way through.

Records kept by the trainmen on one day's conversations with the White House make the point. The day was May 18—the date the strike was scheduled to be effective at 4 p. m.

Three times that day Whitney and Johnston talked by long distance to the White House. They talked from Whitney's office in Cleveland. On the Washington end of the three conversations were John R. Steelman, the President's labor aide, and, at times, the President himself. During one of the conversations, Steelman was alone. During the other two, the President was at Steelman's elbow at such time as he was not himself on the line.

On the Whitney-Johnston end of the line, there was a third man, a stenographer, who took down the conversation, which is now being released by the brotherhoods.

INTERESTING ON TWO SCORES

The conversations are especially interesting on two scores:

(1) The arrangement by which the White House took the initiative to protect the union leaders from prosecution under the Smith-Connally Act. (Technically, Whitney and Johnston feared they would be in violation of the law if they called off the strike and then reinstituted it later. The strike, as originally called, was legal. If, by their acts, they canceled it, the strike when it resumed might be technically a new strike—an illegal one.)

(2) The assurance which the White House gave that there was some point to a delay: That further concessions could be expected by the workers.

On the second point, note that President Truman, in his press conference a few minutes after he left the phone, told the reporters that "he had not consulted with management spokesmen before calling the union chiefs, but reiterated, nevertheless, that progress could be made in negotiations." The quotation is from the New York Times account—substantially the same as reported by the rest of the press.

The record of the phone conversation shows that this was not the impression Whitney and Johnston received.

That the assurances were only in words and not based on reality was confirmed in the next 5 days, while the strike was held up. Until the last hour of the period of delay there was not so much as a negotiating conference arranged for the rail chiefs with the railroads. The only concession was an ultimatum from the President which eliminated gains in working conditions recommended by his emergency board and offered an equivalent amount of wage increase instead.

Here are the texts of the three conversations from Whitney's files:

2:05, P. M. MAY 18, 1946

Dr. John Steelman called from The White House in Washington, and with President Whitney and Grand Chief Engineer Johnston each on the telephone, the following conversation took place:

"Dr. STEELMAN. Hello.

"Brother JOHNSTON. Hello, John.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Which Al is this.

"Brother JOHNSTON. This is Eagle Eye Al.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Whitney?

"Brother JOHNSTON. No, Johnston.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Oh, Johnston; oh, yes, Al. All right. How does it look today, fellow?

"Brother JOHNSTON. No change in the weather.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Is Whitney there with you?

"Brother JOHNSTON. He is in the next room.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Well, look, Alvanley, what I wanted to say, I am calling you on my own here, I am calling you personally to see if you have anything in mind that we could do.

"Brother JOHNSTON. I don't know; it's your move to move down there; they are the ones that took the play away from us.

"Dr. STEELMAN. That's right; and pretty fast, too. I was a little disappointed in the way things worked out; I thought there might be a way out; I will tell you confidentially what I had in mind. I just want to talk to you between us first. From what I can learn I just can't help but tell you, and I tell you this in all sincerity, I can't help but believe there is a chance for you, Al, there is a better chance for you if we find some way out at the last hour; it will be at least better than this strike.

"Brother JOHNSTON. And how about us under this Smith-Connally business? We couldn't do——

"Dr. STEELMAN. You could if you reached some kind of an understanding; if there was a postponement of 4 or 5 days.

"Brother JOHNSTON. I know; but John, what right have we got to do that? We would be violating the law.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Well, no; I don't think you would. I will tell you what I had in mind; getting the boss on the telephone and talk to you two together, and just ask you as the President of the United States—to ask you to do two things—to send out word postponing the strike for 5 days at least—5 or 10—and to come immediately back to Washington, and he would order the operators in here with you and start you into negotiations immediately. There is a hell of a lot of pressure here to get him to go on the radio and make a speech explaining the whole thing, and putting the blame where it belongs; but I don't believe in the long run it would do a bit of good.

"Brother JOHNSTON. It will not do any good. After all, we have to start from the beginning; they granted us nothing in 6 months.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Well, what do you think?

"Brother JOHNSTON. Yes; we are willing to do anything in reason, but by God he has to take the onus; we will not take the chance of jeopardizing our position.

"Dr. STEELMAN. That's right, and I had in mind that is the way to do it, and from what I learn here today I don't believe it is going to do any good to let the thing go and not make this last-minute effort and I thought if he personally asked you to postpone it and to return to Washington immediately and to meet here with the operators.

"Brother JOHNSTON. What assurance have we got that they are not going to tell us the same gol-darned story, that they have no money; what assurance have we got that they won't tell us the same thing? What assurance can the President give us that the railroad will do something?

"Dr. STEELMAN. That is just what I think—that he should get on the telephone; he wanted to do that, and if he had reason to believe it was the thing to do and that you would gain rather than lose by it. I think we can go further.

"Brother JOHNSTON. Well, that's all right, if he can give us some kind of assurance.

"Dr. STEELMAN. That's what I want to talk over with him, but I wanted to be sure.

"President WHITNEY. I think that if we postpone the strike and then we fail to settle and the men go out we are definitely in violation of the Smith-Connally Act, and I think we cannot afford to do that; that is my view after having consulted some very capable attorneys.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Yes—you have done that?

"President WHITNEY. Yes.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Well, of course my whole idea would be that you come back here for the purpose of settling.

"President WHITNEY. I know, but we know the railroads so well, that we appreciate the fact that all they would want to do would be to throw a few crumbs and say they had offered us something, and I don't know, I wouldn't want you to embarrass the President by having him call us.

"Dr. STEELMAN. That's the point; I don't want him to call you unless there is some use. If I found he was inclined to call and ask you to postpone the strike for a period that you thought was right and to come immediately back to Washington and come into conference, and he told you he had reason to believe that would lead toward a settlement, I think you would be better off.

"Brother JOHNSTON. Well, John, if we could get a commitment, if they would make a commitment as, for example, that they would increase the rates to 18 percent and negotiate the rules—but to go in there with empty hands—we will come out with empty hands. We have to have something from the railroads.

"President WHITNEY. The railroads have been encouraged because of the attitude of Colonel Johnson. We will stand ready to settle any time they want to talk with us. We realize a settlement must be made, and we will try to make ourselves available on very short notice.

"Dr. STEELMAN. What I think you can do, Al, is the same thing John Lewis has done; in fact, if you agreed with the President to postpone the strike for a certain number of days—you could even set the hour—if you postpone the strike and come back here immediately for these negotiations, I don't think you would be legally tied, so far as I can see, any more than you are now—just like Lewis—he has a deadline set for next Saturday night.

"President WHITNEY. I know, but if he doesn't settle and his men go out he is definitely in violation of the Smith-Connally Act.

"Dr. STEELMAN. No, he isn't; he has done it four or five times during the war; the only trouble is if he ordered them out anew; he doesn't do that, and you won't either.

"Brother JOHNSTON. You only have an hour and 45 minutes before the dead line. I think we should have some kind of a commitment from somebody down there that there is something in the bag for the men if we go back; what's the use of running back and forth if they are broke and can't do anything.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Well, I realize that, Al, but I think they themselves know, they realize now better than they did before that there is a strike coming; it isn't going to be funny to you or them before it's over.

"Brother JOHNSTON. We can't be charged with putting on this show, because we asked 6 months ago. There's hope now if we can get some sort of an assurance, otherwise I don't see where we would get off; we are not looking for any red fire or anything like that.

"Dr. STEELMAN. I know it.

"Brother JOHNSTON. We have got to protect these men. If you can secure a commitment out of them and the President will give us any assurance, we will give it consideration; we are not disposed to insult him or anybody, but we want to protect our men's interests.

"Dr. STEELMAN. If you did find a way of postponing it at his request, I think you would be in a better position right from here on out.

"Brother JOHNSTON. That might be; getting something out of us—get something out of the other fellows, too.

"Dr. STEELMAN. I think I can, but I do not think I can do it today.

"Brother JOHNSTON. Well, then, in an hour and 45 minutes the balloon goes up.

"Dr. STEELMAN. It is for him to talk to you and to tell you he wanted you to do this at his request, and to come back immediately, and tell all of you to go into the room and stay there, not dicker around like you did this week but go into negotiations and stay right through.

"Brother JOHNSTON. That's it. We worked for 6 months. I get your thought and your idea, and I am sure that Whitney and I and the committees would go along if we had some kind of an assurance that something would happen, but our men would give us the horselaugh if we didn't get something.

"Dr. STEELMAN. I think you will. What you wouldn't be able to say is that he asked you—that there was something that was worth trying.

"Brother JOHNSTON. Yes; if something didn't turn out we would consider he double-crossed us.

"President WHITNEY. We want something pretty definite, Doctor.

"Dr. STEELMAN. If you think it is worth while I will talk with him and see what he feels he can say to you.

"President WHITNEY. I don't believe it's worth while unless he gets something from the railroads; if he could talk with the railroads and give us some assurance, why then it might be worth while.

"Dr. STEELMAN. I will see if I can get hold of him. I just wanted to talk with you before I went into it. I will call you back.

"Brother JOHNSTON. So long.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Good-by."

3:02 P. M. MAY 18

Dr. Steelman called from the White House, and with Grand Chief Johnston on one phone and President Whitney on another the following conversation took place:

"Dr. STEELMAN. I am here with the President; I came over to his office since I talked with you, and we have talked a little about the point you mentioned; it still looks like it is worth while trying. I have told the President what your problem is if you called off the strike and came back here and get exactly the same answer you have been getting you would be the laughing stock; you cannot afford to do that and if the President can assure you that we will see that you do make some progress when you get back here and keep in conference with these fellows then I think you will be in a better position, and so that is the way it looks at this moment. The President is ready to say something along that line to you.

"Brother JOHNSTON. Well, John, what do the railroads say?

"Dr. STEELMAN. I can see to that—and you know it.

"Brother JOHNSTON. If they want to give us the same old song and dance—that they are broke; if he sees to it—but they say they are broke—if we can get something out of it now.

"Dr. STEELMAN. The President doesn't—he was disinclined to call you, but I don't want to let loose on this thing if I can see that you get back into conference and you do make some progress on these rules.

"Brother JOHNSTON. How about the money; we have to have some money.

"Dr. STEELMAN. You know what I told you about the money; we are going to get the rules out of the way and then get the money. And, also, the President doesn't even want to be in a position, and you know him well enough to know that he doesn't want to ask you to do something and then have it work out some other way, and he isn't trying to pull any trick on the Smith-Connally Act. He doesn't think any more of it than you do. So, we have a suggestion here on that, and you would rather he mention it than me; you are not going to get into trouble over that if you agree to a postponement.

"Brother JOHNSTON. Well, John, as I said, all that we have got to do is to get some assurance from somewhere that we will get somewhere.

"Dr. STEELMAN. You can take the President's word for that. So, I am going to ask him to talk to you.

Brother JOHNSTON. I would like to get something out of the railroads.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Well, we can handle that end of it.

"Brother JOHNSTON. Well—O. K.

"The PRESIDENT. Hello, I was talking to John about his conversation with you.

"President WHITNEY. Yes.

"The PRESIDENT. And Byrnes also called me on the telephone and told me he had a conversation with you. And it seems to me that further negotiations might get somewhere on this. I thought it would, yesterday, but didn't have a chance to tell you that and as far as a postponement is concerned, if it is properly handled, I don't think there is any chance of any trouble if you don't work it out.

"Brother JOHNSTON. Well, Mr. President, as I said to you yesterday—the other day—I know we would not get anywhere; they gave us the same old song and dance that they are broke.

"The PRESIDENT. I can't answer for that, but I am satisfied that is not the idea; I wouldn't be asking you to negotiate further if I thought it was.

"President WHITNEY. This is Mr. Whitney, Mr. President. Can you give us assurance that you have talked with the railroads and that they want a conference and are willing to do something definite.

"The PRESIDENT. Yes.

President WHITNEY. And, further, that in case we don't settle that the Smith-Connally Act will not be used against us.

"The PRESIDENT. If you handle the matter in the manner suggested to you, why there is no possibility of your getting into any trouble on that.

"President WHITNEY. Our attorneys advised us if we postpone this strike for 5 days, we will say, and then we don't settle, and the strike goes on, that that might be considered a violation of the Smith-Connally Act.

"The PRESIDENT. I don't think it would be if you follow the directions that Steelman has dictated to you.

"President WHITNEY. And you will protect us with the Attorney General, as far as you can?

"The PRESIDENT. Yes.

"President WHITNEY. Well * * *

"Brother JOHNSTON. That's a long ways to go if you will do that.

"The PRESIDENT. What's that?

"Brother JOHNSTON. If you will protect us with the Attorney General.

"The PRESIDENT. I will. I have been trying to protect you, but you were not very kind to me when I talked to you before. I felt mighty badly about that because you were in the President's corner before, and you were not this time.

"Brother JOHNSTON. You were all right; but they weren't—the railroads.

"The PRESIDENT. I understand that, but you didn't give me a chance to do anything about that. I am asking you now to give us that chance.

"President WHITNEY. We will talk with our committees here and call you back within 10 minutes. Will that do?

"The PRESIDENT. That will be all right.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Wait a minute.

"Brother JOHNSTON. He said wait a minute.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Hello, A. F., what I had in mind here, just for your own benefit, if you are going to discuss it; we don't want to pull any tricks on you with that Smith-Connally Act, and if you agree with the President and you announce at the President's request you are postponing the strike, here is the way you put it: 'We have moved the strike date over from 4 p. m. May 18 to 4 p. m.—whatever date. * * *'

"President WHITNEY. The 23d.

"Dr. STEELMAN. I would like to have 10 days, but if you think we can do the job quicker we want to do it; the quicker the better, of course. You move the strike date from 4 p. m. May 18 to 4 p. m. some other date; see what I mean?

"Brother JOHNSTON. Yes.

"President WHITNEY. Yes.

"Dr. STEELMAN. We cannot say—nobody can criticize you or get after you on the law about that.

"President WHITNEY. All right.

"Brother JOHNSTON. You understand the only way we can call this off or postpone it we have to put out a code word. Now then, I want to have the assurance if we postpone this thing and we later got to reinstate another code word that will not be considered a violation of the law.

"Dr. STEELMAN. You use a code word now to postpone it?

"Brother JOHNSTON. To call it off, which will advise the postponement, that's right.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Then, I think after you do that you could send a wire and get yourselves on record that you have agreed upon the request of the President to move the strike from-to.

"Brother JOHNSTON. That is not it. They will have to have this code word if we postpone. Now then, we want another code word to take care of it, and I want to ask—that wouldn't be a violation?

"Dr. STEELMAN. No.

"Brother JOHNSTON. O. K.

"Dr. STEELMAN. No, that's right.

"President WHITNEY. We will call you in a few minutes.

"Dr. STEELMAN. The President will see to it that the railroads will make some further concessions, but you cannot quote it. Say you are postponing at his request and returning here immediately for further negotiations.

"President WHITNEY. I think we understand the situation he is in.

"Dr. STEELMAN. All right.

"President WHITNEY. O. K.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Good-by."

3:38 P. M. MAY 18

At 3:38 p. m., President Whitney and Brother Johnston called the White House, and the following conversation took place:

"President WHITNEY. Hello; Dr. Steelman?

"Dr. STEELMAN. Yes; I am still sitting here with the President.

"President WHITNEY. Can you listen in and have one of your stenographers take down what I say, so you will have it.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Yes; we can get somebody on the line to take it down; wait just a minute. [A pause.] O. K. You want to give it to me and say a word to the President later?

"President WHITNEY. All right. The organizations have agreed to postpone the strike date.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Have agreed to postpone the strike date.

"President WHITNEY. From 4 p. m., May 18, to 4 p. m., Thursday, May 23.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Start over.

"President WHITNEY. All right; we will start over. The engineers and trainmen have agreed to postpone the strike date from 4 p. m., May 18, to 4 p. m., Thursday, May 23, 1946, if the President will immediately announce this action, and state that our action is responsive to a request from the President, with his assurance that further concessions can be made with the railways, and that the organizations will not become involved by such postponement under the terms of the Smith-Connally Act. Is that enough?

"Dr. STEELMAN. Is that it, now, Al?

"President WHITNEY. Now, can the President make that announcement?

"Dr. STEELMAN. Yes; I want to talk to you a minute about that so there is no misunderstanding. This statement; now, I will get our man here to type that immediately and bring that in to us while we hold you on the telephone.

"President WHITNEY. We only have 20 minutes to get this word out now.

"Brother JOHNSTON. If we don't do that and do it damned quick, they will be out anyway.

"Dr. STEELMAN. That's right.

"President WHITNEY. Now, another thing; I think you should announce that the Trainmen's code word is 'convention' so our men would understand it.

"Dr. STEELMAN. The trainmen's code word is 'convention'?

"President WHITNEY. That's it.

"Brother JOHNSTON. And the engineers' code word is 'Johnston.'

"Dr. STEELMAN. 'Johnston'?

'Brother JOHNSTON. All right; I will hold the wire.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Does that mean to continue operations.

"President WHITNEY. That to them means that they will continue operations until next Thursday at 4 p. m.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Now, then, I will let you explain that to Charley Ross; you want us to mention that from here, too.

"Brother JOHNSTON. If you want to get these men to work—otherwise they will be out.

"Dr. STEELMAN. What does Mr. Ross say to the press?

"President WHITNEY. Just say to the press that the Trainmen's code word is 'convention' and that the Engineer's code word is 'Johnston.'

"Brother JOHNSTON. Now, John, another thing; can you have the President arrange for transportation in a plane out of here tomorrow morning to take care of our 9–10 men?

"Dr. STEELMAN. Yes; we can get a plane to bring you in here tomorrow.

"Brother JOHNSTON. What time; you don't know?

"Dr. STEELMAN. We will get a plane out there and get you in here.

"Brother WHITNEY. We can talk about that later today.

"Brother JOHNSTON. All right.

"Dr. STEELMAN. There is one word here—I don't personally think the President ought to say he has assured you about the Smith-Connally Act. I think you move the strike from such a date to such a date. I will see the Smith-Connally Act is not involved.

"Brother JOHNSTON. Ray Miller wants to talk to you.

"Mr. RAY T. MILLER. John.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Yes, Ray.

"Mr. MILLER. You are going to make the announcement from the White House?

"Dr. STEELMAN. We will make it right this minute.

"Mr. MILLER. I am very much concerned about the postponement of this thing resetting a strike date which could be in violation of the Smith-Connally Act.

"Dr. STEELMAN. You set a strike date and move it and nobody can touch you for moving the day.

"Mr. MILLER. Here is what I think you might do; when you make the announcement, do this—'That this postponement was agreed to for the purpose of arriving at a settlement at the request of the President of the United States which entails notice to all employees, officers, and so forth, and calls for the setting of a new strike date on May 23, 1946, with the understanding that no violation of the Smith-Connally Act is involved.'"

"Dr. STEELMAN. Yes.

"Mr. MILLER. Then, I think we are all set.

"Dr. STEELMAN. We could say that the Smith-Connally Act is not involved in this postponement.

"Mr. MILLER. Because I think a postponement is definitely a violation unless agreed to.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Look here, Ray, the President doesn't think we ought to say a word about that—to handle it in your own notice; we will say that you moved the strike date, but the President has given you his word that it doesn't apply.

"Mr. MILLER. Since we have that, that's all right. Say, better get hold of Tom Clark and have him so understand.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Well, there is no trouble.

"Mr. MILLER. Now you think we ought to use the word 'move' instead of 'postpone.' All right.

"Dr. STEELMAN. We will put out notices accordingly.

"President WHITNEY. Hello, Mr. President.

"The PRESIDENT. Hello. This message you have dictated is O. K., and Steelman understands it.

"President WHITNEY. We would like to have you announce it to the public immediately because we haven't got time enough to call the strike off now.

"The PRESIDENT. All right.

"President WHITNEY. But we will do the best we can to reach everybody possible.

"The PRESIDENT. We will announce it here.

"Brother JOHNSTON. You take care of it from your end. Thank you.

"The PRESIDENT. Thank you; good-by.

[From PM of May 31, 1946]

STORY BACK OF TRUMAN'S LABOR CRACK-DOWN

(By John P. Lewis)

Yesterday PM published stenographic records of the telephone calls by which President Truman and his labor aide, John R. Steelman, persuaded the Brotherhoods of Railroad Trainmen and Locomotive Engineers to postpone their rail strike for 5 days. That was on May 18—minutes before the time first set for the strike to be effective. For the big chiefs of the Brotherhoods, A. F. Whitney and Alvanley Johnston, that was the beginning of the great contradiction of the rail crisis.

The two, seated together in Whitney's Cleveland office overlooking windy Lake Erie, opened up their private files to PM to tell their story of the President's telephone calls and to reveal their memoranda on the events that followed. From all the evidence on their side of the table—and this is not contradicted by any information so far made public elsewhere—there is every reason for

the railroad men to believe that the White House request for a delay was made in bad faith and that its only purpose was to provide time and a platform for the President's crack-down on labor 6 days later.

That is a serious statement, and the best that can be said for the Administration is that was not its purpose, explanations are long overdue.

Turn back to the telephone calls on May 18. The administration's request for a 5-day delay in the strike was predicated on this telephone statement by Steelman to Whitney and Johnston:

"I will tell you what I had in mind, getting the boss [Truman] on the telephone and talk to you two together and just ask you as the President of the United States—to ask you to do two things—to send out word postponing the strike for 5 days at least—5 or 10—and to come immediately back to Washington and he would order the operators in here with you and start you into negotiations immediately."

That was reinforced by this direct exchange between Whitney and the President:

"President WHITNEY. Can you give us assurance that you have talked with the railroads and that they want a conference and are willing to do something definite?

"The PRESIDENT. Yes."

So the strike was called off for 5 days. In an atmosphere of great concern for speed by the administration—Washington suggested a plane would be faster—Whitney and Johnston left Cleveland to work out a settlement in negotiations with the carriers. They arrived in Washington the next morning—May 19, Sunday.

By the time they reached Washington, the atmosphere of urgency had evaporated—only they didn't know it. Immediately after putting up at the Mayflower, they called Steelman at 9 o'clock that Sunday morning. They hadn't needed to hurry. Whitney tells of it:

"So Steelman says, 'There's nothing doing right now, and I will call you after I have conferred with the carriers.' We learned through some of the carriers later that some of them were not even in the city on Sunday. Enochs [H. S. Enochs, chairman of the executive committee for the eastern group of railroads] had gone home and some more of them had gone home. So there was no particular effort."

That afternoon Steelman called at the Whitney-Johnston hotel rooms. He didn't bring any word from the railroads. He didn't bring plans for resumption of the negotiations and he didn't bring any indication that the railroads were "willing to do something definite." He did bring information which throws some light on the thinking which was going on in the White House. Here's the memorandum prepared by Whitney and Johnston a few minutes after the talk:

"Dr. John Steelman called at our rooms and discussed with Johnston and me the national rules-wage situation, and stated that beginning yesterday morning, May 18, the President's office was deluged with telegrams and calls, indicating that businessmen began to get panicky, fearing the strikes would go as scheduled, and that by noon the President began to look upon the matter rather seriously.

"He added that the Honorable James Byrnes, Secretary of State, called upon the President and urged him to take some action toward a settlement of the rules-wage case, reminding him that nothing would please Molotov more than to hear of a Nation-wide strike in the United States; that Byrnes was very much in earnest.

"He did also say that the President had insisted all along that we abandon the rules (changes in working conditions to bring the railroad men closer to the 8-hour day, 40-hour week that prevails in other segments of American industry) and undertake to get more money. We advised him that this position was the position of the railroads and the other three organizations (nonstriking unions) and had been ever since November 1945, and that it was a face-saving proposal, but that we positively would not abandon the rules.

"Dr. Steelman said that the reasons he had not arranged a conference for us with the railroads today was because he felt that it would be better for him to have a long talk with them first.

"The conference brought forth no results that we could put our finger on."

That transcript, from the files of the railroad chiefs, indicated for the first time that possibly administration thinking on the railroad strike was being colored by the fears that the United States of America would lose face or prestige in dealing with Russia. The idea was that American workers had to be kept in line, apparently for fear that Molotov would laugh if capitalistic democracy couldn't keep them quiet.

On this point the arguments advanced made a deep impression on both Whitney and Johnston and they said later that one of their reasons for finally settling up, after the President's club had fallen on them, was that they didn't want to divide the country and embarrass international dealings.

So there were no negotiations with the railroads on Sunday, the first day of grace in the 5-day waiting period on the strike. Nor on the second day, Monday. Steelman called on the rail chiefs during that afternoon—May 20, 3 days before the new strike dead line—"and indicated that he had been talking with the carriers, that they were not in a mood to talk to us and we would be better off to defer the meeting for a day or two." When Steelman first called that day, he said he would be in at 9:30 a. m., called again and made it 11, and finally arrived around 4 p. m., the brotherhood files disclose.

On that day Steelman asked for a revised proposition from the brotherhoods. In response they prepared a proposal which was delivered to him the following day. In that proposal the brotherhood chiefs slashed deeply into the demands they had originally made for 44 changes in rules governing working conditions. They asked for an 18 percent wage boost with a minimum increase of $1.44 on the basic day. They asked, of course, that they be granted the 7 rules changes which had been granted them in whole or in part by the President's emergency board in an earlier unsuccessful effort to settle the grievances and left 24 still in dispute. They added to the proposal a demand that there should be no reprisals against railroaders who had left the job on the 18th due to failure to get the orders canceling the strike. (This battle to prevent reprisals was finally won at the last minute on the day the brotherhoods settled after the President's crack-down.)

It was on that day—Tuesday, May 21, now 2 days before the strike that the shape of things to come was coming clear.

Finally, that day, the direct question was put to Steelman: "Are we being double crossed here?"

The question was better answered by developments later that week than by anything Steelman said at the time.

On Wednesday—May 22, the day before the new strike deadline—the brotherhood files show one conference with Steelman and another with the President. Whitney and Johnson went to the White House at 4:45 p. m. Steelman and Reconversion Director John W. Snyder were in the President's office when they entered. They were all seated, the two railroad chiefs directly across from the President, seated at his big desk.

"Well, the President opened the conversation and he was quite friendly that day," said Whitney.

The President said that he proposed to offer the railroad men an 18½-cent an hour wage increase (the President's emergency board which had made an award earlier in the strike crisis after hearings on the unions' demands had proposed a 16-cent-an-hour increase plus support for changes in seven rules governing working conditions).

Whitney tells what happened:

"Well, we said, how about the rules that were awarded by the board? He said, 'We are not going to grant the rules. I don't know anything about the rules.'

"We said, 'Rules are something that we prefer to wages. You said to us the other day that you propose to back your board and we are just wondering why you are repudiating the board's decision.'

"We said that we thought more of the rules than of the 2½ cents. He kept saying, he didn't know anything about rules."

The President's offer differed from the award made by his emergency board only in that the President eliminated the seven changes in working rules, and gave the men an amount of money, 2½ cents an hour, which was equivalent to what the rules changes would have cost the railroads. Consequently, it didn't increase the award previously rejected by the workers, but merely changed its terms into money as an alternative to a combination of money and working conditions.

The railroaders left the President's office, conferred in the White House Cabinet room, talked to Dr. Steelman, and then returned to the President for 3 minutes to tell him they would answer his proposal the next day. That night the brotherhood wage committees refused the offer and the next day the President was informed by letter.

That night—May 22, the day before the strike was to be resumed—Whitney and Johnston packed up to return to Cleveland. No direct negotiations with the railroads had been held and no further concessions had been made. They were intercepted at the Washington station by calls from Steelman, who said that the President wanted to meet them the next day and urgently requested that they remain.

Whitney and Johnston stayed overnight for the meeting with the President—but there was no meeting.

That day they spent most of their time at the White House with Steelman, but nothing happened. They met a few of the railroad officials at 12: 50 p. m. But it wasn't a negotiation conference. That was just 3 hours and 10 minutes before the strike was to be resumed again—and 4 days, 20 hours, and 50 minutes since the brotherhoods had postponed the strike at the President's request so he could "order the operators in here with you and start into negotiations immediately" with assurances that further concessions from the roads would be forthcoming.

Actually, there wasn't a meeting with the railroads' conference committee (the railroads' negotiators) until 4:05 p. m. that day—5 minutes after the delayed strike was again effective. That meeting again was in the Cabinet room at the White House.

All that happened was that Whitney and Johnston read to the railroad negotiators the transcripts of their telephone talks with Steelman and the President. The response from the railroaders was:

"This is the first we have ever heard of this."

Nothing happened.

So the strike was on. American transportation was tied up. The American press screamed. And the stage was set for President Truman's dramatic address to the American people on the following night to castigate Whitney and Johnston of the brotherhoods and to lay the foundation for his appeal to Congress to pass legislation to do these things:

Give the President the power by proclamation and injunction to end strikes on his terms at his own will in esential industries.

Provide penal terms for union officers who do not end strikes in plants taken over by proclamation.

Strip striking workers of their jobs, seniority, and other rights if they fail to obey the President's request to return to work.

Put defiant strikers in the Army. (This part of the plan has now been killed by the Senate.)

Whitney and Johnston of the railroad brotherhoods, the country and Congress were told, had made it necessary to ask for this legislation. They had been arrogant. They had been ill-advised and misguided. They had been unpatriotic. They had refused to arbitrate the matter for their unions.

Now flash back to one more record from the secret files of the brotherhoods. It is a memo of a meeting with the President at the White House on February 21. The meeting was called at the President's request in the middle of the railroad dispute (it actually started way back last July) after the railroad trainmen and the locomotive engineers had sent their members a strike ballot as the first action to set the wheels of the Railway Labor Act in motion and get adjustment of their demands.

Whitney and Johnston entered the President's office together. The President was cordial. There was talk about their mutual friendship.

The President asked about the status of the rail controversy. Whitney and Johnston explained that while other brotherhoods had chosen to drop requests for changes in rules on working conditions so they could arbitrate demands for additional pay, the Locomotive Engineers and Railroad Trainmen were more concerned with eliminating the injustices and inequities in working conditions and decided to press their demands. They said they were proceeding with a strike vote under the Railway Labor Act. (Under the terms of this act, a strike vote is the first resort, rather than the last by which the employees can get serious consideration of their demands.)

From the files of the brotherhoods comes this report on the conclusion of that meeting:

"We added, 'We are now taking a vote of our members; reports coming in indicate that the vote is ranging from 98 to 100 percent in support of our demands. We are attempting, if you please, Mr. President, to avoid an unauthorized strike such as we experienced in 1920, at which time we lost thousands of members and chaos prevailed throughout the Nation. We must have prompt action, and that the railroads have not given us.'

"The President stated that under all the circumstances he could not blame us for refusing to arbitrate a portion of our demands."

[From PM of Sunday, June 2, 1946]

UNANSWERED QUERIES ON TRUMAN'S LABOR CRACK-DOWN—WHY WERE OFFICIAL EFFORTS FOR SETTLEMENT SUDDENLY DROPPED?

(By J. P. Lewis)

There are several unanswered questions about the rail strike, which was the basis for President Truman's recent crackdown on labor. Among them, are these:

Why did the White House fail to make good on its pledges to the railroad brotherhoods that if they would delay their strike for 5 days immediate negotiations with the railroads would be arranged with assurances of "further concessions"? (See PM Friday edition.)

Why were proposals for settlement of the strike, which were presented to Secretary of State Byrnes before the President went on the air with his antilabor program to the people and Congress, permitted to die?

Why were all official efforts to settle the strike dropped abruptly several hours before President Truman appeared before Congress to propose his drastic antilabor legislation?

Settlement of the strike was agreed to, according to the union leaders, half an hour before the President appeared before Congress—why were announcements held up until after the President had started speaking?

COULD ONLY GUESS

Alvanley Johnston, grand chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, who pieced together their story of the strike from their private files for PM last week, didn't get the answers to these questions from their side of the conference table. They could only guess how the timetable of their own frustation fitted into that of the President's appeal to the people and Congress for restrictive legislation against labor.

The forthcoming issue of the Trainman, organ of Whitney's union, will say that:

"Several hours before he (the President) went on the air, his representative was given a compromise proposal * * * We never received a reply to this proposal. It was ignored, and if presented to the carriers would probably have been adopted * * *."

That proposal was made Friday, the day after the strike was made effective, the railroad chiefs say—and before Truman went on the air to the people Friday night. Johnston and Whitney referred to it in a letter sent to the President on the following day:

"As you have by now heard, we had last (Friday) evening a very constructive talk with the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, and the Honorable Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor. It was suggested that if the Government feels that it should not enter into a permanent agreement with the Engineers and Trainmen, we would be willing to negotiate a temporary agreement for the duration of Federal control if you would approve an increase of 18.5 cents an hour, or $1.48 a day, and the seven rules recommended by your board, with appropriate interpretations, with the further proviso that we would be willing to arbitrate such other rules as we are unable to settle through negotiations with the railroads."

The day that letter was delivered, Saturday, the brotherhood met with Byrnes and Schwellenbach again in the morning. This is their story of what happened:

They told Byrnes that they would be willing to go back to a settlement proposal—which they had once rejected—by the President's emergency board, accept that offer as far as it went, and arbitrate some remaining dispute over rules governing working conditions that had not been settled by the emergency board's findings. The emergency board had proposed a 16-cent-an-hour wage increase and gave support to changes in seven rules governing working condition out of 44 rule changes which the brotherhoods had asked. Previously, Johnston and Whitney had themselves withdrawn a number of these proposed rule changes, so there were only 20 or so left in dispute. Byrnes raised some questions on the number of rule changes involved, and on the effect of the offer on other rail brotherhoods which had been granted a 16-cent-an-hour increase in wages by arbitration and had dropped their disputes over rule changes at the time they entered arbitration. He asked if the unions had some other offer they could make.

ANOTHER OFFER

Then Whitney and Johnston made another:

They offered to accept a proposal by the President of an 18½-cent-an-hour wage increase without the seven rule changes that the President's emergency board had supported—but with the proviso that the disputed rule changes then would be arbitrated. (The President's proposal was the same as that of his emergency board, except that he dropped the rule changes and proposed to give the men an amount of money equivalent to the cost of the rule changes—2½ cents—plus the 16-cent-an-hour wage increase the board had recommended.)

During the conversation, as the rail chiefs reconstructed the scene, Schwellenbach indicated that if the brotherhoods were willing to accept the arbitration, he was willing to act as arbitrator. They said they were willing to have a Government-appointed arbitrator and pledged to accept his decision.

There was no formal acceptance of either formula by either Byrnes or Schwellenbach—the brotherhood chiefs knew Byrnes and Schwellenbach did not have the authority. But the railroaders left the conference with the opinion that their second proposal was all right to Byrnes. And Schwellenbach had affirmatively said that he was willing to be the arbitrator. Byrnes said he would lay the proposals before the President, and that they should go to the railroads.

About 40 minutes later Johnston called Byrnes back by telephone. In Johnston's words, here is the way the call went:

"I said: 'Jimmy, what about the proposition you were going to put to the railroads?'

" 'Well,' he said, 'I didn't do it.' He said: 'Things have happened so that I've got to wash my hands of the whole thing'."

To nail down the thing that had happened, Steelman arrived at the brotherhood hotel rooms about half an hour later, and told them that he, too, had been forbidden further to negotiate officially by the President.

After that time, Steelman continued to meet with the brotherhood chiefs, but these last-day consultations were conducted by Steelman on his own, as a private citizen.

The entire status of the proceedings on that crucial day was changed and all official attempts at settlement were abandoned by the White House many hours before the President appeared before Congress to ask for antilabor legislation on the basis of the rail strike.

Actually, the strike was settled before the President started speaking. The men had been beaten by noon of that Saturday. The negotiations and the concessions which the President had promised during the 5 days of delay hadn't come through, and the President had gone on the air to denounce the strikers.

Despite the dropping of official mediation, Johnston and Whitney met with the carriers and with Steelman at 3 p. m., Saturday. By 3:30 p. m., the railroaders say, it was clear that the strike was off. Says Whitney:

"We have every reason to believe that the President knew at 3:32 or 3:33 that the strike had been called off, but he wanted to get in a wallop—and he got it in."

Johnston first called his headquarters to notify the men to return to work, followed by Whitney, who was on the phone by 3:58 p. m. to release the trainmen. At 4 p. m., Truman appeared before Congress with his climactic request for legislation, basing his speech on the fact that the strike was still on (and interrupting it in the middle with a dramatic announcement that he had just received word of a settlement).

What really happened that day? And before?

Johnston and Whitney could only guess that a settlement of the strike earlier would have impaired the President's plans for his appeal to the people and Congress for restrictive labor legislation.

From the whole chronology of the strike, particularly of the closing hours, who can blame the railroad workers—or for that matter other workers—if they feel that the White House led them on, lending its dignity as a front to the railroads in resisting the workers' demands—and carefully set the brotherhoods up for a knock-down in a labor crack-down to establish Truman as the master in all future labor crises?

I cannot blame anyone for believing just that. For, after reading the secret brotherhood files, going over the story with Johnston and Whitney in great detail, and checking what facts have otherwise been made public, that's what I believe.

[From PM of June 3, 1946]

REVEALED FOR FIRST TIME—WHAT HAPPENED IN TRUMAN'S TALKS WITH RAIL UNION CHIEFS—PRESIDENT SMASHED FIST ON DESK IN ORDERING MEN TO CONFER

(By John P. Lewis)

A week ago President Truman pilloried Alvanley Johnston, grand chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, as the foundation for his crack-down on labor. Before that he had met with them on four occasions in connection with the railroad strike crisis.

What goes on at such meetings between a President and the labor leaders who are to feel the stinging weight of a public Presidential rebuke? What kind of a chance does he give them for their white alley? Does he tell them privately—when they can answer back—what he says in public?

The two brotherhood chiefs have made available to PM the full texts of their written reports, plus their recollections of the conferences in the White House which preceded their castigation. The first of these texts are published below. The rest will follow tomorrow.

FIRST CONFERENCE

The first meeting was held in February, this year, at the time the two brotherhoods were conducting the poll which led to the recent strike. On February 19, Johnston and Whitney received wires from Matthew J. Connelly, secretary to the President, asking them to see the President at noon on February 21. They accepted, of course. The memorandum of the meeting was written immediately after the meeting, and bears the initials of A. F. Whitney:

"On arriving at the President's office he (the President) directed his remarks to me, and said: 'Mr. Whitney, you are responsible more than any other man for me being here; you urged me to run for Vice President at the Chicago convention when I was undecided what to do,' I said; 'Yes, Mr. President, I said to you—this is a wonderful opportunity; it may never rap at your door again, and I suggest that you become a candidate for Vice President.'

"He added: 'Both of you gentlemen are my friends, and I am dependent upon the support of my friends to carry through. Some of the people on the Hill, for political reasons, are trying to embarrass me, but we will be able to surmount these difficulties.' "

(The President's friendly greeting to the brotherhood chiefs was in striking contrast to his rancor about that time against the big three in labor outside of the brotherhoods—Philip Murray, of the CIO; William Green, of the AFL; and John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers. As far back as last December, Truman was making no secret, in his private conversations, of his feeling against these three. More than one White House visitor came away with the word that he was bitter because they had promised to support his labor program and he felt they were not making good. Visitors were also told that the President felt that labor was against him and had been ever since the Chicago convention where he was nominated for Vice President over Henry Wallace, who had the backing of most of labor.)

"The President then asked about the status of the national rules-wage matter as it concerned engineers, train and yard men.

"Johnston and I gave him a brief history of the case, explaining how we had come to break with the other three transportation brotherhoods, and advised that the carriers had delayed conferences with us 4 months and 3 days after the filing of our demands, and that thereafter there was no attempt on the part of the carriers to negotiate, but they insisted that we divide our rules and wage demands and handle them separately; this we declined. We stated that mediation was invoked and that the Mediation Board became an advocate for the railroads and insisted that we divide our proposal, which we declined to do. Thereafter the Board proffered arbitration on wages only and proposed a moratorium on the rules; we declined arbitration. We have declined to split our proposition, as there has been no improvement in working conditions for our men during the past 25 years."

(Last July all of the railroad unions—Johnston's engineers, Whitney's trainmen, 3 other brotherhoods of operating workers, and 15 unions of nonoperating or office workers—asked for wage increases and for 44 changes in rules governing working conditions. The railroads refused and the situation fiddle-faddled until January. Then the 15 nonoperating unions, which had little or no stake in changing the working rules, agreed to arbitrate wage demands and drop rules changes. The other three operating unions, aside from the trainmen and locomotive engineers, took the same course.

(The Johnston-Whitney unions decided to press for changes in the rules which would bring them closer to the 8-hour day, 40-hour week standards enjoyed by other workers. Under the Railway Labor Act, a strike vote is the first, instead of a last, step to getting serious consideration of grievances, so that course was taken.)

"We added: 'We are now taking a vote of our memberships; reports coming in indicate that the vote is ranging from 98 to 100 percent in support of our demands. We are attempting, if you please, Mr. President, to avoid an unauthorized strike such as we experienced in 1920, at which time we lost thousands of members and chaos prevailed throughout the Nation. We must have prompt action, and that the railroads have not given us.

"Johnston stated that prompt action in appointing a President's Board would be very helpful, and I concurred. The President countered that he feared he did not have authority to appoint a board until an emergency arose, and we advised him that an emergency was here, that our reports indicated that the men we represent on more than 60 percent of the railroads had voted almost unanimously in favor of a strike; that that created an emergency.

"We stated to the President that the Mediation Board had broken down, that the only member on the Board capable of functioning fairly was Judge Douglas (Frank P., formerly of Oklahoma oil business); that Board member Cook (George A., formerly on old Railroad Labor Board and one time a timekeeper on Chicago Great Western Railway) was a person who generally favored the carriers; that Chairman Schwartz (H. H., former Senator from Wyoming) was a very fine gentleman who knew but little about the technique of mediation and that he was past 76 years of age, and the Board should be reorganized.

"The President stated that under all the circumstances he could not blame us for refusing to arbitrate a portion of our demands."

(PM previously reported this section of the conversation, which expressed the President's approval of the refusal of the two unions to arbitrate. The President's statement on that occasion was completely contradictory to his later public attack on the union chiefs for refusing arbitration.—See PM's Friday edition.)

"We went from the President's office to the Cabinet room where we conferred with Dr. John R. Steelman for 30 minutes. We reviewed the wage case and our talk with the President, as we desired that he be kept informed of the situation, since he is the President's labor expert.

"We gleaned from our talk with Dr. Steelman that he was very bitter toward Board Members Schwartz and Cook. He stated that when the task of selecting a referee for the Board of Arbitration of the other three (operating) organizations was under consideration, the White House had asked the Board to submit the name of the proposed arbitrator to the White House before announcing it. He added the White House was double-crossed; the Board went to Chicago and announced the name of Arbitrator (William F., Jr.) Mitchell, through the press from Chicago, and the first the White House knew of it was through the columns of the press.—A. F. W."

SECOND CONFERENCE

The second meeting between the rail chiefs and the President came on May 14. The strike was now set for four days away and negotiations with the carriers had been stalled since May 2.

On May 13, a girl in Secretary Connelly's office called Johnston and Whitney separately, and asked them to see the President on the following day. They were requested to report at the east entrance—the back door, in effect—so that their presence wouldn't be known to the reporters at the customary Pennsylvania Avenue entrance.

At 3:20 p. m., on the 14th, with their attorney, Ray T. Miller, they entered the White House as requested, and were taken by a guard through a long hallway to the Cabinet Room, a short distance from the President's office. They were met there by Steelman who took them to the President's office. Truman greeted them, shook hands, and presented them to Labor Secretary Schwellenbach, H. H. Schwartz, Chairman of the National Mediation Board, and John Snyder, Stabilization Director.

The President sat at his desk, the others around and across from him, in sequence: Snyder, Schwartz, Schwellenbach — with Steelman, Miller, Johnston, and Whitney taking their places in chairs left for them—the latter two directly across from the President.

The President was stern, unsmiling.

The brotherhood record of that conference, written in collaboration by Johnston, Whitney, and Attorney Miller, immediately after it broke up:

"The President seated himself at his desk and the narrative conversation, in substance, is as follows:

"The PRESIDENT. I brought you gentlemen in here to discuss with you the present emergency of a threatened railway strike. I think you should call this strike off and continue to negotiate with the railroads as to your rules.

"Mr. WHITNEY. Mr. President, this strike has been called for Saturday, May 18, at 4 p. m., and unless we can secure some additional fundamental rules, the strike will go on as scheduled, and we must have more money.

"The PRESIDENT. The President's board recommended 16 cents an hour increase and several rules (changes in working conditions) which brings your increases up to about 18½ cents an hour. I propose to support my board. I think that you ought to accept this award and you can later negotiate further."

(This referred to an award of the emergency board appointed by the President as the first step to try to settle the grievances under the Railway Labor Act. Emergency board awards are not binding—as in the case of arbitration—and the workers rejected this one, to press their demands directly on their employers. More than money, the issue was

rules—changes in working conditions to correct such things as loss of time without pay while workers wait before starting runs, waiting between runs, appearing in court in railroad claim cases, etc. The emergency board had supported 7 of 44 requested rules and ignored or rejected the rest.)

"Mr. WHITNEY. That would be tantamount to scuttling our program.

"The PRESIDENT. I propose to have all of the interested parties meet here and settle this issue.

"Mr. WHITNEY. We will not meet with the other three organizations. There is no emergency existing as far as they are concerned. They withdrew their rules and there is no one involved in this emergency except engineers and trainmen."

(The other three organizations referred to by Whitney were the three operating brotherhoods which had dropped the fight for improving working conditions through rules changes. These three had agreed to arbitrate their money demands and abandon the requests for rules changes altogether. The Johnston-Whitney brotherhoods, however, were not proceeding under arbitration, but were taking further steps under the Railway Labor Act, seeking both pay increases and rules changes.)

"The PRESIDENT. You will meet them and settle these matters here. Otherwise the Government will run the railroads. [At this point the President smashed his fist down on the desk.]

"Mr. WHITNEY. Do you mean to say, Mr. President, that the Government will act as strikebreaker on engineers and trainmen?

"The PRESIDENT. No; but I propose to see that the American people are protected."

[From PM of June 4, 1946]

THE MYSTERY OF TRUMAN'S RAIL STRIKE COURSE—UNION HEADS STILL PUZZLED BY THE PRESIDENT'S PROCEDURE

(By John P. Lewis)

Yesterday PM started publication of the texts, heretofore unprinted, of the meetings between President Truman and the chiefs of the Brotherhoods of Locomotive Engineers and Railroad Trainmen prior to the recent railroad strike. The accounts of the meetings were made available to PM by Alvanley Johnston, grand chief of the locomotive engineers, and A. F. Whitney, president of the railroad trainmen.

At a conference on May 14, 4 days before the railroad strike was to start, the President demanded that Johnston and Whitney meet with three other operating railroad unions, which had taken another course in the controversy with the railroads.

The reason for this demand by the President is completely unclear. This was the situation:

The five railroad brotherhoods which operate the trains, together with 15 unions of nonoperating employees—office workers, etc.—last summer joined in demands on the railroads. Locomotive engineers and trainmen demanded 25-percent wage increases, plus improvement in working conditions through changes in 44 working rules. The other three operating unions asked for a pay increase of $2.50 a day, and joined in backing the demands for rules changes. The nonoperating unions asked for raises and had no stake in the rules changes.

In January three of the brotherhoods—the Order of Railway Conductors, the Switchmen's Union, and the Brotherhood of Firemen and Enginemen—agreed, along with the nonoperating unions, to drop demands for rules changes, and to submit wage demands to arbitration. The locomotive engineers and railroad trainmen refused to give up their demands for rules changes, cutting themselves off from arbitration.

So the demands of the workers took two different courses:

Eighteen of the unions—now asking only for pay increases—went to arbitration, and the arbitrator awarded 16-cent-an-hour wage increases.

The locomotive engineers and trainmen—asking for both pay increases and rules changes—went on to hearings before an emergency board, appointed under the Railway Labor Act, which recommended a settlement to these unions of 16-cent-an-hour pay increase, plus changes in 7 of the 44 working rules. The engineers and trainmen rejected this, and pressed for direct negotiations with the carriers for fuller settlement.

There were differences with the other brotherhoods—differences of long standing—but the crucial difference in the strike crises of the engineers and trainmen was not with the other unions, but with the carriers.

Nevertheless, the President demanded that the Johnston-Whitney unions meet with the three operating brotherhoods which had taken another course. Today's installment goes on with the records of the meetings from that point.

MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14

"Mr. WHITNEY. Mr. President, we have always supported you and your administration, and we are in earnest about this strike. One hundred and twenty-five of my general chairmen have instructed me to refrain from meeting with the other three organizations, and I am not going to meet them. I will resign first.

"The PRESIDENT. If that is your position, I am telling you here that I am going to protect the public and we are going to run these railroads—and you can put that in your pipe and smoke it."

At this point the President was visibly emotional.

"Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, with the many questions that come before you every day, I am convinced that you do not understand this question.

"The PRESIDENT. Yes; I do understand it. I know all about it.

"Mr. JOHNSTON. I cannot understand how you would know all about this question, and I want to say that these two organizations [the locomotive engineers and trainmen] started this movement over a year ago and upon a request from the railroads that we defer until such time as the other three organizations could go with us, we did defer. And the other three organizations went with us and prepared these proposed rules, and request for increase in pay. They later ran out on us and withdrew their request for rules and went ahead by themselves for a wage increase. This is the second time this has happened. They did the same thing with President Roosevelt and us on the vacation question in 1943. [It was not until that year that the brotherhoods won annual vacations of 7 days from the carriers.] They requested a flat increase in pay. We are requesting a percentage increase in pay. We think it is no more than right that these large engines get the higher rate of pay than the smaller engines, and the Emergency Board, if you will read, handed down a recommendation that that be done and we are asking that now. It is my opinion, Mr. President, the thing that should be done is for the railroads and ourselves to continue negotiations and let Dr. Steelman [the President's labor aide] or Secretary Schwellenbach sit in as in the role of mediator and see if something cannot be worked out. We don't care what the railroads do with the other three. That's up to them. But we are of the opinion that if an honest effort is put forth, something can be worked out in the nature of a settlement.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Do you think that a settlement could be made that would be satisfactory to the other organizations if they would be present? [The last part of this question appears to be in error, either in transcription or in understanding. Probably it should read '* * * if they were not present?'] The railroads were afraid that it could not be done.

"Mr. JOHNSTON. We believe a settlement could be made, and if any settlement was reached, we would be willing to recommend that that same settlement be given to the other organizations. We did that before in the vacation agreement when we requested President Roosevelt to give the other three organizations the same settlement that was given to us.

"The PRESIDENT. Go into the Cabinet room while I see these other parties and I will talk to you later."

At this point Johnston and Whitney, with their attorney, Ray T. Miller, who attended the conference with them, went into the big meeting room where the President holds his Cabinet sessions. After 15 minutes Steelman left the President's office, where he had remained behind with Truman, Labor Secretary Schwellenbach, Stabilization Director John Snyder, and H. H. Schwartz, Chairman of the National Mediation Board. He joined Johnston, Whitney, and Miller in the Cabinet room. The brotherhood record of that talk follows:

"Dr. STEELMAN. The President did not have information in ample time to know the differences existing between yourselves and the other organizations, and as a consequence there is some confusion. I have been sent in here to talk to you and ask you whether or not you would be willing to reopen negotiations with the carriers and whether or not you would object to the carriers meeting the three organizations separately and on their own.

"Mr. JOHNSTON-Mr. WHITNEY. We don't care who the carriers negotiate with, or what they say or what they do with the other organizations. We are desirous of averting a strike and are willing to negotiate with the carriers and attempt to work out a proper settlement.

"Mr. MILLER. Dr. Steelman, I argued this case to the Emergency Board. Our testimony disclosed and our arguments pointed out that we would not be bound by a pattern handed down by the arbitration boards. Our emergency board knew that and, when it adopted the 16 cents an hour and attempted to apply it as a pattern on the engineers and trainmen, the board knew, or should have known, that it was not acceptable. Our issue was different. The evidence and the arguments presented in our case were different than that presented by the arbitration boards, and any finding made by those arbitration boards should not and could not have been impressed on us. We requested a percentage raise. They requested a cents-per-hour increase. We had rules. They had no rules. They were bound by agreement to accept the findings of the arbitration boards. We were not bound.

"Dr. STEELMAN. Yes; I understand that situation. I have read thoroughly the President's emergency board report which you sent to me. Would you consent to postponing this strike for 30 days pending negotiations?

"Mr. JOHNSTON-Mr. WHITNEY (with great emphasis). No; if we can't settle in 4 days, we can't settle in 4 months."

Steelman then left for the President's office and returned in the course of 10 minutes and the meeting went on:

"Dr. STEELMAN. It will be quite agreeable to the President if you will immediately open negotiations with the carriers. The President has seen the representatives of the other three organizations and they stated that their position was that all organizations together should negotiate for settlement. But the President, after talking

to the railroads, stated to me that the railroads were willing to negotiate either way as the President requested. That is, either with the engineers and trainmen and separately with the other three organizations; or, to negotiate with them all together. The President stated that because of our position and the willingness of the carriers to negotiate with us separately, that he would immediately contact them and arrange for a time to start negotiations. Would it be agreeable to you for me to see the carriers and arrange a time to start negotiations?

"Mr. JOHNSTON-Mr. WHITNEY. 'Yes, we will meet them any time, day or night.'"

Steelman said the carriers were willing to meet with the railroaders at 6 p. m. that night in the Transportation Building in Washington. He pushed aside the secrecy shrouding their visit—they had been brought to the White House by the east entrance to escape notice—and asked Johnston and Whitney to step out and tell the reporters that a meeting with the carriers was on for 6 p. m. that night. They did, and then, with their attorney, left the White House. As they left, it was raining. They returned to their hotel room at the Mayflower by foot, wet and bedraggled.

The rail chiefs met with the carriers at 6 p. m. and indicated to the carriers some concessions we were willing to make.

"When we adjourned that night, after a 3½-hour conference with the carriers, they said they would give us a proposition," Whitney said of the meeting. "That proposition has not been received."

Instead, the carriers stalled for 2 days, and on May 16 called in the brotherhoods to say that the carriers were not in a position to grant anything beyond the rates and rules recommended by the President's Board. That afternoon, the 16th, Steelman met with the brotherhood heads. Their records contain this account of that meeting:

"During our discussion he said that he would like to secure something concrete to submit to the President and believed that the President might recommend to the railways the basis of a settlement, whereupon we advised the doctor that it was necessary for us to secure an 18-percent increase in wages [the original demand was for 25 percent], and we furnished him a list of eight rules, the adoption of which was imperative, and stated that we would be willing to negotiate further in connection with the other rules with the understanding that the rules recommended by the President's Emergency Board would be adopted."

MEETING OF MAY 17

Steelman called Johnston and Whitney the next morning, May 17, the day before the strike was to start. Here are the brotherhood records of that day, initialed by Whitney:

"Dr. Steelman was at our rooms and advised us that the President had stated that he did not wish to become involved in the rules program. He asked how much money it would require to settle the issue and for us to hold the rules in abeyance. We advised him that several of the rules were of such importance that it was imperative that they be granted.

"Later we received a call from Secretary Connelly's [one of the President's secretaries] office advising that the President desired to see us at 2:30 p. m. We arrived at the White House at 2:15 and were admitted to the inner reception room and waited until 2:45 when we entered the President's office, where we found Dr. Steelman and Mr. John Snyder.

"The President asked us what progress we had made. We told him none. We advised him that on Tuesday evening following our conference with him we conferred with the carriers from 6 to 9:30 o'clock and proposed a number of modifications in our rules, almost to the compromising point, but received no comment from them; that the carriers stated that they desired to meet us on Wednesday morning at 10 o'clock; that we reported to the meeting room in the Transportation Building, only to be advised that they were preparing a reply which was not ready and asked that we retire, stating they would call us later; we further advised the President that we remained at our rooms during the day and received a call later in the afternoon advising that the carriers would meet us Thursday morning at 10 o'clock; that at the appointed time our wage committees, Johnston, and the undersigned met the carriers and they advised they had nothing to offer; that they did not even extend the courtesy of giving us a written reply, but did hand us copy of a statement they later released to the press.

"The President asked us if we had anything further to offer and we told him "No"; that there was no change in the situation.

"He said: 'I am sorry, gentlemen, if that is your last word,' and I replied: 'Yes, Mr. President, that is our last word,' and he reached for some papers in front of him and said: 'I will sign an order for the Government to take the railroads over.'

"We both told him that we were sorry that a settlement could not be reached and he said he was sorry, too, and then we bid him and the others in the room goodbye and left the Executive offices.

"A. F. W."

The rules changes referred to in this conference are rather technical regulations under which railroaders work and are paid. As a sample: the men were asking for a change in the rules so that they would receive pay for "terminal delay." When a railroader is called to go on a train, he reports to the yard, but doesn't get paid until the train goes out. The railroaders originally asked that pay start 15 minutes after a man reported for work at the hours assigned by the railroad, whether or not the train went out. They modified this demand to ask that pay begin 45 minutes after the man reported to work.

The President's demeanor, the rail chiefs reported, was more agreeable that day than during the conference of the 14th. Whitney gave the picture:

"He just sat and listened and pretended he didn't know anything about the situation.

"He asked, 'What's your position?'

"At the end he just reached over for a bunch of legal papers and started to sign.

"I said, 'Mr. President, are you through with us?'

"'Yes,' he said.

"And we walked out. There was no discussion. That was snappy."

Johnston and Whitney returned to their offices in Cleveland, and the next day, May 18—the day the strike was set for 4 p. m.—they received calls from Steelman and Truman by telephone. This was the day brotherhood records show that the White House assured the railroaders that if they would delay the strike for 5 days negotiations with the railroads would be arranged and "further concessions" would be forthcoming. Records of these conversations were published in PM last Thursday.

After the telephone talks, Johnston and Whitney postponed the strike to May 23, and returned to Washington for the negotiations with the carriers and the "further concessions" which had been promised. Neither was forthcoming.

MEETING OF MAY 22

On May 22—the day before the strike was now set—they were called to the White House. They arrived via the Pennsylvania Avenue entrance—no secrecy had been requested this time—a few minutes before 3:45 p. m. Steelman and Stabilization Director Snyder were already with the President. Whitney's files give this account of the meeting:

"A. Johnston and I met the President of the United States for 15 minutes, after which we retired to the Cabinet room and talked to Dr. Steelman intermittently. We then returned to the President's office and talked with him about 3 minutes. He asked us for our decision in connection with the national rules-wage case and we advised him that we would confer with our committees and give him an answer before noon May 23. We left the White House at 5:30 p. m."

That record doesn't give details of the talk, but Johnston and Whitney elaborated:

"Well, the President opened the conversation and he was quite friendly that day. He said that he proposed to offer as a basis of settlement an 18½-cent-an-hour increase.

"'Well,' we said, 'how about the rules that were awarded by the Board?'

"He said, 'We are not going to grant the rules. I don't know anything about the rules.'

"We said: 'Mr. President, you are trading off our rules for money for the other groups, and rules are something that we prefer to wages. You said to us the other day that you propose to back your board, and we are just wondering why you are repudiating the Board's decision.'

"We said that we thought more of the rules than of the 2½ cents.

"He kept saying he didn't know anything about rules."

The 18½-cent settlement proposed by the President was not a further concession. The emergency board, which had previously made a recommendation, had suggested a settlement on the basis of a 16-cents-an-hour wage increase, plus changes in seven of the operating rules, which would have cost the railroads an additional 2½ cents and hour. The President discarded the rules changes and lumped the 2½-cent cost onto the 16-cent wage increase to reach his proposal of an 18½-cent-an-hour wage increase.

During the second part of the Presidential conference the railroaders brought up the fact that the negotiation meetings with the railroads and further concessions he had promised had not been forthcoming. They told of it this way:

"We told him that we had postponed the strike, 'as you know, Mr. President, in the belief and with the assurance that we would have further negotiations with the carriers, and up to this moment we have not seen them.'"

The President made no answer or explanation. The only explanation the railroaders ever were to receive came the following week end when it became clear that the time futilely wasted by the brotherhoods waiting for the President to make good on his promise was used by the White House for preparation of Truman's program of restrictive labor legislation and the crack-down speeches against Johnston and Whitney with which he launched it.

[From PM of Wednesday, June 5, 1946]

A MAXIMUM OF FAIRNESS

I have spent most of the past week working on and writing about the recent railroad strike crisis. The things which stand out as the broad background for the 48-hour tie-up in American transportation are these:

That the American railroads today stand secure with the profits of the most prosperous years in their history. The Commerce Department has estimated that profits of class I railroads increased 1,164, percent above the prewar average from 1941 to 1944, inclusive.

That productivity per railroad worker has increased tremendously due to such things as bigger locomotives, multiple Diesel or electric locomotives operated in tandem by

single crews, longer trains, and bigger loads. The Commerce Department estimated the increase in productivity per man-hour at more than 40 percent between 1940 and 1945.

That the wages of railroad workers have not kept pace with the increase in their productivity, with the increasing prosperity of their employers, or with the advancing wages of workers in other industries. In the 10 years just ended, transportation employees have slipped from second to twenty-seventh position—the bottom of the heap—in percentage raises in hourly compensation. In the last 10 years, up to the settlement of this strike—they had received increases of only 44 cents a day in 1937, a top of 76 cents in 1939, and 32 cents in 1943, falling further and further behind in the race with living costs.

That in working conditions, the record is worse. It has been 25 years since railroad workers have had an improvement. In the meantime workers in other industries—over almost the entire Nation—have gone on an 8-hour day, 40-hour week. Suburban passenger service rail workers have not. The 7-day week prevails on passenger runs and the 10-hour day without overtime is commonplace. Many workers—and you can verify it by asking the ticket collectors the next time you ride a suburban train—spend 12 and 14, sometimes 16, hours a day to get credit for a working time of 8 to 10 hours.

The facts on working conditions may sound startling. Really they aren't startling. The railroad has grown as a corporate colossus further and further away from the people it serves and from the men who work for it. The startling thing is that conditions aren't worse. Railroading, more than any other American industry, is a creature of bond brokers, stock sellers, and stock-market financeers. By tradition, since its very earliest days, railroad ownership has been made the play toy of men who make their money by moving stocks and bonds, rather than by moving cargo.

By tradition, the railroad industry has always struggled along trying to earn interest on capital structures so tremendously watered that earnings could support them only during times of tremendous transportation—such as war. In the lean years the industry's excess capitalization has kept it chronically in the hands of receivers and stock and bond reorganizers. Its ownership and capital structure are so complex and so rigged in the interests of the stock and bond market, as against the interests of workers and customers, that the control of whole railroad empires sometimes is bartered around in the banking houses like a stack of blues in a Reno casino.

A few years ago, a Wall Street speculator picked up control of the $2,000,000,000 Van Sweringen empire—almost a tenth of the American railroad system—by a total investment in rail securities estimated at only $4,000,000. Of the $4,000,000 securities purchased in that deal, most were immediately marketable, and only a little over $250,000, by the estimate of Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, represented stock actually necessary to be held to control these tremendous properties.

Unlike steel and other industries, in which there is a similar situation, railroad management in many cases is in the hands of men who don't even have a tradition in railroading—only in banking or bond selling or stock marketing. Small wonder that such an industry pays small attention to the men who run the trains.

It was against this kind of set-up that the Brotherhoods of Locomotive Engineers and Railroad Trainmen set out some months ago to try to bring their workers back up with the procession.

Get this point clear before you go further: These are responsible unions, not harum-scarum operators or hell raisers—but organizations of conservative trade unionists who do not live by adventuring. You may be confused about that because you remember that you have read a lot of talk in the newspapers for years and years back about railroad strike votes. You should also remember that railroad strike votes rarely have been followed by railroad strikes.

The reason for the frequent strike talk and for the occasional strike vote is not that either the men or their leaders are strike-happy, but that under the Railway Labor Act a strike vote is the first step toward getting serious consideration and setting the machinery of settlement in motion whenever the men have a request to make on the management. Other unions make their requests first, and when all other recourses for settlement fail, they sometimes take a strike ballot. The railroad unions have to start with a strike ballot.

It was against this set-up, too, that President Truman set out to handle the recent crises after another strike had been voted and efforts at settlement had stalled. Three things stand out in Truman's handling of the situation:

That Brotherhood transcripts of White House telephone calls show the President and his labor aide, John R. Steelman, made definite commitments to the Brotherhoods on May 18, that if they would stall their strike 5 days they could negotiate with the railroads (the carriers had stalled all negotiations for days and days) and that "further concessions" would be forthcoming. The White House pledges were not fulfilled. Neither negotiations nor concessions materialized. The only possible effect was to dissipate the workers' strength, dramatize the case against them—and to protect the railroad management from public pressure to meet their workers across the conference table and settle up the deadlock speedily.

That the President called off all official negotiations to settle the strike hours before he went before Congress to castigate the strike leaders as the foundation for his legislative program to substitute Presidential proclamations and injunctions for collective bargaining in settling major labor disputes. This action balked official action on compromise offers by the Brotherhood chiefs that were tantamount to complete surrender. It followed the President's previous radio denunciation to the people and the course of the broken pledges which already had won the issue for the railroad managements by subjecting the men to an unremitting 5-day campaign in the press, while the managements were protected from the consequences of their refusal to deal with their workers.

That if the President did not in fact know at the time he made his final crack-down appearance before Congress that the strike was settled, he could have known it. It was known by those at the last settlement conference in plenty of time for the President to learn that he did not have to use this club on the railroad workers.

These things not only raise the question, but they add up to a conclusive indictment that President Truman's concern was not so much to save or to spare the country from the effects of the railroad strike as to establish himself as a dictatorial master of American labor for the remainder of his term in the White House. He counseled the brotherhood chiefs into a position of weakness and then he struck them down—and with them the rest of labor.

The grievances were just, but possibly critics of the strike do have a point in the way it was handled on the union side. Union leaders, like generals, are supposed to win—or, if defeat looms, to back away and husband their forces for a later try. Maybe the leaders of this strike can be criticized for their failure either to win or to get away in time. But it must be said that whatever mistake was made was chiefly one of misplaced confidence in the White House.

These unions and these leaders had been to the wars before. They don't resent firmness of the Government in settling a strike, if the firmness is evenly distributed. As recently as 1943, when President Roosevelt was still alive, there was a strike vote—but under Roosevelt there was no strike. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, told about it in the official publication of his union:

"A Nation-wide * * * strike was forestalled by firm, but not unfriendly action of President Roosevelt. He demonstrated his firmness when he said right off the bat that the railroads would operate strike or no strike. He demonstrated his friendliness when he indicated that he was for overtime payment after 40 hours a week, for compensation for away-from-home expenses and for vacations with pay. * * * He suggested how we could get a maximum of fairness. * * *"

President Truman did not need his restrictive labor legislation to avert or to settle his railroad strike. The key to settlement was already available to Truman—if he had cared to know it. If he had spent 5 minutes reading the records on Roosevelt's handling of the previous situation, he would have known that the key was in that last statement of Whitney's * * * "a maximum of fairness."

The President may feel that he has won the power to impose labor peace on this country. He has not. Laws and Presidential crackdowns cannot do it. The only thing then, or now, or in the future which can bring industrial peace is the Roosevelt formula * * * "a maximum of fairness."

JOHN P. LEWIS.

MORSE ASKS PROBE OF TRUMAN RAIL PARLEYS

WASHINGTON, June 5.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican, Oregon, who yesterday introduced a resolution asking for investigation of the events which led up to the May 25 settlement of the Nation-wide rail strike, revealed today that the leaders of the striking railroad brotherhoods decided to surrender about 7 hours before President Truman made his speech to Congress demanding emergency draft-labor legislation.

Here is MORSE's story as he told it:

"I was and still am exceedingly critical of the conduct and bad judgment exercised by representatives of the brotherhoods and told them so, but the fact is that at 9 o'clock on Saturday morning in my office I had a conference at the request of the brotherhoods with Ray T. Miller, counsel for the trainmen.

"I told him that in my opinion the brotherhoods didn't have a leg to stand on. I advised him to proceed without further delay to notify the White House that the men would go back to work and that the brotherhoods would accept the recommendations of the President's own emergency board, following which the railroads and brotherhoods could work out by negotiations in accordance with those recommendations any unsettled differences over working rules.

"Miller left my office, went directly to Whitney and Johnston and communicated my advice to them, which they accepted. I was so notified by telephone.

"But when they tried to carry out the surrender, they found that they were unable to get a conference at the White House. Whitney and Johnston then went to Secretary of State James F. Byrnes to notify him of their intentions.

"Byrnes went from the State Department to the White House. I am reliably informed that he took the matter up with Steelman. Before noon on Saturday, Steelman notified Whitney and Johnston that the President had instructed him (Steelman) not to carry on any further negotiations in the President's name with Whitney and Johnston. The President took that position in spite of the fact that Whitney and Johnston had notified his advisers that they had no intention of going ahead with the strike.

"I appreciate the fact that the President was obviously angry and that he had cause to be angry, but he also had the obligation inasmuch as he had set the 4 o'clock dead line himself to do everything he could to consummate a settlement of the matter before he made his speech at 4 o'clock.

"I am informed that at any time on Saturday the controversy could have been settled by the President or any of his advisers with his consent. I say that it was the President's public duty to try to complete the settlement before he came to the hill for his speech irrespective of the fact that Whitney and Johnston had previously been adamant in their position."

[From PM of June 6, 1946]

INSIDE WASHINGTON—MORE ON THE RAIL CRACK-DOWN

White House insiders contend that A. F. Whitney and Alvanley Johnston, who led the short-lived railroad trainmen and engineers strike, could have won seven rules changes in addition to the 18½ cents an hour increase if they had been willing to let well enough alone.

Whitney and Johnston probably will deny the White House version of the story, which follows:

On several occasions, John R. Steelman, special assistant to President Truman and mediator in the railroad dispute, suggested that Whitney and Johnston agree in writing to accept the 18½ cents, plus the seven rules changes recommended previously by a Presidential fact-finding board.

But Truman's aides have indicated that each time the two brotherhood chiefs would maintain that additional rules changes should be included.

It was not until after Whitney and Johnston had declined flatly to take the 18½ cents and the seven rules, according to the White House sources, that Truman grew weary of continued dickering on the rules and resolved on the take-it-or-leave-it offer of 18½ cents with no rules changes whatsoever.

The two striking brotherhoods first tried to leave it, but were forced to take it when Truman threatened to call out the Army and prepared to call on Congress for support in breaking the strike.

Reached by phone at his home in Cleveland, Whitney said about the White House story:

"There is not one word of truth in such a statement. Mr. Johnston and I, on the 24th—the day before the crackdown—offered to settle with Jimmy Byrnes on the basis of 18½ cents and the seven rules changes, and that we'd withdraw 20 rules and arbitrate the rest. We offered to take Mr. Schwellenbach as arbitrator, but Schwellenbach said the President would be displeased and suggested that an outsider do the job.

"The President was even displeased at Byrnes in the picture, too. That even went for John Steelman—the President fired him on Saturday morning and Steelman met with us as a private citizen later. No, we never turned down the 18½ cents and the rules changes."

TRIBUTE TO MARINE LT. JOHN H. LEIMS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, tomorrow five young men will be decorated with the Congressional Medal of Honor by the President of the United States. One of these young men is a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, who comes from Chicago, Ill., Lt. John H. Leims. This young man at Iwo Jima led his contingent ahead of the line so far that the other troops could not support him, and his contingent had to be pulled back. He led them back, but found that two of his men were badly wounded, and he made two trips to bring those wounded men back to the lines.

Lieutenant Leims was one of the outstanding heroes of the war. He has been listening to this debate. He is in the gallery now, sitting up here to my right. I want the Senate to know how proud we of Illinois are to have Lieutenant Leims in the Senate, and how proud we will be again tomorrow when the President puts the Congressional Medal of Honor ribbon around his neck.

[Applause, Senators rising, and Lieutenant Leims arising and acknowledging the tribute.]

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Ivy W. Duggan, of Mississippi, to be Governor of the Farm Credit Administration for a term of 6 years from June 15, 1946 (reappointment).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Midshipman Samuel A. Pillar to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign, from the 5th day of June 1946.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Warner W. Gardner, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice Michael W. Straus; and

C. Girard Davidson, of Oregon, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice Oscar L. Chapman.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive F, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session: A supplementary protocol, signed at Washington on June 6, 1946, modifying in certain respects the convention between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income which was signed at Washington on April 16, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles Fahy, of New Mexico, to be legal adviser of the Department of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I had intended to make a statement on behalf of Mr. Fahy, but I now ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In casting my vote to confirm Mr. Fahy as legal adviser to the Department of State, I take this opportunity to express once again my admiration for the devotion, ability, and courageous leadership manifested by him in his brilliant career.

His career of patriotic service began during World War I, when he pioneered in naval aviation and earned the Navy Cross. More recently, of course, he has served with great distinction as assistant solicitor of the Interior Department, general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, Solicitor General of the United States, and legal adviser to General Eisenhower in the military occupation of Germany. For that and other wartime achievements President Truman has awarded him the Medal of Merit, our highest civilian award, given only "to such civilians of the nations prosecuting the war under the joint declaration of the United States and other friendly foreign nations, as have, since the proclamation of an emergency by the President on September 8, 1939, distinguished themselves by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service."

The citation for this rare award discloses the full measure of the service he rendered:

"Charles Fahy, for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service to the United Nations. As the only civilian member of the President's Base-Lease Commission, Mr. Fahy represented the United States in the negotiations held in London early in 1941 between the United States of America and the British Government with regard to the acquisition of United States bases in the British Atlantic possessions, which resulted in an agreement that has served as a precedent and pattern for other vital agreements. While with the Army of the United States, Mr. Fahy has distinguished himself as legal adviser to the Military Governor for Germany and United States member of the Legal Directorate, Allied Control Authority for Germany, from July 15, 1945, to May 15, 1946; as Director of the Legal Division, United States Group, Control Council (Germany), from July 15, 1945, through September 30, 1945; as Director of the Legal Division, Office of Military Government for Germany (United States), from October 1, 1945, through May 15, 1946; as Chief of the Legal Branch, Civil Affairs Division of the General Staff, Headquarters, United States Forces, European Theater, from July 15, 1945, through September 30, 1945; and as Director of the Legal Division, Office of the Military Government (United States zone), from October 1, 1945, through May 15, 1946. While serving in these capacities, Mr. Fahy, through scholarly legal ability, sagacious political insight, sound judgment, and painstaking work, contributed in a high degree to the cooperation between the United States, British, Soviet, and French Governments required for successful quadripartite government of Germany as a whole and to the success of the military government of the United States areas of occupation in Germany.

"HARRY TRUMAN."

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John L. Sullivan, of New Hampshire, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the nominations on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 14, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 13 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Charles Fahy to be legal adviser of the Department of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

John L. Sullivan to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICERS, UNCLASSIFIED, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Robert M. Beaudry	John Y. Millar
Lewis D. Brown	James O. Morgan
Edwin D. Crowley	Edward F. Rivinus, Jr
Alexander J. Davit	Richard Sears, Jr.
Robert B. Hill	Forrest Shivers
Edward W. Holmes	Joseph A. Silberstein
Edward L. Johnson	David G. Sprague
William E. Knight 2d	James S. Sutterlin
Thomas W. McElhiney	

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be senior assistant scientists, effective date of oath of office

John L. Schwab	Don E. Eyles
David B. Lackman	Frederick S. Philips
Howard W. Bond	

To be assistant scientists, effective date of oath of office

Grover C. Pitts
Howard K. Schachman

To be senior surgeons

John R. Murdock	Anthony P. Rubino
Joseph F. Van Ackeren	William W. Nesbit

To be temporary surgeons

Kenneth M. Endicott	Ralph W. Pagel
Malcolm J. Ford	Raymond S. Roy
Leslie W. Knott	Rudolph F. Sievers
Stanley E. Krumbiegel	Robert L. Smith
Arnold B. Kurlander	Samuel S. Spicer

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Master of Galilee, Thou hast said: "Learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly of heart." O great Teacher of the fine art of right living, in Thine earthly life Thou didst pass through manifold circumstances with such wondrous courage and strength that we would learn of Thee, in joy and in sorrow, in labor and in leisure, in success and in failure. In all these experiences do Thou steady our souls and guide us in the way. May Thy example glow in our conduct until it becomes the very music and poetry of our daily lives. Quicken our consciences toward all things upright, and keep us mindful that self-control is by way of self-will, that liberality is by way of giving, and that magnanimity of soul is by way of self-denial.

Be very near us today, full of sympathy for those who mourn, ignoring our failures, whispering peace into our breasts, and strengthening us in all things, and Thine shall be the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 11, 1946:

H. R. 238. An act for the relief of Henrietta Silk;

H. R. 845. An act for the relief of Mrs. Luther S. Sykes;

H. R. 941. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee, administratrix of the estate of Ross Lee, deceased;

H. R. 1299. An act for the relief of Morris Fine;

H. R. 2576. An act for the relief of William F. Schmeltz;

H. R. 2665. An act for the relief of Acchille Guillory and Olivia Guillory;

H. R. 2747. An act for the relief of George A. West;

H. R. 3018. An act for the relief of Crystal R. Stribling;

H. R. 3100. An act for the relief of Rolland Lee Frank;

H. R. 3125. An act for the relief of Lovie M. Trotter;

H. R. 3365. An act for the relief of Kay Beth Bednar;

H. R. 3523. An act for the relief of Sam Damico and Clint Hamm, operating as the D and H Grocer;

H. R. 3641. An act for the relief of M. Martin Turpanjian;

H. R. 3676. An act for the relief of Pershing W. Ridgeway;

H. R. 3702. An act for the relief of Maurice C. Ritter;

H. R. 3751. An act for the relief of Mrs. Theodora O. Anzures, and the legal guardian of Bernice Anzures and Andrew Anzures;

H. R. 3770. An act for the relief of Lyndon T. Montgomery;

H. R. 3781. An act for the relief of Mabel M. Fischer and Nora M. Steinmetz;

H. R. 3822. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles M. Overcash, deceased;

H. R. 3823. An act for the relief of Gertrude McGill;

H. R. 3828. An act for the relief of James R. Vaughan;

H. R. 3967. An act for the relief of Ahto Walter, Lucy Walter, and the legal guardian of Teddy Walter, a minor;

H. R. 3968. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles W. Stewart;

H. R. 4016. An act for the relief of Dorothy Morgan;

H. R. 4047. An act for the relief of Edward A. Hollis, Sr.;

H. R. 4074. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Burnison;

H. R. 4115. An act for the relief of the estate of Eleanor Doris Barrett;

H. R. 4142. An act for the relief of Johnnie V. Nations;

H. R. 4176. An act for the relief of the estate of Earle R. Woodfall, Jr., deceased;

H. R. 4210. An act for the relief of the estate of Bob Clark and the estate of George D. Croft;

H. R. 4237. An act for the relief of the estate of Vedal B. Brooks, deceased; Mrs. Katherine I. Brooks; and the legal guardian of Sally Brooks, a minor;

H. R. 4244. An act for the relief of Fundador Nieves del Valle;

H. R. 4338. An act for the relief of Anna Blanchard and others;

H. R. 4352. An act for the relief of Ola L. Wright, Mrs. Margaret Wright, and the legal guardian of Betty Bea Wright, a minor;

H. R. 4400. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Hershel Dean Curry, a minor;

H. R. 4405. An act for the relief of John Bakelaar;

H. R. 4414. An act for the relief of Eva D. Champlin, Robert H. Howell, Emily Howell, and Stella Ward;

H. R. 4491. An act for the relief of Vertie Bea Loggins;

H. R. 4510. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact between Colorado and New Mexico with respect to the waters of Costilla Creek;

H. R. 4527. An act for the relief of O. T. Nelson and wife, Clara Nelson;

H. R. 4537. An act for the relief of Lillian Jacobs;

H. R. 4545. An act for the relief of George Leslie Dobson;

H. R. 4567. An act to amend the act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims which the Ute Indians, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1938;

H. R. 4607. An act for the relief of Margaret Lee and Mike Sopko;

H. R. 4609. An act for the relief of Jerome Dove;

H. R. 4639. An act for the relief of C. LeRoy Phillips;

H. R. 4640. An act for the relief of Gladys Hastings;

H. R. 4647. An act for the relief of Albert R. Perkins;

H. R. 4723. An act for the relief of John M. Shipp;

H. R. 4777. An act for the relief of the Sawtooth Co.;

H. R. 4854. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Smith;

H. R. 4915. An act for the relief of Irving W. Learned;

H. R. 4976. An act for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Fortunato;

H. R. 4977. An act for the relief of Mrs. Theresa Ebrecht;

H. R. 5111. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred L. Bupp;

H. R. 6334. An act for the relief of the estate of Carmen Aurora de la Flor, deceased;

H. R. 6343. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to lend certain property of the War Department to national veterans' organizations for use at State and National conventions;

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution creating the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission; and

H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution to correct a technical error in the act approved April 18, 1946 (Pub. Law 347, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

On June 12, 1946:

H. R. 2569. An act for the relief of Daphne Webb;

H. R. 3525. An act for the relief of Owen Young;

H. R. 4832. An act for the relief of Stanley B. Reeves and Mrs. Stanley B. Reeves;

H. R. 210. An act for the relief of Jack Williams; Mrs. Lora Sally Williams, the legal guardian of Garry E. Williams, a minor, and the legal guardian of James Williams, a minor;

H. R. 874. An act for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges;

H. R. 4416. An act for the relief of George H. Buxton, Jr.;

H. R. 4670. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edna B. LeBlanc; and

H. R. 4904. An act for the relief of Cleo D. Johnson and Mr. and Mrs. Jack B. Cherry.

On June 13, 1946:

H. R. 208. An act for the relief of Marion Contracting Co.;

H. R. 3556. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Glen Rothenberger; and

H. R. 3808. An act for the relief of the estate of William N. Therriault and Millicent Therriault.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SUNDSTROM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution unanimously adopted by the 1946 Victory Convention of the Kiwanis International.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters he received from a constituent.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

WORDS FROM CONFUCIUS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, Chiang Kai-shek read these words from Confucius when China's fate hung in the balance. It seems very appropriate for us to recall them:

The men of old, when they wished their virtues to shine throughout the land, first had to govern their states well. To govern their states well, they first had to establish harmony in their families. To establish harmony in their families, they first had to discipline themselves. To discipline themselves, they first had to set their minds in order. To set their minds in order, they first had to make their purpose sincere. To make their purpose sincere, they first had to extend their knowledge to the utmost. Such knowledge is acquired through a careful investigation of things. For with things investigated knowledge becomes complete. With knowledge complete the purpose becomes sincere. With the purpose sincere the mind is set in order. With the mind set in order there is real self-discipline. With real self-discipline the family achieves harmony. With harmony in the family the state becomes well governed. With the state well governed there is peace throughout the land.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a certain form.

Mr. WADSWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed by Mr. Lessing Rosenwald, president of the American Council for Judaism, to the President of the United States under date of May 10, 1946.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Protestant Voice, published at Fort Wayne, Ind.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Josephus Daniels to the graduating class of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill on June 10, and further to extend his remarks and include an article from the Illinois State Register by Admiral V. Y. Dallman.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter dated June 12, 1946, from Col. John Thomas Taylor, director of the national legislative committee of the American Legion.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one a letter to the President of the United States and several editorials, and in the other two articles and an editorial.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune entitled "The Proof." My subtitle is "The New Deal President and the New Deal Supreme Court Are the Captives of Big Labor."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was granted permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous matter, which I am now informed will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $240. I hesitate to ask that it be placed in the RECORD in view of that fact, but it is a very important matter, so I ask unanimous consent that, despite the fact that it exceeds the limit, it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY PRODUCTION OF SUGARS AND SIRUPS IN INDUSTRIAL ALCOHOL PLANTS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162) extending for 7 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugar or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 3126 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to emergency production of sugars and sirups in industrial alcohol plants) is amended by striking out "July 1, 1946," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1947."

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file several of the rules that have been voted out by the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRIME MINISTER BEVIN'S PERFIDY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the cat is out of the bag. Foreign Minister Bevin is deliberately refusing to allow 100,000 Jews into Palestine. This is disheartening and horrifying. He gratuitously added at a labor meeting:

The agitation in the United States and particularly in New York for 100,000 Jews to be admitted to Palestine is caused by the desire not to have too many of them in New York.

This is an absolute insult and Hitler could not have improved on it.

The British have totally disregarded our President on the whole question of Palestine. First with regard to the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine, and second in the case of the President's appointment of the Cabinet committee. The President was inveigled into these two acts by the British.

Now we know the British have no intentions of carrying out their promises. If they cannot be trusted with regard to the one pledge, we dare not trust them with regard to another.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

MR. BEVIN'S STATEMENT ON THE PALESTINE SITUATION

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, as a Christian and as a citizen of the city of New York, I rise to express my deep resentment of the remarks made by Mr. Bevin yesterday. We in New York are proud to associate with that section of our population which is Jewish. We feel they have made great contributions to the city. We would welcome more. It is too bad that we cannot solve this problem by bringing in the 100,000 from Europe that the President has recommended and which we believed Mr. Bevin agreed to in good faith.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, many of us who supported the President and voted for the labor bill in response to his recommendations, occasioned by the crisis resulting from the railroad strike, are keenly disappointed that the Senate has seen fit to remove from that bill the provision for the diversion of profits into the Treasury of the United States. True, they removed the labor draft and the loss of seniority provisions, but without the provision for diverting profits to the Treasury it definitely comes back to us as a one-sided measure. It contains only provisions for punitive action against labor. I hope the conferees will restore this provision to the bill so that it will embody something which will enable the Government to enforce cooperation on the part of management as well as labor.

HON. LUTHER PATRICK

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Fellow Members of Congress, I was left at the hitching post. I was supposed to make a "lame duck" speech this afternoon, the second in my brilliant career. I think I should tell you how it happened for your sake—not for mine. You need to know some of the things I ran into, for they will be of help to you in your coming campaigns over the country. I think this is the best Congress we have ever had, and we do not need to prove it. I am going to accompany the body of our late lamented Senator from Alabama and will have to leave Washington at 4 or 5 o'clock this afternoon. Therefore, I would not be able to be here.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the special order I had for this afternoon be postponed to Thursday, a week from today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I understand a bill is coming before the Congress to raise our pay. Regardless of the merits of the bill, I want to say there are people who need it more. I refer to the blind, aged, cripple, and sick. Until something is done along that line, there are many of us here who will vote against any such measure as it is proposed to bring before this House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to include a resolution, and in the other two to include newspaper editorials.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cleveland Press.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the country and the world as a whole, I believe, was reassured by the action of the Senate with reference to the extension of the Selective Service Act. I understand the conferees are now working out the differences between the House and the Senate. The Senate bill is not altogether satisfactory, but I hope no further steps will be taken to cut down the bill which passed the Senate. That is the absolute minimum that will meet the requirements ahead of us.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

URGENT LEGISLATION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I expect there is no Member of the House who would any rather be able to go home soon than I, but I asked for this time to say I do not think we are ready to go or that we will be for some time.

I made a short list of things I am convinced we must do first. At the top of it is the passage of legislation in the field of control of atomic energy, the most important question ever to face this Congress. In my judgment, the Senate passed a very good bill. I hope that the House will speedily pass one similar to it.

Then there are the draft bill, the British loan, the long-range housing bill, amendment of the Social Security Act to broaden and extend it and make it an effective means to economic stabilization, investigation of the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration, the creation of a committee to study labor and management relations with a view to long-range legislation in that field, Railroad Retirement Act amendments, minimum-wage legislation, the OPA, the improvement of the machinery of Congress, to mention only a few. We have a big job, and upon the discharge of that job in the course of the next few weeks will depend almost everything to the future of this National Legislature, of our country, and of the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

MINORITY VIEWS ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 138

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority may have until midnight tonight to file minority views on Senate Joint Resolution 138, and to have those views included with the majority report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE SENATOR JOHN H. BANKHEAD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 656, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to attend the funeral of the late Senator John H. Bankhead the following Members: Mr. HOBBS, Mr. BOYKIN, Mr. GRANT of Alabama, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MANASCO, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. PATRICK, and Mr. RAINS.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the

Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual reports of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1944 and 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The WHITE HOUSE, *June 13, 1946.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress a communication from the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, together with a report covering the work of the juvenile court for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The WHITE HOUSE, *June 13, 1946.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the Navy casualty list for Mississippi for World War II.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a very good article from Nicholas Latchford, printed in the Washington Daily News of June 12 under the title "Family Allowances Plan Adopted by Other Countries."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I renew the request I made the other day to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Maj. Gen. Ray A. Porter before the national security committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars entitled "Universal Military Training." This exceeds the two-page limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing. I am advised by the Public Printer that it will take approximately three pages and cost approximately $180.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Illinois Division of Labor.

THE TEAMSTERS UNION WOULD "CRACK THE COTTON BLOC"

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include excerpts from an editorial in the teamsters' union paper. The editorial is headed "How to crack the cotton bloc."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Dan Tobin, of the teamsters union, has solved the problem of how to destroy the cotton industry in America. He comes and advises people "Don't buy cotton."

When he attacks the cotton bloc he is, of course, attacking not only southern Congressmen, but the cotton growers of all the Southern States.

Cotton is the one commodity upon which our balance of foreign trade depends.

There is not a well-clothed human being, or half-clothed being, on earth today who is not in touch with cotton all the time. It furnishes work for more laboring people, in field and factory, than any other one commodity on earth. It adorns the rich; it clothes the naked, and it feeds the hungry; it warms the poor. It is the greatest of America's products. Yet Dan Tobin's teamsters union would destroy it if he could in order to punish the southern people whom he cannot dominate and southern Congressmen whom he cannot control.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6777), making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2269), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JENSEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

THE COST OF DISPOSING OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand the Treasury statement for the 31st of May, for the month of May.

The total expenditures for the surplus property disposal agency was $35,981,000. The total receipts according to the Treasury statement were $41,283,000. In other words, the receipts for the disposal of surplus property exceeded the expenditures by only $6,000,000.

THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the Secretary of State and his aides will journey to Paris for another effort—and for ought one knows—a final effort to reach an agreement with the Soviet representatives on the unsolved problems which seem to stand in the way of an ultimate peace.

In his recent report to the American people Secretary Byrnes stated that progress at the recent Paris Conference of Foreign Ministers was disappointingly small and Senator VANDENBERG stated that the conference was not a success in gaining agreement on several key questions and considered it unfortunate that greater progress cannot be reported.

Meanwhile, it might be inferred from the observations made by a Member of another body recently—Senator PEPPER—that the Congress and the American people are not solidly behind the endeavors and purposes of the American delegation to the conference.

Every American citizen, and every Member of Congress should vigorously applaud the efforts already made by the American delegation and congratulate its members on the unity of purpose and objective which they have developed among themselves. As they prepare to enter the diplomatic tournament again to salvage freedom and bring new hope to peoples who feel the heel of oppression behind that awful shroud so commonly referred to as the "iron curtain," let us assure them now that we, the representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States stand firmly behind their endeavors.

Let us assure our delegation now—before it departs for this momentous conference—that with a firmness that is in the best tradition of America, we expect them to face up to the arrogance, the sniping, the lack of cooperation and the exorbitant demands which has thus far characterized the actions of the Soviet delegation.

Let us make it emphatically known now that we do not regard with equanimity, the discourteous and uncooperative treatment accorded the Pauley mission in Korea, the constant effort to undermine MacArthur in Japan, the circumvention in Iran, and the steadfast effort to continue chaos and confusion in Europe.

Having generously provided the Soviet Union with eleven billion of lend-lease goods and supplies in the interest of victory, without special hope of repayment, we are becoming a bit concerned with virulent Soviet propaganda and their attacks upon our motives; with the constant effort to magnify the indiscretions of American GI's in order to provoke ill-will toward this country; with the daily barrage of pro-Soviet propaganda that

reaches congressional desks every morning under the imprint of one group or another in eastern Europe which is under Soviet domination; with this unconscionable abuse of our hospitality; with this determined effort to sabotage peace and freedom behind the impenetrable folds of an "iron curtain"; with this indefensible attack upon a former respected official of the United States because he uttered a few words of welcome for the Polish hero who defended Warsaw; for the studied effort to keep the Allied Control Commission in Berlin in a state of impotence; for the effort to continue instability and chaos to the end that the Communist ideology might be extended to other parts of the world.

The greatest service that this country can render to the world, to itself, and to the people of the Soviet Union who must entertain an abiding hope for peace and an earnest desire for amicable relations with the people of the United States is for the American delegation to proceed firmly with its endeavors to effectuate an early and equitable peace and to reassert the determination of this country that freedom, self-determination, and the principles of the Atlantic Charter shall not be destroyed by imperialism and selfishness.

We are willing to do our full share to feed the starving and destitute peoples of Europe and Asia, but in proportion as order and stability are restored and production can go forward, the strain upon our own dwindling food reserves will be relieved. I for one believe—and this is a wholly personal point of view—that the immediate and future implications which are involved in these unsolved problems is so momentous that the President might well transfer General MacArthur to Germany to address his special talents to the restoration of stability, and the salvation of those values for which young Americans so freely sacrificed and died.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana (at the request of Mr. PLOESER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6777) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for a little while and that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas?

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6777, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, during my service as a Member of Congress I have had no more interesting assignment than the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling this bill. For the first time in the history of the Government of the United States a committee of Congress is presenting to the Congress a single bill involving the programs and appropriations for all the wholly owned Government corporations. This is a very significant thing—a very important moment in the affairs of our Government; it is a forward step, the most forward step, perhaps, taken in years in regard to the fiscal affairs of the Government of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this significant step is being taken by the House today by reason of legislation which was enacted last year and which was approved by the President on December 6, 1945. The legislation to which I refer is the Government Corporations Control Act.

IMPORTANCE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED CORPORATIONS

At first glance this question of Government-owned corporations may seem to be a most uninviting, forbidding, and unimportant subject, but a little survey of the situation will reveal that such is not the case.

The economy of this Nation has been in the past and is today very vitally affected by the operation of Government corporations. I had almost said that it would be easier to enumerate the enterprises in this country which are not directly or indirectly affected by Government corporations than to enumerate those which are affected by these corporations. I am trying to point out this fact, that the economy of our country, in agriculture, in industry, and otherwise, is very directly affected by the operations of these Government corporations. The amount of money recommended for appropriation by this bill is relatively small; the amount being $45,000,000. But that is no yardstick by which to judge the programs of the Government-owned corporations. The Government-owned corporations in the fiscal year 1947, the year beginning the first of next month, will expend in excess of $17,000,000,000. So it will readily appear that the functions and operations of these Government-owned corporations are very important indeed to all and to each of the 140,000,000 American citizens.

TYPES OF PROGRAM

Government-owned corporations have the sole responsibility of maintaining prices for cotton and grain and other agricultural products, a program which is carried out by offering loans of 92½ percent of parity on cotton and 90 percent of parity on other basic farm crops—such support prices being guaranteed by Congress for a period of at least two more years. Government-owned corporations are undertaking in South America to promote the good-neighbor policy. Government-owned corporations are financing the sale of American cotton and American products in a dozen nations around the world. Government-owned corporations are contributing to the splitting of the atom down in the State of Tennessee. Government-owned corporations are making loans to banks and big business on Wall Street, and making loans to little businesses on Main Street throughout the length and breadth of the land. Government-owned corporations are undertaking to help provide housing for veterans and other citizens. Government-owned corporations are dealing in crop insurance for certain important farm crops. Government-owned corporations have a direct or indirect relationship to many loans that are made in this country for the promotion of home ownership on the farms and in the cities. Government-owned corporations have to do with transportation on the Mississippi River, with the acquisition of rubber from the jungles of South America, with production of sugar cane in the Virgin Islands, with the conduct of the Panama Railroad Co. and the operation of a steamship line between New York and the Canal Zone. Government corporations are providing loans to the Rural Electrification Administration which are being used by the REA to help turn on the lights all over rural America. This is an enumeration of only a few of the things which are being done by Government-owned corporations.

Does it not then appeal to the wisdom of the House that these far-reaching operations should be annually brought before the House of Representatives in order that the House might have the real story of what is happening in this far-flung enterprise of Government-owned corporations? Some of these corporations have gone far afield. Congress has created these agencies and seemingly has walked away and forgotten about some of them, and has permitted them to run their own unhindered way, which in every instance has not been in the public interest. So I say with every degree of confidence that it is high time, indeed, that the Congress do what it is doing today in this House; that we take a long look at what these gigantic institutions are doing, and determine whether or not they shall continue to do as they are doing. It is for us to determine to what extent they shall continue to operate; what changes may be made in their operations in order that the public interest may be promoted and protected.

If you should look at the hearings you would find approximately 1,500 pages of printed testimony which was presented to our committee. This is the first time in the history of the Government that there has been assembled in one volume

such a wealth of information in regard to these corporations, some 40 in number. This could well be a book of source material for our use and consideration in the future.

The report, which has been made through the cooperation of our able clerk, Mr. George Harvey, is virtually a textbook on the program of Government-owned corporations. There are many of these organizations. There are all types of Government-owned and partially owned corporations, about 105 in number. The wholly owned corporations number about 40.

LIQUIDATION PROVISIONS

The Corporations Control Act of 1945 very wisely provides that the operations of these corporations owned by the Government shall be surveyed, and that in cases where they are not chartered by the Federal Government prior to 1948 they shall be put into a program of liquidation beginning in 1948, in order that we may clean house of some of these agencies which do not have an important and vital part of our governmental economy. It will therefore be up to the Congress to determine in the very near future just which of these corporations that have been organized under laws other than those passed by the Congress shall be permitted to continue.

As I said, these corporations are of varied parentage, some of them almost of uncertain origin. Some of them are Delaware corporations, one of them is a Tennessee corporation, and some are Maryland corporations. One is incorporated under the laws of a municipality, I believe, down in the Virgin Islands. They have sprung up in a most haphazard way, but under the present program of the Congress they will be brought under rein and check.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I am interested in the last statement as to the origin and genesis of many of these corporations. I wonder if the gentleman could discuss the attitude of the committee with respect to the corporations that are formed by virtue of the actions of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. There are numerous corporations that have as their genesis merely the passage of a resolution by the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation setting up that so-called corporation.

I have always wondered at the legal background of a corporation that was created with bylaws and articles adopted by the Board of Directors of the RFC and having and exercising all the powers of a corporation when as a matter of fact its creator was not a sovereign entity but was a creature of the Congress which set up the RFC. In other words, I always felt that the creation of a corporation and the investment of corporate powers in a corporation was the surrender to that corporation of a certain sovereignty possessed by a sovereign institution. We gave the power to the RFC, and it in turn charters such corporations as the Defense Plants Corporation and others that I might name. I wonder if the committee gave any consideration to the legality, if you please, of corporations organized in that manner.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his very interesting question and I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is seeking recognition.

Mr. GORE. In reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin, the committee did give consideration to the entire subject matter. The facts are that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation now has four subsidiaries, but the RFC does not have authority to create further subsidiary corporations.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for the statement which he has made. I was just about to say that this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations is made up of five members appointed this year, following the passage of the act last December. The able gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. JAMIE WHITTEN, the ranking majority member, and the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. ALBERT GORE, serve on the majority side with me. They have served with great understanding, diligence, and industry. They are legislators of superior ability. I wish to express my appreciation for what they have done and are doing in the public interest. Of course, I cannot make that statement without referring to the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. BEN F. JENSEN, the ranking minority member, and the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. PLOESER, the other minority member, who likewise have struggled with us in a very able and patriotic and statesmanlike way, if I may say so, in trying to present to the House a worth-while report and bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my personal appreciation of the work which the subcommittee has done on this bill. The presentation of this bill to the Congress constitutes a landmark in the fiscal policy of the Government. It is highly appropriate that the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] should occupy the Chair at this time, for he is entitled to a great deal of credit for the existence of the Government Corporations Control Act.

The Government Corporations Control Act was originally or popularly known as the Byrd-Butler bill and was introduced in the other body. During the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill a year ago last January, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] spoke of the need for a stricter control over the financial operations of the Government corporations.

Agreeing with him as I did, because of matters which had come to our attention in hearings on the independent offices bill and because of the need for a full audit by the General Accounting Office in some of our operations in the Canal Zone which had come to my attention in our hearings on the bill for the civil functions of the War Department, I had studied the Byrd-Butler bill which was then pending in the Senate, so I introduced that bill in the House. It was assigned the number H. R. 2051. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] who, I know had given a great deal of study to the matter, also introduced the bill and it became H. R. 2177.

In fact, the gentleman from Mississippi is the one who is entitled in the House to the credit for the passage of this legislation, although I shared with him the pleasure of going down to the White House at the time the President signed the bill when each of us was given one of the pens with which the President signed the bill. But it was the gentleman from Mississippi who followed through on the matter in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and was primarily responsible, in my judgment, for the passage of the committee-revised bill (H. R. 3660) in the House of Representatives although I would not minimize the work of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], whose repeated revelations on the operations of Government corporations laid a groundwork for action.

The Congress approached this problem in the so-called Byrd amendments to another measure with which I had something to do in the House. But that action would have effectively reached only the problem of auditing. We needed not merely auditing; we needed budgetary control if Congress was to have any effective voice in the operations of these Government corporations.

The problem is complex. You deal with a variety of enterprises with a variety of authorizations in basic law. It was a difficult job to work out a workable control law and I know that the Appropriations Subcommittee had to study a large number of basic laws and conduct exhaustive hearings in order to write this first appropriation bill in this field.

So it is with particular pleasure at this time that I express my appreciation for the work of the subcommittee which is now presenting the first of the appropriation bills to budget and control the expenditures of Government corporations.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for his timely observations in regard to the work which has already taken place on this bill, and particularly the work which has been done by the present occupant of the chair, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED IN SECURING NECESSARY INFORMATION

I shall not begin a discussion of the details of this bill with an apology, because

I think the Members of the House will understand the difficulty under which we have operated. In trying to survey the operations of agencies which will have to do with the expenditure of $17,000,000,000 during the next year, we found ourselves with quite a task. The bill providing the legislation had only become law in December. The legislation provides for an annual audit by the Comptroller General of the United States of the operations of all of these agencies. It cannot be said in criticism of the Comptroller General that he failed to use due diligence in providing us with the audit which we so badly needed. It was not physically possible for the Comptroller General to audit all of these corporations and get those audits before our committee in time for us to have the benefit of that information prior to presenting the bill to the House. So it can easily be seen that on succeeding years, when these audits are made available to the committee and to the Congress, a much better job can be done by the Congress. This is the first step taken.

Almost the day after we got the estimates from the Bureau of the Budget it was necessary for us to begin hearings. We began our hearings on April 11. I may say in explanation of the difficulty confronting the Budget, that the Bureau of the Budget had little time to prepare the material for submission to Congress, but I am sure the Bureau did the best it could under the circumstances. We were not satisfied with all of the statements which were given, and with the language which was suggested, and we made changes in line with the best judgment of the committee in that connection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. You have a very interesting subject. Soon we will have before us a bill limiting the direct public debt to $275,000,000,000, which the public knows is about $273,000,000,000 now. What I want to know and what our people ought to know is the liability of the Government by these corporations, which is a vast sum already. When we tell our people the limitation of the public debt is $275,000,000,000 we are not telling the truth, of course. The liability under these corporations is very great. Have you any figures on that?

Mr. MAHON. Each corporation submitted to us in the Budget document a most interesting and comprehensive statement in regard to the various obligations and fiscal affairs of such corporation.

Mr. GIFFORD. You know that those corporations own a great deal of property that must be disposed of at a terrific loss, so that the money involved, which we have guaranteed amounts to a vast sum. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], presented some figures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I want to know our liability outside of the direct public debt.

Mr. MAHON. I cannot give the gentleman the exact figures because, for one reason, we do not yet have a direct and complete audit.

Mr. GIFFORD. Can the gentleman give it within $10,000,000,000?

Mr. MAHON. We do not have a complete audit, but the Budget message, which is not now before me, contains comprehensive estimates as to outstanding obligations of each corporation.

Mr. GORE. If the gentleman from Texas will yield, I will be glad to supply figures in reply to the interrogatory.

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The total liabilities of all wholly Government-owned corporations as of June 30, 1946, will be $17,063,653,000; and to offset that the total assets as of the same date are estimated to be $16,447,517,000.

Mr. GIFFORD. I thank the gentleman, but that is an estimate. A very great Senator from another body thought that probably we could not realize over 50 percent of those assets.

Is it possible there is only $17,000,000,000 liability? The liability on insurance alone is between forty and eighty billions of dollars.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman from Massachusetts should not misinterpret the term "estimate" as I use it, because it includes fixed assets like good loans receivable, $3,791,000,000; land, structures, and equipment $8,831,000,000; cash and appropriated funds is a considerable item; and sound investments run to another large figure.

So in further answer, if the gentleman will yield further, this is more than just a loose estimate; it is a responsible evaluation of the liabilities and the assets of Government-owned corporations furnished by the Bureau of the Budget to the committee upon the most responsible authority and after the most diligent study that could be given it in the length of time available between passage of the Government Corporations Control Act and the time at which this information had to be submitted to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. GIFFORD. The only remark I care to make is that it does not square with what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has stated. The liability of the Government is vastly more than $17,000,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Let me state that the Government-owned corporations themselves are not necessarily a liability. Many of the operations of these corporations have been most successful financially. For example, we could take the Commodity Credit Corporation with its far-flung program of supporting the price of agricultural products. The Commodity Credit Corporation by these operations has in many instances while supporting the price of agricultural products also made money for the taxpayers of the United States. That was true with respect to cotton and I think the same could be said with respect to certain other commodities.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am interested in the gentleman's observation that the Commodity Credit Corporation has made money for the taxpayers, in view of the fact that apparently it incurred obligations of $921,000,000.

I note that, instead of making an appropriation to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the committee followed what was permissible under what I think is a bad law and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to cancel notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the amount of that $921,000,000. That, of course, is a bit of delicate bookkeeping that ought not to be lost sight of just because it is covered by a little figure "1" inside of a couple of things called parentheses, referring to a footnote in very small type. But there is $921,000,000 there which represents a cost to the taxpayers of the country for the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation which, to be sure, the Congress authorized; nevertheless when you talk about their making money it ought to be realized that it has also cost the taxpayers $921,000,000 in canceled obligations of the Treasury.

CONSUMER SUBSIDIES

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for raising that very pertinent and important question which I myself expected to raise a little later in the discussion of this item. While some of the programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation have been financially successful others have not been financially successful.

For example, this $921,000,000 in notes owed to the Treasury by the Commodity Credit Corporation, which we propose to cancel by this bill, represents money paid out of the Treasury of the United States for consumer subsidies. This consumer subsidy program was approved by Congress, but it was a program with which I personally disagreed, and which I have opposed as unsound. In other words, by law, the Commodity Credit Corporation was directed to help pay the grocery bill of the people of the Nation in that the Commodity Credit Corporation was told to pay out Government money for consumer subsidies on milk amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. There were, and are, consumer subsidies on many other commodities, and it is well understood by all that there is no possibility for any financial good to come to the Treasury or to the Commodity Credit Corporation. It was simply in keeping with the policy of this administration to use this device in an effort to hold down the price of consumer goods in order to prevent inflation. All of us oppose inflation, but the consumer subsidy policy was a policy with which I personally did not agree, but it was, nevertheless, the policy of the Congress in dealing with this important question.

Some losses were also incurred by the RFC. The RFC in its business enterprises has been a success and has made money for the taxpayers of the Nation, but in its capacity of dishing out funds upon the mandate of Congress for subsidies on butter, for example, it has not been financially successful. The RFC pays subsidies on butter in order to reduce the board bill of the people of America, a program which some of us did not sponsor and did not approve. Obviously

it would not be possible to make money on a transaction when you are paying out subsidies to stimulate production or to reduce the cost of living of the consumers of the Nation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has made a very fine statement and the statement he has made is his best qualification for being chairman of the subcommittee handling this Government corporation appropriation bill, because in the statement he has made he states that he does not believe in these consumer subsidies, which is a mark of qualification, in my judgment, and gives to the people of America a guarantee that as far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned in its handling of these Government corporations it is not going to encourage that policy, at least it is not going to forward that policy of legerdemain by which we pass on to our grandchildren the grocery bill of the people of today.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his generous statement.

There were other losing ventures on the part of the corporations that I might mention. For example, there was our program in rubber development. As we all recall, when we entered into the war we found our stock pile of rubber was not adequate and a desperate, frenzied effort was made to augment the supply of rubber. We went down into South America on what was obviously a losing financial venture but one that was very important to the security of our Nation. We spent money down there in order to stimulate a program of getting out of the jungles of South America all of the available raw rubber that could be found. There were many other war programs which were carried out at a financial loss but which were extremely important in the winning of the war.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. I believe the Home Owners' Loan Corporation is covered by this appropriation bill. It is my understanding that when this Corporation winds up its affairs, which will occur shortly, it will show not a dollar of loss and, as a matter of fact, will return its capital stock to the United States Treasury. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation has been a financially successful venture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the time the program was started it was necessary to try to bail out the home owners of this Nation in order to prevent a complete collapse. It was not only necessary to help bail out the home owners or the would-be home owners who had not discharged their indebtedness on homes, but it was necessary to take that step in order to protect the banks and the lending corporations that were threatened with collapse at the same time. So, while I deplore the activity of any Government corporation which is not performing a useful service, my hat is off to those corporations that are performing a worthwhile service in the interest of our country.

AIDS TO AGRICULTURE

Since we have been engaging in some discussion about the problems of agriculture, and since Government corporations have such a vital part in the program of agriculture, I think I should like at this time to make further reference to the subject. The four corporations comprising the Farm Credit Administration came before us through their representatives and presented their programs with respect to agriculture and farm loans. The able Governor of the Farm Credit Administration was the principal witness. There was also presented to us the program of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. We found that this program is not one of those successful projects from the standpoint of the taxpayer; that the Crop Insurance Corporation incurred a deficit in 1945 to the extent of some $14,000,000. There are some of us who take issue with the Crop Insurance Corporation with respect to certain aspects of the Administration's program and certain requirements and regulations which we feel are not in the best interest of the farmer. But nevertheless, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party in their national conventions have placed their stamp of approval on the principle of crop insurance, and it is the policy of the Congress today to undertake to make it work. It is not working successfully at this time. There are many shortcomings, and there is a loss confronting the Treasury from year to year, but it is hoped that with experience many of these difficulties and problems can be solved and that we will have what we all, I think, would like to see, a workable crop insurance program which will pay its own way and give additional security to the farmers of the country. Some of the unsatisfactory features of the present program are discussed in detail in the printed hearings.

As I have already pointed out, perhaps the Commodity Credit Corporation is the most important of all the agencies of the Government when it comes to stabilizing agriculture. It is this corporation upon which we must rely to stabilize agricultural prices during the 2-year period following the declaration of the end of hostilities, and we have dealt as kindly as we could, consistent with the public interest, in providing funds for and in making limitations on this agency. It is for the reason that we want the Commodity Credit Corporation to remain strong and virile and able to do the job for the farmers of the Nation that we proposed the cancellation of $921,000,000 worth of notes to the Treasury. We did not want this impairment of the capital stock, which was largely brought about by the payment of consumer subsidies, to prove too great a weight for the corporation to carry.

Some reference has been made to the Federal Loan Agency and its numerous Government corporations; to the Export-Import Bank; to the National Housing Agency which, through its comprehensive and complicated program, is undertaking to stimulate the housing program of this Nation, which is certainly one of the most urgent problems confronting the American people, particularly the veterans of the late war and their families.

I might make some reference to the fact that we have recommended the liquidation of some of the corporations having to do with inter-American affairs. A couple of these corporations already are in process of liquidation. However, the Institute of American Affairs and the Inter-American Educational Foundation had committed our Government to certain programs in Central and South America. In order that we might keep faith, we have provided appropriations to take care of commitments which have previously been made.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

I should not conclude my remarks without making reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Tennessee Valley Authority has begun to repay some of its obligations to the Government, having made the first payment of $12,500,000, in December 1945. About $800,000,000 has been invested in the Tennessee Valley Authority. The TVA has earned very considerable revenue, but through act of Congress has been permitted to utilize that revenue in carrying on and expanding its programs.

We would have been in desperate straits during the war if it had not been for this great program of the TVA, which gave us the power to go forward in our aluminum program and various other programs at a rapid rate in order that we might prepare ourselves for the emergencies of the war. It was through TVA that much of the work of the splitting of the atom was made possible. The committee pays tribute to the TVA for what it has done, but respectfully suggests in the report that a schedule of repayments to the Government now be inaugurated and that the TVA undertake in the next 40 years to reimburse the Federal Government for that portion of the investment which has to do with the generation of electric power.

The committee has provided for a reduction in the Budget estimate for the TVA in the amount of $9,000,000, a sum which had been requested for the construction of a dam. The purpose of the committee in making this reduction was to permit materials which would of necessity be used in the construction of the dam to be used in veterans' housing and otherwise. This program was suspended at the beginning of the war or shortly thereafter, and while the work is to some extent completed, we did not feel that a further delay would be out of order. For that reason, we made certain reductions in the program of the TVA.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, the programs of the Government corporations are so big and so varied that it would be impossible for anyone to cover this vast subject in the

time allotted to the committee this afternoon. I have never served upon a committee or a subcommittee of the Congress where the members showed such concern and interest in the problems at hand. My responsibility as chairman has been lessened because each member of the committee has been alert to the problems confronting us, and is able to assist the House in securing information and arriving at what I hope will be a proper solution of any question which may arise on the floor.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have listened to the very able explanation of this bill by our very distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. It is a privilege to be a member of a committee with such able and conscientious gentlemen as are my colleagues on this committee. We have worked long, earnestly, and diligently to do the very best kind of job we possibly could do under rather difficult circumstances.

Had it not been for the able assistance of our clerk, Mr. George Harvey, the job would have been almost unbearable. I am happy to give him much credit. We finally finished the hearings, marked up the bill, brought the bill to the full committee this forenoon, and now it is here on the floor of the House for consideration, and we trust our colleagues and the American people will bear with us, knowing this is a new venture for a congressional committee, that we had no precedent to follow, and further that the committee, as is most every committee of Congress, understaffed so far as getting needed information is concerned.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad to yield to my good friend, the able Congressman at Large, from the great State of Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. While the gentleman is paying tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and its other members and the clerk of the committee, I think it is entirely in order for me to say that the gentleman now addressing the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is a very modest and self-effacing man and has contributed a great deal to the Committee on Appropriations and to this subcommittee and deserves the congratulations of the House. He has our respect because of his devotion to his job.

Mr. JENSEN. I appreciate the kind words of my good friend from Ohio, but I must say I have felt less adequately equipped to perform this function as a member of this committee than on any other undertaking which I have ever undertaken. I think most everyone can understand what a job it is to go into the working functions of these many Government corporations and bring to the floor of Congress, and to the American people, a clear picture of just how the corporations function, what their duties are, and how we can best bring them under the control of Congress, the representatives of the people for the general good of the taxpayers of America and all the people. The minority members of the subcommittee who are the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] and myself have agreed substantially with most everything in this bill and in the report which is here submitted in relation to the bill. The sessions were very harmonious. We have high regard for each other. But there were a few matters on which we could not come to a meeting of the minds. In fact, we were so far apart that the minority members felt it plain our duty to submit minority views on those particular points by submitting a minority report.

While it is true it is an unusual thing for the minority members of an appropriation subcommittee to do, but because of the unusual situation with which we were dealing, and because it is a new venture in the duties and responsibilities of members of a committee of Congress, we felt it was the right and proper procedure.

The big question in issue is section 302 of the bill, which the minority after much study believe gives the President more power than any President should have. We think it is not necessary. We think that the Government corporation has sufficient latitude to operate efficiently to the benefit of the American people without giving the broad authority provided in section 302 of the bill. So at the proper time a motion will be offered to strike out that entire section of the bill.

Also another amendment will be offered.

Many of these Government corporations are incorporated under the laws of different States, as you will note on page 2 of the report, which gives the name of the corporation and the State in which it was incorporated. Some of these corporations are instituted under Federal charter.

As our chairman has pointed out, a number of these corporations are to be liquidated. All of them must be liquidated by June 30, 1948, except where they are continued by an act of Congress. Some of the State laws are very liberal. The laws of the State of Delaware, for instance, provide that a corporation has a 3-year period after application has been made for liquidation before the books of that corporation can be closed. During that time administrative staffs must be maintained—possibly greater staffs than are necessary.

While, we want to give plenty of time for anyone who has a claim against these Government corporations to present his claim and have it considered, it does appear that 3 years is more time than is necessary. I was surprised to note that these Government corporations had full authority to pay all claims that might be filed against them, or to settle them in any way they see fit. That is more power, I am sure, than a great majority of the American people feel such officials of a Government corporation handling the taxpayers' money should have as to the power to lend the taxpayers' money with hardly any restrictions as to the amount or as to who shall receive the loan, but also that these officials who are not elected representatives of the American people can pay out vast sums of the taxpayers' money in claims without going through the regular channels of Congress. After all, the Members of Congress are the representatives of the people and should have control over expenditures of that kind which entail not only thousands but millions of dollars. If allowed to go to its final conclusion it could amount to billions of dollars.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I will be so happy to yield to my esteemed colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I appreciate the very able and splendid statement the gentleman is making, and his observations. What check in the way of auditing does the Government have over these corporations?

Mr. JENSEN. I was coming to that but I will answer the gentleman right now. Heretofore, until this act, known as the Government Corporations Control Act was passed last year, no Government corporation was audited by the General Accounting Office. That act brought them under the control of Congress to some degree at least. I contend they should be under complete control of Congress. Some may not agree with me but under this Corporations Control Act it is my contention that we are at least endeavoring to put these Government corporations under full control of Congress. Since it is the duty of Congress to control the purse strings for our people. Heretofore they have been operating under the basic acts. It appears to me they have been acting without any consideration of the Congress.

The committee was greatly handicapped in the fact that we had no reports as yet from the General Accounting Office, reports which they will make after they have audited the books of all these corporations. We were happy to learn that shortly after the law was passed our highly respected and able former colleague, Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, made a determined effort to get the right man, the best-qualified man obtainable, to be at the head of the auditing staff for these Government corporations. In fact, they went to the South Pacific to secure this man, it is such an important job, and that man finally accepted the position. I might add that he did so at a financial loss to himself. He appeared before our committee and we were greatly impressed. I know he is going to do a good job.

They are auditing the books at the present time. Next year the committee, the Congress, and the American people will have the benefit of those reports. I am sure they will be clear, concise, understandable, and I am sure the General Accounting Office is going to call a spade a spade. If there is anything wrong in Denmark, they are going to say so in no uncertain terms, I feel certain.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman has stated that the corporation does go ahead and consider claims against the Government that are filed and pays them.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. So that this auditing the gentleman speaks of comes after the transaction is completed?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman think the Congress ought to have something to say about the amount of money appropriated and have more supervision than we have now?

Mr. JENSEN. I absolutely do also. I think we should pass legislation which will provide that all claims over a certain amount, say $500, shall be dealt with through the Congress. That is, they would have no authority to settle those claims, but would be compelled to come to the Congress and submit the claim through the regular channels.

Mr. Chairman, on page 61 there is a minority report, which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD for the information of the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, on page 63 it will be observed that reference is made by the minority members of the committee to the Inter-American Affairs, the organization sponsored by Nelson Rockefeller. I shall not read the full section except to say that the minority members felt that after the commitments which have been made by the Government are executed and completed that corporation should be entirely liquidated.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to my good friend the able gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa for taking that stand. I have personally made an investigation of this Inter-American Affairs organization under Rockefeller and, in my opinion, it should be brought to an end as rapidly as possible.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

I do direct your attention to the hearings where Mr. Wyatt appeared before the committee to justify his requests for additional appropriations for administrative expenses. I think you will find the hearings very enlightening and interesting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation, in the opinion of the minority members of the committee, has served its purpose, and we recommend that the loans held by the Government be sold to private lending institutions, especially since the private banks and lending institutions are bulging with money, as they say, at the present time.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Did the hearings disclose whether the Home Owners' Loan Corporation had proved itself to be a self-liquidating proposition, that is, whether it operated at a loss to the Government or not?

Mr. JENSEN. There is going to be a considerable loss, but because of the inflated prices on homes it will not be too awful bad.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is it expected that the audit the gentleman previously referred to will disclose exactly what the status is?

Mr. JENSEN. To the penny, I am sure. I asked Mr. Fahey, the Director of Home Owners' Loan Corporation, if he was encouraging the liquidation of this organization and if he was encouraging private banks and lending institutions to buy these loans. He said, to the contrary, that he was discouraging it, which surprised me greatly, so we went into it at quite length. In that respect I also refer you to the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I shall say at this time. When the bill is read for amendment I shall again make a statement relative to the amendments which we shall offer and some other points in the bill which I shall want to refer to at a later time as the debate progresses.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent I insert the minority report at this point:

MINORITY VIEWS

The brevity of the minority's views indicates that the majority report of the committee represents with limited exceptions the view of the entire subcommittee. A minority report from the House Committee on Appropriations is unusual. It has been made, in this instance, to emphasize some views and to reflect some fundamental differences in opinion which it is felt are particularly important in these times. The minority members sincerely believe the exercise of this function to be our plain duty.

PURPOSE AND EFFECT OF THE ACT

It was the obvious intent of Congress in enacting the Government Corporation Control Act to bring the corporations under the fiscal controls of the Government and to reestablish the constitutional powers of Congress as the only appropriating authority. This is necessary in order to provide a working fiscal program which embodies all the agencies of government which are integrally a part of the financial structure and enable the Congress and the public to determine readily the outstanding obligations and commitments of the United States. The committee has endeavored to carry out this intent but it is our view that the action taken does not go far enough. While it is true that the bill as reported to the House carries in it restrictions which should prohibit the use of funds or authority for any purpose not related to budget programs, the committee has also approved a section (sec. 302 of the bill) which was proposed by the Bureau of the Budget which would permit a corporation to initiate a new program merely by securing the approval of the President. In our judgment this section greatly weakens, if not vitiates, the controls attempted by the remainder of the bill. It is the purpose of the minority to advocate and contend for adequate Budget control over the Government corporations and to seek amendments of the Corporation Control Act if it is determined that such amendments are necessary to provide that degree of control which must be had in order to meet the constitutional requirements for control of the Federal finances. The corporations deal entirely with the taxpayers' money and have attained such a size as to almost dominate the economy of the Nation through their power to expand and use at will the credit of the United States.

There are fiscal fundamentals which the minority feels must be the guide for any action of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress if the domestic economy is to be stabilized. Of these, the following four are pertinent to the duties and responsibilities of this subcommittee:

1. Shrink the national debt.
2. Reduce Federal Government expenditures to the minimum.
3. Avoid actions upon the part of Government which hinder the full functioning of a free competitive economy.
4. Avoid any financial performance or operation upon the part of Government, the trend of which is inflationary.

The expansion of Federal credit is inflationary and easy "cheap money" is inflationary. Both of these inflation-producing elements are inherent vices in the authority and in the method of transaction of the business of the large lending agencies which are included in the accompanying bill. The various lending agencies of the Government operate under statutory and corporate charter powers which are so broad as to place them not only in competition with private financial institutions but, in some instances, with each other. For example, there is no power of The RFC Mortgage Company to make a loan which is not duplicated either by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Federal National Mortgage Association. Instances of solicitation of loans by certain of the lending agencies have come to the attention of the committee. If the Federal Government is to be in the money-lending business at all certainly that function should be restricted to supplementing the private sources of capital as required by emergent needs only and in no event should a Government agency make a loan until every reasonable private source has been exhausted, as was the intention of the Congress in enacting the various laws under which Government loans are made.

The minority members of the committee take the position that no Government corporation should be incorporated other than by specific authority of Federal law. Attention should also be directed to the fact that under the laws of some States where Government corporations have been incorporated, there is a 3-year period required after a corporation has actually gone out of business before it can be finally liquidated and its charter surrendered. It is, therefore, necessary for the Government to maintain offices, and bear the expense of personnel, and other administrative costs for 3 years after the business is closed. The officials of Government corporations have full authority and autocratic power to allow any claim against such a corporation and pay that claim with the taxpayers' money without going through the regular channels of the Congress and are not governed in these settlements, by the laws respecting the payment of claims by the Government generally. Such authority in the hands of unscrupulous officials might well lead to the payment of unjust claims amounting to great sums. It is not difficult to see how a condition of this kind could lead to misappropriation of the taxpayers' money.

STAFF OF THE COMMITTEE

No committee of Congress is at present properly staffed with auditors, examiners, or investigators whose duty it would be to check into not only the functions of the different departments, commissions, agencies, etc., of the Government to ascertain at regular intervals whether or not they are living up to the letter of law. Especially is every subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee handicapped, to the detriment of the taxpaying public, in that the members of the committees do not have the very much needed staffs to keep them properly informed as to how the spending agencies of Government are expending appropriated funds. Once during each fiscal year departments come before the 12 respective subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee to justify

their request for funds and it is a physical impossibility for the members of the committee to know with any degree of accuracy the amount of money each agency should have to meet its needs.

The minority members of the committee are, however, gratified to know that the Committee on Reorganization of Congress has made recommendations for such examining staffs and we wholeheartedly endorse this recommendation. The present staff of the committee is as efficient and as capable as could be secured but is wholly inadequate in size. The additional staff members proposed by the Committee on Reorganization should work under the direction of the secretary of each subcommittee.

INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

The appropriations carried in the bill are approved by the minority only because they are for the purpose of meeting contractual obligations heretofore entered into. It has been stated that there is some intention of continuing certain aspects of these programs under the auspices of the Department of State. No such continuing activity should be embarked upon as a result of these appropriations or through the existing corporations. These corporations should be liquidated as soon as their outstanding commitments have been met.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The following statement is quoted from the Budget:

"The bank was established to stimulate the international trade of the United States."

Under the original practice, within this expressed purpose, the bank made loans to foreign and domestic enterprises who were dealing in exportation of American-produced commodities and the importation of foreign commodities. In that field the bank has in the past and could in the future render a useful service. By its operation in the field of foreign government loans, it has become a means of avoiding the specific approval of the Congress in the lending of money to foreign governments. It is the recommendation of the minority that congressional approval be obtained on all loans to foreign governments.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The minority is of the opinion that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation where it operates in the event of emergent needs should be governed solely by its own Board of Directors. Influence is brought to bear by other administrative branches of government which are intolerable and have in the past caused bad banking practices. Attention is invited to testimony on the loans to the Kaiser interests on pages 660 to 662 of the hearings. Any subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which does not now serve an emergent need should be liquidated.

Public works: It has been the practice of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to make loans to States, political subdivisions thereof, and other public bodies of the United States for public works. It is the opinion of the minority that public-works expenditures should be restricted strictly to those programs authorized by specific legislation including descriptive limitations on types of programs and amounts of money.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

We are impressed with the apparent confusion in the minds of those charged with the veterans' housing program. It appears to be the acknowledgment of all that the various controlling agencies of government are in conflict and their rules and conflicts have created in the building industry black markets which are in themselves a great inflationary force. Black-market operators are tax evaders. The minority has joined in the liberality of the committee in approving the Administrator's request only because of the great housing shortage and its great desire to provide adequate housing for the American people.

There is now pending in Congress legislation to authorize additional housing programs. Before such legislation is presented for consideration by the House, there should be a thorough and complete study not only of the existing laws but of the housing needs generally with a view to minimizing the participation of the Federal Government in what is essentially a local problem. In any such enactment the present confused situation should be clarified through codification and simplification.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

Now that the banks and other local financial institutions are in need of sound investments for the large amounts of money on hand the Home Owners' Loan Corporation should make every effort to transfer every loan it holds to these private lending agencies and thereby enable the Federal Government to liquidate this Corporation. The purposes for which the Corporation was founded have now been served and its continued operation is not justified. You will note on page 1126 of the hearings that the Administrator of this Corporation testified that they were discouraging the recommendations as made by the minority members of this committee in this report. Such action could be interpreted only as an attempt on the part of the Administrator to maintain continuance of office at the unnecessary expense of the taxpayer. A request was made to this committee for the sum of $5,179,000 for administrative expenses. The committee allowed $4,500,000 which could be saved, in addition to giving the private lending institutions of our Nation the benefit of this business, if the recommendations of the minority members of the committee are carried out.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, which has resulted in a loss to date of $49,700,000 as it has been operated, is a continually failing venture without any general benefit to the economic welfare of the farmers or of the Nation. Under the present law, the administrative and operating costs are paid out of an appropriation from the Treasury and the income from insurance premiums is used only to meet losses. The amount of losses given above represents the difference between premiums collected and losses paid, and does not take into account any of the expenses for personnel and other administrative costs. The total loss is reflected in the following table:

Total insurance losses paid	$110,950,597
Total of administrative expenses and operating costs	46,249,081
Insurance premiums collected	61,170,079
Net cost of the operation	95,249,081

In 1943 the Committee on Appropriations recommended and the Congress approved the dissolution of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. Subsequently another law was passed reestablishing it. The minority members of the committee believe that history and experience justify the position taken by the Committee on Appropriations in 1943. We recognize that private underwriters are not interested in this field and that if such a venture is deemed an economic necessity, it would have to be conducted by the Government. It is a known factor that no such program can succeed unless it is participated in by farmers generally and to date it is apparent that only the high hazard areas are interested and that the rates obtained are inadequate and inequitable.

The minority members of the committee recognize the intolerable conditions partially imposed by Federal programs in certain flood areas. These people are entitled to redress. It is our opinion, however, that the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is not a proper or equitable vehicle.

INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

It has been recommended on page 802 of the hearings by the Secretary of Commerce that the Inland Waterways Corporation be sold. The statute creating the Corporation provides that the Corporation shall continue operations until navigable channels have been completed; terminal facilities have been established; joint tariffs with rail carriers have been published and filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission; and private persons, companies or corporations engage, or are willing to engage, in comparable common-carrier service. It should be pointed out that the Secretary's contention is that the statute has not been fully complied with but sufficiently so that it justifies a recommendation to the Congress for the sale of the Corporation. The minority believes that the statute has been complied with insofar as various sections of the waterways are concerned, with the exception of the Missouri River between St. Louis and Kansas City. Testimony indicated that this segment was as yet in pioneer stages of development. As further proof that this Corporation should be liquidated the hearings revealed that private carriers are now and can in the future render to the public the necessary services at reasonable rates. It should be stated also that Inland Waterways Corporation has since 1939 lost $2,500,000 while during the same period private carriers have enjoyed profits and have paid substantial taxes into the Federal Treasury. The continued losses can be expected unless a complete rehabilitation of equipment is instituted as a part of the program of the corporation. It cannot expect to again be put in the successfully competitive position. The Department of Commerce requested an allowance of $2,600,000 for replacement of plant and equipment which the committee by majority vote has allowed in this bill. In view of the minority's recommendation, this allowance is opposed.

BEN F. JENSEN.
WALTER C. PLOESER.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is a new bill by a new committee under a new law. It is, therefore, a rather notable bill, and marks an important milestone in the history of congressional appropriations. It is the first time the Committee on Appropriations has reported a Government corporation appropriation bill. For that reason, the new committee has proceeded in the formulation of this bill without previous landmarks or precedents, without compass or charts. It is a new field. Despite this formidable handicap the committee has reported a bill which conforms in every respect to the requirements of the statute and which meets with general approval.

In order to comply with the statute in the drafting of this bill it was necessary to appoint a new committee. I doubt whether the members of any subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has ever been selected with more care. They were appointed without regard to rank. They were of course appointed without regard to ability, because all the members of the Committee on Appropriations are men of tested ability, with the exception of a few appointed in earlier years when we were

not quite so circumspect in selecting membership. But we selected these five men who comprise the subcommittee on the basis of their capacity for hard work, and their interest in the financial integrity of the Government.

The committee consists of Mr. MAHON as chairman of the committee, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. GORE, Mr. JENSEN, and Mr. PLOESER, all of them picked men. The bill which they have presented more than justifies the care with which they were selected.

I hardly think that in all my service here in the House I have seen a Member rise more rapidly, and more deservedly, than the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. His capacity for leadership, his sound judgment, and his interest in the maintenance of essential Federal activities at a minimum of expenditure have placed him on committees holding the purse strings over some of the most important departments of the Government. Although the Committee on Appropriations is the largest in either House, and advancement is necessarily slow, he has become in a remarkably short space of time one of the influential members of the committee and the House. The bill which he reports today is exceptionally well prepared, and marks a long step forward in the supervision and control of agencies and corporations which have up to this time been to a large degree a law unto themselves.

There is, however, one feature about this report, outside of the Chair's province which might be misunderstood. Up to this time it has not been the custom to print minority views in the report as submitted to the committee.

An appropriation bill is not a political bill. It deals purely with economic and fiscal matters. There is no place for partisanship in the general supply bills. If you will go back through the bills of former years and read the opening speeches by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee, you will note that the debate on practically every appropriation bill reported to the House was prefaced with the statement: "There is no politics in this bill." While I am certain that is true of the pending bill, the conclusion might be drawn from this departure, from the custom of the committee that partisanship is being injected.

Knowing the members who have signed the report I am certain there is no ground for such conclusion and I make this statement in order to express the hope that the situation will not be misinterpreted and that it will not be taken as a precedent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In this connection, it will be noted on page 62 of the minority report under "Staff of the committee" the statement that—

> No committee of Congress is at present properly staffed with auditors, examiners, or investigators whose duty it would be to check into not only the functions of the different departments, commissions, agencies, and so forth, of the Government to ascertain at regular intervals whether or not they are living up to the letter of law.

Of course, if carried to its ultimate conclusion, the activity proposed here would be an infringement upon the duties of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. And, equally obvious, this subcommittee, or any member of this subcommittee, could have secured at any time the services of an unlimited number of examiners, auditors, or investigators, if they had wanted them. All that would have been necessary would have been for them to make application to the Chairman and ranking minority member of the committee and they would have secured just the men they wanted and as many as needed—just as every other subcommittee has secured examiners, auditors, and investigators for this character of work over the last 3 years.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that we knew we could get examiners whenever we wanted them by asking our good chairman and getting his consent.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. It has never been refused, either by the chairman or the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. JENSEN. That is right. We knew that perfectly well. We also knew that you would get those examiners from some other department of Government to examine a department of Government that we wanted examined. In other words, the gentleman knows that it is not natural to expect any member of one department of the same Government in the same administration to do a thing that would bring disrepute to some other department of Government. Consequently, the gentleman also knows that the examinations, audits, and investigations that those gentlemen have made have been of little consequence. Indeed, I think a good share of them have done a pretty good job of whitewashing.

The gentleman also knows that I introduced a bill 2 years ago which provided examining and auditing staffs for each subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and that he opposed it. Consequently, I never was able to get it out of committee. The Special Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress, however, recommended such staffs. I presume the gentleman knows that I appeared before that special committee and had at least an hour's session with them in which I made that recommendation which they incorporated in their report and suggestions for the reorganization of the Congress. I am wondering if the gentleman is going to support that section of the reorganization recommendations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is entirely alone in his assertion that the examinations which we have made have been without effect. Repeatedly on this floor it has been stated that millions of dollars have been saved through the action of these investigators. They are not partisan. They are men under civil service. They come to us from the Secret Service of the Treasury Department, from the investigations staff of the Civil Service Commission, from the scentists of the Health Department, from the auditors in the General Accounting Office, and from the FBI which as everyone knows trains the finest investigators to be found anywhere in the world. Never in the last 3 years has there been any suggestion that these investigations were not efficient or effective. We always got the information we requested.

So far as I know the gentleman himself has never asked for any investigation which was denied or delayed, and he has never asked for a second investigation on the grounds that the first investigation was unsatisfactory. The work of the trained experts supplied by the departments—by the FBI, for instance—cannot be compared with the biased and inadequate results secured by political appointees who might be recommended by some Member of the House. We have had experience with that sort of investigation.

We had a fair sample of that when we investigated WPA and other special committee assignments.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman said he never remembers that I asked for an investigation. I am glad the able chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is on the floor.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Iowa misunderstood me. I said he had never asked for an investigation that was denied.

Mr. JENSEN. That is true.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And so far as I know if the gentleman had an investigation he never complained that the investigation failed to discover the facts.

Mr. JENSEN. Also the gentleman knows I never gave them any compliments; so it is about even.

The gentleman mentioned the FBI. Possibly I am not well informed, but I know other members of the Appropriations Committee generally believe as I do that the FBI has never been asked to make a report to the Appropriations Committee under this particular set-up that we have.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. An FBI man has been in charge of all these investigations. There has never been a refusal by the FBI to give us a man. They always give us men who are eminently qualified. And there are no better qualified investigators in the world—either in character and integrity or in training and ability.

Mr. JENSEN. Then I will say that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has kept a lot of things secret, because, certainly, he has not informed the members of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. So far as I know every investigation has been considered a part of the executive sessions of the committee which conducted it. As a rule the committee itself does not know the name of the operators who make the investigations. Requests for

investigations are handled through the clerk of the committee who transmits requests to the operator in charge, who in turn calls in his men and transmits their reports to the clerk without mentioning the names of the men who participated in the investigation.

This system is the only practical system for the purpose. It is elastic. If all 10 subcommittees are investigating you have men for 10 investigations. Under the plan suggested by the gentleman you would be unable to conduct simultaneously the investigations requested by the committees. And when you have no investigations you have no one on the pay roll. Under the gentleman's plan you would have the force cooling its heels at Government expense.

Under this system you send each time a new man—one whom the departments have never seen before. He secures much of his information before they know they are being investigated. But a permanent staff would be known to everybody and his presence would be telegraphed around when he entered the door.

It is the most economical system. No man is paid more than his civil-service salary and he is paid only when he is actually detailed to work. We have operated for 3 years for less money than was ever spent on an investigation of this size. And we have saved millions of dollars. No committee ever asked for information it did not secure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman did not answer the question when I asked him if he is in favor of the recommendations as to the reorganization of the Congress as regards auditing staffs for committees of Congress.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Oh, no; I am not. I do not think that any man could be in favor of that system as contrasted with the system the House Committee on Appropriations is using. The proposal is a theory. The Committee on Appropriations has been investigating for 3 years and without a single complaint. It is theory against practice.

Mr. Chairman, in the brief time allotted me I regret to note in the minority report on the Inland Waterways Corporation the recommendation that the corporation be sold. There has been no agency established by the Congress which has been of such value to the American farmer in the reduction of freight rates as the Inland Waterway Corporation. By using the rates of the Inland Waterway Corporation as a yardstick we have compelled carriers to reduce rates throughout the Mississippi Valley.

The statement is also made that we have lost money. There were years in which we made money. If you will examine the testimony you will find that if the recommendation made by this committee is carried out we will not maintain this yardstick which has held down rates to the farmers of the Mississippi Valley, but we will put it in position to pay dividends upon its investment.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In connection with the reorganization bill that passed the Senate by such an overwhelming majority on Saturday last, I read in the Sunday papers about the gentleman's opposition to that plan. He says he is going to put that statement in the RECORD?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No, it is already in the RECORD. On three different occasions I have discussed the subject fully—and I hope convincingly. But perhaps the gentleman refers to the committee investigations.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I am speaking about the bill as a whole because the gentleman has been quoted in the paper last Saturday as being very strongly opposed to this reorganization plan that has been sponsored by Members of Congress and others who believe that there is a real opportunity for service and to put the Congress on a more efficient basis. Is the gentleman going to put a statement of his opposition to that bill in the RECORD, and, if so, when?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am sorry the gentleman has not noted my frequent discussion of the matter in the RECORD. Of course few read the RECORD.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. On the present plan that passed the Senate last Saturday?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The plan that passed the Senate has been under consideration for many months. It may have been slightly modified in passage but fundamentally it is largely the bill as originally recommended by the joint committee. It is built around a proposition to increase the salaries of the Members of Congress.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not give much credence then to those who have made a very thorough study of this situation or give them credit for making a valuable report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They do not report anything which would be of any particular advantage to this body. I take it that the gentleman considers an increase in congressional salaries an advantage to the country.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Well, the gentleman is going to put his remarks in the RECORD bearing on that point then, is he?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have already done that, and I will be very glad to send the gentleman a copy of some of my speeches on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, in the brief time remaining, I wish to also express regret that the minority views condemn the Federal crop insurance without its day in court. The report fails to point out the most pertinent fact in connection with the subject. And that is the fact that when the new law was written specific provision was incorporated in the act requiring that the rate of premium be high enough to take care of all losses. Under the new law, crop insurance is self-sustaining. The minority report completely overlooks this very material consideration.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, and in response to the suggestion contained in the first paragraph of the minority views, I wish to include a statement on governmental expenditure and the national debt in connection with the national budget by Mr. Harold D. Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, as follows:

An inquiring reporter recently discovered that during the 7 years I have been its Director, the Bureau of the Budget has approved for submission to the President and the Congress recommended appropriations of a little over $500,000,000,000, or more than half a trillion dollars. If all the budget requests of the executive departments had been approved, this sum would have been even larger.

Quantitatively, such sums are so completely beyond our experience as individuals that they are incomprehensible. Yet their meaning for us as individuals and as a Nation, while not simple, is nevertheless comprehensible to any person who will give his public budget at least as much thought as he gives his private budget. If this were not so, the democratic process would fail at its source.

Mr. Average Citizen can no longer afford to neglect his public budget. As far as the Federal Budget is concerned, he cannot afford the luxury of occasional heated criticism of the administration in Washington with the resultant righteous feeling that his obligations as a citizen toward the Budget have been discharged.

Those New Deal budgets before the war, about which many citizens complained loudly, now rate in third or fourth place. They were relatively small, and in retrospect we can say that as far as their impact on the national economy was concerned, they did some good and little harm.

The situation is very different now. The war and its aftermath have brought us large Federal budgets. These budgets represent, among other things, the test to which our enemies put us. Their magnitude is something of a measure of a dynamic democracy, not a decadent one, as our enemies have discovered to their sorrow. The war budgets were large because our war production was beyond anything thought possible, and our war effort as a whole was a tribute to the dynamics of democracy.

Postwar budgets will be several times the magnitude of prewar budgets. During each of the four prewar years, the Federal Budget averaged about $8,000,000,000. Some time ago I publicly stated that postwar Federal Budgets would be approximately $25,000,000,000, or over three times that prewar average. I have been criticized for using the $25,000,000,000 figure. But now the developing evidence points to the possibility that this figure is too low rather than too high.

Let us take a look at the Federal Budget for fiscal 1947 in terms of the major categories of expenditures. We will assume, for example, a Budget for 1947 of approximately $40,000,000,000.

First, expenditures for the Army and the Navy and war liquidation may amount to as much as $18,000,000,000. This compares to $1,000,000,000 for national defense expenditures in the Budget of 1938. One need only get a picture of the state of the world from his daily newspaper to understand why this large expenditure for national defense has not been cut more quickly.

Then there is the interest bill of $5,000,000,000 annually for the public debt. There are not many proposals for cutting that.

There are also the Government's obligations to veterans, of approximatey $5,000,000,000 in fiscal '47, and there are active legislative proposals which would enormously increase this amount.

Here we have a total of $28,000,000,000 accounted for by just three items in the Budget.

If we group together aids to agriculture and housing, and refunds to taxpayers, we have another item of $3,500,000,000. International finance and social security come to $4,500,000,000. Public works is $1,200,000,000 and the rest of the Government is $2,300,000,000.

In case you have not already totaled them, these items come to $39,500,000,000. I have used figures roughly to give you a picture of what the Budget may look like for fiscal '47 after the Congress has completed its work on appropriation measures.

I wish specifically to call your attention to the item of $2,300,000,000 for general government. Aside from the Army and the Navy, this item finances the administration of the departments and independent agencies of the Government. It finances the departments headed by personalities you hear about and read about—the departments you normally think of as composing the Government of the United States. Yet here is only $2,300,000,000 out of a total of nearly $40,000,000,000. Any school boy could readily tell you that you cannot do much to balance the Federal Budget if you concentrate 90 percent of your effort—as some do—on this item. In the light of these figures, you could eliminate a large part of the personnel in the departments of the Government and you would accomplish little in the direction of balancing the Budget. While I am pointing out the obvious, I sometimes feel that when it comes to budgets the obvious is often strangely obscure.

It does not take a very wise person to observe how inflexible are the major expenditure items in the Federal Budget in relation to the political realities both national and international. Reducing Federal expenditure is a tough job. As Director of the Federal Budget, I can assure you that very powerful forces work against you from start to finish. One can make a pleasant task of a speech about economy in general, but budgets are not built on generalities. They consist of very specific, detailed proposals for expenditure. It is a rare occasion indeed when someone or some group benefiting from a governmental expenditure proposes that that expenditure be reduced. There are plenty of proposals made by one group for the reduction of expenditures that affect another group, but "Oh, don't cut us."

As an example, I recall the energetic head of a business organization in a State where a large amount of Federal funds was being spent. He was a vociferous adherent of a policy of Government economy. I asked him where he would recommend a cut in Federal expenditures within his own State. With this question his economy crusade collapsed.

I have read many pamphlets on how to cut Federal expenditures. Some of them give the reader the impression that if obdurate Federal officials would only do a few simple things the budget could be readily reduced. There is a tendency to gross oversimplification of a complex problem, and oversimplification is the number one stumbling block to the solution of any problem. I am not against the pamphleteers. If anything, I am arguing for more and better ones. Such activity is helpful in molding public opinion, and consequently is of great importance in a democracy. Representative government, after all, does rather precisely what the citizens want done.

What I am trying to say here is that the Budget of the Federal Government is what you make it, not what some officials in Washington make it. If you want Federal expenditures cut you have to work at it where it hurts. You have to counteract some of the forces which work to increase Federal expenditures. In short, budget-balancing, like charity, begins at home.

The President has said, "We are on the way to a balanced budget." On behalf of the Administration, I can assure you that the budget will be balanced. The argument is not whether or not the budget can be balanced. It must be balanced and more than balanced. The larger the surplus the better.

During 16 years of deficits it was quite natural that many people would despair that the Federal Budget would ever be balanced. We have talked a lot about a compensatory fiscal policy. Most of that discussion has been devoted to arguments for and against deficits in times of depression. If we hold in favor of a budget deficit for depression periods, we are utterly inconsistent if we do not hold with equal conviction for a budget surplus now. The time has come to take our foot off the accelerator and apply the brakes.

When Federal budgets were small, as they were during the first hundred years of our existence, their impact upon the economy was relatively insignificant. Now we are dealing with a new set of budget magnitudes. These were forced upon us during the war. Each of us must think in new terms if we are to grasp the significance of our current situation. Our concepts of fiscal policies when budgets were small have to be modified and revised. The fiscal policies that were desirable in times of depression and inevitable in times of war have to be reversed in situations such as we now face. I am not arguing that the Budget must be balanced merely because it seems sounder for the Government's revenues to equal its expenditures. There is more to balancing the Budget than that. And at this time many more compelling reasons argue for balanced budget.

We are confronted with a situation of actual and potential inflation. In order to use the Budget as a damper on inflation, we must have as big a surplus as can possibly be achieved. The war has not only distorted our economy on the production side; it has distorted our financial structure as well. People want the goods they were unable to get during the 4 years of war. Their purchases can be financed from savings accumulated during 4 years of high wartime incomes. To the extent that the Federal Government pays out more dollars than it receives it only adds to the purchasing power available and thereby aggravates the inflation. Also, to the extent that the Federal Government purchases goods in competition with private industry it increases pressure on prices.

At this time you cannot have increased public services and the houses, refrigerators, and washing machines you want. To attempt to have both now is like trying to have your cake and eat it. There is an abundant purchasing power to take goods off the market at higher prices. Any producer or merchant who succeeds in getting price ceilings broken has little fear that he will be unable to sell his product because the price is too high. The main bulwark against inflation was and still is the OPA.

I believe that our budget policy during the war is in part responsible for the threat of inflation at the present time, although during the war as a nation we did a relatively creditable job and in relation to the last war we did a magnificent job. We did raise taxes far higher than they had ever been before. We did put personal income taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis. We did make strenuous efforts to induce people to invest in Government bonds. All these things helped, but they were not enough. Vast amounts of purchasing power did accumulate in the hands of individuals and businesses.

I have always thought and argued during the war that we should have had higher taxes than we did and also that we should have had a system of compulsory savings. With compulsory savings, funds could now be released in an orderly manner as goods become available. As it is, we have an abundance of purchasing power accumulated during the war confronting shortages of goods at every turn. We have an accumulation of approximately $175,000,000,000 of liquid assets in the hands of individuals and unincorporated businesses. About $145,000,000,000 of this amount is in the hands of individuals. All of it may be freed to compete in the market for scarce goods. You may get some perspective if you recall that $175,000,000,000 of liquid assets is equal to the national income for a record year.

We face a serious inflationary situation which will end only when goods again become abundant in relation to purchasing power. The Federal budget has an essential role to play in combating inflation. We must balance the budget with a surplus if it is to play that essential role.

But we cannot achieve a surplus merely by talking about it. Both the legislative and executive branches of the Government must cooperate to resist pressures to increase major expenditure programs or to reduce taxation. There are now one or more measures in the Congress which separately or in combination could remove any prospect of a balanced budget. As an example there is a proposal before the Congress for terminal-leave pay for GI's, the cost of which is estimated variously from two to six billion dollars. Such a measure would not only seriously jeopardize our chances of a balanced budget, but it would rob us of any prospect of a budget surplus. It would aggravate the forces of inflation and would thus be a hollow benefit to the veterans.

To achieve a surplus we must attack some of the major expenditure programs. We must cut them where possible. Where it is impossible to cut them we must resist all attempts to undertake new expenditures on programs that can be deferred.

The national defense outlay will represent more than 40 percent of the 1947 budget. I am sure that economies can be achieved in this program without in any way affecting national security. Some day the American people will wake up to the fact that competition between the armed services is an expensive luxury. When that day comes there will be no hesitancy about adopting the President's recommendations for unification of the armed services.

Our public construction programs need special scrutiny. There is a very grave danger that we will arrive at a premature peak in public works. The point which I made earlier—that we cannot have increased public services at this time without conflicting with the private production of civilian goods—is particularly true in the construction of public works.

We may have to take another look at Army and Navy construction projects, some of which appear to have little relationship to our security. Our civilian public works must also be carefully examined. There are construction projects such as emergency housing and veterans' hospitals which must go forward. But we must take a conservative view about starting new projects. We should plan to have public construction reach its peak after private construction begins to decline. However, there remains the danger that we may reach peaks in private and public construction at about the same time.

We should bear in mind that public construction projects cannot be treated lightly. Some of them have a very high priority and are essential for our future progress. If the air transport industry and the automobile industry are to play their parts in sustaining postwar prosperity, adequate highways and commercial airport facilities must be available. We must work out a construction program that balances the needs of the future against the requirements of the present.

We can and will achieve further economies in the administration of government. But

as I have already indicated, economies in administration make only a trivial contribution to the total result. It is the major expenditure programs which require attention.

On the revenue side of the budget, it is clear that there should be no reduction in taxes. That was the policy announced by the President in his Budget message in January. It is more urgent today that it be carried out than it appeared to be then. Measures to reduce taxes further should not be considered until inflationary pressures have disappeared.

It is obvious that to balance the Budget with a surplus means on the one hand, that taxes must be maintained or raised, and on the other hand, that expenditures must be reduced. If we do cut taxes further, it will merely mean that there will be more purchasing power bidding for scarce goods.

If present tax laws are retained and if efforts to enlarge expenditure programs and adopt new ones are resisted, we can expect to balance the Budget in fiscal 1947. But to make its proper contribution to the fight against inflation, the budget should yield a surplus.

However, the Budget cannot be balanced merely because the President and the Director of the Budget want it balanced. It cannot be balanced merely because the Congress wants it balanced. The administration can exercise leadership and can say what ought to be done. But in order to get a Budget surplus, it is necessary that the public take the pressure off the Congress for public services.

I am a realist. I know how items get into the Budget. There is no mystery about it. Congressmen also know how projects get into the Budget. Congressmen cannot ignore the pressure of the people whom they represent.

Since it seems clear that we should balance the Budget, then if every official and every citizen will take all the steps within his capacity toward this goal we shall certainly achieve it.

I cannot overstress the importance of budget policy at the present time. The operations of the Federal Government are so large that their impact on the national economy cannot be ignored. The Budget can promote stability. It can, in turn, contribute to instability. We must balance the Budget with a surplus. Nothing short of that would content us. That is the policy of the national administration.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this bill, but the remarks just made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, it seems to me, call for some answer. If I understood the distinguished gentleman, he complained, in the first instance, because the minority members of this new committee had seen fit to file a minority report, a thing which he says in his 25 years of experience had never heretofore been done, and that by the filing of this minority report it indicates the infiltration of political matter into the work of the Committee on Appropriations.

Well, I happen to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and in the work of the subcommittee on which I am privileged to serve I have devoted myself as diligently as any man possibly could. But I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri and to the Members of this Congress and to the people of America that I do not concede it to be my responsibility merely because I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations to surrender my opinion and to surrender my judgment when the vote in the subcommittee is very frequently dictated by the majority party. You may call it politics or call it what you will, the two minority members of this subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, perhaps represent a different political philosophy than you do. They perhaps represent a different political philosophy than the party that you represent. The people who send them to Congress and who send me to the Congress intend that their Representatives in the Congress shall carry out the will which they expressed when they went to the polls, and one of those things was that we should curb this everlasting, apparently insatiable appetite on the part of the New Deal, to spend the public's money.

When you say to me and say to the Members of this Congress that these two minority Members are deviating from a well-established traditional policy of the Committee on Appropriations, that they should not have filed and not given expression to their views when they are not in accord with the action of the majority party, I think it is high time that the members of the Committee on Appropriations follow the signal lead that has been established by my two friends on this appropriations subcommittee. In view of the fact that this is a new bill dealing with momentous questions in which the the people of America are interested, I think they have charted a course they can well be proud of when they have had the courage to let not only the Congress, but the people of the United States know, after their diligent study of these problems, what the attitude of the minority is, and not have the minority's opinion smothered by the action of the majority, which may be entirely political in its genesis, and then charge these men with introducing politics into the Appropriations Committee because they have had the temerity to stand up and register their own views. I want the gentlemen of this minority to know that as far as I am concerned as one member of the Appropriations Committee I applaud their action, and I hope that the time will come when the people of America will know that the minority members of this Appropriations Committee have some rights and that they have the right to give expression to their views even though it does form a minority report.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Just to keep the record straight, I think the record should show that during my term of service on the Appropriations Committee there have been several minority reports filed. I personally have prepared one or two of them and signed them, along with other minority members.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. It seems to me that is a fundamental duty of a member of the Appropriations Committee. I listened with chagrin to the criticism of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, which was directed to such outstanding members of the Appropriations Committee as my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]. I believe it is not only their right but their solemn responsibility, and they would be derelict in their responsibility to those whom they represent and to the membership of this House if they did not record their views as they have seen fit to do in this minority report.

This is a new bill. As the chairman says, this is a new departure. I thank God that it is a departure, in my opinion, in the right direction.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Would the gentleman say as a member of the Committee on Appropriations that because this is a bill concerning as a group a dozen or perhaps a score of corporations of the Government that they have brought together here as a new procedure and departure in the Appropriations Committee, the more they owe, they owe the duty to file a minority report, particularly in view of the fact that public attention has been focused upon these corporations with their vast powers and vast expenditures of money?

Mr. KEEFE. Exactly. May I say further that it has been my observation since I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee that while we have tried at all times and have been quite successful in the consideration of Budget items to refrain from injecting political implications into our discussion, yet every member of this Appropriations Committee well knows that there has been a tendency to submerge individual attitudes and individual opinions as to certain appropriation items in the interest of conciliation, in the interest of harmony, and in the interest of bringing out a unanimous report.

I think, Mr. Chairman, and I speak to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee when I say "Mr. Chairman," that the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Missouri have pointed the proper way in matters of this kind, so that the minority may let the people know and let the Congress know that they are on the job and that they do intend to give expression to their views in order that we may sometime, pray God, stop this unholy expenditure of public funds.

Mr. GORE. Perhaps it should be said in extenuation of the gentleman's remarks that the work of this particular subcommittee, as well as this bill, is something different and quite apart from the work of the usual subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. We not only are recommending direct appropriations here, we are exercising supervision over corporations with far-flung activities, which do not require direct appropriations. There are things in the pending bill and in the subject matter of the report which could in my opinion properly be points of party as

well as personal differences. For instance, the proposed sale of the Inland Waterways Corporation raises a question on which the majority members are unanimously agreed that it should not be sold at this time, while the minority members recommend its sale.

I see nothing inimical about the minority members filing a minority report on this bill. Quite to the contrary, it is not only their right but it is their duty to set forth their sincere views separate from the majority if need be.

Mr. KEEFE. I am certainly glad to have the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee make that statement. I was just about to come to that because that was the second point in the argument presented by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] in making his objection to this minority report. It seems to me on the question of whether or not the Inland Waterways Corporation should now be disbanded and go out of business is a matter upon which the minds of reasonable men could well differ, and it does not necessarily have to be along political lines. I, for instance, happen to be one of those who believe that the functions of the Inland Waterways Corporation have been fully carried out as indicated in the report filed by the minority members. In accordance with the dictates of the law itself, when the requirements of the law have been complied with, it was the intent and express purpose of the Congress that the Government should go out of that business. The gentleman from Missouri, in his characteristic fashion, tells about the wonders and glories of the Inland Waterways System in fixing freight rates for the farmers out in the Middle West and has dragged in the usual old argument about agriculture and the farmers in attempting to justify the continuation of Government operation of these barge lines when there are independent operators ready and willing to take over that operation and furnish the transportation in accord with the rates fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Those barge lines, as the gentleman well knows, were set up as a yardstick and an experiment. The language of the statute that created it had in mind that when this yardstick had been completed the operation would be turned back to private control. Thereafter, the rate for carrying your agricultural food products on those barges would be subject to the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission as is the case with any other carrier.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I dislike to break into the gentleman's discussion at this point, but I must leave the Chamber presently to attend a hearing before one of the subcommittees on appropriations. I merely want to say in response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] that the instance to which he refers was not an instance in which minority views were printed in the report. They were submitted by the gentleman from New York from the floor and were not printed as minority views. I have just refreshed my memory by consulting the clerk of the committee who has been with us for many years and he tells me that that was the situation. In all the years I do not recollect an instance in which minority views on an appropriation bill were included in the report. The present instance is a most unusual and unprecedented procedure. I trust it will not be made a precedent which will be followed in the future.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say I am in complete disagreement with the attitude of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations upon that subject. I, for one, hope that this will be a guiding influence that will permit minority members of the Committee on Appropriations to express their opposing views in a report that is filed, and I will tell you why. The gentleman well knows that in the practice before the full Committee on Appropriations, time and time again, in a little three-quarters of an hour or half-hour debate involving one of these supply bills, numerous members of the minority have expressed their right to disagree with the action taken by the majority and have reserved the right to offer amendments on the floor in complete disagreement with the action taken by the majority. Therefore, in view of that practice which is usually carried out in the closed-door sessions of the Appropriations Committee, it seems to me it is perfectly proper that the entire membership of the House should have the benefit of these minority views and have them printed in the report, instead of having to rely upon the opportunity to make a little 5-minute speech upon the floor of the House when the House is in Committee of the Whole and the bill is under discussion and debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I have a distinct recollection of having participated in presenting to the House minority views which, by unanimous consent, were ordered printed with the majority report, on at least 10 different occasions, as I remember it. I believe it is the duty of the minority, when they have things which they believe should be presented in the House, to make such presentation as minority views.

Mr. KEEFE. I am very glad to have the distinguished minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, who no doubt will become chairman of that committee in the next House of Representatives, make that statement as expressing his views on this very important question, because I find my own views in complete accord with the views of the distinguished gentleman from New York. I could not allow the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to go unchallenged, because I firmly believe I am expressing the views of a majority of the Appropriations Committee itself.

May I say to the gentleman from Missouri, in carrying out what I conceive to be my duty as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I cannot seal my lips and keep from the Congress my opinion as to items in appropriation measures, by allowing myself to at least inferentially agree to a report, with many items of which I am in complete disagreement.

Miss SUMNER or Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Looking at it from the point of view of convenience of the Members, we do not know whether there is going to be a fight on a bill or not. We have to sit here hour after hour to see whether amendments are going to be offered. If you could pick up a minority report you would know whether there is a controversy and you would know what to do.

Mr. KEEFE I thank the gentlewoman for her very constructive remarks and suggestions.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman speaks of sealing lips. Of course, there is no possibility of that under the practice which has obtained in the committee and the House for many years.

Mr. KEEFE. No possibility of what?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Sealing the gentleman's lips. Circumscribing his right to debate. The failure to file minority views in no wise interferes with the right of any Member to the floor or his opportunity to express his views.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to say to the gentleman that there is no possibility of sealing my lips.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No report on any appropriation bill reported to the House for many years has carried minority views. And yet no member of the minority has ever suggested that he was limited in any way in his right to express his views. The suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin that failure to include minority views in the conference repart seals his lips is beside the point.

The gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from New York have referred to former instances in which minority views were filed by themselves. It is a matter which can be easily determined by the citation of the Congress and the number of the report. It will be found in each instance that the minority reports were submitted from the floor and that minority views were not included in the committee print of the report.

The incident merits more than passing interest. Outstanding men in the history of the House have served on the Committee on Appropriations—men of both parties. Tawney, of Minnesota; Fitzgerald, of New York; Good, of Iowa; the Great Commoner whose effigy faces us there above the Speaker's rostrum; Madden, of Illinois; Wood, of Indiana; Byrns, of Tennessee; and others, on both sides of the aisle, have served in both the

majority and the minority, and none of them ever submitted minority views in this form. It was their belief that the appropriation bills should be divested of all partisan or political implications. I am sorry to see this departure from the example which they set and the procedure which they established.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that I have always understood that it was a cardinal principle of his party that democracy was a dynamic thing, it was a living thing, it was a growing thing; that we live, that we grow, that we make progress, and that we look ahead instead of looking back. I do not know how many times I have heard the gentleman from Missouri preach that sort of doctrine in this body.

The minority members of this committee are demonstrating here on the floor of the House when they make this report that democracy does move. Merely because a rule has been followed for the past 25 or 50 years, in my humble opinion is a pretty good argument why we should abandon it in these days of change and confusion. The people are entitled to all the facts. And on this question of closing anybody's mouth——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. About the only time I have ever had my mouth closed on this floor was when the distinguished gentleman from Missouri was talking and I have asked him to yield. I never have been able to get him to yield to me when I wanted to ask a pertinent question any time he was making an address, or get him to answer a question. I believe everybody on the floor of this House knows that to be the truth and knows that to be a fact.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish our chairman were here.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, he is so busy outside; he says he has to go to another meeting.

Mr. JENSEN. He never said that before, or at least not for the last 25 years has a minority report been submitted to the House from a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. I wish to remind the gentleman that never before in the history of this Nation has this country come so perilously close to the precipice which may destroy us and everything for which America stands; so these things are necessary.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say just one word in closing. I know the three majority members of this committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and I agree with one thing that the chairman said in his remarks; that there is not a finer, more distinguished group that could have been chosen from the Appropriations Committee to handle this most important work than those five men, majority and minority. I am glad to know that the same type of criticism that has been directed at the minority by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has not found expression—at least, I have not heard it—in the attitude expressed by the distinguished members of the majority who serve upon this subcommittee. I wish to compliment not only the majority but the minority members for bringing in a bill absolutely new on an uncharted course, so to speak, before this Congress, that I believe is a magnificent step in the right direction, in the interest of bringing under the control of Congress all this far-flung realm of Government corporations that have been spending the people's money in a manner that the people themselves well never be able to follow in the magnitude of their ramifications unless and until years of study have been given by this committee to this work.

I want to say the statement the gentleman from Iowa has made with respect to the necessity for continuous aid and assistance on the part of trained investigators does not contemplate the mere picking out of some man down in another agency of Government to go out and make some little specific study of a particular item in the bill, but it means that the committee will have available all the time, 12 months in the year, men to go through these departments, examine their personnel records, examine their expenditures, make an audit of their books, if necessary, to see what they are doing and whether they are carrying out and following the recommendations of the Congress. As a member of the Appropriations Committee for the last 7 years, as the gentleman from Iowa has, lamented the fact that we have not had the proper kind of help in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I exceedingly regret the injection into this debate of the remarks of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. After complimenting the members of the subcommittee on being a hand-picked crew he then found considerable criticism in the fact that we honestly had differences of opinion and honestly conceded to one another the right to publish them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think one of the most encouraging things about the minority report to this bill is the fact that you concur in and agree with the Joint Committee on Reorganization which recommended a necessary staff of experts with which to do a job by the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. Incidentally, the Senate approved that proposal and it approved the bill by a vote of 49 to 16 a few days ago. I sincerely hope that if we are going to do a job in the interest of balancing the Budget and in the interest of efficiency not only in the corporations but in all departments of government that that recommendation of the joint committee can be approved and followed.

Mr. PLOESER. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois is probably one of the most able Members who ever served on the Appropriations Committee and I think he fully recognizes, as indicated by his remarks, and I think the vast majority of the members of the Appropriations Committee recognize, that our present method of investigation has inherent weaknesses in that we borrow from the executive department men to examine the executive branch of the Government instead of having men who are responsible solely to the Congress. I have never approved the method used by the Appropriations Committee in making its investigations. I have had occasion to use it once without satisfactory results, which probably was no fault of the individual making the investigation except he was under a pressure to which he should not be subjected on an impartial job.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One of the most anomalous things in the fiscal history of the country is that the Congress, which is charged with the power of the purse, must depend for data, facts and information upon the very people who come and supplicate Congress for legislation and also for money. They have a very definite interest in the subject matter and yet we must rely on them essentially.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it should be added that that is a particular weakness in the procedure in the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so.

Mr. PLOESER. We ask the people who are requesting money to justify their position and they give virtually the only argument a subcommittee ever hears.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is quite right.

Mr. PLOESER. It is only natural that they are not going to argue against themselves. We have an outstanding instance in this very bill under the section having to do with Federal public housing, which involves a governmental function in the housing field. They came before this subcommittee and asked for some $4,000,000 plus for subsidies for low housing rents.

He justified this on the first appearance, and then by some method of the grapevine learned that this subcommittee did not intend to make the allowance, and they came back later and indicated that they probably could get along with half a million dollars; a perfect indication of how so many departments of Government get all they can to spend all they can, and they have no consideration whatsoever for the public purse or for the taxpayer. I did not mean to get into that part of the discussion before talking about the reasons for the minority report.

Contrary to the opinion expressed by the chairman of the whole Committee on Appropriations I think it is noteworthy to say here and now that there never was a moment in the proceedings of this subcommittee when it did not work in complete harmony. Many of our views have been merged in the ma-

jority report. After an expression of differences on the part of the various members of the committee, we found common ground upon which we could agree, and when we did not, when there was some fundamental difference, there was never the slightest indication on the part of any Member of the majority of this committee that they felt that the minority should not express their opinion in a published report.

I want to express my appreciation to the Members of the majority on this subcommittee for their splendid attitude all the way through and their cooperative attitude toward the minority in the expression of its opinion, and which was reciprocated by the minority. I have served with one of these Members on another subcommittee in which you could find common ground, but in which you could not, except maybe under the most unusual and unique circumstances, accept a minority report, and that is the naval subcommittee. These men devoted long, hard work to this matter, and these two reports have been published because, as we said, there were one or two things which we thought deserved additional emphasis, and then there were some things in which we were in fundamental disagreement. Not to express that difference would be false representation. Are we to be indicted for that? I hardly think so, and certainly not justly so. We felt it was our plain duty that the minority should express this difference, and we ask the Members to read the minority report. I have the feeling that it will probably be read. So many reports of the Congress are not. It is one that probably attracts your attention because of so much being said about it. It is short. I wish you would read it, and when you read the entire report you will find that here is what the committee was dealing with.

Last year, 1945, the Congress of the United States tried to bring under congressional approval and control the budgets of the various wholly owned Government corporations. We have, as exemplified by this bill, two types of operation in the Federal Government. We have those normal appropriations which go to operate the various departments and agencies and commissions and boards of Government, and then we have as a result of a practice of the last two decades principally a set-up of certain Government corporations that operate or have operated almost entirely independently of the balance of the Federal Government with the exception of intercession of some Executive orders. They have not been compelled to come under the supervision of the people's branch of the Government, the Congress, in connection with the expenditure of their funds.

As this bill indicates, these wholly owned corporations use annually $18,000,000,000 worth of the taxpayers' money, or approximately that amount, yet the taxpayer has little or nothing to say about it or has had little or nothing to say about it. The Congress has had virtually nothing to say about it. It could either terminate the corporation or it could sit here and hope to learn what sort of a business the corporation was conducting. In the Government Corporation Act of 1945 we hope to bring this under control of the appropriate authority of the Congress. One of the unusual situations that caused this minority report is the opinion of the two groups that we found fully accomplished the intent of the Congress under this bill. For example, in reading the Government Corporation Control Act you will find that there are certain weaknesses in the act. We attempted in this bill to strengthen the language in such a fashion that there will be no misunderstanding as a result of this legislation, but after having done so, in section 302 of this bill we then sought to make an exception whereby the President could order and authorize these corporations to go into what might be called extra-curricular activities, activities for which estimates were not submitted by the Budget Bureau, activities which have not come under the review of the Congress and still might fall within the authority granted under their charters. We thought the Government Corporation Control Act sought to restrict to that extent. The entire committee felt that way and so drafted this bill. But as to this one section of the bill we find ourselves in difference. The minority feel that we have weakened what we did so well in the beginning of the bill, so we will seek before the debate is ended on this bill to strike out section 302 because of that weakness we think it puts into this appropriation bill.

That is an honest disagreement. We are not very far apart. We have the same intention, but at the same time we rather differ as to how we are to achieve the ultimate objective. Such an honest view should be set forth, and I see little difference except emphasis between whether we stand on the floor of this House and debate the subject and here disagree, whether we submit amendments to show our disagreement, or whether we publish it as the minority views in the report of the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I will be happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I cannot see anything wrong in filing a minority report on a bill that is absolutely new in nature, with a new committee set-up on this corporation control. I have been listening to all of this debate. I had very little opportunity to read all the hearings, but as a member of the Appropriations Committee, may I say that I think this minority report is absolutely in order.

I see in the report some items affecting some of the agencies which my Subcommittee on Appropriations has been handling heretofore, for instance, the Inland Waterways Corporation. I think it was always the intent that the whole program of the inland waterways organization, after it has served its purpose, would go into private industry.

Mr. PLOESER. May I say to the gentleman it is not only the intent, it is the express language of the law.

Mr. STEFAN. There are other items, such as the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. The public is interested in that. The banks are full of money today. Private industry wants to go ahead. They believe in the liquidation of some of these Government corporations which they thought should have been liquidated a long time ago.

I know every member of the gentleman's committee. Some of them have served with me and now serve with me on subcommittees on appropriations. I think they are the finest set of men in the House. They have the interest of the Government and the interest of private industry at heart.

I am very glad to see a minority report like this published. The Members of the House get very little information about our appropriation activities until a bill and the report on it come to the floor of the House. They usually come to the floor of the House on the day the bill is reported from the full committee, and the Members of the House, the 435 of us here, have practically no knowledge as to what the bill contains unless we take the report and hearings home and read them far into the night. A report such as the minority of this committee has made gives us a large amount of valuable information from which we can answer very many of the questions in the letters sent to us by our constituents. I appreciate the gentleman's views and concur with them. I want to emphasize another fundamental difference. In the creation of most Government corporations, the law has said and the intent of Congress has been expressed that it was created for the duration of some given emergency. We have found in the history of recent years that emergencies never end and once a Government corporation is formed to satisfy or alleviate, if you please, some emergency, that emergency always seems to be then perpetuated. So that there is a continuing need and we never get to the end of the line. Today, when America has more money among more of her people than at any other time in the history of the Nation, we are continuing credit emergencies for business, for example, through the RFC operating in the making of mortgages by the Mortgage Corporation, a subsidiary of the RFC.

It is the opinion of those who filed this minority report that when we are not in a period of emergency according to the original intent or the practiced intent of those corporations during an emergency, then it is either time to shrink that to no operations whatever or to liquidate such corporations. I think there is probably a substantial difference. Some people believe they should just be brought back into a state of inactivity and held there as a club possibly over private business for the future.

I, for one, do not agree with that. I, for one, am of the opinion that the Government corporations can be used effectively in some instances but it should not become the general practice of government. Today these Government corporations in this bill are the dominant in-

fluence in the economic life of America. There is little need for the RFC during this period, with remote exceptions, to be out doing a general banking business for business when the banks of the country are having a hard time finding a place to lend their money at interest rates which are cheaper than at any other period in the history of the country. We have said so in the minority report and we certainly feel we have a right to express that view, contrary to the opinion of any Member of the majority. We did express that view and will again when the occasion requires.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I am interested in the item on the Commodity Credit Corporation. I notice a reduction on page 6 of over $921,000,000. Where was that reduction made?

Mr. PLOESER. It is not an actual reduction.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course it is not.

Mr. PLOESER. I understand it is a cancellation of these notes on the part of the Treasury so that it ceases to be an obligation of the Commodity Credit Corporation and, therefore, appears as a reduction when it is not actually the saving of any dollars, but represents the final expenditure of those dollars.

I am putting into the RECORD today an accounting and a tabulation of subsidies that have been paid and subsidy payments made by the Commodity Credit Corporation which indicates in the three fiscal years 1945, 1946, and 1947 that that Corporation will have spent over $3,000,000,000 in subsidies.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Commodity Credit Corporation's expenditures, losses, and gains on subsidies and price-support purchases

[Compiled from the Corporation's justification of appropriations for the fiscal year 1947]

	Expenditures, losses, etc.			Losses or subsidies	Claimed gains		
	Actual, 1945	Estimated, 1946	Estimated, 1947		Actual, 1945	Estimated, 1946	Estimated, 1947
Cotton, upland					$23,069,742	$54,198,000	$11,500,000
Corn	$9,366,296			Losses		7,236,000	
Wheat	16,952,251					14,500,000	
Tobacco		$208,800		Losses	2,040,889		
Rice							2,035,000
Peanuts	9,119,557	10,500,000	$13,600,000	Losses			
Beans, dry edible	2,321		64,000	do		103,000	
Dressed chickens		7,500,000	22,500,000	do			
Cotton, American-Egyptian		391,000	156,000	do	151,153		
Eggs		10,190,000	108,510,000	do			
Peas, dry edible	216	173,000	2,550,000	do			
Potatoes, white	12,333,875	18,500,000	11,150,000	do			
Turkeys		1,875,000	5,625,000	do			
Barley	16,559			do			
Hemp	11,463,378	4,635,000		do			
Oats	9,212					290,000	25,000
Oils, vegetable					151,423		
Rye	139,821			Losses		632,700	
Seed, winter crop cover	264,849	1,066,000	775,000	do			
Sorghum, grain	61,138			do		221,400	76,000
Wool	1,086,068	59,744,000	38,850,000	do			
Dairy production [1]	532,253,665	496,500,000	515,000,000	Subsidies			
Sheep and lamb [1]		36,000,000	36,000,000	do			
Milk, fluid	12,902,735	12,000,000	14,000,000	do			
Grapes and raisins, California	22,503,815	11,350,000	17,600,000	do			
Prunes, dried		5,888,000	7,900,000	do			
Peach			200,000	do			
Pear	142,237		300,000	do			
Flaxseed	20,456	1,000,000	15,000,000	do			
Soybeans	43,670,521	45,000,000	40,000,000	Losses			
Sugar, foreign and domestic:							
Cuban	52,586,192						
All other	62,515,381	80,303,000	43,800,000	Subsidies			
Vegetables, canned	14,974,414	52,346,000	35,200,000	do			
Commodity exports:							
Cotton	2,951,507	30,000,000	30,000,000	do			
Wheat	593,084	260,628		do			
Fats and oils, foreign and domestic	2,431,774					8,000,000	
Other foreign purchases					435,689		
Fertilizer, ammonium nitrate					45,958	129,000	150,000
Total	808,761,332	885,430,428	958,780,000		25,994,854	85,310,100	13,786,000

RECAPITULATION

Expenditures, loans, etc.:		
1945, actual	$808,761,332	
1946, estimated	885,430,428	
1947, estimated	958,780,000	
		$2,652,971,760
Gains claimed:		
1945, actual	25,994,854	
1946, estimated	85,310,100	
1947, estimated	13,786,000	
		125,090,954
Probable net cost, 3 years of subsidies, etc		2,527,880,806
Estimated cost of OPA for 3 years, $179,000,000 a year		537,000,000
Total estimated CCC expenditures and OPA		3,064,880,806

[1] Details in justification are particularly worthy of note.

Mr. PLOESER. Three billion dollars is a tremendous item when we stop to consider much of the false propaganda which has gone out to the country in recent weeks on the subject of price control. Remember, every dollar of subsidy payments comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers ultimately and that every dollar that has been spent by subsidy payments is just another way of the people of America paying their own food bill but being led to believe they are not paying it. If our debt continues as it has in recent years, it is another way of passing the food bill to our grandchildren and great-grandchildren, which I have always thought was a pretty shallow way to live. In regard to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, we found, as indicated in the hearings, that in the making of loans it does not always adhere to what we would consider sound banking practice, but frequently is under the pressure of other departments of Government to make loans which it otherwise would not make. I have in mind particular reference to the so-called Kaiser Co. loan. I am placing in the RECORD today statements from the RFC, in answer to correspondence of mine, which indicates that the Kaiser Co. today is indebted to the Federal Government in the amount of approximately $114,000,000 and that thirty-four or thirty-five million of this amount was a part of a refunding program on which they pay no interest. If you will study the reply of the RFC and also study the hearings, you will learn that the Kaiser enterprises are a sort of mutual partnership between the Federal Government and Henry Kaiser, in which the Federal Government assumes all the risk and hopes to get a portion of the return from the profits. I predict that they never will pay off these loans. Many of them were made in the postwar period and I can find no justification whatever for such favoritism in the loaning of Government funds.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The Director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation testified that the Kaiser interests, if they were forced to pay up today, the Government would lose many millions of dollars on that transaction.

Mr. PLOESER. That is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I was told a story just today by an investigator for the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Co., that when in California at one of the Kaiser plants last year the treasurer of that particular unit had in a filing box on his desk a 1-cent piece. When asked what that 1-cent piece was, he said, "Don't remove that. That is Mr. Kaiser's personal interest in this project."

Mr. PLOESER. Well, I imagine it amounts to a great deal more than 1 percent as it has accrued as a result of the spending of many, many millions of Government funds. But I think that is

entirely unjustifiable action for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the postwar period.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. While the minority has emphasized it in its report, I am not so sure that that is the exclusive opinion of the minority.

Now, we did differ on the Inland Waterways Corporation. Either my colleague from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] or I will offer an amendment later on to put a slight restriction in the bill concerning the Inland Waterways Corporation. I want to make my position on the matter clear at this time. The Inland Waterways Corporation served a very necessary purpose, in my opinion, and did it very successfully up until the war. There may be justifying circumstances for the fact that in recent years, certainly all during the war, it has been showing a constant loss. But there are certain facts that stand out. First, that the Secretary of Commerce came before the committee and recommended the sale of the Inland Waterways Corporation. I imagine the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is in conflict with the Secretary of Commerce in his opinion, and said this, that either the Corporation should be sold in accordance with the law, and even though he admitted he did not feel the law had been completely complied with, and I do not think the law has been fully complied with, he felt it had been sufficiently complied with that it was time for him, in his duty as Secretary of Commerce, to come before the Congress and ask for legislation to sell the Corporation.

The adoption of the amendment which will be offered does not sell the Corporation. The difference of opinion between the views of the majority and the minority on this committee will not affect the sale of this particular Corporation one way or the other except as those opinions are adopted possibly by another legislative committee which would have to consider specific legislation to make the authorization. But there is this difference; we know on testimony that the Corporation can be expected to continue heavy losses in operation unless there is a complete rehabilitation of its floating equipment. That estimate is somewhere in the neighborhood of $10,000,000, and probably is not a good firm estimate because of the fluctuations in construction costs. Either we must give the Corporation the right to spend $10,000,000 of its assets for rehabilitation purposes or else we must say to them that within the next year or possibly 2 years we are going to require them to make a sale of the assets of the Corporation. And until that decision is made, in the light of recommendations of the Department of Commerce, I think it is the duty of this House, and certainly the duty of the Appropriations Committee, not to make any allowance for replacement of floating stock or equipment. In this bill, while it is not evidenced in the language of the bill, the authority does exist for them to spend about $2,600,000 for replacement of equipment. We will seek to put a prohibition against that replacement. If in the interim period between now and the next appropriation bill dealing with this matter the Congress has acted either pro or con on the subject of sale, then I shall expect this committee to be unanimous in carrying out the most recently expressed opinion of Congress.

The Corporation has substantially served its purpose. There is one segment of the riverway between St. Louis and Kansas City in which there is grave doubt as to whether it has served its full purpose, and the minority has expressed that opinion in its report.

We do not propose that it be sold except under the strict interpretation of the law, but we do propose that we support the Secretary's recommendation that he come before the Congress and ask for an authorization of sale, remembering that such authorization should comply with the original act insofar as it requires the purchaser to carry on and continue all of the activities conducted by the Corporation to date. I am not interested personally in all the squabbles that are going on with the former head of the Inland Waterways Corporation or with the Secretary of Commerce or his squabbles or any of his troubles in the management of the business; I am interested only in the service that is conducted on that river. I want substantial compliance with the law, and when that has been done and on that premise we recommend going forward with the sale of the Corporation.

It will be argued that by rehabilitating the Corporation we stand a chance of getting a much better price. That is certainly doubtful, and there is no evidence in the hearings which justifies that opinion fully.

As I told you before, two amendments will be offered, one to strike out section 302 because we believe it weakens the bill; and the other to deny to the Inland Waterways Corporation any funds for rehabilitating equipment until a decision is made as to what disposal will be had on the part of the Corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD].

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed to learn that we are appropriating the sum of $10,000, administrative expenses, for the United States Spruce Corporation, and I am certain that the people of the Pacific Northwest who are familiar with the activities of this organization would likewise be amazed to know that the taxpayers are still paying for the continuation of this long defunct corporation. The purpose and usefulness of the Spruce Corporation, which was organized in August 1918, ended on Armistice Day of that same year. It was the sole purpose of this organization to provide spruce lumber for aircraft of the United States and our allies during the last war.

I fully realize that it necessarily requires reasonable time for liquidation and termination of an organization of this type, but it is absolutely inexcusable that this liquidation should have taken 28 years. No adequate excuse or reason has been or is given in the committee reports for this neglect and delay.

Although this bill provides that the administrative duties and responsibilities of this Corporation shall be assumed by the War Department officers and employees on January 1, 1947, it is my position that we should make the termination of this corporation and all of its affairs absolutely mandatory by July of 1947. If this has not been accomplished within the next year, I shall demand a full and complete report of the activities of this organization, an account of the moneys expended, and the names, duties, and functions of those who have been receiving these public funds over a period of years. This Corporation must wind up its affairs and discontinue this protracted expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, Members who have preceded me have discussed some of the problems we had in considering this bill making appropriations for the various Government corporations.

Government corporations have proved to be one of the most effective means of carrying on many types of government business. It is hard to place the full value on the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for instance. This Corporation has bailed out thousands of drainage districts, railroads, banks, and many others. By reason of their activities the stockholders, the people, of the Nation have been saved, landowners saved their lands, depositors their deposits, and all this at a net profit to the Nation.

The Export-Import Bank has moved into foreign trade 800,000 bales of cotton; the Tennessee Valley Authority has brought light and power to literally millions of our people; the Commodity Credit Corporation has supported prices for agricultural commodities saving to the farmers of the Nation millions of dollars, and this too at a profit to the Government.

Yet the operation of these corporations and other Government corporations is a big part of government. They handle billions of dollars and, of course, should be under the surveillance and control of the Congress. Heretofore we have not had the proper control of such Government corporations, nor have we had an adequate knowledge of their operations. The Congress recognized this last December when it passed the Corporation Control Act bringing these Government corporations under the surveillance of the Congress and providing also for the Appropriations Committee to conduct those hearings and to pass on the administrative expense of these corporations for the next fiscal year.

The statute providing for corporation control having passed only in December of last year the Budget Bureau and

Comptroller's office have had insufficient time to prepare for the consideration of the committee either audits or budget reports in the fullness that would have been most helpful to the committee in considering this problem; however, the committee itself was appointed only a very short time before these hearings were begun and when we did get the Budget report and started hearings we had the best available information. That best available information was not always adequate and we are looking forward next year to having more information for the consideration of the committee and expect to do a much more thorough job than we were able to do at this time.

In the consideration of these corporations this committee as a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, insofar as the law permits, has kept in this bill a strict control over the operations of these corporations during the ensuing year.

Mr. Chairman, much ado has been made about the minority report filed with regard to this bill. It has been my pleasure to have served on the Appropriations Committee with the various members of the subcommittee for some time. The chairman of our subcommittee is most fair. There is no more able chairman of a committee in all the Congress. He applies himself to his duties, he works hard, and has done a splendid job of directing and steering the activities of this committee. The other Democratic member, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the minority members, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], of this committee are all splendid gentlemen. They have worked hard in their effort to carry out the intent of the Congress and to really go into the workings of these Government corporations. I may say if you will read the hearings this will be very revealing to you. All the ramifications of the activities of these corporations are almost unbelievable. Truly they reach throughout the world. The minority members have cooperated and helped us in every way in the consideration of this bill. Their real work in this bill, in my opinion, is reflected in the bill itself and in the majority report to which they subscribed. So far as this minority report is concerned, if you will read it you will not find where they differ from us in the amounts of money that were appropriated in any case.

You will find that in many instances they are not in favor of the substantive law which makes it necessary that the Committee on Appropriations provide adequate appropriations. You will find that they advocate quite a number of changes in the substantive law. In other words, in my opinion the minority report is nothing more or less than a speech which could very properly be made by either of these gentlemen on the floor of this House in regard to this bill. It also embodies much on which they might go to the appropriate legislative committee advocating a change in the substantive law.

Basically you will find the minority members differ with us not in what has been done in this committee, but in the changes in the substantive law which they would like to have carried out.

Mention has been made of the Inland Waterways Corporation. I do not think they seriously argue that this committee has anything in the world to do with whether the Inland Waterways Corporation is sold or not. The Inland Waterways Corporation, under the basic law, can only be sold when certain conditions are met. I think all agree that those conditions have not been met. I think the Secretary of Commerce was inviting the question when he brought it before this committee. It is properly pending, as he stated, before the appropriate legislative committee. It is surplusage, so to speak, bringing it to the attention of this committee, but having brought it to the attention of the committee we tried to bring out the facts in regard to it. But this committee cannot sell it and they cannot tell them not to sell if the requirements of the law are met. The minority report filed by these gentlemen is merely an expression of what they think the proper legislative committee of the Congress should do. The majority members of the committee felt that there was no need for this minority report, but it does not reach what is contained in this bill. The same thing might be said in regard to whether or not additional staffs should be provided for the Committee on Appropriations. True, some members of the whole Committee on Appropriations feel that additional staff members should be provided for each subcommittee. That would require some change in the present set-up, and as was brought out here, the members who signed this minority report recognized what is needed because they went before the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Congress and recommended that it be incorporated there, because that is the proper place. But it does not necessarily mean a great deal by having it in the so-called minority report.

In regard to inter-American affairs, which is pointed out in the minority report, they call attention to the fact that while we did not especially like some of these contracts, the Federal Government had entered into such contracts with some of these foreign governments; and whether they were wise or unwise, they were entered into during the war, and, being contracts, this Congress could only do what the committee did, and that was to provide for the carrying out of our commitments. So there is nothing in that paragraph which would differ with the action of the whole committee nor with the majority report.

In regard to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, I think I should take issue with my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri, when he said that the RFC is soliciting business. It was clearly brought out in the committee that to obtain a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation you must show that you cannot borrow the money from private sources. The hearings are clear also that if you cannot borrow it from private concerns and do borrow it from the RFC, the RFC then makes that loan available to commercial interests and they will let the private commercial interest take it even after they refused to make such loan in the first instance. I do not think they want to strike at the RFC. I think they want to complain a little on general principles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman not recall the testimony before the committee to the effect that $300,000,000 in securities had been purchased by the RFC but of that amount $275,000,000 had been sold to private interests.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for that statement. It is absolutely borne out by the evidence before the committee and in the copies of the hearings before us. In addition, the $25,000,000 which was not sold was on a project which has not been completed but which was held up by reason of the war and will be offered to commercial interests as soon as the project is completed.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I think I should make myself very clear to my distinguished colleague and friend that the general practice of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as conducted by the Board of Directors is to make strictly business loans. If they are strictly business loans, 90 percent of the time there are other means of financing which will do the job. But take the Kaiser loan, for example. I doubt if any bank or any group of bankers in America would have made that loan. I doubt if the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would have made that loan; in fact, I have good reason to know they would not have made the loan if it had not been for pressure brought upon them from other departments of the executive branch.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman mentions the Kaiser loan. In the first place, I do not claim to have complete knowledge with regard to the Kaiser loan. From the general information which has been in the press and elsewhere it is doubtful that anyone will take pride in some of the ramifications of the Kaiser business interests. At the same time, I think we should call attention to the fact that the Kaiser loans were made during the war largely in an effort to promote the war. Whether it was wise or unwise, it made a great contribution.

Since the war, the Government has been left with a considerable part of those activities which were built by Government money on loans to Kaiser and on which he owed money and which he could not pay with the cessation of the war activity and with the cancellation of his contracts. So the Government, as borne out by the record—and that is all

I can say; I know nothing further than that—then was faced with a great loss of money which had been loaned to the Kaiser interests and to build war plants by reason of the cancellation of his contracts the RFC either had to foreclose on the properties which had been put up with Government money or they had to finance the conversion of those facilities to peacetime operations. It was a case of losing what you had in it or, by making additional loans, permitting the conversion of those facilities so that the Kaiser interests could work it out and the Government in the long run would lose less money. The decision was whether to lose this amount of money or try to advance some additional money and by reason of that make the loss to the Government smaller. Whether that was wise or unwise, they make a very good showing in this record.

In addition, with regard to some of these facilities representatives of the RFC clearly showed to the committee that with regard to the sale to the Kaiser interests it was made at a considerably higher price than they had been offered for similar facilities in another State of the same kind; in fact, it was about two to one times greater than was true in the other case. Whether that was good business or bad business, if you will read this record you will find that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made a very good showing as to why these agreements were entered into. We were caught with outstanding loans to the Kaiser interests for war activities. They could not meet them when we canceled their contracts. We either had to take our loss then or try to enable them to work it out.

With regard to the automobile activities of the Kaiser interests, the record shows that not one dollar of Federal money has been advanced with regard to that. It does show that the RFC leased the Kaiser interests the Willow Run plant, but only after they tried to lease it to everybody else under the sun and nobody was interested in it at all. This man entered into a contract which will pay to the Government a considerable amount of money in the event he is able to meet his commitments.

I do say that the record shows that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will not make commercial loans without a showing that the money cannot be obtained from private sources. It further shows that if you cannot obtain such loan from private sources and borrow the money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, then the RFC will offer those securities and those notes to private interests and the RFC will get rid of such paper as fast as private commercial interests will buy it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman feel reasonably certain that the advancement of this additional sum in the Kaiser case will assure a return to the Government which they could not otherwise secure?

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is asking me to pass judgment on a matter that I frankly admit I do not know too much about. From the showing that was made to this committee, apparently there is an excellent chance that by reason of making some additional advances for converting these wartime facilities over to peacetime use the Kaiser interests will be able to repay the Government and will thereby reduce to a large extent the amount of loss which we would have had if we had merely taken our loss as a wartime expenditure and quit. All I can refer you to is the showing which was presented to the committee and which has gone out in the hearings.

Mr. SPRINGER. Under the showing that was made, do you feel reasonably certain you will be able to make a better recovery by reason of the advancement than you would otherwise make?

Mr. WHITTEN. So far as the showing that was made to us is concerned, that is the conclusion that I as a reasonable man would draw. I do not claim to be an expert in this type of matter. I must accept at face value the statements of those officials of the RFC who testified before our committee and who have been conducting the activities of this organization.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

I think it is worthy of particular note that $34,500,000 for refunding operations was loaned without interest for a long period of time. I think it is an old, sound practice of banking that you do not chase good money after bad. I think if the gentleman would go to the RFC and have conversations with them he would get these answers: that they do not think it is a good loan; they did not think it was a good loan; they do not believe they are going to recover their money; they do not even hope to recover their money; they never would have made the loan if they had not been pressured to do so.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman may be closer to the RFC than I am. I am going wholly by the testimony in the record. I claim no outside knowledge. But, if there is any outside knowledge, it is in the mind of the gentleman himself or someone who has been closer to them than I have. All I know is what has been brought out in the record. I feel if the gentleman had any personal knowledge of the matter he would have developed it fully so that the whole committee would have had the benefit of it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman realizes that on this so-called Kaiser deal the Kaiser interests agree to accept the Fontana steel plant at the full value, at a price of about $115,000,000, against which he has pledged some $27,000,000 of his ship profits. Of course, we can push Mr. Kaiser around now that we do not need his skill to build ships any more, but he established a record that we were very proud of in this country sometime ago. By Kaiser's taking the Fontana plant at full value the Government has a chance to recover all of its investment—no water has been wrung out of it. By comparison, another steel plant in the West was disposed of recently in which over $200,000,000 of Government money was invested, it was liquidated for about $47,000,000. That was not such a good deal.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, the committee has passed judgment on what it has had before it, and that is all that we could do.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. May I say to the gentleman who has just spoken that certainly I do not condone the conditions about which he complains—I complain with him. For the benefit of my distinguished friend from Mississippi, let me say that the additional information I have gotten on the Kaiser loan has been obtained since the hearings, and some of it arrived here only at 1 o'clock this afternoon. I am going to extend that part in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

MAY 27, 1946.

Hon. CHARLES B. HENDERSON,
Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: This is to confirm my verbal request regarding RFC loans to the Henry J. Kaiser interests.

I would like you to prepare for me a brief and specific history of the Kaiser loans, showing the amount of money loaned, the period for which it was loaned, when repayment and in what amount was made, interest rates, interest paid, principal paid and principal delinquent, at whose instigation or recommendation loans were made and for what purposes, why the refunding operation was requested and why it was granted and at whose instigation or recommendation.

Please also include balance sheet of Kaiser industries which guarantees these loans.

If you care to comment on whether you think these loans are sound banking loans, whether your collateral is adeuqate, and whether you have firm reason to expect completion of commitments from the borrower to the Government, I would appreciate it.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, June 13, 1946.

Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PLOESER: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated May 27, 1946, requesting that you be furnished with certain information regarding RFC loans to the Henry J. Kaiser interests.

KAISER CO., INC., OAKLAND, CALIF.

As a result of letters and recommendations received from the War Production Board and its predecessor, the following loans were authorized to Kaiser Co., Inc. Kaiser Co., Inc., consists of two divisions, the shipbuilding division which operated shipyards for the Maritime Commission, and the iron and steel division. The loans in question were made for the benefit of the iron and steel division, and net profits from fees received by the company from the Maritime Commission for the building of ships were pledged to the repayment of the loans.

On March 4, 1942, a loan was authorized in the amount of $48,700,000 for the requisition and construction of iron and steel plant facilities located principally at Fontana, Calif., and subsequently other loans were authorized for the same purpose (but including $16,650,000 for working capital), all aggregating $111,805,000 and all of which was disbursed. Interest on these loans was paid at the rate of 4 percent to July 1, 1945, and payments were made reducing the aggregate balances thereof to $102,788,198.13.

Prior to July 1, 1945, the officials of the company discussed with us the possibility of obtaining additional funds to provide additional facilities and to improve some of the existing facilities for postwar civilian production. We were of the opinion that these changes would add to the protection of our loans.

Of the balance due on July 1, approximately $10,318,000 represented working capital which had been advanced by the RFC and $92,510,000 represented plant investment. We retained Arthur G. McKee & Co., Cleveland, Ohio, a leading industrial steel and engineering firm, to make a complete survey of the Fontana plant.

On August 18, 1945, the aggregate balances outstanding were authorized to be refunded by three loans. However, this action was amended on September 26, 1945, so as to provide for two refunding loans as follows:

A loan in the amount of $79,818,000 (which included $11,500,000 for the acquisition and construction of additional plant facilities), maturing July 1, 1960, to be evidenced by two notes, one in the amount of $69,500,000, payable as follows: Three consecutive annual payments beginning July 1, 1948, of $1,390,000 each, thereafter consecutive annual payments of $2,780,000 each; interest for the period from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, payable out of net earnings of the iron and steel division, but not to exceed 4 percent; beginning July 1, 1947, interest to be payable quarter-annually at the rate of 4 percent per annum. The second note of $10,318,000, payable $412,720 annually, beginning July 1, 1953. Interest for the period from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, payable only out of net earnings out of the company's iron and steel division and not to exceed 4 percent. Beginning July 1, 1947, interest to be payable quarter-annually at the rate of 4 percent per annum. In addition to the foregoing required annual payments on the two notes, borrower is required to pay for application first on account of interest and principal of the second note, then to interest and principal of the first note in regular order of maturity, 27½ percent of the net profits of the company's shipbuilding division received in connection with contracts for construction and repair of shipyards and vessels entered into prior to July 1, 1945.

A second loan in the amount of $34,510,380.23, due July 1, 1970, and to be repayable from 25 percent of the net earnings of the company's iron and steel division remaining after payments required to be made on account of the first loan, the first of such payments to be based on net earnings for the period from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, and annually thereafter; and 72½ percent of the net profits of the borrower's shipbuilding division received under contracts for the construction and repair of shipyards and vessels entered into prior to July 1, 1945. This loan does not bear interest.

Enclosed is a schedule showing the status of the 10 loans to Kaiser Co., Inc.

As to your inquiry as to whether we think these are sound banking loans and whether the collateral is adequate and whether we have a firm reason to expect repayment, I wish to state that it must be recognized that the loans in the first instance were made to make possible the production of iron and steel to be used in the war effort in the construction of ships, and in this respect we believe the company did an excellent job. The management of the steel plant has been improved and earnings are increasing.

The loans are not guaranteed by any other Kaiser industries. The stock is owned 100 percent by the Henry J. Kaiser Co.

THE PERMANENTE METALS CORP., OAKLAND, CALIF.

Upon the recommendation of the predecessor of the War Production Board that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation cooperate with the above company in the creation and establishment of a magnesium plant, a ferrosilicon plant, and a dolomite calcining plant, net loans aggregating $28,475,000 were made for such purposes. These loans were made during the period February 21, 1941, and September 25, 1943. The loans were fully disbursed and bore appropriate annual repayment provisions with interest payable monthly at the rate of 4 percent per annum. The loans were to mature on December 22, 1951. As of November 28, 1945, all loans, including all accrued interest, had been entirely paid and the company is no longer indebted to this Corporation.

Henry J. Kaiser Co. and the Kaiser Co. each owned 11.8 percent of the stock of Permanente, the balance of the stock being held by others.

KAISER CARGO, INC., OAKLAND, CALIF.

On March 4, 1943, as a result of a letter received from the War Department, a loan was made to the above company in the amount of $1,000,000, to be repaid $18,333 monthly, including interest, plus 75 percent of the company's net earnings.

The loan was made to apply on the purchase price ($1,695,059.15) of all the assets of Fleetwings, Inc., Bristol, Pa., interested parties furnishing the remainder of the funds required for the purchase price. The loan was fully disbursed and was to mature June 17, 1948. On February 14, 1946, the then unpaid balance of $525,535.72 and accrued interest was paid and the company is no longer indebted to this corporation.

Henry J. Kaiser Co., the Kaiser Co., and California Kaiser Co. own 45 percent, 15 percent, and 15 percent, respectively, of the stock of the company, the remaining 25 percent being held by others.

I have endeavored to give you the information requested and if it is not sufficient for your purpose, I shall be glad to furnish any additional information which you may desire.

With kind personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. HENDERSON.

Kaiser Co., Inc., status of loans

N. D. loan No.	Authorized		Disbursed			Maturity date	Amount principal paid	Amounts refunded	Interest paid	Use of loan proceeds	
	Date	Amount	From—	To—	Amount					Fixed assets	Working capital
1	Mar. 4, 1942	$48,700,000	Mar. 19, 1942	Apr. 13, 1943	$48,700,000	Mar. 16, 1952	$3,758,851.87	$44,941,148.13	$4,979,290.23	$45,200,000	$3,500,000
2	July 10, 1942	8,619,000	Nov. 12, 1942	May 18, 1943	8,619,000	do	647,500.00	7,971,500.00	722,968.15	8,619,000	
3	Oct. 1, 1942	700,000	Jan. 20, 1943	Sept. 30, 1943	700,000	do	64,750.00	635,250.00	55,772.43	550,000	150,000
4	Nov. 2, 1942	26,050,000	do	Feb. 9, 1944	26,050,000	do	1,980,000.00	24,070,000.00	1,833,719.07	23,550,000	2,500,000
5	Apr. 10, 1943	21,736,000	June 18, 1943	Oct. 31, 1944	21,736,000	do	1,735,000.00	20,001,000.00	1,232,303.13	14,236,000	7,500,000
6	Sept. 18, 1943	4,000,000	Dec. 22, 1943	Sept. 25, 1944	4,000,000	do	727,200.00	3,272,800.00	181,198.63	1,000,000	3,000,000
7	Jan. 27, 1944	1,000,000	Aug. 24, 1944		1,000,000	Jan. 31, 1952		1,000,000.00	20,602.74	1,000,000	
8	Dec. 22, 1944	1,000,000	Apr. 3, 1945	Oct. 5, 1945	1,000,000	Mar. 16, 1952	103,500.00	896,500.00	3,091.72	1,000,000	
Total		111,805,000			111,805,000		9,016,801.87	102,788,198.13	9,028,946.10	95,155,000	16,650,000

Refunding loans (LBE)	Authorized		Disbursed			Maturity date	Amount principal paid	Balance
	Date	Amount	From—	To—	Amount			
9	Aug. 18 and Sept. 26, 1945	$79,818,000.00						
Note 1		69,500,000.00	Nov. 17, 1945	May 31, 1946	$59,099,817.90	July 1, 1960		$59,099,817.90
Note 2		10,318,000.00	do		10,318,000.00	do	$482,235.14	9,835,764.86
10	Aug. 18 and Sept. 26, 1945	34,510,380.23	do		34,510,380.23	July 1, 1970	1,271,347.19	33,239,033.04
Total		114,328,380.23			103,928,198.13		1,753,582.33	102,174,615.80

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, knowing him as I do, that I do not mean to charge him with holding out anything on the committee. I know that on any information that he may have he would give the committee the benefit of it as has been and is his policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. I feel this committee has done a fine job in developing for the information of the House the background and the history of the operations of these corporations. We have tried to bring out a comprehensive statement of the projected plans of each of these corporations for the next fiscal year. As I have stated, we did not have available an audit of those corporations which

must come only after we have had adequate time to make such audits and which are in process of being made. We have tried to tie these corporations to the program as outlined in the budget. We have approved the programs which were outlined in the budget.

We have provided that in proper cases, other programs which were not listed, or in proper cases they would have a right to add that program to the year's operation in the event necessity dictated it, and in the event such program was authorized by law.

This is not a perfect job, but it is a good job, in my opinion. I know the other members of this committee have worked diligently in an effort to bring this to you. As I say, the minority members of this committee have worked hard and their real work is reflected in the actions of the committee and in the majority report. I say again, this minority report is much ado about nothing, for the reason that a good speech about the substantive law should properly be made before a legislative committee. These gentlemen are friends of mine. I felt there was no occasion for a minority report. As far as I know, they are within their right if they want to express their views in this way. They have done so. At the same time their real worth in this activity is reflected by the majority report and by the bill on which you will find no differences in the minority report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EARTHMAN].

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have heard most interesting and enlightening remarks made by those who have preceded me, by way of explanation of the appropriations provided in this bill for Government Corporations for the fiscal year 1947. While I am not a member of the committee, I have studied rather thoroughly the testimony presented by the Committee on Appropriations as well as the committee report.

I shall not attempt, in the limited time apportioned me, to discuss all the provisions contained in the bill, but in that I represent the Fifth District of Tennessee, I do not feel that anyone is more familiar or conversant with the operations and benefits of the Tennessee Valley Authority than am I.

I remember very distinctly when only a portion of the inhabitants of the towns and villages in my section had electricity in their homes. At that time electricity on a farm or anywhere in the rural sections was the exception. Under those conditions the farmer was limited in his agricultural activities and confined largely to laborious and hazardous crops to provide the actual cash required for maintenance of his farm operations and his family.

The common expression at that time was, "A farmer is a hazardous financial risk for he has nothing but to wait for the fall (of the year) and a failure (crop) with which to pay."

Throughout my section, which was true of most of the area now served by TVA, the landscape was brown and dingy the most of the year, due to the fact that we were almost entirely dependent on row crops which resulted in stubblefields which were unattractive in appearance. This condition was uninviting and had no appeal especially during the winter months because of the general appearance void of beauty of landscape.

As a vocation farming was not appealing due to the fact that most of the income was on an annual basis, and that coupled with the crop failures. This condition created an uncertainty which prevented the farmers from budgetary methods. This prevented plans for family advantages and in far too many cases necessitated, on the part of every member of the household, the grind of labor without pleasure or pay.

I have seen the picture change. As an eyewitness I have watched the transition with much pleasure. As I ride through the countryside I find myself among a people whose years will be lengthened and their tasks lightened. As I approach the average farm home today, instead of the stubblefield, I gaze upon fields carpeted with green velvet, as it were, thickly dotted with livestock either winter or summer. This picture often is framed by a neat white fence and in the background a cozy, comfortable cottage with green shutters and vines around the door, with blooms whose fragrance beckons a welcome call to a happy home.

The children are no longer ashamed to invite their city friends as of yore. It is not necessary to draw four or five bucketsful of cold water with a zinc tub in the apple orchard, with lye soap and a corncob, with honeybees flying around, in order to get a bath.

Father is in a better humor when he greets the visitors for he no longer has to trudge in the darkness through the barn lot in mud shoe-mouth deep to feed and milk by lantern light.

Mother is all smiles as she joins the children in greeting their guests, for her hours of toil—sweeping with an old-fashioned broom, carrying water from the well, keeping the wood-burner in the kitchen red hot, as she suffers in the unbearable heat providing niceties with which to supply the table—are lightened and shortened.

Yes, I have seen it all change for now when the children romp in from school, they flip a switch and the lights become brilliant and when mother commands that they tidy up they run upstairs and draw water, and it is hot, out of the side of the wall with a turn of the wrist. They, like their city friends, now get into their shiny slick tubs and with a crooked brush can touch that impossible spot between their shoulder blades. Their clothes are spick and span and well ironed. For mother, with little effort, with the electric iron, has long since finished the family laundry. The house is spotless, the vacuum cleaner safely tucked away, as they sit back, all through with their chores, tidy and happy, listening to an enjoyable electric radio program, awaiting the arrival of their friends; while mother finishes up in the kitchen that is equipped with an electric stove and electric refrigerator.

They hear their daddy whistling as a boy coming from his tasks with an air of security, calm, and happiness, for he now does not have to wait for "the fall and failure." With the aid of electricity, his motors turn, which enable him, with a minimum of labor, to expand his operations on a dependable basis, and each month his milk checks and other income allow him to make a budget with reasonable certainty that includes year-around advantages for his family and himself.

If time permitted, I should like to endeavor to paint many other pictures, of the changes for the better, which I have observed in the last few years.

What caused this picture to change? Why, it has all come about since the advent of electricity at reasonable rates in the country and greatly reduced rates in the towns provided by TVA through the lines of REA and municipally owned electric systems.

I am very sorry indeed that the shortage of houses and homes for the veterans exists, not only because of the veterans themselves but because this committee has seen fit to temporarily postpone the building of the South Holston and Watauga Dams, which should be built as quickly as conditions permit.

The Congress of the United States passed a law May 18, 1933, creating the Tennessee Valley Authority. It was established to improve the navigability and to provide for the flood control of the Tennessee River, to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley, to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of said valley, to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes.

To accomplish these purposes the corporation was specifically authorized to construct such dams and reservoirs in the Tennessee River and its tributaries as will provide and maintain a 9-foot channel in the river from Knoxville to its mouth and will best serve to promote navigation on the Tennessee River and its tributaries and control destructive floodwaters in the Tennessee and Mississippi drainage basins. Insofar as may be consistent with these navigation and flood-control objectives, it was directed to provide and operate facilities for the generation and sale of electric energy.

The Corporation was also specifically authorized to take over the World War I munition-plant facilities in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, Ala., and to utilize and enlarge these facilities to develop and demonstrate new forms of fertilizer under practical farm conditions and to provide munitions for military purposes. In addition, the President determined by Executive Order 6161—June 9, 1933—that TVA should make the surveys, plans, experiments, and demonstrations contemplated by the act to further the

proper use and development of the natural resources of the Tennessee River Basin and adjoining territory.

I have only mentioned a very few of the present and potential advantages offered millions of people by this great Authority. If time permitted, I should like to paint many pictures of transition. I would like to discuss the influx of industry into the Tennessee Basin following cheap power. I would like to take up the great advance made in the production of fertilizers. It would be a revelation to see what has been done in the way of soil conservation to say nothing of the general betterment in the welfare of a people served by TVA and REA. It is needless for me to describe the mammoth part played by the facilities and power produced by TVA in the war effort for you Members of Congress saw this picture as I did.

My advocacy of the provisions in this bill cannot be expressed strong enough in mere words for I live in the land of the TVA and I know and have seen the change.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. PLOESER. I have no further requests on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and that it now be open for amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would any part of the bill be open to points of order at this time?

Mr. MAHON. That would be agreeable to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman include that in his request?

Mr. MAHON. I include that in my request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against section 302 of the bill on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and violates the Government Corporation Control Act.

The language clearly is legislation. It proposes to make it possible for the corporation or agency to change its budget program on getting Presidential approval and initiate programs, authorized by law to be sure but not programmed or set forth in the budget submitted to and approved by the Congress. If it were not for this language it clearly would be a violation of the Government Corporation Control Act for them to do so. The presence of the language in this bill is evidence of the fact that it seeks to make possible doing something which otherwise would not be possible to do under existing law. Therefore, it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GORE. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, under the present law, without the passage of this act, the various governmentally owned corporations included in this bill have the authority, with or without approval of the President, to expend funds available to them either through appropriations or through their borrowing authority, for purposes authorized to them by law.

This provision seeks to give the corporations an escape valve, so to speak, to deal with new emergencies or situations not anticipated in their budget, not from the law as it now is, but from the previous sections of the pending bill. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, section 302 gives to the corporations no authority which they do not now have. It does give to the corporations, Mr. Chairman, some limited authority which they are denied in previous sections of the bill.

I see no legislation despite the views expressed by the gentleman from South Dakota who made the point of order, involved in this section. It cannot therefore be regarded as legislation on an appropriation bill; it is merely a limited relaxation of the restrictions contained in previous sections of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the Chairman please, the Corporate Control Act provides in section 103—with which the chairman is thoroughly familiar, having served on the committee which prepared this originally as follows:

> The budget program of the corporations as prepared and authorized by the President shall be transmitted to the Congress as part of the annual budget—
>
> And so forth.
>
> The budget transmitted by the President to the Congress shall be considered and, if necessary, legislation shall be enacted making available such funds or other financial resources as the Congress may determine.
>
> The provisions of this section shall not be considered as preventing wholly-owned Government corporations from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law, nor shall any provisions of this section be construed as affecting in any way the provision of section 26—

And so forth. This clearly gives to the Congress the right to pass on the budgets of these various corporations in line with section 104 of such Corporate Control Act. This budget was submitted to the Congress. It was transferred or directed to the Appropriations Committee for appropriate action under the act. The Appropriations Committee in handling this bill, as they are authorized to do under section 104, it having been directed to this committee, provided in title II on page 4:

> The following corporations and agencies, respectively, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority—

And so forth. By such section this committee approved the budget programs of these various corporations for the next fiscal year and tied those corporations to those budget showings. This committee, if it had ended its language with that statement or with the provisions of title II beginning at line 13, page 4, would have run directly into conflict with section 104 of the basic law, the Corporate Control Act. Having provided title II, the first paragraph, the only way that we prevented such provision from conflicting with section 104 of the Corporate Control Act was by providing section 302, which permits such corporations to carry out activities authorized by law but not included in the budget of such corporation considered by the committee. Section 104 of the Corporate Control Act preserves that right to Government corporations.

So in my view, Mr. Chairman, the Corporate Control Act provides for a wholly different procedure to that customarily followed by a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee; and this bill having been referred to the Appropriations Committee, I feel that in this instance the committee has jurisdiction to discharge the duties that are set out on the part of Congress in the Corporate Control Act, and is acting with additional rights and authorities with regard to this particular bill as compared with the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee handling on direct appropriations.

If this committee is without authority to retain section 302 in this bill, then the committee is without authority to carry out the provisions of the Corporate Control Act.

On the other hand no legislative committee of the House would have authority to carry out the provisions of the Corporate Control Act for they have no jusisdiction over the appropriation features of these corporations.

For these reasons I feel that the language to which the point of order has been made, section 302, must be included in this bill in view of section 104 of the Corporation Control Act, and the committee in providing such section is acting clearly within the provisions of the Corporate Control Act and therefore, is not to be judged by the usual rule with regard to appropriations or legislation on an appropriation bill. We are operating under different law with different duties outlined in the basic law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] desire to be heard?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the point of order made by the gentleman from South Dakota to say that, in my opinion, section 302 goes much further than the provisions of the basic act, in that it delegates to the President more power than is provided in the basic act, hence it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in the basic Corporation Control Act this language appears:

> The budget program shall contain estimates of the financial condition and operations of the corporation for the current and ensuing fiscal year and the actual condition and results of operation for the last completed fiscal year.

It is impossible for me to read the entire sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act without feeling that it was the definite intent of the act, and I speak with some assurance on that, and I feel that the Chairman, as well as the gentleman speaking, knows something of the intent of the act, to bring the entire operating program of the Government corporations

before the Congress. The point which the gentleman from Iowa has just made that the language in section 302 would take that control from Congress and place it in the hands of the President for the language in 302 specifically provides that in order to meet emergencies not provided for in the budget program that the changes may be made with the approval of the President. That clearly places in the hands of the President rather than the Congress the authority to initiate new programs not contemplated by the Congress when the bill was considered and it would be violative of the spirit and intent of the act.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Does the gentleman have before him section 104 of the Corporation Control Act?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. WHITTEN. After reading section 104 does the gentleman believe that the Congress granted to this committee any right to prevent these corporations from exercising activities authorized under the basic law? Section 104 in part states:

> The provisions of this section shall not be construed as preventing wholly owned Government corporations from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law, nor shall any provisions of this section be construed as affecting in any way the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The point of order is not directed to that section.

Mr. WHITTEN. No.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The language the gentleman has just cited deals with the provisions of section 104 which is not germane to the point of order being directed against section 302.

Mr. WHITTEN. With regard to the section to which the gentleman directs his point of order, it should be considered together with title II on page 4 in which we tie the corporations down to the budget submitted to us. If we tie them down to the program outlined in the budget, we are going contrary to section 104 of the Corporation Control Act. Without section 302 we violate section 104 of the Corporation Control Act with title II, page 4.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If section 302 remains in the bill it will be going contrary to the provisions of the basic act itself without regard to what it may do to other sections.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman contend that without the passage of this bill, without regard to whether it is passed or not, that the corporations would not have authority under existing law to use funds available to them and their borrowing authority to carry out and initiate programs authorized by law?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, that is not the question at all here. I contend that under the Government Corporations Control Act the Government corporations are required to present their budget programs to a Committee on Appropriations of the Congress in order that they may be reviewed, in order that the Congress may authorize the appropriation of certain funds for possibly administrative expenses, and in that way to get a review of their entire program and to get a voice to determine what these agencies are going to do, and that the very act itself constitutes a chance for the Congress to have a review, and if you turn around and surrender that control and give it to the President, you have violated the basic act.

Mr. GORE. Section 302 does not do that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to address this to the gentleman from South Dakota. As was brought out by the gentleman from Tennessee, it is the contention of the Members of the committee that these corporations already have these rights; that they have full rights under the present law, and under section 104 of the Corporations Act to carry out all duties and activities which they are authorized to do by law. So that being true, section 302 does not take away any rights. It grants no new rights but attempts to restrict to a certain course of procedure the exercise of the rights protected by section 104 of the Corporate Control Act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman were correct, there would be no necessity for putting the language in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from South Dakota makes the point of order against section 302 of the pending bill that it is legislation without authority of law on an appropriation bill. That section is as follows:

> SEC. 302. In order to meet emergencies or contingencies arising subsequent to approval of the Budget and not provided for in the Budget program, a corporation or agency covered by the provisions of this act may, with the approval of the President, adjust its budget program to provide, within the limits of available funds and borrowing authority, for the immediate initiation of programs authorized by law and not specifically set forth in the Budget: *Provided*, That the new program shall be promptly transmitted to the Congress as an amendment to the Budget: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as authority for increasing the amount available for administrative expenses under any limitation on such expenses.

The appropriation under consideration is being made under Public, 248, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Government Corporation Control Act.

Section 2 of the act declares it to be the policy of the Congress of the United States to scrutinize the operations of the Government corporations and to provide current financial control thereof.

Section 103 provides that the budget programs of the corporations as authorized in section 102 shall be transmitted to the Congress by the President as a part of the annual Budget for the consideration of the Congress. Section 103 further provides that amendments to the annual Budget programs may be submitted from time to time.

Section 104 provides in part, and I quote:

> The provisions of this section shall not be construed as preventing wholly owned Government corporations from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law, nor shall any provisions of this section be construed as affecting in any way the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended.

The Chair is of the opinion that when the Budget of the President has been transmitted to the Congress and when that Budget has been considered and finally approved by Congress the only way a change can be made in the Budget is by an amendment to be subsequently passed by the Congress. That procedure certainly embraces the matter of administrative expenses.

The provisions of section 104 shall not be construed to prevent wholly owned corporations from carrying out and financing their activities as authorized by existing law, but when Congress approves the budget, Congress finds that the approval does not prevent the carrying out and financing of the activties. The law is plain. The approval of Congress is under the law. It is for Congress to say in approving whether or not corporations need additional authorizations to carry out and finance their activities.

When the administrative expenses have been approved by Congress, or when the carrying out and financing activities have been approved by Congress, the President may submit amendments, and Congress may adopt or reject the amendments, but the approval of Congress is binding upon the corporations until either further recommendations are submitted or amendments are adopted.

Section 302 of the pending bill provides for adjustments or approvals or amendments not by the Congress and, in fact, without any action by Congress. The said section provides for a procedure that is not contemplated under either the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 or the Government Corporation Control Act, and is, therefore, legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House. The chair is therefore constrained to sustain the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. I may say that the subcommittee is authorized by the full committee to secure a rule for the consideration of this bill.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PLOESER. Is that motion subject to debate?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would it be possible to get a rule making in order a paragraph which had previously been stricken from the bill on a point of

order, unless that rule was adopted by a two-thirds vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that that inquiry is not one that can be answered in the Committee of the Whole. It is a matter that would have to be determined by the Speaker of the House.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 33, noes 49.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 23, in line 12, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That no funds shall be used for the purchase of floating equipment."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the real purpose of my amendment is to prohibit the Inland Waterways Corporation from spending $2,600,000 of their available money for new equipment, and to make repairs on old equipment. The Inland Waterways Corporation was instituted in 1922 for the purpose of developing inland waterway traffic. We contend that it has served its purpose as provided by law and that, as provided by law, it should be liquidated as soon as it had served its purpose. The Secretary of Commerce came before our committee and recommended that the Inland Waterways Corporation be liquidated. Nevertheless, the majority of the subcommittee recommended otherwise. They contend that the intent of the law has not been fully accomplished. The minority members contend that it has been sufficiently accomplished and that it should be liquidated with one exception which is stated in the minority report. The Corporation has lost money ever since 1939 while the competitive private water carriers have made money and have also contributed thousands upon thousands of dollars in tax revenue to the Treasury of the United States. All water rates are controlled by the Interstate Commerce Commission and rates are set by that Commission, so the rates must be fair and equitable. We contend that to spend more money in this failing enterprise would be throwing good money after bad money. That is the purpose of my amendment. I think it is justified in light of the facts in the case.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. In view of the fact that the gentleman's amendment is intended to liquidate the operation of the Inland Waterways Corporation, may I ask him, is there a prospective purchaser for the Inland Waterways equipment and would the liquidation of the Inland Waterways Corporation at this time necessarily handicap some of the shipments of grain that they need down the river?

Mr. JENSEN. It will not affect any kind of shipments. I will say to the gentleman that whoever purchases the Inland Waterways Corporation, and this is in the basic act, must carry on the same functions in the same manner, so far as the transportation facilities are concerned, as does the Government at this time.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there a prospective purchaser for the Inland Waterways equipment?

Mr. JENSEN. Without a doubt there is, and without a doubt there will be many purchasers if we decide to sell the Inland Waterways Corporation and it is so publicized that the people may know it is to be sold. Because of the fact that the public now is being well served by private carriers and because this Corporation has served its purpose, we feel it should be entirely liquidated as soon as possible. Surely we should not spend $2,600,000 on this old equipment under the circumstances which obtain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 160]

Adams	Gavin	Norton
Allen, Ill.	Gearhart	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews, Ala.	Geelan	O'Hara
Andrews, N. Y.	Gerlach	O'Toole
Arends	Granger	Outland
Baldwin, Md.	Grant, Ala.	Patrick
Baldwin, N. Y.	Grant, Ind.	Patterson
Barden	Green	Pfeifer
Barry	Gwinn, N. Y.	Philbin
Bennet, N. Y.	Halleck	Plumley
Biemiller	Harness, Ind.	Powell
Bloom	Harris	Quinn, N. Y.
Bonner	Hart	Rabin
Boren	Hartley	Rains
Boykin	Heffernan	Randolph
Brumbaugh	Hoffman, Mich.	Rayfiel
Buckley	Hoffman, Pa.	Reece, Tenn.
Bunker	Hook	Rich
Butler	Horan	Richards
Byrne, N. Y.	Howell	Robertson, N. Dak.
Cannon, Fla.	Jackson	Robinson, Utah
Carlson	Jarman	Roe, N. Y.
Celler	Johnson, Ind.	Rogers, N. Y.
Clark	Johnson, Luther A.	Savage
Clason	Jones	Sheppard
Cochran	Judd	Slaughter
Cole, N. Y.	Kearney	Smith, Ohio
Colmer	Kee	Smith, Va.
Cooley	Kefauver	Somers, N. Y.
Corbett	Kilburn	Stewart
Courtney	King	Stigler
Curley	Klein	Sumners, Tex.
Curtis	LaFollette	Taylor
Davis	Lane	Tolan
Dawson	Lanham	Torrens
Delaney, James J.	Luce	Traynor
Delaney John J.	Ludlow	Vinson
Dingell	McCormack	Wadsworth
Doyle	McGehee	Wasielewski
Durham	McGlinchey	Weichel
Eaton	McGregor	Welch
Ellsworth	Madden	Wickersham
Elsaesser	Manasco	Wilson
Fuller	Mason	Winstead
Fulton	Monroney	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gathings	Morrison	Woodhouse
	Murphy	Zimmerman

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6777, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 289 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6777, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to find out from the acting majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and for next week.

Mr. PRIEST. It is expected, of course, that the pending bill will be finished this afternoon.

Tomorrow the national cemetery bill is scheduled for consideration.

On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, and following that the bill H. R. 6699 will be taken up. That is the debt-reduction bill, from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that if the national cemetery bill is completed tomorrow there will be no session on Saturday.

Mr. PRIEST. I believe that is the understanding.

On Tuesday the bill H. R. 6597, the flood-control bill, is scheduled for consideration.

Wednesday, of course, is Calendar Wednesday.

On Thursday there will be further consideration of the railroad retirement bill, H. R. 1362, and the House will probably meet at 11 o'clock on Thursday morning in an effort to finish that bill on Thursday.

The War Department appropriation bill is scheduled for Friday.

The program for Saturday of next week is undetermined so far.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is a general understanding that after today if there are any roll calls they will be put over until next Wednesday?

Mr. PRIEST. That is the understanding.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, there is pending before the Committee an amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa which prohibits the Inland Waterways Corporation from using any of its funds for the purchase of floating equipment. There is now available an enormous quantity of barges and other

surplus marine equipment both from the Navy and War Shipping Administration. If the Inland Waterways Corporation is to continue its operation, it would be but a sensible, practical, and economical thing to do for the Corporation to avail itself of the opportunity it now has in the market of buying floating equipment at reduced prices. This amendment, however, broaches a much bigger question before the Congress. That question is, What shall be done with the Inland Waterways Corporation? The specific question raised is whether or not the Government-owned Inland Waterways Corporation should be sold to private operators. The question was raised before the Subcommittee on Government Corporations by the distinguished Secretary of Commerce who has made a recommendation to the committee and is seeking to bring legislation before the proper legislative committee to effectuate a sale of the Corporation to private interests.

The direct question of sale is not, of course, before the Congress at this time, but it is in effect before us, because the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], in his speech, said, as was said in the minority report, that he favored the sale, and the purpose of this amendment is to prevent the Corporation from purchasing new equipment, thereby facilitating the forcing of its sale.

Perhaps this question cannot be answered adequately in 10 minutes, but certainly a statement of the history and the purposes of the Corporation should be made at this time. The Corporation arose out of World War I. By 1924, traffic on the inland waterways had all but ceased, especially on the Mississippi. It had all but vanished. The Congress in 1924 passed an act creating the Inland Waterways Corporation, assigning it certain duties. Its foremost duty was to demonstrate the feasibility of water transportation on the inland rivers, and to extend the benefits of this service to the people of the United States. The Corporation has been phenomenally successful. Since its operation, both by its own operations, per se, and by the example which it has provided, there has been an enormous increase in the volume of traffic moving on our rivers. For 14 successive years prior to the beginning of World War II, this Corporation operated profitably. During those 14 years it accumulated profits in excess of $2,600,000, after more than $7,000,000 had been set up as a reserve for depreciation. During the present war it operated at a loss. It operated at a loss for 5 years. The reason for that was because of the war. It is nothing new that a business of this country will lose money or be affected because of the war and during the war, because of a change in the movement of freight. For instance, just before the outbreak of the war this Inland Waterways Corporation moved approximately 1,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1 year, but during the war it scarcely moved any. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation requisitioned much of its best equipment and converted it to other uses. So, merely because it lost money during the war is no reason why it should be sold now.

The original act set up conditions which the Corporation must meet before it could be sold. One of those conditions was that it be sold at a time when it could be sold to the best advantage to the Government. I submit that this agency, even if it is advisable to sell it, cannot be sold to the best advantage to the Government now when it is at the lowest ebb of its earning capacity; when at the end of a 5-year period of successive losses and on the threshold of a period which the economic conditions of the country as well as testimony before your subcommittee indicate will be a profitable period, and at a time when it can rehabilitate its equipment at a minimum cost.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman has stated that during the 5-year period comprising the war it lost money, that it was due to the war. That may be, but I should like to know how the gentleman accounts for the fact that most similar operations on waterways have shown very fine profits during the war?

Mr. GORE. The character of service offered by the Inland Waterways Corporation differs widely from that offered by private carriers. For instance, it is the only barge line in the United States that will take all freight, come what will, in small quantities or large quantities. Some private barge lines will not take small quantities of certain freight, will not take small quantities of any as a matter of fact, but certainly they will not haul objectionable freight. This line operates on schedule, leaves terminals on the hour, and takes all comers as customers. Another reason is that the operations of this barge line were unduly—perhaps not unduly but to a larger extent than other barge line carriers—were affected because the Government requisitioned so much of its equipment. Another reason why I do not think this barge line should be sold is its effect upon the freight rate of the whole Mississippi Valley. One condition which the original act set out that must be met before it could be sold was that joint freight rates between railroads and barge lines be published. That condition has not been met. Nor do I think it has reached its ultimate in the demonstration of the feasibility of inland waterways transportation. To be sure, competent witnesses testified before the committee that inland waterways transportation had been but scratched on its surface. More rivers are being opened to navigation. Only last week we passed another large bill for river improvement. Before you adopt this amendment and hamper the operations of this corporation remember these things. For one thing, it will require additional legislation before it can be sold. It is doubtful indeed that the Congress after due consideration will ever enact that legislation, or will enact it within the reasonable future. Therefore, if it must operate, the sensible thing is to allow it to operate in an economical fashion. It cannot operate in an economical manner if it is compelled to continue to use its old and dilapidated equipment, exhausted during the war not only by the operations of this barge line itself but by other governmental agencies which operated the requisitioned equipment. The sensible, the practical, and the economical thing to do, if this line is to operate as a Government corporation or as a privately owned corporation, is to buy while the buying is good to replace and rehabilitate their old worn-out equipment. I do not think there is anything sinister in public ownership for a public purpose. The people own the rivers; I see no reason why they could not continue to own this yardstick for the use of the rivers in demonstrating the feasibility of inland waterways traffic, to provide a yardstick for the freight-rate structure of the entire Mississippi Valley, and also to expand these benefits to the people of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I shall not argue with the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee the thesis that the experiment in the inland waterways has been a good thing and that the continued operation of water transportation is a good thing for the people of America. I wish, however, that the gentleman from Tennessee and some other members of this committee would give the Congress the truth about this operation. I know that you are sparring around the real truth as to why this Inland Waterways Corporation made money up until 1939 and ever since 1939 has lost money to the tune of $2,512,000. The gentleman from Tennessee has not given the Congress nor the American people the real facts about that situation. Some of us, I believe, really know the true reason why that barge line is losing money and will never be able to operate at a profit under any circumstances if the present system of operation is carried out. The gentleman knows, I am sure, to what I am referring. I shall not indulge myself because I have not the time, but it is pretty well known by everybody who knows of the operations of this Inland Waterways what a hot potato it really is for the Department of Commerce, their hands being tied by the labor contracts they now have for the operation of those waterways. I know that there is not a member of this committee who does not know it and I know also that is the reason why the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Henry Agard Wallace, came before your committee and testified, and I will read his testimony so there will be no question about it. Listen to what Mr. Wallace says on this subject. Certainly he is not one of the most outstanding protagonists of private enterprise. At least, he has not been thought of as such. This is what he says:

> I am heartily in accord with the policy of Congress that the facilities and operating rights of the corporation be sold to private parties when there is assurance that such parties will conduct a common-carrier service similar to that performed by the Corporation. After studying this problem since I have been in the Department, I have come to the conclusion that now is the appropriate time to offer the facilities of the Corporation for sale to private interests.

The Secretary of Commerce himself says:

Now is the time to offer these barge lines to private interests to operate.

He says further:

I believe that the conditions for sale described above have been substantially complied with—

Namely, the conditions in the statute—

now is the time to sell and put those barge lines into the control of private operators.

Mr. Chairman, that is the Secretary of Commerce who has charge of this Inland Waterways Corporation. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] asks, "Why should we spend $2,600,000 of the taxpayers' money and put it in more equipment, more barges, when the Secretary of Commerce says the deal is losing money to the tune of $2,512,000 and now is the time to put it into private operation and save $2,500,000 of the taxpayers' money?"

That is what the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] proposes to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the question before the committee is not one of whether we should sell the Inland Waterways Corporation or not. If that were the question we could make a most forceful argument against a sale on the ground that the Inland Waterways Corporation is saving millions of dollars of money to the shippers of this Nation because of the effect of its operations on railroad freight rates and on other water transportation. This committee is without authority to provide this afternoon for the sale of the Inland Waterways Corporation, nor can this committee prevent the sale to private interests if certain conditions are met. Regardless of what action you may take on the pending amendment under the basic law of the land, the Inland Waterways Corporation will continue to operate as a Government corporation until the requirements of the law are met, and it is obvious that they have not been met at this time. You have here a Government corporation which is operating a barge line on the rivers of the Nation. Under the basic law it is going to continue to operate such barge lines. Admittedly it does not have the right kind of equipment because much of it is old and obsolete, and other of its equipment has been taken over for war activities of the Nation during the war period. Since the Corporation is going to operate these lines, then it is necessary and essential to permit the Corporation to use a part of its own surplus to buy additional equipment so that it can operate efficiently and well.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa does not provide for the sale of this corporation. It provides only that this corporation cannot get the needed equipment to operate efficiently until we do sell it economically for the best interests of the country. The gentleman wants to sell the line. The effect of his amendment is to make the line continue to lose money. Thereby he hopes to enhance his chances of forcing a sale to private interests. Yet the membership of this House must know if we are going to operate this barge line, certainly we owe it to the Government to see that it is operated so that it will make money and so that the losses, if any, will be kept at a minimum. I say to you at this time since there are more surplus tugs and barges and other equipment available than ever before. The Government needs to make use of such equipment. To sell such equipment to this Government corporation is to take money out of one pocket and put it in another. Actually it means for the Government to make use of what is has. Now though the Secretary of Commerce recommends the sale of this barge line in the future, I say to you that one of the conditions for the sale will be that the purchaser must guarantee the continuation and the carrying on of comparable common carrier service, by the purchaser. If the purchaser of this barge line is going to do that, and he must do it under the law, I say to you that if you let the present operation run down today so that we have a poor type of common carrier service with few runs and with old equipment which cannot serve the public, all that the purchaser of this corporation is going to have to do is to guarantee that he will carry on the same poor schedules, the few trips which this Corporation will have carried on because of its inadequate equipment. Such a service will not meet the needs of the people.

Because the people can avail themselves of this common-carrier service, private carriers are giving a good service. If the public were altogether dependent on such private carriers who knows what the situation would be. Thus whether the Inland Waterways Corporation is eventually to be sold or not we owe it to this Corporation to provide for it adequately, and let it use its surplus to get its hands on the barges that are needed for the operation of this worth-while service. If you sell it you owe it to the country to provide a good type of common-carrier service by the private interests which will purchase the Corporation; and who must guarantee to carry on the type of common-carrier service they find then in operation when they buy it.

If we provide for the proper operation of this Corporation's service, its purchaser must provide a worth-while service which will meet the needs of the people through the Mississippi Valley and in other river areas and provide excellent common-carrier service. If it was a question whether to sell or not to sell, we could make you a more forceful argument as to the benefit coming from this Corporation, but I say whether the Corporation is sold or not there is the greatest need for operating it properly during the period that the Government does operate the lines on a worthwhile basis to meet the needs of the people in that area. If you are going to sell the line the purchaser must pay for the physical equipment of this Corporation, and certainly the surplus property converted to this Corporation would be an asset for which money would be returned to the Treasury, and the purchaser of the Corporation would carry on an excellent common-carrier service that is badly needed throughout this area for the service it renders the people of the Mississippi Valley and elsewhere and for the tremendous savings resulting from the effects of such water carrier on railroad freight rates which has saved millions of dollars to the shippers of the Nation.

This amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, let us analyze a few arguments that have been made. The one by the gentleman from Tennessee is that this is a cheap time to rehabilitate the equipment because of the many surpluses in Government hands, and therefore he assumes, without any apparent knowledge on the subject, that our surpluses contain barges suitable for this operation. I think he will find, if he consults the Maritime Commission, that they have few items of surplus that are really suitable.

As to the sale of this Corporation, the law requires that whoever the purchaser may be, he must guarantee to carry on the same or similar service so that the service will not be lost to the area served, so all of that argument is specious as far as I am concerned. I do not expect or advocate that anybody sell this contrary to law. As a matter of fact, while we have advocated in the minority report that is probably a good thing to sell it, this amendment does not provide for any sale. This amendment merely says, "Do not spend money for rehabilitation until we make up our mind whether we are going to continue it or sell it." That is the position on this side of the aisle.

The assumption is continually repeated that there are no other carriers on the rivers, that the job of pioneering is still going on. That is true only as it applies to the waterways between the great cities of St. Louis and Kansas City on the Missouri River. This amendment would not prohibit the continued operation of that segment of the waterways. Unless we could have a full, bonded guaranty that that segment would be operated in the future, I for one would not advocate the sale of that segment. There is nothing compelling the sale of this in one bundle. It can be sold in segments if it is so desired. All this amendment does is prohibit spending money for rehabilitation until there is a final determination as to what is going to be done, retain, or sell.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. May I point out to the gentleman that Mr. Trimble, who is head of the Inland Waterways Corporation, testified before the committee that equipment suitable for river traffic is available in surplus commodities.

Mr. PLOESER. Is it available to the extent that they can rehabilitate their entire floating equipment? If it is, then it is contrary to the information I have gotten from the Maritime Commission direct.

Mr. GORE. I do not remember that he said it is available to the extent of rehabilitating all of their equipment, but he said it is plentiful.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well for us to get clearly in mind what the issue is before us at this time. This will be the concluding reference to the amendment, and the vote will come in 5 minutes.

There is some controversy, I am sure, over the question of whether or not the Inland Waterways Corporation should be sold, but that is in no way the issue before the committee at this time. That would be a legislative matter which would not be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa provides that the Inland Waterways Corporation shall not be permitted to spend any money for floating equipment in the next fiscal year. The Corporation still has a job to do, a mandate from the Congress, but the hands of the Corporation would be tied because we would be placing in the law a prohibition against the acquisition of any floating equipment during the next year.

Bear in mind that this Corporation was created shortly after World War I, that it operated successfully from the standpoint of finances for about 14 years, and that it has sustained losses during World War II.

It is not suggested in this bill that any appropriation be made. This is not an appropriation matter. It is a matter whereby the gentleoman offering the amendment seeks to prevent the Corporation from using its own funds, and it has ample funds. It has $5,000,000 in Government bonds. The effort is being made to keep this corporation from using its own funds for any additional floating equipment during the next fiscal year.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I want to make it clear that the Corporation's own funds are the funds of the United States, it being a wholly owned Government corporation.

Mr. MAHON. Oh, yes; the gentleman is entirely correct. It is a wholly owned Government corporation which we had set up to do a job, yet the adoption of the amendment would deprive the corporation of the opportunity of doing the job which it has a mandate from Congress to do.

Let me direct your attention to just how far-reaching this amendment is. It says no floating equipment can be bought. Suppose a barge breaks down? Could a new engine be purchased? I do know that would be a technical question perhaps for lawyers to decide. But certainly no new barge could be bought. Even a rowboat could not be bought. Emergencies may arise by reason of floods or disasters. We cannot foresee these things. Yet the hands of the corporation would be tied and no floating equipment could be purchased during the coming fiscal year. It would certainly be a most unwise thing to adopt such a far-reaching amendment. Mr. Ed O'Neill, of the Farm Bureau, and Mr. Ogg appeared before our committee and said, "Gentlemen, the farmers of this Nation in the Midwest and the Mississippi Valley are very much interested in the question of freight rates."

Well, believe me, we are interested in the Southwest in the question of freight rates also. Those gentlemen expressed apprehension that if this Waterways Corporation should cease to operate then it would result in an increase in freight rates and thereby injure the agricultural interests of the Middle West and the Mississippi Valley and perhaps repercussions would be felt in other areas. For that reason, any crippling of this agency was opposed. The Corporation has the money to buy this floating equipment. There never was such a time as now to buy surplus floating equipment. Now is the time for them to get the necessary equipment to carry on the operations. A year from now will be too late. So it certainly would be an unfortunate affair if we should adopt any such amendment as has been suggested here because this Corporation is going to run next year; and when it is sold, the purchaser must run it in a way comparable to the way in which the Government is now operating it. But if the Inland Waterways cannot successfully be operated in the next year, then no service will be given to the people. I ask the Committee to reject the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 69, noes 78.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. MAHON and Mr. JENSEN to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 89, noes 86.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6777) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt the House divided and there were—yeas 74, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for five legislative days, on account of official business.

To Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial, and in the other a news item.

OPA PRICE POLICY ON FARM MACHINERY

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed at this time for such time as may be necessary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, farm implement men claim that the OPA order dated May 10 which requires a reduction in working margin of profit will drive them out of business.

The farm implement dealers of southwestern Minnesota, one of the greatest agricultural regions in America, have appealed to have these margins restored.

On May 15, I called this situation to the attention of Mr. Paul Porter, Administrator of OPA, and described its effect on the distribution of farm machinery and repair parts in southwestern Minnesota. Today I am in receipt of the following letter from Mr. Porter:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1946.

The Honorable H. CARL ANDERSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSEN: Thank you for your letter of May 15, 1946, in which you refer to amendment 16 to Maximum Price Regulation 246.

For your information, I might say that whenever this Office issues an industry-wide adjustment in prices, it is our policy as required by Executive order of the President to require absorption of such increases to the manufacturer at the retail level, when it is clearly indicated that the dealers can safely do so. Retail increases are required only when over-all earnings of the retail trade group affected are reduced below peacetime levels (earning standard) or when retail prices on individual products are less than operating expenses (the product standard). These standards have been closely adhered to in all industry adjustments.

In the case of the action to determine the ability of retail sellers to absorb, this Office made a study of financial and cost data obtained from a very substantial segment of the trade. The survey included a comparison between the base period, 1936–39, and 1945, from which it was found that the dealers generally are in a better position now than during the base period and can absorb to

the extent required without being forced below their normal 1936–39 profits.

I am glad you referred this letter to me and hope that you will feel free to call upon me at any time that I can be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL A. PORTER,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the statement in Mr. Porter's letter that implement dealers generally are in a better position now than during the base period as far as normal profits are concerned. The operating costs of small businesses have increased tremendously during the war period and today, nearly a year after the cessation of hostilities, operation costs are higher than at any time in history.

We cannot expect these implement dealers, or any other group of businessmen, to continue to give necessary services to agriculture if their profits are decreased to the point where there is no incentive to render such services.

I am today requesting Mr. Porter to reconsider the position taken in his letter of June 12. The farm equipment situation is bad enough, and I say that from personal experience as an operating farmer, without making it worse by rendering it almost impossible for dealers to give necessary services in these critical times when the production of every possible bit of food is urgently needed. May I call to the attention of the Members of the House the statement made by several dealers in Rock County, Minn. The study of this statement will disprove these contained in Mr. Porter's letter. The Rock County Star-Herald, of Luverne, Minn., carries this as an advertisement, which reads as follows:

IT'S YOUR FRIEND AND NEIGHBOR, THE "LITTLE FELLOW" AT THE END OF THE IMPLEMENT LINE, THAT'S TAKING THE LICKING—WE'RE ASKING YOUR HELP

To the Farmers of This Community:

You no doubt have read or heard statements regarding the advance in the retail price of farm machinery which was announced by OPA on Saturday, May 11, which inferred that the increase in price to the farmers was only 3 percent. May we at this time call your attention to the fact that this is incorrect; the raise in the retail prices in most cases is 5 percent, but the raise to the manufacturer on a wholesale basis is 10.25 percent. This increase in price was due to the requests from manufacturers of farm equipment primarily because of increased labor costs and the increased cost of materials and component parts needed to manufacture farm machinery.

Dealers' operating margin has been reduced one-fifth by OPA's new regulation.

This means that your farm-equipment dealers must operate from now on, on a one-fifth-less working margin than they had before May 10, 1946.

OUR COSTS HAVE BEEN HIKED, BUT OUR LIVING HAS BEEN WIPED OUT

This means that your local service dealer, even though his operating costs have mounted tremendously during this war period must operate on a lesser margin than he had during World War II. When all other industries Nation-wide were demanding increases for their products, your farm-equipment retailers did not ask for any increase.

WE DON'T WANT TO CURTAIL SERVICE TO YOU, OUR CUSTOMERS AND NEIGHBORS

This decrease means that many of your farm-equipment retailers will be forced to curtail the services that have made it possible for you to operate during these emergency periods with many obsolete machines even when new repair parts were not available.

This means that many farm-equipment dealers may be forced to remove from their pay rolls mechanics, servicemen, and other employees, many of them GI's, so that their operating costs will be in line with their reduction in their earning margin.

MANY LOCAL DEALERS CAUGHT IN THE SQUEEZE MAY BE FORCED TO CLOSE

This means that many dealers, because of this squeeze in dealer's working margins, may be forced to close their doors and discontinue their operations.

WILL YOU HELP SO THAT WE CAN CONTINUE TO SERVE YOU?

All we ask of you, Mr. Farmer, is that you consider your welfare, and if you feel that we have done a good job for you during these hectic years, that you please contact your Congressmen and Senators and ask them to restore to us the working margins we had before this new OPA ruling. Please bear in mind that we are not asking for any increase, but we cannot stand a reduction at the present time if we are to continue our operations. We would be pleased to have you stop in at our stores to discuss more thoroughly this program which is threatening to destroy the farm-equipment retailers of America.

Thanking you kindly,

Thone Implement Co., A. T. Friestad; Sellen & Co.; Rapp Motor Co.; Vandevelde Hardware & Implement Co., Kenneth; Sjolseth Implement Co., Hills; Otto Bierkamp; Fred Herman; Elwood Shackelford; Shelby's; the Edmond's Co., Steen; H. C. Petersen, Hardwick; Berghorst Implement Co., Hills.

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter and an advertisement.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan (at the request of Mr. PLOESER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. PITTENGER (at the request of Mr. PLOESER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. PLOESER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a statement by the Little Business Men's League of America, and in the other to include a letter by Mr. Norman Bernstein, of Chicago, a small businessman who urges extension of OPA.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a timely editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to include as a part of his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today the minority views in reference to Government corporations.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 14, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1385. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide military advice and assistance to the Republic of China to aid it in modernizing its armed forces for the fulfillment of obli-

gations which may devolve upon it under the Charter of the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1386. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates for decreases in appropriations in the amount of $52,913,139 and increases in appropriations in the amount of $14,785,368 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for the War Department, for military activities (H. Doc. No. 657); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1387. A communication from the President of the United States; transmitting for the fiscal year 1947, a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $120,000,000 for surplus disposal, care, and handling (H. Doc. No. 658); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1388. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $730,000, for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 659); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1389. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $1,500 for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 660); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1390. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $5,200 for The Tax Court of the United States (H. Doc. No. 661); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1391. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $56,000 for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 662); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1392. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the War Assets Administration for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $545,100,000, and general provisions pertaining to the Office for Emergency Management (H. Doc. No. 656); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6777. A bill making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. 2269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 364. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of an international animal quarantine station on Swan Island, and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent importation of such animals into other parts of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6689. A bill to extend, for an additional year, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar; without amendment (Rept. No. 2271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6408. A bill to authorize the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission to make available certain surplus property to certain maritime academies; with amendment (Rept. No. 2272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 6547. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire in fee or otherwise certain lands and rights in land on the island of Guam, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3230. A bill to provide for the investigation and conservation of the fishery resources and the development of the fishing industry of the Territory of Hawaii and of adjacent waters of the Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4484. A bill relating to the construction and maintenance of permanent buildings and improvements for banking purposes on the Fort Ord Military Reservation, Calif.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6741. A bill relating to the operation of section 8 of the Federal Airport Act with respect to the fiscal year 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 2276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3993. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to sell and convey to the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., a right-of-way and easement for railroad purposes across a portion of Camp Cooke Military Reservation, Calif.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POAGE: Committee of Agriculture. H. R. 5876. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease to Henry A. Scandrett, Walter J. Cummings, and George I. Haight, trustees of Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1936; with amendment (Rept. No. 2278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 657. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 513, a bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the residence for naturalization purposes of certain aliens who serve in the military or naval forces of one of the allied countries during the Second World War or otherwise assist in the Allied war effort, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2279). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 658. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3663, a bill to amend the immigration and naturalization laws to deny admission to the United States of certain aliens who have served in the armed forces of countries at war with the United States, also members of certain parties and organizations, and to deny naturalization to such persons, and to reduce immigration quotas; without amendment (Rept. No. 2280). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 659. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6279, a bill to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2281). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 654. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5520, a bill for the purpose of regulating the conditions of employment of mechanics, helpers, laborers, and all per diem employees engaged in trades and occupations at all Government naval shipyards, naval stations, arsenals, and other Government industrial establishments, within or without the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2282). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 660. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6646, a bill to establish the Office of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs; without amendment (Rept. No. 2283). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 661. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 896, an act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2284). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6778. A bill to provide for the integrated development of the water resources of the Central Valley of California by the Bureau of Reclamation for irrigation and reclamation purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. ROE of Maryland:

H. R. 6779. A bill to provide for an examination and survey to determine the advisability and feasibility of dredging Chapel Creek, a tributary of the Great Choptank River, Dorchester County, Md.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 6780. A bill to create an Evacuation Claims Commission under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, and to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 6781. A bill to incorporate the Amvets, American Veterans of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 6782. A bill to incorporate the Amvets, American Veterans of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 6783. A bill to prohibit the induction under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, of persons who have served in the land or naval forces subsequent to September 16, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 366. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to investigate and eradicate the predatory sea lampreys of the Great Lakes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. J. Res. 367. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of

the Interior to investigate and eradicate the predatory sea lampreys of the Great Lakes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. Con. Res. 157. Concurrent resolution relative to the Jewish national home in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 6784. A bill for the relief of Gerald S. Furman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 6785. A bill for the relief of Sylvester T. Starling; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6786. A bill for the relief of Ollie McNeill and Ester B. McNeill; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 6787. A bill for the relief of R. L. Wheeler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 6788. A bill for the relief of Isolantite, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 6789. A bill for the relief of Gordon Palmer, chairman; Frank Thomas; H. A. McDowell; Mark Hodo; O. G. Gresham; E. A. Camp, Jr., secretary and treasurer; and Borden Burr, as trustees of the Boswell fund for the use and benefit of Charles A. Boswell and his heirs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 6790. A bill for the relief of Martin L. Rust; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6791. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of John Henry Mackey, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 6792. A bill for the relief of Winfred W. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1976. By Mr. SHARP: Petition of 349 citizens of Suffolk County, Long Island, N. Y., in opposition to the reinstitution of prohibition or any action trending in that direction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1977. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of State Teachers' College of Milwaukee, urging passage of Senate bill 1770, which would make possible the construction of a veterans' dormitory; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1978. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Mrs. Sophia Copp, 24 Holmdel Place, Rochester, N. Y., and 18 others, urging congressional action to stop the use of grain by brewers and distillers, while millions are starving and grain shortages are acute; and supporting House Joint Resolution 325, pending before the House Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1979. Also, petition of Herbert J. Goff, 636 Garson Avenue, Rochester, N. Y., and 20 others, urging congressional action to stop the use of grain by brewers and distillers, while millions are starving and grain shortages are acute; and supporting House Joint Resolution 325, pending before the House Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1980. Also, petition of Mrs. A. J. Verdine, 735 Parsells Avenue, Rochester, N. Y., and 18 others, urging congressional action to stop the use of grain by brewers and distillers, while millions are starving and grain shortages are acute; and supporting House Joint Resolution 325, pending before the House Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1981. Also, petition of Mrs. Regina Taylor, 167 Seymour Road, Rochester, N. Y., and 23 others, urging congressional action to stop the use of grain by brewers and distillers, while millions are starving and grain shortages are acute; and supporting House Joint Resolution 325, pending before the House Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1982. Also, petition of Muriel L. Jones, 497 North Goodman Street, Rochester, N. Y., and 18 others, urging congressional action to stop the use of grain by brewers and distillers, while millions are starving and grain shortages are acute; and supporting House Joint Resolution 325, pending before the House Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1983. By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of Mr. Joseph Walters, of Rochester, and others, in opposition to legislation having for its objective partial or national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 14, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Master of all good workmen, again as sounds the call to the labor of yet another day we wait for Thy benediction, that in this secluded garden of devotion our souls may be refreshed and restored as the morning dew of prayerful reverence glistens on our parched and feverish lives. Grant that our hearts may be shrines of prayer, our homes nurseries of virtue, our personalities centers of contagious good will, and our Nation still a bulwark for the oppressed and a flaming beacon of hope whose beams shall battle the darkness in all the world. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1946.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CLYDE R. HOEY, a Senator from the State of North Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HOEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, June 13, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6777) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate after the close of today's session for the next 45 days.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask consent of the Senate to remain away from the Senate for 30 days.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Andrews	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hoey	Overton
Ball	Huffman	Reed
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brewster	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Bridges	Kilgore	Shipstead
Briggs	Knowland	Smith
Brooks	Lucas	Stanfill
Burch	McCarran	Stewart
Bushfield	McClellan	Taft
Byrd	McFarland	Taylor
Capehart	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Carville	Maybank	Tunnell
Chavez	Mead	Tydings
Cordon	Millikin	Wagner
Downey	Moore	Walsh
Eastland	Morse	Wheeler
George	Murdock	White
Gerry	Murray	Willis
Gurney	Myers	

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business, attending the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are members of the committee on the part of the Senate, attending the funeral services of the late Senator John H. Bankhead, of Alabama.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, at-

tending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate as members of the committee appointed by the United States Senate to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Bankhead.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is unavoidably absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For the President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 6953.)

PROMOTION OF NAVAL PERSONNEL—VETO MESSAGE (S DOC. NO. 205)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1805, the purpose of which is to provide for the promotion of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who were prisoners of war, without regard for the needs of the service, and with provisions for retroactive increases of pay and allowances.

In my opinion the measure is neither necessary nor in the national interest.

The act does not include personnel of the Army and it is my considered belief that any such law should provide a common policy for prisoners of war of all of the armed forces of the United States.

The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy entered into an agreement on March 31, 1945, establishing a common policy on this matter, giving special consideration to the promotion of returned prisoners of war of their respective services, with provisions for waiver of time in grade, position, vacancy, and billet requirements. By administrative action of the two Departments under existing law, such personnel have been or are now being promoted to the rank, grade, or rating and precedence which they presumably would have acquired had they not been captured.

The act contemplates expenditure of large and indefinite sums of money by reason of its retroactive features relative to increases in pay and allowances. The number of personnel of the Army who were taken prisoners of war far exceeds the number of such personnel of the Navy, and if equal provision were made applicable to personnel of all the armed forces of the United States, there would be involved an expenditure of additional sums far in excess of those contemplated by the act in its present form.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 14, 1946.*

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the principal part of the text of the annual report of that Board covering operations during the year 1945, and stating that "a copy of the printed report will be sent as soon as it is available," which, with accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROTEST AGAINST INCREASE IN PAY-ROLL TAXES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received an important letter from C. E. Beck, chairman of the Ranney-Davis Mercantile Co., Arkansas City, Kans., one of the leading business concerns of my State, protesting against increase in pay-roll taxes. I am in accord with Mr. Beck's position on taxation, and ask unanimous consent to have his letter printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RANNEY-DAVIS MERCANTILE CO.,
Arkansas City, Kans., May 31, 1946.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I know you are a very busy man these days and the writer, for one, does not want to bother you any more than possible, but I would like to take a little time to call your attention to pay-roll taxes which will be up for automatic increase on January 1, 1947, as I understand it, to 2½ percent. I also understand there is a new bill before Congress to try to place the pay-roll tax at 1½ percent.

However, I think you will agree with the writer that since such a large sum has been accumulated, there is no particular reason for advancing these taxes at this time, and I am wondering if you won't agree with me that the present rate of 1 percent is entirely enough to take care of the situation. All taxes are so heavy that industry should be saved the burden of any increases which are not absolutely necessary.

We hope we may have your support on this matter.

Yours very truly,

C. E. BECK,
Chairman of the Board.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, a letter and a copy of a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation, setting forth the position of that organization with respect to legislation for the continuation of price controls. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1946.

To All Members of the United States Senate:

At its meeting in Chicago on May 31, 1946, the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation reviewed pending legislation for the continuation of price controls, and adopted a resolution setting forth the position of the federation thereon. I enclose a copy of this resolution.

In line with these recommendations, we favor the provisions of H. R. 6042, as reported by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, for the decontrol of agricultural commodities and for the adjustment of price ceilings whenever necessary to secure needed production, on the basis of determinations to be made by the Secretary of Agriculture. The bill, as reported by the committee, includes adequate provisions for restoring price controls to prevent run-away prices in the case of any agricultural commodities on which price ceilings are removed. We also favor the establishment of an independent decontrol board to determine when supplies of nonagricultural products are in sufficient supply to warrant removal of controls.

The provisions for removal of consumer subsidies on agricultural commodities in the bill as reported by the Senate committee are inadequate. We are strongly opposed to continuing any consumer subsidies on agricultural commodities beyond December 31, 1946. We urge the adoption of an amendment requiring the complete elimination of all these subsidies not later than December 31, 1946, and requiring corresponding adjustments in price ceilings when such subsidies are reduced or eliminated.

I hope these recommendations will meet with your approval.

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 31, 1946

The American Farm Bureau Federation was one of the first organizations representing a large segment of our society that insisted upon the control of inflation and has constantly supported legislation for this purpose. We have insisted that price control, when necessary, must apply equitably to all

segments of our economy, including agriculture, labor, manufacturers, distributors, and all others. Notwithstanding farmers' insistance on these policies, the administration has bowed to the demands of labor and other groups for inflationary increases in their price and wage levels. This failure to hold the line has undermined price control as a method of controlling inflation. OPA's unrealistic administration has restricted production so much that it has in itself become a major inflationary factor. The only hope now is to correct the basic causes of inflation, including revision of Federal tax, monetary, and credit policies.

The American Farm Bureau Federation insists that a definite schedule for the complete removal of consumer subsidies on agricultural commodities not later than December 31, 1946, must be enacted and price ceilings adjusted correspondingly. We further insist that provision be made for prompt elimination of price ceilings on any commodity or items whenever the current supply of such commodity or item is reasonably in line with current requirements and a definite schedule providing for this should be included in the law. Unless these provisions are included, we will not support the extension of the Price Control Act.

We further recommend that the authority for establishing, removing, and reestablishing price ceilings on agricultural commodities and determining adjustments necessary in order to obtain adequate production be transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture. We also suggest that an independent decontrol board be established with final power to decide when supplies of nonagricultural products are in sufficient supply to warrant removal of controls.

We are sure that there are many agricultural commodities which are either in sufficient supply or in which black-market operations are so excessive that it is apparent that OPA's efforts have totally broken down to the extent that consumers are receiving little benefit from the price ceilings, and on which price control should be terminated immediately. We would support the specific exemption of these commodities in legislation proposed to Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LUCAS (for Mr. PEPPER), from the Committee on Patents:

H. R. 5223. A bill to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for patents, for taking action in the United States Patent Office with respect thereto, for preventing proof of acts abroad with respect to the making of an invention, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1502); and

H. R. 5311. A bill to amend Revised Statutes, 4921 (U. S. C. A., title 35, Patents, sec. 70), providing that damages be ascertained on the basis of compensation for infringement; with amendments (Rept. No. 1503).

By Mr. HOEY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 2125. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1504);

S. 2307. A bill to provide that every Saturday shall be a holiday for banks and building and loan associations in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1505); and

H. R. 6265. A bill to create a Department of Corrections in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1506).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2253. A bill to further amend the act of January 16, 1936, as amended, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1507).

ECONOMIC CONCENTRATION AND WORLD WAR II—REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL-BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Study and Survey Problems of Small-Business Enterprises, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report on the subject of economic concentration and World War II, and request that it be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

This report was prepared for the committee by the Smaller War Plants Corporation and was transmitted shortly before the functions of that Corporation were transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Department of Commerce.

The report represents a statistical study of the extent of economic concentration, with particular reference to the changes which took place during World War II. It does not go into the question of the effects of concentration—that is, whether it is good or bad for the country. Nor does it offer any specific solution to the problem. However, the statistical information which it does present should be of the greatest interest to all of us.

During the last 4 years, we in the Senate Small Business Committee have been acutely conscious of the fact that economic concentration has been rapidly rising. We have seen the signs of this in the increased centralization of prime contracts in the hands of a few large corporations; in the difficulties experienced by capable small-business concerns in obtaining subcontracts; in the construction of great, new war facilities which often merely duplicated the unused plants of small business; in the holding back of civilian production by small firms until the big firms had completed their war contracts and were in a position to resume civilian peacetime operations; in certain surplus property disposal policies; and in many other ways.

Our general impressions concerning this increase of business concentration have now been confirmed, far beyond our worst fears, by the statistical evidence presented in this report.

The key to the great increase in concentration which took place during the war was the distribution of war contracts. Two-thirds of the value of the prime contracts awarded during 1940–44 went to the top 100 corporations. The top 10 corporations received no less than 30 percent of the awards. Furthermore, only a relatively small proportion of these awards were subcontracted out to small firms.

A high degree of concentration also prevailed in the other aspects of war production. Thus the hundred top corporations consumed 45 percent of the carbon steel, 70 percent of the alloy steel, 81 percent of the aluminum, 79 percent of the copper, and 66 percent of the copper-base alloy; they operated 75 percent of the Government-owned war-built facilities, and built 51 percent of the privately financed war facilities.

As a result of this centralization of war production, the relative importance of big business grew rapidly. Large firms employing more than 500 workers increased their share of manufacturing employment from 48 percent of the total in 1939 to 62 percent in 1944. Most of this increase took place in the very largest concerns—those employing more than 10,000 workers—which increased their share of manufacturing employment from 13 percent of the total in 1939 to fully 30 percent in 1944.

This increase in concentration is by no means a temporary matter. Rather, the report points out a number of reasons for assuming that big business will retain most of its wartime gains. In the first place, the big corporations greatly increased their productive capacity. Before the war, the gross value of our manufacturing plants amounted to approximately $40,000,000,000. During the war, some $26,000,000,000 of new facilities were added, of which some $20,000,000,000 is considered in the report to be usable for peacetime production. Most of these increased facilities were owned or operated by big business. The report points out that if the 250 largest manufacturing corporations were to acquire the usable Government-owned facilities which they operated, they would have approximately as much facilities as the entire economy had before the war, or two-thirds of the Nation's entire manufacturing capacity.

But economic concentration does not end with the giant corporations, since on top of them are a handful of immensely strong financial interest groups. Thirty-one of the Nation's 250 largest manufacturing corporations are controlled by five of these interest groups, namely, Morgan-First National, Mellon, Rockefeller, du Pont, and the Cleveland group. If these 31 corporations were to acquire the usable Government-owned facilities which they operated during the war, they would hold about half as much facilities as the entire economy had before the war, or 30 percent of the Nation's manufacturing facilities. That is economic concentration carried almost to the ultimate.

In addition to facilities, big business obtained most of the fruits of the scientific research carried on during the war, which, it should be pointed out, was conducted largely at Government expense. Some 68 corporations received no less than 66 percent of the Federal funds awarded to private industrial firms for scientific research.

It should be obvious that these corporations will have the first crack at putting into effect the peacetime applications of this research. And further than this, the contracts under which most of this research was conducted generally gave to the private corporations the patent rights on the peacetime applications, the Government receiving only a royalty-free license for its own use.

Furthermore, the financial position of the big corporations, and thus their

general economic strength, was greatly improved during the war. The 63 largest manufacturing corporations now hold nearly $10,000,000,000 of net working capital, and a large part of their current assets is in liquid form. With this capital, these few corporations could purchase the assets of 94 percent of the total number of all manufacturing corporations in the United States.

Actually, big business is now actively engaged in buying up small independent firms. In the last year, the trend of mergers in manufacturing has shot almost straight up and now resembles the sharp upward sweep which took place at the end of the First World War. Merger activity is particularly intensive in the fields of iron and machinery, drugs and pharmaceuticals, liquors, foods, and textiles.

As the report states:

> The trend of mergers and acquisitions is a symptom in peacetime of growing concentration of economic power. The fact that big business is now actively engaged in buying up small companies strongly suggests that it will probably follow other courses of action designed to increase its economic power.

What is the real meaning of this increase in concentration? In my opinion, it lies basically in the fact that concentration is the forerunner of collectivism. It is a fact that every industrialized nation which has become highly concentrated has succumbed to one form or another of collectivism. What right have we to assume that we can automatically escape this historical trend?

We have just waged a terrible war and sacrificed the lives of our youth in order to prevent collectivism from being imposed on us from without. Are we now to permit it to develop from within?

Are we preventing collectivism when 250 giant corporations hold two-thirds of the Nation's productive capacity; when corporations controlled by five financial interest groups hold nearly one-third of our capacity; when 2 percent of the concerns account for 62 percent of the total manufacturing employment; and when big corporations are granted the patent rights on the fruits of scientific research conducted at the taxpayers' expense?

The situation is one which demands action. And the opportunity for that action is now at hand. The one agency of the Government which is really attempting to halt this increase in concentration is the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. In fact, the antitrust laws are the only means at our disposal of holding in check the forces of monopoly. They are the last bulwark of the people against a collectivism which, as the figures in the report indicate, is now almost upon us.

The House of Representatives has passed an appropriation for the Antitrust Division of $1,700,000, or $200,000 less than last year's appropriation. Frankly, I am at a loss to understand the logic behind such a cut. It will be recalled that last year, as in all the war years, important antitrust suits were withheld, at the request of the War and Navy Departments. The excuse given was that such suits might, in some way, affect war production. But now that this excuse no longer exists, is the Congress to cripple the Division in still another way by the simple expedient of not granting it an adequate appropriation?

As a first and modest step of demonstrating our real concern and anxiety over this problem, the Senate should insist that the appropriation for the Anti-Trust Division be made the equivalent of the cost of fighting the war for 1 hour—just 1 hour. Such an appropriation would amount to $7,000,000. That is indeed a small price to pay for the prevention of collectivism and the maintenance of freedom and opportunity in our economic world.

If we believe that our system of free enterprise should be preserved, if we believe that the American economy should be the expression of a free society, then we cannot stand idly by and watch the march of monopoly to power. We cannot risk the consequences—for in this struggle, if we are too little and too late, there will be no second chance.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed as requested by the Senator from Montana.

NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM—PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 275, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res 275), submitted by Mr. MURRAY on May 31, 1946, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the said committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress on the bill (S. 1606) to provide for a national health program.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT 1211 RELATIVE TO DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 282, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 282), submitted by Mr. MCMAHON on June 10, 1946, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 4,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 1211, current session, accompanying the bill (S. 1717) for the development and control of atomic energy, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, 1,000 for the Senate document room, and 1,000 for the House document room.

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY, 1946

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, on the 10th and 11th of May of this year the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy visited that institution and conferred with the supervisory personnel and with the cadets, and thereafter prepared a report containing recommendations resulting from its inspection at that time. I send the report to the desk and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KINGS POINT, N. Y., *May 11, 1946.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, approved May 11, 1944, the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated to constitute the 1946 Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

SENATORS

By the Vice President: GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, Maryland.

By the Committee on Commerce: JOSIAH Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey, L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas; GUY CORDON, Oregon.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

By the Speaker of the House: EUGENE J. KEOGH, Ninth Congressional District of New York; ROBERT HALE, First Congressional District of Maine.

By the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee: SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, First Congressional District of Virginia (ex officio); EDWARD J. HART, Fourteenth Congressional District of New Jersey; FRED BRADLEY, Eleventh Congressional District of Michigan; HERBERT C. BONNER, First Congressional District of North Carolina.

Representative GORDON CANFIELD, of the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey, was subsequently appointed to the Board of Visitors in place of HEBERT C. BONNER, First Congressional District of North Carolina, who was unable to attend.

The members of the Board were accompanied from Washington to Kings Point by the following officers from headquarters of the training organization of the War Shipping Administration: Commodore Telfair Knight, USMS, Assistant Deputy Administrator for Training; Capt. John T. Everett, USMS, Depuy Supervisor, United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps; Capt. William Porter, USMS, chief information officer of the training organization; Lt. Comdr. Calvin R. Shorter, USMS, chief legal officer of the training organization; and Lt. Comdr. Clifford W. Sandberg, USMS, of the Academy, and secretory pro tempore to the Board of Visitors.

The Board assembled at Wiley Hall, Kings Point, at 9:30 a. m., Friday, May 10, 1946, where the members were received by the Superintendent, Commodore Richard R. McNulty and his staff.

The following members of the Board were present at the first meeting: Senator GUY CORDON; Representatives SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, EUGENE J. KEOGH, FRED BRADLEY, and ROBERT HALE.

FIRST MEETING OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS

Representative SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND served as temporary chairman for the purpose of organization. Senator GUY CORDON was elected permanent Chairman of the Board. Lt. Comdr. Clifford W. Sandberg and Lt. (jg) Robert J. Carroll were designated as secretary and assistant secretary of the Board, respectively.

At the request of the Chairman, Commodore Telfair Knight, Assistant Deputy Administrator for Training, and Commodore Richard R. McNulty, Supervisor of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and

Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and his staff were invited to join the Board in conference.

The Chairman noted that the Board had previously read the Superintendent's report, en route from Washington to Kings Point, and were familiar with its contents. Representative FRED BRADLEY moved that the Board dispense with the reading of the Superintendent's report, a copy of which is forwarded herewith. The motion was seconded and carried.

The Chairman then requested that the Superintendent's staff be introduced to the members of the Board. Upon the conclusion of the introductions the Chairman indicated that the Board would be pleased to learn of the operation of the training organization of the War Shipping Administration, the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, and its Academy; and such other reports as deemed pertinent and proper.

Commodore Telfair Knight presented the respects of Commissioner Edward Macauley, Acting Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, and Granville Conway, Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, and addressed the Board recounting the history of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy; and of the hopes and aspirations of those charged with the executive management.

Commodore Knight pointed out that the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps was a direct outgrowth of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which placed upon the United States Maritime Commission the responsibility of educating American citizens to become licensed officers of the merchant marine of the United States and Reserve Officers of the Navy. Commodore Knight also noted that the Cadet Corps began operations 8 years ago, on March 15, 1938, and that upon the dissolution of the War Shipping Administration, June 30, 1946, it will again function under the United States Maritime Commission. Upon the conclusion of Commodore Knight's statement a general discussion period ensued, during which questions concerning the operation and curriculum of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps were answered by the Superintendent and his staff.

At the request of Commodore McNulty to have a member of the Board address the regiment of cadet-midshipmen at the formation to be held Saturday in Barney Square, the chairman designated Representative SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND.

Recess was taken at 11:30, at which time the Regimental Commander, Cadet-Midshipmen Raymond French, United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, was presented to the chairman and members of the Board, when he extended them an invitation to lunch with the regiment of cadet-midshipmen in Delano Hall.

TOUR OF ACADEMY AND MEETING WITH THE REGIMENT OF CADET-MIDSHIPMEN

At 11:15 a. m. the members of the Board were escorted to Delano Hall by the cadet-midshipmen regimental commander and his staff for luncheon with the regiment.

After luncheon the members of the Board, accompanied by escorts, proceeded at 1 p. m. on an official inspection of the Academy, visiting Barry Hall, cadet-midshipmen living quarters; the Department of Naval Science and Tactics and Physical Training in O'Hara Hall; the athletic and drill fields; the war memorial; the Departments of Ship Management and History and Languages, temporary library and auditorium in Bowditch Hall; the Department of Engineering, Fulton Hall; the Department of Nautical Science, Samuels Hall, where exhibitions of cargo handling, breeches buoy operation and a life boat drill were observed from the signal bridge. The official inspection was then concluded after a visit to the bark-rigged museum ship *Emery Rice* and a short cruise in the superintendent's gig to view the modern turbo-electric training vessel *Kings Pointer*.

Upon returning to the Academy grounds, each member of the Board conducted a private conference with cadet-midshipmen from his home State.

SUPERINTENDENT'S RECEPTION AND DINNER

The Superintendent's dinner in honor of the Third Congressional Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy was held in the superintendent's residence at 7:30 p. m. Because of previous commitments Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH was unable to be present at the dinner.

Upon conclusion of the dinner a documentary film entitled, "Future Leaders of Our Merchant Marine," depicting the activities of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy, was shown.

SECOND MEETING OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS

(Saturday, May 11, 1946)

The second meeting of the Board commenced at 8:45 a. m. in the conference room in Wiley Hall. Present at this meeting were Senator GUY CORDON, Representatives SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, EUGENE J. KEOGH, FRED BRADLEY, and ROBERT HALE.

The chairman informed the Secretary of the Board's desire to confer with the executive heads of the Training Organization and the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and such staff members as they deemed necessary. Accordingly, Commodore Telfair Knight, Assistant Deputy Administrator for the Training Organization; Commodore Richard R. McNulty, Supervisor of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy; Capt. Philip C. Mahady, Deputy Superintendent; Capt. Harold V. Nerney, Executive Officer; and Commander Edward S. Hichuli, secretary of the academic board, were invited to join the board in conference.

The chairman then asked Commodore Knight if there was any new business to be discussed, and upon Commodore Knight's negative answer, the chairman proposed a number of questions to Commodore McNulty dealing with the forthcoming graduation of First Class men, the proposed awarding of a degree and accreditation of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its academy.

To explain more completely the accreditation of the Academy, permission was requested and granted, for Mr. Joseph I. Kochka, educational adviser to the Supervisor, to answer such questions as the Board deemed necessary in reference to accreditation and the awarding of a degree. The Board having asked such questions, the Superintendent and his staff were excused and the Board entered into executive session with the Secretary and Assistant Secretary. At the conclusion of the executive session, there being no further business, the second meeting was adjourned at 11 a. m. The board and War Shipping Administration officials from Washington were then escorted to the portico of Delano Hall to attend a review of the regiment of cadet-midshipmen, at which time Representative SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND addressed the Regiment of Cadet-Midshipmen in behalf of the Board of Visitors.

At the conclusion of the review the members of the board, accompanied by the Secretary of the board, departed from Kings Point and briefly examined the interim headquarters of the United Nations at Lake Success, Long Island, N. Y., prior to their return to Washington, D. C.

As a result of the two meetings with the Superintendent and his Staff, conversations with Cadet-Midshipmen of the regiment, and the tour of inspection of the Academy, the Board of Visitors respectfully submits the following general and special comments and specific recommendations.

GENERAL COMMENTS

1. The Board desires again to go on record and emphasize the fact that the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps was created pursuant to the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, commenced operations in March 1938, and that its site at Kings Point, N. Y., was acquired for the purpose of constructing a permanent Federal Merchant Marine Academy as shown by the reports which accompanied House Joint Resolution No. 260 (Public Law 472, 77th Cong.; 56 Stat. 124) approved March 4, 1942.

2. The Board is impressed with the need of a suitable chapel in view of the fact that the present facilities for divine worship, in the form of an improvised chapel in Wiley Hall, are most inadequate. The necessity for a properly equipped library is also clearly evident, for in order to qualify the United States Merchant Marine Academy to award degrees, a suitable library building must be provided. The Board appreciates the fact that no further land expansion is presently contemplated by the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps.

3. The Board is gratified to learn of the resumption of the 4-year course and recommends to the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps that steps be taken to put its Academy on an accredited basis at the earliest possible moment, consistent with economical and efficient operation.

4. The Board is aware of the transition period brought about by the conclusion of hostilities and subsequent extension of the course to the normal 4-year program. In reference to the curriculum in effect during this transition period, the Board desires to go on record as being satisfied that the administration has given the problem full consideration and is confident that the matter will be adjusted to the satisfaction of all. The Board considers the proposed semiannual entering classes and graduations, rather than annual graduations, to be a sound and logical move.

5. The Board is particularly impressed with the high type of young men at Kings Point and the fact that all of the cadet-midshipmen had served as third classmen at sea in combat areas aboard merchant vessels. The Board appreciates the close cooperation that has existed between the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and the United States Navy at large. The Board commends those responsible for this close cooperation, for it recognizes in the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy at Kings Point, a most important factor in the maintenance of a vigorous and strong merchant marine and a competent sea experienced Naval Reserve officer component.

SPECIAL COMMENTS

1. In view of the fact that the first change of superintendents has taken place since the Board of Visitors was created, the Board desires to commend Rear Admiral Giles C. Stedman, USNR, for his efficient administration of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, during his tenure of office as superintendent, from October 16, 1943 to April 1, 1946.

2. The Board desires to record its appreciation and admiration for the foresight, tenacity, and devotion to duty displayed by the Assistant Deputy Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, Commodore Telfair Knight, USMS, for his efforts in the establishment and development of the training organization, of which the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its academy at Kings Point is a division.

3. The Board also wishes to commend Commodore Richard R. McNulty, USMS, Supervisor of the United States Merchant Marine

Cadet Corps since its inception and now also Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, for the efficient and economical operation of the corps, his informative and interesting report, and in making available, for the Board's information, members of his staff and cadet-midshipmen of the regiment.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Board specifically recommends that funds be made available, as soon as possible, for the construction and equipping of an adequate library.

2. The Board specifically recommends that funds be made available, as soon as possible, for the construction and equipping of a suitable chapel.

3. The Board specifically recommends that the Superintendent's discretionary fund not only be continued but also the following, which are granted to other Federal academies: Board of Visitors fund, Commandant of Cadet-Midshipmen fund, Academic Board fund, be established at the earliest practicable date.

4. The Board specifically recommends that the rank of the Superintendent, who holds commissions as commodore in the United States Naval Reserve and United States Maritime Service, be raised to rear admiral in both services while occupying the superintendency.

CONCLUSION

The Board is pleased to record its support and admiration of the splendid work being done at Kings Point to develop outstanding officer personnel for the merchant marine and the United States Naval Reserve, and to keep our Nation in the forefront of world commerce.

The Board is most impressed with the sincerity of purpose of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps administration and the Academy staff, and with that splendid group of young Americans—the regiment of cadet-midshipmen. The Board wishes to congratulate the Superintendent, Commodore Richard R. McNulty, USMS; his officers; cadet-midshipmen of the regiment, and personnel of the United States Merchant Marine Academy for their unselfish devotion to duty in developing Kings Point, a great national institution, in which every citizen should take pride.

To Lt. Comdr. Clifford W. Sandberg, USMS, secretary to the Board, and Lt. Robert J. Carroll, USMS, assistant secretary to the Board, the Board expresses its sincere appreciation for their untiring cooperation and efficient assistance in its behalf.

Respectfully submitted.

GUY CORDON.
SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND.
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
FRED BRADLEY.
ROBERT HALE.

Attest:

C. W. SANDBERG,
Secretary.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2340. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sophy R. Bennett; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 2341. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RETURN OF GRAND RIVER DAM PROJECT TO GRAND RIVER DAM AUTHORITY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAYBANK submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5508) to authorize the return of the Grand River Dam project to the Grand River Dam Authority and the adjustment and settlement of accounts between the Authority and the United States and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6777) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMERICAN PETROLEUM INTERESTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to give notice in the RECORD that American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries is the subject of a volume of hearings held by the Senate Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources, which is being released today for publication by the Government Printing Office.

The information contained in this important text will include information on the following topics among others: (a) The historical evolution of the United States oil policy and the pattern played therein by the State Department; (b) activities of American nationals in foreign fields and the diplomatic protection afforded by our Government in the development of legitimate enterprises in the Middle East and other foreign fields; (c) a statement by the Army and Navy in connection with the importance of oil in its contribution to the future peace of the world; (d) the proposed Anglo-American oil agreement; (e) a brief history of foreign oil development, by countries, over a period of 85 years; (f) foreign exchange and experiences in refining and marketing by American companies abroad; (g) a special report on oil resources developed by the American petroleum industry abroad, particularly in northern South America, and in the Middle and Far East.

These hearings will also include opinions prepared by Judge Manley O. Hudson, of Harvard University, and Prof. Edwin Borchard, of Yale University, relating to the Continental Shelf and certain legal problems incident thereto.

The Superintendent of Documents advises me that this booklet, containing approximately 500 pages, will be placed on sale at $1 per copy.

I make this announcement because the demand for copies is expected to exceed the limited supply made available to the committee. It would be advisable, therefore, particularly for persons who desire extra copies to place their orders immediately with the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

THE SITUATION IN PALESTINE

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the British policy toward Palestine, published in the New York Post of June 13, 1946, and a statement issued by him on the same subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK CARLSON AT CONCORDIA, KANS.

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. FRANK CARLSON on June 12, 1946, at Concordia, Kans., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE POSTMASTER GENERAL AT CONVENTION OF MISSOURI CHAPTER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan at the convention of the Missouri Chapter, National Association of Postmasters, at St. Louis, Mo., on June 7, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANNIVERSARY OF SOUND MOTION PICTURES

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, every American has had occasion, during the years that we were engaged in a second world conflict, to witness the superlative contribution of motion pictures to the winning of that gigantic struggle. In fact, among the great and positive developments that resulted from the war were the magnificent development of the airplane and of the sound motion picture. I specifically speak of the sound motion picture, because the achievement of the film, both in war and peace, lends even greater significance to an event of the very first magnitude. I refer now to the twentieth anniversary of the sound and talking motion picture, which is being commemorated this year.

It was exactly 20 years ago, in August 1926, that Warner Bros. presented the first commercially successful sound film, thereby not only transforming the making of motion pictures but at the same time opening unprecedented horizons for the use of the film as an important educational and social document, as well as the medium of entertainment for millions of Americans, and, indeed, for millions of people throughout the world.

The presentation of sound films was a scientific achievement whose positive results are only beginning to be assayed. As an entertainment and art form, we all know the contribution of the motion picture to the morale of civilian and soldier alike during the dark years from which we have just emerged. But even more vital is the fact that sound and speech on the screen proved so important a device in bringing the voices of distinguished leaders and statesmen before these millions of people; in documenting the fateful events of our time; and, finally, but by no means least, in providing speedy and highly efficient training of our armed forces. We must not forget, in recognizing the feat of research and enterprise that went into the making of sound films, that the talking motion picture has been one of the strongest forces in symbolizing concretely everything that is implied by our democracy and the American way of living. Only through the phenomenon of sound pictures have we been able to witness outstanding presentations of urgent problems of our day, as in such films as Hitler Lives? not to mention such other aspects

of the motion picture as the presentation of drama and biography, and history, and the brilliant exposition of the marvels of science and nature through the means of audiovisual education. In bringing the first commercially successful sound motion picture to the screen, it was the vision, the resourcefulness, the faith, and the enterprise of the Warner Bros. who, pioneering and intrepid, saw their convictions fulfilled in the establishment of sound motion pictures as one of the truly great media of communication and entertainment of our times. To say that this was a distinct public service is only to give recognition to this accomplishment, and I therefore earnestly congratulate these pioneers in the production of sound motion pictures on this twentieth anniversary.

THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That when the Senate convenes on tomorrow (June 14, 1946), it proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar, beginning with Order No. 1192.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in connection with the calling of the calendar, I request that Calendar No. 129, House bill 2227, and Calendar No. 501, Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, be stricken from the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, House bill 2227 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 21 will be stricken from the calendar.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS ADJACENT TO ROCK CREEK PARK—RECOMMITTAL OF A BILL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Chair to the second bill on the calendar, Calendar No. 104, Senate bill 461.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator that we are not going back to that part of the calendar.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand. Senate bill 461 authorizes the acquisition for park purposes of certain lands adjacent to Rock Creek Park in the District of Columbia. I ask the Chair, he being acting chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, if he sees any reason why that bill should not be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia, in view of the court decision affecting the lands in question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that he thinks that would be the proper course.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask that the bill be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1192, on page 8.

ASSISTANCE TO CHINESE NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT—BILL PASSED OVER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 5356) to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a naval establishment, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "advisable", to insert "or will assist in relieving United States forces of duty in China or putting the Government of the Republic of China in better position to protect or improve the safety of navigation in its waters."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, perhaps I ought not to interrupt until all amendments to the bill are acted upon, but I should like to ask that the bill be passed over temporarily in order that I may have opportunity to check one or two items connected with the bill, and I suggest the bill be considered later.

Mr. WALSH. I have no objection to that course being pursued.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

ENACTMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF NAVAL APPROPRIATION ACT OF 1946

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1917) to enact certain provisions now included in the Naval Appropriation Act, 1946, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 3, on page 2, line 14, after "Academy", to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$800; head of the Postgraduate School at the Naval Academy, $400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in section 25, on page 10, line 12, after the words "credit of the", to strike out "Treasury" and insert "Treasurer."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 33, on page 12, line 12, after the word "limitations", to strike out "in" and insert "on."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 34, page 12, line 21, before the word "under", to strike out "license" and insert "licenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 37, page 14, line 4, after the word "war", to strike out the comma and the words "and until the end of the first fiscal year thereafter."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 40, on page 15, line 6, after the word "duty", to insert "and personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey when serving with the Navy."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to add a new section 41, on page 15, after line 12, as follows:

SEC. 41. The President, in his discretion, is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, graduates of reputable schools of osteopathy as commissioned medical officers in the Navy, in such numbers as the President should determine to be necessary to meet the needs of the naval service for officers trained and qualified in osteopathy.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out, on page 15, after line 19, all of title II, as follows:

TITLE II AMENDMENTS TO THE PAY READJUSTMENT ACT

SEC. 201. The third paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is amended to read as follows:

"Enlisted men entitled to receive allowances for quarters or subsistence shall continue, while their permanent stations remain unchanged, to receive such allowance while sick in hospital or absent from their permanent duty stations in a pay status: *Provided,* That allowances for subsistence shall not accrue to such an enlisted man while he is in fact being subsisted at Government expense. Enlisted personnel not receiving allowances for subsistence shall be entitled to commutation in lieu of rations while on furlough or authorized leave or when authorized to mess separately, under such regulations and at such rates as may be prescribed by the head of the executive department concerned."

SEC. 202. The first paragraph of section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended by section 9 of the Act of September 7, 1944 (37 U. S. C. 112), is amended to read as follows:

"Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including active and retired personnel of the Regular Establishments and members of the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, while on active duty in the Federal service, when traveling under competent orders without troops, including travel from home to first station in connection with their appointment or call to active duty and from last station to home in connection with relief from active duty or discharge not the result of their own misconduct, shall receive a mileage allowance at the rate of 8 cents per mile, distance to be computed by the shortest usually traveled route and existing laws providing for the issue of transportation requests to officers of the Army traveling under competent orders, and for deduction to be made from mileage accounts when transportation is furnished by the United States, are hereby made applicable to all the services mentioned in the title of this act: *Provided,* That the head of the executive department concerned may, in his discretion, direct that, in lieu of mileage, actual and necessary expenses shall be allowed to officers traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, without regard to the length of time away from such posts. Actual expenses only shall be paid for travel under orders in Alaska and outside the limits of the United States in North America."

SEC. 203. The second paragraph of section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is amended to read as follows:

"Unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no officer of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be allowed or paid any sum in excess of expenses actually incurred for subsistence while traveling on duty away from his designated post of duty, nor any sum for such expenses actually incurred in excess of $8 per day. The heads of the executive departments concerned are authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance, not exceeding $7, in lieu of subsistence to officers traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, without regard to the length of time away from such posts. Officers, midshipmen, and cadets of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard when absent from a vessel or designated post of duty while assigned to shore patrol duty may be paid their actual expenses, and naval personnel on duty with or under training for the Naval Air Transport Service and away from their permanent stations may be paid their actual expenses, or per diem in lieu thereof, at rates not ex-

ceeding those prescribed for naval officers in a travel status, without in either case the issuance of orders for specific travel: *Provided*, That for travel by air under competent orders on duty without troops, under regulations to be prescribed respectively by the heads of the departments concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Nure Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this act, and of the legally constituted Reserves of said services while on active duty, and of the National Guard while in Federal service, or while participating in exercises, or performing duties under sections 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, shall, in lieu of mileage or other travel allowances, be allowed and paid their actual and necessary traveling expenses not to exceed $8 per day, or, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed $7 per day. Without regard to the monetary limitations in this act, and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, the heads of the departments concerned may authorize the payment to members of the services mentioned in the title of this act on duty outside continental United States or in Alaska, whether or not in a travel status, of actual and necessary expenses or per diem in lieu thereof, considering all elements of cost of living, including cost of quarters, subsistence, and other necessary incidental expenses."

SEC. 204. Section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is amended by inserting between the fourth and fifth paragraphs thereof the following new paragraph:

"Under regulations prescribed by the head of the department concerned (1) officers entitled to transportation (as distinguished from mileage) and enlisted personnel of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act may be paid, in advance or otherwise, a money allowance of 3 cents per mile in lieu of transportation, regardless of the mode of travel, (2) applicants for enlistment (including rejected applicants) in such services may be furnished or reimbursed for transportation and subsistence incident to recruitment of such personnel, and (3) insane patients may be furnished transportation and subsistence from military hospitals to other hospitals or their homes."

SEC. 205. (a) Section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is amended by inserting between the fifth and sixth paragraphs thereof the following new paragraph:

"Upon changes of station, members of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be entitled to transportation (including packing, crating, drayage, temporary storage, and unpacking) of baggage and household goods and effects, or reimbursement therefor, as authorized by regulations prescribed by the heads of the department concerned, which shall be uniform for the services mentioned and shall be approved by the President. Such transportation may be by rail, water, or van, without regard to comparative costs."

(b) The fifth paragraph of section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is amended by striking out the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That the personnel of all the services mentioned in the title of this act shall have the benefits of all existing laws applying to the Army and Marine Corps for the transportation of household effects."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, and when in his opinion it will be of benefit to the conduct of the work of the Navy Department, personnel of the Naval Establishment may attend meetings of technical, professional, scientific, and other similar organizations and may be reimbursed for their expenses at the rates authorized by law.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy may provide for the physical examination by civilians of employees engaged in hazardous occupations where the professional services of the Medical Department are not available, and may compensate such civilians on a contract or fee basis for such professional services at the rates customary in the locality.

SEC. 3. In addition to all other allowances authorized by law, the following amounts may be paid annually, out of the naval appropriations available for pay, to the officers serving in the following capacities, such amounts to be expended in their respective discretions for the contigencies of such offices: Director of Naval Intelligence, $2,000; President of Naval War College, $1,000; Superintendent of Naval Academy, $5,200; Commandant of Midshipmen at the Naval Academy, $800; Head of the Postgraduate School at the Naval Academy, $400.

SEC. 4. Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, there may be allowed and paid out of naval appropriations the cost of installation and use (other than for personal long distance calls) of extension telephones connecting public quarters occupied by naval personnel with the switchboards of their official stations.

SEC. 5. The third paragraph under the head "Navy Department" in the act of March 18, 1904 (33 Stat. 117; 5 U. S. C. 415), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 6. Within the limits of appropriations made therefor, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to provide for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising in the Naval Establishment, but impossible to be anticipated or classified, and when so specified in an appropriation such funds may be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy and for such purposes as he may deem proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government, and he may make a certificate of the amount of such expenditures as he may think it advisable not to specify and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended.

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to employ such civilian professors, lecturers, and instructors as he may deem necessary for the proper instruction of naval personnel at the Naval War College and the Naval Academy, and the professors, lecturers, and instructors so employed shall be paid out of naval appropriations such compensation as he may prescribe.

(b) The first paragraph under the head "Naval Academy" in the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 607), as amended (34 U. S. C. 1071), and section 1528, Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 1072), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to award medals, trophies, badges, and cash prizes to naval personnel or groups thereof (including personnel of the reserve components thereof whether or not on active duty), for excellence in accomplishments related to naval service, to incur such expenses as may be required to enter such personnel in competitions, and to provide badges or buttons in recognition of special service, good conduct, and discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.

SEC. 9. Uniforms and other equipment or material issued to the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps in accordance with law may be furnished from surplus or reserve stocks of the Navy without payment.

SEC. 10. Officers and enlisted personnel of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve on active duty shall not be entitled to receive pay, allowances, travel, or other expenses while drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay (other than as members of the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve or as members of the honorary retired list of such Reserves forces) from the Government of the United States.

SEC. 11. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to provide for the maintenance and operation of the Naval Home, including the transportation, admission, entertainment, support, and care of beneficiaries, hospitalization of beneficiaries in naval hospitals, transportation and subsistence of attendants of beneficiaries where required, and the burial and care of graves of deceased beneficiaries.

SEC. 12. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to provide for the maintenance and operation of naval prisons and prison farms and for the subsistence, welfare, recreation, and education of all naval prisoners.

SEC. 13. The Secretary of the Navy may, when authorized in an appropriation, contribute to the support of schools in localities where naval activities are located if he finds that the schools, if any, available in the locality are not adequate for the welfare of dependents of personnel of the Naval Establishment stationed at the activity, and may provide for the transportation of such dependents between the schools and the activities when such schools are not accessible to such dependents by regular means of transportation.

SEC. 14. Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, enlisted naval personnel may receive additional compensation at the rate of $5 per month while assigned to duty as messmen.

SEC. 15. (a) Within such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, naval personnel, including members of the Nurse Corps, may be furnished public quarters, including heat, light, water, and refrigeration.

(b) Where sufficient quarters are not possessed by the United States, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to provide lodging accommodations for naval personnel, including naval personnel on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable: *Provided*, That such accommodations shall not be occupied by the dependents of naval personnel.

SEC. 16. (a) No table linen, dishes, glassware, silver, and kitchen utensils shall be furnished for use in the residence or quarters occupied by officers with their dependents except for messes temporarily set up on shore for bachelor officers and officers attached to seagoing or district defense vessels, to aviation units based on seagoing vessels, to the fleet air bases, to the submarine bases, or to landing forces and expeditions.

(b) Enlisted naval personnel may be assigned to duty in a service capacity in officers' messes and public quarters, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, where the Secretary finds that the use of such personnel for such work is desirable for military reasons. No provision of law shall be construed as preventing the voluntary employment in any such capacity of a retired enlisted person or a transferred member of the Fleet Reserve without additional expense to the Government.

(c) The sale of meals by general messes afloat and ashore is authorized under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe.

SEC. 17. (a) All enlisted naval personnel while on active duty or on authorized leave or furlough therefrom, midshipmen and cadets shall be allowed a ration, or commutation thereof in money, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe. Such regulations shall establish rates at which rations shall be commuted in money. Members of the Nurse Corps may be subsisted in kind but, if so subsisted, there

shall be deducted from the allowances which they are otherwise entitled to receive, one subsistence allowance.

(b) The proviso in the first paragraph under the head "Bureau of Provisions and Clothing" in the act of January 30, 1885 (23 Stat. 291; 34 U. S. C. 901); the proviso in the first paragraph under the head "Maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps" in the act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 154; 34 U. S. C. 976); and section 1585 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (34 U. S. C. 907) are hereby repealed.

SEC. 18. During the existence of war or national emergency as declared by the President, there may be transported and subsisted on naval vessels at Government expense such persons as the Secretary of the Navy may authorize by regulation.

SEC. 19. Until September 1, 1946, enlisted men of the Navy and the Marine Corps and the Reserve components thereof, if otherwise eligible, shall be eligible for appointment to the Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy if they will have completed 9 months' active service on the date of entrance.

SEC. 20. (a) Candidates for appointment as midshipmen at the Naval Academy or as cadets at the Coast Guard Academy shall receive a mileage allowance at the rate of 5 cents per mile for travel performed while proceeding from their homes or duty stations to the Naval Academy or the Coast Guard Academy for examination and appointment.

(b) Midshipmen and cadets discharged or dismissed from the Naval Academy or the Coast Guard Academy shall be furnished transportation in kind and subsistence from the place of discharge to their homes.

SEC. 21. Section 126 of the act of June 3, 1916, as amended (10 U. S. C. 752; 34 U. S. C. 895), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"An enlisted person of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, including Reserve components thereof, upon discharge except by way of punishment for an offense, retirement, or relief from active duty, shall, under such regulations as the head of the department concerned may prescribe for personnel under his jurisdiction, receive a money allowance of 5 cents per mile for the distance from the place of discharge or release from active duty to his home, or place of acceptance for active duty, or place from which ordered to active duty, or such other place as may be determined to be most appropriate by the head of the department concerned. For sea travel involved in travel between place of discharge or release from active duty and place to which travel is authorized only transportation in kind and subsistence en route shall be allowed."

SEC. 22. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to make such expenditures out of available naval appropriations as he may deem necessary for the apprehension and delivery of deserters, stragglers, and prisoners and for the operation of shore patrols.

SEC. 23. Naval appropriations chargeable for transportation or travel shall be available for the payment or reimbursement of ferry, bridge, and similar tolls and streetcar, bus, and similar fares paid in connection with such transportation or travel.

SEC. 24. (a) The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to make such expenditures as he may deem appropriate for scientific investigations and research out of and in accordance with naval appropriations available for such purposes.

(b) The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to make such expenditures as he may deem appropriate for promotion and maintenance of the safety and occupational health of, and the prevention of accidents affecting, personnel of the Naval Establishment, including the purchase of clothing, equipment and other materials necessary thereto, and naval appropriations available for the activities in which such personnel are engaged shall be available for the foregoing purposes.

SEC. 25. Without deposit to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States and withdrawal on money requisitions, receipts of public moneys from sales or other sources by officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard on disbursing duty and charged in their official accounts may be used by them as required for current expenditures, all necessary bookkeeping adjustments of appropriations, funds, and accounts to be made in the settlement of their disbursing accounts.

SEC. 26. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to expend out of naval appropriations available for construction or maintenance such amounts as may be required for minor construction (except living quarters), extensions to existing structures, and improvements at naval activities, but the cost of any project authorized under this section which is not otherwise authorized shall not exceed $20,000.

SEC. 27. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to furnish materials for the manufacture or production by patients of products incident to the convalescence and rehabilitation of such patients in naval hospitals and other naval medical facilities, and ownership thereof shall be vested in the patients manufacturing or producing such products, except that the ownership of items manufactured or produced specifically for the use of a naval hospital or other naval medical facility shall be vested in the Government and such items shall be accounted for and disposed of accordingly.

SEC. 28. The annual appropriations for the pay of the Marine Corps shall be available for the payment of post exchange indebtedness of deserters and personnel discharged or sentenced to terms of imprisonment while in debt to the United States, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe.

SEC. 29. Proceeds from the sale by the Coast Guard of rations, supplies, uniforms, and other clothing shall be credited to the current appropriations from which purchase of these articles are authorized.

SEC. 30. When personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard are ordered to make any permanent change of station motor vehicles owned by them may be transported to their new posts of duty on Government-owned vessels.

SEC. 31. The first sentence of section 10 (a) of the act of June 6, 1940 (54 Stat. 248; 14 U. S. C. 135), is hereby amended by inserting in the first line thereof the words "working parties in the field," after the words "enlisted men of the Coast Guard."

SEC. 32. The Coast Guard may pay rewards for the apprehension and conviction, or for information helpful therein, of persons found interfering in violation of law with aids to navigation maintained by the Coast Guard.

SEC. 33. Existing limitations on the number of enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard who may be detailed for duty in the District of Columbia or at Coast Guard headquarters shall not apply while the Coast Guard is operating as a part of the Navy.

SEC. 34. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to provide, out of naval appropriations available for the purchase or manufacture of equipment or material, for the purchase of letters patent, applications for letters patent, and licenses under letters patent and applications for letters patent that pertain to the equipment or material for which the appropriations are made.

SEC. 35. (a) The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to pay cash rewards to civilian personnel of the Naval Establishment or other persons in civil life when, due to a suggestion or series of suggestions by them, there results an improvement or economy in manufacturing process or plant or naval material, or in efficiency or economy in the operation or administration of the Navy Department or the Naval Establishment. Such sums as may be awarded to employees in accordance with this section shall be paid them out of naval appropriations in addition to their usual compensation. No employee or other person in civil life shall be paid a reward under this section until he has properly executed an agreement to the effect that the use by the United States of the suggestion or series of suggestions made by him shall not form the basis of a further claim of any nature against the United States by him, his heirs, or assigns.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (a) hereof, civilian personnel of the Naval Establishment shall not be paid any premium or bonus or cash reward in addition to their regular salaries.

(c) The last paragraph appearing on page 718 of volume 40 of the Statutes at Large (5 U. S. C. 416), which is a part of the act of July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 704), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 36. The Secretary of the Navy, in requesting competitive bids for the construction of naval vessels, shall require each bidder to file with its bid the estimates on which the bid is based.

SEC. 37. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized in time of war to exceed the statutory limit on repairs and alterations of vessels, whenever he deems it necessary.

SEC. 38. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, out of any naval appropriation made therefor, to provide for (1) the administration by the Navy of liberated and occupied areas; (2) expenses for special compensation and for travel and subsistence of officers and students of Latin American countries, and other expenses deemed necessary by the Secretary for Latin American cooperation; and (3) payment of rewards, not to exceed $500 in any one instance, for information leading to the discovery of missing naval property or the recovery thereof.

SEC. 39. The authority conferred upon the Secretary of the Navy in this act or in the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as now or hereafter amended, except the authority to prescribe regulations, may be delegated by him to such persons in the Naval Establishment and to such extent as he may deem proper, with or without authority to make successive redelegations.

SEC. 40. As used in this act, (a) the term "Naval Establishment" includes the Navy Department, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard while operating as a part of the Navy; (b) the term "naval personnel" includes all personnel of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard while operating as a part of the Navy, including personnel of the Reserve components while on active duty, and personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey when serving with the Navy; (c) the term "personnel of the Naval Establishment" includes both civilian (departmental and field) and naval personnel; and (d) the term "Naval appropriations" includes all appropriations for the Naval Establishment, including those made for departmental purposes.

SEC. 41. The President, in his discretion, is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, graduates of reputable schools of osteopathy as commissioned medical officers in the Navy, in such numbers as the President should determine to be necessary to meet the needs of the naval service for officers trained and qualified in osteopathy.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL FOREST GRAZING LANDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 33) relating to the management and administration of national forest grazing lands, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and

Surveys, with amendments, in section 1, page 1, line 5, after the word "permittee", to insert "the holder of a 10-year permit"; and in line 9, after the word "act", to insert "and who was a holder of such permit on December 31, 1945", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of national forest grazing lands, the Secretary of Agriculture, or his authorized representative, shall not (a) deny any permittee, the holder of a 10-year permit, who has complied with the regulations and instructions to which he may be subject and who owns commensurate property or other facilities, as provided in section 2 of this act, and who was a holder of such permit on December 31, 1945, a renewal of his permit to graze livestock in the national forests, similar as to number and kind of livestock and for national forest grazing land of substantially equivalent grazing quality and accessibility, or (b) reduce the number of permitted livestock upon the transfer by any permittee of livestock, land, or both, unless the Secretary, after according the permittee an opportunity to be heard, finds that such denial of renewal or such reduction is necessary—

(1) to protect such lands from overgrazing;

(2) to preserve public resources thereof from destruction or improvident impairment; or

(3) for the orderly administration of the use or uses to which such lands shall in fact be put for reforestation, recreation, wildlife conservation, mining, public watershed protection, or public water storage and flood control.

In the event of such denial or reduction, the Secretary, upon the request of the permittee, affected, shall set forth in writing the grounds upon which such denial or reduction is based.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of the first section, property shall be considered commensurate if it consists of a recognized livestock operating base which is adequate to support permitted livestock in accordance with the customs of the localities during the period or periods of the year in which grazing upon national forest lands is not authorized, and which is complementary to such national forest lands in comprising a properly balanced year-long livestock operation: *Provided*, That where such grazing is authorized during the entire year, property shall be considered commensurate for such purposes if it consists of suitable headquarters and ranch or range improvements, or other facilities.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to promulgate regulations and instructions fixing such additional standards for each area containing national forest lands as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of determining whether property or the facilities are adequate and suitable for the purposes specified in subsection (a).

SEC. 3. (a) To provide national forest grazing permittees means for the expression of their recommendations concerning the management and administration of national forest grazing lands, a local advisory board shall be constituted and elected as hereinafter provided for each national forest or administrative subdivision thereof whenever a majority of the grazing permittees of such national forest or administrative subdivision so petitions the Secretary of Agriculture. Each elected local advisory board existing for such purpose at the time of the enactment of this act, and recognized as such by the Department of Agriculture, shall continue to be the local advisory board for the unit or area it represents, until replaced by a local advisory board or boards constituted and elected as hereinafter provided.

(b) Each such local advisory board shall be constituted and elected under rules and regulations, consistent herewith, now or hereafter approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, and shall be recognized by him as representing the grazing permittees of the national forest or administrative subdivision thereof for which such local advisory board has been constituted and elected.

(c) Each such local advisory board shall consist of not less than 3 nor more than 12 members, who shall be national forest grazing permittees in the area for which such board is constituted, elected, and recognized. In addition, a wildlife representative may be appointed as a member of each such board by the State game commission, or the corresponding public body of the State in which the advisory board is located, to advise on wildlife problems.

(d) Each such local advisory board shall meet at least once annually, at a time to be fixed by such board, and at such other time or times as its members may determine, or on the call of the chairman thereof or of the Secretary of Agriculture or his authorized representative.

SEC. 4. Upon the request of any party affected thereby, the Secretary of Agriculture, or his duly authorized representative, shall refer to the appropriate local advisory board for its advice and recommendations any matter pertaining to (a) the modification of the terms, or the denial of a renewal of, or a reduction in, a grazing permit, or (b) the establishment or modification of an individual or community allotment. In the event the Secretary of Agriculture, or his duly authorized representative, shall overrule, disregard, or modify any such recommendations, he, or such representative, shall furnish in writing to the local advisory board his reasons for such action.

SEC. 5. (a) At least 30 days prior to the issuance by the Secretary of Agriculture of any regulation under this act or otherwise, with respect to the administration of grazing on national forest lands, or of amendments or additions to, or modifications in, any such regulation, which in his judgment would substantially modify existing policy with respect to grazing in national forests, or which would materially affect preferences of permittees in the area involved, the local advisory board for each area that will be affected thereby shall be notified of the intention to take such action. If as a result of this notice the Secretary of Agriculture shall receive any recommendation respecting the issuance of the proposed regulation and shall overrule, disregard, or modify any such regulations, he or his representative shall furnish in writing to the local advisory board his reasons for such action.

(b) Any such local advisory board may at any time recommend to the Secretary of Agriculture, or his representative, the issuance of regulations or instructions relating to the use of national forest lands, seasons of use, grazing capacity of such lands, and any other matters affecting the administration of grazing in the area represented by such board.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act shall be construed as limiting or restricting any right, title, or interest of the United States in any lands or resources.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1847) to amend the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat., pt. 2, p. 565), as amended by the act of May 1935 (49 Stat. 218), providing for the detail of United States military and naval missions to foreign governments, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF TERM OF DESIGN PATENT GRANTED TO GEORGE BROWN GOODE

The bill (H. R. 5896) to extend the term of design patent numbered 21,053, dated September 22, 1891, for a badge, granted to George Brown Goode, and assigned to the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, a similar Senate bill, S. 1808, will be indefinitely postponed.

LOTS ACQUIRED BY SETTLERS IN WADSWORTH, NEV.

The bill (S. 1979) to eliminate the restriction on the number of lots which may be acquired by settlers in the town site of Wadsworth, Nev., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to issue a patent, pursuant to applicable laws, to any qualified settler in the town site of Wadsworth, Nev., for more than two lots in that town site as surveyed and platted, notwithstanding the restriction contained in section 2382 of the Revised Statutes. No patent heretofore issued to any settler in the town site for more than two lots shall be vacated or annulled on the ground that it covers more than two lots.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1640) to provide for the acquisition by the United States of certain real property in the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to acquire on behalf of the United States, by purchase or otherwise, the tract of land consisting of parcels 251/42 and 251/64 in the District of Columbia, together with the improvements thereon, such tract fronting on Chesapeake Street, Second Street, and Nichols Avenue SW., and the premises being known as 199 Chesapeake Street SW., in order to eliminate hazards to life and property resulting from frequent flights directly over the dwelling house upon such property by aircraft taking off from and landing at Bolling Field. Any appropriation available to the War Department for the acquisition of real property shall be available for carrying out the provisions of this act.

CONVEYANCE OF TITLE TO CERTAIN SPACE IN JACKSON (MISS.) CITY HALL

The bill (S. 1161) authorizing the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain space in the Jackson (Miss.) City Hall was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Jackson, Miss., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain rooms in the city hall in Jackson, Miss., conveyed by the mayor and aldermen of said city

to the United States under deed dated February 15, 1856.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN REAL ESTATE IN POLK COUNTY, ARK.

The bill (H. R. 2677) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to accept and dispose of real estate devised to the United States by the late Maggie Johnson, of Polk County, Ark., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1271) to provide for cooperation with State agencies administering labor laws in establishing and maintaining safe and proper working conditions in industry was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5433) to amend section 540 of title 10, and section 441 (a) of title 34 of the United States Code providing for the detail of United States military and naval missions to foreign governments was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONDEMNATION OF CERTAIN FOOD PRODUCTS

The bill (H. R. 3611) to authorize the condemnation of materials which are intended for use in process or renovated butter and which are unfit for human consumption, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 307) to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of atomic weapons upon such vessels was announced as next in order.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Let the joint resolution go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection I wish to state that when the call of the calendar is finished I understand that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] desires to take up the bill.

Mr. HUFFMAN. That is satisfactory.

ATTENDANCE OF MARINE BAND AT NATIONAL CONVENTION OF UNITED STATES SPANISH WAR VETERANS

The bill (H. R. 5641) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national convention of the United Spanish War Veterans' to be held in Milwaukee, Wis., August 4 to 10, inclusive, 1946, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I think until later in the day this bill should go over, in the absence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. The bill provides for attendance of the Marine Band at the national convention of the United Spanish War Veterans to be held in Milwaukee, Wis., August 4 to 10, inclusive, and is in accordance with the custom of allowing the band to attend certain national veterans' conventions. I shall call the bill up later in the day after the amendment filed at the desk has been considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PROVISION OF NECESSARY OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FOR CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS AND DISTRICT COURTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4230) to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment was in section 1, on page 1, after line 2, to strike out:

That every circuit judge and every district judge may employ a law clerk and a secretary and such other assistants and employees as may be necessary and as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year, except that for the appointment of a law clerk by a district judge a certificate to the necessity of the appointment by the senior circuit judge of the circuit, having jurisdiction over the district in which the clerk is needed, shall be requisite. Also every circuit court of appeals and every district court may appoint such librarians and other officers and employees not otherwise provided for as may be necessary and may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year.

And insert:

That every circuit judge and every district judge may appoint a law clerk and a secretary and such other assistants and employees as may be necessary and as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year, and every circuit court of appeals and every district court may appoint such librarians and other officers and employees not otherwise provided for as may be necessary and as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year: *Provided*, That prior to the creation of any new position for such employees there shall be filed with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts a certificate of necessity signed by the senior circuit judge of the circuit affected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in section 3, on page 3, after line 9, to insert:

SEC. 4. The following laws are hereby repealed:

Section 118a of the Judicial Code (U. S. C. of 1940, title 28, sec. 222a).

Section 11b of the Judicial Code (U. S. C. of 1940, title 28, sec. 128).

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 225) to quiet titles of the respective States and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such State and to prevent further clouding of such titles was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the joint resolution go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 304) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1946, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF ACT ESTABLISHING HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK

The bill (H. R. 5317) to amend the act establishing the Hot Springs National Park, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUNDRY MATTERS AFFECTING THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2061) to provide for sundry matters affecting the armed forces, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was in section 14, on page 6, line 14, after "May 31", to strike out "1922", and insert "1902", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 14. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized when so specified in an appropriation, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the furnishing of heat, water, and light for buildings on military reservation authorized to be used for purposes similar to that provided for by the act approved May 31, 1902 (10 U. S. C. 1346).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 17, on page 8, at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "graduation" and the comma, and insert "graduation"; so as make the section read:

SEC. 17. (a) Appropriations for maintenance and operation of the United States Military Academy may be used, under such regulations as the Superintendent of the Military Academy may prescribe, to liquidate the indebtedness of cadets separated from the service for any reason other than graduation who, at the time of their separation, are in debt to the Treasurer, United States Military Academy, or any instrumentality maintained for the benefit of cadets.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, the regulation allowance of commutation in lieu of rations for enlisted men, applicants for enlistment while held under observation, civilian employees who are entitled to subsistence at public expense, and general prisoners, while sick in hospitals, may be paid to the surgeons in charge of such hospitals.

SEC. 2. The third proviso in the second paragraph of section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended (10 U. S. C. 1393), is hereby amended to read as follows: "*And provided further*, That when an enlisted man is discharged otherwise than honorably, all uniform outer clothing in his possession shall be retained for military use, and, when authorized by regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, a suit of citizen's outer clothing, and when necessary, an overcoat, may be issued to such enlisted man."

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, motor vehicles owned by Army personnel may be transported on Government

vessels in connection with changes of station of such personnel.

SEC. 4. Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, discharged military prisoners and persons discharged from St. Elizabeths Hospital after transfer thereto from the military service may be furnished transportation to their homes or elsewhere as they may elect, the cost not to be greater than to the place of last enlistment.

SEC. 5. Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, transportation (or reimbursement therefor) may be furnished for general military prisoners and commutation of quarters and rations for such prisoners traveling under orders may be paid.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of War is authorized to undertake, through such War Department agencies as he may designate, such activities connected with photography, meteorology, guided missiles, radio, radar, electronic equipment, air-crew and aircraft-rescue and fire-fighting equipment, including trucks and boats, as are necessary to the discharge of his responsibilities for the security of the United States and for the military functions of the War Department.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for activities incident to the raising of food and forage on military reservations, including irrigation, and the encouragement of the breeding of riding horses suitable for the Army.

SEC. 8. (a) Section 2 of the Act of March 9, 1928, as amended (10 U. S. C. 916a), is amended to read as follows:

"Authorized funeral expenses shall include the expenses of, and incident to, the recovery of bodies, cremation (only upon the request of relatives of the deceased), preparation for burial, transportation to the homes of the deceased or to a national or other cemetery designated by proper authority the use of the uniform and articles of clothing as may be required, communication service, the acquisition by lease or otherwise of temporary burial sites, round trip travel (including reimbursement or authorized allowances) of an escort from the place of death to the place of interment, and interment."

(b) Section 3 of the act of March 9, 1928, as amended (10 U. S. C. 916b), is amended to read as follows:

"Funeral expenses shall be allowed for (1) all persons in the Army of the United States who die while in the active military service; (2) accepted applicants for enlistment who die prior to induction; (3) enlisted men who are discharged in hospitals and continue as inmates of said hospitals to the date of their death; (4) civilian employees of the Army or of the War Department who have been ordered by competent authority away from their homes in the United States to foreign countries, Hawaii, the Philippine Islands, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or the Canal Zone, and who die while on duty in such places or while performing authorized travel thereto or therefrom; (5) civilian employees of the Army or of the War Department who die on Army transports or while accompanying troops in the field, or who, while on Army transports or while accompanying troops in the field, incur injury or contract disease resulting directly in death away from their homes: *Provided*, That the benefits of this act will be denied in no case on the ground that the deceased was temporarily absent with or without leave when death occurred.

SEC. 9. Applicants for enlistment in the Army while held under observation may be furnished with the authorized issues of toilet articles, laundry materials, and barbers' and tailors' materials.

SEC. 10. Appropriations are hereby authorized for subsistence to be supplied by the Army at Government expense to supernumeraries when authorized by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 11. Funds appropriated to the War Department for cemeterial expenses shall be available, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, for the acquisition of grave sites; for the care and maintenance of that portion of Congressional Cemetery to which the United States has title, and the graves of those buried therein, including Confederate graves; for headstones or markers for unmarked graves of any member of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service or former member whose last discharge therefrom was honorable, including headstones for graves of members of their immediate families buried in national cemeteries and civilians interred in post cemeteries; for repairs and preservation of monuments, tablets, roads, fences, and so forth, made and constructed by the United States in Cuba and China to mark the places where American soldiers fell; and for the care and maintenance of graves used by the Army for burials in commercial cemeteries.

SEC. 12. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the operation, maintenance, and improvement of the Alaska Communication System.

SEC. 13. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the operation of the Army Medical Library and Museum; and to employ civilian nurses, not including the Army Nurse Corps, and cooks and other civilians necessary for the proper care of patients under such regulations fixing their number, qualifications, assignments, pay and allowances as shall have been or shall be prescribed by him.

SEC. 14. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized, when so specified in an appropriation, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the furnishing of heat, water, and light for buildings on military reservation authorized to be used for purposes similar to that provided for by the act approved May 31, 1902 (10 U. S. C. 1346).

SEC. 15. Appropriations are hereby authorized to enable the Secretary of War to undertake, by such War Department agencies as he may designate, such mapping and surveying activities, including photogrammetric processes and compilations, as are necessary to the discharge of his responsibilities for the security of the United States, and for the military and civil functions of the War Department.

SEC. 16. (a) The following provisions of the act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat. 213), as amended, are hereby repealed: "and the Secretary of War is hereby further authorized to assess upon vessels using the wharf at Fort Monroe, Va., one-half of the actual cost of repairs rendered necessary by the ordinary wear and tear of said wharf, and any damage done to said wharf by any vessel shall be paid for by the owner or owners of said vessel; and he is also authorized and directed from time to time to cause to be assessed upon and collected from the owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and from individuals or corporations engaged in business thereat, other than water navigation companies, one-half of such sum or sums of money as he may deem just, reasonable, and necessary for expenditure upon the repair and operation of, such roads, pavements, streets, lights, sewerage, and general police, as, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, should be constructed and maintained in order to protect the interest of the United States and the interests, health and general welfare of the said nonmilitary interests now established or that may hereafter be established at Fort Monroe: *Provided further*, That all funds collected as above provided, or that may be received from other incidental sources from and after this date, be, and are hereby, made special contingent funds, to be collected and expended for the above purposes in accordance with rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War."

(b) The Secretary of War is hereby empowered to authorize and regulate the activities of the nonmilitary interests on the Fort Monroe Military Reservation in accordance with the law, and rules and regulations prescribed by him, relating to similar nonmilitary interests on other military reservations.

SEC. 17. (a) Appropriations for maintenance and operation of the United States Military Academy may be used, under such regulations as the Superintendent of the Military Academy may prescribe, to liquidate the indebtedness of cadets separated from the service for any reason other than graduation who, at the time of their separation, are in debt to the Treasurer, United States Military Academy, or any instrumentality maintained for the benefit of cadets.

(b) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, a cadet discharged from the United States Military Academy shall be entitled to transportation from the place of his discharge to his home, or to reimbursement therefor.

SEC. 18. The duties of librarian of the United States Military Academy may be performed by an officer of the Regular Army retired from active service and detailed on active duty for that purpose.

SEC. 19. Within the limits of appropriations made therefor, the Secretary of War is authorized to provide for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising in the War Department or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices in the District of Columbia, or in the Army at large, but impossible to be anticipated or classified, and when so specified in the appropriation, such funds may be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of War and for such purposes as he may deem proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government, and he may make a certificate of the amount of such expenditures as he may think it advisable not to specify and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended.

SEC. 20. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for all expenses incident to the care, maintenance, subsistence, pay, allowances, clothing, housing, transportation, training, and education of prisoners of war, other persons in Army custody whose status is determined by the Secretary of War to be similar to prisoners of war, and persons detained in Army custody pursuant to Presidential proclamation.

(b) The Secretary of War, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to pay not to exceed $25 to a civil officer or other person, as compensation for services and in reimbursement of expenses, for apprehending, securing, and delivering a soldier absent without leave, a deserter, or any person who has escaped from military custody, arrest, or confinement.

SEC. 21. The Secretary of War is authorized and empowered to purchase or otherwise acquire letters patent, applications for letters patent, licenses under letters patent and applications for letters patent pertaining to equipment, materials or processes used by or useful to the War Department or the Military Establishment.

SEC. 22. Section 3 of the act of May 28, 1928 (32 U. S. C. 181c), is amended to read as follows:

"For the incidental expenses of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle

Practice, including books, pamphlets, badges, trophies, prizes, and medals to be expended for such purposes, such sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually."

SEC. 23. Uniforms and other equipment or material issued to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in accordance with law and furnished from surplus stocks of the War Department may be furnished without payment from appropriations for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

SEC. 24. The cost of transportation from point of origin to the first point of storage or consumption of supplies, equipment, and material in connection with the manufacturing and purchasing activities of the Quartermaster Corps may be charged to the appropriations from which such supplies, equipment, and material are procured.

SEC. 25. When so specified in appropriations of the War Department, the Secretary of War is authorized to provide (1) for entertainment and instruction in connection with the welfare of military personnel, and to equip, maintain, and conduct schools, reading, eating, and amusement rooms, service clubs, chapels, theaters, gymnasiums, libraries, and all such instructional, recreational, and educational activities and facilities as he may deem advisable for the education, welfare, entertainment, and recreation of military personnel; (2) for the instruction and training, including tuition not otherwise provided for, of civilian officers and employees in and under the War Department and the Military Establishment; and (3) for expenses of such nonmonetary awards, including citations, insignia, emblems, medals, and devices, as may be granted such officers and employees in recognition of faithful and meritorious service.

SEC. 26. The Secretary of War may delegate to such persons in the Military Establishment as he may deem proper authority conferred upon him by this act, or by the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, with or without the power of redelegation, except power to issue regulations.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4437) to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON and Mr. TAFT asked that the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BURIAL OF REMAINS OF UNKNOWN AMERICAN WHO LOST HIS LIFE IN THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The bill (H. R. 3959) to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEFINITION OF MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY IN THE AMERICAN LEGION

The bill (S. 1893) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American Legion," approved September 16, 1919, as amended October 29, 1942, so as to extend membership eligibility therein to certain persons was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who reported the bill from the committee, if the bill is broad enough to include all members of the armed forces. As I read the bill, it would allow those who served up to September 2, 1945, to become members of the American Legion. What about the boys who are now going into the Army and Navy, or who entered the service after September 2, 1945, and were sent to Germany or Japan? Are they included?

Mr. MCCARRAN. They are not included under the terms of this bill. This is an amendment to the act incorporating the American Legion. The bill was presented to the Committee on the Judiciary at the request of the American Legion, and the date was fixed by the Legion. I understand that the bill would not include those who entered the service after September 2, 1945, and who may hereafter be discharged, because of the uncertainty of legislation, and what their status might be when discharged. In other words, the purpose of the bill was to permit membership in the Legion by those who served in the late war.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we are to amend the charter, should it not be amended so as to include the boys who are now in the service? It seems to me that it would be to the advantage of the Legion if the charter were amended so as to make it broad enough to include the new boys. I am a member of the Legion.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I will say to the Senator that so far as I am concerned—and I am not a member of the Legion—I would have no objection. However, the bill was presented by representatives of the American Legion, and I reported it in the form requested by them. Not being a member of the Legion, I could not do otherwise. But I would have no objection to an amendment if the Senator wished to offer one.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I understand, the bill would not bar from membership those who became members of the armed forces prior to September 2, 1945, and who may be still in the service. It would only bar those who entered the service since September 2, 1945.

Mr. MCCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not wish to be persistent, but why are not the boys who went in after September 2, 1945, just as much a part of our armed forces?

Mr. MCCARRAN. My answer to that is that the policy of the Legion was to confine membership to war veterans. After that date they are not war veterans. They are in the Army, but not war veterans. That is my answer, so far as I know the policy of the Legion, although I am not a member of the Legion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, after line 2, to strike out:

That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American Legion," approved September 16, 1919 (41 Stat. 285; title 36, U. S. C., 1940 ed., sec. 43), as amended by section 2 of the act of October 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 1012; title 36, U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. IV, sec. 43), is hereby further amended to read as follows.

And insert:

That section 5 of the act approved September 16, 1919 (41 Stat. 285; U. S. C. of 1940, Supp. IV, title 36, sec. 43), entitled "An act to incorporate the American Legion," as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows.

On page 2, line 10, after "United" to strike out "States," and insert "States"; and in line 11, after the words "the time of", to strike out "enlistment" and insert "enlistment,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act approved September 16, 1919 (41 Stat. 285; U. S. C. of 1940, Supp. IV, title 36, sec. 43), entitled "An act to incorporate the American Legion", as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"That no person shall be a member of this corporation unless he served in the naval or military services of the United States at some time during the period between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, or during the period between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, all dates inclusive, or who, being citizens of the United States, at the time of enlistment, served in the military or naval services of any of the governments associated with the United States during either of said World Wars: *Provided, however*, That such person shall have an honorable discharge or separation from such service or continue to serve honorably after September 2, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1497) to amend subsection 9 (a) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1118) to amend the Hatch Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

W. S. BURLESON

The bill (S. 437) for the relief of W. S. Burleson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. S. Burleson, the sum of $1,900, in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising from actual losses sustained as a result of erroneous descriptions of certain Indian lands in Oklahoma County, Okla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary not-

withstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

COLLECTION OF FUNDS FROM INDIAN SERVICE IRRIGATION PROJECTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 115) to modify section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, with reference to certain funds collected in connection with the operation of Indian Service irrigation projects, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That on and after July 1, following approval of this act, collections made from water users on each Indian irrigation project on account of assessments levied to meet the cost of operating and maintaining such project shall be deposited into the Treasury for credit to a trust-fund account pursuant to section 20 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934 (48 Stat. 1233), and shall be available for expenditure in carrying out the purposes for which collected.

SEC. 2. There shall be credited to each trust-fund account so established the excess, if any, of (1) the unexpended balance of any repealed special fund appropriation to which operation and maintenance collections were credited prior to July 1, 1935, and (2) the amount of receipts covered into the Treasury pursuant to section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934 (48 Stat. 1227), over expenditures from appropriations provided for the operation and maintenance of the irrigation project from which such unexpended balance or receipts were derived, and the amount so credited shall be subject to expenditure as prescribed in section 1 hereof.

SEC. 3. Revenues hereafter collected from power operations on each Indian irrigation project and deposited into the Treasury for credit to miscellaneous receipts pursuant to section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934 (48 Stat. 1227), or pursuant to other provisions of law, are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, in specific or in indefinite amounts, equal to the collections so credited, for the following purposes in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived: (1) Payment of the expenses of operating and maintaining the power system; (2) creation and maintenance of reserve funds to be available for making repairs and replacements to, defraying emergency expenses for, and insuring continuous operation of the power system, the fund for each project to be maintained at such level, within limits set by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, as may from time to time be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior; (3) amortization, in accordance with the repayment provisions of the applicable statutes or contracts, of construction costs allocated to be returned from power revenues; and (4) payment of other expenses and obligations chargeable to power revenues to the extent required or permitted by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to modify sections 4 and 20 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, with reference to certain funds collected in connection with the operation of Indian Service irrigation projects, and for other purposes."

AMERICAN INDIAN DAY

The bill (S. 1074) designating American Indian Day was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth Saturday in September of each year is hereby designated and shall hereafter be known as American Indian Day.

SEC. 2. The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on such day and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies, as a memorial to the aborigines of this Nation and their contributions to the establishment and maintenance of this Nation.

SEC. 3. The President is also requested to communicate this declaration, by proclamation or otherwise, to the governors of the several States, and request them to take such action as they may deem advisable in order to bring about observance of such day.

TAX EXEMPTION FOR PROPERTY TRANSFERRED TO THE RED CROSS

The bill (H. R. 4654) to exempt transfers of property to the American National Red Cross from the District of Columbia inheritance tax was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADOPTION OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 2110) to amend section 4 of the act of August 25, 1937, so as to provide a filing procedure in cases of adoption outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Calendar No. 1354, House bill 6070 is an identical bill. Without objection, the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill, and will be considered at this time.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6070) to amend section 4 of the act of August 25, 1937, so as to provide a filing procedure in cases of adoption outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 2110 will be indefinitely postponed.

CROW IRRIGATION PROJECT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1681) to provide for adjustments in connection with the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments, on page 11, in line 5, after the word "assessments", to insert a semicolon and "(4) to reform in accordance with the adjustments made by the provisions of this act any deferment contracts heretofore executed in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803)."; and on page 12, in line 15, after the word "made", to strike out "as herein provided" and insert "as recommended in the district engineer's report of November 29, 1945, referred to in section 1 (3) of this act,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (1) notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the aggregate charge for all expenditures which have been made for construction of the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., exclusive of the Willow Creek storage works, against all non-Indian-owned lands under the Crow irrigation project is hereby fixed at $45,000, which charge shall be the sole charge against these lands. The charge thus fixed shall cover all such expenditures, whatever their source, chargeable against such lands and includes expenditures from reimbursable and gratuity appropriations from the Treasury of the United States, and from moneys of the Crow Tribe whether or not the expenditures of such tribal moneys were specifically approved by the Indians in council.

(2) All non-Indian-owned lands under this project shall bear their pro rata share, computed on a per-acre basis, of the total charge fixed by this section, except that against the pro rata share chargeable to any particular tract there first shall be credited payments which have been already made on that tract to meet charges for reimbursable expenditures arising from the construction of such irrigation project. No credit in excess of such pro rata share, computed on a per-acre basis, shall be allowed. No refunds shall be made of amounts paid on any tract in excess of such pro rata share, computed on a per-acre basis. The first lien of the United States shall continue on each non-Indian-owned tract for repayment of the pro rata share, computed on a per-acre basis, against such tract less any credit allowable under this subsection. The word "tract" as used in this act shall mean a 40-acre legal subdivision or fraction thereof.

(3) Where the Secretary of the Interior finds that certain non-Indian-owned lands subject to the pro rata share of the costs dealt with in section 1, as well as Indian-owned lands within the irrigation project, cannot be put to immediate productive use due to a need of proper drainage facilities; need of clearing and leveling, need of additional project construction work; present unfavorable soil conditions which can be corrected at an economic cost, he shall declare such lands temporarily nonirrigable until such time as he shall determine such lands can be put to productive use, and no irrigation project charges shall be assessed against such lands during such periods. Upon application of the landowners the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to eliminate from the project 504.9 acres of land located in sections 21, 27, and 28, of township 5 south, range 26 east, and in section 10 of township 1 north, range 33 east, described in the district engineer's report of November 29, 1945, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs on the conditions of the Crow Indian irrigation project.

(4) The cost of the necessary survey to determine the irrigable acreage of the project, made by the land designation committee, whose report was approved by the Secretary of the Interior in 1944, shall be reimbursed in a sum not to exceed $5,000 by the owners of project lands in Indian and non-Indian ownership. Such costs shall be reimbursed by the project landowners over a period not to exceed 3 years. During this period each year the per acre annual operation and maintenance charge shall be increased in amount sufficient to insure the per acre repayment of this cost.

(5) All obligations arising out of contracts heretofore entered into with the United States for the payment to the United States of construction charge in connection with this project are hereby canceled, and all lands heretofore covered by such contracts shall be subject to the provisions of subsections (1), (2), (3), and (4) of this section.

(6) The provisions of this section shall become operative only when the Secretary of

the Interior shall determine that the contracts contemplated by section 3 have been entered into, and that the releases required by section 2 have been obtained.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall obtain releases of claims which non-Indians owning lands under the Crow irrigation project may have against the United States on account of the construction of the Crow irrigation project or the assessment or collection of construction or operation and maintenance charges in connection with the project.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior may enter into contracts with irrigation districts acting on behalf of all non-Indians owning land under the Crow irrigation project in which the irrigation districts shall agree to pay the charge of $45,000 fixed by subsection (1) of section 1. Such contracts shall provide for the payment of the aforesaid sum on a per acre basis without interest over a 20-year period in equal annual installments, credits to be given in the amounts allowable under subsection (2) of said section 1; for the payment by the districts of the proportionate share chargeable to the lands within the districts of the annual cost of operation and maintenance of the project; and for a first lien on the lands within the districts in favor of the United States for the repayment of such construction and operation and maintenance charges.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior may enter into contracts with irrigation districts acting on behalf of all non-Indians owning lands under the Crow irrigation project on the Little Big Horn River watershed in which the irrigation districts shall agree to repay to the United States the proportionate share chargeable to the non-Indian lands within the districts of the reimbursable cost of construction of the Willow Creek storage works not to exceed $210,726. The contracts with the districts shall provide for delivery by the Secretary or his duly authorized representative to lands within the irrigation districts of the proper share of the waters stored by the Willow Creek storage works, for the repayment of such construction charges on a per acre basis in equal annual installments over a 40-year period without interest, and for the payment on a per acre basis of the proportionate share chargeable to the lands within the district of the cost of the annual operation and maintenance of the Willow Creek storage works. The contracts shall provide that the United States shall have no lien on the lands included within the irrigation districts for the repayment of the share of the construction cost of the Willow Creek storage works to be paid by the irrigation districts under the contracts. In the event of the failure of the districts to fulfill their obligations of contracts with the United States before entire repayment of the construction charges shall have been completed under the contract all unpaid portions of such construction charges shall again become charges against the lands within the districts and the United States shall again have a first lien on the lands for the repayment of such charges remaining unpaid. The contracts may provide that if during any year the operation of the Willow Creek storage works is so affected in any way, except by lack of adequate precipitation, that no delivery of storage waters can be made to lands within the irrigation districts, the payments by the districts of construction charges shall be suspended, and that upon resumption of operation the payment of annual construction charges shall also be resumed until the total charges fixed by the contracts shall have been paid. If the irrigation districts at any time shall fail to pay the construction or operation and maintenance charges as provided in the contracts, the Secretary of the Interior shall not deliver any stored waters from the Willow Creek storage works to lands within the districts until the districts shall have complied with the provisions of the contracts.

Until such time as the irrigation district or districts shall execute a contract as herein provided for, the lands within said district or districts shall not be liable for either the construction or operation and maintenance charges of the Willow Creek storage works, nor shall such lands be entitled to any benefits from said storage works, either by the direct use of the stored water or by substituted water, except as authorized by section 8 of this act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior may enter into contracts with non-Indians owning lands on the Little Big Horn River watershed under private ditches which have been constructed prior to the date of approval of this act, in which, on the same terms and conditions as are contained in the contracts entered into pursuant to section 4, such owners shall agree to the repayment of their proper proportionate share of the reimbursable cost of construction and the cost of operation and maintenance of the Willow Creek storage works, and the Secretary shall agree to deliver water to their ditches. The covenants of each such contract shall run with the land, and the contract shall provide for a first lien in favor of the United States for the repayment of such construction and operation and maintenance charges. Each owner shall be privileged to pay in full at any time his pro rata share of the construction cost. The Secretary shall not enter into any contract pursuant to this section after 5 years have elapsed from the date of approval of this act. The Secretary shall also designate the Indian lands under private ditches to receive benefits provided for herein. The Indian lands thus designated shall be subject to provisions and conditions of the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564–565).

SEC. 6. The contracts entered into between the Secretary of the Interior and an irrigation district or districts, or with non-Indians owning land under private ditches, in pursuance to sections 4 and 5, shall provide that the owners of the lands included in such contracts shall agree to pay annually to the United States for a period of 5 years beginning November 15 next following the date of approval of this act, $1 per acre for each irrigable acre covered by such contract or contracts, and shall further agree at the end of such 5-year period to pay thereafter their proportionate share of the total reimbursable cost of the construction of the Willow Creek storage works in the sum of $210,726. The Secretary of the Interior shall allow full credit to each landowner for all construction cost repayments applicable to the Willow Creek storage works, made to the United States during such 5-year period, and on behalf of all payments made pursuant to the temporary public notice of the Secretary of the Interior issued March 1, 1944.

SEC. 7. Water stored in the Willow Creek storage works shall be made available by the Secretary of the Interior only to the following lands on the Little Big Horn River watershed irrigable under irrigation works which have been constructed prior to the date of approval of this act: Indian-owned lands; non-Indian-owned lands within the irrigation districts referred to in section 4; those non-Indian-owned lands covered by contracts entered into pursuant to section 5, subject, however, to the authority of the Secretary to dispose of the water as provided for in section 8 hereof.

SEC. 8. Pending the execution of contracts with a district or districts, and thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior may, in lieu of disposing of the stored water as prescribed in sections 4, 5, and 6 of this act, dispose of any uncontracted part of the stored water during any year on an acre-foot basis upon such terms and conditions as he shall determine. The Secretary is authorized to fix annual charges to cover the costs of operating and maintaining the storage works and the distribution of the stored water.

SEC. 9. No further construction work on the Crow Indian Reservation shall be undertaken by the United States without the prior consent of (1) the Crow Tribe, (2) the irrigation district or districts affected, (3) the Congress of the United States, and (4) without the prior execution of repayment contracts by the non-Indian water users or irrigation district or districts, obligating the non-Indian lands for the payment of their share of such construction costs. The consent of the Crow Tribe shall be obtained by a majority vote of the general council of the tribe expressed at a duly convened meeting: *Provided, however,* That such consents shall not be necessary to construct laterals necessary to irrigate the lands within the Crow Indian irrigation project as now determined and classified as irrigable by the land designation committee report, as approved by the Secretary of the Interior in 1944.

SEC. 10. Pursuant to the findings of the report referred to in section 1 (3), the sum of $676,891.83 of operation and maintenance assessments against Indian- and non-Indian-owned lands of the project on the water-users' ledger is hereby canceled, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed (1) to credit not to exceed $28,000 on future operation and maintenance assessments against certain lands described in the report; (2) to make refunds not to exceed $3,000 from Crow project operation and maintenance collections on deposit in the Treasury to cover overpayments made to the project by landowners as provided for in the report; (3) to make refunds not to exceed $40,000 from Crow project operation and maintenance collections to heirs of certain Crow allottees on account of moneys withheld from their estates by the United States and used for the payment of delinquent operation and maintenance assessments; (4) to reform in accordance with the adjustments made by the provisions of this act any deferment contracts heretofore executed in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803).

SEC. 11. All claims of every description, all costs, charges, and unpaid assessments against lands in Indian ownership under the Crow irrigation project system, arising out of the expenditure of Treasury and tribal moneys for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Crow irrigation project system, including the Willow Creek storage works, to and including expenditures for the fiscal year 1945, except the proportionate share of the amount authorized in section 1 (4) of this act, are hereby canceled, and the obligations of the Indians and their lands to repay any part or all of said claims or sums are hereby dissolved, provided the Crow Tribe of Indians by appropriate action of their tribal council releases the United States and all lands of the irrigation project from any and all claims said tribe may have arising out of the expenditure of tribal moneys by the United States for the construction, operation, and maintenance of said project.

SEC. 12. All costs and charges against lands in non-Indian ownership under the Crow Indian irrigation project system arising out of the expenditure of Treasury and tribal moneys for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the said project systems except (1) $210,726, which is the proportionate part of the cost of the Willow Creek storage works chargeable to non-Indian lands; (2) $45,000 as provided for in section 1 (1) of this act; (3) the proportionate share of the non-Indian landowners in the $5,000 expenditure provided for in section 1 (4) hereof; and (4) all unpaid operation and maintenance assessments remaining on the water users' ledgers of the Crow project after the adjustments have been made, as recommended in the District Engineer's report of November 29, 1945, referred to in section 1 (3) of this act, which assessments when collected shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United

States for the operation and maintenance of the project, are hereby canceled, and the obligations of non-Indians and their lands to repay to the United States or the Crow Tribe any part or all of said sums so canceled are hereby dissolved; however, this cancellation of reimbursable costs and charges shall not serve to change the present lien status except as provided in section 4 hereof.

SEC. 13. The cancellation of the reimbursable status of all project construction, operation, and maintenance costs and expenditures as herein provided shall be reported in the reimbursable accounts rendered to the Comptroller General of the United States, pursuant to the provisions of the Act of April 4, 1910 (36 Stat. 270), as deductions from the total indebtedness of the project without regard to fiscal years or appropriations from which expenditures were made.

SEC. 14. This act, so far as non-Indian lands are involved, shall cease to be effective when 2 years have elapsed from the date of its approval unless prior to that time the contracts contemplated in section 3 have been executed and the releases required by section 2 have been obtained: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to the cancellations, adjustments, and application of credits to be entered on the operation and maintenance water users' ledgers not exceeding $60,300 pursuant to the findings of the report of conditions on the Crow Indian irrigation project herein referred to, which entries shall be made upon approval of this act.

SEC. 15. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe regulations and to perform all acts required for the effectuation of the purposes of this act.

SEC. 16. All provisions of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby superseded to the extent of such inconsistency.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLOTMENT OF LANDS OF THE CROW TRIBE

The bill (S. 2077) to amend section 1 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 658), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), as amended by section 1 of the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 658), be further amended by striking out the next to the last sentence of section 1, reading "No lease shall be made for a period longer than 5 years," and by substituting therefor the following: "No lease of any allotment shall be made for a period longer than 5 years except that irrigable lands in Indian ownership under the Big Horn unit of the Crow Indian irrigation project may be leased for farming purposes for a period not exceeding 10 years. All other provisions of these acts with respect to the leasing of Crow Indian lands shall continue in effect."

LEASING OF ALLOTTED LANDS ON THE CROW INDIAN RESERVATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 763) to provide for the leasing of allotted lands on the Crow Indian Reservation, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, in line 9, after the word "purposes", to insert "In any case in which more than one person has an interest in any such lands, no such lease shall be valid unless it shall have been agreed to by the holder or holders of a majority of such interests." and on page 2, in line 3, after the word "years", to insert "except that any such lease with respect to lands within the Big Horn unit of the Crow Indian irrigation project may be made for a period not exceeding 10 years", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Crow Indian allottee, and any other adult Crow Indian having an interest in allotted lands on the Crow Indian Reservation, may without restriction lease any part of his or her allotment or interest in allotted lands, or of any such interest of his or her minor children, for farming or grazing purposes. In any case in which more than one person has an interest in any such lands, no such lease shall be valid unless it shall have been agreed to by the holder or holders of a majority of such interests. No such lease shall be made for a period longer than 5 years, except that any such lease with respect to lands within the Big Horn unit of the Crow Indian irrigation project may be made for a period not exceeding 10 years. All leases made under this act shall be recorded at the Crow Agency.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

The bill (S. 141) to clarify the law relating to the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso contained in section 2 (a) of the act approved May 24, 1940, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional district and circuit judges" (54 Stat. 219), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in each of said districts, except the district of New Jersey and the eastern district of Pennsylvania, shall not be filled."

RENUNCIATION OF PENSION BY ALBERT W. JOHNSON

The bill (H. R. 5413) to accept the renunciation by Albert W. Johnson of pension under section 260 of the Judicial Code was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The bill (S. 2041) to amend the act of May 28, 1896, as amended, relating to the appointment of assistant United States attorneys was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 8 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 181), as amended (28 U. S. C. 483), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That whenever in the opinion of the Attorney General and the United States attorney for any district or territory, including the District of Columbia, the public interest requires it, one or more assistant district attorneys may be appointed by the Attorney General."

AMENDMENT OF AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION ACT

The bill (S. 2141) to amend the act entitled "An act for the creation of an American Battle Monuments Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1923, as amended, in order to extend the Commission's authority to all areas in which our armed forces have operated during World War II, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 4, 1923, as amended, entitled "An act for the creation of an American Battle Monuments Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the Commission, known as the American Battle Monuments Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) shall consist of not more than 11 members who shall be appointed by the President, who shall also appoint one officer of the Regular Army to serve as its secretary. The members and secretary shall serve at the pleasure of the President who shall fill any vacancies that from time to time occur. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, commissioned officers of the armed forces of the United States may be appointed members of the Commission.

"The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation except that their actual expenses in connection with the work of the Commission may be paid from any funds appropriated for the purposes of this act, or acquired by other means hereinafter authorized.

"Upon the request of the Commission, the heads of the Federal departments or agencies are authorized to designate such personnel of their respective departments or agencies, or of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, as may be necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act, and the Commission is authorized to employ such further personnel as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, within the limits of any appropriation or appropriations made for such purposes.

"SEC. 2. That the Commission shall prepare plans and estimates for the erection of suitable memorials to mark and commemorate the services of the American armed forces and shall erect and maintain memorials in the United States and at such places outside the United States where the American armed forces have served or shall hereafter serve as the Commission shall determine. The Commission shall also erect and maintain works of architecture and art in such American cemeteries located outside of the United States, its Territories and possessions, as the Secretary of War shall declare to be permanent cemeteries.

"The Commission shall control as to materials and design, provide regulations for, and supervise the erection of, all memorial monuments and buildings in American cemeteries located outside of the United States and its Territories and possessions.

"The Commission shall control as to materials and design and provide regulations for the erection of all memorial monuments and buildings commemorating the services of the American armed forces erected in any foreign country or political division thereof which may authorize the Commission to perform

such functions, or upon federally owned or controlled property in the United States or in its Territories and possessions, except national cemeteries.

"SEC. 3. That before any design or material for memorials is accepted by the Commission, the same shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts.

"SEC. 4. That the Commission is authorized to cooperate with American citizens, States, municipalities, or associations desiring to erect war memorials outside the continental limits of the United States in such maner as may be determined by the Commission: *Provided,* That no assistance in erecting any such memorial shall be given by any administrative agency of the United States unless the plan has been approved in accordance with the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 5. That the Commission shall advise the Secretary of War of the location and date of completion of each memorial erected by it.

"SEC. 6. That the President is requested to make the necessary arrangements with the proper authorities of the countries concerned to enable the Commission to carry out the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 7. That the Commission is authorized to receive funds from any State, municipal, or private source for the purpose of this act, and such funds shall be deposited by the Commission with the Treasurer of the United States and shall be kept by him in separate accounts and shall be disbursed upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Commission.

"SEC. 8. That authority is hereby given for the preparation of models and designs and the fabrication of memorials, and the materials for such memorials, at arsenals or navy yards, or by other governmental agencies, if the Commission shall so determine.

"Authority is hereby given for the use of captured war materials, not otherwise disposed of by congressional action, in the fabrication of memorials constructed under the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 9. That the Commission is authorized to furnish replicas of any memorial, or any part thereof, to States, municipalities, or interested private persons or associations at actual cost, and to apply any proceeds from such sales to the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 10. That the Commission shall transmit to the President of the United States annually on the 1st of July a statement of all its financial and other transactions during the preceding fiscal year.

"SEC. 11. That the records and archives of the Commission shall, upon the termination of its duties, be deposited with the National Archives.

"SEC. 12. That the President may by Executive order transfer to the Commission, with respect to any national cemeteries located outside of the United States and its Territories and possessions, the same functions of administration which were transferred to the Commission with respect to national cemeteries located in Europe by Executive Order 6614, dated February 26, 1934.

"SEC. 13. That such sum or sums as Congress may hereafter appropriate for the purposes of this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

"SEC. 14. That within the limits of any appropriation or appropriations made for such purposes, the Commission is authorized (1) to acquire land or interest in land in foreign countries for carrying out the purposes of this act or of any Executive order conferring functions upon the Commission without submission to the Attorney General of the United States under the provisions of section 355 of the Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 520; 40 U. S. C. 255); (2) to maintain, repair, and operate motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and other property, which may be furnished to the Commission by other departments of the Government; (3) to establish offices in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in or outside of the United States; (4) to rent office and garage space in foreign countries, which may be paid for in advance; (5) to procure printing, binding, engraving, lithographing, photographing, and typewriting, including the publication of information concerning the American activities, battlefields, memorials, and cemeteries with respect to which it may exercise any functions.

"Notwithstanding the requirements of existing laws or regulations, under such terms and conditions as the Commission may in its discretion deem necessary and proper, the Commission may contract for work, supplies, materials, and equipment outside of the United States and engage, by contract or otherwise, the services of architects, firms of architects, and other technical and professional personnel.

"The Commission may under such terms and conditions and in such manner as it may deem proper, dispose of any land or interest in land in foreign countries which has been or may hereafter be acquired by the Commission in connection with its work: *Provided,* That this subsection shall not be effective until the expiration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

"The Commission may delegate to its Chairman, secretary, or officials in charge of any of its offices, under such terms and conditions as it may prescribe, such of its authority as it may deem necessary and proper."

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT

The bill (S. 178) to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BALL subsequently said: Mr. President, when Calendar No. 1340, Senate bill 178, was called, I interposed an objection. I now withdraw my objection, and ask unanimous consent to return to the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 178) to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the first two sentences of section 9 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 759), are amended to read as follows: "For any injury sustained by an employee while in the performance of duty, whether or not disability has arisen, the United States shall furnish to the employee all services, appliances, and supplies prescribed or recommended by duly qualified physicians or chiropractic practitioners, which, in the opinion of the Commission, are likely to cure or to give relief or to reduce the degree or the period of disability or to aid in lessening the amount of the monthly compensation. Such services, appliances, and supplies shall be furnished by or upon the order of United States medical officers and hospitals, but where this is not practicable they shall be furnished by or upon the order of private physicians and hospitals, or chiropractic practitioners, designated or approved by the Commission."

SEC. 2. The sixth paragraph of section 40 of such act, as amended (U. S. C., title 4, sec. 790), is amended to read as follows:

"The term 'medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies' includes services and supplies by osteopathic and chiropractic practitioners and hospitals as licensed by State law and within the scope of their practice as defined by State law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend sections 9 and 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended."

FACILITATION AND SIMPLIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4386) to facilitate and simplify the Administration of Indian Affairs, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, in line 8, after the word "Affairs", to insert "insofar as such powers and duties relate to action in individual cases arising under general regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 6, after the word "Affairs", to insert "Such delegated powers shall be exercised subject to appeal to the Secretary, under regulations to be prescribed by him, or, as from time to time determined by him, to the Under Secretary or to an Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, or to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 16, after the word "law", to change the period to a comma, and insert "nor shall anything in this act be deemed to convey authority to delegate any power to issue regulations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BUSHFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, while the calendar was being called this afternoon I was summoned from the Chamber, and during that period of time Calendar No. 1341, House bill 4386, was passed. I ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which House bill 4386 was passed, and that the bill be restored to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which House bill 4386 was passed is reconsidered. The bill will be restored to the calendar.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO RICHARD S. FISHER

The bill (S. 1251) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard S. Fisher was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Calendar No. 1348, House bill 4046, is an identical bill. Without ob-

jection, the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill and will be considered at this time.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4046) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard S. Fisher, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1251 will be indefinitely postponed.

DISPOSITION OF TRIBAL FUNDS OF THE CONFEDERATED SALISH AND KOOTENAI TRIBES

The bill (S. 1272) to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Calendar No. 1390, House bill 3843, is an identical bill. Without objection the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill and will now be considered.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3843) to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1272 will be indefinitely postponed.

JURISDICTION OF CLAIMS OF CONFEDERATED SALISH AND KOOTENAI TRIBES OF INDIANS

The bill (S. 782) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Calendar 1391, House bill 2678, is an identical bill. Without objection, the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill and will now be considered.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2678) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 782 will be indefinitely postponed.

SALE OF WEATHER BUREAU PROPERTY IN MICHIGAN

The bill (S. 1198) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain property in the State of Michigan now occupied by the Weather Bureau and to acquire land in the State of Michigan for the erection of a Weather Bureau station, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to sell, in such manner and on such terms and conditions as he deems to be to the best interest of the United States, to the Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, the Weather Bureau station located on the campus of the said college, to convey such property to the said college by quitclaim deed, and to deposit the proceeds of such sale in the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to acquire a site and cause to be erected thereon a suitable and commodious building for the use and accommodation of the Weather Bureau at East Lansing, Mich., to replace the station authorized to be sold under the provisions of section 1.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2044) to promote the common defense by unifying the departments and agencies of the Government relating to the common defense was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. WALSH asked that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5991) to simplify and improve credit services to farmers, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator who has objected to present consideration of the bill withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. BALL. Yes, but I must insist upon the objection, because I was asked to object by Senators who are not now present.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the committee considered the Bankhead bill and made a favorable report, and the Senate passed the bill and sent it to the House of Representatives. To date, the House has not acted on it.

Later the House passed what is known as the Cooley bill, and sent it to the Senate. It was referred to my committee. It is a very long bill, and the committee is unable to make a report on it. But the committee ordered the text of the Cooley bill stricken, and ordered the Bankhead bill, which previously had been passed by the Senate, substituted in its place. We hope to have the Bankhead bill substituted for the Cooley bill, and in that way we shall obtain a conference on the Bankhead bill.

The Bankhead bill simply provides that greater farm tenant benefits shall be made available to veterans.

So it is hoped to obtain a conference and to have a chance to accept a conference report. We do not plan to accept the Cooley bill, because it calls for an extensive organization, and the bill is very voluminous and complicated. As chairman of the committee, I have no idea of considering favorably the provision of the Cooley bill. If we are unable to get the Bankhead bill agreed to by the conferees, there will be no conference report, and nothing will be done. That is the situation as it presents itself to the Senate today.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I take it that the bill as reported by the Senate committee is the same as the original Bankhead bill, and that it would simply liberalize the Farm Security Administration provisions.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct. The Bankhead bill already has been passed by this body, at the present session.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I wonder what Senators who now are absent from the Chamber have objected.

Mr. BALL. I think various Senators are interested in the measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to ask him how firm the Senate conferees will be in regard to this bill when it goes to conference, because the House bill is highly objectionable. Although a change has been made in that bill by the committee, and that change is very acceptable, nevertheless when bills go to conference we cannot tell what will come from the conference.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have already committed myself as chairman of the committee, and I am reasonably sure that the committee will sustain my viewpoint. My viewpoint is that if we cannot get the Bankhead bill in substantially its present form, with no change in regard to the benefits, no report will come from the conference. In other words, if we cannot do something to liberalize the existing farm-tenant system for the benefit of the returning soldiers, then nothing will be done at this session of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

INCORPORATION OF CIVIL AIR PATROL

The bill (H. R. 5744) to incorporate the Civil Air Patrol, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGISTRATION OF TRADE-MARKS

The bill (H. R. 1654) to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HAWKES subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that while I was absent at the White House to attend the presentation by the President of the United States of the Congressional Medal of Honor to a group of soldiers, one of whom was a fine young man from New

Jersey, Tech. Sgt. John Meagher, of Jersey City, N. J., Order of Business No. 1358, House bill 1654, to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes, was called, and objection was made to it, as I understand, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. He is willing, if I am correctly advised, to withdraw his objection. If so, I shall explain the situation.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is in the Chamber, is familiar with the bill, and I think will express himself on the subject. I had a talk with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], chairman of the Patents Committee, yesterday, and he is very agreeable to this bill being passed by the Senate and enacted into law.

This bill, I may say, has been before the Congress for 7½ years. It has been passed unanimously by the House several times, and has been passed by the Senate two or three times. It has now been brought into concert with the views of all the different departments. I believe the Senator from Wyoming will state how he feels in regard to it. We have expended considerable work and effort on the bill, and I should like very much to see it passed by the Senate today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to join in the request of the Senator from New Jersey that there may be immediate action upon this measure. I may say that at the last session of Congress when this bill was here on the call of the calendar I made objection because of certain provisions in the measure which I felt required additional study. Such additional study has been given during the present session of Congress. The Committee on Patents has gone very thoroughly into the measure. The amendments were unanimously approved by the committee, when the Senator from New Jersey, the chairman, other members of the committee, and I, myself, were present. We studied the bill very thoroughly, and I am satisfied that in its present form it represents a substantial and material improvement upon the trade-mark law, and that the bill ought to be passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Patents with amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments reported by the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Patents was, under the heading "Title I—The Principal Register—Marks registrable on the Principal Register," in section 2, on page 5, line 22, after the word "is" to insert "merely."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Use by related companies," in section 5, page 7, line 22, after the word "used" to insert "legitimately."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Cancellation," in section 14, page 17, line 7, after the word "mark" to insert "becomes descriptive of a patented article or"; in line 10, after the words "provisions of" to insert "section 4 or of"; in line 21, after the word "this" to strike out "Act." and insert "Act; and"; and after line 21, to insert:

(d) at any time in the case of a certification mark on the ground that the registrant (1) does not or is not constituted so as legitimately to exercise control over the use of such mark, or (2) engages in the production or marketing of any goods or services to which the mark is applied, or (3) permits the use of such mark for other purposes than as a certification mark, or (4) does not permit the use of such mark on nondiscriminatory and reasonable terms by all persons engaged in the production and marketing of such goods or services who maintain the standards or conditions which such mark certifies.

Provided, That the head of any Government department or agency may apply to cancel marks registered under the provisions of section 4 of this act and the prescribed fee shall not be required.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 15, on page 18, line 15, after the word "under" to strike out "subsection (c)" and insert "subsections (c) and (d)"; on page 19, after line 3, to insert "(1) if the mark or trade name becomes descriptive of a patented article, it may be contested at any time"; at the beginning of line 5, before the word "there", to strike out "(1)" and insert "(2)"; in line 9, before the word "there", to strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)"; in line 12, before the word "an", to strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)"; and in line 18, after the word "subsections", to strike out "(1) and (2)" and insert "(1), (2), and (3)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—Fees and charges," in section 31, page 27, line 2, after the word "register", to strike out "$15" and insert "$25"; in line 3, after the word "class", to strike out "$15" and insert "$25"; in line 7, after the word "hereof", to strike out "$5" and insert "$10"; in line 8, after the word "cancellation", to strike out "$10" and insert "$25"; in line 9, after the word "Commissioner", to strike out "$20" and insert "$25"; in line 11, after the word "Commissioner", to strike out "$20" and insert "$25"; in line 14, after the figures "$10", to strike out "for filing in each class each application communicated to the United States from the International Bureau, Habana, $15; for filing and transmitting application in each class to the International Bureau, Habana, including certificate, $10;"; in line 22, after the word "additional", to strike out "75 cents" and insert "$1"; in line 24, after the word "certificate", to strike out "25" and insert "50"; on page 28, line 5, after the word "less", to strike out "50 cents; each additional one hundred words or fraction thereof, 10 cents" and insert "$1"; in line 12, after the word "additional", to strike out "50 cents" and insert "$1"; in line 13, after the word "certificate", to strike out "50 cents" and insert "$1"; in line 14, after the word "addition", to strike out "50 cents" and insert "$1"; in line 15, after the word "records", to strike out the comma and "per page, 20 cents; if certified, for the certificate, additional, 50 cents" and insert "and drawings, the reasonable cost of making them."; and after line 17, to strike out "For photographic copies of drawings, per sheet, 20 cents".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VI—Remedies," in section 33, at the top of page 33, to insert:

(7) That the mark has been or is being used in violation of the antitrust laws of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 34, on page 34, line 24, after the word "wrapper" to strike out the semicolon and "and for each notice required and furnished to the Commissioner in compliance herewith a fee of 50 cents shall be taxed by the clerk as costs of suit."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title X—Construction and definitions", in section 45, page 44, in line 18, before the word "controls" to insert "legitimately."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title XI—Repeal of previous acts," in section 46, on page 49, line 10, after the word "limiting" to strike out "or"; in the same line, after the word "restricting" to insert "modifying, or repealing"; in line 12, after the words "trade-marks" to insert "or trade names", and in line 13, after the word "Federal" to insert "department of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments to the bill which has just been passed, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will appoint the conferees later.

Subsequently the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. PEPPER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. HAWKES conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4512) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis,

and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

MONONGAHELA RIVER BRIDGE, FAYETTE COUNTY, PA.

The bill (H. R. 5387) granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River between the Borough of Belle Vernon, Fayette County, Pa., and the Borough of Speers, Washington County, Pa., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MONONGAHELA RIVER BRIDGE IN ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PA.

The bill (H. R. 5357) granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River, at a point between the Boroughs of Elizabeth, in Elizabeth Township, and West Elizabeth, in Jefferson Township, in the county of Allegheny, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NEW RIVER BRIDGE IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, VA.

The bill (H. R. 5187) granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across New River near Radford, Montgomery County, Va., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WABASH RIVER BRIDGE NEAR MOUNT VERNON, IND.

The bill (S. 1984) authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Wabash River near Mount Vernon, Ind., was considered, ordered to be engrosed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Wabash River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, near Mount Vernon, Ind., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission is hereby authorized either to operate said bridge free of tolls or to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the Act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including interest at a rate of not to exceed 5 percent per annum and reasonable financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period not to exceed 30 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

SANTEE RIVER BRIDGE, SOUTH CAROLINA

The bill (S. 1922) to revive and reenact the act granting the consent of Congress to the State Hightway Department of South Carolina to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River, at or near Leneudes Ferry, S. C., approved August 18, 1941, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved August 18, 1941, granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Department of South Carolina to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Santee River, at or near Leneudes Ferry, be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to is completed within 3 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE AT OR NEAR MAUCKPORT, IND.

The bill (S. 1983) authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Ind., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Mauckport, Ind., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission is hereby authorized either to operate said bridge free of tolls or to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including interest at a rate of not to exceed 5 percent per annum and reasonable financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE, GALLATIN COUNTY, ILL.

The bill (S. 1809) to revive and reenact and amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio Rover at or near the city of Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., to a point opposite thereto in the county of Union, State of Kentucky," approved July 18, 1939, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved July 18, 1939 (heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved July 2, 1940), authorizing the county of Gallatin, in the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River, at or near Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., is hereby revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 1 year and completed within 3 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act of July 18, 1939, as revived and reenacted, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the county of Gallatin, in the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, all such rights and

powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State."

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

EXTENSION OF LANHAM ACT

The bill (H. R. 5796) to amend title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to permit the making of contributions, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for the maintenance and operation of certain school facilities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this bill comes to the Senate from the other House without a dissenting vote and with unanimous approval of the Committee on Education and Labor. All it does, in essence, is to authorize the Director of the Federal Works Administration to proceed to expend in 1947 not more than the sums spent in 1946 for school districts in areas where the building of Government projects resulted in a large number of school-age children being brought into the locality in excess of what the local school districts could take care of. The bill calls neither for an authorization of funds nor for an appropriation of new funds, but it does give to the Federal Works Administrator the authority to aid with funds already appropriated such school districts as I have indicated.

This bill was assigned to me by the Committee on Education and Labor for study and report. Several weeks ago I made my report to the committee which was adopted unanimously after full discussion. Members of the Senate have on their desk the report which I wrote for the committee. Although the report carries the name of the chairman, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], that is a printer's error which will be corrected in the new reprinting of the document at the request of the chairman of the committee.

It will be noted that my report points out that during the war, with the influx of thousands of war workers and military personnel, many communities experienced rapid and substantial increases in population. These wartime increases in population have imposed heavy burdens upon the public utilities and municipal services of the local communities. The schools, particularly, have been overtaxed. Local school revenues, though materially increased over the prewar period, have not been sufficient to meet the demands for school services for the children of the in-migrant war workers and of the military personnel. Under the so-called Lanham Act—entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended—the Federal Government, through the Federal Works Administrator, has been extending financial assistance to local school agencies needing help in providing school services for war-connected children. The amount of Federal aid has been limited, in general, to the deficit incurred by the school agency, constituting the difference between the cost of operating and maintaining the school facilities and all other income otherwise available to the school agency to defray such cost. Under existing law this Lanham Act assistance will terminate on June 30, 1946.

The proposed legislation provides for a continuation of this Federal aid for schools upon a limited basis for an additional year to June 30, 1947.

State and local funds for schools in war areas have been increased substantially but in many cases will not be adequate to meet the greatly increased responsibilities. Increases in teachers' salaries and other operation and maintenance costs, the removal of property from the tax rolls because of its acquisition by the Federal Government, the delays in the new construction of taxable improvements, legal restrictions, and other factors make it difficult for numerous communities in war areas to provide school services to war-connected children unless some Federal assistance is granted.

The passage of the bill is urgent. Many local school agencies must enter immediately into contracts with teachers for the next school year. The number of teachers that can be employed is dependent in many cases upon whether Lanham Act assistance will be available. Delays in the enactment of this legislation will delay many schools in the extremely important function of employing teachers.

The bill, as I have said, was passed by the House of Representatives without a dissenting vote.

For the 1945–46 school year, the Federal Works Administrator made allotments up to February 28, 1946, to assist in the operation and maintenance of 339 school projects located in 40 States. The total amount of Federal funds allocated for such projects as of such date is approximately $12,888,000. This, it is estimated, may be ultimately increased to $13,750,000 by the approval before June 30, 1946, of applications pending on February 28, 1946, or received since such date. At the same time, State and local funds of over $62,000,000 are being provided for these 339 projects.

It is estimated that under the proposed legislation the total amount of Federal funds required will not exceed $10,000,000. This represents a substantial reduction in the amount allotted for the current school year.

Sufficient funds to meet the requirements of the bill have heretofore been authorized to be appropriated. Moreover, it appears that of the funds heretofore appropriated to permit the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the purposes of titles II and III of the Lanham Act there will be unobligated and available at the end of this fiscal year an amount sufficient to meet the requirements of the proposed legislation. Hence, it is not necessary to authorize any additional appropriation or to appropriate any new funds.

Under the proposed legislation contributions to local agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools may be made without complying with that portion of section 202 of the Lanham Act requiring the President, also, to approve allotments of funds. In view of the restricted scope of the school-assistance program authorized to be continued under the proposed legislation and the available data respecting the projects and allotments that may be approved thereunder, the bill properly omits the requirement of a Presidential approval of allotments.

Under the proposed legislation contributions may also be made without regard to section 301 of the Lanham Act. Section 301 provides that the authority to make contributions shall terminate when the President shall have declared that the emergency declared by him on September 8, 1939, has ceased to exist. The bill also provides that contributions may be made without regard to the provisions in any appropriation act which may conflict with the purpose of the bill. Under the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1945—Public Law 132, Seventy-ninth Congress—approved July 5, 1945, it was specifically provided that the amount appropriated to carry out the functions vested in the Federal Works Administrator by titles II and III of the Lanham Act was "to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, but not to be available for obligation for new projects after June 30, 1946."

The bill authorizes the Federal Works Administrator to continue to make contributions for the operation and maintenance of school facilities during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947. The purpose of permitting the making of contributions without regard to section 301 of the Lanham Act and without regard to any conflicting provisions in appropriation acts is to avoid legal questions regarding the powers of the Federal Works Administrator under the proposed legislation in the event the President should declare, prior to June 30, 1947, the end of the national emergency declared to exist on May 27, 1941, or the end of the national emergency declared to exist on September 8, 1939.

This bill affects Government projects areas and school districts in all but 8 States as I recall the figure. Its passage is essential to the providing of adequate educational opportunities and facilities to many thousands of boys and girls throughout the Nation. It is of the utmost importance not only to my State in which 20 school districts are involved but to every other State in which Lanham Act funds have been made available in order to tide over many school districts through the school dislocations caused by the emergency conditions created by the war. It would be a serious blow to

a huge number of boys and girls in this country if we should fail this afternoon to pass this very essential educational bill. I sincerely hope that no objections will be raised to this bill this afternoon by any Member of the Senate but if there are any questions in the mind of any Senator about the bill I would like to have an opportunity to answer them before anyone raises any objections. I can say in all honesty and sincerity in behalf of the Education and Labor Committee that we are unanimously of the opinion that this is must legislation.

I wish to reiterate that the passage of the bill will not require either the authorization of funds or the appropriation of new funds because the Lanham Act money which would be expended in connection with this bill has already been authorized and appropriated and all that is needed is the granting of authority to the Federal Works Administrator to expend the money in accordance with the terms of this bill. I trust that the Senate will support the unanimous recommendation of its Committee on Education and Labor which I have been authorized to present in behalf of the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5796) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COORDINATION OF RESEARCH IN DENTAL DISEASES

The bill (S. 190) to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions; to establish the National Institute of Dental Research; and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator in charge of the bill if, in his opinion, the bill is in any way related to a bill providing for a national science foundation which I hope will be brought before the Senate without too much delay. In other words, should not this bill be passed over until we discuss the other bill and see what disposition will be made of it?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not believe this bill has any connection with the bill referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts. This bill has been the subject of very extensive hearings before the committee, and it has been unanimously reported to the Senate. It has the support of the American Dental Association, and many civic bodies throughout the country. Every Senator recognizes that dental diseases will represent one of the most serious problems confronting us. The selective-service officials were required to reject many persons because of their dental conditions. It seems to me that this bill provides for a very important program of research. I believe that the program should be established.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not question the importance of the bill, but would it not provide for a foundation which would distribute funds to universities, States, and various organizations for research into dental conditions?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, should not the bill be passed over until we are in position to discuss Senate bill 1850, which would do very much the same as this bill would do, only on a much larger scale? I have no objection to the bill, but I believe, in the interest of good legislation, that it should be passed over and considered later.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, today we are engaged in certain research in the field of medicine. The Federal Government is engaged in such activities, and is assisting research in various States. At Bethesda, Md., there is located the National Health Institute which is engaged in conducting a research in the field of cancer. I believe that a similar program is being followed in connection with tuberculosis and venereal diseases.

On the Senate Calendar at the present time are two bills—one of them being the bill which has been announced as next in order, providing for dental research, and the other providing for psychiatric research. I believe it is perfectly proper to proceed with the development of research activities in connection with public health, regardless of what may be done in connection with general research activities. I doubt very much whether the present existing activity should be moved into a national council. The field encompassed by the pending bill is a small one in which very little research is being done. I believe there are only two or three universities which are engaged in dental research. The bill has the backing of all dental associations in the United States. It is proposed to construct a building alongside the Cancer Research Institute. The work there will be on a limited scale, but it will be sufficient for the purpose intended.

I believe that we should not terminate what has been a gradual progress. I hope that consideration of the bill will not be unduly delayed merely because of a prospective consideration of general scientific research.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to pose the same question the Senator from Massachusetts posed. There is on the calendar a bill of which I am one of the authors. The bill would establish a so-called national research foundation. I have no objection to the bill which has been announced as next in order. There is, as the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, ample precedent for it.

When I was a Member of the other House, I was one of the authors of a bill to provide for a national cancer institute. But it seems to me that before we attack the problem in a piecemeal manner by the passage of bills for dental research or psychiatric research the Senate should first consider the basic scientific research program which is embraced in a bill now on the Senate Calendar. I will, therefore, object to consideration of the present bill.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has said that he will object, but he is not objecting, as I understand. Will the Senator yield further, so that I may make a brief additional statement?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. With regard to the matter of psychiatric research, I may say that it is of particular urgency because the Veterans' Administration is so engaged in problems affecting psychiatric research that if we do not establish a research institute in the Surgeon General's office, they will have to establish it themselves. They have so many psychiatric cases that they require immediate action. I am inclined to believe that the general problem of a national research institute is unlikely to be passed upon by the Congress at this session. In that case, I think it would be well to pass the bill now before us.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope that Senate action will be taken in connection with the bill for national scientific research at the present session. The Office of Scientific Research and Development expires July 1 of this year. Someone or some organization must take it over. The President has recommended immediate action. The House is now conducting hearings on the subject. The Joint Committee on Commerce and Military Affairs spent months on the subject of a scientific foundation.

I was just conferring with the Senator from Montana. I have no objection to this bill at all. I was one of the authors of the cancer bill in the House when I was a Member of that body some years ago. I do not think, however, we ought to take piecemeal action now. Perhaps the pending bill should be passed, but I hope I can have an understanding with the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Montana that, if and when we take up the broad general national scientific research bill, that we might, if there is any conflict between this bill and the general bill, include this in the general research bill. I am sure that can be worked out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not object to the consideration of this bill. There is a very widespread interest in it. I have telegrams and letters from all over the country urging its consideration. The Senator from Washington knows that I have conferred with him frequently about the bill in which he is interested, the general research bill, which I hope we may take up before long. I trust that we can pass this bill and get it on its way. I see no fundamental conflict between this bill and the general research bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor, with an amendment in section 7 (a), page 6, line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of conducting researches, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions; assisting and fostering similar research activities by other agencies, public and private, and promoting the coordination of all such researches and activities and the useful application of their results, with a view to the development and prompt widespread use of the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions, there is hereby

established in the National Institute of Health of the United States Public Health Service a division which shall be known as the National Institute of Dental Research (hereinafter referred to as the "Institute").

SEC. 2. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service (hereinafter referred to as the "Surgeon General") is authorized and directed for the purposes of this act and subject to its provisions, through the Institute and in cooperation with the National Advisory Dental Research Council hereinafter established—

(a) to conduct, assist, and foster researches, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions;

(b) to promote the coordination of researches conducted by the Institute and similar researches conducted by other agencies, organizations, and individuals;

(c) to provide fellowships in the Institute, from funds appropriated or donated for such purpose;

(d) to secure for the Institute consultation services and advice of persons who are experts in the field of dental diseases and conditions from the United States and abroad; and

(e) to cooperate with State health agencies in the prevention and control of dental diseases and conditions.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created the National Advisory Dental Research Council (herein referred to as the "Council"), to consist of six members to be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator, and of the Surgeon General, ex officio, who shall be chairman of the Council. The six appointed members shall be selected from leading dental, medical, or scientific authorities who are outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of dental diseases and conditions in the United States, and at least four of these members shall be dentists. Each appointed member shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the Surgeon General at the time of appointment, two at the end of the first year, two at the end of the second year, and two at the end of the third year after the date of the first meeting of the Council. No appointed member shall be eligible to serve continuously for more than 3 years, but shall be eligible for reappointment if he has not served as a member of the Council at any time within 12 months immediately preceding his reappointment. Each appointed member shall receive compensation at the rate of $25 per day during the time spent in attending meetings of the Council and for the time devoted to official business of the Council under this act, and actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while away from his place of residence upon official business under this act.

SEC. 4. The Council is authorized—

(a) to review research projects or programs submitted to or initiated by it relating to the study of the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions, and certify approval to the Surgeon General, for prosecution under section 2 (a) hereof of any such projects which it believes show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions;

(b) to collect information as to studies which are being carried on in the United States or any other country as to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions, by correspondence or by personal investigation of such studies, and with the approval of the Surgeon General make available such information through the appropriate publications for the benefit of health agencies and organizations (public or private), physicians, dentists, or any other scientists, and for the information of the general public;

(c) to review applications from any university, hospital, laboratory, or other institution, whether public or private, or from individuals, for grants-in-aid for research projects relating to dental diseases and conditions, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of grants-in-aid in the cases of such projects which show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of dental diseases and conditions;

(d) to recommend to the Surgeon General for acceptance conditional gifts pursuant to section 6; and

(e) to make recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. In carrying out the provisions of section 2 all appropriate provisions of section 301 of the Public Health Service Act shall be applicable to the authority of the Surgeon General.

SEC. 6. The Federal Security Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States gifts made unconditionally by will or otherwise for study, investigation, or research into the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of dental diseases and conditions, or for the acquisition of grounds or for the erection, equipment, and maintenance of premises, buildings, and equipment for the Institute. Conditional gifts may be accepted by the Administrator if recommended by the Surgeon General and the Council. Any such gifts, if in money, shall be held in trusts and shall be invested by the Administrator in securities of the United States, and the principal or income thereof shall be expended by the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, for the purposes prescribed by this act, subject to the same examination and audit as provided for appropriations made for the Public Health Service by Congress. Donations of $50,000 or over in aid of research under this act shall be acknowledged permanently by the establishment within the Institute of suitable memorials to the donors.

SEC. 7. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $2,000,000 for the erection and equipment of a suitable and adequate building and facilities for the use of the Institute in carrying out the provisions of this act. The Administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise, a suitable and adequate site or sites in or near the District of Columbia for such building and facilities, and to erect thereon, furnish, and equip such buildings and facilities when funds are made available. No permanent building shall be erected with funds authorized to be appropriated under this section until after the end of the war.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $730,000 for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act (except subsec. (a) hereof). Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection may be expanded in the District of Columbia for personal services, stenographic recording and translating services, by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; traveling expenses (including the expenses of attendance at meetings when specifically authorized by the Surgeon General); rental, supplies and equipment, purchase and exchange of medical and dental books, books of reference, directories, periodicals, newspapers, and press clippings; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding (in addition to that otherwise provided by law); and for all other necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appointed in the Public Health Service, in accordance with applicable law, such commissioned officers as may be necessary to aid in carrying out the provisions of this act.

(b) This act shall not be construed as limiting (1) the functions or authority of the Surgeon General or the Public Health Service under any other act or of any other officer or agency of the United States relating to the study of the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions; or (2) the expenditure of money therefor.

(c) The Surgeon General with the approval of the Administrator is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(d) The Surgeon General shall include in his annual report for transmission to Congress a full report of the administration of this act, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements.

(e) This act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

(f) The term "dental diseases and conditions" shall mean diseases and conditions affecting teeth and their supporting structures and other related diseases of the mouth.

(g) This act may be cited as the "National Institute of Dental Research Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read a third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN CLARK COUNTY, NEV.

The bill (H. R. 3966) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands situated in Clark County, Nev., to the Boulder City Cemetery Association for cemetery purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW JOHNSON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 154) to establish the Andrew Johnson Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the preservation of the birthplace, at Raleigh, N. C., of Andrew Johnson, seventeenth President of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Library with an amendment, to strike out:

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,000, which will be available to defray the necessary expenses of the Commission in the performance of the duties herein prescribed.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Andrew Johnson Memorial Commission, and to be composed of five commissioners, to be appointed by the President of the United States. Such Commission shall consider and formulate plans for the preservation of the birthplace at Raleigh, N. C., of Andrew Johnson, seventeenth President of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Commission may, in its discretion, accept from any source, public or private, money or other property for use in carrying out its functions under this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall report its recommendations to Congress as soon as practicable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4590) to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. McMAHON asked that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

RENT CONTROL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 2219) to extend for the period of 1 year the provision of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McMAHON. I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Connecticut withhold his objection for a moment in order to permit the present occupant of the Chair, in his capacity as a Senator, to make a statement? The bill which has just been called relates to the District of Columbia. It is an emergency measure merely extending the Rent Control Act for the District of Columbia for 1 year, or to June 30, 1947. It has been unanimously adopted by the committee and has the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I think we ought to have an opportunity to see what is going to happen to the bill which the Senate passed last night.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this is the District of Columbia Rent Control bill. It is entirely independent of the bill passed last night and applies solely to the District of Columbia. I hope there will be no objection to it.

Mr. McMAHON. Suppose the bill which was passed last night is vetoed by the President and we have no OPA control at all over the country, why should rent control exist, then, in the District of Columbia? The housing situation is no tighter here than in my State. I am for rent control everywhere in the country. If it is not going to exist in the country it should not exist here.

Mr. BARKLEY. Congress thought that the situation in the District of Columbia was sufficiently identified in its own right to pass a special bill on the subject applicable to the District.

Mr. McMAHON. In view of the situation I have suggested, I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

MILITARY SCIENCE AND TACTICS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS

The bill (S. 2142) to provide for two heads of departments of military science and tactics in the public schools of the District of Columbia, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Board of Education is hereby authorized to establish in the public schools of the District of Columbia two positions, each with a title "head of department of military science and tactics." Persons shall be appointed or promoted to so such positions in accordance with the provisions of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, as amended, and shall be entitled to receive salaries at the same rate as heads of departments assigned to salary class 17 of the salary schedules set forth in title I of said act.

SEC. 2. That the act entitled "An act to provide for the payment of a military instructor for the high-school cadets of Washington, District of Columbia," approved June 4, 1935, is hereby repealed.

FEDERAL CHARTER COMMISSION

The bill (S. 1942) to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator who objected kindly withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am not making the objection on my own account, but by request, and the Senator making the request is not present.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, even at the hazard of what the Senator says, I wish to make an explanation. The bill merely permits the people of the District of Columbia to formulate a charter, which they must submit to the Congress. Congress is not bound to adopt. Congress may adopt it, it may amend it, it may do as it pleases with it. It merely provides for the initial steps for local self-government in the District of Columbia. I understand the Senator is bound to object notwithstanding?

Mr. CORDON. I regret that I must make objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES FOR MILITARY AND NAVAL SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 5271) to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II" was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEVELOPMENT OF OIL AND GAS ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1236) to promote the development of oil and gas on the public domain and on lands acquired for the Appalachian National Forest, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That section 1 of the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 181, and the following), as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"That deposits of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, or gas, and lands containing such deposits owned by the United States, including those in national forests, but excluding lands acquired under the act known as the Appalachian Forest Act, approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), and those in incorporated cities, towns, and villages and in national parks and monuments, those acquired under other acts subsequent to February 25, 1920, and lands within the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves, except as hereinafter provided, shall be subject to disposition in the form and manner provided by this act to citizens of the United States, or to associations of such citizens, or to any corporation organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof, or in the case of coal, oil, oil shale, or gas, to municipalities. Citizens of another country, the laws, customs, or regulations of which deny similar or like privileges to citizens or corporations of this country, shall not by stock ownership, stock holding, or stock control, own any interest in any lease acquired under the provisions of this act.

"Lands, the jurisdiction over which has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for Indian use, which are not subject to disposition under applicable law, shall be subject to disposition in the form and manner provided in this act: *Provided*, That receipts from leases or permits for minerals in such lands shall be disposed of in the same manner as receipts from such leases or permits in other public lands covered by this act. The United States reserves the ownership of and the right to extract helium from all gas produced from lands leased or otherwise granted under the provisions of this act, under such rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That in the extraction of helium from gas produced from such lands it shall be so extracted as to cause no substantial delay in the delivery of gas produced from the well to the purchaser thereof."

SEC. 2. Section 16 of the act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. That all leases of lands containing oil or gas, made or issued under the provisions of this act, shall be subject to the condition that the lessee will, in conducting his explorations and mining operations, use all reasonable precautions to prevent waste of oil or gas developed in the land, or the entrance of water through wells drilled by him to the oil sands or oil-bearing strata, to the destruction or injury of the oil deposits. Violations of the provisions of this section shall constitute grounds for the forfeiture of the lease, to be enforced as provided in this act."

SEC. 3. Section 17 of the act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. All lands subject to disposition under this act which are known or believed to contain oil or gas deposits may be leased by the Secretary of the Interior. When the lands to be leased are within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field, they shall be leased to the highest responsible qualified bidder by competitive bidding under general regulations, in units of not exceeding 640 acres, which shall be as nearly compact in form as possible, upon the payment by the lessee of such bonus as may be accepted by the Secretary and of such royalty as may be fixed in the lease, which shall be not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease. When the lands to be leased are not within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field, the person first making application for the lease who is qualified to hold a lease under this act shall be entitled to a lease of such lands without competitive bidding. Such leases shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of a royalty of 12½

percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease. Leases issued under this section shall be for a primary term of 5 years and shall continue so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.

"Any lease issued under this act upon which there is production during or after the primary term shall not terminate when such production ceases if diligent drilling operations are in progress on the land under lease during such period of nonproduction.

"Upon the expiration of the primary term of any noncompetitive lease maintained in accordance with applicable statutory requirements and regulations, the record titleholder thereof shall be entitled to a single extension of the lease, unless then otherwise provided by law, for such lands covered by it as are not on the expiration date of the lease within the known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field or withdrawn from leasing under this section. A withdrawal, however, shall not affect the right to an extension if actual drilling operations on such lands were commenced prior thereto and were being diligently prosecuted on such expiration date. No withdrawal shall be effective within the meaning of this section until 90 days after notice thereof shall be mailed, registered mail, to each lessee to be affected by such withdrawal. Such extension shall be for a period of 5 years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities and shall be subject to such rules and regulations as are in force at the expiration of the initial 5-year term of the lease. No extension shall be granted unless an application therefor is filed by the record titleholder within a period of 90 days prior to such expiration date. Any noncompetitive lease which is not subject to such extension in whole or in part because the lands covered thereby are within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field at the date of expiration of the primary term of the lease, and upon which drilling operations are being diligently prosecuted on such expiration date, shall continue in effect for a period of 2 years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.

"All leases issued under this section shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee in advance of a rental of not less than 25 cents per acre per annum. A minimum royalty of $1 per acre in lieu of rental shall be payable at the expiration of each lease year beginning on or after a discovery of oil or gas in paying quantities on the lands leased: *Provided*, That in the case of lands not within any known geological structure of a producing oil or gas field, the rentals for the second and third lease years shall be waived unless a valuable deposit of oil or gas be sooner discovered.

"Whenever it appears to the Secretary of the Interior that lands owned by the United States are being drained of oil or gas by wells drilled on adjacent lands, he is hereby authorized and empowered to negotiate agreements whereby the United States, or the United States and its lessees, shall be compensated for such drainage, such agreements to be made with the consent of the lessees affected thereby and the primary term of any lease for which compensatory royalty is being paid shall be extended by adding thereto a period equal to the period during which such compensatory royalty is paid."

SEC. 4. The Act is hereby amended by adding a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall, upon timely application therefor, issue a new lease in exchange for any lease issued for a term of 20 years, or any renewal thereof, or any lease heretofore issued in exchange for a 20-year lease, such new lease to be for a primary term of 5 years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities and at a royalty rate of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from such leases, except that the royalty rate shall be 12½ percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from said leases, as to (1) such leases, or such part of the lands subject thereto, and the deposits underlying the same, as are not within the known productive limits of any producing oil or gas deposit, as such productive limits exist on the effective date of this act, and (2) each oil or gas field or deposit discovered after May 27, 1941, which is entitled to the benefits of the act of December 24, 1942, or which is included in any approved unit or cooperative agreement."

SEC. 5. The act is hereby amended by adding a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (b) For the purpose of more properly conserving the natural resources of any oil or gas pool, field, or like area, or any part thereof (whether or not any part of said oil or gas pool, field, or like area, is then subject to any cooperative or unit plan of development or operation), lessees thereof and their representatives may unite with each other, or jointly or separately with others, in collectively adopting and operating under a cooperative or unit plan of development or operation of such pool, field, or like area, or any part thereof, whenever determined and certified by the Secretary of the Interior to be necessary or advisable in the public interest. The Secretary is thereunto authorized, in his discretion, with the consent of the holders of leases involved, to establish, alter, change, or revoke drilling, producing, rental, minimum royalty, and royalty requirements of such leases and to make such regulations with reference to such leases, with like consent on the part of the lessees, in connection with the institution and operation of any such cooperative or unit plan as he may deem necessary or proper to secure the proper protection of the public interest. The Secretary may provide that oil and gas leases hereafter issued under this act shall contain a provision requiring the lessee to operate under such a reasonable cooperative or unit plan, and he may prescribe such a plan under which such lessee shall operate, which shall adequately protect the rights of all parties in interest, including the United States.

"Any plan authorized by the preceding paragraph which includes lands owned by the United States, may, in the discretion of the Secretary, contain a provision whereby authority is vested in the Secretary of the Interior, or any such person, committee, or State or Federal officer or agency as may be designated in the plan, to alter or modify from time to time the rate of prospecting and development and the quantity and rate of production under such plan. All leases operated under any such plan approved or prescribed by the Secretary shall be excepted in determining holdings or control under the provisions of any section of this act.

"When separate tracts cannot be independently developed and operated in conformity with an established well-spacing or development program, any lease, or a portion thereof, may be pooled with other lands, whether or not owned by the United States, under a communitization or drilling agreement providing for an apportionment of production or royalties among the separate tracts of land comprising the drilling or spacing unit when determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be in the public interest, and operations or production pursuant to such an agreement shall be deemed to be operations or production as to each such lease committed thereto.

"Any lease issued for a term of 20 years, or any renewal thereof, or any portion of such lease that has become the subject of a cooperative or unit plan of development or operation of a pool, field, or like area, which plan has the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, shall continue in force until the termination of such plan. Any other lease issued under any section of this act which is committed to any such plan that contains a general provision for allocation of oil or gas shall continue in force and effect as to the land committed so long as the lease remains subject to the plan, provided oil or gas is discovered under the plan prior to the expiration date of the primary term of such lease. The minimum royalty or discovery rental under any lease that has become subject to any cooperative or unit plan of development or operation, or other plan that contains a general provision for allocation of oil or gas, shall be payable only with respect to the lands subject to such lease to which oil or gas shall be allocated under such plan. Any lease which shall be eliminated from any such approved or prescribed plan, or from any communitization or drilling agreement authorized by this section, and any lease which shall be in effect at the termination of any such approved or prescribed plan, or at the termination of any such communitization or drilling agreement, unless relinquished, shall continue in effect for the original term thereof, but for not less than 2 years, and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.

"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, on such conditions as he may prescribe, to approve operating, drilling, or development contacts made by one or more lessees of oil or gas leases, with one or more persons, associations, or corporations, whenever, in his discretion, and regardless of acreage limitations provided for in this act, the conservation of natural products or the public convenience or necessity may require it or the interests of the United States may be best subserved thereby.

"The Secretary of the Interior, to avoid waste or to promote conservation of natural resources, may authorize the subsurface storage of oil or gas, whether or not produced from federally owned lands, in lands leased or subject to lease under this act. Such authorization may provide for the payment of a storage fee or rental on such stored oil or gas, or, in lieu of such fee or rental, for a royalty other than that prescribed in the lease when such stored oil or gas is produced in conjunction with oil or gas not previously produced. Any lease on which storage is so authorized shall be extended at least for the period of storage and so long thereafter as oil or gas not previously produced is produced in paying quantities."

SEC. 6. Section 27 of the act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 27. No person, association, or corporation, except as herein provided, shall take or hold coal, phosphate, or sodium leases or permits during the life of such leases in any one State, exceeding in the aggregate acreage 2,560 acres for each of said minerals; and no person, association, or corporation, except as herein provided, shall take or hold at one time oil or gas leases exceeding in the aggregate 15,360 acres granted hereunder in any one State. No person, association, or corporation shall take or hold at one time any interest or interests as a member of an association or associations or as a stockholder of a corporation or corporations holding a lease or leases, permit or permits, under the provisions hereof, which, together with the area embraced in any direct holding of a lease or leases, permit or permits, under this act, or which, together with any other interest or interests as a member of an association or associations or as a stockholder of a corporation or corporations holding a lease or leases, permit or permits, under the provisions hereof for any kind of minerals hereunder, exceeds in the aggregate an amount equivalent to the maximum number of acres of the respective kinds of minerals allowed to any one lessee or permittee under this act. For the purpose of this act, no contract for

development and operation of any lands leased hereunder, whether or not coupled with an interest in such lease, nor any lease or leases owned in common by two or more persons, shall be deemed to create a separate association under this section between or among such contracting parties, or the persons owning such lease or leases in common. The interest of an optionee under a nonrenewable option to purchase or otherwise acquire one or more oil or gas leases (whether then or thereafter issued), or any interest therein, when taken for the purpose of geological or geophysical exploration, shall not, prior to the exercise of such option, be a taking or holding or control under the acreage-limitation provisions of any section of this act. No such option shall be entered into after June 1, 1946, for a period of more than 2 years, without the prior approval of the Secretary of the Interior, and no person, association, or corporation shall hold at one time such options of more than 100,000 acres in any one State: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be construed to invalidate options taken prior to June 1, 1946, and on which such geological or geophysical exploration has been actually made, and which are exercised within 2 years after the passage of this act. Each holder of any such option shall file with the Secretary within 90 days after the 30th day of June and the 31st day of December in each year a statement under oath showing as of said dates (1) name of optionor and serial number of lease or application for lease, (2) date and expiration date of each option, (3) number of acres covered by each option, and (4) aggregate number of options held in each State and total acreage subject to said options in each State. If any interest in any lease is owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by means of stock or otherwise, in violation of any of the provisions of this act, the lease may be canceled, or the interest so owned may be forfeited, or the person so owning or controlling the interest may be compelled to dispose of the interest, in any appropriate proceeding instituted by the Attorney General. Such a proceeding shall be instituted in the United States district court for the district in which the leased property or some part thereof is located or in which the lease owner may be found, except that any ownership or interest forbidden in this act which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for 2 years and not longer after its acquisition. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit sections 18, 18a, 19, and 22 or to prevent any number of lessees under the provisions of this act from combining their several interests so far as may be necessary for the purposes of constructing and carrying on the business of a refinery or of establishing and constructing as a common carrier a pipe line or lines of railroads to be operated and used by them jointly in the transportation of oil from their several wells, or from the wells of other lesses under this act, or the transportation of coal or to increase the acreage which may be acquired or held under section 17 of this act: *Provided,* That any combination for such purpose or purposes shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior on application to him for permission to form the same. Except as in this act provided, if any of the lands or deposits leased under the provisions of this act shall be subleased, trusteed, possessed, or controlled by any device permanently, temporarily, directly, indirectly, tacitly, or in any manner whatsoever, so that they form a part of or are in anywise controlled by any combination in the form of an unlawful trust, with the consent of the lessee, or form the subject of any contract or conspiracy in restraint of trade in the mining or selling of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, or sodium entered into by the lessee, or any agreement or understanding, written, verbal, or otherwise, to which such lessee shall be a party, of which his or its output is to be or become the subject, to control the price or prices thereof or of any holding of such lands by any individual, partnership, association, corporation, or control in excess of the amounts of lands provided in this act, the lease thereof shall be forfeited by appropriate court proceedings."

SEC. 7. The act is hereby amended by adding a new section to read, as follows:

"SEC. 30. (a) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in section 30 hereof, any oil or gas lease issued under the authority of this act may be assigned or subleased, as to all or part of the acreage included therein, subject to final approval by the Secretary and as to either a divided or undivided interest therein, to any person or persons qualified to own a lease under this act, and any assignment or sublease shall take effect as of the first day of the lease month following the date of filing in the proper land office of three original executed counterparts thereof, together with any required bond and proof of the qualification under this act of the assignee or sublessee to take or hold such lease or interest therein. Until the required bond is so filed, the assignor or sublessor and his surety shall continue to be responsible for the performance of any and all obligations as if no assignment or sublease had been executed; and in the event that the Secretary shall disapprove the assignment or sublease for lack of qualification of the assignee or sublessee or for lack of sufficient bond, the lessee and his surety shall remain liable for the continued performance of all of the terms and conditions of the lease. Any partial assignment of any lease shall segregate the assigned and retained portions thereof, and, to the same extent as in the last preceding sentence provided, release and discharge the assignor from all obligations thereafter accruing with respect to the assigned lands; and such segregated leases shall continue in full force and effect for the primary term of the original lease, but for not less than 2 years after the date of discovery of oil or gas in paying quantities upon any other segregated portion of the lands originally subject to such lease. Assignments under this section may also be made of parts of leases which are in their extended term because of production, and the segregated lease of any undeveloped lands shall continue in full force and effect for 2 years and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities."

SEC. 8. The act is hereby amended by adding a new section to read, as follows:

"SEC. 30. (b) Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in section 30 hereof, a lessee may at any time make and file in the appropriate land office a written relinquishment of all rights under any oil or gas lease issued under the authority of this act or of any legal subdivision of the area included within any such lease. Such relinquishment shall be effective as of the date of its filing, subject to the continued obligation of the lessee and his surety to make payment of all accrued rentals and royalties and to place all wells on the lands to be relinquished in condition for suspension or abandonment in accordance with the applicable lease terms and regulations; thereupon the lessee shall be released of all obligations thereafter accruing under said lease with respect to the lands relinquished, but no such relinquishment shall release such lessee, or his bond, from any liability for breach of any obligation of the lease, other than an obligation to drill, accrued at the date of the relinquishment."

SEC. 9. Section 31 of the act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 31. Except as otherwise herein provided, any lease issued under the provisions of this act may be forfeited and canceled by an appropriate proceeding in the United States district court for the district in which the property, or some part thereof, is located whenever the lessee fails to comply with any of the provisions of this act, of the lease, or of the general regulations promulgated under this act and in force at the date of the lease; and the lease may provide for resort to appropriate methods for the settlement of disputes or for remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

"Any lease issued after August 21, 1935, under the provisions of section 17 of this act shall be subject to cancellation by the Secretary of the Interior after 30 days' notice upon the failure of the lessee to comply with any of the provisions of the lease, unless or until the land covered by any such lease is known to contain valuable deposits of oil or gas. Such notice in advance of cancellation shall be sent the lease owner by registered letter directed to the lease owner's record post-office address, and in case such letter shall be returned as undelivered, such notice shall also be posted for a period of 30 days in the United States land office for the district in which the land covered by such lease is situated, or in the event that there is no district land office for such district, then in the post office nearest such land."

SEC. 10. Section 39 which was added to the act by the act of February 9, 1933 (47 Stat. 798; 30 U. S. C., sec. 209), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 39. The Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of encouraging the greatest ultimate recovery of oil or gas and in the interest of conservation of natural resources is authorized to waive, suspend, or reduce the rental, or minimum royalty, or reduce the royalty on an entire leasehold, or on any tract or portion thereof segregated for royalty purposes, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to do so in order to promote development, or whenever in his judgment the leases cannot be successfully operated under the terms provided therein. In the event the Secretary of the Interior, in the interest of conservation, shall direct or shall assent to the suspension of operations and production under any lease granted under the terms of this act, any payment of acreage rental or of minimum royalty prescribed by such lease likewise shall be suspended during such period of suspension of operations and production; and the term of such lease shall be extended by adding any such suspension period thereto. The provisions of this section shall apply to all oil and gas leases issued under this act, including those within an approved or prescribed plan for unit or cooperative development and operation."

SEC. 11. Section 5 of the act approved February 7, 1927 (44 Stat. 1057; 30 U. S. C., sec. 285), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That the general provisions of sections 26 to 38, inclusive, of the act of February 25, 1920, entitled 'An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain', as amended, are made applicable to permits and leases under this act, the thirty-seventh section thereof being amended to include deposits of potassium."

SEC. 12. From and after the effective date of this act, the royalty obligation to the United States under all leases requiring payment of royalty in excess of 12½ percent, except leases issued or to be issued upon competitive bidding, is reduced to 12½ percent in amount or value of production removed or sold from said leases as to (1) such leases, or such part of the lands subject thereto, and the deposits underlying the same, as are not within the known productive limits of any oil or gas deposit, as such productive limits exist on the effective date of this act, and (2) each oil or gas field or deposit discovered after May 27, 1941, which is entitled to the benefits of the act of December 24, 1942, or which

is included in any approved unit or cooperative agreement.

SEC. 13. Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting existing leases within the borders of the naval petroleum reserves, or agreements concerning operations thereunder or in relation thereto, but the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized, with the consent of the President, to enter into agreements such as those provided for in section 17 (b) of the act of February 25, 1920, as amended by this act, which agreements shall not, unless expressed therein, operate to extend the term of any lease affected thereby.

SEC. 14. The act of July 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 742; 30 U. S. C., sec. 226a); section 1 of the act of July 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 726; 30 U. S. C., sec. 226b), as amended; and section 2 of the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 679; 30 U. S. C., sec. 223a), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 15. No repeal or amendment made by this act shall affect any right acquired under the law as it existed prior to such repeal or amendment, and such right shall be governed by the law in effect at the time of its acquisition; but any person holding a lease on the effective date of this act may, by filing a statement to that effect, elect to have his lease governed by the applicable provisions of this act instead of by the law in effect prior thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of oil and gas on the public domain, and for other purposes."

MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

The bill (S. 2254), to provide military assistance to the Republic of the Philippines, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Republic of the Philippines Military Assistance Act."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President is authorized, upon application by the Republic of the Philippines, and whenever in his discretion the public interest renders such course advisable, to provide: (a) for the instruction and training of military and naval personnel of the Republic of the Philippines; (b) for the maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation of military or naval equipment in the possession of the said country; and (c) for the transfer to the said country of any arms, ammunition, and implements of war as defined in the President's proclamation 2549 of April 9, 1942, or any superseding proclamations; any other aircraft; naval vessels except those of the following category: Battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines; any stores, supplies, services, technical information, material, and equipment: *Provided*, That such transfer shall be consistent with military and naval requirements of the United States and with the national interest.

SEC. 3. The President is authorized to provide such assistance or transfer property or information pursuant to section 2, by sale, loan, exchange, lease, gift, or transfer for cash, credit, or other property with or without warranty and upon such other terms and conditions as he may deem proper.

SEC. 4. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance, information, or property pursuant to this act the Government of the Republic of the Philippines shall undertake, (a) that it will not, without the consent of the President of the United States, transfer title to or possession of any property transferred to it pursuant to this act; (b) that it will not permit use of any property so received or disclosure of any plan, specification, or other information pertaining thereto or any technical information furnished, by or to anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of the Republic of the Philippines or for any purpose other than those set forth in this act, and (c) that the Government of the Republic of the Philippines will make provisions comparable to those customarily made by the United States, for the security of any article, plan, or information received under the terms of this act.

SEC. 5. The President of the United States is authorized, upon application from the Republic of the Philippines, and whenever in his discretion the public interest renders such a course advisable, to detail officers and enlisted men of the Army of the United States, and the United States Navy and Marine Corps, to assist that Government: *Provided*, That the officers and enlisted men so detailed are authorized to accept from the Republic of the Philippines offices and such compensation and emoluments thereunto appertaining as may be first approved by the Secretary of War, or by the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be: *Provided further*, That such compensation may be accepted by the United States Government for remittance to the individual if in the opinion of the Secretary of War, or of the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, such a course appears desirable: *Provided further*, That while so detailed such officers and enlisted men shall receive, in addition to the compensation and emoluments allowed them by that Government, the pay and allowances whereto entitled in the Army of the United States, or the United States Navy, and Marine Corps, and shall be allowed the same credit for longevity, retirement, and for all other purposes that they would receive if they were serving with the forces of the United States: *And provided further*, That in addition to or in the absence of such compensation from that Government, the officers and enlisted men so detailed shall receive such additional compensation as may be determined by the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, and approved by the President.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That articles or services furnished pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be within the limits of appropriations made specifically for that purpose or to the extent of availability of items which are surplus to the needs of the United States Government.

SEC. 7. The President may from time to time promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this act; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him by this act through such department, agency, or officer as he shall direct: *Provided*, That no property shall be transferred by such department, agency, or officer pursuant to this act except after consultation with the Secretary of State, and the Secretaries of War and Navy, as their respective interests may appear.

SEC. 8. The provisions of this act become effective on the 4th day of July 1946 and continue in effect for a period of 5 years.

EXPENDITURES BY THE ALASKA RAILROAD

The bill (H. R. 5453), to authorize certain expenditures by the Alaska Railroad, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CERTAIN CASES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2788) to limit the time during which certain actions under the laws of the United States may be brought, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 9, on page 2, after the word "effect", to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no liability for unpaid overtime accrued prior to the effective date of this act shall be predicated in any case where it shall appear by a preponderance of the evidence that the employer in good faith regarded the employees as employees with respect to whom the Interstate Commerce Commission has power to establish qualifications and maximum hours of service pursuant to the provisions of section 204 of the Motor Carrier Act, 1935."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, with regard to this bill, I send forward an amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 8, it is proposed to strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "five."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I certainly object to the extension. The only purpose of the bill is to impose a statute of limitations for a reasonable period. Certainly if it is changed from 2 years to 5, it seems to me, offhand, to eliminate the purpose of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator that the Committee on the Judiciary, having the bill in charge, dealt with the bill as it came from the House, with provision for 1 year. It was deemed best to make it 2 years. The Department of Justice recommends in writing that it be 5 years. Certain organizations have come before us and requested that the period be made 5 years. It was my thought to offer this amendment as I have offered it now, providing for 5 years, with the hope that in conference we would arrive at some lesser period, probably 3.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Department of Justice has objected to the bill throughout. I do not know why we should now pay attention to their 5-year provision. The House passed the bill with a provision for 1 year, and the 2-year provision is more than reasonable. I certainly think the amendment should not be made, that we should agree with the position of the Committee on the Judiciary, as I understand it, who have recommended 2 years as the period of limitation. I should have to object to the bill if it is to be increased to 5 years.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the amendment withdrawn?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; I offer the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: I ask the attention of the Senator from

Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Reverting to Calendar No. 1424, House bill 2788, to which I offered an amendemnt, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I withdraw the objection.

Mr. TUNNELL. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS ON THE ISLAND OF GUAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2246) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire in fee or otherwise certain lands and rights in land on the island of Guam, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 8, after the period, to insert "The authority contained herein may include, but shall not be limited to, acquisitions for the purpose set forth in Public Law 225 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, approved November 15, 1945", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to acquire in the name, and for the use, of the United States, by purchase or otherwse, land and rights pertaining thereto situated on or within the island of Guam, including interests in fee, leasehold interests with or without option to purchase interests in fee, and rights-of-way and easements both temporary and perpetual for highways, drainage system, water supply and water distribution facilities, power lines, communication systems, and communication distribution facilities, upon conveyance of title acceptable to him or to such other officer as he may designate without regard to and notwithstanding section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C. A., title 40, sec. 255), or any other provision of law requiring approval of title by the Attorney General of the United States. The authority contained herein may include, but shall not be limited to, acquisitions for the purpose set forth in Public Law 225 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, approved November 15, 1945.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,630,000 to effectuate the purposes of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2133) to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 9, after the word "adjudged" to insert the words "or decreed"; and on page 2, line 2, after the word "such", to strike out "an adjudgment" and insert "a judgment or decree", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph at the end of section 4 thereof:

"Payments of allowances which have been or hereafter may be made under this act based on a purported marriage and made prior to judicial annulment or termination of such marriage are valid: *Provided*, That it is adjudged or decreed by a court of competent jurisdiction that the marriage was entered into in good faith on the part of the spouse in military service or that, in the absence of such a judgment or decree, such finding of good faith is made by the head of the department concerned or by such officer of the department concerned as he may designate for the purpose."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the conferees of the Senate and the House are now working on a new pay bill for the Army and Navy, the Coast Guard and Marine Corps, I wonder if we could not hold this bill up until that is concluded.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this has nothing to do with pay. The bill seeks to prevent the Navy Department from collecting from servicemen money that is retained for allowances in certain cases. The best illustration is a case where a man thinks he is married, and is married, and apparently legally, but finds out in 6 months or a year that his wife was married before, and there is an annulment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, with that explanation, I withdraw the objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS OR RESOURCES ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2126) to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States, which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the words "dispose of", to strike out "materials or resources, including"; on line 5, after the word "gravel", to strike out "vegetation"; on line 6, after the word "timber", to strike out "or other forest products"; on line 8, after the word "materials", to strike out "or resources"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "materials", to strike out the words "or resources"; on line 7, after the word "materials", to strike out the words "or resources"; on line 11, after the words "disposition of", to insert the word "such"; on line 11, after the word "materials", to strike out the words "and resources"; page 2, line 18, after the word "material", to strike out the words "or resource"; on line 24, after the word "material", to strike out the words "or resource"; on line 25, after the word "material", to strike out the words "or resource"; on page 3, line 4, after the word "materials", to strike out the words "or resources", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, may dispose of sand, stone, gravel, and timber on public lands of the United States which are under his exclusive jurisdiction, if the disposal of such materials (1) is not otherwise expressly authorized by law, including the United States mining law, (2) is not expressly prohibited by laws of the United States, and (3) would not be detrimental to the public interest. Such materials may be disposed of only in accordance with the provisions of this act and upon the payment of adequate compensation therefor, to be determined by the Secretary. Within any calendar year, the Secretary shall not dispose of such materials to any one person, firm, corporation, or association in quantities the value of which shall exceed $15,000. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress an annual report of the disposition of such materials made under this act. Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to lands in any national park or national monument or to any Indian lands or lands set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including lands over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for the use of Indians.

SEC. 2. Where the appraised value of the material exceeds $1,000, it shall be disposed of by the Secretary to the highest responsible qualified bidder by competitive bidding and after publication of notice of the proposed disposal once each week for a period of at least 30 days in a newspaper of general circulation in the county in which the material is located. Where the appraised value of the material is $1,000 or less, it may be disposed of by the Secretary upon such notice and in such manner as he may prescribe.

SEC. 3. All moneys received from the disposal of materials under this act shall be disposed of in the same manner as moneys received from the sale of public lands.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the disposal of certain materials on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, reverting to Calendar 1428, S. 2126, neither the author nor the Senator in charge of the bill is on the floor, and while I have no objection that I know of, I should like to have the bill go over in order that we might have an explanation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has already been passed. Does the Senator ask for reconsideration?

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to have the vote by which the bill was passed reconsidered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada moves that the vote by which Senate bill 2126 was passed be reconsidered.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that the bill go over so that we may have the author of the bill present.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

DESCRIPTION OF LAND CONVEYED TO WYOMING

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 160) to amend the act of March 22, 1946, for the purpose of correcting the description of the small parcel of land authorized to be conveyed to the State of Wyoming by such act was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act entitled "An act to convey certain lands to the State of Wyoming," approved March 22, 1946, is

amended (1) by striking out "$12" and inserting in lieu thereof "$24"; (2) by striking out "one hundred feet", wherever it occurs in such act, and inserting in lieu thereof "two hundred feet"; and (3) by striking out "forty-eight one-hundredths" and inserting in lieu thereof "ninety-six one-hundredths."

HEIRS OF JESUS GONZALES

The bill (S. 1988) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the heirs of Jesus Gonzales all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain described tract of land within the Carson National Forest, N. Mex., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in recognition of the following facts: (1) That Jesus Gonzales, of Rodarte, N. Mex. (now deceased), and his predecessors in interest had by occupancy and use for agricultural purposes during a period of approximately 40 years established an equitable interest in certain lands comprising a portion of the Santa Barbara Grant prior to the acquisition of said grant by the United States through an exchange consummated under the provisions of the act of January 12, 1945 (43 Stat. 739), whereby said grant became a part of the Carson National Forest, said Jesus Gonzales subsequently continuing such occupancy and use until the time of his demise; (2) that the said area thus occupied and cultivated by the said Jesus Gonzales has been specifically delineated by a survey executed on July 12, 1945, by H. C. Langston, truck trail locator, of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, whose field notes and plat of said survey have been accepted and filed by said Department and show the area occupied and cultivated by said Jesus Gonzales to be 8.2 acres; and (3) that the said Forest Service has found and stated that the equities of the said Jesus Gonzales are such as to warrant recognition of his lawful heirs as the true and full owners of the said described 8.2 acres of land, the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed on behalf of the United States to execute a quitclaim deed conveying to the lawful heirs of the said Jesus Gonzales, their successors or assigns, all right, title, and interest which the United States now holds in the said described lands.

MRS. ESTELLE M. WILBOURN

The bill (H. R. 4113) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain lands to Mrs. Estelle M. Wilbourn, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISPOSITION OF VESSELS, ETC., BY THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1547) to provide for the disposition of vessels, trophies, relics, and material of historical interest by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, upon such terms and conditions as he may in his discretion prescribe, to transfer by gift or otherwise obsolete or condemned vessels of the United States Navy or captured vessels in the possession of the Navy to any of the several States, Territories, or possessions of the United States, and political subdivisions, or municipal corporations thereof, the District of Columbia, Canal Zone, or to corporations or associations whose charter or articles of agreement denies them the right to operate for profit. The transfer agreement for the disposition of any vessel shall include a stipulation that the transferee shall maintain the vessel in a condition satisfactory to the Navy Department and that no expense shall result to the United States as a consequence of such transfer or as a consequence of such terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 34 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 765; 50 U. S. C. 1611) shall apply to this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to loan or give to any of the several States, Territories, or possessions of the United States, and political subdivisions or municipal corporations thereof, the District of Columbia, Canal Zone, Soldiers' Monument Associations, post of the Grand Army of the Republic, posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, posts of the American Legion, and other recognized war veteran associations, State museums, libraries, historical societies, and museums operated and maintained for educational purposes only, whose charter denies them the right to operate for profit, and posts of the Sons of Veterans Reserve, educational institutions whose graduates or students fought in World War I or World War II, captured, condemned, or obselete ordnance, guns, projectiles, books, manuscripts, works of art, drawings, plans, models, and other condemned or obsolete material, trophies, and flags, and other material of historic interest which may not be needed in the service of the Navy Department.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to loan or give to any individual who sponsored a ship or vessel the name plate or any small article of a negligible or sentimental value from that ship or vessel, and any person, State, group, or organization named in section 2 of this act who donated any article, material, or equipment, including donations of silver service, may receive such articles, equipment, or material, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy. The loans or gifts described in sections 2 and 3 of this act shall be made subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, and the Government shall be at no expense in connection with any such loan or gift.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer, without reimbursement, such devices and trophies, as he may in his discretion determine, to the Secretary of the Treasury for the promotion of the sale of war or Victory bonds, and to any other Government agency for scientific, experimental, monumental, or display purposes. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell or donate such war devices and trophies for the promotion of the sale of war or Victory bonds.

SEC. 5. Any person who gave or loaned binoculars to the United States or to the United States Navy in order that such binoculars might be used in the naval service during World War II and to whom the binoculars given or loaned cannot be returned shall be entitled to receive from the Secretary of the Navy binoculars similar in type to the binoculars given or loaned.

SEC. 6. No transfer, loan, or gift authorized by section 1 or 2 of this act shall take effect until information of the proposal to make such transfer, loan, or gift has been transmitted to the Congress. The transfers authorized by section 1 of this act shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which information of the proposal to make such transfer is transmitted to the Congress; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period, there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the proposed transfer. The loans and gifts authorized by section 2 of this act shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 30 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which information of the proposal to make such loan or gift is transmitted to the Congress; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 30-day period, there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the proposed loan or gift.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEATH COMPENSATION OR PENSION TO WIDOWS AND CHILDREN OF CERTAIN DECEASED VETERANS

The bill (S. 2100) to remove the limitations on the amount of death compensation or pension payable to widows and children of certain deceased veterans, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following acts or parts of acts, which limit the total amount of death compensation or pension payable to widows and children of certain deceased veterans, are hereby repealed:

(a) The last sentence of subsection (a) of section 14 and the last sentence of subsection (b) of section 14 of the act entitled "An act to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes," approved July 13, 1943 (57 Stat. 554).

(b) Subsection (b) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to compensate widows and children of persons who died while receiving monetary benefits for disabilities directly incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service in the World War," approved June 28, 1934, as amended (58 Stat. 804).

SEC. 2. Subparagraph (b) of paragraph III of part III of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), which limits the total amount of death compensation or pension payable to widows and children of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer Rebellion, or the Philippine Insurrection, is hereby repealed.

FUNERAL AND BURIAL EXPENSES OF DECEASED VETERANS

The bill (S. 706) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to increase the limit of amounts payable thereunder in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., The Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, is amended by striking out the amount "$100" wherever such amount appears in paragraphs II and III thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the amount "$150."

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE TO PROPERTY OR PERSONAL INJURY CAUSED BY MILITARY PERSONNEL OR CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 2200) to amend the act approved July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death

caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; 31 U. S. C. 223b), as amended by the act of May 29, 1945 (Public Law 67, 79th Cong.) be, and it is hereby, further amended by striking out the figures and words "$500, or in time of war not in excess of" as they appear in the first sentence thereof, and by striking out the figures and words "$500, or in time of war $1,000," as they appear in the last sentence of said section and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000."

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 1 of this act shall be applicable to section 1 of the act of December 28, 1945 (Public Law 277, 79th Cong.).

AUTHORIZATION OF INDIAN FUNDS FOR INSURANCE PREMIUMS

The bill (S. 1235) to authorize the use of the funds of any tribe of Indians for insurance premiums, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act authorizing the use of the funds of any tribe of Indians for payments of insurance premiums for protection of the property of the tribe against fire, theft, tornado, and hail," approved April 13, 1926 (44 Stat. 242), is amended to read as follows:

"That hereafter the funds of any tribe of Indians under the control of the United States may be used for payments of insurance premiums for protection of the property of the tribe against fire, theft, tornado, hail, earthquake, or other elements and forces of nature, and for protection against liability on account of injuries or damages to persons or property and other like claims."

TRANSFER TO DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR OF SURPLUS LANDS AND PROPERTY ON RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1672) to authorize the transfer to the Department of the Interior of surplus lands and property of Federal agencies on reclamation projects, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 3, after line 4, to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 2. So much of any lands, improvements, and equipment acquired by the War Department for use at the Indianola Prisoner of War Camp, Indianola, Nebr., as has been declared surplus pursuant to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and as may be required by the Bureau of Reclamation shall be transferred, without cost, to said Bureau upon its request.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 12, after "SEC.", to strike out "2" and insert "3. (a)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 16, to insert a new subsection (b) as follows:

(b) The first section of the act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II," approved September 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 747), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "No person who has served or who shall have served in the military or naval forces of the United States for a period of at least 90 days during World War II, and who is honorably discharged from such service, shall be disqualified from making homestead entry or from any other benefits of this act solely by reason of not having reached the age of 21 years."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 5, after the word "SEC.", to strike out "3" and insert "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 17, after "SEC.", to strike out "4" and insert "5"; and in line 24, after the word "amended" to insert "or, at the option of the Secretary of the Interior, in accordance with the reclamation law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 1, after "SEC.", to strike out "5" and insert "6"; and in line 6, after the word "Act." to insert "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to be spent by the Bureau of Reclamation to carry out the purposes of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 5, after line 9, to add a new section 7, as follows:

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That lands, improvements, or equipment acquired by the War Relocation Authority and located as hereinafter provided and which have been or may hereafter be declared surplus by the Director of the War Relocation Authority and with respect to which no other final disposition has been made, or with respect to which said Director certifies that such lands, improvements, or equipment located on the War Relocation Centers at Heart Mountain, Wyo.; Hunt, Idaho; or Tulelake, Calif., are no longer required for the purpose for which they were acquired, shall be transferred, without cost, to the Bureau of Reclamation on its request.

SEC. 2. So much of any lands, improvements, and equipment acquired by the War Department for use at the Indianola Prisoner of War Camp, Indianola, Nebr., as has been declared surplus pursuant to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and as may be required by the Bureau of Reclamation shall be transferred, without cost, to said Bureau upon its request.

SEC. 3. (a) Any of said lands may be opened to public entry, with preference to veterans of World War II under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws in the same manner and to the same extent as public lands opened to entry.

(b) The first section of the act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II," approved September 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 747), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "No person who has served or who shall have served in the military or naval forces of the United States for a period of at least 90 days during World War II, and who is honorably discharged from such service, shall be disqualified from making homestead entry or from any other benefits of this act solely by reason of not having reached the age of 21 years."

SEC. 4. Any of the buildings of the said relocation centers may be used in place or transferred in whole or part to farm units on the respective projects to provide temporary or permanent shelter for settlers. No buildings shall be placed on a farm unit for permanent shelter except at the request of the settler. Any buildings so placed shall be paid for on terms and conditions approved by the Secretary of the Interior and calculated to return the expenditures of the Bureau of Reclamation in making such shelter available and usable: *Provided*, That in no event shall the repayment period for such shelter exceed the estimated useful life of the structure.

SEC. 5. Any of the lands, improvements, and equipment so transferred and not required for the settlement program on the project shall be available to the Bureau of Reclamation for use in construction, operation, and maintenance of projects, including the provision of housing at sites of construction work. Property not so utilized shall be disposed of in accordance with the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended or, at the option of the Secretary of the Interior, in accordance with the reclamation law.

SEC. 6. The Bureau of Reclamation is hereby authorized to use any funds available to it for construction and other purposes, with appropriate regard to the purposes for which made available, to operate, maintain, transfer, reconstruct, rehabilitate, and dispose of the property transferred to it pursuant to this act. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to be spent by the Bureau of Reclamation to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The preamble was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the transfer to the Department of the Interior of surplus lands, improvements, equipment, and other property of Federal agencies on reclamation projects for the settlement and employment of veterans and for other purposes."

INDIANS OF THE FORT BERTHOLD RESERVATION, N. DAK.

The bill (H. R. 1095) for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5716) to amend the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest that it go over temporarily.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over temporarily.

The bill (H. R. 5626), to authorize the Veterans' Administration to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is preparing an amendment

to that bill which may cause some discussion, and I ask that the bill go over until the call of the calendar is concluded, when it may be brought up for consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

EFFECTIVE DATES OF RATING AND AWARDS UNDER VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION SCHEDULE

The bill (H. R. 5149) to govern the effective date of rating and awards under the Veterans' Administration's revised Schedule for Rating Disabilities, 1945, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN TERMS IN LAWS ADMINISTERED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1578) to clarify the terms "compensation" and "pension" under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "and", to strike out "such benefits for non-service-connected disability or death shall be designated" and insert "not", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration monetary benefits, other than retirement pay, for service-connected disability or death shall be designated "compensation" and not "pension."

SEC. 2. Section 33 of Public Law No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DESIGNATION OF NAME OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL AT FARGO, N. DAK.

The bill (S. 1915) to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Fargo, N. Dak., as the Clarence Theodore Hoverson Memorial Hospital was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Fargo, N. Dak., shall be known and designated on the public records as the Clarence Theodore Hoverson Memorial Hospital.

RETURN OF CERTAIN SECURITIES TO THE PHILIPPINE COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT.

The bill (S. 2210) to provide for the return of certain securities to the Philippine Commonwealth government, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to return to the Philippine Commonwealth government certain securities in the principal amount of $6,269,750, which securities were deposited with the Government of the United States, and now in the custody of the Treasurer of the United States, in accordance with Commonwealth Act No. 282, approved June 3, 1938, as security to the United States against the loss, damage, or destruction of military supplies and equipment made available by the United States for the use of the armed forces of the Philippine Commonwealth government.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN PERSONS SERVING IN THE FORCES OF THE PHILIPPINE COMMONWEALTH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2235) to provide a system of relief for veterans, and dependents of veterans, who served during World War II in the organized military forces of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the service of the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of July 26, 1941, of the President of the United States, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia please explain the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. The bill extends to soldiers of the Philippine Commonwealth who were brought into the Army of the United States benefit payments for disability and burial allowances on the basis of one peso for each dollar which we allow the American soldiers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in grateful recognition of the recent struggles and sacrifices of the heroic legions of the Philippine fighting men, who comprised the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the recognized guerrilla forces, titles I to V, inclusive, of this act are intended to provide an exclusive system of relief for such persons and the dependents of those deceased. Titles I to V, inclusive, of this act may be cited as the "Philippine Veterans' Act of 1946."

TITLE I

CHAPTER I—GENERAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 101. The benefits provided by titles II, III, and IV of this act shall be available to persons who are otherwise eligible when it has been certified by the Secretary of War or his designee to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that the veteran for whom, or on account of whose service, benefits are claimed:

(a) Served before July 4, 1946, or the date of the termination of the present war as declared by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, whichever is the earlier—

(1) in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, while such forces are in the service of the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States dated July 26, 1941; or

(2) in an organized guerilla force on or after December 7, 1941, under a commander who was appointed, designated, or subsequently recognized by the Commander in Chief, Southwest Pacific Area or other competent authority in the Army of the United States;

together with the dates such service was rendered; and that pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Secretary of War, it has been determined that such service was substantially similar in character to the honorable active service which under similar circumstances would have been rendered by members of the armed forces of the United States; and

(b) Is not believed to have rendered assistance to an enemy of the United States or of its allies.

TITLE II

CHAPTER II—PENSIONS FOR DISABILITY

SEC. 201. For disability resulting from personal injury or disease contracted in line of duty, or for aggravation of a preexisting injury or disease contracted or suffered in line of duty, the United States will pay, pursuant to regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to any person thus disabled, when the disease or injury or aggravation of the disease or injury directly resulted from the performance of active service (which has been certified as provided in section 101), a pension as hereinafter provided in this chapter.

SEC. 202. When the disability was incurred or aggravated on or after December 7, 1941, the pension provided by section 201—

(1) if and while the disability is rated 10 percent, shall be at the rate of 11.50 pesos monthly;

(2) if and while the disability is rated 20 percent, shall be at the rate of 23 pesos monthly;

(3) if and while the disability is rated 30 percent, shall be at the rate of 34.50 pesos monthly;

(4) if and while the disability is rated 40 percent, shall be at the rate of 46 pesos monthly;

(5) if and while the disability is rated 50 percent, shall be at the rate of 57.50 pesos monthly;

(6) if and while the disability is rated 60 percent, shall be at the rate of 69 pesos monthly;

(7) if and while the disability is rated 70 percent, shall be at the rate of 80.50 pesos monthly;

(8) if and while the disability is rated 80 percent, shall be at the rate of 92 pesos monthly;

(9) if and while the disability is rated 90 percent, shall be at the rate of 103.50 pesos monthly;

(10) if and while the disability is rated as total, shall be at the rate of 115 pesos monthly;

(11) if the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of pension shall be increased by 35 pesos per month; and in the event of anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subparagraphs (12) to (14), inclusive, the rate of pension shall be increased by 35 pesos per month for each such loss or loss of use, but in no event to exceed 300 pesos per month;

(12) if the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or of one hand and one foot, or is blind in both eyes, with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly pension shall be at the rate of 200 pesos;

(13) if the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of two extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, or has suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly pension shall be at the rate of 235 pesos;

(14) if the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss of two extremities so near the shoulder or hip as to prevent the use of a prosthetic appliance or has suffered the anatomical loss of both eyes, the monthly pension shall be at the rate of 265 pesos;

(15) if the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to two or more of the rates provided in one or more of the subparagraphs (12) to (14), inclusive, no condition being considered twice in the determination, or has suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, the monthly pension shall be at the rate of 300 pesos; and

(16) in the event the disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed the requirements for any of the rates prescribed herein, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in his discretion, may allow the next higher rate or an intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of 300 pesos.

SEC. 203. When the disability was incurred or aggravated prior to December 7, 1941, the pension provided by section 201—

(1) if and while the disability is rated 10 percent, shall be at the rate of 8.62 pesos monthly;

(2) if and while the disability is rated 20 percent, shall be at the rate of 17.25 pesos monthly;

(3) if and while the disability is rated 30 percent, shall be at the rate of 25.87 pesos monthly;

(4) if and while the disability is rated 40 percent, shall be at the rate of 34.50 pesos monthly;

(5) if and while the disability is rated 50 percent, shall be at the rate of 43.12 pesos monthly;

(6) if and while the disability is rated 60 percent, shall be at the rate of 51.75 pesos monthly;

(7) if and while the disability is rated 70 percent, shall be at the rate of 60.37 pesos monthly;

(8) if and while the disability is rated 80 percent, shall be at the rate of 69 pesos monthly;

(9) if and while the disability is rated 90 percent, shall be at the rate of 77.62 pesos monthly;

(10) if and while the disability is rated as total, shall be at the rate of 86.25 pesos monthly;

(11) if the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of pension shall be increased by 26.25 pesos per month; and in the event of anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subparagraphs (12) to (14), inclusive, the rate of pension shall be increased by 26.25 pesos per month for each such loss or loss of use but in no event to exceed 225 pesos per month;

(12) if the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or of one hand and one foot, or is blind in both eyes, with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly pension shall be at the rate of 150 pesos;

(13) if the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of two extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, or has suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly pension shall be at the rate of 176.25 pesos;

(14) if the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss of two extremities so near the shoulder or hip as to prevent the use of a prosthetic appliance or has suffered the anatomical loss of both eyes, the monthly pension shall be at the rate of 198.75 pesos;

(15) if the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to two or more of the rates provided in one or more of the subparagraphs (12) to (14), inclusive, no condition being considered twice in the determination, or has suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, the monthly pension shall be at the rate of 225 pesos; and

(16) in the event the disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed the requirements for any of the rates prescribed herein, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in his discretion, may allow the next higher rate or an intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of 225 pesos.

SEC. 204. Any person entitled to pension at the rates prescribed by section 203 shall be paid instead a pension at the rates prescribed by section 202 if the disability resulted from an injury or disease received in line of duty—

(1) as a direct result of armed conflict; or

(2) while engaged in extrahazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war.

SEC. 205. For all purposes in connection with this act disability shall be rated only in accordance with Schedule for Rating Disabilities, 1945 edition, as now constituted or hereafter amended.

CHAPTER III—PENSIONS FOR DEATH

SEC. 301. The surviving widow, child or children, and/or dependent mother or father of any deceased person whose death is the result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active service in line of duty on or after December 7, 1941, shall be entitled to a pension, when the disease or injury or aggravation of the disease or injury directly resulted from the performance of active service (which has been certified as provided in section 101), at the monthly rate specified next below:

(1) Widow but no child, 50 pesos;

(2) Widow with one child, 65 pesos, with 13 pesos for each additional child;

(3) No widow but one child, 25 pesos;

(4) No widow but two children 38 pesos (equally divided) with 10 pesos for each additional child (total amount to be equally divided);

(5) Dependent mother or father, 45 pesos (or both) 25 pesos each:

Provided, That as to the widow, child, or children, and/or dependent mother or father this subsection shall not exceed 100 pesos.

SEC. 302. The surviving widow, child or children, and/or dependent mother or father of any deceased person whose death is the result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active service in line of duty prior to December 7, 1941, shall be entitled to a pension, when the disease or injury or aggravation of the disease or injury directly resulted from the performance of active service (which has been certified as provided in section 101), at the monthly rates specified next below:

(1) Widow but no child, 38 pesos;

(2) Widow with one child, 49 pesos, with 10 pesos for each additional child;

(3) No widow but one child, 19 pesos;

(4) No widow but two children, 28 pesos (equally divided) with 8 pesos for each additional child (total amount to be equally divided);

(5) Dependent mother or father, 30 pesos; or both, 20 pesos each:

Provided, That as to the widow, child, or children, the total pension payable under this subsection shall not exceed 75 pesos.

SEC. 303. Any person or persons entitled to pension at the rates prescribed by section 302 shall be paid instead a pension at the rates prescribed by section 301 if the death on account of which such pension is payable is the result of an injury or disease incurred or aggravated in line of duty—

(1) as a direct result of armed conflict; or

(2) while engaged in extrahazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war.

TITLE III

CHAPTER IV—HOSPITALIZATION

SEC. 401. For disability resulting from personal injury or disease contracted in line of duty, or for aggravation of a preexisting injury or disease contracted or suffered in line of duty when the disease or injury or aggravation of the disease or injury directly resulted from the performance of active service (which has been certified as provided in section 101), the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized in his discretion and insofar as he deems necessary and proper, to provide, pursuant to regulations to be promulgated by him—

(a) necessary hospital care, including medical treatment while hospitalized, in the Philippine Islands and in the United States, its Territories and possessions. Such hospital care in the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, may be provided in hospitals operated by the Veterans' Administration or in public or private hospitals under contracts entered into by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

(b) necessary supplies, including dental appliances, wheel chairs, artificial limbs, trusses, seeing-eye dogs, mechanical and electronic equipment for the blind and similar items or appliances, including (1) special clothing made necessary by the wearing of prosthetic appliances and (2) clothing where the person is indigent and clothing is necessary to protect health or sanitation during a period of authorized hospitalization or upon discharge.

(c) Transportation and other necessary expenses incident to the receipt of the benefits afforded by (a) and (b) above; and

(d) Transportation expenses (including preparation of the body), where death occurs while receiving hospital care as provided by (a) above, to place of burial—

(a) in the Philippine Islands (if death occurred there); or

(b) in the United States, its Territories or possessions (if death occurred in such a Territory or possession or in the United States); and burial and funeral costs (not in excess of $100).

TITLE IV

CHAPTER V—BURIAL BENEFITS

SEC. 501. Upon the death after separation from service of a person whose service is certified as provided in section 101, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may provide, pursuant to regulations to be promulgated by him, a United States flag to drape the casket (which flag shall thereafter become the property of decedent's next of kin) and shall pay for burial and funeral expenses and transportation of the body (including preparation of the body)—

(1) where death occurs in the Philippine Islands, the sum of 100 pesos; or

(2) where death occurs at a place other than the Philippine Islands, a sum equal to the reasonable cost of such burial and funeral and transportation expenses not, however, in excess of $100;

to such person or persons as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

TITLE V

CHAPTER VI—GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AND PENAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to continue, establish, and maintain in the Philippine Islands such offices, hospitals, and other field installations as he may deem necessary for the administration, execution, and enforcement of this act and the regulations prescribed pursuant to it and of the laws and regulations pertaining to veterans who have served in the armed forces of the United States and their dependents, and to purchase land and to purchase, construct, and maintain such buildings as he deems necessary including hospitals, office buildings and buildings to house officers and employees of the Veterans' Administration and their dependents.

SEC. 602. Notwithstanding subsection 5 (a) of the act of January 3, 1946 (Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress), or any similar provision of law, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized in his discretion to appoint and employ in the Philippine Islands persons who are not citizens of the United States and to establish pay scales for persons so employed which are lower than the pay scales provided by law for the positions to which such noncitizens are appointed.

SEC. 603. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to pay the expenses of transportation and subsistence of officers and employees of the Veterans' Administration and their immediate families in going to and returning from their posts of duty in the Philippine Islands under orders from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is further authorized, whenever he deems it in the public interest, to order to the United States on official leave of absence any officer of employee of the Veterans' Administration who is a citizen of the United States and who has performed 3 years or more of continuous service in the Philippine Islands: *Provided*, That the expenses of transportation and subsistence of such officers and employees and their immediate families in traveling to their homes in the United States and return shall be paid under the same rules and regulations applicable in the case of officers and employees going to and returning from their posts under orders when not on leave: *Provided further*, That while in the United States the services of such officers and employees shall be available for such duties with the Veterans' Administration as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe.

SEC. 604. Any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, while on duty in the Philippine Islands and away from the post to which he is assigned, shall be entitled to receive his necessary traveling expenses and his actual expenses for subsistence, or a per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended.

SEC. 605. While in the Philippine Islands, officers and employees of the Veterans' Administration and members of their immediate families shall be, if citizens of the United States, eligible for hospitalization and medical care provided by the Veterans' Administration. Charges for such services shall be made at rates established by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

SEC. 606. All decisions rendered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under the provisions of this act, or the regulations issued pursuant thereto, shall be final and conclusive on all questions of law and fact, and no other official or court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to review by mandamus or otherwise any such decision. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to delegate authority to render decisions to such person or persons as he may find necessary.

SEC. 607. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in the administration, execution, and enforcement of this act, shall have the same power and authority as he presently possesses in connection with the administration, execution, and enforcement of laws which afford benefits, rights, or privileges for or on account of service in the armed forces of the United States.

SEC. 608. Administrative and penal provisions of Public, No. 844, Seventy-fourth Congress (38 U. S. C. 101, 102, and 103), shall be for application under this act: *Provided*, That the limitation on fees in such laws shall be deemed to refer to pesos instead of dollars.

SEC. 609. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the administrative, definitive, penal, and forfeiture provisions in and under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and the provisions of Public, No. 262, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended (38 U. S. C. 450, 451, 454a, and 556a), shall be for application under this act: *Provided*, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may by regulations prescribed in accordance with this act modify and change the administrative and definitive provisions to the extent he deems proper by reason of unique conditions existing in the Philippine Islands.

SEC. 610. Except as otherwise specified, the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 611. The first proviso under the heading entitled "Transfer of Appropriations", contained in title II of the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946 (Public Law 301, 79th Cong., approved February 18, 1946), is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That effective as of July 26, 1941, service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, while such forces were in the service of the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States dated July 26, 1941, shall not be deemed to be or to have been service in the military or naval forces of the United States or any component thereof for the purposes of any law of the United States conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon any person by reason of the service of such person or the service of any other person in the military or naval forces of the United States or any component thereof, except benefits under (1) the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, under contracts entered into prior to February 18, 1946, and (2) The Philippine Veterans' Act of 1946: *Provided further*, That any payments made prior to February 18, 1946, to or with respect to any member of the military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines who served in the service of the armed forces of the United States shall not be deemed to be invalid by reason of the circumstances that his service was not service in the military or naval forces of the United States or any component thereof."

SEC. 612. The President of the United States, upon determining that the Government of the Philippine Republic has failed to cooperate in the administration, enforcement, and execution of this act, may suspend, by Executive order, the benefits provided by this act in whole or in part for such period or periods as he deems necessary.

SEC. 613. This act shall be effective as of July 26, 1941: *Provided*, That the enactment of this act shall not be construed to render invalid, in whole or in part, payments made pursuant to laws administered by the Veterans' Administration prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 614. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to procure such additional military and civilian personnel or to detail such personnel as he deems necessary to carry out the functions placed upon him by this act, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the War Department in addition to appropriations otherwise available, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out such functions.

TITLE VI

Paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"IV. No person shall be entitled to receive domiciliary, medical, or hospital care, including treatment, who resides outside of the continental limits of the United States or its Territories or possessions: *Provided*, That in the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs necessary hospital care and medical treatment may be furnished (1) to veterans who are citizens of the United States and who are temporarily sojourning or residing abroad, for disabilities due to war service in the armed forces of the United States and (2) to veterans residing in the Philippine Islands for disabilities due to service in the armed forces of the United States."

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF ASSOCIATE MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

The bill (H. R. 6153) to remove the existing limitation on the number of associate members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans' Administration, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 100 OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

The bill (H. R. 6069) to amend section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EASEMENT FOR HIGHWAY PURPOSES TO COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

The bill (H. R. 5907) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement for highway purposes to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in certain lands in the reservation of the Veterans' Administration hospital, Lebanon County, Pa., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FACILITATION OF DECENTRALIZATION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The bill (S. 2018) to facilitate the decentralization of the Veterans' Administration, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That appropriations of the Veterans' Administration now or hereafter available for traveling expenses shall be available for the payment to employees transferred from one official station to another of special allowances, in addition to those provided by law for transfer from one official station to another for permanent duty, of $5 per day after arrival at destination for 6 days for employees, plus $2.50 per day additional for 6 days for each member of immediate families of employees, where the transfer of the employee is ordered in connection with the decentralization of certain functions of the Veterans' Administration from the Central Office in the District of Columbia or from the branch of Central Office in New York, N. Y., to any of the 13 branch offices of the Veterans' Administration; or where

the transfer is the result of a separation of regional office and hospital or domiciliary facilities and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall find that such new post of duty is beyond reasonable commuting distance from the previous post of duty.

SEC. 2. This act shall remain in effect until June 30, 1947.

ACCEPTANCE BY ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS OF GIFTS, ETC.

The bill (S. 2099) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accept gifts, devises, and bequests in behalf of the general post fund for the use of veterans and for the sale and conveyance of any such property under certain circumstances and the covering of the proceeds thereof into the post fund, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized in his discretion to accept devises, bequests, and gifts, made in any manner, with respect to which the testator or donor shall have indicated his intention that such property shall be for the benefit of groups of persons formerly in the active military or naval forces of the United States who by virtue of such service alone, or disability suffered therein or therefrom, are or shall be patients or members of any one or more hospitals or homes operated by the United States Government, or shall have indicated his intention that such property shall be for the benefit of any such hospital or home, or shall be paid or delivered to any official, as such, or any agency in administrative control thereof.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of acquiring the title and the possession to any property which he is by this act authorized to accept, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to initiate and to appear in any appropriate legal proceedings, and to take such steps therein or in connection therewith as in his discretion may be desirable and appropriate to reduce said property to possession. He may incur such expenses incident to such proceedings as he deems necessary or appropriate, which shall be paid as other administrative expenses of the Veterans' Administration. All funds received by devise, bequest, or gift, or otherwise, for the purposes in this act contemplated, including net proceeds of sales by this act authorized, shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the general post fund, a trust fund provided by Public Law No. 473 of the Seventy-third Congress, approved June 26, 1934, being section 20 (b) (45) thereof (31 U. S. C. 725s; 48 Stat. 1233).

SEC. 3. (a) Disbursements from the general post fund shall be made on orders by and within the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and in the manner prescribed in section 4 of the act of December 26, 1941 (Public Law No. 382, 77th Cong., 55 Stat. 868); except that (1) if the testator or donor has directed or shall direct that his devise, bequest, or gift be devoted to a particular use authorized by this act, the same, less expenses incurred, or the net proceeds thereof, shall be used or disbursed as directed, except that a precatory direction shall be fulfilled only insofar as may be proper or practicable; and (2) if the testator or donor shall have indicated his desire that his devise, bequest, or gift shall be for the benefit of persons in hospitals or homes, or other institutions operated by the United States but under the jurisdiction of an official other than the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the same, less expenses incurred, or the net proceeds thereof which may come into possession of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be disbursed by transfer to the governing authorities of such institution, or otherwise, in such manner as the Administrator may determine, for the benefit of the persons in the institution indicated by the testator or donor, for proper purposes, as nearly as practicable in conformity with such desire of the testator or donor.

SEC. 4. If the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall receive any property other than moneys as contemplated by this act, he is authorized in his discretion to sell, assign, transfer, and convey the same, or any interest therein claimed by virtue of such devise, bequest, or gift, for such price and upon such terms as he deems advantageous (including consent to partition of realty and compromise of contested claim of title); and his assignment, deed, or other conveyance of any such property, executed in the name and on behalf of the United States, shall be valid to pass to the purchaser thereof such title to said property as the United States, beneficially or as trustee of said post fund, may have by virtue of any such devise, bequest, or gift, and the proceedings incident thereto, subject to the conditions, limitations, and provisions of the instrument so executed by the Administrator.

SEC. 5. (a) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify the act of May 23, 1928 (45 Stat. 715; 38 U. S. C. 438a), or section 4831 of the Revised Statutes, or any other statute authorizing the acceptance of devises, bequests, or gifts to the United States for their own use and benefit or for any particular purpose specified by the donors or testators.

(b) In any case where the United States hereafter receives property and it appears that it is, or shall have been, the intention of the testator or donor that such devise, bequest, or gift be for the benefit of those persons described in section 1 of this act, or any particular hospital or other institution operated primarily for their benefit, such property or the proceeds thereof shall be credited to the post fund as provided for in this act, and shall be used or disbursed in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. The annual report to Congress by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall include a summarized statement of post fund receipts, disbursements, and investments, and other pertinent information concerning said post fund.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I inquire what action was taken on Calendar No. 1439, Senate bill 1672? I was called from the Chamber when it was reached.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That bill was passed without objection.

INTER-AMERICAN TRADE EXPOSITION, FORT WORTH, TEX.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Inter-American Trade Exposition, Fort Worth, Tex., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF WILLIAM NEEDOM RASHAL, A MINOR

The bill (H. R. 3665) for the relief of the legal guardian of William Needom Rashal, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARIE EDENS NAST ET AL.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3010) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Edens Nast, Mrs. Bessie Amann, and George R. Townsend, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$7,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5452) making appropriation for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that is an appropriation bill, and will have to go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BARKLEY. The same is true with respect to Calendar No. 1460 (H. R. 6601), Calendar No. 1461 (H. R. 6335), Calendar No. 1462 (H. R. 6496), as well as Calendar No. 1464. I ask that those four bills be passed over, as they are all appropriation bills.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the four bills will be passed over as requested.

APPOINTMENT OF COURT REPORTERS

The bill (S. 2264) to amend the act providing for the appointment of court reporters, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 5a of the Judicial Code (act of January 20, 1944, 58 Stat. 5; 28 U. S. C. 9a (a)) be, and it hereby is, amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit the special employment of stenographers on a contractual basis for the reporting of proceedings before commissioners appointed to determine just compensation in condemnation suits, United States commissioners, referees in bankruptcy, grand juries, or any other proceedings specifically excluded by order of court from the scope of duties to be required of the official reporter of such district court."

INSURANCE BENEFITS TO SURVIVORS AND VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II

The bill (S. 2204) to amend title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, by giving insurance benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of that act to survivors of veterans of World War II, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say that all the amendments provided by the bill are merely clarifying in character. There are several amendments to the act. They are intended merely to clarify the text. Otherwise title II is not amended in any substantial way. The bill is important. It is intended to give the veterans of World War II and their dependents insurance benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act. Under conditions specified, the veteran—

Shall in the event of his death during the period of 3 years immediately following separation from the active military or naval

service, whether his death occurs before or after the enactment of this section, be deemed—

(1) to have died a fully insured individual;

(2) to have an average monthly wage of not less than $160; and

(3) for the purposes of section 209 (e) (2), to have been paid not less than $200 of wages in each calendar year in which he had 30 days or more of active service after September 16, 1940.

The bill is intended to take care of the widows and children of veterans of World War II who died prior to this time or who may die 3 years after discharge, and who are not eligible for pensions or other payments under the law as administered by the Veterans' Administration.

The bill is estimated to have an over-all cost—not annually, but an over-all cost—of $175,000,000 through 1959. It is a bill which is the culmination of a number of proposals made in both Houses by various Members, and as a result of study under the direction of the President, of the Budget, of the Veterans' Administration, and other agencies of Government. I very earnestly hope that the bill may be passed, because it does afford some relief to the dependents of veterans who have died heretofore or who may die within the 3-year period after their discharge and who are not entitled to pensions or other benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

The first amendments were in section 210, paragraph (2), on page 3, line 11, after the words "respect to the", to strike out "wages" and insert "death"; in line 13, after the words "regard to" to insert "paragraph (1) of"; on page 4, line 1, after the word "shall", to strike out "pay" and insert "certify"; in line 2, after the word "benefits", to insert "for payment"; in line 4, after the word "theretofore", to strike out "made" and insert "certified"; in line 12, after "payment", to strike out "made" and insert "certified"; and in the same line again after the word "payment", to strike out "made" and insert "certified."

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendments were in subsection (c) on page 4, line 18, after the word "any", to strike out "such", and after the word "individual" to insert "referred to in subsection (a)."

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was in paragraph (3), on page 5, line 17, after the word "six", to strike out "month" and insert "months."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in paragraph (4) on page 5, line 19, after the word "for" to insert "a lump-sum death payment or"; in line 21, after the word "heretofore", to strike out "made" and insert "certified by the Board for payment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in subparagraph (d), page 6, line 14, after the words "appropriated to the", to strike out "trust fund" and insert "Trust Fund."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"BENEFITS TO SURVIVORS OF WORLD WAR II VETERANS

"SEC. 210. (a) Any individual who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of World War II (as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress, whichever is the earlier), and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more, or by reason of a disability or injury incurred or aggravated in service in line of duty, shall in the event of his death during the period of 3 years immediately following separation from the active military or naval service, whether his death occurs before or after the enactment of this section, be deemed—

"(1) to have died a fully insured individual;

"(2) to have an average monthly wage of not less than $160; and

"(3) for the purposes of section 209 (e) (2), to have been paid not less than $200 of wages in each calendar year in which he had 30 days or more of active service after September 16, 1940:

Provided, That this section shall not apply in the case of the death of any individual occurring (either before or after the enactment of this section) while he is in the active military or naval service, or in the case of the death of any individual who shall have been discharged or released from the active military or naval service of the United States subsequent to the expiration of 4 years and 1 day after the termination of World War II.

"(b) (1) If any pension or compensation is determined by the Veterans' Administration to be payable on the basis of the death of any individual referred to in subsection (a) of this section, any monthly benefits or lump-sum death payment payable under this title with respect to the wages of such individual shall be determined without regard to such subsection (a).

"(2) Upon an application for benefits or a lump-sum death payment with respect to the death of any individual referred to in subsection (a), the Board shall make a decision without regard to paragraph (1) of this subsection unless it has been notified by the Veterans' Administration that pension or compensation is determined to be payable by the Veterans' Administration by reason of the death of such individual. The Board shall notify the Veterans' Administration of any decision made by the Board authorizing payment, pursuant to subsection (a), of monthly benefits or of a lump-sum death payment. If the Veterans' Administration in any such case has made an adjudication or thereafter makes an adjudication that any pension or compensation is payable under any law administerd by it, by reason of the death of any such individual, it shall notify the Board, and the Board shall certify no further benefits for payment, or shall recompute the amount of any further benefits payable, as may be required by paragraph (1) of this subsection. Any payments theretofore certified by the Board pursuant to subsection (a) to any individual, not exceeding the amount of any accrued pension or compensation payable to him by the Veterans' Administration, shall (notwithstanding the provisions of sec. 3 of the act of August 12, 1935, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 38, sec. 454a)) be deemed to have been paid to him by the Veterans' Administration on account of such accrued pension or compensation. No such payment certified by the Board, and no payment certified by the Board for any month prior to the first month for which any pension or compensation is paid by the Veterans' Administration, shall be deemed by reason of this subsection to have been an erroneous payment.

"(c) In the event any individual referred to in subsection (a) has died during such 3-year period but before the enactment of this section—

"(1) upon application filed within 6 months after the enactment of this section, any monthly benefits payable with respect to the wages of such individual (including benefits for months before such enactment) shall be computed or recomputed and shall be paid in accordance with subsection (a), in the same manner as though such application had been filed in the first month in which all conditions of entitlement to such benefits, other than the filing of an application, were met;

"(2) if any individual who upon filing application would have been entitled to benefits or to a recomputation of benefits under paragraph (1) shall have died before the expiration of 6 months after the enactment of this section, the application may be filed within the same period by any other individual entitled to benefits with respect to the same wages, and the nonpayment or underpayment to the deceased individual shall be treated as erroneous within the meaning of section 204;

"(3) the time within which proof of dependency under section 202 (f) or any application under 202 (g) may be filed shall be not less than 6 months after the enactment of this section; and

"(4) application for a lump-sum death payment or recomputation, pursuant to this section, of a lump-sum death payment heretofore certified by the Board for payment with respect to the wages of any such individual may be filed within a period not less than 6 months from the date of enactment of this section or a period of 2 years after the death of any individual specified in subsection (a), whichever is the later, and any additional payment shall be made to the same individual or individuals as though the application were an original application for a lump-sum death payment with respect to such wages.

No lump-sum death payment shall be made or recomputed with respect to the wages of an individual if any monthly benefit with respect to his wages is, or upon filing application would be, payable for the month in which he died; but except as otherwise specifically provided in this section no payment heretofore made shall be rendered erroneous by the enactment of this section.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Trust Fund from time to time such sums as may be necessary to meet the additional cost, resulting from this section, of the benefits (including lump-sum death payments) payable under this title."

ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF PERSONS OF RACES INDIGENOUS TO INDIA

The bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION OF NATURALIZATION OF FILIPINOS

The bill (H. R. 776) to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos was announced as next in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, may I inquire whether there was objection to Calendar No. 1467, House bill 776?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. To the bill to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. But there was no objection to Calendar No. 1466, House bill 3517?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think there was any objection to House bill 3517.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. House bill 3517 was passed. Calendar No. 1467, House bill 776, was objected to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think the Chair misunderstood. I wanted Calendar 1466, House bill 3517, to go over, in view of the fact that the author of the bill, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is not present to make an explanation of it. I have no objection to the bill, but would like to have it explained.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, if the Senator has no objection to the bill relating to the naturalization of Filipinos——

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is not the Filipino bill.

Mr. BALL. They are similar bills. Calendar 1466, House bill 3517, would simply place India in exactly the same status as China, with a quota of 100 a year, and would permit the naturalization of persons of races indigenous to India. House bill 776, Calendar 1467, would authorize the naturalization of Filipinos who otherwise would be excluded by section 303 of the Naturalization Act, which provides for exclusion of orientals.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As the Senator from Minnesota knows, I was one of the authors of the bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act.

With that explanation, I have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. House bill 3517 has already been passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand, the bill would place persons of races indigenous to India in the same status as the Chinese.

Mr. BALL. Exactly the same status.

Will the Senator withdraw his objection to Calendar No. 1467, House bill 776?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I made no objection to that bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 776, Calendar No. 1467?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 776) to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF ALIEN FIANCÉES OR FIANCÉS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (S. 2122) to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on or before July 1, 1947, the alien fiancée or fiancé of a citizen of the United States who is serving in, or who has been honorably discharged from, the armed forces of the United States during World War II may be admitted into the United States with a passport visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months (unless in exceptional circumstances such period is extended by the Attorney General) under the provisions of subdivision 2 of section 3 of the Immigration Act approved May 26, 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 154; 8 U. S. C. 203): *Provided*, That—

(a) the alien is not subject to exclusion from the United States under the immigration laws;

(b) the nonpreference portion of the quota to which the alien would be chargeable is exhausted at the time the alien applies for a visa;

(c) the administrative authorities find that the alien is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to a citizen of the United States who is serving in, or who has been honorably discharged from, the armed forces of the United States during World War II; and

(d) the administrative authorities find that the parties to the proposed marriage are able and intend to contract a valid marriage within the period for which the alien is submitted.

SEC. 2. In the event the marriage does not occur within the period for which the alien was admitted, the alien shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported at any time after entry in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act the period of World War II shall be considered as having started on September 1, 1939, and to have ended upon the formal conclusion thereof by a treaty of peace, or by the passage of a joint resolution of Congress, or by a proclamation by the President declaring an end to hostilities.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

MASTER SERGEANT GERHARD NEUMANN

The bill (H. R. 3441) to provide for the naturalization of Master Sergeant Gerhard Neumann was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF SENIA LASSILA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3185) for the relief of the estate of Senia Lassila, deceased, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "to" to insert "George Lassila, administrator of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of George Lassila, administrator of the estate of Senia Lassila."

J. B. McCRARY CO., INC.

The bill (H. R. 3494) for the relief of the J. B. McCrary Co., Inc., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RICHARD C. WARD

The bill (H. R. 4693) for the relief of Richard C. Ward was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LAWRENCE PORTLAND CEMENT CO.

The bill (H. R. 3391) for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HAMSAH OMAR

The bill (H. R. 233) for the relief of Hamsah Omar was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO WILMA BRANDON IRVING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1566) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Wilma Brandon Irving, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the words "range 26" to strike out "east, Black Hills" and insert "west, sixth principal", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Wilma Brandon Irving, of Grand Ronde, Oreg., a patent in fee to the following described lands allotted to her in the State of South Dakota: The Northwest quarter of section 17, township 37 north, range 26 west, sixth principal meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE SIMPLE TO LOUIS RUNS ABOVE

The bill (S. 1695) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Louis Runs Above, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Louis Runs Above, of St. Francis, S. Dak., a patent in fee to the following described lands situated in the State of South Dakota: The southeast quarter of section 5, township 99 north, range 76 west, fifth principal meridian.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO SHADRICK PONCA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1564) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Shadrick Ponca, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the figure "99", to strike out "south" and insert "north"; and in line 8, after the figure "72", to strike out "east, Black Hills" and insert "west, fifth principal", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Shadrick Ponca, of Okreek, S. Dak., a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in the State of South Dakota: The southwest quarter and the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 20, township 99 north, range 72 west, fifth principal meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POLICY WITH RESPECT TO CHARTERING OF CERTAIN NONPROFIT CORPORATIONS BY ACT OF CONGRESS

The bill (S. 2223) to establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or chartering of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] to the fact that on page 2 of the bill there has evidently been an omission in draftsmanship. In line 8, after the word "purposes", the words "or societies for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals" should be added. To my knowledge, since 1917 in connection with all charitable organizations of this sort the language of the act has invariably contained those words. The reason is that societies for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals are law-enforcement societies in many cases, and therefore do not come under the definition of charitable organizations, although they do an enormous amount of good.

Mr. KILGORE. If the Senator from Rhode Island will offer such a amendment, I will accept it.

Mr. GERRY. I shall offer it as an amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator please explain the bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Ohio that I explained the bill at the time it was reported. We are besieged with bills for the chartering of all sorts of nonprofit corporations. The bill in question merely lays down a policy, and prescribes what must be contained in the acts. In the first place, it prescribes that, instead of such corporations filing their own reports at various intervals before various committees, they shall make an accounting to the General Accounting Office.

In the second place, it eliminates provisions which have been permitted to slip into other bills, such as a provision to remove taxable property from the tax books in States. We have had provisions that States should not tax such property.

In the third place, the bill provides that the act of incorporation must contain a provision for the disposition of assets when the charter is revoked or when the corporation terminates. It really establishes a standard form for the chartering of corporations for nonprofit purposes. We have had so many conflicting bills that the Judiciary Committee finally directed the preparation of a bill which would establish a formula for the incorporation of such organizations, and afford certain protection to the public against being mulcted by persons who might get a bill through for an organization which was not designed for proper purposes.

Incidentally, the bill provides for an investigation by the Department of Justice, at the request of the Judiciary Committee of either House, of the incorporators and the purpose of incorporation, and provides for a report to the committee. However, it does not bind the committee to act in accordance with the report, nor to request a report. Nor does it prevent the Congress from acting on a charter, even though it might not be in conformity with the terms of the bill. However, it establishes a policy.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the bill would not apply to Government corporations, wholly owned or controlled.

Mr. KILGORE. That is true.

Mr. TAFT. Would it apply to corporations such as the Federal farm-loan banks, in which there is mixed Government and private ownership?

Mr. KILGORE. It applies to so-called nonprofit corporations which are chartered by the Congress of the United States. As the Senator well knows, in all the States there are general corporation laws which provide some officer or agency to handle corporations of all sorts. The Congress has no such agency or officer. Nor does the Congress have a policy. The bill would establish a policy for the creation of nonprofit corporations. It prescribes what their charters shall contain, or rather, what shall be contained in the acts incorporating them. All of those with whom I have talked who are interested in bills now before the committee providing for the incorporation of such organizations are perfectly agreeable. We have an armload of bills now pending before the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2223) to establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or charter of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, in section 1, on page 1, line 9, after the word "not" to insert "hereafter"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "income" to insert "or assets"; on page 2, line 9, after the word "is" to insert "hereafter"; on page 2, line 15, after the word "corporation" to insert "hereafter"; and in line 16, after the name "Congress" to insert "and each such corporation heretofore so created or chartered, still in existence, and by the terms of its charter a corporation not for profit", so as to make the section read:

That the Congress hereby declares and establishes this policy with respect to the creation or chartering, by act of Congress, of corporations other than corporations wholly owned or controlled, or to be wholly owned or controlled, by the United States or a department or agency thereof:

(a) The benefits and prestige of a charter awarded by act of Congress are not hereafter to be conferred upon or made available to any such corporation other than a corporation not for profit, no part of the income or assets of which inures to the benefit of any of its members, directors or officers, or is distributable thereto otherwise than upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation; nor to any such corporation organized, operated, or intended to be operated for other than charitable, educational, patriotic, or civic improvement purposes.

(b) No such corporation is hereafter to be created or chartered by special act of Congress except after careful investigation by the Department of Justice of the corporation proposed to be created or chartered, its purposes, its incorporators, or proposed incorporators, and all other pertinent facts relative thereto.

(c) Each such corporation hereafter created or chartered by act of Congress, and each such corporation heretofore so created or chartered, still in existence, and by the terms of its charter a corporation not for profit, is to be subject to an annual audit of its financial transactions by the General Accounting Office, at the expense of such corporation, and a report on each such audit is to be made to the Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, on page 4, line 3, after the word "income", to strike out "from" and insert "or assets of"; on page 4, line 7, after the word "no", to strike out "substantial"; and on page 2, line 9, after the word "propaganda", to strike out the comma and the words "or otherwise attempting to influence legislation", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. A bill to provide for the creation or chartering of a corporation other than a corporation wholly owned or controlled, or to be wholly owned or controlled by the United States or a department or agency thereof, shall not be deemed to be in conformity with the standards prescribed in this section unless such bill—

(a) Clearly sets forth and defines the purposes of the corporation, showing such purposes to be in accord with the policy set forth in subparagraph (a) of section 1 of this act.

(b) Provides that no part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members, directors, or officers, or be distributable thereto, otherwise than upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation.

(c) Provides that no part of the activities of the corporation shall consist of carrying on propaganda.

(d) Provides that the corporation, and its officers and directors as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elective public office.

(e) Sets forth—

(1) the name of the corporation, which shall be in the English language; shall not be the same as the name of (A) any corporation, whether for profit or not for profit, existing under any act of Congress or of any State, or (B) any foreign corporation, whether for profit or not for profit, authorized to transact its business or conduct its affairs in any State or in the District of Columbia; and shall not contain any word or phrase which indicates or implies that the corporation is organized for any purpose other than the specified purpose or purposes of the corporation;

(2) the period of duration, which may be perpetual;

(3) the name and address of each incorporator;

(4) the number of directors constituting the first board of directors, and the name and address of each such director;

(5) the place where such corporation is to be located and the place or places in which its activities are to be conducted;

(6) specific provisions with respect to the right of the members or any class or classes of members to vote or otherwise participate in the management of the corporation; and

(7) provision for distribution of assets upon dissolution or final liquidation: *Provided*, That such provisions shall not be deemed to violate the provisions of this act or of the corporate charter against the distribution of income to members, directors, or officers.

(f) Grants to the corporation the power to—

(1) have succession by its corporate name;

(2) sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(3) adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

(4) choose such officers, managers, and agents as the business of the corporation may require;

(5) ordain and establish bylaws and regulations, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States of America or any State thereof, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(6) contract and be contracted with;

(7) take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property, which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real and personal property by, a corporation operating in such State;

(8) transfer and convey real or personal property; and

(9) borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, and issue bonds therefor, and secure same by mortgage subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal or State law.

(g) Specifies that the corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents.

(h) Provides that the corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for such corporation; and that notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

(i) Contains provisions, in conformity with this act, respecting the annual audit of the books and records of the corporation by the General Accounting Office pursuant to section 5 of this act.

(j) Provides for the officers of the corporation, and for a democratic method of election thereof.

(k) Contains a reservation to the Congress of the right to alter, repeal, or amend such bill.

(l) Requires that the corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having any of the authority of the board of directors; and shall keep at its registered office or principal office a record giving the name and addresses of its members entitled to vote; and provides that all books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

(m) Provides that the corporation shall not have or issue shares of stock, nor declare or pay dividends.

(n) Provides that no loans shall be made by the corporation to its officers or directors, or any of them, and further provides that any directors of the corporation who vote for or assent to the making of a loan or advance to an officer or director of the corporation, and any officer or officers participating in the making of any such loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

(o) Contains no provision for exemption from taxation of the corporation or its property, real or personal, or its income, or relative to or establishing the tax deductibility of gifts or donations to the corporation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, on page 9, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "all corporations heretofore or" and insert "each corporation (other than a corporation wholly owned or controlled by the United States or a department or agency thereof)"; in line 10, after the name "Congress", to strike out the comma and the words "other than corporations wholly owned or controlled by the United States or a department or agency thereof" and insert "or heretofore so created or chartered, still in existence, and by the terms of its charter a corporation not for profit"; on page 10, line 1, after the word "by", to strike out "depositaries" and insert "depositories"; on page 10, line 12, after the words "with the", to strike out "first full" and insert "corporate"; in line 12, after the word "year", to strike out "following its incorporation" and insert "in progress on the date of approval of this act"; and on page 10, line 18, after the word "year", to strike out "for" and insert "during", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. (a) The financial transactions of each corporation (other than a corporation wholly owned or controlled by the United States or a department or agency thereof) hereafter created or chartered by act of Congress, or heretofore so created or chartered, still in existence, and by the terms of its charter a corporation not for profit, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the respective corporations are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the respective corporations and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians. In case of the refusal to allow the foregoing rights, the General Accounting Office may invoke the aid of any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which a corporation has property. Any such court may issue an order requiring the corporation to allow the representatives of the General Accounting Office the above-stated rights, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. With respect to corporations existing on the date of approval of this act, the audit of each such corporation shall begin with the corporate fiscal year in progress on the date of approval of this act.

(b) A report of each such audit during each fiscal year ending on June 30 shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January 15, following the close of the fiscal year during which such audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds; and shall also include such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial conditions of, and the use of any Government funds and facilities by, each such corporation, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable. The report may also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law or in violation of law or is not within the scope of the expressed corporate purposes or is not in conformity with this act. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the corporation concerned at the time such report is submitted to the Congress.

(c) The expenses of auditing the financial transactions of corporations pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be borne out of appropriations to the General Accounting Office, and appropriations in such sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized. Each such corporation shall reimburse the General Accounting Office for the full cost of any such audit of the financial transactions of such corporation as billed therefor by the Comptroller General, and the General Accounting Office shall deposit the sums so reimbursed into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 4, to insert:

SEC. 7. For purposes of court jurisdiction based upon diversity of citizenship a corporation created by or under an act of Congress shall be deemed to be a citizen of Maryland, unless otherwise specified by act of Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 8, after the word "purposes" it is proposed to insert "or societies for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GERRY. I ask unanimous consent that those words be also inserted at any other place where they may be required.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby declares and establishes this policy with respect to the creation or chartering, by act of Congress, of corporations other than corporations wholly owned or controlled, or to be wholly owned or controlled, by the United States or a department or agency thereof:

(a) The benefits and prestige of a charter awarded by act of Congress are not hereafter to be conferred upon or made available to any such corporation other than a corporation not for profit, no part of the income or assets of which inures to the benefit of any of its members, directors, or officers, or is distributable thereto otherwise than upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation; nor to any such corporation organized, operated, or intended to be operated for other than charitable, educational, patriotic, or civic improvement purposes, or societies for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals.

(b) No such corporation is hereafter to be created or chartered by special act of Congress except after careful investigation by the Department of Justice of the corporation proposed to be created or chartered, its purposes, its incorporators or proposed incorporators, and all other pertinent facts relative thereto.

(c) Each such corporation hereafter created or chartered by act of Congress, and each such corporation heretofore so created or chartered, still in existence, and by the terms of its charter a corporation not for profit, is to be subject to an annual audit of its financial transaction by the General Accounting Office, at the expense of such corporation, and a report on each such audit is to be made to the Congress.

SEC. 2. (a) This section is enacted by the Congress as an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

(b) Any committee to which is referred a bill to provide for the creation or chartering of a corporation other than a corporation wholly owned or controlled, or to be wholly owned or controlled, by the United States or a department or agency thereof, may refer such bill to the Attorney General for an investigation and report pursuant to section 4 of this act.

(c) No committee shall report a bill to provide for the creation or chartering of a corporation other than a corporation wholly owned or controlled, or to be wholly owned or controlled, by the United States or a department or agency thereof, unless such bill is in conformity with the standards prescribed in section 3 of this act.

SEC. 3. A bill to provide for the creation or chartering of a corporation other than a corporation wholly owned or controlled, or to be wholly owned or controlled by the United States or a department or agency thereof, shall not be deemed to be in conformity with the standards prescribed in this section unless such bill—

(a) Clearly sets forth and defines the purposes of the corporation, showing such purposes to be in accord with the policy set forth in subparagraph (a) of section 1 of this act.

(b) Provides that no part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members, directors or officers, or be distributable thereto, otherwise than upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation.

(c) Provides that no part of the activities of the corporation shall consist of carrying on propaganda.

(d) Provides that the corporation, and its officers and directors as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elective public office.

(e) Sets forth—

(1) the name of the corporation, which shall be in the English language; shall not be the same as the name of (A) any corporation, whether for profit or not for profit, existing under any act of Congress or of any State, or (B) any foreign corporation, whether for profit or not for profit, authorized to transact its business or conduct its affairs in any State or in the District of Columbia; and shall not contain any word or phrase which indicates or implies that the corporation is organized for any purpose other than the specified purpose or purposes of the corporation;

(2) the period of duration, which may be perpetual;

(3) the name and address of each incorporator;

(4) the number of directors constituting the first board of directors, and the name and address of each such director;

(5) the place where such corporation is to be located and the place or places in which its activities are to be conducted;

(6) specific provisions with respect to the right of the members or any class or classes of members to vote or otherwise participate in the management of the corporation; and

(7) provision for distribution of assets upon dissolution or final liquidation: *Provided*, That such provisions shall not be deemed to violate the provisions of this act or of the corporate charter against the distribution of income to members, directors, or officers.

(f) Grants to the corporation the power to—

(1) have succession by its corporate name;

(2) sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(3) adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

(4) choose such officers, managers, and agents as the business of the corporation may require;

(5) ordain and establish bylaws and regulations, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States of America or any State thereof, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(6) contract and be contracted with;

(7) take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real and personal property by, a corporation operating in such State;

(8) transfer and convey real or personal property; and

(9) borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, and issue bonds therefor, and secure same by mortgage subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal or State law.

(g) Specifies that the corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents.

(h) Provides that the corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for such corporation; and that notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

(i) Contains provisions, in conformity with this act, respecting the annual audit of the books and records of the corporation by the General Accounting Office pursuant to section 5 of this act.

(j) Provides for the officers of the corporation, and for a democratic method of election thereof.

(k) Contains a reservation to the Congress of the right to alter, repeal, or amend such bill.

(l) Requires that the corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having any of the authority of the board of directors; and shall keep at its registered office or principal office a record giving the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote; and provides that all books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

(m) Provides that the corporation shall not have or issue shares of stock, nor declare or pay dividends.

(n) Provides that no loans shall be made by the corporation to its officers or directors, or any of them, and further provides that any directors of the corporation who vote for or assent to the making of a loan or advance to an officer or director of the corporation, and any officer or officers participating in the making of any such loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

(o) Contains no provision for exemption from taxation of the corporation or its property, real or personal, or its income, or relative to, or establishing the tax deductibility of gifts or donations to the corporation.

SEC. 4. The Attorney General is authorized and directed, in any case where there is referred to him by a standing committee of either House of the Congress a bill to provide for the creation or chartering of a corporation other than a corporation wholly owned or controlled, or to be wholly owned or controlled, by the United States or a department or agency thereof, to conduct or cause to be conducted a full and complete investigation of the proposed corporation, its purposes, incorporators, and proponents, and any other matters in connection therewith which he shall elect to include in such investigation, and to make a full and complete report thereon, which report shall be transmitted to the committee which referred such bill to the Attorney General, accompanied by the opinion of the Attorney General as to whether such bill and the corporation thereby proposed to be created or chartered are in compliance with this act, together with the recommendations of the Attorney General with respect to the enactment of the proposed legislation.

SEC. 5. (a) The financial transactions of each corporation (other than a corporation wholly owned or controlled by the United States or a department or agency thereof) hereafter created or chartered by act of Congress, or heretofore so created or chartered, still in existence, and by the terms of its charter a corporation not for profit, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and proce-

dures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the respective corporations are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the respective corporations and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians. In case of the refusal to allow the foregoing rights, the General Accounting Office may invoke the aid of any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which a corporation has property. Any such court may issue an order requiring the corporation to allow the representatives of the General Accounting Office the above-stated rights, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. With respect to corporations existing on the date of approval of this act, the audit of each such corporation shall begin with the corporate fiscal year in progress on the date of approval of this act.

(b) A report of each such audit during each fiscal year ending on June 30 shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January 15, following the close of the fiscal year during which such audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds; and shall also include such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial conditions of, and the use of any Government funds and facilities by, each such corporation, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable. The report may also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law or in violation of law or is not within the scope of the expressed corporate purposes or is not in conformity with this act. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the corporation concerned at the time such report is submitted to the Congress.

(c) The expenses of auditing the financial transactions of corporations pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be borne out of appropriations to the General Accounting Office, and appropriations in such sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized. Each such corporation shall reimburse the General Accounting Office for the full cost of any such audit of the financial transactions of such corporation as billed therefor by the Comptroller General, and the General Accounting Office shall deposit the sums so reimbursed into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 6. The right of the Congress in its discretion to grant or withhold Federal charters for corporations is expressly reserved, and compliance with any or all provisions of this act by any corporation or other applicant or applicants for any Federal charter shall not be deemed to create or imply any obligation on the part of the Congress to grant or approve such charter.

SEC. 7. For purposes of court jurisdiction based upon diversity of citizenship a corporation created by or under an act of Congress shall be deemed to be a citizen of Maryland, unless otherwise specified by act of Congress.

ESTATE OF C. BENJAMIN STAPLETON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1965) for the relief of the estate of C. Benjamin Stapleton, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of C. Benjamin Stapleton, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of the said C. Benjamin Stapleton as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States Army vehicle, on Cass Avenue, in Detroit, Mich., on February 8, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WALTER A. MOFFATT

The bill (H. R. 3031) for the relief of Walter A. Moffatt was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN HAMLET

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2954) for the relief of John Hamlet, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out $1,782.13" and insert "$1,250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

D. C. TODD

The bill (H. R. 1460) for the relief of D. C. Todd was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF DAVID OWENS, JR.

The bill (H. R. 5811) for the relief of the legal guardian of David Owens, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARY A. HONNELL

The bill (H. R. 5091) for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Honnell was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARION POWELL, A MINOR

The bill (H. R. 5000) for the relief of Marion Powell, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM H. ROMAN

The bill (H. R. 4495) for the relief of William H. Roman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JAMES PLUMB

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4419) for the relief of Mrs. James Plumb, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$4,511.67" and insert "$4,252.40."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ESEQUIEL (FRANK) PADILLA AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 4331) for the relief of Esequiel (Frank) Padilla, and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCISCA SÁNCHEZ FIGUEROA

The bill (H. R. 4251) for the relief of the estate of the late Francisca Sánchez Figueroa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. HAZEL M. SKAGGS

The bill (H. R. 3622) for the relief of Mrs. Hazel M. Skaggs was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSÉ VILLAFAÑE MUÑOZ

The bill (H. R. 4245) for the relief of José Villafañe Muñoz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FANNIE C. FUGATE

The bill (H. R. 4339) for the relief of Fannie C. Fugate was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORITY TO COMPROMISE AND SETTLE CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY NAVAL VESSELS

The bill (S. 2247) to permit the Secretary of the Navy to delegate the authority to compromise and settle claims against the United States caused by vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, or for towage or salvage services to such vessels, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 726), be amended by adding another section thereto as follows:

"SEC. 9. When the net amount paid in settlement does not exceed $1,000, the authority of the Secretary of the Navy, as set forth in section 7, may be exercised by such person or persons as he may designate."

MIAMI HERALD, KEY WEST CITIZEN, AND MIAMI DAILY NEWS

The bill (S. 2292) for the relief of the Miami Herald, the Key West Citizen, and the Miami Daily News was considered,

ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $139.23 to the Miami Herald; the sum of $66.14 to the Key West Citizen; and the sum of $293.55 to the Maimi Daily News, all of the State of Florida, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for newspaper advertising contracted by the Navy Department during the period of September 13, 1942, and May 1, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

TRANSFER OF VESSEL TO AMERICAN ANTARCTIC ASSOCIATION, INC.

The bill (S. 2291) to the authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer a vessel to the American Antarctic Association, Inc., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the American Antarctic Association, Inc., a nonprofit scientific corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Maryland, for use in a projected scientific expedition to the Antarctic one naval vessel and related and necessary equipment on such terms and subject to such conditions as are deemed appropriate by the Secretary: *Provided, however*, That such transfer shall be for purposes of carrying out the projected Antarctic expedition only, and that prior to the transfer the American Antarctic Association, Inc., deposits with the Secretary a bond with good and sufficient sureties to guarantee payment to the United States Government of such charge as is determined by the Secretary as is reasonable for the use of the vessel and to reimburse the United States in the event of the loss of the vessel or its return to the Navy in a damaged condition.

SEC. 2. The vessel transferred to the American Antarctic Association, Inc., under this act shall be returned to the Navy if the projected scientific expedition has not departed from the continental United States within 6 months after the date of the transfer of the vessel and, subject to unforeseen circumstances, shall be returned to the Navy at a port within the continental United States no later than July 1, 1948.

ORAN EDMUND RANDALL RUMRILL

The bill (H. R. 4525) for the relief of Oran Edmund Randall Rumrill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DATE OF ACCEPTANCE OF COMMISSION BY WILLIAM LEON DE CARBONEL

The bill (H. R. 4863) to establish the date of acceptance of a commission as lieutenant (junior grade), United States Naval Reserve, by William Leon de Carbonel to be June 1, 1941, and the date of reporting for active duty to be December 9, 1941, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF MILITARY RESERVATION TO THE STATE OF ALABAMA

The bill (H. R. 4433) to provide for the conveyance to the State of Alabama for use as a public park of the military reservation known as Fort Morgan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAMAGES CAUSED BY REMOVAL OF IMPROVEMENTS FROM BOISE RECLAMATION PROJECT

The bill (H. R. 1689) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Anderson Ranch Reservoir site, Boise reclamation project, Idaho, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTION WORK BETWEEN YUMA PROJECT AND BOULDER DAM

The bill (H. R. 5674) to amend the laws authorizing the performance of necessary protection work between the Yuma project and Boulder Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUSTAV F. DOSCHER

The bill (H. R. 4888) for the relief of Gustav F. Doscher was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOFTS & SON

The bill (S. 1517) for the relief of Lofts & Son was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lofts & Son, a partnership consisting of A. C. Lofts, Clara Lofts, and Arthur C. Lofts, Jr., of Hood River, Oreg., the sum of $1,000, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for damages resulting from the relocation and reconstruction, in connection with the construction of the Bonneville Dam, of a portion of the Hood River-White Salmon Highway over and across certain premises near Hood River, Oreg., then in the legal possession of Lofts & Son, such relocation and reconstruction having made necessary the removal of certain structures, materials, and equipment of Lofts & Son from such premises, having caused delays and shut-downs in the operation of the business of Lofts & Son, and having prevented the use by Lofts & Son of a direct and convenient means of entering and leaving such premises: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

WILLIAM W. WILLETT, JR.

The bill (H. R. 797) for the relief of William W. Willett, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. HATTIE MAIN BABCOCK AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 3401) for the relief of Mrs. Hattie Main Babcock, Chester N. Main, and Mr. and Mrs. Earl Norman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PHILBERT L. BERGERON, ALFRED QUIST, AND ASTRID QUIST

The bill (H. R. 3399) for the relief of Philbert L. Bergeron, Alfred Quist, and Astrid Quist was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMY MARY RICHTER

The bill (H. R. 4353) for the relief of Amy Mary Richter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN LEBERMAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1150) for the relief of John Leberman, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$7,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Leberman, of Lawton, Okla., the sum of $7,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for a certain building built by him and used as a meat market on the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla., which was acquired by the United States Army on April 1, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. DORA FOSTER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5071) for the relief of Mrs. Dora Foster, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6 after the words "sum of", to strike out "$6,345" and insert "$5,719."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MICHAEL J. KEAVENEY AND MARY C. KEAVENEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5208) for the relief of Michael J. Keaveney and Mary C. Keaveney, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum

of", to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AXEL H. PETERSON

The bill (H. R. 4118) for the relief of Axel H. Peterson, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIE LAM AND EDGAR LAM

The bill (H. R. 3512) for the relief of Willie Lam and Edgar Lam was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARY BELK

The bill (H. R. 3359) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Belk was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERNEST I. WADE AND ALMA WADE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4997) for the relief of Ernest I. Wade and Alma Wade, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CARL AND NAOMI FITZWATER

The bill (H. R. 4373) for the relief of Carl and Naomi Fitzwater was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CECIL ATKINSON

The bill (H. R. 1258) for the relief of Cecil Atkinson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADELE NAHAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2315) for the relief of Adele Nahas, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, in line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$9,082.14" and insert "$10,434.14."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

WILL O'BRIEN, MRS. BESSIE O'BRIEN, AND THE LEGAL GUARDIAN OF JANE O'BRIEN

The bill (H. R. 2785) for the relief of Will O'Brien, Mrs. Bessie O'Brien, and the legal guardian of Jane O'Brien was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 2107) for the relief of certain postal employees was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to approve payment of vouchers submitted by postal employees for travel performed during the fiscal years 1944, 1945, and 1946 as a result of their transfer from one post office to another by direction of the Postmaster General in those instances where the Postmaster General determined that the transfer was in the interest of the Government, notwithstanding that the expenses of travel were not authorized in the order directing the transfer and the travel order authorizing the expenses of travel was issued retroactively after the travel had been performed: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2108) to provide for the payment of members of the military and naval forces of the United States who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia while in military pay status prior to assignment to active duty was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this bill would merely give to certain persons a civil-service status for the purpose of being paid for a small amount of work they did in the interim between the time when they were inducted into the military service and the time when they actually reported for duty. They were called into the service, but in the interim were required to work for one of the agencies of the Government, and they continued to render such service for that agency until they were actually required to report for duty in the armed forces. The bill involves only a few days' pay for the persons thus concerned.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the bill states—

That members of the military and naval forces of the United States, who subsequent to May 1, 1940, shall have performed service in any civil branch of the Government while in military pay status prior to assignment to active duty shall be entitled to full compensation for such civil service and leave accrued by reason thereof—

And so forth. Do I correctly understand that it is proposed that they shall receive both their military pay and their civil pay during that period?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. But during the period referred to they were performing a service for a Government department or agency, and in a great many cases the pay which they would receive for doing that work in a civil status would be four or five times the pay they received after they were drafted into the military forces.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that is not necessarily so; at least, I do not see why such a person should be paid both the civil pay and the military pay.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The passage of the bill is recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, and the bill has the approval of his Department.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object for the time being, until I have a chance to study the matter further.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

JUAN CALCAÑO

The bill (H. R. 2772) for the relief of Juan Calcaño was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF PATSY ANN MAHEUX, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 4600) for the relief of the estate of Patsy Ann Maheux, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM E. ROBERTSON AND ESTELLE ROBERTSON

The bill (H. R. 4479) for the relief of William E. Robertson and Estelle Robertson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 181) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their system of public education was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

REVISIONS IN THE BOUNDARY OF HOPEWELL VILLAGE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3533) to authorize revisions in the boundary of the Hopewell Village National Historic Site, Pennsylvania, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment on page 2, in line 1, after the word "area" to strike out "and may be disposed of by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of the Surplus Property Act (Public Law 457, Seventy-eighth Congress)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 104) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with exception of certain provisions thereof was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let the joint resolution go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5508) to authorize the return of the Grand River Dam project to the Grand River Dam Authority was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has offered an amendment to that bill. He has been compelled to leave the Chamber temporarily. Therefore, I think the bill should be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

REAL ESTATE IN CONVERSE COUNTY, WYO.

The bill (H. R. 5676) to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real estate in Converse County, Wyo., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162) extending for 7 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. BARRY, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. GAMBLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6084) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of New York, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ARENDS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

COMPENSATION OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. BURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 743, House bill 3709.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3709) to amend section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928, and section 3 of the act of March 29, 1944, affecting the compensation of postmasters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, with an amendment, in section 3, on page 2, line 8, after "January 1," to strike out "1946" and insert "1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SWORN STATEMENTS REGARDING CIRCULATION OF WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 2543, Calendar No. 742, on page 5 of the calendar. The bill appears on the calendar a few pages ahead of the point at which the call of the calendar was commenced today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2543) to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, that bill was passed over when it was last called because of an objection raised by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], who is not present at this time. I ask that the bill be now considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WILLIS subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to file a motion for the reconsideration of the vote by which House bill 2543 was passed earlier in the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

ATTENDANCE OF MARINE BAND AT UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS' CONVENTION

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, when Calendar No. 1263, House bill 5641, was called on a previous occasion, I objected to its consideration. I now withdraw my objection. I do not believe that the objection which the committee has made on the basis that the bill would establish a precedent is sound. I therefore ask that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill be passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On May 21, 1946, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] offered an amendment which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 4, after the word "concerts", it is proposed to insert "at the department convention of the American Legion to be held at Racine, Wis., on August 3, 1946, and"; on the same page, at the end of line 9, strike out "convention" and insert in lieu thereof "conventions"; on page 2, line 1, strike out "$9,408.26" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,986.26."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

USE OF NAVAL VESSELS IN ATOMIC BOMB TEST

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1262, House Joint Resolution 307.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 307) to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of atomic weapons upon such vessels.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 2, after line 9, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Prior to the employment of any vessel of the Navy under authority of section 1 of this act, the Secretary of the Navy shall come into agreement with the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to such prospective employment.

And insert:

SEC. 3. The number of combatant vessels, exclusive of those received from foreign governments, which may be employed as targets for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this joint resolution, is limited to 33. The term "combatant vessels" for purposes of this section is defined as naval vessels of the following categories: Battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, in line 4, after the word "President", to strike out "is authorized to" and insert "in his discretion may."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the committee amendments. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this bill was before the Senate some time ago and was discussed at some length. Thereafter it was recommitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs for the purpose of reducing, if possible, the number of naval vessels which might be assigned for use in making the atomic-bomb test.

The committee concur with the beliefs of the President, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the making of all three tests are of vital importance to our

national defense. When the bill came from the House to the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate, it provided for the use in these tests of 97 vessels. The committee requested the Navy Department to make a restudy, with the result that the number was reduced.

The purpose of this resolution is to test the effect of the atomic bomb against naval vessels in order to gain information upon possible required changes in—

First. Ship design.

Second. Tactical formations at sea and anchoring distances in port.

Third. Number and location of operating bases and repair yards.

Fourth. Strategic disposition of ships.

Other purposes of the resolution are—

First. To test the effect of the atomic bomb against aircraft, both airborne and grounded, and upon a wide variety of military ground weapons and equipment in order to learn what redesign of any items may be necessary and what may be needed in the way of dispersal to minimize the effects of the bomb.

Second. To learn more of the various effects of the atomic bomb against living beings.

Third. To gain information regarding the relative value of atomic-bomb attack against naval vessels as compared with other types of targets.

Fourth. To gain further information of general scientific value upon phenomena accompanying atomic explosions.

It is contemplated to make these types of tests:

A. Air blast, tending to crush the above-water structure and kill or maim personnel.

B. Intense heat, affecting the ship's structure, the crew, and possibly the ammunition and fuel.

C. Radioactivity, affecting the personnel, and certain types of equipment.

D. High waves, endangering both the safety of the ship, especially at anchor, and the lives or health of the crew.

E. Underwater shock.

F. Underwater pressure, tending to rupture the hull and sink the ship.

COST OF TESTS

The general expenses of carrying on the tests are estimated to be $100,000,000. The approximate cost of the vessels to be used as target ships was originally $425,000,000. The Navy Department claims that 90 percent of the ships would have only scrap value if sold, and that they would realize only 1 percent of the original cost. The report of the committee sets forth the actual elements of cost, which, as stated above, represent $100,000,000. The expected cost will be $25,000,000 or $30,000,000. Including the cost of the personnel and all other expenses, it would be $100,000,000. If the tests were not held, we would save only $25,000,000.

SECTION STRICKEN FROM THE BILL

Section 3 has been stricken from the bill by reason of the request of President Truman. In a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee, the President claimed this section was unconstitutional.

WHEN AND WHERE THE TESTS WILL BE HELD

It is expected the first test will be held in July when a bomb will be dropped on the target by the Army Air Forces. It is expected the second test will be made approximately 6 weeks later. The third test will take place approximately a year after the second test. The termination date of 2 years after the enactment of the bill is believed will allow sufficient time for the completion of the tests.

These tests are to be held on an atoll in the Marshall group, called Bikini, and its inhabitants are 169 people. The Marshalls are about 1,200 miles east of Guam.

The bill provides for the appointment of an advisory board by the President to cooperate with the Secretaries of War and Navy in the conduct of these tests. The board is to consist of five civilians, three Navy officers, and three Army officers.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. President, I am compelled to object to further consideration of the joint resolution. The Senate is asked today to approve a joint resolution to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of atomic weapons upon them at Bikini Atoll on the Pacific Ocean.

On March 29 I stated to this body, in proposing the cancellation of these tests, that the Navy was planning to use a hundred vessels in this demonstration. Thereafter the pending ship-target resolution was returned to the Committee on Naval Affairs and the list revised downward to 77. The revised resolution is the one which is before us today.

For many months preparation for these tests have been in progress. Islands have been cleared in the Pacific, steel towers have been erected, and vessels have been concentrated at Bikini and several other points in the Pacific.

All this has been going on without the target ships having been authorized for destruction by the Senate. It may well be charged, under these circumstances, that the cart has been placed before the horse.

It was with utter amazement that I read in Collier's magazine of June 8, 1946, an article by Vice Admiral Blandy entitled "Atomic Test Case." The editor explains that Vice Admiral Blandy is the man in charge of the "most stupendous military experiment in history" and that it is he who is setting the stage for the atomic-bomb test due to start within a few weeks at Bikini Atoll.

After presenting the nature of the tests the admiral states that from the beginning there have been objections to them. He mentions the fact that a group of nuclear-energy scientists who had worked on the atomic project, declared it was unnecessary to stage such an elaborate experiment. He says that they maintain that the scientific results gathered from New Mexico, Hiroshima and Nagasaki are conclusive enough to show what would happen to ships when an atom bomb is detonated just above or on the surface of the sea. He also says that one prominent nuclear physicist, Dr. Lee A. Dubridge of the University of Rochester, has asserted that the results of the tests could be estimated from information in Army files on the damage done at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

His answer to all these criticisms is that nothing will act as a substitute for an actual test of the bomb on naval targets, which would be a very good answer, since an actual test is the best test, if we were in danger of attack, and a bomb no worse than this one should be used.

The admiral says there were also protests in Congress when this body was asked to make the target ships legally available for the tests, and that some Members considered this potential destruction of part of our fleet as an extravagance, regardless of the results. Other critics, he states, insisted that the use of old ships would prove little, and that if we are to make the tests, we should use modern ships as targets.

It is to be regretted, so far as I am concerned, that the admiral completely ignores the principal reasons advanced here for the cancellation of this costly and useless procedure. The main reason advanced in this body, was that the United Nations Organization is still in its infancy, and that it is incongruous to its every aim and purpose for this Nation or any nation to exhibit large-scale preparations for future wars, and that it is unthinkable that the United States should even remotely indicate that she is preparing for an atomic war; that this is no time for martial gestures, and that the proposed tests should be canceled until the cause of international cooperation for a firm and lasting peace has been given every opportunity to succeed.

These were the most important arguments advanced against the conducting of the tests at the present time, but the admiral in his article in Collier's does not give those reasons the slightest consideration.

The admiral also makes this statement:

"We had so much difficulty in getting the obsolete types authorized we hesitated at asking for new construction."

Mr. President, I rise to inquire of the admiral here on the floor of the Senate, not having ready access to the columns of Collier's, when and by whom were these obsolete types authorized for destruction? It is my understanding that they can only be authorized by the action of both Houses of the Congress. Up to this moment they have not been authorized. Until there exists joint congressional authorization for a military spectacle of this colossal magnitude, the admiral should have thought twice before he published such an article. It seems to me that altogether too much has been taken for granted in the process of preparing for these tests.

Why should not the question of the authorization of these vessels for such an experiment have been brought before the Senate when such tests were first proposed? Why should not the necessity or desirability for the future use of atom bombs not have been fully debated and discussed here at the very outset of such a venture? Would it not have been much more in keeping with the proper determination of what we are asked to do, to have asked that we pass calmly and deliberately upon the question, before millions of dollars were spent and the stage all set for what may prove to be the very beginning of an armaments race for a disastrous atomic war?

Mr. President, today for the first time the resolution comes before the Senate of the United States for its approval or disapproval, and the Senate is asked to act as a rubber stamp in placing its approval on this mighty atomic bomb show which, as I see it, is in full discord with our every plea for the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and especially with the pleas which were made on the floor of the Senate on June 1, about 2 weeks ago, when the bill for the development and control of atomic energy was passed without a dissenting vote.

On June 14, that is, today, the United States is scheduled to make proposals to the Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations. These proposals should be sufficiently enlightening and comprehensive to point the way to an atomic age that will utilize this energy for the benefit of mankind and not its destruction.

Mr. President, the position which America should take in its proposal to the Commission was well expressed by the able senior Senator from Michigan on June 1, when he said:

> I express only the prayer and hope that the success which we have had in thus meeting the domestic problem may soon be paralleled in the larger area where, under the auspices of the United Nations, we must find an international formula for the international control of atomic energy on a basis which will effectively prohibit the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes anywhere in the world, and which will dependably police such situation against anyone who exercises bad faith. Except as we can move from this unanimous action to the larger unanimous action in the world itself, we shall hereafter confront the kind of destruction which may involve a war which will last minutes instead of months, and in which the first casualty list will be the last.

It does not appear logical to assume that the proper approach to the "larger unanimous action" in the world itself lies in the dangerous field of our continued detonation of atomic bombs which we alone, at this time, possess. Common sense, under present conditions, would seem to dictate modest forbearance rather than bombastic action.

If this joint resolution should be here approved, let us consider the disadvantage in which the Senate is going to place our representatives on the Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations. How can we successfully lead the way in demanding the use of atomic energy for peaceful pursuits alone, and against its use for destructive purposes, if we as a nation are simultaneously employing it in martial maneuvers, even though in the guise of determining how we may best defend against it upon the sea?

Our actions, Mr. President, simply are not squaring up with our professed intentions. We cannot escape the accusation that we are performing in a manner most unbecoming and hypocritical. I for one do not propose by my vote to place America in such an unenviable position.

What is the position of scientists generally in this matter? On May 26, the Federation of American Scientists made public comment on the Bikini Atoll tests. They stated categorically that scientists are not professionally interested in these tests to learn more about the potentialities of atomic energy; that the tests are purely military, not scientific. In unequivocal language they state, "Scientists expect nothing of scientific value, and little of technical value to peacetime uses of atomic energy, as a result of these tests."

It is well known that the atomic bomb is a military weapon and these tests are based upon one idea, and that is the world may have an atomic war in which navies must try desperately to survive, defend their countries and carry the attack to the enemy.

The scientists say that they seek by education to teach mankind that it must abandon atomic weapons in order to preserve civilization. Their greatest fear right now is that it may require an atomic war to teach this lesson to a few survivors.

Scientists say that they are cooperating in these tests at the request of the armed forces of the United States, although they do so reluctantly and without enthusiasm.

The statement of the scientists relative to the proposed tests is based on a special report made by the men who developed the bomb, and first made tests at Alamogordo, N. Mex., and who are working on current tests.

It is the consensus of these well-informed men that the number of ships destroyed in the proposed Bikini tests will not be the best standard for judging the effect of the bomb. The area of damage affected by a bomb on brick or steel and concrete structures is about 10 square miles, and total destruction extends for a radius of about a mile. Assuming that there will be approximately 80 assorted target ships spread over a radius of miles, the scientists say, the majority will not be damaged to any extent. This, of course, will depend upon the space of deployment and distance from the center of the bomb explosion. There is no doubt, however, in the mind of any informed person that a direct hit or a near miss by an atom bomb will destroy any vessel ever constructed.

Poorly constructed houses 3 miles from the blast were destroyed at Hiroshima and Nagasaki but it is estimated that battleships are more than 50 times as strong as Japanese houses. Scientists predict that ships closer than one-half mile will be damaged but only those closest to the point of detonation will be sunk. It is therefore pointed out in advance that reasonable men should discount probable reports that the fleet survived the tests or that only one ship was sunk. And it must not be assumed that any conclusions may be drawn from this as to what damage a bomb would do to an American city because cities are not built like battleships, and houses cannot be readily deployed.

Mr. President, at best these tests will give us only a transient idea of destruction or defense. We are living in a scientific world of unpredictable developments and the effect of atomic bombs used today can present only an inadequate picture of what the more powerful bombs of the future have in store. We may as a result of this test proceed to attempt to build battleships and submarines and other vessels that may be just as inadequate against the bombs of the future, by the time they have to be used, if they ever have to be used—and God forbid that they must be used—as are the ships of the present time against the present bomb.

The cost of a modern battleship is approximately $100,000,000, and the cost of a destroyer is about $20,000,000. It is reported on good authority that an atomic bomb can now be produced for about $1,000,000. It takes much more time to produce a vessel than an atomic bomb. These data prove to us conclusively that a nation can afford to use atomic bombs to sink important naval vessels when relative costs are compared. We are already convinced that one atomic bomb can destroy one naval vessel, battleship or otherwise, and a direct hit is not required to accomplish that result, nor is a test in the Pacific Ocean required to prove to us the facts. But atomic bombs are expensive, even if they cost only a million dollars apiece, and no naval or military strategist is ever going to expend one atomic bomb on every naval vessel of a properly deployed fleet. If block busters or torpedoes can accomplish the work just as well on a single vessel, of which there is no doubt, they will be employed, and no Bikini test is required to demonstrate that fact.

As has been suggested by the scientists, atomic bombs will not be employed against a far-flung fleet to destroy each deployed vessel when one square mile of a city, representing $500,000,000, or five times the cost of one battleship, can be destroyed atomically at a single blast. We do not need to hold tests in the Pacific Ocean or elsewhere to convince us of that fact.

In future wars guided missiles in the form of robombs with atomic warheads, traveling 100,000 miles an hour, will arch through the stratosphere so far above even our Air Forces that they will be beyond the reach of any kind of radar detection and defense. Since there is no foreseeable defense whatever against such an attack in future wars, the proposed Bikini tests pale into insignificance. As a matter of fact, defense against atomic weapons of the future appears so futile that these experiments which even contemplate atomic war are sheer madness.

In addition to all this it is well known from the bombs already dropped that radiation and incendiary effects will produce untold and unforeseeable damage. The Federation of American Scientists state that a breeze containing radioactive particles, blown for miles and undissipated by the processes of nature, might conceivably result in the death of many, many people miles away from the bombing. These are only a few of the horrors that would accompany atomic warfare. I need not dwell at length upon these horrors of future warfare because they are well known to all those who read, all those who listen to the radio.

But laying aside all the consideration of the ill effects of these naval atomic bomb tests on the future peace of the world, it occurs to me from the facts and figures which are offered by the scientists that their statement is sound and unassailable when they say that under no circumstances are the Bikini tests at this time worth the cost.

Mr. President, the only extremes that could possibly justify this Roman holiday in the Pacific are two, namely, that a future war is inevitable and that scientific progress will not greatly improve the destructive weapons to be tried out before such a conflict arrives. The first premise we hope to make wholly false through the United Nations Organization, and the latter, that destructive weapons will not be improved, we well know to be untrue.

From the very beginning it has been my position that the United States, together with Canada and Great Britain, should maintain the secret of the atomic bomb, at least until it has been demonstrated that human nature in some of the other nations of the world has taken a turn for the better. I have never believed that we could keep the secret indefinitely. Scientists have convinced me that what we have discovered about the use of atomic energy as an explosive can be worked out by other nations, since the principle is generally understood by some scientists in every major nation in the world. This doubtless means that we will not be able to keep the secret for any great length of time. But since that is the case, and in view of the fact that at the present time we are still attempting to secure world tranquillity by means of the United Nations, I feel that it is a vital mistake to take any step that may in any way give further knowledge of atomic destruction to any potential aggressor.

There is another very impelling reason why the Senate should not place its approval upon these experiments by authorizing these target ships. Other nations of the world are going to glean almost all the information developed, and some of them have been invited to witness the event. It might not have been objectionable to have invited the other nations to witness this spectacle if America were an aggressor nation. But America has never been an aggressor, and she is not likely to become one within the foreseeable future. By these tests we are simply educating would-be aggressors in atomic warfare, just as surely as the sun will rise tomorrow. The awful danger lies in the fact that a tremendous, and perhaps fatal, advantage will lie with the aggressor in the war of the future. It is altogether possible that an attacked nation in the days to come will be defeated before its planes can leave its borders, regardless of its area. This consideration alone is a sufficient reason for the Senate to refuse to lend its assistance to such experiments so long as universal understanding is a possibility.

Our use of an atomic weapon, either to discover what devastating effect it will have upon the enemy, or how we may best defend against it on the water cannot help but stand as a definite admission to the other nations of the world that we have little faith in the success of the United Nations Organization. That organization is dedicated to the purpose of assuring nations that they can work out their problems and differences without resort to war. Instead of staging the most stupendous spectacle in all history, our untiring energy should be earnestly devoted at this time to the ideal of world cooperation and perpetual peace and not a demonstration of atomic weapons.

Mr. President, since there is admittedly no real defense against atomic bombs there should be no further employment of them unless and until collective security has failed. But we must not let collective security fail; it is the one hope of the world in an atomic age. We must do everything we can to strengthen and improve the United Nations Organization and if it cannot succeed, let the blame for that catastrophe rest upon some other nation than the United States.

Should our efforts for international cooperation and a successful United Nations fail I am for thorough military preparation but God forbid we may ever see the necessity for such a course.

Mr. President, the possibilities of wars of the future are simply too dreadful to contemplate and are unthinkable. In spite of this we are asked today to approve a joint resolution which may be the prelude to an atomic armaments race. The consequences could well be far-reaching, far beyond our imagination, because an armaments race means war—war means atomic bombs—and atomic bombs mean the destruction of civilization.

It matters much less what would happen on the ocean than what would be the results upon the land in an atomic war. It is the devastation of cities that we have most to fear. In a future war the important cities of every country involved would be completely annihilated. This Nation is indulging in criminal curiosity in staging this "most stupendous miltary experiment in history" at Bikini at a time when every precaution should be taken to confine the use of atomic energy to peaceful pursuits and those pursuits alone.

Mr. President, it staggers common sense to maintain that the peace and safety of the world is being promoted by the continued use of atomic explosives for military purposes.

The warning for mankind was flashed to the world from Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Further demonstrations of destructive might are superfluous. No results at a barren reef in the Pacific, where we are asked to authorize the use of these vessels, can possibly be as impressive as were the two blasts in Japan under war conditions.

The only important impression these tests are going to give the world is that the United States is not done with war. What more logical conclusion can be drawn from a gaudy show that is advertised and headlined as the "most stupendous military spectacle in history."

Mr. President, the polestar course for America lies implicit in the Oppenheimer-Lilienthal Report to our Department of State which clearly warns that the job for all nations is to protect us from atomic destruction and give us instead the blessings of atomic power.

The Senate, in the interest of international understanding and cooperation, should refuse to authorize the use of these ships for atomic bomb targets at Bikini in the Pacific.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I realize how useless and futile it may be for me to oppose the joint resolution now pending before the Senate. However, I wish to take this opportunity sincerely to congratulate the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN] upon the presentation which he has made before the Senate against holding the proposed atomic test in the Pacific.

I think I should preface my remarks upon this subject by saying that previous to Pearl Harbor, and for some time after Pearl Harbor, the Senator from Illinois was a member of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs. During those hectic and trying days before Pearl Harbor I never hesitated to give to the Navy of the United States whatever it requested in the way of naval equipment, in order to give to this country an adequate security and an adequate national defense After Pearl Harbor my position remained the same. The Navy seldom asked me where I stood, because it knew in advance my interest in national defense.

I suppose some may say that it is presumptuous for a United States Senator even to question those high in the Naval Establishment at this time with respect to holding this test; but, Mr. President, sometimes intuitive judgment is better than the determination of individuals who set out upon a course and are bound and determined to go through with a test of this kind, whether or no.

I cannot relate to the Senate the name of the individual who is high in the naval life of this Nation, who told me not more than 40 days ago that test No. 1 and test No. 2 are absolutely useless at this particular time in the history of world affairs. A cogent and potent argument exists and can be made for test No. 3, but test No. 3 will not come until some time next year.

Mr. President, it is especially annoying to me to find that at this very moment we are sending our ships to this island in the Pacific Ocean for this test, when I pick up the Evening Star for today and learn what Mr. Bernard Baruch said earlier today to the Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations Organization. Mr. President, this test is not as important as it was when it was first being planned. In the beginning, when the Navy felt that everyone was in favor of having the test made, the Navy set out to send an armada of approximately 96 ships, as I recall, to the island, to be used for the test. Because a few Members of the Senate and some editorial writers and commentators throughout the country wondered why the test was to be carried on, a change was made. I understand from the report of the Naval Affairs Committee that only 33 ships are to be used. Other reasons are given for the decrease from 96 to 33 ships; but in the opinion of the Senator from Illinois the reason the decrease was made in the number of

vessels was to make sure that the test would not fail. If the Navy had had its way from the beginning, it would really have had a naval display which would have been worth while from the standpoint of the Navy.

Mr. President, that is all the first two tests will be, namely, a real naval display in the Pacific, but not an experiment which in my opinion will be worth very much as compared to the cost in dollars and as compared to what it will cost us in terms of our relations with the rest of the world.

I desire to prove my point by referring to the speech which was made this morning by Mr. Bernard Baruch. The Evening Star has this to say about that speech:

UNITED STATES URGES WORLD ATOM AGENCY; OFFERS TO SCRAP BOMBS ON HAND AND CEASE MANUFACTURING THEM—BARUCH PRESENTS PLAN TO ALLIED COMMISSION

NEW YORK, June 14.—The United States today proposed to the world the creation of an international atomic-development authority to handle atomic energy and agreed to destroy its own store of atom bombs and cease manufacturing them if an adequate control system is set up.

The United States made it crystal clear that there must be no veto power in any part of the framework it was proposing for the development and peaceful use of atomic energy.

It called for renunciation of the atom bomb as an instrument of warfare and for a world-security program "not composed merely of pious thoughts but of enforceable sanctions—and international law with teeth in it."

Mr. President, how can Mr. Baruch make any progress before that Commission at this particular time, when every other nation in the world knows that our ships are now on their way to the center of the Pacific Ocean for this test?

I read further from the article in the Evening Star:

BARUCH REVEALS UNITED STATES PROPOSALS

Bernard M. Baruch, 75-year-old financier who played a leading role in this country's victories in both world wars, laid the United States' atomic cards on the table at the first meeting of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, on which he is the United States representative.

He lost no time in getting down to business. Addressing himself to "My fellow citizens of the world," Mr. Baruch said the United States "proposes the creation of an international atomic-development authority to which should be intrusted all phases of the development and use of atomic energy. * * *"

"When an adequate system for control of atomic energy, including the renunciation of the bomb as a weapon, has been agreed upon and put into effective operation and condign (suitable) punishments set up for the violations of the rules of control which are to be stigmatized as international crimes," Mr. Baruch said, "we propose that:

"1. Manufacture of atomic bombs shall stop;

"2. Existing bombs shall be disposed of pursuant to the terms of the treaty; and

"3. The authority shall be in possession of full information as to the know-how for the production of atomic energy."

Those are the three principal proposals which have been made by Mr. Baruch on this very day before the Atomic Energy Commission, set up by the United Nations Organization, for the purpose of outlawing mankind's most deadly weapon, the most deadly weapon which has ever been seen on the face of the earth.

Mr. President, I maintain that the making of this test at this particular time will strike a hard blow at what Barney Baruch and the Atomic Energy Commission are attempting to accomplish. It will be a difficult task for Mr. Baruch to convince other world powers of our good faith on the three propositions to which I have referred, which have been laid down by Mr. Baruch, when they observe that we are carrying on this awful, destructive test in the Pacific. If the United States wishes to strengthen Mr. Baruch's hand at this moment, if the United States wishes to show the world that we mean business in the renunciation of the atom bomb as an instrument of warfare, we should even now call off this test, or at least it should be delayed until we can see what constructive results can come from the noble and wonderful proposal which has been made by this great man, Bernard Baruch. Mr. President, in 3 or 4 months perhaps this Commission may come forward with a solution of a problem of how to make atomic energy safe from the standpoint of war. Surely 3 or 4 months' delay in this experiment would not impair our security. But if we were to delay at this moment, if the President of the United States, in view of the statement which has been made by Bernard Baruch, were to call off the test for the time being, I am certain that Mr. Baruch's hand would be strengthened in attempting to carry out the noble objective as set forth in his admirable declaration to outlaw atomic energy as a war weapon.

Mr. President, in my opinion this test will only increase world-wide apprehension. It will do nothing toward gaining world peace, and in my judgment a delay of the test will not one whit weaken our security or our national defense. The proposed test will be more of a naval display than an experiment; at least, I so conclude insofar as the first two tests are concerned. It is sheer fantasy to go through with this test under present world conditions.

Mr. President, what do we gain by going through with this experiment in the Pacific? What is there to be gained? When we read the report of the Naval Affairs Committee we learn that it is anticipated that some technical advantages are to be obtained, and it is contended that certain things must be learned from the test if we are to prepare ourselves properly in the future. Mr. President, certainly I do not want this country to be unprepared. But regardless of any preparedness which we may make, unless the world controls atomic energy from the standpoint of war, civilization is doomed. Civilization will decline and ultimately will fall. Every gesture which this country can make toward outlawry of the bomb for the purposes of waging war, should be made. In other words, we should be looking in the direction of New York where Bernard Baruch is now bending all his efforts to outlaw the bomb, instead of looking toward the Pacific atoll.

When we make the test, assuming that it will be a complete success, what will we then do? Suppose when the test is made we destroy all 33 ships with one bomb, whether it explodes at the water's surface, or explodes 300 or 400 feet above the water. We tell the world that, from the standpoint of the atomic bomb, our present-day Navy is useless.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, we may tell the world that our present-day Navy is useless, but we also tell ourselves that it is useless. I understand that a $5,000,000,000 naval appropriation bill will be brought before the Senate next week.

Mr. LUCAS. For what purpose?

Mr. McMAHON. For a complement of 500,000 men. Five billion dollars is a lot of money. I think there is a great desire on the part of the Navy to know whether the establishment which it is proposed to maintain during the next fiscal year, will be worth maintaining. That is the basic purpose of the test, as I see it.

I may say to the Senator, if he will indulge me further, that I am compelled to leave shortly in order to fill a long-time engagement at 3 o'clock. I wish to add, however, that I am in thorough sympathy with the Senator's estimate of the situation in New York and within the United Nations Organization. No one is more thoroughly convinced than I am that it is in the deliberations of that organization that we must look for permanent peace, even more so than in the meeting of the foreign ministers which is about to take place at Paris. I thoroughly subscribe to the statement which the Senator has made with regard to those negotiations. Everything this Nation has done since we came into possession of atomic energy is an indication to the world that we mean to do the right thing with regard to atomic energy. It was this country which called the conference on atomic energy. It is this country which appointed a commission to study ways and means of controlling atomic energy.

I might say, Mr. President, that on August 21 last year, in an address which I made in New Haven, Conn., I called for a test on what then remained of the Japanese fleet. It never occurred to me that our Navy would contribute 75 or 80 other ships for use in that test. However, I am not a Navy man, and I do not want to say or do anything which will prevent a proper test being made.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator need not worry about the test. It will be a proper one.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not believe that any nation will be in position to say that when we test our own ships we are putting on a demonstration to scare anyone. After all, the demonstration of the use of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki has not been without value. The nations of the earth saw the results of the use of those bombs, and they will enter into agreements because they appreciate the situation, or they will not be influenced by what takes place at Bikini.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator does not believe then that the test in the Pacific will affect the New York situation whatever?

Mr. McMAHON. I do not know. All I say is that logically it should not.

Mr. LUCAS. Logically it should not, but the great difficulty with the Senator from Connecticut is that he would want the Senate of the United States and the people of the United States to understand that the peoples of the world understand us as we understand ourselves. The peoples of the world do not understand us any more than we understand the people of some other countries. When the ordinary citizen of a foreign country sees what is taking place in this country, he cannot help but believe that this country, as the result of the test, believes that another war is in the making.

The Senator has referred to a $5,000,000,000 appropriation bill for the Navy. Such a bill would be another indication to the ordinary citizen of the world that we are perhaps doing more than merely getting ready for peace. I am talking about the attitude and conclusions of other peoples of the world, but under no circumstances can we place ourselves in the position of the other fellow any more than he can place himself in our position here.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. President, I ask the able Senator from Connecticut whether or not he believes that there is any question concerning the ability of an atomic bomb to sink a battleship?

Mr. McMAHON. From everything I have heard, and tried to learn, there is no question in my mind that if a direct hit or a near miss takes place, the battleship concerned will go up in smoke. There just will be no battleship left.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Then, I ask the Senator, What is the defense, in his opinion, against an atomic bomb which is being used in an attack upon a fleet?

Mr. McMAHON. I would be better pleased if the third test were to come first. I agree with the Senator and the scientists that the third test will be the most effective of the three.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I concur in the Senator's statement.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator concurs in what I say. Regardless of what the Senator and I believe with reference to the destructive potentialities of the bomb in an attack on battleships, I am sure that the Senator would not stand on this floor and attempt to reduce the requested $5,000,000,000 appropriation unless an actual concrete test of the bomb had been made. However, I will say to the Senator that next week, when the Navy appropriation bill comes before the Senate, I shall, perhaps, have something to say about it because I think that the appropriation is too large. However, I am sure that the Senator from Ohio will not have an effective answer, in the absence of an actual test, regardless of what he and I believe.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Does the Senator believe that after an actual test has taken place we shall be in any better position to answer the question than we are now? What difference will the test make, in the Senator's opinion, with reference to the design and type of ships which it would then be necessary to construct?

Mr. McMAHON. If the tests demonstrate the utter futility of building battleships, and we proceed to appropriate money to maintain present ships and build additional ones, we will be the greatest collection of morons that ever sat in this Chamber. I cannot imagine anything like that being done.

Mr. HUFFMAN. It is my opinion that the facts and figures are sufficient to demonstrate the futility of attempting to defend against the bomb upon the surface of the water against ships which try to proceed in fleets and are not properly deployed. However, I will admit that the facts and figures are not sufficiently present in the form of scientific data, or in the Army files, to show what might be the effect of an explosion of a bomb under the surface of the water.

Mr. McMAHON. In other words, the Senator is saying that he is not prepared to cut the cloth for the future until he has had a practical demonstration of what the scientists and the engineers have told us.

Mr. HUFFMAN. That is true only with respect to undersea explosions. It is my position that the greatest harm which could come to this country and to civilization generally would be in the use of the bomb at this time for any military purpose, or for any purpose which would indicate that it might be used at any time for destructive purposes. It is my belief that all our energies at the present time should be devoted to preventing the use of the atomic bomb as a means of destruction.

Mr. McMAHON. I will have to leave shortly if I keep my engagement, but I wish to reiterate that I cannot see how the holding of these tests could prejudice the negotiations which are taking place in New York. If I believed otherwise, I would be opposed to holding any tests whatever. In my opinion, unless we are successful in New York in reaching agreements regarding the effective control of atomic energy and the use of atomic bombs, we will be in a very desperate situation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator does not believe that the New York situation will be aided in any way, does he, by holding the atomic bomb tests?

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator that I cannot see why the test should prejudice in any way the New York situation, because in everything we have done since we dropped the bomb on Japan, we have evidenced our good will, our good intentions, and the fact that our efforts will be devoted to turning atomic energy into peaceful pursuits.

Mr. HUFFMAN. How can we expect to strengthen the hands of our representatives on the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, by using the bomb for destructive purposes, at the very time we are asking them to tell the other representatives on the Commission that we desire to use atomic energy only for peaceful pursuits?

Mr. McMAHON. We are using the bomb on our own property, in waters which are controlled by this Government. We do not threaten to hurl the bomb at the property of any other nation. If we had not taken the steps we have taken looking toward international control, then I say to the Senator this action might be misinterpreted, but I do not see how any national thinking person could conclude that because we are testing our own bomb on our own battleships, we are deviating from our peaceful purposes. They know it is costing $5,000,000,000 to operate our Navy.

Mr. HUFFMAN. We are not attacking any other nation, but we are attacking peace itself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the great trouble with the argument of the Senator from Connecticut is that he assumes, as I said before, that everybody in this world thinks of America as we think about ourselves. From what has happened in the various meetings of the members of the United Nations Organization, and from what the newspapers of the country and some men high in political life have charged, many Americans believe, that Russia has been double-talking and double-dealing But does anyone think that the people of Russia do not believe that the Russians are pursuing the course that is best for their own nation? Of course the average Russian citizen thinks that.

When the Senator from Connecticut says that this test in the Pacific is one conducive to peaceful relations with the rest of the world simply because the peoples of the world know that we have been out in front in trying to do something to control the bomb, I cannot agree with him. On the one hand, while our representative, Mr. Baruch, is in New York trying to do something extraordinarily constructive and humanitarian, at the same time we are holding this devastating test in the middle of the Pacific. If the Senator believes the leaders of certain respective countries of the world will not tell their people we are not acting in good faith, then I think he does not understand nationalistic trends and tendencies.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. As I gather, then, the Senator is afraid that the world might misinterpret the reason for making the test. However, I do not understand the Senator to say that he misinterprets the reason for making the test.

Mr. LUCAS. If the world misinterprets the reason for making the test at the very time we are trying to bring about control of atomic energy in order to outlaw war, then that does injure and impair the national security and safety.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to get an answer from the Senator. He personally does not misinterpret, does he, the reason why we are conducting these tests?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not misinterpret anything. As I said in the beginning, I think it is a useless and futile test, and, from the standpoint of world security, is injuring our national defense rather than helping it. That is my

point. I believe I understand something about human nature throughout the world.

I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that if the situation were reversed, if the United States had a land army of ten or twelve million soldiers, but did not have much of an air force, and had no navy at all, and Russia had a navy and had control of atomic power, and at this very moment Russia were in the Aleutians, conducting such a test as we are about to conduct in the Pacific, I am sure the Senator from Connecticut would be here doing a little talking about Russia holding such an experiment in our backyard, and wondering why Russia was doing it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If, on top of that possibility in the Aleutian Islands, or at any other place, Russia were attempting to work out an understanding with us for the control of atomic energy, would the Senator still be of the same opinion?

Mr. LUCAS. Considering the feeling some Senators have and the feeling entertained by many American citizens toward Russia's good faith, I think the Senator from Colorado would not approve anything Russia might do so far as our own security was concerned. I say that in the best of spirit. I am merely saying that the American people, in my judgment, do not understand the Russian people, any more than the Russian people understand us, and I undertake to say that if the situation were reversed and Russia were carrying on such tests in the Aleutian Islands at this time, the people of this country, in view of their lack of faith in Russia, would have an overwhelming fear of what might happen.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator mean to insinuate that Russia is not justified in having any faith in our good intentions?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not mean to insinuate that at all. We do not have any great faith in their intentions; at least that is what I gather from some of the debates on the floor of the Senate and from what I read in some of the editorials and some of the comments made. Perhaps they are justified; I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Who has been making such arguments?

Mr. LUCAS. Such arguments have been made. I have heard some such speeches against Russia made on the floor of the Senate, and so has the Senator; that is the privilege of any Senator. Let it be understood I am not defending Russia; I am an American. But I again say that if the situation were reversed, if Russia had control of the atomic power of the world, if she had the Navy we have at the present time, and were holding tests in the Pacific at this particular moment, there would be much fear and much talk around this country as to why Russia was doing it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I share very much the Senator's idea that we should not take provocative action regarding Russia. On the other hand, I think he would also agree, as a long and earnest advocate of our being adequately prepared, that we do have a right, as George Washington said a long time ago, to maintain a posture of defense, and keep our powder dry. I have felt that this activity came probably within that category, and I certainly hope our Russian friends will not feel we are preparing this thing for them. It certainly is not in the thought of those of us who are members of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for his contribution, and I do not differ with him altogether in his statement. I do not think the Senator was present when I began my speech. I stated that Barney Baruch had just issued a statement which every Senator should read. He made a powerful and far-reaching plea before the Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations Organization for the control of atomic energy.

My thought is, and I say it in all sincerity to the Senator from Maine, that we can help Barney Baruch's hand as he sits there day after day during the next 3 or 4 months by delaying this test. I may be wrong about it, but that is my honest belief. On the one hand, we are talking about control of atomic power to the end that we shall not, through it, have war, and at the same time we are moving in the Pacific to hold this test to determine what greater atomic power and more and larger bombs will do to battleships.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does not the Senator think it may be a little persuasive?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think so. It may be, and I hope the Senator is correct; but I believe that if the President of the United States at this hour should say, as the result of what Barney Baruch has stated, "I am going to delay this test for another 3 months, or 4 months, or even 6 months, to see whether there is not a great opportunity for the members of the Atomic Energy Commission to work this matter out," I honestly believe it would strengthen Mr. Baruch's hand, and would again show the world our good faith in trying to lay down international rules which would definitely control atomic energy as it applies to war.

Mr. BREWSTER. What would the Senator feel as to the old philosophy of "Speak softly and carry a big stick"?

Mr. LUCAS. We have done that right along.

Mr. BREWSTER. No; we have not; we have not had the big stick. That has been the trouble.

Mr. LUCAS. We have gotten along pretty well.

Mr. BREWSTER. We have had a couple of wars, have we not?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; but we got through them pretty well, even though we made many mistakes before we became involved.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator pardon me while I make a unanimous-consent request to be excused from attendance?

Mr. LUCAS. I will yield for that purpose, although I might be inclined to object.

Mr. McMAHON. I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow. I make the request particularly in view of the fact that I have to leave before this debate is concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is excused.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would not think this test would show the very devastating power of the atomic bomb on ships, or on naval armaments, and that that would be all the more reason for doing what Baruch has suggested? Would not that uphold his hand?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may be right, assuming his premise to be correct, but, assuming the test is a fizzle, assuming it is a dud, then what are the other countries going to say? They are going to say that the stories about Nagasaki and Hiroshima were exaggerated. That would be their conclusion. In other words, it does not make any difference whether we destroy the ships or do not. As I see it, in the final analysis, we lose as the result of this test, from the standpoint of world security.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that, of course, he must realize that the test in the Pacific which is about to take place—and ships are going out there and scientists and others are on their way—is only a culminating test. Other tests have been had. It is pretty well known—not in detail, but pretty well—what this test in the Pacific will do. I do not think the test will turn out to be a fizzle. As a matter of fact, it will be just the reverse. Their problem is to hold this force down, rather than to worry about any fizzle. We might show the rest of the world, as I hope we will, when we work this thing out, as Mr. Baruch is trying to work it out in his way, what a terrifying thing the atomic bomb is. Then I think we will reach the point where we accomplish the very thing the Senator from Illinois wants to accomplish. I do not see how we can talk about the atomic bomb with other nations, or with our own people, or determine a policy with respect to it, unless we know exactly what it can do and will do insofar as naval warfare is concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know why our Army and Navy men want any more demonstrations of what an atomic bomb will do, after what was done to Nagasaki and Hiroshima. That would seem to me to be very convincing that there is enough power in that bomb to cause great destruction. I only make the countersuggestion because it is apparent that they do not know what it is going to do to capital ships, or they would not conduct the test in the Pacific.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We do not exactly know what the test is going to bring out, but this thing gets down to an exact science. Those conducting the tests want to know the exact effect on the armor of ships, they want to know the

exact effect on the navigation of a ship many miles away when a bomb explodes, and, above all, my information is that they want to find out the effect of the so-called gamma and radio waves in water. That is something we do not quite know yet.

Mr. LUCAS. They can find that out without sinking a battleship.

Mr. MAGNUSON. These ships are all going to be declared surplus.

Mr. LUCAS. That is not the point. They can find that out without sinking a battleship.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not on any great scale.

Mr. LUCAS. I only reiterate the point I made, that in the event they do not succeed in doing what they contemplate with respect to sinking these battleships, the world is going to know that, too, and the world will see that atomic power is greatly overrated and exaggerated, and that we did not succeed in doing what we reported was done at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have got to try it some time, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know whether we do or not. That is the point I am making. I hope we may never have to try it, and that is why Mr. Baruch is in New York at this particular time, hoping that we may never have to try one of these bombs again. If we do have to do so in war, God help us all.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The tests will also, of course, bring out a great deal of information as to the peacetime uses of atomic energy.

Mr. LUCAS. This is not a peacetime test, Mr. President. This is a Navy test to find out just what we can do with this bomb in case we need it in the future, and we are not the only ones who are fooling around with atomic power. There are other nations who have scientists in their laboratories. They are working on the project day and night. The only thing I am hoping is that Mr. Baruch will be able to reach his high and noble purpose and I contend we ought to give him all the help possible. One way we can give him help, strengthen his hands, and show members of the Atomic Commission of the United Nations Organization that we are not interested in developing more and bigger bombs, is to call a halt to this test at Bikini. What disadvantage would result from delaying the test another 3 or 4 or 5 months to see what may happen in New York?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have not had the advantage of reading the statement of Mr. Baruch. I wonder if in his statement he said anything about the test that is to be made.

Mr. LUCAS. No; he did not.

Mr. MURDOCK. Would it be unreasonable to assume that he knows that the test is contemplated, that it is going to be made, and that if he had felt at all that the test would detract in any way from what he is doing in the United Nations organization that he would have had something to say about it himself?

Mr. LUCAS. There may be something in what the able Senator from Utah says. On the other hand, Bernard Baruch is in a very peculiar position. Even if Bernard Baruch felt the way that I do about the situation, I doubt that he would at this particular time dare suggest a different policy for the Navy. He is in one category of Government, and the officials engaged in this test are in another category. He also knows that those who have already decided to make the test are now on their way to make it. But the fact that Mr. Baruch did not say anything one way or the other about it does not mean that he does not have an opinion respecting it. In other words, he could have said also that he thought this test was proper, but he did not.

Some time ago in a speech I made on the floor of the Senate I raised the same point, that with the commission which called a meeting at which to make a determination on this question, was where the power lay really to take care of atomic power, and that we should do nothing which would in any way militate against the successful functioning of that commission when it finally met. I may be wrong about this matter, but I do believe the Pacific experiment impairs the efficacy of our position in this all-important meeting.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the statement the Senator now makes is certainly a statement that no one could disagree with, that this country could certainly do nothing to impede or interfere with what is happening at the United Nations Commission meeting. Knowing Mr. Baruch as I do, knowing him to be a man who usually says exactly what he believes, I rather assume, inasmuch as he has not mentioned this test, that he does not have any objection to it. But I agree with the Senator from Illinois that his silence could certainly be construed in the other way.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I doubt the propriety of Mr. Baruch getting into this matter and I think that is the position he would by necessity be compelled to take.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House Joint Resolution 307 is still before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. WALSH. If a yea-and-nay vote is to be taken, I believe I should suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. The yeas and nays have not been asked for.

Mr. WALSH. I understand there is no request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF RACES INDIGENOUS TO INDIA AND NATURALIZATION OF FILIPINOS

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, a little while ago on the call of the calendar the Senate passed two immigration bills extending to the Filipinos and to East Indians the same quotas that we extended to the Chinese in 1943. After those bills had been passed I was informed by the clerk of the Committee on Immigration that, since both of them amended the same section of the Nationality Act, and we made no amendments in the House bills, whichever one the President signs last would automatically repeal the other one. It therefore is necessary, in order to straighten out this angle, to reconsider the vote by which both bills were passed, to amend one of them so as to combine the two, and then send them to the House for concurrence.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the votes whereby House bill 3517 and House bill 776 were passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and the votes whereby the bills were passed are reconsidered.

Mr. BALL. I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the Senate proceed to consider the bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BALL. I move to amend the bill on page 2, line 2, by inserting before the semicolon a comma and the words "and Filipino persons or persons of Filipino descent."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. On the same page of House bill 3517, page 2, in lines 15, 16, and 17, I move to amend the bill by striking out the words "native-born Filipinos having the honorable service in the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard as specified in section 324, nor of."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Then between lines 19 and 20, on page 2 of the bill, I move to insert two new sections, which are sections 2 and 3 of House bill 776, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1137; 8 U. S. C. 907) is hereby amended by adding a new section, to be known as "Sec. 321A." and to read as follows:

"SEC. 321A. Certificates of arrival or declarations of intention shall not be required of Filipino persons or persons of Filipino descent who are citizens of the Commonwealth of the Philippines on the date of the enactment of this section, and who entered the United States prior to May 1, 1934, and have since continuously resided in the United States. The term 'Filipino persons or persons of Filipino descent' as used in this act shall mean persons of a race indigenous to the Philippine Islands and shall not include persons who are of as much as one-half of a race ineligible to citizenship."

SEC. 3. Section 324 (a) (54 Stat. 1149, 8 U. S. C. 724) of such act, as amended is amended by striking out after the word "person" the words "including a native-born Filipino."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BALL. It then becomes necessary to renumber the sections; section 2 on page 2 becomes section 4, and section 3 on page 3 becomes section 5, and in line 7 on page 3, after the word "section" it is necessary to change the "2" to "4." I ask that the sections be numbered accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the sections will be renumbered.

Mr. BALL. Then I ask that the title be amended so as to read "To authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, and persons indigenous to the Philippine Islands, and make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the title will be amended accordingly.

EMPLOYMENT BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION OF RETIRED OFFICERS WITHOUT AFFECTING THEIR RETIRED STATUS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, when the calendar was called, at my request, Calendar No. 1442, House bill 5626, was passed over, and I stated at the time that it was desired by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and other Senators to add an amendment to the bill. In its present form and as it came from the House, I am sure that there can be no objection whatever to that. I should be very glad to explain the bill, but I doubt that an explanation is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5626) to authorize the Veterans' Administration to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

INCREASE IN CERTAIN SOCIAL SECURITY PAYMENTS

SEC. —. (a) In order to provide for an increase of $5 per month in the Federal share of old-age assistance payments made under the Social Security Act, section 3 (a) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That for each month during the period beginning July 1, 1946, and ending June 30, 1949, the amount otherwise paid to any State shall be increased by $5 for each individual receiving old-age assistance under the State plan for such month, but only if the State's share of the average old-age assistance payment under the State plan for such month is at least $20, or is at least as large as the State's share of the average old-age assistance payment under such plan for the month of May 1946."

(b) Section 3 (b) (1) of such act is amended by striking out "one-half of the total sum" and inserting in lieu thereof "the total sum of the non-Federal share."

(c) In order to provide for an increase of $3 per month in the Federal share of payments for aid to dependent children made under the Social Security Act, section 403 (a) of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That for each month during the period beginning July 1, 1946, and ending June 30, 1949, the amount otherwise paid to any State shall be increased by $3 for each individual with respect to whom aid to dependent children is paid under the State plan for such month, but only if the State's share of the average payment for aid to dependent children under the State plan for such month is at least as large as the State's share of the average payment for aid to dependent children under such plan for the month of May 1946."

(d) Section 403 (b) (1) of such act is amended by striking out "one-half of the total sum" and inserting in lieu thereof "the total sum of the non-Federal share."

(e) In order to provide for an increase of $5 per month in the Federal share of payments for aid to the blind made under the Social Security Act, section 1003 (a) of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That for each month during the period beginning July 1, 1946, and ending June 30, 1949, the amount otherwise paid to any State shall be increased by $5 for each individual receiving aid to the blind under the State plan for such month, but only if the State's share of the average payment for aid to the blind under the State plan for such month is at least $20, or is at least as large as the State's share of the average payment for aid to the blind under such plan for the month of May, 1946."

(f) Section 1003 (b) (1) of such act is amended by striking out "one-half of the total sum" and inserting in lieu thereof "the total sum of the non-Federal share."

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, this amendment to the Social Security Act which I am presenting is a simple amendment. It provides, in substance, that for the aged people of the Nation the Federal share of assistance in each State shall be increased by $5. The increase for dependent children shall be $3 for each child; and the increase for the blind shall be $5 per person, without the State being required to match that amount, provided the State does not reduce its present payments. It must continue to pay the old people, the children, and the blind as much as it paid in the month of May of this year.

Mr. President, the old people are the forgotten people. We have raised the wages of Federal employees. The other day the Senate passed a bill raising the wages of Senators. The wages of people throughout the Nation have been raised, but these old people, who are helpless, the children who are helpless, and the blind who are helpless are forced to sit back and exist on small pensions in a period of high prices.

A short time ago I introduced Senate bill 1769, which would have been permanent legislation, providing for an increase of 35 percent over the amount which the Federal Government is now paying. It was my hope that the States would meet this increase with a similar increase. However, it has been suggested that a different formula be worked out. Therefore I am offering this amendment as a temporary measure, for a period of only 3 years. The aged in this country are faced with prices going higher and higher, while the buying power of their pensions is going lower and lower. I am sure that the Senate will be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I see it, this is a fundamental change in the old-age assistance program. It has not been considered by the Finance Committee. It certainly should not be voted upon offhand in the Senate at a time when few Senators are present, and when no Senator has had notice that such a proposal was to be made.

I think perhaps it would be wise to consider a general increase in the old-age assistance program. We may have to make such an increase; but certainly it has no place in connection with the pending bill, which has no relation to the question whatsoever. The amendment relates to a subject which is of fundamental importance to the budget and the whole outlay for social-security payments, old-age assistance, and the whole social-security program which has been elaborately considered by the House of Representatives.

I see no reason why we should have to consider this amendment in connection with the pending bill. Regardless of the merits of the amendment, I think it should certainly be voted down.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Has the Senator any idea of what the additional cost of this amendment would be?

Mr. TAFT. No; I have not been able to read the amendment with care. I could not tell the Senator. It would increase the possible Federal contribution by not less than 25 percent, and I think in many States by 50 percent, roughly speaking.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I can answer the question of the distinguished Senator from Maine, from figures which were supplied me by the Federal Security Agency.

First, I wish to say that I am proceeding in accordance with the suggestion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance.

The amendment provides such increases for only 3 years, which allows time for the State and Federal Governments to make a study of permanent legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this is permanent legislation. If we once raise these contributions $5 a month, they will be increased forever. Probably they should be increased permanently. But

we cannot deal with a matter of this sort by temporary legislation. If we establish a certain scale of payments, we cannot subsequently reduce the payments to old-age pensioners. It would be impossible.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not agree with the distinguished Senator. The amendment provides such increases for only 3 years, which allows time for the State and Federal Governments to make a study of permanent legislation.

As to the cost, according to the figures which were given me today by the Federal Security Agency, there are in the United States 2,071,086 old people receiving old-age assistance. There are 751,656 dependent children, and 56,424 blind people receiving assistance. It is a matter of simple mathematics. From those figures we get a cost of $154,710,216 a year.

Mr. President, we have voted money for everything else in the world. We have voted money to feed the starving people of the world. Are we going to delay increased assistance to our own old people again? When will we get action? I insist that we should pass this temporary measure, and give study to permanent legislation. I agree that perhaps a different formula should be worked out for permanent legislation; I am not willing however to stand idly by and see our old people suffer when we are voting money for everything else. I say that this is a worthy amendment, and I believe it should be adopted today.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say a very few words about this amendment. I have had no opportunity to read it. I do not know its terms and conditions. I do not know, except as the Senator has just stated, anything about the cost. But there are some things that are certain. It is an amendment of major importance and consequence. No Senator—unless it be the Senator who drafted the amendment—has as yet had an opportunity to see the amendment and read it. No committee has passed upon the amendment. I submit to the Senate that this is not the proper way to legislate, and that the amendment ought not to be adopted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the question is of such importance that I think we should have a quorum present if we are to consider the amendment seriously.

Mr. President, I am very serious about it. I never was more serious in my life. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Downey	Magnuson
Andrews	Eastland	Mead
Austin	George	Millikin
Ball	Gerry	Moore
Barkley	Gurney	Morse
Brewster	Hawkes	Murdock
Bridges	Hayden	Murray
Briggs	Hoey	Myers
Brooks	Huffman	O'Daniel
Burch	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Overton
Byrd	Kilgore	Reed
Capehart	Knowland	Robertson
Capper	Lucas	Saltonstall
Carville	McCarran	Shipstead
Chavez	McClellan	Smith
Cordon	McFarland	Stanfill
Stewart	Thomas, Utah	Walsh
Taft	Tunnell	Wheeler
Taylor	Tydings	White
Thomas, Okla.	Wagner	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the pending amendment gives to the old age, the blind, and children, only what they deserve. In the field of labor, the workers have demanded certain increases because of advances in living costs. It costs the old and the blind as much to live as it costs any other person in America. The amendment would give to a child only $3 a month more. It would give to the aged and the blind only $5 a month more. If anyone can say that the living costs have not risen that much I should like to meet such a person.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Living costs have risen much more than that, I will say to the distinguished Senator, but the amendment which we have presented contains a figure much lower because we thought, if we made it low, that we would not have any opposition in having it adopted. We would rather get half a loaf for the old people than to get nothing at all. If we should increase this to what it should be, it would be $14 a month more for the old people, if we increased it to 35 percent. But we are asking for only a $5 a month increase for the old people and the blind.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Arizona. I am on the committee which proposed this amendment, and I know we would have liked to make it 3 or 4 times as much, but we felt that if we asked for this meager amount there would not be any opposition, especially after we have given billions of dollars, even, to people who are not even living in the United States. Certainly we can give this measly amount to people here at home.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator brought out that point. Is it not true that, so far as the Senators who are sponsoring the amendment could ascertain, this is about the only great class of American people who have not in some way, either by legislative action or by private action, collective bargaining, or on the part of producers, agricultural and otherwise, by an increase in prices, been given an increase since the costs of living have risen?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, Mr. President. Furthermore, the amendment would not let the States reduce the amounts they are now giving, but the Federal Government would provide the additional amount without the States matching any more than they do at present. The amendment is very simple, but it means much to the people of the United States who are affected by it. I hope the Senate will see fit to adopt it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator describe actually what is done under the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Under the amendment a very old person or a blind person will get $5 a month more from the Federal Government, without the States matching to any greater extent than at present, but the States must not reduce the amounts they are now giving. The same applies to the child except that it gets $3 a month more instead of $5.

Mr. TAFT. So that if Ohio gives $20, and $20 comes from the Federal Government, the Federal Government will add $5?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Federal Government will provide $5 in addition to what it is now paying.

Mr. TAFT. The Federal Government would then pay in Ohio about 55 percent of the total, but if a State is paying $5 a month and the Federal Government $5 and we add $5, the Federal Government will be putting up two-thirds of all the old-age assistance. Is not that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Senator cares to figure it from that standpoint, that is entirely correct, but should a person who lives in a State which has a low per capita wealth suffer because he lives in that State? Personally, I think the money should be given by the Federal Government in accordance with the ability to match, rather than making them match dollar for dollar.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what is proposed is that we change the whole old-age-assistance plan, which has been in effect since social security was started. It has always been on a 50–50 basis. That has been the whole theory of the plan. Those who receive this assistance are infinitely better off than those who receive old-age insurance under the Federal plan. There is a place where we require people to contribute from their pay, yet they get less than the noncontributors.

Mr. President, this amendment has not been considered by the Committee on Finance, it has no relation at all to the bill before the Senate. It was offered without the slightest warning to anybody. As I have said, it would upset the whole basis of old-age assistance.

I do not know what the second part of the amendment means. It reads:

> Section 3 (b) (1) of such act is amended by striking out "one-half of the total sum" and inserting in lieu thereof "the total sum of the non-Federal share."

I should like to know what the purpose of that amendment is.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to know who has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If any Senator desires to object to the amendment merely because it has not been considered by a committee at this particular session of Congress, that is perfectly all right, but I will say that committees considering proposals of this kind have had matters like this before

them time and time again during the years in the past, and they know how they feel with regard to amendments such as this.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Ohio says that the amendment, if adopted, would change the present system. I submit to the Senator from South Carolina that the present system should be changed. Where is the justice in the aged of a rich State receiving more from the Federal Treasury than the aged of a poor State? If all men stand on the same plane of equality before the law, why is it not right that the aged of every State receive the same amount from the Federal Government? I submit that the system under which we operate today is wrong, and should be changed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with the Senator from Mississippi. As I see it, this amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator see any reason why we should not require the State to put up $5 so that these aged people would get $10 more and maintain the present basis?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to answer the question in this way: The Senator from Ohio knows that none of our State legislatures will be in session until next January, and the only way to help the aged between now and then is for the Federal Government to do it, and not require the States to match. The States will not have the money to match until then.

Mr. TAFT. This provides it shall be for 3 years, so that it would be easy enough to provide for the State to put up an additional $5 and maintain the present basis of old-age assistance.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In answer to the Senator from Ohio, I hope Congress, before another year shall pass, will match the funds in a different way, and not require a dollar-for-dollar matching, but in accordance with whether or not the State is rich or poor, on a per capita basis.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator——

Mr. EASTLAND. A point of order. The Senator from South Carolina yielded to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. TAFT. I heard him yield to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yielded to the Senator from Mississippi, but the Senator from Ohio came in about the same time and started talking.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will let the Senator from Ohio speak.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wanted to ask the same question I had propounded. What does this amendment accomplish? It takes one-half of the total sum in 3 (b) (1) relating to the division and the insertion of the total sum of the non-Federal share. What is the effect of that amendment?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will permit me to answer the Senator from Ohio, the effect of the provision is to do away with the requirement that the funds be matched on a 50–50 basis, and it permits the $5 additional to be paid to each individual, provided the average amount the State is now paying is not reduced. Without that provision, there would be a conflict in the 50–50 matching.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this is a complicated matter. It is closely related to the whole problem of old-age insurance and old-age assistance, and the basis on which it shall be provided. The proposal has been given no consideration whatever by the committee, and I therefore move that the bill with the amendment be referred to the Committee on Finance.

I may say to the proponents of the amendment that I shall certainly urge that prompt consideration be given to the proposal. I am not at all certain that the Senator is not right that the basis should be changed by adding $5 to the Federal share without any further assistance from the State. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not care to detain the Senate. I hope the motion will not prevail. This is only a temporary provision. There have been many methods suggested. One of them was a variable formula and method of meeting the emergency. But all these will take time, and in the meantime the old people will suffer, the children will suffer, and the blind will suffer. It is no time for delay, it is time for action.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. To be perfectly frank, if the motion of the Senator from Ohio shall be agreed to it will mean that the aged will get no more relief from this Congress.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. The real issue on this motion is whether or not old-age assistance will be increased, as everyone admits the aged are entitled to have done.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator is entirely correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to say that when we were considering the full-employment bill I offered an amendment, which was agreed to in committee, providing that it was the policy of the United States Senate to provide our senior citizens with a sufficiently high standard of living to permit them to live in competition in the labor market. The amendment was agreed to by the United States Senate, but was eliminated in conference. So the Senate has gone on record as favoring the proposition of taking adequate care of our old people. I am certainly in favor of it, and, as has been stated, the plight of these senior citizens is critical. Costs have increased greatly and these old people, who never were sufficiently provided for, are now in dire straits. I hope the amendment will be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, will be adopted.

Mr. TAFT. May I suggest that if the proponents of the proposal really want to do anything they ought to do it in the right manner? In my opinion, those who really want to help the aged—and I think in this particular I should be in favor of the proposal—should be in favor of sending the measure to the Finance Committee for what we may hope will be prompt consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5626) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BALL subsequently said: Mr. President, I enter a motion that the vote by which the Senate passed House bill 5626 be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I should like to refer to Calendar No. 1378, House bill 4512, to which I objected earlier in the day. The only purpose of my objection was to take a look at the bill. I have done so in the meantime and I now withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4512) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 6429 making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6429) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Senate," at the top of page 2, to insert:

There shall be paid to each Senator after January 1, 1946, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments. For making such payments through June 30, 1947, $360,000, of which so much as is required to make such payments for the period from January 1, 1946, to June 30, 1946, both inclusive, shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Secretary," on page 2, line 22, after the word "and", to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$2,000"; on page 3, line 2, before the word "and", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$6,500"; and in line 3, after the word "clerk", to strike out "$4,000" and insert "$6,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 5, after "$4,000", to insert "and $240 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator from Maryland to the fact that the bill increases the salaries of four clerks in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, each now receiving $4,000 a year, two to receive $500 increase and two receive $240 increase. There must have been some error in that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator want to make a motion?

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to move in line 6 to strike out "$240" and insert "$500."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think perhaps that was an oversight, and, without objection, I will take the matter to conference and see if we cannot work it out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 7, after the word "clerk", to strike out "$4,000" and insert "$5,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 9, after the figures "$4,000", to insert "and $240 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to make the same motion with respect to the amendment in line 9 on page 3, to strike out "$240" and insert "$500."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 11, after the word "and", to strike out "$460" and insert "$960"; in line 15, after the word "and", to strike out "$420" and insert "$920"; in line 19, after the word "at", to strike out "$3,360" and insert "$4,000"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "one at $3,180" and insert "two at $3,180 each"; at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "two at $2,880 each" and insert "one at $2,880"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "three at $2,640 each" and insert "one at $2,760, two at $2,640 each"; on page 4, line 6, after the word "each"; to strike out "three at $2,640 each" and "two at $1,440 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 8, after the words "in all", to strike out "$168,000" and insert "$177,480."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask that the totals on page 4 be changed to make them conform to the amendments just adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the totals will be changed accordingly.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Committee employees," on page 5, line 20, after the word "committee", to strike out "$6,000" and insert "$15,000"; in line 25, after the word "committee", to strike out "$6,000" and insert "$15,000"; on page 7, line 12, after the figures "$2,220", to insert "assistant clerk, $1,800"; and on page 8, line 25, after the words "in all", to strike out "$587,800" and insert "$607,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Clerical assistance to Senators," on page 10, line 1, after the word "entitled", to strike out the comma and "and shall be employed only during the period of the emergency."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 5, to insert:

For an additional amount for clerical assistance to Senators (including chairmen of standing committees) at the rate of $2,400 per annum for each Senator, $230,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 17, after the word "Senators", to strike out "$1,646,640" and insert "$1,877,040."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper," on page 12, line 3, after the word "and" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "$480" and insert "$720."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the point at issue in connection with this amendment is that a number of salaries were increased $240 a year. Among those whose salaries were so increased were the assistant secretary for the minority and the assistant secretary for the majority, whose salaries we are now considering on page 12. They asked for a $500 increase, but when we increased the salaries of certain other clerks $240, $240 was also accepted with respect to these two individuals. Both of them have been in the service of the Senate over a long period of years, and the Senate is paying a tribute to both sides of the aisle by its action. They certainly ought to be worth this increase or they ought to be fired, one or the other. I think we will agree that they are doing a pretty good job, and inasmuch as we have provided for increase from $240 to $500 in the case of others, I should like to move that we add $260 more, which would provide a figure of $980 in place of the $720 on line 3.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I want to express my complete approval of what the Senator from New Hampshire has just said, and I express the hope that the Senator from Maryland will accept the amendment which the Senator from New Hampshire has offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 6, after the word "and" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$1,500"; in line 8, after the word "one" where it occurs the third time, to strike out "$2,200" and insert "$2,500"; in line 12, after the word "each", to strike out "thirty" and insert "one at $1,980; twenty-nine"; on page 13, line 5, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$1,380" and insert "$1,402.50"; in line 11, after the figures "$3,000", to strike out "assistant superintendent, $1,960" and insert "two assistant superintendents at $1,960 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 16, after the words "in all", to strike out "$283,325" and insert "$286,827.50."

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask unanimous consent that the totals at the end of this paragraph be corrected in line with the amendments which were just adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses of the Senate," on page 14, line 19, after the word "furniture", to strike out "$8,000" and insert "$12,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 25, after the word "words", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 8, after the word "law", to strike out "$35,500" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 24, after the word "boxes", to strike out "$970" and insert "$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "twenty-six" and insert "fifty"; and in line 20, after the word "than", to strike out "one hundred and thirty" and insert "two hundred and fifty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$300 per year for each Senator" and

insert "$450 per year for each Senator, payable semiannually."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 6, to insert:

There shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate charges on official Government business paid and collect telegrams when so designated, said charges not to exceed three hundred telegrams per calendar month for each Senator, and the first sentence of section 5266 of the Revised Statutes is amended by inserting after the word "officers" the following: "including telegrams paid for by Members of Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 18, to insert:

The last paragraph (relating to contingent expenses of the Senate) under the caption "Senate" in Public Law No. 812, Seventy-sixth Congress, "An act making supplemental appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes," approved October 9, 1940, is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "House of Representatives—Official Reporters of Debate," on page 29, line 9, after the word "clerk", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$3,200"; and in line 10, after the words "in all", to strike out "$70,500" and insert "$71,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the "Architect of the Capitol—Library buildings and grounds—Mechanical and structural maintenance," on page 41, line 7, after the word "grounds" to strike out "$164,600" and insert "$209,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 11, after the word "devices" to strike out "$53,000" and insert "$77,680."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Library of Congress," on page 43, line 3, after the word "Librarian" to strike out "$2,004,000" and insert "$2,203,370."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Copyright Office," on page 43, line 7, after the word "services" to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$526,925."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Legislative Reference Service," on page 43, line 18, after the word "Librarian", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$425,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Printing and binding," on page 47, line 13, after the word "buildings", to strike out "$369,000" and insert "$381,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 21, after the word "cards", to strike out "$410,000" and insert "$447,482."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Library buildings," on page 48, line 22, after the word "Librarian", to strike out "$427,600" and insert "$437,760."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 6, after the word "Buildings", to strike out "$32,000" and insert "$34,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government Printing Office—Working capital and congressional printing and binding," on page 51, line 10, after the word "character" to insert "purchase of uniforms for guards."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Cost of handling penalty mail, Government Printing Office," on page 57, after line 12, to strike out section 107, as follows:

SEC. 107. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment, the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 107. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the Untied States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk three amendments which I am authorized to offer on behalf of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Maryland on behalf of the committee will be stated seriatim.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$35,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$45,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 38, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "$409,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$415,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 39, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$517,600" and insert in lieu thereof "$518,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at this point I ask to have printed in the RECORD an explanatory letter covering these amendments, the need for them, and the use to which the money is to be put.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1946.

Hon. M. E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Legislative Subcommittee,
Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Rules, United States Senate, at a meeting held yesterday, June 11, 1946, authorized and directed the Architect of the Capitol, by resolution, to submit to the Senate Committee on Appropriations request for an appropriation of $17,200 to effect improvements in the Senate restaurants in the Capitol and Senate Office Building, recommended by the Architect of the Capitol.

It is respectfully requested that the following changes (involving 3 amendments) be made in H. R. 6429, Seventy-ninth Congress, as reported to the Senate, in order that the necessary funds may be made available to carry out the improvements approved by the Senate Committee on Rules, during the summer recess:

AMENDMENT NO. 1: SENATE RESTAURANTS

Page 15, line 17, srike out the amount "$35,000"' and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$45,400."

Explanation: The additional amount of $10,400 is asked for the following improvements:

Luncheonette in Senate Office Building: Modernize luncheonette in Senate Office Building by replacing present obsolete fountain and other service equipment with complete new equipment, and replacing existing booths and tables with new pedestal-base tables and chairs, $5,800.

Cafeteria in Senate Office Building: Install a thermo oven in the cafeteria for keeping vegetables and other foods properly warm, $600.

Senate Restaurant in Capitol: Replace present deteriorated dishwashing machine and glasswashing machine with new equipment, including stainless steel tables required in connection with their use, $4,000.

Total, $10,400.

AMENDMENT NO. 2: CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

(In accordance with past practice, this being an item affecting the Capitol Building structurally is carried under the "Capitol Buildings" maintenance appropriation)

Page 38, line 7, strike out the amount "$409,500" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$415,500."

Explanation: The additional amount of $6,000 is asked for the following improvement:

Senate Restaurant in Capitol: Installation of acoustical tile on the sidewalls and the undecorated portion of the ceiling in the dining room reserved for Senators and their guests, and on the sidewalls and ceiling of the adjoining public dining room, $6,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3: SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

(This being an item that affects the Senate Office Building structurally is carried under the "Senate Office Building" maintenance appropriation)

Page 39, line 9, strike out the amount "$517,600" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$518,400."

Explanation: The additional amount of $800 is required for the following:

Luncheonette in Senate Office Building: For installation of new hot and cold water lines, sewer lines, and electrical conduit to service the new equipment to be installed in the luncheonette; for cutting the existing concrete floor and the walls for the new installations, including repairs; for replacing existing linoleum covering the concrete floor with new asphalt tile or new linoleum, $800.

Grand total of the three amendments proposed, $17,200.

I am attaching hereto two copies of the justification of these items as submitted to, and approved by the Senate Committee on Rules. For your information, Senator McKELLAR, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and member of the Rules Committee, participated in the Rules Committee action and is entirely conversant with the matter if further information is desired.

Respectfully,

DAVID LYNN,
Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, it is proposed to strike out lines 7 to 13 inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

There shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate charges on official Government business paid and collect telegrams when so designated in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think some explanation should be made of this amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Illinois will give an explanation; but I wish to say that many of us worked on this problem, trying to find a way out of the difficulty. So far as the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee are concerned, we are a unit behind the solution which the Senator from Illinois offers, which is a compromise of many conflicting viewpoints.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the paragraph referred to on page 18, after line 6, is a part of a committee amendment which has already been agreed to, and it will be necessary to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 18, after line 6, was agreed to, be reconsidered, so that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] may then be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the committee amendment which was originally adopted by the Senate, and just now reconsidered at the request of the Senator from Maryland was adopted by the Appropriations Committee because of the fact that some time ago the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate adopted a rule which would permit an unlimited number of what we call book or block telegrams, telegrams under 10 words. That rule worked very well for quite a while. However, because of the unusual amount of mail which has been received by Senators in the past 6 or 8 months, the bill for telegrams which were being sent by Senators in reply to telegrams which they received on official business was running rather high. As I understand, the committee heard some evidence on this question and finally wrote into the bill a section which would permit each Member of the Senate to send not to exceed 300 telegrams in each calendar month.

Some of us who live in large cities, and many other Senators, believe that that amendment was a little too drastic. I learned from the Western Union telegraph office that approximately 197,000 telegrams have come to Senators in the past few months.

Strange as it may seem, the folks out in the States whom we represent expect answers to the communications which they address to us on these important matters. That means that Senators must either have more personnel in their offices in order to answer the tremendous amount of mail which they receive, especially from the large nearby States, or they must adopt the method of answering such communications by what is known as the book telegram.

In conjunction with the able Senator from Maryland, who is chairman of the subcommittee, and also a member of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, we devised a rule. The able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] was present; and I believe the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was also present at the meeting.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment reads as follows:

There shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate charges on official Government business paid and collect telegrams when so designated in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Would that mean that the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate could say to one Senator, "You may send so many telegrams," and to another Senator, "You may send a different number of telegrams"?

Mr. LUCAS. It would mean that. Under that amendment the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate would have the right to lay down that kind of a rule.

I was about to tell the Senate exactly what we have already agreed upon among ourselves in the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, which will give the Senator the answer to the question which he has in mind.

At first we thought that we might write this rule into the law, but that did not seem to be the proper thing to do. We finally agreed on the amendment which has been offered, with the further explanation of the rule which we have already adopted, for application in the event the amendment becomes law. The rule is as follows:

There shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate charges on official Government business paid and collect telegrams when so designated, except charges on congratulatory telegrams and telegrams of condolence.

The Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has had a considerable amount of trouble with certain types of telegrams which have been sent, which were more or less censured because they violated one of the seven rules. We have eliminated five of those rules, and now the only kind of a telegram which a Senator will be compelled to pay for himself will be a telegram of condolence or a telegram of congratulations.

I read further from the rule:

Each Senator from any State which has a population of 3,000,000 or less inhabitants shall be entitled to send not more than 150 telegrams in book form per calendar month.

That means just what it says. In other words, a Senator may send all the telegrams he wishes to his constituents, as individual separate telegrams. But when a Senator wishes to send the same telegram to 100 constituents in his State, he may send only 150 a month in book form to a State having a population of less than 3,000,000.

Each Senator from any State which has a population of more than 3,000,000 and less than 6,000,000 inhabitants shall be entitled to send not more than 300 telegrams in book form per calendar month; and each Senator from any State which has a population of 6,000,000 or more inhabitants shall be entitled to send not more than 450 telegrams in book form per calendar month. Charges on book telegrams by Senators in excess of the limitations herein imposed shall not be paid. Book telegrams shall not exceed 10 words, and must be sent at night letter Government rates.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. So far as sending telegrams to my State is concerned, I

have no objection to the rule. But one of the difficulties is that as chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce I receive telegrams which pour into the committee with reference to railroad matters and many other subjects. For example, in connection with the Bulwinkle bill, and various other pieces of legislation, I have been flooded with telegrams. It seems to me that in connection with committee business there should be some exception. So far as telegrams going to my State are concerned I have no objection. But in connection with telegrams and letters which come to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, they are of such great volume that I am afraid I would not be able to answer them.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator understands that be can send all the telegrams he wishes to send, without any limitation as to number. This rule is only to take care of the book telegram. A Senator may wish to send the same telegam to a number of persons in Baltimore, for example. It was that sort of a situation, which was wide open, which made some restriction absolutely necessary. The Senator could send all the telegrams he wished to railroad companies, for example, which might inquire about some particular legislation, without any restriction whatever. This rule applies only to the book telegrams. Four hundred and fifty a month are allowed to the large States.

Mr. WHEELER. I have no objection to that; but I receive hundreds of telegrams in connection with legislation affecting railroad labor, for example.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator can answer them.

Mr. WHEELER. What I wish to know is whether, as chairman of the committee, I could send out telegrams with reference to certain legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. I doubt if this rule would cover what the Senator is discussing. Let me remind the Senator that this is only a tentative suggestion. I am glad he brought up this question. It may be that we shall have to make some special arrangement for chairmen of committees in the handling of strictly committee business. I understand what the Senator means.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me suggest that that is something which can very well be handled by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. It is something which the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has already adopted, and it is a flexible arrangement.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me suggest to the Senator from Illinois that I think he could cover the situation envisaged by the Senator from Montana by means of a regulation or rule on the part of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses. This matter relates to individual Senators only, and a ruling from the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses could be obtained so as to cover the situation.

Mr. WHEELER. Such a situation does not arise very often. But let me say by way of illustration that when the Railroad Retirement Act was under consideration by the Committee on Interstate Commerce, the committee received hundreds and hundreds of telegrams. In order to answer them, we had to send either letters or telegrams. But we did not have sufficient office help in the committee to send letters in reply to all the telegrams we received.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the example the Senator has cited points out an excellent reason why we should not try to write something of this sort into law, but we should leave it flexible, as the committee attempts to do, so that the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses may take care of such cases.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order to correct the RECORD, let me say I think the Senator from Illinois inadvertently said that 197,000 telegrams had come to the Senate in a period of several months. I checked on the matter, and I find that the correct statement is that 197,000 telegrams came to the Senate in a single month. That shows the necessity for providing a means of lifting the limitation which has been placed on Senators, under the rule.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. President, I wish to say that in 1945 my office sent out 97,920 pieces of mail, and that did not include telegrams. This year, in the first 5 months, we have sent out 71,421 pieces of mail. That shows that the volume this year is almost double the volume of a year ago.

So it is obvious that there is a tremendous problem for all Senators, especially the Senators who come from the States with the larger populations.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is it the policy of the chairmen of committees to answer all telegrams which they receive?

Mr. LUCAS. It all depends on the policy of the individual Senator. I have made it a rule to try to answer all my mail.

Mr. ANDREWS. A Senator may receive 100 telegrams about a certain matter; and he may be able to judge from reading them that they are all "inspired." If he attempts to answer all of them, he places a great expense upon the Government.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the reason why we are trying to have Senators answer such telegrams by dictating letters to the members of their office staffs, rather than to incur the expense incident to sending telegrams in reply.

Mr. ANDREWS. I think we can save hundreds of thousands of dollars if we proceed in the way the Senator has suggested.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me point out that night letters are often sent on the basis of "book" telegrams. A great amount of money can be saved by adopting the suggestion which has been made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say that I quite agree with the Senator. However, I think it should be pointed that some of us who come from the far West frequently find ourselves in a situation in which the urgency of a request from a constituent requires the sending of a telegram because the matter cannot possibly be handled by mail. I think that is a matter for the exercise of honest discretion. I think the matter should be an open book; I think a Senator should be prepared to appear before the Senator's committee at any time in order to show whether the practice in which he has been engaging is honest or whether it is an abuse of the privilege. Certainly I think the committee should protect the public interest.

But I know of many cases in which it would have been almost a laches on my part if I had not sent a telegram to a constituent in regard to a matter which could be handled properly only in that way.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. If I correctly understand what the Senator from Oregon has said and if I understand the proposed rule, it seems to me there is nothing in the proposed rule which would militate against his use of telegrams. The limitation, as I understand it, is to be placed upon what are known as book telegrams.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. If that be the case, I have no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. The great number of violations occurred in connection with what are called "book telegrams," and the situation had developed to such an extent that something had to be done.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have understood for years that there is a distinct rule against such a practice, and I have refrained from using the book-telegram method.

Mr. LUCAS. It has been the rule, but some Senators have been violating it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator from Oregon that he and I and other Senators from the far West have a telegraphic problem, but I also wish to point out that we also have a problem in connection with the use of air mail. It seems to me that in the case of Senators who come from great distances—Senators such as the Senator from Oregon and I—it would be very helpful if the Senate would permit the Congressional frank to be extended to air mail. I think such an extension is a reasonable one, inasmuch as the air mail rate has been reduced to 5 cents. Such an extension would be very helpful to us, for regular mail takes 4 days to reach my State, and sometimes 2 weeks pass before an answer can be received. So I hope the Senate will consider that phase of the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the com-

mittee amendment on page 18, after line 6.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read a third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 6429) was passed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. REED, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

THIRD URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1946

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6601, making appropriations to supply certain deficiencies.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6601) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—General appropriations—Legislative—Senate," on page 2, after line 3, to insert the following:

For payment to Mary Scott Glass, widow of Carter Glass, late a Senator from the State of Virginia, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 5, to insert:

Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper. For the payment of 21 pages for the Senate Chamber, at $5 per day each, for the period commencing July 1, 1946, and ending with the last day of the month in which the Seventy-ninth Congress adjourns sine die at the second session thereof, so much as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 11, to insert:

For the employment of an additional assistant chief telephone operator at $2,400 per annum, and seven additional telephone operators at $1,800 per annum each, fiscal year 1947, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent offices—Federal Works Agency—Bureau of Community Facilities," on page 4, line 4, after the word "planning", to strike out "$35,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am asking the Senate to disagree to that amendment. The item for an appropriation of $35,000,000 for public works advance planning was carried in the bill as passed by the House. The Senate Committee has reduced the amount to $10,000,000. This appropriation is made under a provision of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act, and there has heretofore been appropriated for this work $30,000,000, all of which or practically all of which has been advanced to States, counties, and municipalities. This is not a gift. It is to be repaid by every municipality or State or county using any of the fund, when and if the project or work planned is actually constructed or carried out.

The purpose of the committee in inserting this provision in the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act was to enable counties, municipalities, and States to do advance planning, to have their plans and specifications ready against the time when they could actually begin construction work. We were trying to hedge against unemployment, but we were also trying to aid and assist municipalities and counties and States to get their plans ready.

It is well known, I think—it should be well known, and I am sure it is known to every Member of the Senate—that until a municipality sells its bonds, it has no money with which to pay for such plans, even though a bond issue may have been authorized. Until the bonds are actually sold and until the cash is realized on them, the municipality has no money with which to pay for plans or specifications, which often must be submitted to the voters of the municipality or county or local political subdivision, as the case may be, before it is possible to bring the issue to a vote—or, at least, to do so intelligently—before the voters of the county or political subdivision.

This item is not a gift. It is simply an advance, repayable when and if the project which is planned or is surveyed is actually completed or finished.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I should like to explain to the Senator that the amount was reduced in the full committee for two reasons. First, in the independent offices bill an appropriation was provided for. Only a couple of months ago the bill was taken up and considered by the regular subcommittee. Later, a deficiency of $35,000,000 was reported. The only testimony we had was in the form of a statement which is set forth in the House report that the Federal Works Agency has approximately $37,000,000 worth of processed applications for which no funds are on hand. On that basis, we recommended an appropriation of a certain amount. Another deficiency bill will be coming before the Senate, and the committee decided that it should talk with representatives of this Agency and look into the matter before they recommended an appropriation of the amount requested.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, allow me to read to the Senate a very brief memorandum from the Office of the Administrator.

There has already been made two appropriations for this purpose—one in the amount of $17,500,000, and the other in the amount of $12,500,000, or a total of $30,000,000.

The committee recently provided for much larger appropriations. The committee has been shortsighted in dealing with this particular appropriation. The appropriation would not result in a wastage of money. It would be used to enable the municipalities to get ready for a public-works program which most of them desire to inaugurate as soon as they can obtain the necessary materials and labor.

I continue reading from the memorandum:

Practically all of this has been advanced and, as a result, local projects financed entirely out of local funds have been planned or as in process, to the amount of $1,200,000,000. The States and localities have with their own funds planned an additional $900,000,000. One-half of the latter total is in New York State alone. The projects that have been planned with the funds appropriated under this act are located in all of the 48 States of the Union, without exception.

The $35,000,000 now requested will be sufficient to complete the plans on an adddditional $1,100,000,000.

This item was not included in the independent offices bill because at the time that bill was under consideration by the House, namely in December last, the program was new. It was impossible to estimate with any degree of certainty how much money would be required. The Federal Works Agency, too, was at that time engaged in an investigation of the whole subject for the Committee on Post War Planning of the House of Representatives. That investigation was completed in February of this year and the estimate upon which the House acted was forwarded to the Congress on the 14th of May by the President. Though not strictly a deficiency appropriation, the item was presented for inclusion in the pending bill with the full approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House. It is confidently expected that the money here under consideration will be returned to the Federal Treasury. The States and localities must agree to return it and those agreements are as good as the faith and credit of the States and local governments.

The memorandum then continues to explain the threefold purpose of the program.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Are the requested funds a part of the $75,000,000 which we

authorized to be advanced to the municipalities and subdivisions thereof for planning purposes?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I recall that the other House allowed only $5,000,000, that we increased it to $35,000,000, and the committee of conference reduced it to $17,500,000.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. So this appropriation would be only a portion of the $75,000,000 which we authorized for this purpose when we passed the original act.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Kentucky is correct. If the appropriation is made in the amount which was approved by the House, it will result in a total appropriation of only $65,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. When the matter was under consideration in the full committee the question was properly asked by the Senator from Minnesota, Why was no provision made for the appropriation in the regular appropriation bill? At that time I did not know the answer, but the explanation made in the memorandum from which the Senator from Georgia has read is to the effect that no estimate was furnished for use in connection with the regular bill. The matter was under consideration by the House committee last December. The agency was not at that time in a position to state how much was needed. The fact is that we are asked to appropriate for the fiscal year and not for a deficiency.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire memorandum from which I have read be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON H. R. 6001 (THIRD URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946) WITH RESPECT TO THE ADVANCE PLANNING OF LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS

The House bill contains an item of $35,000,000 for this purpose. The item has been reduced by the Senate Appropriations Committee to $10,000,000. It is desired to have the amount restored to $35,000,000.

The appropriation is made under the authority of title 5 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act. That title provides that advances may be made to State and local governments for the planning of their public works on condition that the advances shall be repaid when, as, and if the works are constructed. These advances serve to stimulate the preplanning of projects. Planning of such projects is usually financed out of the proceeds of bond issues voted for construction. Obviously bond money cannot be used for planning until the bonds are approved.

There has already been made two appropriations for this purpose—one in the amount of $17,500,000, and the other in the amount of $12,500,000, or a total of $30,000,000. Practically all of this has been advanced and, as a result, local projects financed entirely out of local funds have been planned or are in process, to the amount of $1,200,000,000. The States and localities have with their own funds planned an additional $900,000,000. One-half of the latter total is in New York State alone. The projects that have been planned with the funds appropriated under this act are located in all of the 48 States of the Union, without exception.

The $35,000,000 now requested will be sufficient to complete the plans on an additional $1,100,000,000.

This item was not included in the Independent Offices bill because at the time that bill was under consideration by the House, namely in December last, the program was new. It was impossible to estimate with any degree of certainty how much money would be required. The Federal Works Agency, too, was at that time engaged in an investigation of the whole subject for the Committee on Postwar Planning of the House of Representatives.

That investigation was completed in February of this year and the estimate upon which the House acted was forwarded to the Congress on the 14th of May by the President. Though not strictly a deficiency appropriation, the item was presented for inclusion in the pending bill with the full approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House. It is confidently expected that the money here under consideration will be returned to the Federal Treasury. The States and localities must agree to return it and those agreements are as good as the faith and credit of the States and local governments.

This program has a 3-fold purpose. First, to utilize the time when construction cannot conveniently go forward on account of housing to plan the necessary public works which are needed in the States; second, to stimulate the States and local governments to use their own credit and own funds for the constructions of these works; and third, to prepare a group of projects on a Nationwide basis that may be quickly undertaken if and when unemployment should develop.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will not agree to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Georgia. We should approve the $35,000,000 appropriation which has been requested so that a building program can be carried forward throughout the United States. I know that in my own State we need more than will be our pro rata share of the appropriation. The Senate has already voted for full employment, but when a proposal such as the one now pending, which will make possible plans for full employment, is made, objection is heard. I think that the requested appropriation should be provided so that the States and their subdivisions may make preparation for the public-works program which will soon go forward. If plans are not made, the work will not be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope that this amendment will not be agreed to. As a member of the Special Committee on Postwar Activities, presided over by the Senator from Georgia, I recall that we went pretty thoroughly into the need for the amount which had been authorized in the bill, namely, $75,000,000; which was to be advanced to the States, counties, cities, and other subdivisions, and used for the purpose of planning public works and enabling communities to receive Government funds.

When the first appropriation was recommended it was reported to the Senate in the amount of only $5,000,000. We increased it to $35,000,000, and it was later reduced to $17,500,000. Time has now run, and the program is no longer a new one. It seems to me that the appropriation in the House bill should be approved. The need for the entire $75,000,000 was pretty thoroughly gone into. In the first place, the committee considered an amount of $150,000,000, but it was finally reduced to $75,000,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was present in the committee when this amendment was considered and agreed to. The situation was such as has been outlined by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. The Federal Works Agency was provided for in another bill. It seemed to us that the additional amount which had been requested should be considered further.

Mr. President, the most vicious practice in connection with making appropriations by the Congress is in authorizing funds to be appropriated. It is easy to authorize. Time after time I have seen authorizations made, and each time an authorization bill was before the Senate it would be asserted that the amount proposed was not really an appropriation, but, however, eventually it became such.

We all know that there is no great amount of unemployment today. We all know, also, that there is a great shortage of building materials for construction purposes. We all know that certain materials which we now have should be used in constructing veterans' houses.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Arizona if it is not true we have another deficiency bill under way?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is supposed to be a catch-all bill.

Mr. BALL. So that we will have another chance. The committee took its action, not on the merits of this matter, but because the committee had no evidence whatever as to the item. We knew it had been left out of the regular bill, and we wanted to have a look at it, and have General Fleming give us some evidence as to what kind of projects they are planning. It is true that, while the Federal Government will be paid, it is only if the community or municipality goes ahead with a project planned. If we advance $50,000 to make plans for a project, and the local community later decides it is impracticable, or changes it, and never goes ahead with it, the Federal Government never will get its money back.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Inasmuch as this item was in the bill as it passed the House and came to the Senate, and was submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, how does it happen that General Fleming was not called and asked to come before the committee and testify about it?

Mr. HAYDEN. General Fleming did appear before the committee, but it happened that the attendance was very slight, and he was given a cursory examination; and there had been a very complete hearing in the House.

Mr. BALL. It came at a time when we had three subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations meeting at the

same time, and every member of the committee had other committee meetings, and the Senate was meeting at 11 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. BARKLEY. Still, I suppose General Fleming testified, and his testimony was taken down.

Mr. BALL. It did not cover this item.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes, it is in the record. He was questioned by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], as appears on page 18 of the hearings. He stated that the budget estimate for this item was $50,000,000. The House had allowed $35,000,000, and he was not asking for an increase above the House amendment at that time.

Mr. BALL. As I recall, he also stated that the total amount for projects that had been processed and screened and were ready to go, for which he has not funds at this time, is only $7,000,000. So that this amount, $10,000,000, will more than cover the pending applications, and the adoption of the amendment will give the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a chance to question General Fleming a little more thoroughly as to this particular amount.

I might say, while I am on this matter, Mr. President, that I do not particularly like the fact that since the Committee on Appropriations acted, and clearly with the idea that they merely wanted another look at the item, every Senator has been flooded with telegrams from local communities or local institutions protesting against this cut. How did they find out about it? They did not read it in the newspapers. The Public Works Agency has been lobbying the Senate against its own Committee on Appropriations, and I think it is about time that sort of activity by Federal agencies was slapped down a little. We have altogether too much of it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Minnesota has a wholly incorrect apprehension of the facts in this case. I do not know anything about any telegrams; I may have received such telegrams in my office, but I have not seen them. But this money is to be repaid by the municipalities and political subdivisions to which it is advanced, not out of any grants——

Mr. BALL. I know that.

Mr. GEORGE. There is no grant involved. The purpose of the committee in formulating the legislation was to get away from grants, and encourage the cities and counties and municipalities to do their own work, to assume the burden, and meet the Federal Government more than halfway, so that we would not have all the burden thrown on us in the event of a recession in employment.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Minnesota understands that.

Mr. GEORGE. Please let me finish. So that in order to encourage the subdivisions to assume the burden without any promise of grant, in order to encourage them to go ahead with their work, we simply set up a fund which could be made available for a specific purpose, to wit, to make surveys, to secure estimates, and to draw the blueprints for their plans.

There can be no doubt, I think, that in nearly every instance the money will all be repaid to the Federal Government. I think it goes right back into the Treasury. What we need to do is to permit this advance planning by all the political subdivisions of the country which anticipate that they wil be able to do some construction work at a later date, and to get that behind them and have it ready.

I made an earnest plea, when the appropriation was first cut down to a level where it could have done no good, to get it raised back to the $75,000,000 which the committee itself has thought would be ample and sufficient. This appropriation, if made at $35,000,000, as the House has recommended, will still be $10,000,000 under what the committee originally thought was a fair and adequate sum to be used for this purpose.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that he apparently misunderstood what I said. I understand perfectly that the money is to be repaid when and if the municipal project for which the planning money is advanced is undertaken, but in the present situation as to construction materials and labor, it may be 2 or 3 years before there is a sufficient supply of materials and labor so that many of these projects will be started. By that time the plans may be changed, they may be abandoned and other projects adopted, and if they are not undertaken, the Federal Government will not get the money back. That is all I said. Those are some of the things I should like to go into with General Fleming. I should like to know what kind of projects are being approved, whether there is any assurance that if construction is delayed 4 or 5 years there will still be reasonable assurance that in the great majority of cases they will still go ahead with it, or whether changing conditions might throw a project out, and the money be wasted. I do not think there is any tremendous rush, certainly for the next 2 years, at least. Filling up the housing deficit is going to be about all we can do.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is entirely mistaken. If he will go to the trouble of advising himself, I think he will find that municipalities and subdivisions throughout the country are now actually doing some construction work. They have been obliged to do it because during the war period it was impossible to do it. I know of two municipalities in my State which are today spending a total of approximately $6,000,000 for the necessary extension of water and sewerage systems. It is precisely that sort of situation we were trying to encourage, and for which we were trying to provide. I do not see the basis for any objection to an appropriation of this kind.

Mr. BALL. All the Senator from Minnesota is saying is that the Senate Committee on Appropriations—and, after all, we have another deficiency appropriation bill coming along—should at least be granted an opportunity to go into this whole subject more thoroughly, and obtain more facts. We may wish to allow them the amount of the budget estimate, but the discussion here I think has disclosed that we do not have sufficient information to act on the matter at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand why this appropriation, which clearly cannot be spent this year, is in a deficiency bill. It seems to me it should be in a supplemental bill, or a regular appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has not been here all the time——

Mr. TAFT. I have heard the statements, and I understand that none of the money is to be used in this fiscal year. I think there is $7,000,000 for a project pending, and the rest is for the next fiscal year. Why is it put in a deficiency bill to supply deficiencies for the fiscal year 1946, and provide supplemental appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1946? Why should we not take care of this year now, and then in some supplemental bill for next year, or in a regular appropriation bill, appropriate the money needed for next year?

Mr. HAYDEN. The difficulty is that the regular annual appropriation bill has already been passed. This is a deficiency bill.

Mr. TAFT. But this is a 1946 deficiency bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is clearly understood that this is to provide money for the next fiscal year. This is the statement before the committee:

> We do not approve applications unless we know that there is some real basis of expectation that they will construct the public works. At the present time we have only $7,000,000 of projects completely reviewed and ready to approve. Every day this amount is being increased so that the $35,000,000 approved by the House will probably be absorbed within the next 8 or 9 months.

It is clearly intended that this money shall be used in the next fiscal year, and we have no other way of providing it except in a deficiency bill, because it was not included in the regular annual appropriation bill.

Mr. TAFT. The only thing that bothers me is that when we come to figure up next year's appropriations, we do not figure what is in this deficiency bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes. There is a statement as to the appropriations for any agency in the deficiency bill and the regular appropriation bill, so that we have full figures before us.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Hampshire yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I am very much concerned with this subject, because I am entirely in sympathy with the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New Hampshire in what they are trying to do. But I have an urgent telegram in my hand from the president of Rutgers University. What is the situation of Rutgers University? It is a State-supported institution. It is one of the public works in our State that needs assistance now. Why? Because it is

trying to take care of the GI boys who have come in great numbers to Rutgers. Rutgers has a program worked out for buildings, temporary buildings it is true, to take care of these boys. If these appropriations are cut down Rutgers cannot look to the Federal Works Administrator to help out. I took the matter up with the Federal Works Administrator who was here yesterday, and he asked me to support the Senator from Georgia in the request that this figure be restored, because such emergency construction as I have mentioned, for taking care of GI's in our colleges, is the type of thing being done. It is being done in my State through the State organization because it is a State-supported college.

Mr. President, I am entirely in sympathy with the desire of Senator from Minnesota to have these matters scrutinized, but we now have some emergency cases which must be taken care of.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, we have reduced this item from $35,000,000 to $10,000,000, but I want to say to the Senator from New Jersey that there will still be enough to take care of emergency cases. When I took up this matter I observed no disposition on the part of members of the Appropriations Committee to kill this item. There is merely what the Senator from Minnesota has advocated, namely, a desire to look into the details and to determine more accurately the desirability or nondesirability of projects. We are going to have another deficiency bill here in 2 or 3 weeks. Two or 3 weeks is not going to make a great deal of difference.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that I hope the amendment will be defeated, because I am getting word from towns that have on their agendas construction work that must be done in the very near future. In two or three instances school buildings have burned down. They have to plan new ones. In many instances the populations of towns and cities have so changed during the war that they have outgrown present school buildings and must plan to construct new ones at the first possible moment, that is, when material is available. Moreover, some towns have grown so that they are having to plan for new water works and new sewer systems. It appears to me that now of all times is when an adequate amount for this planning should be made available.

I heard the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] say that Senators were receiving telegrams from many persons who oppose the amendment, and the inference was that the Public Works Administration was asking people to telegraph to Senators to restore this cut. As a matter of fact, with the pending applications which the Federal Works Administration has, and the new ones which are coming in every day, the only decent thing for the Federal Works Administrator to do is to tell the applicants from the various towns and cities that the allocation to them is dependent upon an adequate appropriation by the Congress. I think a good many departments of Government have to tell applicants for funds that the allocation of such funds and the availability of such funds is dependent upon adequate appropriations. It seems to me that now of all times an adequate fund for this purpose should be available. So I join with my colleague, the Senator from New Jersey in expressing the hope that the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senate Appropriations Committee has made a perfectly reasonable request that this whole item go over until another deficiency bill comes before us, so that we may have a hearing and obtain more facts than we had when this item was before us. If the Senate is going to refuse to permit its Appropriations Committee even that much discretion because of a little pressure, which I still contend was deliberately stirred up by the Federal Works Agency, then I want to know it on a record vote. So I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Reed
Andrews	Hayden	Shipstead
Ball	Hoey	Smith
Barkley	Huffman	Taft
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Taylor
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Utah
Burch	Knowland	Tunnell
Bushfield	Lucas	Wagner
Capper	Murdock	Walsh
Chavez	Murray	White
George	O'Mahoney	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty-two Senators have answered to their names, not a quorum. The clerk will call the names of absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BRIGGS, Mr. CARVILLE, Mr. GERRY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. WHEELER answered when their names were called.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. CORDON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MEAD, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. TYDINGS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 4, in line 4.

Mr. BALL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REED. I understand that we are now about to vote on the committee amendment on page 4, in line 4.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. REED. I further understand that a "yea" vote will be to sustain the position of the committee in regard to the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct. A "nay" vote will be to leave that part of the bill in the way it was passed by the House of Representatives.

On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business, attending the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in Bermuda.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are members of the committee on the part of the Senate attending the funeral services of the late Senator John H. Bankhead, of Alabama.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

I also announce the following general pairs: The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]; the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate as members of the committee appointed by the United States Senate to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who would vote "yea" if present, has a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]; and the Senator

from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Bankhead.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent on official business. If present, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is detained at the State Department on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—15

Ball	Capper	Robertson
Bridges	Gerry	Shipstead
Brooks	Gurney	Taft
Bushfield	Millikin	White
Capehart	Reed	Willis

NAYS—36

Aiken	Huffman	Murray
Andrews	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Overton
Briggs	Kilgore	Smith
Burch	Knowland	Stewart
Carville	Lucas	Taylor
Chavez	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Magnuson	Tunnell
George	Mead	Tydings
Hayden	Morse	Wagner
Hoey	Murdock	Walsh

NOT VOTING—44

Austin	Guffey	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hart	Pepper
Bilbo	Hatch	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hawkes	Revercomb
Buck	Hickenlooper	Russell
Butler	Hill	Saltonstall
Byrd	La Follette	Stanfill
Connally	Langer	Tobey
Donnell	McCarran	Vandenberg
Downey	McKellar	Wheeler
Ellender	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Mitchell	Wilson
Gossett	Moore	Young
Green	Myers	

So the amendment was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 4, in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,183,000" and insert "$250,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in view of the action the Senate has taken on the preceding amendment, we must disagree to this amendment, because the two are connected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Veterans' Administration", on page 7, line 4, before the word "unobligated", to insert "this contract authorization plus", and in line 17, after the word "such" where it occurs the first time, to strike out "project" and insert "projects."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, all of the committee amendments on pages 7, 8, and 9 are true deficiency amendments, for the District of Columbia, and they involve only small amounts. I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

(The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:)

On page 7, after line 18, to insert:

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"FISCAL SERVICE

"Collector's office: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Collector's office,' including the objects specified for this purpose in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $65,000."

At the top of page 8, to insert:

"REGULATORY AGENCIES

"Coroner's office: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Coroner's office,' including the objects specified for this purpose in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $5,640."

On page 8, after line 5, to insert:

"PUBLIC LIBRARY

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Salaries and expenses, public library,' including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $27,500."

On page 8, after line 10, to insert:

"FIRE DEPARTMENT

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Salaries and expenses, Fire Department,' including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $47,500."

On page 8, after line 15, to insert:

"PUBLIC WELFARE

"MENTAL REHABILITATION SERVICE

"St. Elizabeths Hospital: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'St. Elizabeths Hospital,' including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $62,100."

On page 8, after line 21, to insert:

"PUBLIC WORKS

"Operating expenses, Office of Superintendent of District Buildings: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Operating expenses, Office of Superintendent of District Buildings,' including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $1,750."

On page 9, after line 3, to insert:

"WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT

"Operating expenses (payable from water fund): For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Operating expenses (payable from water fund),' including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $32,400."

On page 9, after line 9, to insert:

"NATIONAL GUARD

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Salaries and expenses, National Guard,' including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $968."

And on page 9, after line 14, to insert:

"DIVISION OF EXPENSES

"The sums appropriated in this act for the District of Columbia, shall, unless otherwise specifically provided, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—General Provisions," on page 14, after line 22, to strike out:

SEC. 201. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provision of existing law.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 201. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or

violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that amendment is in the usual form, and I ask that it be agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 202, page 16, line 25, after the word "in", to strike out "any regular annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1947, not a law on July 1, 1946" and to insert "(1) any regular annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1947, or (2) contained in other than a regular annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1947, and being for such fiscal year, or (3) contained in other than a regular annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1947, and being supplemental to an existing appropriation and for obligation after June 30, 1946, such acts not being laws on July 1, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments as printed in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the committee I offer an amendment which I send forward and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

For payment to Musa Harkins Bankhead, widow of John H. Bankhead, late a Senator from the State of Alabama, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the committee I offer the amendment which I send forward and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 17, it is proposed to insert the following:

COMMISSION TO REPRESENT THE UNITED STATES AT THE PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE CEREMONIES

For travel and other expenses of the Commission created by House Joint Resolution 360, entitled "Joint resolution to provide for United States participation in the Philippine independence ceremonies on July 4, 1946," to enable the Commission to make and carry out appropriate plans for United States participation in such ceremonies, in accordance with the provisions of said joint resolution, $30,000, to remain available until July 31, 1946, and to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send forward and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

Such sums as may be necessary are hereby appropriated for making for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1947 (1) grants to States for assistance to aged needy individuals, needy dependent children, and needy individuals who are blind, as authorized in titles I, IV, and X, respectively, of the Social Security Act approved August 14, 1935, as amended, and (2) grants to States for unemployment compensation administration: *Provided*, That the obligations incurred and expenditures made for each of such purposes under the authority of this appropriation shall be charged to the appropriations therefor in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1947.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment is necessary in order that money may be advanced immediately to 18 States which cannot match on the 1st of July. We have followed the same procedure each year as an accommodation to the States.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, did the committee vote for this amendment? I understood the Senator from Arizona to say that he offered it by direction of the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. No, I did not say that.

Mr. President, in further explanation of the amendment, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which has been prepared on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE FOR GRANTS-IN-AID, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD, FISCAL YEAR 1947

In each of the last 3 years the delayed enactment of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation bill has made it necessary to submit to Congress a request for a joint resolution authorizing the expenditure for the first quarter's requirements of the next fiscal year for grants-in-aid to States in advance of the passage of the Appropriation Act.

The same circumstances exist at the present time with respect to requirements for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1947. Eighteen States cannot, under State laws, release funds for assistance to the aged, blind, and dependent children for the new fiscal year until Federal funds are actually available. A closely similar situation exists with respect to unemployment compensation; certain States have laws prohibiting the incurring of obligations for which no Federal funds are currently available. To avoid interference with normal processing it is highly desirable that funds be available by June 10.

In the public assistance grants program the balances remaining in the hands of the States on June 30 for use after that date, will aggregate approximately three to four million dollars. Some States will have relatively large balances; others will have nothing; still others will be owed money by the Federal Government. Both in total and in the several States the balances will be insufficient for the required allocations for the first quarter of the fiscal year.

In the unemployment compensation program only approximately $700,000 will be available for use by the States on July 1. This amount, scattered in 51 jurisdictions, will not be sufficient to tide them over until the 1947 money is available.

For these reasons it is requested that provision be made in the Third Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act making 1947 funds immediately available for public assistance grants and unemployment compensation administration grants. The amounts involved are $121,000,000 for public assistance and $12,000,000 for unemployment compensation. These amounts are one-fourth of the amounts carried in the appropriation bill for 1947 as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and as passed by the House. All sums obligated or expended under this provision are to be charged against the 1947 appropriation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send forward and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 2, it is proposed to strike out lines 6 to 11, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

For the payment of 21 pages for the Senate Chamber, at $5 per day each, for the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1946, both dates inclusive, fiscal year 1947, $19,320.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this amendment would make it possible to pay to the pages of the Senate the same rate of compensation that is paid to the pages of the House. I cannot see why the pages of the Senate should not be paid the same compensation which is paid to the pages of the other House. I wish to go on record in favor of either reducing the compensation of the pages to half what it now is or increasing the compensation to the same level that is followed in compensating the pages of the other House.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Each House, of course, is the judge of its own procedure. This matter was taken up in committee. Never before were the pages paid more than a month's salary during vacation. The Congress has been practically in continuous session for the past several years, and therefore the pages have been paid practically for the entire year. It is contemplated that the Congress will adjourn approximately the middle of July, and under those circumstances the committee members were of the opinion that the pages should not be paid for work not performed by them, regardless of what may be the practice in the other House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. What the Senator from Arizona has said may be true, but I believe that it would be right and proper for the Senate to pay its pages at the same rate of compensation as that which is received by the pages of the other House. I believe the same principle applies to the Members of the Senate. The Members of the House of Representatives received $2,500 a year more than do Senators.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. This matter was taken up once before, and it is in conference at the present time. Inasmuch as we have already passed the appropriation bill, I believe that the amendment of the Senator, in connection with a deficiency bill, is entirely out of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from South Carolina could not be considered by the Senate unless a motion were made and agreed to to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 2, line 6, was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I inquire whether, in the legislative bill which the Senate has only recently passed, we did what the Senator from South Carolina is now seeking to do?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to. [Putting the question.]

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to point out that the legislative bill has been passed and we are now on a different bill. I make the point of order that we may not reconsider an item in a bill which has been passed by the Senate while we are considering another bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the motion to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to had no relationship to the legislative bill which has already been passed. The motion had relationship only to a committee amendment to the pending bill which had already been agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; Mr. President, the Senator is not correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, what we are now considering has to do with a deficiency bill. So far as I know, the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina was never offered by any Senator when the legislative bill was being considered. If it had been brought before us then, probably we would have been influenced greatly by the action which the other House had taken. But the matter did not come before the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee nor before the full committee when the legislative bill was being considered. So the Senator from South Carolina is within his right in offering the amendment to the pending bill. My reason for opposing it is that I do not believe it is wise policy, after we have passed the legislative bill, to incorporate in a deficiency bill, which the Senate is considering a half an hour later, an amendment which should have been considered when the legislative bill was before the Senate and which should also have been submitted to the committee. I believe that I am in honor bound to stand by the Appropriations Committee, because no consideration was given to this matter at all when the bill was before that committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, does the Senator take the position that because the Committee on Appropriations never gave any consideration to this matter, the Senate may not now give consideration to it?

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, no.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the position in which we find ourselves. The fact of the matter is that the Senate would be perfectly within its rights in considering this amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I do not feel that the Senator from Maryland is under any obligation to defend the Senate Appropriations Committee as though it had taken action when, in reality, it has taken no action. So the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina is to be considered in no way as any reflection on the Appropriations Committee. I think the Senator did not understand me. The point I made was that within 2 hours we had before us the bill upon which this amendment should logically have been considered. It was the legislative appropriation bill. I do not believe it is wise policy when we are considering a deficiency bill, to amend the deficiency bill on the floor of the Senate when there was opportunity during the day to offer the amendment to the appropriate bill.

I am not criticizing others who do not see it as I do, but certainly as chairman of the legislative appropriation subcommittee, which has just had the legislative appropriation bill passed this afternoon, I do not feel I can go along with the amendment without going back on my colleagues who helped me to put together that bill, which was passed a little earlier today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I cannot see how the Senator from Maryland will be going back upon his colleagues by voting for an amendment which they never considered. Since they have taken no position upon it, he is not going back on them if he supports the amendments.

The fact of the matter is, it seems to me, that if the amendment had been offered to the legislative bill, those of us who are supporting it now would have supported it then. The mere fact that the legislative bill has been passed is no bar in parliamentary law or in logic to the consideration of the amendment now, and I for one hope the Senator from South Carolina will pursue his amendment. I shall certainly support it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the legislative appropriation bill, which we have just passed, increase the pay of the pages of the House?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my understanding it did.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that the pages of the House have for some time received higher pay than the pages of the Senate?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. If I may clear the point up, the Senate does not provide money for pay of the pages when the Senate is not in session. My understanding is that the House made provision to pay the House pages even though the House were not in session. What we are about to do is to provide that the Senate pages shall be paid when the Senate is not in session. They are going to be paid, of course, when the Senate is in session.

Mr. BARKLEY. The difference is that the House has inserted a provision paying the pages during the recess, until the 31st of December, and our pages will not be paid?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And this amendment provides for their being paid?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the legislative bill having been passed, and the matter not being in shape to be considered in conference, the item must be in this bill or some other bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is no law on the subject, but we have a definite understanding that the Senate will not interfere with any appropriation the House makes for its own body, and the House will not interfere with any appropriation the Senate makes for its own body.

It is often the case that one officer of the House is paid at one rate and a similar officer in the Senate at another. There is a tendency in time for both to seek the higher level, never the lower level. We have had a rule that neither the Senate nor the House will interfere with measures which have to do with either body only.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is why the House has provided $2,500 a year expense money for the Members of the House. The Senate never made that provision. We have the understanding I have stated. Always, whenever the Senate makes the pay for one of its officials a little higher than a similar official is paid in the House, a drive is made in the House to equalize, and when the situation is reversed, there is a drive put on in the Senate to equalize. But none of the drives ever go downward, all of them go upward.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which should have been put in a bill passed some days ago.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, after line 20, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

General Accounting Office: The salary of the Comptroller General shall be at the rate of $15,000 per annum so long as the office is held by the present occupant.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, briefly, the purpose of the amendment is that the Comptroller, Mr. Lindsay Warren, is primarily the representative of Congress to audit the expenditures of the Government. I am sure that most of us feel that Mr. Warren has by proper and conscientious auditing saved hundreds of millions of dollars to the people of this country.

I understand that Mr. Warren—not from him at all, but from some of his friends—has had many offers, many of them recently, to leave the Government service at several times his present salary. I think he is too experienced and too skilled a public servant for us to lose him.

The office of Comptroller General, which Mr. Warren occupies with such distinction and merit, should be higher paid if we are to hold in that important office as auditor for the Government of the United States the kind of man we need to discharge the duties which we, as Congress, have imposed upon him as our representative in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, why would not the proper method be to offer this amendment to the next deficiency bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. It should have been put in the independent offices bill, and I understand there is a sentiment for this increase. In fact, the request to offer this amendment has come from Members of Congress and other officials in the Government, and, so far as I know, not from Mr. Warren himself. As the amendment was not put into the independent offices bill, where it should have been, the proper place to provide for it is in this deficiency bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why should it not be considered by the committee?

Mr. TYDINGS. Everybody knows the facts, and we have now finished everything except the urgent deficiency bill, which will be the last one. I have no objection to putting it off.

Mr. BALL. What is the salary now?

Mr. TYDINGS. Twelve thousand dollars.

Mr. BALL. This would raise it to $15,000?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. He is the Auditor General of our whole Government. He is really the representative of the Legislature, which has a check on the doings and the actions of the executive branch of the Government, and I think it is very small compensation for the work he is doing.

Mr. AIKEN. Would this put his salary on a par with that of Cabinet members?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; it would.

Mr. AIKEN. It appears to me that this one official of the Government, who is almost the sole representative of the legislative branch in such a position, should be put on a par with members of the Cabinet, who are really the arms of the executive branch. I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland will be agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is the amendment in order?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is in order.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have great respect for Mr. Warren, but I call attention to the fact that if we start in to give $15,000 to one man who is an arm of the legislative branch of the Government, then we are going to have the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the SEC, and similar bodies which are arms of the legislative branch of the Government asking for salaries of $15,000 for the members of those bodies. Many of those officers could leave the Government and get more money working for private industry than they are paid by the Government.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. I call attention to rule XVI, and make the point of order that the amendment is not in order because the appropriation is not made to carry out a provision of some existing law.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would be subject to the point of order.

Mr. TAFT. I make the point of order.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have no desire to push the amendment if the Senate feels it is not wise to take the action. I offer it primarily in conjunction with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. TAFT. I only make the point of order because, as I understand, we have recommended a general increase in the salaries of all Government employees, including Cabinet officers, and it seems to me it should all be done at once, and that one man should not be raised through an amendment to an appropriation bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate the reasons the Senator from Ohio has in mind, and I shall not press the matter. I could ask that the rule be suspended, or appeal from the decision of the Chair, but I shall not do either. I want the Senator to know that the Senator from Virginia, who has devoted a great deal of time to the curtailment of Government expenditures, and particularly those which have in his opinion exceeded quite often the authority and restraints put on them by Congress, feels that if Mr. Warren should leave the Government service and it should become necessary to break in a new man, it would probably be rather expensive in these emergent times, when so much money is being expended.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I might also add that if the Congress would give heed to the recommendations and the messages of the Comptroller General to the Congress, it could save the entire amount of the $15,000 salary every 15 minutes. That is only an estimate, of course. I do not think we recognize the importance of the work of the Comptroller General. It is important to the Congress, and a very large amount could be saved to the taxpayers if we heeded Mr. Warren's recommendations.

Mr. TYDINGS. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that I concede that the position of the Senator from Ohio is well taken, and if he makes a point of order there is no use in our discussing it, because we cannot change the situation.

Mr. AIKEN. I express the hope that at the first feasible opportunity this increase in salary to the Comptroller General be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossing of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6601) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

MODIFICATION OF RAILROAD FINANCIAL STRUCTURES

Mr. WHEELER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1190, Senate bill 1253.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1253) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I want to speak to the motion, if I may.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of making a motion?

Mr. WHEELER. I have already made a motion to take up Calendar 1190, Senate bill 1253.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask for the floor to speak against the Senator's motion.

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I find myself always embarrassed when I am in opposition to the Senator from Montana. But he has proposed now, at 6:15 o'clock on Friday night, at the conclusion of a very busy week, to take up a subject which is a very important and in my judgment a very complicated one. The report of the committee alone comprises 172 pages. The bill involves not only the interests of working men on various railroads, but it involves securities amounting to approximately $2,500,000,000. It changes fundamental law respecting reorganized railroad properties. It will probably affect the trust and insurance funds of many people who relied upon the law not being changed. I think this is a bad time and a late hour to take up such an important bill, and I hope the Senate will not consent to it. I hope we will take it up when we have more Members present. It was difficult to secure

a quorum a few minutes ago, and I hope the Senate will not take up the bill at this time.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the bill was reported by the Committee on Interstate Commerce about 2 months ago. It has been under study by the Interstate Commerce Committee for approximately a year. I know of no bill ever presented to the Interstate Commerce Committee or to any other committee that to my knowledge has had the thorough study this particular bill has had. It does not change the fundamental law in many respects, because some years ago we passed the law known as the McLaughlin Act, and after that we passed the Chandler Act which provided identically the same procedure that is prescribed in this bill.

Congress adopted what was known as section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. That was passed in the closing days of the Congress some years ago. That measure had never been considered by a committee. Everyone recognizes that section 77 has worked a great injustice to the stockholders of various railroad companies, and it has not worked out as it was intended it should work out by those who proposed the law at that time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask my distinguished colleague from Montana whether he has made the motion to take up the bill with the idea that it will be considered and acted upon today, or with the idea that it be made the unfinished business, for action later?

Mr. WHEELER. I will say that I have been trying to have this bill taken up for some weeks. I intend to leave Washington on Monday morning at 9 o'clock. For that reason I wanted to have it taken up and discussed now. The bill was studied by the Interstate Commerce Committee. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] worked on it very diligently, as did other Senators on both sides of the aisle. It came out of the committee with only one vote against it. The Senator who voted against it proposed an amendment which I expect to accept, which affects certain railroads, and I am sure it affects the very road in which the Senator from Illinois is interested. The bill does not affect railroad labor at all except insofar as railroad labor is interested in railroad legislation generally. As a matter of fact, many of the railroad employees organizations have gone on record in favor of the proposed legislation. I first introduced the bill at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Then hearings were held on it. Everyone who appeared, bondholders, railroad officials, and others, approved of the bill as it was originally introduced. Subsequently we amended the bill in committee. We added certain sections to it. After we amended the bill we set it down for further hearings, and again we had long hearings on it, and everyone who wanted to be heard from one end of the country to the other was heard. No bill has ever been presented to this committee or to any other committee to my knowledge on which there have been such long and thorough hearings, and everyone who wanted to be heard, from one end of the country to the other, was heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana for the present consideration of Senate bill 1253. [Putting the question.] The nays appear to have it.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1253) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with amendments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I voted in favor of taking up the bill, but it seems to me that the hour is so late that it is difficult to consider the bill, since suggestion of the absence of a quorum may fail to secure a quorum. It seems to me we either ought to meet tomorrow or take it up on Monday or later. I think we ought to take up the bill, but it seems to me that this is not an hour appropriate for taking up so important a bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had hoped that we might avoid a session tomorrow. For that reason we have been hanging on a little later than usual. But if it is necessary to meet tomorrow to accommodate the Senator from Montana, or the Senate itself, I am perfectly willing to move for a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to meet tomorrow. I have no desire to proceed tonight if we may have a session tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. We shall have to do that.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to take about 2 minutes to tell wherein time is of the essence in connection with this bill.

The valuation determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission under chapter 77 of the Bankruptcy Act for the reorganization of bankrupt railroads was based upon the hard-time earnings and was made very low. As a result, in many instances the junior stockholders and junior security holders were wiped out. The whole purpose of the bill is to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider these questions in the light of the enormous earnings during the war and their effect upon the cash assets in the future position of the bankrupt railroads.

The reorganization of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul and the wholesale wiping out of securities, was a national scandal. Senators from the States of Minnesota, South Dakota, Montana, and other States in the Northwest know that to be so. The same may be said of the Chicago & North Western.

The Rock Island reorganization is so severe that probably $60,000,000 worth of securities will be wiped out entirely, as against what would happen if we could get that reorganization back to the Interstate Commerce Commission, where this bill would send it. Final approval of the Rock Island reorganization has been withheld by the courts in Chicago for several weeks, waiting to see what the Congress would do in connection with this bill. Let me say to Senators from Illinois and Iowa that we are taking about $60,000,000 away from the Rock Island stockholders and junior security holders. That case is now set for final determination by the court on the 30th of June.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and I have been trying for many weeks to obtain consideration of the bill. I agree that it is late, but I also fully realize the desperate need for immediate action. The House has twice passed a bill which the Senator from Montana and I think is unsound. Other bills have been considered. This is a Senate bill, which is approved by everyone. Even in its present form it is approved by the savings banks and insurance representatives. There has been no objection to it except here and there from a very small group of bondholders who do not want anyone to have a fair deal except themselves.

Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to have the bill go over until tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that the bill will have to go over, and that we shall have to meet tomorrow. The motion to take the bill up has been agreed to, so that it is now the unfinished business.

NAVAL ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, when the calendar was called this afternoon, House bill 5356, to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a naval establishment, and for other purposes, was passed over at the request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. I have conferred with him and he has drafted an amendment which he says meets his objection.

I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5356, Calendar No. 1192.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5356) to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a naval establishment, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, in section 1, on page 1, line 5, after the word "advisable", to insert "or will assist in relieving United States forces of duty in China or putting the Government of the Republic of China in better position to protect or improve the safety of navigation in its waters."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 17, after the word "instance", to insert: "*Provided further*, That no information, plans, advice, material, documents, blueprints, or other papers, bearing a secret or top-secret classification shall

be disposed of or transferred under authority of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 12, to strike out:

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall terminate 5 years after the date of its enactment.

And insert:

SEC. 3. (a) War-built vessels, as defined in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, of 2,000 gross tons or more, shall not be subject to the provisions of this act, and war-built vessels, as defined in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, of less than 2,000 gross tons, shall not be subject to disposal under this act until January 1, 1948, unless the United States Maritime Commission is consulted by the Secretary of the Navy as to the proposed disposal of any such vessel under this act and states that it has no objection to such disposal.

(b) The provisions of this act shall terminate 5 years after the date of its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. As I have said, I have conferred with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. He has drafted this amendment, which he says meets his objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 2, after the word "in", it is proposed to strike out "naval matters" and insert "training its personnel to operate the ships and equipment herein transferred."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article by Drew Pearson which was published in the Washington Post of June 13, 1946, on the subject of the railroad strike.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON, June 5.—It is now possible to give a play-by-play account of what happened inside the White House during the "lost week end."

This columnist has been around Washington a good many years, but the events preceding Harry Truman's labor message to Congress were the most bizarre ever witnessed. They prove that Harry Truman's worst enemy is his own loyalty to friends. Here is what happened:

On Friday morning, just after the rail strike started, Truman held a Cabinet meeting. He was hopping mad at A. F. Whitney and Alvanley Johnston. Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach was equally burned up, but not at the strikers. He was sore at likeable John Steelman, the White House labor expert, and John Snyder, the war reconverter, for messing up the negotiations.

At the Cabinet meeting, Postmaster General Hannegan wanted Truman to go on the air with an appeal to the public, but no crackdown on labor. Secretary of War Patterson wanted the President to take over the railroads at once, even produced a blueprint for the Army's strike-breaking operations. Secretary Byrnes said he thought a settlement could be reached but not by Steelman, in whom the unions had lost faith.

At the Cabinet meeting also Secretary of the Treasury Fred Vinson asked how much money separated the railroad workers and the operators—in other words, how much would it take to satisfy labor's unmet demands. Steelman, who had been conducting negotiations for more than a week, said he didn't know. So did Schwellenbach. So did Byrnes. But John Snyder volunteered that they were between three hundred and five hundred million dollars apart. This very large estimate led Vinson and Byrnes to the conclusion that there was no possibility of a negotiated settlement, and they then cast their weight with the Secretary of War in favor of letting the Army run the railroads.

After the Cabinet meeting, Truman lunched with Snyder and Steelman. They urged him to use force to break the strike; also, to go before Congress and ask for new legislation. After lunch, therefore, Truman called a special meeting of certain Cabinet members and advisers, including Secretary of States Byrnes, Attorney General Clark, Secretary of the Treasury Vinson, John Steelman, John Snyder, Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach, and the President. Truman informed them he had decided (1) to go on the air that night and (2) address Congress the next day. He then outlined the general nature of what he wanted to say—some of it drastic.

At this point Secretary Vinson, realizing an important break with Roosevelt precedent was imminent, once again asked whether Snyder was sure of his figures regarding the distance between the railroad operators and the brotherhoods. Snyder then sheepishly admitted that only between twenty-five and thirty million dollars separated the two.

Steelman also confessed that the three important rules changes the union was really insisting on would only cost the railroads $18,000,000.

At this, both Byrnes and Vinson hit the ceiling. They claimed it was fantastic to let the whole country be tied up when both sides were so close to agreement. A settlement, they insisted, was both possible and probable, and it was unwise, in the light of this information for the President to take the strong action he contemplated.

John Snyder, however, insisted that it was too late. Word had already gone out to the public that the President would address the Nation and talk to Congress. He could not turn back. Truman agreed with Snyder and asked those present to return at 7 o'clock with drafts of the speech he was to deliver at 10 p. m.—a pitifully short time for any Chief Executive to prepare such a momentous pronouncement.

Shortly after 7:30, the group reconvened at the White House. Secretary Byrnes stayed only a few minutes, left to meet with union leaders Whitney and Johnston.

Principal speech writer turned out to be slow-moving, good-natured, Presidential Secretary Bill Hassett, known as a fair editor but a terrible speech writer. He was only a second-string man on the Roosevelt team.

Snyder showed up for the meeting, feeling no pain. He interrupted the speech writing from time to time with inane cracks which served no useful purpose.

Several times Vinson and Schwellenbach tried to balance the speech by pointing out that the railroad operators had refused to make concessions. Each time Snyder and Steelman vetoed the proposal. Each time Truman sided with Snyder.

Schwellenbach and Vinson both opposed Truman's personal denunciation of Whitney and Johnston, but Snyder shouted wildly that the two union leaders were trying to destroy the Chief, and that they had to be named. Truman agreed.

Finally, the speech was completed only 20 minutes before the President went on the air. At the time he made it, Truman didn't even know what kind of legislation he was going to request of Congress the next day. It was in this confused, uncertain atmosphere that the President of the United States made the most important political decision of his career.

Under Secretary of Commerce Al Schindler—one of the Missouri boys by adoption—will resign soon. Schindler hopes to become Under Secretary of the Navy.

EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED OFFICERS BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I understand that today a motion to reconsider the vote by which House bill 5626, Calendar No. 1442, was passed, was entered by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. That is an important piece of veterans' legislation. I wish to give notice that at a very early date I shall seek action on the motion to reconsider.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I regret that circumstances have made it necessary to have a session tomorrow, but in the hope that we may wind up speedily by meeting early I propose, when we conclude today's business, to make a motion to take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Paul A. Walker, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1946.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Midshipman Dean L. Kellogg to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign, from the 5th day of June 1946; and

Sundry officers for appointment in the Navy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of C. Girard Davidson to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Warner W. Gardner to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ivy W. Duggan to be Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Samuel A. Pillar to be Assistant Paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from June 5, 1946.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, June 15, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 14 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

James Joseph Reynolds, Jr., of New Jersey, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1946.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

John R. Steelman, of Alabama, to be Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion for a term of 2 years, vice John W. Snyder, resigned.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

James H. Flanagan, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years from July 1, 1946. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARIZONA

James M. Rice, Fry, Ariz. Office became Presidential January 1, 1942.

COLORADO

Edward Lee Barrington, Granada, Colo., in place of M. P. Wion, resigned.

DELAWARE

Anne H. Rose, Delaware City, Del., in place of A. H. McCarthy, to correct name.

GEORGIA

George W. Adolphus, Sandy Springs, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

IDAHO

Myrtle M. Cochran, Juliaetta, Idaho, in place of J. H. Millard, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Irene M. Parrent, Hurst, Ill., in place of G. G. Vaughan, resigned.

Anna Mae Smith, Roselle, Ill., in place of H. C. Thiemann, removed.

KENTUCKY

Charles R. Nilles, Bagdad, Ky., in place of Clayton Samples, transferred.

LOUISIANA

Laura P. Grantham, Bush, La., in place of Christine Jarrell, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

James F. Desmond, Reading, Mass., in place of J. F. Desmond, commission expired.

Vernon D. Morgan, South Yarmouth, Mass., in place of A. W. Baker, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Irving A. Kime, Burt, Mich., in place of L. A. Green, resigned.

Marlie Slingluff, Elwell, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEBRASKA

Eldon B. Pittam, Adams, Nebr., in place of C. D. Gottula, transferred.

Rudolph F. Biere, Cook, Nebr., in place of M. B. Packwood, resigned.

Herbert H. Ottens, Dunbar, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Henry F. Taddiken, Shelby, Nebr., in place of J. H. LaMunyon, transferred.

NEW MEXICO

Ramonsita Gallegos, Chama, N. Mex., in place of Paul Nesbitt, resigned.

NEW YORK

Frank G. Shattuck, Bouckville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edward T. Mulhern, Brockport, N. Y., in place of John Foye, resigned.

Leonard W. Riell, Copake Falls, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alton B. Moses, Parishville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Norman L. Howell, Sunmount, N. Y., in place of E. P. Sullivan, deceased.

OHIO

Harold E. Hall, West Lafayette, Ohio, in place of C. A. Kempf, resigned.

OREGON

Eleanor R. Stewart, Monroe, Oreg., in place of R. A. Chisholm, retired.

Ross H. Linville, Yachats, Oreg., in place of S. M. Mitchell, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

William H. Lambie, Liverpool, Pa., in place of R. P. Williamson, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Marvin C. Baldwin, Orangeburg, S. C., in place of A. B. Chavis, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Harry Schnarr, Brandt, S. Dak., in place of G. S. Severson, resigned.

Frank E. Phelps, Humboldt, S. Dak., in place of J. H. Harris, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Floyd E. Joyner, Huntingdon, Tenn., in place of J. C. Owens, transferred.

Cordia T. Miller, Indian Springs, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Albert Keathley, New River, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TEXAS

Lucile W. Martin, Hearne, Tex., in place of W. C. Allen, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Ruby M. Nicholson, Ferrum, Va., in place of C. B. Nolen, transferred.

WASHINGTON

Daniel F. Coulter, South Bend, Wash., in place of H. M. Connor, removed.

WEST VIRGINIA

Lucille R. Cooper, Kincaid, W. Va., in place of E. B. Dooley, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Franklin J. Fritsche, Dorchester, Wis., in place of A. A. Beck, resigned.

William S. Sinkler, Green Bay, Wis., in place of J. J. Brogan, Jr., resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 14 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF THE INTERIOR

C. Girard Davidson
Warner W. Gardner

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Ivy W. Duggan to be Governor of the Farm Credit Administration for a term of 6 years from June 15, 1946.

IN THE NAVY

Samuel A. Pillar to be an assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign, from June 5, 1946.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 14, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Master, in this quiet moment we await Thy divine presence that will enable us to hold our course amid the exactions of our responsibilities. Thou hast said: "I will keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee." Illuminate our lives with such wise thoughts and cheerful words that we may have no other purpose than to do Thy will.

As rich harvests are foretold, lift our hearts to Thee; quicken our sense of Christian duty to feed and nourish the starving ones in stricken lands; may Thy good angels watch over them and the children and keep them from ill and distraction. As we serve them may we make a highway of hope through the deserts of their want and distress: for their sakes may we take comfort in necessities and privations. O keep the sacred fires burning on the altars of our natures, that our flag, the challenge of the centuries, with its symbolism of sacrifice and service, may not be in vain. In the name of the world's Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the

President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 13, 1946:

H. R. 1229. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary M. Wolf.

On June 14, 1946:

H. R. 1394. An act for the relief of William H. W. Komp;

H. R. 1538. An act for the relief of Robert J. Cramer;

H. R. 3177. An act for the relief of James J. Barrett, Jr.;

H. R. 3355. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Jones Hansel;

H. R. 3378. An act for the relief of Dr. John A. Logan;

H. R. 5212. An act for the relief of the dependents of Cecil M. Foxworth, deceased; and

H. R. 5407. An act to grant to the Federal Works Administrator certain powers with respect to site acquisition, building construction, purchase of buildings, and other matters.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6042. An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. MILLIKIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6084. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TRAYNOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include in one a newspaper column and in the other a statement on foreign policy by the Union for Democratic Action.

Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the June 6 edition of the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very fine article by Capt. Joel W. Westbrook that appeared in a recent issue of Collier's magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 13, 1946, commenting on the visit of Poland's valiant soldier, Gen. Tadeusz Komorowski.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to insert therewith an article by Mr. M. S. Szymczak, member of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, notwithstanding the fact that the article exceeds the two-page limit by one-third page. The estimated cost is $140.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Political Predictions," which appeared in the Fairmont Times on the 11th of June.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENDING THE PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, BARRY, WOLCOTT, CRAWFORD, and GAMBLE.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 662, Rept. No. 2285), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H. R. 388) to amend section 201 (g) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1138–1139; 8 U. S. C. 601), with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same hereby is, agreed to.

PAY READJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6084), an act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAY, THOMASON, BROOKS, SPARKMAN, ANDREWS of New York, SHORT, and ARENDS.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include an editorial from the Lowell Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. GROSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

THE NEBRASKA ELECTION AND THE BRITISH LOAN

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, it is my considered judgment that any Member of Congress from the Midwest, either Democrat or Republican, who votes for the British loan should buy a one-way ticket when he leaves Washington to go home, because he will not need a return ticket. The vote in Nebraska, in my opinion, was a 2-to-1 vote against the British loan. The feeling in my district is at least 3 to 1. I believe that the feeling all through the Midwest is at least 2 to 1. Now, you can take that as a prophecy if you want to or as a warning.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some quotations.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter regarding a trip to Yellowstone Park.

Mr. ELSTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times, Mr. Truman's Shoes Do Not Fit.

Mr. SAVAGE (at the request of Mr. DE LACY) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain tributes to the flag.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a cablegram from Manila.

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a letter and a statement.

THE BRITISH LOAN

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, when I heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] comment on the fact that those from the Midwest should buy only a one-way ticket home if they voted for the British loan, it is my hope that all Members of Congress who feel they are being compelled, on account of some undue reason to vote for the British loan, wherever they live, whether Pennsylvania, New England, or the South, will get a one-way ticket also, because I am hopeful that the people of this country will make their wishes known. The people should let you know if they want you to give away their money. If you will analyze the statement of the Federal Treasury showing the amount of indebtedness which the people of this country have to pay, you will not find that we have $4,400,000,000 either of money or commodities in this country which we can give to Great Britain. I do not think the people want it, and I hope you will carefully consider the matter. I have nothing against Great Britain but I have love, honor, respect, and hold all things dear that is good for the United States of America. I am afraid if you run us into debt any more you will wreck us financially. You will bankrupt our Treasury. You have no right morally or constitutionally to jeopardise our solidarity as a nation. Any Representative who does is a mighty poor representative of the American people and I hope the people of this country will keep that in mind in November when they elect their Congressman. It is easy to vote the money away but it is hard for your constituents to pay.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 663) and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. HOFFMAN of Pennsylvania is hereby elected to the Committee on Mines and Mining, Indian Affairs, and Patents.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—TWENTY-SECOND REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER LEND-LEASE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the twenty-second report of operations under the Lend-Lease Act.

This report contains an explanation of the lend-lease settlement reached with the United Kingdom on December 6, 1945, and includes the specific agreements of March 27, 1946, between the United States and the United Kingdom. I am convinced that this settlement, which is in accordance with the aims of article VII of the master lend-lease agreement between the two Governments, serves the best interests of the United States and, at the same time, will "promote mutually advantageous economic relations" between the two countries.

This report also discusses the continuation of lend-lease aid to China, which has been necessary to enable that country to take over the areas under Japanese occupation, and information on the total amount of lend-lease aid rendered.

Operations under the Lend-Lease Act which remain to be completed, in addition to accounting and reporting activities, include the delivery of the small quantity of supplies still in the lend-lease "pipe lines," for which the foreign governments have agreed to pay on varying terms, and negotiation of final settlements. Deliveries of "pipe line" supplies are being made as rapidly as circumstances permit. As of this date final lend-lease settlements have been negotiated with the United Kingdom, Turkey, India, France, and Australia. Negotiations with other countries are being carried on and will be completed as early as possible. Terms of these settlements will be discussed in future reports.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 14, 1946.*

NATIONAL CEMETERIES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 639 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the act (S. 524) to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory, and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of war veterans. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the act and to continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the act shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the act for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the act and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in 1939 Congress passed a National Cemetery Act. However, the need of a more comprehensive act to fit present conditions was recognized, and the Senate passed unanimously S. 524 and sent it to the House. After careful consideration, the Committee on Military Affairs reported it unanimously with amendments, and this rule makes it in order to take up that bill.

The amendments provide that the Secretary of War has authority to establish a new national cemetery only when it is needed in 1 of the 21 States which do not now have a national cemetery. There is further provision that where there are already existing cemeteries which are no longer adequate, additional land may be procured adjoining the present cemetery.

The bill provides that the superintendents or employees of such national cemeteries shall be selected from "meritorious and trustworthy officers, warrant officers, or enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard who have been honorably discharged, relieved from active duty, or transferred to a Reserve component, and who may have been disabled for active service in line of duty."

The bill has been before the Committee on Rules since last year. Although requests have been made for a rule, I have withheld action until I could make investigation as to need and cost. Both the War Department and the Bureau of the Budget have approved the bill in its present form.

In that intervening period I have received hundreds of letters from American Legion posts and from other local veterans groups; from civic organizations; and from relatives of those who offered all to their country. It appears from actual surveys made by local American Legion posts indicate that in a majority of cases relatives of soldiers or former soldiers eligible for burial in the national cemeteries will prefer that burial be made there, either because of the honor or because the relatives simply do not have the means otherwise to procure suitable lots and markers in expensive private cemeteries. It appears, too, from those letters that there are thousands of near relatives of American soldiers who own no private burial lots and who urged the establishment of a national cemetery in each State in order to avoid the undue travel of perhaps as much as a thousand miles or more to the officially consecrated burying grounds in other States. It is to be clearly understood, however, that this will not preclude the use of private grounds when preferred by the surviving relatives.

The least we can do for the brave men who have come to the defense of our country, and for their relatives, is to provide proper public burial places.

Then there is another phase of the question of public burial grounds which must be faced. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, but that you have read in recent months of the unfortunate methods used by some private cemeteries to induce grief-stricken relatives to purchase cemetery lots at outrageously high prices. Those unscrupulous methods have been used against even relatives of our war dead. Then, only today, there was called to my attention a news report in the Chicago Sun of June 11 which describes another shameful practice. This article states that a Nation-wide investigation of allegedly illegal monopolistic practices in the sale of caskets and other burial supplies. I am sure that not all manufacturers and morticians, nor all operators of private cemeteries, have been involved in any such ghoulish illegalities; but it is sad to think that any have thus preyed on sorrow, and we can hope that passage of this bill will help in discouraging such practices.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I desire to include the news article from the June 11 edition of the Chicago Sun already mentioned:

PLANS PROBE OF CASKET SALES—JUSTICE DEPARTMENT SEEKS EVIDENCE OF MONOPOLISTIC TACTICS

Plans for a Nation-wide investigation of allegedly illegal practices in the sale and distribution of caskets and other burial supplies were revealed yesterday by George B. Haddock, chief of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in this area.

Haddock, who was authorized by Attorney General Clark to conduct the investigation, obtained seven grand jury subpenas against individuals, firms, and morticians' associations. The probe will be centered here.

RECORDS TO BE SCANNED

The organizations will be asked to produce their records preliminary to the presentation of evidence to the grand jury.

Names of those to be subpenaed were not revealed, but Haddock was authorized to investigate the following seven organizations:

National Funeral Directors of America, National Selected Mortuaries, Casket Manufacturers of America, Casket Hardware Manufacturers' Service Bureau, Independent National Funeral Directors, Advertising Funeral Directors of America, and Metal Vault.

It was indicated that the inquiry would be centered on the sale and distribution of supplies and the possibility of price-fixing and monopolistic activities in violation of the Sherman antitrust law.

CASE RECALLED

The high cost of coffins was brought to public attention here last January when John D. Regan, manager of the Mid-City Funeral Home, 822 West Madison Street, was accused of overcharging Mrs. Gerania Espinoza, 1149 West Harrison Street, for the coffin in which her husband was buried.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as far as I have been able to learn, there is no objection to the rule for the consideration of this bill on this side of the aisle, but I understand there is some objection to the bill itself.

The report states that the Committee on Military Affairs believes that there is an urgent need for the establishment of national cemeteries throughout the United States and its possessions. I believe it is vitally important that the Committee on Military Affairs bring forth a good case and show the need and desire for these national cemeteries.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman wish to use any more time? If not, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

PARK RIVER DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT, WALSH COUNTY, N. DAK.—REREFERENCE OF RESOLUTION

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 354, to provide for the designation of the Park River Dam and Reservoir project in Walsh County, N. Dak., as the Homme Reservoir and Dam, and that the resolution be rereferred to the Committee on Flood Control. I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and there is no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 161]

Adams	Gavin	Miller, Calif.
Andrews, Ala.	Gearhart	Miller, Nebr.
Andrews, N. Y.	Geelan	Murphy
Angell	Gerlach	Norton
Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	O'Brien, Mich.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gore	O'Hara
Barden	Granger	Outland
Barrett, Pa.	Grant, Ala.	Patrick
Barry	Grant, Ind.	Patterson
Bell	Green	Peterson, Ga.
Bender	Gwinn, N. Y.	Pfeifer
Bennet, N. Y.	Hall,	Philbin
Boren	Leonard W.	Ploeser
Boykin	Hancock	Plumley
Bradley, Mich.	Hand	Powell
Brumbaugh	Harris	Pratt
Buckley	Hart	Quinn, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Rabin
Butler	Heffernan	Rains
Byrne, N. Y.	Herter	Ramey
Camp	Hobbs	Randolph
Cannon, Fla.	Hoffman, Mich.	Rayfiel
Carlson	Hoffman, Pa.	Reece, Tenn.
Celler	Holifield	Rich
Clark	Hook	Richards
Clason	Horan	Rivers
Clevenger	Huber	Robertson,
Cochran	Jackson	N. Dak.
Cole, N. Y.	Jarman	Robinson, Utah
Colmer	Johnson, Calif.	Roe, N. Y.
Cooley	Johnson, Ind.	Rogers, Fla.
Corbett	Johnson,	Rooney
Courtney	Luther A.	Ryter
Crawford	Jonkman	Sadowski
Curley	Judd	Savage
Curtis	Kearney	Sheridan
Dawson	Kefauver	Slaughter
Delaney,	Keogh	Smith, Ohio
James J.	Kilburn	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney,	King	Sparkman
John J.	Klein	Starkey
Dingell	Knutson	Stevenson
Dirksen	Kopplemann	Stewart
Douglas, Calif.	Kunkel	Stigler
Durham	LaFollette	Sumner, Ill.
Elliott	Lane	Taylor
Ellsworth	Lanham	Thomason
Elsaesser	Lea	Tolan
Engle, Calif.	Lesinski	Torrens
Fallon	Luce	Wasielewski
Fernandez	Ludlow	Welch
Fisher	McCormack	White
Fogarty	McGehee	Wickersham
Folger	McGlinchey	Wigglesworth
Fuller	McGregor	Winstead
Fulton	Manasco	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gamble	Mankin	Woodhouse
Gathings	Marcantonio	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 259 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL CEMETERIES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 524) to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of war veterans.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 524, with Mr. FLANNAGAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Florida Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the national cemetery program as it now exists had its inception at the time of the Civil War. Since then it has been added to from time to time, but there never has been what might be considered an over-all policy of planning for national cemeteries. It is recognized that as the result of World War II and the fact that millions and millions of men served in World War II and that they and their families are going to be eligible for burial in national cemeteries, that the time has come when we must begin to plan from a national standpoint for this very important matter

The bill which is brought to you today, S. 524, is brought to you with a view of setting up an over-all program purely and simply on the basis of need. I should like to point out to the Committee that there are at present in the United States 21 States which have no national cemetery. The greater number of these States are in the far West where the distances are great. There are eight States which have strictly limited national cemetery facilities and there are other States which on the face of it have facilities for the burial of veterans and their families in national cemeteries, but because of local circumstances they are not being utilized, and I doubt that they are going to be utilized. For instance, I should like to mention Andersonville, Ga. In the War Department report Andersonville, Ga., is listed as a cemetery which has space for a great number of burials. Without going into the right or wrong of the tragic events that took place in Andersonville, I think we all realize that that cemetery is not going to be utilized by veterans who live in the area. There are a number of cemeteries that are so situated that although there is space for burials they are not going to be utilized for the burial of the veterans who live in those areas.

S. 524 attempts to correct a situation which we believe requires immediate correction. The War Department believes that it will have to come to Congress beginning not later than the first of next year and ask for authorization to set up national cemeteries at various places in the United States or to enlarge present cemeteries. If that takes place we shall have a lot of piecemeal legislation. We will do this thing one bill at a time, one place at a time. It is considered more reasonable and logical to attempt to set up a national policy now, to attempt to answer all of the questions that we can at this point, by authorizing an immediate over-all national cemetery program.

I should like to point out that when S. 524 came to the House, it provided for the immediate construction of 79 additional cemeteries and for the extension of 13 present cemeteries. The House Committee on Military Affairs has amended the act in order to put it purely on a basis of need. The authorization will exist, but the cemeteries will not be constructed, under the amendments suggested by the House committee, until and as they are needed, that need to be determined by the Secretary of War.

I wish to point out to the committee that when bodies were brought back after the First World War, about 12½ percent were interred in national cemeteries, most of them in Arlington.

It is now estimated that roughly 16⅔ percent of the veterans of World War I who died during or after their war service have been interred in national cemeteries. I would like to point out also that some of the members of the families of 80 percent of those veterans have also been buried in these cemeteries. Under the law the widows, the minor children, and unmarried daughters may be buried in the national cemetery if the husband or father is buried there. If there had been attractive nearby national cemeteries many other veterans would no doubt have taken advantage of the opportunity to be buried in them. At present excessive distances, which in some cases are as great as 500 to 1,000 miles, deter veterans and their families from using the facilities of the national cemeteries. Under the completed program which we propose there would be but few people in this country living more than 100 miles from a national cemetery.

It is estimated that there are now living nearly 20,000,000 veterans of wars of the United States who are eligible for burial in national cemeteries. I do not presume to say that all of these 20,000,000 are going to want to be buried in a national cemetery. Naturally the greater number of them will be buried in their own family plots. However, it is their right to be buried in a national cemetery with as little inconvenience and expense to the family as possible in the event they so desire.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. Is it not a fact that the War Department now is asking each family whether they want the body of the dead soldier returned and, furthermore, as to where it shall be buried?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct, under a bill which we passed in this Congress a short time ago providing for the repatriation of World War II dead now buried overseas. The War Department is asking the families of the dead if they wish the bodies of their loved ones brought back to this country. The next of kin will have the right to have them buried in a national cemetery or they may be buried in a local cemetery if it is so desired.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Can the gentleman give us the approximate number of our foreign dead that are eligible to be repatriated?

Mr. SIKES. It is estimated that there are approximately 300,000 men buried overseas or who are still listed as missing and whose bodies may yet be found and that the greater number of those will be brought back. About 60 percent of the bodies of World War I dead were brought back, but it is estimated after careful studies that a considerably greater number of the bodies of World War II men are going to be brought back. The number probably will run 80 percent or more.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I notice a number of our national cemeteries are filled. A number of others have space for less than 400 plots. How many plots are there now available in national cemeteries?

Mr. SIKES. An over-all figure would be approximately 175,000 plots now available in all national cemeteries, plus acreage permitting the development of perhaps 200,000 more. But I would like to point out to the gentleman that many of these are not considered attractive or even desirable under present conditions. In many instances they are inaccessible. They are not evenly distributed over the Nation. Actually, about 62 of the existing 80 national cemeteries were founded as a direct result of the Civil War. Many of these do not command local interest or are not in keeping with local traditions. Some of them are so located in industrial or other restricted areas that it is impossible to beautify them and expand them in a way to make them attractive or desirable.

The best-known one, Arlington National Cemetery, is rapidly filling up, and the War Department estimates that within a very few years, Arlington National Cemetery will no longer offer a place of burial for our honored war dead. It is going to be necessary at a very early date to provide additional national cemetery space; consequently, it is thought that the logical and sensible thing to do is to provide for an over-all national cemetery program which will permit these cemeteries to be established in various States as they are needed.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman stated that there are 20 States that have no national cemeteries?

Mr. SIKES. There are 21 States that have no national cemeteries.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I wish the gentleman would comment on the provisions of the bill which require appointment of superintendents and caretakers from the group of honorably discharged soldiers, if they are obtainable at all.

Mr. SIKES. I will be glad to do that. The bill is short, and on page 3, beginning in line 9, it specifically states that—

> The superintendents of national cemeteries shall hereafter be selected from meritorious and trustworthy officers, warrant officers, or enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, who have been honorably discharged—

And so forth.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. As I read that section of the act you have currently confined the appointment of these superintendents to veterans without regard to whether they will be available or not, as you have done with the other personnel. Was it the gentleman's intention to confine it to those? If you cannot find any in that category, why bar yourself from the appointment of any superintendent whatsoever?

Mr. SIKES. I find it rather difficult to imagine a situation presenting itself where we would not find an honorably discharged veteran of the services who is not interested in a position of this kind.

Mr. MATHEWS. But he must also have been disabled for active service in line of duty.

Mr. SIKES. I do not think it is the intention to confine it to them, but rather to give preference to this group.

Mr. MATHEWS. That is not what it says.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. Can the gentleman tell how many positions will be involved in this bill?

Mr. SIKES. It is impossible for me to tell the gentleman at this time how many positions would be involved, because I do not know how rapidly these new cemeteries will be established. There would be a caretaker or superintendent for each cemetery, and of course there would be other personnel required in carrying on work in connection with the maintenance and operation of the cemetery.

In the little time remaining, I wonder if I might be permitted to proceed so that I can touch on the cost of the bill?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Who is going to administer this program? Will it be the Quartermaster Corps or some other branch of the Army?

Mr. SIKES. The Secretary of War, as the bill is presented by the committee, would be in charge. The bill as it came from the Senate provided that the quartermaster would be in charge, but the House Committee offered an amendment which would leave the Secretary of War with direct responsibility for the administration of the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. The Quartermaster Corps has always performed a wonderful service in taking care of the bodies of our soldiers and service men.

Mr. SIKES. I certainly agree with the gentleman. The Quartermaster Corps has done a great job in carrying on this very important and worthy work through many years and I believe it is capable of carrying on that work.

Mr. STEFAN. But as the bill now reads, the Quartermaster Corps will have nothing to do with it.

Mr. SIKES. Not necessarily. The Secretary of War may designate the Quartermaster Corps to carry on the work, but it would be optional with the Secretary of War to designate such department as he sees fit.

I would like to point out that the Secretary of War has recently issued rules and regulations which would place the construction of these cemeteries under the engineers and the care and maintenance of the cemeteries under the Quartermaster Corps.

Mr. STEFAN. Then it is optional with the Secretary of War to designate some branch of the service to take care of them?

Mr. SIKES. As the bill is brought to the floor by the House committee, an amendment is offered which would have that effect.

I will now attempt to touch on the cost of this legislation. The over-all cost is estimated to be $123,000,000, but I want to point out that this measure is simply an authorization. Further it is an authorization for the complete program, extending over a period of years. It does not mean an expenditure of $123,000,000 now or a year from now or 10 years from now. It simply means that we have estimated this amount to be the over-all cost of the entire program. As national cemeteries are shown to be needed and as the Committee on Appropriations gets a request from the Secretary for funds for additional national cemeteries, then it will be in order for the Committee on Appropriations to bring to the floor a recommendation for the expenditure of a part of that $123,000,000.

The authorization will make possible, as needed, the establishment of 79 new cemeteries and the enlargement of 13 existing ones. The figure of $123,000,000 includes an estimated cost of maintenance for 1 year on all of these establishments. That maintenance and operation cost is given in the committee hearings as roughly $10,000,000 for the first year, and about $6,000,000 annually afterward. But please bear in mind that this is the figure for all of the program, much of which may not be existent for several years.

This cost, then is about $6 per person for the veterans who are eligible for burial in national cemeteries, and much less than $6 when the members of the families are included. It has been urged that the Congress appropriate additional funds for burial plots and for funeral expenses in the family cemeteries as a substitute for this measure. It is reliably shown that this will cost the Government $50 to $300 for each veteran, or $1,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000.

We seek in this measure to provide attractive, dignified settings appropriate to the sacred trust left by those who gave their all for this Nation. These cemeteries will be great memorials to our honored dead, each symbolic of the history and setting of the State in which it is located.

May I point out that this measure comes to us with the recommendation of the War Department, of the Bureau of the Budget, and of that great national organization, the American Legion.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I do not want anything I may say to be construed as indicating that I am opposed to the exercise by the Government of a proper function to see to it that the veterans who have served this Nation are given an opportunity for decent, respectable, honored burial, but after thoroughly reading the testimony given in support of this bill I find myself unable to support this legislation even as the bill has been tempered by the committee, as indicated by the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

It is true that this is an authorization bill. As the gentleman has indicated, the letter from the Secretary of War indicates that the final effect of the enactment of this bill, according to their estimates, is that it will cost for acquisition purposes $123,000,000. Further reading of the testimony indicates that with this program in operation the annual cost of maintaining the operation will be somewhere between $10,000,000 and $20,000,000.

Let us see what is stirring up this demand for such a grandiose program as this. In accordance with the testimony found on page 6 of the hearings submitted by this committee, the recorded burials in the foreign service of soldiers in the present war are 208,004. They estimate that there may be 40,000 more scattered or lost throughout the world, but so far as the records of the War Department are presently concerned we are dealing with the figure of 208,004. As the gentleman indicated, those bodies are going to be brought back if the parents or the interested next of kin desire them to be brought back. The cost of bringing them back and reinterring them in America will be borne by the Government.

Where are these people going to be reinterred? I have received at least 50 letters from parents in my district who want their sons brought back to America. Not a single one has indicated that they want them brought back to any place except their local cemetery, where they can be buried beside father and mother and the other members of the family.

The gentleman knows and the record shows conclusively that only a mere pittance of those who were brought back from the last war found lodgement in these national cemeteries. The evidence shows that people of America consider the interment of the dead as a religious rite and a religious ceremony. You cannot overcome that attitude upon the part of the American people. They want their honored dead buried near at home in the family plot, where they can go out and visit that plot and reverently, if you please, decorate the graves of their dead.

I have spoken now of those who are going to be returned. As to the millions that are being discharged from the service, what does Uncle Sam do for them? The Veterans' Administration will provide $100 for burial expense. Suppose a veteran in my town passes away and by some strange quirk of conscience the family says, "We want to bury him in Arlington Cemetery" or some other national cemetery, something that has never happened to my knowledge in my area, but suppose it was true. The family of that veteran would be given a mere pittance of $100 to carry that body from Wisconsin out here to Arlington, that is all. They give them the interment charges free, and a little plot of land out there to put that body in. I want to have the chairman of this committee tell the Congress how big a lot they give for the burial of the widow and the infant children so that they can be buried together in a national cemetery. Under the situation presently existing in national cemeteries, if a wife is to be buried with her husband they would have to be buried one over the other. You know that as well as I do. The space set aside is so small that they cannot bury them side by side and they would have to be buried two deep.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MAY. That is answered in this legislation which provides for the extension or enlargement of existing cemeteries where the Secretary of War finds it necessary. In other words, if he does not have enough space to bury them side by side, he can provide for that.

Mr. KEEFE. There is nothing in this legislation which says they are to be buried side by side. They have issued a regulation with which I am very familiar because I have studied this record carefully, which on its face pretends to give to the veteran the right to have his wife, infant child, and in some cases an unmarried minor child, buried in the same plot. But I would like you to show me where in the set-up as it presently exists there is available in any national cemetery the space for them to be buried side by side. I would like you to show me any regulation which is now proposed to cover the situation where there is a wife, infant child, and two or more minor unmarried children of the veteran. How in Heaven's name in the plot that is reserved for them in the cemetery can they possibly be buried side by side? They just cannot do it and that is all there is to it. Members of Congress, how much use has been made of these cemeteries? We have some fine national cemeteries. The evidence shows on page 49 of the hearings that the Zachary Taylor Cemetery, which was built in 1928, to date has only 988 interments. The Government cemetery on Long Island, which was built in 1936, only 9 years ago, in the most densely populated area of America, with a population of 10,000,000 contiguous to it, has but 18,693 interments. The cemetery at Baltimore which was built in 1937 has only 2,025 interments, and the cemetery at Golden Gate, San Bruno, which was built in 1939, only has 3,765. The one at Fort Snelling which was built in 1939 only has 2,467 interments. What do these figures show when you take into consideration the number of deaths of people entitled to interment in national cemeteries? They show beyond peradventure of doubt that deep in the heart of the American boy or man who has served in the military forces of his Government there is a religious, an emotional, a real sentiment, to be buried near his next of kin where they can come and visit his grave. You all know that to be a fact. This grandiose scheme has been referred to as a mere authorization. That is true. But you know what will happen when you pass this authorization. The Secretary of War will be bludgeoned from all sides. It will be said, "The Congress has authorized a cemetery out there near my town. Now I want you to put it there." He will determine the need. I tell you, you are embarking upon a program that is going to cost you $122,000,000 and a minimum, in my opinion, of $20,000,000 a year for maintenance in perpetuity.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think it might be possible for the Congress to pass some legislation which might provide aid to veterans who might desire to be buried in the Government cemeteries?

Mr. KEEFE. Why, of course. According to the Army's own figures, they estimate that only 16⅔ percent of the veterans will have the benefit of this legislation. Eighty-four percent of the veterans will have no benefit under this legislation. It is class legislation of the worst kind. It will only take care of a mere 16⅔ percent of the veterans. If you want to do something real you should provide for the family of the veteran some funds with which to purchase in his local cemetery a decent lot and a decent memorial. Under this bill you let 84 percent of the veterans shift for themselves. You cannot justify this thing as a mere authorization. When you pass this bill you will be asked for the money, and it will come mighty quickly, and the Congress will have to respond.

I hope we can send this bill back to the committee and bring in some legislation that will fit the need and the demand for giving these veterans a suitable, decent, and proper burial.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, consideration of this legislation today reminds us that the military carries its caste system to the grave.

Fallen soldiers, both officers and enlisted men, gave their lives for their country. Their sacrifice was equal. Their honors in death should be equal.

The War Department explains it follows custom in the present system of segregating graves of officers and men. I do not believe this is right and it should not be done. It has informed at least one newspaper it contemplates no change in this system unless Congress enacts legislation to the contrary.

It is my hope the committee will amend the bill now under consideration to provide for the elimination of the War Department's practice of segregating the graves of enlisted men from those of officers in national cemeteries. Death is a great leveler of persons—of "dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return"—and when the human body is buried in Mother Earth our soldiers should be buried indiscriminately.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, because of my firm belief that there should be a national cemetery in every State, I am going to support this bill.

On February 12, 1945, I introduced a bill, H. R. 2114, which carries the principles embodied in the bill now under consideration. I was prompted to do this because of my experience during my services as chief of the division of soldiers' relief in my home State of Rhode Island, at which time, through my graves registration officer, a large number of graves of veterans of all wars were found to have been neglected and apparently forgotten for years. These we found in family plots located on farms, as well as in other locations in villages and towns throughout the State. As a result of what we found, a system has been established whereby the State now takes care of these graves, but it is my sincere belief that if a national cemetery were to be established in my home State of Rhode Island, 20 or 30 years from now those in charge of looking after veterans' graves would not have the same sad experience that we had a few years ago. The condition that was found in Rhode Island during the middle thirties, I am sure, has been found or can be found in every other State in the Union.

It has been said here in debate today that national cemeteries are not very often the choice of the relatives of deceased veterans as a burial place. Of course, that is easy to understand under existing circumstances where, if a veteran is to be buried in a national cemetery, in most instances the grave would be several hundred miles away from his home. That is the principal reason why the number of veterans interred in national cemeteries has been limited, but I am sure that if a national cemetery were established in every State the percentage of those choosing national cemeteries for

burial of their veteran loved ones would be much greater.

Someone has mentioned that because of religious reasons they are opposed to burial in national cemeteries. There is nothing in this bill, nor in any of the other bills that I have seen introduced on the subject that would compel the burial of veterans in national cemeteries, but I believe that in justice those who so desire should not be deprived of that opportunity. I sincerely hope that this bill, which has already passed the Senate, will be passed by the House and signed by the President without any undue delay.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, the war came to an end last September 1. We lost some 358,000 men who today are buried overseas. When I hear the bitter denunciations made of a well-ordered military cemetery program for the interment of the American dead of this war, I wonder whether or not in these few short months some of us have forgotten the sacrifices that those men made for their country. I have received some bitter opposition to this program for a national cemetery program for the dead of this war, I have heard bitter statements around the Capitol about this same thing. I have heard it said from private sources that it will interfere to some extent with the profits of private cemeteries. When I consider all those things, Mr. Chairman, I think of the language of the immortal poet who wrote that wonderful poem, each verse of which ends with "Oh, Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget; lest we forget."

Mr. Chairman, the situation following this war is entirely different from the situation following the last war. After the First World War this land found that our overseas dead were buried to a large extent in small cemeteries in France and in Belgium, and it was found desirable then to build and maintain under the direction of the Battle Monuments Commission a number of American cemeteries as the final resting places for those heroes of ours who gave their lives in foreign lands. As a result of that program we find several cemeteries located overseas, largely in France. But at the end of the Second World War, Mr. Chairman, we found ourselves with a greatly enlarged problem. In the first place, we have American dead located in France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Italy; in fact, all over Europe; and also we have countless thousands of American dead buried in almost every island throughout the great Pacific—in China, Japan, and even in Australia. Those are climates, Mr. Chairman, that do not permit a satisfactory maintenance of cemeteries, and do not permit the satisfactory handling of this program. Whereas after the First World War we found 61 percent of our people wanted the bodies of these men brought back, I predict that following this war the number who want the bodies brought home will run from 95 to perhaps 98 percent. At least that percentage will want the bodies brought home and interred in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, when this problem comes to us you will see that the present number of active national cemeteries in the United States will not be sufficient to meet the need and the desires of those of our people who want our hero dead placed in national cemeteries. My friend who has just spoken has perhaps a national cemetery in his State, but there are lots of States in the Union, Mr. Chairman, which have no national cemetery, and are not as fortunate as my friend from Wisconsin, where is located a national cemetery in which American dead can be buried.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Louisiana is one of the conferees between the House and the Senate in the consideration of the extension of the draft, and he knows that the record shows there have been more than 15,000,000 men who have passed in and out of the service during this war; and nobody knows how much longer it will continue. The need in the future, therefore, has just begun.

Mr. BROOKS. And when you count the 4,500,000 veterans of the First World War you have something like 20,000,000 American veterans who are entitled to be interred, when they die, in national cemeteries.

Proceeding with this thought, Mr. Chairman, there is, for instance, not a single national cemetery in all New England. Do we expect the people of Maine, for instance, who have veteran dead to be interred—do we expect the nearest of kin to ask that the dead be interred a thousand miles away from home where the family cannot go at periodic intervals to visit the sanctuary and the grave of that relative who is interred? No; of course we do not. The national cemetery program intends to eliminate that difficulty of distance and make available in every State one national cemetery for the interment of our war dead.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman from Wisconsin stated critically that only 16⅔ percent of the dead of World War I are buried in national cemeteries. Was not that due in large measure to the fact that many of those veterans live more than 500 to 1,000 miles away from an existing national cemetery?

Mr. BROOKS. Why, certainly, that is the situation, exactly. If you lose a dear relative, you do not want that relative buried a thousand miles away from home, and the kin of these men who died are entitled to have their loved ones buried in a national cemetery. We do not want them buried a thousand miles away where it will cost four or five hundred dollars in travel expenses to visit the graves of their loved ones.

Mr. Chairman, this program is intensely important. Those who oppose it have said that we should add several hundred dollars to the burial allowance of the veteran's family and permit the veteran to be buried in a private cemetery. It will take at least $300, in my judgment, to handle it this way; and when you figure out the costs, you find you are embarking upon a tremendous program that may run up to four or five billion dollars, if you figure 20,000,000 veterans. I submit this program is much preferable to any other program.

Mr. Chairman, after the First World War and after several years had elapsed, I recall one day some reporter went out to a cemetery in the Middle West and found the graves of the first three American dead in the First World War. They wrote up the condition in which they found the graves and gave it widespread publicity. That article described those graves in private cemeteries as being sadly neglected, and covered with several feet of weeds. The graves were not cared for at all. I thought to myself there are the last mortal remains of the first three men who gave their lives for America and for freedom in the First World War, yet within a few years their graves are neglected and entirely uncared for. This program will prevent that sort of thing. In the case of a veteran who received the Congressional Medal of Honor or some other medal, that man will be buried, if his family desires to have him so buried, in a national cemetery. Mr. Chairman, that will mean that throughout all time his grave will be properly cared for.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I want to commend the gentleman for his very fine statement and I would like to take this opportunity to cite the great work the gentleman from Lousiana has done in studying the need for this legislation and in helping to develop the program which is offered here. My colleagues in the House know that this fine work is nothing new on the part of the gentleman from Louisiana. He has been an outstanding and a tireless worker in many matters of major interest to the serviceman and to the veteran. His is one of the outstanding records of our great Committee on Military Affairs and of the Congress.

Would the gentleman care to touch on the very vigorous support given to this legislation by the American Legion, the Gold Star Mothers and other such organizations?

Mr. BROOKS. All of the service organizations that I know of are behind the program. I may say to the gentleman that only yesterday I placed in the RECORD a very strong letter which I received from the American Legion in support of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Wisconsin, I hope that my sentiments upon this question will not be misconstrued. Like him, I have tremendous respect and admiration for those who have given their lives for our country, and I would never hesi-

tate to join in doing them honor. However, I am old-fashioned. I have been assured of it many times, and perhaps I am.

I cannot bring myself to admire a policy, a policy to be adopted by the Congress deliberately, which will encourage wholesale burying of dead in constricted areas. To me each one of those men has an individuality, acquired originally from his family when he was a youngster in the town or village or city in which he was brought up. True, he belongs to America, but when he passes away it seems to me far more fitting that he should return to the place from which he started. So I cannot find myself enthusiastic over any measure proposed here in the Congress which will beckon or encourage or invite thousands and thousands of American citizens to be concentrated in national cemeteries in each State. It is more in accordance with our American traditions and habits of life that the honored dead shall lie in or near the locality in which they were born.

Nearly all of the cemeteries which we now have came out of the War Between the States. They were battlefield cemeteries. Men were killed at Gettysburg, at Antietam, at Fort Donaldson, at Shiloh, at Vicksburg, and, perforce, were buried there. When that war was over, many of them were left there, and the Federal Government took charge of those properties. That was exactly the right thing to do. But I think we should not confuse battlefield cemeteries with the kind of cemetery contemplated in this bill. They will not be battlefield cemeteries at all. They will be cemeteries whose sites will be chosen eventually by some sort of political interest. Make no mistake about it.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs has reported to the House a very interesting bill. In effect it extends and enlarges the powers of the Battle Monuments Commission to take care of the cemeteries near our battlefields in Europe, in the Pacific, in North Africa, and in Asia. The Battle Monuments Commission has done a splendid job during the years in taking care of the cemeteries in France, where there are, I think, eight cemeteries. But those cemeteries are located near or actually at the field of action, and it can be said of those men, whose bodies are still left there, that they died there in defense of America in action, all of them, and the same policy should be carried out with respect to the men who died in action in this war. I assume that the House and the Senate will pass that bill in order that that excellent work may be continued.

But I cannot bring myself to consider those battlefield cemeteries, filled with men who died in action, in the same category as the cemeteries contemplated in this bill. I would infinitely prefer that the burial or funeral allowances be increased so that the individual with very, very slight means, the widow who cannot otherwise afford it, could bury her husband or her son near her own home; near the home that he lived in. I would rather spend $10 that way than $1 this way.

To my mind it is closer to the American ideal.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the national cemetery bill for the following reasons:

First. It is the wish of many men who have served in the Army and Navy that since they spend a considerable period of their lives in the armed services their proper place after death is to be again united with their brothers-in-arms in a distinctively hallowed burial ground.

Second. On many occasions veterans' organizations are required to take care of burials of their former comrades who no longer have any loved ones or close relatives interested in the proper burial of the veteran. These veteran organizations feel that the proper place for such a veteran is in a national cemetery. Now I realize that a majority of the families of veterans may never take advantage of the provisions of this bill since they will want to bury their kin in a cemetery of their own choosing or in a family plot in a private cemetery. However, there is no compulsion on the part of anyone to bury the veteran other than where he or his family desire. This bill merely makes it possible for those who do desire to be buried or to have their loved ones buried in a national cemetery among the other defenders of our Nation might have an appropriate place within the borders of each State.

Now I am especially anxious to have this bill enacted because for several years now I have endeavored to have the cemetery at Fort Rosecrans in the city of San Diego, enlarged to provide for the great demands made upon it. This cemetery has been practically filled for some time and I have received hundreds of requests from the surviving members of veterans' families and from all of the veterans' organizations for permission to have further burials in the cemetery.

The War Department has refused to give more land from the Fort Rosecrans reservation for this purpose. However, owing to our efforts this bill on page 2, section 2, line 15, states "land adjoining existing national cemeteries for the extension of such national cemeteries, as the Secretary of War may determine to be needed for the burial of war veterans." This means that the Secretary of War, under this bill, will have the authority to give additional land adjoining our present cemetery for its enlargement and, as you know, it also makes it possible for the Secretary of War to obtain any other suitable site for additional cemeteries. I know the sentiment existing among the Amvets, the DAV, the VFW, the Spanish War Veterans, and the American Legion, and I can assure you, my colleagues, that these organizations are definitely in favor of the enactment of this bill. I trust that its enactment may no longer be delayed. It is very obvious that we need this for my district and I feel sure the need is almost as great in most other districts throughout the country.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in doing what appears to be the right thing in connection with taking care of our veterans, but I cannot see this as one of those things.

In the first place, the hearings do not disclose what I have understood its proponents were to present. It does appear that perhaps 16 percent of the bodies returned from overseas might be buried in the national cemeteries that now exist. It does not appear that any such percentage of the total number of veterans would be buried in those cemeteries.

I call your attention to page 7 of the hearings, indicating that within a radius of 100 miles of cemeteries now existing there are living about 125,000,000 of our people. This appears in the last third of page 7 of the hearings.

It has been the practice of this Congress to establish new national cemeteries when there was a specific demand in a specific locality. That was done in 1936 on Long Island. It undoubtedly will be done any time there is real need for it. On the other hand, we face this situation. With the very large number of national cemeteries now existing, there is space to take care of 312,000 bodies. Why we should proceed in a mass way to obligate ourselves to a program of $123,000,000 as an initial payment and from $10,000,000 to $20,000,000 as an annual payment to maintain cemeteries when the situation does not present itself as a need I cannot see. We might a great deal better take care of the obligations we presently owe and, if a situation arises where it is necessary to establish an individual cemetery because of a need in a particular place, then establish it.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. Is it not true that under the present law the Government has authority to acquire all the national cemeteries that are needed?

Mr. TABER. I think it has.

Mr. HANCOCK. Title 24 of the code provides that. What, then, is the reason for this? The authority is there now.

Mr. TABER. I can see no excuse for it. We have always done this sort of thing whenever it was necessary. We should not go ahead and authorize an enormous program at this time. It is not in the interest of the veterans that we do this thing. It is not in the interest of treating him fairly and taking care of our responsibilities to him. I hope this bill will be rejected.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I believe every Member of this House favors the right of every veteran to burial in a national cemetery if he and his family so desire. Provision should be made to safeguard that right. We are told, however, that 5,000,000 graves are currently available in existing national cemeteries. Where is the justification then in spending $122,000,000 in capital outlay

and $10,000,000 to $15,000,000 in annual maintenance at a time when the Federal Treasury is not even in sight of a balanced budget? Let us buy more cemetery space at such times in the future as the need develops and not prejudice our present economy by a new and entirely unnecessary drain on the Treasury. This bill should be defeated.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, there are two or three questions which have occurred to me concerning the bill and the way in which it it drawn, as well as the committee amendment. If I might, I would like to have the attention of the members of the committee that reported the bill in order to ask them: Is it true that this initial cost of $123,000,000 which has been mentioned is occasioned by the probable cost of the sites?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, I will undertake to answer that question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. One hundred and twenty-three million dollars is the over-all cost of acquiring the cemeteries, including the sites, and providing for the necessary beautification of the grounds and the necessary buildings as well as including the first year of maintenance, according to the hearings. One hundred and twenty-three million dollars is the over-all cost, assuming that the cemeteries are purchased and put into operation now. I would like to point out in that connection that the $10,000,000 figure is the cost of maintenance for the first year, and after that, it was stated in the hearings, that cost of maintenance would go down to five or six million dollars a year for all of the cemeteries.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, then it seems to me that the question might well be raised as to why the bill proposes to repeal the 1938 act which permitted acceptance of donated sites and why it provides for the purchase or condemnation? It occurs to me that the committee amendment might well be limited to authorizing the acquisition by donation of suitable sites and thereby eliminate at least $100,000,000 of the original cost.

Also, during the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] the question was raised about this double burial or the burial of the wife in the plot two-deep with the veteran. I understood the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] to say in reply that this bill was designed to take care of that by permitting the purchase of land adjoining national cemeteries for extension of those cemeteries which would provide for the additional land necessary to permit the husband and wife to be buried side by side. But in reading the bill, in section 2, I notice in lines 15 to 18 on page 2, with reference to these extensions this language.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota (reading):

> And land adjoining existing national cemeteries for the extension of such national cemeteries, as the Secretary of War may determine to be needed for the burial of war veterans.

Under that language, unless there is some definition of war veterans to include the spouse, I do not see how that provides for burial side by side unless both should be war veterans.

Mr. SIKES. I do not believe I can tell the gentleman whether there is legislation or whether it is a regulation which permits the burial of the wife and minor children with the veteran, but that is done now in all national cemeteries. I am informed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] that there is legislation to permit that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does that define the term "war veteran" and would it be applicable to this act?

Mr. BROOKS. I could not tell the gentleman offhand, but it would seem to me that when land is needed for the burial of veterans it would be included.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like the attention of the chairman of the committee for the purpose of asking a question.

I have read the bill with a great deal of care. I have not been able to find a satisfactory answer to the question that has arisen in my mind. I would like to inquire whether any provision of the bill recognizes the religious belief of some individuals as to the propriety of being buried in consecrated ground?

Mr. MAY. Well, I do not know what the regulation is on that, as a matter of fact. I imagine there is one, but I do know we were told that where there is any religious desire to be buried in any particular place, those desires would be respected.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. The act itself makes no reference to the subject, nor have I been able to find any regulation that would enable those of such religious beliefs to be buried in consecrated ground. Without some such provision the use of the cemeteries provided by this bill would not be possible for heroic dead affiliated with such religious faiths. Furthermore, in view of the fact that we now have national cemeteries capable of taking care of 375,000 bodies, that it would be much better and more in accord with the desire of our veterans, and their families, to make provision for the burials to be made in the cemeteries where the families have their own burial plots. This would enable veterans to be buried close to their home locality and thereby give greater opportunity to the families to visit and perform the acts that arise from loving hearts.

National cemeteries in most instances are far removed from the homes of veterans. Their present existence gives to families of veterans an opportunity to bury in such cemeteries if they so desire, and, that is perfectly right and just, but, it is my opinion that most veterans would prefer to also have the right to be buried in cemeteries of their own choosing in close proximity to the family home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, this bill does not bring up an entirely new matter. Regulations existing as to national cemeteries today would be presumed to be carried over into the future, in the event the bill is passed.

The bill has for its purpose simply uniformity in the handling of the national cemetery program. In the past we have had separate acts, to a large extent, creating a national cemetery in one place and then a national cemetery in another place, all of which have been totally disconnected action on the part of Congress. There was no general policy. This act would set forth a general policy which would permit the Secretary of War, when he found it necessary to add a national cemetery to the number of national cemeteries throughout the country, to proceed accordingly, instead of continuing the policy of the Congress as in the past, which has been a policy of legislating separately upon each national cemetery.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I notice reference made in the hearings to the Andrews bill, which makes provision for a Government contribution toward the purchase of a lot in a private cemetery at $50. Has the committee given any consideration to that measure?

Mr. BROOKS. I touched upon that in the remarks I made a few minutes ago.

Mr. HINSHAW. Why would that not be included in the present measure?

Mr. BROOKS. If it is the policy of the Congress to do so, it is all right. Heretofore it has not been the policy. It has been the policy to provide national cemeteries. The sole question, it seems to me, is whether or not we pursue that policy in an orderly manner or whether we go ahead in a haphazard fashion as we have in the past. In the past we have had congressional enactment establishing a national cemetery, we will say, at San Antonio, Tex., and one up in New York State, but there has been no over-all national cemetery policy that would permit the orderly development of that program.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to know if the gentleman would not offer an amendment to the present bill to include the Andrews bill, which I have not yet seen. No doubt the gentleman has a copy of it.

Mr. BROOKS. I will say to the gentleman that $50 by itself will not reach the problem. The matter of purchasing a lot in a perpetual upkeep cemetery is one that may take more money. It seems to me that if the country is to embark on that kind of program it might require as much as $300 for the veteran and the total amount involved may run into the billions of dollars. At any rate, I personally will be glad to consider the gentlemen's suggestions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired, all time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to acquire, by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, in each State and Territory of the United States in which there is not situated on the date of enactment of this act a national cemetery, a suitable site wherever practicable within such a State or Territory for the establishment thereon of a national cemetery.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all of lines 3 to 9, inclusive, and insert the following: "That wherever the Secretary of War determines, in the case of any State or Territory in which there is not situated a national cemetery, that there is need for a national cemetery in such State or Territory for the burial of war veterans, he is authorized to acquire, by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site wherever practicable within such State or Territory for the establishment thereon of a national cemetery for such purposes."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. I desire to offer an amendment to the committee amendment. Is it in order to do so at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. At what time would a point of order lie against the bill on the ground that the committee reporting it was without jurisdiction because at the time it reported the bill there was not a quorum present?

The CHAIRMAN. Answering the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry the Chair will state that such a point of order would be too late now that the House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. Such a point of order should be made in the House before consideration of the bill.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE to the committee amendment: Page 2, line 1, after the word "that" insert the following: "Whenever the number of unoccupied graves developed or capable of development in existing national cemeteries is less than 500,000 and."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, as I read the testimony and the evidence given by the War Department in support of this bill, it is contended that there are available for commitment purposes present in national cemeteries 375,000 graves. It has been stated that there are 5,000,000, but I think that refers to a number of graves that will be provided for under this bill if it passes. But there are presently available for use by any veteran who may wish to utilize the facilities of a national cemetery approximately 375,000 graves. At the rate at which they are being buried in national cemeteries, about 24,000 a year maximum, it would take in the neighborhood of 15 to 18 years to use up the graves that are presently available in national cemeteries.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I listened to the distinguished gentleman a while ago and I thought he argued for the burial of veterans near their relatives at home. If I understand his present remarks correctly, he wants them placed in existing national cemeteries, which, in many instances, would mean from 500 to 1,000 miles from their families.

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, no; that is not my argument at all. I am surprised to hear the gentleman make such a statement. I have argued against this whole bill from start to finish because it does not provide the service that the veterans of America intend to use.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did not the gentleman argue that veterans should be buried near their homes?

Mr. KEEFE. Exactly. I so argued and I say that now. The point I am trying to make is that, if there are any veterans who want to be buried in a national cemetery there are presently available for them, and I hope the gentleman will listen, 375,000 grave spaces. The amendment which I am offering raises the ceiling from 375,000 grave spaces to 500,000 spaces. All that it does is to say that no new cemetery shall be established unless the available number of grave spaces falls below 500,000. Certainly that is giving sufficient leeway for all the grave spaces for which demand will ever be made, and it will give to the Secretary of War, if this bill should happen to inadvertently pass, an argument and a reason why he should not succumb to the pressure of 96 Senators and 435 Representatives who might bring pressure to have one of these cemeteries established in every State in the Union.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this is a very sensible amendment. I propose to offer the same amendment to section 2 to establish a ceiling of 500,000 graves, which at the rate which they have been utilized and the rate which the War Department expects them to be utilized in the future will last for twenty-odd years. During that period of time we can determine from time to time whether this program shall be expanded. I see the gentleman from New Jersey present who asked a question. If he will read these hearings he will find that the War Department representative testified that the Catholic, the Jew, the Lutheran, or any other religious organization that might want sanctification of ground in one of these national cemeteries will not be permitted to so act, therefore foreclosing an individual of Jewish faith, an individual of Lutheran faith, or an individual of the Catholic faith from ever accepting burial in a national cemetery. This is certainly class legislation if I have ever heard of any, and one which, as I said before, will only permit as a maximum 16⅔ percent of all the veterans to utilize, if they see fit, the services of these national cemeteries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana moves to strike the enacting clause.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The motion is not in proper form.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I am opposed to the amendment is that its adoption will destroy the entire national cemetery program. The thing that we want to do is to establish an over-all program. Merely placing a ceiling upon the number of grave plots will not give the over-all program which is so much desired.

For instance, here is what easily could develop, Mr. Chairman. There might be a cemetery available, we will say, down in Texas, and yet the veteran who dies is located in California. In that event the nearest of kin, if they desired interment in a national cemetery, would be compelled to have funeral services at the grave in Texas, and that is a thing we want to avoid in an over-all program of national cemeteries. We want to have a cemetery located close enough so if the next of kin of the veterans want interment in a national cemetery, they will be able to attend the funeral and will be able to see the last services performed for their loved one before he is placed in his final resting place.

To limit the number of plots will not accomplish this. It will do just the reverse. It will result in the failure to establish cemeteries in certain areas remote from the home of the veteran.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does the pending bill set out the number of cemeteries to be established and whether or not such cemeteries shall be divided equally among the States? Furthermore, is there a limit to each State, or is it true that under the provisions of this pending bill the Secretary of War is authorized to name the number of cemeteries and the locations of same in any manner that he chooses?

Mr. BROOKS. The Secretary of War has an over-all discretion in the program, but the policy of the legislation is to have at least one national cemetery in every State. I will tell my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, why it is so important that this be done initially. When we bring back two or three hundred thousand bodies from overseas to inter them in the United States, naturally the next of kin want them buried near home, and if we wait and gradually develop a piecemeal program of cemeteries here and there, it will mean that some States, although they have suffered severe casualties in the last war, will not be permitted the privilege of burying those men in a national cemetery in that particular State. I think it is most unfair.

I go further and say this, that there are 75,000 men who were killed who are carried as missing in action. There will be thousands brought back to this country whose bodies are not identified and who remain forever unknown. I think these bodies ought to be buried in the several States of the Union and that no State ought to be denied its proper number of burials of unidentified, unknown American dead.

I go still further than that and say that I believe every State ought to have a little shrine in its national cemetery where a tomb can be dedicated to the unknown soldier or sailor who gave his life in this war; and that on every occasion, such as Memorial Day, the veterans of every State ought to have an opportunity to go to that cemetery and hold their patriotic services in honor of the unknown dead and in honor of all dead of American wars in a national cemetery in their own State.

I go further and say that I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to force the veterans of Louisiana to go to New York, or the veterans of Wisconsin to go to Louisiana to hold their services, and I think that there should be more than one national shrine in the United States, the one at present being located at Arlington. I think that every State ought to have its national cemetery shrine and pursue this program of being fair to every State. I think we have to follow the language providing for cemeteries when they are needed.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preferential motion offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: Mr. HARNESS of Indiana moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken from the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the motion that it has already been disposed of in the consideration of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The previous motion was held out of order because it was not in proper form. The present point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes to discuss this motion. This bill was before our committee on a number of different occasions and each time was passed over for further consideration. It was the impression of most of us that the bill had been killed. As a member of that committee, I have no recollection of the committee ever having a quorum present when the bill was reported out. I may be in error, but in discussing it with other members of the committee I found none of them who has any recollection of it.

This bill would authorize the expenditure of more than $100,000,000 to build cemeteries in the various States. I am certain that the parents of the boys who died or were killed in the war wish to select their own places of burial for their loved ones. I see no good purpose in this bill. I sincerely hope that this House will not authorize the appropriation of this tremendous sum of money for this purpose. I hope this motion will be carried.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I merely desire to state that with reference to those men who have sacrificed their lives during the war and whose identity are unknown, as mentioned by the gentleman from Louisiana a few moments ago, that surely there is ample room in Arlington Cemetery where lie thousands of other honored dead, including the Unknown Soldier of World War I. Certainly there would be no objection to one or more national cemeteries in other parts of the country for those parents and loved ones who prefer that the remains of their soldier dead rest in a national cemetery like Arlington on the banks of the Potomac. But let me say that of the many Gold Star Mothers, as well as the fathers of our heroic dead with whom I have talked or who have written me about this proposal of establishing one Federal cemetery in each State, that almost without exception they are unalterably opposed to the idea. They want the remains of their sons brought home as soon as possible. They want a respectable burial allowance and it is their desire that he be buried in the home-town cemetery among their relatives and friends who knew and loved their boy. They want to be able to journey to that grave on holidays and Sundays without chartering a train or a bus and taking at least a day's journey. It seems to me that the House should go slow in enacting legislation of this kind that touches the heartstrings of millions of fathers, mothers, wives, and loved ones of our heroic dead.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am sure that the gentleman is correct in that statement. We have provided for burial allowances already; and are considering an increase of these direct individual allowances.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to devote 1 minute of my time to answering the statement or the intimation or the insinuation of my colleague from Indiana that this bill was reported at a time when a quorum of the committee was not present. That is not correct by any means. At no time in the 8 years that I have been chairman of that committee has it ever reported any bill without a quorum. We do not report bills that way. On the occasion when this bill was reported, the chief opponent of the bill on the committee was present. The ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] was present and opposed reporting the bill and voted against it. Everybody knows that his opposition to it was such that if we had been without a quorum he would have made the point of order and it would have been sustained.

The purpose of this motion is to kill the bill without this Committee having the opportunity to make proper amendments to it. Two or three amendments have been suggested that, in my judgment, will improve the bill. I think it is nothing but fair to the committee and fair to the Committee of the Whole as well, that you vote down this motion and give the Committee of the Whole, that can control consideration of the matter, an opportunity to perfect the bill under the usual procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY) there were—ayes 78, noes 31.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAY and Mr. HARNESS of Indiana.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 88, noes 34.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 524) to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of war veterans, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of this bill be passed over until next Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman what is the purpose of the request.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman may know that the majority and minority leaders entered into an agreement that

there would be no roll-call votes before that time.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Then, Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY) there were—ayes 37, noes 72.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to keep my word if I can with the leadership in not having any roll-call votes, but if this motion is insisted upon I am going to object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present. I wonder if we cannot have some agreement that it will go over until Thursday.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY) there were—ayes 82, noes 31.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and in line with what I have just said I would ask that this go over until Thursday next.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that further proceedings on this vote be postponed until next Thursday.

Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the granting of the request means that on Thursday we will have a roll call on the motion if the gentleman from Kentucky still insists upon it?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman objects to the vote on the ground of no quorum and a quorum is not developed, or if the yeas and nays are demanded and a sufficient number demand the yeas and nays.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I submit the report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY 1946, KINGS POINT, N. Y., MAY 11, 1946

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, approved May 11, 1944, the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated to constitute the 1946 Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

SENATORS

By the Vice President: GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, Maryland.

By the Committee on Commerce: JOSIAH W. BAILEY, North Carolina (ex officio); JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas; GUY CORDON, Oregon.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

By the Speaker of the House: EUGENE J. KEOGH, Ninth Congressional District of New York; ROBERT HALE, First Congressional District of Maine.

By the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee: SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, First Congressional District of Virginia (ex officio); EDWARD J. HART, Fourteenth Congressional District of New Jersey; FRED BRADLEY, Eleventh Congressional District of Michigan; HERBERT C. BONNER, First Congressional District of North Carolina.

Representative GORDON CANFIELD, of the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey, was subsequently appointed to the Board of Visitors in place of HERBERT C. BONNER, First Congressional District of North Carolina, who was unable to attend.

The members of the Board were accompanied from Washington to Kings Point by the following officers from headquarters of the training organization of the War Shipping Administration: Commodore Telfair Knight, USMS, Assistant Deputy Administrator for Training; Capt. John T. Everett, USMS, Deputy Supervisor, United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps; Capt. William Porter, USMS, chief information officer of the training organization; Lt. Comdr. Calvin R. Shorter, USMS, chief legal officer of the training organization, and Lt. Comdr. Clifford W. Sandberg, USMS, of the Academy, and secretary pro tempore to the Board of Visitors.

The Board assembled at Wiley Hall, Kings Point, at 9:30 a. m., Friday, May 10, 1946, where the members were received by the Superintendent, Commodore Richard R. McNulty and his staff.

The following members of the Board were present at the first meeting: Senator GUY CORDON; Representatives SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, EUGENE J. KEOGH, FRED BRADLEY, and ROBERT HALE.

FIRST MEETING OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS

Representative SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND served as temporary chairman for the purpose of organization. Senator GUY CORDON was elected permanent chairman of the Board. Lt. Comdr. Clifford W. Sandberg and Lt. (jg) Robert J. Carroll were designated as secretary and assistant secretary of the Board, respectively.

At the request of the chairman, Commodore Telfair Knight, assistant deputy administrator for training, and Commodore Richard R. McNulty, Supervisor of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and his staff were invited to join the Board in conference.

The chairman noted that the Board had previously read the Superintendent's report, en route from Washington to Kings Point, and were familiar with its contents. Representative FRED BRADLEY moved that the Board dispense with the reading of the Superintendent's report, a copy of which is forwarded herewith. The motion was seconded, and carried.

The chairman then requested that the Superintendent's staff be introduced to the members of the Board. Upon the conclusion of the introductions the chairman indicated that the Board would be pleased to learn of the operation of the training organization of the War Shipping Administration, the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, and its Academy; and such other reports as deemed pertinent and proper.

Commodore Telfair Knight presented the respects of Commissioner Edward Macauley, Acting Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, and Granville Conway, Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, and addressed the Board, recounting the history of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy; and of the hopes and aspirations of those charged with the executive management.

Commodore Knight pointed out that the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps was a direct outgrowth of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which placed upon the United States Maritime Commission the responsibility of educating American citizens to become licensed officers of the merchant marine of the United States and Reserve officers of the Navy. Commodore Knight also noted that the Cadet Corps began operations 8 years ago, on March 15, 1938, and that upon the dissolution of the War Shipping Administration, June 30, 1946, it will again function under the United States Maritime Commission. Upon the conclusion of Commodore Knight's statement a general discussion period ensued, during which questions concerning the operation and curriculum of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps were answered by the Superintendent and his staff.

At the request of Commodore McNulty to have a member of the Board address the regiment of cadet-midshipmen at the formation to be held Saturday in Barney Square, the chairman designated Representative SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND.

Recess was taken at 11: 30 a. m. at which time the regimental commander, Cadet-Midshipman Raymond French, United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, was presented to the chairman and members of the Board, when he extended them an invitation to lunch with the regiment of cadet-midshipmen in Delano Hall.

TOUR OF ACADEMY AND MEETING WITH THE REGIMENT OF CADET-MIDSHIPMEN

At 11:55 a. m. the members of the Board were escorted to Delano Hall by the cadet-midshipman regimental commander and his staff for luncheon with the regiment.

After luncheon the members of the Board, accompanied by escorts, proceeded at 1 p. m. on an official inspection of the Academy, visiting Barry Hall, cadet-midshipmen living quarters; the departments of naval science and tactics and physical training in O'Hara Hall; the athletic and drill fields; the war memorial; the departments of ship management and history and languages, temporary library and auditorium in Bowditch Hall; the department of engineering, Fulton Hall; the department of nautical science, Samuels Hall, where exhibitions of cargo handling, breeches-buoy operation, and a lifeboat drill were observed from the signal bridge. The official inspection was then concluded after a visit to the bark-rigged museum ship *Emery Rice* and a short cruise in the Superintendent's gig to view the modern turbo-electric training vessel *Kings Pointer*.

Upon returning to the Academy grounds, each member of the Board conducted a private conference with cadet-midshipmen from his home State.

SUPERINTENDENT'S RECEPTION AND DINNER

The Superintendent's dinner in honor of the Third Congressional Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy was held in the Superintendent's residence at 7:30 p. m. Because of previous commitments, Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH was unable to be present at the dinner.

Upon conclusion of the dinner a documentary film entitled "Future Leaders of Our Merchant Marine," depicting the activities of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy, was shown.

SECOND MEETING OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS

Saturday, May 11, 1946

The second meeting of the Board commenced at 8:45 a. m. in the conference room in Wiley Hall. Present at this meeting were Senator GUY CORDON, Representatives SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, EUGENE J. KEOGH, FRED BRADLEY, and ROBERT HALE.

The chairman informed the secretary of the Board's desire to confer with the executive heads of the training organization and the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and such staff members as they deemed necessary. Accordingly, Commodore Telfair Knight, Assistant Deputy Administrator for the Training Organization; Commodore Richard R. McNulty, Supervisor of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy; Capt. Philip C. Mahady, deputy superintendent; Capt. Harold V. Nerney, executive officer; and Commander Edward S. Hochuli, secretary of the Academic Board, were invited to join the Board in conference.

The chairman then asked Commodore Knight if there was any new business to be discussed, and upon Commodore Knight's negative answer, the chairman proposed a number of questions to Commodore McNulty dealing with the forthcoming graduation of first classmen, the proposed awarding of a degree, and accreditation of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy.

To explain more completely the accreditation of the Academy, permission was requested and granted, for Mr. Joseph L. Kochka, educational adviser to the Supervisor, to answer such questions as the Board deemed necessary in reference to accreditation and the awarding of a degree. The Board having asked such questions, the Superintendent and his staff were excused and the Board entered into executive session with the secretary and assistant secretary. At the conclusion of the executive session, there being no further business, the second meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a. m. The Board and War Shipping Administration officials from Washington were then escorted to the portico of Delano Hall to attend a review of the Regiment of Cadet-Midshipmen, at which time Representative SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND addressed the Regiment of Cadet-Midshipmen in behalf of the Board of Visitors.

At the conclusion of the review the members of the Board, accompanied by the secretary of the Board, departed from Kings Point and briefly examined the interim headquarters of the United Nations at Lake Success, Long Island, N. Y., prior to their return to Washington, D. C.

As a result of the two meetings with the Superintendent and his staff, conversations with cadet-midshipmen of the regiment, and the tour of inspection of the Academy, the Board of Visitors respectfully submits the following general and special comments and specific recommendations.

GENERAL COMMENTS

1. The Board desires again to go on record and emphasize the fact that the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps was created pursuant to the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, commenced operations in March 1938, and that its site at Kings Point, N. Y., was acquired for the purpose of constructing a permanent Federal Merchant Marine Academy as shown by the reports which accompanied House Joint Resolution No. 260 (Public Law 472, 77th Cong.; 56 Stat. 124), approved March 4, 1942.

2. The Board is impressed with the need of a suitable chapel in view of the fact that the present facilities for divine worship, in the form of an improvised chapel in Wiley Hall, are most inadequate. The necessity for a properly equipped library is also clearly evident, for in order to qualify the United States Merchant Marine Academy to award degrees, a suitable library building must be provided. The Board appreciates the fact that no further land expansion is presently contemplated by the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps.

3. The Board is gratified to learn of the resumption of the 4-year course and recommends to the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps that steps be taken to put its Academy on an accredited basis at the earliest possible moment, consistent with economical and efficient operation.

4. The Board is aware of the transition period brought about by the conclusion of hostilities and subsequent extension of the course to the normal 4-year program. In reference to the curriculum in effect during the transition period, the Board desires to go on record as being satisfied that the administration has given the problem full consideration and is confident that the matter will be adjusted to the satisfaction of all. The Board considers the proposed semiannual entering classes and graduations, rather than annual graduations, to be a sound and logical move.

5. The Board is particularly impressed with the high type of young men at Kings Point and the fact that all of the cadet-midshipmen had served as third classmen at sea in combat areas aboard merchant vessels. The Board appreciates the close cooperation that has existed between the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and the United States Navy at large. The Board commends those responsible for this close cooperation, for it recognizes in the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy at Kings Point, a most important factor in the maintenance of a vigorous and strong Merchant Marine and a competent sea experienced Naval Reserve officer component.

SPECIAL COMMENTS

1. In view of the fact that the first change of superintendents has taken place since the Board of Visitors was created, the Board desires to commend Rear Adm. Giles C. Stedman, USNR, for his efficient administration of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, during his tenure of office as superintendent, from October 16, 1943, to April 1, 1946.

2. The Board desires to record its appreciation and admiration for the foresight, tenacity, and devotion to duty displayed by the Assistant Deputy Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, Commodore Telfair Knight, USMS, for his efforts in the establishment and development of the training organization, of which the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy at Kings Point is a division.

3. The Board also wishes to commend Commodore Richard R. McNulty, USMS, Supervisor of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps since its inception and now also Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, for the efficient and economical operation of the Corps, his informative and interesting report, and in making available, for the Board's information, members of his staff and cadet-midshipmen of the regiment.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Board specifically recommends that funds be made available, as soon as possible, for the construction and equipping of an adequate library.

2. The Board specifically recommends that funds be made available, as soon as possible, for the construction and equipping of a suitable chapel.

3. The Board specifically recommends that the Superintendent's discretionary fund not only be continued but also the following, which are granted to other Federal academies: Board of Visitors fund, commandant of cadet-midshipmen fund, academic board fund, be established at the earliest practicable date.

4. The Board specifically recommends that the rank of the Superintendent, who holds commissions as commodore in the United States Naval Reserve and United States Maritime Service, to be raised to rear admiral in both services while occupying the superintendency.

CONCLUSION

The Board is pleased to record its support and admiration of the splendid work being done at Kings Point to develop outstanding officer personnel for the merchant marine and the United States Naval Reserve, and to keep our Nation in the forefront of world commerce.

The Board is most impressed with the sincerity of purpose of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps Administration and the Academy staff, and with that splendid group of young Americans—the regiment of cadet-midshipmen. The Board wishes to congratulate the Superintendent, Commodore Richard R. McNulty, USMS; his officers; cadet-midshipmen of the regiment, and personnel of the United States Merchant Marine Academy for their unselfish devotion to duty in developing Kings Point, a great national institution, in which every citizen should take pride.

To Lt. Comdr. Clifford W. Sandberg, USMS, Secretary to the Board, and Lt. Robert J. Carroll, USMS, Assistant Secretary to the Board, the Board expresses its sincere appreciation for their untiring cooperation and efficient assistance in its behalf.

Respectfully submitted.

GUY CORDON.
SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND.
EUGENE J. KEOGH.
FRED BRADLEY.
ROBERT HALE.
C. W. SANDBERG,
Secretary.

UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY—SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT TO CONGRESSIONAL BOARD OF VISITORS, MAY 10, 1946

OUTLINE OF REPORT

Part I. Introduction.
Part II. Wartime operation.
Part III. Operation of the Academy.
Part IV. Recommendations of preceding Board of Visitors.
Part V. Requirements submitted for consideration.
Part VI. Conclusion.

SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

GENTLEMEN: We are, indeed, gratified to welcome the Third Congressional Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy. This year we meet under happier circumstances, for we have successfully concluded a terrible and costly war and are now adjusting our activities to meet our peacetime maritime needs. It is our earnest hope that your brief visit will be pleasant as well as informative, for upon your observations and recommendations rests, to a large extent, the ability of the Cadet Corps and its Academy to fulfill successfully its national mission.

Part I. Introduction

The United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, of which the Kings Point Academy is a part, stems from the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended. Among the responsibilities placed upon the Maritime Commission, which was created by the act, is that of training "American citizens to become licensed officers of the merchant marine of the United States."

One of the earliest activities undertaken by the Maritime Commission, under the leadership of the late Admiral Henry A. Wiley, was the investigation and the making of recommendations concerning the establishment of a merchant marine officers' train-

ing program. After much detailed study of foreign merchant marine training systems, the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps was established and put into operation 8 years ago, on March 15, 1938.

At its inception in 1938, the Cadet Corps had but 99 cadet-midshipmen serving aboard Government-owned or subsidized vessels. In the early part of 1939, national competitive examinations for appointment to the Cadet Corps were established. This permitted, for the first time in our history, young Americans from every State in the Union and our Territories to receive a formal education for a career in the merchant marine, as well as for service in the Naval Reserve. The course of study was of 4 years' duration. Pending the acquisition of its own shore facilities, the Cadet Corps shared quarters with other governmental activities, utilizing borrowed Navy installations at San Francisco, Calif., and Algiers, La., and the private Admiral Billard Academy in New London, Conn.

With the declaration of a national emergency and the growing officer needs of our merchant marine and Navy, the enrollment in the cadet corps was increased, and the training course shortened. As the necessity for obtaining adequate shore facilities grew, two cadet schools for basic courses were established, one at Pass Christian, Miss., and the other at San Mateo, Calif. Shortly after, in December 1941, Congress authorized the purchase of the Walter P. Chrysler estate at Kings Point for the establishment of the first Federal Merchant Marine Academy. Construction began at once, and, except for the hospital, the academy was completed and dedicated in September of 1943 at a cost of approximately $10,000,000, inclusive of equipment.

At the present time less than 500 cadet-midshipmen are attached to the academy, and for this reason it is not possible for you to observe the full extent of our normal activities. This is regretted but is explained by the adjustments necessitated by the transition from the accelerated wartime courses to the regular 4-year curriculum. With the return of third classmen on July 1 from their sea training, the normal complement of 1,200 will be aboard to commence the summer term.

Part II. Wartime operation

Upon our declaration of war, the cadet corps suspended its normal operation and entered fully into the war effort. The strength of the corps was increased and at its peak numbered 7,870, of which 2,400 cadet-midshipmen were in the first and second classes at the academy which had been designed to accommodate 1,200. The remainder were fourth classmen at the cadet schools at San Mateo, Calif., and Pass Christian, Miss.; and third classmen aboard merchant ships at sea. The course was necessarily reduced to 18 months in order to meet the increasing officer requirements of the Navy and the merchant marine. The outstanding feature of this program was, and remains, the actual service at sea by cadet-midshipmen while in training. This sea training took place aboard all standard types of merchant vessels after the cadet-midshipmen had completed a basic course. The sea training was then followed by advanced studies at Kings Point.

In view of the dual status of the cadet-midshipmen—cadets in the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and midshipmen in the United States Naval Reserve—they were eligible, upon graduation, for service with the merchant marine as third officer or third engineer, or for active duty as officers with the Navy.

As of July 1, 1945, some 7,300 cadet-midshipmen had graduated from the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its academy. Of this number, about 1,800, or approximately 25 percent of the graduates went on active duty with the Navy; the remainder were serving as officers in the merchant marine.

Two hundred and four cadet-midshipmen in training, cadet officers and graduates, gave their lives in service to their country, while many others survived torpedoings and bombings in actual combat duty. During the early days of the war the percentage of casualties sustained by the Cadet Corps was higher than that of any of the armed forces.

Kings Point graduates have served with distinction in the Navy, merchant marine, and in the field of foreign service. Approximately 200 graduates are now sailing as masters and chief engineers of merchant vessels, while more than 100 graduates have served as port operations assistants in many of the world's major seaports.

Part III. Operation of the Academy

In the spring of 1945, plans were completed for the extension of the course to 3 years commencing in September of that year. The sudden termination of the war, however, made it advisable to provide for the early resumption of the 4-year course. Accordingly, the prewar 4-year course was resumed to become effective September 17, 1945, with appropriate provisions to cover the transition from the accelerated to the extended course. The complement of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps is being reduced to 2,500 for the fiscal year 1947, of which 1,300 will be fourth classmen at the cadet schools and third classmen on merchant vessels at sea.

The curriculum is projected on a high level—collegiate in scope. It is designed, primarily, to develop merchant marine officers of the highest professional competence, qualified to serve as Reserve officers in the Navy in times of national emergency. Foreign languages and economic and cultural subjects are included to an extent necessary to equip graduates with a balanced view of life, broad in their outlook upon national and international affairs, compassionate in understanding personnel relations and with an appreciation of good citizenship. With such a background, some should be fitted eventually to assume managerial and executive positions in the shipping industry and for responsible positions with Government agencies related to shipping or to the development of the foreign commerce of the United States.

For the successful completion of the course it is proposed to award graduates a degree of bachelor of science in marine transportation. Authorization for such an award is sought in H. R. 5380 introduced by the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH, of the Ninth District of New York. This bill has passed the House and, after final approval, steps will be promptly initiated to secure the necessary accreditation from the Association of American Universities. With this in view, exhaustive preliminary surveys have been conducted at Kings Point, San Mateo and Pass Christian to evaluate all phases of our operations, embracing curriculum and courses of study, student activities, library service, guidance service, instruction, outcomes, the school staff and plant, and the school administration. In addition, a meeting of a specially created selection board convened at Washington in February of this year to determine and report upon instructor qualifications, departmental complements, and related matters.

In order to secure highly qualified young men for appointment as cadet-midshipmen, American boys with the equivalent of a high school education are selected annually in accordance with State and Territory quotas based on the population as shown by the latest census.

As part of the entrance procedure, scholastic tests, prepared and graded by competent college entrance authorities, are administered for us by the Civil Service Commission on a competitive basis within State quotas. In addition, all candidates must pass the naval physical examination required for appointment as midshipman, United States Naval Reserve.

The athletic program is receiving close attention. Last year marked the entrance of Kings Point into intercollegiate competition and did much to bring the Academy and cadet corps to favorable public notice. The varsity program includes football, baseball, wrestling, swimming, tennis, basketball, track, fencing, and sailing. Schedules are now in the course of preparation for the coming seasons.

Presentation of the course consists of 1 year as fourth classmen at either of the cadet schools, in Pass Christian, Miss., or San Mateo, Calif., 1 year as third classmen at sea aboard various types of merchant vessels, and 2 years as second and first classmen at Kings Point.

A modern merchant type vessel has recently been acquired for training purposes, and will be utilized for the practical demonstration of professional subjects. To effectuate the curriculum adopted, work is now in progress on the modernization of our existing laboratories and shops, and the equipment of new physics, chemistry, and electronics laboratories, although curtailment of the budget entails some difficulty in carrying out the original plans to the extent desirable.

The administrative and instructional staff is comprised predominantly of officers who have gained their experience and depth of background chiefly at sea or ashore in the shipping industry or are specialists in their chosen subjects. To keep abreast of the latest developments in technological advances, and for the betterment of teaching techniques, self-study by instructors and participation in courses offered by other institutions is stressed and encouraged. Wide use is made of visual training aids and special trips to nearby shipyards, manufacturing plants and similar points of interest are regularly conducted throughout the course.

It is deemed fitting to record here our deep appreciation of the sympathetic understanding and close cooperation which has been extended so willingly by the Navy Department in support of our activities. They have contributed unstintingly through their advice and guidance and through the allocation of modern training equipment and the assignment of competent Navy personnel for the presentation of naval science subjects and have done much to cement the natural mutual bond between the merchant marine and the Navy which is so essential to our national interests.

During the war years the demand for officers required that successful applicants enter the cadet corps almost continuously and, as a consequence, graduations were held at intervals ranging from 1 week to 1 month. Under the 4-year course entrance examinations will be conducted annually and classes will be graduated in May of each year.

In the administration and operation of the Academy the necessity for the exercise of rigid economy has been keenly appreciated. Keeping apace with the diminishing complement of cadet-midshipmen, the staff of officer-instructors, and enlisted and civil service personnel has been correspondingly reduced. The following figures are submitted for ready comparison:

OFFICER PERSONNEL

	U. S. Maritime Service	U. S. Naval Reserve	U. S. Public Health Service	Total
May 1, 1945	157	100	----------	257
May 1, 1946	131	10	13	154
Reduction	26	90	[1] 13	103

[1] Denotes increase.

ENLISTED PERSONNEL

	U. S. Maritime Service	Cadet school	U. S. Navy	Total
May 1, 1945	668	37	10	715
May 1, 1946	425	43	1	469
Reduction	243	[1] 6	9	246

[1] Denotes increase.

Based upon an average complement of 1,100 cadet-midshipmen the total cost of training is estimated at $3,000 per cadet-midshipman per year while at Kings Point. Over the 4-year course it is estimated that this average is $2,200 per cadet-midshipman per year, the reduction resulting from the unique nature of the system of training under which the merchant-vessel owners participate by assuming the wages and subsistence of cadet-midshipmen during the third-class year in their service.

During the abbreviated wartime courses, cadet-midshipmen were furnished their uniforms, equipment, and textbooks without charge. With the resumption of the 4-year curriculum, cadet-midshipmen will assume these expenses and a material saving in operating costs will be effected.

The observance of the utmost care in the disposition of funds in all phases of our activities has our constant attention and expenses are held at a minimum consistent with the attainment of efficient operation.

Part IV. Recommendations of preceding Board of Visitors

As a result of inspections made and interviews held with members of the staff and cadet-midshipmen of the regiment, the preceding Board of Visitors recommended that the cadet corps return to the 4-year curriculum at an early date. As has been outlined in this report, this recommendation has been acted upon.

The Board further recommended that to qualify the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps to issue degrees, a properly equipped library building be provided. While plans for such a library have been prepared, funds are not available at this time to carry out construction. In the meantime, to meet the requirements of accreditation, funds are being sought to procure the necessary titles and number of volumes, and the main deck of Bowditch Hall must be converted for use as a temporary library.

Another recommendation was for the construction of an urgently needed chapel. Plans for this chapel have been drawn. However, funds will not be available for its construction during the coming fiscal year.

Provision for the development of adequate athletic and recreational facilities was also recommended. A new athletic field has since been completed which should meet requirements for the conduct of intramural activities.

Part V. Requirements submitted for consideration

It is hoped the members of this Board may be disposed to endorse and repeat the recommendations of the Board of 1945 for the construction of a properly equipped library building and a suitable chapel.

Since legislation authorizing the awarding of degrees has been passed by the House of Representatives, it is necessary that the Academy be so equipped as to make it possible to qualify in accordance with the requirements of the Association of American Universities, and an adequate library is one of the most important adjuncts to such qualification.

It will be readily apparent to your Board, upon inspection, that the facilities for divine worship at the Academy are most inadequate. In humble consciousness of the necessity and value of spiritual and moral guidance as an all-essential element in our training and educational program, we solicit your active interest and aid in making the proper facilities available as soon as possible.

Part VI. Conclusion

It is with a deep sense of responsibility and pride that we resume our peacetime pursuits, secure in the belief that our efforts will bring into full fruition the objectives contemplated by the Congress.

Our country has emerged from the war with the largest merchant fleet ever registered under one flag. Although principally engaged at present in the transport of much needed relief supplies to war-torn nations, this fleet will gradually enter the normal channels of trade on the world's ocean lanes, where our leadership among maritime nations will be challenged. To meet this challenge, and for the solution of the multiplicity of problems with which the conversion from war to peace is beset, the interest and application of the finest talents procurable is required. In this program the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, wholly conscious of its obligations, is determined and anxious to make its full contribution to maintain our Nation in the forefront of world commerce—a place won at such enormous cost and sacrifice. To attain this goal it requires and earnestly seeks the continued support and advice of its Congressional Board of Visitors.

R. R. McNULTY,
Commodore, United States Maritime Service, Supervisor of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6572) to provide military assistance to the Republic of the Philippines in establishing and maintaining national security and to form a basis for participation by that government in such defensive military operations as the future may require.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, at this time we have with us the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, Mr. ROMULO. He understands the situation perfectly. I ask that the gentleman yield to permit him to explain the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines.

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a bill which is called the Republic of the Philippines military assistance bill. I wrote the Committee on Foreign Affairs a letter for their record which explains really what this bill means to the Philippines and to the United States. I said in that letter, which is quoted in full by the committee in its report:

President Roxas has instructed me to advise you that the Philippine Government regards the military assistance bill as a vital measure in that it provides the Philippine Army with the means whereby it can discharge its responsibility in preserving in cooperation with the armed forces of the United States the peace of the far Pacific.

We regard the bill as an implementation of a responsibility and a sacred trust which the Republic of the Philippines is about to assume as an independent nation. The people of the Philippines are now prepared as they have been in the past to place their sons in the ranks with their American comrades in arms in carrying out this solemn obligation. I regret to say, however, that the ravages of the recent conflict have so depleted our resources that we will not be able until our economic rehabilitation is under way to discharge this duty without the military assistance which will be furnished by this legislation. We will need not only the guns, and tanks, and planes, but other military supplies as well, such as food, clothing, and fuel. This is essential if we are to be able to have Philippine manpower effectively play its full part in preserving the peace in the far Pacific.

I know that you are anxious to restore to their families as many as possible of your young men now serving in the Philippines. Every Filipino who takes his place in the armed forces of the Philippines fully equipped and adequately supplied will permit the speedy return of another American veteran.

That is the letter I wrote the Committee on Foreign Affairs on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the blood has dried on our battlefields. The rubble is being cleared from the streets of Manila. We are at peace. We may now set about the enormous task of rebuilding the shattered economy of our country. The energies, the talents, and the resources that were so recently devoted to the prosecution of the war against the Japanese may now be used in the reconstruction of our ruined cities and to the reorganization of our national economy.

The extent of the destruction wrought upon my country is so great that the task of reconstruction will require us to devote all our resources to this task for some years to come. Our domestic problems are legion, and the temptation is great to concentrate on our internal problems to the neglect of our international responsibilities. We are weary of war. But the complacency that so quickly followed the flush of victory in so many countries does not find repose in the heart of a Filipino.

This year on the anniversary of your independence and the birth of ours, we shall stand beside the United Nations with the dignity of a free and independent country. Though our hearts shall be filled with pride in our independence, we shall nevertheless be conscious that with our new freedom we shall assume additional heavy responsibilities. We will not shirk our new obligations as an active member of the United Nations. Our geographic position and our traditions impose upon us a still heavier responsibility.

The Philippines stand today as an outpost of Christianity and democracy in the Orient. The armies of democracy emerged victorious against totalitarianism, but unfortunately we are faced today with the stark reality that there still exist in the world forces that are opposed to those democratic principles held dear by our two peoples.

We Filipinos, who have nurtured and preserved for centuries the tenets of Christianity and who have kept brightly burning in our hearts the ideals of democracy through the harrowing experience of the ruthless Japanese occupation, know that Christian and democratic institutions can only be freely enjoyed

by a people strong enough to be free from fear of military conquest.

The people of the Philippines are now willing, as they have been in the past, to place their sons in the ranks with their American comrades-in-arms to defend the principles of democracy whenever the need arises. I regret to say, however, that the ravages of the recent conflict have so depleted our resources that we will not be able, until our economic rehabilitation is under way, to discharge our responsibility in preserving, in cooperation with the armed forces of the United States, the peace of the Far Pacific, without the material assistance which will be furnished by the Philippine military assistance bill, H. R. 6572.

We will need not only the guns and tanks and planes, but other military supplies as well. By other supplies we mean food, clothing and fuel, to be furnished to our army for a period of 5 years. This is essential if we are to be enabled to have Filipino manpower effectively play its full part in preserving the peace in the Far Pacific.

I know that you are anxious to restore to their families as many as possible of your young men now serving in the Philippines. I repeat, every Filipino who takes his place in the armed forces of the Philippines, fully equipped and adequately supplied, will permit the speedy return of another American veteran.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman kindly explain to the membership the urgency of this legislation? Independence of the Philippines takes place on July 4, and without this legislation the Philippines would be left without any protection at all.

Mr. ROMULO. Yes; on July 4 the independence of the Philippines will be proclaimed. It is important that this bill be approved before the advent of independence.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a wonderful contribution to the Philippines and to the United States. The committee was extremely glad if for no other reason than that to go along with this bill, which is so vitally necessary and which, as the gentleman knows, was reported out of the committee unanimously.

Mr. ROMULO. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. There are in the Philippines today more than 300,000 firearms in the hands of people who have no right to hold them. We must have peace and order in the Philippines and to have this peace and order we must get assistance from the United States Government as provided in this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman give the House an idea as to the cost of this measure for 5 years? I ask that question because the legislation authorizes the transfer of property that may be of immense value and authorizes any appropriation that may be necessary for that purpose. I can understand that there might have been a unanimous report but this is legislation that has been but recently introduced and it looks to me as if the Congress of the United States should consider it other than by unanimous consent. What is the probable cost of the legislation?

Mr. BLOOM. May I say that the Senate just passed the bill as it is. The cost to the Government of the United States was figured all together, including uniforms, food, and things of that kind, at about ten or eleven million dollars. Let me say that the matériel that is being used or that will be transferred to the Government of the Philippines on July 4, will be of no use at all to the United States unless they leave it there to be used by the soldiers in the army that will be left there after we leave the islands. After July 4 we will have no further use for it. It is there. The only cost, as I understand it, is the cost of uniforms, the food, and the expense of officers in training the soldiers of the Philippine Government.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have no disposition to argue, but if that argument is to obtain in the future we might leave all of our surplus property abroad, if it is of no value. We have had many hearings. There is much property needed by the Philippines, but there has been a demand for property in the Pacific to be returned to the United States, property that is needed by the American people, particularly on account of the strikes that obtain in this country and nonproduction.

Mr. BLOOM. In the Philippines there is an entirely different situation existing than in any other part of the world. This is what will happen: We are in possession of the army. They have no craft at all down there, all of them having been destroyed in the war. If this Government does not enact the legislation provided in this bill, on July 4 and after that date the Philippine Islands will be left without any protection at all and, as stated by the gentleman from the Philippine Islands, General ROMULO, there are between three and four hundred thousand guerillas, well armed, over there. We armed them because they were our guerillas during the war. They are pillaging the whole country. There is no other situation on the face of the earth that is comparable with the situation in the Philippine Islands and that which will obtain after July 4.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This bill was not introduced by the gentleman from New York until the latter part of May. If there was an urgent situation of that sort, it would seem to me the committee should have provided for it before that time.

Mr. BLOOM. I got the bill on one day and the next day introduced it. We held hearings. The bill has the unanimous report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It passed the Senate without amendment just a little while ago. This legislation is very urgent and that is why we are asking for it at this time.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. In the hearings on the War Department appropriation bill in connection with the determination of how many troops we will have to have in the army of occupation, if I remember correctly, the Philippine Republic is to furnish 50,000 Philippine soldiers for occupational troops in Japan.

Mr. ROMULO. That is correct. They are the Philippine Scouts.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Those 50,000 will make it possible to reduce our armed forces to that extent and require 50,000 less American boys to be sent to Japan.

Mr. ROMULO. That is correct. As I said, the 50,000 will be Filipino Scouts.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Anyone who has gone through Manila and who has seen Manila and other parts of the Philippine Islands will have to agree that the Philippine Republic is unable, after occupation by Japan, to arm these troops.

Mr. ROMULO. Yes. President Roxas came to Washington recently and in public speeches and press releases explained the deplorable state of our public finance because of the recent war.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. May I say that I am ready, as a member of the War Department Subcommittee, to give the Philippines adequate assistance under this bill to have an adequate army because I feel that every soldier you have in the Philippines equipped to fight potential enemies in the Pacific will mean one less soldier that we will have to equip in the United States.

Mr. ROMULO. I thank the gentleman on behalf of my people.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think it should be noted, in spite of the tremendous pressure placed upon the Filipino people and the Philippine Nation, that during the war that has just closed they remained loyal to the United States, and it is because of the defense that they put up through the assistance that we gave them that we were able to accomplish what was accomplished in the Pacific. Now when the time comes for the United States to withdraw, all that was accomplished will be lost unless you have some defense to take care of yourselves.

Mr. ROMULO. That is right. But more than that. Don't forget that our security is also America's security. You will have air and naval bases there. You are helping us so that we can help you.

Mr. DONDERO. Therefore I am in favor of this bill.

Mr. ROMULO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I think the gentleman will agree that I am in a peculiar position due to the fact that I have definite information regarding the situation in the Philippines that coincides exactly with what the gentleman has just told

this House. I hope there will be no objection to the immediate consideration of this bill, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. ROMULO. The gentleman's son is an officer in the United States Army and he fought in the Philippines. I am proud to make that of record today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The bill also provides that certain personnel shall be sent to the Philippines to help train the Filipinos. It seems to me it is a great protection to the United States to pass this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. We have had the Philippines under our jurisdiction for these years. We were prepared to give the Filipinos independence on the 4th of July. If there had been no war destroying the Philippines, shattering their economy and their civilization, it would have been one thing, but they are in a position now where they need to be cared for and protected from internal and external danger. It is our duty to do our part. If we do not do it in this way, we will have to do it in a very much more expensive way later on. I feel strongly for this bill, and I hope it will pass.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I, too, have some knowledge of the needs of the Filipinos, having been to Manila and parts of the Philippine Islands last fall. But for the purpose of the RECORD it seems to me we ought to have one or two statements about the bill, and for that purpose I would like to ask one or two questions. First of all, does this bill authorize the payment of salaries to any Filipinos who would be members of the Philippine Army?

Mr. BLOOM. Not the Filipinos.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it authorizes payment to certain members of our own forces.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. For the purpose of instruction.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it does not provide for the payment of salaries and expenses of the Philippine Army?

Mr. BLOOM. No.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. However, it does authorize the maintenance and repair of such equipment as we might turn over to them during this 5-year period?

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under the reservation previously made, I should like to say this: I think it has been productive of results. Here is a bill that involves a matter of vast importance, the discharge of our obligation in the Pacific. It may involve the expenditure of millions of dollars. I made the reservation in order that the matter be developed, and to say this, on an important bill like this, recommended by both sides of the House, and only to be considered under agreement here where we cannot have a vote before next Monday except by unanimous consent, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Republic of the Philippines Military Assistance Act."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President is authorized, upon application by the Republic of the Philippines, and whenever in his discretion the public interest renders such course advisable, to provide: (a) for the instruction and training of military and naval personnel of the Republic of the Philippines; (b) for the maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation of military or naval equipment in the possession of the said country; and (c) for the transfer to the said country of any arms, ammunition, and implements of war as defined in the President's proclamation 2549 of April 9, 1942, or any superseding proclamations; any other aircraft; naval vessels except those of the following category: Battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines; any stores, supplies, services, technical information, material, and equipment: *Provided*, That such transfer shall be consistent with military and naval requirements of the United States and with the national interest.

SEC. 3. The President is authorized to provide such assistance or transfer property or information pursuant to section 2, by sale, loan, exchange, lease, gift, or transfer for cash, credit, or other property with or without warranty and upon such other terms and conditions as he may deem proper.

SEC. 4. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance, information, or property pursuant to this act the Government of the Republic of the Philippines shall undertake (a) that it will not, without the consent of the President of the United States, transfer title to or possession of any property transferred to it pursuant to this act, (b) that it will not permit use of any property so received or disclosure of any plan, specification, or other information pertaining thereto or any technical information furnished, by or to anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of the Republic of the Philippines, or for any purpose other than those set forth in this act, and (c) that the Government of the Republic of the Philippines will make provisions comparable to those customarily made by the United States for the security of any article, plan, or information received under the terms of this act.

SEC. 5. The President of the United States is authorized, upon application from the Republic of the Philippines, and whenever in his discretion the public interest renders such a course advisable, to detail officers and enlisted men of the Army of the United States, and the United States Navy and Marine Corps to assist that Government: *Provided*, That the officers and enlisted men so detailed are authorized to accept from the Republic of the Philippines offices and such compensation and emoluments thereunto appertaining as may be first approved by the Secretary of War, or by the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be: *Provided further*, That such compensation may be accepted by the United States Government for remittance to the individual if in the opinion of the Secretary of War, or of the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, such a course appears desirable: *Provided further*, That while so detailed such officers and enlisted men shall receive, in addition to the compensation and emoluments allowed them by that Government, the pay and allowances thereto entitled in the Army of the United States, or the United States Navy, and Marine Corps, and shall be allowd the same credit for longevity, retirement,, and for all other purposes that they would receive if they were serving with the forces of the United States: *And provided further*, That in addition to or in the absence of such compensation from that Government, the officers and enlisted men so detailed shall receive such additional compensation as may be determined by the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, and approved by the President.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That articles or services furnished pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be within the limits of appropriations made specifically for that purpose or to the extent of availability of items which are surplus to the needs of the United States Government.

SEC. 7. The President may from time to time promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this act; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him by this act through such department, agency, or officer as he shall direct: *Provided*, That no property shall be transferred by such department, agency, or officer pursuant to this act except after consultation with the Secretary of State, and the Secretaries of War and Navy as their respective interests may appear.

SEC. 8. The provisions of this act become effective on the 4th of July 1946 and continue in effect for a period of 5 years.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 9, strike out "of the following category: Battleships" and insert "in the category of battleships."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "may deem" and insert "shall find."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6393) to amend the act entitled "An act for the creation of an American Battle Monuments Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1923, as amended, in order to extend the Commission's authority to all areas in which our armed forces have operated during World War II, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 4, 1923, as amended, entitled "An act for the creation of an American Battle Monuments Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the Commission known as the American Battle Monuments Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) shall consist of not more than 11 members who shall be appointed by the President, who shall also appoint one officer of the Regular Army to serve as its secretary. The members and secretary shall serve at the pleasure of the President who shall fill any vacancies that from time to time occur. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, commissioned officers of the armed forces of the United States may be appointed members of the Commission.

"The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation except that their actual expenses in connection with the work of the Commission may be paid from any funds appropriated for the purposes of this act, or acquired by other means hereinafter authorized.

"Upon the request of the Commission, the heads of the Federal departments or agencies are authorized to designate such personnel of their respective departments or agencies, or of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, as may be necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act, and the Commission is authorized to employ such further personnel as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, within the limits of any appropriation or appropriations made for such purposes.

"SEC. 2. That the Commission shall prepare plans and estimates for the erection of suitable memorials to mark and commemorate the services of the American armed forces and shall erect and maintain memorials in the United States and at such places outside the United States where the American armed forces have served or shall hereafter serve as the Commission shall determine. The Commission shall also erect and maintain works of architecture and art in such American cemetries located outside of the United States, its Territories and possessions, as the Secretary of War shall declare to be permanent cemeteries.

"The Commission shall control as to materials and design, provide regulations for, and supervise the erection of, all memorial monuments and buildings in American cemeteries located outside of the United States and its Territories and possessions.

"The Commission shall control as to materials and design and provide regulations for the erection of all memorial monuments and buildings commemorating the services of the American armed forces erected in any foreign country or political division thereof which may authorize the Commission to perform such functions, or upon federally owned or controlled property in the United States or in its Territories and possessions, except national cemeteries.

"SEC. 3. That before any design or material for memorials is accepted by the Commission, the same shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts.

"SEC. 4. That the Commission is authorized to cooperate with American citizens, States, municipalities, or associations desiring to erect war memorials outside the continental limits of the United States in such manner as may be determined by the Commission: *Provided*, That no assistance in erecting any such memorial shall be given by any administrative agency of the United States unless the plan has been approved in accordance with the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 5. That the Commission shall advise the Secretary of War of the location and date of completion of each memorial erected by it.

"SEC. 6. That the President is requested to make the necessary arrangements with the proper authorities of the countries concerned to enable the Commission to carry out the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 7. That the Commission is authorized to receive funds from any State, municipal, or private source for the purpose of this act, and such funds shall be deposited by the Commission with the Treasurer of the United States and shall be kept by him in separate accounts and shall be disbursed upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Commission.

"SEC. 8. That authority is hereby given for the preparation of models and designs and the fabrication of memorials, and the materials for such memorials, at arsenals or navy yards, or by other governmental agencies, if the Commission shall so determine.

"Authority is hereby given for the use of captured war materials, not otherwise disposed of by congressional action, in the fabrication of memorials constructed under the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 9. That the Commission is authorized to furnish replicas of any memorial, or any part thereof, to States, municipalities, or interested private persons or associations at actual cost, and to apply any proceeds from such sales to the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 10. That the Commission shall transmit to the President of the United States annually on the 1st of July a statement of all its financial and other transactions during the preceding fiscal year.

"SEC. 11. That the records and archives of the Commission shall, upon the termination of its duties, be deposited with the National Archives.

"SEC. 12. That the President may by Executive order transfer to the Commission, with respect to any national cemeteries located outside of the United States and its Territories and possessions, the same functions of administration which were transferred to the Commission with respect to national cemeteries located in Europe by Executive Order 6614, dated February 26, 1934.

"SEC. 13. That such sum or sums as Congress may hereafter appropriate for the purposes of this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

"SEC. 14. That within the limits of any appropriation or appropriations made for such purposes, the Commission is authorized (1) to acquire land or interest in land in foreign countries for carrying out the purposes of this act or of any Executive order conferring functions upon the Commission without submission to the Attorney General of the United States under the provisions of section 355 of the Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 520; 40 U. S. C. 255); (2) to maintain, repair, and operate motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and other property, which may be furnished to the Commission by other departments of the Government; (3) to establish offices in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in or outside of the United States; (4) to rent office and garage space in foreign countries which may be paid for in advance; (5) to procure printing, binding, engraving, lithographing, photographing, and typewriting, including the publication of information concerning the American activities, battlefields, memorials, and cemeteries with respect to which it may exercise any functions.

"Notwithstanding the requirements of existing laws or regulations, under such terms and conditions as the Commission may in its discretion deem necessary and proper, the Commission may contract for work, supplies, materials, and equipment outside of the United States and engage, by contract or otherwise, the services of architects, firms of architects, and other technical and professional personnel.

"The Commission may under such terms and conditions and in such manner as it may deem proper dispose of any land or interest in land in foreign countries which has been or may hereafter be acquired by the Commission in connection with its work: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not be effective until the expiration of the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

"The Commission may delegate to its Chairman, secretary, or officials in charge of any of its offices, under such terms and conditions as it may prescribe, such of its authority as it may deem necessary and proper."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

ACQUISITION OF BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6627) for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for the use of the Government of the United States of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, that bill has an all-inclusive title. Will the gentleman explain it? I see that there are present most of the members on both sides of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but this bill should not pass without some explanation and consideration.

Mr. BLOOM. I shall be very pleased to explain this to the House.

This bill was considered by our committee and has received the unanimous approval of both sides of the committee. The bill provides for the exchange of some of our surplus property throughout the world for buildings and lands for the use of our Foreign Service. In other words, we exchange about $125,000,000 worth of surplus property that is of no practical use to the Government of the United States for buildings and lands on which to build our embassies, legations, and chancelleries throughout the world.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The purpose of this bill certainly appeals to me. I am not sure about the details of the bill, but last fall when the Committee on War Department Appropriations was making its postwar trip to various parts of the world we learned in Tehran that due to the foresight of Ambassador Murray some 20 years ago we had acquired land there for our Embassy which proved to be quite valuable and which had increased in value. When we were at Naples and Rome it was pointed out to us that because of restrictions the State Department had placed on the amount of Italian currency that might be accepted in payment for lend-lease goods we were unable to dispose of a great deal of our surplus property in Italy. At the same time, it was pointed out that one of

the royal properties in Italy would be very suitable for our Embassy use there, and that it would facilitate the acquisition of that property if authorization existed for the exchange of our surplus goods.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When the subcommittee came back we made some recommendations which we presented to the President, and among them we included a recommendation that action of this sort be authorized, in the belief that unless we did something of this sort we would be unable to get anything for a great deal of the surplus we had overseas, and in the further belief that if we were to make such exchanges we would save ourselves a great deal in rent and other expenses of maintaining our embassies through the years to come; further, that these exchanges would make possible the acquisition of land or properties in some of these places which would let the United States have embassy property that would be commensurate with the dignity and place the United States ought to occupy in our representation overseas. Therefore, I certainly favor the objective of the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observation. It was as a result of that suggestion that this bill was drafted.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. There is just one point that I would like to comment on or have the chairman comment on. It will be noted there is a committee amendment to this bill which was unanimously adopted jumping or increasing the amount from $16,000,000 to $110,000,000 with reference to exchanges. The reason was that we found out during the hearings there is available, possibly before Congress may meet again, an amount up to $110,000,000 of surplus property that can be exchanged so that we can adequately take care of our missions throughout the world. Therefore, the committee itself unanimously adopted this amendment which would make it possible for us to use this surplus property immediately.

Mr. BLOOM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In that connection, under the Surplus Property Act of October 4, 1944, it is distinctly stipulated and provided in the substantive law that any surplus property abroad may be sold for cash or credit or exchanged for property or land or anything else in kind including raw material. I am wondering if the committee explored that matter to ascertain whether or not the passage of this legislation was necessary in order to enable the governments abroad where this property is situated to transfer sites for Government buildings because the Surplus Property Act provides for transfer and payment in kind.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the transfers to which the gentleman refers cannot be made under existing law. It would require an act of Congress to authorize the State Department to be the beneficiary of these exchanges; otherwise, the exchanges simply would go to the Foreign Liquidation Commission.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. This particular legislation was suggested originally by the action of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the State Department which, during their investigations abroad, found out that surplus property would be available for this purpose but found that additional legislation would be necessary. That is the reason for bringing this bill in and the reason for attempting to have it adopted promptly so that these exchanges can take place immediately.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, here is another bill introduced by the chairman of the committee on May 31 involving $110,000,000 which we are asked to pass by unanimous consent. It does strike me that if we needed any substantive law to enable the Department of State to accept this property, that matter could have been presented. I would like to say in this connection that the President of the United States under the Surplus Property Act issued an Executive order, whether he had the right to or not, to place the disposal of surplus property abroad in the State Department, and it is now being disposed of under the direction of Mr. Clayton, the Assistant Secretary of that Department. I again say, Mr. Speaker, it is an unfortunate situation that there has been an agreement here that there shall be no votes of any kind on legislation and that legislation involving from $10,000,000 to $110,000,000 in the bills that we have had up here within the last half hour should be considered by unanimous consent.

Mr. BLOOM. This does not involve any expenditure of money at all. It is something that the Government is going to get from the Surplus Property Act and some property that it needs equivalent to about $110,000,000. We are going to get it back. If you do not do it this way, it will cost us more. May I say to the gentleman that I have been exploring these things ever since I have been here. The gentleman mentioned Italy. I bought that palace over in Italy for the Government and by the time we got the appropriation they would not sell it to us. In Paris, we had to pay $250,000 because we waited. May I further say to the gentleman, I know this game. The gentleman may know his but I know this particular game. If we do not do it this way at this time you cannot buy this for $500,000,000 later on.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The Surplus Property Act prescribes certain standards of value. While I have a high regard for the business judgment of the gentleman, this act is so drawn that there is nothing said about value.

Mr. BLOOM. I beg the gentleman's pardon. This is done by a committee of which the Secretary of State is the head; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] and myself are members of that committee. I am chairman of the committee. Senator CONNALLY is a member, and another Senator whose name I just now forget. In fact, we have a committe of 12 people who act upon anything done according to this legislation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has missed my point altogether.

Mr. BLOOM. I have not missed anything.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is absolutely no standard as to the value of the percentage of cost of what you are going to get.

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman knows real estate, that is a matter of negotiation. I do not believe you could put that into a bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is in the surplus property law now.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does not this bill substitute barter for a cash transaction? I raise the same point which the gentleman from Mississippi raised. How are we going to know whether we are going to get a square deal and have the property valued under this bill?

Mr. BLOOM. We are surely going to get a square deal because we are going to get $110,000,000 worth of property for a lot of surplus goods that are lying around over there. If we do not do it this way we will not get anything and that is all there is to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of further carrying into effect the provisions of the Foreign Service Buildings Act of May 7, 1926, as amended (22 U. S. C. 291–297), there is authorized to be appropriated in addition to the amount authorized by such act, and the act of May 25, 1938, an amount not to exceed $75,000,000, of which $60,000,000 shall be available exclusively for payments representing the value, in whole or in part, of property or credits of whatever nature acquired through lend-lease settlements, the disposal of surplus property abroad, or otherwise, and held abroad by the Government or owing the Government by any foreign government or by any person or organization residing or situated abroad, which property or credits may be used by the Department of State for sites buildings, equipment, construction, and leaseholds; such payments to be made to the agency of the United States administering the property or credits and be treated by such agency as though made by the foreign government, person, or organization concerned. Sums appropriated pursuant to this act shall be available for the purposes and subject to the conditions and limitations of the above acts, except that there shall be no limitation on the amount to be appropriated in any 1 year and that expenditures for furnishings shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$125,000,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 8, strike out "$60,000,000" and insert "$110,000,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMASON (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a citation issued incident to the awarding of a medal of honor to Sergeant Ruiz.

Mr. FORAND (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR CONFERRED UPON PFC DIRK J. VLUG

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, for a second time the Fifth District of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent, enjoyed the distinction of seeing one of her sons decorated by the President of the United States with the coveted Congressional Medal of Honor.

Today at the White House it was my privilege to attend the ceremony in which that honor was conferred upon Pfc Dirk J. Vlug of Grand Rapids, Mich., on the following citation:

Pfc Dirk J. Vlug, First Battalion, One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Infantry, displayed conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty on December 15, 1944, when an American road block on the Ormoc Road near Limon, Leyte, Philippine Islands, was attacked by a group of enemy tanks. He left his covered position, and with a rocket launcher and six rounds of ammunition, advanced alone under intense machine gun and 37-mm. fire. Loading single-handedly, he destroyed the first tank, killing its occupants, with a single round. As the crew of the second tank started to dismount and attack him, he killed one of the foe with his pistol, forcing the survivors to return to their vehicle which he then destroyed with a second round. Three more hostile tanks moved up the road, so he flanked the first and eliminated it and then, despite a hail of enemy fire, pressed forward again to destroy another; with his last round of ammunition he struck the remaining vehicle, causing it to crash down a steep embankment. Through his sustained heroism in the face of superior forces, Private Vlug alone destroyed five enemy tanks and greatly facilitated successful accomplishment of his battalion's mission.

The simple, stately sentences of the above citation describe, in language which beggars human imagination and defies further description, one of the epics in World War II.

The history of our great country is replete with accounts of heroic deeds beyond the power of comprehension, and it was inspiring to see Private Vlug enrolled as one of those who have won an outstanding and honored place amongst the great war heroes of our Nation.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HALL PLAN TO FEED THE WORLD'S STARVING

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, I introduced the Hall plan to feed the world's starving and urged the President to order bread to be flown to Europe immediately. That was in February when famine and hunger were really beginning to take their toll of human lives.

Nothing was done, however, with this proposal. Yet if action had been taken at that time, the starving nations would have been fed and the world would now be well on the road to recovery.

In the meantime, millions upon millions of bushels of precious grain have been shipped out of the United States to points unknown.

I have conducted a careful search and made many inquiries of what is being done with grain and flour which the American people no longer have available. I confess that very little information is at hand and a lot of supposition exists.

We know the grain and food are loaded on ships bound for foreign ports. We know most of our domestic supply is being taken for this purpose.

What we do not know is where the grain goes and who gets it, what method of distribution it receives, how much the hungry people are compelled to pay for the food in order to consume it.

I am in no way accusing anyone of misrepresentation or dishonesty in connection with the handling of this grain which is destined for foreign use. I am not trying to draw a red herring across the path of our effort to save lives.

But I think the American people have the right to hear the truth about how this food is used. We all want it to go into hungry mouths over across. We all want it to do the good we intend it should do.

The greatest exodus of food and grain the world has ever known is now taking place from our shores. We expect this precious stuff to reach the peoples in need of it all over the world. We expect that an honest, painstaking policy is being carried out in distribution and that this policy includes making the food available to men, women, and children who are in need in all the nations where want and privation are rampant.

This food we are sending ought to be put within easy reach of all hungry peoples and not held out at black-market prices which poor people cannot possibly pay.

The questions I am now asking of all agencies having to do with distribution of American grain and food throughout hunger areas of Europe and Asia are:

First. What percentage of our exported food is reaching the people who are starving?

Second. Is food distributed on basis of need, free from all political control?

Third. How much more of American grain and food will be needed before the starving areas will be on their own feet?

Fourth. How many people have been and are being saved from starvation as the result of our aid?

Fifth. How much waste or black-marketeering are there after our food goes into other countries?

These questions and others relating to our whole grain and food exporting for human need should be answered and I am urging those in authority to do so right away.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by former Secretary of the Interior Ickes and a comment thereon by Mr. F. O. Hagie.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks concerning the bill S. 524.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each instance to include a statement and newspaper items.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CALIFORNIA OBSERVES HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY, RAISING OF BEAR FLAG, SONOMA, CALIF., JUNE 14, 1846—NATIVE SONS AND NATIVE DAUGHTERS OF THE GOLDEN WEST EMPHASIZING HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, today, June 14, 1946, is the hundredth anniversary of the raising of the Bear Flag, Sonoma, Calif., June 14, 1846; and being a native-born son of this glorious State of the Golden West, and being a charter member of Long Beach Parlor No. 278 of the Native Sons of the Golden West, which State-wide organization, together with its companion organization, the Native Daughters of the Golden West, is appropriately emphasizing this significant anniversary, I am sure you rightfully expect me to speak with you a few

minutes about the history of and service by the great State of California to the prosperity and progress of our beloved Nation and of the world.

Much of the historical data and many of the historical facts and incidents I briefly relate are derived from appropriate booklets of the Native Sons and Native Daughters of the Golden West, and from the secretary of state, and other books it is always a joy for me to delve into.

Ever since Columbus and Magellan made their historical waterway voyages it seems as though the watchword of the world has been "Westward, Ho!" Not only has that been true of the waterways of the world, but over the trails, the horseback and wagon trails of the covered wagon and oxen teams, it still is "Westward, Ho!" as indicated by trends and moves of industries and commerce, and now the man-made birds of the skies wing their way "Westward, Ho!"

Contrary to facts, the impression has been that the worthy organizations of the Native Sons and Native Daughters originated out of the plans of native-born Californians. Quite the contrary is true, because in 1875, under the thinking of Gen. A. M. Winn, of the great State of Virginia, affectionately called the Cradle of Liberty, a group of men were called together because of their primary interest in the welfare of California, and out of this small beginning, inspired by patriotic motives of a distinguished citizen of Virginia, arose the patriotic and useful orders of the Native Sons and Native Daughters of the Golden West. Today they stretch from Arcadia on the north to San Diego on the south, and from Truckee on the east to the shores of the mighty Pacific.

STATE CAPITOL

Plans for the State capitol at Sacramento were drawn by Miner F. Butler and selected by a commission July 14, 1860, from seven competitive drawings submitted. Work on the foundation started September 24, 1860, and the cornerstone was laid with Masonic ceremonies May 15, 1861. The structure was first occupied by the Governor and State officers November 26, 1869, and by the legislature December 6, 1869, but was not actually completed until 1874. Cost of construction was $2,600,000. Length of the building is 320 feet; depth, 164 feet; height—not including dome—94 feet; elevation of ball of capitol dome above street level, 247 feet; height from first floor to top of rotunda, 125 feet; area of Capitol Park, including extension site, 40.2 acres. The park contains more than 400 varieties of trees, shrubs, and flowers. Other major State buildings are located in Sacramento as well as in San Francisco and Los Angeles.

STATE SONG

California has no offfcial song. Several have been presented to the State legislature but have failed to receive recognition. A popular song for State and festive occasions is I Love You, California.

GOVERNOR'S FLAG

The Governor's flag is emblematic of the Governor's rank as commander in chief of the National Guard—now the State guard—and the naval militia. The flag is provided by the military and veterans code and has been in use since prior to the turn of the century.

STATE FLOWER

In 1903 the State legislature officially adopted the golden poppy—Eschscholtzia Californica—as the State flower. The golden poppy can be found blooming in some portion or the State on any day throughout the year. It once grew in great profusion the length and breadth of California, and the flaming glow it lent to the hills could be seen from far out at sea. "Its satiny petals, bright with the gleam of our gold mines, rich with the sheen of our fruits, and warm with the radiance of our sunshine, typify the ideal of California as no other flower could."

STATE BIRD

The State legislature in 1931 gave official recognition to the California Valley quail—Laphortyx Californica. The California Valley quail is found in many sections of the State; is social in nature; and it is noted for its hardihood and adaptability.

STATE FLAG

The original bear flag was raised at Sonoma June 14, 1846, by a group of Americans in revolt against Mexican authority. In less than 4 weeks it was replaced by the American flag, but was made an official symbol of California in 1911 when the State legislature adopted the bear flag as the California State flag.

STATE SEAL

The design for the great seal and coat of arms of California was adopted October 2, 1849, by the convention which framed the Constitution of the State of California. The 31 stars around the bend of the ring represent the number of States in the Union after the admission of California. The grizzly bear has long been considered symbolic of the State. The goddess Minerva, who sprang full-grown from the brain of Jupiter, embodies the type of political birth of the State of California, which was admitted as a State without having gone through the usual probationary period as a territory. The mine represents a leading industry and the shipping scene typifies commercial greatness. The snow-clad peaks in the background represent the Sierra Nevadas. The Greek motto Eureka—I have found it—applies either to the principle involved in the admission of the State or to the success of the miner at work.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to thank the gentleman for his very appropriate speech today on the anniversary of the raising of the flag over our State and to tell him that I have been truly inspired by the things he has said and that I concur most heartily in them.

Mr. DOYLE. I thank the gentleman from California for his very gracious remarks.

California was admitted to the Union as the thirty-first State on September 9, 1850, after the territory of which it was a part had been relinquished to the United States by Mexico on February of 1848 as the result of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

The first California Legislature was assembled at San Jose in December of 1849, shortly after a constitutional convention, called by the military governor, Gen. Bennett Riley, in June, had completed its work at Monterey.

After meeting in San Jose and for brief periods at Vallejo and Benicia, the legislature moved to Sacramento which was established as the State capital in 1854.

However, the recorded history of California goes back 400 years to September 28, 1542, when Cabrillo discovered San Diego Bay and explored the coast as far north as Point Reyes. In 1579 Sir Francis Drake landed probably at Drakes Bay, naming the territory New Albion, and claiming it for England. In 1602 Sebastian Vizcaino again explored the coast but it was not until 1769 that Spanish colonization started with the arrival at San Diego of the expeditions led by Gaspar de Portola.

Before the English colonists on the Atlantic coast started the American Revolution, the Spaniards had already established Franciscan missions along the California coast. The pastoral civilization, however, which developed in California remained isolated from both the Old and the New Worlds for more than 50 years, except for the occasional visits of foreign vessels, chiefly engaged in the sea-otter trade.

The period of Mexican rule which began in California in 1822 was soon followed by the influx of more traders and pioneer American settlers, but it was not until after the American acquisition of the territory that news of James Marshall's discovery of gold in the tail race of Sutter's lumber mill at Coloma on January 24, 1848, started the great gold rush that led to the rapid development of the northern part of the State.

California has shown a constant growth in population and by 1945 it reached an estimated 8,650,000. In 1850 the population was less than 100,000.

This population extends from the border of Mexico nearly 1,000 miles northward along the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

The State of California embraces three-fifths of the western coast line of the United States, and if transposed to comparable latitudes along the Atlantic coast its shore line would extend from Boston, Mass., to approximately Charleston, S. C. The average width of California is 150 to 200 miles.

The land area of the State is 156,803 square miles, and therein exist nearly every combination and every contrasting extreme of topography, climate, soil and mineral, plant and animal life which can be found in the United States, as well as some which are unique to California.

California is larger in area and has a greater diversity of natural economic resources than some of the principal Eu-

ropean nations. Its land area is larger than the British Isles.

About one-fourth of this land area is level and most of the valley lands are between sea level and 500 feet in elevation. They comprise the principal agricultural areas of the State. The warm belts—most characteristic of California and where most of her people reside—are below the 2,000-foot elevation.

Three-quarters of California's area is in rolling hills, foothills, and rugged mountain areas which range in elevation from 500 feet to over 14,000 feet. Mount Whitney, in California, the highest peak in the United States, outside of Alaska, reaches an elevation of 14,496 feet. Death Valley, 60 miles east of Mount Whitney in the Sierra, is 276 feet below sea level. This is not only the lowest spot in the United States, but also the hottest.

Approximately one-half of California's land area, or 49,897,574 acres, is publicly owned, of which 23,822,359 acres are in National forests and National parks and monuments.

There are 18 national forests in the State. The State park system is composed of 70 parks and historic monuments totaling 313,816 acres in area, and preserving ocean beaches, lakes, streams, redwood groves, and desert recreation areas for public use.

Annual average rainfall varies from 3 inches to less in the southeast corner of the State to over 100 inches in the northwestern section. In most of the highly developed agricultural sections of the State the precipitation varies from 5 to 30 inches yearly, and it is largely concentrated in the winter months from November to March. Consequently, supplemental irrigation during the summer months is necessary for most vegetable and fruit crops.

California has a sufficient diversity of the great natural economic resources to enable its people to sustain themselves as an isolated empire if necessary, but, without trade, it would be on a lower scale than now enjoyed.

Every agricultural product of the Temperate Zone is produced in California as well as many subtropical crops not grown elsewhere in the United States.

All staple foods and textile materials from cotton to wool are produced. Although silk is not produced commercially, experiments have demonstrated its possibility. The guayule plant for production of rubber is being grown extensively.

California has some 133,000 farms which include an area of 30,500,000 acres, with 7,000,000 acres used or available for crop production and 5,000,000 acres under irrigation.

Commercial timber resources of California include 39,000,000,000 board feet of redwood and 177,000,000,000 board feet of pine, fir, and other species.

Mineral resources include nearly all the basic materials used in the chemical, structural material, and metal-working industries. Some of these, such as iron ore, chromite, and manganese, are now being developed for expansion of the iron and steel industries, due to war demands.

Gold was the economic resource which led to California's first development. Since 1849, California's gold mines have yielded more than $2,000,000,000 in treasure.

Petroleum has far outstripped gold as a source of new wealth from mineral production in California. Since the discovery of oil in this State, over 6,000,000,000 barrels, with average value of $1 per barrel, have been produced in California.

The giant sequoias—Sequoia gigantea—are the largest and oldest living things in the world. They grow only in our high Sierra Nevada—snowy—Mountains. They can easily be seen in Yosemite and Sequoia National Parks. The largest tree in the world, called General Sherman, is in the Sequoia National Park. It has an estimated age of between three and four thousand years and is 272 feet high. It is 36½ feet through, 5 feet above the ground. Foresters say there is enough lumber in it to build 40 houses of 5 rooms each. General Grant is the Nation's Christmas tree. It is in Kings Canyon National Park. By vote of the school children of the country, the giant sequoia was chosen the United States tree. It is often called the big tree.

California has many beautiful native trees. It has more native plants than any equal area in the United States and more different kinds of cone-bearing trees, called conifers, than any equal area in the world.

The California redwood was designated by the State legislature in 1937 as the official State tree. It grows to a greater height than any other living thing; its natural distribution is limited almost wholly to California. The maximum recorded height of the redwood is 364 feet, and the age about 2,200.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, my brief words and humble recitation of these facts about my beloved State, are not made in any spirit of boast or undignified pride nor with any thought of undue emphasis, and certainly with no lack of affection and utmost appreciation of all the values of all of the States and of all the citizens of all the States. These States of ours in the composite, now forming the greatest Nation in this world neighborhood, and forming our beloved United States of America, must increasingly depend upon unity of purpose and the renewing of our spiritual sinews of devotion and patriotism to the high principles for which our forefathers came to this continent. Our Nation is today the greatest in the world, by reason of the fact that our forefathers came to these shores in order that they might serve God and serve Him with more freedom and devotion. Granting that there are some variations to this statement of mine, yet according to historical record I believe it is firmly established in the progress of our Nation that we have continued to be great only in proportion as we have continued to live according to the spiritual foundations for which man was created, rather than for the reverse. Therefore, it is becoming that I speak to the point that on this broad foundation of spiritual sinews and strength, my beloved State of California has contributed her share of the sinews of progress to the permanency of our beloved democracy.

May the framers of the Constitution of the State of California, which was adopted October 2, 1849, have cause to be continually aware of the fact that California steadfastly continues strong in the high purposes for which she came into being, and for which she continues to endure. In closing, it is appropriate that I say for the congressional delegation from the State of California, the glorious State of the Golden West, that we feel we have cause of just pride in the fact of representing California in this Congress, and we felicitate our neighbors on this date and throughout this anniversary year as they join hands in their appropriate festivities on the occasion of this hundredth anniversary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARNAHAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DECLARATION OF POLICY WITH REFERENCE TO OCCUPATION OF ENEMY TERRITORY

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, less than a year ago we concluded a vast conflict in defense of certain human rights. To preserve a way of life, we sacrificed the lives of 250,000 of our men and expended the incomprehensible sum of $200,000,000,000. With an unparalleled singleness of purpose, we forged the mightiest war machine in the history of the world. Aided by our allies, we crushed the forces of hate and greed which had arisen in the form of the Fascist armies of Germany and Japan. It was our mutual resolve, while we were engaged in that great war, that when the fighting was finished, we would forever insure ourselves against the reemergence of those sinister forces.

We should hold firmly to that resolve. We must not break faith with those who sacrificed, fought, and died for us. We must take every precaution to assure that we do not now lose what they won for us at so great a price. I am sure that every Member of this House joins me in this belief.

We must recognize that our job will not be done until Germany and Japan are forever rendered impotent to wage war. It will not be done until we prove to the world that we are determined to maintain peace. This job is still on our list of unfinished business. It is a job that requires men.

Today we are faced with the problem of providing the necessary men for our Army to do their part of the job.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly urged that we meet this problem squarely. Last September, when Congress went into session following VJ-day, I took the floor of this House to call attention to our needs. At that time I asked that Congress immediately tackle the job of finding out how many men were needed to enforce the peace and make the necessary provisions for obtaining them. Time after time I have repeated this

request. Unfortunately, the administration in power has turned a deaf ear to the requests.

On March 18 of this year, I joined with 25 other Members of this House in introducing House Concurrent Resolution 135, providing for a declaration of policy with reference to occupation of enemy territory and providing for a joint committee to determine our military needs and to recommend methods for obtaining the men required to meet these needs. I would like to quote from the joint statement we made, not yesterday but 3 months ago:

If the efforts to establish and maintain a peaceful world are to succeed, the United States, together with all other peace-loving nations, must meet its full share of responsibility to that end. We are confident that the people of the United States recognize and accept such responsibility and, fully informed as to the relevant facts, will give determined and continuous support to all measures necessary to be taken by our Government in relation thereto.

That responsibility requires, among other things, that the United States shall furnish its quota of the forces necessary to make effective the power of the United Nations Organization and shall maintain sufficient forces for the occupation of enemy territory for such time as may be necessary.

We recognize that conscripted service in peacetime is contrary to our traditions and repugnant to the great majority of the people, but it is unthinkable that the United States should be compelled to dishonor any of its obligations or commitments or to withdraw from full participation in world affairs, or that it should endanger its own security.

It is the duty of Congress to determine what action is necessary and to see that it is taken. We must proceed with the greatest possible dispatch, yet we must also act wisely and on the basis of full knowledge and the best advice which can be had on the difficult and technical questions involved.

What happened to that resolution? It is still languishing in the Rules Committee.

If that resolution had been adopted, if those studies had been made, we would be standing on firmer ground today as we move toward the solution of the problem. The people would have the facts—facts determined by their elected representatives. The Congress would have the facts—facts which would dissipate much of the fog which has surrounded the debates on the extension of draft legislation.

But, we cannot live in the land of might-have-been. Today, we have no other choice than to accept the Army's estimate of the situation. We must proceed upon that estimate, praying that it is correct, admitting that we are in no position to dispute it one way or another. We must accept it, and we must provide the men for minimum forces which they have estimated they will require.

Those estimates call for an Army gradually reducing in size until on July 1, 1947, a level of 1,070,000 men is reached. The problem then is the procurement of sufficient men to provide for a certain flow of replacements to compensate for normal attrition and particularly to enable the veterans of the fighting war to return home and still meet the figure set by the Army.

From the time that the last shot was fired, I have urged the necessity of providing replacements for the men who served their country so nobly in the fighting war. I do not believe any Member of this House has been more concerned with the matter of bringing these boys back home to their families and friends than has the Member from Wisconsin addressing you now. I have constantly called the attention of this House to the importance of taking prompt and constructive action in this direction. I said to this House on September 17 of last year:

The problem of obtaining replacements for our veterans is the number one job of this country.

I emphasize again today that there is no more immediate problem in the field of national policy than this one of replacement and maintenance of our armed forces.

How then are we to get the men?

Mr. Speaker, there are only two ways to get the men—a voluntary way and an involuntary way. One is by inducement, and the other is by compulsion.

The War Department says it wants a voluntary Army. General Eisenhower has indicated his preference for volunteer troops. There can be no serious disagreement about the desirability of meeting our requirements through voluntary enlistments. It is the fairest method, and it is productive of the highest type of military forces. It obviates peacetime conscription, which is repugnant to democratic people unless they are convinced that there is no alternative.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman is making a very fine statement on this proposition that will soon be before us. I am wondering if he has seen any evidence on the part of the War Department to put over a real enlistment program.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I have not and I am going to come to that point. We must admit, as all authorities on the subject do, that the desirable way to meet our needs is by voluntary enlistment. It is the fairest method and it is productive of the highest type of military forces. It obviates peacetime conscription, which is repugnant to democratic people unless they are convinced that there is no alternative.

Again may I call your attention to the fact that I have consistently urged that the necessary action be taken to assure a volunteer Army. It has been my firm position that the necessary men could be obtained without resorting to the draft if this Congress and the armed forces took the proper steps.

I firmly believe that, if conditions of employment are made attractive enough, there is no such thing as a position that cannot be filled. When we had a production job to do we did not hesitate to hire the job done, regardless of the effort or cost necessary. We have an equally important job now; there should be no hesitation in doing everything that is necessary to hire it properly done.

When the House passed the armed forces voluntary recruitment bill of 1945, last September, you may recall that I said:

Much more must be done than is provided for in this bill in order to immediately secure voluntary replacements.

That bill, however, was a step in the right direction. So was the bill providing for increased pay for military personnel, which passed this House on April 15. It was my hope and, I am sure, the hope of many Members of this House, that that bill would be acted upon immediately by the other body of this Congress and the President so as to stimulate voluntary enlistments.

Again, we must remove ourselves from the land of might-have-been. We must face the fact that this has not been done, and we, therefore, cannot judge what effect an increase in pay will have on voluntary enlistments. All we can do today is to guess at what might have happened. I believe there is too much at stake today to continue that guessing game any longer.

I think it is to the credit of this House that some very definite steps have been taken to accomplish the objective of obtaining the necessary volunteers to maintain our armed forces.

Let us not forget, as I think most of the people have, that the procurement agency, in this case the Army itself, also has a definite responsibility in connection with securing the necessary personnel. I feel sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that they have failed miserably to meet their responsibility in this regard. I cannot help but feel that they have placed to much reliance upon the idea that Selective Service would get the men for them. Of course, it is very simple for the Army to pick up the telephone and ask Selective Service for 30,000 men for June, 20,000 men for July, or for any number they feel they need. I am very much afraid that this is what the Army has been doing. They have been taking the easy way.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The Navy has apparently done a fine job on the voluntary-enlistment program. I am wondering if there is really any difference between the two jobs. If the Navy can do a good job, why cannot the Army do it also?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think the point raised by the gentleman is a very good one, but it does require that the Army take affirmative action. I think they have failed definitely to do so as of this time. I think this Congress must be constantly watching the activities of the Army in this respect.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am sure the gentleman would not want to leave the impression that the enlistment program has been a total and complete failure.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not mean to leave that impression but I do want to give the impression, and I feel very sincerely about it, that they have

not done as good a job as they should, and I am very convinced that if they did the proper job we would get enough men by voluntary enlistment.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. My point is this. That big "if" is there all the time. If they recruit the way they should, then we will be all right, but how can we rely on it?

Mr. CHENOWETH. According to the last figures I saw, we now have about 800,000 men in the Regular Army of this country.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I believe the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CHENOWETH. They propose to have only 1,070,000 a year from now. It does not seem to me we are going to fall very far short even under this program. I agree with the gentleman it should be accelerated, stimulated, and encouraged in every way possible. I feel satisfied we are going to get all the men we need through voluntary enlistment. I commend the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House this afternoon.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I hope the gentleman is right. I hope we get them that way. As far as I am concerned, no stone should be left unturned to see that we do get them that way.

What has the Army done during the recent months to encourage voluntary enlistments? What has happened to the Army's recruitment program?

The drive which started with such fanfare last fall has strangely fizzled since early spring. It seems to me that the program for WAC recruitment during the war displayed more ingeunity, sales promotion, and advertising genius than the present program to provide more men at an admittedly critical time. Here is another example where I think the Army is failing. We must do something to make sure that they spur up their drive and show a sincereity of purpose in trying to get men by volunteer methods.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I concur in what the gentleman says, that he feels a better job could be done than what is being done at this time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. A much better job could be done.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I commend the gentleman for making a fine statement. I know he has given this matter much study. In line with what the gentleman from Colorado said, I believe the gentleman will agree that perhaps some of the lag that has developed recently may have been due to the fact that there was no likelihood for the time being that the teen-age group would be inducted. I think as long as they were likely to be inducted the enlistment and recruitment campaign made considerable progress. It dropped very suddenly when there appeared a likelihood that they would not be inducted.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. If the gentleman would look at the figures of the number of recruits they were getting up to, let us say, May or April, when we started discussing the extension of the draft and the idea went out that the 18- and 19-year-olds probably would not be drafted, you will find that the biggest percentage of those who were reenlisting at that time or were volunteering were not 18- and 19-year-old people who were only going in because they were going to be drafted. If the gentleman will look at the figures he will find that to be the situation.

Mr. PRIEST. They were men who were reenlisting?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes; they were reenlisting.

Mr. PRIEST. If the gentleman has listened to the radio recently I believe he would agree that there is a rather intensive campaign under way at the present time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. They are thinking and talking about it, but they are waiting until the Congress acts. It is not on at this moment. I appreciate there is conversation over at the Pentagon Building about putting on a real good drive.

Mr. PRIEST. For the last week I have heard nearly every night a radio program sponsored by the Recruitment Division of the War Department in which the slogan is, "Make it a million." They have about 800,000 now and they are bearing down pretty heavily on this idea of making it a million. It seems to me, and I want to assure the gentleman I am not being critical, at the present time there is a rather well-organized campaign under way which I hope will be successful.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. So do I, but the only point I wish to make is that you do not see it back in the communities where you were going to get the boys.

For instance, why were requirements for enlistment in the Regular Army raised over wartime standards? The duties of occupation can scarcely be more arduous than the rigors of war. For instance, what has the Army done to meet squarely the mass of charges of lack of discipline, discrimination, and immorality in its internal structure? I appreciate that the Army set up a board to make proposals with regard to future relations of officers and men to one another. But, other than the issuance of a nice-sounding report, what has been done?

All of these questions must be answered. If we are forced to draft men to fill the gap between total enlistments and minimum requirements, then it is only common sense that we assure ourselves of the efficiency of the agency which is used to procure those enlistments. If we are ever to terminate Selective Service, if we are ever to arrive at the ideal of an entirely voluntary Army, then we must constantly scrutinize the efforts being made to accomplish that end.

In view of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Military Affairs Committee of this House to conduct a thorough investigation to find out what the Army has done and what it shall do to increase the flow of replacements by voluntary enlistments. I have today introduced a resolution calling for such an investigation. Among other things, this resolution requires that the Military Affairs Committee report to this House quarterly on the following matters:

First. What the Army is doing to encourage voluntary enlistments.

Second. The effect of the program of the Army in terms of men required and voluntary enlistments obtained.

Third. Recommendations of the committee to the Army with regard to improving the recruitment program.

Fourth. Action taken by the Army on recommendations made by the committee.

Last April, when this House was considering the extension of the Selective Service Act, I was convinced that, with the proper pay adjustments and the proper internal adjustments in the Army and with the proper recruitment program, it would not be necessary for the Army to call upon selective service to meet its needs. I felt that the machinery of selective service should be kept intact for an emergency but that future inductions would be made unnecessary by a recruitment program. It was my feeling and hope that a voluntary recruitment program would be given a fair trial. I regret to say that from the action or inaction of the Army during the past few months, we cannot be assured that it will be given a fair trial. The Army is apparently adamant about doing anything until it has a Selective Service Act on the books in the form it wants.

With the need for maintaining adequate occupation forces, with an international picture which is anything but clear and heartening, and with the necessity of getting war veterans home, I do not feel that we are justified in resting our case on hope alone. Mr. Speaker, under present conditions, I must support the extension of the Selective Service Act. Until voluntary enlistments approach the level of our minimum requirements, I do not believe we have any other choice than to pass draft legislation to bridge that gap. The urgency of presenting a unified front to the world as we seek to establish and maintain a just peace convinces me of the necessity for continuing the draft in spite of my normal feeling of revulsion to peacetime conscription.

I do hope and I urge and pray that the Army will recognize its responsibility to secure the necessary men by voluntary methods and that they will call upon selective service for their requirements only as a last resort. The Army must carry out its responsibilities in this respect, or it will have broken faith with the Congress and the American people. An early passage of the resolution which I have just introduced will assure us that the Army is meeting this responsibility.

Having assured ourselves and our consciences that we have made every effort possible to persuade men to serve voluntarily, then I think it only logical that we should pass draft legislation that will provide for any possible failure of that program to meet the Army's need.

The Army maintains that it needs to draw from the entire 18- to 45-year-age groups, with the exception of fathers, in

order to meet its needs and in order to limit service of inductees to 18 months.

I believe we should pass legislation providing selective service with the legal means to do so, but specially including in that legislation the limitation that teenage men shall be taken only if the other age groups do not provide the necessary men to meet the gap between requirements and enlistments. The compelling reasons for not drafting these boys were recognized during the war. They certainly should be given recognition now.

I urge that the conference committee now studying the bill to extend selective service report the bill with amendments providing for the limitation just suggested.

With such legislation and with a perpetual concentration of effort to assure a volunteer Army, we will arrive at a just and workable solution of this urgent problem.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Information has come to me that the Army has raised the physical and mental requirements under the enlistment program higher than the requirements under selective service. I want to ask the gentleman whether or not that information, from the study he has made, is substantially correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wjsconsin. My understanding is they have not changed the physical requirements but they have changed the mental requirements. They have raised the mental requirements from an index figure of 59 to a figure of 70. That is the cause of their uncertainty of obtaining their Army by recruitment methods and we should therefore be on our guard at all times to insist that they do everything reasonable to obtain them by enlistment.

Mr. KEEFE. Am I correct therefore in the assumption that young man "A" might want to enlist in the armed services and might be rejected because of failure to measure up to the rigid tests imposed by the Army in its recruitment service, but that after his rejection as a volunteer he might be called upon under selective service and be placed in the Army, being able to meet the minimum requirements of selective service?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is my understanding of the way the Army is operating at the present time.

Mr. KEEFE. If that be the situation, and I am advised it is, it is indeed a very anomalous thing that any young man who is inspired to want to enlist in the United States Army stands a chance to be rejected only to be caught by selective service and find himself right in the same Army. That is true, is it not?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is true, and that is one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I say this Congress has to keep a finger on what the Army is doing and make sure that they act in accordance with the desires of this Congress. I do hope that serious consideration is given to the resolution which was introduced today, insisting that the Military Affairs Committee keep investigating every move the Army makes in this respect.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on June 21, after the reading of the Journal, our colleague, the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, Mr. ROMULO, may be permitted to address the House on the subject of his farewell to Congress and farewell to the Nation as the last commissioner from the Philippine Islands, the islands on the 4th of July next becoming an independent nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and special orders heretofore granted I may address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

INFLATION, INDUSTRIAL CONFLICT, DEPRESSION

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago indignation swept the country when the House of Representatives passed a so-called price-control bill crippling the Office of Price Administration in its efforts to protect the Nation from disastrous postwar inflation. Telegrams and letters swamped Members of Congress in unprecedented volume and the country gained hope that the Senate would correct the mistakes of the House bill.

Now we know that this will not be done. The bill recommended for passage by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee is more crippling even than that passed by the House of Representatives. The bill as it emerges from the Senate today is far worse than that which was recommended by the committee.

It is not a price-control bill, it is a bill to control the price controllers so that they cannot control prices.

It is a bill to destroy the purchasing power of the American dollar.

It is a bill to prevent us from making good on our food commitments to starving people abroad.

It is a bill to put up the price of meat, bread and milk, the three foods most necessary for human life.

It is a bill to increase the cost of clothing to the American people by at least a billion dollars a year.

It is a bill to bring a new wave of industrial conflicts and work stoppages, just when the country is settling down for an era of peace and large-scale production.

It is a bill to put disabled veterans, soldiers' dependents, veterans on educational allotments, and all persons with fixed incomes, in a punishing squeeze.

It is a bill to bring about, after a period of wild inflation, an economic collapse which will cause widespread unemployment, business failures, and farm mortgage foreclosures.

It is a bill to inflate still further the profits of business.

It is a bill to put the hands of all kinds of special interests into the pocketbooks of the American people.

Let us see a few of the things that this bill does. In the first place, it removes all price controls from meat, milk and other dairy products, and from poultry and eggs. It will set meat producers, dairymen, and poultry raisers, without any limitations on their prices, into competition for the shortest grain supply this country ever faced. Under these conditions it will be impossible to hold ceiling prices on grain. Many of our grain-producing farmers of the Middle Western States are also hog and cattle feeders. If they are not, their neighbors are. With no ceilings on meat, grain-producing States inevitably will find it to their advantage to feed, and not to sell, their grains. Dairymen, poultry and egg producers, and cattle feeders in seaboard States, away from the grain-producing sections, will experience the utmost difficulty in getting needed feed. If an attempt is made to hold ceilings on flour, bread, and cereals, there will be no production of these essential products, because the millers of the country will be unable to secure the grain they need. The best estimate is that, if this bill is enacted, at least $5,000,000,000 will be added immediately to the food bill of the consumers of the Nation.

The bill also requires OPA to abandon its maximum average price order, which requires manufacturers to sell low-priced as well as high-priced clothing. It will permit these manufacturers, without restrictions, to concentrate on the manufacture of high-priced clothing. This, it is estimated, will add $1,000,000,000 to the Nation's clothing bill and the people who will pay the extra billion will not be the well-to-do, but those accustomed to buy low-cost clothing.

The bill also denies to the Office of Price Administration authority to control the prices of cotton; at the same time requiring that prices of cotton textiles be increased every time the price of cotton advances. It also contains a provision for a 5-percent increase on the prices of all cotton textiles, as a so-called production incentive. These latter provisions will add about $150,000,000 to clothing prices, making the total increase in the cost of clothing $1,150,000,000. For food and clothing alone, if this bill passes, the living costs of the American people will be increased by $6,000,000,000.

It should be obvious that labor cannot, in the face of an increase of 20 or 30 percent in living costs, sit back content with existing wage rates. A new series of labor-management disputes inevitably will follow enactment of this bill that will make those of the recent past seem tame by comparison. Not only will production be handicapped, when we appear to be opening up for a maximum output of goods, but wages in the end inevitably will be adjusted upward. Up will go production costs and most of the increases inevitably will have to be reflected in higher prices. Thus, the dreaded inflationary spiral will be put into effect. Prices will go up and up until they

outrun public buying power or willingness to buy. Then will come a price and production crash that inevitably will bring disaster to the Nation, as it did after World War I.

I want to emphasize this point: It is true, as opponents of price control state, that if controls are abolished demand and supply will come into balance at some new price level. Obviously, however, they cannot come into balance until prices rise to a point where they restrict demand. Obviously, too, demand at that point will be for less goods than are now used or desired. Meat consumption may fall back from the present level of 150 pounds per person, per year, to the prewar consumption of 126 pounds. Fresh milk consumption may fall back from present use of 220 quarts per person, per year, to the prewar level of 150 quarts. Egg consumption may fall back from the present use of 365 eggs per person, per year, to 298 per person, per year. Perhaps this will help the farmers; but I do not think so. It did not help them after World War I when farm prices soared, cutting down public ability to buy and leading to a crash that in 5 years caused 453,000 farmers to lose their jobs through mortgage foreclosure.

Meat, milk, and eggs, however, are not the only goods that will be priced out of their present and prospective markets. Fewer automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, furniture, rugs, draperies, and all other kinds of household goods will be purchased if prices soar too high. That means fewer jobs, and more unemployment, and still further reduction in buying power. After the runaway inflation that followed World War I, and the collapse that resulted, factory employment dropped 33 percent in 2 years, factory pay rolls 44 percent. Unemployment rose 5,600,000. Manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers lost heavily on swollen speculative inventories and in the next 5 years an average of 20,000 business firms a year went into bankruptcy. Twenty thousand a year compared with just 810 that failed last year, under price control.

Our soldiers and sailors and discharged veterans will be among the principal sufferers if this bill becomes a law. Disabled veterans, other veterans receiving pensions, dependents of men still in the servics and veterans receiving fixed educational allotments will be put in a cruel squeeze by mounting prices.

So far, with few exceptions, every veteran wanting a job has found one. Nonagricultural employment today exceeds all previous records, even those at the wartime peak. If we remove controls and have runaway prices, wide employment opportunities will continue for some time. In a year or two, however, runaway prices will cut demand for goods, a price and production collapse will follow and millions of GI's will be without jobs. That was what happened after World War I; it is what will happen again.

Millions of other veterans, having started small businesses, with loans under the veterans' bill of rights, will be caught in the collapse and go into bankruptcy; having only debts to show for their efforts.

One would think from listening to the debate on price control in the House and reading the record of the debate in the Senate, that the country was in desperate straits and could be saved only by Congressional intercession to change the policies of the Office of Price Administration. The fact is, however, that in spite of the very serious work stoppages, which resulted from postwar wage adjustments, the country is in an extraordinary good economic condition.

Farm production is running approximately one-quarter ahead of prewar levels. Industrial production in March, according to the Federal Reserve Board index, was at an annual rate of 69 percent above average production for the prewar years 1935–39; at 7 percent above average production for 1941.

Nonagricultural employment, according to the United States Labor Department, is greater than at any previous time in the history of the Nation, even during the peak of wartime employment.

We have heard a great deal about OPA-created business hardship. The truth is that the amount of business hardship is far less today than it was before the war. In the boom year 1929, 22,900 business firms failed. In the last prewar year, 1939, 14,700 failed. Last year only 810 failed, and the present rate is only slightly in excess of last year's figures. If it continues as at present, less than 1,000 business firms will fail in the United States this year. Certainly there is no evidence in these figures that any sort of catastrophe faces the Nation, or the businesses of the Nation.

With most of our postwar adjustments behind us, there is every reason to believe, if we continue the conditions which now exist and maintain a reasonably stable price level, that we shall attain, before the end of the year, an industrial production double that of the prewar period.

These supposed calamities which face the Nation, and hardships to which business is supposedly subjected, are pure figments of the imagination of people who want to destroy price control in order to earn inflationary profits.

If someone proposed in this Chamber that a tax of 2, 3, or 5 percent should be levied upon meat, milk, bread, poultry, eggs, clothing, and other necessities of life, the roar of protests that would go up would reach the farthermost shores of the Pacific coast; yet this bill will take 25 cents out of every dollar from the pocketbooks of the American people, and the majority of this House and of the Senate seem to think that this is in the interest of the people and for the benefit of the country.

The people themselves have a different idea, which they will clearly prove next November. Every poll of public opinion shows 75 percent or more of the people for extension of price control. The action of the House and Senate on this bill is a distortion of representative government, a concession to pressure groups. It will put the hands of special interests into the pocketbooks of the American people.

After passage of the House bill a wave of wires and letters seldom before equaled flooded Congress. But these were a mere flurry compared with the flood that will deluge us when meat prices rise 50 percent and milk, poultry, eggs, and bread prices go up sharply. Before it is too late this sell-out of the interests of the American people should be reversed. I only hope that an acceptable bill, far different from those which passed the two Houses, will come out of conference. If it does not it should be vetoed by the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 7 minutes.

ATOMIC ENERGY AND THE HOPE OF PEACE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly in the House in discussing the problems of atomic energy and atomic weapons I have said that in my judgment the only thing that could save mankind from a terrtible fate would be an act of statesmanship comparable in scope, imagination, and daring to the scientific progress represented by the atomic bomb. In my opinion, such an act of statesmanship has been performed by our Nation. It began with the presentation of the Acheson-Lilienthal report, and the newspapers this afternoon carry the dramatic story of the proposal advanced by the American representatives on the United Nations Commission on Atomic Energy, headed by Mr. Bernard Baruch.

Anyone who cannot see the tremendous, almost indescribable gain to the people of the United States from the possible establishment of a world-wide control by international police power governed by representatives of all the nations of the world over the right of any nation to possess aggressive, terrible, destructive weapons of this sort, anyone who cannot see the tremendous advantage to the people of our country from an enforceable prohibition against the nations doing those things, it seems to me, is shortsighted indeed.

For one, although I realize that there will probably be considerable discussion of this matter and those who speak boldly about it may be attacked for so doing, I want to make my own position quite clear. It is that I rejoice that our country has given a challenge to the world about this greatest of all problems that mankind has ever faced.

America's proposal for the control of these forces of destruction is a gateway through which mankind could march into a warless world. And our choice is a warless world or the end of civilization. Never before in history, so far as I am aware, has a great nation offered to make a law of peace superior to itself on condition that all other nations would do likewise. America's action will stand forth as an essentially unselfish and statesmanlike act in the highest sense. Such action is rare. May it bring the results it deserves.

I predict that that nation which refuses to join with us in this great effort for peace, in this attempt to save the

lives of the people of the world, will stand before the bar of world public opinion in a most dark position. I most earnestly hope no nation will do so.

ANOTHER SUBJECT: SAVING OUR GRAIN

Mr. Speaker, I have another matter that I want to speak about today, and that is the importance of our preserving for the use to which it was really intended and for uses for which it is desperately needed today the grain resources of this Nation.

In the month of April, according to the official figures of the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Treasury, American distilleries produced 19,000,000 gallons of distilled spirits, against which production there were withdrawals for consumption purposes of 15,000,000 gallons.

In other words, 4,600,000 gallons were added to stocks, making a total of stocks equal to 386,000,000 gallons which is more than a 2½ years' supply of distilled liquor. This production was achieved despite existing restrictions, and grain is being used for this purpose, which is desperately needed for human as well as animal food.

My bill, House Joint Resolution 325, would stop this and channel the grain where it ought to go.

I read from the Farm Journal for June 1946 a brief paragraph:

> More than a million long tons of grain went into beverage alcohol and beer the first 4 months of this year. Distillers used 6,000,000 bushels in January, 7,000,000 in February, 5,250,000 in March, and about 4,000,000 in April. Beginning May 1 they were reduced to 2,500,000 a month. They used 3,500,000 bushels of wheat in January and February, none since. They have been using corn, supposedly unfit for human consumption, at a rate of 3,000,000 bushels a month, or a fourth more than prewar.

The use of scarce grains for whisky distillation is now impeding essential reconversion industries as well as our domestic livestock and poultry feed program and foreign famine relief.

Within the next few weeks, many essential industries in this country engaged in starch processing or dependent upon starch products—starch, sizings, textiles, dextrose, foundry core-binders, corn oil, various essential chemicals, and many other products—will be shut down tight for lack of corn and other grains. Grain inventories of the wet milling industry are now down to rock bottom, and these producers are finding it nearly impossible to buy grain in the open market.

In the meantime, allocations of grain to the whisky industry have been sufficiently generous to permit very substantial increases in whisky inventories since VJ-day. Whisky stocks have increased from 343,000,000 gallons on August 31, 1945, to 370,000,000 gallons on April 30, 1946, according to the United States Treasury Department, despite record sales in the interval. There is certainly no justification for increasing whisky stocks any further at the expense of more essential users of grain. Present whisky stocks are adequate for at least 2½ years of continued sales at the present rates.

Whisky manufacturers are still using 2,500,000 bushels of grain per month. In addition, they are now using potatoes at a rate of 10,000 carloads per month. With such a supply of raw materials, the inventories of the whisky industry will continue to increase, while other grain users suffer.

Whisky interests are believed to have huge holdings of grain at the present time. Their inventories of corn and other grains are variously estimated at between 5,000,000 and 10,000,000 bushels. Much of their inventories are believed to be held in third-party hands. Moreover, distillers are apparently able to continue purchasing corn in the open market, Business Week—page 7, June 1, 1946—by bartering whisky and gin.

There is no justification for continued whisky distillation at a time when we are not shipping enough grain to feed the starving; at a time when there is a terrible livestock and poultry feed shortage here at home; when flour mills are everywhere shut down, and there are bread lines in all our cities, and when the wet-milling industry is being forced to shut down, which will result in widespread stoppage of basic production and considerable unemployment.

The whisky people are in a very comfortable position indeed, having 30,000,000 gallons more whisky in their warehouses than they had a year ago, and 63,000,000 gallons more than the wartime low. It should also be particularly noted that the whisky industry customarily shuts down operations entirely during the hot summer months. In view of their greatly increased inventories, and the needs of more essential users for their grain supplies, the whisky industry should again be shut down this year, of all years, and the whisky industry's supplies of grain should be diverted to more essential needs.

My bill, House Joint Resolution 325, provides for just such action.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from an item from the magazine, Business Week, for June 1, 1946, which is as follows:

DISTILLERS FAIL TO DELIVER

> Whisky distillers are failing to deliver their commitment of 900,000 bushels of grain to UNRRA. Fiery Fiorello LaGuardia blackjacked them into making such a charitable offer by threatening to have them shut down entirely if they didn't cooperate.
>
> Many distillers have the full inventories permitted by the Government—7½ days' mashing capacity—which, on the present basis of operating 3 days a month, is a 2½ months' supply. Others are finding it virtually impossible to buy legally enough grain to stay in production, except by bartering whiskey and gin for corn. The consequence is that less than one-third of the 900,000-bushel quota has been delivered.
>
> Some of them have offered to contribute cash instead of grain for UNRRA. But LaGuardia has plenty of cash, wants corn. This is proving nearly impossible to get.
>
> After announcement of the donation to UNRRA, the distillers received telegraphic authorization to continue production at the rate of 3 days a month during June and July.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that in this battle against hunger the kind of action that will appeal to the American people as well as to those abroad is action which will make it clear, first of all, that we here at home are putting to the best possible use such resources as we have. Livestock ought not to have to be slaughtered. Nor should enterprises such as the producers of starch products and other products of that sort and producers of corn, oil, and various chemical industries have to be cut down while we add still further to what already constitutes a 2½ years' supply of hard liquor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE PALESTINE SITUATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, some time ago it was promised that 100,000 persons of the Jewish race would be allowed to enter Palestine. Nothing is being done, and it seems a very cruel and unjust thing that these people who have suffered so horribly and been tortured so terribly should not be allowed to enter Palestine. It is another evidence, as I said before when the resolution passed for their benefit in the last session of Congress, of fooling the Jewish people. It is very unjust and very unfair. I am doing everything through the proper authorities to see that this is done and done immediately.

The time has finally come when understanding voices in Congress must once again make themselves heard. There is no discussion on the entry of the 100,000 Jews into Palestine. After 4 months of diligent inquiry, all members of the Commission agreed that that must come to pass. Then our President substantiated that stand.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. VINSON, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 17, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1393. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Col. S. V. Constant, General Staff Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

1394. A letter from the Administrator Office of Price Administration, transmitting the sixteenth report of the Office of Price Ad-

ministration, covering the period ended December 31, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 665); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1395. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the Solid Fuels Administration for War for the fiscal year 1947, in the amount of $2,950,000 (H. Doc. No. 664); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1396. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act approved June 6, 1924, entitled "An act providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital," as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 662. Resolution to take H. R. 388 from the Speaker's table; without amendment (Rept. No. 2285). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. Senate Joint Resolution 138. Joint resolution to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4842. A bill to allow the disposal of surplus vessels without necessity for public bidding with prior inspection rights, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2291. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Minority views on H. R. 3129. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 so as to limit the power of the Securities and Exchange Commission to regulate transactions in exempted securities (Rept. No. 2164, pt. II). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5178. A bill for the relief of Marian Antoinette McCloud; without amendment (Rept. No. 2286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5391. A bill for the relief of Ann Maureen Bell; without amendment (Rept. No. 2287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5527. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Karamouzis (known as James C. Karamouzis or James C. Kar); without amendment (Rept. No. 2288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 6793. A bill to require the Departments of War and Navy to furnish photographs of permanent graves located outside of the United States to the next of kin of the decedents; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 6794. A bill to incorporate the Amvets, American Veterans of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6795. A bill to provide military advice and assistance to the Republic of China to aid it in modernizing its armed forces for the fulfillment of obligations which may devolve upon it under the Charter of the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 664. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Military Affairs to conduct an investigation of the size and character of the Army, particularly with respect to enlistment, recruitment, and induction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Res. 665. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate and study the commitments of the United States to furnish grain and other foodstuffs to foreign countries; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 666. Resolution to provide for expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 665; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. Res. 667. Resolution creating a subcommittee of the Committee on the Civil Service to investigate Communist and subversive activities among Federal employees; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALMOND:

H. R. 6796. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Essie N. Fannin, Miss Helen Hicks, Miss Marie Hicks, Miss Frances Fannin, William O. Thompson, and Mrs. W. D. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 6797. A bill for the relief of Michel Ferapontow; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 6798. A bill for the relief of Myron R. Leard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 6799. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Charles Frederick Wynia; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 6800. A bill for the relief of Mrs. May Enta Kitajima; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1984. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Clyde Leading Fighter, Parmelee, S. Dak., and 27 other signers, members and former members of the armed forces of the United States in World Wars I and II, and parents and relatives of such veterans, respectfully petitioning the enactment of the Indian Emancipation Act, House bill 3710; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1985. Also, petition of Harris Yellow Cloud, Norris, S. Dak., and 25 other signers, members and former members of the armed forces of the United States in World Wars I and II, and parents and relatives of such veterans, respectfully petitioning the enactment of the Indian Emancipation Act, House bill 3710; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1986. Also, petition of Adelbert Thunder Hawk, Rosebud, S. Dak., and 25 other signers, members and former members of the armed forces of the United States in World Wars I and II, parents and relatives of such veterans, respectfully petitioning the enactment of the Indian Emancipation Act, House bill 3710; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1987. Also, petition of Mathew J. Boneshirt, St. Francis, S. Dak., and 23 other signers, members and former members of the armed forces of the United States in World Wars I and II, and parents and relatives of such veterans, respectfully petitioning the enactment of the Indian Emancipation Act, House bill 3710; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1988. Also, petition of Frank Pacer, of Parmelee, S. Dak., and 28 other signers, members and former members of the armed forces of the United States in World Wars I and II, and parents and relatives of such veterans, respectfully petitioning the enactment of the Indian Emancipation Act, House bill 3710; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1989. By Mr. ROGERS of New York: Petition of Joseph Walters, secretary, Local Union No. 57, International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, and Soft Drink Workers of America, Rochester, N. Y., and approximately 354 others protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; also, restriction of grain recently placed on the brewing industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1990. By Mr. EBERHARTER: Petition of thousands of United States citizens protesting against the present 30-percent reduction in grains available for the manufacture of beer and against any further restrictions now or at any future time; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1991. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Mrs. Ella L. McCarthy, 34 South Hunter Avenue, Auburn, N. Y., and 20 others, asking Congress to pass the joint resolution which would authorize the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture to issue directives preventing the use of grain for alcoholic beverages until the world's food shortage is relieved; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1992. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the national executive committee of the American Legion, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of Senate bill 524; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1993. Also, petition of the court of Morgan County, Berkeley Springs, W. Va., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to commemoration of National Pioneer Day; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

1994. Also, petition of various Townsend Clubs of Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of House bills 2229 and 2230; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1995. Also, petition of the general synod of the Reformed Church in America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the recall of Myron Taylor as the President's representative to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1996. Also, petition of the American Christian Palestine Committee of Indianapolis, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1997. Also, petition of president, Kiwanis International, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the duties, responsibilities, rights, and privileges of management and labor; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JUNE 15, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who hast ordained that in trial we shall find our triumph, the day is Thine when shines the sun in radiance on our path; still it is Thine when clouds and darkness shadow the earth and we bend our heads to meet the driving storm. The earth is Thine and the fullness thereof; its goodness is Thy gift to all Thy children. Denying that heritage and forsaking Thy ways, man has blasted it with bombs, drenched it with blood, scorched it with fire: Thy mercy on Thy people, Lord. Prosper, we beseech Thee, in councils whose decisions will shape the tomorrow all sincere efforts of those who speak for the nations, that there may be found a more excellent way when in sharing all Thy sundered children may gain all: And Thine shall be the kingdom and the power and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, June 14, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOSSETT:

S. 2342. A bill for the relief of Thomas Abadia; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2343. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—AMENDMENT

Mr. HAYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the committee amendment beginning with the word "Shasta" in line 25, page 52, and ending with the amount "$20,836,670" in line 5, page 53, insert the following: "and substations, $4,572,000, including Shasta to Delta switchyards via Oroville and Sacramento, 230 kilovolt, Shasta to Delta switchyards (west side lines), 230 kilovolt; Keswick to Sacramento, 115 kilovolt; Contra Costa power distribution system, miscellaneous transmission, feeder lines and facilities, and substations; in all, $25,000,000."

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5452) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 2, line 3, strike out "Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury."

On page 2, line 4, strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three."

On page 2, line 5, after the words "District of Columbia", insert the words "and elsewhere."

On page 2, line 6, strike out "$442,000" and insert "$440,000."

On page 2, line 6, beginning with the word *"Provided"*, strike out down to and including line 8.

On page 2, line 7, strike out the word "eighteen" and insert the word "sixteen."

On page 2, line 12, strike out "$4,400,000" and insert "$4,000,000."

On page 2, line 18, after the word "any", insert the word "legal."

On page 2, line 19, strike out "regulations, or instructions" and insert "or regulations."

On page 2, line 21, strike out the comma after the word "functions."

On page 2, line 23, after the word "military", insert the words "or naval."

On page 3, line 1, strike out the words "motor-propelled."

On page 3, beginning in line 1, strike out the words "a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle" and insert "one or more motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles."

On page 3, line 5, strike out the words "and reimbursement of" and insert "or."

On page 3, line 6, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,050,000."

On page 3, line 9, immediately preceding the figure "$175,000", insert "and elsewhere,."

On page 3, line 9, strike out "$175,000" and insert "$200,000."

On page 3, line 12, after the comma immediately following the word "Columbia" insert "and elsewhere,."

On page 3, line 12, strike out "$90,500" and insert "$90,000."

On page 3, line 15, after the comma immediately following the word "Columbia", insert "and elsewhere,."

On page 3, line 15, strike out "$165,000" and insert "$160,000."

MODIFICATION OF RAILROAD FINANCIAL STRUCTURES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1253) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, last evening I explained very briefly this bill. I desire to make a further explanation this morning. First of all, I shall state what the bill does. It enables railroad companies to adjust their financial affairs quickly, economically, and on a business basis. The procedure it provides will reduce any disturbance of their affairs to a minimum, and will provide the maximum of protection for both the railroads and their investors.

The existing law, section 77, was enacted in 1933, without hearings and without consideration by any subcommittee or commitee of the Senate.

When the bill came up on the floor of the Senate it was severely criticized by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and by numerous other Senators, including the late Senator Norris. It was passed in the last hours of the session. It was enacted in the belief that it would help railroads to correct their financial affairs, but has been found to do exactly the opposite. Speaking of section 77, I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that it has placed in the hands of Government officials extraordinary power, which they had not requested, over 25 percent of the country's railroad mileage—a power which they have exercised:

First, to demolish every part of the financial and corporate structures of those railroads;

Second, to plan in every respect the financial and corporate future of those exercised;

Third, to pick men to control those railroads; and

Fourth, to decree the forfeiture of $2,500,000,000 of investments.

For more than a year, as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, I received a large number of letters not only from investors in railroad securities who were scattered from one end of the country to the other, but also from many prominent lawyers interested in this legislation, suggesting that something should be done to prohibit the forfeiture of $2,500,000,000 of securities held by such investors. Because of this and the fact that I was importuned by a large number—I was going to say by at least half—of the Members of the Senate to correct this situation, I asked the staff of the committee to make an investigation of the whole subject. A resolution was submitted which was adopted by the Senate of the United States. A thorough report on the situation was made and submitted to the Senate. That report was commended by the leading financial journals and editors of the country and by many of our leading newspapers, including the Wall Street Journal and the Journal of Commerce. As a result of that investigation and at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I introduced this bill in its

original form as Senate bill 1253. Extended hearings were held on this bill. Every railroad executive, every banker, every life insurance company representative, and every railroad employee who came before the committee testified in favor of it.

After those hearings we amended the bill by adding new sections to take care not only of the railroads which might possibly go into bankruptcy in the future but likewise return to the management of railroad companies now in bankruptcy its rights to bring together its creditors and stockholders to compromise their debts and work out a plan of reorganization equitable to all.

After redrafting the bill the committee again held extensive hearings. Thus this subject has been under consideration by the Committee on Interstate Commerce for more than a year, and, as I said yesterday, it has had the most careful study. More people have testified with reference to it than with reference to almost any other piece of legislation handled by the Interstate Commerce Committee in the twenty-some-odd years I have been a member of that committee.

The pending bill puts an end to every one of the powers I enumerated a few moments ago and restores the operation of railroads to their managements and the adjustment of their finances to the companies themselves, with the assistance of their securityholders, where necessary.

The bill proposes that two new sections, 20b and 20c, be added to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Section 20b (1) would authorize all railroads to correct, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, conditions which under present law force railroads into expensive and prolonged court proceedings. The conditions are principally the fixed dates for the maturity of railroad bonds and bond interest; other difficulties of a similar nature could be similarly corrected.

Equipment obligations are excepted.

Paragraph (2) of section 20b provides for hearings on a railroad's application to modify its obligations. The Commission may require assents of a specified percentage of the creditors, and shall specify the nature of the notice to be given by the applicant railroad company.

The proposed alterations cannot be ordered by the Commission unless it finds, after hearing, that they are:

First, just and reasonable;

Second, within the scope of paragraph (1), above described;

Third, in the public interest;

Fourth, in the best interests of the railroad and of each class of its bondholders and other creditors affected; and

Fifth, not adverse to the interests of any other bondholders or other creditors.

The Commission must also first make the findings required by paragraph (2) of section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act. Section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act deals with the issuance of new securities by a carrier. If modification contemplated by the proposed new section 20b involves the issuance of new securities it will be necessary for the Commission to make the findings required by paragraph (2) of section 20a, as follows:

First, that the issuance of new securities is for some lawful object;

Second, that the object is within the carrier's corporate purposes;

Third, that it is compatible with the public interest;

Fourth, that it is necessary or appropriate for or consistent with the proper performance by the carrier of service to the public as a common carrier;

Fifth, that it will not impair its ability to perform that service; and

Sixth, that it is reasonably necessary and appropriate for such purpose.

If the Commission makes all these findings—and it must make them all in order to act further—it will direct the railroad to submit the alterations to the bondholders and other creditors they affect.

The Commission orders the changes to go into effect if they are accepted by (i) the owners of 66⅔ percent of such affected class of obligations, or (ii) at least 51 percent, if, after hearing, the Commission finds any percentage between 51 and 66⅔ to be just and reasonable and in the public interest, or (iii) such percentage, greater than 66⅔, as it may fix in cases where an affected class of obligations is owned by fewer than 25 holders.

The Commission's order will then bind all holders of obligations of the affected classes.

The correctness and sufficiency of communications to affected investors to get their assent to alterations must be submitted to the ICC.

Paragraph (3) of section 20b defines the obligations affected by proposed alterations. It also provides that pledged obligations shall be voted by the holders of the bonds or notes secured thereby.

Subparagraph (a) of paragraph (4) of section 20b makes the alteration effective as to any carrier assenting thereto, which is a guarantor, endorser, surety or the like of the altered obligation.

Subparagraph (b) makes paragraph (4) applicable to all secondary obligors.

Paragraph (5) of section 20b authorizes the carrier to make the alterations approved by the Commission, and frees its authorization from subordination to other laws, Federal or State. This is customary in such exercise of the commerce power as is delegated to the Interstate Commerce Commission by Congress, and has been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. This paragraph prescribes the negotiability of negotiable instruments issued by carriers and subjected to alterations under the bill.

Paragraph (6) directs the Commission to require the carrier to report its action in carrying out the order of alteration.

I shall not go through all these sections unless there is inquiry regarding them, but I do wish to call attention to the background of the problem as we have set it forth in the report. We have made very exhaustive and explanatory reports before and after the hearings on this bill in order to indicate clearly the background and intent of the committee. Senate Report No. 925 preceded the hearings. Senate Report No. 1170 followed them. Both are equally important. In the latter it is pointed out that the present situation arises out of the administration of section 77 of the bankruptcy laws affecting railroads. There was not one railroad lawyer or anyone else who testified before the committee who did not condemn section 77. All stated that, while in the first instance they thought it was going to be a good thing, it had worked out to the detriment of the railroads themselves and of the railroad investors. I challenge anyone to come on the floor of the Senate and say that any lawyer who represents any group of railroads in this country will not say that section 77 has worked to the detriment of the railroads of the United States generally.

One of the things I wish specifically to call to the attention of the Senate is that all the railroads which were not in bankruptcy have, during the past few years, reduced their interest charges and their fixed charges to a very great extent. This has been due in large measure to the institution of competitive bidding on bond issues by the Interstate Commerce Commission at the instance of the then Senator Truman and me.

I shall give one illustration with which I am familiar. The Great Northern Railroad Co.'s fixed charges were something like $19,000,000 a year. By refunding their bonds they have cut those charges to approximately $8,000,000 a year. The Chesapeake & Ohio, the original proponent of competitive bidding, the Pennsylvania, the Baltimore & Ohio, the Union Pacific, and the Southern Pacific railroads have done a magnificent job in accomplishing the same result. Practically every railroad which has not been in the hands of the court under section 77 has reduced its fixed charges by taking advantage of the low money market and has thus placed itself in a vastly better position to weather another depression than the railroad industry has enjoyed in its history.

Some of the roads have reduced the interest on their bonds from 5 and 6 percent to 2½ percent. Some refunded 5- and 6-percent bonds at 3½ to 4 percent and subsequently further refunded them at 2¾ percent.

I wish to say on behalf of the railroads which have been out of bankruptcy that they have done a magnificent job in reducing their fixed charges so as to weather the storm of another depression. On the other hand, the railroads which were in the hands of trustees appointed by the courts have in practically no case reduced their fixed charges. On the contrary, they have kept their fixed charges at exorbitant rates, despite the demonstrated opportunity to reduce them to reasonable rates. Instead of reducing their carrying charges and thereby making certain that they would hereafter remain solvent, they have wiped out two and a half billion dollars' worth of securities. This they have done despite the fact that, according to Moody's and Poors' statistical manuals,

they have earned their fixed interest charges from two and a half to six times.

I can understand this action only in the light of domination of these reorganizations by a small group of New York lawyers who run each and every one of these reorganizations alike in the interests of other clients who are interested in preserving high-interest-bearing bonds for themselves, no matter what the consequence to the railroad or other security holders therein. They, like the trustees, are interested solely in the continuation of their millions of dollars in fees. The objection to this scandal is coming from those people whose junior bonds and stock holdings have been or are being wiped out while the senior bonds sell at par or above. As an example of the injustices being practiced, take the North Western Railroad. It went through reorganization, and the trustees wiped out millions of dollars' worth of securities. The trustees then issued new securities to the senior bondholders and immediately paid a dividend on them of 20 percent. In the case of the Milwaukee, the same scheme was followed. It declared a 5-percent dividend immediately after it had come out of the hands of the court.

The size of the fees paid some lawyers in these bankruptcy cases and the manner in which the railroads have been handled by some trustees is a national scandal. The only difference between some of the lawyers who have taken fees in the process of wiping out stockholders and Jesse James is that Jesse James had a gun.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator will doubtless recall that one New York law firm billed the receivers of the Seaboard Air Line for a million dollars.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly.

Mr. REED. That was the fee for one firm. The total legal fees in the Seaboard Air Line case, which was an equity receivership, and not under section 77, amounted to more than $3,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas if the Seaboard Air Line is affected by the pending measure?

Mr. REED. The Seaboard was about ready to come out of receivership when we added——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The answer is "No," is it not?

Mr. REED. That receivership terminated before we could get any action here in the Senate on the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Not only that, Mr. President, but while we have been trying to get action on this bill some other railroad receiverships have terminated. If the bill is not passed at this session of the Congress millions of dollars of holdings by stockholders in railroads are going to be unnecessarily wiped out, they are going to become a total loss to their holders, and the railroads are going to be turned back to what? They are going to be turned back to a few voting trustees representing insurance companies and big financial houses in New York, which hold less than 10 percent of the bonds of these railroads. What happens is this. Insurance companies and big financial houses in New York buy up a considerable amount of the senior bonds. They then write a reorganization plan by which they receive new bonds and stock in the reorganized company. Since under State law they have to sell the common stocks of the railroads they provide in the reorganization plan that all stock in the new company shall be voted by voting trustees selected by them notwithstanding the fact that they do not have a dollar's worth of stock. By this voting-trust device they continue to control the railroads for at least the next 5 or 10 years. Those who buy stock in the reorganized company are deprived of any voice in management.

Mr. President, in connection with this railroad scandal I want to call attention to the fact that in St. Louis a Federal judge appointed two brothers who are law partners as trustees for two bankrupt railroads. One brother was appointed trustee for one railroad and the other brother as trustee for another railroad. Those two brothers each operate a railroad, both of which are in competition with each other. In my judgment that is a violation of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from Montana able to give any estimate as to the percentage of railroads of the United States which are controlled by New York financial interests at this time?

Mr. WHEELER. Practically all of them are controlled by New York financial interests.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. WHEELER. As a matter of fact the railroads of this country are to a large extent dominated by the big New York financial interests, and frankly those interests move the presidents of the railroads around like one moves chessmen around upon the chess board.

Mr. AIKEN. The entire railroad transportation system of the country is controlled by a few men.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. Let me remind the Senator from Montana that, as he knows, the date when the last word shall be said respecting the Rock Island receivership has been set by the district court in Chicago as June 30 of this year, and unless the Senate acts on this bill today or in the very near future—and I hope it will do so today—the stockholders and junior security holders of the Rock Island Railroad will be deprived of about $60,000,000 which they in equity and fairness are entitled to have.

Mr. WHEELER. Not only that but, according to figures which I shall cite a little later on, the securities which have been wiped out would, if they had not been wiped out, now be earning a good rate of interest.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not suppose there is a Member of the Senate who does not deplore the situation which the Senator from Montana has been discussing. I think the Senator will agree that all these trustees and lawyers who receive the big fees have been appointed by the Federal courts.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; they have been appointed by the Federal courts, but those trustees have almost invariably been appointed at the instigation of the big insurance companies and big financial interests in New York.

Mr. BROOKS. I should like to ask the Senator, Is that situation remedied in the bill by permitting management to handle the properties instead of the courts?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; exactly.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the Senator point out that provision as he comes to it in the bill?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. That is exactly what we are doing.

Mr. BROOKS. That situation should be remedied.

Mr. WHEELER. That is exactly what we are doing by this bill. One lawyer who is in favor of the bill said to me, "Of course, WHEELER, the adoption of this bill is going to wipe out a lot of big fees for our law firm, but," he said, "frankly I believe it is in the best interest of the railroads."

Let me say further that I have talked with the president of a railroad company who is not interested in this legislation one way or the other, who said to me that something must be done to prevent the wiping out of millions of dollars' worth of securities merely on the guess of some members of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. President, that is what is happening. Members of the Commission will guess—and it is nothing but a pure unadulterated guess—that certain securities will not be worth anything in the future, so they proceed to wipe them out. They have guessed wrong because of the fact that during the war the railroads of course made more money than they have ever made before in their history. So some members of the Commission have made a completely wrong guess. If it had not been for the war, and if there had been a depression it is possible that the guesses made with respect to some railroads might have proved correct.

I said to one of the Interstate Commerce Commissioners, "You do not know any more than I do what are going to be the earnings of these railroads in the next 10 or 15 years. Neither you nor any other living person knows what the economic conditions of this country are going to be in the near future."

Those conditions are going to depend upon many different things. The economic conditions of the country will depend in great measure on what the con-

ditions in the rest of the world will be. They will depend on whether we are going to have peace in the world. They will depend on whether the United Nations will be successful in their efforts to bring about peace and cooperation. Our economic conditions will depend upon whether there will be peace in Europe, upon what the conditions will be in China, and China's condition will of course also depend upon whether we have prosperity in this country. And our prosperity will depend upon a hundred different things. No living man today can guess correctly what our economic or business conditions are going to be, or what those conditions are going to be throughout the world in the next 5 or 10 years.

I hope I am wrong, but I must confess I am rather pessimistic about the matter. Yet someone in the Commission sets himself up as a prophet and without consulting the person injured says, "We guess that these securities are not going to be any good; we guess that your stocks, for which you have paid $100 par, will become worthless; we guess that the railroad securities into which some workingman has put his money, the stock of a railroad in which some widow has put her insurance money, or that some man has bought as security for his wife or his children for their future years is going to be wiped out. That is our guess." Mr. President, I say that represents too much responsibility and power to give to any Commissioner or to any individual person in this country.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I wonder if the committee made any investigation as to how much of the stocks of the widows and workingmen the Senator speaks of—and I sympathize with them and I want to see that they are adequately protected—how much of their stocks changed hands in the last 5 years while the railroads have been under receivership?

Mr. WHEELER. Much less of stock has changed hands than bonds. The great speculation that has gone on—and there has been a tremendous speculation—has been in the bonds of the railroads that were under section 77. There has been little speculation in the stocks of those railroads. The big speculation has been in the bonds, because those who speculated knew that if the stocks and the junior securities were wiped out, then the senior bonds of these companies would be of tremendous value. Millions upon millions of dollars have been made by people who speculated in these securities which were given excessive value by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. BROOKS. The chairman of the committee can tell the Senate now, can he not, that there has been practically no speculation or very little speculation in the common stocks?

Mr. WHEELER. Everything is relative, and, relatively speaking, there has been very little speculation in the stocks compared with the speculation that has been had in the bonds.

Mr. BROOKS. How many railroads will this legislation affect?

Mr. WHEELER. Five major roads.

Mr. BROOKS. Does the committee have any figures as to what speculation there has been—not relatively, but in actual figures?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course not. It is impossible for us to say what speculation there has been in these bonds.

Mr. BROOKS. I am not talking about the bonds.

Mr. WHEELER. We do not know how much stock has been sold or speculated in, but I will say to the Senator that he can ask any Senator who has been flooded with letters from his constituents, and he will tell him of the tremendous amount of securities which have been wiped out. Thousands of letters have come to my office and to the offices of other Senators, from poor people whose entire savings have been wiped out. I receive such letters by the thousands.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the provisions of this bill are applicable only to railroads— and I quote from page 14—

(a) whose gross railway operating revenues for any of the calendar years 1942 to 1944, inclusive, were in excess of $50,000,000.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Why is not the provision made applicable to the smaller roads, which are just as deserving of the right to freedom, if they can get it, as are the other roads?

Mr. WHEELER. I will tell the Senator why. Many of the smaller roads——

Mr. AIKEN. I happen to know of one of them.

Mr. WHEELER. Many of the smaller roads were owned almost entirely by some other railroad.

Mr. AIKEN. I have in mind particularly the Rutland Railroad.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say with reference to the Rutland Railroad that we tried to get the president of the Rutland Railroad to come before the committee and testify with reference to it, but for some reason or other he did not wish to testify.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, at one time the stock of the Rutland was controlled by the New York Central and the New Haven, but that interest has been disposed of. The gross revenues are nowhere near $50,000,000, but it is an important road to the people of the community. It is approximately 400 miles long. Why would not the Senator be willing to allow a road like that to come under the provisions of this bill if the Interstate Commission should decide that it may?

Mr. WHEELER. We had a great deal of difficulty in the committee with some of those people. There was opposition to this bill from those who held large amounts of securities on which they hoped to make a great deal of money. What we were trying to do was to protect as many people as we possibly could, and do the best job we could under the circumstances.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the figure of $50,000,000 probably represents a compromise.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me so that I may answer the question of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. I believe I first raised the question as to the $50,000,000 limit, taking exactly the position described by the Senator from Montana. I thought that all railroads ought to be allowed to come under the provisions of the bill. We considered the removal of the limitation, but we did not find a particle of support from any quarter—not even from the Rutland Railroad. That was one railroad which I had particularly in mind. We sent a special invitation to the president of the Rutland Railroad to come before the committee and talk about it, but we could not persuade him to come. We considered the New York & Susquehanna, the Central of New Jersey, the Alton, the Monon, and a number of other railroads whose revenues were below $50,000,000. We did not receive a single complaint because of that line of demarcation, and we did find considerable support for it. The Senator from Montana will remember that the New York & Susquehanna feared that the Erie might get hold of it again.

Mr. WHEELER. Not only that, but the Interstate Commerce Commission felt that it should not be included.

Mr. REED. We gave earnest consideration to that question.

Mr. WHEELER. In the first place, no small railroad asked to be included. The Interstate Commerce Commission said that they should not be included. Frankly, many of the small railroads were short-line railroads which were controlled by the larger railroads. The stockholders in those railroads were to a large extent other railroads.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know why the officials of the Rutland or other small railroads did not appear before the committee. It would seem that if any of them still believe that they should come under the provisions of the proposed act, they can still appear before the House committee and ask to be included.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. The Senator has much more information on this subject than I have. I should like to ask if he has any information or evidence as to material dealing in these stocks since the bill was first introduced.

Mr. WHEELER. I cannot tell the Senator, because, as a matter of fact, I have never dealt in railroad stocks or bonds in my life, and I have not followed the stock market to see whether or not there has been any activity of the kind referred to by the Senator. I assume that there has been some speculation in railroad stocks since the bill was introduced, because there is always some speculation whenever a bill comes before the

Congress which affects railroads or anything else. But the biggest speculation, in which many millions of dollars were made, was in the senior bonds.

Anyone who speculates in railroad stocks based upon this legislation is taking a terrific chance, for the simple reason that there is no assurance that any of those stocks in which there is speculation will be of any value whatsoever. Neither this bill nor any other legislation which Congress may enact can write value into stocks which are worthless. The Interstate Commerce Committee does not seek to write in values where no values exist.

All the bill seeks to do is to say to the railroad executives, who have been elected by the stockholders, "You propose a plan; you may get together the bondholders, stockholders, and others, and extend the time for payment of some of their bonds; you may reduce the interest charges upon those bonds, and agree among yourselves that a certain percentage of the bonds should be dropped out." They can get together in a thousand different ways. That procedure was followed in the case of the Baltimore & Ohio, the Delaware & Hudson, and the Lehigh Valley.

When the Chandler Act passed the House and came before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce I was extremely skeptical about the legislation. I think it was drafted in the first instance by Colonel Anderson, of Richmond, Va., who is one of the receivers of the Seaboard Air Line, and who has had a great deal of experience. I was very skeptical of it at first, but that legislation worked so admirably that practically every railroad executive in the United States, many lawyers, and even insurance company representatives, said, "We want that kind of bill to apply to every railroad in this country in the future." Does anyone doubt that when $2,500,000,000 worth of securities belonging to the people of this country are wiped out, the people will hesitate about investing in railroad securities in the future, thereby, to that extent threatening our very transportation system.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I appreciate very much what the Senator says; but I still wish to suggest to him that if there is speculation in railroad stocks because of this bill, it will not be the poor man or the widow who will be speculating. It will be the big speculators.

Mr. WHEELER. Speculation in stocks started with the Hobbs bill, which twice passed the House of Representatives by an almost unanimous vote.

Mr. BROOKS. Many of those stocks are not in the hands of widows and workingmen.

Mr. WHEELER. Some of them are not. But the Hobbs bill was quite a different bill from this bill. It caused some speculation. In my office I have many thousands of letters from widows and workingmen who own their stocks today. A retired policeman in my State, an elderly man, came to me last summer and said. "I have $2,000, all the savings of my life, invested in preferred stock of the Milwaukee road. Can you not do something about it? My savings are completely wiped out." He is not speculating.

Moreover, railroadmen in the Senator's State and in every other State in the Union have been advised to invest their money in their railroads, including the Rock Island. Unless this bill is passed, the investments of those railroadmen will be wiped out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will this bill do anything for the Senator's policeman friend in Montana?

Mr. WHEELER. No; it will not, for the simple reason that we have not been able to get the bill enacted into law in time. If we could have passed the bill several months ago, soon after it was reported, that would at least have given him a chance to protect a part of his lifetime savings.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Has this bill been passed by the House of Representatives?

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senate passes the bill today, will the bill immediately become the law?

Mr. WHEELER. I think it will pass the House at this session because a bill has twice passed the House of Representatives. Representative REED of Illinois introduced a bill on this subject, and it was reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary and is now awaiting floor action. The Hobbs bill was introduced in the House of Representatives and was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, and on two occasions it was passed by the House of Representatives.

Representative REED's bill has been reported by the House Judiciary Committee and it is on the calendar, and there is a rule for its consideration from the Committee on Rules. So there is no question in my mind that if we pass this bill it will be passed by the House of Representatives and will be modified in the House and there will be a chance to save the interest of some of the people whose investments are being wiped out.

I agree with the Senator that a great injustice has been done to many of the stockholders of the North Western; a great injustice has been done to the stockholders of the Milwaukee and of the Western Pacific and of a number of others.

Mr. REED. And a great injustice is threatened to the others.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; a great injustice is threatened to the stockholders of the New York, New Haven & Hartford and the stockholders of the Rock Island and the stockholders of several other railroads.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator has spoken somewhat critically of many of the reorganization plans which have been adopted by the courts, and through the operations of which the interests of thousands of junior security holders have been wiped out. I think the Senator has spoken the truth about that matter. I should like to ask a question. Is there not in the law, somewhere, a provision that such plans which go to the courts for approval must also be submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission and must receive its approval?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; they must first be approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. But the courts have taken the position, which I think is wrong, that notwithstanding the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission may make serious blunders and mistakes, the courts cannot do anything about them.

In the Denver & Rio Grande case, Judge Phillips, of the circuit court of appeals, held that a great injustice had been done to some of the junior bondholders, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What did the Supreme Court say about Judge Phillips' decision?

Mr. WHEELER. The Supreme Court simply said that because of the laws which were in force it could not do anything about the matter.

Mr. WHITE. So if there is fault with the courts, there must also be fault with the Interstate Commerce Commission for approving these plans; is that correct?

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to ask another question. Does the provision which requires the approval or concurrence of the Interstate Commerce Commission also provide any authority over the appointment of the trustees, or is that matter wholly in the hands of the courts?

Mr. WHEELER. It is wholly in the hands of the courts.

Mr. WHITE. I assumed that was so. So if improper trustees are appointed, the fault for their appointment must rest with the court; is that correct?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. But if unwise reorganization plans have been worked out, there is joint responsibility; is there?

Mr. WHEELER. That is true in part.

Mr. REED. Primarily it is the fault of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. I do not say that the courts have been wrong in their interpretation of that provision, but they have made the interpretation that in a case in which the Interstate Commerce Commission makes a finding, even though it results in wiping out the interests of the security holders, and even if the fiscal conditions have changed materially, the courts are helpless to change it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to read a decision on that point.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, before the Senator from Kansas reads the decision, I wonder whether the Senator from Montana will permit me to say a word.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The matter that was before Judge Phillips and before the Federal district court was not a controversy between bondholders and shareholders, but it was one between junior bondholders and senior bondholders.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So stockholders and shares of stock are not involved in the matter in any way.

Mr. WHEELER. No. The ones who are involved are the junior bondholders and senior bondholders. However, it is just as much a disservice to wipe out junior bondholders as it is to wipe out stockholders, because a great many people invest their money in junior bonds on the theory that such bonds are of more value than stock. Then along comes the Interstate Commerce Commission, and on a guess, wipes out their investments completely.

Mr. President, I had been reading from the committee's report on the bill, and I now continue to read from it:

A small number of Wall Street banking houses and insurance companies who own, in the major roads in bankruptcy on which they testified, not more than 10 percent of all bond issues being reorganized, will become temporarily the owners and in any case exercise far into the future complete control and domination of a substantial portion of the railroad mileage of the United States.

This pattern of control of a major share of the Nation's railroads already exists through interlocking directorships. Direct ownership of an additional 30,000 miles of railroad mileage by these banking houses and insurance companies would result from current reorganization procedures which wipe out stock (representing ownership) while making whole the top bond issues, which are the senior mortgages. In part payment for the bond, the bondholder receives new stock, thus becoming the owner of the property as well as a continuing mortgagee. Insurance companies and other fiduciaries sell the stocks. As they sell the stocks they divest themselves of ownership. But control of the railroad's management and policies continues to be exercised through a 5- to 10-year voting trust, in which the majority of the trustees are the representatives—not of all the bondholders, not of 50 percent of the bondholders, but of less than 10 percent of the bondholders. That 10 percent are the banks and insurance companies. Moreover, during the past 2 years the percentage of railroad-bond ownership by these institutions has steadily decreased, but the percentage of control, either during the reorganization process in which they prepare and present the reorganization plans or afterward, remains constant in their hands.

The condition pictured in that brief summarization is literally shocking in its stark rejection of every recommendation made by the famed 1933 Senate Banking and Currency Committee investigation of stock-market practices, in its evasion of many of the recommendations made by this committee in its investigation of railroads from 1935 to 1940, and in the legalistic blinking at the real purpose of correctives sought by enactment of section 77 of the bankruptcy laws. The committee is fully aware of the import of this summarization. This committee believes it has a duty here to report in careful detail the step-by-step degeneration of the original intent of law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. On the point of railroad finances, let me say that, of course, human nature being what it is, the fellow who loans money is always in the doghouse after he has loaned the money. We know that happens in international finance. When the United States becomes a money loaner, it becomes the hated Shylock. So it happens that the financial interests of Wall Street become the objects of attack after they have loaned money; and when the loans are not being repaid, it is human nature to attack them.

The situation is that prior to the creation of the RFC there was no place to go for money except to Wall Street. The railroads had to have huge financing, and that is the reason why the loans were made in New York, and that is the reason why this concentration of power occurred in New York. Since the RFC was created, and since there has been a place where railroad credits can be cleared outside of Wall Street, the condition to which the Senator has referred has not existed to the same extent that it had existed before. Of course, it is always popular to attack the Wall Street financiers, and yet, they were the only ones on this earth who had the money and could take care of the financial requirements of the railroads and keep them operating when credit was absolutely necessary for their operation. Of course, the stockholders were in an unfortunate position because their equities were being put up as security for the loans. When the railroads experienced more and more distress the stockholders naturally were the ones who lost. That was a perfectly natural condition. I regret the situation is as it is. But when the Senator attacks insurance companies which loaned to the railroads not their own dollars but the dollars of their policyholders, and incurred losses, I may point out that the welfare of the United States was involved in the losses of those policyholders.

As a matter of fact, I believe the proper title to the Senator's bill would be "A bill to destroy railroad credit were it not for the RFC."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I cannot allow the Senator to get away with that statement, because the bill does exactly the opposite. There is not a railroad executive in this country, or any intelligent railroad lawyer who would not refute the statement which the Senator has made. If we wipe out $2,500,000,000 worth of securities on the basis of a guess of some official in the Interstate Commerce Commission, who will invest money in any railroad security? Will any intelligent person invest his money in any railroad security if someone in the Interstate Commerce Commission, who does not know what will happen in the future, may wipe out $2,500,000,000 in railroad securities? One of the biggest railroad executives of this country recently talked with me about the situation. He said that he was afraid that what was being done under section 77 procedures would destroy railroad credit in the United States. What I am seeking to do by this bill is to put some degree of confidence in the people of the country who will invest their money in the future. Who else will invest his money in railroad securities? The Senator from Colorado says that the only place to go in order to secure funds is Wall Street. Nothing of the kind. The Wall Street people own less than 10 percent of railroad securities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They have already made huge loans.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; but do they keep the securities? No, they sell them at a profit to the people from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is why I say the RFC has cured that situation, because it handles the loans which formerly had gone through Wall Street.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sorry that I must disagree with my friend from Colorado, but the truth of the matter is that the RFC has less than $100,000,000 worth of railroad securities at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. How much did they have in the first place?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the truth of the matter is this: Ever since I have been a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, and particularly since I have been chairman of the committee, I have urged upon the Interstate Commerce Commission time and again that what they should insist upon is that the railroads set up their securities on a competitive bidding basis. But did the financial interests in New York want to do that? Not at all. Did the Morgans, the Kuhn-Loebs, or any of those banking houses want to do that? Certainly not. Why? Because they wanted to retain control of the railroads. Finally, after pressure was brought upon the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Commission did what I had urged. What is taking place right now? Take the Erie Railroad, for example. That railroad has saved millions of dollars because of the fact they have advertised their bonds on a competitive basis. I can tell the Senator about one president of a railroad who talked with me about railroad securities. I said, "Why did you not put your railroad securities up for sale to the lowest bidder instead of going to only one banking house?" He said, "I went over to another house in New York and asked them what they would bid on my bonds. The reply which I received was 'What did so and so tell you?'" The man to whom I refer was Mr. Dan Willard. He said, "I took my hat in my hand and walked out, because two houses in New York absolutely control railroad finances, and if one house says that it will pay so much, the other house will say that it will pay so much, and they never deviate."

Now that securities are put up to bid, what do we have? Financial houses in Cleveland and Chicago are bidding on bonds and saving the railroads of the country hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, there have been manipulations in railroad bonds, and all of us know it, but the SEC has cured many of those disgraceful situations.

Mr. WHEELER. Neither the SEC nor the RFC does anything with reference to the matters which I am talking about.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The matters about which the Senator is talking took place before the SEC became active and before the RFC got under way.

Mr. WHEELER. The RFC had nothing to do with it except that they loaned some money during the depression when some of the banking houses were about broke, and came to the rescue of some of

the railroads. But the SEC had nothing at all to do with the rates of interest which the railroads were required to pay. The SEC had nothing to do with the advertisements of securities for bid, and it was only because of the pressure which was put on by the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate and by the Interstate Commerce Commission, as well as a few other agencies, that the roads were ever permitted to advertise for bids, which, in turn, saved the railroads hundreds of millions of dollars. Does the Senator believe for one minute that the railroads could have refunded bonds and reduced the interest from 6 percent to 2¾ percent if they had not been permitted to advertise for bids? As I have already said, Mr. Willard, one of the finest and most intelligent of men, said to me, "I went over to this house and I asked, 'What will you bid on my bonds?" The reply was "What did the other fellow tell you?"

Mr. President, let us not kid ourselves at all about the situation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is it not a fact that most of the money which the RFC loaned to railroads was used to cover the bonds which the big banks and lending institutions were calling?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. The railroads themselves never, in fact, received the money. It was the banks and lending institutions.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. The Senator from Arizona is absolutely correct. Take, for example, the Allegheny Corp. When the RFC Act was enacted the Van Sweringens were sitting outside at the door waiting to get the money. I could tell Senators a tale about that. But who did the money go to? To the banking houses in New York. Sixty million dollars went to pay a bank loan. Because the banks themselves were in financial trouble, money was loaned not to the railroads so much as to the banks in order to pay off bank loans which had been made to the railroads.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield further?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sorry the Senator disagrees with my statement as to the great contribution made by the RFC toward railroad financing in this country, and as to the contribution made by the SEC.

Mr. WHEELER. The SEC has made no contribution to railroad financing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They have exercised supervision over the issue of bonds.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is wrong about that. They have nothing to do with the railroad bonds. The only agency that has anything to do with the railroad bonds is the ICC. So the Senator is entirely mistaken, I am sorry to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I may be mistaken on that point, but I am not mistaken about the part the RFC has played, and I will stick to that.

I do not wish to disturb the continuity of the Senator's fine discussion, if he will yield further, I should like to say that when I first came to the Senate I heard address after address in the Senate about taking the water out of railroad stocks. That was a subject which was then very popular. There was too much water in them; too much stock had been issued with no values back of it. I recall that our present President, Mr. Truman, made several addresses on that very question. In that day it was popular to talk about dewatering the stocks of the railroads.

Mr. WHEELER. There was a time, I will say to the Senator from Colorado, when the railroads were overcapitalized, but frankly money has been put into the railroads today, and I doubt very much whether they are now overcapitalized. Some of the roads may be overcapitalized to the extent that they cannot earn money upon their present capitalization; but that does not mean that the money has not gone into the railroad.

The Senator says that I have criticized the insurance companies. I am not criticizing the insurance companies. I simply stated the facts with reference to them and made no criticism of them, because I appreciate that the insurance companies have invested in the railroads some of the money they have received. I want to see the roalroads on a sound basis so that the insurance companies themselves can with safety invest their money in railroad securities.

In this connection let me call attention to the fact that the insurance companies, including the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., the Prudential Life Insurance Co., and other insurance companies came before the committee and testified in favor of the modification of section 77 and enacting the original provisions of the bill. So, I am not attacking the insurance companies, for the insurance companies, I think without exception, and the savings banks also testified in favor of the bill.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I have not been on the committee for more than a year and know very little about the pending bill; in fact, I have not read it completely. But skimming through it and getting just a little way into the bill, I notice a statement on page 3 which gives me some concern. It is in line 4, and reads:

> It shall be unlawful (any express provision contained in any mortgage indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument to the contrary notwithstanding)—

In other words, it would seem to me that this bill would authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to change a contract after it has been written.

Mr. WHEELER. No; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. GURNEY. I merely wanted to have that question answered because I am concerned about it. All through the bill, as I hurriedly read it this morning, there is authority granted to modify and change obligations which have been entered into. My question is this: Is the Interstate Commerce Commission authorized to change a contract after it is written?

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say that what is authorized is for the bondholders and the security holders themselves to get together with the stockholders and the other security holders and modify the terms of the bonds. In other words many of these securities, we will say, come due in 1946 or 1950, and rather than to throw the railroad into bankruptcy, which means waste and extravagance, the bill provides that under certain circumstances, with the consent of the stockholders and the bondholders, the terms of the bond may be modified so that it will not be necessary to throw the road into bankruptcy.

Mr. GURNEY. Are there any provisions whereby the ICC can authorize the railroads, without the consent of the bondholders, to reorganize?

Mr. WHEELER. Under section 77 that is exactly what the Commission can now do.

Mr. GURNEY. I am asking about this bill.

Under any conditions, can the railroads get permission to reorganize without first obtaining the consent of the bondholders and the stockholders?

Mr. WHEELER. The Commission may get them to compromise. It is the bondholders and other securityholders who prepare the reorganization plans, not the ICC in the first instance. As it is now, under section 77, the Interstate Commerce Commission may not only modify the obligations, but wipe them out without the consent of anybody.

Mr. GURNEY. On page 4, line 17, this language appears:

> If the Commission shall not require the applicant to secure any such assurance, or when such assurances as the Commission may require shall have been secured—

There are two conditions there.

Mr. WHEELER. The words "if the Commission shall not require the applicant to secure any such assurance, or when such assurances as the Commission may require shall have been secured, the Commission shall set such application for public hearing" refer to an application that is made by the company itself to present a plan to the Interstate Commerce Commission. As I pointed out a moment ago, it first has to be agreed to by 66⅔ percent of the various bondholders and then in certain circumstances the Commission is given power to reduce that to 51 percent. But to that portion of the bill, as I said, every insurance company, every railroad, and everybody else agreed.

Mr. GURNEY. It is somewhat like the question we have in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway, whether it is a treaty or an agreement. In the one case it could get by with a 51-percent vote; but if it is a treaty, a two-thirds vote is required.

Mr. WHEELER. This provision was drafted by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and it met with the approval of every railroad and every insurance company and every savings bank and everybody else because they said, for instance, if bonds were coming due in 1946, and temporarily they had to meet

a payment, it would be much better for them to be able to extend the time of payment than to throw the road into bankruptcy and tie it up, as has been done in the past. That is something everybody wanted.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Am I to understand, from the Senator's discussion and the remarks made previously, that, in his judgment, this bill, if enacted, will have a tendency to do away with the abuses that have grown up of railroads being thrown into bankruptcy and being operated over a long period of years under receiverships and trustees?

Mr. WHEELER. That is exactly what it is intended to correct. In the judgment of the members of the committee, this bill will be of great benefit to the stockholders and the other security holders of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. Formerly Governor Ely, of Massachusetts, who came before the committee and testified in favor of the bill, represents some of the stockholders who have been kicked around in the courts. He went to the Commission and wanted to have a modification, but he complained he could not get any hearing. He was really one of the very best and ablest witnesses who testified before the committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. I know there is a great deal of irritation the way trustees in bankruptcy have hung on year in and year out.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly. They have hung on year in and year out and piled up great legal fees. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] called attention to one firm alone which put in a bill for over a million dollars' fees. Notwithstanding it was paid about $50,000 a year all the time, it put in a bill for an extra million dollars after the case was closed.

Frankly, in my humble judgment it has been a racket with some of the trustees and lawyers. I called attention to the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate some years ago, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] being a member, held hearings with reference to some trusteeships in California, and the committee made a report and condemned the practice of the courts appointing some of their favorites as trustees, who would draw down big fees, then appoint their friends as lawyers, and they would draw big fees.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to have the Senator tell me two things. One is, how are new cases which arise handled, and, secondly, how will the proposed law affect existing cases?

Mr. WHEELER. Any railroad which happens to go into bankruptcy in the future can come in under section 20 (b). If a railroad is operating under section 77 at the present time, the railroad itself or those who represent the stockholders can come in and take it out from under section 77, and attempt to arrange with creditors a plan to work out some feasible method by which all the junior bondholders and stockholders who would otherwise be wiped out can get something out of it. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. There are in my State some very important insurance companies which have large investments in railroad securities, and I am wondering whether those companies favor the bill. I do not happen to know, and I called my office to see if there had been any correspondence on the subject, but there is none.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know about that. Some insurance representatives have testified. Was it the Metropolitan?

Mr. SMITH. I am thinking of the Prudential. I should like to be advised about that.

Mr. WHEELER. They were in favor of the original bill, that is, as to future railroad reorganizations. Frankly, I think Mr. Stedman, of the Prudential, disagreed with some features of the bill, not with all of them, but I believe that there are one or two points in the bill which will have to be worked out later on.

Mr. SMITH. I am interested in knowing whether these insurance companies, which have the savings of thousands of little people we are trying to protect, favor the bill. They may hold senior obligations. Would the position of those senior obligations be jeopardized?

Mr. WHEELER. The insurance companies, for instance, like the Prudential, hold less than 10 percent of all the bonds of the railroad companies. The remainder is held by individuals. When all the junior securities and stock are wiped out, some of the insurance companies which hold the top bonds are going to profit at the expense of the poor fellow who holds junior bonds.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, under all circumstances the senior bondholder gets his pound of flesh regardless of what it does to anybody.

Mr. SMITH. I am not opposing the bill; I am very well impressed with the general approach to the subject the bill contemplates. But I did want to say a word for these senior holders of securities, such as the insurance companies, who represent the savings of the little people.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, if the bondholders get their pound of flesh, did they not put in a pound of flesh when the railroads were bankrupt, and did they not hold them up until they could be helped?

Mr. WHEELER. No, indeed.

Mr. BROOKS. Who put it up?

Mr. WHEELER. The people who operated the railroads. The insurance companies did not put up any more money to help the railroads after they went into bankruptcy.

Mr. BROOKS. Who put up the money?

Mr. WHEELER. They either went to the RFC and got some money, or they took it out of the revenues of the railroad in view of the fact they did not have to pay any interest or dividends on the bonds and stocks outstanding. When a railroad is put into bankruptcy, it does not pay out dividends or interest on its bonds or other securities.

Mr. BROOKS. Am I to understand that there was no money subscribed to maintain the roads?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly not by the insurance companies. I know of no railroad anywhere at any time that was in trusteeship under section 77 to which any money was given. There may have been some railroads in section 77 bankruptcy that went to the RFC if they needed money.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, is it not a fact that in the case of some roads there has been an indirect contribution through the fact that the men who work on the road have not received increases in pay which the employees of other roads have received? That would be an indirect contribution by the employees of the road.

Mr. WHEELER. That is true, but the principal contributions were due to the fact that no one received any dividends on stock or interest on bonds. All of these railroads piled up in the banks of this country millions on millions of dollars, because, instead of paying it out in interest, they put it in the bank.

The Missouri Pacific has a hundred million dollars on deposit in the banks at the present time and had not even paid the RFC loan until recently. I got after the RFC and said, "You should make the Missouri Pacific pay that loan." When the RFC made a demand on the road after I had gone to them the trustee went to New York to consult the insurance company to see whether or not they should pay it. Here they were. They had bonds outstanding, with interest accruing at 5 percent—they had a hundred million dollars, and they did not even pay off the bonds they could have been paying and stopped the interest on them. They could have refunded those bonds at 2¾ percent, but they did not do it, because they wanted the bonds to continue to bear 5 and 6 percent, and accumulate the interest upon the bonds. In my judgment, it has been a scandal of the worst kind, and there is no one who knows anything about it, who has gone into it, who would for one single moment put his stamp of approval upon it.

If the Senate wants to let these scandals go on in the face of what has happened in this country, it is perfectly all right with me. I am never wedded to any piece of legislation, but I am pointing out what has taken place. The Interstate Commerce Committee gave as much study to this legislative proposal as it has to any other that has come before that committee in the last 25 years.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield further?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. As I understand the bill in an elementary, A B C way, not being a member of the committee, but being casually familiar with the bill, what is attempted is to substitute for Government-dictated or judicially appointed and controlled receivership of railroads a sort of citizen representation, uncontrolled by any Government or judicial dictation?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. We propose to let the businessmen themselves—who know more about railroads than some Government officials—sit

around and try to work the matter out, as the Senator and I would try to work it out if I owed him some money and said, "I cannot pay this note at this particular time, but if you will give me an extension for 6 months, or reduce the interest, I will try to work it out." That is all this does. It does set up some protections, so that the Interstate Commerce Commission will throw some protection around a case so stockholders will not be robbed. It does lay down certain standards the railroads have to follow.

Mr. BRIDGES. If this measure becomes law, how will the stockholders and the bondholders, and others interested in a railroad which has been in receivership for a period of years, step in?

Mr. WHEELER. Under this law they would apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission and propose a plan within 6 months' time and then try to work out that plan. They would have another year, after that 6 months, to work out the plan.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Has this bill had the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission? Did the Commission cooperate with the Senator's committee to work it out?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; the Interstate Commerce Commission worked with the committee with respect to it. There are some features the Commission did not approve, but many of the features the Commission did approve, and many the Commission itself wrote.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Following my question to the distinguished Senator from Montana, what about the Federal judges in this set-up of a railroad which is in receivership now? Does this measure change the status of the existing trustees and the Federal set-up?

Mr. WHEELER. The management of the road temporarily comes into the hands of the owners of the road. The property remains in the custody of the court, but the management of it and the working out of the plan is in the owners of the road.

Mr. BRIDGES. The management then comes in automatically and has authority, although the trustees retain custody. When the Senator speaks of their retaining custody, just what does he mean? How far does the actual authority go?

Mr. WHEELER. The management comes in and tries to work out a plan between the stockholders and other security holders for the purpose of settling the situation, of working it out satisfactorily, and during that period the court retains legal custody of the property.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Does the bill provide that someone else can be substituted as president of a road, or that someone else can be substituted in its management?

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. BROOKS. The court has no such authority.

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that after a road is thrown into receivership there is tendency to prolong that receivership? And is not the main purpose of the bill to get railroads out of receivership as quickly as possible, and also to give railroads the right to refinance and continue operations without having to pay out the tremendous costs which rise from railroads being in the courts?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. One of the big things the bill does, as I pointed out earlier, is to permit the owners of the railroad and of its bonds to get together on a plan. For example, they may get together to refinance so as to issue securities drawing less than, let us say, 5 percent interest, or perhaps to pay off part or all of the bonded indebtedness. As I said, the Missouri Pacific has $100,000,000 in the banks which the trustees are holding. The management, under this plan, could say, "It is in the interest of the railroads and of the stockholders and everyone else to pay off some of the bonds which are drawing interest at 5 percent. We should get rid of them by paying them off and then refinance the remaining bond issues."

The management of the Missouri Pacific could do the same as the Great Northern Railroad has done, or as the Pennsylvania, the Illinois Central, the Southern, the Southern Pacific, the "Katy" and other railroads have done. But now the management of the Missouri Pacific and of other railroads in bankruptcy cannot do that. At least they have not been able to do it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that railroads have millions and millions of dollars they cannot use for such purpose, which, if they could use it would obviate the paying of the high rate of interest now paid?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. The railroads claim they cannot use the money for such purposes, that the courts will not let them use the money. I think the courts and the trustees have been wrong in many instances, but the courts and the trustees want to keep the hundred million dollars, or the fifty million dollars, or whatever the amount may be, in their pockets to play with, and use to pay out exorbitant fees, and journeying around the country in private cars and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. From the Senator's own experience with railroad financing will he not say it is true that the receipts of railroads will probably again drop; that the railroads will again be in financial trouble?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And that again the so-called preferred bondholders will be the recipients of what cream there is? The Senator well knows that probably the greatest speculation in wartime in bonds was in preferred railroad bonds which were bought way down.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Which now are way up.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. Some of these senior bonds sold for as low as $8 or $10—in fact some sold for as low as $2.50. In the report we show that some of the bonds were selling for as low as $2.50.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And they are now up to $100 and over.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, many are now up to nearly par or above.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And if we keep drifting along, and do not enact this legislation, we will find ourselves back in the same position as before, with speculators buying railroad bonds, at a low price, getting their interest on them, and the stockholders will again be holding the sack.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. Let us consider the matter from the social standpoint. If we have another depression in this country we are bound to be faced with some grave social problems. What do Senators believe the people of the country will think of Government agencies which permit the wiping out of $2,500,000,000 worth of railroad stock, a considerable portion of which was owned by working men and women, by widows and orphans, while at the same time bonds which had been selling for as low as $2.50 rose to par or over, by reason of the fact that the guess made by the Interstate Commerce Commission resulted in wiping out the stocks? What are those who lost by reason of that guess going to think of that Government agency?

Time and time again on the floor of the Senate I have defended the Interstate Commerce Commission, but I say that the Commission should have said to the courts, "We are going to call back the plans affecting these railroads now in receivership, revamp them, make them conform to facts and realities, and try to have the railroads operated for the benefit of those who own the roads." But they did not do that. The result is that those who held the senior securities which they bought in some cases at as low at $2.50 now have bonds worth up to $80 or $90 or even $100.

I now yield the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think it ought to be made a little more clear to the Senate that there are two parts to this bill. The original bill dealt only with the composition of future obligations or future due dates. Section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act was enacted in 1933 under the belief that its effect would be advantageous and beneficial. It turned out, however, that it resulted in proceedings being very slow, awkward, and troublesome. The Chandler Act was enacted in 1939. It provided a way whereby the creditor and the debtor could get together and compose their difficulties. When that law expired by limitation, Congress enacted the McLaughlin Act, which continued the other measure.

The first part of this bill was an amplification of the McLaughlin Act, and it was written by the Interstate Commerce Commission and introduced by the Sen-

ator from Montana at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Subsequently, when we began to deal with this matter and to hold hearings on the cases of the railroads which were in bankruptcy under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act and which were in the possession of the courts and trustees of the courts while being reorganized, it developed that the drastic scaling down of the capitalization of these roads by the Interstate Commerce Commission caused a storm of complaints; and so in the committee we added the latter part of the bill to deal with these cases, of which there are about five or seven important ones.

The procedure with respect to those cases is this: The property is turned back to the owners, who within 6 months must file an application with the Interstate Commerce Commission to submit a plan for reorganization. They are allowed 12 months in which to do that. If at the end of 18 months the creditors and the debtors of the roads now in bankruptcy have not reached an adjustment of their difficulties, the whole matter goes back to the Interstate Commerce Commission which handled it in the first place. I am now largely guessing, but I wish to discuss the amount which I think is involved in the case of the important railroads. In 1939 and 1940, under the authority of the Bankruptcy Act, the Interstate Commerce Commission determined the value of the railroads involved on the basis of their earning power. In that determination the Commission considered mostly—not entirely, but mostly—the earnings during the depression period. As a result the capitalization was scaled down. Then came the war and the enormous earnings of the war period. As the chairman of the committee has repeatedly stated, while the total face value of the securities wiped out by the Interstate Commerce Commission was $2,500,000,000, that was not the real value. I think in many cases there was common stock—and in some instances preferred stock—which under no circumstances would have any value. If this bill had been the law the junior bondholders and the stockholders—preferred and common—would have received $700,000,000 more than they have been allowed under the valuation fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is my best judgment, based on the hearings, that if this bill passes $80,000,000 more will be available for the stockholders and junior bondholders of the New York, New Haven & Hartford; about $60,000,000 in the case of the Rock Island; $100,000,000 in the case of the Missouri Pacific; and probably $75,000,000 in the case of the Frisco. That is a guess. I do not want anyone to take it as anything more than my best judgment based upon the testimony in the hearings.

I hope the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is present, because I am about to discuss the court situation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that securities of the face value of $850,000,000 have already been wiped out?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If something is not done along this line to refinance the bonds which carry a high rate of interest, and if those bonds continue to carry high rates of interest instead of being refinanced when lower rates of interest can be had, then when we go from good times into a depression, or whatever one may choose to call it, many of the railroads will go into bankruptcy. They cannot pay the high rates of interest. So long as a railroad is in court, it is not possible to refinance the bonds.

Mr. REED. The Senator from South Carolina is correct.

There is one thing on which there is no disagreement. Generally speaking, the railroads have improved their financial position out of their war earnings. In not a single case have any of the war earnings been applied toward improving the financial position of the major railroads now in the hands of the courts under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. We are trying to get the remaining cases which have not been decided back for another look.

Let me say to the Senator from Colorado——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am listening patiently for more enlightenment on the legal question from the great authority from the State of Kansas. Both my ears are wide open.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Colorado and I are both farmers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And good ones.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] referred to a decision of the circuit court of appeals in Denver, dealing with the Denver & Rio Grande. That case was considered by the Supreme Court within the past few days, and the decision was reversed. Let me read to the Senator from Colorado why it was reversed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator has already read it, but I shall be glad to hear him reread it, because the Senator is a good reader, and his voice is very entertaining.

Mr. REED. In its decision the Supreme Court said this:

> Our construction of the chief provisions of the section was handed down in March 1943.

That was in the Western Pacific and Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul reorganization cases.

> Although the results of reorganizations under the section, as thus construed, have been criticized as unfortunate, and changes have been suggested, no different legislation has been enacted.

That is the trouble. The Court interpreted the law as we enacted it, according to its best judgment. But the Court says that no additional legislation has been enacted, and it emphasizes that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator from Kansas hold it against the Senator from Colorado because no legislation has been enacted?

Mr. REED. I am trying hard to enlighten the Senator from Colorado, and I hope he will not make it any more difficult than necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I appreciate the fact that it is very difficult.

Mr. REED. On page 6 of its loose-leaf decision the Court says:

> No new enactments have changed the law since those decisions on March 15, 1943.

I regret that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is not present. I wish to read the comment of the senior circuit judge at Chicago. I believe that is in the sixth circuit. The Rock Island trusteeship case was before that court. The attorney for the Rock Island receiver and trustee was speaking with the court. The attorney for the Rock Island said:

> If we follow that line of thought, it is impossible for me to say or understand how the Rock Island can be reorganized within less than 10 years from now.

Judge Evans, who is the senior presiding judge of the circuit court of appeals at Chicago, uttered these remarkable words:

> Maybe so; but there is also the thought that if it takes 10 years to get it right, it is pretty nearly right to do it.

Then he proceeds to discuss the two reorganizations which have caused so much criticism, and which have been almost an open scandal:

> I had quite a little part in the St. Paul Railroad, and it was always shocking to think that there should be such an absolute denial of any right for any stockholder, notwithstanding that money was just rolling into the St. Paul and the North Western Railroad, but, notwithstanding that, it was decided, "You are out." That don't set very well on your conscience. If you did it wrong, it is about time you correct it.

As nearly as I can make a guess at the value which might have been given the St. Paul stockholders and the North Western stockholders, it is my best judgment that if the courts had been operating under the proposed law instead of the bankruptcy statute there would have been $150,000,000 more available to the stockholders of the Milwaukee than they got, and $150,000,000 in the case of the Chicago & North Western.

That is what it means for us to enact new legislation, which the Supreme Court has almost suggested that we do. This situation is not the fault of the courts. I join in the criticism of the Interstate Commerce Commission uttered by the Senator from Montana.

I wish to refer to another matter very briefly. I do not find much opposition to the enactment of this bill. Time is of the essence. The next big trusteeship to come on is that of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad. It is my belief that if we enact this bill $60,000,000 more will be available for the junior bondholders and the stockholders of the Rock Island than will be given them if the bankruptcy proceeding is terminated on June 30, which is 15 days away.

It is my thought that if the Senate passes this bill today, it will not be out of line for the Senator from Montana, the chairman of the committee, to advise

Judge Igoe, just for his information, of the passage of the bill by the Senate. As a matter of fact, Judge Igoe has postponed final approval two or three times so as to give us a chance to legislate. We are so close to enactment of the bill now that I do not think it would be out of the way to advise Judge Igoe, for his information, so that he could take that matter into consideration.

About 2 or 3 weeks ago a personal representative of the president of the Burlington Railroad, Mr. Ralph Budd, a very good friend of mine, talked to me about the reorganization of the Denver, Rio Grande & Western, in which the Burlington Railroad is interested. He was considerably disturbed, because the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy has a very considerable interest in the operation of the Denver, Rio Grande & Western. The State of Colorado and the city of Denver also have a definite interest, as the Senator from Colorado knows and as I know. So I told the representative of the Burlington that in working out this bill we would take into consideration the interest of the State of Colorado, as I think we can, and as I have told the Senator from Colorado.

A representative of the Burlington Railroad called me again this morning. I said to him, "When you went to Aurora, where your big shops are located, and caused your employees to send a telegram to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], urging him to oppose this legislation, you made the situation more difficult. Since you have done that, we should find out what the Missouri Pacific shopmen at Sedalia, Mo., and at Osawatomie, Kans., want. We cannot handle this legislation solely on the basis of what the Burlington shopmen at Aurora want. If you are going to proceed along that line, I think we must also consider what the shopmen of the Missouri Pacific at Sedalia, Mo., and at Osawatomie, Kans., want." I further told him, "In view of the consideration we have given this matter and the effort we have made to draft a fair and adequate bill, I think the way you have proceeded is a very cheap way for you to go about this matter. I have already told your president's personal representative that we would do the best we could. Now, for you to attempt to throw a scent across the trail is not fair to the Senators who are handling this legislation. If we are going to take into consideration the views of the Burlington shop people at Aurora, we ought also to take into consideration the views of the Missouri Pacific shop people at Sedalia, Mo., and at Osawatomie, Kans."

Mr. President, in all my service in the Senate I have never worked more earnestly or harder on a measure than I have on this particular bill. No piece of legislation which I have helped to work out has been quite so difficult to handle as has this one. I think I have never worked on a measure which has involved greater interests, many of which conflict.

Because of the need for early enactment of this bill, because of the pending completion of the Rock Island reorganization, which, if completed under the present plans by June 30, will deprive the stockholders and the junior bondholders, in my judgment, of $16,000,000 which in all fairness and equity they are entitled to have, I hope this measure will be enacted at once.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, reference has been made to the employees of the Burlington Railroad; and, as I understand, much of the testimony before the committee and much of the debate here on the floor of the Senate has been with reference to protecting the rights of the workingmen and the widows and the orphans. I have received from the workingmen on the railroads of my State two telegrams which I should like to read into the RECORD:

AURORA, ILL.

Hon. WAYLAND C. BROOKS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We employees of the Burlington Railroad in a mass meeting held at Aurora, Ill., today gave consideration to proposed amendment to section 77 contained in Senate bill 1253. We hold that this amendment as now written will adversely affect Burlington Railroad employees between Chicago and Denver, including those in this area, because under the provision the Missouri Pacific Railroad will again get stock control of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad and will operate that railroad to the benefit of the Missouri Pacific Railroad by favoring business via the Pueblo route rather than the Denver Moffat tunnel gateway used by the Burlington Railroad. The result will be the eventual discontinuance of Burlington transcontinental freight and passenger trains to the detriment of Burlington employees, including industries and other businesses located along the Burlington route. We maintain that the Denver & Rio Grande Western should always be neutral segment to the central transcontinental route. We, a committee appointed by employees here represented and with their full approval, urge you to amend the bill in such a manner as will protect the Burlington Railroad's through connection at Denver to the Pacific coast, which is in the interest of your constituents and other employees. Committee with authority to sign.

E. A. Raidy, J. R. Simpkins, E. F. Presby, W. J. Moore, J. Maier, R. L. Mooney, V. D. Rierson, J. S. Lohr.

QUINCY, ILL.

Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Washington, D. C.:

I am representing 350 men at Galesburg, and they are opposed to amendment to Senate bill 1253, House of Representatives bill 5924, as they do not want to lose transcontinental business through Denver gateway.

L. W. MAYFIELD.

The same situation applies to the workingmen on the Rock Island Railroad, which is under discussion.

I represent those workingmen, and I intend to protect their interests to the best of my ability. Not only do I intend to do so for the unknown persons who may hold some of the stock, but I intend to do so in the interest of the workingmen on the railroads who make their living from the railroads.

Mr. President, I wish to inquire whether the bill will protect the workingmen, if it is passed.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, if a sounder and more stable railroad, not dominated by Wall Street interests and operated by local interests alive to the problems of its employees will protect the workingmen, then this bill will protect the workers. It will also protect the railroads and it will do what railroad management has asked to have done.

Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has an amendment which he wishes to offer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have. Is it in order to offer amendments to the bill at this time?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. First, Mr. President, I offer and send to the desk some procedural amendments which I ask to have considered en bloc. They do not change the effect or meaning of the bill in any way, shape, or form. There is simply a necessity to change some section numbers and to make other minor changes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments are considered and adopted en bloc.

The amendments adopted en bloc are as follows:

On page 1:

In line 3, strike out the words "in aid of the national" and insert in lieu thereof the word "the."

In line 4, strike out the word "transportation" and the words "as set forth in the."

In line 5, strike out the words "preamble of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended."

In line 7, insert between the words "service" and "and" the words "by railroads."

On page 2:

In line 3, insert the word "said" between the words "of" and "common"; insert a comma after the word "carriers"; strike out the word subject."

In line 4, strike out the words "to part I of said act."

On page 3:

Strike out lines 1, 2, and 3.

In line 4, strike out the words "20b (1)" and insert in lieu thereof the words "SEC. 1."

In line 7, strike out the word "Commission" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Interstate Commerce Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission)."

In line 10, insert at the end thereof the following: "of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act."

On page 4: In line 5, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 5:

In line 4, insert the word "said" between the words "of" and "section."

In lines 8, 9, 10, and 13, delete the quotation marks.

On page 7: In line 22, delete the quotation mark.

On page 10: In line 13, delete the quotation mark.

On page 11:

In lines 6 and 11, delete the quotation marks.

In line 20, strike out the word "this" and insert in lieu thereof "the Interstate Commerce."

On page 12: In lines 14 and 20, delete the quotation marks.

On page 13:

In line 6, insert the word "said" between the words "of" and "section."

In line 9, delete the quotation mark, and insert the word "said" between the words "of" and "section."

In lines 19 and 24, delete the quotation marks.

On page 14:

In line 3, strike out "SEC. 20c." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 2."

In line 7, insert the word "said" between the words "in" and "section."

In lines 10, 13, and 20, delete the quotation marks.

In line 22, strike out "20b" and insert in lieu thereof "1."

On page 15:

In lines 1, 6, 7, 8, and 11, delete the quotation marks.

In line 16, delete "20b" and insert in lieu thereof "1."

On page 16:

In lines 6 and 16, delete the quotation marks.

In line 9, strike out "20b" and insert in lieu thereof "1."

On page 17:

In lines 4 and 12, strike out the quotation marks.

In line 14, strike out "20b" and insert in lieu thereof "1."

On page 18:

In lines 1, 7, 10, and 15, strike out the words "20b" and insert in lieu thereof "1."

In lines 1 and 22, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 19: In lines 8 and 25, strike out "20b" and insert in lieu thereof "1."

On page 20:

In lines 10, 13, 17, and 25, strike out the quotation marks.

In lines 7, 21, and 25, strike out "20b" and insert in lieu thereof "1."

In line 12, strike out the word "this" and insert in lieu thereof "the Interstate Commerce."

In line 25, strike out "20c" and insert in lieu thereof "2."

On page 21: Strike out all after the words "Amend the title so as to read:" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "A bill to enable debtor railroad corporations expeditiously to effectuate reorganizations of their financial structures; to alter or modify their financial obligations; and for other purposes."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Following line 24, on page 20, it is proposed to insert the following paragraph:

(11) The provisions of this section shall not apply if at the time of filing the petition for reorganization under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act as amended, more than 90 percent of the outstanding voting stock of the debtor railroad corporation shall have been owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by voting trust or otherwise, by another railroad corporation and/or by a corporation owning or controlling more than 90 percent of the outstanding voting stock of another railroad corporation. The term "corporation" as used in this paragraph shall be deemed to include its trustees appointed under the aforesaid section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act.

Mr. WHEELER. I have no objection to the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to have assurance from the chairman of the committee and from the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], for the record, regarding the amendment. It is not offered simply as another amendment to go to conference. I know that occasionally in the Senate an amendment is agreed to in order to avoid controversy, and the amendment is taken to conference, and then it immediately disappears out the window.

But that is not the kind of amendment I have offered. This amendment is desperately needed by the people of my State. I have offered it in all sincerity, and I certainly wish to have the assurance of the chairman of the committee that the amendment will have his wholehearted support in the conference. I also should like to have the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] give me such assurance for the record.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Colorado that, so far as I am concerned, the amendment will have my support.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator for that assurance.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Colorado has had assurance from me on a number of occasions that I sympathize with the position he occupies in Colorado and with the desires of Denver and of Colorado, and I shall do my very best to help work out the situation in a way that will accomplish all the Senator from Colorado asks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Kansas to mean that in the conference he is going to do everything within his power to uphold the amendment which I have offered?

Mr. REED. If we can find an equally satisfactory way or a better way to do the same thing, will the Senator from Colorado be satisfied?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If it is possible to find a better way, I am for a better way, of course, and that will have my consent. But pending the assurance——

Mr. REED. I want to be frank with the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I want the Senator to be frank. I am asking for frankness.

Mr. REED. I doubt that the method which has been proposed by the Senator from Colorado is the best way to accomplish what he seeks. If a better way cannot be found, I shall endeavor to keep in the bill the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is satisfactory.

Mr. President, paragraph 10 of section 20c of the pending measure is very unsatisfactory to the Senator from Colorado. In my opinion, it makes the bill totally bad and vicious. I am assured by the Senator from Montana that paragraph 10 of section 20c will have the attention of the conferees. With the hope that a more equitable provision can be worked out, I shall not offer at the present time an amendment which I have on my desk. The amendment would, however, cure the viciousness, as I see it, of paragraph 10 of section 20c. However, if a satisfactory provision can be worked out in conference, I shall not offer the amendment. I refrain from offering the amendment in the interest of expediting disposal of the bill and its early enactment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments of the Committee on Interstate Commerce will be stated.

The first amendment was, on page 2, in line 4, after the word "act" to insert "to preserve the investments of security holders to the fullest possible extent, to prevent forfeitures of investments."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, in line 3, to strike out "section" and insert "sections."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, in line 8, after the word "carrier", to strike out "(other than a carrier in equity receivership or in process of reorganization under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act)" and insert "as defined in section 20a (1)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, in line 13, before the word "whether" to insert "("; after the word "secured", to strike out "or"; and in the same line after the word "unsecured" to insert "matured, or unmatured)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, in line 22, after the word "rejection", to insert:

All letters, circulars, advertisements, and other communications, and all financial and statistical statements, or summaries thereof, to be used in soliciting the assents or the opposition of such holders shall, before being so used, be submitted to the Commission for its approval as to correctness and sufficiency of the material facts stated therein.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, beginning in line 3, after the last committee amendment, to strike out:

If the Commission shall find that as a result of such submission the proposed alteration or modification has been assented to by the holders of at least 75 percent of the aggregate principal amount outstanding of each class of obligations affected thereby (or in any case where 75 percent thereof is held by fewer than 25 holders, such larger percentage, if any, as the Commission may determine), the Commission shall enter an order approving and authorizing the proposed alteration or modification upon the terms and conditions and with the amendments, if any, so determined to be just and reasonable.

And insert:

If the Commission shall find that as a result of such submission the proposed alteration or modification has been assented to by the holders—

(i) of at least 66⅔ percent of the aggregate principal amount outstanding of each class of obligations affected thereby; or

(ii) of less than 66⅔ percent but not less than 51 percent of any particular class or classes of securities affected, and the Commission, after hearing, finds that such reduction in percentage will be just and reasonable and in the public interest; or

(iii) in any case where 66⅔ percent thereof is held by fewer than 25 holders, of such larger percentage, if any, as the Commission, after hearing, finds will be just and reasonable and in the public interest;

the Commission shall enter an order approving and authorizing the proposed alteration or modification upon the terms and conditions and with the amendments, if any, so determined to be just and reasonable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, in line 11, to strike out:

An obligation shall not be deemed to be outstanding for the purposes of this section if in the determination of the Commission the assent of the holder thereof to any proposed alteration or modification is within the

control of the carrier or of any person or persons controlling the carrier.

And insert:

For the purpose of the finding of the Commission referred to in paragraph (2) of this section as to whether the required percentage of the aggregate principal amount outstanding of each class of obligations affected by any proposed alteration or modification has assented to the making of such alteration or modification, any obligation which secures any evidence or evidences of indebtedness of the carrier or of any company controlling or controlled by the carrier shall be deemed to be outstanding unless the Commission in its discretion determines that the proposed alteration or modification does not materially affect the interests of the holder or holders of the evidence or evidences of indebtedness secured by such obligation. Whenever any such pledged obligation is, for said purposes, to be deemed outstanding, assent in respect of such obligation, as to any proposed alteration or modification, may be given only (any express or implied provision in any mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, note, or other instrument to the contrary notwithstanding) as follows: (a) Where such obligation is pledged as security under a mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, pursuant to which any evidences of indebtedness are issued and outstanding, by the holders of a majority in principal amount of such evidences of indebtedness, or (b) where such obligation secures an evidence or evidences of indebtedness not issued pursuant to such a mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, by the holder or holders of such evidence or evidences of indebtedness; and in any such case the Commission, in addition to the submission referred to in paragraph (2) of this section shall cause the carrier in such manner as it shall direct to submit the proposed alteration or modification (with such terms, conditions, and amendments, if any, as the Commission shall have determined to be just and reasonable) for acceptance or rejection, to the holders of the evidences of indebtedness issued and outstanding pursuant to such mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, or to the holder or holders of such evidence or evidences of indebtedness not so issued, and such proposed alteration or modification need not be submitted to the trustee of any such mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, but assent in respect of any such obligation shall be determined as hereinbefore in this section provided. For the purpose of any such assent the evidences of indebtedness issued and outstanding under any such mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument shall be determined by the Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 2, to insert the following:

SEC. 2. (1) All proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, whether before the Interstate Commerce Commission or United States courts, relating to the preparation or effectuation of plans of reorganization of each carrier by railroad as defined in said section 20a (1) whose properties on the effective date of this section or at any time thereafter are in the custody of the United States courts, and—

(a) whose gross railway operating revenues for any of the calendar years 1942 to 1944, inclusive, were in excess of $50,000,000; or

(b) if its gross railway operating revenues were not in excess of such amount, such carrier is a debtor in any such proceeding, or is a party defendant in any proceeding ancilliary thereto, with another such carrier whose revenues were so in excess;

shall be forthwith suspended and discontinued as of the effective date of this section.

(2) Carriers to which paragraph (1) of this section is applicable shall institute proceedings and file application under section 1 of this act as expeditiously as possible but in no event later than 6 months after the effective date of this section, or such longer period as the Commission, on application, may approve.

(3) The properties of any carrier specified in paragraph (1) of this section shall continue in the custody of the United States courts having custody of them; except that the following portions of said section 77 shall not be applicable in any such case:

(a) The first two paragraphs of subsection (b).

(b) Subdivision (1) of subsection (c).

(c) The first five sentences and the first seven words of the sixth sentence of subdivision (2) of subsection (c).

(d) Subsections (d), (e), (f), and (k).

In addition to the foregoing exceptions and for the purpose of applying to such carriers in the cases in which and during the period for which such custody is held under said section 77, and pending the consummation of proceedings under section 1 of this act, the word "debtor" shall be substituted for the words "trustee or trustees" wherever such latter words occur in subdivisions (3), (5), (9), and (10) of subsection (c), and subsections (i) and (o) of said section 77. The final determination heretofore or hereafter made in the United States courts with respect to the relative priorities as between the respective classes of security holders, the subordination of the interest of a creditor or security holder of the debtor to the interest of other creditors or security holders, or the validity, amount, and priority of any claim shall continue in full force and effect. Nothing herein is intended or shall be construed to modify or rescind any such determination or to prevent or delay the prosecution to final determination of any such issue now pending, and not yet finally determined, in the United States courts.

(4) The proceedings with respect to any such carrier specified in paragraph (1) of this section under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act shall be dismissed upon consummation of proceedings affecting such carrier under section 1 of this act, or upon payment of its matured, unpaid obligations, or the making of other arrangements with reference to such obligations satisfactory to the owners of the claims therefor; and such proceedings may be dismissed under the conditions and in the manner prescribed in subsection (g) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act.

(5) The appointment, term of office, powers, authority, compensation and fees of each trustee appointed by the court, and of each counsel of such trustee, shall be terminated on or before 30 days after the effective date of this section. The United States court having custody of the properties of any carrier specified in paragraph (1) of this section shall have the power, in its discretion, to require the carrier to appoint the present trustee or trustees in a managerial or lesser capacity, for the performance of such duties in behalf of such carrier as the court may specify, for such period or periods during said proceeding and under such terms and conditions as the court may specify; the court shall also have the power to terminate such services and appointment.

(6) If the United States of America, or any agency thereof, or any corporation (other than the Reconstruction Finance Corporation) the majority of the stock of which is owned by the United States of America, is a creditor or stockholder of any such carrier, the President of the United States or any officer or agency he may designate, is hereby authorized to act in respect of the interest or claims of the United States or of such agency or other corporation.

(7) The Commission shall designate one or more qualified members of its staff to serve as mediator or mediators in each of the proceedings under section 1 with respect to carriers specified under paragraph (1) of this section for the purpose of bringing the different classes of creditors and other security holders together, of being available to advise with them, of assisting in the effectuation of changes, compromises, arrangements, negotiations, and dealings with the various classes of creditors and other security holders and with individuals, groups, and committees representing creditors or other security holders, of assisting in expediting all stages of the proceedings and the early termination and the consummation of all transactions hereunder, including all steps requisite for the effectuation thereof.

(8) In proceedings under section 1 with respect to a carrier specified in paragraph (1) of this section the Commission shall have the power, in its discretion, to submit to holders of obligations, any proposed alteration or modification affecting them which the Commission has caused the carrier to submit to such holders under the provisions of the fourth sentence of paragraph (2) of section 1 hereof; in the event that it is satisfied that such alteration or modification has been accepted by or on behalf of creditors of each class to which submission is required under section 1 holding more than two-thirds in amount of the total of the allowed claims of such class which have voted on said alteration or modification, the Commission shall enter an order approving and authorizing the proposed alteration or modification as provided in said paragraph (2) of section 1 hereof: *Provided*, That it shall enter such order in any case in which such alteration or modification has not been so accepted by the creditors of any class or classes if it finds, after hearing, that such rejection is not reasonably justified in the light of the respective rights and interests of those rejecting them and all the relevant facts.

(9) If after having submitted a proposed alteration or modification to holders of affected obligations as provided in paragraph (8), the Commission shall not have entered an order approving and authorizing such proposed alteration or modification within a period of 12 months following the date of the filing of an application in accordance with paragraph (2) of this section, or such extended periods as the Commission on application therefor may approve, then the Commission, after hearings, shall formulate and submit to holders of affected obligations such alteration or modification as in its opinion meets the standards set forth in section 1 above; in applying such standards of section 1 for the purpose of any such alteration or modification under this paragraph, the Commission shall give full effect to all changes, facts, and developments since 1940, including, without limitation, for such period total railway operating revenues, operating expenses and other charges, net earnings, the full effect of amortization deductions on earnings of past and future years, improvements to the property, the effect of the released collateral through past or future payment of loans, cash and net current assets, retirements and purchases of debt, including retirements and purchases at a discount that have been made or that can reasonably be made, adjustment and reduction of interest rates on outstanding debt that may be made including the adjustment and reduction of interest rates for prior years. In the event the Commission is satisfied that such alteration or modification has been accepted by the percentages required for acceptance under the provisions of section 1 or of paragraph (8) of this section (or, if not so accepted, it finds after hearing as provided in paragraph (8) that such rejection is not reasonably justified) it shall enter an order approving and authorizing such alteration or modification, unless it finds that, prior to the entry of such order, the alteration or modification

submitted under paragraph (8) has been accepted by the percentages required by the provisions of that paragraph or of section 1, in which event it shall enter an order approving and authorizing such alteration or modification submitted under paragraph (8).

(10) No holding company, individual, group, partnership, association, corporation, or other entity (excluding a common carrier subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act)—

(A) which exercises direct or indirect control of one or more carriers the properties of which are not in the custody of a court in proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act; and

(B) which also owns shares of voting stock of any carrier to which paragraph (1) of this section is applicable, in sufficient number to enable the owner thereof to control such carrier,

shall, during the proceedings under section 1, vote such shares for the election of more than a minority of the directors of such carrier to which paragraph (1) of this section is applicable.

"SEC. 20d. If any provision of section 1 or 2, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of such sections and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the committee amendments. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1253) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, in order to promote the public interest in avoiding the deterioration of service by railroads and the interruption of employment which inevitably attend the threat of financial difficulties and which follow upon financial collapse and in order to promote the public interest in increased stability of values of railroad securities with resulting greater confidence therein of investors, to assure, insofar as possible, continuity of sound financial condition of said common carriers, to preserve the investments of security holders to the fullest possible extent, to prevent forfeitures of investments, and to enable said common carriers, insofar as possible, to avoid prospective financial difficulties, inability to meet debts as they mature, and insolvency. To assist in accomplishing these ends and because certain classes of the obligations of such carriers are in the usual case held by a very large number of holders, and further to enable modification and reformation of provisions of the aforesaid classes of obligations and of provisions of the instruments pursuant to which they are issued or by which they are secured in cases where such modification and reformation shall have become necessary or desirable in the public interest in order to avoid obstruction to or interference with the economical, efficient, and orderly conduct by such carriers of their affairs, it is deemed necessary to provide means, in the manner and with the safeguards herein provided, for the alteration and modification, without the assent of every holder thereof, of the provisions of such classes of obligations and of the instruments pursuant to which they are outstanding or by which they are secured.

SEC. 1. It shall be lawful (any express provision contained in any mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument to the contrary notwithstanding), with the approval and authorization of the Interstate Commerce Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission), as provided in paragraph (2) hereof, for a carrier as defined in section 20a of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act: (1) to alter or modify (a) any provision of any class or classes of its bonds, notes, debentures, or other evidences of indebtedness, (whether secured, unsecured, matured, or unmatured) issued under any mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument of like nature, such bonds, notes, debentures, or other evidences of indebtedness being hereinafter in this section sometime called "obligations"; (b) any provision of any mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument pursuant to which any class of its obligations shall have been issued or by which any class of its obligations is secured: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any equipment-trust certificates in respect of which a carrier is obligated, or to any evidences of indebtedness of a carrier the payment of which is secured in any manner solely by equipment, or to any instrument, whether an agreement, lease, conditional-sale agreement, or otherwise, pursuant to which such equipment-trust certificates or such evidences of indebtedness shall have been issued or by which they are secured.

(2) Whenever an alteration or modification is proposed under paragraph (1) hereof, the carrier seeking authority therefor shall, pursuant to such rules and regulations as the Commission shall prescribe, present an application to the Commission. Upon presentation of any such application, the Commission may, in its discretion, but need not, as a condition precedent to further consideration, require the applicant to secure assurances of assent to such alteration or modification by holders of such percentage of the aggregate principal amount outstanding of the obligations affected by such alteration or modification as the Commission shall in its discretion determine. If the Commission shall not require the applicant to secure any such assurance, or when such assurances as the Commission may require shall have been secured, the Commission shall set such application for public hearing and the carrier shall give such notice of such hearing in such manner, by advertisement or otherwise, as the Commission may find practicable and may direct, to holders of such of its classes of securities and to such other persons in interest as the Commission shall determine to be appropriate and shall direct. If the Commission, after hearing, in addition to making (in any case where such alteration or modification involves an issuance of securities) the findings required by paragraph (2) of said section 20a, shall find that, subject to such terms and conditions and with such amendments as it shall determine to be just and reasonable, the proposed alteration or modification—

(a) is within the scope of paragraph (1);

(b) will be in the public interest;

(c) will be in the best interests of the carrier and of the holders of each class of its obligations affected by such modification or alteration; and

(d) will not be adverse to the interests of the holders of any other class of the carrier's securities or to the interests of any creditor of the carrier not affected by such modification or alteration.

then (unless the applicant carrier shall withdraw its application) the Commission shall cause the carrier, in such manner as it shall direct, to submit the proposed alteration or modification (with such terms, conditions, and amendments, if any) to the holders of each class of its obligations affected thereby, for acceptance or rejection. All letters, circulars, advertisements, and other communications, and all financial and statistical statements, or summaries thereof, to be used in soliciting the assents or the opposition of such holders shall, before being so used, be submitted to the Commission for its approval as to correctness and sufficiency of the material facts stated therein. If the Commission shall find that as a result of such submission the proposed alteration or modification has been assented to by the holders—

(i) of at least 66⅔ percent of the aggregate principal amount outstanding of each class of obligations affected thereby; or

(ii) of less than 66⅔ percent but not less than 51 percent of any particular class or classes of securities affected, and the Commission, after hearing, finds that such reduction in percentage will be just and reasonable and in the public interest; or

(iii) in any case where 66⅔ percent thereof is held by fewer than 25 holders, of such larger percentage, if any, as the Commission, after hearing, finds will be just and reasonable and in the public interest;

the Commission shall enter an order approving and authorizing the proposed alteration or modification upon the terms and conditions and with the amendments, if any, so determined to be just and reasonable. Such order shall make provision as to the time when such alteration or modification shall become and be binding, which may be upon publication of a declaration to that effect by the carrier, or otherwise, as the Commission may determine. Any alteration or modification which shall become and be binding pursuant to the approval and authority of the Commission hereunder shall be binding upon each holder of any obligation of the carrier of each class affected by such alteration or modification, and upon any trustee or other party to any instrument under which any such class or obligations shall have been issued or by which it is secured, and when any alteration or modification shall become and be binding the rights of each such holder and of any such trustee or other party shall be correspondingly altered or modified.

(3) For the purposes of this section a class of obligations shall be deemed to be affected by any modification or alteration proposed only (a) if a modification or alteration is proposed as to any provision of such class of obligations, or (b) if any modification or alteration is proposed as to any provision of any instrument pursuant to which such class of obligations shall have been issued or shall be secured: *Provided*, That in any case where more than one class of obligations shall have been issued and be outstanding or shall be secured pursuant to any instrument, any alteration or modification proposed as to any provision of such instrument, which does not relate to all of the classes of obligations issued thereunder, shall be deemed to affect only the class or classes of obligations to which such alteration or modification is related. For the purpose of the finding of the Commission referred to in paragraph (2) of this section as to whether the required percentage of the aggregate principal amount outstanding of each class of obligations affected by any proposed alteration or modification has assented to the making of such alteration or modification, any obligation which secures any evidence or evidences of indebtedness of the carrier or of any company controlling or controlled by the carrier shall be deemed to be outstanding unless the Commission in its discretion determines that the proposed alteration or modification does not materially affect the interests of the holder or holders of the evidence or evidences of indebtedness secured by such obligation. Whenever any such pledged obligation is, for said purposes, to be deemed outstanding, assent in respect of such obligation, as to any proposed alteration or modification, may be given only (any express or implied provision in any mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, note, or other instrument to the contrary notwithstanding) as follows: (a) Where such obligation is pledged as security under a mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other

instrument, pursuant to which any evidences of indebtedness are issued and outstanding, by the holders of a majority in principal amount of such evidences of indebtedness, or (b) where such obligation secures an evidence or evidences of indebtedness not issued pursuant to such a mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, by the holder or holders of such evidence or evidences of indebtedness; and in any such case the Commission, in addition to the submission referred to in paragraph (2) of this section, shall cause the carrier in such manner as it shall direct to submit the proposed alteration or modification (with such terms, conditions, and amendments, if any, as the Commission shall have determined to be just and reasonable) for acceptance or rejection, to the holders of the evidences of indebtedness issued and outstanding pursuant to such mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, or to the holder or holders of such evidence or evidences of indebtedness not so issued, and such proposed alteration or modification need not be submitted to the trustee of any such mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, but assent in respect of any such obligation shall be determined as hereinbefore in this section provided. For the purpose of any such assent the evidences of indebtedness issued and outstanding under any such mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument shall be determined by the Commission.

(4) (a) Any authorization and approval hereunder of any alteration or modification of a provision of any class of obligations of a carrier or of a provision of any instrument pursuant to which a class of obligations has been issued, or by which it is secured, shall be deemed to constitute authorization and approval of a corresponding alteration or modification of the obligation of any other carrier which has assumed liability in respect of such class of obligations as guarantor, endorser, surety, or otherwise: *Provided*, That such other carrier consents in writing to such alteration or modification of such class of obligations in respect of which it has assumed liability or of the instrument pursuant to which such class of obligations has been issued or by which it is secured, and, such consent having been given, any such corresponding alteration or modification shall become effective, without other action, when the alteration or modification of such class of obligations or of such instrument shall become and be binding.

(b) Any person who is liable or obligated contingently or otherwise on any class or classes of obligations issued by a carrier shall, with respect to such class or classes of obligations, for the purposes of this section, be deemed a carrier.

(5) The authority conferred by this section shall be exclusive and plenary and any carrier, in respect of any alteration or modification authorized and approved by the Commission hereunder, shall have full power to make any such alteration or modification and to take any actions incidental or appropriate thereto, and may make any such alteration or modification and take any such actions, and any such alteration or modification may be made without securing the approval of the Commission under any other section of the Interstate Commerce Act or other paragraph of this section, and without securing approval of any State authority, and any carrier and its officers and employees and any other persons, participating in the making of an alteration or modification approved and authorized under the provisions of this section or the taking of any such actions, shall be, and they hereby are, relieved from the operation of all restraints, limitations, and prohibitions of law, Federal, State, or municipal, insofar as may be necessary to enable them to make and carry into effect the alteration or modification so approved and authorized, in accordance with the conditions and with the amendments, if any, imposed by the Commission. Any power granted by this section to any carrier shall be deemed to be in addition to and in modification of its powers under its corporate charter or under the laws of any State. The provisions of this section shall not affect in any way the negotiability of any obligation of any carrier or of the obligation of any carrier which has assumed liability in respect thereto.

(6) The Commission shall require periodical or special reports from each carrier which shall hereafter secure from the Commission approval and authorization of any alteration or modification under this section, which shall show, in such detail as the Commission may require, the action taken by the carrier in the making of such alteration or modification.

(7) The provisions of this section are permissive and not mandatory and shall not require any carrier to obtain authorization and approval of the Commission hereunder for the making of any alteration or modification of any provision of any of its obligations or of any class thereof or of any provision of any mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, which it may be able lawfully to make in any other manner, whether by reason of provisions for the making of such alteration or modification in any such mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, or otherwise: *Provided*, That the provisions of paragraph (2) of said section 20a, if applicable to such alteration or modification made otherwise than pursuant to the provisions of this section, shall continue to be so applicable.

(8) The provisions of paragraph (6) of said section 20a, except the provisions thereof in respect of hearings, shall apply to applications made under this section. In connection with any order entered by the Commission pursuant to paragraph (2) hereof, the Commission may from time to time, for good cause shown, make such supplemental orders in the premises as it may deem necessary or appropriate, and may by any such supplemental order modify the provisions of any such order, subject always to the requirements of said paragraph (2).

(9) The provisions of subdivision (a) of section 14 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 shall not apply to the solicitation by or on behalf of a carrier of assents (or assurances of assents) by holders of its obligations to a proposed alteration or modification pursuant to this section.

(10) The Commission shall have the power to make such rules and regulations appropriate to its administration of the provisions of this section as it shall deem necessary or desirable.

SEC. 2. (1) All proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, whether before the Interstate Commerce Commission or United States courts, relating to the preparation or effectuation of plans of reorganization of each carrier by railroad as defined in said section 20a (1) whose properties on the effective date of this section or at any time thereafter are in the custody of the United States courts, and—

(a) whose gross railway operating revenues for any of the calendar years 1942 to 1944, inclusive, were in excess of $50,000,000; or

(b) if its gross railway operating revenues were not in excess of such amount, such carrier is a debtor in any such proceeding, or is a party defendant in any proceeding ancillary thereto, with another such carrier whose revenues were so in excess—

shall be forthwith suspended and discontinued as of the effective date of this section.

(2) Carriers to which paragraph (1) of this section is applicable shall institute proceedings and file application under section 1 of this act as expeditiously as possible but in no event later than 6 months after the effective date of this section, or such longer period as the Commission, on application, may approve.

(3) The properties of any carrier specified in paragraph (1) of this section shall continue in the custody of the United States courts having custody of them; except that the following portions of said section 77 shall not be applicable in any such case:

(a) The first two paragraphs of subsection (b).

(b) Subdivision (1) of subsection (c).

(c) The first five sentences and the first seven words of the sixth sentence of subdivision (2) of subsection (c).

(d) Subsections (d), (e), (f), and (k).

In addition to the foregoing exceptions and for the purpose of applying to such carriers in the cases in which and during the period for which such custody is held under said section 77, and pending the consummation of proceedings under section 1 of this act, the word "debtor" shall be substituted for the words "trustee or trustees" wherever such latter words occur in subdivisions (3), (5), (9), and (10) of subsection (c), and subsections (i) and (o), of said section 77. The final determination heretofore or hereafter made in the United States courts with respect to the relative priorities as between the respective classes of security holders, the subordination of the interest of a creditor or security holder of the debtor to the interest of other creditors or security holders, or the validity, amount and priority of any claim shall continue in full force and effect. Nothing herein is intended or shall be construed to modify or rescind any such determination or to prevent or delay the prosecution to final determination of any such issue now pending, and not yet finally determined, in the United States courts.

(4) The proceedings with respect to any such carrier specified in paragraph (1) of this section under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act shall be dismissed upon consummation of proceedings affecting such carrier under section 1 of this act, or upon payment of its matured, unpaid obligations, or the making of other arrangments with reference to such obligations satisfactory to the owners of the claims therefor; and such proceedings may be dismissed under the conditions and in the manner prescribed in subsection (g) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act.

(5) The appointment, term of office, powers, authority, compensation and fees of each trustee appointed by the court, and of each counsel of such trustee, shall be terminated on or before 30 days after the effective date of this section. The United States court having custody of the properties of any carrier specified in paragraph (1) of this section shall have the power, in its discretion, to require the carrier to appoint the present trustee or trustees in a managerial or lesser capacity, for the performance of such duties in behalf of such carrier as the court may specify, for such period or periods during said proceeding and under such terms and conditions as the court may specify; the court shall also have the power to terminate such services and appointment.

(6) If the United States of America, or any agency thereof, or any corporation (other than the Reconstruction Finance Corporation) the majority of the stock of which is owned by the United States of America, is a creditor or stockholder of any such carrier, the President of the United States or any officer or agency he may designate, is hereby authorized to act in respect of the interest or claims of the United States or of such agency or other corporation.

(7) The Commission shall designate one or more qualified members of its staff to serve as mediator or mediators in each of the proceedings under section 1 with respect to carriers specified under paragraph (1) of this

section for the purpose of bringing the different classes of creditors and other security holders together, of being available to advise with them, of assisting in the effectuation of changes, compromises, arrangements, negotiations, and dealings with the various classes of creditors and other security holders and with individuals, groups, and committees representing creditors or other security holders, of assisting in expediting all stages of the proceedings and the early termination and the consummation of all transactions hereunder, including all steps requisite for the effectuation thereof.

(8) In proceedings under section 1 with respect to a carrier specified in paragraph (1) of this section the Commission shall have the power, in its discretion, to submit to holders of obligations, any proposed alteration or modification affecting them which the Commission has caused the carrier to submit to such holders under the provisions of the fourth sentence of paragraph (2) of section 1 hereof; in the event that it is satisfied that such alteration or modification has been accepted by or on behalf of creditors of each class to which submission is required under section 1 holding more than two-thirds in amount of the total of the allowed claims of such class which have voted on said alteration or modification, the Commission shall enter an order approving and authorizing the proposed alteration or modification as provided in said paragraph (2) of section 1 hereof: *Provided*, That it shall enter such order in any case in which such alteration or modification has not been so accepted by the creditors of any class or classes if it finds, after hearing, that such rejection is not reasonably justified in the light of the respective rights and interests of those rejecting them and all the relevant facts.

(9) If after having submitted a proposed alteration or modification to holders of affected obligations as provided in paragraph (8), the Commission shall not have entered an order approving and authorizing such proposed alteration or modification within a period of 12 months following the date of the filing of an application in accordance with paragraph (2) of this section, or such extended periods as the Commission on application therefor may approve, then the Commission, after hearings, shall formulate and submit to holders of affected obligations such alteration or modification as in its opinion meets the standards set forth in section 1 above; in applying such standards of section 1 for the purpose of any such alteration or modification under this paragraph, the Commission shall give full effect to all changes, facts, and developments since 1940, including, without limitation, for such period total railway operating revenues, operating expenses and other charges, net earnings, the full effect of amortization deductions on earnings of past and future years, improvements to the property, the effect of the released collateral through past or future payment of loans, cash and net current assets, retirements and purchases of debt, including retirements and purchases at a discount that have been made or that can reasonably be made, adjustment and reduction of interest rates on outstanding debt that may be made, including the adjustment and reduction of interest rates for prior years. In the event the Commission is satisfied that such alteration or modification has been accepted by the percentages required for acceptance under the provisions of section 1 or of paragraph (8) of this section (or, if not so accepted, it finds after hearing as provided in paragraph (8) that such rejection is not reasonably justified) it shall enter an order approving and authorizing such alteration or modification, unless it finds that, prior to the entry of such order, the alteration or modification submitted under paragraph (8) has been accepted by the percentages required by the provisions of that paragraph or of section 1, in which event it shall enter an order approving and authorizing such alteration or modification submitted under paragraph (8).

(10) No holding company, individual, group, partnership, association, corporation, or other entity (excluding a common carrier subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act)—

(A) which exercises direct or indirect control of one or more carriers the properties of which are not in the custody of a court in proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act; and

(B) which also owns shares of voting stock of any carrier to which paragraph (1) of this section is applicable, in sufficient number to enable the owner thereof to control such carrier,

shall, during the proceedings under section 1, vote such shares for the election of more than a minority of the directors of such carrier to which paragraph (1) of this section is applicable.

(11) The provisions of this section shall not apply if at the time of filing the petition for reorganization under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act as amended, more than 90 percent of the outstanding voting stock of the debtor railroad corporation shall have been owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by voting trust or otherwise, by another railroad corporation and/or by a corporation owning or controlling more than 90 percent of the outstanding voting stock of another railroad corporation. The term "corporation" as used in this paragraph shall be deemed to include its trustees appointed under the aforesaid section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act.

SEC. 20d. If any provision of section 1 or 2, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of such sections and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and to limit the application of an act entitled 'An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States,' approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, and for other purposes."

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed Calendar No. 1378, House bill 4512, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes. The bill was passed in such haste that no consideration was given to the committee amendments. I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, does the Senator intend to have the bill taken up now?

Mr. TAFT. The bill was passed yesterday, and, unfortunately, without amendments being agreed to which had been proposed by the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say, Mr. President, that the fact that the committee amendments were not acted upon was a mere oversight, and the Senator from Ohio has moved that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. It has been proposed to amend one of the committee amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4512) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 5, in line 10, to strike out:

> Three of the appointed members shall be selected from a panel of six such authorities to be submitted to the Surgeon General by the deans of the approved medical colleges and schools in the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, in line 14, after the word "Administrator", to strike out "*Provided*, That consent of a legal guardian shall be obtained before the transfer of any patient from Saint Elizabeths Hospital for such treatment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, in line 3 after the word "institutions", to insert "including grants to such institutions for the construction, acquisition, and leasing of hospital, clinic, laboratory, and related facilities, but only to the extent necessary for the purposes of such training and instruction."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, in line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$4,500,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on page 13, in line 21, I move that "$10,000,000" be stricken out and in lieu thereof "$7,500,000" be substituted. That was the condition upon which the objections to consideration of the bill were withdrawn yesterday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment on page 13, in line 21.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the committee amendments.

The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4512) was read the third time and passed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate during the next 30 days.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate next week.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1469, House bill 5990, the appropriations bill for the District of Columbia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill, H. R. 5990, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

FACILITATION AND SIMPLIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon Calendar No. 1341, House bill 4386, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, was considered on motion made by me because I did not believe that the bill which had been acted upon conformed with what the committee desired to have done. I was absent from the Chamber when the bill was called up during consideration of the calendar.

I wish to invite attention, particularly of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], to the statement which was made before the Committee on Indian Affairs when the bill was under consideration there. The bill was considered several weeks ago. Because of an objection which had been raised by members of the committee, including the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs was requested to change the wording of the bill so that it would conform with the committee's ideas. The bill was later reported to the Senate and was passed yesterday by the Senate without containing the changes which the committee desired to have made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator is mistaken. The change which the committee requested was reported to the Senate in the form of an amendment which was agreed to by the Senate yesterday.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I realize that, Mr. President, but I say that the bill was not changed in the way in which the committee had requested the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to reword the bill. Allow me to read from the testimony which was taken before the committee when the matter was discussed. In the committee meeting, Mr. Crawford, formerly one of the superintendents of the Klamath Reservation, made the following statement:

I am seeking information. I am not here opposing the legislation, other than that I want to know that it is going to be helpful to the Indians. As I understood Mr. Brophy here a few minutes ago, he cited to the committee that superintendents would make the leases and transfer the lands of individuals, and the superintendent would have personal supervision over an Indian on his individual property. I think that is pretty wide authority to give a superintendent on an Indian reservation, when I know what goes on in an Indian reservation, and what has been going on in the past years, and is going on now.

So I should like to ask Mr. Brophy if he is going to call in the chiefs of the different divisions with his legal staff to write these regulations. Would you answer the question, please?

Mr. BROPHY. Regulations referred to in the proposed bill would be written by the staff of the Secretary of the Interior, I take it. I reiterate that no additional power on substantive matters is intended to be conferred by the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brophy, to answer Mr. Crawford's question explicitly, I think we should refer not only to the regulations mentioned in lines 6 and 7 of page 1, which I take it are the regulations under which the delegation shall be made?

Mr. BROPHY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But we should refer also to the regulations which are authorized by law to be drawn by the Secretary to carry out laws affecting Indian affairs. Now, is it not a fact that it is not your intention to ask authority to delegate that power to write regulations under existing law?

Mr. BROPHY. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. But, of course, you know from the reading of the bill that it is drawn in such broad language that it would constitute that delegation?

Mr. BROPHY. I did not so understand the bill. I thought that the delegation of authority——

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it grants a broad power to delegate, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, "his powers and duties under said laws," those laws being the laws governing Indian affairs. Now, if there is any law governing Indian affairs which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make rules and regulations—and, of course, there are many such—this bill would authorize a delegation of the regulation-making power, and I am sure you do not want to ask that.

Mr. BROPHY. That is not the purpose or intent of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. And you do not want language broad enough to convey that authority?

Mr. BROPHY. I do not. It would be fruitless for the Commissioner to try to make a regulation governing the Secretary of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. Therefore, you do not want to ask Congress to pass a law which in terms grants that power?

Mr. BROPHY. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. It is obvious that this is a bill that has to be rewritten.

That is the end of the testimony.

Mr. President, this bill is H. R. 4386. I wish to read the first paragraph of the bill. It is the bill which was supposed to be changed by officials in the Indian Office. It reads:

For the purpose of facilitating and simplifying the administration of the laws governing Indian affairs, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to delegate, from time to time, and to the extent and under such regulations as he deems proper, his powers and duties under said laws, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, insofar as such powers and duties relate to action in individual cases arising under general regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The language the Senator has just read, beginning with the word "insofar" and ending with the word "law" is one of the three amendments which were adopted by the Committee on Indian Affairs to meet the objections which I, as chairman of the committee, raised, and to adjust the bill to the understanding of the committee.

The fear which I expressed at the time the bill was under consideration by the committee was that it would result in the delegation to subordinate officials of the power to write regulations, and I expressed clearly my conviction—and in this opinion the committee agreed with me—that Congress should not adopt any law which by any manner of interpretation could lead to such a conclusion.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is the very point I have raised in this matter. I read further from the bill itself:

Subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to delegate, in like manner, any powers and duties so delegated to him by the Secretary, or vested in him by law, to the assistant commissioners or the officer in charge of any branch, division, office, or agency of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Such delegated powers——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is an amendment, if I may interrupt the Senator.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Such delegated powers shall be exercised subject to appeal to the Secretary, under regulations to be prescribed by him, or, as from time to time determined by him, to the Under Secretary or to an Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, or to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. President, the bill was prepared and written by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs or the Secretary of the Interior, and I maintain that the language written into the bill now delegates power to any superintendent of any Indian reservation or any employee on any of these reservations to issue orders and regulations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will read the last amendment he will see that that possibility clearly has been eliminated. The last amendment consists of the last three lines of the bill before the Senate yesterday, and provides, "nor shall anything in this act be deemed to convey authority to delegate any power to issue regulations."

I suggest to the Senator that the committee very adequately covered the criticism which the Senator from South

Dakota and I raised to the bill as it originally came before the committee. I feel confident that the Senator's interpretation and my interpretation of the authority which should be conveyed is fully safeguarded by the measure as passed yesterday.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am sure that the chairman and the committee itself were concerned about the delegation of power to write regulations, and it seems to me that under any interpretation of this language, including the amendment, it may be termed a delegation of authority to anybody connected with the Office of Indian Affairs.

In that connection, Mr. President, in order to clarify the language, and to put it in such form that there can be no question about it, I move that the bill be recommitted to the committee for further consideration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not insist upon that motion, because I think the language in these amendments clearly protects the legislation from the danger which he and I apprehended. If the Senator desires to make it any more clear, I suggest that instead of attempting to send the bill back to the committee, he offer an additional clarifying amendment. That would be the more expeditious way to handle it. It is a matter of tremendous importance to the Indians that their business shall be carried on. Under the law as it now stands, unless the power is granted to delegate certain ministerial duties, those duties will accumulate upon the desks of the Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries and of the Commissioner, without being transacted, and great suffering and inconvenience will necessarily be occasioned by the delay.

This measure is intended to facilitate the disposal of Indian affairs, and I submit to the Senator it does that, and the amendments which the committee unanimously approved and which the Senate adopted yesterday close the door to the only possibility of abuse which the committee had in mind.

I should be very glad to cooperate with the Senator in drafting any clarifying amendment. I rose for the purpose of moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill; and if the Senator will be good enough to postpone this matter until we have disposed of the appropriation bill, I shall be very happy to confer with him further.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I shall be glad to postpone it, but I believe that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has not understood my position. I am very much opposed to the head of the Department, the Secretary of the Interior, preparing the regulations and rules through the local superintendents.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This bill absolutely prevents that, as we have now drafted it. I shall be very happy to confer with the Senator, and I am sure we can agree on an additional clarifying amendment which will eliminate all doubt in his mind.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I withhold the motion until the Senate has concluded action on the appropriation bill.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1947

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5990, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 2, line 14, after the word "relief", to insert "Veterans' Services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General administration," on page 4, line 13, after the words "District of Columbia", to strike out "$165,870" and insert "$182,530."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fiscal service," on page 5, line 13, after "Auditor's office", to strike out "$271,920" and insert "$308,544."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Regulatory agencies," on page 7, line 15, after the word "vehicle", to strike out "$121,391" and insert "$124,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 4, after the word "room", to strike out "$185,672" and insert "$199,036."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 17, after the word "Commission", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That the foregoing provision shall not be construed to prevent the Public Utilities Commission from holding a hearing upon any application that may be made for the installation of meters in taxicabs."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public schools—Operating expenses," on page 9, line 3, after the word "periodicals", to insert "purchase, operation, and maintenance of one passenger automobile"; and in line 4, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$421,572" and insert "$430,372."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 14, after the word "children", to strike out "$10,539,900" and insert "$10,881,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 10, after the word "courses", to strike out "$2,218,520" and insert "$2,264,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Capital outlay", on page 11, line 23, after the word "buildings", to strike out "Bell Vocational High School"; on page 12, line 1, after "Richardson Elementary School" to insert "Anacostia Senior High School, Logan Elementary School, Tyler Elementary School"; and in line 5, after the word "Southeast", to strike out "$275,080" and insert "$189,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 14, to strike out:

For continuing construction of a new extensible vocational high school building to replace the present Alexander Graham Bell (Abbot) Vocational School, to be located in Brentwood Park, $370,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line, 18, to insert:

The contract authorization of $1,190,000 for the construction of the Alexander Graham Bell (Abbott) Vocational School, contained in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, Public Law 269, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, is hereby rescinded, and the unobligated balances of appropriations heretofore made for beginning and continuing construction of this school shall be covered into the general fund of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 6, to insert:

For an additional amount for the construction of an addition to the Taft Junior High School, including 10 classrooms, 2 gymnasiums, recreation facilities, an inclined floor in the auditorium, necessary remodeling of the present building, and treatment of grounds, $311,020, and the amount appropriated in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, for an addition to the Taft Junior High School is available for the construction of the addition specified herein.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 15, to insert:

For an additional amount for the construction of an 8-room elementary-school addition to the Logan School, including an assembly hall-gymnasium, recreation facilities, treatment of grounds, and the necessary remodeling of the present building, $200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 20, to insert:

For beginning construction of a new 24-room elementary-school building, including an essembly hall-gymnasium, recreation facilities, and treatment of grounds, in the vicinity of Third and L Streets Northwest, to replace the present Walker and Jones Schools, $300,000, and the Commissioners are authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for such building at a total cost not to exceed $600,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $2,100 may be transferred to the credit of the appropriation account "Office of Municipal Architect, construction services," and be available for the preparation of plans and specifications for said buildings.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 7, to insert:

For an additional amount for the construction of a 16-room extensible elementary-school building, including an assembly hall-gymnasium, and treatment of grounds, in the vicinity of Fifty-third and Blaine Streets Northeast (Richardson School), $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 12, to insert:

For the construction of a 7-room addition on the third floor of the Anacostia Senior

High School, including the necessary remodeling of the present building, $93,320, and the limit of cost as specified in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, is increased to $95,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 17, to insert:

For completion of construction of a new elementary school building, including an assembly hall-gymnasium, recreation facilities, and treatment of grounds, in the vicinity of Eleventh and G Streets SE., to replace the present Cranch and Tyler Schools, $439,500;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 22, to insert:

For an additional amount for the construction of an eight-room extensible elementary-school building (Slowe), four rooms to be left unfinished, to be located in the vicinity of Fifteenth and Hamlin Streets NE., $50,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 2, to insert:

For building improvements and alterations at Western Senior High School, including structural changes in the gymnasiums, $147,900, and the limit of cost as specified in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, is increased to $150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 7, to insert:

For the preparation of plans and specifications for a new junior-high-school building to replace the present Terrell Junior High School building, including recreation facilities and treatment of grounds, to be constructed at a total cost of not to exceed $1,350,000, on a site in the vicinity of First and Pierce Streets NW., $28,350, which amount may be credited to the appropriation account "Office of Municipal Architect, construction services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 15, to insert:

For the preparation of plans and specifications for an addition to the Armstrong Senior High School, including the necessary remodeling of the present building and treatment of grounds, to be constructed at a total cost of not to exceed $1,560,000, $32,760, which amount may be credited to the appropriation account "Office of Municipal Architect, construction services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 22, to insert:

For the preparation of plans and specifications for an addition to the Eliot Junior High School, including 10 classrooms, a gymnasium, necessary remodeling of the present building, and treatment of grounds, to be constructed at a total cost not to exceed $350,000, $7,350, which amount may be credited to the appropriation account "Office of Municipal Architect, construction services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 7, after the word "specifications", to strike out "$2,008,000" and insert "$3,348,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 8, to strike out:

No part of the appropriations herein made for the public schools of the District of Columbia shall be used for the free instruction of pupils who dwell outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to pupils who are enrolled in the schools of the District of Columbia on the date of the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public Library—Operating expenses," on page 18, line 25, after the word "Woodridge", to strike out "$848,900" and insert "$906,210."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Recreation department," on page 20, line 3, after the word "binding", to strike out "$751,900" and insert "$782,719."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 7, to insert:

For the acquisition of parcel .101/25, known as the Emery estate, as a site for recreational purposes and in the discretion of the Commissioners as a site for a branch library, $204,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Metropolitan Police," on page 22, line 3, before the words "of which", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$5,344,275."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fire Department," on page 23, line 10, after the word "grounds", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "3,211,138."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 16, to insert:

VETERANS' SERVICES

For all expenses necessary to provide services to veterans and war workers, including personal services without regard to classification or civil-service laws, and printing and binding, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 21, to insert:

Utilities for veterans' housing: For all expenses necessary to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide necessary utilities for veterans' housing furnished and erected by the National Housing Administrator, including necessary sewers, water, and streets for temporary housing for families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, $250,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Health Department," on page 28, line 13, after the word "inspectors", to strike out "$1,605,423" and insert "$1,654,623."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 4, after the word "grounds", to strike out "$1,319,592" and insert "$1,389,308."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 16, after the word "at", to strike out "$8,000" and insert "$8,750", and in the same line, after the words "per annum", to insert "plus $1,500 per annum for a residence"; and on page 30, line 5, after the word "grounds", to strike out "$2,341,148" and insert "$3,841,148."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 18, after the word "Hospital", to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$80,000"; in line 19, after the word "Hospital", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$55,000"; in line 20, after the word "Hospital", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$65,000"; and in line 21, after the words "in all", to strike out "$185,000" and insert "$225,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public welfare—Family welfare service," on page 32, line 11, after the word "building", to strike out "$688,140" and insert "$758,380."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 19, to insert:

Capital outlay, child care: For an additional amount for the construction of a receiving home and classification center in parcel 141/68, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 4, after the word "Commissioner", to insert "vocational rehabilitation of disabled residents of the District of Columbia in accordance with the provisions of the act of July 6, 1943 (Public Law 113)"; in line 13, after the word "institutions", to strike out "$55,500" and insert "$63,500"; in line 21, after the word "including", to insert "the supervision of 'Victory' gardens and"; in line 22, after the word "products", to strike out "of home gardens" and insert "thereof"; on page 34, line 3, after the word "binding", to strike out "$2,008,500" and insert "$2,041,500"; and in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "home" and insert "'Victory'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Juvenile correctional service," on page 35, line 20, before the word "*Provided*", to strike out "$475,748" and insert "$499,908."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Adult correctional service," on page 36, line 19, after the word "residences", to strike out "$1,873,407" and insert "$2,238,407."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 19, to insert:

Capital outlay: For structural improvements at the jail, including outside walls and fences, guard towers, and control gates, $116,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Mental rehabilitation service," on page 38, line 4, after the word "grounds", to strike out "$542,580" and insert "$587,120."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 5, to insert:

Capital outlay, District Training School: For the construction and equipment of laundry building and employees' housing, $420,000; and for the improvement of roads, $50,000; in all, $470,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public works," on page 40, line 11, after the word "equipment", to insert

"uniforms and caps for guards"; and in line 12, after the word "binding", to strike out "$545,700" and insert "$548,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 4, after the word "binding", to strike out "$408,500" and insert "$415,800."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in lieu of the amendment which appears in line 4, on page 41, by the authority of the committee, I desire to offer as a substitute two amendments. On page 41, line 2, after the word "buildings", I move to insert the following: "three members of board of special appeal and two members of the electrical examining board at $300 per annum each."

Then, in lieu of the committee amendment in line 4, page 41, I move to strike out "$408,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$421,100."

These two amendments, Mr. President, will have the effect of increasing the appropriation by $5,300 over the amount recommended by the committee in its report, in order to implement certain new regulations issued by the Commissioners to reduce the fire hazard in the buildings in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming on behalf of the committee are agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 12, after the word "services", to strike out "(except a director)"; and in line 13, after the word "binding", to strike out "$547,600" and insert "$603,852."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 7, after the word "taxes", to strike out "$1,420,000" and insert "$1,476,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 6, to insert:

Water fund, investment, District of Columbia: The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell United States securities now held for and on account of the water fund of the District of Columbia in such amounts as may be certified by the Commissioners as necessary and credit the proceeds of such sale to said water fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Washington Aqueduct," on page 55, line 7, after the word "Dalecarlia", to insert a semicolon and "new mixing and sedimentation basins for the Dalecarlia filter plant (first half); 30,000,000-gallon clear water basin at Dalecarlia (first third); and the United States Engineer Office, District Engineer, is authorized to enter into contract or contracts for the completion of the two last above-named projects at a total cost of not to exceed, respectively, $967,000 and $1,250,000"; and in line 19, after the word "laws", to strike out "$989,000" and insert "$1,980,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Capital Parks," on page 58, line 9, before the word *"Provided"*, to strike out "$1,200,000" and insert "$1,223,846."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Zoological Park," in section 11, page 62, line 15, after the word "Administration", to strike out "and in no event more than $1,050."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee and in accordance with the notice heretofore given, I send forward an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the amendment is agreed to.

If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5990) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. WILLIS, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I regret to say that while the bill was being passed the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] was endeavoring to engage my attention with the desire to offer an additional amendment. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the vote, by which the bill was passed, may be reconsidered so that this additional amendment may be offered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move that section 3, on page 60, beginning in line 4 and ending in line 22, be stricken out, and that similar language carried in the Navy appropriation bill be inserted in lieu thereof.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 60, it is proposed to strike out section 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 3. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The question now is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5990) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did the fact that the vote by which the District of Columbia bill was originally passed was vacated in order to consider an additional amendment vacate the subsequent appointment of conferees?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. The Chair announced that they had been previously appointed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, Acting Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6393. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the creation of an American Battle Monuments Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1923, as amended, in order to extend the Commission's authority to all areas in which our armed forces have operated during World War II, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6572. An act to provide military assistance to the Republic of the Philippines in establishing and maintaining national security and to form a basis for participation by that Government in such defensive military operations as the future may require; and

H. R. 6627. An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for the use of the Government of the United States of America.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6627) for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for the use of the Government

of the United States of America, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REFEREES' SALARY BILL

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4160, Calendar No. 968.

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object, I understand this is the bill which was objected to by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the call of the calendar yesterday.

Mr. HUFFMAN. No; it was not, Mr. President.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator assure me that the Senator from Oregon has withdrawn his objection?

Mr. HUFFMAN. I should like to correct the Senator from Maine. The Senator from Oregon did not object to this bill on the call yesterday. Objection was made to it some months ago.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon is not now pressing any objection?

Mr. HUFFMAN. That is my understanding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4160) to amend an act entitled "Ar act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 2, line 10, to strike out "(8) 'Council' shall mean the council of circuit judges for the circuit, as defined in section 306 of the United States Judicial Code." and insert "(8a) 'Council' shall mean the judicial council of the circuit provided for by section 306 of the United States Judicial Code."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 18, after the word "fund", to strike out the comma and "which funds are hereby permanently appropriated for the purposes of the respective funds."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 21, after the words "out of", to insert "annual appropriations from."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 23, after the words "out of" to insert "annual appropriations from."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUFFMAN. There are a number of other amendments which have been agreed to by the committee, and on behalf of the committee I offer the amendments and ask that they be now considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The first amendment offered by Mr. HUFFMAN on behalf of the committee was, on page 3, line 8, to strike out the word "council" and insert in lieu thereof the words "senior judge."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, to strike out lines 11 to 16, inclusive, as follows:

b. Reappointment: A referee shall be reappointed upon the expiration of the term of his office, unless there is cause for not reappointing him by reason of incompetency, misconduct, or neglect of duty: *Provided, however*, That, in the case of a part-time referee, an additional cause for not reappointing him shall be that his services are not needed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, to strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive, as follows:

If the Director shall report to such judge or judges any of the above-mentioned causes for removal of a referee and the judge or judges shall fail to remove such referee, the council may remove him from office for any one or more of such causes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 16, beginning with the word "and", to strike out "and shall further, on petition, be entitled to review of such order by the council, and opportunity to be heard on such review."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, to insert a period after the word "charges" in line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 3, to strike out "less than $3,000 nor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 5, to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4160) was read the third time and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before we took up the District of Columbia bill the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] made a motion to recommit House bill 4386, Calendar 1341, which was passed yesterday. I have consulted the Senator from South Dakota, and I now ask unanimous consent that the bill may remain on the calendar for consideration when the Senate next assembles, in order that the Senator from South Dakota and the chairman of the committee may have an opportunity to offer a perfecting and clarifying amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6335, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes. I make this motion with the understanding that the bill will not be taken up today, but will be the unfinished business of the Senate when it convenes next week.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

CLAIMS OF PATUXENT DEVELOPMENT CO., INC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In his capacity as a Senator, the present occupant of the chair takes the liberty of asking unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 884, Calendar No. 901. When the bill was reached on a previous call of the calendar, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] objected because he thought there ought to be an amendment. The Senator has prepared an amendment which is acceptable.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 884) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Patuxent Development Co., Inc., which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claims of the Patuxent Development Co., Inc., of Southern Pines, N. C., against the United States arising out of the use and occupancy of the Pine Needles Hotel property, at Southern Pines, N. C., by the Army Air Forces Technical Training Command under contract No. W2203 eng-16862, dated March 3, 1942. In the determination of such claims the said company shall, notwithstanding any provision of any contract, release, or other agreement, be deemed to be entitled to receive fair and just compensation from the United States for the use and occupancy of such property, including fair and just compensation for expenses incurred by the said company, and for damage done to such property by reason of its use and occupancy by the United States.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph twentieth of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] on February 21, 1946, will be stated.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 9, after the name "United States", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "all between and including August 17, 1943, and August 31, 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul A. Walker to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Navy nominations are routine promotions, and so forth. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, June 18, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Harry F. Besosa for appointment as State director of selective service for Puerto Rico under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of State director of selective service for Puerto Rico will be at the rate of $6,650 per annum.

The persons named below for appointment to the positions indicated opposite their respective names:

John L. McCormick, State director, Alaska, $5,905.20.

Ebenezer L. Compere, State director, Arkansas, $6,384.

Vivian B. Collins, State director, Florida, $6,384.

Paul G. Armstrong, State director, Illinois, $9,376.50.

John Van B. Metts, State director, North Carolina, $8,179.50.

Holmes B. Springs, State director, South Carolina, $7,102.20.

Carleton C. Pierce, State director, West Virginia, $6,384.

Candler Cobb, director, New York City, $8,179.50.

Homer A. Higgins, State medical adviser, Arkansas and Oklahoma, $5,905.20.

Philip H. Bartholomew, State medical adviser, Nebraska, $5,905.20.

Troy W. Lewis, Chief, Legal Division, Arkansas, $5,905.20.

Frank D. Norton, administrative officer, District of Columbia headquarters, $6,384.

Joseph A. Bell, administrative officer, Research and Statistics Division, Philadelphia branch, $5,905.20.

Joseph Kormann, Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, Philadelphia branch, $7,102.20.

Raymond V. Bowers, Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, national headquarters, $7,102.20.

William Green de Rosset, records analyst, national headquarters, $5,905.20.

Edmund A. Flagg, Executive, Communications, and Records Division, National Headquarters, $5,905.20.

Angus J. Gallagher, Chief, Headquarters Division, National Headquarters, $8,179.50.

Ronald M. Holmes, Chief, Appointments and Personnel Division, National Headquarters, $7,175.

Colgate Hoyt, Assistant Chief, Veterans' Personnel Division, National Headquarters, $7,102.20.

Austin S. Imirie, Administrative Officer, National Headquarters, $8,179.50.

Raymond M. Lancaster, Fiscal Accountant, National Headquarters, $5,905.20.

Kenneth H. McGill, Chief, Research and Statistics Division, National Headquarters, $8,179.50.

James M. Smith, Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, National Headquarters, $7,102.20.

Under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Paul A. Walker to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years, from July 1, 1946.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

Dean L. Kellogg to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from June 5, 1946.

OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Edward W. Rounds et al., officers for appointment in the United States Navy, which were transmitted to the Senate on June 10, 1946, and which appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Edward W. Rounds on page 6581 and ending with the name of Clyde H. Walsworth on page 6587.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 17, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of mercy and length of days, without whom nothing is pure, nothing is good, and nothing can abide, blessed be Thine excellent name. Morning, noon, and evening Thou art pouring forth Thy blessings; at Thy touch the better feelings of our natures are moved and the spheres of our usefulness are enlarged. O God, arouse our souls to greater zeal, greater understanding and devotion, that throughout our land evil may be diminished and that peace with justice may prevail. O bring all peoples to a high plane of self-control; hover over them until all laws and institutions shall feel Thy presence and be directed by Thy wisdom, that the ultimate aim of all councils shall be one of accord and of good will to the whole world. Direct the Congress today and shadow our Republic with Thine infinite presence. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 14, 1946, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 14, 1946:

H. R. 3506. An act for the relief of Mary A. Wallis.

On June 15, 1946:

H. R. 1037. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court, Southern District of Florida;

H. R. 3094. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Zephyr Aircraft Corp. against the United States;

H. R. 3726. An act for the relief of Earl D. Massey, Marvin Marshall, and Fred C. Mitchell;

H. R. 4633. An act for the relief of John B. Clausen; and

H. J. Res. 360. Joint resolution to provide for United States participation in the Philippine independence ceremonies on July 4, 1946.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without

amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 233. An act for the relief of Hamsah Omar;

H. R. 797. An act for the relief of William W. Willett, Jr.;

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota;

H. R. 1258. An act for the relief of Cecil Atkinson;

H. R. 1460. An act for the relief of D. C. Todd;

H. R. 1689. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Anderson Ranch Reservoir Site, Boise reclamation project, Idaho;

H. R. 2677. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to accept and dispose of real estate devised to the United States by the late Maggie Johnson, of Polk County, Ark., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2678. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Juan Calcaño;

H. R. 2785. An act for the relief of Will O'Brien, Mrs. Bessie O'Brien, and the legal guardian of Jane O'Brien;

H. R. 3031. An act for the relief of Walter A. Moffatt;

H. R. 3359. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Belk;

H. R. 3391. An act for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co.;

H. R. 3399. An act for the relief of Philibert L. Bergeron, Alfred Quist, and Astrid Quist;

H. R. 3401. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hattie Main Babcock, Chester N. Main, and Mr. and Mrs. Earl Norman;

H. R. 3441. An act to provide for the naturalization of Master Sgt. Gerhard Neumann;

H. R. 3494. An act for the relief of the J. B. McCrary Co., Inc., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3512. An act for the relief of Willie Lam and Edgar Lam;

H. R. 3611. An act to authorize the condemnation of materials which are intended for use in process or renovated butter and which are unfit for human consumption, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3622. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hazel M. Skaggs;

H. R. 3665. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of William Needom Rashal, a minor;

H. R. 3843. An act to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana;

H. R. 3959. An act to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War;

H. R. 3966. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands situated in Clark County, Nev., to the Boulder City Cemetery Association for cemetery purposes;

H. R. 4046. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard S. Fisher;

H. R. 4113. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain land to Mrs. Estelle M. Wilbourn;

H. R. 4118. An act for the relief of Axel H. Peterson;

H. R. 4245. An act for the relief of José Villafañe Muñoz;

H. R. 4251. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Francisca Sánchez Figueroa;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Esequiel (Frank) Padilla, and others;

H. R. 4339. An act for the relief of Fannie C. Fugate;

H. R. 4353. An act for the relief of Amy Mary Richter;

H. R. 4373. An act for the relief of Carl and Naomi Fitzwater;

H. R. 4433. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Alabama for use as a public park of the military reservation known as Fort Morgan;

H. R. 4479. An act for the relief of William E. Robertson and Estelle Robertson;

H. R. 4495. An act for the relief of William H. Roman;

H. R. 4525. An act for the relief of Oran Edmund Randall Rumrill;

H. R. 4600. An act for the relief of the estate of Patsy Ann Maheux, deceased;

H. R. 4654. An act to exempt transfers of property to the American National Red Cross from the District of Columbia inheritance tax;

H. R. 4693. An act for the relief of Richard C. Ward;

H. R. 4863. An act to establish the date of acceptance of a commission as lieutenant (junior grade), United States Naval Reserve, by William Leon de Carbonel to be June 1, 1941, and the date of reporting for active duty to be December 9, 1941, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4888. An act for the relief of Gustav F. Doscher;

H. R. 5000. An act for the relief of Marion Powell, a minor;

H. R. 5091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Ronnell;

H. R. 5149. An act to govern the effective dates of ratings and awards under the Veterans' Administration revised Schedule for Rating Disabilities, 1945, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5187. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across New River near Radford, Montgomery County, Va.;

H. R. 5271. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II";

H. R. 5317. An act to amend the act establishing the Hot Springs National Park;

H R. 5357. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River, at a point between the boroughs of Elizabeth, in Elizabeth Township, and West Elizabeth, in Jefferson Township, in the county of Allegheny, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 5387. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River between the borough of Belle Vernon, Fayette County, Pa., and the borough of Speers, Washington County, Pa.;

H. R. 5413. An act to accept the renunciation by Albert W. Johnson of pension under section 260 of the Judicial Code;

H. R. 5453. An act to authorize certain expenditures by the Alaska Railroad, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5674. An act to amend the laws authorizing the performance of necessary protection work between the Yuma project and Boulder Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation;

H. R. 5676. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real estate in Converse County, Wyo.;

H. R. 5744. An act to incorporate the Civil Air Patrol;

H. R. 5796. An act to amend title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to permit the making of contributions, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for the maintenance and operation of certain school facilities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5811. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of David Owens, Jr.;

H. R. 5896. An act to extend the term of design patent No. 21,053, dated September 22, 1891, for a badge, granted to George Brown Goode, and assigned to the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution;

H. R. 5907. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement for highway purposes to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in certain lands in the reservation of the Veterans' Administration hospital, Lebanon County, Pa., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6069. An act to amend section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944;

H. R. 6070. An act to amend section 4 of the act of August 25, 1937, so as to provide a filing procedure in cases of adoption outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6153. An act to remove the existing limitation on the number of associate members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans' Administration;

H. J. Res. 304. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1946, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brigadier General Casimir Pulaski; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Inter-American Trade Exposition, Fort Worth, Tex., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Adele Nahas;

H. R. 2954. An act for the relief of John Hamlet;

H. R. 3010. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Edens Nast, Mrs. Bessie Amann, and George R. Townsend;

H. R. 3185. An act for the relief of the estate of Senia Lassila, deceased;

H. R. 3533. An act to authorize revisions in the boundary of the Hopewell Village National Historic Site, Pa., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3709. An act to amend section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928, and section 3 of the act of March 29, 1944, affecting the compensation of postmasters;

H. R. 4230. An act to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts;

H. R. 4419. An act for the relief of Mrs. James Plumb;

H. R. 4512. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4997. An act for the relief of Ernest I. Wade and Alma Wade;

H. R. 5071. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Foster;

H. R. 5208. An act for the relief of Michael J. Keaveney and Mary C. Keaveney;

H. R. 5356. An act to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a Naval Establishment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5641. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the National

Convention of the United Spanish War Veterans to be held in Milwaukee, Wis., August 4 to 10, inclusive, 1946; and

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of atomic weapons upon such vessels.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 33. An act relating to the management and administration of national forest grazing lands;

S. 115. An act to modify sections 4 and 20 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, with reference to certain funds collected in connection with the operation of Indian Service irrigation projects, and for other purposes;

S. 141. An act to clarify the law relating to the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania;

S. 178. An act to amend sections 9 and 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended;

S. 190. An act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions; to establish the National Institute of Dental Research; and for other purposes;

S. 437. An act for the relief of W. S. Burleson;

S. 706. An act to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to increase the limit of amounts payable thereunder in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans;

S. 884. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Patuxent Development Co., Inc.;

S. 1074. An act designating American Indian Day;

S. 1150. An act for the relief of John Leberman;

S. 1161. An act authorizing the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain space in the Jackson (Miss.) City Hall;

S. 1198. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain property in the State of Michigan now occupied by the Weather Bureau and to acquire land in the State of Michigan for the erection of a Weather Bureau station;

S. 1235. An act to authorize the use of the funds of any tribe of Indians for insurance premiums;

S. 1236. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of oil and gas on the public domain, and for other purposes;

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Lofts & Son;

S. 1547. An act to provide for the disposition of vessels, trophies, relics, and material of historical interest by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1564. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Shadrick Ponca;

S. 1566. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Wilma Brandon Irving;

S. 1578. An act to clarify the terms "compensation" and "pension" under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

S. 1640. An act to provide for the acquisition by the United States of certain real property in the District of Columbia;

S. 1672. An act to authorize the transfer to the Department of the Interior of surplus lands, improvements, equipment, and other property of Federal agencies on reclamation projects for the settlement and employment of veterans and for other purposes; and

S. 2041. An act to amend the act of May 28, 1896, as amended, relating to the appointment of assistant United States attorneys.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1654. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PEPPER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. HAWKES, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6429. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. REED, and Mr. FURGUSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6601. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSION TO ATTEND PHILIPPINES CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 414, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission to represent the United States at the ceremonies to be held at Manila on July 4, 1946, the celebration of the independence of the Philippines, and to make and carry out appropriate plans for United States participation in such ceremonies, the following Members of the House: Mr. BELL, of Missouri; Mr. ROBINSON, of Utah; Mr. FERNANDEZ, of New Mexico; Mr. DOMENGEAUX, of Louisiana; Mr. CRAWFORD, of Michigan; and Mr. LECOMPTE, of Iowa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRAYNOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. BUNKER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to the President.

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article on the Mariners' Museum.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM F. ALLEN

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, William F. Allen, former member of the House in the Seventy-fifth Congress from the State of Delaware, affectionately known as "Bill" to his many friends in Delaware, passed to his eternal rest on Friday, June 14, 1946.

Mr. Allen who was long active in Democratic politics served with honor and distinction in the State Senate of Delaware for two terms in 1925 and 1927 and was president pro tempore, during his second term. In 1920 he was a delegate to the Democratic convention in San Francisco.

Mr. Allen as a young man was a railroad worker, later a wholesale produce broker and founder of the Allen Oil Co., wholesale distributors of gasoline and oil. At the time of his death he served as chairman of the Pure Oil Products Corp. of Seaford, Del.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STARKEY], may be excused until next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SHOWING OF FILM OF ATOMIC BOMB STRIKE ON NAGASAKI

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon at 3 o'clock the War Department will show the official films displaying the atomic-bomb strike at Nagasaki and Hiroshima in the Military Affairs Committee room of the New House Office Building, Room 1310. Every Member of Congress is cordially invited to come and see this.

Within the next few days we are going to be faced with consideration of Senate bill 1717 or a similar House bill. It would be wonderful information for

every Member to have to see the official films of what these two bombs did in Japan. The films will be shown at 3 o'clock this afternoon.

STRATEGIC STOCK-PILE BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT RECOMMITTED

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on the bill S. 752, an act to amend the act of June 7, 1939, as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes, be recommitted to the conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech delivered by himself.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each an editorial.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frank M. Smith, appearing in the Times-Herald of today, the article pointing out one of the important issues confronting the farmers at this time.

Mr. BUFFETT (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a newspaper editorial and a newspaper article.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and newspaper item, and in the other to include correspondence and other material.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANDIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FARMERS COMPELLED TO SELL WHEAT ARE ENTITLED TO HAVE THE PRICE PROTECTED

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has recently issued an order whereby farmers who store their wheat in commercial elevators, are required to sell 50 percent of it. One-half of the amount sold is purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the remainder goes for commercial uses. The Government pays ceiling price for its share of the wheat.

The proposition works out so that a farmer who does not have wheat storage on the farm, is required to sell half of his wheat whether he wants to or not and he must take the price fixed by the Government. In other words, he must sell and must take the Government price. Of course, if he has storage of his own, he can sell his wheat when he chooses to do so.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the demand that farmers sell their wheat to take care of immediate allocations abroad and requirements in this country, it is only fair that the farmer who sells his wheat under these conditions shall be protected in the event of a change in price during the next year.

I have today requested the Secretary of Agriculture to make provision for the issuance of certificates of purchase to farmers who sell their wheat under these conditions and the farmer be allowed to cash such certificates at any time he chooses to do so during the period of a year and whereby they may receive the market price of the wheat at the time such certificates are cashed. The certificates, of course, can be handled through the local banks.

Mr. Speaker, my proposal is fair and equitable and I hope the Department of Agriculture and other agencies of Government dealing with this problem will see fit to accept it immediately.

STOCK PILE OF STRATEGIC RAW MATERIALS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky asked to have a bill re-referred to the committee a few moments ago which is of great importance to everybody. He has just assured me the bill is being referred back to the committee for a correction and not for substantial change. This bill has to do with the stock piling or the accumulation of war materials.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, my section of the country has to do with the mining of iron ore. Most of the iron ore that went into the production of war materials during World War II came from the little district that I have the honor to represent in northern Minnesota.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, relates to the stock piling of strategic materials that would be necessary in wartime.

During the last two wars the rich deposits of iron ore in my district have been heavily depleted. In the interest of national defense the citizens of northern Minnesota feel that the present supply of high-grade iron ore should be considered as strategic war material. They believe that a sufficient amount ought to be mined now and stock piled or stored in reserve in the event that our Nation should ever be threatened in another war.

A delegation of the mayors of different towns and villages in northern Minnesota are in Washington for the purpose of conferring with Government officials regarding the problem of stock piling the iron ore for emergency purposes. They have asked me to arrange for them to meet Members of Congress who are interested in the strategic war-material legislation, and I have arranged a conference with them and with my colleagues for Wednesday morning at 10 a. m. in the committee room of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives. We shall be glad to have those of you who are interested meet us at that time and get acquainted with the visiting mayors who have a message dealing with this problem which will appeal to all of you.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENKINS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HEARINGS OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, a year ago I introduced House Resolution 197 to open the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations to Members of Congress, which resolution I have not pressed. Incidentally, the opening of these hearings is recommended by the congressional reorganization plan.

This morning I learned that the Committee on Appropriations was holding a hearing on a three-quarters of a billion dollar appropriation for the War Assets Administration, and as chairman of the special committee investigating that agency, I asked permission to attend and was refused. My reason in asking permission to attend was that I wanted to hear that evidence from an agency that last month sold $40,000,000 worth of material and spent $35,000,000 doing it.

I serve notice here and now that at the next meeting of the Committee on Rules I shall press my resolution to open the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations to the Members of Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Henry J. Taylor over the radio entitled "Courage Versus Opportunism."

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one two editorials, and in the other an address which he delivered.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from Gov. Earl Warren, of California.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the request of several of my constituents I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered in Chicago by Robert R. Watson. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $150, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and to include excerpts in each.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in yesterday's Post.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a table of veterans' benefits.

PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENNINGS] inform the House a few minutes ago that he had been instructed by the Republican National Committee to obtain certain information. Invariably, the Republican National Committee seems to obtain official information before we hear it in the House. I wonder what information they possibly can be seeking? Surely it cannot be in regard to anything which the Republicans, as a national party, have ever done to help the farmer, because that is one thing the Republican Party has never been successfully accused of. The only national party which has ever done anything for farmers is the Democratic Party.

But some of the representatives of farm organizations are not satisfied with what has been done in the past, nor with the high prices farm products are getting now. They forget the days when cotton was 6 cents a pound and corn was burned as fuel because the price would not return the cost of production; and these representatives continue to urge and demand still higher prices notwithstanding that the cost of living has gone up in the last few years nearly 60 percent. I was amazed when I learned that they have forced the Food Administration to boost the price of butter another 11 cents; to boost the price of milk; to boost the price of imitation cheeses.

HOW WILL PEOPLE LIVE?

I want to know, Mr. Speaker, how far this sort of thing can and will go, especially if OPA is mangled, emasculated, stripped of its powers to control runaway prices? I actually believe, Mr. Speaker, that without a strong price-control policy to act as a brake on rising food costs, and other essential costs of living, prices will shoot up with startling rapidity 15 percent, 20 percent, 25 percent, perhaps more.

How can people live then who have small fixed salaries—white-collar workers, wage earners, annuitants, pensioners? How will they exist?

PROSPEROUS FARMS ARE FACTORIES

I know there will be some to say that the poor farmer works from dawn to dark and gets no return. I have been a farmer. I know that farmers do work hard. But skyrocketing consumers' prices will not help the poor tenant farmer who needs help; it will benefit only temporarily the prosperous farmer who is really a businessman, an industrialist, with modern machinery and implements, balanced fertilizers, power from REA cooperatives in his barnyard, motorized plows and harrows and discs and harvesters.

Once more I repeat—I want farmers to receive an adequate return on the products of their toil and investment. I want no man to slave for nothing. I want good prices on farm products. But I do not want to see prices so high people cannot pay them. I admit that some Representatives from strong agricultural districts have voted against extension of the Price Control Act; I realize that for a little time farmers will get a still better return for their products, even after the middlemen have taken their cut; but if this dizzy spiral of price increases continues there is bound to be another crash as in 1930 under Hoover.

REPUBLICANS WILL BE RESPONSIBLE

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that that is what the Republican National Committee and the Republicans generally are going to be responsible for. They do not realize that if the cost of living goes up and up and up, wage earners and salary earners will be obliged to demand higher and higher and higher wages in order to live. Reports from Government departments show that great corporations have salted away millions upon millions of dollars in cash; they can ride out a depression and they will refuse to raise wages, so there will be more strikes.

You are trying to make the farmer believe you are helping him, but you may be digging a pitfall for him. Personally, I am willing that you have all the information you desire; I only hope it will be made public without distortion.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, whenever the farmers of this country have to depend on the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] for their prosperity, God save the country. The cotton farmer gets 1 cent an hour for every cent a pound he gets for his lint cotton. Today he is toiling in the hot sun, fighting the boll weevil and the vicissitudes of nature, for 29 cents an hour, while men are striking all over the country who are drawing as much as two or three dollars an hour or more.

I am not in favor of letting the OPA get back onto the neck of the American farmers. Let farm commodities rise to their normal level and stop trying to penalize the people who till the soil. Let cotton, wheat, corn, and other farm products rise to the normal levels justified by existing conditions, and let the farmers of the Nation enjoy some real prosperity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. SABATH from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 668, Rept. No. 2292), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6597) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Flood Control, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Alien Property Custodian on proceedings had under the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ending June 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 15, 1946.*

JOHN G. JOHNSON—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 2579, an act for the relief of John G. Johnson.

The purpose of the bill is to pay the sum of $509.15 in satisfaction of all claims against the United States incident to the packing, storage, and removal of household effects in connection with his change of official station from Washington, D. C., to Chicago, Ill.

The change of station in this case was effected because of the removal of the headquarters office of the Railroad Retirement Board from Washington to Chicago pursuant to the decentralization plan of the President. In order to defray the expenses of the individual employees so transferred, allotments were made from the emergency fund of the President. The letters of allotment in all cases of decentralization limited the weight of household effects which an employee might transport at Government expense to 7,000 pounds. The shipment in Mr. Johnson's case weighed 14,710 pounds—which involved an excess weight of 7,710 pounds—and he was required to refund the proportionate cost of shipping the excess weight, which amounted to $509.15.

All other employees similarly involved who shipped household effects in excess of the authorized weight likewise were required to pay the excess cost, and no reason is apparent for singling out this individual for special consideration.

In view of the above, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 15, 1946.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—CHARLES B. BORELL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

There is returned herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4716, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "An act for the relief of Charles B. Borell."

The purpose of the bill is to propose payment to Charles B. Borell, of Champlain, N. Y., of the sum of $163.20 as reimbursement of the cost of shipping his household effects from Belfast, Ireland, to New York, N. Y., December 27, 1930, in connection with his transfer from Belfast to Washington, D. C. The shipment was accomplished on a vessel not registered under the laws of the United States, in contravention of the requirements of section 601 of the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 697), that any officer or employee of the United States traveling overseas should travel and transport his personal effects on vessels registered under the laws of the United States. The only reason advanced for the failure to make use of an American vessel is the unsatisfactory statement in a report submitted by the Attorney General that Mr. Borell attempted to secure a copy of the Standardized Government Travel Regulations from his supervisor but that he was unable to furnish him a copy.

The act of May 22, 1928, is a public law, and all citizens of the United States are chargeable with notice of its provisions. Furthermore, the travel orders issued to Mr. Borell directed specifically his return to the United States "via a vessel of American registry." The act of May 22, 1928, also provides the conditions under which failure to comply with its provisions may be excused by directing that "the Comptroller General of the United States shall not credit any allowance for travel or shipping expenses incurred on a foreign ship in the absence of satisfactory proof of the necessity therefor." I am informed that the records of the General Accounting Office do not reflect that any action was taken by Mr. Borell to submit to the Comptroller General of the United States "satisfactory proof of the necessity," for the use of a foreign vessel in the transportation of his household effects; that nothing is indicated otherwise as to any such necessity; that the liability of the United States for the freight charges in this case amounting to $130 was denied by the Comptroller General when the matter was presented to his office for preaudit in January 1931; and that the additional amount claimed, $33.20, as reimbursement for storage, brokerage, and cartage, also was denied for the reason that such charges would not have been necessary had the shipment been made on an American vessel.

The claim for the amount stated in this enactment again was presented to the General Accounting Office in December 1944, nearly 14 years later, but was returned to the claimant with the information that consideration thereof was barred by the 10-year statute of limitations. To single out this individual for relief over others similarly involved who have not been so relieved would not only be an unfair discrimination against them but would furnish, also, a precedent for relief in all other similar cases, thus nullifying, in effect, the provisions of section 601 of the act of May 22, 1928.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

JUNE 15, 1946.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the message and accompanying bill are referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the able pen of Blair Moody, Washington correspondent of the Detroit News, under date of June 16, entitled "Labor Warned To Clean House."

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar (H. R. 4435) to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

RAILROAD REORGANIZATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5924) to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without

further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ENLISTMENTS FOR DUTY AT LIFEBOAT STATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6219) to authorize the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to accept enlistments of certain individuals for duty at lifeboat stations during the year 1946.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 8 (A) OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6459) to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when this bill was called 2 weeks ago I asked some questions and the committee did not give me any answer. Is there anyone present who can answer those questions now?

Mr. PACE. I will be glad to try to do so.

Mr. KEAN. This bill provides that reasonable opportunity be given to the States to change the law. I note that the bill was originally passed in 1936. Ten years have passed. I just wonder how long a reasonable opportunity should be.

Mr. PACE. When the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act was originally enacted, it was contemplated it might ultimately become administered by the States. It has proven to be impracticable for each individual State to have a separate program. The act should, in my judgment, be rewritten and the State feature taken out. It has been the policy of the committee and the Congress simply to continue the provision of temporary Federal administration of the program for the time being. This bill simply further extends the over-all program by Federal administration rather than directing it to be done by the States, which I am sure is impractical and which the States have not agreed to assume. In my judgment, this is the finest program for the farmer—soil conservation and soil rebuilding—but I do agree with the gentleman that we should meet the issue and either give it to the States or take the States out of the picture, which the committee will try to do.

Mr. KEAN. I thank the gentleman for the information, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 (a), as amended, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. IV, title 16, sec. 590h (a)) is amended (a) by striking out "January 1, 1947" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1949", and (b) striking out "December 31, 1946" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1948."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN WARD COUNTY, N. DAK., TO THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1336) to transfer certain real and personal property in Ward County, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota acting by and through the Industrial Commission of North Dakota.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon the written consent of the majority of directors of North Dakota Rural Rehabilitation Corp., the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to transfer and to cause to be transferred forthwith to the State of North Dakota, acting by and through the Industrial Commission of North Dakota, all right, title, claim, and estate in and to all real and personal property in Ward County, N. Dak., known as the Burlington farmstead and coal-mine project, and which said properties were transferred by North Dakota Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, in trust to the United States of America acting by and through the Secretary of Agriculture, by transfer agreement dated June 25, 1937, and which said properties have been subject to administration by the Secretary as trustee under such agreement. Such transfer by the Secretary of Agriculture shall be subject to any legal rights existing by virtue of any lease or other agreement by the Secretary, his successors or representatives as such trustee, to use such properties or any proceed received therefrom wholly for rural rehabilitation.

SEC. 2. The transfer of the real and personal property under this Act is hereby found to be in the general interest of rural rehabilitation and particularly in the rehabilitation of disabled veterans of the United States, and dependent members of their families, resident in North Dakota, and shall not be deemed to impose any liability upon the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to his obligations under such agreement of transfer of June 25, 1937.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF DAMS FOR HIGHWAY BRIDGES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6324) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to provide for the design and construction of dams so that they will serve as foundations for highway bridges, to provide for the design and construction of highway bridges upon and across such dams, to authorize the granting of easements and rights-of-way in connection therewith, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter each executive department, independent establishment, office, board, bureau, commission, authority, administration, corporation wholly owned or controlled by the United States, or other agency of the Government of the United States, hereinafter collectively and individually referred to as "agency", now or hereafter having jurisdiction over and custody of any dam constructed or to be constructed and owned by or for the United States, shall be, and is hereby, authorized, with any funds available to it, to design and construct any such dam in such manner that it will constitute and serve as a suitable and adequate foundation to support a public highway bridge upon and across such dam, and to design and construct upon the foundation thus provided a public highway bridge upon and across such dam: *Provided*, That the highway department of the State in which such dam shall be located jointly with the United States Commissioner of Public Roads shall first determine and certify to such agency that such bridge is economically desirable and needed as a link in the State, or Federal-aid highway systems, and shall request such agency to design and construct such dam so that it will serve as a suitable and adequate foundation for a public highway bridge and to design and construct such public highway bridge upon and across such dam, and shall agree to reimburse such agency pursuant to section 4 hereof for any additional costs which it may be required to incur because of the design and construction of such dam so that it will serve as a foundation for a public highway bridge and for any expenditures which it may find necessary to make in designing and constructing such public highway bridge upon and across such dam: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the design and construction of a bridge upon and across any such dam be undertaken hereunder except by the agency having jurisdiction over and custody of the dam, acting directly or through contractors employed by it, and after such agency shall determine that it will be structurally feasible and will not interfere with the proper functioning and operation of the dam.

SEC. 2. Construction of any bridge upon and across any dam pursuant to this act shall not be commenced unless and until the State in which such bridge is to be located, or the appropriate subdivision of such State, shall enter into an agreement with such agency and with the Commissioner of Public Roads to construct, or cause to be constructed, with or without the aid of Federal funds, the approach roads necessary to connect such bridge with existing public highways and to maintain, or cause to be maintained, such approach roads from and after their completion. Such agreement may also provide for the design and construction of such bridge upon and across the dam by such agency of the United States and for reimbursing such agency the costs incurred by it in the design and construction of the bridge as provided in section 4 hereof. Any such agency is hereby authorized to convey to the State, or to the appropriate subdivision thereof, without cost, such easements and rights-of-way in its custody or over lands of the United States in its custody and control as may be necessary, convenient, or proper for the location, construction, and maintenance of the approach roads referred to in this section, including such roadside parks or recreational areas of limited size as may be deemed necessary

for the accommodation of the traveling public. Any bridge constructed pursuant to this act upon and across a dam in the custody and jurisdiction of any agency of the United States, including such portion thereof, if any, as may extend beyond the physical limits of the dam, shall constitute and remain a part of said dam and be maintained by the agency: *Provided, however,* That any such agency may enter into any such contracts and agreements with the State or its subdivisions respecting public use of any bridge so located and constructed as may be deemed appropriate, but no such bridge shall be closed to public use by the agency except in cases of emergency or when deemed necessary in the interest of national security.

SEC. 3. All costs and expenses incurred and expenditures made by any agency in the exercise of the powers and authority conferred by this act (but not including any costs, expenses, or expenditures which would have been required in any event to satisfy a legal road or bridge relocation obligation or to meet operating or other agency needs) shall be recorded and kept separate and apart from the other costs, expenses, and expenditures of such agency, and no portion thereof shall be charged or allocated to flood control, navigation, irrigation, fertilizer production, the national defense, the development of power, or other program, purpose, or function of such agency.

SEC. 4. Not to exceed $10,000,000 of any money heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented, shall be available for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads in accordance with the provisions of this act, as an emergency fund, to reimburse any agency for any additional costs or expenditures which it may be required to incur because of the design and construction of any such dam so that it will constitute and serve as a foundation for a public highway bridge upon and across such dam and to reimburse any such agency for any costs, expenses, or expenditures which it may be required to make in designing and constructing any such bridge upon and across a dam in accordance with the provisions of this act, except such costs, expenses, or expenditures as would have been required of such agency in any event to satisfy a legal obligation to relocate a highway or bridge or to meet operating or other agency needs, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated any sum or sums necessary to reimburse the funds so expended by the Commissioner of Public Roads from time to time under the authority of this section. Of each bridge constructed upon and across a dam under the provisions of this act, there may be financed wholly with Federal funds that portion thereof which is located within the physical limits of the masonry structure, or structures, of the dam, and the Commissioner of Public Roads shall in his sole discretion determine what additional portion of the bridge, if any, may be so financed, such determination to be final and conclusive. The remainder of the bridge, and any necessary related approach roads, shall be financed by the State or its appropriate subdivision, with or without the aid of Federal funds; but said portion of the bridge so financed by the State or its subdivisions, including such portion thereof, if any, as may extend beyond the physical limits of the dam shall, nevertheless, be designed and constructed solely by the agency having custody and jurisdiction of the dam as provided in section 1 hereof.

SEC. 5. In making, reviewing, or approving the design of any bridge or approach structure to be constructed under this act the agency shall, in matters relating to roadway design, loadings, clearances and widths, and traffic safeguards, give full consideration to and be guided by the standards and advice of the Public Roads Administration.

SEC. 6. The authority conferred by this act shall be in addition to and not in limitation of authority conferred upon any agency by any other law, and nothing in this act contained shall affect or be deemed to relate to any bridge, approach structure, or highway constructed or to be constructed by any such agency in furtherance of its lawful purposes and requirements or to satisfy a legal obligation incurred independently of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 16, strike out the word "local."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I hope that no objection will be made to the passage of this bill. It is definitely in the public interest. The proposals have been considered for many, many months by representatives of the various agencies and by the Roads Committee of the House. After many conferences all of the agencies are in agreement on the provisions of this measure and they join in asking that Congress enact it into law.

The bill has been fully considered by the Roads Committee and the report of that committee is unanimous in recommending its passage. The proposal of the bill is to establish a national policy so as to have the Public Roads Administration, the State highway commissioner in the State involved, and the agency which may build a dam, cooperate in planning before a dam is built—whether it might be advisable and in the public interest to construct the dam so as to permit a road to be built over it. Dams have been and will be built by the Corps of Engineers, the Interior Department through its Reclamation Division, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. In the future, of course, other dams may be built by other governmental agencies. If a dam is to be built, it would certainly be logical to consider whether the system of roads around the dam would require a road to be built over it. If a road over the dam would fit into the highway scheme of the Federal Government, the State, or the county, the road should be built if it is feasible. This, of course, would save money as it is cheaper to build a road on a dam than to build a separate bridge.

This bill has nothing to do, whatsoever, with the existing requirement placed upon governmental agencies such as the TVA, Corps of Engineers, and the Interior Department to maintain existing highway connections. That is a constitutional requirement. In the case of TVA, for instance, they would be required to build a road over a dam or to maintain a ferry if their work interfered with an existing highway system, or if in the operation of the dam a road over it was necessary. But the TVA—and the same applies to the Corps of Engineers and Interior Department—is not required to consider the future needs of the situation; that is, they do not have to look into the question of whether a road might, in a year or two, be highly desirable over a dam from the highway viewpoint.

Under the provisions of this bill, a corps of engineers would be authorized to build a bridge or road across an existing dam where it was found by the Public Roads Administrator and the highway commissioner of the State that the bridge or road is desirable and essential in the Federal or State road system. The bill also provides that the agency which operates the dam must certify that the building of the bridge or road is economically feasible. No one, of course, would want to have the road or bridge built if it would damage or interfere with the operation of the dam in a material way.

The bill provides that the Federal Government will bear the cost of the bridge or road immediately above the dam. The State or local community will share in the payment of the balance of the structure and will also provide rights-of-way.

In my district there are two dams—Chickamauga near Chattanooga and Watts Bar, which is between Spring City and Decatur—which should have had bridges constructed on them at the time the dams were built. Had this measure been the law it would have required the TVA, Public Roads Administration, and the State highway commissioner to have a conference and determine whether bridges over these dams would fit into and be necessary parts of a State or Federal highway system. In both cases they would have found bridges were necessary.

Mr. Thomas H. McDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads Administration, has stated to me that he felt that bridges should have been built over these dams and that they would be under this bill. Now that the dams have been built, upon passage of this measure it will be the duty of the TVA, Public Roads Administration, and State highway commissioner to consider whether bridges over these dams would be a desirable link in a State or Federal highway system. Mr. McDonald has stated to me that, insofar as he is concerned, he thinks they do constitute necessary links.

The same consideration, of course, will be given to bridges throughout the country. This is not a local measure in any sense of the word, but establishes a national policy which is in the public interest and which will save money for the Government.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to emphasize the remarks made on this bill by my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

He and I, as well as a great many other Members of Congress in both Houses the Nation over, are interested in the passage of this bill, H. R. 6324, which has finally been worked out with the counsel of many of the experts who have dealt respectively with Government dams and Federal aid highways. It is thought that the bill is fair, sound, wise, and in the public interest.

We all join in urging the enactment into law of this excellent bill and its approval by the President.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM PERSONAL INJURY OR DEATH CAUSED BY MILITARY PERSONNEL OR CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6454) amending the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; 31 U. S. C. 223B), entitled "An act to provide for settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities of the War Department or of the Army."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, this legislation continues during peacetime the amendment to the law that we passed during wartime authorizing the War Department to settle claims up to $1,000.

If we do not pass this bill we shall have hundreds and hundreds of small private claims coming in here. This is a departmental bill. It is an amendment to a law which was requested by the War Department and which was reported out of the Claims Committee 2 or 3 years ago and passed. It is a permanent extension of the time so they can settle claims while the war is technically going on and while the Army is still busy getting those claims. That briefly is the effect of the bill. It is a bill in the interest of expediting the handling of public business.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand the gentleman's statement, it does not permit the settlement of claims in excess of $1,000?

Mr. PITTENGER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In other words, if a claim is in excess of $1,000 it must come to the Claims Committee.

Mr. PITTENGER. It would still have to come to the Claims Committee and to Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does this permit the War Department to settle personal injury claims as well as property damage?

Mr. PITTENGER. That is my understanding; I am sure that is correct.

As I have indicated, this bill came from the Departments. The War Department asked for it, the Navy Department also favored it, and the Bureau of the Budget has no objections to these amendments.

This legislation makes permanent in peacetime temporary legislation which was intended to help out the War Department while the war was in progress. There can be no real objections to the passage of this bill, because it will help in the payment of claims against the Government, and at the same time decrease the volume of work by the Claims Committee and by Congress in the passage of legislation involving small claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; 31 U. S. C. 223b), as amended by the act of May 29, 1945 (Public Law 67, 79th Cong.), be, and it is hereby, further amended by striking out the figures and words "$500, or in time of war not in excess of" as they appear in the first sentence thereof, and by striking out the figures and words "$500, or in time of war $1,000," as they appear in the last sentence of said section and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000."

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 1 of this act shall be applicable to section 1 of the act of December 28, 1945 (Public Law 277, 79th Cong.).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

METHOD OF PAYMENT OF OVERTIME, LEAVE, AND HOLIDAY COMPENSATION IN CERTAIN DEPARTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6532) to provide a method for payment in certain Government establishments of overtime, leave, and holiday compensation on the basis of night rates pursuant to certain decisions of the Comptroller General, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all claims by employees or former employees of the United States for overtime, leave, and holiday compensation based upon the difference between amounts heretofore received by such employees for overtime, leave, and holiday compensation computed at day rates and such compensation computed at night rates pursuant to decisions of the Comptroller General of the United States (23 Comp. Gen. 962; 24 Comp. Gen. 39, 155, 189, 550, 867), shall be paid by the appropriate disbursing officers for the department or agency under which such compensation was earned: *Provided*, That claims for amounts due deceased persons or persons determined to be mentally incompetent shall be settled in the General Accounting Office.

SEC. 2. The heads of the departments and agencies concerned, or such subordinates as they may designate, are hereby authorized and directed to certify to the proper disbursing officer or to the General Accounting Office, as may be appropriate, the amount found to be due under any claim authorized to be paid by section 1 of this act. Payments made pursuant to certifications hereby authorized shall, in the absence of fraud, be final and conclusive.

SEC. 3. (a) No amount shall be certified for payment under section 2 of this act on account of any compensation earned prior to March 28, 1934, and this act shall not apply with respect to any claim for compensation earned subsequent to the date of approval thereof.

(b) No amount shall be certified for payment under section 2 of this act unless application shall have been submitted in writing, prior to the expiration of 2 years after the date of approval of this act, over the signature of the person performing the service: *Provided*, That claims of deceased persons or persons determined to be mentally incompetent may be submitted by their heirs or personal representatives.

(c) Except as otherwise provided in this section, no claim submitted in accordance with the terms of this act for compensation earned between the dates specified in subsection (a) of this section shall be barred by any statute of limitations.

SEC. 4. Any amount certified for payment under section 2 of this act shall be paid without deduction for retirement or withholding of any amount for taxes.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for payment of amounts certified under this act.

SEC. 6. The heads of the departments and agencies concerned, including the Comptroller General of the United States, are hereby authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act in their respective agencies.

With the following committee amendment:

: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSTRUCTION AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY OF 20 PERSONS FROM THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1288) to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to permit, upon designation of the President of the United States, not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics (other than the United States) to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y. Not more than three persons from any one of such republics shall receive instruction under authority of this act at the same time. The persons receiving instruction under authority of this act shall receive the same pay, allowances, and emoluments, to be paid from the same appropriations, as cadets at the United States Military Academy appointed from the United States, except that the mileage allowance payable to such persons for travel performed in proceeding to the United States Military Academy for initial admission shall not be limited to mileage for travel within the continental limits of the United States. Such persons shall, except as may be determined by the Secretary of War, be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as cadets at the United States Military Academy appointed from the United States, but they shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States Army by reason of their graduation from the United States Military Academy: *Provided*, That any persons permitted to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy under authority of this act shall not be subject to the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. After the date of enactment of this act, no person shall have authority to permit citizens of the American Republics to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to permit citizens of the American Republics to receive instruction at professional educational institutions and schools maintained and administered by the Government of the United States or by departments or agencies thereof," approved June 24, 1938 (52

Stat. 1034). Any person who is receiving instruction at the United States Military Academy on such date of enactment under authority of such act of June 24, 1938, may, in the discretion of the President, be permitted to continue to receive such instruction and, if so permitted, shall thereafter be deemed to be receiving instruction under the provisions of section 1 of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO GOVERN THE DISTRIBUTION OF WAR TROPHIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5915) to govern the distribution of war trophies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DECORATION FOR ACTS PERFORMED DURING THE PRESENT WAR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1523) to modify the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations prescribed by the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 845, 871), and the act of August 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 743, 744), with respect to the time within which the Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Navy Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Silver Star Medal, Navy and Marine Corps Medal, and devices in lieu thereof, may be issued and the time within which statements or reports suggesting or recommending such awards may be made shall not apply to any case in which (1) the act or service justifying the award was performed during the period commencing December 7, 1941, and ending with the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war and (2) the recommendation for official recognition of such act or service was initiated not later than 6 months after the latter date. The term "date of the termination of hostilities in the present war" means the date proclaimed by the President as the date of such termination or the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such termination, whichever is earlier.

GLACIER NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1273) to provide for the acquisition by exchange of non-Federal property within the Glacier National Park.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept title to any non-Federal lands, interests in lands, buildings, or other property, real or personal, within the authorized boundaries of the Glacier National Park, as now or hereafter established, when the acquisition by exchange of such property would, in his judgment, be in the best interests of the United States. In exchange for the non-Federal property so to be acquired, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the grantors of such property, or to their nominees, any federally owned lands, interests in lands, buildings, or other property, real or personal, within the authorized boundaries of the Glacier National Park, located in the State of Montana and administered by the National Park Service, which are of approximately equal value, as determined by the Secretary, to the property being acquired. In order to facilitate the making of such exchanges, the Secretary of the Interior may enter into agreements for the reservation in conveyances to the United States, or for the grant in conveyances from the United States, of such estates for years, life estates, or other interests as may be consistent, in his judgment, with the accomplishment of the purposes of this act, but all such limitations shall be considered in determining the equality of the interests to be exchanged.

SEC. 2. The title to all lands, interests in lands, buildings, or other property to be acquired pursuant to this act shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior. Any property acquired pursuant to this act shall, upon acceptance of title thereto, become a part of the Glacier National Park, and shall be subject to all laws applicable to such area. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1857) to authorize the availability for certain necessary administrative expenses of appropriations for the Department of the Interior.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That appropriations for field work of the Department of the Interior shall be available for the hire, with or without personal services, of boats, work animals, and animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles and equipment.

SEC. 2. Appropriations for contingent expenses of the Department of the Interior shall be available, to the extent specified therein, for the payment of damages to private property (not to exceed $500 in any one case) caused by the negligent operation of motor vehicles under such appropriations.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the act of February 22, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., ch. 15A), is authorized to cooperate with Federal and State authorities.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING AN EXCHANGE OF LAND IN EAGLE COUNTY, COLO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5840) to authorize an exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, is hereby authorized to accept on behalf of the United States title to the hereinafter-described lands, to wit: Beginning at corner numbered 3 of tract 45, which is also corner numbered 4 of tract 46 D of section 5, township 5 south, range 84 west, sixth principal meridian; thence north eighty-seven degrees forty-one minutes east a distance of two and one one-hundredths chains; thence north one degree forty-eight minutes east a distance of four and sixty-one one-hundredths chains; thence east a distance of one and sixty-six one-hundredths chains; thence south one degree forty-eight minutes west a distance of twenty-four and thirty-six one-hundredths chains; thence south eighty-seven degrees fifty-one minutes west a distance of three and sixty-seven one-hundredths chains to corner numbered 7 of tract 47 and corner numbered 2 of tract 48, said section 5; thence north one degree forty-eight minutes east nineteen and seventy-five one-hundredths chains to point of beginning, situate in Eagle County, Colo., and containing approximately 8 acres, and to issue to the persons conveying said lands a patent to lands of the United States described as follows: Lots 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 of section 31, township 3 south, range 84 west, sixth principal meridian, being in Eagle County, Colo., and containing approximately one hundred and forty-four and forty-two one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 2. That title may be accepted or patent issued subject to reservations or exceptions of minerals, timber, or easements and that the survey of the tract to be conveyed to the United States shall be by and at the expense of the United States.

SEC. 3. That upon acceptance of title thereto the lands conveyed to the United States shall be used and administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with the protection and management of the White River National Forest and shall be subject to the rules and regulations applicable to said national forest.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING FURTHER THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3492) to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 17 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, is further amended by changing the final period to a semicolon and adding thereto the following: "nor shall there be any withholding or recovery of any moneys mentioned in this act on account of any certification or payment made by any former officer or employee of the United States in the discharge of his official duties unless the head of the department or agency on behalf of which the certification or payment was made certifies to the Civil Service Commission that such certification or payment involved a fraud on the part of such officer or employee."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 6 OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4651) to amend section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third paragraph of section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"If a recovered disability annuitant whose annuity is discontinued subsequent to June 30, 1945, shall fail to obtain reemployment

through no fault of his own in any position included in the provisions of this act, he shall be considered as having been involuntarily separated from the service within the meaning of section 7 of this act as of the date he was retired for disability and shall, after the discontinuance of the disability annuity, be entitled to an annuity in accordance with the provisions of such section, computed at the attained age at the date of discontinuance of the disability annuity."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "shall" insert "after due diligence on his part."

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "through no fault of his own."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETTING ASIDE CERTAIN LANDS FOR THE KIOWA, COMANCHE, AND APACHE INDIAN RESERVATION, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1043) to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma in trust for the Indians of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described lands are hereby eliminated from the Rainy Mountain School Reserve in Oklahoma and title is hereby vested in the United States in trust for the Indians of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian Reservation: South half and northwest quarters of section 13; all of section 14; south half and northeast quarter of section 23; and west half of section 24; township 6 north, range 16 west, of the Indian meridian, Oklahoma, containing 1,920 acres.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUSTMENTS—CROW IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4983) to provide for adjustments in connection with the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (1) notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the aggregate charge for all expenditures which have been made for construction of the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., exclusive of the Willow Creek storage works, against all non-Indian-owned lands under the Crow irrigation project is hereby fixed at $45,000, which charge shall be the sole charge against these lands. The charge thus fixed shall cover all such expenditures, whatever their source, chargeable against such lands and includes expenditures from reimbursable and gratuity appropriations from the Treasury of the United States, and from moneys of the Crow Tribe whether or not the expenditures of such tribal moneys were specifically approved by the Indians in council.

(2) All non-Indian-owned lands under this project shall bear their pro rata share, computed on a per-acre basis, of the total charge fixed by this section, except that against the pro rata share chargeable to any particular tract there first shall be credited payments which have been already made on that tract to meet charges for reimbursable expenditures arising from the construction of such irrigation project. No credit in excess of such pro rata share, computed on a per-acre basis, shall be allowed. No refunds shall be made of amounts paid on any tract in excess of such pro rata share, computed on a per-acre basis. The first lien of the United States shall continue on each non-Indian-owned tract for repayment of the pro rata share, computed on a per-acre basis, against such tract less any credit allowable under this subsection. The word "tract" as used in this act shall mean a 40-acre legal subdivision or fraction thereof.

(3) Where the Secretary of the Interior finds that certain non-Indian-owned lands subject to the pro rata share of the costs dealt with in section 1, as well as Indian-owned lands within the irrigation project, cannot be put to immediate productive use due to a need of proper drainage facilities; need of clearing and leveling; need of additional project construction work; present unfavorable soil conditions which can be corrected at an economic cost, he shall declare such lands temporarily nonirrigable until such time as he shall determine such lands can be put to productive use, and no irrigation project charges shall be assessed against such lands during such periods. Upon application of the landowners the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to eliminate from the project 504⅘ acres of land located in sections 21, 27, and 28 of township 5 south, range 26 east, and in section 10 of township 1 north, range 33 east, described in the district engineer's report of November 29, 1945, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs on the conditions of the Crow Indian irrigation project.

(4) The cost of the necessary survey to determine the irrigable acreage of the project, made by the land designation committee, whose report was approved by the Secretary of the Interior in 1944, shall be reimbursed in a sum not to exceed $5,000 by the owners of project lands in Indian and non-Indian ownership. Such costs shall be reimbursed by the project landowners over a period not to exceed 3 years. During this period each year the per-acre annual operation and maintenance charge shall be increased in amount sufficient to insure the per-acre repayment of this cost.

(5) All obligations arising out of contracts heretofore entered into with the United States for the payment to the United States of construction charges in connection with this project are hereby canceled, and all lands heretofore covered by such contracts shall be subject to the provisions of subsections (1), (2), (3), and (4) of this section.

(6) The provisions of this section shall become operative only when the Secretary of the Interior shall determine that the contracts contemplated by section 3 have been entered into, and that the releases required by section 2 have been obtained.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall obtain releases of claims which non-Indians owning lands under the Crow irrigation project may have against the United States on account of the construction of the Crow irrigation project or the assessment or collection of construction or operation and maintenance charges in connection with the project.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior may enter into contracts with irrigation districts acting on behalf of all non-Indians owning land under the Crow irrigation project in which the irrigation districts shall agree to pay the charge of $45,000 fixed by subsection (1) of section 1. Such contracts shall provide for the payment of the aforesaid sum on a per-acre basis without interest over a 20-year period in equal annual installments, credits to be given in the amounts allowable under subsection (2) of said section 1; for the payment by the districts of the proportionate share chargeable to the lands within the districts of the annual cost of operation and maintenance of the project; and for a first lien on the lands within the districts in favor of the United States for the repayment of such construction and operation and maintenance charges.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior may enter into contracts with irrigation districts acting on behalf of all non-Indians owning lands under the Crow irrigation project on the Little Big Horn River watershed in which the irrigation districts shall agree to repay to the United States the proportionate share chargeable to the non-Indian lands within the districts of the reimbursable cost of construction of the Willow Creek storage works not to exceed $210,726. The contracts with the districts shall provide for delivery by the Secretary or his duly authorized representative to lands within the irrigation districts of the proper share of the waters stored by the Willow Creek storage works, for the repayment of such construction charges on a per-acre basis in equal annual installments over a 40-year period without interest, and for the payment on a per-acre basis of the proportionate share chargeable to the lands within the district of the cost of the annual operation and maintenance of the Willow Creek storage works. The contract shall provide that the United States shall have no lien on the lands included within the irrigation districts for the repayment of the share of the construction cost of the Willow Creek storage works to be paid by the irrigation districts under the contracts. In the event of the failure of the districts to fulfill their obligations of contracts with the United States before entire repayment of the construction charges shall have been completed under the contract, all unpaid portions of such construction charges shall again become charges against the lands within the districts and the United States shall again have a first lien on the lands for the repayment of such charges remaining unpaid. The contracts may provide that if during any year the operation of the Willow Creek storage works is so affected in any way, except by lack of adequate precipitation, that no delivery of storage waters can be made to lands within the irrigation districts, the payments by the districts of construction charges shall be suspended, and that upon resumption of operation the payment of annual construction charges shall also be resumed until the total charges fixed by the contracts shall have been paid. If the irrigation districts at any time shall fail to pay the construction or operation and maintenance charges as provided in the contracts, the Secretary of the Interior shall not deliver any stored waters from the Willow Creek storage works to lands within the districts until the districts shall have complied with the provisions of the contracts.

Until such time as the irrigation district or districts shall execute a contract as herein provided for, the lands within said district or districts shall not be liable for either the construction or operation and maintenance charges of the Willow Creek storage works, nor shall such lands be entitled to any benefits from said storage works, either by the direct use of the stored water or by substituted water, except as authorized by section 8 of this act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior may enter into contracts with non-Indians owning lands on the Little Big Horn River watershed under private ditches which have been constructed prior to the date of approval of this act, in which, on the same terms and conditions as are contained in the contracts entered into pursuant to section 4, such owners shall agree to the repayment of their proper proportionate share of the reimbursable cost of construction and the cost

of operation and maintenance of the Willow Creek storage works, and the Secretary shall agree to deliver water to their ditches. The covenants of each such contract shall run with the land, and the contract shall provide for a first lien in favor of the United States for the repayment of such construction and operation and maintenance charges. Each owner shall be privileged to pay in full at any time his pro rata share of the construction cost. The Secretary shall not enter into any contract pursuant to this section after 5 years have elapsed from the date of approval of this act. The Secretary shall also designate the Indian lands under private ditches to receive benefits provided for herein. The Indian lands thus designated shall be subject to provisions and conditions of the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564–565).

SEC. 6. The contracts entered into between the Secretary of the Interior and an irrigation district or districts, or with non-Indians owning lands under private ditches, in pursuance to sections 4 and 5, shall provide that the owners of the lands included in such contracts shall agree to pay annually to the United States for a period of 5 years beginning November 15 next following the date of approval of this act, $1 per acre for each irrigable acre covered by such contract or contracts, and shall further agree at the end of such 5-year period to pay thereafter their proportionate share of the total reimbursable cost of the construction of the Willow Creek storage works in the sum of $210,726. The Secretary of the Interior shall allow full credit to each landowner for all construction cost repayments applicable to the Willow Creek storage works, made to the United States during such 5-year period, and on behalf of all payments made pursuant to the temporary public notice of the Secretary of the Interior issued March 1, 1944.

SEC. 7. Water stored in the Willow Creek storage works shall be made available by the Secretary of the Interior only to the following lands on the Little Big Horn River watershed irrigable under irrigation works which have been constructed prior to the date of approval of this act; Indian-owned lands; non-Indian-owned lands within the irrigation districts referred to in section 4; those non-Indian-owned lands covered by contracts entered into pursuant to section 5, subject, however, to the authority of the Secretary to dispose of the water as provided for in section 8 hereof.

SEC. 8. Pending the execution of contracts with a district or districts, and thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior may, in lieu of disposing of the stored water as prescribed in sections 4, 5, and 6 of this act, dispose of any uncontracted part of the stored water during any year on an acre-foot basis upon such terms and conditions as he shall determine. The Secretary is authorized to fix annual charges to cover the costs of operating and maintaining the storage works and the distribution of the stored water.

SEC. 9. No further construction work on the Crow Indian Reservation shall be undertaken by the United States without the prior consent of (1) the Crow Tribe, (2) the irrigation district or districts affected, and (3) the Congress of the United States, and without the prior execution of repayment contracts by the non-Indian water users or irrigation district or districts, obligating the non-Indian lands for the payment of their share of such construction costs. The consent of the Crow Tribe shall be obtained by a majority vote of the general council of the tribe expressed at a duly convened meeting: *Provided, however*, That such consents shall not be necessary to construct laterals necessary to irrigate the lands within the Crow Indian irrigation project as now determined and classified as irrigable by the land designation committee report, as approved by the Secretary of the Interior in 1944.

SEC. 10. Pursuant to the findings of the report referred to in section 1 (3) the sum of $676,291.83 of operation and maintenance assessments against Indian- and non-Indian-owned lands of the project on the water users' ledger is hereby canceled, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed (1) to credit not to exceed $28,000 on future operation and maintenance assessments against certain lands described in the report; (2) to make refunds not to exceed $3,000 from Crow project operation and maintenance collections on deposit in the Treasury to cover overpayments made to the project by landowners as provided for in the report; (3) to make refunds not to exceed $40,000 from Crow project operation and maintenance collections to heirs of certain Crow allottees on account of moneys withheld from their estates by the United States and used for the payment of delinquent operation and maintenance assessments.

SEC. 11. All claims of every description, all costs, charges, and unpaid assessments against lands in Indian ownership under the Crow irrigation project system, arising out of the expenditure of Treasury and tribal moneys for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Crow irrigation project system, including the Willow Creek storage works, to and including expenditures for the fiscal year 1945, except the proportionate share of the amount authorized in section 1 (4) of this act, are hereby canceled, and the obligations of the Indians and their lands to repay any part or all of said claims or sums are hereby dissolved: *Provided*, That the Crow Tribe of Indians, by appropriate action of their tribal council, releases the United States and all lands of the irrigation project from any and all claims said tribe may have arising out of the expenditure of tribal moneys by the United States for the construction, operation, and maintenance of said project.

SEC. 12. All costs and charges against lands in non-Indian ownership under the Crow Indian irrigation project system arising out of the expenditure of Treasury and tribal moneys for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the said project systems except (1) $210,726, which is the proportionate part of the cost of the Willow Creek storage works chargeable to non-Indian lands; (2) $45,000 as provided for in section 1 (1) of this act; (3) the proportionate share of the non-Indian landowners in the $5,000 expenditure provided for in section 1 (4) hereof; and (4) all unpaid operation and maintenance assessments remaining on the water users' ledgers of the Crow project after the adjustments have been made, as herein provided, which assessments when collected shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States for the operation and maintenance of the project are hereby canceled and the obligations of non-Indians and their lands to repay to the United States or the Crow Tribe any part or all of said sums so canceled are hereby dissolved: *Provided, however*, That this cancellation of reimbursable costs and charges shall not serve to change the present lien status except as provided in section 4 hereof.

SEC. 13. The cancellation of the reimbursable status of all project construction, operation, and maintenance costs and expenditures as herein provided shall be reported in the reimbursable accounts rendered to the Comptroller General of the United States, pursuant to the provisions of the act of April 4, 1910 (36 Stat. 270), as deductions from the total indebtedness of the project without regard to fiscal years or appropriations from which expenditures were made.

SEC. 14. This act, so far as non-Indian lands are involved, shall cease to be effective when 2 years have elapsed from the date of its approval unless prior to that time the contracts contemplated in section 3 have been executed and the releases required by section 2 have been obtained: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to the cancellations, adjustments, and application of credits to be entered on the operation and maintenance water users' ledgers not exceeding $60,300 pursuant to the findings of the report of conditions on the Crow Indian irrigation project herein referred to, which entries shall be made upon approval of this act.

SEC. 15. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe regulations and to perform all acts required for the effectuation of the purposes of this act.

SEC. 16. All provisions of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby superseded to the extent of such inconsistency.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 11, line 5, after the word "assessment" insert a semicolon and the following: "to reform in accordance with the adjustments made by the provisions of this act any deferment contracts executed in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803)."

Page 12, line 10, strike out the words "as herein provided" and insert the following: "as recommended in the district engineer's report of November 29, 1945, referred to in section 1 (3) of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FARM LANDS ON BIG HORN UNIT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6195) to amend section 1 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 658).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), as amended by section 1 of the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 658), be further amended by striking out the next to the last sentence of section 1, reading "No lease shall be made for a period longer than 5 years," and by substituting therefor the following: "No lease of any allotment shall be made for a period longer than 5 years except that irrigable lands in Indian ownership under the Big Horn unit of the Crow Indian irrigation project may be leased for farming purposes for a period not exceeding 10 years. All other provisions of these acts with respect to the leasing of Crow Indian lands shall continue in effect."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECORDS OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN ARMY TRANSPORTATION CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6263) to amend the act of June 23, 1943, so as to authorize inclusion of periods of education and training in an Army Transportation Corps civilian marine school as service in the merchant marine.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the act entitled "An act to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave

their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes, approved June 23, 1943 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. IV, title 50 App., sec. 1471), is amended to read as follows: "That when used in this act the term 'service in the merchant marine' means service as an officer or member of the crew on or in connection with a vessel documented under the laws of the United States or a vessel owned by, chartered to, or operated by or for the account or use of the Administrator, as an enrollee in the United States Maritime Service on active duty, and, to such extent as the Administrator shall prescribe, any period awaiting assignment to such service and any period of education or training for such service in any school or institution under the jurisdiction of the Administrator or any civilian marine school under the jurisdiction of the Army Transportation Corps."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF DEVICES IN RECOGNITION OF THE SERVICES OF MERCHANT SAILORS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6488) to amend the act to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act of May 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 81), as amended by the act of July 31, 1945 (59 Stat. 511; 50 U. S. C., App. 753f), be, and it is hereby, amended by inserting, after the comma following the citation "(9 F. R. 10613)" the words "as amended by Executive Order 9692 of February 5, 1946 (11 F. R. 1421)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3129) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 so as to limit the power of the Securities and Exchange Commission to regulate transactions in exempted securities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5958) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill why this bill is necessary if we pass the next bill? It seems to me we might eliminate this bill and pass the other one.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, it is not at all necessary immediately in view of the next bill. But I think we should proceed and pass this one, as it has the unanimous approval of all the peanut growers. The gentleman understands that the peanut acreage has now almost trebled what it used to be. When the acreage was 1,600,000 acres the act provided that no State should be allotted less than 95 percent of what was allotted to it in 1941. The peanut production has been greatly expanded in some areas and not in others. Frankly, this bill is for the particular benefit of the Virginia and North Carolina producing areas, which were the original peanut-producing sections of the United States and which have not been able to expand acreage. It simply strikes the words "not less than 95 percent" and says that when we do return to acreage control each State will receive at least as much acreage as it was allotted in 1941.

Mr. KEAN. The next bill, of course, recommends a study of the whole question and the formulation of permanent legislation.

Mr. PACE. The next bill will suspend the quotas for 1 year.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman feels that in spite of the next bill we should pass this one?

Mr. PACE. This bill is unanimously agreed to by everyone, the Agricultural Department and everywhere else.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 358 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. IV, title 7, sec. 1358), is amended (a) by striking out, in the provision in subsection (a) and in the first proviso in subsection (c), the language "95 percent of", and (b) by inserting before the colon at the end of the first proviso in subsection (c) the following: "and any additional acreage so required shall be in addition to the national allotment and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "provision" and insert "proviso."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEANUT-MARKETING QUOTAS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 359) relating to peanut-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] a question. In view of his previous statement, I understand that the acreage has been increased by about 300 percent.

Mr. PACE. About treble.

Mr. SABATH. In view of that tremendous increase, why is it that its costs me 60 cents a pound for peanuts now when I used to get them for 10 cents a pound in years gone by?

Mr. PACE. I might say to the gentleman that the farmer receives at the present time 8 cents per pound, and the gentleman can make his own calculation of the spread between the farmer and the consumer.

Mr. SABATH. I pay about seven times as much for them than the farmer receives.

Mr. PACE. The farmer receives between 8 and 9 cents a pound.

Mr. SABATH. In view of the fact that we granted a rule to the gentleman's committee some years ago for the purpose of making an investigation as to the spread, may I ask the gentleman what he has done and why that matter has not been somehow or another adjusted and the unfair prices eliminated?

Mr. PACE. I might say to the gentleman that under the splendid leadership of our chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], that committee has been functioning throughout the year. It is very hopeful that it will be in a position shortly to submit some very worth-while recommendations.

Mr. SABATH. How soon may we expect a report on it?

Mr. PACE. I hope during the year. The chairman, perhaps, would be in a position to say.

Mr. SABATH. I am anxious to help the farmers because they receive only about one-seventh or one-eighth of what we pay for the peanuts, and I want to know where that money goes, and why.

Mr. PACE. That is one of the problems; the spread between what the farmer receives and the consumer.

Mr. SABATH. I think they should receive a little higher price and we should pay less.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 357–359, inclusive, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. IV, title 7, secs. 1357 to 1359, inclusive), and in view of the critical shortage of high protein foods and feeds, and fats and oils, peanut-marketing quotas shall not be proclaimed with respect to the crop of peanuts produced in the calendar year 1947, and no national, State, or farm acreage allotments for peanuts for the 1947 crop shall be established.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOLICITOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1460) to fix the salary of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the sponsor of this bill to give us a little information on it.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. This bill fixes the statutory salary for the Solicitor of the Interior. At the present time he comes under the Classification Act. He gets $9,975, and we deemed it advisable to fix a flat salary of $10,000 and also to provide that the Solicitor shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Solicitor's

office has gradually increased in importance until it was felt that he should be appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate and his salary fixed by law. It amounts to a $25 salary increase a year over the present incumbent.

Mr. RICH. Why do you adopt this method? Does the Secretary of the Interior recommend it?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. It came to us from the Senate and it passed the House and had a favorable report from the Secretary of the Interior except the original bill as drafted contemplated that the Secretary of the Interior would make the appointment, and the Senate and the House felt that the President should make the appointment and confirmation had by the Senate. If we fixed it as a definite statutory position we felt that should be the case. It is not my personal bill, but I think it is a good bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Florida this question? After this statutory salary of $10,000 is set, how much bonus will the official then receive under the laws recently passed?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I have not checked as to that. That is a general civil-service bill. We fix the salary definitely at $10,000. That apparently is the limit, and I understand $10,000 salaries are not affected under the civil-service bill. That is the limit, and there will be nothing additional.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, those drawing $10,000 do not receive any additional benefits?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter the legal work of the Department of the Interior shall be performed under the supervision and direction of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior with the advice and consent of the Senate and who shall be paid a salary of $10,000 per annum.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "Secretary of the Interior" and insert "President."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider, was laid on the table.

IMPROVEMENT OF RANGE LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1392) for the purpose of renewing and increasing forage and improving watershed conditions on range lands, forests or Indian lands, or other public owned and controlled land of the United States; authorizing the sowing operations by airplane, machinery, or other means, for conducting experiments to improve methods of reseeding, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

AUTHORIZING THE EXCHANGE OF OREGON LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2423) to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings of lands acquired for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, in the State of Oregon, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to exchange any such lands for other lands of approximately equal value when in his opinion such action is in the interest of the United States, the title to any lands acquired hereunder to be satisfactory to the Secretary. Upon the vesting of title thereto in the United States, any lands acquired pursuant to this authorization shall become a part of the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, and shall be subject to the laws applicable thereto.

SEC. 2. Upon the conveyance of the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project to the State of Oregon, or political subdivision thereof, pursuant to the act of June 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 326), the Secretary of the Interior may authorize the grantee to exchange or otherwise dispose of any lands so conveyed in order to acquire other lands of approximately equal value for the purpose of consolidating the holdings of the grantee, the title to lands so acquired to be satisfactory to the Secretary. For the aforesaid purpose the Secretary is authorized to execute a release, as to the particular lands involved, of any condition providing for a reversion of title to the United States, that may be contained in the conveyance by the United States to said grantee. No such release shall be executed, however, unless the grantee shall agree, in form satisfactory to the Secretary, that the lands to be acquired by it shall be subject to the conditions contained in the original conveyance from the United States, except that, in lieu of a provision for reversion, the grantee shall agree to convey said lands to the United States upon a finding by the Secretary in accordance with the procedure provided in said act of June 6, 1942, that the grantee has not complied with such conditions during a period of more than 3 years. Lands so conveyed to the United States shall be subject to administration or disposition in like manner as recreational demonstration project lands that revert to the United States under the terms of the aforesaid act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1963) to authorize additional permanent professors of the United States Military Academy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That one additional permanent professor is hereby authorized for each of the nine departments of instruction of the United States Military Academy for which one such professor is now authorized. Such professors shall have the rank, pay, allowances, retirement rights, and other benefits authorized for other permanent professors of the Academy: *Provided*, That the senior professor in each department of instruction shall be the head thereof.

SEC. 2. The positions of professor of law and professor of ordnance of the United States Military Academy hereafter shall be filled by the appointment of permanent professors, who shall have the rank, pay, allowances, retirement rights, and other benefits authorized for other permanent professors of the Academy.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized, as an additional permanent professor of the United States Military Academy, a dean of the Academic Board, who shall have such duties as may be prescribed from time to time by the Superintendent of the Academy with the approval of the Secretary of War. Appointments to this position shall be made from among permanent professors who have served as heads of departments of instruction of the Academy. The dean of the Academic Board shall have the rank, pay, allowances, retirement rights, and other benefits authorized for permanent brigadier generals of the Army, except that the statutory retirement age shall be the same as that of other permanent professors of the Academy.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6682) to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and to repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SABATH. I object, Mr. Speaker.

AUTHORIZING CITY OF ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, TO ISSUE BONDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5112) to authorize the city of Anchorage, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $7,500,000 for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, improving, extending, bettering, repairing, equipping, or acquiring public works of a permanent character, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN ALASKA TO ISSUE BONDS FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5800) to authorize school districts in Alaska to issue bonds for school construction, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 589; 48 U. S. C., sec. 315 and the following), entitled "An act to authorize public utility districts in the Territory of Alaska to incur bonded indebtedness, and for other purposes", is hereby amended to read: "That public utility and school districts in the Territory of Alaska, organized or which may be organized under

the laws of the Territory, are hereby authorized to construct, improve, extend, better, repair, reconstruct, acquire, and operate any and all types of public utilities and improvements, school buildings and facilities connected therewith, respectively, under and in accordance with and to the full extent provided by the laws of said Territory relating to public utility and school districts in said Territory, and to incur bonded indebtedness and to issue negotiable bonds for any or all of said purposes: *Provided, however,* That no public utility or school district shall incur bonded indebtedness or issue its negotiable bonds under this act to an amount which shall exceed 10 percent of the aggregate value of the real and personal property within such district subject to taxation by such district."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the above-entitled act is hereby amended by inserting after the words "public utility" the words "or school."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIBRARY OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6721) to authorize the Postmaster General to accept gifts and bequests for the benefit of the library of the Post Office Department.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to accept, receive, hold, and administer gifts and bequests of personal property, and loans of personal property other than money, from individuals or others for the benefit of the library of the Post Office Department, its collections, or its services. Gifts or bequests of money shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States under the title "Library fund of the Post Office Department," and shall be subject to disbursement by the Postmaster General for the purposes in each case specified.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of Federal income, estate and gift taxes, gifts, and bequests accepted by the Postmaster General under the authority of this act shall be deemed to be a gift or bequest to or for the use of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, upon request of the Postmaster General, to invest or reinvest the funds, or any part thereof, deposited in the Treasury pursuant to section 1 of this act in securities of the United States Government or in securities guaranteed by the United States Government. The interest accruing from such securities shall be deposited to the credit of the library fund of the Post Office Department.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOLL BRIGE ACROSS RIO GRANDE, RIO GRANDE CITY, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6751) authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge and originally designed approaches thereto across the Rio Grande, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interest of navigation, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject further to the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and also subject to the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico to the construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge: *Provided,* That the construction of the bridge herein authorized shall not be undertaken until after an agreement regarding such construction shall have been effected between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Mexican States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Texas needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its originally designed approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State of Texas.

SEC. 3. The said Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge in accordance with any laws of the State of Texas applicable thereto, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act to any public agency, or to an international bridge authority or commission, is hereby granted to Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, or legal representatives; and any such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE HIGHWAY BRIDGE ACROSS THE COLUMBIA RIVER, NORTHPORT, WASH.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 943) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Columbia River at Northport, Wash.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Columbia River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the town of Northport, in Stevens County, Wash., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE HIGHWAY BRIDGE ACROSS DES MOINES RIVER, FARMINGTON, IOWA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1834) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Iowa or the Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Des Moines River at or near Farmington, Iowa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Iowa or Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Des Moines River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Farmington, Iowa, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE, LAREDO, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1212) authorizing the State of Texas, acting through the State Highway Commission of Texas, or the successors thereof, to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Laredo, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, the State of Texas, by and through its State Highway Commission, or successors of said Commission, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Rio Grande, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Laredo, Tex., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject to the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico. The State of Texas likewise is authorized to negotiate and enter into any agreement or agreements between the governments of said State and the Republic of Mexico relating to the acquisition, construction, and maintenance of any such bridge or bridges.

SEC. 2. The authority granted herein for construction of the bridge shall cease and be null and void unless the actual construction be commenced within 3 years and completed

within 5 years from the date of the passage of this act unless otherwise authorized by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, after "and", strike out the remainder of line 7 and all of lines 8 to 12, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "further subject to the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and also subject to the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico to the construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge: *Provided,* That the construction of the bridge herein authorized shall not be undertaken until after an agreement regarding such construction shall have been effected between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Mexican States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the State of Texas, acting through the State Highway Commission of Texas, or the successors thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Laredo, Tex."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BRIDGE BETWEEN PLYMOUTH AND HANOVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5537) granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Susquehanna River at a point between the borough of Plymouth, in Plymouth Township, and Hanover Township, in the county of Luzerne, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object.

WABASH RIVER BRIDGE NEAR MOUNT VERNON, IND.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5606) authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Wabash River near Mount Vernon, Ind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Wabash River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, near Mount Vernon, Ind., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporation for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission is hereby authorized either to operate said bridge free of tolls or to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including interest at a rate of not to exceed 5 percent per annum and reasonable financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE AT MAUCKPORT, IND.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5736) authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Ind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Mauckport, Ind., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceeding therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission is hereby authorized either to operate said bridge free of tolls or to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including interest at a rate of not to exceed 5 percent per annum and reasonable financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTEE RIVER BRIDGE AT LENEUDES FERRY, S. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5748) to revive and reenact the act granting the consent of Congress to the South Carolina State Highway Department to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River, at or near Leneudes Ferry, S. C. (H. R. 4231), approved August 18, 1941.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved August 18, 1941, granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Department of South Carolina to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Santee River at or near Leneudes Ferry be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided,* That the act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to is completed within 3 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled 'An act granting the consent of Congress to the South Carolina State

Highway Department to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River, at or near Leneudes Ferry, S. C.'"

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT CAHOKIA, ILL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6004) to provide authorization for the village of Cahokia, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cahokia, Ill., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for the military and other purposes, the village of Cahokia, Ill., is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Cahokia, Ill., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the village of Cahokia, Ill., all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The said village of Cahokia, Ill., is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge, the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all of the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to said village of Cahokia, Ill., its successors or assigns, and any corporation, private or municipal, to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 16, after the word "mortgage", insert "to the State of Illinois or public agencies or political subdivision thereof."

Page 3, line 19, after the word "Illinois", strike out "its successors or assigns," and the words "any corporation, private or municipal, to" and insert "such State or public agencies, or political subdivision thereof, to."

Page 4, line 2, strike out "corporation" and insert "State or public agencies or political subdivision thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WABASH RIVER BRIDGE AT MONTEZUMA, IND.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6041) authorizing the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Wabash River at or near Montezuma, Ind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Wabash River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Montezuma, Ind., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions contained in this act.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE AT CANNELTON, IND.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6065) authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Cannelton, Ind., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission is hereby authorized either to operate said bridge free of tolls or to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including interest at a rate of not to exceed 5 percent per annum and reasonable financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DES MOINES RIVER BRIDGE AT EDDYVILLE, IOWA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6081) granting the consent of Congress to the Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Des Moines River at or near the town of Eddyville, Iowa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Iowa State Highway Commission, and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Des Moines River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the town of Eddyville, Iowa, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALCASIEU RIVER BRIDGE AT LAKE CHARLES, LA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6222) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River, at or near Lake Charles, authorized to be

built by the State of Louisiana, by an act of Congress approved June 22, 1943, and heretofore extended by the act approved June 1, 1944, are hereby extended 2 and 4 years, respectively, from June 22, 1946.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELAWARE RIVER BRIDGE AT WILMINGTON, DEL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6285) authorizing the State of Delaware, by and through its State highway department, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Delaware River near Wilmington, Del.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the State of Delaware, by and through its State highway department or the successor of said department, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Delaware River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, from a point between Pigeon Point near the city of Wilmington, in the State of Delaware, and New Castle, in said State, to a point near the Salem Canal in the State of New Jersey, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. In addition to the powers granted to the State highway department by the laws of the State of Delaware, there is hereby conferred upon the said State highway department or its successor all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The said State highway department or its successor is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The authority hereby granted shall cease and be null and void unless the actual construction of said bridge and its approaches be commenced within 3 years and completed within 5 years from the date of this act.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, after the word "act" insert "and further subject to the approval of the location, navigation clearances, and other design features of the bridge by the Secretary of the Navy concurrently with the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers of the War Department."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration is similar to H. R. 6286 which I introduced to permit the State of Delaware by and through its State highway department to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Delaware River between the States of Delaware and New Jersey. The bridge is to be constructed from a point below Wilmington, Del., to a point on the New Jersey side of the river just north of Pennsville, N. J.

The Delaware State line at the point where the bridge is to be constructed extends across the Delaware River to the low water mark on the New Jersey side. Because of this fact the bridge will be constructed by the State of Delaware by and through its highway department, and the entire expense will be carried by the State of Delaware. The Legislature of New Jersey has already given its consent to the construction of the bridge.

The public demand for this bridge is steadily increasing and its construction is of vital importance to the ever-increasing local and long-haul vehicular traffic along the Atlantic seaboard. This traffic serves commerce and business, both in war and in peace. The building of the bridge appears as a public necessity in the full development of the highway system along the Atlantic coast and it is believed that this necessity should be met as promptly as possible. Both the War and Navy Departments have recently filed reports indicating that they will interpose no objections to the proposed legislation. The Federal Works Agency, to which the pending legislation was also referred, has reported favorably upon the proposal.

The bridge is to be constructed as a toll project, on the basis that only the users of the bridge pay for its use, thus amortizing the cost of construction without any increase or effect upon State or Federal taxes. Upon amortization the bridge would become free from tolls. The bonds to be issued would be revenue bonds, and these bonds would be supported wholly by the earnings of the bridge. No credit of the States or the Federal Government would be pledged in support of such bonds. The toll rates would be reasonable and subject to review by the Federal Government. The proposed bridge is not only an interstate project, but more truly a regional or even a national project. The benefits would be so widespread and far-reaching throughout all the States of the North and South Atlantic seaboard that it may be stated that in its construction the State of Delaware would be acting merely as the agent for all the other interested States.

The importance of this large volume of motor traffic makes it virtually imperative that a safe, quick, dependable, and economic crossing be provided near and below Wilmington. These requirements can be met only through the construction of a modern, long-span, high-level highway bridge. The value of such a bridge to commerce and business and for pleasure is almost beyond calculation. Its value in wartime would likewise be of considerable importance from strategical, tactical, and productive points of view.

The bill should pass without objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL PARK

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bill (H. R. 4435) to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all those certain tracts, pieces, or parcels of land, title to which is vested in the United States of America, and being in the State of North Dakota, and within the boundaries particularly described, as follows, to wit: Beginning at the point where the north line of the right-of-way of United States Highway No. 10 intersects the east boundary of section 36, township 140 north, range 101 west, fifth principal meridian; thence southwesterly and northwesterly along the north line of said right-of-way through section 1, township 139 north, range 101 west, and sections 36, 35, 34, 27, 28, and 29, township 140 north, range 101 west, to the west boundary of said section 29; north along section lines to the northwest corner of said section 29; west along section line to the southwest corner of section 19, township 140 north, range 101 west; north along township line to the southeast corner of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 24, township 140 north, range 102 west; west to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of said section 24; north to the northwest corner of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of said section 24; westerly along section lines to the southwest corner of section 16, township 140 north, range 102 west; northerly along section lines to the northwest corner of section 4, township 140 north, range 102 west; thence west along township line to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of section 34, township 141 north, range 102 west; northerly

through the center of sections 34 and 27 to the northwest corner of the northeast quarter of section 27 of said township 141 north, range 102 west; easterly along section lines to the northeast corner of section 28, township 141 north, range 101 west; south along section lines to the southeast corner of said section 28; east along section line to the northeast corner of section 34, township 141 north, range 101 west; south to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of section 35, township 141 north, range 101 west; easterly through center of sections 35 and 36 to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of said section 36 of said township 141 north, range 101 west; south to the southeast corner of said section 36; thence east along township line to the northeast corner of lot 3, section 2, township 140 north, range 101 west; southerly through the center of sections 2 and 11 to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of said section 11, township 140 north, range 101 west; easterly along section lines to the northeast corner of section 13 of said township 140 north, range 101 west; southerly along township line to the northwest corner of section 19, township 140 north, range 100 west; easterly along north line of said section 19 to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter; southerly through center of sections 19, 30, and 31 to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of section 31; easterly along the center of said section 31 to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter; southerly along the east line of said section 31 to the southeast corner; westerly along the township line to the east line of section 36, township 140 north, range 101 west; northerly along the township line between townships 140 north, range 100 west and 140 north, range 101 west to the north right-of-way line of United States Highway No. 10, the place of beginning, containing thirty-five thousand two hundred and seventy acres, more or less, are hereby dedicated and set apart as a public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people, and shall be known as the Theodore Roosevelt National Park. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to construct and maintain a road or highway through the park connecting with a State or Federal highway.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to cause condemnation proceedings to be instituted in the name of the United States under the provisions of the act of August 1, 1888, entitled "An act to authorise the condemnation of lands for sites for public buildings, and other purposes" (25 Stat. 357), to acquire title to the lands, interests therein, or rights pertaining thereto that are privately owned within the boundaries of the said national park, and such property, when acquired, shall become a part thereof: *Provided*, That when the owner of such lands, interests therein, or rights pertaining thereto shall fix a price for the same, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, shall be reasonable, the Secretary may purchase the same without further delay: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of land, interests therein, or rights pertaining thereto required for the Theodore Roosevelt National Park: *And provided further*, That title and evidence of title to land and interests therein acquired for said park shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. That for the purposes of acquiring non-Federal lands within the boundaries of said park as established by this act, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to exchange federally owned lands within the Roosevelt recreational demonstration area project, located outside the boundaries of the park for State or privately owned land of approximately equal value within the boundaries of the park, when in his opinion such action is in the interest of the United States, the title to any lands acquired under this section to be satisfactory to the Secretary. Upon the vesting of title thereto in the United States, any lands acquired pursuant to this authorization shall become a part of the park and shall be subject to the laws applicable thereto.

SEC. 4. The administration, protection, and development of the aforesaid park shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," as amended.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt, in the village of Medora, N. Dak., with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts: *Provided*, That the cost of the monument shall not exceed $35,000 and there shall be conveyed to the United States such suitable site as may in the judgment of the Secretary be required for said monument: *Provided further*, That the village of Medora, or other public agency or organization shall furnish, in writing, assurance satisfactory to the Secretary of its willingness to assume the perpetual care and upkeep of the monument.

SEC. 6. That nothing herein contained shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the land laws of the United States, whether for homestead, mineral, right-of-way, or any other purposes whatsoever, or shall affect the right of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his land.

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTIONS 81, 82, AND 83, AND REPEALING SECTION 84 OF CHAPTER IX OF THE UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 481 H. R. 6682, to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and to repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I originally objected to this bill, but it has been explained to me by the members of the committee, and I withdraw my objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 81, 82, and 83 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended (U. S. C., title 11, secs. 401, 402, and 403), are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 81. This act and proceedings thereunder are found and declared to be within the subject of bankruptcies and, in addition to the jurisdiction otherwise exercised, courts of bankruptcy shall exercise original jurisdiction as provided in this chapter for the composition of indebtedness of, or authorized by, any of the agencies or instrumentalities hereinafter named, payable (a) out of assessments or taxes, or both, levied against and constituting liens upon property in any of said agencies or instrumentalities, or (b) out of property acquired by foreclosure of any such assessments or taxes, or both, or (c) out of income derived by such agencies or instrumentalities from any income-producing property, whether or not secured by a lien upon such property: (1) Drainage, drainage and levee, reclamation, water, irrigation, or other similar districts, commonly designated as agricultural improvement districts or local improvement districts, organized or created for the purpose of constructing, improving, maintaining, and operating certain improvements or projects devoted chiefly to the improvement of lands therein for agricultural purposes; or (2) local improvement districts, such as sewer, paving, sanitary, or other similar districts, organized or created for the purposes designated by their respective names; or (3) local improvement districts, such as road, highway, or other similar districts, organized or created for the purpose of grading, paving, or otherwise improving public streets, roads, or highways; or (4) public-school districts or public-school authorities organized or created for the purpose of constructing, maintaining, and operating public schools or public-school facilities; or (5) local improvement districts, such as port, navigation, or other similar districts, organized or created for the purpose of constructing, improving, maintaining, and operating ports and port facilities; or (6) incorporated authorities, commissions, or similar public agencies organized for the purpose of constructing, maintaining, and operating revenue-producing enterprises; or (7) any county or parish or any city, town, village, borough, township, or other municipality: *Provided, however*, That if any provision of this chapter, or the application thereof to any such agency or district or class thereof or to any circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the chapter, or the application of such provision to any other or different circumstances, shall not be affected by such holding.

"SEC. 82. The following terms as used in this chapter, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall be construed as follows:

"The term 'petitioner' shall include any agency or instrumentality referred to in section 81 of this chapter.

"The term 'security' shall include bonds, notes, judgments, claims, and demands, liquidated or unliquidated, and other evidences of indebtedness, either secured or unsecured, and certificates of beneficial interest in property.

"The term 'creditor' means the holder of a security or securities.

"Any agency of the United States holding securities acquired pursuant to contract with any petitioner under this chapter shall be deemed a creditor in the amount of the full face value thereof.

"The term 'security as affected by the plan' means a security as to which the rights of its holder are proposed to be adjusted or modified materially by the consummation of a composition agreement.

"The singular number includes the plural and the masculine gender the feminine.

"SEC. 83. (a) Any petitioner may file a petition hereunder stating that the petitioner is insolvent or unable to meet its debts as they mature and that it desires to effect a plan for the composition of its debts. The petition shall be filed with the court in whose territorial jurisdiction the petitioner or the major part thereof is located, and, in the case of any unincorporated tax or special-assessment district having no officials of its own, the petition may be filed by its governing authority or the board or body having authority

to levy taxes or assessments to meet the obligations to be affected by the plan of composition. The petition shall be accompanied by payment to the clerk of a filing fee of $100, which shall be in lieu of the fees required to be collected by the clerk under other applicable chapters of this title, as amended. The petition shall state that a plan of composition has been prepared, is filed and submitted with the petition, and that creditors of the petitioner owning not less than 51 percent in amount of the securities affected by the plan (excluding, however, any such securities owned, held, or controlled by the petitioner) have accepted it in writing. There shall be filed with the petition a list of all known creditors of the petitioner, together with their addresses so far as known to petitioner, and description of their respective securities, showing separately those which have accepted the plan of composition, together with their separate addresses, the contents of which list shall not constitute admissions by the petitioner in a proceeding under this chapter or otherwise. Upon the filing of such a petition the judge shall enter an order either approving it as properly filed under this chapter, if satisfied that such petition complies with this chapter and has been filed in good faith, or dismissing it, if not so satisfied.

"Whenever the petition seeks to effect a plan for the composition of obligations represented by securities, or evidences in any form of rights to payment, issued by the petitioner to defray the cost of local improvements and which are payable solely out of the proceeds of special assessments or special taxes levied by the petitioner, or issued by the petitioner to finance one or more revenue-producing enterprises payable solely out of the revenues of such enterprise or enterprises, it shall be sufficient if the petitioner aver that the property liable for, or the revenues pledged to the payment of such securities, principal, and interest is not of sufficient value, or that the revenues of the enterprise or enterprises are inadequate to pay same, and that the accrued interest on such securities is past due and in default; and the list of creditors to be filed with such petition need contain only the known claimants of rights based on those securities evidencing the obligations sought to be composed under this chapter, and such list shall include separately the names and addresses of those creditors who have accepted the plan of composition. If the plan of composition sought to be effected requires a revision of assessments so that the proportion of special assessments or special taxes to be assessed against some of the land will be different from the proportion in effect at the time the petition is filed, a list of the record owners or holders of title, legal or equitable, to any real estate adversely affected in the proceeding shall also be filed with the petition, and such record owners or holders of title shall be notified in the manner provided in this section for creditors and be entitled to hearing by the court upon reasonable application therefor.

"The 'plan of composition,'" within the meaning of this chapter, may include provisions modifying or altering the rights of creditors generally, or of any class of them, secured or unsecured, either through issuance of new securities of any character, or otherwise, and may contain such other provisions and agreements not inconsistent with this chapter as the parties may desire.

"No creditor shall be deemed to be affected by any plan of composition unless the same shall affect his interest materially, and in case any controversy shall arise as to whether any creditor or class of creditors shall or shall not be affected, the issue shall be determined by the judge, after hearing, upon notice to the parties interested.

"For all purposes of this chapter any creditor may act in person or by an attorney or a duly authorized agent or committee. Where any committee, organization, group, or individual shall assume to act for or on behalf of creditors, such committee, organization, group, or individual shall first file with the court in which the proceeding is pending a list of the creditors represented by such committee, organization, group, or individual, giving the name and address of each such creditor, together with a statement of the amount, class, and character of the security held by him, and attach thereto copies of the instrument or instruments in writing signed by the owners of the bonds showing their authority, and shall file with the list a copy of the contract or agreement entered into between such committee, organization, group, or individual, and the creditors represented by it or them, which contract shall disclose all compensation to be received, directly or indirectly, by such committee, organization, group, or individual, which agreed compensation shall be subject to modification and approval by the court.

"(b) Upon approving the petition as properly filed, or at any time thereafter, the judge shall enter an order fixing a time and place for a hearing on the petition, which shall be held within 90 days from the date of said order, and shall provide in the order that notice shall be given to creditors of the filing of the petition and its approval as being properly filed, and of the time and place for the hearing. The judge shall prescribe the form of the notice, which shall specify the manner in which claims and interests of creditors shall be filed or evidenced, on or before the date fixed for the hearing. The notice shall be published at least once a week for three successive weeks in at least one newspaper of general circulation published within the jurisdiction of the court, and in such other paper or papers having a general circulation among bond dealers and bondholders as may be designated by the court, and the judge may require that it may be published in such other publication as he may deem proper. The judge shall require that a copy of the notice be mailed, postage prepaid, to each creditor of the petitioner named in the petition at the address of such creditor given in the petition, or, if no address is given in the petition for any creditor and the address of such creditor cannot with reasonable diligence be ascertained, then a copy of the notice shall be mailed, postage prepaid, to such creditor addressed to him as the judge may prescribe. All expense of giving notice as herein provided shall be paid by the petitioner. The notice shall be first published, and the mailing of copies thereof shall be completed, at least 60 days before the date fixed for the hearing.

"At any time not less than 10 days prior to the time fixed for the hearing, any creditor of the petitioner affected by the plan may file an answer to the petition controverting any of the material allegations therein and setting up any objection he may have to the plan of composition. The judge may continue the hearing from time to time if the percentage of creditors required herein for the confirmation of the plan shall not have accepted the plan in writing, or if for any reason satisfactory to the judge the hearing is not completed on the date fixed therefor. At the hearing, or a continuance thereof, the judge shall decide the issues presented and unless the material allegations of the petition are sustained shall dismiss the proceeding. If, however, the material allegations of the petition are sustained, the judge shall classify the creditors according to the nature of their respective claims and interest: *Provided, however,* That the holders of all claims, regardless of the manner in which they are evidenced, which are payable without preference out of funds derived from the same source or sources shall be of one class. The holders of claims for the payment of which specific property or revenues are pledged, or which are otherwise given preference as provided by law, shall accordingly constitute a separate class or classes of creditors.

"At the hearing or a continuance thereof the judge may refer any special issues of fact to a referee in bankruptcy or a special master for consideration, the taking of testimony, and a report upon such special issues of fact, if the judge finds that the condition of his docket is such that he cannot take such testimony without unduly delaying the dispatch of other business pending in his court, and if it appears that such special issues are necessary to the determination of the case. Only under special circumstances shall references be made to a special master who is not a referee in bankruptcy. A general reference of the case to a master shall not be made, but the reference, if any, shall be only in the form of requests for findings of specific facts.

"The court may allow reasonable compensation for the services performed by such referee in bankruptcy or special master, and the actual and necessary expenses incurred in connection with the proceeding, including compensation for services rendered and expenses incurred in obtaining the deposit of securities and the preparation of the plan, whether such work may have been done by the petitioner or by committees or other representatives of creditors, and may allow reasonable compensation for the attorneys or agents of any of the foregoing: *Provided, however,* That no fees, compensation, reimbursement, or other allowances for attorneys, agents, committees, or other representatives of creditors shall be assessed against the petitioner or paid from any revenues, property, or funds of the petitioner except in the manner and in such sums, if any, as may be provided for in the plan of composition. An appeal may be taken from any order making such determination or award to the United States circuit court of appeals for the circuit in which the proceeding under this chapter is pending, independently of other appeals which may be taken in the proceeding, and such appeal shall be heard summarily.

"Such compensation of referees in bankruptcy and special masters shall not be governed by section 40 of this act.

"On 30 days' notice by any creditor to petitioner, the judge, if he finds that the proceeding has not been prosecuted with reasonable diligence, or that it is unlikely that the plan will be accepted by said proportion of creditors, may dismiss the proceeding.

"(c) Upon entry of the order fixing the time for the hearing, or at any time thereafter, the judge may upon notice enjoin or stay, pending the determination of the matter, the commencement or continuation of suits against the petitioner, or any officer or inhabitant thereof, on account of the securities affected by the plan, or to enforce any lien or to enforce the levy of taxes or assessments for the payment of obligations under any such securities, or any suit or process to levy upon or enforce against any property acquired by the petitioner through foreclosure of any such tax lien or special assessment lien, except where rights have become vested, and may enter an interlocutory decree providing that the plan shall be temporarily operative with respect to all securities affected thereby and that the payment of the principal or interest, or both, of such securities shall be temporarily postponed or extended or otherwise readjusted in the same manner and upon the same terms as if such plan had been finally confirmed and put into effect, and upon the entry of such decree the principal or interest, or both, of such securities which have otherwise become due, or which would otherwise become due, shall not be or become due or payable, and the payment of all such securities shall be postponed during the period in which such decree shall remain in force, but shall not, by any order

or decree, in the proceeding or otherwise, interfere with (a) any of the political or governmental powers of the petitioner; or (b) any of the property or revenues of the petitioner necessary for essential governmental purposes; or (c) any income-producing property, unless the plan of composition so provides.

"Any agency or instrumentality referred to in section 81 of this chapter may file a petition for a preliminary stay with the court referred to in section 83 (a) stating (a) that the petitioner is insolvent or unable to meet his debts as they mature; (b) that it desires to effect a plan for the composition of its debts, a copy of which is filed and submitted with the petition; (c) that a creditor of the petitioner holding a security affected by the plan or a person claiming to be such a creditor (naming him and giving his address and the name and address of his attorney of record, if any), is attempting or threatening to obtain payment of said security in preference to other creditors by means of the commencement or continuation of a suit or process of the class hereinbefore in this section 83 (c) described; (d) that efforts are being made in good faith to the end that creditors of the petitioner owning not less than 51 percent in amount of the securities affected by the plan (excluding, however, any such securities owned, held, or controlled by the petitioner) shall accept it in writing; (e) that there is a reasonable prospect of such acceptance within a reasonable time; (f) that upon such acceptance the petitioner intends to file a petition under section 83 (a) of this chapter; and (g) that the petitioner prays that the judge will upon notice enjoin or stay the commencement or continuation of said suit or process. A single petition may seek the preliminary stay of several suits or process brought or threatened by the same or different creditors or persons claiming to be creditors. The petition shall be accompanied by the filing fee required in section 83 (a) of this chapter, unless such fee shall have been paid upon the filing of an earlier petition for a preliminary stay involving the same plan, and no further fee shall be required upon the subsequent filing of a petition under said section 83 (a). Upon such petition the judge shall fix a time and place for hearing and direct that notice thereof shall be given in such manner as he shall prescribe to said creditor or person claiming to be a creditor and to any other person deemed by him to be interested. After such hearings, and upon being satisfied of the truth of the allegations of the petition, the judge may, in his discretion, except where rights have become vested, enjoin or stay the commencement and continuation of said suit or process until a date fixed by him in his order not exceeding 60 days from the date of entry thereof. The judge shall retain jurisdiction to vacate said injunction or stay, or to extend the period thereof for one additional period of not exceeding 60 days, upon good cause shown.

"(d) The plan of composition shall not be confirmed until it has been accepted in writing, by or on behalf of creditors holding at least two-thirds of the aggregate amount of claims of all classes affected by such plan and which have been admitted by the petitioner or allowed by the judge, but excluding claims owned, held, or controlled by the petitioner: *Provided, however,* That it shall not be requisite to the confirmation of the plan that there be such acceptance by any creditor or class of creditors (a) whose claims are not affected by the plan; or (b) if the plan makes provision for the payment of their claims in cash in full; or (c) if provision is made in the plan for the protection of the interests, claims, or lien of such creditors or class of creditors.

"(e) Before concluding the hearing, the judge shall carefully examine all of the contracts, proposals, acceptances, deposit agreements, and all other papers relating to the plan, specifically for the purpose of ascertaining if the fiscal agent, attorney, or other person, firm, or corporation promoting the composition, or doing anything of such a nature, has been or is to be compensated, directly or indirectly, by both the petitioner and the creditors thereof, or any of such creditors—either by fee, commission, or other similar payment, or by transfer or exchange of bonds or other evidence of indebtedness whereby a profit could accrue—and shall take evidence under oath to make certain whether or not any such practice obtains or might obtain.

"After such examination the judge shall make an adjudication of this issue, as a separate part of his interlocutory decree, and if it be found that any such practice exists, he shall forthwith dismiss the proceeding and tax all of the costs against such fiscal agent, attorney, or other person, firm or corporation promoting the composition, or doing anything of such a nature, or against the petitioner, unless such plan be modified within the time to be allowed by the judge so as to eliminate the possibility of any such practice, in which event the judge may proceed to further consideration of the confirmation of the plan. If it be found that no such practice exists, then the judge may proceed to further consideration of the confirmation of the plan.

"At the conclusion of the hearing, the judge shall make written findings of fact and his conclusions of law thereon, and shall enter an interlocutory decree confirming the plan if he finds and is satisfied that (1) it is fair, equitable, and for the best interests of the creditors and does not discriminate unfairly in favor of any creditor or class of creditors; (2) complies with the provisions of this chapter; (3) has been accepted and approved as required by the provisions of subdivision (d) of this section; (4) all amounts to be paid by the petitioner for services or expenses incident to the composition have been fully disclosed and are reasonable; (5) the offer of the plan and its acceptance are in good faith; and (6) the petitioner is authorized by law to take all action necessary to be taken by it to carry out the plan. If not so satisfied, the judge shall enter an order dismissing the proceeding. No case shall be reversed or remanded for want of specific or detailed findings unless it is found that the evidence is insufficient to support one or more of the general findings required in this section.

"Before a plan is confirmed, changes and modifications may be made therein with the approval of the judge after hearing upon such notice to creditors as the judge may direct, subject to the right of any creditor who shall previously have accepted the plan to withdraw his acceptance, within a period to be fixed by the judge and after such notice as the judge may direct, if, in the opinion of the judge, the change or modification will be materially adverse to the interest of such creditor, and if any creditor having such right of withdrawal shall not withdraw within such period, he shall be deemed to have accepted the plan as changed or modified: *Provided, however,* That the plan as changed or modified shall comply with all the provisions of this chapter and shall have been accepted in writing by the petitioner. Either party may appeal from the interlocutory decree as in equity cases. In case said interlocutory decree shall prescribe a time within which any action is to be taken, the running of such time shall be suspended in case of an appeal until final determination thereof. In case said decree is affirmed, the judge may grant such time as he may deem proper for the taking of such action.

"(f) If an interlocutory decree confirming the plan is entered as provided in subdivision (e) of this section, the plan and said decree of confirmation shall become and be binding upon all creditors affected by the plan, if within the time prescribed in the interlocutory decree, or such additional time as the judge may allow, the money, securities, or other consideration to be delivered to the creditors under the terms of the plan shall have been deposited with the court or such disbursing agent as the court may appoint or shall otherwise be made available for the creditors. And thereupon the court shall enter a final decree determining that the petitioner has made available for the creditors affected by the plan the consideration provided for therein and is discharged from all debts and liabilities dealt with in the plan except as provided therein, and that the plan is binding upon all creditors affected by it, whether secured or unsecured, and whether or not their claims have been filed or evidenced, and, if filed or evidenced, whether or not allowed, including creditors who have not, as well as those who have, accepted it. If securities are deposited by the petitioner with the court or disbursing agent for delivery to the creditors, such final decree shall not be entered unless the court finds and adjudicates that said securities have been lawfully authorized and, upon delivery, will constitute valid obligations of the petitioner, and that the provisions made to pay and secure payment thereof are valid.

"(g) A certified copy of the final decree, or of any other decree or order entered by the court or the judge thereof, in a proceeding under this chapter, shall be evidence of the jurisdiction of the court, the regularity of the proceedings, and the fact that the decree or order was made. A certified copy of an order providing for the transfer of any property dealt with by the plan shall be evidence of the transfer of title accordingly, and, if recorded as conveyances are recorded, shall impart the same notice that a deed, if recorded, would impart.

"(h) This chapter shall not be construed as to modify or repeal any prior existing statute relating to the refinancing or readjustment of indebtedness of municipalities, political subdivisions or districts: *Provided, however,* That the initiation of proceedings or the filing of a petition under section 80 of this act shall not constitute a bar to the same agency or instrumentality initiating a new proceeding under section 81 of this chapter.

"(i) Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to limit or impair the power of any State to control, by legislation or otherwise, any municipality or any political subdivision of or in such State in the exercise of its political or governmental powers, including expenditures therefor: *Provided, however,* That no State law prescribing a method of composition of indebtedness of such agencies shall be binding upon any creditor who does not consent to such composition, and no judgment shall be entered under such State law which would bind a creditor to such composition without his consent.

"(j) The partial completion or execution of any plan of composition as outlined in any petition under the terms of this act by the exchange of new evidence of indebtedness under the plan for evidences of indebtedness covered by the plan, whether such partial completion or execution of such plan of composition occurred before or after the filing of said petition, shall not be construed as limiting or prohibiting the effect of this title, and the written consent of the holders of any securities outstanding as the result of any such partial completion or execution of any plan of composition shall be included as consenting creditors to such plan of composition in determining the percentage of securities affected by such plan of composition."

SEC. 2. Section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended by the acts of August 16, 1937, June 28, 1940, and June 22, 1942, is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 9, strike out the word "as."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OPERATION OF SECTION 8 OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6741) relating to the operation of section 8 of the Federal Airport Act with respect to the fiscal year 1947.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the objectors on this side are rather loath to let any legislation be passed which is on the calendar but not yet eligible for consideration. Would the gentleman tell us the urgency of passing this bill at this time?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes. I will be pleased to. This bill really amends section 8 of the Airport Act, which was passed recently. If the conferees could have agreed upon a bill prior to the 1st of January or February last, there would not have been the necessity for it. But the larger class airports, 4 and 5, could not be considered until the fiscal year 1948. It is necessary to pass this bill in order that the Civil Aeronautics Administration may report to the Congress on those ports by the 1st of January next.

Mr. KEAN. If we did not pass this bill now it would put it off an extra year?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes. It was a unanimous report from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. KEAN. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 8 of the Federal Airport Act—

(1) Request by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for authority to undertake, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports, may, despite the time fixed by such section, be submitted to the Congress at any time on or before the day fixed for the first meeting of the Eightieth Congress; and

(2) Unless, on or before the sixtieth day after the day so fixed, a contrary intent shall have been manifested by the Congress by law or by concurrent resolution, authority to undertake such projects during such fiscal year, with the use of appropriations available therefor (whether made before or after the submission to Congress of such request), shall be considered to be granted.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL ANIMAL QUARANTINE STATION ON SWAN ISLAND

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 364, to provide for the establishment of an international animal quarantine station on Swan Island, and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent importation of such animals into other parts of the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia inform me of the urgency of this proposition?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Recently a number of cattle were brought in from Mexico without going through quarantine. Some of them found their way into the United States. The Department of Agriculture immediately established a blockade along the Mexican border in order to keep all cattle out until the situation could be cleared up, because the last time some of these cattle got in it cost the Government millions of dollars to eradicate the hoof-and-mouth disease that they brought in.

The Department made this recommendation. We heard the Department witnesses and the representatives of the cattle raisers of the West who, primarily, will be affected; and the committee reports the bill unanimously.

The object of this legislation is to establish a quarantine station on Swan Island where cattle that are needed in this country for breeding purposes can remain in quarantine until it is determined that the cattle are free of all diseases. We need to bring in certain types of cattle for breeding purposes, but before they are brought in we want to be sure there is no danger of the cattle bringing in the hoof-and-mouth disease or some other disease. We have assurances that the Mexican Government and the governments of Central America will cooperate with us in operating the station.

It is thought that the station after being established will be self-sustaining as the funds covering running expenses would be derived from fees assessed against livestock on a per capita basis.

Mr. KEAN. Is this a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It is a unanimous report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in his discretion, to establish and maintain on Swan Island, either independently or in cooperation with other American Republics and with breeders' organizations and similar organizations and individuals within the United States, an international animal quarantine station, including the acquisition of sites by lease or otherwise, and the construction of temporary buildings, improvements, and other facilities on such sites, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law but subject to regulations prescribed hereunder by the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent the introduction into the United States of communicable diseases of animals, animals may be brought into said quarantine station from any country, including but not limited to those countries in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines that rinderpest and foot-and-mouth disease exist, and may be subsequently imported into other parts of the United States under said regulations.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6689) to extend, for an additional year, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It is.

Mr. KEAN. What is the urgency for the passage of the bill?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The urgency is that the Sugar Act will expire at the end of this year and there is a lot of confusion among the sugar industry as to what will be done. They have been trying to adjust their differences in order to agree on a bill, but they have been unable to agree and, in my opinion, there is no possibility of their getting together before the first of the year.

The bill before us only extends the act 1 year in order to see if the different interests cannot get together and agree on a proper bill in the meantime.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand this continues the Sugar Act as it applies to quotas.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It continues the whole act.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Does the gentleman know whether it is contemplated to continue the suspension of quotas during the 1-year period?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I do not know. This extends the present law for the period of 1 year. I do know that Mr. Dodd, Under Secretary of Agriculture, in his letter to me of June 11, 1946, says this:

This procedure—

Extending the act for 1 year—

would permit revision of the Sugar Act before it will be necessary to reinstate sugar quotas.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. It is the law under which quotas are possible.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It is a continuation of the present act.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I shall have to object.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Will not the gentleman withhold his objection to permit me to make a further statement?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I will withhold it for the time being.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I understood that all the Florida Representatives had agreed that the only thing to do was to extend the act. The industry and the sugar people for some time have been making an effort to agree on legislation, but so far have been unable to agree. When it became apparent to the committee that an agreement at this time is impossible, we decided the best thing to do is to extend the act for 1 year. I thought all the Florida Congressmen thought likewise.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it not true that in the absence of extending the act at this time that as of December 31 this year, assuming the present Congress does adjourn, we would awaken on the morning of January 1, 1947, without any Sugar Act in operation whatsoever?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. That is correct; that is one danger we face.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me ask another question: At the moment and during the past many months the quotas have not been applied, have they?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The quotas have not been applied, and that is the reason I rise. If I could be assured that quotas would not be applied during this year of extension on the Florida product then I would withold my objection. To me it seems absurd to apply quotas in a period of critical shortage like this.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman and it seems to me it would be the essence of asininity to apply marketing quotas on any domestic production during the present calendar year and perhaps the calendar year 1947.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I would rather not object if I can get an assurance.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Of course, I cannot speak for the administration, however, I feel sure there will be no change during the coming year. This opinion is confirmed by the statement in Dr. Dodd's letter.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. If they attempt to restore quotas which would affect Florida would the gentleman join with me in asking the department not to do it?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I certainly would.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Has this bill passed the Senate?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. No; it has not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 513 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to termination of powers of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Sugar Act), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 513. The powers vested in the Secretary under this act shall terminate on December 31, 1947, except that the Secretary shall have power to make payments under title III under programs applicable to the crop year 1947 and previous crop years."

SEC. 2. Section 3508 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to termination of taxes with respect to sugar) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3508. Termination of taxes.

"No tax shall be imposed under this chapter on the manufacture, use, or importation of sugar after June 30, 1948."

SEC. 3. Section 503 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to payments to the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1948."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCUSING EMPLOYEES OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT ON JULY 5, 1946

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 6691, to excuse employees of the executive branch of the Government from work on July 5, 1946, and its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know anything about what this bill provides. No one has spoken to the Chair about taking the bill up at the present time. The Chair requests the gentleman to withhold his request for the time being.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

PUBLIC DEBT ACT OF 1946

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6699) to decrease the amount of obligations issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6699, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 6699 decreases the debt limit of the United States from $300,000,000,000 to $275,000,000,000.

The $300,000,000,000 debt limit was established by the Public Act of 1945, approved April 3, 1945. This act increased the debt limit from $260,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000 and was the last of a series of increases which were brought about by the necessity of financing the most costly war in history.

This war is now over; and I believe that we can look forward, not merely to a balanced budget, but to a surplus during the fiscal year which will begin on the first of next month.

Happily, it was not necessary for the public debt to be increased to the full limit authorized by Congress. The gross public debt of the United States, including guaranteed obligations, as reported in the Treasury accounts, reached a high of $279,800,000,000 on February 28, 1946. This amount is somewhat lower, as I shall presently explain, than the amount of the debt as reported for the purpose of the statutory debt limitation. The debt, as computed for this purpose, amounted to $289,600,000,000 at that time.

Since February, the gross debt has been reduced by about $10,000,000,000. This reduction will continue for some time to come as the balance in the Treasury is reduced from the level appropriate to wartime expenditures to one appropriate to those of peacetime. In addition, I hope that the debt will be further reduced during the next fiscal year by applying funds arising from a budgetary surplus.

We never can reduce the debt if we keep on appropriating unnecessarily. I think that can be proved by my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylcania.

Mr. RICH. If we carry out the program as outlined by the President in his Budget message in January, wherein he says it will take $35,000,000,000 to run the Government beginning July 1, and for the next succeeding 2 years $25,000,000,000 each, and with conditions in the country being as they are, where the income of corporations and labor has decreased on account of strikes like it has this year, I cannot see how you are going to keep from having the Budget go over the $275,000,000,000 mark again. That is liable to happen at the beginning of next year, especially if you give $4,400,000,000 to Great Britain and billions to other nations.

Now you Democrats are in the hot spot right now, and you have got to do something to cut down expenses. I do not mean you, Mr. DOUGHTON, because it is the gentleman's business to raise revenue, but you, as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that raises the revenue, ought to demand of the Committee on Appropriations that they do cut down Government spending and that Congress see that we get a balanced Budget. I have a lot of confidence in the gentleman from North Carolina, and I know he will do that, and if there is anything that we can do now that will save this country. It will be the cutting down of unnecessary spending. It will not be the passing of this resolution, unless the Congress has made up its mind that it will cut down expenses so that this resolution that the gentleman is putting through today will really mean something. Otherwise it is only a gesture to the public, and you will again run over two hundred and seventy-five billion.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Will my good friend please help me by informing me how we would enforce that demand?

Mr. RICH. If the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Vice President of the Senate, and the President of

the United States would call in the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate and tell them just what we are going to have in the way of revenue and then say, "Now, gentlemen, it is your business to stop appropriating over and above that amount," then we will go some place in economizing, providing also the people back home let the Members of Congress know they want less spending and more economy in Government.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. As I understand my friend, he modifies his demand that the Committee on Ways and Means do it, and now suggests that the Speaker of the House do it.

Mr. RICH. No. The President of the United States is more responsible than anyone else for the spending of money, but he has not the sole responsibility. It is the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate. There is the nigger in the wood pile, and we have got to get after them and let these people know that they cannot go on and make these appropriations if this resolution means anything.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I hope my friend will get that nigger out of the wood pile that causes so much trouble.

Mr. RICH I will do everything I can to that end, and I always have,

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. If he can, we will be much better off. I would not be in favor of shooting anybody; but if he is in there and creating trouble, there ought to be something done about it.

Mr. RICH. What effort is being done by the powers that be now in this administration to cut down expenses? That is the point. That is the thing that is going to count; and unless they realize that responsibility, may I say to the gentleman, I do not think this resolution is worth a cent, or a tinker's hoot.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The war ended earlier than we anticipated, and consequently appropriations that we thought would be necessary for the war were not necessary, and in place of increasing the debt we have reduced it by $10,000,000,000. That is encouraging. It is to be hoped that my good friend from Pennsylvania, the watchdog of the Treasury as far as the House is concerned, will assist in holding down appropriations to necessary expenditures and thereby lighten the heavy burdens on the taxpayers of today, and if he does, no one will be more pleased than the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RICH. I know that and I realize that, but may I say this to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means? We have a lot of appropriation bills that are coming in here that will require a lot of money. Take, for instance, Great Britain, with a request for $4,400,000,000. They are also talking about giving Russia a billion-dollar loan and France $750,000,000 as well as a lot of these other foreign countries.

We just have no money to loan any country. We might barter or trade with foreign countries and do business with them, but we just must stop being a good fellow and a Santa Claus.

Our responsibility to our people is great and they expect of us a sensible, sound administration of the affairs of our Government.

If we want to keep our own house in order we just cannot afford to take on those obligations to all those foreign countries. Does the gentleman think we can? That is a fair question.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. No, I do not think we can.

Mr. RICH. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I would infer that my good friend from Pennsylvania is not in favor of all these loans or gifts or whatever they may be, and I somewhat share his opinion on the subject. That is an open question on which, however, we must keep an open mind until the evidence is all in. I always try to wait until the evidence is in before I arrive at a conclusion.

It seems appropriate, therefore, that the debt limit should be reduced to reflect this new situation. This is the first bill reducing the debt limit which this committee has had the privilege to report to the House since I became a Member of it in 1925. I know that you can all appreciate how happy I am to be able to report this bill and recommend its adoption.

In addition to reducing the debt limit from $300,000,000,000 to $275,000,000,000, H. R. 6699 changes the manner in which the debt is computed for the purpose of applying the limitation.

Some say that this is excessive, but I think the bill intends just to tell the truth and the facts as far as the actual debt of the United States is concerned. There may be an honest difference of opinion, but I think the bill is an improvement on the present law in that respect.

The present $300,000,000,000 limitation applies to the total face amount of the debt that can be outstanding at any one time. In the case of savings bonds sold at a discount, face value is identified by the present law with the maturity value, rather than with the issue price or current redemption value, of the obligations. This means, for example, that when the Treasury sells a Series E savings bonds for $75 it increases the debt for the purposes of the statutory debt limitation by the full maturity value of the bond—that is $100—although the Treasury has received only $75 from the sale.

The $100 will not be due until the end of the 10 years.

The debt limitation has been applied in this manner for many years. During this same period, the Treasury Department has, with the full knowledge of our committee, issued its monthly statement of the amount of the public debt, not on the basis of the maturity value of the securities outstanding, but on the basis of their current redemption values. In a statement made upon this basis, a savings bond sold at $75 is included in the public debt at $75 as long as it is redeemable at that amount. When at the end of one year, the redemption value of the bond increases to $75.50, it is taken into the public debt at that amount, and so on, until the tenth year when it is included in the debt at its maturity value of $100.

Computing the debt in this way makes more sense for most purposes than taking it at its maturity value. In addition to the fact that periodic Treasury financial statements have for years reported the public debt on this basis, Congress has recognized it by tying various pieces of legislation—for example, the determination of the rate of interest to be paid on special obligations issued to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund—to the amount of the debt as so computed. The informed public has also recognized that this is the more significant method of computing the debt. The figures based on current redemption values are used almost universally in public discussions, although the Treasury Department regularly publishes figures on both bases. The figures based on maturity values, on the other hand, have been little used, except in discussions of changes in the debt limitation statute. This has resulted in unnecessary confusion. Your committee believes that this confusion should be ended by placing the statutory limitation on the same basis as that used for other purposes.

For a number of years, the Treasury Department has issued at the end of each month a statement reconciling the amount of the debt as shown in its ordinary accounts with its amount for the purposes of the statutory debt limitation. That is, it issues two statements, one showing the actual maturity value of the obligations outstanding and the other showing the current redemption value, which is really what the Government owes at the time the statement is issued.

We had up this matter in 1944. The House passed a bill, and the Senate changed it, whereby the debt obligation of the United States would be computed on the same basis as provided in this bill.

That was first called to the attention of the chairman of the committee by Mr. Dewey, a very able and distinguished member of our committee, as well as of Congress, and a very able banker. He is now connected with some bank and has been in the banking business many years. I offered the amendment at his suggestion to change the method of computing the obligations of the United States. He certainly would not have advocated that if he had not thought it was sound legislation.

The bill which we are now reporting has been made possible by the rapid decline in Government expenditures and by the sustained level of tax receipts since VJ-day. Secretary Vinson recommended its adoption, and I think its passage by the House today will be a fitting recognition of the healthy state of Government finances as Secretary Snyder takes over. I am sure that the passage of this bill will give the House more satisfaction than that of any bill which has been before it in some time.

As my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, has so pertinently observed and so often emphasized, if the

Congress can hold down the obligations, expenditures, authorizations, and appropriations to an amount necessary to meet the necessary expenditures of the Government, we will have no trouble or difficulty in balancing the budget while revenue receipts are at a reasonable level. If we are to retain the confidence of the public, we must gradually reduce or lower the debt. The only way we can do it is by a greater economy than we have ever effected up to this time or at least for many years.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The report sets forth that the current redemption value of any obligation issued on a discount basis which is redeemable prior to maturity, at the option of the holder shall be considered to be the face amount of such obligation.

If that is applied to bonds, what does it mean? Does it mean the face value of the bond would be considered the amount that the Government would pay to the holder even though he bought it at a discount?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. No; it means that the redemption value of the bond shall be what he paid for it plus the interest that has accrued. For instance, a $100 bond is sold at a 25-percent discount which means that he paid $75 for it.

If the purchaser holds the bond for the 10 years, he will get $100. But if the holder wants to cash the bond and turns it in, he will just get the $75 plus the interest that has accrued, provided he does not turn it in before 1 year.

Mr. DONDERO. In other words, they do not have to redeem it at a loss?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. No, he does not have to cash it at a loss. He cannot turn it in at a profit and he gets no interest until he has held it a year, but he can call for his money any time after 60 days.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means what he thinks of the sale of surplus property. It seems to me that all the money that is derived from the sale of surplus property should be turned in toward reducing the national debt as fast as that money comes into the hands of the Government through the various Government organizations, because we should not confuse the operation of the Government in deriving income from the sale of this property with the money we have appropriated in the past to run the Government. We should figure the amount of our expenses annually as well as our receipts and the difference should be either a gain or a loss, a surplus or a deficit. All the moneys that are derived from the sale of surplus property should be turned in toward the reduction of our national debt and we should keep the account separate.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Of course, receipts from the sale of surplus property are turned in to the general Treasury fund. That augments the fund in addition to what we receive from the customs and internal-revenue taxes. Therefore it is all one fund, as I understand it. If at any time there is a surplus in the Treasury above a reasonable balance or a safe balance, it ought to be paid on the public debt and the bonds should be called in and the interest should be stopped.

Mr. RICH. I hold in my hand the Treasury statement of June 12, which shows a credit here for the fiscal year 1946 of receipts of $337,387,948.02 from the Surplus Property Act of October 3, 1944.

Certainly we should have a greater credit than that to apply on our national debt from sale of surplus property. What is this administration doing with surplus property sales? Why does not the Treasury statement reveal where it is applied?

Now, we know that there has been a great deal more surplus property than that sold. As fast as they sell it, they should get that money into the Treasury.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. At least that 2 cents should go to the reduction of the public debt. I am sure of that. We should be counting mills and cents now, we are so far in debt.

Mr. RICH. It is as amusing to you as it is to me how these Government statements mention 2 cents, the way they have been squandering money the last few years. But every 2 cents in bookkeeping is accurate accounting to me and should be tenderly cared for—10 pennies make a dime and 10 dimes make a dollar.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The gentleman expresses my views exactly as far as that is concerned.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, my support of this bill is, to say the least, qualified. In the first place, it is in part an attempt to fool the American people—for this bill pretends to reduce the debt limit by $25,000,000,000 when it is really only reducing it by some fourteen or fifteen billions.

The difference comes through changes in the method of bookkeeping.

Whether it is correct to figure savings bonds at their redemption value today, or at the figure which they must be redeemed if held to maturity is a question about which accountants will disagree—so I suppose it is only human nature here to find the Treasury Department advocating the way which is most politically advantageous.

I personally would prefer that we be more honest with the public—leave the accounting rules as they are at present and make the figure two hundred and eighty-five billion, rather than the two hundred and seventy-five billion as appears in the bill.

The public will like this bill for it seems to show that the administration is heading in the right direction.

But does this bill really mean anything? Is not the whole question of the size of the public debt entirely a question of how much Congress is going to spend?

If we continue to appropriate at the rate we have been doing, what does this bill mean?

It only means that we say to the Secretary of the Treasury, "If Congress keeps spending, you will have to find the money in some other way than through borrowing."

You would set up quite a problem for him. Of course he could draw down his working balances for a while, but you would find him hot-footing up to Congress asking us to change this limit again—or crying for more taxes, or asking us to give him authority to issue printing-press money, or some other scheme for what our debt is—is entirely a question of how much we appropriate here.

The bill does not mean anything.

It does not accomplish anything.

It is merely a somewhat misleading gesture to the American people calling attention to the fact that Congress has not spent as much as was envisioned when we raised the debt limit to three hundred billion.

Of course, he have not. The war was on then—has been over nearly a year now. But we have, and are spending much too much. And the blame lies right here in this Capitol Building.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, if we were to take this bill at its face value I dare say anybody and everybody would support it without any qualms of conscience or any excuses or any reasons; but, just as my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] indicated, the bill on its face does not state the actual facts; and neither do any of these bills that we have passed heretofore with reference to debt limitation. Just as we have increased the debt limit several times we never have, had, nor has it ever been the intention that the bills we passed should include all of the debt we owed. We have had this matter up before. The last time we had it up I made a very exhaustive speech on the subject. I shall not attempt to do that today, but I shall go into it far enough to show that what we owe is not covered by or included in this bill. The Government owes many billions in addition to anything we have ever covered in legislation of this kind. For instance, we owe all of the contingent liabilities of the country. A year ago they aggregated $21,000,000. Some of them have been paid and some have been reduced. I do not have the figures at this time to cover them. Then we have other organizations that have the right to incur and bind the United States in debt obligations. There are a number of them. I listed them before. There were about 41, I think. Some of them have outlived their usefulness by this

time, of course, and do not have that authority. I do not have the exact figures but I feel sure that the actual debt and contingent obligation of the Federal Government at this time would be at least $50,000,000,000 more than that included in this bill. I do not want to be held down to any exact figures because I think the principle is the same no matter how the figures vary, but a year or so ago I did have the figures showing that it ran up, I think, to about thirty-five or forty billions.

What is the need for legislation of this kind? I have always maintained that we have never needed any of these debt limitations for this reason: Regardless of the fact we passed a law providing that the debt limit shall be so much, that does not mean that we bind ourselves, because it is the Congress that has passed that limitation and the Congress can at any time it wishes exceed that limitation. In other words it is just like my saying that I will not spend any more money. It is my money, and if I change my mind I can spend some more of my own money. I may budget myself. I can live within the budget or if I do not want to live within the budget I can exceed the budget. It is not a bad idea to pass a law limiting the debt obligation, but I cannot see any reason why we should have to pass a debt-limit law when we are going down. For instance, if we say the present debt limitation is $300,000,000,000, what is the use of passing a new limitation fixing it at only $275,000,000,000 when we are coming down to that figure? It is only natural that the debt should recede with the conclusion of the war and really I maintain that it does not mean practically anything for you to say how much the debt shall be. For instance, if we approve this $275,000,000,000, something in the very near future might come up that might require us to assume some great obligation, for instance, say something in connection with this atomic age, where we would want to surpass that limit. There is no reason why we should not. There was one instance, I think, during the war when the debt ran above the limit before we had time to raise the limit. So we can do it again. I made a little speech out in Columbus, Ohio, about a year ago in which I divided up the amount that each community would have to pay of the national debt. We talk about the national debt being $275,000,000,000, but we do not appreciate how much it is. That is a terrific amount. Take the city of Columbus, Ohio, or one the size of Columbus, 400,000, and their portion of that debt is $655,000,000. That city now has the right to vote under the law a debt of no more than $22,000,000. In other words, the greatest debt that she could incur under the law would be $22,000,000, but if she started out to pay her portion of the national debt it would amount to $655,000,000. That is 147 percent of the assessed value of the whole city. That same situation is true all over the United States. So it is no wonder that the great group of people we call the common people does not pay much attention when we say that the national debt amounts to so much.

It is so colossal that there is not much chance for us to ever pay it, especially under the plans and legislative programs we have been using in the last few years. The only way we can ever pay it is to devolve plans that bring the United States to maximum production. Let us produce all we can, let everybody work and everybody produce and everybody earn his daily bread. When we do that, we might pay the debt sometime. When that will be, I would not dare to prophesy. I hope to live a long time, but I have no reason to expect to live that long.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. Assuming this House passes what is commonly called the British Loan Act, which is to be financed by the sale of bonds of the United States Government. Would that come under the provisions of this act now before us?

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman probably knows, if he has studied the British Loan Act very closely—and I am sure he has—that the claim is made it will not. They claim that the plans by which they are going to fund this obligation will be such that it will be taken care of so that it will not become a part of the national debt. But that is only a manipulation.

Mr. MATHEWS. I would like the gentleman's viewpoint.

Mr. JENKINS. It is only manipulation. You cannot incur an obligation that is not a debt. You can devise any kind of bookkeeping you please, but in the final wind-up it is a debt. If we advance it as a gift to Great Britain, we will not get it back. If we advance it as a loan, it will depend on how much you are going to figure that loan to be worth. You may lend money to a certain individual that you know is good and you would consider such a loan a good debt. But if you lend money to somebody you have grave doubts that he will pay you back, it is not a good loan. We are, as I understand the plans, to issue bonds which will be used to secure funds with which to make the proposed loan to Britain. Any kind of bonds issued by the Government are a part of the national debt.

Mr. MATHEWS. If the British-loan agreement is passed or agreed to by this House and that legislation amends this act to include the British loan, then this limitation does not mean very much, does it?

Mr. JENKINS. If it should develop that the Appropriations Committee will be called upon, in order to sustain the financial honor of the country, to appropriate money that will run the national debt beyond $275,000,000,000, we, the Members of Congress, will vote it on the floor of the House. If we obligate ourselves to lend this money to Great Britain, we will lend it; and if we must run the debt limit above $275,000,000,000, we will do so. That is one boast that we can make about America: we always live up to every obligation to which we agree. If it be a financial obligation, we pay what we agree to pay. We perform what we agree to perform. We should exercise that care before we incur an obligation, because after it has been incurred it is too late.

Mr. Chairman, let me say one more word. I want to impress especially on the Republicans that they should not get into their minds that this bill today means that $275,000,000,000 is all we owe. The day may come when we will be in power and we will then find that the country owes much more than two hundred and seventy-five billions. Then we might want to pass a debt-limitation law that will include the whole debt. In that event we might want to exceed the two hundred and seventy-five billion limit and just because a man says he owes only a thousand dollars that will not protect from paying $2,000 if he actually owes $2,000. Do not be backward about remembering that when we vote for this bill today we do it as a matter of expediency. Do not be fooled about all these figures. You have heard that sometimes figures do not tell the truth, which is the case here. The figures do not tell the truth and do not commence to tell the whole truth. I am going to vote for the legislation because it is just a little matter of expediency. Of course, I am glad that we are coming down a little with the national debt. We should have paid the debt off much faster than we have been paying it. But, as I said before, we will never pay our debt off until we produce more, until we have a more complete national income, an income that is a real income, not a manipulated income. The national debt will never be paid until the Republican Party is restored to power. That has been the history of our country. After World War I the Republicans were restored to power and we paid the debt off at the rate of $1,000,000,000 per year. We will have the task to do again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JENKINS. I yield myself an additional minute.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to my distinguished and learned colleague from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman made some very interesting statements about the share of the national debt in my district, which is Columbus, Ohio. The gentleman gave figures, I presume, based upon the population; on the per capita share of the debt.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I wonder if it would not be possible for the gentleman, from his studies, to tell us what the share, for instance, of the national debt in my district would be based upon the amount of income tax we now pay or the amount of property in my district. It occurs to me that while the per capita debt is an extremely interesting figure, I happen to know that my district is going to have to pay far more than its per capita share of the debt if it is ever going to be paid.

Mr. JENKINS. That results from the fact that the gentleman comes from one of the finest districts in the United States as far as ability to pay taxes is concerned. I refer to the capital city of Ohio. Incidentally, I might say for the State of

Ohio that we are far in the lead, as far as that is concerned, over the average of the States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself four additional minutes.

There is no question but what there are some cities in the country that have large populations that do not have much tax to pay, and consequently do not pay a great amount of taxes in proportion to other cities that have a less population. But the city of Columbus, I dare say, is far above the average, and the gentleman should get ready to pay more than his share.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. My people might just as well understand that they are not only going to have to pay the gigantic sum the gentleman has mentioned, but more, too, if the United States is to remain solvent.

Mr. JENKINS. There is no question about that.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. The gentleman was speaking of the public debt per district. If we consider the Federal, State, and municipal debt combined as the public debt, it amounts to about $435,000,000,000, or about a billion dollars per congressional district.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman is absolutely right. I wish we could say that all the national, State, and political subdivision debts were included in this sum of money. The States owe a colossal amount. The municipalities owe a colossal amount, and the various Government agencies owe a colossal amount. But I say this, taken as a whole, the financial position of the States is far better than the financial position of the United States of America at this time. The United States is staggering under the most colossal debt that ever burdened any country. There are some who say "Why worry, we owe it to ourselves." That is going to be a poor answer to an aged thrifty person who has denied himself in order to buy a few Government bonds to carry him on through his life. When he asks for cash for his bonds it would not be right to tell him he owes anybody any part of his bond. That would be repudiation. Repudiation is not American. Should America ever repudiate her honest debt then America would be America no more. Repudiation is inconsistent with the very genius of America.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio who just preceded me. This is a very embarrassing bill to our Republican friends. This is a bill that they have been asking for time after time. This is a bill as to which the distinguished Member from Ohio who preceded me has consistently stated "Why, there is no such thing as a limitation on debt by statute." So today we are now presented with this bill that has been introduced by our distinguished Chairman. The purpose of the bill is not to decrease the debt limit, but to decrease the amount of obligations issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act which may be outstanding at any one time.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Let us have a little understanding here. The gentleman does not mean, of course, to give the impression that the passage of this bill will reduce the debt any more.

Mr. LYNCH. Absolutely not. It does, however, put a ceiling on the amount of bonds that may be issued.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right. Now I want the gentleman to get this right. What we Republicans were clamoring for was not this bill but a condition when the debt would come down. We are glad you have reached that place finally.

Mr. LYNCH. The situation is that under this bill the obligations which may be issued under the authority of the Second Liberty Bond Act are limited to $275,000,000,000, which is a reduction of $25,000,000,000 from the present authorized amount.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. We decrease the amount of obligations which can be outstanding at any one time without further legislation.

Mr. LYNCH. That is correct.

It has been stated here by one of my colleagues that this involves a change in Treasury accounting. Actually it does not involve a change in Treasury accounting. It conforms to the manner in which the Treasury has been rendering its accounts in the past and to which exception has been taken.

It also has been said here that we now seem to be heading in the right direction insofar as the administration is concerned. The American people were pledged time after time that as soon as the war expenditures were over the Democratic administration would make every effort to reduce our obligations. That is what has been done in the past, that is what we are doing now, and that is what I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania will recognize we are doing in the future. Is that correct?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. Certainly.

Mr. RICH. If this has anything to do with reducing our expenditures, then I know nothing at all about financing. This does not reduce expenditure one iota. You are not going to do anything so far as doing the sound, solid thing for this Government is concerned, unless you stop the appropriations you are making. By passing this bill and having the country think you are reducing the national debt, you are not reducing it one cent. All you are doing is putting a limit on it, but after awhile you will make appropriation after appropriation and then you will find you are up against a stumbling block, and you will probably have to come back here and increase the limitation again, as we have done 8 or 10 times in the last 4 or 5 years.

Mr. LYNCH. There is no more chance of our increasing the obligations once we have passed this bill than there is for the gentleman to fly out of the room.

Mr. RICH. This is only a shot in the arm.

Mr. LYNCH. The fact of the matter is that under this bill we are limiting the obligations that can be issued to $275,000,000,000 instead of $300,000,000,000. That is bringing it down $25,000,000,000, which is in line with what the gentleman has been asking for so eloquently in the years in which he has been in the House, as to where we are going to get the money. Now we have this reduction insofar as the obligations that may be issued under the bill are concerned. We have said under this bill that no obligations can be issued above $275,000,000,000. The existing law is that no obligations shall be issued over $300,000,000,000. That, to my mind, is definitely in line with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been asking for a good many months and a good many years. Now, when we are trying to do what the gentleman asks, we are told that this is a fraud and that this is a cheat and that the American people are being deceived.

The fact of the matter is that this is $25,000,000,000 and not 2 cents like you were arguing about before. It is $25,000,000,000 less than the existing authorization. I should think you would be very happy.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman is not correct when he says it is $25,000,000,000 less than the existing authorization. It is only $14,000,000,000 less than the existing authorization.

Mr. LYNCH. The gentleman's method of calculation is a rather peculiar one.

Mr. KEAN. It is the way the Treasury has calculated.

Mr. LYNCH. I fail to understand why he calculates that way. If you owed $1,000 on a demand note, would you say your obligation was $1,000 plus 6 percent interest for 6 years or would you say your obligation was $1,000 plus 6 percent up to the present day? Of course, the gentleman would say that his obligation was $1,000 plus interest up to the present day. That is the way it is with these $75 bonds which have a face value of $100 but the obligation is only $75 plus the accrued interest down to the present time.

Mr. KEAN. In my hand I hold a bond. It says $25 and does not say $18.75. That is the principal amount of the bond.

Mr. LYNCH. The principal sum of the bond is $18.75 and you have the accumulated interest. The gentleman knows that very well. The accumulated interest for 10 years brings it up to $25 in the case of an $18.75 bond.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. If the gentleman would turn the bond over and read the back of it he will see that it does not have a value of $25. It

is worth $25 at the end of 10 years. But the gentleman should read if he will what the value is after 1 year or 2 years or 3 years. The value then is much less than $25.

Mr. KEAN. Why did they print $25 on that bond then?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Why do you not give the whole story?

Mr. KEAN. I know the whole story. I have bought bonds the same as the gentleman has.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Why do you not give us the whole story?

Mr. LYNCH. I know the gentleman is familiar with that bond because as he says, and as I know, he has purchased many of them. He is one of the most patriotic Members of the House. At the same time the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey knows very well that actually that bond was bought for $18.75. If he will look at the face of the bond he will note that the obligation runs from the date printed thereon up to the present time. If the bond was presented for payment today, a person would get $18.75 plus the interest from the date of the bond to the 17th day of June 1946, and that, in my opinion, is the real obligation of the United States Government—to pay that bond of $18.75 with interest to the time when it is presented. It can be presented at any time and if it were presented today, that would be the amount of the obligation of the Government.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The bond shows how much it is worth after each year and it is not worth $25 until the end of 10 years. It is written plainly on the back of the bond how much it is worth at the end of each year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, certainly no damage can be done by passing this resolution. But if we are cutting down our national debt $25,000,000,000, it would please me a whole lot more than it is to pass this resolution. I have a statement of June 12 showing that our national debt is $271,188,582,719.95.

Now, the situation is just this. This resolution has no effect whatever in aiding or assisting in cutting down our national debt. It is just saying that our debt shall not be increased over and above $275,000,000,000. But you know the President sent a message in here last January that the expenditures for the year beginning July 1 would be $35,000,000,000. For the next 2 years it would be $25,000,000,000 each year. That means if you want to balance the budget you have to take in $35,000,000,000 next year. With the system of taxation we have and the condition of business in the country and the number of strikes there are at this time I question whether you will get $35,000,000,000 income. Therefore if you do not get it, you will naturally have to increase the debt a little over and above what it is at that time.

In my opinion you will go in the red about $1,000,000,000 a month next year. That is, if you do not take into consideration any moneys you receive from the sale of surplus property, your regular income and outgo. If you go into debt $12,000,000,000 next year, the following 2 years you will go into debt five or six billion dollars. To me that is a terrible situation to be in. You have not had a balanced budget since 1941. Just think of it. That is the longest period in the history of our Nation that we have gone in the red. We have had the greatest orgy of spending that any nation has ever had. It behooves the Members of Congress and those responsible for the operation of this Government not to permit any more expenditures than are absolutely necessary for the conduct of the affairs of this Government. We have been too lax in trying to hold down expenses. Too lavish in spending. I know the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee realizes that as much as any Member of the House, but I hope he will join with the Republicans and say we are not going to permit the expenditure of any more funds than we are going to take in by our revenues regularly collected. If you do that, it is up to you, Mr. Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, to see that we get the money before we spend it. If we will take an attitude of that kind, then I believe we will be able to get this country on its feet. That is, provided we do not play Santa Claus to every nation in the world. I say it with all respect to every nation on the face of this earth, this country cannot afford to go into debt any further, in order to help all the countries of the earth we would like to help, and who have their hands out, because of the way this Nation has played Santa Claus to every nation and every organization in the world in the last 10 years of New Deal experimenting, New Deal incompetency, and New Deal extravagance, vote maneuvering and waste.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The gentleman will agree there is nothing in this bill, by any stretch of the imagination, that could be interpreted as increasing the public obligation or increasing the debt? The purpose of it is to fix a limitation of obligations to be outstanding at any one time.

Mr. RICH. Exactly so.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It does not increase or decrease the public debt, as far as that is concerned, or as far as expenses are concerned. The British loan and appropriations and all those things will come up later. One thing about the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I will say he is always consistent. He does not believe in wasting money. I wish I were a little stronger than I am in that respect. I cannot go quite as far as he does, but I keep as near to him as I can.

Mr. RICH. Well, I always had to work and earn and save if I wanted to get along, and I think every man in this country has to do the same thing. We must work for what we get and we will appreciate it more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. I think every Member of Congress has to come to the conclusion that every dollar he appropriates and spends is going to be added to the burden of his constituents who are the taxpayers. When every Member of Congress realizes that it is his duty now to try to keep expenditures down so that his taxpayers back home are not going to be overburdened with paying taxes that will be assessed, then we will get some place, and we can save this country from financial ruin. But this country is in danger of being taken over by the radicals and people who believe in spending and spending. We have had enough of those radicals in the administration in the last few years, and I hope the people back home eliminate them all. The administration now, since we have a new President, must realize that it should insist on economy of Government operation, consolidate departments, cut out duplication, leave much of the New Deal functions on the shelf, or put them in a basket, carry them to the dump and throw them overboard. They have no place here. We ought to clean them up.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The taxpayers are weary and heavy laden. They are entitled to a rest and are demanding a rest.

Mr. RICH. The taxpayers are the voters. The voters, the people back home, I am sure, will soon realize the situation and refuse to support Members of Congress who come here for everything under the sun in the way of expenditures when every State in the Union is now in better financial condition than the Federal Government. There is not a State that is not in better financial position than the United States Government.

I hope the membership of the House will remember these facts when these requests come to us for unnecessary spending of our own and foreign loans. Next week we are going to have a request to lend $4,400,000,000 to Great Britain. We cannot make that loan or gift because we just cannot obligate the taxpayers of this country to make these gifts to foreign countries when it is not due them, when we do not owe it to them in any way. And it may wreck us financially if we give them the money. Stop it before it is our downfall.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this bill, of course, is an altogether proper bill. I am sure it is going to pass without any dissent. It seems to me that the bringing in of this debt-limit-reduction bill today, coinciding, as it does, with the report of the Federal Reserve Board which is contained in this

morning's papers, is rather significant, and I wanted to speak about it from that point of view.

We all know, of course, that the reason it is possible for us to bring in this bill today, the reason it is possible for us to look forward to the likelihood of a balanced budget, if not the running of a surplus, is because of the high level of production that is taking place in the Nation today. The first point I want to make is that everything connected with the possibility of reducing the national debt depends upon the maintenance through the years of that full production which incidentally means reasonably full employment for our people.

The Federal Reserve Board has recommended that we maintain taxes for the next few years without reducing them further—at least the net amount of the tax, regardless of the incidence. That might be changed, but they recommend that the total amount of taxes collected should not be reduced. I agree with them. I think we already perhaps have gone too far in that direction. Then they recommend a reduction of Government expenditures just as much as possible. Again, of course, the Board is right. Then they proceed to point out, in effect, that we still will not be out of the woods if we do those things.

To approach the matter from a little different angle for a moment, I am one of those people who have believed that we needed a more realistic administration of OPA, one aimed more directly at getting maximum production than we have had. But I have had, and still have, the fear that if OPA were virtually eliminated or seriously reduced or taken away at the present time we would face a dangerous inflationary period. I think that is true, and I am afraid it is going to happen. Under those circumstances, then, as the Federal Reserve Board points out, it becomes incumbent upon the Congress to attempt to use every other means at hand to prevent inflation. Those other means should have been used from the beginning, and some of these means are vastly more fundamental to the problem than anything this OPA itself can apply. So it is necessary, the Board points out, to attack what it calls the "inflationary potentials" of the present situation. I might quote statements made by the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, Mr. Chester Davis, who pointed out in a radio address not very long ago the following:

> We must stop the expansion in our supply of money which is due to monetization of bank debts.

In another place he said:

> We must act on the inflationary source of bank credit particularly.

In another place he points out there are two different kinds of borrowing the Government engages in: First, borrowing from individuals and corporations; and the second is "borrowing from banks who create new money on those bonds. That, in large part, has been responsible for the great growth of our money supply as the result of the war."

That is not myself speaking. That is Mr. Chester Davis speaking. He is, however, saying things that I have said many, many times in the well of this House. I pointed out that we were in effect permitting the banking system of the United States to create hundreds of billions of dollars of brand new money during the war period.

What does the Federal Reserve Board say we ought to do about it? They point out that more than $100,000,000,000 of Government bonds is now held by the banks or about 40 percent of our total national debt? To the extent that the national debt is reduced by paying off some of these bonds, as we all hope can be done, the amount of the bonds becomes cash in the hands of the banks and creates a new inflationary danger of five times the proportion of the present one. The reason is that under present banking laws and regulations, with the reserves now at their maximum at which the Federal Reserve can legally fix them, for every dollar of cash reserves the bank has it can loan into circulation $5 of bank credit of demand deposit money. So the Federal Reserve Board is concerned about this matter, and quite properly so.

The first thing that might occur to the Federal Reserve Board or to any one else who studies the question would be to raise the rate of interest. If they raised the rate of interest that would make it less desirable for people to borrow. It would put a brake upon the desire of people to borrow this money from the bank, and thus put a brake on the expansion of the monetary supply of the country. The monetary supply of the Nation today is more than twice what it was 4 years ago, in 1941. Then people wonder why we have the inflation problem. The reason the Board cannot raise the rate of interest, however, is very succinctly stated by the Federal Reserve Board when they point out that a rise in the rate of interest of even 1 percent means an addition to the Nation's tax bill of $1,000,000,000 a year under present circumstances. The Board points out that the national debt is six times as big as it was 4 years ago.

So the Board recommends three measures to be taken. Here is what they are: In the first place, they recommend that there should be a limitation on the opportunity of banks to make long-term investments with newly created money; that is, bank credit money created on the bank's books with which the Government has nothing to do at all. It is the use of a sovereign power of the Nation by a banking system to create new money. They recommend that the bank's right to use that money created on their books by making long-term investments be eliminated. Otherwise the banking system can and does buy for example productive plant in the country with money it has created out of thin air. They also recommend that a portion of the short-term bonds be frozen in the banks as a part of their reserves. This would mean the banks could not turn their short-term bonds into cash nor expand upon them at a 5 to 1 ratio in the manner I have described.

In the third place they recommend an increase in the Board's power to control reserve requirements. They say that the Federal Reserve Board should have the power to increase the reserves in the commercial banks as against demand deposits to a greater extent than they now have. I believe the Board is decidedly on the right track. I would only say that I do not think they have gone far enough if we are in earnest about meeting the present situation.

I have a proposal. I have made it before repeatedly. I have made it in books, articles, and speeches. I have written books and I have made speeches in the House recommending that what we ought to have is a hundred percent reserves behind the demand deposits in the banks. When people have money in the bank, when they think they have money in the bank, it ought to be there dollar for dollar. Suppose we did that. Then we should at the present time, as a means of making the transition easy and as a means of preventing inflation permit the banks to use Government bonds that they now hold as a part of those reserves and make those bonds eligible as a part of the reserves. This would mean that the banks would have to hold those bonds and could not use them as a basis for inflationary expansion. The bonds would be a part of their reserves. Let the banks hold them and draw interest on them as long as the bonds are outstanding and until they reach maturity. Then at the point where they do reach maturity, in view of the fact that those bonds were acquired by the banks through the process of the creation of money on the bank's part, therefore were bought with money the only security for which was the credit of the United States of America as a nation, I would pay those bonds off at point of maturity, by an act of Congress, authorizing the creation by the American Government of money in precisely the way the banking system created the money when they bought the bonds. Thus I would replace those bonds with lawful money in the hands of the banks as their reserves behind demand deposits.

If this were done, three things would happen: One, 40 percent of the national debt of the United States would have been paid off in the course of time, not immediately, but would be paid off without the necessity of a single dollar of tax raise to do it. No. 2, danger of inflation at the moment would be largely eliminated or, at least, greatly mitigated. No. 3, not a single bank in the United States could ever fail again as long as it lasted in all history, for the possibility of bank failure would be automatically wiped out.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I simply asked for this time because I believe this bill is quite a proper bill, and I am glad it is possible to bring it in. Also the bill points in the direction that we must go. To go in that direction we must be resolute in resisting reduction of taxes, we must be resolute in the curtailment of expenditures, but more than that we must establish a proper policy in the monetary and fiscal field.

I just want to make this point, too, that when the river and harbor bill was on the floor I offered an amendment to the bill which said that none of those projects should be engaged in until such time as there was either insistent need for the construction of the project or until such time as vital materials were available in ample supply and there was a volume of unemployment in the construction industry requiring that need for expansion of employment and business in the construction industry. Yet, I got very little support on that amendment. That amendment was designed in a way that we could have cut down expenditures now when we do not need to make them and wait until such time as it was sound to make public improvement. But I also want to say that when I offered that amendment, some gentlemen on the minority side of the aisle that talk so much about economy did not rise on their feet and support the measure.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. If we follow the procedure outlined, how would the banks make their profit?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The banks would make their profit, first of all, because there would be a larger volume of savings accounts than there are now, and those savings accounts are put in the banks for the purpose of investment and lending by the banks. In the second place, the banks would be allowed to make service charges for the services they perform in connection with those demand accounts. We would pay them honestly for the services they perform. In the third place, the present volume of money and credit now outstanding would not be reduced and would be available for reloaning whenever loans now outstanding were paid off. I could answer the gentleman much more at length if there were time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think this bill gives us an opportunity to say some things which I believe should be said for our own benefit and for the benefit of the people of this country. I do not want the good people of my district to understand that this bill reduces the debt of the Federal Government, and I ask the members of the committee to correct me on any statement that I make in error while I am addressing the House.

As I understand this bill, it reduces the authorization of the debt.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It rather limits the authority to issue obligations. It curtails the authority.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman. The Treasury has recently reduced the amount of the debt outstanding by taking a portion of the excess cash which the Treasury had on hand and which came to the Treasury as the result of selling bonds in the last bond drive beyond the actual needs of the Treasury, as it has since developed, and I think that reduction has run in the neighborhood of $10,000,000,000. I congratulate the Treasury for taking the excess cash on hand and reducing the debt in that manner. If the Treasury still has excess cash on hand as a result of borrowing from our people and our savings institutions and banks, I hope the Treasury will further reduce the debt to the point where it cannot go any further with respect to the cash it has on hand. Of course I am in favor of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a rather blunt statement here for the benefit of the people in my section of the country, and that is this, that the management of the present debt during the coming 25 to 50 years will undoubtedly have as much to do with the quantity of business we transact in this country, with the rate of interest which our people receive on their investments and their savings and their loans, with price levels, with wages, with the total volume of business, and with the total national income, as any other single factor that will operate in the United States.

I repeat that the factor which will exercise this vast and far-reaching influence on our economy is the management of the present debt. I do not wish to get into this particular argument with any thought with respect to what we may add to the present debt by additional deficit financing during the current fiscal year or any other fiscal year during the next 25 to 50 years. These remarks are directed directly to the proposition of the management of the present debt. I keep repeating that because I find it necessary to drive it home continually, the management of the present debt. What are we going to do with it?

Our good friend from California, whom we all admire so much [Mr. VOORHIS], has started the ball rolling, and I hope before this House recesses a sufficient number of men will take the floor to discuss this proposal, which comes from the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, so that our people in this country will begin to see what the management of the present debt is going to mean to them.

What kind of banking system did you have in this country prior to the approval of the Federal Reserve Banking Act of 1913? You had a banking system largely based on Government bonds. After using the Federal Reserve Banking System for some 34 years, here comes a proposal from our friend from California to throw the compass away with respect to sailing on the sea of central banking, the Federal Reserve Banking System, and go back to a proposition of bank deposits based on 100-percent reserves invested in Government bonds, if you please.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The only reason I propose to use the Government bonds as part of the reserve is as a means of controlling the present inflationary situation and as a temporary means of enabling the banks to have sufficient reserves for that purpose. I do not believe it ought to be the basis of reserves, I will say to the gentleman. I think those bonds ought to be monetized in the course of time and that eventually it should be a cash basis.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think I understood exactly what the gentleman said originally and I certainly understand what he says now, but I still make my statement to the effect that, temporarily or otherwise, here is a proposal to throw the compass away.

What are we going to do about that in this country? Let me tell you something. As of January 1 of this year the individuals, partnerships, and corporations of this country had on deposit in the banks of the United States—I am referring to insured banks—approximately $112,000,000,000. You can get the exact figure from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation with respect to all the insured banks. Against those deposits the banks hold about $28,000,000,000 in loans. So deduct your $28,000,000,000 from the $112,000,000,000 and you have left about $84,000,000,000 of deposits which belong to the people of this country, the depositors of the banks. Those are debts which the banks owe to the people, if you please. Since when in all history did anything like that ever happen before? I can appreciate the predicament in which the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System find themselves under the present Federal Reserve Act. Suppose the OPA does die after June 30? Suppose it does die as of next December 31, or next April 1, or next July 1947? It does not make any difference which of those dates you select because the date furtherest away is only a few months from now. What kind of a gadget do we propose to recommend to the people of this country for the purpose of controlling inflation or preventing inflationary forces running wild after OPA has been liquidated? OPA has been just a political economic umbrella. It will not suffice when the real storm breaks. The Board of Governors know that. That is the problem the Federal Reserve Board is wrestling with. That is why every commercial bank in the United States is wondering at this very minute what in the world is going to become of its earnings. The banks draw their earnings at the present time primarily from investments and loans. If you are going to prohibit commercial banks from making loans on which they can draw interest and if you are going to prevent commercial banks from buying more bonds issued by the Treasury, or from drawing interest on bonds now held as investments, what will be the net effect on bank earnings, and bank capital? Remember the commercial banking system in this country has for the past 5 years been the residuary purchaser of all bonds issued by the Treasury which the public did not purchase—it does not make any difference how much was issued, whatever the public did not purchase, the banks had to take; and as a result you had in the insured banks of this country

as of last December 31, about $96,000,000,000 worth of these bonds, and to that extent we monetized the debt of the United States, drew checks against it, turned the check money out into the hands of the people, and today that constitutes a very large portion of the potential inflationary base with which the Board of Governors and this Congress is wrestling through OPA machinery and the far-reaching and startling recommendations made by the Board which the gentleman from California referred to.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman should point out that 70 percent of all deposits in banks are now represented by Government bonds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has said is another significant fact. In World War I your commercial banks purchased about $4,000,000,000 worth of these Treasury issues. Today as I have pointed out to you, the commercial banks alone, let us put it that way, hold about $96,000,000,000, according to my last figures. In other words, about 57 percent of the total balance-sheet footings of the banks; that is, the total assets of the banks, is represented by these Government bonds; or say, about $158,000,000,000 total of all deposits and bank holding roughly, as of last December 31, some $96,000,000,000 of bonds.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman discussed the question of the management of loans. I think one of the things that are disturbing the financial institutions of the country is the question of how the $130,000,000,000 of short-term paper issued by the Treasury is going to be managed. I refer to certificates of indebtedness and Treasury notes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Out of the total interest-bearing debt at the present time of $270,000,000,000 roughly $130,000,000,000 is short-term paper. You have $61,000,000,000 of that debt maturing within this year and $124,000,000,000 of that debt maturing say before January 1, 1952. That does not include the $49,000,000,000 of savings bonds which are held by the people and which can be made demand paper on the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury is the appointee of the party in power. He must think in terms of the management of that debt from the standpoint of the political exigencies of the case.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is a nonpolitical organization. They must think of the management of the debt as related to the responsibilities imposed upon them by the provisions of the Central Reserve Banking Act. This Congress may have to do something before it adjourns, especially if OPA dies as of June 30. Whether OPA dies June 30 this year or June 30, 1947, make up your minds you will have to deal with the most far-reaching banking legislation imaginable on this floor sometime during the coming 12 months, because every commercial bank in this country will undoubtedly be whipped to its knees as a result of the cut in its earnings. A situation will develop with reference to its ratio of capital to deposits by reason of the mismanagement of the Federal debt of the United States. Do not overlook this most important problem in your study and analysis of inflationary movements, controls related thereto, and the disposition of OPA.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the Congress in April, 1945, fixed the national debt limit at $300,000,000,000. It was not known then when the war would end or what financial obligations it might be necessary for the Government to incur. I wish to commend the able Committee on Ways and Means for having favorably reported H. R. 6699, the bill now before us for consideration, which amends section 21 of the Second Liberty Loan Act and fixes the maximum debt limit at $275,000,000,000.

This does not mean that we are balancing the budget or that we have paid $25,000,000,000 on the national debt. The President and the Treasury Department estimate that we shall have a deficit on June 30, 1946, of $21,700,000,000. In other words, the war in Germany has been over since April 1945, and the war in Japan since August 1945. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, our expenditures will exceed our revenues by $21,700,000,000, and may I point out that we have collected in taxes and other revenues from the American people for this fiscal year approximately $45,000,000,000. We have spent all of that and we still shall go into the red $21,700,000,000 by June 30, 1946, for the present fiscal year.

There will be collected from the American people for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1946, and ending June 30, 1947, approximately $31,500,000,000, and there will be expended approximately $36,000,000,000, and it is estimated there will be a deficit for the coming fiscal year of approximately $4,500,000,000, and that means that this Government up to June 30, 1947, will have gone into the red for 17 successive years. This Nation will have spent each year more money than it has taken in for 17 years, and only the Almighty Himself knows how many more years this Nation will continue to go into the red.

This is an alarming situation. What would we think of any business concern going into the red every year for 17 years and piling up additional debts? How could such a concern escape bankruptcy? This Nation must quit deficit financing. We must put our financial house in order. We must balance the budget. We must quit exacting from the people 12 times as much in taxes as was taken in in 1930 or 1931, and still spend each year billions more than we take in.

I said some years ago that so long as the New Deal remained in power, taxes and the national debt would increase. I do not expect any relief from these intolerable conditions so long as the New Deal remains in power. It is up to the American people to elect a Congress in 1946 and a President in 1948 who are willing to stop this waste and extravagance, and save our country from financial and economic disaster.

In addition to our fixed national debt, we have billions of undetermined obligations. We are informed that our Government has approximately one hundred and thirty billion of short-term loans the demands for payment of much of which could be made in 1946. The American people have in their possession approximately fifty billions of bonds on which they could demand payment. Approximately 70 percent of the deposits in our banks are represented by Government bonds. From 50 to 75 percent of the assets of our banks are Government bonds. While we have not resorted to the printing press in the printing of billions of dollars in money, we do use the printing press printing bonds. These all present a serious threat of uncontrolled inflation. What will happen to our banks and to our country if we continue this unwise policy of deficit financing and the holders of these bonds present them for payment?

There is a heavy drive on now to sell Government bonds. Why is this? One reason is we continue to spend more than we take in in the way of taxes and other revenues. The other is, according to press reports and other information we have, the American people are cashing in their bonds in greater quantities and faster than they are buying bonds, and hence, the bond drive to sell more and more Government bonds. With that situation confronting our country we shall be called upon in a few days to pass a bill approving a loan to Great Britain for $3,750,000,000. We have pointed out that we face a deficit of nearly twenty-two billion for the present fiscal year and more than four billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, yet we propose to reach down into our empty Treasury and turn over to Great Britain three billion and seven hundred and fifty million. We do not have the money to lend. In fact, we are not paying our own running expenses. With a national debt confronting us of two hundred and seventy-five billion we must borrow the money. The only way the Government can borrow the money is through increasing the sale of bonds to our overburdened banks and our people.

We have been going into the red for more than 15 years. How long will it be before the American people become alarmed and present their bonds by the billions and demand payment? As we pay off these bonds we must sell additional bonds to replace them. How can the people have faith in the way and manner in which our Government is conducting its finances?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. If bonds were floated to raise the three billion and seven hundred and fifty million of the British loans, does the gentleman believe the American people would buy them?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have no way of knowing, of course, just what American people would or would not do. I certainly would not buy bonds for that purpose, and it is my own personal opinion that the average American would not grab up these bonds for that purpose. Our national debt is three times that of Great Britain. Our deficit for the present year is two or three times that of Great Britain. We have been going in the red ever since 1930. To me it seems very, very unwise to borrow money under our present financial conditions and lend it to Great Britain. No other country has ever done that. No other country would do that for us. If we aided any country under the circumstances, I would prefer to aid Great Britain, but I think it is our first duty to maintain the financial and economic stability of our own country. We have been very generous with our British allies in furnishing men and our own materials in helping to win the war. Since the war closed we have turned over to Great Britain $6,021,000,000 worth of surplus stable materials and supplies of every kind at a little over 10 cents on the dollar, giving them 55 years in which to pay it and the same length of time to pay this cash loan at the rate of 2 percent. No payment or interest is to be due until after December 31, 1951, and then no interest is to be paid unless the foreign trade of Great Britain is approximately 60 percent more in volume than it was before the war.

Our veterans have been unable to secure surplus property because of the immense amount we have turned over under these conditions to Great Britain and other countries have also received billions of dollars of surplus property. We also canceled the $25,000,000,000 balance due us on lend-lease. We turned over to Great Britain our Army, Navy, and air bases with all the equipment, installations, and improvements in Great Britain, free of charge, and then we propose to give Great Britain access with little or no tariff to the rich American markets.

Under all the circumstances, I cannot see where Great Britain has any just claim at all for a cash loan from us of this immense sum of money. Is it possible that those in authority believe there is no limit to the financial resources or credit of the United States?

We must not overlook the welfare of the American people.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, quite a number of years ago, in fact shortly after the First World War, I made a very careful study of the effects of the printing-press type of government as operated in those countries abroad that were ruined. I made a careful study of what happened in Germany when they started the printing presses running. I made a study of what happened in France. Remember their fine educational institutions with their wonderful endowments. What happened to them under printing-press financing? I think the highest that was realized on some of their best endowments in France was 14 percent. One of their fine institutions was only saved because it had all invaluable serums to sell to the afflicted, war-torn world, so that France did not go quite so far in the depreciation of their money as did Germany.

You will recall that one of our able economists went over to Germany to study the inflationary situation. He stopped off on his way to Germany to see an economist in Great Britain. This economist in Great Britain said to him: "When you get to Germany you will find the people do not know they have inflation. They just figure they have had a rise in prices." Our economist said, "That is incredible. They must know it. The school children in the United States know it." But when he arrived in Germany he found that no one there, even the highest officials, thought they had inflation. They just thought they had had an increase in prices.

In spite of OPA, and to large extent because of it, we have inflation in this country. The administration has been using the printing press, only it has been using it in a subtle and slick way so that the people have not realized any more than they did in Germany why it was that prices have been going up. We have heard a discussion here today, and I am not going to repeat it, of the amount of money in the banks that the people could use and would like to use to buy things they need. But the administration has been carrying on inflation from two different directions. The OPA has strangled all possibility of maximum production in this country. You all know it. You all get mail from your districts that this particular industry or that industry cannot get started, it is on a dead-center, principally because they cannot get materials or because of some fool, idiotic regulation under which they just cannot operate. So I am not very much worried about what may happen to OPA when that comes along, except to destroy it if possible to do so.

This country has been flooded with credit money. Of course the country is short of goods for the people to buy with their money. The result is inflation of prices and inflation is growing at an alarming pace every day. The Federal Reserve has known all of this or should have known it for a long time, but today they are coming up for air. They are frightened. They have a right to be frightened. This country is a good deal nearer the brink of insolvency than it has ever been in its history, there is no question about that, and this bill that we have before us at the present time is not an open, frank bill. It misleads the people. It may make them feel a little more secure to be told the debt is only $275,000,000,000 instead of $300,000,000,000. Perhaps the administration may think by bringing out this bill it will relieve a lot of fear.

We have heard much talk about bonds, such as has been exhibited in the debate. We can differ on the floor and debate it to our heart's content, but this changing the rules in the middle of the game as is provided in this bill does not give the true picture. Heretofore we have figured the face value of these bonds in measuring the national debt. Now the administration just wants to disregard the face value and make the people believe we are really reducing the national debt by about $10,000,000,000 when we are doing nothing of the kind.

It would seem to me, speaking to both sides of the House, leaving out all partisanship, that the fight we all should make, now that we know the situation our country is in, is to try to restore the solvency of this Government, because you cannot preserve the freedom of the people with an insolvent government. The most dangerous enemy of free government is the printing press. We have been printing bonds, we have been deceiving the people in regard, for instance, to the great fund of $7,000,000,000 collected under the Social Security Act. Where is it? It has been spent for running expenses of the Government and millions of taxpayers in the future including our GI's, many of whom are under covered employment, are going to be taxed to pay this trust fund over again. It is a plain fraud upon the people of the United States.

Away back in the early days before the King of France lost his head, Louis XVI devised a very clever scheme of annuities. Everybody was wild over Government annuities. They hired money to purchase Government annuities, they bought annuities wholesale. Then the Government financed the annuity system much as our Social Security System has been financed.

The people bought annuities for their babies and for themselves figuring that in a few years they would get a large percent on their annuity investment, that they could then retire and live happily forever afterward. Finally, the King let Necker, the conservative Minister of Finance, go. The people knew something was wrong. When the people found out that something was wrong, the King tried to reestablish the confidence of the people by recalling Necker. It was too late. What happened was that the money the people had invested in annuities; a profligate King and his officials had spent the money and the annuities were gone, and they were in such financial distress and hunger that finally the people marched to Versailles, brought the King back and ultimately beheaded him.

The time has come when there ought not to be partisanship in our legislation. The time has come for this Congress to save this country from insolvency. That is the important thing for the Members to do and that is the specific responsibility we are sworn to discharge as representatives of the people. The only way that you can create confidence in the minds of the people is to legislate wisely and sanely, and on matters even of this kind to tell them the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. If that is done so that all the people really understand the serious financial plight of their country, how near it is to the

financial abyss, you will find that the people will tighten their belts to meet and solve the problem. The American people will see to it that a Congress is elected and sent here that will underwrite the future of this great Republic.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. On the social security trust fund I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not he would agree that a completely accurate statement of that situation would be as follows: The money was collected. The money was not stored away as money, but a certificate of indebtedness to that trust fund was issued.

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; I agree with the gentleman that it was a certificate of indebtedness; just printing-press bonds.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Had that not been done, we would have had to borrow the $7,000,000,000 elsewhere.

Mr. REED of New York. Of course, the administration should have been honest about it and said so.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And you would have owed the money to some other place than to that trust fund, is that not true?

Mr. REED of New York. The money has been spent. Why did not the administration come out and inform the people and let them know what this OASI is costing them instead of deceiving them and using this money, which is nothing more than an income tax imposed upon the smaller taxpayers of the country? They do not realize that the $7,000,000,000 has to be paid over again, but it will have to be paid over again by future taxpayers.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not agree that it will have to be paid over again.

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; the people will have to be taxed to pay it over again.

Estimated ownership of interest-bearing securities issued or guaranteed by the United States Government (guaranteed securities held by the Treasury are excluded)

[Amounts are in par values in billions of dollars]

	December 1939	December 1945	February 1946
Total amount outstanding	47.1	276.2	278.5
Commercial banks	15.9	90.1	92.5
Federal Reserve banks	2.5	24.3	22.9
Individuals	9.8	63.6	63.7
Insurance companies	6.3	24.4	24.8
Mutual savings banks	3.1	10.7	11.1
Corporations and associations	2.7	29.9	29.0
State and local governments	.3	6.3	6.4
U. S. Government agencies and United States trust funds	6.5	27.0	28.0

Source: Treasury Bulletin, May 1946.

Commercial banks: Commercial banks, trust companies, and stock savings banks in the United States and in Territories and insular possessions. Excludes securities held in trust departments.

Individuals: Includes partnerships and personal trust accounts.

Corporations and associations: Includes savings and loan associations, dealers and brokers, and investments of foreign balances in this country.

State and local governments: Comprises trust, sinking, and investment funds of State and local governments and their agencies, and Territories and insular possessions.

United States savings bonds, series A–D, E, and F are included at their current redemption values.

United States Government receipts, expenditures, and public debt

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year ended June 30	Total expenditures	Total net receipts	Net deficit	Debt at end of period
1939	8.7	5.2	3.5	40.4
1940	9.0	5.4	3.6	43.0
1941	12.7	7.6	5.1	49.0
1942	32.4	12.8	19.6	72.4
1943	78.2	22.3	55.9	136.7
1944	93.7	44.1	49.6	201.0
1945	100.4	46.5	53.9	258.7
1946 (estimated):				
Budget message	67.2	38.6	28.6	275.0
Apr. 11, 1946	64.6	42.9	21.7	275.0
1947:				
Budget message	35.8	31.5	4.3	271.0
Apr. 11, 1946	39.0	40.0	0.0	-------

Receipts: Figure shown for receipts does not include old-age insurance tax receipts.

Expenditures: This item does not include appropriations to old-age insurance trust fund, or net outlays of Government agencies and sinking fund for debt-retirement.

Current expenditures (April–June 1946) are running at approximately $12 to $13 billion according to the Budget Bureau or at the rate of about $4 to $4.5 per month. Official Budget estimates for fiscal 1947 will not be available until after July 1, 1946. If there are no substantial tax reductions effective in calendar 1947, it is assumed the budget will be in balance.

Insurance in force by United States Government agencies as of Sept. 30, 1945

DESCRIPTION AND FACE AMOUNT

Insurance in force:	
Life insurance:	
United States Government life insurance	$2,440,995,416
National Service life insurance	125,489,287,661
Property insurance—War Damage Corporation	119,333,000,000
Marine and war-risk insurance—War Shipping Administration	2,294,709,840
Insurance of bank deposits and savings and loan share accounts and creditor obligations:	
Deposits in commercial banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	[1] 55,000,000,000
Savings and loan association share accounts and creditor obligations insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	4,944,792,000
Total insurance in force	309,502,784,917

[1] As of June 30, 1945. Figures for Sept. 30, 1945, are not available.

Guaranteed loans by U. S. Government agencies as of Sept. 30, 1945

DESCRIPTION AND AMOUNT GUARANTEED

Guaranteed loans outstanding:	
Insured housing loans:	
Primarily for repair, alteration, or improvement of property—title I insurance	$81,623,544
Secured by mortgages on structures designed primarily for residential use:	
Loans to improve housing standards and conditions—title II insurance:	
Small home mortgage insurance	2,749,437,137
Multifamily structure built for rental occupancy	87,803,076
War housing insurance—title VI insurance	1,507,012,821
Guaranteed war-production and termination loans—V loans:	
War Department	675,721,495
Navy Department	237,048,092
U. S. Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration	4,105,337
Guaranteed commodity loans secured by agricultural commodities	480,782,676
Agreements to participate in loans by commercial banks to business enterprises:	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	63,620,197
Smaller War Plants Corporation	44,868,302
Acceptances and loans by private banks under "take out" agreements with the Export-Import Bank of Washington	88,362,017
Guaranteed loans to veterans of World War II under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944:	
Home loans	36,604,738
Business loans	1,824,732
Farm loans	585,001
Guaranteed premiums on life-insurance policies and guaranteed interest on policy loans to military personnel under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940	14,000,000
Total guaranteed loans outstanding	6,073,399,165

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the pending bill, H. R. 6699, is to decrease the amount of obligations issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act which may be outstanding at any one time from the present $300,000,000,000 to the amount provided in the bill of $275,000,000,000. A similar bill has already passed the Senate. The pending bill is supported and recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Under section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act as amended the face amount of

the obligations issued under the authority of that act and the obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States except such bonds as are held by the Secretary of the Treasury is fixed at $300,000,000,000. As I stated a moment ago, the pending bill provides for that amount to be reduced to $275,000,000,000.

The pending bill also provides that the current redemption value of any obligation issued on a discount basis which is redeemable prior to maturity at the option of the holder of the obligation shall be considered for the purpose of section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to be the face amount of such obligation.

As was pointed out by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the present statutory debt limit was fixed by the act of Congress of April 1945, when we were at war with Germany and Japan. We were unable to tell at that time what it would cost to win the war. But since the defeat of Germany and Japan, the demands on our Federal Treasury have considerably decreased, and we can now form a much more accurate estimate as to the amount of expenditures that will be necessary, so that the present limit of $300,000,000,000 as provided under the Second Liberty Bond Act may be safely reduced to the amount provided in this bill of $275,000,000,000. Our present outstanding debt under the Second Liberty Bond Act is about $270,000,000,000, so that it will be seen that we will have about a $5,000,000,000 margin between the present amount of the indebtedness and the amount authorized under the pending bill.

I would especially like to invite attention to the fact that the provision in the pending bill which provides for the redemption value of these outstanding savings bonds to be used rather than the maturity value is based upon the principle of accuracy in bookkeeping and accounting. It is well known that many of these savings bonds are being cashed all along. We know that a person after holding a bond for 60 days can cash it at its present redemption value. Therefore, it is not accurate to say that the maturity value 8 or 10 years from now is the outstanding indebtedness of the United States, because the fact is that many of these bonds are being paid all the time.

It should further be borne in mind that the provisions contained in this bill provide for exactly the type of system and arrangement that is now reflected in the Treasury statements that we receive. The fact is that the passage of this bill will simply make the situation conform to the practice that is now being followed by the Treasury Department in issuing these financial statements from time to time. So the charges made here about any fraud being practiced upon the public or anything of that kind are simply not borne out by the actual facts as they exist in this case. This is simply to make the accounting system conform to the existing practice that reflects the real truth of the situation to the American people. As was also pointed out by our distinguished chairman, the peak of our outstanding debt under the Second Liberty Bond Act reached the highest figure in February of 1946, which was $279,213,558,897. Since the close of the war and especially during recent months, the Treasury Department has redeemed or paid off something like $10,000,000,000 of the public debt. We had the assurance of the Treasury Department when they appeared before your committee that it is their intention to continue that practice to retire these outstanding bonds and pay off the public debt as rapidly as it can safely be done. So your Committee on Ways and Means presents this bill today feeling that it is in the interest of the people of this country that the outstanding authorization for the issuance of bonds under the Second Liberty Bond Act be reduced by this $25,000,000,000 as is here provided and that the accounting method to be used be based upon the facts of the case so that the true situation will be presented. I do not know of any opposition to this bill. Your committee feels it should pass and that it is in the public interest. The Treasury Department has recommended it. I hope there will be no opposition to it in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 21. The face amount of obligations issued under authority of this act, and the face amount of obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States (except such guaranteed obligations as may be held by the Secretary of the Treasury), shall not exceed in the aggregate $275,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time. The current redemption value of any obligation issued on a discount basis which is redeemable prior to maturity at the option of the holder thereof shall be considered, for the purposes of this section, to be the face amount of such obligation."

SEC. 2. This act may be cited as the "Public Debt Act of 1946."

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6699) to decrease the amount of obligations, issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole certain tables and materials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three letters advocating extension of the OPA.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address made by the Commander in Chief of the Polish armed forces.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a broadcast made by himself.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Pennsylvania Bankers' Association.

EXTENSION OF HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1945, an important piece of legislation was introduced into the United States Senate. Extensive hearings were held on it during which the measure received almost universal support from all elements of our society. This measure has since been passed by the Senate, favorably reported by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and now awaits the favorable action of that committee for consideration by this House of Representatives.

I speak of Senate bill 191 which provides for the use of Federal funds—under careful control—for the construction of hospital facilities for the use of our civilian population.

American hospitals represent the finest traditions in American life, having received the faithful support of great numbers of interested citizens with no thought of private gain. An overwhelming proportion of their physical assets are an expression of the philanthropy of the American people. During the grim days of the early thirties funds were not available for their extension to meet the expanding needs of our growing population and to keep their physical facilities abreast of the advances in modern medical science. Only a small proportion of the funds spent for public works during those years was used for hospital construction, and then only for institutions that were wholly owned by government. During the war years construction has been impossible so that we are now faced with a population which has outgrown its hospital facilities, and a science which has outgrown its workshop.

Hospitals have traditionally called forth the finest support on a voluntary basis from our population. It would be unthinkable for this Congress to do anything which would dampen the ardor of the vast numbers of our citizens who contribute time, energy, and money to hospitals. It would be equally deplorable if this Congress does not take a firm stand in stimulating the extension program for our civilian hospital facilities so urgently needed.

With the great Johns Hopkins in my home district, and the University of Maryland Medical School and Hospital also located in my home city, Maryland is often thought of as a medical center, but, within 50 miles of those institutions—indeed, within 50 miles of the spot where I stand at this moment—are areas of the same State not adequately served with hospital facilities.

Senate bill 191 represents a carefully developed plan, meeting with universal approval of health authorities and all sections of our public, to stimulate, on a sound basis, the necessary extensions of hospital facilities. It is imperative that this House of Representatives take immediate and favorable action on this measure.

PHOTOGRAPHS OF GRAVES OF DECEASED SERVICEMEN

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith a copy of a bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 14 I introduced H. R. 6793, a bill directing the Departments of War and Navy to furnish photographs of permanent graves located outside of the United States to the next of kin of the decedents. The carrying out of the provisions of this bill will represent a very small expenditure in money but will mean much to our citizens who have lost a relative during the recent war.

The Congress has recently enacted legislation which provides for the return of the remains of our honored war dead for burial at home in the United States if the next of kin requests such return. For those who may elect not to have the remains of their loved ones returned the furnishing of photographs of the permanent grave will mean much in assurance that the loved one was correctly and reverently interred. Such photographs will relieve any doubt regarding the location of the permanent grave and will give assurance that the grave has had and will continue to receive adequate care.

The bill has been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I am asking that the bill be given immediate consideration and that it be placed on the Consent Calendar. I invite the favorable consideration of the House membership to this bill. I feel that no Member of the House will find any objection since we are all anxious to extend this assuring expression of appreciation to those of our people who made the heavy contribution of a relative to the winning of the war. We are also anxious to perpetuate the remembrance of our war dead who made the supreme sacrifice that we might remain free.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a copy of this bill.

(A copy of the bill referred to is as follows:)

H. R. 6793

A bill to require the Departments of War and Navy to furnish photographs of permanent graves located outside of the United States to the next of kin of the decedents

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to cause photographs to be made of each permanent grave located outside the 48 States and the District of Columbia of those who died in World War II while serving in the Army or any civilian capacity under the direction of the War Department. Such photographs shall include a view of the grave, showing its general surroundings and a view of the grave showing all identifying markings placed thereon. Such photographs with the negatives shall be furnished without charge to the next of kin of the deceased.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to cause photographs to be made of each permanent grave located outside the 48 States and the District of Columbia of those who died in World War II while serving in the Navy or Coast Guard or any civilian capacity under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy. Such photographs shall include a view of the grave showing its general surroundings and a view of the grave showing all identifying markings placed thereon. Such photographs with the negatives shall be furnished without charge to the next of kin of the deceased.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 33. An act relating to the management and administration of national forest grazing lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 115. An act to modify sections 4 and 20 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, with reference to certain funds collected in connection with the operation of Indian Service irrigation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 141. An act to clarify the law relating to the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 178. An act to amend sections 9 and 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 190. An act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions; to establish the National Institute of Dental Research; and for other purposes; to the Commiteee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 437. An act for the relief of W. S. Burleson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 706. An act to amend Veterans Regulation numbered 9 (a), as amended, so as to increase the limit of amounts payable thereunder in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution extending for 7 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 18, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in executive session, on Tuesday, June 18, 1946, at 10 o'clock a. m., in Committee Room 356, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

The Committee on Pensions will hold open hearings at 10 a. m., Thursday, June 20, 1946, in Room 428, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 3779, H. R. 5740, and H. R. 5741, bills to increase service pensions for certain veterans and widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1397. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1398. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $16,000 for the legislative branch, Architect of the Capitol (H. Doc. No. 666); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 668. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6597, a bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2292). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5234. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in matters relating to social protection, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PACE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6477. A bill to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as

amended, and section 3 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6694. A bill for the relief of Olive Irene Miloglav; without amendment (Rept. No. 2293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 6801. A bill to provide for the retention by the United States Government or its agencies or instrumentalities of real and personal property within the Philippines now owned or later acquired and for the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, in the Philippines, subsequent to independence; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6802. A bill to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, for the purpose of making a clerical correction; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 6803. A bill to authorize employment by the Secretary of Agriculture of qualified inspectors of fresh fruits and vegetables; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOCH:

H. R. 6804. A bill to provide relief for veterans required to reimburse the United States for overpayment on their adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 6805. A bill exempting tax bonuses paid by States, Territories, possessions, and political subdivisions thereof, from the Federal income tax for those who served in the armed forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 368. Joint resolution to prevent disposition of certain Government-owned plants and facilities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 6806. A bill for the relief of Lanty J. Squyres; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois:

H. R. 6807. A bill for the relief of Toshitaro Ishikawa and Mrs. Koman Ishikawa; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6808. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Mitsuo Higa, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H. R. 6809. A bill for the relief of R. H. Padgett; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred, as follows:

1998. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Mrs. L. M. Kelly and other residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., urging legislation to prevent the use of grain in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1999. Also, resolution of American Legion Post, No. 41, of Syracuse, N. Y., calling upon Congress to pass effective labor legislation to correct economic conditions in the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

2000. By Mr. LARCADE: Petition of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, urging the enactment of a draft law to maintain a strong armed force; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2001. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of United Commercial Travelers of Wisconsin, urging our Congress to fight for the promulgation of the American way of life in our country, and to fight against the totalitarian form of government; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our life, our hope, our strength, like clanging bells on a lonely ocean tolled by the restless sea, so in our unquiet souls tolls the longing for Thee that will not be stilled. Out of the night that covers us we come groping up the altar stairs to the light that never fails. For our day, with all its sinister renewal of injustice, misery, and of ruthless regimentation that robs men of their freedom, make us children of the light, harbingers of the day. Thou seest us plunged, almost unaware of its dire portent, into the most fateful struggle of human history. As those called to steer the Ship of State in mountainous seas, reveal to us the things that belong to our peace and our salvation. With the rapture of high resolve, being done with lesser things, gird us with might to clear across the ravished earth a highway for the feet of our God whose kingdom has no frontiers. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, June 15, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] may be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate of this day and of each day to and including June 21.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GEORGE B. HARRIS TO BE DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 25, 1946, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of George B. Harris, of California, to be district judge of the northern district of California, new position. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], chairman; the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN]; and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 15, 1946, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 470. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of W. P. Richardson, as successor and assignee of W. P. Richardson & Co., of Tampa Fla.; and

S. 1163. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of California.

EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED OFFICERS BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—WITHDRAWAL OF A MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion for the reconsideration of House bill 5626, a bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 943. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Columbia River at Northport, Wash.;

S. 1043. An act to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma in trust for the Indians of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian Reservation;

S. 1273. An act to provide for the acquisition by exchange of non-Federal property within the Glacier National Park;

S. 1288. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States;

S. 1336. An act to transfer certain real and personal property in Ward County,

N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota, acting by and through the Industrial Commission of North Dakota;

S. 1523. An act to modify the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war;

S. 1834. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Iowa or the Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Des Moines River at or near Farmington, Iowa;

S. 1857. An act to authorize the availability for certain necessary administrative expenses of appropriations for the Department of the Interior; and

S. 1963. An act to authorize additional permanent professors of the United States Military Academy.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1460) to fix the salary of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1212. An act authorizing the State of Texas, acting through the State Highway Commission of Texas, or the successors thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Laredo, Tex.;

H. R. 2423. An act to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3492. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 4435. An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes;

H. R. 4651. An act to amend section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 4983. An act to provide for adjustments in connection with the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 5606. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Wabash River near Mount Vernon, Ind.;

H. R. 5736. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Ind.;

H. R. 5748. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the South Carolina State Highway Department to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River, at or near Leneudes Ferry, S. C.";

H. R. 5800. An act to authorize school districts in Alaska to issue bonds for school construction, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5840. An act to authorize an exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo.;

H. R. 5958. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 6004. An act to provide authorization for the village of Cahokia, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cahokia, Ill., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6041. An act authorizing the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Wabash River at or near Montezuma, Ind.;

H. R. 6065. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind.;

H. R. 6071. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Des Moines River at or near the town of Eddyville, Iowa;

H. R. 6195. An act to amend section 1 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 658);

H. R. 6222. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.;

H. R. 6263. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1943, so as to authorize inclusion of periods of education and training in an Army Transportation Corps civilian marine school as "service in the merchant marine";

H. R. 6285. An act authorizing the State of Delaware, by and through its State highway department, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Delaware River near Wilmington, Del.;

H. R. 6324. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to provide for the design and construction of dams so that they will serve as foundations for highway bridges, to provide for the design and construction of highway bridges upon and across such dams, to authorize the granting of easements and rights-of-way in connection therewith, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the act approved July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army";

H. R. 6459. An act to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers;

H. R. 6488. An act to amend the act to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors;

H. R. 6532. An act to provide a method for payment in certain Government establishments of overtime, leave, and holiday compensation on the basis of night rates pursuant to certain decisions of the Comptroller General, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6682. An act to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and to repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto;

H. R. 6689. An act to extend, for an additional year, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar;

H. R. 6721. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to accept gifts and bequests for the benefit of the library of the Post Office Department;

H. R. 6741. An act relating to the operation of section 8 of the Federal Airport Act with respect to the fiscal year 1947;

H. R. 6751. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 6699. An act to decrease the amount of obligations, issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time;

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution relating to peanut-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 364. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of an international animal quarantine station on Swan Island, and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent importation of such animals into other parts of the United States, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162) extending for 7 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

REPORT OF ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For President's message, see page 7006 of the proceedings of the House of Representatives of June 17, 1946.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Continuation of Acceptance by Treasury Department of Deposits of Public Moneys From the Philippine Islands

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the continuance of the acceptance by the Treasury of deposits of public moneys from the Philippine Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

Cemeterial Expenses—Provisions of Third Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Bill

A letter from the Attorney General, calling attention to a certain provision of House bill 6601, the third deficiency appropriation bill, relating to "War Department—Civil Functions, Cemeterial Expenses"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report of National Labor Relations Board

A letter from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth annual report of that Board for the year ended June 30, 1945, and lists containing the names, salaries, fiscal statement, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Board, together with lists of cases in which hearings were held and decisions were rendered by the Board during the fiscal year (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Report on Government-Owned Synthetic Rubber Plants and Facilities

A letter from the Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second supplementary

report relating to Government-owned synthetic rubber plants and facilities, and stating that this is the final report in accordance with section 19 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a memorial from O. W. Suhr, of Forest Park, Ill., remonstrating against the so-called Forand amendment to the Navy Department appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. William E. R. Hamilton, Washington, D. C., relating to the increased pay of Federal employees and of retirement benefits; to the Committee on Civil Service.

A petition of sundry members of the Sixty-fourth Engineer Topographic Battalion, stationed in Tokyo, Japan, relating to the extension of the Selective Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter from Carlos P. Romulo, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, transmitting a resolution adopted by the Municipal Council of Caramoan, Camarines Sur, Philippines, relating to an amendment to the Tydings-McDuffie Philippine independence law; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

Resolutions adopted by the Fifty-fifth Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C., relating to freedom of speech over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Dr. A. F. de Valera, Aibonito, P. R., recommending the appointment of Robert Cooper, judge of the Federal Court of Puerto Rico, as Governor of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Harvey E. Roach, of Cheyenne, Wyo., relating to the freezing of wages, prices, and pay-roll taxation; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Sylvia Tuck, of the Bronx, N. Y., praying for the continuation of the Office of Price Administration; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

A concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Finance.

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to exempt all veterans of World War II from the payment of any Federal income taxes during their tenure of service and for 1 year subsequent to honorable discharge on net income not exceeding $2,500 per annum

"Whereas the democracy of this country is owed largely to the millions of its youth who served in the armed forces during the global conflict known as World War II; and

"Whereas the sacrifices made by these gallant men and women of the United States cannot be compensated in dollars and cents, and such is not expected by them; and

"Whereas their whole lives were transformed during their training and fighting without any concern being given to personal business activities, and many of them do not have the funds to defray income-tax payments due or becoming due for the period of their military service; and

"Whereas in most instances periods of readjustments are required for these veterans to settle down to civilian routine, employment, and business transactions: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Louisiana (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Legislature of Louisiana do respectfully request and recommend to the Congress of the United States that its membership sponsor and enact amendments to the Internal Revenue Act whereby each and every veteran of World War II shall be exempted from the payment of any Federal income taxes during their tenure of service and for 1 year subsequent to honorable discharge on net income of each not exceeding $2,500; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Louisiana be, and he is hereby, directed to send certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, President pro tempore of the United States Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"J. EVERRET,
"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.
"R. NORMAN BAUER,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 15

"Whereas the legislature had the privilege of enjoying a most interesting and informative address by Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, National Director of Selective Service; and

"Whereas we realize the perilous position that the United States now faces due to the unsettled conditions in numerous countries now suffering from starvation, famine, diseases, and internal strife: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the legislature, That we express our thanks to General Hershey for his most timely message; and be it further

"Resolved, That the members of the Louisiana delegation in Congress be requested to give their undivided support in helping to maintain a strong armed force to defend the peace just won and to urge Congress to enact a draft law for this purpose."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Resolution 9

"Whereas the Federal Government built and operated during World War II ammonia plants at Sterlington and Lake Charles, which plants are still the property of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the Sterlington and Lake Charles plants will be subject under the Federal law to sale or lease and negotiations looking toward such disposition are now under way; and

"Whereas it is to the manifest interest of Louisiana and adjacent States that when said plants are leased or sold that they be operated at least in part for the production of fertilizers to which they can be easily converted, which utilization will not only mean conversion to a permanent industry but will be of great benefit to the farming population of Louisiana and adjacent States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana, That it urge and memorialize the Federal Government and its appropriate agencies to require any lessee or purchaser of the Sterlington and Lake Charles ammonia plants to use at least a portion of the capacity thereof for the production of fertilizers; and that preference be given to bidders proposing such utilization over those which do not."

THE WHEAT SITUATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred telegrams from O. E. Case, secretary, Kansas Grain Feed & Seed Dealers Association, and Roy F. Bailey, State senator and editor, Salina Journal.

Reports from other sources in eastern and western Kansas tell of this same kind of sentiment among the farmers of that section. I have brought this matter to the attention of the Department of Agriculture and in doing so pointed out that the Senate on Thursday adopted an amendment which would authorize the issuance of certificates to these wheat growers. I trust this provision will be retained in H. R. 6042 in its final form.

There being no objection, the telegrams were received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *June 12, 1946.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Grain dealers, who are members of this association, advising producers are angry because of forced selling of wheat under amendment 8 to WFO 144; and many reported refusing to deliver wheat, preferring to pile on ground. Suggest CCC guarantee that if any advance in ceiling price of wheat occurs prior to June 1, 1947, it will be made retroactive to all forced sales of wheat (one-half of all wheat covered by said amendment 8 to WFO 144 delivered to elevators and warehouses); and retribution to producer will be made by CCC in the amount of such increase per bushel in the ceiling price on wheat multiplied by the number of bushels producer was forced to sell under the provisions of amendment 8 to WFO 144.

O. E. CASE,
Secretary, Kansas Grain Feed & Seed Dealers Association.

SALINA, KANS., *June 14, 1946.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Farmers in central and western Kansas up in arms on threatened seizure of half their crops, and price uncertainties. They plan to store more grain than ever before at a time when it is most needed. Worse than that, wheat has ripened unevenly in same fields, which makes storage dangerous because of spoilage. As a means of getting wheat sold at harvest, so it will be available for feeding ourselves and as many others as possible, and avoiding losses which will result from organized program of holding back on the farm, hope you will do everything possible to prevent proposed seizure of half each farmer's crop as it goes to elevator. Also believe Congress should guarantee that any increased ceiling prices granted before next June, be made available to the producer. Having been fooled before, the farmer is justified in being suspicious, and he is entitled to assurances on which he feels he can rely before he sticks his neck out again. Harvest now getting under way and quick action is essential if wheat is to pour into elevators where it can be cared for properly, and become available for food and feed immediately. I believe this situation to be acute and dangerous.

ROY F. BAILEY.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2306. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Georgia Power Co. a 100-foot perpetual easement across Fort Benning in the State of Georgia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1509).

By Mr. REED, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

H. R. 2536. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to certain agreements between carriers; with amendments (Rept. No. 1511).

By Mr. DOWNEY, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 2335. A bill to excuse employees of the Government from work on July 5, 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 1512).

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2280. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1513); and

S. 2341. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1514).

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; with amendments (Rept. No. 1517).

By Mr. McCARRAN:

From the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6056. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1510).

From the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2265. A bill to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape; without amendment (Rept. No. 1515).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 32. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 1516).

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with amendments the bill H. R. 6407, being an act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1508) thereon. I ask that the bill be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2344. A bill authorizing the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. TYDINGS):

S. 2345. A bill to provide for the retention by the United States Government or its agencies or instrumentalities of real and personal property within the Philippines now owned or later acquired and for the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, in the Philippines, subsequent to independence; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 2346. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2347. A bill to amend the act of August 19, 1937, relating to the incorporation of the Southeastern University of the Young Men's Christian Association of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES) introduced S. J. Res. 167, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the composition of the Supreme Court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

UTILIZATION OF WARTIME PLANTS AND FACILITIES FOR PROCESSING AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES, ETC.—EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE REPORT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on October 9, 1945, the Senate agreed to Senate Resolution 176, which requested all administrative agencies holding war plants to place a temporary freeze on the sale of such plants which were designed and equipped to process surplus agricultural crops into raw materials for industrial use. This resolution was designed to give the Congress time to study the question of the proper disposal of these plants. We want to adopt a definite national policy toward them before they are sold into the hands of private interests, which might dismantle them or might not use them in the best interests of American agriculture or the national welfare.

Since that resolution was agreed to we have made considerable progress toward developing such a national policy on these plants. We now have a bill—Senate bill 1908—in the Agriculture Committee which we expect to bring before the Senate very soon. I am very hopeful that the Senate will adopt it and that it will be finally enacted into law within a few weeks—before the end of the session, at least.

We did expect to have all action completed on the subject before this time. Unfortunately for one reason and another, the report called for by Senate Resolution 176 has been held up and is not yet in print for general distribution. We expect to have it available within a few days. Meanwhile Senate Resolution 176 set a termination date at the end of this month. The resolution I am now presenting will move that date up to March 1 of next year at the latest, or until the time when Congress passes some legislation establishing a definite policy, such as Senate bill 1908 that the Agriculture Committee will report within a day or two. We have set the final termination date for next March just to cover the possibility that we may not get around to taking final action on Senate bill 1908 at this session because of the rush of last-minute business and the desire of so many Members to adjourn and get home. That might make it necessary to take up Senate bill 1908 again at the opening of the next session. But we really expect to have the whole matter disposed of before we adjourn next month.

I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution for reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 286) was received and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 176 (relative to the continued operation of federally owned plants for processing agricultural commodities and forest products or for manufacturing nitrates for fertilizer), agreed to October 9, 1945, is hereby amended by striking out "July 1, 1946" wherever it appears in such resolution and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1, 1947."

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR JOHN H. BANKHEAD

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 288), which was referred to the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the Committee appointed by the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. John H. Bankhead, late a Senator from the State of Alabama, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION OF GENERAL SURVEY OF CONDITION OF INDIANS

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 289) which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 79, agreed to February 2, 1928, and continued by subsequent resolutions, authorizing the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, to make a general survey of the condition of the Indians in the United States, hereby is continued in full force and effect during the Eightieth Congress.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1212. An act authorizing the State of Texas, acting through the State Highway Commission of Texas, or the successors thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Laredo, Tex.;

H. R. 5606. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Wabash River near Mount Vernon, Ind.;

H. R. 5736. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Ind.;

H. R. 5748. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the South Carolina State Highway Department to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River, at or near Leneudes Ferry, South Carolina";

H. R. 6004. An act to provide authorization for the village of Cahokia, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cahokia, Ill., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6041. An act authorizing the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Wabash River at or near Montezuma, Ind.;

H. R. 6065. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind.;

H. R. 6081. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Des Moines River at or near the town of Eddyville, Iowa;

H. R. 6222. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.;

H. R. 6263. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1943, so as to authorize inclusion of periods of education and training in an Army Transportation Corps civilian marine school as "service in the merchant marine";

H. R. 6285. An act authorizing the State of Delaware, by and through its State highway department, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Delaware River near Wilmington, Del.;

H. R. 6488. An act to amend the act to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors;

H. R. 6741. An act relating to the operation of section 8 of the Federal Airport Act with respect to the fiscal year 1947; and

H. R. 6751. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 2423. An act to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4425. An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5840. An act to authorize an exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 3492. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; and

H. R. 4651. An act to amend section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 5800. An act to authorize school districts in Alaska to issue bonds for school construction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5958. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 6459. An act to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers;

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution relating to peanut marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 364. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of an international animal quarantine station on Swan Island, and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent importation of such animals into other parts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 6324. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to provide for the design and construction of dams so that they will serve as foundations for highway bridges, to provide for the design and construction of highway bridges upon and across such dams, to authorize the granting of easements and rights-of-way in connection therewith, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6721. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to accept gifts and bequests for the benefit of the library of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 6532. An act to provide a method for payment in certain Government establishments of overtime, leave, and holiday compensation on the basis of night rates pursuant to certain decisions of the Comptroller General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6682. An act to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and to repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6689. An act to extend, for an additional year, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar; to the Committee on Finance.

SALARY OF SOLICITOR OF INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1460) to fix the salary of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, which was, in line 6, to strike out "Secretary of the Interior" and insert "President."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. MAGNUSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 84, after line 25, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Trout-rearing pools Quilcene, Wash.: For the construction of trout-rearing pools at Quilcene hatchery, Quilcene, Wash., to supply trout for stocking lakes and streams within Olympic National Park, $35,000."

RETURN OF GRAND RIVER DAM PROJECT TO GRAND RIVER DAM AUTHORITY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 5508) to authorize the return of the Grand River Dam project to the Grand River Dam Authority, and the adjustment and settlement of accounts between the Authority and the United States, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following notices in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Page 35, after line 4, insert the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, on or before June 30, 1947, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States, but such termination shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government if declared eligible for such employment by the United States Civil Service Commission."

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Page 67, after line 18, insert the following new paragraph:

"The Navy Department is authorized to transfer without charge to the Coast and Geodetic Survey two AGP seaplane tenders, two PCS submarine chasers, and three SC submarine chasers from the reserve or surplus to the needs of the Navy Department, each of the seven vessels equipped with the necessary launches and ship's outfit."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6056, the Departments of State, Justice, etc., appropriation bill, 1947, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notices.)

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. McCARRAN pursuant to the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate gave notices in writing of his intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5452) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, several amendments, as follows:

On page 13, following the paragraph ending in line 21, insert the following:

"As used hereafter in this section—

"(1) The term 'veteran' means any person who was in the military service of the United States, as defined in section 101 (1) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of 1940, at any time during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, and who shall have been honorably discharged from such service; or any person who served in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps and who shall have been honorably discharged for disability incident to such service.

"(2) The term 'veteran's loan' means a loan made by a lending agency to a veteran pursuant to the provisions of this act for the purpose of enabling such veteran to retire indebtedness owed by him on the date of his discharge from the service.

"(3) The term 'lending agency' means any banking institution the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, any Federal savings and loan association organized pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, and any building and loan association which is a member of a Federal home-loan bank.

"(4) Masculine pronouns shall be taken to include the feminine, the singular to include the plural and the plural to include the singular.

"Upon receipt of an application in such form as may be prescribed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corporation') pursuant to section 5 (a) of this act, filed by a veteran within 6 months after the date of his discharge from the service, or within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later and upon execution by such veteran of a veteran's note in such form as may be prescribed by the Corporation pursuant to such section 5 (a), a lending agency is authorized to make a veteran's loan to such veteran in an amount not to exceed the amount of indebtedness and accrued interest thereon owed by such veteran on the date of his discharge as evidenced in the manner prescribed in subsection (c) of this section; but in no case shall the amount of such loan exceed $1,000.

"Such veterans' loan shall be on the monthly installment plan, repayment to begin 6 months after the date of execution of the loan. Veterans' loans shall bear interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum on the unpaid portion of the obligation. No veteran's loan shall be made for a period longer than 3 years; but if made for a shorter period, any veteran's loan may be refinanced, in the discretion of the lending agency, by extension of payments, without impairing the obligation of the Corporation under section 5 (a) of this act: *Provided*, That under any refinancing plan agreed to, equal monthly installments shall be required, and provision shall be made for complete discharge of the entire obligation, including interest, not later than 3 years from the date of the veteran's loan. Acceleration of installments on a veteran's loan shall not be permitted by the lending agency unless the loan is more than 3 months in arrears, except that the lending agency may accept whole or partial settlement of any veteran's loan, without regard to prescribed installments, in any case where the lending agency has good reason to believe that the veteran's loan was procured, wholly or in part, by fraud.

"Any application for a veteran's loan shall be accompanied by satisfactory evidence of the honorable discharge of the applicant, by a list of present and certain future benefits due the applicant from the Government of the United States, or from any of its departments or agencies, at the time of the application, and by a certified list of creditors showing the amounts owed by such applicant as of the date of such discharge; and shall comply with such other requirements as may be provided in accordance with section 5 (a) of this act. No security, endorsers, or comakers shall be required with respect to any such loan. The obligation of the Corporation to purchase, as provided in section 3, shall not be created in the case of any borrower who is not in fact a veteran.

"Within 5 days after making any veteran's loan, the lending agency shall give notice thereof, in such form as shall be provided in accordance with section 5 (a) of this act, to the Corporation and to all Government departments and agencies from which benefits are due or to become due the applicant, according to the list filed by the applicant with his application, as provided in subsection 2 (c) of this act.

"The Corporation shall agree to purchase from the lending agency any note legally executed by a veteran for the purpose of securing a veteran's loan, in full compliance with the provisions of section 2 and subsection 6 (a) of this act, which remains unpaid for 30 days after the date of maturity thereof, or on which installments are more than 3 months in arrears, at a price equal to the unpaid portion of such note and any interest accrued and unpaid thereon: *Provided*, That in any case in connection with which the lending agency is guilty of fraud or gross negligence, the Corporation shall not be obligated under this section. As consideration for such agreement by the Corporation, the lending agency shall agree to pay to the Corporation an amount equal to 1½ percent per annum of the unpaid portion of such loan, to be payable at such time and in such manner as the Corporation may prescribe.

"Upon notice by the Corporation or by a lending agency that it is the holder of a note given by a veteran for the purpose of securing a veteran's loan under this act, any Government department or agency of the United States shall consider the amount of unpaid principal and interest thereon as a preferred lien on any pension, compensation, insurance, or other financial benefit accrued or thereafter accruing, under any of the laws administered by such department or agency, to such veteran or to his dependents or beneficiaries, and shall withhold from such accrued or accruing benefits, and remit to the Corporation upon demand, such amounts as will fully discharge such indebtedness: *Provided*, That the official having charge of the payment of any such benefits may, with the approval of the Corporation, release all or part of such benefits from the Corporation's lien, in any case where he determines such release is advisable because of the needs of the veteran, or his dependents or beneficiaries.

"The special remedy in the preceding paragraph shall not be deemed exclusive.

"The Corporation is authorized and directed to prescribe and furnish to lending agencies forms of applications for veteran's loans under this act and of notes to be executed by veterans for the purpose of securing such loans, and to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to enable it to carry out the provisions of this act, and such forms, rules, and regulations, shall be uniform with regard to all veterans' loans.

"The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations which the Corporation is authorized to issue and have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to enable the Corporation to carry out the provisions of this act.

"Not more than one veteran's loan shall be made under the provisions of this act to any veteran, regardless of the amount of such loan, except that a veteran who has received a veteran's loan for less than the maximum amount of the loan to which he is entitled under subsection 2 (a) of this act, but who is otherwise eligible for a veteran's loan, may apply for and receive a second veteran's loan: *Provided*, That the existence of the first veteran's loan shall be disclosed by the applicant to the lending agency to which application for a second veteran's loan is made, and that such lending agency shall make certain such first loan is paid in full, both as to principal and interest, from the proceeds of such second veteran's loan.

"Any person who, having obtained a veteran's loan under this act, solicits, applies for, or accepts another such loan, except as provided in subsection 6 (a) of this act, and any person who knowingly and willfully furnishes any false or misleading information for the purpose of obtaining a veteran's loan, or of enabling another to obtain a veteran's loan, under this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both."

On page 15, following the paragraph ending in line 12, insert the following:

"The Commissioner of Internal Revenue is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the business practices and operations of the alcoholic-beverage industry in all its phases, including any matters relating to the production, importation, distribution, purchase, or sale of whisky, gin, rum, brandy, or other distilled spirits, or wine or malt beverages. The Commissioner shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with his recommendations for necessary legislation."

On page 15, following the paragraph ending in line 12, insert the following:

"Section 2806 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) All distilled spirits found in any cask or package, and any bottled distilled spirits found in any case, without having upon such cask or package or case each mark and stamp required therefor by law or regulations, shall be forfeited to the United States.'

"Section 4 of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act (U. S. Code, title 27, sec. 204) is amended in the following respects:

"(1) Subsection (d) is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) A basic permit shall be conditioned upon (1) compliance with the requirements of section 5 of this act (relating to unfair competition and unlawful practices) and of section 6 of this act (relating to bulk sales and bottling), with the twenty-first amendment and laws relating to the enforcement thereof, and with all other Federal laws relating directly or indirectly to distilled spirits, wine, and malt beverages, including taxes with respect thereto, and (2) conduct of the operations under such permit in conformity with the laws of the State in which such operations are conducted.'

"(2) Clause 1 of subsection (e) is amended by striking out 'provided that for a first violation of the conditions thereof the permit shall be subject to suspension only.'

"(3) Subsection (g) is amended to read as follows:

"'(g) A basic permit may be issued for 1 year and shall expire on the 31st day of December next succeeding the issuance thereof unless suspended, revoked, or annulled as provided herein, or voluntarily surrendered: *Provided*, That the Secretary may without formal application extend any permit granted under this part after August 31 in any year to December 31 of the succeeding year. (1) If leased, sold, or otherwise voluntarily transferred, the permit shall be automatically terminated thereupon, and (2) if transferred by operation of law or if actual or legal control of the permittee is acquired, directly or indirectly, whether by stock ownership or in any other manner, by any person, then such permit shall be automatically terminated at the expiration of 30 days thereafter: *Provided*, That if within such 30-day period application for a new basic permit is made by the transferee or permittee, respectively, then the outstanding basic permit shall continue in effect until such application is finally acted on by the Secretary of the Treasury.'

"(4) The second sentence of subsection (h) is amended to read as follows: "Such appeal shall be taken by filing, in the district court of the United States within any district wherein such person resides or has his principal place of business, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, within 60 days after the entry of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Secretary be modified or set aside in whole or in part."; and the next to the last sentence thereof is repealed.

"All basic permits issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended (Public, No. 401, approved August 29, 1935; U. S. C. 1940 edition, title 27, ch. 8, sec. 201 and the following) prior to the approval of this act shall expire on the 31st day of December 1945: *Provided*, That if this act is approved after August 31, 1945, the Secretary may, without formal application, extend any such permit to December 31, 1946: *Provided further*, That before the expiration date of any such permit it may be terminated, or, upon notice and hearing, suspended, revoked, or annulled as provided in the said Federal Alcohol Administration Act."

On page 17, following the paragraph ending in line 2, insert the following:

"The principles set forth in section 29.23 (m)–16 of Treasury Regulations 111 shall be similarly applicable with respect to development costs in the case of mines."

On page 17, following the paragraph ending in line 2, insert the following:

"Section 7 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act is amended by inserting after the third paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

"'No license under this act of any class shall be transferred to, or issued with respect to, premises which on the date this paragraph takes effect are not licensed, excluding hotels, if such premises are within 600 feet of the nearest boundary of premises on which is located a school, church, playground, public library, eleemosynary institution providing housing for the indigent, soldiers' home, Army post, navy yard, or marine barracks. For the purposes of this section, the term "hotel" means an establishment operating under a hotel license and having in excess of 50 rooms used predominately for transient occupancy; that is, for living quarters for nonresidents upon a short-time basis.'

"Section 9 of such act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) No holder of a retailer's license, class A, or retailer's license, class B, or wholesaler's license shall, with respect to alcoholic beverages covered by such license—

"'(1) advertise, by any means or through any medium, the price for which such alcoholic beverages are for sale;

"'(2) distribute, sell, or give away any price list or information with respect to the price of such alcoholic beverages;

"'(3) display in his place of business any price list or sign with respect to the price of such alcoholic beverages if any price on such list or sign is visible from the street; or

"'(4) display, or leave in his place of business, in a place where customers may take it away, any price list or information with respect to the price of such alcoholic beverages.'"

On page 20, following the paragraph ending in line 9, insert the following:

"Hereafter every Saturday shall be a holiday and not a business day for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; and any act which would otherwise be required, authorized, or permitted to be performed on Saturday in the Bureau, if Saturday were not a holiday, shall or may be so performed on the next succeeding business day, and no liability or loss of rights of any kind shall result from such delay."

On page 34, following the paragraph ending in line 9, insert the following:

"The Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, approved June 30, 1945, is hereby amended as follows:

"(1) By striking out the word 'forty' where it appears in section 201, in subsection (b) of section 202, and in subsections (a) and (d) of section 604 and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'thirty';

"(2) By striking out the words 'forty-eight' in subsection (a) of section 202 and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'forty'; and

"(3) By striking out the words 'two thousand and eighty' where they appear in subsection (a) of section 201 and in subsections (a) and (b) of section 203, and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'one thousand five hundred sixty.'

"Sections 26b and 26c of title 5 of the United States Code, being, respectively, (1) section 11, title II, chapter 212 of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1516); and (2) section 1, chapter 359 of the act of June 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 269), are hereby repealed.

"The Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to issue, within three months after the date of enactment of this act, and subject to the approval of the President, such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of the provisions of this act insofar as this act affects officers and employees in or under the executive branch of the Government."

On page 34, following the paragraph ending in line 22, insert the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Postmaster General, acting through the postmaster of the Senate Post Office, is authorized and directed to cash checks for Senators and secretaries to Senators, in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may deem advisable, and for that purpose he is authorized to use any funds available for disbursement by him."

On page 41, following the paragraph ending in line 14, insert the following:

The following provisions of this act shall apply to the carrying of mail on star routes within the United States.

"(1) There shall be placed in charge of the Star Route Service in the Post Office Department a Superintendent of Star Route Service.

"(2) For the purpose of fixing rates for the transportation of mail on star routes the Postmaster General shall divide such routes into classes A and B. Class A shall consist of those routes on which the mail service is performed by aircraft or by common carrier by motor vehicles. Class B shall consists of those routes not included in class A.

"(3) (a) Upon the expiration of an existing contract on a class A route, or upon the creation of a new class A route, the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, advertise for proposals for the transportation of mail on such route, or may negotiate therefor without advertising, for a contract period not exceeding four years.

"(b) Upon the expiration of an existing contract on a class B route, or within ninety days after the enactment of this act, the contractor on the route, if otherwise qualified, shall be afforded an opportunity to accept an appointment as carrier on such route under the provisions of this act by giving notice in writing to the Postmaster General of such desire, the appointment to be without term, except as hereinafter provided.

"(c) To be eligible as a class B carrier under this act a person must be a citizen of the United States; a resident of the county or counties through which the star route passes, or a resident of a county adjoining such county or counties; of good moral character; between the ages of 21 and 70 years; in good health, except that a present contractor may be considered eligible if capable of performing the duties required on the route which he has been serving. Vacancies shall be filled by the Postmaster General upon certification by the Civil Service Commission from registers of eligibles resulting from examination: *Provided*, That only persons between the ages of 21 and 55 years shall be eligible to take such examination.

"(4) At the end of the month in which a class B carrier serving under the provisions of this act attains his seventieth birthday he shall be relieved of the duties of his appointment and the vacancy thus created shall be filled as provided herein, except that a present contractor capable of performing the duties of his route shall be permitted to carry the route for a period after reaching his seventieth birthday not exceeding the expiration date of his present contract.

"(5) Class B carriers serving under the provisions of this act shall be paid for the scheduled time of the route, including scheduled lay-over time at outside places to be fairly established by the Postmaster General, at the rate of 90 cents per hour; and in addition thereto shall be paid for equipment maintenance for horse, horse and vehicle, dogs and sleds, boat, passenger motorcar, or lesser type of equipment, a sum equal to 6 cents per mile or major fraction of a mile traveled in performing star-route service; for one-half-ton truck station wagon, or closed body delivery truck, 7 cents; for one-ton truck but less than two-ton, 8 cents; and for two- and two-and-one-half-ton truck, 9 cents; and for large equipment, 10 cents: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General shall determine the size of equipment necessary to transport the mail over the route with certainty, celerity, security, and economy. Payment of equipment maintenance shall be at the same period and in the same manner as payments for regular compensation.

"(6) Each class B carrier shall designate a substitute carrier acceptable to the postmaster at the head of the route to act in the absence of the carrier. The substitute shall receive for his services the same amount as is paid to the carrier for such services: *Provided*, That if the substitute carrier uses the equipment of the carrier to perform the services of the route the equipment maintenance allowance for the use of such equipment may be paid to the carrier.

"(7) Every class B carrier and substitute carrier shall take the official oath prescribed in section 30, Postal Laws and Regulations, and shall execute a bond in the sum of $1,000 with acceptable sureties, the bond to be forwarded to the Postmaster General; the amount of bond required on each class A route to be determined by the Postmaster General.

"(8) Wherever the Postmaster General is unable to procure mail service on a class B route under the provisions of this act he may enter into a temporary contract for the performance of mail service on such route at a rate in excess of the fixed rate until such time as he is able to procure such service at the rate scheduled herein.

"(9) Carriers on all routes shall furnish equipment sufficient for transportation of the mails and the proper handling of all postal business on the route with certainty, celerity, security, and economy."

On page 44, following the paragraph ending in line 5, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"It is the sense of the Senate that September 8, 1946, being the twenty-sixth anniversary of the dispatch by the Post Office Department of the first air-mail letter from coast to coast, the Postmaster General should issue a special air-mail postage stamp, of 8-cent denomination, of such design and for such period as he may determine, in commemoration of this anniversary."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5452, the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, fiscal year 1947, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see foregoing notices.)

THE SALVATION OF DEMOCRACY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on the subject The Salvation of Democracy, delivered by him on June 12, 1946, in Chicago,

Ill., to the graduating class of 1946 of De Paul University, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HOUSING PROBLEM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an adress on the housing problem from the national viewpoint, delivered by Senator ELLENDER, in the city of Washington on June 17, 1946, before the Citizens Council for Community Planning, which appears in the Appendix.]

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA BEFORE NEVADA STATE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

[Mr. CARVILLE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina, before the Nevada State Democratic Convention on May 14, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT—ADDRESS BY LELAND OLDS

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project, delivered by Hon. Leland Olds, Chairman, Federal Power Commission, at Syracuse, N. Y., on May 27, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NUREMBERG TRIALS—PAPER BY SAMUEL A. HARPER

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a paper entitled "The Nuremberg Trials," by Samuel A. Harper, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON WORLD INDUSTRIALIZATION—ARTICLE BY MORRIS LLEWELLYN COOKE

[Mr. Taylor asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Some Observations on World Industrialization," by Morris Llewellyn Cooke, consulting engineer in management, Philadelphia, Pa., published in the May 1946 issue of Mechanical Engineering, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARNINGS—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TIMES

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Warnings," dealing with labor and industrial relations, published in the Chicago Times of June 13, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GUFFEY obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	O'Daniel
Austin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Pepper
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Brooks	Hill	Reed
Buck	Hoey	Revercomb
Bushfield	Huffman	Robertson
Butler	Johnson, Colo	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Carville	Knowland	Stewart
Chavez	La Follette	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McFarland	Tunnell
Ellender	McKellar	Wagner
Ferguson	Millikin	Walsh
George	Moore	White
Gerry	Morse	Wiley
Green	Murdock	Willis
Guffey	Murray	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BURCH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr MITCHELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent on official business, attending the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in Bermuda.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5605) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 9, 10, 17, 24, 27, 28, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 57, and 64.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 20, 23, 33, 35, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 53, 62, 63, and 65, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$1,309,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$2,163,457"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics under the heading 'Economic investigations' shall be use for State and county land-use planning, for conducting cultural surveys, or for the maintenance of regional offices"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$885,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$497,032"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$981,012"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$2,428,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$2,070,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$1,355,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$584,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: $2,676,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$3,066,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$461,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$6,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$2,754,111"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$1,003,710"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$21,786,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$2,380,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$1,395,000, of which at least $10,000 shall be expended for research in the utilization of waste woods"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$39,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$27,942,888"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 6 and 7 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "Seventy-ninth Congress, second session" and insert in lieu thereof, the following: "approved June 4, 1946 (Public Law 396)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert: "$1,219,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert: "$70,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of a total outstanding obligation of $5,000 for all such loans or the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment, insert the following: "and no loans, excepting those to eligible veterans, may be made for the acquisition or enlargement of farms which have a value, as acquired, enlarged, or improved, in excess of the average value of efficient family-size farm-managed units, as determined by the Secretary, in the county, parish, or locality where the farm is located"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 43, 52, 54, 55, 66, 67, and 68.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CLYDE M. REED,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report. I think it will not take more than 2 minutes.

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5605, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 11, 1946.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 43, 52, 54, 55, and 68 to the bill (H. R. 5605) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 66 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert:

"SEC. 5. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further*, That any person who engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67 to said bill an concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 6. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, or modify in any manner whatsoever, the aggregate maximum personnel ceilings established by section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law No. 390) nor to authorize the compensation of a greater aggregate number

than the number provided for in the aforesaid act. In the case of any activity whose personnel may be increased in consequence of appropriations contained in this act, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall recommend and effectuate such reduction in personnel in such governmental agencies as he may deem advisable as will offset any increase in personnel for which provision is made in this act."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 66 and 67.

The motion was agreed to.

ANDRE DACHARRY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of Andre Dacharry, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. WHERRY conferees on the part of the Senate.

JOSEPH E. BENNETT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2091) for the relief of Joseph E. Bennett, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. WILSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

CROW IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, when the calendar of the Senate was called on Friday last two Senate bills were passed, one, S. 1681, to provide for adjustments in connection with the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., introduced by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and another bill, S. 2077, also introduced by the senior Senator from Montana, to amend section 1 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 658).

Yesterday the House passed two companion bills, which are identical in all respects with the Senate bills passed last Friday. In order, therefore, to secure the action which both Houses have taken, I ask unanimous consent that the two House bills now be received and considered by the Senate, and passed. Let me refer first to H. R. 4983, which is now on the desk.

I ask that the vote by which Senate bill 1681 was passed be reconsidered, and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 4983.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4983) to provide for adjustments in connection with the Crow Indian project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1681 is indefinitely postponed.

ALLOTMENT OF LANDS OF THE CROW TRIBE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now ask that the vote by which Senate bill 2077 was passed be reconsidered, and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 6195.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6195), to amend section 1 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes, as amended by the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 658), was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2077 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding for this purpose, and I assure him that the delegation from Montana and the Crow Indians will likewise be grateful.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I find that the House and Senate passed identical bills to provide for military assistance to the Republic of the Philippine Islands. Both bills were passed on the 14th of June, 1946. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which Senate bill 2254 was passed be reconsidered, and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 6572.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand the bills are identical or substantially identical.

Mr. HAYDEN. I notice that one bill provides that the Secretary shall deem something to be proper, and in the other bill the Secretary shall find something to be proper. The language would seem to be practically identical.

Mr. WHITE. I should think that would be near enough.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6572) to provide military assistance to the Republic of the Philippines in establishing and maintaining national security and to form a basis for participation by that Government in such defensive military operations as the future may require, was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2254 will be indefinitely postponed.

ECONOMY ABROAD AND ECONOMY AT HOME

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has frequently called upon the Federal Government to make drastic reductions in pay roll and other expenses.

Recently, as chairman of the committee dealing with such matters, he has recommended that Federal personnel be reduced to 1,650,000 by June 30 of next year.

This would mean a reduction of 1,243,670 from the 2,893,670 employees on the Federal pay roll as of January 31.

Economy is a popular issue for any man in public life.

There are few Members of the Congress and few of their constituents, who will not agree in principle that economy is a good thing.

Since it is not alleged that the supposedly personnel are not performing services to the public, the question is one of curtailing services now rendered.

When we ask what services are to be curtailed, we encounter a difficult problem.

Certainly many agencies set up exclusively for war purposes could and should be reduced or eliminated.

At the same time, the problems of reconversion have made new and different public services necessary, all requiring personnel. This means that while we fire with one hand we hire with the other, so that any large-scale reduction can be accomplished only at the expense of services which the Congress has voted to give.

We cannot arbitrarily decree that nearly half of our civil servants shall be fired during the next year unless we are prepared to abandon the work those employees do.

Year after year the Federal Government has taken on new and greater obligations which it cannot now abandon.

The social security program, to give one illustration, involves many thousands of employees who were not necessary before social security legislation was enacted.

Many other new agencies which are performing essential public services account for many more thousands.

If the Congress wishes the laws administered and enforced, it must provide the manpower to do the job.

Consequently, I suggest that pay rolls cannot be considered apart from agencies, or agencies from the laws which impose duties upon them.

The question cannot be settled by a simple arithmetical slash of personnel.

It must necessarily involve abandonment by the Federal Government of some fields in which it now operates.

It reduces itself to this—can we reduce the functions of the Federal Government?

In recent years the functions of all Government agencies, whether Federal, State or local, have increased to a marked degree.

Since the senior Senator from Virginia has been such an outstanding advocate of curtailed Federal pay rolls, I have been interested to see how his home State of Virginia dealt with this problem.

It is a matter of general knowledge that in his home State the senior Senator is a person of considerable influence.

I would not say that he is the political boss, since that might have connotations which I do not intend, but I believe I may say that he is on terms of friendship if not intimacy with the elected officials and the legislators of Virginia.

I might venture further to say that his word carries great weight, and that any policies of State government which conflicted with his opinions or principles would make little progress in Virginia.

With this in mind, I have been amazed to find that the fiscal practices of the Virginia State administration, sponsored and elected through the influence of the senior Senator, not only have little in common with, but in fact are diametrically opposed to, the fiscal practices which the senior Senator urges so eloquently and so forcefully upon the Federal Government.

I am very surprised to discover that although the senior Senator advocates wholesale pay-roll reductions in Washington, he apparently does not do so back home.

The distinction, I suspect, is that in Washington he is not burdened with the problem of administering the laws, whereas in Virginia his political associates face it every day.

They face the fact, just as the Federal Government does, that the public demands more services, and that personnel and taxes are necessary to provide those services. So, just as the Federal Government does, they put people on the pay roll to do the job.

One of the largest and most influential newspapers in Virginia, The Richmond Times-Dispatch, has called attention to the fact that State jobs have increased more rapidly than Federal jobs.

In June of 1924 Virginia had 4,650 employees, the Federal Government 550,000.

For June of 1930 the figure was 7,011 for Virginia, 608,900 for the Federal Government.

In June 1937, the total was 12,250 for Virginia and 841,700 for the Federal Government, while in June of 1942 it was 17,590 for Virginia and 2,248,600 for the Federal Government.

The Federal increase from 1924 to 1942 was 300 percent, and the Virginia increase a little less than 300 percent. But if we eliminate war agencies, the increase is 92½ percent for the Federal Government and 278 percent for Virginia.

The Times-Dispatch, in another article, pointed out that only 8 States in the country had larger State pay rolls, and that 10 other States, larger than Virginia, had substantially fewer State employees.

Virginia had 1 employee for every 164 persons in its population, whereas 18 larger States ranged from 197, for my own State of Pennsylvania, to 466 population per State employee.

It would appear from this that even Pennsylvania, with a Republican State administration breaking all records to pad its pay rolls with political workers, could not equal Virginia's record in this respect.

It is worth noting, in passing, that, although the senior Senator's Virginia associates apparently do not read his economy speeches, they are in accord with his crusade for low salaries.

The salaries paid by the State of Virginia are substantially below those paid by the Federal Government for comparable work.

Yet, strangely enough, this has not prevented the cost of government from rising in Virginia.

The economy that is urged upon the Congress by the senior Senator finds no echo in the State budget of Virginia.

On the contrary, the cost of government has risen virtually as fast in Virginia as it has in the Federal Government.

The State's costs rose from $33,108,973 in 1925 to $89,432,589 in 1940—an increase of 170.1 percent.

During the same period the cost of the Federal Government increased from $3,063,000,000 to $8,998,000,000, or 193.7 percent.

Comparisons of expenditures during the war years would be meaningless because of the Federal war expenditures.

However, it should be noted that Virginia spent $126,906,962 in 1945, or 1,487½ percent more than it spent in 1915.

In the past 10 years its biennial budgets have increased from $123,000,000 for the 2 years ending June 30, 1938, to $321,000,000 for the 2 years ending June 30, 1948.

This is a stupendous sum for a State with 3,000,000 population, when we consider that my own State, with 10,000,000 population and with a free-spending Republican administration in office, has a current biennial budget of less than $500,000,000.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to be advised, if the Senator knows, whether Virginia has a bonded indebtedness.

Mr. GUFFEY. I do not know. I am taking this information from the Times-Dispatch.

Mr. OVERTON. The reason why I ask the question is that I understand that Virginia built her roads without floating a single bond; and, so far as I know, she may be now on a cash basis. I think that is a remarkable condition.

Mr. GUFFEY. I may say the same of Pennsylvania. I think the only debt we have in the State is the self-liquidating debt on the turnpike.

Mr. OVERTON. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, in calling attention to these figures it is not my intention to be critical of the senior Senator or of the State administration of Virginia.

It is rather my purpose to point out to the senior Senator and to those in accord with his proposal to cut Federal pay rolls in half that the same reply which the Virginia State administration gave to the Richmond Times-Dispatch, in answer to its criticism of State pay rolls, applies equally to the senior Senator.

The answer, in brief, was that pay rolls had increased because the State had taken over additional functions.

Federal pay rolls have increased in precisely the same way, because the Federal Government has taken over additional functions.

It would be pertinent to suggest to the senior Senator, whose word carries great weight in Virginia, that he attempt a practical demonstration in that State of the policy he has suggested for adoption on a Nation-wide scale.

If Virginia can cut its State pay roll in half, at the same time paying a decent wage to its public servants and not curtailing any essential public services, then I will be convinced that the senior Senator's plan to do the same in the Federal Government is sound and feasible.

Until he does, I suggest that the most damaging and irrefutable argument against his economy proposals is the object lesson which his own State administration has provided on the other side of the Potomac.

THE POWER LOBBY OF 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. In recent years able economists and distinguished leaders in business have been pointing to the rapid growth of monopoly in our country. They have been directing attention to the trend toward the growth of large combinations involving the control of prices and other basic factors which are the direct opposite of the principle of free markets.

During the depression years of the 1930's, Walter Lippmann, a distinguished writer on economic problems, in referring to this trend, said:

> The development of combinations in business which are able to dominate the markets in which they sell their goods and in which they buy their labor and their materials must lead irresistibly to some form of state collectivism. So much power will never for long be allowed to rest in private hands, and those who do not wish to take the road to the politically administered economy

of socialism must be prepared to take the steps back toward the restoration of the market economy of private competitive enterprise.

Shortly before World War II, Mr. George H. Davis, then President of the United States Chamber of Commerce, frankly recognizing this growth of big business, said:

> There is not much doubt that the development of business organization has outrun the public understanding of it. It is like a locomotive that has become too heavy for the roadbed on which it runs.

I could quote a score of other men distinguished in business and industrial life, all expressing grave apprehension in regard to the future of our system of free enterprise.

Just a few days ago, Mr. Eric Johnston, the retiring president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, who represents the liberal viewpoint in that body, in addressing a convention of the United States Chamber of Commerce in Atlantic City, called for a series of reforms in our economy in order to make it operate in the interest and welfare of the whole people.

Mr. President, this growth of monopoly and control of business by large combinations is seen as creating serious problems for our country. It is a collectivist technique, and it makes necessary the development of huge government bureaus and agencies to control our economy in order to safeguard the public interest. In our country, business has become divided into two groups—one favoring the extension of big business and monopoly, and the other crying out for a return to the principle of free enterprise. This economic system, half monopoly and half free enterprise, cannot long continue to work; and unless we are willing to sacrifice political democracy in America, we must start now to stop this progress of collectivism and return business to the democratic competitive order.

Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln once said: "A house divided against itself cannot stand." While he did not believe that the house would fall, he thought it would eventually have to become all one thing or all the other. That simile illustrates the division and confusion existing in our economic system today. We cannot continue to operate our capitalistic economy under such a dual system, with one section operating on the basis of free competition and the other, a rapidly growing section, operating under a system of big business and monopoly.

Small independent concerns are being rapidly pushed to the wall, while monopolistic practices in all lines are continuing to expand. This trend toward economic feudalism will eventually destroy all opportunity and the right of men to engage in business.

WHO'S WHO IN THE POWER LOBBY OF 1946

Mr. President, the wilting touch of monopoly not only affects our economic life directly but it reaches out to slow up and throttle the will of the people in their efforts to better our Nation's economy through governmental procedures. This political arm of monopoly is the big-business lobbies. These lobbies seek to influence every action taken by this body. We have struggled with their efforts on major legislation—as with the OPA measure last week. The appropriation bill for the Interior Department that we are now considering has limped its weary way to this floor through a maze of obstacles placed in its path by some of the oldest and most powerful lobbies known to Washington. It was with this appropriation measure in mind that, on March 11, 1946, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, took the floor to denounce the private-utility lobby now infesting Washington. He warned the House and the public against being deceived by their activities in opposition to public power and rural electrification. His speech followed one delivered on February 27, 1946, by Representative SAVAGE, of Washington, who, likewise, paid his respects to these sinister influences.

In addition to that, the dean of the House, the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, of Illinois, on March 12, 1946, introduced a resolution to investigate lobbies; and on the following day he spoke on the subject, declaring that although all Members of the Congress, and especially the older Members, had seen "some vicious and unscrupulous lobbies here in Washington," he doubted that "any of us have seen a time when there were so many, nor when there was more evidence of common understanding and purpose among the legislative counsels and the national representatives." He concluded with the words, "The evil far from being abated is greater than ever before in my memory of my long service here."

Mr. President, this is a most significant statement. The distinguished dean of the House is not given to careless or sensational utterances for mere oratorical effect. He first came to Congress in 1906. He has served under 8 Presidents and for 20 consecutive terms—40 years—added to which he has been a member of the House Rules Committee for 17 years and chairman of that powerful committee since 1939. That position has put him in close touch with the fate of all important legislation before Congress. Hence, when a legislator of such unique and impressive experience deliberately asserts, in sum, that the lobby evil is worse today than at any time during the twentieth century, and that present-day lobbies seem to have more influence with Members of this Congress than any other Congress during this momentous period, his words constitute a challenge to every American who values the honesty and effectiveness of representative government.

PIERRE DU PONT DEFINES LOBBYING

I shall presently deal with the water and power lobby in particular. But, first, I desire to make clear the kind of lobbying I am discussing. It was once aptly defined by none other than Mr. Pierre S. du Pont, when president of the great du Pont corporation, as "underhanded promotion of individual interests."

The occasion of the pronouncement is of unique interest today when the extension of the TVA idea is a burning issue. It was in 1916. Congress was considering a government hydroelectric plant, presumably Muscle Shoals, for making by the Government of air nitrates for munitions of war. The du Pont corporation had a corps of men in Washington fighting this proposal and seeking a 50-year lease of Muscle Shoals under which the du Ponts would supply the Nation with nitric acid for munitions. The late Senator Underwood had, in effect, charged du Pont with lobbying. Du Pont, while admitting he had representatives in Washington, denied lobbying in a letter inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 3, 1916, in which he used the phrase "lobbying—that is, underhanded promotion of individual interests," as I quoted before.

I recoil from thinking of what would have happened to the Tennessee River and Valley and its people had Mr. Du Pont's "representatives" succeeded. Certainly there would have been no TVA, and certainly underhanded opposition to public development has been going on ever since that day.

The hoary age of the power lobby has not dimmed its ardor nor sapped its effectiveness. In the appropriation bill which we are now studying, that lobby has been and is playing a big hand.

The power sales responsibilities of the Interior Department are great. They require that we appropriate necessary funds to assure that publicly produced power shall be made widely available to the people, especially through public agencies and farmer cooperatives, and not turned over to a few utility monopolists. But the directive of the Congress to this agency that it so dispose of Federal electric power as to encourage its widespread use and prevent its monopolization can be nullified by failure to appropriate funds for transmission lines to carry the power from the dams.

The sharp cuts made in the House would have destroyed effectively the power programs of this Department. The House hearings on this bill show that lobbyists from power companies throughout the land appeared in opposition to the Government's power programs. Those hearings—and, of course, no record fully discloses the extent of off-the-record wire-pulling—have resulted in the emasculated bill that came to this body. Fortunately, the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and his committee were able to repair much of the damage. But there are still three important power items that have fallen by the wayside. I refer first to the Central Valley transmission lines which were vigorously opposed by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., and are no longer in the bill. Second, to the lines for the Colorado-Big Thompson project which were opposed by the Colorado power companies, and have met a similar fate. And, finally, to the Southwestern power appropriation which has been fought by the combined utility companies of the Southwest and has been sunk without a trace.

Here we have an example in the present situation of the strength of the power lobby in Washington which operates

against the interests of our people and continues year after year its deadly work in spite of all of our efforts to bring it to book.

LOBBY INVESTIGATIONS BY CONGRESS

It will be useful briefly to recount the efforts of Congress to expose and end this underhanded power lobbying since the turn of the century.

The first water power lobby to make its appearance in great force in Washington was during the close of the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908 and 1909. It opposed conservation measures sponsored by the President under the leadership of Hon. Gifford Pinchot, of Pennsylvania, a Republican, and United States Senator Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada, a Democrat. Historians of the period note that the most active lobbyists were those representing special interests from the South and West which had vast water power and other resources awaiting development. There was no demand then for Government operation, but under the banner of States' rights and freedom for private enterprise, that lobby resisted any attempt of the Federal Government even to regulate or to control water power utilization of that or other natural resources.

The first real lobby investigation by Congress was made in 1913. The need for conservation had rightly captured the imagination of the American people. The Democratic and Bull Moose platforms of 1912 contained strong planks for progressive measures of various kinds, including conservation of water resources. When the Sixty-third Congress was organized, the largest army of lobbyists then known to our history had turned up in Washington to prevent the redemption of those campaign pledges. But President Wilson, in a forthright public statement, exposed its existence. The then sensational "Mulhall investigation" followed, which disclosed that the most powerful brigade of this army of lobbyists was the so-called National Council for Industrial Development with 250 member associations Nation-wide. That organization, with its high-sounding name, was a mere front for the National Manufacturers Association which is still with us and still employing their same old practices and methods of evasion and deception.

In 1916 there was another flurry in Congress over a lobby intent upon blocking honest water power legislation and seeking to pass a bill concocted by private utilities. That struggle lasted until 1920, when the Federal Power Commission was created.

In 1928 when the Swing-Johnson Boulder Dam bill and the Norris Muscle Shoals bill were pending, Congress authorized the notable Federal Trade Commission investigation of the propaganda and financial methods of the electric and gas utilities under a resolution jointly sponsored by Senators Walsh of Montana and Norris of Nebraska. That probe revealed that both electric consumers and investors were being looted by the captains of finance dominating the holding companies, and that they were propagandizing everybody from United States Senators down to children in the grade schools in their efforts to control public opinion.

The House hearings on this appropriation bill contain statements and admissions by power company officials that these efforts to control public opinion through donation of money to schools and country clubs are still being made. The testimony of Mr. Davis, of the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., in the hearings is not about his activities back in the terrible twenties—he openly admits to the expenditure today of his utility company's funds for country club memberships, schools, and newspapers.

In 1929 and 1930, a most thorough investigation of lobbying was made by a Senate committee, under the chairmanship of Senator Caraway, of Arkansas. Other members of that committee were Senators Borah of Idaho, Walsh of Montana, Blaine of Wisconsin, and Robinson of Indiana. Shocking practices by the private-power interests were exposed in those hearings and the lobby organizations, a joint committee of electric, gas, and street railway national organizations, quickly dismantled their sumptuous offices in the Washington Building here and silently left the city.

I wonder what Senator Caraway, that stalwart fighter against monopoly and greed and arch foe of the lobbies, would think if he could witness the lobby that today emanates from his own great State of Arkansas against a public-power program that can so greatly benefit the people of that region and bring about the development of its great natural resources. Did not the nylon lobby originate with the power companies of Arkansas?

Five years later in 1935, another Senate lobby investigation committee, under the chairmanship of Senator Hugo Black of Alabama, was directed to look into the million dollar lobby opposing the passage of the utility-holding company bill. That bill, which was designed to break the strangle hold of that utility monopoly on the American people, was a direct result of the findings of the Federal Trade Commission investigation. Mr. President, it is safe to say that Senator Black's investigation saved that bill from certain defeat. Mr. Howard C. Hopson, president of the now defunct Associated Gas & Electric Co., was one of the leaders of that lobby. He was later convicted and sent to the Federal penitentiary for maladministration of the funds of his trusting investors.

EIGHTY-TWO BILLS HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED

Mr. President, an examination of the record discloses that during the 40 years here under discussion, as a result of these inquiries, no less than 82 bills have been introduced in Congress to regulate this vicious practice and mitigate its evils. I shall not go into the details of the remedies proposed because not one of these bills has been enacted into law, with the result that this treacherous lobby system of the power interests is worse than ever in all its evil manifestations.

Through the radio, the press, and by personal observation, the people of the entire Nation are now becoming acutely aware of this intolerable situation which threatens the very foundation of democracy. If a public opinion poll were taken today, it would be certain to reveal the fact that the power lobby is exercising a controlling influence in all legislation affecting power problems.

Mr. President, I wish now to briefly discuss the origin and character of the allied lobbies opposing the extension of TVA principles to the development of the other river valleys of the Nation.

AFTER BOTH WORLD WARS

There is a remarkable parallel between the aims and methods of the electric utilities at the close of the two world wars. In 1919, their trade organization, the defunct National Electric Light Association, launched a Nation-wide propaganda campaign to block further municipal ownership, prevent multipurpose dams and Government development and sale of power on the Colorado, Tennessee, Columbia, or other rivers. The Federal Trade Commission probe officially reported it to be probably the greatest peacetime campaign ever conducted by private interests in this country.

For nine long years, this propaganda campaign conducted in connection with active lobbying in Washington blocked any progress. Then came exposure that cleared the way for the Boulder Dam Act, the TVA Act, Bonneville, Coulee, Santee-Cooper, Fort Peck, Lower Colorado in Texas, Grand River in Oklahoma, and others, all multipurpose projects for water and land conservation, and distribution to the people of the low-cost power produced on their own rivers from their own dams built with their own money.

That great program of reclamation and public-power development has made a tremendous contribution to the expansion of the national economy. It has meant new homes for millions of our people in the less populated sections of the country. It has meant a huge development of national resources and an unprecedented expansion of industry and business in the areas affected. It has given new life and vigor to democracy and has educated the people as to the benefits of free enterprise over monopolies.

But now again at the close of World War II, these same monopoly interests in the same fashion as in 1920 have inaugurated a like powerful propaganda lobby effort to block any further extension of the TVA idea of the development and public marketing of public power.

It is a well-planned and efficiently executed campaign highly financed and unique only in that the power interests have summoned to their aid more outside organizations than ever before. I can here only roughly sketch the main maneuvers of this campaign as it has recently developed.

THE CAMPAIGN OPENS

To begin with, it was well known in the spring of 1944 that President Roosevelt, if nominated and reelected, would vigorously pursue the TVA policy as soon as the war ended. In May of that year, the United States Chamber of Com-

merce, which the late Senator Norris used to call the big brother of the Power Trust, submitted to its member chambers referendum No. 81, declaring against more TVA's, advocating further development by the Army engineers and existing bureaus, and the sale of electric power to private companies for retail by them. Regional authorities were said to be super government, inimical to private free enterprise, destructive of State rights, and socialistic. It is germane to observe that on the natural resources committee of the chamber which prepared this policy document for the businessmen of America, we find the names of Kinsey M. Robinson, of Spokane, president of the Washington Water Power Co.; ex-Governor Ralph L. Carr, of Denver, Colo., utility attorney; and L. Ward Bannister, of Denver, utility attorney and corporation spokesman.

This declaration was accompanied with arguments for the policy but none against. It was approved and of course got a good press. Hence, the Nation was advised that organized business was against more TVA's, and it was charged that the Roosevelt administration had been without regard for States' rights and opportunity for private enterprise. The broadside was well timed.

The Presidential campaign was beginning. Soon following this in September in the middle of the campaign under the leadership of the National Reclamation Association there was held in Chicago a water conservation conference with representatives from 28 States. It also denounced the regional authority principle and created a continuing committee to represent it in Washington.

These maneuvers of the chamber and the self-styled reclamation leaders were undoubtedly intended to influence the election and perhaps the attitude of the President, but they failed. During the campaign he announced his support of an MVA bill, which I had introduced; and following the election, while he signed the Flood Control Act on December 22, 1944, he warned that construction in the Missouri Basin there authorized would not jeopardize the creation of an MVA.

In February, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] introduced an authority bill for the Columbia River Basin. Hearings on these measures were in prospect, and another wing of the opposition organized a temporary water lobby and went into action.

In the Flood Control Act of 1944, the combined power lobby took a serious setback. That measure provided that all power produced at flood control and navigation dams should be sold on the same public power basis as the Congress provided for TVA, Bonneville, and Fort Peck. The strenuous efforts of the lobby to defeat that sound measure failed. But the appropriations necessary to make effective the policy we declared in the Flood Control Act are now being hamstrung by the same forces. They must be defeated here today again by restoring the President's power Budget items.

THE WATER LOBBY

Mr. Fred D. Benke, an attorney of Memphis, Tenn., is the enterprising secretary-treasurer of both the Rivers and Harbors Congress and the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association. He was instrumental in calling together the heads of 20—later increased to 31—organizations from Maine to California, who, for various reasons, were opposed to the TVA method of administration, and other like independent regional authorities. These gentlemen formed a coordinating committee, and sent to all Senators in Congress on April 13, 1945—3 days before hearings began on my bill (S. 555) to establish a Missouri Valley Authority—a joint statement signed by the officers of 20 organizations declaring all regional authorities to be dictatorships, superstates, inimical to free enterprise, and which "threatened interference with social and cultural activities of the people." It asserted that the Flood Control Act of December 1944, constituted a new water bill of rights, and demanded that the Army engineers, Reclamation Bureau, and others, be entrusted with further river valley development. As to electric power, it was to be disposed of on sound business principles, whatever that may mean.

These gentlemen, as I have said, had appointed from among their number a coordinating committee of five to represent the group before Congress. It is highly entertaining to note that when last July the Washington Daily News printed a brilliant series of six articles by Peter Edson with the caption "Washington Water Lobby," and indicating motives not disclosed in their propaganda, the coordinating committee issued an indignant denial that the then organization of 31 was a lobby. "The objective," they said, "is the enlightenment of all the people as to the true story of TVA."

I refrain from comment on the mass of misinformation and false charges about TVA being presented to committees of the Congress and vended in pamphlets by this committee, except to say that if the gentlemen are not lobbying, then a new distinction must be drawn between ordinary lobbyists and alleged crusaders of enlightenment on the beneficent effects of power monopoly.

The chairman of this coordinating committee was the late Roy Miller, of Texas, dean among lobbyists, who, for a generation, represented waterway interests in Washington, as well as the Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., whose charm and hospitality led him to acquire a wide acquaintance among Representatives and Senators.

On this committee is the name of our old friend, F. O. Hagie, who for years represented in Washington the National Reclamation Association, and who recently left the job of executive secretary of that association to go to work for the Seattle Chamber of Commerce. He works for large appropriations for reclamation and irrigation, but strangely enough is unalterably opposed to public power. This reclamation association is today largely composed of, and dominated by, utility, railroad, mining, banking, contracting and other large interests and their legion of lawyers, instead of working farmers. As ex-Secretary Ickes has pointed out, "Utility job holders have joined the Reclamation Association in droves and they have become an influence so great that this once great progressive body has degenerated to such a degree that it is now denouncing as 'communistic' cheap public power and the 160-acre land limitation law—two of its three original goals." The National Reclamation Association also has affiliated with it State reclamation associations of the same sort of personnel in Montana, Idaho, Washington, and other Western States collaborating with its Washington campaign against more authorities. It is significant that some of them have been just recently organized.

Next in importance on this committee is the name of William H. Webb, for years quartered in Washington by the Rivers and Harbors Congress which is interested in appropriations for harbor and river improvements, and is likewise opposed to public power. Mr. Webb talks of authorities as "monopolistic Federal agencies," and demands development by the States or existing agencies.

Next comes the veteran Washington agent of the Mississippi Valley Association, Lachlan MacLeay, strong for navigation and flood-control works to be done by Army engineers, but who eloquently denounces multipurpose dams of the TVA kind.

Mr. MacLeay declares that the principle of TVA's and their alleged destruction of free enterprise is "a most outrageous undercover attempt to impose socialism upon the United States." Is it possible that the American people can be deceived by such obvious hypocrisy?

It is unfortunate that the selfish motives at the roots of these organizations have not been established as clearly as was that of the Associated General Contractors. This organization, though not listed among the 31, is also opposed to MVA's and CVA's. Its general manager, H. E. Foreman, with offices in the Munsey Building in Washington, told Senate committees that "the valley authority idea is contrary to the American way of life, and destructive to our American system of free enterprise." Questioned as to whether the attitude sprung from selfish interest, Mr. Foreman reluctantly admitted that the TVA did its own construction and "let no work out on contract." Furthermore, that "the MVA bill has no provision requiring its work to be done by private contracts."

THE ELECTRIC UTILITY LOBBIES

So much, Mr. President, for the land and water lobbies. The next organized attack in point of time against the TVA idea was made by the electric utilities themselves. On July 15, 1945, the newly created National Association of Electric Utilities announced the opening of a Washington office, and 4 days later, Mr. C. Hamilton Moses, president of the Arkansas Power Co., spokesman for a group of 167 utilities, in a newspaper statement, fired the opening blast of a campaign against new valley authorities of the TVA type, claiming, as do others, that they were dictatorships.

Mr. Moses has spent much time here in Washington opposing the Southwestern Power Administration program. Fortunately, the light and power users of

Arkansas do not depend upon work of this official for their electricity—or that area would have been in the dark most of this year.

A new National Association of Electric Utilities, with its offices on Fifteenth Street in Washington, is the successor of the 1928 Joint Committee of National Utility Association, which folded up when the light was turned on by the Trade Commission investigation. Later, of lesser potency, came the Council of Utility Executives, managed by the late Philip Gadsden of the United Water Improvement Co. of Philadelphia, another wheel horse in the United States Chamber of Commerce.

In direct command of the Washington office in this latest electric lobby is Purcell L. Smith, of Chicago, former president of the Midwest Corp., an Insull holding concern, who is said to be receiving a salary of $65,000 a year to tutor Congress in favor of monopoly.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to point out that these expensive and extravagant propaganda campaigns are paid for by the people themselves, and not by those who profit by reason of being in control of these various power companies and other interests. There is no question that every dollar of the millions which must now be spent and which are being spent to create a feeling more favorable to the private utilities among the people is being added to the electric-light bills of the Nation.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is exactly right. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. President, powerful in the formation of the National Utility Association and direction of its work is Kinsey M. Robinson, before noted as a factor in shaping the power policies of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Ex-Gov. Ralph L. Carr, of Denver, took office space with Messrs. Purcell, Smith, and Robinson soon after the new lobby got started. Governor Carr has a right there since he is a utility attorney. He is also the western leader of the States' Rights crusade and promoter of the meetings of Governors to protect the power monopoly under the guise of protecting irrigation rights as against authority bills, although all such rights are fully protected in said bills.

Differ as the lobbyists may among themselves on their ordinary objectives, there are several strident notes which they all sound in common accord, namely, "No more TVA's," "Change the Holding Company Act," "Cut power-line appropriations."

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me point out that when the issue of danger to honest Government from private interest lobbies is raised, the rejoinder always comes that the so-called radical forces also maintain powerful lobbies in Washington and out, and hence, private utilities and other interests are forced to fight back in self-defense.

This explanation, however, places the cart before the horse. The truth is that, as a rule, the people are forced to organize lobbies, if you please, to defend their interests against encroachments of entrenched special privilege. But the distinction goes further and turns upon the character of the lobbying and the propaganda accompanying it.

No Member of Congress, least of all myself, will deny to the utilities, the manufacturers, irrigation interests, or any other interest, the right to present their case to Congress and the public. The right of petition involved has cost oceans of blood in past centuries, and was a chief cause of the creation of republics. But such presentation should be honest, candid, and a truthful statement of facts and principles relating to any question.

There is an old adage which we all remember, to the effect that where there is so much smoke there must be fire. This recital of who's who and what's what in the power lobby of 1946 is intended as a first attempt to sweep aside some of the cloud of smoke which conceals that fire. At a later date I and other Members of the Senate will have more to say about the power lobby at work in Washington.

I am firmly of the opinion, from my own personal experience with the power lobby, that it has sinned most grievously against Congress and the general public. The array of falsehoods told the people and whispered in the ears of Members of Congress and other public officials against the growth of authorities, can only be compared to the canards circulated when TVA was being formed.

This matter is so serious that I agree with the distinguished dean of the House, Representative SABATH, that the Congress should investigate lobbying 1946 style fully. We need the detailed facts that such an investigation would disclose.

But the immediate job at hand is to assure ourselves that the objectives of the power lobby are not accomplished through emasculating this important appropriation measure. The Central Valley transmission lines, essential to making Shasta power available to the Government's own pumps in the Delta area and to public agencies throughout northern California, must be built and built quickly.

In the Southwest, the Government dams already constructed and those under construction should be tied together with transmission lines so that this Federal power will not be bottled up but will be widely available to public bodies, farmers' cooperatives, and private industry and play its part in the building of that great region.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has made reference to an investigation which was made by the Federal Trade Commission about 15 years ago of the power lobby and the methods employed by them. In that investigation it was found that one of the methods of propagandizing was for the power interests to write editorials which they would send to newspapers all over the country, in which it is presumed they had some interest, if nothing more than an advertising interest, and that all over the United States editorials exactly alike, or almost exactly alike, would appear, lauding the utility interests and decrying public power and other movements they felt were opposed to their interests. Lest anyone should think that that method has been done away with, I desire to call attention to more recent developments. As the Senator knows, I have been interested in getting the approval of Congress for the St. Lawrence seaway development, which is the greatest source of undeveloped power in North America today. This project has had the consistent opposition of the utility companies and the financial interests which control them. In early March hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. The testimony at those hearings was overwhelmingly in favor of the development of the St. Lawrence power and seaway project. The subcommittee reported favorably by a 3 to 1 vote and the full committee has since reported the bill favorably to the Senate.

On March 25 there appeared in the Reporter News of Abilene, Tex., an editorial headed "What about the big ships?" and the first two paragraphs read in this vein:

> A charge that more than 91 percent of the Amercan merchant marine and 81 percent of the world's tonnage would be barred from the long-proposed St. Lawrence seaway, connecting the Atlantic and the Great Lakes, has been made by the American Merchant Marine Institute, a trade association which includes a majority of the Amercan merchant fleet's owners and operators.
>
> In a letter to Senator CARL HATCH, the institute claims that only 404 of the 5,025 ships built for our merchant fleet since 1939 could pass through the 27-foot channel from Montreal to Lake Ontario when fully loaded. Of those 404, 130 are coastal vessels.

Then the editorial goes on to oppose the development. It gives an inference directly contrary to the facts, because at the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee the acting chairman of the Maritime Commission testified that more than 30,000,000 tons of American shipping could use the St. Lawrence seaway if it were developed. But this editorial was printed in the Abilene (Tex.) Reporter News of March 25, 1946.

On March 26, 1946, there appeared in the News of Harrisburg, Pa., an editorial word for word the same, and headed "What about the big ships?"

Then the Times of Roanoke, Va., on March 25, 1946, printed an editorial against the St. Lawrence seaway headed, "What about the big ships?"

A week later, on April 2, there appeared in the Arizona Republic, of Phoenix, Ariz., an editorial headed "Not designed for big ships." This was printed a week later, and during that week's time the editor had apparently rewritten the editorial to some extent.

I do not know how many more newspapers in the United States printed the same boiler-plate editorials which were undoubtedly sent out by the utility interests in opposition to the St. Lawrence

development project. These four happened to have been sent to me.

It may be recalled that on December 8, 1944, as I remember the date, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] very ably exposed some 20 or 30 or more newspapers in the United States which made a practice of printing in their editorial columns whatever the utility interests sent them to print. To show that they have not abandoned this practice, I ask unanimous consent that these four editorials may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the address of the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont? The Chair hears none, and the editorials may be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator has pointed to the subtle methods and practices which these lobbyists follow. If an investigation were made, I think it would be found that editorials of the same style are published in a great many newspapers all over the country.

Mr. AIKEN. I may further add that an investigation today would disclose that every one of the subtle methods used by the utility interests in the late twenties, and which were exposed by the Federal Trade Commission, are being employed today by the same interests in their effort to prevent the development of our natural resources for the benefit of the people of the United States.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) News of March 26, 1946]

WHAT ABOUT THE BIG SHIPS?

A charge that more than 91 percent of the American merchant marine and 81 percent of the world's tonnage would be barred from the long-proposed St. Lawrence seaway, connecting the Atlantic and the Great Lakes, has been made by the American Merchant Marine Institute, a trade association which includes a majority of the American merchant fleet's owners and operators.

In a letter to Senator CARL HATCH, the institute claims that only 404 of the 5,025 ships built for our merchant fleet since 1939 could pass through the 27-foot channel from Montreal to Lake Ontario when fully loaded. Of those 404, 130 are coastal vessels.

At the same time, the institute's letter continues, foreign shipping would carry the bulk of the trade through the waterway, since 72 percent of the world's merchant ships of 25-foot draft or less are foreign-owned. The letter makes the point that a draft deeper than 25 feet would be unsafe, because a vessel draws 6 inches more in fresh water than in the denser salt water, because a ship rides lower in motion at rest, and because there must be some allowance for bottom clearance.

A natural question is: Why not build smaller shallow-draft ships to negotiate the seaway? The institute's answer is that the construction cost of a smaller vessel is disproportionately high per ton. A small ship requires almost as large a crew as a big one, while carrying about one-third the cargo at one-third the revenue.

With America's high construction and maintenance costs, and high wages and living standards aboard its merchant vessels, our lines must carry bigger cargoes in bigger ships in order to compete with foreign operators.

Naturally, it is to be expected that these charges will be investigated thoroughly and considered carefully. The St. Lawrence seaway, which proposes to take oceangoing ships into the industrial heart of this country, promises great opportunity and great expense. It would be bitter irony if this gigantic project, partly sponsored and financed by this country, should be closed to most of our merchant fleet, which now includes 60 percent of the world's tonnage.

What it would cost to deepen the seaway's channel to accommodate our larger ships, and what mechanical obstacles would be encountered in so doing, should be explained to Congress as fully as possible.

It would then be up to Congress to match those difficulties and expenses against the possible difficulties and expenses involved in excluding the greater part of our fleet from a new field of opportunity, and diverting the greater part of the revenue from that field away from our shores.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times of March 25, 1946]

WHAT ABOUT THE BIG SHIPS?

A charge that more than 91 percent of the American merchant marine and 81 percent of the world's tonnage would be barred from the long-proposed St. Lawrence seaway, connecting the Atlantic and the Great Lakes, has been made by the American Merchant Marine Institute, a trade association which includes a majority of the American merchant fleet's owners and operators.

In a letter to Senator CARL HATCH, the Institute claims that only 404 of the 5,025 ships built for our merchant fleet since 1939 could pass through the 27-foot channel from Montreal to Lake Ontario when fully loaded. Of those 404, 130 are costal vessels.

At the same time, the Institute's letter continues, foreign shipping would carry the bulk of the trade through the waterway, since 72 percent of the world's merchant ships of 25-foot draft or less are foreign-owned. The letter makes the point that a draft deeper than 25 feet would be unsafe, because a vessel draws 6 inches more in fresh water than in the denser salt water, because a ship rides lower in motion than at rest, and because there must be some allowance for bottom clearance.

A natural question is: Why not build smaller shallow-draft ships to negotiate the seaway? The Institute's answer is that the construction cost of a smaller vessel is disproportionately high per ton. A small ship requires almost as large a crew as a big one, while carrying about one-third the cargo at one-third the revenue.

With America's high construction and maintenance costs, and high wages and living standards, aboard its merchant vessels, our lines must carry bigger cargoes in bigger ships in order to compete with foreign operators.

Naturally, it is to be expected that these charges will be investigated thoroughly and considered carefully. The St. Lawrence seaway, which proposes to take oceangoing ships into the industrial heart of this country, promises great opportunity and great expense. It would be bitter irony if this gigantic project, partly sponsored and financed by this country, should be closed to most of our merchant fleet, which now includes 60 percent of the world's tonnage.

What it would cost to deepen the seaway's channel to accommodate our larger ships, and what mechanical obstacles would be encountered in so doing, should be explained to Congress as fully as possible.

It would then be up to Congress to match those difficulties and expenses against the possible difficulties and expenses involved in excluding the greater part of our fleet from a new field of opportunity, and diverting the greater part of the revenue from that field away from our shores.

[From the Arizona Republic, Phoenix, Ariz., of April 2, 1946]

NOT DESIGNED FOR BIG SHIPS

The American Merchant Marine Institute, a trade association made up of a majority of American merchant ship owners and operators, contends about 91 percent of the American merchant marine and around 81 percent of the world's merchant shipping will be barred from the long-proposed St. Lawrence seaway, should it be authorized and built according to present specifications. The institute wants a deeper channel so the big ships can use the seaway which proposes to take ocean-going vessels into the industrial heart of the United States.

The institute asserts only 404 of the 5,025 ships built for the United States merchant fleet since 1939 could navigate the proposed 27-foot channel from Montreal to Lake Ontario when fully loaded. Of the 404 ships, it explains, 130 are coastal vessels. The institute further explains that 72 percent of the world's merchant ships of 25-foot draft or less are foreign-owned. Ships with more than 25-foot draft, it explains, could not pass through the waterway since a vessel draws 6 inches more in fresh water than in the denser salt water. Furthermore, it points out, a ship in motion rides lower than one at rest. Twenty-seven feet, it claims, isn't sufficient clearage for ships over 25-foot draft.

With respect to building ships of shallower draft for the proposed seaway, the institute explains the construction cost of the smaller vessels is disproportionately high per ton. A small ship, it points out, requires almost as large a crew as the bigger ones although carrying one-third of the cargo at one-third of the revenue.

Before the waterway is built, these matters should be investigated. It would be ironical, indeed, if the seaway's construction is partially financed by this country and then turns out to be closed to the greater part of our own merchant fleet. The irony wouldn't be lessened by the fact that we now have about 60 percent of the world's merchant tonnage. If the seaway is built, it should be deep enough to accommodate our ships, otherwise there would be no point in sponsoring it or aiding in the financial cost of construction.

[From the Abilene (Tex.) Reporter News of March 25, 1946]

WHAT ABOUT BIG SHIPS?

A charge that more than 91 percent of the American merchant marine and 81 percent of the world's tonnage would be barred from the long-proposed St. Lawrence seaway, connecting the Atlantic and the Great Lakes, has been made by the American Merchant Marine Institute, a trade association which includes a majority of the American merchant fleet's owners and operators.

In a letter to Senator CARL HATCH, the institute claims that only 404 of the 5,025 ships built for our merchant fleet since 1939 could pass through the 27-foot channel from Montreal to Lake Ontario when fully loaded. Of those 404, 130 are coastal vessels.

At the same time, the institute's letter continues, foreign shipping would carry the bulk of the trade through the waterway, since 72 percent of the world's merchant ships of 25-foot draft or less are foreign-owned. The letter makes the point that a draft deeper than 25 feet would be unsafe, because a vessel draws 6 inches more in fresh water than in the denser salt water, because a ship rides lower in motion than at rest, and because there must be some allowance for bottom clearance.

A natural question is: Why not build smaller shallow-draft ships to negotiate the seaway? The institute's answer is that the construction cost of a smaller vessel is disproportionately high per ton. A small ship requires almost as large a crew as a big one,

while carrying about one-third the cargo at one-third the revenue.

With America's high construction and maintenance costs, and high wages and living standards aboard its merchant vessels, our lines must carry bigger cargoes in bigger ships in order to compete with foreign operators.

Naturally, it is to be expected that these charges will be investigated thoroughly and considered carefully. The St. Lawrence Seaway, which proposes to take ocean-going ships into the industrial heart of this country, promises great opportunity and great expense. It would be bitter irony if this gigantic project, partly sponsored and financed by this country, should be closed to most of our merchant fleet, which now includes 60 percent of the world's tonnage.

What it would cost to deepen the seaway's channel to accommodate our larger ships, and what mechanical obstacles would be encountered in so doing, should be explained to Congress as fully as possible.

It would then be up to Congress to match those difficulties and expenses against the possible difficulties and expenses involved in excluding the greater part of our fleet from a new field of opportunity, and diverting the greater part of the revenue from that field away from our shores.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution calling for an investigation along the lines which I have discussed.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 287), submitted by Mr. Murray, was received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Whereas the full development and careful conservation of the natural resources of the United States is essential to the present and future defense of the Nation; and

Whereas the availability from these resources of a great volume of electric energy is essential to the present and future defense of the Nation; and

Whereas it was necessary to increase the volume of available electric power from 51,518,000 kilowatts to 62,835,000 kilowatts between 1940 and 1944 in order that the national defense might be strengthened and in order that the war might be prosecuted, and even this volume was barely adequate to the emergency; and

Whereas in any future contingency it will be more necessary than at any time in the past, by reason of the great significance of electricity in the production of atomic energy, in the conduct of projectile warfare and of modern war in all its phases, that a very great volume of such electrical energy be immediately available; and

Whereas installations now existing in the United States may well prove inadequate in the event of future emergency for the production of sufficient electric power; and

Whereas construction of future public power projects and continued successful operation of present installations is reported in the press to be seriously threatened by the activities of a strongly financed and unscrupulous lobby maintained by the private power interests of the country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation of all lobbying activities designed to prevent or delay the enactment of public power legislation, and to report to the Senate not later than January 1, 1947, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations concerning any necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE, SHAWNEETOWN, ILL.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on Friday last, during the call of the calendar for bills to which there was no objection, the bill (S. 1809) to revive and reenact and amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, its successors, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near the city of Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., to a point opposite thereto in the county of Union, State of Kentucky," approved July 18, 1939, was passed. It develops that there is now pending before the Committee on Commerce a substantially similar bill, House bill 5444.

In order to have the same bill passed by both Houses, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from further consideration of House bill 5444, and that the House bill be considered at this time and passed; also that the vote on the passage of Senate bill 1809, which is now in the custody of the Senate, be reconsidered, and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

I have taken this question up with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], acting chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and he sees no objection to the request.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senate Committee on Commerce considered an identical bill, Senate bill 1809, and approved it, and the Senate has passed the Senate bill.

Mr. LUCAS. The committee passed on an identical bill, with one exception. In the House bill the Senate inserted section 3, which provides as follows:

No toll or other charge shall be levied against any employee, civil or military, or any vehicle or conveyance of the United States Government for the use of such bridge in the performance of official duties.

The Senator from Illinois has no objection to that provision, and I presume that no other Senator would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the minority leader [Mr. WHITE] is not at the moment present in the Chamber, and I do not see any minority members of the Commerce Committee present. I wish to make sure exactly what the Senator is proposing.

Mr. LUCAS. What I am proposing is simply this: Sometime ago I introduced Senate bill 1809, authorizing the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, and its successors, to construct a bridge over the Ohio River near Shawneetown, Ill. At the same time a similar bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by the Repreesntative from the twenty-fourth district, in which the bridge is located. The House passed that bill and sent it to the Senate with the provision which I have previously discussed, prohibiting the charging of tolls to Government employees.

The House bill came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Commerce, but for some reason or other the Committee on Commerce has no record of receiving that bill, although we know it is here. In the meantime the bill which the Senator from Illinois introduced in the Senate was favorably reported by the Committee on Commerce. I caught the situation on last Friday, and after we passed the Senate bill I had the Senate hold it up until I could make this motion. In reality, all I am doing in presenting this question to the Senate today is seeking to have the Committee on Commerce discharged from further consideration of the House bill, so as to have the House bill passed as it came from the House. Is that a clear explanation?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is perfectly clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and the Committee on Commerce is discharged from the further consideration of House bill 5444.

Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 5444?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5444) to revive and reenact and amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near the city of Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., to a point opposite thereto in the county of Union, State of Kentucky," approved July 18, 1939, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 1809 was passed is reconsidered; and the bill is indefinitely postponed.

THE UTILITY PROPAGANDA MILLS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, for some time now, from a variety of sources, there has been coming to my desk in letters, clippings, pamphlets, a series of strangely similar and equally irresponsible attacks on TVA. At first I ignored them. Then I decided that the frequency and similarity both deserved a little investigation. I have made such an investigation, and I am convinced the subject deserves further exploration.

It seems clear to me that today thousands if not millions of dollars are being poured into a widespread, vicious, and unprincipled lobbying and propaganda campaign. It centers here in Washington, but it extends into practically every

hamlet in the land. So sordid and so bold has this campaign become that it begins to assail the nostrils like the malodorous affairs exposed by the Federal Trade Commission in the lush money days of the 1920's, when the financial freebooters of the Power Trust, led by the Insulls of Chicago, were riding high—and riding inevitably to a fall.

The objectives of the current campaign are clear. The stakes are high. The question is simply this: Shall the wealth of our many rivers and their watersheds be developed in the public interest for the benefit of the people or shall they be turned over to those who would exploit them for their own profit? This lobbying and propaganda campaign is aimed at stopping, at all costs, the development of our watercourses except as the power which results is handed over to special interests to exploit as they please.

Specifically, these lobbyists and propagandists are out to halt, by any means that come to hand, any integrated regional developments like that which has proved so successful in the Tennessee Valley. What has roused them to a desperate, last ditch stand is the fact that in the Columbia Basin, in the Missouri Valley, in the Arkansas, people are rising to ask: If a TVA can bring so many benefits to the Tennessee Valley, why not a CVA or an MVA or an AVA in our own river valley?

I have no doubt of the answer to that question, once the facts are known. Nor is there any doubt in the minds of those with special axes to grind. Once the truth becomes known, their cause is lost. That, more than anything else, explains the reckless frenzy with which the power interests are throwing their money around in attempts to befog the issues. They see the signs.

In the Missouri Valley, in the Columbia Basin, and in other river valleys throughout the country people are coming to see the possibilities of a proper, balanced development of their natural resources. They are becoming restless and dissatisfied with the old methods of development which have cost so much and accomplished relatively so little. They are tired of turning over their natural resources to exploitive, selfish interests, in return for a fond hope or a nebulous promise that some of the benefits of private exploitation would somehow dribble down to them. They are ready to try something new.

It is this new resolve on the part of the people that the propagandists are out to stop, by fair means or foul. It is this which has roused the Power Trust and its satellites to a new campaign of distorters, clippings, pamphlets, a series of which is reminiscent of the days of the late and unlamented National Electric Light Association—NELA.

This assault by special interests is well organized and well heeled with money. Those behind it, those who represent the privileged few as against the interest of the many, are sparing no expense and overlooking no bets in their efforts to halt progress and turn back the clock. Today we have high-priced utility executives leaving their posts to come to Washington to direct the campaign, instead of staying home and figuring ways to give consumers cheaper power. New organizations of doubtful antecedents and mysterious financing have sprung up all over the lot. Though claiming to represent diverse interests, we find them piping the same false tune in remarkable harmony. Mimeograph machines and printing presses have gone on a mass-production basis to pour forth a torrent of misinformation about every effort to improve and develop our resources for the public welfare.

To those of us who know the story of Power-Trust propaganda in the years before 1933, all this has a familiar ring. What is going on today recalls the frantic efforts of special interests over a period of 15 years to capture control of the Government-built power plant at Muscle Shoals and to hamstring the proposals for development of rivers of the far West and other areas.

But there is one essential difference between those years and the present. In 1933, the advocates of river developments and public power had little but faith and hope to sustain them in their efforts for the public welfare. Examples of public-power developments were relatively few and scattered. It was easy to smother facts about their operations beneath the flood of propaganda issued by the high priests of the NELA and kindred organizations, propaganda which was even insinuated by devious methods into the schools and textbooks.

Today, that is changed. The world has moved forward in the past decade and a half, although the Power Trust propagandists are apparently not yet aware of it.

While great developments in the Tennessee Valley and in the Pacific Northwest have been constructed and have served the people magnificently, the propagandists have clung to all their ancient myths about public operation. They go on saying that it cannot be done; or that if it can be done, it will not work; or that if it does work, then success should be disregarded, because the whole idea is clearly the work of un-American totalitarians led by George W. Norris and Franklin D. Roosevelt. In terms of their thinking, their methods, and their regard for the public weal, these special interests and their lobbyists and propagandists have stood still. Of them we can say, as Talleyrand said of the Bourbons, "They have learned nothing and forgotten nothing."

People cannot be fooled for long in these days by such arrant nonsense. When they read in a slick and expensive brochure that integrated development of a river is impossible, or that the same system of dams cannot provide both flood control and power, or that regional authorities are superstates robbing the people of their liberties, they have only to ask the people of the Tennessee Valley to learn that such propaganda is false.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I assume that the Senator from Alabama is aware of the fact that the Mississippi Valley Authority bill, which is the only one of the authority bills which has yet received any consideration, was considered by the Senate Committee on Commerce, and that committee unanimously reported it unfavorably. It was then considered by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and from that committee it received a practically unfavorable report. I do not know whether the able Senator has read those bills. If he has, I think he will not hesitate to agree that the 21 members of the Commerce Committee and, I think, the 21 members of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, representing almost half of the United States Senate, are correct in their belief that those bills represent a proposal to vest in the Authority an autocratic power which is greater and more far-reaching than any power which the Constitution of the United States vests in the National Legislature. Of course those bills have not been approved.

I hope the able Senator is not espousing the cause of authority legislation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I say to the Senator that I am not speaking about those bills, and of course I am in no way, either by thought or action, criticizing the Senator's committee. However, I am speaking about the advantage of regional developments, as demonstrated in the Tennessee Valley; and before I conclude my remarks I shall talk a great deal about the terrific campaign which the propagandists and lobbyists of the Power Trust are carrying on today against public power developments.

Mr OVERTON. The Senator is talking about regional developments. Let me carry it home——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not mind yielding to the Senator, but I have a speech which I should like to make. I do not wish to be discourteous, and I wish to yield to the Senator whatever time he wishes. But I should much prefer to have the Senator wait until I conclude my remarks, and then I shall be delighted to yield to him.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, today, I intend to trace some of the devious lines of this propaganda campaign. I am going to show that it can be traced back, in its origins, its sponsors and its methods, to the golden era of exploitation and high finance before the Insull debacle. I am going to show that, on the basis of the evidence, the Power Trust's propaganda machine did not go out of existence after the exposures of the Federal Trade Commission, nor was it reformed. The evidence is that it simply went underground. Now it is emerging in its old character.

I am going to talk about this campaign in terms of its relationship to TVA, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for two reasons: First, because I come from the Tennessee Valley area and I know the works of the TVA intimately and at first hand. I have fought for it since the earliest days. I introduced in the House of Representatives the bill which became the TVA Act. In the House I led the fight in 1935 to secure needed amendments to the original act, and on many occasions during the past 13 years I have

risen to defend it against attacks which would have hamstrung or destroyed it. I know what the TVA has meant to the Tennessee Valley and to my own State of Alabama.

The second reason why I am going to limit my analysis of the utility propaganda to its relationship to the facts about TVA is because TVA is today the target of most of this propaganda campaign. I can understand that. The Power Trust and its propaganda satellites know full well that if they are to keep their strangle hold on the resources of the people of this country, they must discredit TVA. They must muddy the waters so the truth will be obscured.

What is it that these men are seeking to hide?

TVA has been in existence 13 years. In that brief space of time it has brought a whole river under control for the benefit of man. This is something which cannot be said of any other major river and its tributaries in the world, in spite of the vast sums which have been spent on other streams. Some have been developed for navigation, a few for flood control, many for power. Only the Tennessee, developed for all three, is really controlled. TVA has provided a 650-mile modern navigation channel—something the people of the Valley had dreamed of for a century. It has provided great reservoirs for flood control, not only making the Tennessee Valley as a whole safe from disastrous floods, but providing benefits worth, at a conservative estimate, $100,000,000 to $200,000,000 to the alluvial valleys of the Lower Mississippi. As recently as last January this still incomplete TVA system saved the city of Chattanooga, Tenn., from $10,000,000 damage in what, if the river had not been controlled, would have been the fourth highest flood in its history.

TVA's dams and steam plants produce nearly 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year, the greatest power system in the country today. We have the word of the Army that it was TVA's ability to supply adequate power at short notice that dictated the location of the great atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn.—Col. K. D. Nichols, Oak Ridge, Tenn. That fact alone, aiding as it did in shortening the war with Japan, would justify the entire cost of the TVA. So would the fact that in the early days of the war TVA's ability to supply power was the key to providing aluminum production when the Nation was just beginning to build its mighty air forces. We could add that it was because of TVA's research in the use of electric furnaces for phosphate production, that TVA and other producers had the capacity to produce large tonnages of elemental phosphorus for munitions, in contrast to World War I, when relatively small amounts were available.

The power which helped to win the war is now being used in peacetime production. We need not rely on TVA's war record to justify its cost. Its service to the people in peace is sufficient answer to its critics. These critics would hide the fact that power is being supplied to consumers at savings of more than $11,000,000 a year as compared with their former power bills. They would obscure the fact that the people are using more power. Residential consumers in the TVA area today are using 50 percent more power than the average consumer in the United States, and they are paying 20 percent less money for it.

And this public power system is paying its way. The TVA system, selling power at wholesale, in the last fiscal year obtained gross revenues of more than $39,000,000, and its net income, which is the property of the Federal Government, amounted to nearly $18,000,000 after payment of all operating expenses interest on outstanding bonds, and payments in lieu of taxes to State and county governments. The municipal and cooperative distribution systems, 140 of them, all locally owned and locally managed, make money by distributing TVA power at low rates to more than 600,000 consumers. Last year their gross revenues were in excess of $38,000,000 and their net income more than $7,000,000.

Other benefits have flowed from this program of river development. Malaria has largely been stamped out in a widespread program which has been studied by medical men all over the world and which gave valuable aid to our armed forces in the Pacific during the war.

The great lakes have provided tremendous recreation possibilities which are being developed by the States, counties, and cities of the valley. These are some of the important secondary benefits of TVA's integrated development of the river.

In TVA's unified development of the region, the dams and reservoirs have been dovetailed into the program on the land. The soil of the region is being rebuilt through new systems of agriculture based on high-analysis phosphates which were developed and experimentally manufactured at Muscle Shoals, and which have been used on 53,000 test-demonstration farms, not only in the valley, but in 21 nonvalley States as well, under the supervision of the land-grant colleges of the States. In a small section of Alabama, near my home, I have seen a cotton country transformed in 5 years into a livestock and dairying region, with half a dozen cheese and butter plants in business where none had been before. Forest owners, from large operators to farm woodlots, are learning sustained-yield practices which will preserve the productiveness of forest lands in perpetuity.

New products, new machines, new knowledge of regional resources have resulted from research programs which TVA has stimulated and helped to carry on. Its staff members, technically trained, have aided farmers and businessmen in meeting their problems. TVA has acted as the technical adviser and servant of the people in achieving the objectives which they themselves desire. There is no overlordship, no superstate. Local agencies operate the power distribution systems in the Tennessee Valley. Farmers are still masters of their own acres down there, they are freer and more independent than ever before, because they are more prosperous. Business and industry are finding more opportunity for growth and expansion than ever before. As an Alabama editor, Mr. Barrett Shelton, of the Decatur Times, wrote, the people of the valley "have caught the vision of their own powers."

The story of TVA is a story of growth and development of a partnership between the people of a region and their Federal Government. It is a story of which every American can feel proud. By many leaders, both at home and in many foreign lands, it is regarded as an example of the best evidence that a democracy will work, an example of achievement within a framework of freedom.

This is the story which the Power Trust and its willing henchmen know they must suppress at all costs. To this end their mimeograph machines and presses have been busy—those of the Edison Electric Institute; the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; the National Association of Electric Companies; the Water Conservation Conference Continuing Committee; the 31 national and regional land and water organizations—which includes the Pittsburgh Coal Exchange and the Trinity Improvement Association; the Mississippi Valley Association; the Economic Research and Service Bureau; the National Reclamation Association; the National Tax Equality Association, and even a nationally known publishing firm. From these sources have spewed phony research reports, studies, memoranda, speeches, and even a novel containing undigested and recognizable lumps of Power Trust propaganda.

All this spew of words professes to discuss the TVA and what it means to the Nation or to various regions. But, when reading this material, one who knows the facts about TVA finds himself in a never-never land of unreality. He learns that TVA multiple-purpose dams, which are doing such a marvelous job today, cannot possibly work. He finds that the sole purpose for building them was to drown out farmer Jones' corn crop. He finds page after page of tables, charts, and text in which tax and financial figures are garbled into nonsense. He finds legal contentions solemnly advanced without reference to the fact that they have already been disposed of by the courts. He is told that TVA is a superstate, superstate, superstate, contrary to what the people of the valley know. He finds the smear words "Communist," "Socialist," "Fascist," "totalitarian," tossed recklessly about.

Big money is being spent to prepare, print, and distribute this balderdash. Where does it come from, and why? I propose to find out.

Let us analyze the origin of some of this fairy story stuff. Let me take first the Edison Electric Institute. The EEI was formed in 1933 in an atmosphere of penitence and piety to succeed the National Electric Light Association—Electrical World, January 14, 1934. The reasons for the demise of the NELA are to be found in the bulging reports of the Federal Trade Commission on its 6-year investigation of the utility industry and particularly its report on propaganda activities—Senate Document 92, part 71A, Seventieth Congress, first session, Report

of the Federal Trade Commission on Efforts by Associations and Agencies of the Electric and Gas Utilities To Influence Public Opinion. These reports constitute a shocking story and I have time for only the briefest reference to it. Those who want a full account of those lush days can find it in the voluminous records and reports themselves.

THE UNLAMENTED NATIONAL ELECTRIC LIGHT ASSOCIATION

The NELA was the darling of the utilities in the twenties, with eight to ten thousand attending its conventions and hymning "the greatness of the industry and its service to the people."—Business Week, June 9, 1934, page 22. Behind the scenes, however, the investigation showed that NELA and its associated organizations subsidized college professors, influenced the presentation of utility propaganda material in college courses, exerted pressure and influence on textbook publishers and writers, prepared attractive booklets for school children, even down to kindergarten age, and got them into the schools, and exerted pressure on newspapers.

Enormous amounts of money were expended. From 1921 to 1932 NELA and its geographical divisions alone spent $1,500,000 a year—FTC Report, page 27—not counting the State associations which obtained their money locally. No expense was spared, apparently, for, as Mr. M. H. Aylesworth, managing director of NELA in 1924, expressed it:

> All the money being spent is worth while. * * * Don't be afraid of the expense. The public pays the expense. (Senate Document 92, pt. 71A, p. 60, 70th Cong., 1st sess.)

When the Federal Trade Commission dragged all this into the open air, NELA was quietly dispatched and laid away without mourning. In its place rose the Edison Electric Institute, whose early conventions were so mild and contrite that Business Week dubbed them "Quaker Meetings."—Business Week, June 9, 1934, page 22.

THE EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE BEGINS

We were told the industry has reformed, that the practices exposed were to be abandoned with the passing of NELA. The EEI was to be different. Was the reformation complete? Had the industry and its organization hit the Glory Road? It appears not. The first president of Edison Institute was George B. Cortelyou, president of the American Gas Association, which the FTC showed was closely allied with NELA in propaganda activities. Bernard F. Weadock, who had been attorney for the NELA during its quarrels with the FTC at a reported $100,000 a year, became managing director of EEI. The leading members of the policy committee of NELA became trustees for EEI.—New Republic, February 7, 1934, page 363.

And in 1935, the late Senator Norris, of Nebraska, on the floor of the Senate exposed the fact that the Edison Electric Institute had secretly contributed $50,000 to the law firm pressing the so-called Ashwander suit for an injunction to prevent TVA from purchasing certain electric facilities from the Alabama Power Co.

So, Mr. President—

Senator Norris commented—

> little by little the truth comes out, and little by little, more and more, the power trust is smearing itself with falsehood and trickery. In this case it appears that the power trust paid $50,000 to have itself sued and to have itself enjoined from carrying out its own contract. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 26, 1935, pp. 11905–6.)

There are other evidences that the reformation of the private utilities was not, and is not, and never has been complete. In 1939 a joint congressional committee which investigated TVA found TVA's power and other operations sound and well conducted, but incidentally it revealed that the Commonwealth and Southern Corp. had secretly contributed $20,000 out of a total of $22,265 expended (according to its reports), by a supposedly spontaneous and independent Citizens and Taxpayers Association which violently opposed public ownership in Chattanooga, Tenn.—Senate Document 56, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, Report of the Joint Committee Investigating TVA, page 199.

The local utility, a subsidiary of the same holding company, likewise subsidized a local newspaper through advertising, reduced power bills, and other means.—Senate Document 56, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, Report of the Joint Committee Investigating TVA.

A year later, in 1940, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch disclosed that the Union Electric Co. of Missouri had accumulated and disbursed a slush fund of $600,000 which it paid, in part, to nearly 200 public officials and candidates for office. Some of it was used to pay the salary of a newspaper reporter on a St. Charles, Mo., paper who, though ostensibly a bona fide member of the staff, specialized in anti-public-ownership articles. "Not only members of the legislature were tampered with, but members of the county courts, and a judge of the circuit court was paid a larger salary than the salary paid him by the State," declared United States District Judge George H. Moore in sentencing one of the company officials for perjury.—St. Louis Post-Dispatch, August 4, 1940. This, Mr. President, was as late as 1940.

Only a few weeks ago the Senate of the State of Kentucky was obliged to undertake an investigation of reports of attempted bribery in connection with efforts to persuade the legislature to vote for a utility-written bill which would have made it impossible for Kentucky cities to obtain cheap TVA power.

These are some fragmentary evidences of the moral state of the industry which the Edison Electric Institute represents. It has not changed over the years. In the course of my own investigation of the question I found that a good many of the activities, disavowed when NELA was buried, are still continued.

Public Service Magazine, for example, was started in 1907 with Sam Insull as a principal stockholder, according to the FTC report, and was reorganized in 1916 to include a number of utility men as stockholders. Of its subscription list of 30,000, about 26,500 copies were paid for and distributed by utilities to, among others, state legislators, libraries, and school teachers.—Senate Document 92, part 71A, Seventieth Congress, First session, Report of the Federal Trade Commission on "Efforts by Associations and Agencies of the Electric and Gas Utilities to Influence Public Opinion," pages 98–100. What about this publication today? Although it has changed ownership, and utility men have disappeared from the list of stockholders, Public Service Magazine is still a purveyor of bitter propaganda against public ownership and particularly against the TVA, and it circulation is still about 30,000.

The Federal Trade Commission report likewise told how, in 1924, the utilities commenced subsidizing E. Hofer and Sons, of Portland, Oreg., to the tune of $85,000 a year, and how Hofer sent weekly batches of canned propaganda editorials to 14,500 newspapers all over the country to be used as expressions of the independent opinions of the independent editors. Senate Document 92, part 71A, Seventieth Congress, First session, Report of the Federal Trade Commission on "Efforts by Associations and Agencies of the Electric and Gas Utilities to Influence Public Opinion." pages 92–97. Considerable success was then reported in thus insinuating utility propaganda into the minds of readers without their knowledge of the source. What has happened to this practice? When I began to trace back the source of identical editorials appearing in papers as far apart as Utah and West Virginia, what did I find? I found they were initiated by E. Hofer and Sons. E. Hofer and Sons, admitting unobstrusively in small type on the sheets it distributes that it is "supported financially" by utilities—and by railroad, banking, chain store, mining, oil, and other special interests—is still sending out its weekly batch of propaganda. There has not been any change in this particular practice. All the way the reformation was skin deep.

The EEI itself has taken on some of NELA's discredited activities. For example, let me pick up a current propaganda thread from the EEI. See if it is not reminiscent of NELA days. In February 1944, the EEI put out a 56 page mimeographed tract called, "An Appraisal of Tennessee Valley Authority," ostensibly only for distribution to EEI members. Of course, it was not an "appraisal" but an attack.

It juggled figures. It discussed flood control in terms of the ancient testimony of power-company engineers, who claimed, in defiance of the records of more than 70 years, that major floods could occur in the Tennessee Valley at any time during the year—testimony which had already been weighed and discarded by the courts. It contained a table attempting to relate TVA payments in lieu of taxes to TVA's total investment, including flood control, navigation, chemical plant, general plant, and even construction in progress, although only

its power investment was purportedly under discussion. The computation of the property taxes it claimed TVA should have paid on its facilities included part of the investment in navigation and flood control. To compare TVA taxes with those of utilities it devised a formula which was based on kilowatt-hour sales, ignoring the fact that almost all TVA power is sold at wholesale. Obviously it does not produce the same revenues per kilowatt-hour as do the sales of power by private utilities to ultimate consumers at high rates. After inflating TVA power investment by the inclusion of navigation and flood-control facilities, it calculated interest at 4 percent, in spite of the fact that utility companies were then refinancing at much less than that and that the cost of money to the Government was only half that amount. These were the devices EEI stooped to in order to charge TVA with a "loss" on power operations.

MR. RISING, OF IDAHO, TAKES UP THE THREAD

No two organizations, no two men, could compound so many errors independently. Yet early in 1945 comes one E. W. Rising, an attorney of Boise, Idaho, who prepared a 14-page TVA brief, ostensibly on his own initiative, from "information available to me," as he expressed it—TVA brief, by Rising. But where did the "information available" come from? We find that the Rising "brief" turns out to be based almost entirely upon the EEI tract "appraising" the TVA, even to the lifting of language verbatim. The same table appears attempting to relate TVA payments in lieu of taxes on power operations to its total fixed assets, including navigation and flood-control facilities, chemical plant, general plant, and construction in progress. The same misleading reference to the flood-control testimony of utility engineers is found in the Rising brief, and again TVA's experimental development and manufacture of high-analysis phosphates is described as a "loss." Tens of thousands of farmers and the leading agricultural specialists of the country would call that activity pure gain, but the private utilities have never betrayed any interest in farmers or the Nation's soil.

With variations, Rising applies the EEI formula for calculating the taxes the utilities would charge against the TVA, again ignoring the fact that TVA's power generating system is not comparable to the generating and distribution systems of private utilities. And finally, by such means having produced an illusory "deficit," Rising indulges in the priceless whimsy of adding to TVA's bill another $10,000,000 as an estimate of Federal income and excess-profits taxes which he says should be paid on an income that he claims does not exist. This rehash of power-trust propaganda was circulated in the West by the opponents of MVA, CVA, and other valley developments, notably by F. O. Hagie, secretary-manager of the National Reclamation Association—Pueblo (Colo.) Chieftain, February 16, 1945—an organization which is reported to be dominated by utility, railroad, and contracting interests.

Apparently encouraged by his local success, we find Rising packing his propaganda tracts in his brief case and heading East. In Chicago, in September 1944, there had been formed the Water Conservation Conference Continuing Committee, apparently at the suggestion of the National Reclamation Association, managed by Hagie—Peter Edson, NEA columnist, in Florence (Ala.) Times, July 19, 1945. In April 1945, another group appeared. A new joint "water lobby" to oppose creation of more valley authorities like TVA, consisting of 31 national and regional land and water organizations, announced its creation—Peter Edson, NEA, Washington (D. C.) News, July 16, 1945. One of the early exploits of this water lobby was to publish the Authority Issue, by Clifford F. Stone in collaboration with other national authorities on land and water subjects, a booklet which, after rehashing much of the propaganda against TVA, attempts to reopen the constitutional issue which was long ago settled by the courts.

These organizations have moved on Washington now, and here we find E. W. Rising, who got his start rewriting power-trust propaganda: Rising is both finance officer of the Water Conservation Conference Continuing Committee and member of the coordinating committee of the 31 national and regional land and water organizations—The Authority Issue, by Clifford F. Stone and others, published by 31 national and regional land and water organizations. Both these organizations are snuggled together in the same offices at 710 Atlantic Building, Washington, D. C. From these offices are distributed all sorts of misleading propaganda documents against TVA—This Is Your Job, biblography of Anti-TVA Propaganda, published by 31 national and regional land and water organizations, 710 Atlantic Building, Washington, D. C.—including Rising's original power trust brief, which was in itself a rewrite of the EEI's appraisal.

PROPAGANDA FROM 20 NORTH WACKER DRIVE, CHICAGO

Let me pick up another propaganda thread and follow its devious course. Twenty North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill., is an address which will live long and unhappily in the memories of the storied widows and orphans to whom the power trust solicitously sold its stock. Twenty North Wacker Drive was the headquarters from which the Insulls built up and ran their fragile and watery holding company empire, the Middle West Utilities, which collapsed so disastrously and with such tragic consequences to investors in the 1930's. It was from here that Insull urged the utility propagandist to "everything but skywriting," as one NELA official put it—George F. Oxley, NELA director of publicity, reported in Senate Document No. 92, part 71A, page 59.

Twenty North Wacker Drive today is the address of the successor to a major part of the Insull empire—the Middle West Corp., and its wholly owned subsidiary, the Middle West Service Co. From this address, in August 1943, 6 months before the EEI attack appeared, there issued a mimeographed propaganda document called The Case Against TVA, written by Edwin Vennard, vice president of the Middle West Service Co. It was obviously intended as a handbook of propaganda against the TVA, although its early use was somewhat obscure. But on April 12, 1945, it blossomed forth in printed form, with colored charts and illustrations, under the title "Dangers of the TVA Method of River Control." This time the Vennard publications purported to come from such Middle West subsidiaries as the Wisconsin Power & Light Co. and the Southwestern Gas & Electric Co.

This precious piece of propaganda, 96 pages in length, endeavored to show that TVA was the result of a Socialist or Communist plot. The only argument attempted consisted of a series of quotations from Norman Thomas, the Socialist; Carl D. Thompson, of the Public Ownership League; and H. S. Raushenbush, of the Department of the Interior, none of whom has now or ever has had any direct connection with TVA. The clincher was an alleged quotation, which turns out to be a misquotation from Lenin that "socialism is electricity plus bookkeeping." What Lenin appears to have said actually—New Republic, January 14, 1946, page 58, Review of Uncle Sam's Billion Dollar Baby, by A. J. Mezerik—was, "Communism is the Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country, for without electrification, progress in industry is impossible." By such shoddy logic as this, it was intimated that because the Soviets realized the importance of electricity, George Norris, the Republican from Nebraska, was a tool of Moscow and the TVA a Socialist plot.

Doubting, perhaps, that the Communist charge would be impressive, this pamphlet in addition tries to prove, for the benefit of anyone not familiar with the facts, that the TVA multiple-purpose system cannot possibly work. This is done by a singular kind of reasoning. First it points to the single-purpose flood-control system on the Miami River, which is successful, for its purpose; then it compares that development with the Grand River Dam in Oklahoma, a single multiple-purpose structure, which failed to control one of the largest floods on the Grand River. Now it happens that neither the Miami nor the Grand River development has the remotest resemblance to the integrated system of the Tennessee. They neglected to use the TVA itself as an example of a multipurpose system which does work, although the facts are available to anyone in search of truth—even to these propagandists.

The reliability of this peculiar document may be further judged by such statements as this: "People with money to loan are asking, on the average, about 6 percent for the use of their money by electric companies." Anyone familiar with the financial pages must have known that utilities at the time the booklet ap-

peared were refinancing for less than 3 percent. Surely that fact must have been known to Edwin Vennard, of the Middle West Service Co., of 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago.

The Vennard booklet has had various propaganda uses since it saw the light of day as a privately circulated "study" and later had its first printing. A short version, in racier language, and copiously illustrated in color, was published by the Economic Research and Service Bureau, Milwaukee, Wis., and is listed for sale by that organization in a bibliography of anti-TVA material put out by the 31 national and regional water lobby organizations. So far as I have been able to gather, the distribution of this reprint of a rehash is the sole bit of economic research published by this organization, of which one John N. Cadby is president. And curiously enough, John N. Cadby, according to the disclosures of the FTC, was executive secretary of the Wisconsin Public Utilities Association and, among other duties, was active in seeing that the proper viewpoint got into a text written by a university professor—Senate Document 92, part 71A, page 165, Seventieth Congress, first session. This reprint of rehashed Vennard propaganda is apparently enjoying a brisk sale among power companies who want to spread the anti-TVA gospel. It has been reported as being distributed by a couple of Kansas utilities and by several others. The Southwestern Gas and Electric Co., having published and distributed the original Vennard booklet, has likewise distributed the shorter, expensive Cadby version. This is a fact which ought to interest the consumers of this company, who are apparently being called upon, through their electric bills, to pay for a double dose of the Vennard nostrum.

Undoubtedly the imitative pamphlets and booklets were satisfying, but Vennard, as a utility propagandist, must have felt he really hit the bull's eye when a book, half novel and half propaganda tract, called Uncle Sam's Billion Dollar Baby, by Frederick L. Collins, was published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. It was a bitter attack on TVA under the guise of folksy dialog between a taxpayer and his family. As a reviewer in one of the great papers in the South wrote, "This is a misleading and prejudicial book and, if you ask this reviewer, a thoroughly dishonest one"—Tarleton Collier in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, September 23, 1945. However, the reputation of Collins the author might suffer, certainly the book's publication was a triumph for Vennard. For Collins' entire theses, practically speaking, was based upon Vennard's Dangers of the TVA Method of River Control, although it did draw upon other propaganda sources such as the United States Chamber of Commerce. The book not only uses Vennard's general argument, but appropriates his language practically verbatim. The cozy state of affairs existing between these propagandists no doubt accounts for the fact that there is no record that Collins and his publisher have been sued for plagiarism by Vennard.

Shades of Sam Insull and the NELA. Here again, in the unscrupulous tradition the Power Trust once claimed to have disavowed, we have utility propaganda insinuated into the public mind under the guise of the work of a supposedly independent writer and under the imprint of a well-known publishing firm.

It would be revealing indeed to find out a few things about this book. How did it come to be written? How was the writing of it financed? Who buys the book? How many have been sold over the bookstore counters? And how many have been purchased in block lots to be judiciously distributed by the Power Trust?

The Vennard booklet has done yeoman service for the Power Trust. Not only has it been distributed in its original version, used as the basis of a more spectacular pamphleteering job, and inspired a novel, but apparently it has been used as a handbook for misleading advertisements directed against the work of TVA, the unprincipled character of which was perhaps best described by George A. Davis, president of the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. This company ran an advertisement campaign reviling TVA which was in turn considered worthy of a full-dress article by Mr. Davis in Public Utilities Fortnightly, of November 8, 1945, under the title "Bug Under the Chip."

These ads sought to show TVA power operations were financially unsound by the shopworn methods I have described: Relating assumed interest and taxes to total, not power, investment, but including the cost of providing navigation and flood control, forgetting or ignoring that on other rivers—the Mississippi, the Ohio, for example—such developments have always been financed as general expenses of government, and are not assessed against the electric consumers. These ads referred to TVA's expenses in carrying on recognized governmental functions as losses, though they are in the same category as the expenses of carrying on similar activities of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, or the United States Army Engineers. The advertisements themselves and the articles describing them are a tissue of falsehoods and adroit misrepresentations. In the article, for example, Mr. Davis declared that the Comptroller General is not given the privilege of auditing TVA accounts—a statement directly contrary to the fact. Under the TVA statute the Comptroller General has now and always has had not only the right, but the duty, to audit TVA accounts, and this right has never been challenged by TVA.

After shamelessly detailing this advertising campaign against the TVA, Davis well expressed the attitude of the Power Trust, when he declared in his article:

> We will not take time to defend our statements.

What did Davis mean? The only possible interpretation is that he and his company intend to continue to make misleading, distorted, and harmful statements against the TVA, whether these statements are true or not.

Though the Insulls are gone from 20 North Wacker Drive, their spirit lingers on, as the Vennard booklet and the ramifications of its use bear testimony. Middle West Utilities of the Insulls has been supplanted by the Middle West Corp., but the propaganda attitude and technique of the former apparently has been transferred with the other assets and liabilities. Its leadership has now been recognized by a large section of the Power Trust.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ELECTRIC COMPANIES IS BORN

In July 1945 there was launched still another organization with offices in Washington. It is called the National Association of Electric Companies. I am told it claims to represent about half the utility industry, and as Business Week frankly stated, is organized "to some extent along the organizational pattern of the NELA." And as Business Week also explained, the new organization was to "perform the public relations functions which EEI has studiously shunned"—Business Week July 28, 1945. I make no comment on the "studious" way EEI appears to have shunned the old NELA activities; I have already described how it helped to finance the fights against TVA and how it was responsible for irresponsible anti-TVA propaganda.

And who heads this high-minded organization which will do what even EEI will not? He is Purcell L. Smith, president of the Middle West Corp., the successor to Insull's Middle West Utilities, and associate of writer Vennard. Mr. Smith has resigned his post as head of the Middle West holding company, to come to Washington to propagandize for the Power Trust at a reported salary of $65,000 a year, and with a guaranty, it is reported, that he will receive $50,000 a year for 3 years, even if his services should no longer be required—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 27, 1946, page 1750. How much is it worth to the Power Trust to mislead the public about TVA? This new propaganda and lobbying organization, quite aside from all the other activities which are being secretly promoted and carried on, pays its top man alone $65,000 a year. With this to start with, what is the total budget of the National Association of Electric Companies—$1,000,000 a year, $2,000,000, or $5,000,000? Or is the sky the limit?

I think the Congress and the public are entitled to know. I think we should take steps to find out. I want to know who is footing the bill. Of course, I know who foots the bill ultimately. The consumer of electricity pays it. But who are the people who decide to take this tribute from the consumer and use it to finance a private battle against the public interest? The consumers, the public, should know the answer.

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES HAS A PART IN THIS PROPAGANDA SCHEME

Let us pick up still a third propaganda thread. This time we find it upon the marble doorstep of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which claims to be the sacrosanct repository for all

the high principles and ideals of American business.

In May 1944 the Chamber of Commerce conducted a referendum, No. 81, on National Water Resources Policies, now become notorious for its unfairness and bias. This referendum submitted a number of propositions to the chamber membership for decision. To help its members decide, so-called information was provided, alleged facts prepared by the national resources department of the chamber were distributed. The national resources department is headed by one David J. Guy, who works apparently under the direction of a national resources department committee. This committee included, among others, Kinsey M. Robinson, of the Washington Water Power Co., who is well known for his lobbying activities here—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 27, 1946, page 1750—and it also included other power-company officials.

The committee membership also included Ralph L. Carr, attorney at law, of Denver, Colo., a former Governor of the State, to whom I shall return in a moment.

One would expect that such a referendum, in fairness to the members of the chamber, if for no other reason, would be based upon a dispassionate presentation of facts. But what do we find? We find that the members received as a basis on which to vote a long discussion of TVA that was about as far from truth as one could get. Flood control was barely mentioned, for example, and then without any indication of its benefits, either existing or prospective. Navigation was discussed in terms of the Army engineers' plan for a low-dam system for the Tennessee River, without mention of the fact that such a system was presented by the engineers as an alternative to the preferred high-dam development with which most of their 700 page report—House Document 328, Seventy-first Congress, second session, "Tennessee River and Tributaries"—was concerned. The chamber's presentation claimed "the TVA public utility business represents a billion-dollar investment." This distortion of more than 100 percent was produced by adding to the power investment of TVA, first, the investments of the municipal and cooperative distributors of TVA power, and then all of TVA's other fixed assets. The cost of the chemical plant was included, for example, as well as the cost of the general plant, construction in progress, and the investment in navigation and flood-control facilities. Finally, when this conglomerate mass failed to total sufficiently high, another $100,000,000 or so was thrown in for good luck—United States Chamber of Commerce Referendum 81.

I note with pain, Mr. President, that the businessmen of the United States have received from their most respected trade association almost the same false figures and the idiotic formulae that the members of EEI and the readers of Messrs. Rising and Vennard have been getting. Members of the chamber of commerce were even treated to some special misrepresentations which were later widely copied. In its "dispassionate" presentation of TVA activities, for example, the chamber included a list of 30 undertakings purporting to show the extent to which TVA was invading the fields of private enterprise. Among these, for example, were listed the operation of schools, of drug stores, grocery stores and commissaries, water systems. The chamber of commerce neglected to mention that such activities were undertaken by TVA only on a temperary basis, when it was necessary to provide such community services for construction workers at isolated sites. The businessmen need not have been frightened. They should not have been prejudiced by such a deceitful presentation.

In the same discussion, TVA research projects in themselves designed to provide the knowledge and stimulus for development of private business, were presented as "manufacturing" operations. It was claimed, for example, that TVA was "manufacturing" laminated wood. Actually, TVA has worked to develop a continuous glue press which would produce high-grade flooring from cull timber. The process, which has been carried through the pilot-plant stage, is soon to be tested in commercial operation by private industry. Private industry will eventually take it over. Private industry, and private industry alone, will use it commercially. It is the same kind of research as that which developed a small, low-cost threshing machine which for several years has been commercially and profitably manufactured by a firm in North Carolina, as a result of TVA research. There have been a number of such devolpments which have been of benefit to private business and private industry. Businessmen of the Valley States and men outside appreciate them highly, in spite of the researchers of the Chamber of Commerce.

I am glad to report this monstrous fraud was not entirely undetected by the membership of the Chamber of Commerce. I know personally that businessmen in my own State and in other States of the Tennessee Valley were shocked and indignant at this deliberate flouting of the facts, and that they advised the chamber of their feelings in no uncertain terms.

THE NATIONAL TAX EQUALITY ASSOCIATION MAKES ITS CONTRIBUTION

Nevertheless, damage was done—to the reputation of the United States Chamber of Commerce, if not to the TVA. The results of this rigid referendum were presented as the mature judgment of American business. The fraudulent data presented by the chamber were seized upon and disseminated as gospel by other propagandists, as, for example, the National Tax Equality Association, of Chicago, Ill., an organization of mysterious antecedents but obvious bias. In a recent tract, prepared by its research department, the NTEA presents as fact the spurious Chamber of Commerce-Vennard list of TVA activities. Likewise, table II in the NTEA research report, purporting to show the effect of interest on TVA power operations at an assumed rate of 2¼ percent, and calculated on total, rather than net investment, after depreciation, came bodily from appendix D of Vennard's Dangers of the TVA Method of River Control. Table III of the same report, purporting to show the effect of both interest and taxes on TVA power operations, stemmed back to the same source, appendix D of Vennard, with some minor variations. Here again, as in Vennard, we find comparisons of "apples and oranges"—the total taxes of utilities on both generation and distribution operations, including excess-profits taxes, used to support a propaganda calculation endeavoring to show the taxes TVA should pay—The Spurious Competition of Government Enterprise, National Tax Equality Association, Chicago, Ill., October 1945.

Here we have a sample of what passes for research by these organizations—the acceptance of material third hand or fourth hand or fifth hand without any original investigation, although original material is readily available. Obviously, the criterion is not the truth or validity of the material, but the simple question Will it, if believed, injure TVA? Will it support our bias?

The latest exploit of this National Tax Equality Association, one of the associations I mentioned earlier today, has been an assault upon the schools, right in the old NELA tradition. NTEA has offered prizes to students for essays upon the subject the Tax Privilege of Public Corporations and Cooperatives and Its Impact Upon Private Business. Prizes are $750, $300, and $100 to the winning students. But this is not all. No doubt in the interest of stimulating objective research, gratuities are provided also in the amounts of $100, $75, and $50 for the professors of the winning students—Business Week, December 22, 1945.

THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CONTINUES ITS PROPAGANDA JOB

Let me go back now and bring the Senate up to date on the chamber of commerce. Although its fraudulent referendum was exposed by its own members in the Tennessee Valley, presumably the members best able to judge the facts, the chamber of commerce has continued its propaganda assault and its misrepresentation of TVA. It has taken some warning. It has become somewhat more careful, but no less misleading.

Early in 1945, about a year after its referendum, the natural resources department of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States retained one C. J. Green, an engineer-accountant, once employed by the Federal Power Commission, to make a study of TVA power operations.

We need not waste much time on analysis of the Green report. Its voluminous pages and tables are filled with bad engineering and accounting. As a single instance, like the others I have mentioned, Green compares TVA's power operations, which consist entirely of wholesale production of power, with the operations of privately owned public utilities which sell their power at retail. Upon such comparisons he draws his conclusions.

It is the genesis of this preposterous report, however, which is of real significance. Here we discover that the Green report resulted from the fact that "the board—of the Chamber of Com-

merce—in response to a statement by Ralph L. Carr, requested the natural resources department to prepare a report on TVA and its possible application to other regions"—D. J. Guy, manager, natural resources department, United States Chamber of Commerce, in Foreward to The Total Cost of TVA Power, by C. J. Green.

It appears, then, that Ralph L. Carr is primarily responsible for the Green report. And who is Ralph L. Carr? He is, as I have mentioned, an ex-governor of Colorado and an attorney. He is also, as is his right, a bitter opponent of TVA, so bitter that he has written that a Missouri Valley Authority—patterned after TVA—"would constitute an assumption of sovereignty greater than either the National Government or the States have ever claimed"—Modern Industry, March 15, 1945, page 113. We will leave it to Mr. Carr, who is a lawyer, to explain how Congress could, if it would, create an agency greater than itself. Mr. Carr is listed modestly in the 1946 Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory as attorney for water, transportation, and aviation supply interests. He is also listed as "Member, board of directors and chairman, natural resources committee, United States Chamber of Commerce since 1943."

But what else do we discover? On February 5, 1946, Mr. Carr appeared in a public forum over the radio on the question, "Do we want more TVA's?" And in the heat of this debate we find him, after considerable prodding by his opponents, admitting that he is also a lawyer for private utilities—"Shall We Have More TVA's?" American Forum of the Air, Mutual Network, February 5, 1946, page 9.

So what do we have with respect to the Green report?

We have Ralph L. Carr, the utility lawyer, asking the Chamber of Commerce to ask Ralph L. Carr, the chairman of the national resources committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce, for an unbiased report on the TVA.

That Mr. Carr's report was satisfactory to Mr. Carr is evident from the uses to which it has been put. Last November 15, D. J. Guy, manager of the natural resources department under Mr. Carr, used the Green-Carr report as the basis of a violent attack upon TVA in a speech made to a meeting of the National Reclamation Association in Denver. This is the organization managed by F. O. Hagie, who, as I previously noted, circulated the rehash of Edison Electric Institute propaganda prepared by E. W. Rising, who is now a leading light in the water lobby here in Washington.

Finally, the cycle is complete. We find the speech by Guy, based on the Green report prepared at the behest of Mr. Carr, the utility lawyer, being sent out as propaganda material by Purcell L. Smith, the $65,000 a year lobbyist and propagandist of the National Association of Electric Companies. The music goes round and round.

WHAT DOES IT ALL COST?

Money is being spent in this campaign like water. How much I do not pretend to know, nor do I think that even the fullest investigation could more than approximate the total. But we have the National Association of Electric Companies paying to one man alone $65,000 a year, or more than double the combined salaries of the TVA Board of Directors. In addition to paying other salaries, they pay for the maintenance of expensive suites of offices, pay printing bills, and make other expenditures the nature of which we can only surmise.

We have organizations like the Water Conservation Conference, and the 31 national and regional land and water organizations with expensive headquarters in Washington, D. C. We have costly advertising and publicity firms like Leon Bloch & Associates, of Washington, sending out antiregional authority propaganda and handling the publicity for such propagandists as E. W. Rising when they appear before congressional committees—National Union Farmer, October 15, 1945.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to say that Mr. Rising is from the State of Idaho. I am ashamed.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. President, we have, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] pointed out—Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2354—reports of a New York advertising firm sending nine $1,000-a-month propagandists to invade the Missouri Valley and organize a campaign of misrepresentation against the MVA bill. And we know, as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch points out, that "expenses of such high-powered 'public relations' men usually far exceed their salaries. If no more than the nine men now employed are sent out the cost for a year would run into hundreds of thousands of dollars"—St. Louis, Mo., Post-Dispatch, May 12, 1945.

We have expensive streams of propaganda tracts, phoney research reports, and even a novel pouring from the printing presses and mimeograph machines, all aimed at discrediting the TVA and the development of natural resources along modern, sensible lines.

Let us not be mistaken. The power trust has not forgotten the adage of the Insull NELA days: "Do not mind the expense. The public pays the expense." The power companies expect to get the money back, with interest and profit compounded, if only they can maintain their vested stranglehold on the Nation's resources.

This is a desperate campaign against the public interest. It may, by its very vehemence, succeed in confusing the issues for a time and misleading those who do not know the facts. It may delay the development of our resources for the people's benefit. But there is one area of the country where it will never succeed. That is the Tennessee Valley.

THE PROPAGANDA IS WASTED WHERE THEY KNOW THE FACTS

In the Tennessee Valley the ridiculous claims of the propagandists are simply laughed out of court. The people of the Valley know that the TVA dams are producing vast amounts of power at low cost and are still earning a fair return. They know that floods are being controlled. They see the increasing number of barges on the new and modern waterway, carrying coal, gasoline, automobiles, timber, wheat, and corn. They see industries springing up to take advantage of the new sources of power and the new waterway. They see the farm fields becoming greener and more productive, less eroded, year by year. They know that these things are happening as a result of the changed systems of farming made possible by proper use of concentrated superphosphates manufactured by TVA at Muscle Shoals. They know that they are learning how to conserve their forests and to rebuild their woodlands into long-lived productiveness. Private enterprise in the Tennessee Valley knows that the program of TVA has helped, not hindered, its development.

And, above all, the people know that they are not the victims of a ruthless "superstate"; they know, in a region where "States' rights" is a watchword, that their State and local Governments are stronger, not weaker, since the advent of TVA. They know what has been achieved in the valley, and they know that it has been achieved in the best tradition of a progressive, grass roots democratic America. They are not fooled. Nor will the masses of people in other regions be fooled, once the facts about the TVA and its accomplishments become known. And become known they inevitably will.

The campaign of propaganda which seeks to obscure the facts will fail in the end. But let us not be misled into believing that it is not a danger today. I do not pretend to know the whole story or the full extent of this campaign, but I have presented what seems to me conclusive evidence of the main lines of attack in one of the best organized assaults upon the public interest ever conceived by a predatory band.

Pick up the threads where we will, they lead back to the same power interests, the same propaganda organizations, and the same practices which were a scandal 20 years ago. If we start with the Edison Electric Institute, the offspring of the old National Electric Light Association, we find ourselves led to supposedly independent land and water organizations lobbying here in Washington. If we start at Chicago's 20 North Wacker Drive, we can go straight to the offices of the National Association of Electric Companies here in Washington, or we can take a more devious route through the anterooms of a supposedly disinterested writer and his publisher. If we pick up the thread on the doorstep of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, we find one end leading back into the office of a utility lawyer, and the other leading inevitably into the sanctum of the NAEC.

It is the old, old story. The story we have heard since the 1920's, the story disclosed to the public by the investigations of the Federal Trade Commission, the story written in the reports of the Commission, the same old story continued today, in 1946. Once more the

people's representatives, Senators of the United States, must act to protect the people by exposing the unscrupulous efforts of those who would exploit the people.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have been unable to be in the Senate Chamber to hear all the Senator's remarks, but I have been told that he referred to former Gov. Ralph Carr of Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I did. I referred to him as a utility lawyer, which fact he admitted in a radio broadcast. If I had the report of my remarks I could cite the Senator to the RECORD. I referred to him also as Chairman of the Water Resources Committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Has the Senator from Alabama associated Governor Carr with the remarks he has made about corruption?

Mr. HILL. I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I understood the Senator to be denouncing corruptionists.

Mr. HILL. I have been denouncing all the misleading propaganda the Power Trust has been engaged in against the TVA, and, for that matter, against public power developments.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I ask, has the Senator attacked the legitimacy of any of Governor Carr's activities in these matters?

Mr. HILL. I said he was a public utility lawyer, and stated in my remarks that he had a right to be.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In the same way, I suggest to the Senator, that these men who have fine perquisites and jobs in the public power field have a right to advocate their causes without any implication of impropriety.

Mr. HILL. The propaganda carried on by the Power Trust against the TVA has been, in my opinion, a different kind of propaganda, if any has been carried on by any advocates of public power.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not know to what the Senator refers as a "power trust," but I know that former Governor Carr was twice Governor of Colorado. He is a very dear friend of mine; he is highly respected in the State of Colorado; he is one of the great, outstanding water experts of this country; he knows more about the power and water problems, so far as they affect the West, I suggest, than any other man in the United States, and if there is anyone in this country qualified to speak on these matters, it is former Gov. Ralph Carr.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that I do not know Governor Carr personally. The only way I know him is through my investigation of this matter. I ran into him both as a utility lawyer which, as I have said, he had a right to be, and as chairman of the water resources committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I understand, Governor Carr is strongly opposed to the duplication of TVA in the Missouri River Valley, and I should like to express my complete admiration and respect for his opposition, and a full concurrence with his views, so far as I know them to be. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has a right to his views, and Governor Carr has a right to his.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, former Governor Carr has also been out in the Northwest making speeches against the CVA.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I did not quite understand the Senator's remark.

Mr. TAYLOR. Former Governor Carr has been out in the Northwest making speeches against the proposed Columbia Valley Authority. He has not confined his reference to the Missouri Valley Authority, which affects Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Idaho that if he has irrigation rights to protect out there he will do well to heed Governor Carr's advice.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have irrigation rights to protect, and we also have land we want developed. He may be very well qualified, but I disagree with his point of view.

Mr. HILL. As one who believes in public power—not all projects, of course, to be public-power projects—I will say that I am not consulting a public-utility lawyer as to my rights.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator might do better in consulting public-utility lawyers than some of the lawyers of the Government.

Mr. HILL. The Senator might be right about that, but at least Government lawyers are supposed to be in the service of the public, and not in the service of a private company which may have some selfish interest in the matter. Long ago we were told that no man could serve two masters.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Government lawyers are often in the service of the perpetuation of their jobs and enlargement of their bureaucracies, and the fastening of fascism on the United States. The distinguished Senator with whom I am having this colloquy does not need advice from anyone, and I am not advising that he take it from either party.

Mr. HILL. Some of the Government lawyers may be guilty of what the Senator from Colorado imputes to them, but the fact remains that in working for the Government they work for far less compensation, far less reward, than do the lawyers who work for private selfish interests.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And I should also suggest that in many cases they are not worth as much.

Mr. HILL. That may be true, too, but I have seen some men in the Government service who are worth far more than many of the little lobbyists who are running around here in behalf of some selfish interest, trying to have something done against the public welfare.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was not making a blanket indictment against Government lawyers.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should not, perhaps, detain the Senate at all in reference to the controversy which has been suggested by the speech made by the able Senator from Alabama; I know the Senate is pressed for time, and is working toward an adjournment, and that we have some very important legislation now pending before the Senate for consideration, and other legislation equally important soon to be presented to us.

I regret that at this hour there should have been brought up for agitation a matter concerning which there is no measure now pending in the United States Senate or in the United States Congress. I would not detain the Senate at all were it not for the fact that the honorable Senator from Alabama refused to yield to me when I wanted to ask him a question.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

Mr. OVERTON. I refuse to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I will not yield to the Senator from Alabama; he refused to yield to me.

Mr. President, one of the questions I wanted to ask the able Senator from Alabama was that he should take home the lesson he was trying in his speech to give the Senate of the United States. He advocates the expansion of regional authorities throughout the United States. I was going to ask him if it would not be well if we should defer action on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Rivers, an item which is now contained in a report made by the Senate Committee on Commerce on the pending river and harbor bill. I was going to ask him if we should take the Tennessee-Tombigbee and convert it into an authority. The TVA constitutes a part of it; that is to say, the new project is going to utilize the Tennessee River, over which TVA now exercises supreme authority, and if we add to the Tennessee River the Tombigbee, the Alabama, and the Mobile Rivers, why should we not just make one glorious picture of the whole, as portrayed by the Senator from Alabama, and have one magnificent regional authority extending from the Ohio River on southward to the Gulf of Mexico.

But, Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose either of criticizing or of espousing TVA. No one is attacking TVA, and I take it that it is not the purpose of the Senator from Alabama to rescue TVA from any insidious attack outside, or from any open attack in, the Halls of the Congress.

Mr. President, I want to compliment the Senator on his magnificent, prodigious speech. It shows wonderful research and investigation. The able Senator must have spent hours and days in perusing all the literature and all the propaganda in order to present it in such a composite and broad view to the United States Senate. Certainly it was not the work of a few days. That speech represents a prolonged and tedious effort, and I do not think there is any other Senator in the Senate who could, with all the duties that a Senator has on his hands, have been able to take the time

and prepare such a speech as this—except the able Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, the main objection I have to TVA at the present time, or, rather, not to TVA but to TVA-ites, is that they are trying to TVA-ize the whole United States of America. Here is a project which is nothing else, after all, but a power project. It is situated in a river which is of comparatively short length. It has no irrigation in connection with it.

The Senator speaks of benefits which flow from flood control in the Tennessee Valley. There are no benefits that flow from flood control in the Tennessee Valley if one side of the scale be weighed against the other, because the mammoth dams and reservoirs that have been constructed and put in operation, in the Tennessee Valley, have inundated just as much land, equally as fertile land, too, equally as productive land as was ever overflowed periodically by the floods that came down the Tennessee Valley. That is the testimony which stands uncontradicted in a number of hearings before the Commerce Committee of the Senate. The flood protection of the Tennessee Valley is offset by inundation of equally as large quantities of land as were ever subjected to overflow in the Tennessee Valley.

There was no navigation to amount to anything in the Tennessee Valley until the Kentucky Dam was constructed and put into production. There is some navigation now. That navigation will be greatly enhanced when the Tennessee River is connected with the Tombigbee River. Then navigation will extend from the Gulf of Mexico to the Ohio, along the Ohio to the Mississippi River and her great tributaries.

The Senator complains of attacks being made against TVA by such men as the ex-governor of Colorado, to whom the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] referred, by such men as Mr. Rising, Mr. Hagie, and Judge Sloan. I know all three of these men because they have appeared before my committee. They are able men, every one of them, the testimony of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] in reference to one of them to the contrary notwithstanding. So far as I know they are patriotic. So far as I know, what they are interested in is to prevent the TVA philosophy and authority being carried into the Missouri Valley Basin and the Columbia Valley Basin and other basins of the United States.

I must say that, notwithstanding the Senator's statement that there is a vast horde of lobbyists connected with the power companies in Washington, I have never been visited in my office by a single one of them in connection with TVA. But I dare say the fight that is being made is in order for the power companies to protect themselves from the evident purpose of some people to make one great Power Trust in the United States of America, and that is to put the Government in charge of power generation through hydroelectric plants throughout the United States and to distribute electric power throughout the United States. These private companies have millions and billions of dollars invested in the utility business, and they are acting for their own preservation.

I have no doubt that another reason for a fight that has arisen against TVA is because, according to common repute at least, Mr. Lilienthal is one of the spearheads back of this movement to convert all the valleys of the United States of America and their great basins into regional authorities. If the TVA-ites and Mr. Lilienthal would play and stay in their own backyard, I do not think they would be subjected to all this criticism.

As far as I am concerned, I have supported TVA ever since I have been in the Congress. I voted for every appropriation made for it. We have appropriated over $700,000,000 to TVA. It is not self-supporting—not by a long jump. We have appropriated over $700,000,000 to it, and we have permitted TVA to take all the income that is produced by the power that is generated through dams that were constructed by Federal money and use that money just as its management pleases without any accounting to the Congress of the United States. I am not fighting the TVA.

I have fought for REA. I am no special private power advocate. I have battled for REA in my State, and battled for REA throughout the United States, and have supported, I think, every appropriation made for and all legislation authorizing REA.

Mr. Lilienthal and the propagandists of TVA would do well if they would content themselves with their own valley, with which they seem to be so well satisfied, and not undertake to convert the great Missouri Basin into one great regional authority or the Columbia Basin or the Arkansas Basin or the Ohio Basin or the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

Mr. President, there is no resemblance whatsoever between the Tennessee Valley and these other great basins. TVA, as I said, is par excellence today a power project. But when we go into the Missouri Basin we go into a basin of vast resources, of diversified resources, of all kinds of interests of which the Tennessee Valley never dreamed or its inhabitants ever conceived. However, over this huge basin it is proposed to extend an authority like unto TVA, and that is largely in the interests of these propagandists for Government control of power production in the United States.

There is no irrigation in the TVA. There is no irrigation in the Tennessee Valley. Yet the arid and semiarid West depends upon irrigation for its fruitful crops, for the raising of its vast herds of cattle, for its beneficial uses of water.

There are certain laws and procedures in these Western States that provide for the use and control of water. Those laws, mostly embraced in what is known as the reclamation laws, have grown up through a large number of years and through the ripened experience of Congress. They are satisfactory to the people of the West and they are working splendidly. But the Missouri Valley Authority would, for the most part, repeal all those laws and set up an authority of three men to be appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate. They need not come from the Missouri Valley at all. These three men would exercise arbitrary power over the irrigation and control of the waters of the Missouri Basin.

Mr. President, the people in the Missouri Basin are undertaking to operate their own schools. They send their children to schools which are supported locally. But this Missouri Valley Authority gives to this three-board trusteeship autocratic control over the educational and cultural development of the great Missouri Basin.

The Senate Committee on Commerce held hearings which lasted for days in respect to the Missouri Valley Authority. They rose from the hearings and unanimously reported against the bill. Then the bill was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, composed largely of western Senators. That committee sat and heard the testimony pro and con with reference to the Missouri Valley Authority. I mention the Missouri Valley Authority because it is the only one which has been considered by any committee of Congress, although the effort is being made through pending bills to have such authorities created throughout the United States. The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, after it had considered the bill, reported it unfavorably, with two exceptions. I think the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and one other Senator voted for the bill.

I wish to read some of the things stated by the committee in its conclusions in reference to the Missouri Valley Authority bill. When I speak of the Missouri Valley Authority, it is just as though I were speaking of the Columbia Valley, the Arkansas Valley, and all the other valleys for which authorities are proposed, because very nearly the same problems are presented in each case and the same pattern of legislation is proposed for each.

A comprehensive plan has been proposed by the joint action of the Army Engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation with reference to the development of the Missouri Valley Basin. That plan had been adopted unanimously by the Congress. There had been no objection to it. Then all of a sudden the Missouri Valley Authority bill came along, to supplant the authority of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers, and to turn over this vast domain, with its almost limitless resources, to a group of neophytes and amateurs. It is proposed to get rid of the experienced men who have been dealing with these problems through years and generations, and turn them over to a three-man board. It is proposed to get rid of the Army engineers, with all their experience, and the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation, and replace them with engineers of their own choosing. It is a great grasp for political power. Of course these two committees, composing over one-third of the membership of the United States Senate, rose as one man to condemn such nefarious legislation. I hope no such bill ever passes the Congress.

I was about to make a statement as to the conclusion reached by the Committee

on Irrigation and Reclamation. Its conclusions are as follows:

(a) A comprehensive plan for the development of the resources of the Missouri River Basin has, after thorough consideration by the Congress, been adopted, and the initial stages thereof have been authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers. This plan provides a program of unified water and land resource development and control for the Missouri River Basin.

(b) Execution of the plan already approved by the Congress through existing Federal agencies, in cooperation with the States, assures proper emphasis on the primary needs of flood control and irrigation, and resolves conflicts between the uses of water. It assures, furthermore, that the plan will be carried out by experienced agencies.

(c) The existing laws and procedures provide for full integration of the activities of the established Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of prosecuting the several phases of water- and land-resource development. These policies and procedures protect States' rights and interests, State water law and provide full cooperation between the local, State, and Federal interests.

(d) The present organization of the Bureau of Reclamation affords the benefits of resource development on a regional basis without the objectionable features contained in S. 555.

That is the Missouri Valley Authority bill.

(e) Under S. 555, policies and laws respecting the use and control of water, heretofore established by the Congress, are in a large measure destroyed, and the State water laws and States' rights and interests in water and its utilization and control are not adequately preserved and protected. Provisions of S. 555, ostensibly designed for this purpose, are wholly inadequate.

(f) The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and the Bureau of Reclamation would either be eliminated entirely from the Missouri Basin, or their activity curtailed at the will of the Authority. Other Federal land and water agencies operating in that basin would find it necessary in large measure to conform with the policies of the Authority. The laws under which these agencies now operate and basic provisions of the present reclamation law, would, so far as the Missouri Basin is concerned, be drastically changed by the repeal and other provisions of S. 555.

(g) Enactment of S. 555 would seriously delay the construction in the Missouri River Basin of works authorized to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation and by the Corps of Engineers—works that are badly needed in the area for reclamation and power development, for flood control and navigation.

(h) Enactment of S. 555 would create serious conflicts between existing agencies of the Government and the proposed MVA, conflicts between development in the Missouri Valley and development in adjoining river basins, and would make impossible the establishment and the carrying out of Nationwide policies and programs.

(i) S. 555 creates a Federal corporation with broad discretionary powers. The bill provides a means for the expansion of Government by Federal corporations. In essence, it is a proposal to create an instrument of government with questionable and irresponsible powers affecting the social, cultural, and economic welfare of the people in a large section of the United States. It is a proposal to create a corporation to plan and to establish for the people of the Missouri River Basin a physical, social, cultural, and economic pattern over which they would have little or no control.

That is what these Authority bills would do. The attempt is made to vest in the corporation to be created more powers than the Constitution of the United States vests in the Congress of the United States. To that extent it is unconstitutional; but it shows to what extent the propagandists of regional control go in their attempt to destroy the established agencies of the Government which have been dealing with these problems for years.

(j) The creation of authorities, along the lines proposed in S. 555, involves the surrender to Federal corporations of legislative powers that should be exercised by the Congress. It is contrary to democratic traditions and would do violence to accepted notions of constitutional government.

(k) Local autonomy is not assured by the enactment of measures such as S. 555. On the contrary, the people directly affected by the corporate form of government thus proposed would have no real control over its operations.

The report sums up as follows:

(l) The creation of an MVA would amount to the welding of economic and political powers resulting in nothing short of autocracy. It would mean the substitution of arbitrary power for democratic processes. It would means the creation of a superstate, neither Federal nor State, and not contemplated by our Constitution. It would subject the social, cultural, and economic welfare of the Missouri Basin to the dictates and whims of a three-man board, not responsible to the people and largely irresponsible to the Congress itself. It would constitute a virtual abdication by the Congress in favor of government by Federal corporations wielding autocratic powers. It would challenge State sovereignty and destroy systems of laws, both State and Federal, under which western agriculture has grown and prospered. It would throttle in the West the reclamation program which has been prosecuted through the years by an experienced agency and which has met with the approval of the Congress and of the people directly affected. It would permit a three-man board to avail itself of trust funds created for reclamation. It would be an excursion into an unchartered field of vast expenditures of public funds and of experimentation under a board unencumbered by the restraints that a democracy should erect against agencies of Government.

Mr. President, to repeat, I do not know why there was presented to the Senate at this time the speech by the able junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], followed by that of the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. There is no bill now pending in the Congress to do away with the TVA, or to modify or curtail its powers in any respect. I can only look upon it as a coordinated effort, such as the Senator from Alabama complains about, to create something to which the Senator from Alabama objects, namely a trust—not a private power trust, but a public power trust. I think that is the chief purpose behind the effort. The proponents of that philosophy wish the TVA theory extended throughout the United States, so as to exercise supreme control over the power development, water development, navigation, flood control, agriculture, industry, cultural education, and all the resources of the magnificent valleys of our land. I hope that no such action will ever be taken by the Congress of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Adele Nahas;

H. R. 3454. An act for the relief of William Clyde McKinney;

H. R. 4419. An act for the relief of Mrs. James Plumb;

H. R. 4997. An act for the relief of Ernest I. Wade and Alma Wade; and

H. R. 5071. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Foster.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 3185. An act for the relief of the estate of Senia Lassila, deceased;

H. R. 4160. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto;

H. R. 6601. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of atomic weapons upon such vessels.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5244) to authorize the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BLOOM, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, and Mr. EATON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LESINSKI, Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana, Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. MASON, and Mr. REES of Kansas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1654) to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BOYKIN, Mr. LANHAM, and Mr. HARTLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the

following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 943. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Columbia River at Northport, Wash.;

S. 1043. An act to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma in trust for the Indians of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian Reservation;

S. 1273. An act to provide for the acquisition by exchange of non-Federal property within the Glacier National Park;

S. 1288. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States;

S. 1336. An act to transfer certain real and personal property in Ward County, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota acting by and through the Industrial Commission of North Dakota;

S. 1834. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Iowa or the Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Des Moines River at or near Farmington, Iowa;

S. 1857. An act to authorize the availability for certain administrative expenses of appropriations for the Department of the Interior;

S. 1963. An act to authorize additional permanent professors of the United States Military Academy;

H. R. 233. An act for the relief of Hamsah Omar;

H. R. 797. An act for the relief of William W. Willett, Jr.;

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota;

H. R. 1258. An act for the relief of Cecil Atkinson;

H. R. 1460. An act for the relief of D. C. Todd;

H. R. 1689. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Anderson Ranch Reservoir site, Boise reclamation project, Idaho;

H. R. 2677. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to accept and dispose of real estate devised to the United States by the late Maggie Johnson, of Polk County, Ark., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2678. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Juan Calcaño;

H. R. 2785. An act for the relief of Will O'Brien, Mrs. Bessie O'Brien, and the legal guardian of Jane O'Brien;

H. R. 3031. An act for the relief of Walter A. Moffatt;

H. R. 3359. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Belk;

H. R. 3391. An act for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co.;

H. R. 3399. An act for the relief of Philibert L. Bergeron, Alfred Quist, and Astrid Quist;

H. R. 3401. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hattie Main Babcock, Chester N. Main, and Mr. and Mrs. Earl Norman;

H. R. 3441. An act to provide for the naturalization of Master Sgt. Gerhard Neumann;

H. R. 3494. An act for the relief of the J. B. McCrary Co., Inc., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3512. An act for the relief of Willie Lam and Edgar Lam;

H. R. 3611. An act to authorize the condemnation of materials which are intended for use in process or renovated butter and which are unfit for human consumption, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3622. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hazel M. Skaggs;

H. R. 3665. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of William Needom Rashal, a minor;

H. R. 3843. An act to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana;

H. R. 3959. An act to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War;

H. R. 3966. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands situated in Clark County, Nev., to the Boulder City Cemetery Association for cemetery purposes;

H. R. 4046. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard S. Fisher;

H. R. 4113. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain land to Mrs. Estelle M. Wilbourn;

H. R. 4118. An act for the relief of Axel H. Peterson;

H. R. 4245. An act for the relief of José Villafañe Muñoz;

H. R. 4251. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Francisca Sánchez Figueroa;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Esequiel (Frank) Padilla, and others;

H. R. 4339. An act for the relief of Fannie C. Fugate;

H. R. 4353. An act for the relief of Amy Mary Richter;

H. R. 4373. An act for the relief of Carl and Naomi Fitzwater;

H. R. 4433. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Alabama for use as a public park of the military reservation known as Fort Morgan;

H. R. 4479. An act for the relief of William E. Robertson and Estelle Robertson;

H. R. 4495. An act for the relief of William H. Roman;

H. R. 4525. An act for the relief of Oran Edmund Randall Rumrill;

H. R. 4600. An act for the relief of the estate of Patsy Ann Maheux, deceased;

H. R. 4654. An act to exempt transfers of property to the American National Red Cross from the District of Columbia inheritance tax;

H. R. 4693. An act for the relief of Richard C. Ward;

H. R. 4863. An act to establish the date of acceptance of a commission as lieutenant (junior grade), United States Naval Reserve, by William Leon de Carbonel to be June 1, 1941, and the date of reporting for active duty to be December 9, 1941, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4888. An act for the relief of Gustav F. Doscher;

H. R. 5000. An act for the relief of Marion Powell, a minor;

H. R. 5091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Honnell;

H. R. 5149. An act to govern the effective dates of ratings and awards under the Veterns' Administration Revised Schedule for Rating Disabilities, 1945, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5187. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across New River near Radford, Montgomery County, Va.;

H. R. 5271. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II";

H. R. 5317. An act to amend the act establishing the Hot Springs National Park;

H. R. 5357. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River, at a point between the boroughs of Elizabeth, in Elizabeth Township, and West Elizabeth, in Jefferson Township, in the county of Allegheny, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 5387. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River between the borough of Belle Vernon, Fayette County, Pa., and the borough of Speers, Washington County, Pa.;

H. R. 5413. An act to accept the renunciation by Albert W. Johnson of pension under section 260 of the Judicial Code;

H. R. 5453. An act to authorize certain expenditures by the Alaska Railroad, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5674. An act to amend the laws authorizing the performance of necessary protection work between the Yuma project and Boulder Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation;

H. R. 5676. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real estate in Converse County, Wyo.;

H. R. 5744. An act to incorporate the Civil Air Patrol;

H. R. 5796. An act to amend title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to permit the making of contributions, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for the maintenance and operation of certain school facilities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5811. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of David Owens, Jr.;

H. R. 5896. An act to extend the term of design patent No. 21,053, dated September 22, 1891, for a badge, granted to George Brown Goode, and assigned to the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution;

H. R. 5907. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement for highway purposes to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in certain lands in the reservation of the Veterans' Administration hospital, Lebanon County, Pa., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6069. An act to amend section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944;

H. R. 6070. An act to amend section 4 of the act of August 25, 1937, so as to provide a filing procedure in cases of adoption outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6153. An act to remove the existing limitation on the number of associate members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans' Administration;

H. J. Res. 304. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1946, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Inter-American Trade Exposition, Fort Worth, Tex., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Office of the Secretary—Salaries," on page 2, line 2, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$1,243,063" and insert "$1,368,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 6, to insert:

WAR AGENCY LIQUIDATION

War Agency Liquidation: For all expenses necessary for liquidating the War Relocation Authority program provided for in Executive Order 9102 and in the President's message of June 12, 1944, to Congress (House Document 656, Seventy-eighth Congress), including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel expenses; printing and binding, $173,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, under the subhead "Office of Solicitor," on page 2, line 17, after the word "field", to strike out "$251,278" and insert "$267,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Division of Territories and Island Possessions," on page 2, line 20, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$141,711" and insert "$167,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, for the consideration of an original resolution which I report from the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. It merely deals with the continuation of standing and select committees, and it provides them the right to employ clerical assistance, hold hearings, and conduct investigations during the Seventy-ninth Congress, and continues that right until January 31, 1947. The resolution is offered because the Congress probably will adjourn sine die sometime during the coming month.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That all resolutions heretofore agreed to authorizing standing or select committees to employ clerical assistance, hold hearings, and conduct investigations during the Seventy-ninth Congress hereby are continued in full force and effect until January 31, 1947.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the resolution would prolong, would it not, the life of the committees until the next Congress?

Mr. LUCAS. It would prolong the life of any special or standing committees until January 31. It is the usual resolution which we adopt prior to adjourning sine die.

Mr. WHITE. The only thing that gives me hesitation is that I do not know whether we have any right to give authority to committees which will serve during the next Congress. I had supposed that the practice was to continue committees during the present Congress, and perhaps up to the beginning of a new Congress. But it is a new idea to me to undertake to extend the life of committees into the next Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask that the Clerk read again the part of the resolution giving the date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Hereby are continued in full force and effect until January 31, 1947.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I may say to the able minority leader that that practice has been followed in the past. It merely keeps the committees in operation until such time as the new Congress can determine whether it wishes to continue them or to do away with them. In other words, the resolution covers both the standing committees and select committees, and it gives them the right to continue to operate when we return for the next session of Congress.

There is nothing irregular about the resolution. It is in the customary form, and it proposes what has been done for years.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think what the Senator from Illinois has said about standing committees is so, and he may be correct insofar as the other committees are concerned. The question arose in my mind as to whether we would be taking in a little more territory than perhaps we are authorized to take in.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to say to the Senator that I am only following the language of resolutions which heretofore have been approved by the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, for the purpose of continuing standing and special committees so that they will have continuity of life until the next session commences.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. We are still a long way from adjourning sine die; and there is no particular need to rush this measure through today, is there?

Mr. LUCAS. There is no particular need. If the Senator does not wish it to go through at this time, I shall withdraw it, so as to give him an opportunity to study the situation.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to study it, and I know there are a few Senators who are not present today who would like to have a similar opportunity.

Mr. LUCAS. I assume that the Senator does not wish to discontinue the right and power of a standing or select committee to meet and hold hearings after the Senate adjourns; does he?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. But there are a number of Senators who would like to have an opportunity to study the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well; I shall withdraw the resolution. It is the customary, usual one. However, it seems a little difficult to have such resolutions adopted. I find that it is easy enough to have unusual resolutions adopted, but it seems a little difficult to get usual ones adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois withdraw the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. I do.

COMPOSITION OF THE SUPREME COURT—PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which is introduced on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself. I request that the joint resolution be appropriately referred and printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 167) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the composition of the Supreme Court, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc. (*two-thirds of each House concurring therein*), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Supreme Court shall be composed of one chief justice and such number of associate justices, not fewer than 6 and not more than 10, as the Congress shall by law provide. Except as provided in section 2 of this article, such justices shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall hold office during good behavior.

"SEC. 2. Not more than three justices of the Supreme Court shall be appointed by any President. Should any vacancies in excess of three occur during the tenure of any President, such vacancies shall be filled by the House of Representatives from among persons holding office as judges of the inferior courts of the United States or of the courts of last resort of the several States, and who do not reside in a judicial circuit, as constituted at the date of ratification of this amendment, in which any other person holding office as a justice of the Supreme Court resided at the date of taking such office. In the filling of any such vacancy by the House of Representatives, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote. A quorum for such purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice. A person chosen by the House of Representatives to fill any such vacancy shall hold office as a justice of the Supreme Court only until another President takes office. Any such person who held office as a judge of an inferior court of the United States at the time he shall have been chosen as a justice of the Supreme Court shall, when he ceases to hold office as a justice of the Supreme Court, be restored to his former office as a judge of such inferior court; and any such person who held office as a judge of the court of last resort of any State at the time he shall have been chosen as a justice of the Supreme Court, shall, when he ceases to hold office as a justice of the Supreme Court, be entitled to such retirement pay as the Congress shall by law provide.

"SEC. 3. If more than three persons holding office as justices of the Supreme Court on

the date of ratification of this article shall have been appointed by the same President, all persons holding such office who were appointed by such President, except the three first appointed, shall be retired and, regardless of age, shall be entitled to retirement pay in accordance with the laws relating to retirement in effect on such date.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, a few days ago in a public statement addressed to the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, Mr. Justice Jackson, who is currently engaged in a controversy with Mr. Justice Black, stated, "The controversy goes to the reputation of the Court for nonpartisan and unbiased decision." I know nothing about the facts. However, Mr. Justice Jackson's charges are very serious, and I hope they will be thoroughly investigated by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, no matter how this controversy terminates, it will not settle the deplorable condition in which the American people find themselves with their present Supreme Court. There are some able men on the bench, and what I have to say does not apply to all of them. More largely it applies to the condition of confusion, perplexity, and bewilderment in which the people of America find themselves as a result of indescribable and inexcusable chaos which exists within the Supreme Court, and does not apply to individuals as such. However, Mr. President, a number of men who now sit upon the Court do not have the proper legal background, judicial temperament, or the ability to sit upon the world's greatest legal tribunal and to decide fundamental questions upon which the very system of our Government, as we know it, depends. There have been many explanations of the cause of this condition, and some students of government have expressed the opinion that these men were appointed because of their economic and social ideologies and their zest for crusading, rather than for their judicial knowledge and legal acumen. It is further the opinion of the bench and bar, Mr. President, that some of the members of the present Court are mediocre and do not measure up to the high traditions of the Court. It has likewise been widely commented upon in the press that some of them came from the classroom, some came from legislative chambers, and some came from out of the whirls of political exigencies. Few of them came, as they should have, from a high position in the legal profession or an eminent place upon the bench.

Mr. President, what is the present situation in which this Court has placed the American people? In the history of the Republic, the Supreme Court of the United States has rendered decisions in 35 cases overruling earlier decisions which expressed controlling principles of law which governed the liberties of the citizens and the rights and powers of the States. In other words, in the entire history of the country, the Supreme Court has rendered 35 important decisions which have overruled former fundamental decisions of the Court. Of this number of cases, the present Court, since January 1, 1939, has rendered 13 decisions which directly and pointedly overruled earlier decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Thus we find that in the short space of 7 years the present Court has rendered approximately 40 percent of all the decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States in the history of the Republic overruling previous fundamental decisions. These decisions were the basic law of the land. Upon them the rights and liberties of the American people depend. While no one contends that law is or should be static, for on the contrary it is a living, breathing thing, yet it nonetheless depends upon stability for its very life; and established principles should be overturned with great reluctance. We find ourselves with a Court, which often is charged with being the weakest in the history of the Republic, a Court which now is engaged in changing the fundamental law of the United States and overruling the considered opinions of their great and illustrious predecessors whom the American people know were learned in the law. It is inherent in our system of government that there must be permanency and consistency in the laws of the land and in the rights of the people under those laws; but this necessary consistency, Mr. President, has been destroyed. The inferior courts and the people of this country do not know what the law is or what their rights are, because of the confusion created by the present Supreme Court. I said the present Court has directly made approximately 40 percent of all decisions which have overruled previous fundamental decisions by the Supreme Court. Mr. President, the decisions constituting that 40 percent do not include the numerous decisions rendered by the present Court which by implication overrule or partially overrule other decisions, with the result that today there is chaos in the jurisprudence of the United States.

Mr. President, to add to the confusion resulting from the overruling of former opinions, the present Court, from January 12, 1942, to June 10, 1946—a period of 4 years—has affirmed 306 cases and reversed 336. Let us contrast the record of the present Court with the record of the Supreme Court from 1916 to 1920. During that 4-year period the United States Supreme Court affirmed 575 cases from the lower courts and reversed 304 cases.

Mr. President, this is the first time in the history of the Republic when any appellate court, over a period of years, has reversed and remanded more cases from inferior courts than it has affirmed.

Do these contrasted epochs imply that the inferior courts and State supreme courts have declined in prestige and learning, and that the United States Supreme Court has increased in capacity? I do not think so. It rather implies, I think, that the United States Supreme Court has dwindled in influence and prestige. I will show why.

Let us contrast the record of the Supreme Court in the past 4 years of 306 cases affirmed and 336 cases reversed and compare this record of reversals with that of three States selected by the Library of Congress at random upon being asked for one eastern State, one western State, and one southern State. The Library of Congress selected Connecticut, Colorado, and Virginia.

For the 4-year period the Supreme Court of Connecticut affirmed 294 cases and reversed 156. The Supreme Court of Colorado affirmed 287 cases and reversed 179. The Supreme Court of Virginia affirmed 262 and reversed 240, but in the State of Virginia the writs dismissed which constitute affirmances of the lower courts were under a different procedure from that which obtains in the other two States. As a matter of fact, the reversals in Virginia were not so great as in the other States which I have named. It can be argued that the poor record of the Supreme Court of the United States may be accounted for by the chaos which exists in the opinions rendered by the Supreme Court itself. Let us examine this feature.

To compound the confusion still further, this Court has plagued the people with an abnormally high number of split decisions. For a 4-year period, from 1941 to 1945, the present Court, according to figures which appeared in the Washington Star under date of June 16, 1946, rendered 850 split decisions, and a goodly percentage of them were decided by one vote. Again let us contrast these figures with the decisions of the Court from 1916 to 1920. Let us remember that this was the period made famous by the dissents of Brandeis and Holmes. During this period of time the Supreme Court, out of 1,021 cases, had only 196 split decisions and a mere 27 were decided by one vote. Mr. President, it is utterly inexcusable that hundreds of cases should be decided by a split decision of any court, and the fact that such a situation has been associated with the United States Supreme Court demonstrates nothing but incompetence on the part of the Court.

Mr. President, the facts to which I have referred are startling. A 5 to 4 decision is not persuasive of the righteousness of any decision, and it does not settle and set at rest the doubts of litigants, or effect the clarification of the law. Moreover, these decisions create grave doubts as to the competency of the Court as a whole.

Mr. President, the people of this country are sick of the bickering, the internal schism, and the floating of rumors and petty factionalism in their highest judicial tribunal. The people desire a Court which is above such things and emblematic of the great traditions of the Nation. In view of the internal schisms of the present Court, its dissension and the temperament of its members are a reflection not only upon the membership of the Court but upon the Congress which permits such a situation to exist.

There is no doubt in my mind that the present Court does not hesitate to legislate but has, in many instances, usurped the power and prerogatives of the Congress, and upon occasions, has actually argued that the plain words of the statutes do not mean what they state. If I recall correctly Mr. Justice Frankfurter's famous statement, that is exactly what he said. There is no doubt in my mind that this legislaiton by the Court is to favor particular groups whose claims have in due course been presented and failed of enactment in Congress. In fact, there appears to be the purpose of the Court to bring about by judicial decisions a social and economic revolution to suit the predilection of its members. Mr. President, what American institution is safe with such a Court and where, Mr. President, does it leave the power of Congress?

Mr. President, it is necessary that the Justices of the Supreme Bench possess judicial temperament, and that in their decisions they shall announce the law regardless of their economic and social beliefs; and, further, that their judgment be not colored by their personal feelings in any matter. According to Justice Jackson, in his message to the Judiciary Committee of Congress, an attempt was made by one of the Justices to rush a decision in order to influence a collective-bargaining agreement which was at that time under negotiation. This is a very serious charge. I do not know whether it is true or not. It involves only one Justice. But, Mr. President, I am of the opinion that the present Court often plays sociological favorites, and that all men do not stand before it upon the same plane of equality before the law. Further, Mr. President, I do not believe that in its decisions the Court grants the same fair, even-handed justice to which all litigants are entitled. This is my personal opinion, and I believe it is likewise the opinion of the overwhelming numbers of the bench and bar of America.

I do not level this charge against every member of the Court, but take the case of the *United States* v. *Local 807* (315 U. S. 521), wherein the Court held the law of robbery and extortion does not apply to a labor organization which interferes with the movement of goods in interstate commerce. This was an outrageous decision which prostituted an act of Congress. In his dissenting opinion Chief Justice Stone stated that this decision would make the crime of robbery an innocent pastime. Mr. President, the present Court, in my judgment, does not possess, with the bar, with the judiciary, or with the American people the reputation for nonpartisan, unbiased decisions. In public esteem it today is at the lowest point of any branch of our Government in the history of the country. Throughout the history of this country the Supreme Court, as a rule, has been composed of outstanding members of the bar. It has been composed of great lawyers whose judicial integrity and competence were above reproach. Until the present time the Court has held the esteem, the confidence, and the respect of the American people as has no other branch of our Government. It has been the balance wheel, Mr. President, which through stress and storm, through partisanship and through the whims of the moment, has kept America anchored to the fundamental principles of freedom, human liberty, and the rights of man upon which this Government was founded. The very strongest safeguard of liberty, the very bedrock of the American Republic in public respect, esteem, and confidence in the courts of this Nation. The people of the country discount many acts of the Congress as being dictated by expediency and the politics of the moment. Many acts of the executive branch of the Government have also been discounted for the same reasons by the American people. But the belief that the Supreme Court was a fair, unbiased guardian of the rights, liberties, and privileges of the individual citizen was the most important and sacred thing in our system. The Court has so acted in the past, it has been a tribunal which has zealously protected the rights of the weak against the strong, the liberties of the individual against the impulses of the moment, and the rights of the States against the encroachments, trespasses, and transgressions of Federal power. All this, Mr. President, is a thing of the past and the American people today look upon their highest judicial tribunal as bereft of unity, spent by dissension, and torn by the bickerings of factions. In fact, they discount its avowed high motives and judge it with distrust and suspicion. It is a sad day for America that this last great citadel of human freedom has been thus compromised. To say the very least, the high pedestal on which the Court formerly rested has been brought low and its effectiveness has been destroyed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wonder if the Senator does not realize that the Supreme Court has been dealing with questions which were most keenly controversial, upon which opinion among the public of the United States itself, and, indeed, in the Congress, has been sharply divided. Is it not more or less natural that in matters which are so controversial there should be sharp differences of opinion, and that when such opinions, amounting to deep-rooted convictions, are held, there should be even some exhibition of intensity in the expression of those opinions and convictions?

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Florida was not present when I gave the figures on the reversals, the split decisions, the compromises, the 5 to 4 decisions, and when I stated that there is utterly no excuse for competent judges to be so divided on the law. It is something which not only has never happened on the Supreme Bench before in our history, but it is a condition which is not present in the courts of last resort in the States. I gave figures as to an eastern State, a western State, and a southern State.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. But does not the able Senator recognize that there is some distinction to be made between the United States Supreme Court and the highest appellate courts of the several States?

Mr. EASTLAND. There is certainly a great distinction to be made between the present United States Supreme Court, which has sunk so low in public esteem and confidence, and the great Court which we have had throughout the history of this Republic until the present time. I have drawn that distinction in my remarks.

Mr. PEPPER. I was not asking the Senator to express his opinion of which one deserves the higher commendation, but I meant to ask if there was not in the Senator's opinion some difference in the nature of the questions which were to be decided, and is not something to be said for the more controversial character of the decisions the United States Supreme Court has to render as against the decisions of the several State courts?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not think so.

Mr. PEPPER. For example, I remind the Senator that many times the United States Supreme Court is called upon to pass on such questions as the meaning of the due-process clause, for which there is no definition laid down in the United States Constitution. It is largely a matter of interpretation, and to a considerable extent it is the opinion of the Court itself which gives meaning to the language, general in character as it is in the Federal Constitution, whereas there are not many instances of that kind found in State decisions.

Mr. EASTLAND. The split decisions have been so many as to outrage reason, and there is no possible excuse for great lawyers so to divide.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will yield one more time, when there is a split court, I am not sure there is anyone who is capable of being the arbiter as to which side is right. The very intensity of the convictions of the judges upon these controversial questions, I dare say, is what gives rise to the 5 to 4 decisions, or split decisions, but surely the Senator is not suggesting that that has not happened in the past.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not think the decisions which face the Court today are greater in difficulty than the decisions which faced the Supreme Court of the United States in the past, and we certainly have not had this condition, we certainly have not had this great number of split decisions, which today run into the hundreds, when there was a very low percentage heretofore.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I have drawn a joint resolution for amendment of the Constitution of the United States, which we ask the Congress to submit to the States, which I shall discuss now, and which I think will cure the situation.

Mr. PEPPER. I merely wanted to submit that there are some of us who regretted before that there was such unfortunate unanimity in the court in an older day, in the wrong direction.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not think it was in the wrong direction. I think the

people of this country had confidence in their Supreme Court, and in their judiciary at that time, and I do not think such public confidence among all classes of people exists today.

Mr. President, the American people and Congress cannot permit this condition to continue. There must be action to remedy the situation, and I have this day, in conjunction with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, the amendment provides that the Supreme Court shall be composed of one Chief Justice and such number of Associate Justices, from 6 to 10, as the Congress shall by law provide. The number was limited to 10 to prevent some future President and Congress from packing the Supreme Court. The Justices are to be appointed by the President, as now provided by the Constitution. But the amendment provides further that not more than three of the Justices shall be appointed by any one President, and should any vacancies in excess of three occur during the tenure of any President, such vacancies shall be filled by the House of Representatives from among persons holding offices as judges of the inferior courts of the United States, or from the appellate courts of the last resort of the several States.

The amendment provides further that no one shall be so elected an interim Justice of the Supreme Court who comes from a judicial circuit as constituted at the date of ratification of the amendment when any of the Justices of the Supreme Court are residents of that circuit. This is to give the proper geographical balance to the Court.

In electing such Justices, Mr. President, the votes of the House of Representatives shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote. This is the identical system which is provided in the Constitution for the election of the President of the United States by the House of Representatives. A Justice so elected to fill any such vacancy shall hold office as a Justice of the Supreme Court only until another President shall take office. The other President can then fill the vacancy as provided originally by the Constitution. Then the Justice shall go back to his former position as a judge of an inferior court or of the court of last resort of one of the States.

Section 3 of the amendment, Mr. President, is very important, and is aimed at the present situation which confronts the country. It provides:

> If more than three persons holding office as Justices of the Supreme Court on the date of ratification of this article shall have been appointed by the same President, all persons holding such office who were appointed by such President, except the three first appointed, shall be retired and, regardless of age, shall be entitled to retirement pay in accordance with the laws relating to retirement in effect on such date.

Under this section all members of the present Court who were appointed by President Roosevelt, with the exception of the first three appointees, shall be retired from the Bench, and shall be entitled to retirement pay in accordance with the laws relating to retirement in effect on the date of the ratification of the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Did I understand the Senator to say that under the proposed amendment there would be an alteration in the present personnel of the Supreme Bench?

Mr. EASTLAND. I did.

Mr. PEPPER. I recall that there was a great hue and cry when it was proposed that the personnel of that Bench be altered, as was proposed a few years ago by President Roosevelt, the suggestion being that that was a Presidential packing of the Court. Would not this be called congressional packing of the Court?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly not, because it would be a matter submitted to the States and ratified by the people of this country.

Mr. PEPPER. But it would be for the purpose of changing the present personnel of the Court?

Mr. EASTLAND. It would be for the purpose of getting a competent Supreme Court.

Mr. PEPPER. But it would be for the purpose of changing the present personnel of the Court?

Mr. EASTLAND. Four of the present Justices; yes. I think it is something which the people of America generally, the people of the South, and the people of the State of Florida all favor.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sorry; I did not hear the last statement of the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. I say, I am sure it is something the people of the country, of the South, and of the Senator's State of Florida, would favor.

Mr. PEPPER. I would hope not, Mr. President, because I am afraid that if the Congress were to lend its efforts to the changing of the present personnel of the Court, it never could in history attack anybody else for packing the Court and getting the kind of Court he wanted.

Mr. EASTLAND. This is certainly not packing the Court. It is submitting a measure to the people of the country in the constitutional way, as the Constitution provides shall be done. It is unpacking the Court.

Except that President Truman would have another appointment to make out his list of three, all other vacancies would then be filled by the House of Representatives under the identical system by which the President is elected. These men would be interim appointees, serving until their places were filled by a new President, as provided by law.

Why are these interim Justices not appointed for life, Mr. President? It is because we desire to maintain the appointment of the Justices by the President in the same manner as provided by the "founding fathers" in the Constitution. We simply desire to correct the abuse of permitting any one President to have complete control of the Court and to correct the present deplorable situation which now confronts the country by the forced retirement of four Justices out of eight who were appointed in the Roosevelt administration. Not only does the plan prevent one President from gaining dominance of the Court, but it fits in with our two-party system of the Government. Not since the Civil War has one party ever had control of the Presidency for a longer term than 16 years. Granting that a President is renominated by his party, there have been only two instances, unless death intervened, where Presidents of one party under this plan could appoint more than six Justices to the Supreme Court. The other vacancies would be appointed by the House of Representatives. Under our system of Government the legislative, executive, and judicial branches are equal and independent of the other.

When any President of the United States, regardless of who he is, appoints a majority of the membership of the Supreme Court, then that President dominates the Court and the independence of the judiciary as contemplated in the Constitution is destroyed. No other President, since Grover Cleveland, has appointed anything like enough judges to control the Court except in two instances, and because of this our Supreme Court has been free and independent of the Executive. There have been two glaring examples of what happens when a President appoints a majority of the Supreme Court. William Howard Taft in one Presidential term named five Justices. The Court, as appointed by President Taft and his predecessors, was often criticized as being too conservative. President Franklin Roosevelt was the other example and the Court which he appointed has taken the other extreme.

We can thus see, Mr. President, that when any President of the United States has appointed more than three Justices to the Supreme Court, the Court has been subject to criticism of the bitterest kind. Under this plan no President, regardless of how many terms he may serve as President, can ever appoint a majority of the Supreme Court and he cannot, therefore, dominate that Court. The advantages under this system of promoting an interim judge from an inferior court will also assure the Court, as a rule, of a judge of judicial temperament and an experienced jurist.

This amendment is not an assault upon the judiciary. It is not an assault by the legislative branch upon the judicial branch of the Government. By this proposal the legislative branch of the Government merely proposes that the Constitution be amended in a lawful way to prohibit an abuse which experience has proven is inimicable to our constitutional system. We merely seek a reform of the present conditions according to constitutional processes. It is done by the people themselves.

This reform is imperative, Mr. President. This country cannot go on as it is. We must have an independent, competent Court of Judges with no special ends to serve. We cannot permit the judiciary of America to be brought further into disrepute. We cannot permit the rights of our citizens to be swept away by a Court bent upon legislating social reforms which have failed of passage in Congress. There must be fixed values and responsibilities in America. There

must be a competent unbiased Court to interpret them.

The system of interim Judges will not be abused for the reason that experience over the past half century has shown that few Presidents have ever appointed more than three Judges of the Supreme Court. I place in the RECORD, Mr. President, the number of Justices and Chief Justices appointed by President Truman and by seven of his predecessors.

Presidents:	*Justices*
Cleveland	3
Harrison	4
McKinley	1
Theodore Roosevelt	3
Taft	5
Wilson	3
Harding	3
Coolidge	1
Hoover	2
Roosevelt	8
Truman	1
Chief Justices	
Cleveland	1
Taft	1
Harding	1
Hoover	1
Roosevelt	1
Truman	1

If the Congress of the United States does not speedily submit this amendment to the States, then I shall propose to the several States, Mr. President, that they initiate this amendment to the Constitution and directly bring about this much-needed correction of the difficulties in which we find ourselves. It is our high duty to give to the American people outstanding Judges whose judicial integrity and ability is recognized by all. We must return to the people a Court undominated by any group, the fearless, independent, impartial arbiter, and the guardian of the indestructible rights of man.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator referred to the appointment by my father of five Justices of the Supreme Court, and spoke of those Justices as particularly being considered to be conservative. I may say that my father appointed six judges, if we include the promotion of Justice White from Associate Justice to be Chief Justice. Of the six he appointed, three were Democrats. White himself was a Democrat from Louisiana, Lurton was a Democrat from Tennessee, and Lamar was a Democrat from Georgia. Those gentlemen, I think, were in no case particularly conservative. The other three were Republicans.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree entirely with the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wanted to make that statement for the RECORD.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is my personal opinion that the Justices appointed by the Senator's father were great Justices. I merely stated that the Court was criticized as being too conservative. I believe that to be an accurate statement.

Mr. TAFT. I think the criticism of the Court for being conservative came a good deal later. The three Republicans appointed were Hughes, Pitney, and Van Devanter. The only one of the six who, I think, was considered to be unduly conservative was Van Devanter. As a matter of fact Lurton, Lamar, and Pitney died rather shortly after they were appointed, so that their particular predilections did not materially affect the general character of the Court for many years.

DECREASE OF LIMIT OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. GEORGE. I ask that the Chair lay down a bill coming over from the House of Representatives respecting the limitation of the national debt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 6699) to decrease the amount of obligations issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act outstanding at any one time, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it will be remembered that the Senate has passed a bill, S. 1760, limiting the national debt to $275,000,000,000. The bill was duly reported from the Committee on Finance and was passed by the Senate. The House has passed a different measure, but in effect the same, that is limiting the debt to $275,000,000,000. The House has taken the view that it was a revenue matter and affected the revenue, and ought to have originated in the House. The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is the author of the bill, and I think under the circumstances the Senate would be willing immediately to consider the House bill without reference to a committee, since we have already passed a similar bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Do I understand that the House has now taken the position which certain Senators on this side took on the British loan, that anything dealing with the bond limit should originate in the House of Representatives?

Mr. GEORGE. At least the House said that this limitation of the national debt to $275,000,000,000 under the Second Liberty Loan Act was a measure affecting revenue and should have originated in the House. So the House proceeded to pass a similar bill with some slight, trivial changes, and sent it back to the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. The House seems to have supported the position of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] that a bill which authorized an increase of the national debt, as the British loan bill did, should originate in the House of Representatives. Is that not correct?

Mr. GEORGE. That may be, but the Ways and Means Committee of the House did not have jurisdiction of the British loan.

Mr. President, I now ask for the immediate consideration and passage of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill H. R. 6699, to decrease the amount of obligations issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act which may be outstanding at any one time, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, we now have under consideration House bill 6335, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior. I wish to make a few brief remarks in connection with a portion of that bill. The appropriation included in the bill for the Missouri Valley Basin and other items for the Bureau of Reclamation might well be entitled "A bill to insure the future food supply of the East." It is primarily the great eastern cities that will benefit from this bill, for it is their food supply which is at stake.

Mr. President, peace and food are the two most important items in the world at the present time. They have always been so. We have seldom had less of either. We can accept as an axiom, also, that we will not have peace until we have food for all the peoples of the earth. War, drouth, or flood, with all of the attendant miseries of each of them, would each constitute a world disaster. We have all three of them present in international proportions.

It is a fallacy in our thinking, however, to believe that hunger is something that concerns only Europe and Asia. The fact is that hunger stalks here at home. Our food shelves are getting bare, and butter and meat are practically unobtainable. This is not due to shipments abroad. Wheat is the only major food that we are exporting in large quantities. We are short of other foods because we simply do not produce enough to feed our own people.

It is true we used to think we had too much of some crops, but that was never really the case. At times the farmer has produced more than he could sell profitably, but never more than was really needed. Now that most of our citizens are employed at good wages and salaries, we can see clearly that we do not have too much. We do not have enough. Furthermore, our consuming population is increasing slowly but steadily—a million a year. Mr. President, our food problem of the future will be one of shortage, not surplus.

Where shal' we get our food supply of the future?

Mr. President, this appropriation bill is, I believe, only the first step in a gigantic program to assure our future food supply, by increasing food production in the only way that it can be increased—by expanding our acreage of irrigated land in the West.

Let me make a few comparisons to show how dependent is the industrial East on the agricultural West for its food supply. I have had compiled some figures on the per capita food production of the nine Northeastern States, namely, New England, plus New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, compared with the nine States of our Missouri Valley—Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana.

This industrial area produces only 3 bushels of corn per capita, while the Missouri Valley States produce 112, and Nebraska, 250.

The Northeastern States produced less than 1 bushel of wheat per capita. In the Missouri Valley, the production was 44; in Nebraska, 27 per capita.

The industrial area produced only 1 pound of creamery butter per capita; the Missouri Valley, 44; and Nebraska, 61; and that does not include the butter churned on the farm.

The industrial areas produced 24 pounds of beef per capita; the Missouri Valley, 722; Nebraska, 967. The industrial areas produced 8 pounds of pork, the Missouri Valley, 717; Nebraska, 907; with respect to mutton the industrial areas did not register at all, although they eat most of it; the States of the Missouri Valley produced 101 per capita; Nebraska, 99 pounds per capita.

In fact, the Missouri Valley is the best provider in the Nation, and one of the few places capable of producing more food. As it is we produce one-half of the bread of this country, one-fifth of the butter, one-sixth of the pork, one-fifth of the beef, one-fourth of the mutton, and one-third of the wool. Nebraska alone makes twice as much butter as New York, New Jersey, and Delaware, or twice as much as all six of the New England States.

Still we are not producing enough, even on this prolific scale. The indisputable fact is that we do not have enough to go around, and it appears we are going to have less.

This brings the problem right back to the question: Where can we produce more food? There is only one answer—reclamation of the acreage that is now lying idle and power development—to help finance these projects and make life more livable on the farm.

Under the present plans for the Missouri Valley alone, the Pick-Sloan plan contemplates the irrigation of 5,000,000 additional acres by surface or gravity irrigation. This does not include many small projects which will ultimately be developed. Nearly 1,000,000 acres of this development are in Nabraska alone, and we can irrigate probably another million acres by the use of subsurface water—that is, by pump irrigation. Every acre irrigated supplements 3 to 4 acres of grazing land. This adds up to between twenty and thirty million additional acres to be benefited, and would save us from slaughtering our herds in the dry years. This area is the source of our future food supply.

The bill we are now considering will take the first steps toward realization of this program. I would like to emphasize that we cannot wait. Our people are leaving the farm. About 200,000 left the valley during the drought years. Nine and seven-tenths percent more left during the war years, and once they have left it is hard to get them back. Figures compiled by the Federal land bank of our area show that less than 50 percent of the veterans from the farm are returning to the farm. This is immediately reflected in less food for the Nation. Unless these population trends are reversed, there will not be enough people left on the farms to grow the crops. We must make farming more profitable and more stable and take away some of the drudgery by expanding the use of electricity. This bill is a good step in that direction.

Mr. President, the action of our Appropriations Committee in restoring the drastic reductions made by the House is very gratifying to me. I have no doubt that these appropriations will be approved by the Senate. But I hope our colleagues representing us in the conference committee will not now rest on their oars and permit these appropriations to be whittled away in conference. I feel sure they will not. I feel sure they realize as well as I that our future food supply is at stake.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point some statistical tables furnished me by the secretary of the Nebraska Reclamation Association. All the figures are drawn from official sources. The crop and meat statistics were prepared under the direction of A. E. Anderson, Nebraska State crop statistician, who is also associated with the Department of Agriculture. Other figures were from the Bureau of Reclamation.

These statements showing the production of beef, pork, and mutton, also the production of corn, wheat, and butter, on a per capita basis, by States, will be interesting as well as profitable to all who are interested in solving our food problems.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. Department of Agriculture (Bureau of Agricultural Economics)

States	Beef					Pork					Mutton				
	Production (1,000 pounds)	Rank	Pounds per capita	Outshipments and local slaughter (1,000 pounds)	Pounds per capita	Production (1,000 pounds)	Rank	Pounds per capita	Outshipments and local slaughter (1,000 pounds)	Pounds per capita	Production (1,000 pounds)	Rank	Pounds per capita	Outshipments and local slaughter (1,000 pounds)	Pounds per capita
Maine	37,275		44	32,615	39	24,341		29	17,491	21	1,180		1	1,100	1
New Hampshire	19,345		39	17,805	36	8,086		16	5,246	11	355		1	410	
Vermont	68,825		192	64,775	180	11,640		32	5,880	16	560		1	800	2
Massachusetts	31,680		7	51,760	14	31,795		7	22,595	5	185			240	
Rhode Island	4,610		6	15,890	22	2,982		4	2,562	4	80			80	
Connecticut	27,790		16	36,170	21	9,779		6	5,939	3	240			175	
New York	343,465		25	293,695	22	95,206		7	55,361	4	11,340			15,910	1
New Jersey	32,080		8	48,390	12	34,302		8	36,792	9	420			840	
Pennsylvania	315,215		32	336,615	34	238,627		24	141,102	14	11,533		1	15,368	2
	880,285		24	897,715	25	456,758		13	292,968	8	25,893			34,923	
Ohio	525,435		76	562,735	81	1,196,704		173	1,212,079	175	62,220		9	93,010	13
Indiana	502,555		146	652,345	190	1,690,763		493	1,736,398	506	38,744		11	59,629	17
Illinois	784,770		99	1,370,700	174	2,166,397		274	2,332,057	295	41,297		5	73,702	9
Michigan	426,160		81	423,360	80	347,504		66	342,774	65	36,812		7	48,952	9
Wisconsin	845,370		269	775,950	247	803,174		256	810,524	258	20,937		7	33,857	11
Minnesota	960,605		344	1,046,950	375	1,401,480		502	1,564,490	561	76,354		27	113,784	41
	4,044,895		138	4,832,040	164	7,606,022		259	7,998,322	272	276,364		9	422,934	14
Iowa	1,660,840		654	2,533,390	997	4,033,348		1,588	4,559,968	1,795	94,249		37	181,254	71
Missouri	1,025,730		271	1,396,340	368	1,358,096		358	1,375,386	363	82,054		22	119,599	32
North Dakota	480,780		749	440,195	686	269,999		421	304,584	475	47,931		75	67,821	105
South Dakota	638,405		993	609,225	947	540,365		840	671,255	1,044	75,448		117	132,198	206
Nebraska	1,032,940		783	1,276,780	967	978,175		741	1,197,100	907	55,343		42	130,698	99
Kansas	1,098,595		610	1,437,855	799	573,038		318	670,438	372	56,875		32	90,640	50
Montana	494,705		885	513,010	918	111,655		200	116,150	208	150,363		269	204,923	367
Wyoming	280,000		1,116	281,435	1,121	32,670		130	34,640	138	111,790		445	151,060	602
Colorado	488,440		436	675,480	603	140,881		126	176,641	158	107,560		96	203,710	182
	7,200,435		567	9,163,710	722	8,038,227		633	9,106,162	717	781,613		62	1,281,903	101
Delaware	10,425		39	8,740	33	10,745		40	6,585	25	100			100	
Maryland	62,895		35	62,560	34	79,553		44	45,803	25	2,325		1	2,220	1
Virginia	201,120		75	211,410	79	253,346		95	141,016	53	19,265		7	18,830	7
West Virginia	133,045		70	145,175	76	80,809		43	33,925	18	21,025		11	23,340	13
North Carolina	121,660		34	105,380	30	312,243		87	148,808	42	2,215			2,075	
South Carolina	68,640		36	68,040	36	149,965		79	73,510	39	65			65	
Georgia	173,785		56	169,500	54	369,527		118	186,852	60	285			130	
Florida	147,450		78	138,440	73	122,114		64	91,354	48	211			201	
	919,020		53	909,245	53	1,378,293		80	727,853	42	45,491		3	47,461	3

U. S. Department of Agriculture (Bureau of Agricultural Economics)—Continued

States	Beef					Pork					Mutton				
	Production (1,000 pounds)	Rank	Pounds per capita	Outshipments and local slaughter (1,000 pounds)	Pounds per capita	Production (1,000 pounds)	Rank	Pounds per capita	Outshipments and local slaughter (1,000 pounds)	Pounds per capita	Production (1,000 pounds)	Rank	Pounds per capita	Outshipments and local slaughter (1,000 pounds)	Pounds per capita
Kentucky	324,360		114	427,305	150	441,811		155	337,416	118	55,350		19	72,125	25
Tennessee	312,650		107	368,160	126	412,420		141	287,140	98	23,260		8	25,465	9
Alabama	208,445		74	212,660	75	294,915		104	174,600	62	855			1,110	
Mississippi	231,685		106	208,310	95	209,997		96	103,037	47	983			1,183	
Arkansas	269,450		138	282,550	145	257,595		132	178,220	91	3,197		2	4,067	2
Louisiana	190,895		81	170,820	72	182,570		77	133,420	57	2,676		1	2,796	1
Oklahoma	769,835		329	987,065	422	313,625		134	296,225	127	15,471		7	19,116	8
Texas	1,516,750		237	2,063,585	322	612,928		96	498,418	78	275,015		43	286,995	45
	3,824.070		161	4,720,455	198	2,725,861		115	2,008,476	84	376,807		16	412,857	17
Idaho	243,700		464	246,670	470	118,910		227	140,800	268	98,002		187	126,942	242
New Mexico	292,405		550	429,660	808	31,288		59	24,513	46	45,785		86	59,990	113
Arizona	178,720		358	265,910	533	12,698		25	12,618	25	24,423		49	19,703	39
Utah	128,835		234	147,070	267	42,470		77	46,970	85	76,747		140	92,525	168
Nevada	97,785		889	92,410	840	6,519		59	4,569	42	18,833		171	23,568	214
Washington	241,770		139	276,170	159	103,618		60	110,208	63	25,353		15	33,128	19
Oregon	292,020		268	293,940	270	85,726		79	96,056	88	50,738		47	67,208	62
California	652,135		94	1,057,635	153	174,518		25	200,478	29	131,713		19	169,983	25
	2,127,370		179	2,809,465	236	575,747		48	636,212	53	471,594		40	593,047	50
	18,996,075		145	23,332,630	178	20,780,908		159	20,769,993	159	1,977,762		15	2,793,125	21

States	Corn					Wheat					Creamery butter		
	Production (1,000 bushels)	Rank	Bushels per capita	Sold (1,000 bushels)	Bushels per capita	Production (1,000 bushels)	Rank	Bushels per capita	Sold (1,000 bushels)	Bushels per capita	Production (1,000 pounds)	Rank	Pounds per capita
Maine	640			5		40			20		405		
New Hampshire	640		1	5									
Vermont	2,553		7	2							4,211		12
Massachusetts	1,763			14							214		
Rhode Island	288			2									
Connecticut	2,080		1	10							10		
New York	25,655		2	160		8,932			5,061		25,511		2
New Jersey	6,755		1	662		1,380			437		93		
Pennsylvania	53,580		5	4,248		20,288		2	9,633	1	11,718		1
	93,954		3	5,108		30,640			15,151		42,162		1
Ohio	142,956	7	21	18,413	3	46,805	7	7	28,289	4	63,291		9
Indiana	176,244	5	51	33,516	10	26,488		8	17,683	5	49,555		16
Illinois	403,695	2	51	150,210	2	24,632		3	20,411	3	70,118		9
Michigan	57,760		11	4,021		23,022		4	13,382	3	64,175		12
Wisconsin	116,536	9	37	4,165	1	1,423			376		124,966		40
Minnesota	253,399	4	91	56,941	20	20,689		7	14,548	5	251,614		90
	1,150,590		39	267,266	9	143,059		5	94,689	3	623,719		21
Iowa	607,608	1	239	150,074	59	2,248		1	1,470		212,482		84
Missouri	162,554	6	43	20,371	5	23,800		6	14,208	4	70,297		19
North Dakota	36,250	8	56	2,589	4	161,630	2	252	146,598	228	56,093		87
South Dakota	140,292	3	218	44,775	70	38,847	8	76	32,634	51	36,622		57
Nebraska	329,855	10	250	154,810	117	35,944	9	27	29,553	22	81,157		61
Kansas	114,793		64	39,078	22	191,669	1	106	173,127	96	60,805		34
Montana	3,308		6	120		73,884	5	132	66,695	119	11,858		21
Wyoming	1,260		5	37		3,198		13	2,248	9	2,922		12
Colorado	16,283		15	3,767	3	19,137		17	15,106	13	19,545		17
	1,412,203		112	415,621	33	550,357		44	481,639	38	551,781		44
Delaware	3,645		14	601	2	1,280		5	863	3	4		
Maryland	17,150		9	3,285	2	8,906		5	6,173	3	2,775		2
Virginia	34,272		13	3,450	1	11,275		4	5,818	2	7,271		3
West Virginia	10,426		5	751		1,680			588		2,240		1
North Carolina	51,524		14	5,966	2	8,928		3	3,369		1,725		
South Carolina	24,160		13	2,589	1	3,653		2	1,011		352		
Georgia	40,802		13	4,700	2	2,964			1,168		1,144		
Florida	7,190		4	698							2		
	189,169		11	22,040	1	38,686		2	18,990	1	15,513		
Kentucky	67,080	12	24	5,916	2	7,902		3	5,113	2	21,344		7
Tennessee	59,950		21	6,331	2	6,714		2	2,783	1	15,054		5
Alabama	48,128		17	7,032	2	218			71		407		
Mississippi	42,224		19	2,649	1	432			159		4,491		2
Arkansas	32,300		17	2,739	1	588			276		6,733		3
Louisiana	18,870		8	1,007							594		
Oklahoma	32,958		14	6,300	3	85,914	3	37	75,162	32	46,852		20
Texas	69,622	11	11	15,805	2	74,746	4	12	69,639	11	30,938		5
	371,132		16	47,779	2	176,514		7	154,205	6	126,413		5
Idaho	1,581		3	300		30,309	10	58	23,970	46	35,869		68
New Mexico	3,510		7	889	2	3,186		6	2,422	5	1,774		3
Arizona	361			39		528		1	403		1,038		2
Utah	754		1	51		7,361		13	4,480	8	7,430		14
Nevada	120		1	11		479		4	145	1	1,230		10
Washington	1,189			50		64,030	6	37	58,439	34	27,977		16
Oregon	1,587		1	137		23,105		21	19,773	18	24,130		22
California	2,211			722		10,393		1	9,001	1	29,466		4
	11,313		1	2,199		139,391		12	118,631	10	128,914		11
	3,228,361		25	760,013	6	1,078,647		8	883,305	7	1,488,502		11

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 20, to strike out:

PETROLEUM CONSERVATION DIVISION

For all salaries and expenses necessary for administering and enforcing the provisions of the act of February 22, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., ch. 15A), and for cooperation with Federal and State authorities in the production and conservation of oil and gas, including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel expenses; contract stenographic reporting services; stationery and office supplies; not to exceed $2,500 for printing and binding; and the maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger-carrying vehicles, $216,908.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

OIL AND GAS DIVISION

Oil and Gas Division: For all expenses necessary for coordinating and unifying policies and administration of Federal activities relative to oil, gas, and synthetic fuels, including cooperation with the petroleum industry and State authorities in the production, processing, and utilization of petroleum and petroleum products, natural gas, and synthetic fuels and the compilation of technical reports thereon, for administering and enforcing the provisions of the act of February 22, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., ch. 15A); and for the liquidation of the Petroleum Administration for War; including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $10,000 for employment of a director without regard to the civil service and classification laws; travel expenses; contract stenographic reporting services; printing and binding; and the purchase (not to exceed five), maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger automobiles; $449,516.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 4, to insert:

DIVISION OF GEOGRAPHY

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Division of Geography, in performing the duties imposed upon the Secretary by Executive Order 6680, dated April 17, 1934, relating to uniform usage in regard to geographic nomenclature and orthography throughout the Federal Government, including personal services in the District of Columbia, stationery and office supplies, and printing and binding, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior," page 5, line 18, after the word "automobiles", to insert "hire of aircraft"; on page 6, line 1, after the word "binding", to strike out "$224,460" and insert "$263,500"; and in line 8, after the words "Grazing Service", to strike out "$6,000" and insert "$4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Commission of Fine Arts," on page 6, line 21, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$7,926" and insert "$11,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bonneville Power Administration," on page 6, line 24, after the word "system", to strike out "For" and insert "To enable the Bonneville Power Administrator to carry out the duties imposed upon him pursuant to law, including the."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is an important appropriation bill, and there is a difference of opinion on the question. I am therefore inclined to suggest the absence of a quorum, but shall not do so at the moment.

Mr. President, the House Appropriations Committee made a record-breaking cut in the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1947 (H. R. 6335) before reporting it to the House, and the House accepted most of the recommendations of its committee. The Budget estimate totaled $346,765,830 and the amount voted by the House totalled only $179,426,846—a cut of nearly one-half. But during the debate in the House some skeptical Members expressed the thought that "in another place" an effort would be made to restore the cuts. This skepticism was, it appears, more than justified. The bill now submitted to the Senate by the Senate Appropriations Committee recommends appropriations totaling $329,337,438, which means that a net restoration totaling $149,910,561 is recommended.

If the bill as recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee becomes a law, then the effort of the House Committee to curb what it called "inefficient and gross extravagance in certain agencies in the Department of the Interior" will fail. The Department of the Interior will be given appropriations for 1947 exceeding those of 1946 by $125,811,025. Practically without exception, every bureau and office in the Department will have more to spend than ever before, and during the war the appropriations of most of these bureaus and offices swelled enormously. The point I am making is very simple. The Senate, by approving the recommendations of its Appropriations Committee, will be throwing its weight against a sincere attempt at economy by the House. I intend, therefore, to offer amendments which will give those Members of the Senate who favor economy a chance to go on record as disapproving certain of the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee.

I am, of course, ready to admit that the cut made by the House was severe and that, in some respects, it may have been too severe. For example, the appropriation provided for the Grazing Service was inadequate. I believe also that the House was too severe toward the National Park Service, the Fish and Wild Life Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. But it was not too severe toward many other bureaus. Take, for example, the Geological Survey. The House subcommittee called attention to the "skyrocketing appropriations" for this Bureau. In 1939 and 1940 it had appropriations of approximately $3,000,000; in 1946 it had $7,816,900; and for 1947 it asked for $13,166,000. The House cut this request to $7,993,445—an appropriation slightly in excess of that for 1946—and in doing so expressed the opinion that it was being "extremely generous."

Mr. President, at this time I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. I previously raised the point of having a quorum call because, frankly, I disagree with some of the amendments, and I should like to have them discussed and have a record vote taken on them.

But if it would suit the purpose of the Senator from Arizona to have the Senate act on the amendments as to which there is no objection or question, I should be perfectly willing to have that done. Then tomorrow the Senate could go into the details of the controversial admendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that arrangement will be satisfactory and it will expedite the final consideration of the bill. If there are any items which the Senator from New Hampshire feels should be passed over, I shall be glad to have him point them out. I know of two or three matters which certain Senators would like to have passed over.

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall offer some amendments to the portions of the bill dealing with the Bureau of Reclamation, the general fund, construction, the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, and the Government in the Territories. So, cannot we take up the other amendments and act upon them, and then tomorrow begin to consider the ones as to which I and other Senators propose to offer amendments?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. Under that arrangement we can now proceed with the amendments; and whenever we reach an amendment which the Senator wishes to have passed over, perhaps he will indicate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, in line 24——

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I did not understand that we had reached that point.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; we have.

Mr. MOORE. I wish to call attention to an item on page 3.

Mr. HAYDEN. I assume that the Senator from Oklahoma refers to the Oil and Gas Division amendment on page 3. In order that the Senator may inquire about it, Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 3, in lines 8 to 24, was agreed to, be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment on page 3, lines 8 to 24, was agreed to, is reconsidered, and the amendment is before the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, now that the matter is before the Senate again, let me ask what the Senator's inquiry is.

Mr. MOORE. I am glad the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is in the Chamber, because I have talked with him about this matter, and probably he knows more about the purpose than I do and is better able to explain.

It seems to me that the amendment would increase the appropriation by approximately $240,000. The reason for that is set out under a proposal to strike out the Petroleum Conservation Division and to substitute for it an Oil and Gas Division.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. Let me explain to the Senator that this item is based upon a supplemental estimate submitted after the bill passed the House. In the estimate it is stated that the Petroleum

Conservation Division has been abolished. The Oil and Gas Division has been created in its place. It has the purpose of coordinating under one head the entire activities of the Department of the Interior relating to petroleum or oil and gas.

The Senator's colleague from Oklahom [Mr. THOMAS] was present at the hearings. We had Mr. Ralph K. Davies before us.

Mr. MOORE. I think I can obviate any further explanation, because I myself heard some explanation at the hearing which was held before the Special Committee of which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is chairman. There Mr. Davies and others gave the reason for the substitution. As I understand the matter, the creation of this new agency is done by means of nothing but an Executive order, evidently in contemplation of a proposal under the reorganization plan to set up this bureau. Of course, that proposal has not been made. So at this time, prior to a proposal for such a consolidation, I see no reason whatever for creating a new agency. If that is to be done under the reorganization bill, why should we now proceed to create this agency, which could be nothing more than a temporary one?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that it seemed to me it was made clear yesterday, at the meeting of Special Committee to Investigate Petroleum Resources, at which the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] was present, that the purpose of the appropriation which is added by this item to the regular appropriation for the administration of the Petroleum Conservation Division, which administers the so-called Connally "Hot Oil" Act, is to enable a new Oil and Gas Division to make a survey of the activities of other executive agencies and departments having to do with petroleum, and thereby make a recommendation to the President for the exercise of his authority under the Reorganization Act. If we do not allow the two-hundred-thousand-odd dollars which will be necessary to enable Mr. Davies to have the staff he will need, then it will be impossible for the executive branch of the Government to study what is being done in the Commerce Department with respect to oil, what is being done in the State Department with respect to oil, what is being done in the OPA or any other emergency agency with respect to oil, and to make a recommendation for the coordination of all such activities.

At the hearing yesterday, Mr. President, it was made clear that it will be the purpose of the Oil and Gas Division to consult with Congress, with the committees of Congress, in preparing any recommendations which are to be made.

As a result of the very complete inquiry which we had yesterday, I feel that it is in the interest of coordinating the activities of some 27 different Federal agencies that this appropriation be provided.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, it seems to me that the appropriation is premature. It would be perfectly proper for the President to make a recommendation or to submit a plan under the Reorganization Act. At that time a plan for the consolidation of the various agencies which have to do with oil could be thoroughly explored. But for the time being to put in a new man, in the person of Mr. Davies, who himself would be the head of a temporary agency for that purpose, would be entirely futile and would not be in accordance with the procedure we usually follow.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me, I think he will see that the contrary is the fact. There is now pending before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate a reorganization order which was issued by the President in compliance with the Reorganization Act.

Mr. MOORE. And it is having a thorough hearing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that that reorganization order was prepared in secret by the Bureau of the Budget.

Here we have an opportunity to have a reorganization order prepared after consultation with the Members of the Senate, the members of the appropriate Senate committees, and the members of an advisory council for the oil industry. I think such a procedure is much superior. The examination which is being made in the Judiciary Committee, under the Reorganization Act, is likely to prove futile, even though we should desire to change the order, because under the Reorganization Act unless both Houses of Congress act, there is no possible way to kill a reorganization order.

Under this method, the Senator from Oklahoma, the members of the Senate special committee dealing with petroleum, the members of the Public Lands and Surveys Committee, and the members of the Appropriations Committee will have an opportunity in advance to know what is being done. I think such a method is much superior, because it brings the matter out into the open. I feel certain that it is the Senator's own desire to make sure that any reorganization which is made will not be in camera reorganization of executive agencies, but will be a reorganization by which the legislative body can proceed. Such a system or procedure is served by this amendment.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I am impelled to make this objection, for the reason that the amendment contemplates the setting up of an industry advisory committee which is to concur with reference to the policy or with reference to the administration of the new agency which is to be created; and, of course, it is to be created through the action of Congress. The membership of that committee, which already has been created from the industry, has never been disclosed, as far as I know. A secret list has been prepared. I simply cannot feel that that is the way to handle this matter. I cannot agree with the Senator from Wyoming that this method will expedite the matter and will bring it out into the open, where we shall have any better opportunity to consider it than we shall have if it comes up under a reorganization plan and then goes before a committee, where we can call witnesses and can discuss the matter properly and can have all of it out in the open. To my mind, the procedure proposed by the amendment is a rather peculiar one.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator will realize, I am sure, that under the Reorganization Act the action of one House of the Congress cannot prevent the carrying out of the reorganization. But under the provisions of this amendment and as a result of the hearings which we had yesterday, the action of the Senate committee alone would, in my judgment, be sufficient to prevent a reorganization which would be unsatisfactory.

Mr. MOORE. The opposition of either the House or the Senate alone would not affect the reorganization proposal, would it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The opposition of one House acting alone would not affect a reorganization order.

Mr. MOORE. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There would have to be a united action, which would be an almost impossible thing to secure.

Mr. HAYDEN. It was clearly understood by the committee that this matter would be temporary, and only for 1 year. We would provide this amount of money——

Mr. MOORE. It is almost a quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. HAYDEN. I consider the oil industry, from a tax point of view, to be about the greatest industry in America. So, the amount of money is not large. It was understood distinctly that the money would be spent in coordinating various agencies of the Government which now have their fingers in the oil business.

Mr. MOORE. The problem is one of consolidating them under one agency?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The question arises, How shall it be done? The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] was very careful in his questioning of Mr. Davies. The testimony begins on page 1292 of the hearings, and reads in part as follows:

> Senator THOMAS. If this appropriation is increased as here requested, would that offer you sufficient money to enable you to give thought and attention to a permanent program which you would consider adequate to submit to this committee or some committee say within the next 10 or 12 months?
>
> Mr. DAVIES. Yes; it would, Senator, and that is precisely what we should do. That is precisely what we want to do here.
>
> Senator THOMAS. Would this money, made available to you, make it possible for you to do that?
>
> Mr. DAVIES. Yes; it is sufficient to enable us to do that. As to the money amounts involved, I would like to say this: While this is additional money, the purpose here is finally to develop a more efficient administration, to eliminate duplication, and to do a better job. The expenditure should be returned severalfold if the idea is any good.

So it is understood just what the money is for, and that it is for no other purpose than to effect a proper reorganization and eliminate duplication of effort.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendment, on page

2, beginning in line 21, ending on page 3, in line 24, go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments, under the heading "Bonneville Power Administration," beginning on page 6, in line 23, and ending on page 7, in line 16, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Grazing Service", on page 8, line 15, after the word "reports", to strike out "fighting fires"; in line 22, after the word "binding", to strike out "$212,500" and insert "$689,000; for payment of a salary of $6 per diem while actually employed and for the payment of necessary travel expenses, exclusive of subsistence, of members of advisory committees of local stockmen, $40,000; in all, $729,000"; on page 9, line 12, after the word "equipment", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That $100,000 of this appropriation shall be available only for the payment to employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 16, to insert:

Fire fighting: For fighting fires on or threatening lands under Grazing Service administration, $50,000, which amount shall also be available for meeting obligations of the preceding fiscal year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 13, after the words "Salaries and expenses", to strike out "and"; and in the same line, after the words "Range improvements", to insert "and fire fighting."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Land Office," on page 10, line 25, after the word "proceedings", to strike out "$950,000" and insert "$1,075,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 9, after the name "Secretary", to strike out "$494,602" and insert "$750,000"; and in line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "one" and insert "three."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 23, after the word "of", to strike out "ten" and insert "twenty-five"; and in line 24, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$387,000" and insert "$397,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 5, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$277,126" and insert "$293,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 1, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$310,191" and insert "$429,240."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$23,500"; and in line 17, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$433,455" and insert "$474,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 21, after the name "Alaska", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs," on page 15, line 9, after the word "journals", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,128,675."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 13, after the word "binding", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$985,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 18, after the word "provisions", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,274,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 1, after the word "service", to strike out "$3,084,008" and insert "$3,609,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 17, after the word "systems", to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$838,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 6, after the name "Arizona", to strike out "$9,600,000" and insert "$10,317,450."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 2, after the word "binding", to strike "$5,930,570" and insert "$6,769,570."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 8, after the word "festivals", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 21, after "(16 U. S. C. 583)", to strike out "$704,728" and insert "$960,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 18, after the word "exhibits", to insert "the control and eradication of fever ticks among livestock of Indians under the jurisdiction of the Seminole Agency, Florida"; and in line 22, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$808,336" and insert "$986,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 5, after "(57 Stat. 459)", to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$1,500,000"; and in line 9, after the word "to", to strike out "$925,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee amendments beginning in the third paragraph on page 20, and ending on page 21 in line 17, should be passed over. Some Senators wish to offer amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be passed over.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, does the Senator refer to the paragraph beginning in line 18, on page 20?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The Senator from Montana wishes to have the word "Montana" included among the States listed, and the Senator from Oregon also wishes to amend the language in respect to his State.

Mr. MURDOCK. Would it be in order for me now to offer an amendment to the committee amendment? I should like to have the word "Utah" inserted before the words "and Wyoming" on page 20, in line 25.

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be done.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, on page 20, in line 25, before the words "and Wyoming," I move to insert "Utah."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the request of the Senator from Arizona, the committee amendments in the paragraph beginning on line 18, page 20, down to and including line 17 on page 21 will be passed over.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, for many years Members of Congress have been seeking to reduce the expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The amount of money appropriated for the Bureau has increased year by year. This year it is proposed to increase the appropriation over last year by about $12,000,000. Actually, the appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs amount to nearly as much as the entire cost of the Congress. It seems to me that it is a matter which should be given serious consideration by all Members of Congress.

At the present time a new plan is being proposed under which certain matters would be frozen in the control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs practically forever. The Bureau plans eventually to take over 7,000,000 acres of Indian land, and I should like to know what is to become of it in the future. If this bill is passed, the Bureau expects to use this year, in starting the program, approximately $1,000,000 of which $350,000 is to be taken out of tribal funds belonging to the Indians themselves.

Mr. President, I am concerned with, but I am not particularly interested in, the general picture. I wish to offer an amendment to include the State of South Dakota. On page 20, in line 25, after the word "Oregon," I move to insert the words "South Dakota."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 10, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$35,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 24, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$1,600,000" and insert "$1,648,000"; in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "$290,000" and insert "$299,631"; and on page 23, line 1,

after the word "and", to strike out "$1,250,000" and insert "$1,284,157."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 8, to insert:

The unexpended balance of the appropriation contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1946, for settlement of claims to water rights in the Gila River, Arizona, is hereby continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1947.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 25, after the word "River", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$500,000"; on page 24, line 1, after the name "New Mexico", to strike out "$45,000" and insert "$50,000"; in line 2, after the name "Papago", to strike out "$18,000" and insert "$20,000"; and in the same line, after the name "Salt River", to strike out "$27,000" and insert "$30,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 3, after the name "Mission", to strike out "$9,000" and insert "$10,000"; and in line 4, after the name "Sacramento", to strike out "$13,500" and insert "$15,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 5, after the name "Southern Ute", to strike out "$13,500" and insert "$15,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 6, after the name "Fort Belknap", to strike out "$5,625" and insert "$6,250"; and in line 7, after the name "Fort Peck", to strike out "$40,500" and insert "$45,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 8, after the name "Carson", to strike out "$13,950" and insert "$15,500"; in line 9, after the name "Pyramid Lake", to strike out "$22,500" and insert "$25,000"; and in the same line, after the name "Western Shoshone", to strike out "$24,750" and insert "$27,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 10, after the name "United Pueblos", to strike out "$13,500" and insert "$15,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 11, after the name "Warm Springs", to strike out "$9,000" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 12, after the name "Wind River", to strike out "$18,000" and insert "$20,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 13, after the word "tracts", to strike out "$45,000" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 14, after the word "investigations", to strike out "$225,000" and insert "$250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 15, after the words "In all", to strike out "$743,825" and insert "$1,104,250"; and in line 18, after the word "the" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "Secretary" and insert "Commissioner of Indian Affairs."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 2, after the word "equipment", to insert a semicolon and "private architectural and engineering services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 4, after the word "quarters", to strike out "$113,300" and insert "$1,359,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 13, to insert:

Fort Apache, Ariz.: for the purpose of cooperating with McNary school district, Apache County, Ariz., for the construction and improvement of public-school buildings, for which the Indian Service may furnish plans, $25,000: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any money so appropriated shall be subject to the condition that the schools maintained by said district shall be available to all Indian children of the school district on the same terms as other children of said school district: *Provided further*, That the amount expended on this project shall be recouped by the United States within a period of 30 years, commencing with the date of occupancy of the project, by the acceptance of Indian pupils in this school without cost to the United States; and, in computing the amount of recoupment of the project, interest at 3 percent per annum shall be included on unrecouped balances: *Provided further*, That with the consent of the Tribal Council of the White Mountain Apache Tribe of the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz., the Secretary may set aside tribal land at McNary, Ariz., as a school reserve so long as such land is needed for school purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 17, after the word "utilities", to strike out "$88,000" and insert "$118,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 22, after the figures "$16,000", to insert "quarters, $8,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 24, after the figures "$2,500", to insert "Shiprock dormitories and utilities, $318,600; Toadlena School expansion, $700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 19, after the word "reference", to strike out "$80,000" and insert "$263,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 20, after the words "In all", to strike out "$875,300" and insert "$3,386,800"; and in line 23, after the word "the" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "Secretary" and insert "Commissioner of Indian Affairs."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 7, after "(Public Law 521)", to strike out "$1,700,000" and insert "$5,700,000, to remain available until expended"; and in line 9, after the word "service", to strike out the semicolon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available except on the basis of apportionment among the States containing Indian population in the following manner: One-third in the ratio which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the said States; one-third in the ratio which the Indian population of each State bears to the total Indian population of all the States as shown by the Federal Census of 1940; and one-third in the ratio of Indian road mileage which each State bears to the total mileage of all the said States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 2, after the numerals "1941", to insert "(55 Stat. 207)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous Indian tribal funds," on page 30, line 12, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$213,320" and insert "$278,170."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 15, to insert:

Administration of tribal affairs, Blackfeet Indians, Montana (tribal funds): For general support of Indians and administration of Indian property of the Blackfeet Indians, Montana, including the purchase of land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Blackfeet Indians, $100,000, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the Blackfeet Tribe of Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 8, after the name "Oregon", to strike out "$106,000" and insert "$224,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 18, after the name "Wisconsin", to strike out "$104,418" and insert "$129,500"; and in line 20, after the word "cash", to strike out "grants" and insert "grants; scholarships (not to exceed $1,000)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 22, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$186,027" and insert "$213,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 8, to insert:

Development of Hot Springs enterprise, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Montana (tribal funds): For all expenses necessary for the development of a health resort on the Flathead Indian Reservation at Hot Springs, Mont., including the construction of buildings, and the payment of private architectural and engineering fees, $350,000, to remain available until expended, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 10, after the word "each", to strike out the comma and "except that $1,000 additional may be expended for the purchase of one passenger automobile for the chief of the Choctaw Nation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$6" and insert "$8."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 2, after the name "Wyoming", to strike out "may not exceed $8 per diem and"; and in line 3, after the name "Illinois", to insert "may not exceed."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 31, line 8, and I wish to ask to have the amendment changing the amount to

$224,000 in the item for the Klamath Tribe of Indians go over until tomorrow, until I can have an opportunity to confer with my colleague. I make the request because I am not fully informed as to the facts, and certain representations have been made to me this afternoon by a member of the council of the Klamath Tribe for further consideration of the item. I told him I would not request any modification until I had had an opportunity to confer both with the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs and my colleague from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

I ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this point a financial statement of the affairs of the Klamath Tribe which this representative of the council filed with me this afternoon.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Klamath funds

Treasury balances:	
Proceeds of labor, Klamath Indians, Oregon	$149,803.77
Interest on proceeds of labor, etc	5,828.23
Klamath Indians, Oregon, revolving loan fund	100,335.62
Interest on Klamath Indians, Oregon, revolving loan fund	39,964.71
Klamath Indians, Oregon, capital reserve fund	2,248,472.70
Interest on Klamath Indians, capital reserve fund	311.59
Klamath fund	3,872.21
Interest on Klamath fund	5,743.66
Payment to Indians of Klamath Agency, Oreg., from lands conveyed to California and Oregon	564.05
Interest on payments to Indians of Klamath Agency, Oreg., etc	170.86
Payment to Indians, Klamath Agency, Oreg. (34 Stat. 367-368)	3,486.04
Total	2,558,553.44

I submit for the record that among the above Treasury balances there are funds which cannot be used for administration without special act of Congress, namely:

Klamath Indians, Oregon, revolving loan fund	$100,335.62
Interest on Klamath Indians, Oregon, revolving loan fund	39,964.71
Klamath Indians, Oregon, capital reserve fund	2,248,472.70
Total	2,388,772.33

I submit for the record also, the fact, that out of the above capital reserve fund, $1,125,000 are minor's funds, $1,500 in lieu of allotment. Just imagine the Commissioner of Indian Affairs continuing to spend the interest on children's funds to support the Indian Bureau employees. He is not satisfied with using the interest on the capital reserve fund where the children's funds are deposited, he uses the funds as a Treasury balance to obtain appropriations for Indian Bureau support.

According to Mr. Province's figures we have:

Total Klamath funds	$2,558,553.44
I offer for the RECORD, funds obligated and funds which cannot be used	2,388,772.33
Balance	169,781.11

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment on page 31, line 8, was agreed to be reconsidered, and that the amendment go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 17, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 25, after the word "Interior", to strike out "$21,980" and insert "$22,980."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 2, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

That there is hereby appropriated out of funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California the sum of $10,000, to remain available until expended, to be used to pay attorneys for the said Indians for services or expenses incurred under and in accordance with any contract of employment which may be approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 13, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$220,000" and insert "$304,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 25, after the word "available", to strike out "$151,375" and insert "$326,375"; on page 37, line 2, after the figures "$50,000", to insert "Kiowa Agency (Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians) for loans to veterans at not to exceed $2,500 each upon approval of the tribal council, $50,000"; and in line 6, after the figures "$100,000", to insert "Colorado River, Ariz., $12,000; Hoopa Valley, Calif., $3,000; Colville, Wash., $50,000; Menominee, Wis., $60,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 13, to insert:

The Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War are hereby authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for the use of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, without compensation therefor, the entire Sitka naval base on Japonski Island and the entire Army installations on the adjacent Charcoal and Alice Islands, located in Alaska, including the land, buildings, and utilities, with the drawings pertaining thereto, and all materials and equipment on both installations, and in addition, the said Secretaries and the War Assets Administrator are authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior for the use of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, without compensation therefor, any other surplus materials, supplies, and equipment needed to equip and operate these facilities for school and hospital purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "one hundred" and insert "two hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 8, to insert:

The Bureau of Indian Affairs is hereby authorized to acquire by transfer without exchange of funds (for three years beginning July 1, 1946), from the War Department, the Navy Department, the Department of Agriculture, or the War Assets Administration, equipment, materials, and supplies of all kinds, with an appraised value of not to exceed $6,300,000 from the surplus stores of these agencies, for use in the schools, hospitals, and agencies, or by any operating division of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the United States and Alaska: *Provided*, That the authorization in this paragraph for transfer of surplus property to the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall not be construed to deny to veterans the priority accorded to them in obtaining surplus property under Public Law 375, approved May 3, 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation," on page 42, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "three hundred and eighty" and insert "one thousand one hundred and sixty-eight"; and on page 43, line 3, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "with funds provided for 'General investigations' and the 'Missouri River Basin', and all sums appropriated in this act to such Bureau shall be available for such hire, maintenance, and operation to meet unforeseen emergencies due to fire, flood, or storm."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General offices," on page 44, line 17, after the word "functions", to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$5,500,000"; and on page 45, line 4, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General investigations," on page 45, line 17, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$3,250,000" and insert "$11,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

Mr. HAYDEN. Is this where the Senator from New Hampshire wanted us to stop in the consideration of the bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think we have made fairly good progress, and if there is no further business to be transacted I shall move that the Senate take a recess.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICERS IN THE CLASSIFIED GRADES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5244) to authorize the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair)

laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert L. Ailworth, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia; and

John White Stuart, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William Holroyd McGinnis, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of West Virginia.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States.

RECESS

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 19, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 18 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Paul V. McNutt, of Indiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Philippines.

The following-named persons to be foreign-service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Frederic S. Armstrong, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Williams Beal, of Massachusetts.
William T. Briggs, of Virginia.
Charles C. Carson, of Mississippi.
Wilbur P. Chase, of Ohio.
John H. Clagett, of Kentucky.
Donald E. Emerson, of Maryland.
Hubert F. Ferrell, of Virginia.
Fred L. Hadsel, of Ohio.
Richard M. Hughes, of Ohio.
Thomas M. Judd, of Maryland.
Donald S. King, of the District of Columbia.
William C. Lakeland, of New York.
Jerome R. Lavallee, of Massachusetts.
LeRoy F. Percival, Jr., of Connecticut.
James W. Pratt, of California.
Norman K. Pratt, of Pennsylvania.
Robert J. Redington, of Connecticut.
Miss Rebecca M. Stribling, of California.
John H. Stutesman, Jr., of New Jersey.
Carlin A. Treat, of Illinois.
Norman E. Warner, of Iowa.
Richard R. Wilford, of Virginia.
Robert A. Wilson, of Maryland.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. George B. Harris, of California, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California. (New position.)

IN THE NAVY

I nominate Vice Adm. James L. Kauffman, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 3d day of April 1945.

IN THE MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The following-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the dates stated:

"K" "K" Bigelow, from the 1st day of October 1942.

Dellwyn L. Davis, from the 16th day of July 1943.

Wendell M. Waskom, from the 1st day of August 1943.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Marine Corps in the ranks hereinafter stated:

TO BE CAPTAINS

John F. Elder
Edward R. Hagenah

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Charles L. Granger

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Charles W. Abrahams
Robert E. Adams
Clifford A. Allison
Robert H. Anderson
Thomas E. Archer
George C. Arnold
Roy S. Bachstein
William E. Baird
Frank E. Banks, Jr.
John M. Barclay
Frank W. Bell, Jr.
Carlton E. Betterton
Albert J. Bibee
William Biehl, Jr.
George F. Bloom
Richard D. Borgstadt
John A. Bowler
Cloyce K. Box
Emidio Briganti
Ralph A. Britson
Gordon S. Browne, Jr.
Harold E. Bryant
William W. Bryant
William A. Buell, Jr.
Leo D. Burdon, Jr.
George R. Burke
Loren E. Burnett
Richard H. Bushnell
Raymond J. Butters
William O. Cain, Jr.
John H. Callan
Francis E. Campo
Frank A. Cassiano
Howard J. Connolly
Edward Cook
Charles E. Crew
William E. Culp
Daniel L. Cummings
Paul F. Curtis
Rex A. Deasy
Harold V. Deering
Earl E. Demers
Nicholas J. Dennis
Anthony R. Digiovanni
Jack W. Dindinger
Thomas S. Dlugos
Lloyd B. Dochterman, Jr.
James T. Doswell 2d
Roy M. Ducharm
Harry J. T. Ellzey
Don D. Ezell
George B. Farish
Robert B. Farrelly
Harvey A. Feehan
Gordon I. Feid
James A. Feliton
Francis J. Field
Richard B. Fielder
Don H. Fisher
Billie C. Forrester
John G. Freeman
Anton Froelich
Floyd K. Fulton, Jr.
Alfred F. Garrotto
Baylor P. Gibson, Jr.
George A. Gibson
Wayne R. Glase
Bruce A. Goewey
Albert Good
James E. Graaff
Robert J. Graham
Harold L. Green
Daniel Greene
Robert M. Greener
William N. Gustafson
Clyde P. Guy
Kenneth G. Hadcock
Peter H. Hahn
Sheldon O. Hall
Arnold J. Hammons
John V. Hanes
Robert M. Hanna
Edwin A. Harper
Esmond E. Harper
Charles W. Harris
Howard H. Harris
Lawrence P. Hart
Merlin L. Halsey
Roland B. Heilman
Jonce L. Helms
Richard Hey, Jr.
Harvy C. Hinckel
Paul L. Hitchcock
Harding H. Holloway
John Hoogendam
Howard M. Humphrey
Robert E. Ingram
Manning T. Jannell
James C. Jewell
Winston E. Jewson
Harrel K. Jobe
Ray N. Joens
John W. Johnson
David M. Johnston
David G. Jones
Robert A. Jones
John H. Keith, Jr.
Gordon H. Keller, Jr.
Donald D. Kennedy
Walter J. Klimek
Charles E. Kollmann
Gordon A. Kroodsma
George Kuprash
Henry H. Kyle
Leo G. Lewis, Jr.
Robert D. Limberg
Roy O. Loftis
William J. Longfellow
James A. MacDonald, Jr.
James E. Machin
William G. MacLean, Jr.
Benjamin G. Martin
Reginald G. Martin
Vincent J. Marzelo
Gordon Matthew
William "S" McCaslin, Jr.
George E. McClane
Wade C. McCoy
Edwin J. McCue
James McDaniel
Monroe E. McNiel
John W. McNulty, Jr.
Edward J. McQuillan
Bernard McShane
Ermine L. Meeker
William E. Melby
Ernest I. Melin
Herbert E. Mendenhall
Robert A. Meyer
John B. Michaud
Roland R. Miller
Joseph C. Missar
Frank N. Mitchell
Reynolds A Moody
Kenneth L. Moos
Richard J. Morrisey
Herbert P. Mosca, Jr.
Edward D. Murray
George Nasif
Joseph A. Nelson
Harry E. Nevill
Arthur W. Nichols
Richard F. Noble
John T. Nugent
James B. Oliver, Jr.
Edward J. Orem
Eugene M. Oster
Donald B. Otterson
Eber V. Overby
Eraine M. Patrias
Nathan B. Peevey, Jr.
Edwin Pendrey
Virgil R. Penley
Philip G. Pickett
George W. Piland, Jr.
George R. Pilon
John B. Piper
Arthur A. Poindexter
Richard A. Polen
Elbert F. Price
Robert G. Price
Joseph Pultorak
John E. Quigley
Frederick A. Quint
Thomas A. Redden
Roy L. Reed
Richard G. Rees
Jack R. Rhoades
Clyde R. Roberts
John M. Rosebush
Jules M. Rouse
Ted J. Ryder
Wilfrid P. Rylander
Kenneth Samples
George W. Sarbacher, Jr.
Harold E. Savage
William H. Schomers
Nicholas L. Shields
Clyde B. Shropshire
Lawrence H. Simmon
Carl L. Sitter
James D. Skinner
Warren J. Skvaril
Franklin L. Smith
Lawrence W. Smith, Jr.
Loren R. Smith
Nathan A. Smith
Raymond Smith
Walter E. Sparlihg
James F. Stebbins
Walter C. Stewart, Jr.
David S. Stockbridge
Andrew J. Strohmenger
John N. Swartley
Samuel Taub, Jr.
Charles F. Temple
Galen M. Thomas
Roy H. Thompson
Gerald J. Tice
John J. Tooley
Lud R. Tucker
John E. VanHousen
Edward H. Voorhees
Andrew J. Voyles
Arthur Wagner
Donald E. Watterson
Robert J. Weaver
James H. Webb, Jr.
Holden C. West
Jack D. White
Elmer E. Wiedeman
Charles S. Wilder
Bruce F. Williams
James B. Williams 3d
Thomas E. Willingham
John B. Wilson, Jr.
Edward B. Winston
Robert L. Wood
Robert C. Woten
Theodore R. Yachik
William E. Zimmer
Harold A. Zimmerman

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we rejoice that we are all Thy children—fathers and mothers, the fearless and the fearful, those in light and those in darkness, in affluence and in want, the eager and the discouraged; to all of these Thou hast promised as our day, so shall our strength be. For as many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

Unshadowed and unchanging, preserve our Republic with all its humanities and philanthropies, and keep it free from the corroding influences of frivolities and intemperance. What a land Thou hast given us! So many to care for us and to share our love. O teach us how to use Thy gifts, and in the place of contention and query give restful minds and hearts to all troubled spirits. Take away our distempered imaginings, and as we walk with Thee may we be unmindful of our pain and folly and limi-

tations and breathe the stimulating air of a fellowship which binds us to a high common purpose. Clothe us, we pray Thee, with that deep wisdom that never fails to bear fruits of happiness and good will, and Thine shall be the glory. Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3517. An act to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4160. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 763. An act to provide for the leasing of allotted lands on the Crow Indian Reservation;

S. 1253. An act to enable debtor railroad corporations expeditiously to effectuate reorganizations of their financial structures; to alter or modify their financial obligations; and for other purposes;

S. 1695. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Louis Runs Above;

S. 1893. An act to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein;

S. 1915. An act to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fargo, N. Dak., as the Clarence Theodore Hoverson Memorial Hospital;

S. 1917. An act to enact certain provisions now included in the Naval Appropriation Act, 1946, and for other purposes;

S. 1922. An act to revise and reenact the act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Department of South Carolina to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River, at or near Leneudes Ferry, S. C., approved August 18, 1941;

S. 1965. An act for the relief of the estate of C. Benjamin Stapleton;

S. 1979. An act to eliminate the restriction on the number of lots which may be acquired by settlers in the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.;

S. 1983. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Ind.;

S. 1984. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Wabash River near Mount Vernon, Ind.;

S. 1988. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the heirs of Jesus Gonzales all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain described tract of land within the Carson National Forest, N. Mex.;

S. 2018. An act to facilitate the decentralization of the Veterans' Administration;

S. 2061. An act to provide for sundry matters affecting the armed forces, and for other purposes;

S. 2099. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accept gifts, devises, and bequests in behalf of the general post fund for the use of veterans and for the sale and conveyance of any such property under certain circumstances and the covering of the proceeds thereof into the post fund, and for other purposes;

S. 2100. An act to remove the limitations on the amount of death compensation or pension payable to widows and children of certain deceased veterans;

S. 2107. An act for the relief of certain postal employees;

S. 2122. An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées of financés of members of the armed forces of the United States;

S. 2141. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the creation of an American Battle Monuments Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the service of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1923, as amended, in order to extend the Commission's authority to all areas in which our armed forces have operated during World War II, and for other purposes;

S. 2142. An act to provide for two heads of departments of military science and tactics in the public schools of the District of Columbia;

S. 2200. An act to amend the act approved July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army";

S. 2204. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, by giving insurance benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of that act to survivors of veterans of World War II, and for other purposes;

S. 2210. An act to provide for the return of certain securities to the Philippine Commonwealth government;

S. 2223. An act to establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or chartering of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes;

S. 2235. An act to provide a system of relief for veterans, and dependents of veterans, who served during World War II in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the service of the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of July 26, 1941, of the President of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 2246. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire in fee or otherwise certain lands and rights in land on the island of Guam, and for other purposes;

S. 2247. An act to permit the Secretary of the Navy to delegate the authority to compromise and settle claims against the United States caused by vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, or for towage or salvage services to such vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 2264. An act to amend the act providing for the appointment of court reporters;

S. 2291. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer a vessel to the American Antarctic Association, Inc.;

S. 2292. An act for the relief of the Miami Herald, the Key West Citizen, and the Miami Daily News;

S. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution to establish the Andrew Johnson Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the preservation of the birthplace, at Raleigh, N. C., of Andrew Johnson, seventeenth President of the United States; and

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to amend the act of March 22, 1946, for the purpose of correcting the description of the small parcel of land authorized to be conveyed to the State of Wyoming by such act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5990. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. WILLIS, and Mr. FERGUSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TRADE-MARKS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1654) to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, agree to the conference asked by the Senate and appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BOYKIN, LANHAM, and HARTLEY.

AUTHORIZING ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF PERSONS INDIGENOUS TO INDIA

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LESINSKI, ALLEN of Louisiana, MCGEHEE, MASON, and REES of Kansas.

AUTHORIZING CITY OF ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, TO ISSUE BONDS IN A SUM NOT TO EXCEED $5,000,000

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5112) to authorize the city of Anchorage, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $7,500,000 for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, improving, extending, bettering, repairing, equipping, or acquiring public works of a permanent character, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the city of Anchorage, Alaska, is hereby authorized to issue and sell its bonds in an amount not to exceed $7,500,000, for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, improving, extending, bettering, repairing, equipping, or acquiring public works of permanent character for said city.

SEC. 2. Such public works shall include but not be limited to water facilities, sewers and sewage-disposal facilities, heating plants and distribution facilities, electric and steam power and light plants and distribution facilities, telephone plants and distribution facilities, stadia, gymnasia, auditoria and athletic fields, streets and steet improvements, corporation or equipment yards, city-hall additions, and school buildings.

SEC. 3. Before said bonds shall be issued, a special election shall be ordered by the common council of the city of Anchorage, Alaska, at which election the question of whether such bonds shall be issued, in an amount not exceeding the amount above specified and for the purposes hereinbefore set forth, shall be submitted to the qualified electors of said city of Anchorage, Alaska, whose names appear on the last assessment roll of said city for purposes of municipal taxation. The form of the ballot shall be such that the electors may vote for or against the issuance of bonds for the purposes herein specified up to the amount herein authorized. Not less than 20 days' notice of such election shall be given to the public by posting notices of same in three conspicuous places within the corporate limits of the city of Anchorage, Alaska, one of which shall be on a bulletin board in the public lobby of the United States post office at Anchorage, Alaska. The election notice shall specifically state the amount of bonds proposed to be issued and the purposes for which said bonds are to be issued. The registration of such election, the manner of conducting the same, and the canvass of the returns of such election shall be, as nearly as practicable, in accordance with the requirements of law for general and special elections in said municipality; and such bonds shall be issued for the purposes herein authorized only upon the condition that not less than 51 percent of the votes cast at such election shall be in favor of the issuance of said bonds for such purposes.

SEC. 4. Said bonds shall be authorized by resolution or ordinance of the common council, and may be issued in coupon form, and may be made registrable as to principal alone or as to both principal and interest under such terms and conditions as the common council shall provide. Said bonds shall be dated and shall be in such denomination or denominations, and may mature in such amounts and at such time or times not exceeding 20 years from the date thereof, and may be payable at such place or places as the common council shall determine. The said bonds may be made redeemable, either with or without premium, in the discretion of the common council, and may be sold at public or private sale. Said bonds shall be signed by the mayor and clerk of the city of Anchorage, Alaska, and shall have impressed thereon the official seal of said municipality, and the coupons annexed to said bonds representing interest to be payable thereon shall be signed with the facsimile signatures of said mayor and clerk. Said bonds shall bear such rate or rates of interest as the common council shall determine, not to exceed 5 percent per annum, payable annually or semiannually, and shall be sold for not less than the principal amount thereof and accrued interest, and with or without premium. In the event any of the officers whose signatures or countersignatures appear on said bonds or coupons shall cease to be such officers before delivery of such bonds, said signatures or countersignatures, whether manual or facsimile, shall nevertheless be valid and sufficient for all purposes the same as if said officers had remained in office until such delivery.

SEC. 5. The bonds herein authorized shall be general obligations of the city of Anchorage, Alaska, and the mayor and common council of the city of Anchorage are hereby authorized and directed, in the resolution or ordinance authorizing the issuance of said bonds, to pledge to the payment of the principal and interest thereof the full faith and credit of the city of Anchorage and to obligate the city, if necessary, to levy taxes upon all the taxable property within said city for the payment of the principal and interest of said bonds as and when the same become due and payable, without limitations as to rate or amount.

SEC. 6. In addition to the pledge of the taxing power contained in section 5 hereof, the mayor and common council are hereby authorized in the resolution or ordinance authorizing said bonds, to pledge to the payment of said bonds and the interest thereon the revenues, income, receipts, and profits derived by the city of Anchorage from the ownership, management, and operation by said city of the electric light, power, water, and telephone properties and all additions and betterments to and extensions thereof remaining after the payment of the expenses of operation and maintenance of said properties and reserve for depreciation and prior pledges of such revenues. In the resolution or ordinance authorizing the issuance of said bonds the common council of the city of Anchorage is authorized to covenant with the holders from time to time of the bonds issued hereunder as follows:

(a) That the city will maintain and operate the public-utility properties of the city hereinbefore mentioned in an efficient and economical manner;

(b) That the city will fix, establish, and collect rates, tolls, rents, and other charges for all commodities, services, or facilities, sold, furnished, or supplied by the city through said public-utility properties adequate to provide revenues, income, receipts, and profits sufficient to pay the expenses of operation and maintenance of said properties and to provide reasonable reserves for depreciation and for the payment of the principal of and interest on all bonds payable from such revenues and all other charges and expenses whatsoever which may be or become a charge on such revenues;

(c) That the city will keep all the revenues, income, receipts, and profits arising from the ownership, management, and operations of the public-utility properties by the city in a fund separate and apart from all other funds of the city to be collected, held, and disbursed in such manner as the city may provide in the resolution or ordinance authorizing the issuance of bonds hereunder;

(d) That the city will not thereafter issue any bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness payable from such revenues, except within such limitations as may be prescribed in such resolution or ordinance;

(e) That the city will not thereafter issue any bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness payable from such revenues which would be a prior lien or charge upon said revenues over the bonds issued pursuant to such resolution or ordinance;

(f) That the city will provide a special fund for renewals and replacements to the public-utility properties into which fund the city shall pay sums from the revenues of said properties in such amounts as may be specified in said resolution or ordinance;

(g) That the city will not sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of any or all of said public-utility properties without then or theretofore making provision for the payment of the bonds authorized by this act;

(h) That the city will keep books and accounts with respect to the operation of said public-utility properties in such manner as prescribed by the Federal Power Commission governing municipal licenses and provide for the periodic audit of such books by certified public accountants who shall report on such operations;

(i) That the city will provide for periodic examinations of the public-utility properties of the city by an engineer or firm of engineers who shall report thereon at such times as shall be prescribed in said resolution or ordinance; and

(j) That the city will do and perform such other acts and take such other proceedings as may be necessary to more fully secure the payment of the bonds authorized by said resolution or ordinance as shall be deemed advisable by the common council.

SEC. 7. Upon the sale of any bonds authorized by this act, the city of Anchorage shall provide for the payment of the proceeds thereof into a special fund which shall be used for no other purpose except as specified in this act, and said bonds may be sold all at once or from time to time, and with such rate of interest not exceeding 5 percent per annum, as the common council of the city of Anchorage shall direct.

SEC. 8. The city of Anchorage is hereby authorized to enter into contracts with the United States of America or any agency or instrumentality thereof to obtain a grant or loan of money funds to aid in the construction of water facilities, sewers and sewage-disposal facilities, heating plants and distribution facilities, electric and steam power and light plants and distribution facilities, telephone plants and distribution facilities, stadia, gymnasia, auditoria and athletic fields, streets and street improvements, corporation or equipment yards, city-hall additions, and school buildings, and is further authorized to expend surplus moneys in the treasury of the city from the revenues of said public-utility properties for such purpose.

SEC. 9. The provisions of this act and of any resolution or ordinance authorizing the issuance of bonds hereunder shall constitute a contract with the holders of such bonds from time to time, and the provisions thereof and hereof shall be enforceable by any owner or holder of said bonds by mandamus or by any other appropriate suit, action, or proceeding at law or in equity in any court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 10. This act shall be complete authority for the issuance of the bonds herein authorized, and shall be liberally construed to accomplish its purposes. Any restrictions, limitations, or regulations relative to the issuance of bonds by the city of Anchorage, Alaska, contained in any other act shall not apply to bonds issued under this act, and any act inconsistent herewith shall be deemed modified to conform with the provisions of this act for the purposes of this act only.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a series of amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BARTLETT:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$7,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "stadia, gymnasia, auditoria, and athletic fields."

Page 3, line 22, strike out the words "or private."

Page 8, line 15, after the word "buildings" strike out the comma and insert a period.

Page 8, strike out lines 16, 17, and 18.

Amend the title so as to read: "To authorize the city of Anchorage, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $5,000,000 for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, improving, extending, bettering, repairing,

equipping, or acquiring public works of a permanent character, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADELE NAHAS

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2315) for the relief of Adele Nahas, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$9,082.14" and insert "$10,434.14."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM CLYDE McKINNEY

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3454) for the relief of William Clyde McKinney, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,709.64" and insert "$4,709.64."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENIA LASSILA

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3185) for the relief of the estate of Senia Lassila, deceased, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "to", insert "George Lassila, administrator of."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of George Lassila, administrator of the estate of Senia Lassila."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JAMES PLUMB

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4419) for the relief of Mrs. James Plumb, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$4,511.67" and insert "$4,252.40."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNEST I. WADE AND ALMA WADE

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4997) for the relief of Ernest I. Wade and Alma Wade, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,000" and insert "$3,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DORA FOSTER

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5071) for the relief of Mrs. Dora Foster, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,345" and insert "$5,719."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 307, to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of atomic weapons upon such vessels, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 5 to 9, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 3. The number of combatant vessels, exclusive of those received from foreign governments, which may be employed as targets for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this joint resolution, is limited to 33. The term 'combatant vessels' for purposes of this section is defined as naval vessels of the following categories: Battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines."

Page 2, line 17, strike out "is authorized to" and insert "in his discretion may."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman conferred with his committee and are the minority members of the committee agreeable?

Mr. IZAC. They are, sir.

Mr. MICHENER. Are any of them on the floor? We did not know this matter was coming up, and I want to serve notice now that this is unusual. This is an important bill. It should not be passed unless we know about it.

Mr. IZAC. May I say to the gentleman that he was advised yesterday by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS] the ranking minority member, that this would be brought up as soon as it came from the Senate. It came from the Senate too late yesterday to bring it up at that time, so I am bringing it up today at the specific request of the Navy Department, because they cannot go ahead with the test; they cannot even dispose of the vessels that are to be bombed until this authorization goes through.

Mr. MICHENER. This is the bill that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, on yesterday suggested was proper for consideration?

Mr. IZAC. That is correct, I will say to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICERS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5244) to authorize the employment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. BLOOM, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, and Mr. EATON.

THIRD URGENCY DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6601) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and consider the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the amendments involved here relate either to the Senate or some joint activity or to routine things that have to be provided for before the 1st of July. Is not that the case?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. The amendments are of a minor nature. There are only a few of them. They involve a little over $300,000.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that it is important that this bill become effective at the earliest date. It carries funds for the housing program, for veterans' hospitals, for bringing the remains of members of the armed forces back from abroad, and it carries a very urgent provision for the Treasury Department, which will be out of money July 10. It also carries money for implementing the law increasing the salaries of postal employees. We passed it in the House May 29, but it has just passed the Senate. Because of its urgent nature the committee has agreed to call it up and has directed me to move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, after line 2, insert:

"SENATE"

Page 2, after line 2, insert:

"For payment to Mary Scott Glass, widow of Carter Glass, late a Senator from the State of Virginia, $10,000."

Page 2, after line 2, insert:

"For payment to Musa Harkins Bankhead, widow of John H. Bankhead, late a Senator from the State of Alabama, $10,000."

Page 2, after line 2, insert:

"For the payment of 21 pages for the Senate Chamber, at $5 per day each, for the period July 1, 1946, to December 31, 1946, both dates inclusive, fiscal year 1947, $19,320."

Page 2, after line 2, insert:

"For the employment of an additional assistant chief telephone operator at $2,400 per annum, and seven additional telephone operators at $1,800 per annum each, fiscal year 1947, $15,000."

Page 3, after line 4, insert:

"COMMISSION TO REPRESENT THE UNITED STATES AT THE PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE CEREMONIES

"For travel and other expenses of the Commission created by House Joint Resolution 360, entitled 'Joint resolution to provide for United States participation in the Philippine independence ceremonies on July 4, 1946,' to enable the Commission to make and carry out appropriate plans for United States participation in such ceremonies, in accordance with the provisions of said joint resolution, $30,000, to remain available until July 31, 1946, and to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Commission."

Page 3, after line 10, insert:

"FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

"SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

"Such sums as may be necessary are hereby appropriated for making for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1947 (1) grants to States for assistance to aged needy individuals, needy dependent children, and needy individuals who are blind, as authorized in titles I, IV, and X, respectively, of the Social Security Act approved August 14, 1935, as amended, and (2) grants to States for unemployment compensation administration: *Provided*, That the obligations incurred and expenditures made for each of such purposes under the authority of this appropriation shall be charged to the appropriations therefor in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1947."

Page 6, line 12, after "of" insert "this contract authorization plus."

Page 6, line 25, strike out "project" and insert "projects."

Page 6, after line 25, insert:

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA"

Page 6, after line 25, insert:

"FISCAL SERVICE

"Collector's office: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Collector's office,' including the objects specified for this purpose in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $65,000."

Page 6, after line 25, insert:

"REGULATORY AGENCIES

"Coroner's office: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Coroner's office,' including the objects specified for this purpose in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $5,640."

Page 6, after line 25, insert:

"PUBLIC LIBRARY

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Salaries and expenses, Public Library,' including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $27,500."

Page 6, after line 25, insert:

"FIRE DEPARTMENT

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Salaries and expenses, Fire Department,' including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $47,500."

Page 6, after line 25, insert:

"PUBLIC WELFARE

"Mental Rehabilitation Service

"St. Elizabeths Hospital: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'St. Elizabeths Hospital,' including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $62,100."

Page 6, after line 25, insert:

"PUBLIC WORKS

"Operating expenses, Office of Superintendent of District Buildings: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Operating expenses, Office of Superintendent of District Buildings', including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $1,750."

Page 6, after line 25, insert:

"WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT

"Operating expenses (payable from water fund): For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Operating expenses (payable from water fund)', including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $32,400."

Page 6, after line 25, insert:

"NATIONAL GUARD

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Salaries and expenses, National Guard', including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $968."

Page 6, after line 25, insert:

"DIVISION OF EXPENSES

"The sums appropriated in this act for the District of Columbia, shall, unless otherwise specifically provided, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946."

Page 12, strike out lines 6 to 25, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 201. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

Page 13, line 2, strike out all after "in" down to and including "1946" in line 3, and insert "(1) any regular annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1947, or (2) contained in other than a regular annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1947, and being for such fiscal year, or (3) contained in other than a regular annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1947, and being supplemental to an existing appropriation and for obligation after June 30, 1946, such acts not being laws on July 1, 1946."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the bill, as passed by the House, appropriated a total of $661,520,810.89.

The Senate has amended the bill in three or four relatively minor respects.

It has added a total of $327,178. Of that amount, $54,320 is for Senate expenses, $30,000 is for the expenses of the Commission to represent the United States at the Philippine independence ceremonies, and the balance—$242,858—for additional expenses of the District of Columbia for the current fiscal year, all of which have Budget support.

One other amendment, in accordance with custom when the regular annual bill is late in passing, advances the availability for first quarter 1947 fiscal year obligation of funds for assistance to aged needy individuals, needy independent children, and needy individuals who are blind.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in all Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD and include an editorial from today's Washington Post.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Syracuse Herald-Journal entitled "Farley's True Words."

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Gallup Poll which appeared in the Washington Post last Wednesday as well as other papers of the Nation under the title "Public Backs Cancer Research With Tax Raised Funds."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

BRITISH TO NEGOTIATE 7-YEAR WHEAT PURCHASE AGREEMENT WITH CANADA

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, while Congress is considering a $4,400,000,000 loan to Great Britain, British Food Minister John Strachey and L. J. Thompson and E. G. Hardwood, of the British Ministry of Food are in Ottawa, Canada, for the announced purpose of negotiating a long-term contract for Canadian wheat.

The quantity reported to be under consideration is between 220,000,000 bushels and 350,000,000 bushels annually, depending upon whether Great Britain alone is to be supplied or subagreements are negotiated between Great Britain and France, Belgium, and other European countries. The term of the proposed agreement is said to be either 4, 5, or 7 years. Prices mentioned range between $1 and $1.50 per bushel.

These bilaterial British Empire negotiations will, when completed, effectively close the European market to the United States grain producers. These negotiations are certainly contrary to the so-called long-range international plans upon which the Department of Agriculture is supposed to be working and which contemplate multilateral international understandings with respect to the disposition of surpluses.

The British loan is scheduled for debate here next week. May I suggest that a loan to Britain at this time would mean financing the destruction of our export grain markets. It is about time that the United States Government required guaranties for the protection of our producers before discussing international loans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances in the RECORD, in two to include newspaper articles, and in the other to include quotations.

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some editorials.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some observations on agricultural production in South Dakota.

CERTAIN LEGISLATION NECESSARY BEFORE ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, Congress should not adjourn for the summer before decisive action is completed on the numerous issues which remain unsettled. Nothing can be gained by delays and indecision which are retarding reconversion. Public confidence is being undermined and destroyed because of the lack of unity and unnecessary conflict between economic groups.

All three branches of government in Washington are overwhelmed by confusion. In the executive department, there is no coordination or orderly planning; in the legislative branch, political factors have overshadowed forthright action on essential measures; the Supreme Court has forfeited its dignity because of internal dissension. The Democratic Party has complete control of all three branches, and its leaders cannot evade full responsibility.

Momentous world and domestic issues challenge our Nation, but almost a year after VJ-day we are bogged down in political red tape. Instead of political expediency, we must have the courage to face postwar problems with resolute determination. Congress should reflect the national will to win the peace and should remain in session until national mandates are carried out without delay. No other course can be justified at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address made by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was granted unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a manuscript entitled "Housing Administration Delays." I am advised by the Public Printer that the extension will take four pages at a cost of $240. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted last week by the Nebraska Stock Growers at Omaha.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Henry Hazlitt entitled "Sham War Against Inflation."

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of today by Frank M. Smith.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GORDON (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LATHAM (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper articles.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1946

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 668 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6597) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Flood Control, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, as the reading of this resolution indicates, its adoption would make in order consideration of the flood-control bill. There is nothing unusual about the resolution. I have no requests for time on this side.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side. The rule provides adequate debate. I think we might as well get to the business of the day.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during debate on the flood-control bill I may include certain letters and statements in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6597) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6597, with Mr. CLARK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

On motion by Mr. WHITTINGTON, and by unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the debate is confined to 2 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and one-half by the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is recognized.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 6597, to be cited as the Flood Control Act of 1946, after full and complete hearings which have been published and are available to the Members of Congress, was unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. Was it unanimously reported?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It was, and I so stated.

The report is most informative and contains a description of the projects authorized, all of which have the approval of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army.

The bill is for the authorization of projects to be constructed over a period of years to be followed by appropriations in the discretion of Congress.

An authorization bill is timely now, as the last bill reported by the committee was on March 29, 1944, more than 2 years ago, and that bill became the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944. That act introduced certain modifications in administrative procedure to aid in carrying out the flood-control program, and authorized land-treatment programs by the Department of Agriculture on the watersheds of the streams on which the Department of Agriculture had submitted favorable reports.

RIVERS

The improvement of rivers and protection of valleys are among the most important functions of the Government.

Rivers are nature's contribution to the progress of the people and are among the Nation's most valuable assets. They are the property of the people and should be improved for their benefit. Impediments to navigation must be removed, channels must be deepened; bars must be eliminated; harbors must be kept open. People and property must be protected from overflows.

Rivers have shaped the course of history. They have played a major part in mythology. They figure in fables, legends, and traditions.

The Garden of Eden, according to the Bible, was located in the fertile valley between the rivers Tigris and Euphrates. The Egyptians worshiped the Nile as a goddess and without the Nile there would have been no Egyptian civilization. The Romans cast offerings into the Tiber and worshiped the river that flowed through the Eternal City. The East Indians regard the Ganges as sacred and to bathe in its waters is a part of the religious rites of the people. According to the ancients Sharon ferried the departed souls across the river Styx.

Many legends and poems have been woven around the Rhine in Europe. The Indians of North America called the Mississippi River the Father of Waters and worshipped it as such. Mark Twain would probably never have become famous nor would he have given us the delightful story of Huckleberry Finn if it had not been for his familiarity with the Mississippi River.

John Muir, as a young man, said, "There is nothing more eloquent in nature than a mountain stream."

Henry D. Thoreau delighted in the companionship of rivers. His stories of the Concord and the Merrimac Rivers are not only entertaining but wonderfully revealing. One of the most interesting books of Henry Van Dyke is Little Rivers. There is a charm about the brooks and streams that are "over the hills and far away."

METHODS

The planning and construction of flood-control works was placed in the Corps of Engineers. The principal rivers of the United States have been studied. Reports have been submitted. Levees, flood walls, diversions, and reservoirs have been constructed in the principal river basins. All factors of safety have been utilized. The methods have been tested. No country in the world has made more rapid progress in the control of floods than the United States. The adopted projects are flexible and can be expanded. As new problems arise, new solutions will be found. It is not too much to say that more progress has been made in flood control in the United States in the past 15 years than has been made in the preceding 125 years. There is a reason. The Corps of Engineers are the most capable flood-control engineers in the world. They have garnered a wealth of experience. Their engineering works excel the flood-control works that have been constructed in all ages and in all countries. I should like to say that the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation in the past 40 years have become experts in their work. They are able and accomplished in construction. They are specialists in their field.

ENGINEERS

When we think of flood control, we think of great engineers. The Egyptians constructed levees and reservoirs in the early dawn of history. Levees were constructed to protect the ancient city of Memphis. Dams were built to provide water for the arid lands. The structures built by the engineers of Egypt are the oldest in history. The Great Pyramids, marvels of engineering, were constructed 5,000 years ago: "All things fear time, but time fears the Pyramids."

Engineers have played a conspicuous part in all civilizations. They made marvelous contributions to the civilizations of antiquity. They have left their monuments in the great walls of China and in the aqueducts and highways of the Roman Empire and in systems of canals and reservoirs, in the Middle East.

But the United States leads the world, both ancient and modern, in engineering and in engineering structures. Fort Peck, Grand Coulee, and Boulder Dams each impound larger volumes of water than the far-famed Assuan Dam in the upper stretches of the Nile. The Panama Canal is the greatest artificial waterway ever built by the hand of man. The levees along the lower Mississippi River have required more than 3 times the excavations of the Panama Canal, and they are the most massive structures in the history of mankind.

It is no accident that in World War II many of the outstanding engineering accomplishments, as well as the miracles of advance and supply of the United States armies were achieved by the Army engineers. A long list of high water fighters won distinction in the war theatres. Maj. Gen. R. W. Crawford, president of the Mississippi River Commission, went to Europe in 1942 as the commanding general, Services of Supply in the Middle East. Later he was in charge of the administration of supply and transportation under Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick built the Ledo Road. The present Chief of Engineers, Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, rendered conspicuous and valuable service in Iran and India.

No profession has contributed more to the progress of mankind than engineers, and no engineers in this or any other age have accomplished as much in flood control as the engineers of the United States Army.

RESUMPTION OF IMPROVEMENTS

It was appropriate as we turned from war to peace that flood-control improvements which had been discontinued should be resumed. It is essential for the general welfare that normal public work activities of the Government following the war should be taken up. While flood-control works were discontinued for the duration, major floods continued. Lives were lost and property was destroyed. We sacrificed much in flood control to win the war. The same is true of other public works. Highways deteriorated. Reclamation is essential to the production of food, and improvements on rivers are imperative to protect lives and property. The national program for flood control was practically stopped during and immediately preceding the global war.

PLANS

Although actual construction was eliminated, Congress provided annual appropriations for the preparation of plans for authorized flood-control projects in order

that this important work could be promptly resumed when the Nation returned to peacetime activities, but plans can only be prepared for works that are authorized. Construction plans cannot be prepared until the projects have been authorized. The bill under consideration contains projects on which favorable reports have been submitted since the act of December 22, 1944. It is important that increases in authorizations be made available at this time for the principal river basins where Congress has heretofore approved comprehensive plans and that the additional new projects be authorized.

FLOOD DISASTERS AND BACKLOGS

Flood disasters are recognized as one of the major problems affecting the welfare and security of the entire Nation. The existing authorized backlog of flood control construction, although equivalent to several years of work does not permit the efficient designing and other preparatory work. The estimated costs of completing projects now in place would fully commit all available authorizations. In certain basins the situation is critical. In the Willamette, the Ohio, and the Missouri Basins, there are no uncommitted balances. New projects are needed in these important basins. Flood control has demonstrated its worth. No projects are authorized unless the benefits exceed the costs. Flood control stands on its merits.

There is a difference between approval and authorization. In all of the river basins of the United States for general or national flood control, the total estimated costs of the approved projects, including projects authorized individually, is $3,675,950,000. The total authorizations in all of the general flood-control acts, beginning with the National Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, and ending with the act of December 22, 1944, is $1,680,400,000. It is estimated that the costs of the projects undertaken, including the costs of completed projects, is $1,638,485,500. Thus, authorizations for only approximately $42,000,000 are available for new construction. Thus far the total appropriations for national flood control aggregate $767,972,000. It takes a long time to complete a large dam. It is estimated that it will take substantially 10 years to complete the authorizations heretofore made and recommended in the pending bill.

There are two parts to flood-control authorizations—the national and the Mississippi River and tributaries. I have given the authorizations and the total appropriations for national flood control. The total authorizations for the Mississippi River and tributaries are $864,934,000 while the total appropriations to date aggregate $548,625,000. There are authorizations available of $316,309,000, but it will be kept in mind that $200,000,000 of this is channelization work to increase the channel depth from 9 to 12 feet between Cairo and Baton Rouge authorized in the act of December 22, 1944. It will also be kept in mind that some of the work was authorized at least 10 years ago and that there has been an increase in cost of around 35 percent in construction. The bill language of the authorization for the Mississippi River and tributaries is for a fixed authorization rather than an estimated cost; hence the necessity primarily on account of increased cost of increasing the authorization by $100,000,000 as carried in the bill.

CONSTRUCTION COSTS

The committee has given consideration to the effects of rising costs of construction. The Chief of Engineers, in basing his cost estimates, has consistently used the latest stable prices based upon similar types of work. The costs or estimates will be higher or lower at the time of construction, depending upon prevailing economic conditions. In general, the benefits to accrue are affected similarly by changing price levels. The result is that the cost-to-benefit ratio remains substantially the same. Many projects recommended for authorization in the pending bill will not be built for some years, and it is impossible to foresee the price levels which will obtain at that time.

REVIEWS

It has been the policy of the committee to recognize that changing conditions often make plans obsolete, and to avoid rigidity, discretion is given to the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers to modify plans as may be necessary and desirable. Moreover, reviews of either reported or authorized projects in the light of major subsequent floods will promote safety and such reviews are frequently authorized. These reviews may be authorized in a flood-control bill or by resolution adopted by the Committee on Flood Control.

PUBLIC WORKS

As I have stated, public works are required for the normal functions of the Government. Flood-control improvements are necessary in normal times. But public works should be increased when there is slack in private construction. There should be adequate plans for sound Federal, State, and local works to stimulate employment in periods of depression.

The United States must profit by the depression following the First World War and by the great depression following the crash of 1929. We have in mind the mistakes made to provide in time for unemployment. There must be no repetitions of work relief. There must be no projects where benefits do not exceed the costs. As I have stated, it is imperative that there be an adequate shelf or backlog with adequate plans not only for normal times, but for periods of crises and unemployment. Economic dislocations in at least portions of the country occur annually. It is the part of statesmanship to provide in advance to prevent the distress and unemployment of depressions. Public works should be thoroughly planned. Projects should be sound. Construction should be capable of being expanded and enlarged to stimulate employment in periods of distress.

CAUTION

Materials are now scarce and so is labor. While we must provide for the functioning of the agencies disrupted by war and while the needs for works are great, the taxpayers are entitled to a dollar's worth of efficient construction for every dollar expended. Labor and materials are not only scarce, but they are high. I will not be disturbed if flood-control construction does not reach its stride for the next 12 months. There is ample work for all who want it. The need for employment will be greater in a year or two. The time to expand the program and the time actually to construct for appropriations made will be when there is greater need for employment than today.

POLICY

The planning and construction of flood-control work is the function of the Corps of Engineers. The investigations of watersheds and measures for run-off, water-flow retardation, and soil erosion is for the Department of Agriculture. The experience of the past 10 years shows that the Departments of Agriculture and War work together harmoniously in the development of flood-control plans and that the works proposed by the two departments are complementary.

APPROPRIATIONS

Congress will determine in the future as in the past the amount of the annual appropriations. Budgetary requirements and national safety will be the controlling factors. The progress of carrying out the authorizations will be determined by Congress through control of the amounts appropriated for flood-control works. I repeat, to emphasize, however, that unless projects are authorized, appropriations for construction cannot be made. The committee believes that the enactment of the pending bill is essential for the orderly accomplishment of flood control, based upon worthy and carefully controlled projects. The progress will be controlled by the Congress by the amount of funds annually appropriated.

ANALYSIS

There is a complete analysis, as I have indicated, by sections of the bill in the comprehensive committee report. I must, therefore, content myself with a brief analysis:

Section 1 is the short form of citation of the bill. We are providing what we have heretofore done in practice.

Section 2 continues existing law and restates the policies of local cooperation.

Section 3 provides for relief to the local interests involved in the alteration of railroad bridges and approaches. Other provisions respecting highways are contained in section 12, and respecting highways, railroads, or utilities are contained in section 8, all being recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

Section 4 provides for the utilization of reservoirs as recreational facilities and at nominal rates to Boy Scouts and schools.

Section 5 increases the payments to the States on account of the releasing of lands under testimony which shows that counties are in difficulties on account of the removal of lands from the local tax rolls.

This provision is in line with the provision of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act which provided that fixed percentages of the gross receipts of the TVA beginning

at 10 percent and being reduced annually to 5 percent should be paid to the States whose properties were condemned for the reservoirs and the dams.

Section 6 provides for granting easements and will improve administrative procedure.

Section 7 authorizes the uses of limited amounts of war-surplus properties for use in the construction of dams and will result in a saving to the United States.

Section 8 will reduce costs to the Government as it will give the Chief of Engineers a flexibility in providing for the relocation of highways, railroads, and utilities, and assuring that the provisions are adequate by authorizing adjustments.

Section 9 is the authorization section of the bill to provide for the additional projects recommended by the Chief of Engineers since the approval of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, and to increase the authorizations in the principal river basins of the United States for projects previously approved. The largest authorization is for the Missouri River in the sum of $150,000,000. The additional authorizations are for the Ohio and the Lower Mississippi in the sum of $100,000,000 each with increased authorizations in the upper Mississippi, in the Arkansas, the White, the Willamette, and other river basins and areas, including the Los Angeles area.

Section 10 provides for preliminary examinations and surveys.

Section 11 increases existing authorization from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000 annually for rescue and repairs in emergencies.

Section 12 provides for clearing and snagging.

Section 13 covers emergency bank protection works for highways, bridge approaches, and other public works.

Section 14 authorizes $750,000,000 for appropriations to be made by Congress.

Section 15 approves a modification of the watershed project in western New York under the Department of Agriculture.

Section 16 authorizes a reappropriation of $5,000,000 and an additional $20,000,000 for the prosecution of works to be carried out by the Department of Agriculture in Soil Conservation improvements.

Section 17 authorizes $150,000,000 for the Department of the Interior along the upper Missouri River and its tributaries and carries out provisions of the act of 1944 for the improvement of the Missouri River and tributaries in the upper stretches by the Bureau of Reclamation and in the lower stretches by the Chief of Engineers.

I may add there will be a perfecting amendment to that section offered as a committee amendment. I have thus completed my general statement and analysis of the pending bill. I now yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, taking the Mississippi and Missouri together as one river system, the Columbia in the West is the second largest river system in the United States. In all this authorization I do not find the Columbia or any of its tributaries mentioned except the Willamette River which flows into the Columbia near its mouth at the city of Portland, yet there is one river, the Boise River, that presents us with a very pressing problem.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. On the Columbia River the Bonneville Dam is already constructed. The Grand Coulee Dam is almost completed; the latter project is under the supervision of the Committee on Reclamation and Irrigation, of which the gentleman is a member. We include in this bill only projects that have been favorably reported by the Chief of Engineers to us. I therefore answer the gentleman's question by saying that the project he has in mind was not reported to the committee. We only include in this bill those projects on which favorable reports have been submitted.

In the Flood Control Act of 1944 Congress provided that before the Chief of Engineers can transmit to the Director of the Budget or to the Congress any project it must be submitted to the Governor of the affected State and to interested Federal agencies. I may say to the gentleman that the project in which he is interested and to which he has referred was not reported by the Governor of his State until after the hearings were concluded, and I understand the Interior Department has not to this date submitted its report to the Chief of Engineers. I trust the Interior Department may report on it in time for it to be considered by the committee in the other body.

Mr. WHITE. The Columbia River has many tributaries, the Snake, the Clearwater, the Salmon, and a great number of others.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is a marvelous river; and I will answer the gentleman by saying that in previous authorizations we have reported every project on which the Chief of Engineers has submitted a favorable report, including projects on three tributaries of the Columbia River, in the Flood Control Act of 1944. The Columbia River happens to be one of those rivers on which hundreds of millions of dollars have been authorized by the gentleman's own Committee on Reclamation and Irrigation.

Mr. WHITE. I understand this bill is a flood-control bill brought in by the Committee on Flood Control and is not a reclamation bill at all.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And the gentleman should understand that this bill does not contain any flood-control project unless there is a favorable report submitted by the Chief of Engineers; and I answer the gentleman's question as I have repeatedly answered him, that we have included in previous bills all projects on which favorable reports have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers on the Columbia and its tributaries.

Mr. WHITE. Our reliance, then, must be placed on the War Department and the Board of Army Engineers in the matter of flood control before the Congress can act on it?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And in the gentleman's case it is the Department of Interior now causing the delay. Had the Department sent its report back there would have been action if the Governor and department had made their reports before the hearings closed.

Mr. WHITE. Then we are dependent on the Army engineers, and not the people's own body, the Congress, although our needs in that region have been demonstrated many times.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; I say again that the Governor of Idaho and now the Department of the Interior are responsible for the delay in this project because it was sent to those agencies for review in accordance with the requirements of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. I notice that section 11 authorizes the appropriation of $2,000,000 for rescue work. It is not contemplated by the committee that that shall be to the exclusion of any other money available to any other agency for that type of work, is it?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all. It is purely for emergency purposes. I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I have listened with great interest to the very fine statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi. I served on the Flood Control Committee for 4 years with him and I wanted to take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation and the appreciation of the people in the Mississippi Valley for the wonderful service he has rendered the country in bringing before the Congress the fine comprehensive flood-control programs he has.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes to answer questions.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I appreciate the fact that you here have a long-range program, the thing we have been talking about. I can conceive of no program that will bring greater profits in the long run to the people of this country than this program which this committee has brought before us.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman from Missouri is most gracious and I would be less than human if I did not say that I do appreciate his very kind words.

For two and twenty years I have listened to the proponents and the opponents, to the great engineers of transportation, flood control, and highways on projects in all the parts of our common country. I think I know somewhat of the problems involved.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Under section 10, page 23 of the bill, the Susquehanna River at or in the vicinity of Sidney, N. Y., is to be surveyed. That is just the preliminary survey, as I understand the gentleman?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. Can the gentleman tell me, without going to too much

trouble, if he knows just exactly what that project is?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No, because we have not had a report on it. This is an authorization for an examination and survey.

Mr. KEARNEY. This is just for a survey?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is a splendid town. I happened to have driven through it on one occasion, but I do not recall the difficulties involved.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman knows I have been particularly concerned about the lifting to Government ownership large tracts of land in my district for reservoir purposes and the effect such will have upon the county tax revenues. I introduced a bill some time ago to offset these losses by turning over to the counties a larger percentage of the revenues derived from the leasing of the lands. As I understand, if this bill becomes law, under section 5, 75 percent of all the money received and deposited in the Treasury of the United States during any fiscal year on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States will be turned over to the counties for road and school purposes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is true, whether those reservoirs are located in Mississippi, Arkansas, New Hampshire, Vermont, or other States. The gentleman is correct. The bills which the gentleman and Mr. WHITTEN introduced are responsible for initiation of the increase which is favorably recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman is also aware of my interest in preliminary surveys to be made in connection with Opookta Creek and Potacocowa Creek in my district. If this bill becomes law, these surveys will be made and at a subsequent date the Flood Control Committee will determine what action, if any, will be taken based upon the reports made by the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OUTLAND. I notice on page 21 of the bill there is an authorized project for flood portection along the Salinas River in California. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi how deeply I personally appreciate this item being included in view of the fact the data came in comparatively late. Had the chairman not been willing to make a concession, we might not have had it included.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman just did get under the wire and he is the last representative who did get under the wire. Some others did not, but we will take them up when we get to them.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the committee on the advanced steps that have been taken, as a matter of declared policy, by the Federal Government with reference to the use of areas and facilities. I refer to the committee's report, page 7, wherein you specify that these areas and facilities shall be used for recreation purposes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We are very glad to have the gentleman's comment.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to make one further observation. I call the gentleman's attention to the committee report on Whittier Narrows, about which I have spoken, as the gentleman will recall. I have read the text of the report and of the hearings. I notice on page 491 General Crawford made the statement that the Whittier Narrows project is essential, quoting the general's exact language. I take it, therefore, that the decision of the committee in asking a restudy of the Whittier Narrows project as one of the great units of the Los Angeles flood-control program is without prejudice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. DOYLE. I take it, therefore, that the decision of the committee in asking a restudy before there is any request for appropriation is without any finding or intimation by the committee that it is not essential, referring to the Whittier Narrows project.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The matter is set forth on page 37 of the committee report. We felt under all the circumstances, and the Chief of Engineers advised us that he thought it was right, in view of this authorization having been made some years ago there should be a restudy of the matter as covered on page 37 of the hearings.

Mr. JENNINGS. I wish to say on behalf of my people and this House generally, so far as I might speak for them, that I deeply appreciate the constructive work that the distinguished chairman of this committee has done in bringing in this comprehensive bill that applies to the whole country. I am especially interested in it because it makes provision for a preliminary survey for two projects which are of vital importance to the people of my district.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There are very few congressional districts in the United States where similar provisions have not been made in the pending bill or in previous bills.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. As the Representative of the district in which Los Angeles is located, which has the headwaters of the Los Angeles River, I am delighted that the committee has seen fit to bring in $25,000,000 additional appropriation for this purpose, and I hope the work can go through. I desire to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for his unselfishness with respect to the other parts of the United States.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And I say the same situation that obtains in the Southwest obtains in the Northwest, and this bill provides $35,000,000 for the Willamette River, an important river in the country.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Having served on the Committee on Flood Control with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, I am sure the gentleman knows that I share the views of many Members here who have complimented him on the pending bill as well as the fine report that has been made. I am sure that the citizens of my State of Oklahoma, who are deeply interested in flood control, will also be interested in knowing of the additional flood control surveys to be made of many streams in Oklahoma. The gentleman knows of my great interest in those surveys, like the Washita and its tributaries, Cache and Beaver and their tributaries, and other small streams throughout southwestern Oklahoma.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is correct. I not only know of his interest in the surveys of the watersheds of the rivers and their tributaries, as mentioned by him, but I recall his service years ago on the Committee on Flood Control and I know of his excellent and constructive work on the Committee on Appropriations in behalf of flood control, not only in Oklahoma and adjoining States, but in other sections of the country. The gentleman has always interested himself in promoting constructive measures to protect the lives and property of the people of his district and State.

I think it is fair for me to make the statement to the Members of the House that every person who has ever sought an opportunity to be heard for or against any project in any State or any part of the country has been heard since I have been chairman of the Committee on Flood Control. And I think it is also fair to state—and the members of the committee are entitled to the credit—that every person, of no matter what degree, in the United States who has ever written to the committee or submitted a flood-control matter, without exception, has received response during the years to his inquiries.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Since the distinguished chairman has discussed proposed surveys authorized under this bill, will say there are some people living in Oklahoma who apparently think that merely because a survey has been ordered or is being made that a dam is definitely to be constructed on a certain river or creek. Is it not true that the Committee on Flood Control adheres to the rule of not recommending the authorization of a flood control project unless and until the Army engineers have first made a favorable report on such a project?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have so stated in detail. The Members will keep in mind that after we have run the gauntlet of the district engineer in the field, the division engineer in the region, the River and Harbor Board in Washington, the Chief Engineer, the Director of the Budget, the Governors of the States, the Government agencies, we have still got to

deal with the gentleman's Committee on Appropriations before the project is ever constructed. The gentleman is correct, and I will say that that impression not only obtains in Oklahoma, but in other parts of the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I say this, as far as the gentleman from Oklahoma is concerned, he is tremendously interested in flood-control projects, not only in Oklahoma, but throughout the entire country, and when the gentleman's Committee on Flood Control recommends the authorization of a flood-control project, that the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Appropriations Committee, has almost without exception, gone to bat to secure funds to construct such project.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I appreciate the splendid work the chairman of the committee has done in bringing in this bill. But the chairman will remember that I appeared before his committee on some projects that were affecting some counties bordering on the Wabash River in Illinois. As I understand, this is an authorization based upon reports up to the present time of the Army engineers, but I thought I further understood that a resurvey was to be made trying to meet some of the objections that I raised in my testimony before the committee, the objections being that the flood level would be raised; that by reason of some levees being built on the Indiana side that the flood level would be raised at Mount Carmel, Ill., about 4½ feet, which would make it necessary for certain buildings, for instance, the light and power company there, to be raised 5 or 6 feet.

I also had a number of complaints from farmers on the Illinois side in this same vicinity that the building of project No. 5, I think it is, on the Indiana side, a levee opposite Mount Carmel, would so restrict and narrow the channel as to make this raise of 4½ feet, which would do great damage to farm land and overflow thousands of acres of farm land. Naturally I am very much concerned about that and would like to protect the interests of my people if possible.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is correct. I recall his having brought that matter to the attention of the committee. My recollection is that we have placed an item in section 10 of the bill to permit a restudy of that situation. That item was passed by the committee and the Chief of Engineers concurred in it to enable him to make a restudy and to prevent the very damage of which the gentleman complains. I think it was handled just as I have outlined.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the chairman. Doubtless this bill is going to pass. May I say to the chairman that I shall appreciate his indulgence in the future in any way that he can in order to see that my people are fairly protected, equally with the people on the other side of the river.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Such is always the desire of the committee. We shall be glad to cooperate with the gentleman.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. Can the chairman of the committee tell me how the engineers handle these propositions? The other day they called a hearing in the city of Passaic with reference to the Passaic River flood control. The plan they submitted would flood thousands of acres in my district. I received no notice that there was going to be a hearing and, as far as I know, nobody in the part of the district that was going to be flooded for the benefit of the other county heard a word about it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No hearings such as the gentleman indicates are provided unless the Congress has authorized an examination and survey. My information is that generally as wide publicity is given the matter as possible. If there has been a project authorized along the Passaic River, if the gentleman will hereafter call the office of the Chief of Engineers and ask that he be notified personally, I am sure they will notify him. But there was probably a publication in some paper that the gentleman overlooked.

Mr. KEAN. It probably was in a paper in the other district.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It may have been. I can appreciate what the gentleman says, but the purpose is to give as wide publicity as possible. If there be any hearing, and if those interested have not been given an opportunity to appear, if the gentleman will take the matter up with the office of the Chief of Engineers a subsequent hearing can be held so that his side of the question may be presented. They always desire to hear both sides, and such is the purpose of the committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is familiar, I am sure, with my interest in the problems of lands which are above certain dams which have been built in the Yazoo Basin. I notice with a great deal of pleasure that the committee has made provision to help relieve some of those problems in the increase in the amount of money that will be paid back from land rentals. Also I notice that the committee has increased the authorization to the Department of Agriculture of funds for handling the flood control problems above the dams in these areas. I wonder if the gentleman can give us any information as to whether the Department of Agriculture and the Corps of Engineers have gotten their heads together so that there will be no strip of territory between that which the War Department will handle and the point at which the Department of Agriculture will attempt to meet the problem.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I recall the gentleman's interest. Under the terms of this bill and under existing law we have been assured that the office of the Chief of Engineers is authorized to go along and undertake to remedy the situation about which the gentleman complains. I understand of course that the Soil Conservation Department has that right independently and it is up to them through their recommendations to the committee, of which the gentleman is a member, to ask for appropriations to carry out the soil conservation work.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say I realize it is not a problem in the law but it is a problem of the determination on the part of these two agencies. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As far as the legislation and authorization are concerned, there is no reason why there should not be that determination as well as that cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, in this connection I wish to announce now that I am including with my remarks a copy of a letter from the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, together with a copy of a letter from the Chief of Engineers in response to that letter, and a copy of my letter to the Governor of the Commonwealth with respect to the Rappahannock project. The copies of the letter of the Governor to me as chairman, dated May 17, 1946, the letter of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 23, 1946, and of my letter to the Governor, dated May 24, 1946, follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Richmond, May 17, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON,
Chairman, Flood Control Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE WHITTINGTON: Since submitting my recommendation of April 6, on the proposed Salem Church Dam, Rappahannock River, Va., I am impressed with the seriousness of objections raised by landowners in Culpepper, Fauquier and Orange Counties, concerning the inundation of bottom lands. I am further informed by Mr. B. E. Morriss, of the Virginia State Planning Board who attended the hearing concerning the Salem Church Dam on the Rappahannock River May 2, that your committee would receive and give further consideration to a further statement concerning the views of the State of Virginia.

It appears that if the dam were constructed, as proposed by the Corps of Engineers who have made an exhaustive study of this project, it would very advantageously and economically utilize the water resources in the Rappahannock Basin. It appears also that if the power pool were limited to 220 feet elevation instead of 240 feet, as proposed, the multiple-purpose dam project would still maintain a very satisfactory economic ratio and would be self-liqidating. If this assumption is correct and in view of the objections by landowners, it is recommended that the dam be constructed in conformity with the preliminary design as prepared by the Corps of Engineers but that the authorization limit the power pool to maximum elevation of 220 feet.

This project would give the much desired flood control for Fredericksburg, and would also reduce the hazard of back-flooding in the vicinity of Remington, and I am advised would satisfy the most serious objections that have been raised. It is hoped this recommendation, if favorably considered, will in no way delay the authorization, and I strongly recommend that your committee give careful consideration to limiting the height of the maximum-power pool to the lowest possible elevation that would result in a self-liquidating project.

Sincerely yours,

WM. M. TUCK,
Governor of Virginia.

MAY 23, 1946.

Hon. WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
Chairman, Committee on Flood Control,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE WHITTINGTON: Reference is made to the letter dated May 17, 1946, from the Honorable William M. Tuck, Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, with respect to the proposed Salem Church project on the Rappahannock River, which you handed to me with your request for comment.

In his letter Governor Tuck states that it appears that if the Salem Church Dam were constructed as proposed by the Corps of Engineers it would advantageously and economically utilize the water resources in the Rappahannock River Basin. He further states that it appears also that if the power pool were limited to 220 foot elevation instead of 240 feet as proposed, the multiple-purpose dam would still maintain a very satisfactory economic ratio and would still be self-liquidating. The Governor then recommends that, if his understanding is correct, the Salem Church Dam be constructed in conformity with the preliminary design as prepared by the Corps of Engineers but that the authorization for the project limit the power pool to a maximum elevation of 220 feet.

As stated in the Governor's letter, and in accordance with the usual policy of the Department, the plan recommended in my report provided for the most advantageous and economical utilization of the water resources of the Rappahannock River basin. The lowering of the power pool would decrease the power output of the project considerably with consequent decrease in revenue. However, since the Salem Church project as planned has a high ratio of benefits to costs, the elevation of the power pool could be reduced to some extent without making the project uneconomic, although the benefit to cost ratio would be reduced.

A detailed analysis has not been made of the Salem Church Dam and Reservoir with a maximum power pool at elevation 220 feet above sea level. However, extrapolation from curves prepared in connection with the determination of the power pool elevation recommended in the report indicates that with the power pool at elevation of 220 feet the project would still be economically justified.

My report on the Rappahannock River Basin recommends that the general plan of development outlined in the report of the division and district engineers be adopted as a basis for the future improvement in the Rappahannock River Basin for flood control, navigation and other purposes, and that the Salem Church project be authorized for construction as the initial step generally in accordance with the plans outlined in the district engineer's report and with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable. Authorization of the project in accordance with my recommendation would permit such modifications in the project as circumstances show to be most desirable when the project is being made ready for actual construction.

It is the desire and policy of the Department to take into account not only changed physical conditions, but also the up-to-date views and wishes of the States and other local interests. I may assure you that the Governor's recommendation for a lower power pool will be carefully considered by the Department. Under these circumstances I do not believe it necessary to definitely fix the power pool elevation by legislation.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. WHEELER,
Lieutenant General, Chief of Engineers.

MAY 24, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM M. TUCK,
Governor, Richmond, Va.

DEAR GOVERNOR TUCK: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 17 in behalf of a modification of the Rappahannock River Dam to say that I recall the testimony and the desire of the citizens above the dam that the elevation be reduced to 200 feet. The committee went into this reduction carefully and it was found that the low dam could not be justified. However, upon receipt of your said letter in behalf of a 220 foot elevation I transmitted the same to the Chief of Engineers and I now hand herewith to you a copy of a letter from him to me, dated May 23, 1946, from which you will observe that the Chief of Engineers believes that he can conform to your recommendation as well as a similar recommendation made by Representative HOWARD SMITH. The authorization of the project will be flexible enough to enable the Chief of Engineers to limit the height as suggested.

I am taking the liberty of forwarding a copy of this letter to Representative HOWARD SMITH. It is always a pleasure to give careful consideration to any matter that either you or he bring to my attention.

Very sincerely,

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
Chairman, Committee on Flood Control.

Copy to Hon. HOWARD SMITH, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

I also desire in this connection to insert a statement furnished me by the Chief of Engineers respecting the Dillon Reservoir on the Licking River in Ohio, and this statement follows:

DILLON RESERVOIR, OHIO

Authority: Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938 (part of Ohio Basin plan).

Location: On Licking River about 6 miles upstream from Zanesville, Ohio, where the Licking River empties into the Muskingum River.

Project: Flood control.

Dam: Rolled earth fill dam about 1,280 feet long and 108 feet high; uncontrolled side spillway on left abutment; gate-controlled outlet works on right abutment.

Reservoir:	*Acre-feet*
Flood-control storage	279,000
Conservation storage	15,000
Total storage	294,000
Power: None.	
Costs:	
Dam	$2,567,000
Lands and improvements	1,973,000
Relocations	5,776,000
Total	10,316,000
Lands:	*Acres*
Tillable	7,110
Wooded	1,660
Pasture	1,290
Waste or swamp	180
Urban	160
Total	10,400
Number of residences affected	300
Total population affected	2,500
Economics	
Average annual benefits:	
Flood protection, Licking and Muskingum Rivers	$225,000
Flood protection, Ohio River	273,000
Conservation and recreation	50,000
Water supply and sanitation	48,000
Navigation	4,000
Flood protection, Mississippi River	16,000
Total	616,000
Average annual charges	506,000
Benefit-cost ratio, 1.23.	

	Flood heights		
	Zanesville	McConnelsville	Marietta
Major floods:			
Flood damage stage	28.0	12.5	35.0
March 1913	51.2	33.2	59.9
January 1937	38.9	21.6	55.7

The Dillon Reservoir will reduce flood heights at Zanesville on the Muskingum River 4 feet, McConnelsville on the Muskingum River 5 feet, Marietta on the Ohio River 0.8 foot.

Comparison of alternate plans

	Dillon Reservoir	Multireservoir plan of Licking Valley Protective Association (13 reservoirs)	Modified multireservoir plan (7 reservoirs)
Drainage area controlled—square miles	748.0	170.3	165.1
Total storage capacity—acre-feet	294,000	399,300	98,700
Flood control storage—do	279,000		72,100
Reservoir area inundated—acres	10,400	14,580	4,180
Residences in reservoir area	300	303	125
Reduction in flood heights:			
Zanesville	4.0	1.2	1.2
McConnelsville	5.0	1.3	1.3
Marietta	0.8	0.2	0.2
Total cost	$10,316,000	$28,634,000	$12,631,000
Average annual benefits	$616,000	$174,000	$174,000
Average annual charges	$506,000	$1,404,000	$619,000
Benefit-cost ratio	1.23	0.1	0.3
Cost per acre-foot	$35	$70	$128

A multireservoir system in the Licking Valley would control less than one-fourth of the drainage area controlled by the Dillon Reservoir, would provide only about one-fourth of the flood-control benefits, and would be considerably more expensive to construct and operate. The average annual benefits for a multireservoir plan would be only about one-third of the annual costs and therefore would not be economically justified. The Dillon Reservoir was planned primarily to control floodwaters of the Licking River, which constitute a major threat to the cities of Zanesville and McConnelsville and to other areas in the Muskingum Valley below Zanesville and in the Ohio River below the mouth of the Muskingum River. This major flood threat cannot be removed by the proposed multireservoir plan, and extensive studies made of the Licking Valley show that the proposed Dillon Reservoir is the most feasible and economical plan for control of the floodwaters of that basin.

(a) Sufficient information is not available for a break-down between flood control and

conservation storage for the plan of the Licking Valley Protective Association.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the last remark of our distinguished chairman relative to the Dillon project; especially do I compliment the chairman of the Flood Control Committee on being one of those individuals who is entirely familiar with all projects incorporated in this file. I do not know of any committee before which anyone can appear where one who is chairman is more familiar with the project than the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. I am particularly interested in this bill, H. R. 6597. So far as I am concerned, this is one of the greatest pieces of pork-barrel legislation that has ever been brought before the consideration of Congress. There are very few Members of Congress who do not have a particular interest in this particular bill. I have an interest in this particular bill, and it is the Dillon Dam, but I am somewhat different because I am bitterly opposed to it. May I say to you that the Dillon Reservoir first came before the Congress way back in 1938. The distinguished chairman recently held the hearings very courteously, and General Crawford and the rest of them were very courteous about it. But it appeared before the Congress way back in 1938, apparently when no one seemed to be thinking of flood control. Then a special appropriation was made in 1939. In 1946 we find we are confronted with this bugaboo again. In 1939 Colonel Arthur told us that he did not want this particular legislation, the Dillon Dam, because of the high cost of construction and the high cost of engineering and building material. I leave it to you, Mr. Chairman, whether we have a high cost of construction now in 1946 compared with 1938 and 1939. Just recently we were told that they were going to relocate the B. & O. Railroad in Ohio, which was originally estimated, if I understand correctly, and I am subject to correction, at eight or nine million dollars. If anyone cares to correct me, I certainly stand corrected.

I understand a contract has recently been let for ten or fifteen million. Why the hurry? Recently we allocated about $400,000,000 to what we might term Expediter Wyatt for the construction of new houses—for the construction of new houses, if you please; yet in this particular project you are going to destroy between six and seven hundred new houses. Now, what consistency do we have when we appropriate money to one Federal agency for the destruction of houses of one Federal agency and to the next Federal agency we appropriate money for the construction of houses?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] has expired.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. McGREGOR. I wish I might have an hour, because it would take that time to cover even a portion of the subject.

Now, that is a comparison between the two. You give one agency, the Army engineers, authority to destroy houses—about 700 units—and then you turn around and you give Expediter Wyatt authority to construct new houses to the extent of $400,000,000. Is it any wonder that Congress is in jeopardy? Now, let us be fair with ourselves. I certainly realize what I am up against in opposing this entire bill, because nearly every Member of this Congress has a project in this particular legislation.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished gentleman who is noted for his economy program.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. There are two of us. I am with the gentleman. I am opposed to further authorizations of flood-control measures. May I say this, that the testimony before the War Department Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations was that there is an increase of from 40 to 45 percent in the cost of construction since 1939.

Mr. McGREGOR. I appreciate the gentleman's comments very much.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield, may I say further, not including the rivers and harbors authorization bill which was passed the other day, there are 700 flood-control projects, enumerated in the hearings last March, ready to work. In addition to that, you have rivers and harbors projects and irrigation and reclamation projects, the total cost of the three authorized will be approximately $7,000,000,000, not including the rivers and harbors authorization which we passed the other day or this bill that is before us now.

Mr. McGREGOR. Seven billion dollars is a lot of money. I wonder if you realize how much a billion dollars is. If you and I spent a thousand dollars a day from the time of Christ down to this time, we are going to spend 30 or 35 years yet before we could spend a billion dollars.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. In those hearings the gentleman will find each of the 700 projects for flood control enumerated; the date of the authorization, the original estimate of the cost and the actual cost. The same with the rivers and harbors and irrigation and reclamation projects. They are in the record in the engineer's statement.

Mr. McGREGOR. I appreciate the gentleman's comments very much.

Now, let us be honest and fair about this. Let us forget personal interest and decide each project on its merits in this program. Why? Because I honestly and sincerely believe that we have got to get back to the basic principle of balancing the budget sometime.

Now, let us not keep on spending money. Let us not give Mr. Wilson Wyatt $400,000,000 to construct houses and then give this particular agency several million dollars for tearing down new houses.

I am going to offer this amendment:

No funds under this act shall be allocated unless actual construction shall have been started prior to this date.

Let us be honest about it. I firmly believe that unless actual construction has been begun on these projects it should not be started, particularly at this time when we are hunting critical building material for veterans' housing projects in our districts. Let us give the material to those who need it to build and repair houses rather than go along with the flood control program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Flood Control is to be congratulated on the splendid measure now under consideration. Its illustrious chairman has made many contributions to the long-range program for the development of our country, not the least of which is the present measure. I am quite certain that I express the gratitude of many thousands of the pecple of Lehigh Valley when I say that we are very grateful for the careful consideration you have given our problem.

The proposed project contemplates the construction of a reservoir together with local protection costing in the neighborhood of $12,500,000. The plan recommended by the Army engineers will eliminate the possibility of any damage being done not only by floods of the size of those already experienced but any that conceivably could occur.

The area thus affected lies in the heart of one of the most highly industrialized sections of the country. The Lehigh River is approximately 100 miles long, with railroads extending for some distance along both banks. The floods experienced in the past have not only done tremendous damage to the industries located along the river but have interfered with the operation of the railroads.

In May 1942 a flood caused damage estimated at nearly $15,000,000. This flood seriously affected the operation of the main plant of the Bethlehem Steel Co., at Bethlehem, Pa. The estimated average annual benefits for the project is $589,100, which, of course, does not include the secondary benefits derived through the effect of this project on the Delaware River.

The State of Pennsylvania has made a small appropriation toward the carrying out of the project and the affected subdivisions of the State are prepared to carry out their part in the consummation of the project.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I would regard flood control as a highly desirable objective for a solvent nation which could afford the cost and which could spare the building materials necessary for such projects.

But, Mr. Chairman, the United States of America today meets neither of these criteria.

On the one hand, the propaganda machines of the executive departments are loosening on the country a different kind of flood—a flood of literature pointing out the hazards of inflation and the measures necessary to protect the Nation against inflation's dangers. On the other hand, here comes a bill authorizing three-quarters of a billion dollars of additional deficit spending at a time when solvency of the Treasury is not even in sight. Since deficit spending is of itself inflationary, the two just fail to make sense.

It is perfectly apparent that this bill, H. R. 6597, lacks legitimate justification. The frantic efforts of proponents to the bill to find any sort of justification, legitimate or otherwise, would be comic under normal circumstances. They are tragic under today's circumstances. Please note that a principal justification, and I quote from the report, is that—

> A large backlog of authorized and fully planned projects would also serve as a weapon against potential unemployment.

Could anything be more outlandish than to spend vast sums of Federal money to prevent potential unemployment at a time when pent-up consumer demand, if given half a chance, would give private employment to every person in the country willing and able to work. And is it not outlandish for this bill to propose utilization of vast quantities of concrete, lumber, steel, and sc forth, at the very moment when the Government is spending hundreds of millions of dollars to stimulate production of those same products in order to provide decent housing for returning veterans who cannot obtain housing.

Surely we are in Alice's Wonderland. We run around in circles trying to catch up with ourselves. The only effect of our running is to spill money from our collective pockets and hasten the arrival of uncontrolled monetary inflation.

This bill should be defeated.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, H. R. 6597, is a measure for the construction of many items of public works on rivers and harbors for flood control. While this measure only provides for an authorization for the items contained in the pending legislation, yet every Member of Congress well knows that when an authorization is once made for any item, the next step is to secure an appropriation for the proposed work, and it is usually granted, and the work then proceeds. This is the ordinary and usual procedure in such matters. The authorization is the first step toward the final appropriation, and the confirmation of the project. Only a few days ago we had a river and harbor bill before the House, and that measure provides for a vast number of projects, which, if finally confirmed, will cost the taxpayers of this Nation the sum of almost $600,000,000. This pending measure provides for authorizations only, yet if all of those items are finally approved this measure will cost the taxpayers of this Nation a vast sum of money.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a very bad way in this Nation at this very moment, as we have a staggering debt of approximately $280,000,000,000 before us. That debt must be paid. The huge amount of interest upon our national debt must be paid annually. The only source of our income is from the taxpayers of the Nation, and the taxpayers are almost worn out—they have paid, and they have paid—and their ability to pay is almost exhausted. They are tired, and they are almost stripped threadbare of their earnings and their sustenance. Thus, this bill comes at a very poor time, I am convinced. While many of these items are desirable—and they would be helpful—yet we must approach these projects in the same light that we approach our business dealings in the ordinary affairs of life. We would enjoy having many things in life, but our finances will not permit—therefore, we are required to abandon those things. Those in power in our Government do not approach any of these projects in that light—they simply go on their way spending the taxpayers' money and further encumbering the resources of the Nation. Since the advent of the New Deal that same policy, and that same program, has been followed; and since the last World War ceased, leaving us with a greater debt than any nation has ever faced, those in power continue to spend and spend, without any recess, and thereby increase our national debt, and our personal obligations. That policy, which is entirely endorsed by the New Deal, must be stopped. If that policy is continued, our Nation and our people will be faced with utter bankruptcy and destruction.

Mr. Chairman, while we are discussing these highly important items, recently the question was asked as to what program our Government should follow, and it happened to be my privilege to answer that question. My answer was merely this: Make possible freedom for all of our people, reduce the Federal spending, abolish Federal control and regimentation, respect the rights of the several States, balance the Federal Budget, care for our disabled veterans who have suffered disabilities during the late war, and return to the American way of life. The people only want a chance to go forward and make progress, but they cannot do this if they are hampered by all kinds and types of controls and regimentation by their own Government, and they cannot make progress if and when they are bowed down under the great and heavy burden of taxes—caused by unnecessary and unessential spending of the taxpayers' money for needless things. The people want freedom—they want freedom from high taxes, from controls and regimentation—they want their own Government, under the control of the administration now in power, to reduce the spending, and to balance the Budget, and to keep the Budget balanced. They want business injected into our Government and its operations, just as every American citizen must operate either as an individual or in his business. They want just a little common sense shown, by those in control, in the everyday transactions—they want our Government to proceed upon a businesslike basis.

Mr. Chairman, these are very serious days. Under this proposed measure, those in power seek to secure the authorizations contained in this measure to spend vast sums of money for proposed flood control. Many of the items contained in this measure fall entirely in the so-called pork barrel designation; while others may have some merit, yet the fact is not dimmed that we can get along for a little while, at least, without them. These items were not proposed when our debt was very insignificant—they were not proposed before the late war—but now, when we are in strained financial straits, this needless measure is proposed—and I fear that these needless projects will be approved, and the taxpayers will find themselves engulfed in a huge debt in addition to our already tremendous indebtedness, which will have to be paid throughout the years to come. All of the people will have their share of it to pay. Our returned and returning veterans will have to pay their portion of it—our laboring men and women, our farmers, our merchants, every class will have to make their contrubution to this very large increase to our existing national debt. When we face the facts I wonder how long this policy will be continued by the President and his administration and by those who speak for the President? How long will the people be able to continue to submit to Government control and regimentation and submit to the utter destruction of their businesses, and at the same time be called upon to pay the highest taxes that any people have been called upon to pay? At this very moment, because of the bungling of agencies of government, the people can hardly obtain a loaf of bread, or a piece of meat, or a sack of flour. They cannot secure lumber which is needed for repairs or construction, and they can see afar the flourishing black markets in full operation, all continuing, and all largely caused by some act of our Government under this administration.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we are in a frightful situation and things are growing worse each day. We will not secure any relief unless and until the President and his assistants about face and take a new and a different course. They must realize that this is America and the people demand that they live under the American way of life. They want freedom and they demand freedom, and they want economy and they demand economy in our Government. The people want to save our Nation, and they have given their all to that end, but they cannot do this job alone. They must have the aid of the President and every agency and department of our Government, and they must have the aid of this administration now in power. The people cannot save our Nation alone.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor today to ask your support of section 15 of this bill. I have lived in the district known as the Buffalo watershed all my life; and, while the survey is very good and complete, it only covers recent years. I can remember the floods we used to have when I was a boy, and while they did a great deal of damage to the four hundred and fifty some-odd square miles in that district, we as boys used to look for them, as we had a lot of fun. In those days we in the outskirts of the city had wooden sidewalks and picket fences—sidewalks for rafts—fence pickets to keep in the current. Gentlemen, we did not realize the damage done by these floods, and in later years I used to drive along some of our highways and see where these high waters and floods swept away acres of the low farm lands. I know from my own observation over a period of years where there has been a loss of many hundreds of acres of good land. I could go on and point out many specific cases in this area. Section 15, however, does not take in any particular case but it is for the good of this whole area in general consisting of about 450 square miles, from the highlands down to the very harbor of the city of Buffalo, on the Buffalo River, where most of this silt is distributed in the channels of navigation where the Government does the dredging. They dredge something like 187,000 cubic yards annually. This project has been approved by the Soil Erosion Branch of the AAA and will be a saving over a period of years both to the farmers, to industry, and to the Government.

I would like to present for your consideration first the problem of sedimentation in Buffalo Harbor, which the proposed stream bank protection work is designed to alleviate. I quote from page 10 of the survey of Buffalo Creek watershed prepared by the Department of Agriculture and printed as House Document No. 574, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session:

SEDIMENTATION DAMAGES

Deposition of sediment in Buffalo Harbor is a major flood problem of the watershed. During periods of high water immense quantities of sediment are brought down by the streams and deposited in the harbor. This sedimentation has reduced the harbor depth so rapidly that it has become necessary to carry out extensive dredging operations every year.

The amount of material dredged from Buffalo River and ship canal annually averages 187,300 cubic yards. Sediment carried by Buffalo Creek also damages machinery of at least four concerns utilizing water from the stream for industrial purposes.

In addition to the above sedimentation damage in the harbor, the survey indicates that in numerous places rapid bank erosion is destroying highly valuable agricultural bottom lands. It is estimated in the report that approximately 60 acres of such land over the whole watershed are damaged or destroyed each year. I quote again from pages 15 and 16 of the same report:

A systematic survey of every fifth mile of the stream channels showed that stream bank erosion dumps more than 600,000 cubic yards of material annually into the main stream channels. Approximately 389,000 cubic yards are coarser materials which are deposited in the stream channels, thus reducing their capacity and increasing the frequency of flood in the bottom lands. The remaining 211,000 cubic yards of sediment pass into Buffalo Harbor, where much of it is deposited.

* * * The stream-bank survey demonstrated that stream-bank erosion is the main source of sediment. After careful consideration of all the information obtained, it appeared reasonable to estimate that about 80 percent of the material deposited in Buffalo Harbor comes from bank erosion.

I would like to discuss with you now the nature of this bank erosion and some of the methods which may be used in effecting its control:

The streams of the Buffalo Creek system are exceptionally steep. They are flattest in their lowest reaches, but even here have a fall of more than 14 feet per mile. The stream gradients increase as the headwaters are approached, some of the slopes having a maximum fall in excess of 200 feet per mile.

The stream slopes and the nature of the stream beds combine to promote bank erosion. The gradients of the streams are fixed, for all practical purposes, by numerous rock ledges. The excess energy of the fast-moving streams thus cannot be dissipated in entrenchment of the channels, and most of this energy finds an outlet in cutting into the banks and dislodging material.

Bank erosion and meandering will continue as long as the flowing water is able to cut into the banks of the stream channels. The process can be stopped by reducing the erodibility of the banks, by providing them with a covering which the flowing water cannot remove. Such covers may be either inert, like stone riprap, or living, like willows and other vegetation. It is feasible to use either or both types of protection for stream banks in the Buffalo Creek watershed.

To control bank erosion effectively on the streams of the Buffalo Creek system, a large proportion of the total bank length would have to be treated. The survey of bank erosion in the watershed indicates that bank erosion in the Buffalo Creek watershed can be effectively controlled by a combination of heavy rock riprap on the lower portions of the banks and the planting of tenacious shrubby vegetation on the upper parts. Durable limestone is available at quarries within the watershed for riprapping of the banks below the elevation of average high water. The following is quoted from page 34 of the same report:

EFFECT ON DREDGING

It is assumed that the cost of dredging varies directly with the quantity of material removed up to the point where the quantity is reduced to the extent that the costs of mobilizing equipment and providing engineering services would be disproportionate compared with the cost of the actual dredging. The stabilization of the stream banks of Buffalo and Cazenovia Creeks would reduce the quantity of material to be dredged by 67.4 percent of its present volume. If this reduction is accomplished in addition to the reduction of 12.3 percent estimated to accrue to the farm-land program the unit cost of the removal of the material will probably increase by about 10 percent.

EFFECT ON DAMAGES TO INDUSTRIAL MACHINERY

It is estimated that damages to industrial machinery would be reduced as follows by the stream-bank stabilization work:

Tributary:	*Reductions* *Percent*
Cayuga Creek	4.6
Buffalo and Cazenovia Creeks	67.4

EFFECT ON LAND DESTRUCTION BY BANK EROSION

The plan for stream-bank stabilization calls for complete treatment of unstabilized banks of the streams and it may safely be assumed that the destruction of agricultural lands by bank erosion would be practically eliminated. The benefits arising from this will, therefore, equal the damages now occurring.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman's keen interest in the project to which he has referred and I cannot help but believe that the House will want to lend its support to this very worth-while improvement. I shall certainly vote for it myself.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the citizens of Calhoun, Pike, and Adams Counties in Illinois are indeed pleased today knowing that the Sny Island levee and drainage district flood-control project is included on page 17 of the authorization in H. R. 6597.

Over 75 years ago the farmers then living in this area organized and built at their own expense levees to protect them from Mississippi floods. They were protecting some of the most fertile land in Illinois as well as their homes.

After these levees were built and, as time went on, improved, again at their own expense, these landowners produced bountiful crops and prospered. The area consists of approximately 110,000 acres and is probably the largest drainage district above Memphis on the Mississippi River.

With the construction of the navigation dam at Cap aus Gris in the late 1930's, the situation of this area began to change. This being a gravity district and containing no pumps to dispose of the water, the Mississippi when at flood stage would flow contrary to gravity and inundate their land. At the time of the dam construction these Illinois citizens were promised by the Federal Government, and it was distinctly understood, that the water effect upon the district would be studied over a 5-year period and that the inhabitants should have drainage facilities comparable with those prevailing before the dams were built.

For the past 3 years, while other rich farm lands produced abundantly, this area has been flooded and property damaged. The United States Engineers have in the past year met with these citizens and outlined their plan, thereby living up to their promise. The citizens affected have approved by an overwhelming majority and agreed to the local contribution as outlined by the engineers. Governor Green, of Illinois,

approved as required by law almost immediately due to a previous study. The board of review engineers has approved. The House Flood Control Committee added their approval and included the project in this authorization. I sincerely hope that it will now pass the Congress.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in three items that appear in this flood-control bill, H. R. 6597.

On page 18, there is the following item:

The local flood-protection works at Olean, N. Y., on Allegheny River, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 12, 1946, at an estimated cost of $2,282,400.

There is also the next item:

The local flood-protection works at Portville, N. Y., on Allegheny River, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 12, 1946, at an estimated cost of $1,281,500.

And the third item:

The local flood-protection works at Allegany, N. Y., on the Alleghany River, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report, dated April 12, 1946, at an estimated cost of $388,800.

Mr. Chairman, in 1942 there was a terrific flood swept down through the city of Olean, N. Y., a beautiful city of 21,506 population, destroying innumerable homes and industries and inundating many beautiful portions of the city and inflicting great damage. These floods have been recurring from time to time, with the result that the city is always faced with the possibility of a very dangerous flood. Many lives have been lost.

Government surveys have been made of this situation by the Army engineers and they have come to the conclusion that the city of Olean should be adequately protected.

Just south of Olean there is a beautiful village in New York State called Portville. It is one of the most beautiful villages to be found anywhere, I think, in the State. The library there is not surpassed by any library in any town of any comparable size with which I am acquainted. Many people contributed rare books to the library from all parts of the world. They had great art treasures in there. Well, this flood of 1942 came along and swept down through that village. They had to send motorboats from Buffalo to assist the people. The railroad tracks, of course, were inundated. There were hills back of the village of Portville, and as many as could left their homes downtown and went up there. Many of the people were taken out from the second story of their homes. Many crept out on the veranda roof, and from there were put into motorboats. The loss there was something terrific. That occurs from time to time, whenever there is a flood.

Here recently, just within a month or so, there was another flash flood that brought recollections of that disastrous flood in 1942. The water was rising so fast that the people moved everything that they could move back onto the high lands, thinking perhaps they were going to have the same disastrous flood that they had in 1942. It was a terrible sight after that flood of 1942. I drove up through there. I went through the houses, where I found beautiful furniture destroyed as well as other equipment. The cellars, of course, were filled with water. The citizens had to make a desperate fight all over that area to prevent the breaking out of pestilence of one form or another which usually follows a flood. The beautiful books in that library were spread out on the lawn. They were trying to dry them out in the sun and, of course, books an inch thick, had become 3 to 4 inches thick. They were practically ruined. There was no chance to salvage many of those fine books nor some of the fine works of art.

I remember, too, their school. They had a beautiful modern school there. That was flooded. It even destroyed the band instruments of the excellent school band.

I only mention these things because disasters, as they are repeated year after year, run into millions and millions of dollars, and with this appropriation here much of that, I hope, can be prevented.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to substantiate what the gentleman has said. I also visited that area in 1942 and saw the results of that devastating flood. Just within the past several weeks that entire area has been again visited by flood, and in one community alone, in the city of Bradford, the losses are estimated at approximately a million dollars. That is just in that one town.

I want to support the position of the distinguished gentleman from New York that some relief should be afforded the people in that area from these devastating, recurring floods that are periodically visited upon the communities. I think it is a mighty fine project and should receive the wholehearted support of the House.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his observation. I appreciate his contribution.

There is the village of Allegany, not very far from Olean. Contiguous to the village of Allegany is one of the finest universities in western New York—St. Bonaventure. There, again, we had a library, filled with books and wonderful works of art brought from all parts of the world. They have students there from all parts of the world. It is a splendid institution. I made inquiry of the Army to find out if the flood-control projects provided for in this bill for the village of Allegany would protect this university.

Of course, this project will not keep the water from coming out on the campus, but War Department engineers assured me that there is no danger, as far as the past history of local floods is concerned, of this water rising high enough to damage the college buildings. With that reassurance, I think we ought to be satisfied perhaps with this item as it now appears in the bill.

Sometimes people say, "Why do these people, when they know there are these recurring floods, continue to live in an area where they are likely to be flooded and perhaps drowned?" The great attachment on the part of people to their home town or the village where they were born, where they were brought up, where their people lived, is a national stabilizing influence. I remember one time many years ago I was in Johnstown, Pa. It was, of course, many years after the Johnstown flood—many years. I became acquainted with a very successful businessman there. He wanted to show me the town.

Johnstown, Pa., is located in a valley, as you all know. He took me up on the heights where I could look down on the city. As we stood there, his eyes became moist and he said, "Isn't that a beautiful city?" I said, "Yes, sir; it certainly is." He pointed out the parks and the public buildings. He was thoroughly proud of the town. He said, "Do you know, I am the only surviving member of a large family. When that Johnstown flood swept down through this valley it carried away all of my relations—father, mother, brothers, and sisters. There were others situated in a similar way."

Finally, he pointed up to a little cemetery and said, "I suppose all of my people are buried in that little cemetery." He said, "You know, after that flood there were three of us little orphans that sat down and debated whether or not we would go to Harrisburg or Pittsburgh and become bootblacks in order to get started again and get some food to eat. We finally said, 'Well, father and mother lived here. This is where we played. Let us stay here.'" He said, "We stayed here half-starved and hungry and we battled it out. I own that big city block there. I helped build these parks. There has not been a day of my life since that flood that I have not tried to contribute something to the betterment of this city."

That is the spirit of these communities when they are wrecked by flood or fire. One of the saddest, one of the most tragic things in the world is for people to be forced out of their homes and into another environment. The spirit that makes America great today is that the people love their homes and are willing to battle to improve the town in which they live. So I believe that this appropriation is fully justified and these people should be protected from these floods and be able to maintain their homes and all the things they love in the community where they live.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I might say that this project concerns Olean, Portville, and Allegany, the upper stretches of the Allegheny River, but these flood-control works will be a contribution to flood control in the Allegheny Valley and will help the situation at Pittsburgh and in the Ohio Valley.

Mr. REED of New York. The whole length of the Allegheny River and down through Pittsburgh and below. I am glad the gentleman brought out that point.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRIFFITHS].

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, because a few months ago a little statement was made on the Dillon Dam I should like to make one myself, because the Dillon Dam happens to be situated in my district practically entirely.

It is not very easy for any Member of Congress, I know, to know that he has to have three villages in his district moved because of a dam. I went into it thoroughly with the people who protested that live in those villages. They submitted other plans. We had the Army engineers go into the matter, and they decided those plans were not feasible, that the present plans were the only way in reason in which it could be controlled. It is true that I have three pretty good-sized villages that will have to be moved.

In regard to the housing situation, let us be fair about that. The engineers stated it was not necessary to move most of these until 1949. They would not have to be destroyed. In fact, the majority of them, practically all of them, will be moved without even disturbing the contents of the homes.

This dam will add materially to the protection of Zanesville, Malta, McConnellsville, and Marietta, Ohio. If you people ever lived along a dam and saw your entire business district flooded so that you could get in a boat and row across the top of the trolley wire, then you would realize how much we are interested in flood prevention. I certainly hope, since this dam was provided for in 1939, that any amendment based on the theory that because it was not started before the dam should never be started will be defeated. I think that is very fallacious reasoning and I certainly hope that amendment when offered will not be accepted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFITHS. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think it is fair to say that the dam under consideration is the last of probably 13 dams. Thirteen dams on the Muskingum River and its tributaries were constructed under the original plan proposed by the conservancy district in Ohio. I know of no river and the tributaries of no river that have been more generously treated. I know of no river and its tributaries where more dams have been constructed under the Flood Control Act than on the Muskingum River. In deference to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], we heard witness after witness. I think it is fair to say that the proposed substitute of smaller dams, according to the testimony in the hearings and according to the report of the Chief of Engineers, shows that more property would be condemned, more land would be condemned, more homes would be condemned, and it would result in less benefits than the dam that is under consideration. Those are the results of the substitution of smaller dams advocated by those who oppose the large dam.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. Can the gentleman give us any reason why it is necessary to construct this dam at this time when it will destroy approximately 750 homes while at the same time we are giving Wilson Wyatt $400,000,000 to construct homes?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I answered the gentleman's question by saying that the dam to which he refers was authorized in 1938. There was a protest before the Committee on Appropriations. The place to file a protest about the actual construction is before the Committee on Appropriations, who considered the matter last December and again this year and made the appropriations. This is not an appropriation bill. This is an authorization bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am delighted to yield, sir, but I do not have a thing on earth to do with Wilson Wyatt, and I opposed housing subsidies.

Mr. McGREGOR. Then the gentleman is hiding behind the idea that because it is something that happened in the past we cannot start to correct it now; is that it?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No, no; I do not hide behind anything.

Mr. McGREGOR. I know you do not.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I always speak out in the open and say what I think. I have tried to answer the gentleman's question fairly.

Mr. McGREGOR. I know you have, sir.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do want to say on behalf of myself as a member of the Committee on Flood Control that of all the committees with which I have been associated, our distinguished chairman is most courteous and most helpful. He has not tried to hide behind anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. If any protest came up, he was perfectly willing to go into such matters and we went into them even after the hearings were concluded. As I said before, anybody who has the idea that 700 homes are going to be destroyed either has not read the report of the engineers or is barking up a tree.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee for a little explanation concerning the item of $125,000,000 on page 18. The gentleman is one of the most erudite gentlemen in the House and he knows more about flood-control projects than most any man in Congress. I refer to Burr Oak Dam, which is to be located in Ohio on the headwaters of the Hocking River. As I understand it, this Congress has heretofore authorized the construction of the project and has indicated that the cost on the part of the Government will be about $560,000. Of course, the project has not been commenced and the State of Ohio is about to make arrangements to come forward with the proper matching, as provided in the original understanding.

I should like to ask whether that $125,000,000 has any application to that situation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have anticipated the gentleman's question. I stated that I was as anxious to protect the taxpayers as anybody in the country, and I was careful to state the total authorizations as distinguished from the total approved projects. I stated that it would require the appropriation of all of the authorizations heretofore made for the Ohio River and its tributaries to complete the projects now under way and the projects that have been initiated, and that the Ohio River Basin was one of the large basins in the United States where there are no funds available for new projects.

To answer the gentleman specifically, the project to which he refers, having been previously authorized, could not be constructed without additional authorization, and this $125,000,000 will provide for additional authorizations, and they will be constructed in the order and under the priorities agreed upon by the local interests and the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand it, if and when the Army engineers have made all the surveys with reference to the Burr Oak Dam, then, if they would put that project on the list and go before the Appropriations Committee and ask for an appropriation, when we pass this bill all the necessary legislation will have been passed for the Appropriations Committee to act?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly so. In the Ohio River Valley from Olean to Cairo—I am not talking about approvals, but all authorizations will be exhausted in the completion of projects that have been put under way and are now in process of construction, and that to provide for appropriations for any project, including the project which the gentleman speaks of as having been previously authorized, this authorization of $125,000,000 is essential.

Mr. JENKINS. The Governor of Ohio is calling into extra session the legislature of that State and one of the propositions he expects to put in his message calling the legislators into special session is the construction of the Burr Oak Dam. I have told the Governor that I think with the previous authorization already made and with the authorization we will make here today, that the Army engineers will be ready to build that project when they have the plans completed, which will be in a short time. I, therefore, think that the Governor of Ohio can safely instruct his legislature to make the necessary preparations to go forward with securing the State's part of the money necessary for the construction of that project.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think the gentleman is correct. Where communities are willing to cooperate, the projects

have been constructed more expeditiously than elsewhere.

Mr. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for his information.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I have been rather concerned about this bill, and as indicated in my questioning of the chairman while he was speaking, it is because I fear the construction of certain levees on the Indiana side, opposite the district I represent, may work a hardship and cause the destruction of considerable property and cause some of the people on the Illinois side great inconvenience. I wanted to go along with this bill, on the belief—and I do have the belief and I know that the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], will do everything within his power to see that justice is done—if and when this bill is passed, the result of the passage of this bill will eventually bring flood construction work into progress. I am not sure at the present time whether I can vote for the bill. Perhaps the debate will help me make up my mind before it becomes necessary for me to cast my vote.

As I stated before, the floodwaters on the river at Mount Vernon, Ill., would be raised some 5½ feet. Restricting the channel at that point by the building of these dams on the Indiana side will probably flood a good many thousand acres of fertile productive land on the Illinois side and cause the power plant serving a city of 10,000 people at Mount Carmel to be raised at great expense. I have had the matter up with the Government and I am in doubt whether the Government will provide financial aid to cover the cost when it becomes necessary to elevate this power plant. I know that in the past, because of flood-control districts raising their levee heights, considerable damage has been done the people on the Illinois side. For that reason I look with considerable questioning on whether or not strictly from a local point of view it will be beneficial or whether it will not be destructive to the people on the Illinois side. For that reason at the present time I withhold my judgment. I hope that if this bill passes—and it is apparent that it is going to pass—that the Army engineers will make the resurvey they promised to make in order that justice may be done to the people on the Illinois side as well as the Indiana side.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have no desire to influence the gentleman's judgment, but I remind him that three of these projects are located in the State of Illinois. I do not know of course whether they are located in the gentleman's district. I may say also that these projects are largely revisions of projects adopted in 1936.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 6597, proposes to continue the flood-control program which the Committee on Flood Control has been sponsoring so well during the last few years. The purpose of the bill is to create authorizations so that the program can go forward in an orderly fashion. I am particularly interested in the authorizations proposed herein for the Missouri River Basin. The existing authorizations will be exhausted by the completion of the projects presently outlined and on which work has been started and funds committed. The bill is necessary if this program for establishing flood control in an area covering one-sixth of the entire United States is to go forward.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am glad to have the gentleman make that statement, and in order that there may be no misunderstanding about the amounts heretofore authorized, I repeat what I have previously stated in my general remarks on this bill, that while there are projects approved aggregating $3,675,958,000, and I have them itemized, the authorizations for appropriations aggregate $1,680,400,000, and the total cost of completing the projects heretofore begun and now under construction is approximately $1,638,485,000. So from a national viewpoint there remains an authorization of only $42,000,000 for new projects.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think it is well to have that statement by the chairman, who, in my opinion, is the best qualified man in the country to speak with knowledge on the subject. He knows what projects have been approved, what their completion costs are, and what authorizations for appropriations have been made. The figures he cited, I understand, relate to all projects and are not limited to the projects in the Missouri Basin in which I had expressed special interest.

The establishment of the cash authorizations is very important for proper consideration of appropriation requests by the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the War Department which handles the so-called civil functions bill. In that committee we are always up against the question of whether or not the appropriations that are requested through the Bureau of the Budget are in excess of existing authorizations. I hope the gentleman will place in the RECORD the itemized list to which he has referred. Such a list would be convenient for reference and we desire to have the record perfectly clear so that when we report a bill carrying actual appropriations it will not be subject to a point of order on the ground of being in excess of existing authorizations for some project or projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished chairman of the Flood Control Committee that I am truly appreciative of one thing that happened last year in connection with this bill? There was at that time a flood hazard in the State of Arizona at Holbrook, on the Little Colorado, which had been examined, surveyed properly by the Army engineers, and their report was complete before the bill was brought to the House; however, the entire survey was not completed, as there were some other reports yet due. After the bill went to the Senate those reports were completed and the item was taken care of in the other body, the chairman giving support in conference. It means that a flood-control hazard has been looked after so far as the legislative part of it is concerned and the way cleared for construction.

Mr. Chairman, again I want to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. I understand that certain flood-control surveys have been completed by the Army engineers along and in the watershed of the Gila River in Arizona, especially one concerning the area near Tucson, another on the upper Gila, and still a third survey on the Bill Williams River in Arizona suggesting the building of a dam on the Alamo site. These surveys, so far as the Army engineers are concerned, have been completed, but the entire requirement for each has not been met. If these surveys or any one of them, can be completed and the recommendations can be submitted, may I ask the chairman of the committee whether there is a possibility of getting one or more of them in the bill in the other body?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will answer the gentleman's question as I have answered others of the same character. If the Department of the Interior, the governor of the State and the agencies agree, and it is submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, I know of no reason why it should not be included in the other body on recommendation of the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman.

I am calling attention to this matter, hoping again this year that it may be possible to hurry up the necessary additional reports on one or more of these Arizona projects and thus perhaps get authorization without the lapse of another year of time. I cannot say surely that any of the flood control provisions called for in the present uncompleted reports are quite so serious as last year, involving jeopardy of human life to such a degree as did the one at Holbrook, Ariz., which was incorporated in the bill last year. However, all of these in Arizona now do involve great risk to life and property and do call for early action. For that reason, I hope that the Senators may be able to add one or more of them to this authorization bill before it goes to the President's desk.

I understand that the Army engineers have finished their report on a project near Tucson, Ariz., in which some very bad floods have recently occurred. I

distinctly recall that my colleague now decreased, Congressman Buell Snyder, of Pennsylvania, told me that on a visit to Tucson 2 or 3 years ago he was caught in a flood on the outskirts of that city and had some risk of losing his life. I remember that it was reported that considerable property damage was done by that flood. I think without doubt there is great urgency with regard to this construction which the Army engineers recommend. Since this does not involve irrigation, it may be that the corollary report called for in so many completed reports will in this case either be unnecessary or in the meantime quickly obtained.

I am not quite sure about the engineers' reports on other portions of the Gila watershed, for it has been surveyed throughout, but I do know that a very destructive flood did great damage to Duncan, Ariz., only a few years ago. I also know that that growing Arizona city has been several times greatly harmed by floods on the Gila River. Here again is a case where dams and other control work which I believe the Army engineers have recommended should be constructed in the near future. More time may be required in this instance because reclamation will be involved here, and reclamation will be involved to a great degree at any place on the Gila River where flood control work is called for.

I do know that the Army engineers have investigated and reported favorably on flood-control dams and other such structures on the Bill Williams River and on the San Pedro River, as well as the Gila River. I hope to see something done in the immediate future toward the building of dams on these streams, especially a dam on the San Pedro at the Old Charleston site, one on the Gila below the San Pedro and more especially a dam on the Bill Williams by the Army engineers at the Alamo Site. Not only is flood control and also irrigation involved in these proposed dams, as well as in a dam recommended on the Gila River below the mouth of the San Pedro, but in all these cases for the protection of property and for some the furnishing of domestic water supply for great and growing cities. To illustrate, I am sure if the people of Los Angeles fully understood the situation pertaining to the proposed dam on the Bill Williams River they would join me in urging that something be done about it.

The Bill Williams River enters the Colorado River just above Parker Dam and at the point where the Los Angeles aqueduct diverts water for the metropolitan water district of southern California, which includes Los Angeles and about a dozen other surrounding California cities. While the Bill Williams is an all-Arizona river and, in my judgment, California has little rightful claim to its waters, it is a fact that those waters are emptied into Havasu Lake from which the great water supply for Los Angeles area is drawn. In fact, the Bill Williams River empties into the lake directly opposite the municipal water intake, in a way to jeopardize the California city's supply. Every man, woman, and child in southern California ought to be interested in protective work on the Bill Williams River even though it is in Arizona.

I certainly am interested in it, for the reasons just indicated, and also for the additional reason that flood protection further down the Colorado River on both sides of the Colorado would accordingly be furnished and also for the further reason that some irrigation in my State would very likely be made possible by such joint construction at or near the Alamo site. Therefore I have felt that I must, during the consideration of this bill, call attention to these needs, in the hope that the finishing up of the required reports might be had on the more urgent of these proposals.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, is there anything in the pending bill that will in any way change or affect existing law with reference to the base, grade, or height of the levees existing in the lower Mississippi River, especially between the States of Mississippi on the east and Arkansas and Louisiana on the west?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Nothing whatsoever.

Mr. NORRELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any further argument necessary with respect to this bill. There is no opposition whatsoever to it and I see no reason for going into a further discussion of the bill itself. I do take time to say a few words, however, in connection with the service of the chairman of this committee.

Recently we have had a number of very valuable members of this Congress who have resigned because they were not able to make ends meet on the salary they received here, and they have accepted the positions which paid them a remuneration sufficient for them to take care of themselves and their families properly and to provide for their future.

In the case of the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], I want to call your attention to the fact that he is serving in the Congress at a great sacrifice. We all know that he has vast interests in the State of Mississippi, and yet he is serving here as chairman of this committee as a patriotic duty, and at great personal sacrifice. He is giving of his talents and of his time in the interest of his State and of his country in one of the greatest works, I think, that any Member of this Congress can undertake. He has made a study of this subject of flood control, and I consider him and Senator OVERTON from Louisiana two of the best-informed men in the United States on that subject.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has just emerged from hearings which lasted during the entire month of April and part of May, and he gave of his patience and his knowledge and his experience to the consideration of all of these great projects that are included in this bill. I think that this Congress and the people of the United States generally owe a great debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Mississippi in this great work.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent bill and I join my colleague who has just paid tribute to this great committee and its members in the laudation and plaudits that are due them.

Mr. Chairman, Red River is one of the great rivers of the world. It is 1,208 miles long. It rises at Canyon, Tex., and flows along the boundary line of Texas and Oklahoma for hundreds of miles, passing through southwest Arkansas and enters northwest Louisiana, flowing in a southeasterly direction to its confluence with the Atchafalaya and the Mississippi. From time immemorial it has created great and devastating floods.

The greatest of all floods on Red River occurred in the year 1945 when the river reached a peak discharge of 303,000 cubic feet per second at Shreveport, La. During that year the river overflowed approximately 1,000,000 acres between Boggy Creek and the Mississippi River backwater area.

Under the plan presented in the bill, consideration of the flood problem along the right bank of the river from Denison Dam in Texas to Boyce, La., is given and also along the left bank of the river from Denison Dam to Moncla, La. Below these points the flood problem falls under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi Commission.

To get some idea of the problem presented, it is interesting to note that the basin has a population of 2,816,000 people as of 1940. In the valley are 91,000 square miles of land to be protected. Between 1843 and 1900 six great floods occurred along the Red River, but as I have said before, the greatest was in 1945. It was during the course of this flood that I had occasion to fly over a large part of it and then traversed the area along the edges of the overflow waters by car, going out into the overflow itself by boat. I saw scenes of property destruction and distress approach that of the war-devastated regions of Europe.

The plan presented by this bill contemplates taking care of a design flood which would overflow 1,700,000 acres, a much greater flood than occurred in 1945. Included in this would be 774,000 acres of cropland.

The plan proposes six reservoirs to be located along the Boggy River, Kiamichi River, Little River, Sulphur River, and two on Cypress Creek. In periods of heavy floods the reservoirs will fill up and retard the flow of water on the main stem of the Red. As the high water recedes, the reservoirs will be gradually allowed to retain the water which will be permitted to flow down the Red River in an orderly manner.

Bank protection and levee work on the main stem will cost about $3,500,000.

When this great project along the Red River is completed it would prevent flood

damages averaging $2,700,000 annually. It will return benefits exceeding $700,000 annually by making certain lands presently unsuitable for cultivation usable as croplands. In other words, the total benefits will exceed $3,400,000 in direct benefits.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the beginning, from time immemorial the people of the Red River Valley have been living in a constant state of fear of floods. Year by year they have seen the floodwaters of other States descend upon them in tremendous volume flooding their lands and destroying their lives and property. Under the laws of the State of Louisiana, our people have organized levee boards along both sides of the river. They have year by year taxed themselves to build levees, bank protection, and do other defensive types of work. Millions upon millions of dollars have been spent by the people of this basin on this type of work and with very helpful results. Everyone has come to realize that the problem of flood control on a river more than 1,200 miles long is not a local problem. Ability does not lie in the local people to properly handle or to cope with floodwaters that descend periodically upon them from other regions far removed. As a result of this fact, the appeal has been made in these flood-control bills to help with interstate streams. This is the only way the problem can be handled and we who live under the shadow of a constant fear plead with you to give us the protection which the lower Red River Valley is entitled to receive.

Mr. Chairman, in 1945 the damages from floods in the United States was very heavy. The Army engineers estimated that the damage for all portions totaled $103,800,000. This damage may be divided between agriculture and industry. For instance, agriculture suffered $45,000,000 in flood damages last year and industrial and other damages totaled $58,000,000. In the Red River Valley alone the damages from the devastating floods of 1945 totaled $12,600,000 and 2,624,000 acres of land in my home State of Louisiana were inundated by the ravages of the 1945 devastating floods.

It is therefore vitally important to our people that this bill do pass. This program means the reclaiming for agricultural and industrial use of millions of acres of land. It means the saving of lives and the annual savings of millions of dollars in property. When the program for flood control on Red River is completed, great development in this area of the world can reasonably be expected. New homes, new businesses, new industries, and new activities will spring up in the reclaimed and protected lands, adding hundreds of millions of dollars to the wealth of the Nation and happiness to the people protected from a dreadful scourge which is as old as the country is itself.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to pay my respects to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] who is the chairman of this Committee on Flood Control. I especially want to compliment him on the fine democratic way in which he has always conducted his committee, the way in which this bill was reported out of committee, and the thorough hearings that were given to everybody concerned with this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, in the closing minutes of this general debate on this very worth-while bill, I do not have the time to discuss the various projects that have been most ably presented by the distinguished chairman of this committee. But I do want to say a few words with reference to flood control generally and with reference to the very fine and able work which the chairman of this committee has done, and, if I may be permitted to do so as a member of the committee, also say something about the work of the committee in general.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said here today, and justifiably so, about the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. I am serving my tenth year on that committee and I want to join others in approving everything that has been said about that very capable gentleman. I believe that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is as great a civilian authority on flood control in general as we have in the United States. The distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, the Honorable JOHN H. OVERTON, is an authority on flood control and has likewise made a great contribution in that direction. I know that in the committee it is difficult to say anything about any stream or even a small creek that the gentleman from Mississippi does not have knowledge of and in most cases intimate knowledge of. He can tell you almost offhand just what has been authorized in every section, in nearly every congressional district, and he can tell you pretty well what has been spent in every section. When we on the committee sit with him day after day and observe his familiarity with the whole flood-control program of the Nation, we ourselves are often astonished at his very intimate knowledge of the broad subject.

Mr. Chairman, may I now say just a word about my colleagues on the committee. This committee is strictly nonpartisan. You hear that about a good many committees, but that is certainly true of the Committee on Flood Control. In the time I have been on that committee I have never known any politics to enter into it. We consider propositions, programs, and plans, and we are not concerned about where they are, what State they are in, what district they are in, or anything like that. We consider the entire picture of the Nation as a whole.

I remember when I first went on that committee in 1937 we had a disastrous flood in the Ohio Valley. I recall that we worked hard for a long time to solve the problems in the Ohio Valley. As I recall now, the southern part of the country, from which I hail, did not receive any great benefits in that particular bill, but we were just as concerned because it helped the country as a whole. I worked hard to bring to the people of that great valley the protection they needed. That has always been the guiding principle of the members of that committee. We have sought to do that thing which would bring to our Nation as a whole the greatest possible benefit.

Now may I say something about the great Corps of Engineers. That group of men in the Corps of Engineers, as has been pointed out here this evening, is perhaps the best qualified group of men in all the world on problems of flood control. They have demonstrated that time and time again. They know their business. They are always fair. They are always considerate. You cannot unduly influence them, but you can always go to them and reason with them. If you have a good proposition they will readily see it and they will do their best to help you. I know of no group of men in all the Government service more capable, more accommodating and more loyal than are the men in the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Chairman, I think something ought to be stated here about the conservatism of the engineers. When there are those who are prone to criticize projects written into flood-control bills by the committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, I remind you of the fact that the engineers are always conservative, thoroughly conservative, sometimes we think ultra-conservative. I am glad they are conservative, I am glad that they screen everything carefully and that they go into every project very carefully, because it allows us as members of the committee to present to you projects that have been carefully weighed and carefully considered by the engineers and by the governors of the State where the projects are situated.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I will be happy to yield to my very distinguished chairman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I stated from my independent recollection to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], when he spoke about the project at Mount Carmel, that I was sure it had been provided for. I should like the record to show that on page 25 of the bill there is provision for an examination and survey covering, and I quote:

Wabash River at and in the vicinity of Mount Carmel, Ill.

I was sure I was right at the time, but I want the record to show that we have not only provided for it in this particular bill under consideration but also by a resolution of the committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thank our chairman. That bears out just what I said about the chairman of our committee. He knows his flood-control work. He knows what has been done and where it has been done.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a word about this bill. This bill affects almost every congressional district in the Nation directly. Indirectly it affects every congressional district in the Nation, even the city districts a long way perhaps from any flood on any river. Those districts are directly concerned because the city people

must get their bread and butter and their fiber from the farms. In many cases those farms are being overflowed. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am glad that throughout the years I have been on this committee, flood-control bills have enjoyed great support even from gentlemen representing city districts because those gentlemen were wise enough and fair enough to realize that the city dwellers are vitally concerned about conserving the lands and the rich valleys of our country in order that the people of this Nation might continue to have food and fiber.

Mr. Chairman, erosion in this Nation has played a tremendous part in our agricultural economy. Back yonder a long time ago we cleared off our lands. However, we were not careful enough to provide against erosion in many places and our lands to a great extent have been depleted and worn out. Several years ago we were told in our committee that lands of the United States were being depleted and worn out to the tune of about 300,000 acres a year. We were also told by the best soil-conservation authority in the United States and probably in the world, Dr. Bennett, that in probably 150 years this Nation would reach a point where it might not be self-sustaining, agriculturally speaking, unless we stopped the trend of erosion and unless we conserved our soil.

Mr. Chairman, this leads me to say that it is most vital, most important—it is a matter of paramount importance that this Congress see to it that our great river valleys all over the country are conserved and protected that they might not suffer recurring floods year after year. I recall in 1945 when regions that had not suffered floods for a good while were completely devastated and crops were destroyed, livestock was killed, and people lost their lives. There were no crops. We are feeling the pinch of that right now at this time when America needs to have all of the food and grain and food products that we can get. Mr. Chairman, in the last 3 years we have had a destruction of probably $350,000,000 worth of property in this country because of floods. Of course, we did not have any flood-control work during the war. That is understandable. Nobody blames the Chief Executive for impounding the money of the country during the war. We had to win the war. But now that the war is over, now that peace has come, at least we hope, it is high time, Mr. Chairman, that this Congress should go back and pick up the flood-control program, and that we should give to the river regions, to the valleys of this land, and to all regions of this country the protective flood-control works which we must have to guarantee to this country a perpetual supply of farm products.

The amount of land contained in our fine river valleys is limited. That land is very fertile. That land has had the washings of centuries. The best soil from the hills of the Nation has flowed into these valleys. That makes it all the more imperative that we now bring to those valleys the greatest possible protection from floods so that the people of the Nation may get the benefit of the protective power of every possible acre of that rich land. Any other course is shortsighted.

Mr. Chairman, as stated a moment ago the flood damages in the past 3 years have probably reached $350,000,000. This vast sum has been lost forever to the people of the United States. Do not think that that loss was only in the valleys where the floods occur. That was a loss to all the people. It is true that the loss was felt most keenly in the valleys, but the result of that loss can be felt, and is being felt, all over the Nation.

Flood control pays dividends. It pays and pays well. Certainly there is no investment that means more for the future happiness and prosperity of our people than the conservation of our lands and the protection of our vast rich river valleys from the constant menace of floods. We get more back each year than we spend on flood control. It is an investment which we owe to those who are to come after us. We have no right to use the blessings which we find to our hands without trying, as best we can, to pass on to and make certain that our children will also be able to enjoy comparable blessings.

Some perhaps will argue that we have sufficient authorizations already. The answer to that, Mr. Chairman, is that we need additional authorizations so that the Corps of Engineers can spend the money at its disposal in shaping a broad comprehensive flood-control plan in each river valley and in the Nation as a whole. More and more the engineers are working out programs and plans to cover each valley as a whole and then to correlate as much as possible the protective works in the various valleys. This is wise. It seems to me that this is the way to realize the maximum amount of good. That is why it is now of great importance that we have additional authorizations so that the engineers can work out a program in each valley that will achieve maximum protection and the greatest good to the whole. Moreover, as has been pointed out here today, additional authorizations will bring us a backlog of projects, worth-while projects, to be used in the event we are visited with terrible depressions in the future. In considering these projects in this bill it is true, as it has always been true in other bills, that each project has received the full approval of the Corps of Engineers. The committee does not include any project which has not been fully approved by the engineers.

This bill is a good bill. Frankly, I think that it is probably the best flood-control bill which has ever been presented to Congress by the committee while I have been a member of the Flood Control Committee. I trust that it will meet the approval of the Members of Congress, and that the project may be authorized. I think it is timely. I urge, therefore, the approval of the bill in its entirety.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1946."

SEC. 2. That section 3 of the act approved June 22, 1936 (Public, No. 738, 74th Cong.), as amended by section 2 of the act approved June 28, 1938 (Public, No. 761, 75th Cong.), shall apply to all works authorized in this act except that for any channel improvement or channel-rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any flood-control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire 5 years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the War Department of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that the required cooperation will be furnished.

The provisions of section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public, No. 534, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), shall govern with respect to projects herein authorized; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

SEC. 3. That hereafter for authorized flood-protection projects which include alterations of railroad bridges the Chief of Engineers is authorized to include at Federal expense the necessary alterations of railroad bridges and approaches in connection therewith.

SEC. 4. That section 4 of the act approved December 22, 1944 (Public, No. 534, 78th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of War, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate public park and recreational facilities in reservoir areas under the control of the War Department, and to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation of such facilities. The Secretary of War is authorized to grant leases of lands, including structures or facilities thereon, in reservoir areas for such periods and upon such terms as he may deem reasonable: *Provided*, That leases to nonprofit organizations may be granted at reduced or nominal rentals in recognition of the public service to be rendered in utilizing the leased premises: *Provided further*, That preference shall be given to Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses may be granted without monetary considerations, to such agencies for the use of all or any portion of a reservoir area, when the Secretary of War determines such action to be in the public interest, and for such periods of time and upon such conditions as he may find advisable. The water areas of all such reservoirs shall be open to public use generally, without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and other recreational purposes, and ready access to and exit from such water areas along the shores of such reservoirs shall be maintained for general public use, when such use is determined by the Secretary of War not to be contrary to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of War may deem necessary. No use of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted which is inconsistent with the laws for the protection of fish and game of the State in which such area is situated. All moneys received for leases or privileges shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

SEC. 5. That section 7 of the act approved August 18, 1941 (Public, No. 228, 77th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That 75 percent of all moneys received and deposited in the Treasury of the United States during any fiscal year on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood-control purposes shall be paid at the end of such year by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which such property is situated, to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of public schools and public roads of the county, or counties, in which such property is situated: *Provided*, That when such property is situated in more than one State or county, the distributive share to each from the proceeds of such property shall be proportional to its area therein."

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him, to grant easements for rights-of-way over, across, in, and upon lands under his control, to any State, political subdivision thereof, or municipality, or to any individual, partnership, or corporation of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, for (a) railroad tracks; (b) oil pipe lines; (c) substations for electric power transmission lines, telephone lines, and telegraph lines, and pumping stations for gas, water, sewer, and oil pipe lines; (d) canals; (e) ditches; (f) flumes; (g) tunnels; (h) dams and reservoirs in connection with fish and wildlife programs, fish hatcheries, and other fish-cultural improvements; (i) roads and streets; and (j) for any other purpose or purposes deemed advisable by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That such rights-of-way shall be granted only upon a finding by the Secretary of War that the same will not be incompatible with the public interest: *Provided further*, That such rights-of-way shall not include any more land than is reasonably necessary for the purpose for which granted: *And provided further*, That all or any part of such rights-of-way may be annulled and forfeited by the Secretary of War for failure to comply with the terms and conditions of any grant hereunder or for nonuse for a period of 2 consecutive years or abandonment of rights granted under authority hereof.

SEC. 7. That the Secretary of War is authorized and empowered, in his discretion, to use any property or parts thereof, including lands and improvements, under his control and jurisdiction for the prosecution of any authorized civil work or function administered by the War Department without charge, except usual handling charges, against appropriations for such civil works or functions.

SEC. 8. Whenever the Chief of Engineers shall find that any highway, railway, or utility has been or is being damaged or destroyed by reason of the operation of any dam or reservoir project under the control of the War Department, he may utilize any funds available for the construction, maintenance, or operation of the project involved for the repair, relocation, restoration, or protection of such highway, railway, or utility: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to highways, railways, and utilities previously provided for by the War Department, unless the Chief of Engineers determines that the actual damage has or will exceed that for which provision had previously been made.

SEC. 9. That the following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this act with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further*, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this act for construction by the War Department when approved by the Secretary of War on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission:

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Lehigh River, Pa., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 587, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $12,471,000.

POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

The local flood-protection project at Cumberland and West Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va., authorized in the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public, No. 738, 74th Cong.), is hereby amended to provide for completion of the project substantially in accordance with plans on file in the Office of the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost to the United States of $7,420,000 and subject to the conditions of local cooperation prescribed for that project in the act approved June 22, 1936, as modified, now estimated at $1,520,000.

The project for flood protection at Waynesboro, Va., on South River is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. ——, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $1,431,000.

The project for protection at Washington, D. C., on Potomac River, authorized by the act of June 22, 1936, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. ——, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $500,000.

Completion of the Savage River Dam on Savage River, Md., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the plan contained in House Document No. ——, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, at a cost to the United States now estimated at $1,900,000, subject to the conditions that local interests make a cash contribution of $200,000 toward the cost of the work, and agree to hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works, and to maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War.

RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER BASIN

The project for the Salem Church Reservoir on Rappahannock River, Va., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 8, 1946, at an estimated cost of $17,755,000.

JAMES RIVER BASIN

The project for the Gathright Reservoir and the Falling Spring reregulating dam on Jackson River, Va, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 18, 1946, at an estimated cost of $11,000,000.

ALTAMAHA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection at Macon, Ga, on Ocmulgee River, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 560, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $349,000.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act approved May 15, 1928, as amended by subsequent acts, is hereby modified and expanded to include the following items and the authorization for said project is increased accordingly:

(a) Improvement of the Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon at an estimated cost of $5,013,000 authorized in the act approved December 22, 1944.

(b) Extension of the authorized improvement under subparagraph (a) to include the improvement of Bayou LaFourche, La., including cut-offs, as may be found requisite to effectuate the purposes of the plan, at an estimated cost of $5,913,000 and substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session.

(c) Extension of the authorized improvement under subparagraph (a) to include the improvement of the Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon north of the Louisiana State line, including cut-offs, as may be found requisite to effectuate the purposes of the plan, at an estimated cost of $4,930,000 substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 8, 1946.

(d) Improvement of Big Sunflower, Little Sunflower, Hushpuckena, and Quiver Rivers and their tributaries, and on Hull Brake—Mill Creek Canal, Bogue Phalia, Ditchlow Bayou, Deer Creek, and Steele Bayou, Miss., at an estimated cost of $3,752,000 authorized in the act approved December 22, 1944.

(e) Extension of the authorized improvement under subparagraph (d) upstream and downstream, including cut-offs, as may be found requisite to effectuate the purposes of the plan, at an estimated cost of $2,500,000 for modification of the authorized project.

(f) Extension of the authorized headwater project for the Yazoo River and tributaries to include improvements in the area between the Yazoo-Tallahatchie-Coldwater River system and the hills to protect against overflows from the main stem and hill tributaries in such cases and by such means as the Chief of Engineers may consider warranted, at an estimated cost of $7,500,000 for modification of the authorized project.

(g) Extension of the authorized headwater project for the Yazoo River and tributaries to include the drainage of run-off waters from the watershed of McKinney Bayou or the providing of pumping capacity additional to that now existing for said waters in the proportion determined by the Chief of Engineers are authorized in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of $300,000 for modification of the authorized project.

(h) The Bayou des Glaises diversion channel, Louisiana, authorized by and constructed under the act approved June 22, 1936.

(i) That portion of the North Little Rock to Gillette, Ark., levee on the north bank of the Arkansas River along and below Plum Bayou authorized by and constructed under the act approved June 22, 1936, work thereon to be hereafter prosecuted in accordance with the act of May 15, 1928, as amended.

(j) The projects for local flood protection on the White River, on the east side between Augusta and Clarendon, Ark., and at the town of De Valls Bluff, Ark., at an estimated cost of $2,847,500 authorized by the act approved August 18, 1941.

(k) The Tiptonville-Obion levee authorized by and constructed under the act approved June 22, 1936.

(l) Extension of the levee under subparagraph (k) to include the levee and drainage improvements, at an estimated cost of $6,000,000 substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 16, 1946.

(m) The improvement of Saint Johns Bayou, Mo., at an estimated cost of $1,300,000, substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 16, 1946.

(n) The improvement of the harbor at Memphis, Tenn., at an estimated cost of $17,120,000, substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 12, 1946.

(o) Modification of the main line levee system of the authorized project for the lower Mississippi River to include protection of the potential industrial area immediately north of Vicksburg, Miss., known as the Vicksburg-Yazoo area, together with local dredging and the construction of such drainage facilities as in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers are requisite and justified, at an estimated cost of $4,000,000, subject to the conditions that local interests provide without cost to the United States all rights-of-way required for levees and drainage, and maintain and operate the works after completion.

(p) Modification of the authorized project for the lower Mississippi River to provide drainage in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers where drainage is impaired by levees hitherto or hereafter constructed, at an estimated cost of $500,000, subject to the conditions that local interests provide without cost to the United States all rights-of-way and maintain and operate the works after completion.

(q) Modification of the authorized project for the lower Mississippi River to provide that the local cooperation to be hereafter furnished for the works authorized in the Saint Francis River Basin and the Yazoo River Basin shall consist of the requirement that responsible local interests agree to maintain levees in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the act of May 15, 1928, where maintenance is required under existing law.

(r) Any former officer of the Corps of Engineers who, after retirement and recall to active duty in the Army, has served over 15 years as a member of the Mississippi River Commission while on such active duty shall, upon being relieved of such active duty, be eligible to and shall retain, during the will of the President, the position and office held by him as a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

In order to provide for the increased costs of construction of the authorized project for the Lower Mississippi River as recommended by the president of the Mississippi River Commission and the Chief of Engineers, the authorization for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River is hereby increased by an additional $100,000,000.

The project for flood control along Lake Pontchartrain in Jefferson Parish, La., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated December 10, 1945, at an estimated cost of $900,000.

The project for flood protection at Memphis on Wolf River and Nonconnah Creek, Tenn., authorized by the act approved August 28, 1937 (Public, No. 406, 75th Cong.), as amended by the act approved June 28, 1939 (Public, No. 154, 76th Cong.), is further amended to authorize the completion of the project at an additional estimated cost of $1,500,000.

RED-OUACHITA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Bayou Pierre in the vicinity of Shreveport, La., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 285, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $127,000.

The general plan for flood control on Red River, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana, below Denison Dam, Texas and Oklahoma, including the incorporation therein of the several separate existing projects for flood control along the Red River below Denison (above the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission) and providing for the modification of the existing or authorized Federal and non-Federal levees, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 602, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $77,500,000.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $40,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Arkansas River Basin, approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

The project for flood protection at Oklahoma City, Okla., on North Canadian River, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 572, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $2,037,000.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $40,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the White River Basin approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the upper Mississippi River Basin approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River at Prairie du Rocher and vicinity is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 17, 1946, at an estimated cost of $2,575,000.

The project for local flood protection on McCraney, Hadley, Kiser, Six-Mile, and Bay Creeks in the Sny Basin, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 17, 1946, at an estimated cost of $4,854,944.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $150,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved by the act of June 28, 1938, as expanded by section 9a of the act approved December 22, 1944 (Public, No. 534, 78th Cong.), for continuing the works in the Missouri River Basin to be undertaken under said expanded plans by the Corps of Engineers.

The project for flood protection at Mandan, N. Dak., on Heart River, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 294, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $246,000.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $125,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Ohio River Basin approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress including: (1) Such channel rectification works or other measures at or below the Muskingum River Reservoirs as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War may be found necessary to provide for the most efficient operation of those reservoirs at an estimated cost of $2,200,000, and (2) the following projects in tributary basins, namely:

The local flood-protection works at Galax, Va., on Chestnut Creek, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 506, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, at an estimated cost of $276,125;

The plan of improvement for flood control in the Wabash River Basin, Illinois and Indiana, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 9, 1946, at an estimated cost of $9,366,000;

The local flood-protection works at Olean, N. Y., on Allegheny River, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 12, 1946, at an estimated cost of $2,282,400;

The local flood-protection works at Portville, N. Y., on Allegheny River, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 12, 1946, at an estimated cost of $1,281,500.

The local flood-protection works at Allegany, N. Y., on the Allegheny River, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report, dated April 12, 1946, at an estimated cost of $388,800.

The project for the West Fork Reservoir on the West Fork of Mill Creek in Ohio, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 8, 1946, at an estimated cost of $1,527,000.

GREAT LAKES BASIN

The project for flood protection at Mount Clemens and vicinity, Mich., on Clinton River, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 8, 1946, at an estimated cost of $378,000.

BRAZOS RIVER BASIN

The project for the Belton Reservoir on Leon River, Tex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 19, 1946, at an estimated cost of $15,500,000.

The project for flood protection at Eastland, on Leon River, Tex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 19, 1946, at an estimated cost of $82,800.

GREAT SALT BASIN

The project for local flood protection on Spanish Fork River, Utah, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 518, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $74,500.

The project for flood protection at Salt Lake City, Utah, on Jordan River, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 562, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $412,000.

The project for flood protection at Magna, Utah, on Little Valley Wash, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 562, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $222,000.

LOS ANGELES-SAN GABRIEL BASIN AND BALLONA CREEK

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Los Angeles-San Gabriel Basin and Ballona Creek, Calif., approved in the act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented, by subsequent acts of Congress.

The project for flood protection along Salinas River, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 29, 1946, at an estimated cost of $1,905,000.

WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $35,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Willamette River Basin approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

The project for flood protection on Amazon Creek at Eugene, Oreg., and vicinity is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 138, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $226,000.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Modification of the existing project for Skagway on Skagway River and Harbor, Alaska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 19, 1946, at an estimated cost of $438,000.

SEC. 10. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its Territorial possessions, which include the following-named localities, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for run-off and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on such drainage areas; the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any examination, survey, project, or work under way or proposed are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of War may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to the Congress if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *And provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this act until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Narraguagus River and tributaries, Maine.

Westfield River, Mass., with a view to modifying the existing Knightsville Reservoir to provide low flow regulation.

Oneida Creek and tributaries, New York.

Susquehanna River, at and in the vicinity of Sidney, N. Y.

Hackensack River and tributaries, New Jersey and New York.

Marshy Hope Creek and tributaries, Maryland.

Coosa River and tributaries, at and in the vicinity of Rome, Ga.

Big South Fork River and tributaries, Tennessee.

Port Arthur, Tex. (with a view to providing protection against damage from Sabine Lake resulting from erosion and from floods due to hurricane winds and tide).

The provision of outlets in the interest of providing egress of flood waters for Jefferson County drainage districts, into existing waterways in the general vicinity of Port Arthur, Tex.

Eight-Mile Creek and Locust Creek and their tributaries, Arkansas.

St. Francis Bay straight slough and Big Bay ditch, Ark., and tributary area.

Bear Creek, a tributary of Big Black River, Miss.

Pearl River and tributaries, Mississippi.

Lost Creek, Mo., at and in the vicinity of Seneca, Mo.

Chunky River, Miss.

Opookta Creek, Attala County, Miss., for flood control and drainage.

Potacocowa Creek, Miss.

Lower Grand River, Mo., with a view to providing protection from erosion and bank caving.

St. Francis River and its tributaries, Arkansas, with special reference to Tyronza and Little Rivers; Big Creek; and Blackfish, Fifteen Mile, and Frenchman Bayous; and the tributaries of these streams for flood control, drainage, and allied purposes.

Mississippi River at and in the vicinity of East Cape Girardeau and Clear Creek, North Alexander, Clear Creek, Preston and Miller Pond drainage and levee district, Illinois.

Mississippi River at and in the vicinity of Perry County drainage and levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Missouri.

Lost Creek and tributaries, White and Hamilton Counties, Ill.

Wabash River at and in the vicinity of Mount Carmel, Ill.

Coal Creek and tributaries, Tennessee.

Buffalo Creek and tributaries, West Virginia and Pennsylvania.

Chariton River and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri.

Pecatonica River and tributaries, Wisconsin and Illinois.

Lost River and tributaries, Minnesota.

Root River and tributaries, Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Clinton River and tributaries, Michigan.

Sagining River and tributaries, Michigan.

Smith River and tributaries, California and Oregon.

Gold Creek and tributaries, Alaska.

Chena slough, Alaska.

SEC. 11. That section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to allot, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, not to exceed $2,000,000 for any one fiscal year to be expended in rescue work or in the repair or maintenance of any flood-control work threatened or destroyed by flood."

SEC. 12. That section 2 of the Flood Control Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to allot not to exceed $1,000,000 from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for any one fiscal year for flood control, for removing accumulated snags and other debris, and clearing and straightening the channel in navigable streams and tributaries thereof, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is advisable in the interest of flood control: *Provided*, That not more than $50,000 shall be expended for this purpose for any single tributary from the appropriations for any one fiscal year."

SEC. 13. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to allot from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, not to exceed $1,000,000 per year, for the construction of emergency bank-protection works to prevent flood damage to highways, bridge approaches, and public works, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is advisable: *Provided*, That not more than $50,000 shall be allotted for this purpose at any single locality from the appropriations for any one fiscal year.

SEC. 14. That the sum of $750,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out improvements by the War Department, the sum of $10,000,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated and expended in equal amounts by the Departments of War and Agriculture for carrying out any examination or survey provided for in this act and any other acts of Congress to be prosecuted by said departments.

SEC. 15. That the program on the watershed of Buffalo Creek and its tributaries authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, is hereby amended to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to include and prosecute works for the stabilization of stream banks such as described in House Document No. 574, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, at an estimated additional cost of $1,842,400.

SEC. 16. That the $5,000,000 authorized to be appropriated in section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, is reauthorized to be appropriated, and the sum of $20,000,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated, for expenditure, by the Department of Agriculture for the prosecution of the works of improvement authorized to be carried out by that Department by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944.

SEC. 17. In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $150,000,000 for the prosecution of the initial stage of the comprehensive plan adopted by section 9a of the act approved December 22, 1944 (Public, No. 534, 78th Cong.), for continuing the works in the Missouri River Basin to be undertaken under said plans by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. WHITTINGTON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point; that amendments be in order to the sections of the bill as the sections may be announced by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to have the gentleman's request apply to the provisions of the bill just read, and to ask the chairman of the committee if it is not true that the paragraph immediately preceding his statement is the paragraph which makes applicable to the projects in this bill the so-called McMillan amendment which was incorporated in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is correct. I am glad to ask that the entire bill be set forth at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any amendment to section 1?

Is there any amendment to section 3?

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to section 3.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAVENS:

On page 2, in line 18, after the word "railroad" insert "highway."

And on page 2, in line 20, strike out the word "railroad" and insert in lieu thereof "such."

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, as section 3 now reads it provides that with respect to local contributions for flood-control projects, the Federal Government, through the Chief of Engineers, may include as a part of the Federal expense the cost of making changes in approaches to railroad bridges, which approaches are required to be changed as a result of the raising of such bridges in connection with flood-control projects. The purpose of my amendment is to include, in addition to approaches to railroad bridges, approaches to highway bridges which must also be raised as a result of the construction of flood-control projects heretofore authorized but not yet constructed, and with respect to the projects authorized in this bill.

The necessity for the amendment is vital to the control program. I know of one case, and there are no doubt many others in the United States, where the now required local contribution for constructing approaches to highway bridges is so enormous that it practically paralyzes the flood-control program in that area. For instance, there is one project in the Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas where the local contribution for constructing approaches to a highway bridge, together with other expenses, such as putting in another bridge over another stream to provide a highway for the handling of traffic while this approach construction is under way, would amount to $360,000 in a community of four or five thousand, which, of course, is absolutely impossible for them to meet. This amendment would not relieve a locality of the expense of constructing the additional bridge and the additional highway to handle the traffic while approaches were being constructed, but would merely require the Federal Government to raise the approaches to bridges which the Federal Government raises in connection with the construction of any of these projects. Without the amendment much needed flood-control projects in many areas would be stagnated and the flood-control program as a matter of practical operation entirely sacrificed.

The committee has authorized the construction of these new approaches at Federal expense with respect to railroad bridges. The only thing this amendment does is to assure that the similar treatment be accorded approaches to highway bridges. The particular bridge I have in mind accommodates two Federal-aid highways and I cannot see why if the flood-control program is to be carried out, it is not fair and equitable to have the Federal Government, if it is going to pay for the approaches to railroad bridges, to also pay the cost of raising the approaches to highway bridges which bridges in turn must be raised in order to get them above the increased flood stage level of the river.

I most earnestly solicit your consideration and favorable action on the amendment now under consideration.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from Arkansas has proposed this amendment. Section 3 was inserted in the bill largely at the instigation of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS].

In connection with projects along the Arkansas River we conducted hearings when he submitted to me the matter of alterations of the approaches, and this covers the matter of approaches and not the matter of highways. The railroads have the bridges, and this particular amendment to section 3 deals with the approaches to railway bridges. It would not suffice if you undertook to correct the approaches to a highway bridge unless you raised the entire highway in order to reach the bridge. So with all due deference to my friend, I oppose his amendment because we did go into the matter and where it involved the matter of approaches to a railroad bridge we undertook to relieve the local interests of the contribution because that was sound; but when it comes to relieving the local interests of approaches to a highway bridge the gentleman, on reflection, will certainly be convinced that it involves something more than approaches; that involves the actual highway itself.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not now; I will yield later.

Let me say in this connection that in an effort to provide as liberally as possible for highways and for railways and for utilities, where there is proper provision for highways we have made provision in section 8. The Members will recall that, under the Flood Control Act, where highways have got to be relocated in a reservoir of a condemned area the Federal Government provides for this relocation, and we have made liberal provision in that regard in section 8. To provide for caving affecting highways and other public improvements, we have made liberal provision in section 12.

I now gladly yield to the gentleman, if I may.

Mr. CRAVENS. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. What I had in mind was this, that where a flood control project necessitates the raising of the approaches to the bridge there has to be considerable work in the way of fill extending back some distance from the bridge.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand the gentleman's question. I have answered it. With all due deference I appreciate the situation the gentleman is up against. We went into the matter. If the gentleman will read the hearings and read the report, this section 3 covers the matter of approaches to railroad bridges. I respectfully submit that the matter of approaches to a highway bridge is something to be considered later. The railroads have had nothing to do with raising the elevations of the highway itself. That is an entirely different matter from the railway bridge. In view of the liberal provisions we have made in an effort to meet the exigencies of the gentleman's area, not only in section 3 but in sections 8 and 12, I trust the amendment will be voted down. I may say to the gentleman that if on further hearings there are cases that develop where there should be additional provision made for highways the House ought to have the report of investigation submitted by the Chief of Engineers and that matter embraced in the hearings.

Mr. CRAVENS. The inclusion of railroad bridges will only relieve the local interests in the particular project I have in mind of $2,000. On the other hand, there will be $360,000 imposed upon this small area, not for the approaches to the bridges, which is a comparatively small sum, but to build another highway and another bridge to accommodate traffic while this work is being done.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We have provisions for Arkansas the same as in every other State. We have treated all States alike. Section 3 of the committee report deals with railroad bridges and approach and under the guise of getting an approach to a railroad bridge or a highway bridge the gentleman should not expect the Congress of the United States to provide that the Federal Government shall pay for absolutely rebuilding the highway proper.

Under the circumstances, while I am in sympathy with the gentleman, I am compelled to ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other amendments?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to section 9.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 7, strike out all of lines 4 and 5 and as much of line 6 as precedes the colon and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the time for initiating projects authorized herein shall be determined by (1) the degree to which the construction of the project is immediately necessary to protect human life and property from the likelihood of destruction; (2) the availability of supply of required material with reference to the need for such materials for home construction or other essential purposes; and (3) the amount of unemployment, if any, existing in the construction industry or related lines of work and the degree of need, if any, to expand construction activity; and it is declared to be the policy of Congress to delay the initiation of projects not immediately necessary to protect human life and property from the likelihood of destruction until such time as there is a clear sufficiency of the supply of materials and need for expansion of employment and activity in the construction industry; and to give effect to this policy the Chief of Engineers shall include in all requests for appropriations specific justification in accordance with this proviso."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on

the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, before speaking on my amendment I would like to say that it is offered in no unfriendly spirit to the Flood Control Committee or the distinguished chairman of that committee. I have had the privilege of serving under him for a number of years and it is my opinion there is not a chairman of a committee in this House, or any other body for that matter, who knows his subject better, who conducts the business of his committee in a more efficient, forthright, and considerate manner. I have a particular reason for saying this, since a project in my own district that presents great problems has been authorized for resurvey by instruction of the committee and I appreciate that very deeply.

The reason I am offering this amendment is that it is almost exactly the same amendment I previously offered to the rivers and harbors bill. I have offered both amendments for a very clear and simple reason. I do not agree with those Members who have gotten up on the floor this afternoon and opposed the passage of this measure. Everybody who knows about the flood hazards of this country or about the problems of erosion, that the gentleman from Louisiana spoke of, has got to be concerned about necessary flood control measures which are recommended by this committee and by the Corps of Army Engineers. I am certainly not opposed to the passage of legislation which will detail what those projects are that need construction, do the preliminary work of studying those projects, and go so far as to grant congressional authorization for them. But I do believe that it is high time that the Congress consider legislation of this character or any other character where moneys are appropriated for public works; I think, indeed, it is high time that Congress consider all legislation that it passes in any field from the standpoint of the over-all circumstances of our country today and what they may be tomorrow.

Everybody knows that at the moment we have the possibility, at least, of achieving a balanced budget and possibly a running surplus, and paying off part of the national debt. We ought to try to do so in every way that we can. In addition we know that at the present time there is a shortage of certain critical material; that materials for home construction, to mention only one thing, and a good many other very essential items are in critical short supply. We also know that the construction industry is, at any rate, booming; that there is demand that cannot be filled by labor in that industry. The time will come when there will be availability of plenty of materials and, secondly, when there may be need to expand the activities in the construction industry and in employment, and when that time comes I do not want to fall back on projects that are of no value. I do not want to do what is termed "leaf raking" projects. I want to do some of these worth-while projects when that time comes. I want to have the most worth-while program we can get.

My amendment is quite clear, Mr. Chairman, that where there is a project, and where the need for the construction of that project to save life and limb is necessary now, that that project will not be interfered with. The amendment only says that there should be that criterion plus the other two criteria, availability of materials and the degree of activity of the construction industry, and that those shall be taken into consideration in deciding what appropriations shall be made. With this provision in the bill it will coincide with an over-all long-range program brought forth by the Congress, not by somebody else, of attempting to maintain over a period of time, as near as we can, an even keel of employment and an even level of prosperity in this country.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is a member of the Colmer Committee on Postwar Planning. I would like to ask the gentleman if his proposal is not in keeping with the philosophy of the recommendations of that committee?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say to the gentleman that I am much obliged to him for asking that question. The fact of the matter is that the report of the Postwar Economic Policy and Planning Committee on Public Works took precisely this point of view, and the whole report was a development of the thesis that we ought to plan public works in such a manner as to stabilize employment in the construction industry. That is all I am trying to do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to speak about the amendment, but I do want to call the attention of the gentleman from California, since he is a member of that committee, that if you want to save material for the construction of homes, why was not something done to stop the construction of a stadium where they are going to have a world's championship boxing match and where, I understand, they are using a lot of material which could be used for the construction of homes?

Mr. McGREGOR. Was not a priority given for that, too?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman asked me a question, and I should like to answer it. I will answer it in this way, by stating that I offered an amendment to the emergency veterans' housing bill which said that no construction other than veterans' homes should be allowed to proceed unless it got a specific authorization for it. My amendment was defeated.

Mr. STEFAN. Construction of that stadium for this boxing match and other unnecessary building involves the use of materials when those materials are absolutely necessary for the construction of homes. Out in middlewest Nebraska people are begging for lumber. We have nothing but kindling wood left in our lumberyards. Farmers can not get lumber to store grain for which the world is waiting.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman's point is incontestable. I think he is quite right. I do not think the material should have been used for that purpose. I do not think you can defend using it for that purpose.

Mr. STEFAN. In some cases they claim they do not use much material for construction, but they do use a lot of lumber for cribbing which could be very well used for the construction of homes which we need so badly now. This stadium, race track, and other construction could well be delayed.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. That is not the point on which I rose to speak. I rise at this time to ask the chairman of the committee about the Missouri River Basin project involving $150,000,000. My colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] asked something about the previous authorizations on that project. Does the gentleman have information as to the previous authorizations for the Missouri River Basin? Are they in the RECORD?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. I recall them offhand.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman was talking about a billion dollars. He was speaking about the over-all picture on flood control, not as to the Missouri River?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all. In the act of 1944 there was authorized for expenditure in the upper stretches by the Bureau of Reclamation $200,000,000, and a similar amount or expenditure by the Corps of Engineers in the lower stretches.

Mr. STEFAN. It is the $150,000,000 in this bill for the Missouri River Basin which I am interested in now. It was indicated in the debate that perhaps the Army engineers are going to be short of funds unless this authorization is made.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Absolutely.

Mr. STEFAN. Does that mean they have no funds on hand now?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No, it does not. It means that all the amounts previously authorized under the act approved in 1944 will be exhausted in the completion of projects which may take 5, 6, or 7 years and that have been initiated under the authority of the act of 1944, so that there will be no money for new projects.

Mr. STEFAN. This $150,000,000 for the Missouri River Basin depends on appropriations. From what the gentleman says now there will be enough to continue for the next 2 or 3 years the projects they have on hand now. This is to implement the Pick-Sloan plan on the Missouri River?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is.

Mr. STEFAN. That is the plan in which the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, and other Government agencies are collaborating in an over-all program. A program which we all favor because flood control work is so badly needed. It is an all-purpose program.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The adjustment was made in the act of 1944.

Mr. STEFAN. Does this $150,000,000 have to do with any work on the Blue River in Nebraska?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is no particular allocation that would authorize the construction of any work or that would provide for any appropriation for any work that has been authorized. My recollection is that provision has been made for the Blue River.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not true that the matter of the specific allocation of any appropriated funds would be a matter for determination when the appropriation is made under these authorizations?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have repeatedly so stated, not only with respect to the Missouri but all other projects.

Mr. STEFAN. I may say to the committee that on the Blue River in the vicinity of the towns of Milford, Seward, and Crete the Army engineers are said to be planning to construct some flood-control works. This project was originally planned, I have been unofficially told, for Kansas. Considerable opposition was made by the people of Kansas, it is charged, and the engineers moved their project up into Nebraska. The people of that particular locality feel they have no flood-control problem there but they do have a soil-conservation problem. Some of us appeared before General Wheeler, Chief of Army Engineers, who has very kindly sent the program back to the field for a resurvey and a restudy. The Nebraska people have held numerous meetings. They protest the rush to do this dam building before they have full opportunity to study a soil-conservation plan. They have sent delegations to Washington to confer with the various departments. We who want the Missouri River program of the engineers, the Reclamation, the Power Commission, and other agencies to succeed, would like for the engineers to restudy this proposed Blue River project until such time that the people in the affected area be given the chance to work out some coordinated program for the best interests of all concerned. I hope the chairman will be sympathetic in helping such a restudy to be made in order that thousands of acres of valuable agricultural land be kept in production of food so badly needed now. I am hopeful the engineers will give this matter further consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word about the Oklahoma City project provided for in this bill. Oklahoma City is not in my congressional district. It is perfectly all right with me for the committee to authorize the project down there to take care of the citizens of Oklahoma City and their properties. The city of Oklahoma City and the bottom farm lands in close proximity thereto have taken terrific beatings from the ravages of the North Canadian. This bill carries an authorization for a project estimated to cost more than $2,000,000. The thing that strikes me, however, as being a little hard to explain is the fact that you now authorize projects such as the Oklahoma City project when a project has already been authorized for many years 250 miles up the same stream, where the water comes from, and nothing has been done about the construction of it. If the Optima Dam, which was authorized some time ago, had been built along with some of the other work authorized, you probably would not need this project down in Oklahoma City.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. Does this project destroy some homesteads in the vicinity of the project?

Mr. RIZLEY. It destroys not only homesteads but it destroys a lot of property in Oklahoma City every year. It not only destroys property but takes lives, as is pointed out in the committee report. It is the overflow of the North Canadian River. But up the river more than 200 miles from Oklahoma City several years ago Congress in its wisdom authorized what is known as the Optima Dam on the same stream. That is where the water comes from. If that project had been built, then you would not need to spend all this money for these projects farther down the stream. That is a policy I do not understand. I do not understand the policy of the Federal Government in authorizing a project and then not doing anything about it, and then coming along and requesting other projects many miles below that must take the force of the water coming down the stream that could have been controlled if the upstream project had been completed.

There is another situation on the Cimarron River, also a part of the Arkansas River Basin. This river, heading way up in New Mexico and coming down through part of my congressional district, down through Kansas, then back into Oklahoma, has been responsible for much flood destruction. It carries a lot of water at flood times. We have been talking about Kenton Dam and the Englewood Dam on that river for years and years and years, but nothing is done about them; they have never even been authorized. I presume this committee will come in in probably a year or two and authorize a project at the mouth of the stream somewhere close to some city where all this damage is being done. Of course, the citizens are entitled to be protected. I do not want to be misunderstood about this. I am just calling your attention to the policy that has apparently been pursued of making authorizations upstream where the water gets rolling at flood stages and then doing nothing about it, and then coming in with another authorization down at the mouth of the stream for flood control.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Frankly, I am like you. I do not know what the difficulty has been after they have been authorized. It may be that the others are more important. But at all events, if the gentleman will ask me about it and give me a little while, I will investigate to see why that project has not been constructed, but I will say that the authorization of this project to protect Oklahoma City ought not to interfere in any wise with this project if it is a worthy project.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman says in his report where he refers to the Optima Dam that if it had been built along with the others it probably would have taken care of the situation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Of course, we have not been able to build anything during the war.

Mr. RIZLEY. I fully appreciate the fact that during the war necessarily these projects were held up. I know the able chairman of this committee, good businessman as he is, will endeavor to see that the upstream projects that would take care of much of the water are given consideration.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That does not mean that the others are going to be built first. Yours may be built first if you get the money.

Mr. RIZLEY. The Optima project has been authorized for many years and not a thing has been done about it.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. While I have definite reservations regarding its applicability to this bill, I believe he is rendering a great service in directing attention to a public-works policy. I heard his discussion of this amendment in the rivers and harbors bill. Many Members of Congress are vitally interested in the work which the gentleman from California has done in exploring this problem and in continually emphasizing the need of an over-all policy regarding the inauguration of desirable public works. As these bills come before us, all having much merit and presenting a strong appeal, we approve them, but nowhere have we adopted with reference to them criteria such as the gentleman from California advances.

I would like to ask the gentleman, therefore, specifically about the first one, with reference to projects designed to save human life. As to projects of that kind he would not impose any conditions at all, would he?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not any.

Mr. HAYS. In other words, when it is determined that human life is involved, none of these other criteria is to be invoked to retard the inauguration of such project?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. That is the whole theory upon which it is based.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman is presenting identically the same amendment that he presented when the rivers and harbors bill was considered?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Well, with some minor changes.

Mr. HAYS. It would also be geared to the policy in the maximum employment bill?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. HAYS. Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Simply to say this, that my judgement is that where a project is not, in and of itself, of immediate urgency for the reasons the gentleman has just discussed, as a matter of general policy it should be delayed until such time as there is an overall economic need for the expansion of business activity, particularly activity in the construction industry, which is the one we can come closest to stabilizing.

Mr. HAYS. I appreciate the gentleman's additional remarks.

The floods of 1943, 1944, and 1945 on the Arkansas River took 47 lives. The gentleman can understand why I wanted to be very clear on the point concerning which I questioned him.

I have pending before the Committee on Agriculture a bill to authorize contributions by the Federal Government to the construction of county agricultural buildings, to be owned by the county. I could not conscientiously ask the Committee on Agriculture to report that bill at this time, because we ought not be building agricultural buildings or any other kind of county buildings with this kind of Federal participation, in competition with residential construction. But my bill has merit. If my bill is reported I think the gentleman's formula ought to be written into it and in that case no long postponement would be necessary.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It is tough to wait to do things that are desirable to be done when the country is going forward in a fairly vigorous fashion, but unless we wait for those things when it would be easy to do them, we shall not have them to construct at the time when we really need them for the basic economy of the Nation.

Mr. HAYS. And the executive department dumps into our laps projects which they say are necessary and we are not prepared to contravert the assertion. I am interested in what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] might say with reference to these matters, for I share the high opinion expressed by the gentleman from California regarding the service of the gentleman from Mississippi as chairman of the Flood Control Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It is unnecessary for me to say that the gentleman from California knows I entertain a very high regard for him personally. He has been perfectly candid. He stated that he offered this amendment to the river and harbor bill recently passed. It is not applicable to that bill. It was overwhelmingly defeated there, and that is at least a precedent why the same course should be pursued here. But there was a reason why it was defeated there, and that reason obtains more especially why it should be defeated here. The gentleman would strike out this language in the bill:

> Projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements.

That language is not new. It has been tried, it has been tested. That is the language of previous appropriation bills, that is the language that states that these new projects authorized for the first time may have the same consideration as a project authorized 10 years ago, so that each project may stand on its merits. We do not propose by appropriations to allocate all of the money that Congress appropriates to projects that have heretofore been started.

Budgetary requirements must be considered. Now, the gentleman means well, of course. He did not appear before the committee, but I recall that the greatest flood our country has ever known occurred at the period of the greatest prosperity that our country has ever known. Some 300 lives were lost in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi in 1927. Did we put off from 1927 to 1933 efforts to repair those damages? Are we going to put it off now until there is a period of unemployment? Not at all. In my judgment, if this proposal could have been disregarded with respect to river and harbor projects, all the more it should be disregarded in the pending bill. Let us consider bills on their merits. Let us consider that when property is being destroyed, when lives are being lost, we will provide for them on the basis of need. The Chief of Engineers reports; he is in touch with the areas in all the 48 States. He says: "I give you this as No. 1 priority. There has been a flood there and flood damage, and it is therefore more important than this other project." And I submit that the appropriations we have next year should be allocated for such priority projects. He might well say to us that in Pennsylvania recently, in the last 4 weeks, because a project had been constructed at Wilkes-Barre and completed those people were protected, but at Williamsport the project had not been constructed and they were flooded. Shall they wait until we have another depression? We had better profit by the experiences we have had in all the previous flood-control acts, by language that has been tried and tested, rather than by language here that is confusing and that may cause uncertainty and that may defeat the very thing that flood control was intended to do, to wit, to protect the property and the lives of people whenever and wherever it is important that that be done. And we rely for the priority and the order in which those projects shall be constructed upon the reports of the Chief of Engineers. There have been no complaints in the past and there will be none in the future; but under the guise of dealing with some particular project I ask you not to adopt language here that is confusing and uncertain and that may hinder and delay and defeat the very purpose for which flood control was established and declared as a national policy.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Has there ever been any complaint against the Army engineers in regard to any of these projects in the matter of priorities?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. None. We have got to depend upon the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the budgetary requirements of the Congress. That is the thing that I had in mind.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Has the gentleman ever heard of any complaint against the Board of Army Engineers in the matter of giving projects priority?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all. I urge that you defeat the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has persuaded me that this amendment ought not to be adopted on the bill now pending. However, I think in fairness to the gentleman from California, though, that it ought to be made quite clear that his amendment, if it is adopted, would not affect construction of projects designed to save human life. The amendment pending is wise in principle, but this is not a fortunate choice of bills in which to offer it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is in good company. The language of the Apostle Paul, "Almost thou persuadest me," is again applicable.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to section 9?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

In reference to one item in this bill, entitled "Improvements to Bayou Pierre, Shreveport, La.," I wish to say that this is a project which is of urgent importance to my people. Some eight square miles of thickly settled urban property is affected by this provision for flood relief totaling $127,000.

My home in the city of Shreveport is located within a very short distance of some of the property affected periodically by floods. I have often gone out to view the rising waters in the heart of the city of Shreveport—a city of over 100,000 people—and seen the rising waters collecting as they tried to flow into Bayou Pierre. I have seen the floodwaters in the yards destroy the gardens and actually entering the homes of many of our people. At times, the water reaches several feet in depth in the midst of fine homes, driving the occupants from them to seek help at the hands of their friends from the swirling waters.

Mr. Chairman, floods have occurred at regular intervals and they are due to the fact that Bayou Pierre, miles below the city of Shreveport, is not properly opened up, permitting the passage of floodwaters as rapidly as they should be

carried away. This project can be easily handled by the Army engineers if Congress allows them to proceed. It will mean savings and protection to hundreds of homes in the city of Shreveport. and I hope there will be no opposition whatsoever to the Bayou Pierre project.

RED RIVER VALLEY

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Louisiana rise?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, as I stated in general debate earlier this evening, this is perhaps the most important flood-control bill which has been reported out by the Flood Control Committee in many years. While I am always interested in every flood-control bill in its entirety, I am particularly interested in the item in this bill providing for flood protective works on Red River Valley in Louisiana. Red River is over 1,200 miles long and directly and seriously affects the States of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, and Louisiana. Red River drains an area of 91,000 square miles. In 1940 the population in the Red River Valley basin was 2,816,000.

Red River Valley is one of the most fertile in the Nation. The vast agricultural lands in that valley produce almost all the standard crops of the Nation. Cotton, corn, hay, oats, potatoes, and many other crops are grown.

While that great valley has been visited by floods from time to time, in 1945 we had perhaps the worst flood in nearly 100 years. The damage was estimated by the Corps of Engineers to be $16,000,000. In the Red River Valley there are 1,700,000 acres subject to overflow. This Red River Valley bisects the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana which I have the honor to represent. I was in my district when the flood was at its worst. I rode in a motor boat over land where the water was so deep that I had to duck my head several times to go under the telephone wires along the railroad. The presence of the railroad could only be detected by the telephone and telegraph wires above. The duration of the flood was 73 days. I was down there in the mud and water trying in every way possible to help the people.

Mr. Chairman, the Flood Control Committee immediately asked the Corps of Engineers to make a new survey of the Red River Valley with the view of working out a plan to give the maximum amount of protection to that great Valley. I met with the engineers and went over the ground with them. We called groups of citizens to meet with us. The engineers worked out a comprehensive flood-control plan, consisting of levees and reservoirs. They felt that levees alone would not be sufficient and that reservoirs alone would not hold back enough water. They feel that the only feasible plan to solve the problem is a combination of levees and reservoirs. That plan is embodied in House Document No. 602 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session. That plan is incorporated in this bill which we are now considering. If this plan is approved by Congress, and the protective works specified are constructed, the engineers assure us that it will bring to Red River Valley the greatest possible measure of protection. I cannot too strongly urge that we approve that plan in this bill. As I said, it vitally concerns four States. When the protective works embraced in that plan are constructed, it will revolutionize agriculture in the Red River Valley.

I have worked for years to bring to that great valley protection from these recurring floods and I was happy to present that plan to the Flood Control Committee and I am happy now to present it to this House and I earnestly ask that it may have the approval of Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, as may be gathered from the question I asked the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] when he spoke a few minutes ago on his amendment, I am in sympathy with his proposal, as I understand it. He and I sat side by side on many long hearings of the Colmer Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning. I recognize that the intent of his amendment would be to carry out the philosophy embodied in certain reports of that Special Committee on Postwar Public Works. However, as I said to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], although the Voorhis amendment was not intended to delay projects which are intended to save human life, I did think that the present bill is the least favorable for such an amendment. I say this because almost all flood-control projects have as their object the safeguarding of human lives. No other kind of public works seem likely to protect human life to the extent that flood-control constructions are intended to do.

My colleague from California and I on the Colmer committee recall that in some of our earlier reports it is recommended by that committee that a program of public works should take many economic factors into consideration in addition to the need for that particular public building. We both feel that a public-building program ought to be related to the general economic condition of the country in such a way that certain needed public works shall be built when there is the least private employment furnished and not be built when private employment is at its highest peak. By such a time schedule a public-works program can be made to serve a double purpose and bring an equalizing, stabilizing influence on our national economy. In this way a wise public-building program can help to counteract the extremes of the business cycle and level off the crests and fill up the hollows in our economic conditions. To make this clearer let me quote one of the recommendations on public housing submitted by a subcommittee of the Colmer committee:

> It will be no service either to the public-works program or to the general economic welfare to expect from public work a larger contribution in the process of reconversion than the construction industry can support. Moreover, it would be a disservice to the national economy to put public work into a competitive position with private industry so that the expansion of needed enterprises would be delayed because of undue emphasis on public work.
>
> The first task of the Federal Government, aside from providing its volume of normal construction and repairs, is to free materials, equipment, and manpower. These will be required both for needed maintenance and repairs and for the reconversion and expansion of private industry. Meanwhile, at the earliest possible date public-works projects should be made ready for release if and when the condition of the industry and the level of business activity are such as to need the stimulation of public construction. The Federal Government is thus conceived as a rear line of defense. Federal financing should be invoked to support a large public-works program only as a necessary resort if local funds and private investment and unemployment insurance fall short of sustaining the economy during the conversion and postwar period.

This quotation hints at a correlation of public works and private building, with a time to emphasize each to the advantage of both and to the benefit of the national economy. However, there is a caution against overreliance upon public works to afford employment in good times. Obviously, though, there is no logic in discouraging public works which are vitally necessary, and no intent to delay flood-control works or any such works necessary for the protection of human lives.

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Chairman, of the projects embraced by this bill, while some are broader in scope and more costly, it is my humble judgment that none are more worthy than that designated as the Gathright and Falling Springs project, to be located on the Jackson River in Alleghany and Bath Counties, Va.

The Chief of Engineers has made a careful investigation of flood problems and conditions in the James River Basin. He presented a comprehensive reservoir plan designed to serve multiple purposes, which would embrace the development of 14 sites. Economic justification, however, would depend on the sale of power to be generated thereby. Of these 14 projects investigated, the engineers find that only the Gathright Dam and Falling Springs reregulating dam on Jackson River warrant construction in the very near future. As the result of exhaustive testimony relevant to existing conditions the Committee on Flood Control was convinced of the immediate need for flood control, improvement of low-water flow, and pollution abatement in the James River Basin. A study made by the Federal Power Commission indicates that there will be a suitable market by 1953 for the power which can be developed at the proposed Gathright Reservoir. This is a multiple-purpose project. It is the killing of more than one bird with the same stone. It will provide for the conservation of water and the regulation of the low-water flow. It will provide for the abatement of pollution. It will so regulate the flow of Jackson River as to bring about flood control. Added to these desirable features is the much needed manufacture of electric power. The drainage area of Jackson River above the town of Covington is approximately 900 square miles. The flow of this river varies from a maximum of 66,000

cubic feet per second to a minimum of about 60 cubic feet per second. One figure, of course, representing flood conditions and the other conditions which obtain as a result of a severe drought; one an enormous and shameful waste of water resources and the other representing a drastic and dangerous water shortage. The town of Covington and its industries get their supply of water from the Jackson River. During the dry seasons in each summer the industrial users consume almost all of the water in the river. These seasons sometime last as long as 3 months. During these periods the normal flow is about 80 cubic feet per second. The population of this town, numbering approximately 12,000 people, are not only seriously inconvenienced but suffer immeasurably as a result of the inadequacy of the water supply. The health of the people is, thereby, jeopardized and they are subjected to the hazards of fire.

Industrial expansion is severely curtailed and limited by reason of the fact that needed water supply is not available during the annual low-water periods. If the waters of Jackson River are stored up and conserved as proposed by this project it would redound to the wholesome and constructive benefit of this great area. The average flow of the river when controlled will vary between 300 and 800 cubic feet per second at Covington. This regulated flow would thus be from 5 to 10 times the present low-water flow. This flow, of course, would vary according to the demands of the situation and would at all times be sufficient to supply the needs of this area and the surrounding territory for both human and industrial uses. The critical problem of water supply would be solved as far as can be seen into the future.

Just a word relative to pollution abatement. Jackson River, located as it is, is the only available avenue for the disposal of industrial waste and municipal sewage. This applies for about a stretch of 5 miles through the town. The same is true with reference to other towns and communities located on the river. During periods when the river is 75 cubic feet or less, conditions become both serious and nauseating. During the hot summer months the pollution is greatly concentrated. The high temperatures operating on the concentrated pollution in the slow-moving water create a most objectionable condition. The relevancy of this condition to health and sanitation is most obvious. The controlled flow of the river which would be made possible by construction of this dam would abate this pollution in three ways. The first would be by dilution. At all times the flow of the river would be four or five times the present normal flow. During the hot summer months the flow would be approximately 500 cubic feet per second, or approximately six times the normal flow of the river. Thus, the pollution would be diluted from six to eight times during the worst months. Then, too, the increased speed of the flow would move the pollution out of the stream. The temperature of the water in hot weather under present conditions is from 80 to 85 degrees. The regulation of the water through the dam would reduce this to about 60 to 65 degrees. This of itself is a factor to be considered. The flood control benefits to be derived through the regulated flow of this river are incalculable. Estimated average annual flood damage to farm lands, crops, timber, to pulpwood and other wood products stored near the river, and damage to homes, railroads, business and personal properties situated along the river is about $75,000. At times, heavy rains, augmented by melting snows, precipitate tremendous volumes of water into this gorge and have caused, and no doubt will cause again, severe flood conditions.

This project will conserve for constructive utilization vast volumes of water otherwise uselessly dissipated and permit its regulation for constructive and wholesome purposes.

I have endeavored to call to your attention the desirable, beneficial, and humane features of this project. These are, of course, very important, but the economic justification of this project resides in its potential production and dissemination of electric power. The estimated annual power potential of this dam is 51,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The regulated flow of the river would have an important effect also in increasing the value of downstream power plants. There are a number of such plants on the James River, owned by municipalities, industry, farms, and public utility companies. These plants would be given increased productive capacities. This increase is estimated at 6,100 kilowatts. The estimated increased production of the downstream plants is 26,000,000,000 kilowatts annually. The factors which have been considered as a basis of economic justification for the construction of this project are both tangible and intangible. These factors are regulation of stream flow, pollution abatement, flood control, electric power, and recreation.

According to the engineers' report, these factors give the project an economic ratio of 1 to 1.73, which means that for every one dollar spent in a year's time, the estimated return is $1.73. If we would disregard entirely the intangible benefits, then the report of the engineers still estimates that the value of the power produced at the dam, plus the value of the increased power produced by existing downstream plants, will more than pay the annual cost of the project, including the carrying charges. I feel that this project is economically sound, and merits the approval of the Congress.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, the legislation now before us for consideration contains projects for the Potomac River Basin. I have been privileged to work closely with Representative BEALL, of Maryland, and others, in the furtherance of the items calling for—

First. A local flood-protection development at Cumberland and West Cumberland, in the State of Maryland, and Ridgeley—a community which I represent—in West Virginia. This program was authorized in the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936. Under the provisions of House bill 6597, we would amend the project which has been previously authorized by providing for the finishing of the work in accordance with certain Army Engineer recommendations, which have been the result of many years of study. There is an estimated cost for the project by the Federal Government of $1,520,000. In this connection I desire to make it very clear that Ridgeley is a relatively small community when compared with Cumberland. We realize the necessity for cooperation between these two municipalities, but I would remind my colleagues that Ridgeley finds itself, as a political subdivision, unable to provide local funds which would be out of proportion to its ability to raise necessary money. In company with Congressman BEALL, I have held many conferences with officials of both Ridgeley and Cumberland, and many splendid individual citizens, in an effort to better understand our mutual problems. The able chairman of the Flood Control Committee [Mr. WHITTINGTON] was most courteous to us when we testified.

Second. The additional project to which I call your attention is the Savage River Dam on the tributary waters of the Potomac about Westernport, Md., and Piedmont, W. Va. This meritorious item, as contained in the legislation now before us, would be completed at an estimated cost to the Federal Government of $1,900,000. This sum would become available on condition that local interests contribute $200,000 toward the cost of the work. We are pleased to advise that this latter sum is available. At this point I wish to commend Owen Hitchins and those individuals of his commission who have worked diligently and constructively over a long period of time to bring about the completion of the Savage River Dam. When finished it will bring needed flood control to the communities of Westernport and Luke, Md., and Piedmont and Keyser, W. Va.

Mr. Chairman, many Members of both the House and Senate have worked for years during their service in the Congress in furtherance of the worth-while projects to which I have made reference. I desire to remember their efforts and to publicly at this time again pay tribute to their helpfulness.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries the authorization for $7,420,000 for flood control in and for the city of Cumberland. It also carries the authorization for $1,900,000 to complete the Savage River Dam. There is no question in my opinion but that both projects are necessary and meritorious.

The city of Cumberland has periodically been inundated when floods did thousands of dollars' worth of damage even to the point of endangering lives. It has been recognized for many years that something should be done to protect property which has been constantly subjected to floods.

Just recently the United States Engineers completed and set up a model plan for flood prevention in their laboratory at Vicksburg, Miss. This plan shows most comprehensively how floods may be prevented in Cumberland. The Army Engineers, after an exhaustive study of this entire situation, have recommended the early completion of this project.

The Savage River Dam was originated as a WPA project, and work progressed until 1942, when the war stopped the project after it was 65 percent completed. More than $4,000,000 has already been spent on this project, and now if the authorization for $1,900,000 is approved, work can be resumed and the original investment preserved. Unless this additional money is authorized and appropriated, the $4,000,000 already spent will be thrown away.

After the project is completed it will control the flow of the Savage River, which in turn empties into the North Branch of the Potomac River. By controlling these waters the flood hazard for the towns of Luke and Westernport, Md., and Piedmont, and Keyser, W. Va., will be practically eliminated. At this point I might call your attention to the fact that more than 25,000 people live in these four towns and the total assessed value of the property runs into millions of dollars. One large paper mill is assessed at some $15,000,000 and is subjected to floods which may occur in the North Branch of the Potomac River. In addition to flood prevention, the completion of this project will also guarantee a flow of fresh water in the Potomac River during the dry season which will eliminate the present stagnation and stream pollution.

It is for these reasons I hope the House will approve the authorization of these two projects.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to section 9?

Are there amendments to section 10?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 23, after line 11, insert the following:

"Schuylkill River and tributaries, Pennsylvania."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 24, after line 2, insert the following:

"Choctawhatchee River, Fla. and Ala."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 24, after line 23, insert the following:

"Little Kanawha River and tributaries, West Virginia."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 25, line 9, strike out the words "and Wisconsin."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN of Lousiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the reading of section 9.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to obtain information from the chairman of the committee concerning the proposed Lucky Peak Reservoir on the Boise River, in Idaho. It is my understanding there is nothing included in this bill for that particular project, although the authorization was approved by the Board of Engineers. Can the chairman give me any information concerning the status of that project?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will give the gentleman my general recollection and in order to do that I repeat what I previously stated to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] that the Idaho projects, according to my information, that have been passed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors under the act of 1944 have been transmitted to the Governor and to the State agencies, but have not been returned, hence were not in position to be transmitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and are not included in this bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I understand they were approved by the Governor and other agencies, that the report is now pending in the Department of the Interior; consequently the Bureau of the Budget was not able to transmit any report to the Congress.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Until and unless the Department of the Interior submits its report, the Chief of Engineers is without authority to transmit it to the Director of the Budget or the Congress. The thing to do is to get the Department of the Interior to forward that report so that it might be considered by the Senate before the bill is passed.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The other body can then consider the project and include it in the bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is correct, and I so stated to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the Potomac River Basin project, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and myself, are deeply interested in at least two of them. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the reading of section 9.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD immediately after the vote taken on the Voorhis amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following section 9.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the same point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 10?

Section 11?

Section 12?

Section 13?

Section 14?

Section 15?

Section 16?

Section 17?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 27, line 22, strike out the words "of the initial stage."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, by reference to the bill, that language is easily understood. Section 17 reads:

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $150,000,000 for the prosecution of the initial stage of the comprehensive plan—

The language stricken is "of the initial stage." That will make the language of the authorization for the Department of the Interior comparable to the language previously used in this bill for the War Department, and it is intended that this $150,000,000 be made available only to the Department of the Interior for projects previously authorized for that Department to be constructed in the upper stretches of the Missouri, under the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This is in line with the amendment I discussed with the gentleman on various occasions, which has the approval of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

IMPORTANCE OF THE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 17

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has just been adopted on the motion of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is, to thousands of people in the Missouri River Basin, second in importance only to the passage of the Flood Control Act of 1944, itself. That act established a basic approval for the comprehensive flood control and water use program often referred to as the combined Pick-Sloan plan, with appropriation authorization limited to certain units or projects set forth as "the initial stages" of the program. This amendment, which has just been adopted, dropping the phrase "initial stages" from the increased authorizations carried in this bill makes possible—and I quote—"the prosecution of the comprehensive plan" adopted by section 9a of the act approved December 22, 1944—Public, No. 534, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Section 9a of that act reads:

The general comprehensive plans set forth in House Document No. 475 and Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as revised and coordinated by Senate Document No. 247, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, are hereby approved and the initial stages are hereby authorized and shall be prosecuted by the War Department and the Department of the Interior as speedily as may be consistent with budgetary requirements.

In succeeding paragraphs there followed a specific authorization of $200,000,000 for each branch of the program, Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation, as has been stated by the gentleman from Mississippi.

In section 9 of the bill now under consideration, in the paragraph appearing on page 17 under the head "Missouri River Basin" there is carried an additional authorization for appropriation of $150,000,000—and I quote:

For the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved by the act of June 28, 1938, as expanded by section 9a of the act approved December 22, 1944 * * * for continuing the works in the Missouri River Basin to be undertaken under said expanded plan by the Corps of Engineers.

And section 17, just approved as amended by striking out the words "of the initial stage," makes a similar authorization of an additional one hundred and fifty millions for the prosecution of the portion of the comprehensive plan to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior.

As indicated by my colloquy with the gentleman from Mississippi, who is the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, the amendment is the outgrowth of previous discussions of the matter. For the purpose of the record, it may be well to review them.

During the deliberations of the committee, when the Missouri River Basin was scheduled for hearing, April 11, 1946, I appeared before the committee and called attention to the need for authorizing work on some of the smaller projects in the comprehensive plan, projects which were approved but which were not listed in the initial stage as set forth by the review board of the Bureau of Reclamation. I mentioned, in particular, the importance of the Keyhole Reservoir on the Belle Fourche River, a branch of the Cheyenne, which is a tributary of the Missouri, and the Bixby and Green Grass Reservoirs on the Moreau River, which is a tributary of the Missouri. References to this matter appear on pages 362, 374, and 386.

Subsequently I discussed the matter with the chairman who suggested that I see the Commissioner of Reclamation and determine whether the Secretary of the Interior would support the proposal, in a new authorization, to drop the limitation to projects on the initial stage list.

This I endeavored to do but a conference could not be arranged until Wednesday, June 5, at which time the bill had been reported. Present at the conference in the office of Commissioner of Reclamation, were the Commissioner, Mr. Michael W. Strauss, the Assistant Commissioner, Mr. William Warne, and their chief project engineer.

At this conference I pointed out that many of the smaller projects encompassed in the comprehensive plan for the Missouri Basin were of urgent importance and should not be required to wait until the large projects mentioned in the initial stage list were completed. I pointed out that it might require 15 or 20 years to complete such projects as the Souris and the Oahe-James, and that in the meantime, many small projects with local flood-control features of the greatest urgency would be stalled, although they could be completed, in some instances, for less than the damages their floods would create.

I pointed out, for example, that floods on the Moreau River in South Dakota in a single year had created damage to highways and bridges and rich bottom hay lands equal to from one-fourth to one-half of the estimated cost of dams that would not only stop the flood damage but also create exceedingly valuable water storage.

The Moreau is a stream of intermittent flow. Some years it has heavy spring floods with a great volume of water. Yet, in late July and August of those same years, the stream may be entirely dry, not even having water for livestock for stretches of from 30 to 100 miles. Yet, the engineers estimate that storage of the flood waters in two reservoirs will provide stock water every year and permit irrigation of approximately 23,000 acres of choice bottom land. This is extremely important to the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation and the lands immediately west of it.

On the other hand the cost of the Souris project in North Dakota, an initial-stage project, is estimated at $133,839,000 and in Montana at $35,247,200, a total of $169,086,200. The cost of the Oahe-James project in South Dakota is estimated at $105,008,000. These figures are for the reclamation features only. They do not include the cost of the dams on the main stem of the Missouri River which are to supply the water for the projects.

These are only two of the projects in the authorized initial stages and there are other sizable ones such as the Hardin at forty-three million and the Marias at twenty-five million.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, if the small projects on the tributaries with high local flood-control urgency and high irrigation values for ranchers already settled in the valleys were to wait until those big projects were all completed, another generation of farmers would be on the scene before results are realized.

Perhaps the most outstanding example of a project with a small cost and yet high irrigation values is that of the Keyhole Reservoir on the upper Belle Fourche River in the Bear Lodge Mountains of Wyoming.

As I said in a memorandum letter on the topics of my conference with the Commissioner, which I left with him at the time:

Keyhole is a unique site and offers a chance to double the storage of the Belle Fourche project for as little as $750,000. The Belle Fourche project was constructed to serve 60,000 acres, yet has never served more than 45,000; and normally serves only 35,000 and in 1 year had only 9 inches of water for that.

The Belle Fourche has always been a problem project because of water shortage. With a capacity of 200,000 acre-feet in the reservoir, even in many years of high run-off, it has only had around 100,000 to 130,000 acre-feet of water because the inlet canal which is 9 miles long will not handle the river's flow in flood. The Keyhole Reservoir can be constructed for $750,000, which is much less than the cost of enlarging the canal would be, besides having other advantages, serving lands above the inlet, etc., providing 275,000 acre-feet of storage and adding at least 10,000 acres to the project.

The Keyhole is not listed in "the initial stages" authorized for appropriations and construction, yet is of great importance.

I am happy to say, Mr. Chairman, that Commissioner Strauss and Assistant Commissioner Warne agreed with me that developments warranted a revision of the authorized program in the way I had suggested and agreed that they would discuss the matter with the Secretary of the Interior.

Subsequently, I had another conference with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and then submitted a memorandum letter on the desirability of the amendment to make the new authorization applicable to the comprehensive plan as a whole, and not limited to the projects listed for the initial stages. Under permission given in the House, I insert the pertinent paragraphs from that letter at this point:

1. Many small projects with high flood-control values will be postponed for years if forced to wait until the projects listed in the initial stage are to be completed first. These projects are on tributaries and have irrigation values and, under the division of responsibility agreed upon in 1944, will be constructed by the Bureau. But the flood damages are such that the committee will be called upon to enact individual flood-control authorizations if their construction is to be thus delayed. It makes sense to let the Bureau proceed with them without waiting until the big projects are finished.

The Moreau River in South Dakota is an example.

2. Section 9a of the Flood Control Act of 1944 refers to the initial stages for both the

Corps of Engineers' projects and those of the Bureau. But the letter of the Chief of Engineers did not specify or limit individual projects for an initial phase of the comprehensive plan as did that of the Commissioner of Reclamation or his Board. This, I think, was not intentional in either case. The existing situation is more accidental, then, and should be corrected.

3. The Bureau has been operating on the theory that projects started could be prosecuted with annual appropriations without measuring the total cost of the completed project against the authorizations. That is at variance with the practice of the Army engineers. It would be in order to require identical policy and practice in this respect, if the authorizations were in identical words; that is, for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan. Otherwise it will be difficult to maintain effective appropriation controls.

I call particular attention, Mr. Chairman, to the third paragraph because I am sure that if Congress is to keep a check upon its expenditures, it is desirable that when projects are begun, their costs shall be measurable against the authorizations the Congress has established.

At a conference which I had with the gentleman from Mississippi, last Saturday afternoon, he advised me that the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation had notified him that they were in accord with the amendment proposed and that he would discuss it with the Chief of Engineers. And so today, I was very happy to have him say to me that he would offer, in behalf of the committee, the amendment which has now been adopted.

I have made this statement, Mr. Chairman, in order that the legislative history on the point may be noted and the intent of the amendment clearly established.

I sincerely hope, therefore, when this bill is passed by both bodies of the Congress, as I am confident it will be, and approved by the President, that the Bureau of Reclamation in preparing its construction program and estimates for next year will include a provision for such meritorious projects as the Keyhole Reservoir in Wyoming and one of the reservoirs proposed for the Moreau River in South Dakota.

The Angostura Dam now being let for construction, the Shadehill Dam on the Grand, proposed for initiation in 1947, the Brennan on Rapid Creek, the Keyhole and the Moreau Dams as well as the Rocky Ford Dam on the White and the small 15,000 acre-foot dam on the Bad River could all be completed, Mr. Chairman, for between 15 and 20 million dollars, which is only a fraction of the amount estimated for some of the larger projects in the comprehensive plan.

And each one of these could be completed in a relatively short space of time and start yielding direct, specific benefits to the generation of farmers who fought their way through dry, hard years of the thirties, and deserve to see their dreams of flood control and irrigation come to fruition in the great basin of the Missouri River and its tributaries.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: On page 28, line 3, after the period insert: "No funds under this act shall be allocated unless actual construction shall have been started prior to this date."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the pending section or to any part of the bill. However, I will reserve it if the gentleman desires to speak on it.

Mr. McGREGOR. I would appreciate it if you would withhold your objection so that I might debate it.

Mr. Chairman, the only reason that I inserted this particular amendment was the fact that this enabling legislation went through here in 1939; really in 1938. Then the Corps of Engineers decided in 1939 that a little project, as the whole program is concerned, down in my district, known as Dillon Dam, costing approximately $8,000,000, should not be built at that time because of the high cost of construction. Now they decide it should be constructed in 1946 at the prices now prevailing. You know, it seems ridiculous to me that we here in Congress allocate a certain amount of money for the Army Engineers for the construction of dams on the one hand, and tear down homes, and then turn around and give Mr. Wyatt, the Expediter, $400,000,000 for the construction of houses. In other words, we give one branch of the Federal Government money to build homes and another branch of the Federal Government the right to tear down homes. They are destroying approximately 768 houses in this particular district. Why in the world do we want to allocate a certain amount of money for the construction of houses in these United States and then turn around and give them money for destroying 768 houses in one district? All I am asking is that you do not allow any of these funds to be allocated until after actual construction has started. There is no actual construction started in our particular dam, known as Dillon Dam. But does it not seem funny to you that we are either going to do one thing or the other—build houses, repair homes, or build dams? We are going to build dams or we are going to build homes for the veterans. You cannot do both. There just is not enough lumber and building material to do it. Let us be honest, and decide what we are going to do. We cannot, as stated above, do both. Either we build houses or we take people's property and build houses—or build dams. I am for protecting the property owner and build homes—not dams. So all I am asking in this very simple amendment, although it has broad features, is that no funds authorized under this act shall be allocated unless actual construction has been started prior to this date.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. If the gentleman's amendment should carry, it would not be possible to start some projects. As a matter of fact, they need this money in order to make a start.

Mr. McGREGOR. This amendment will not hurt any project unless it has not been started. If it has not been started it will not be started. The engineering cost is covered entirely outside of the allocation of the construction cost. If you have not started, you will not get started, but if you have started, it will not hurt you a particle.

Mr. ELSTON. The engineers would not be able to go ahead and start any of these Ohio River flood-control projects. There are many of them that have not been started where they have comprehensive plans, but unless this money is authorized and is later appropriated, those Ohio River projects cannot be started if the gentleman's amendment should carry.

Mr. McGREGOR. Certainly they will not be started, but you are going to have to decide here in Congress whether you are going to build flood-control walls or whether you are going to build houses for veterans. That is the subject that is here before us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sure all of us are interested in securing houses for veterans, but for the life of me I cannot see how this conflicts with flood control. Will the gentleman tell me the name of a single flood-control project where any appreciable amount of lumber has ever been used in flood control that could be used otherwise?

Mr. McGREGOR. I will be very happy to, because I am personally interested in one. They are just getting ready to relocate 10 miles of the B. & O. Railroad down in Licking County. If the gentleman will sit down and figure it out he will get this result. I will go through it in my head. Ten miles of 7-by-8 cross ties which you have to move will mean approximately 2,000 houses for veterans. On this amendment you are either going to vote for 2,000 houses for veterans or you are going to vote for 10 miles of relocation of the B. & O. Railroad. I will be very glad to answer the gentleman's question further if that does not answer it. It is a very simple proposition. You are going to do one thing or the other, as stated above. You are going to vote for veterans' housing or you are going to vote for flood construction which means flood control in certain areas.

Let us be honest and vote; are we for flood control or for house repair and houses for our veterans? No other issue is involved. It is up to you.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to insist upon my point of order. The language of the amendment has to do with allocations and appropriations. No funds are being allocated or appropriated in this bill. A moment's reflection will show that this language is utterly contradictory. This is an authorization bill authorizing something. Now he undertakes to say that that thing shall not be started. In the very nature of the case it could not be started until it is authorized, so that the language is not only not germane—it might be applicable to an appropriation bill and it was made applicable to appropriations in the Deficiency Act last De-

cember because we confined that act to projects on which work had been begun—but I respectfully submit that this language here is not applicable to an authorization bill, and that the point of order should be sustained because this language is utterly inconsistent and contradictory in an authorization bill, and is certainly not germane to section 17. It is not offered as a new section.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CLARK). The amendment may not be germane to the particular section to which it is offered but the Chair does think it would be germane to the bill as a whole in the nature of a limitation. The Chair sustains the point of order, but calls attention to the fact that it could be offered as a new section to the bill. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Section 17 authorizes appropriation to be made in the future in the sum of $150,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan adopted under the Sloan-Pick plan for the development of the Missouri Basin. It is necessary that this authorization be made at this time so that planning for the development of this basin can be carried on in an orderly manner. The plan for the development of the water, soil, and power resources, and flood control and navigation features of the basin has been adopted by the Congress and approved by the President. If the development of this basin is to proceed, it is necessary that Congress authorize the expenditure of funds from time to time, so that the appropriation may be made as manpower and materials are available for the construction. It is necessary that this authorization be included in this bill and passed at this time so that the unified development of the basin as a whole may proceed, that is the development of the upper basin should proceed in conjunction with the flood-control and navigation projects of the lower basin.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair Mr. CLARK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6597) to authorize the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 668, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCK) there were—ayes 68, noes 10.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on the bill be continued until next Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] withdraw his point of order of no quorum?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to have the vote taken on Thursday. I withdraw the point of order.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill and that all Members who spoke on this bill may have permission to extend their remarks at the point where they debated on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

AMENDING BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 4160, an act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 10 to 12, inclusive, and insert:

"(8a) 'Council' shall mean the judicial council of the circuit provided for by section 306 of the United States Judicial Code."

Page 3, line 5, strike out "council", and insert "senior judge."

Page 3, strike out lines 8 to 13, inclusive.

Page 3, line 14, strike out "'c.'" and insert "'b.'"

Page 4, strike out lines 4 to 7, inclusive.

Page 4, line 13, strike out all after "charges" down to and including "review" in line 15.

Page 9, line 24, and page 10, line 1, strike out "less than $3,000 nor."

Page 10, line 2, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$5,000."

Page 13, line 16, strike out all after "fund" where it occurs the second time, down to and including "funds" in line 18.

Page 13, line 19, after "of" where it appears the first time insert "annual appropriations from."

Page 13, line 21, after "of" insert "annual appropriations from."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

Mr. SPRINGER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to object, I would like to have the distinguished gentleman from Alabama explain the situation at this time.

Mr. HOBBS. The distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is a member of our committee and knows that the full committee this morning authorized this bill to be called up in pursuance of the unanimous report by the subcommittee. This bill is the salary bill for referees in bankruptcy, which takes out of our judicial system the last vestige of the fee system which has been so long a thorn in the flesh.

The amendments by the Senate, except three that are of some substance, are merely clarifying and perfecting amendments. There is no objection to them. Both the subcommittee and the full Committee on the Judiciary have asked that the bill be called up and the Senate amendments agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER. The subcommittee and the full committee have both passed upon this bill?

Mr. HOBBS. Unanimously.

Mr. SPRINGER. And this morning unanimously requested that the gentleman from Alabama call the matter up and agree to the Senate amendments?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes; that is true.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Under this bill as it is now written and will be accepted if adopted by the House, it will place a ceiling on the salaries of referees in bankruptcy at $10,000; is that correct?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. At the present time how much in fees do many of the referees receive in the United States?

Mr. HOBBS. According to the hearings and testimony before our subcommittee, there were several referees in bankruptcy who in years past had made more than $100,000 a year each. Many of them make three or four times as much as their creators, the district judges.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will this bill increase or lessen the number of referees?

Mr. HOBBS. This will greatly decrease the number of referees, and I think will insure a more judicial attitude on the part of all of them and a better staffing of their offices, and better accounting.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. With the salaries limited to $10,000, will this bill be self-supporting from the fees paid in?

Mr. HOBBS. According to the testimony, and we think it is accurate, there not only will not be a deficit in the fund but probably a profit to the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a memorial address recently delivered by a former colleague, Hon. Lewis E. Miller.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole, and include certain letters which he wrote.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made at the Stock Growers Convention on the value of meat in the diet.

Mr. GORSKI asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FOREIGN RELIEF AND DOMESTIC FOOD SHORTAGES

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the question of food is giving the people of America great concern at the present time. This afternoon I wish to speak on one small phase of the food problem, but before proceeding I should like to announce to the House that a communication comes in today from Armour & Co., of Chicago, one of the major meat packers of this Nation, stating that 6,500 head of beef cattle have passed through the Chicago yards but that, under OPA compliance, they were not able to buy a single head.

Mr. Speaker, the administration here in Washington, acting for the Government, has bought up and cornered the wheat market and the corn market by paying a premium of 30 cents a bushel above the normal price, when the stocks of wheat and corn were short.

Now they have control of the wheat and corn, which they purchased to relieve the famine areas in Europe and Asia. Unless they release and allow some of these products to be diverted for the use of the American people, industry will be seriously crippled throughout the Nation and we will have a near famine if not a real one here in America.

Most of the flour mills throughout the Nation are shut down today and bread lines are appearing, according to newspaper reports, with a meat shortage as well. Coal miners in Illinois threaten to strike unless they get meat.

Corn is not only necessary for the feeding of livestock and poultry, but it is necessary in many ways in keeping industry going. The farmers are asked to raise less hogs and less poultry. A bad food shortage can happen in this year or in 1947 unless we act with due caution.

Let me give you one of many illustrations which is applicable throughout the Nation. The Hollywood Candy Co., of Centralia, Ill., in my congressional district, for some time has been running only about half time because of the lack of corn sirup. This company employs 550 people and unless it can get relief right away it must close down, throwing these people out of work. The president of the company had wired me asking that I intercede with the administration and the Department of Agriculture in an effort to have sufficient sirup allocated to his plant to continue operation.

My first move was to contact the Department in an effort to find the cause of this shortage, and here is the interesting information from the Department of Agriculture which is authentic and can be verified.

They told me that in an effort to help the people in the famine areas abroad that between April 22 and May 11, by paying a 30-cents-per-bushel bonus, that the Government bought about 34,000,000 bushels of corn at approximately $1.51 per bushel, including bonus. Part of this corn has been shipped to Europe for processing, but the greater part of it is to be processed in this country and, as I understand, largely made into sirup.

Having bought up the corn, which is extremely scarce in this particular instance, the Government contracted with the Union Starch & Refining Co., at Granite City, Ill., to have 600,000 bushels of this corn made into 21,000,000 pounds of sirup to be shipped to Europe to be distributed by UNRRA.

This Union Starch & Refining Co., at Granite City, had been supplying the Hollywood Candy Co. with its sirup. Because of a shortage of steel this company processed and shipped 24 carloads of sirup in wooden barrels and because of continuing shortage of steel for the making of steel drums which were preferable, and also because of the shortage of wooden barrels, the company has processed and filled with sirup 35 steel tank cars which are on the siding at Granite City, Ill.

The CPA has allocated steel to make 26,000 more steel drums for this company of which 5 carloads are expected to arrive this week.

Mr. F. A. Martoccio, president of the Hollywood Candy Co. wired me urging that his former supplier located only 50 miles away be permitted by the Government to divert some of this sirup to his company so that he may continue to keep his plant going insuring employment for 550 people.

Up to Saturday last the Department here in Washington which controls the situation did not feel they could make such a diversion. Monday, however, they gave me the good news that the sirup contained in the tank cars would be diverted to supply the domestic or home-front trade temporarily which will give the Hollywood Candy Co. some much needed immediate relief. This diversion will only be a drop in the bucket to what the trade generally needs for home consumption. It is, however, greatly appreciated by me and will be appreciated by Mr. Martoccio, the president of the company, and the 550 people who work for that company.

I would like to pay the highest compliment to the men in the Department of Agriculture who are handling this most difficult problem. I have found them at all times honest, frank, sympathetic, and deeply interested in the welfare of the Nation.

In fact, those in charge of this corn and wheat program, I am sure, are deeply concerned as to the effect the carrying out of the administration's program is going to have on the economy of our Nation. I am sure they fear under the present situation, that they will not be able to secure enough of the refined products of corn to even supply the industrial and pharmaceutical plants which need it until the late fall corn crop comes in.

The American people contributed about $50,000,000,000 to the European allies in food and equipment to defeat the Axis Powers; they contributed in the sacrifice and lives of their sons a priceless loss that money can never repay. They are still willing to share as much as is possible of our food, medicine, and clothing to the famine areas abroad.

There is, however, a limit to our generosity. Charity begins at home. Our first obligation is to the American people. There is no glory and no sense in dragging down the American people to a low level at home throwing countless thousands of people out of work by those in charge of our Government.

Since the Government has bought up the surplus wheat, bought up the surplus corn, and controls the market, it is the first duty and responsibility of the Government to release enough of the wheat to the millers to stop the bread lines in this country. To release to the processors enough corn to reasonably protect the established business concerns which must have such corn products to continue to employ their people and supply the food products in the confectionery line which the people need and want for their physical well-being.

Servicemen who helped to defend this country are writing to me asking for more sirup and sugar for businesses they are operating.

It is the responsibility of this Government, which has cornered the market, to see that the bakers have sufficient corn sugar, corn sirup and such by-products as will permit them even in a limited form to continue their regular established business practices. If they do not, thousands of bakeries will close.

I note the bakers are to be allowed to make only 60 percent of the cakes, pies, cookies, and more highly sweetened products that they were permitted to make in 1941. This will save no bread. The loaf of bread has been reduced in weight and raised a penny in price. Another contribution to famine abroad.

Carrying the illustration of the Hollywood Candy Co. a little further, let me point out just what the Administration, which has placed on these rigid controls, is doing to the officials in management and to the 550 men and women who work in that plant.

THEY TAKE AWAY THEIR JOBS

The management and the men and women throughout the war bought bonds mostly checked off from their salaries every month. The money they have loaned the Government by buying bonds is now used by the Government paying 30 cents a bushel bonus for corn and this corn is being processed by the Union Starch & Refining Co., at Granite City, making 21,000,000 pounds of sirup which is being shipped to Europe to the famine areas. The result is that 550 men and women are having their pay checks stopped by being thrown out of work because the Government has stepped in buying up the corn, taking over the processing plant and shipping the product to Europe. Many will have to cash their bonds and go on unemployment relief unless this sirup is made continuously available.

This practice is going on all over the Nation. It is the continuation of the policy which has been in force for years of taking too great an interest in the people of other countries at the expense of the American people. It is a continuation of the give-away policy which goes far beyond reasonable, sensible charity. The American people are generous and want to help but there is a limit to their generosity.

The Government has planned to ship out 100,640,000 pounds of sirup which they say is being bought by the UNRRA organization. The cost of laying it down in Europe is largely borne by the Federal Government. The American Government has donated billions to UNRRA. In fact, of the 50 nations pooling their finances from the beginning, the United States has put in 72 percent of all the money and probably a great deal more. We furnish UNRRA the money to buy our products. That completes the gift.

Mr. Speaker, the time has arrived when we Members of Congress demand an immediate investigation. We want to know just what the Government is doing with the millions of bushels of wheat bought at a bonus of 30 cents a bushel and what they are doing and are going to continue to do with the 34,000,000 bushels of corn bought in the same manner. We should find out how much of this wheat and corn is in the United States, how much is being processed here, and how much is being processed in Europe. Yes; how much of it is being wasted and allowed to spoil, and whether the Government will divert some of it to our own people and our own industries to keep them going.

There has been colossal waste connected with practically every activity of UNRRA, and, doubtless, colossal waste will be practiced in handling of the food we are sending to the famine areas abroad.

I am satisfied if the Members of Congress had the figures now these figures would show that more of the wheat and more of the corn which is now cornered and hoarded by the Government could be loaned to the millers and processors to prevent the shortage of bread, the shortage of sirup, and the shortage of many things that are happening because more of this grain is hoarded than is necessary at the present time. The grain could be paid back later if necessary and our industries could be kept going.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] last Friday, introduced a resolution to appoint a committee of the House to immediately start such an investigation to learn what commitments have been made on famine relief. It can do no harm but could do a great deal of good. If we will put this resolution through the Congress immediately and start such an investigation, maybe this time we can "lock the door before the horse is stolen."

I want to endorse this resolution and commend it to the Members of the House. Let us get behind it and take action now, because time is of the essence.

Let us try to prevent waste, and investigate first. There has been an investigation uncovering a tremendous waste in the handling of surplus property. There is a demand for an investigation of the waste of some $5,000,000,000 alleged to have happened through War Shipping Administration. There has been waste and investigation of waste on a scale never paralleled before in the history of this Government. Let us not hysterically waste ourselves into a food famine in the country.

Mr. Speaker, the American people were willing to be regimented during the war. They had hoped that controls would be lifted as rapidly as possible afterward. To the amazement of Congress and to the amazement of the American people controls have been tightened. New controls never thought of in this country have been clamped down on the American people. Regimentation greater than any time during the war is beginning to give the people great concern.

They had hoped for something better. The Congress must continue to do its best to combat further controls so that the people may get back, maybe once again to their normal American way of life.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I believe the gentlemen meant to indicate that they had passed through the Chicago livestock yards and not through the yards of Armour & Co.

Mr. VURSELL. That is right. They further state that is hardly probable that they will be able to buy under OPA compliance and butcher any cattle during this entire week.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. At a food hearing meeting at Indianapolis on the 8th day of June the representatives of Kingan and Armour were present and testified. They gave evidence that at the Indianapolis stockyards on one day something over 3,000 head of livestock had passed through and they were able to secure but 256 head for slaughtering purposes; that the others were loaded into trucks, taken into the large centers; and they were ostensibly used for black-market purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Along that same line, I had a telegram from the Black Hills Packing Plant, Rapid City, S. Dak., calling attention to their situation and to a report in the newspaper there to the effect that it had been impossible for them to be in compliance. This is a federally inspected plant. They found it impossible to purchase live animals and to dress them out and have the required percentage of dressed meat. They say that because of the conflicting regulations and the large number of regulations it is impossible to stay in business and do it lawfully today.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The same situation prevails on the west coast. I am glad the gentleman is taking this up, because it involves loss because of the meat being diverted from the usual channels and very important parts of the meat industry, and it involves the loss of fats and oils which we need now.

Mr. VURSELL. That is quite correct. Millions of pounds of food are being lost by the small slaughterers over the Nation that the people need because the regulations of the OPA have forced them out of the legitimate channels into the black market.

I shall not go further with this subject, but I wanted to make this announcement. I should like now to confine my remarks to wheat and grain and to other problems of byproducts that are being shipped out of the country.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield briefly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Speaking of the black market, a packing plant has come to my attention which has been unable to make any money because it wanted to abide by the law. A party approached the owner of that packing plant and offered to pay the owner of this small plant $2,500 a week, $10,000 a month, or $120,000 for 12 months, he to have nothing to do except turn his little packing plant over to this party to operate, ostensibly to go into the black market for the disposal of his meat.

Mr. VURSELL. In other words, instead of regulations set up so that business can operate under them, they have been set up in such manner as to breed the circumvention of the law and make marketing difficult for people of this country who otherwise want to be good, law-abiding citizens.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I want to compliment the gentleman on his splendid remarks. I am particularly interested in the statement that the gentleman made with reference to the contribution this country has made to the stricken people of Europe and Asia. I understand that the United States has made nearly 50 percent of all of the

world shipments during the past year. Of the four countries of the world producing wheat, this country, Canada, the Argentine, and Australia—by reason of these orders the gentleman has just mentioned, we have stripped our carryover of wheat down to the point where we have about two-thirds of a bushel per capita in this country, whereas Canada has 6 bushels per capita, Australia 1.5 bushels, and the Argentine 5.6 bushels per capita.

Will the gentleman explain to me why it is that the powers that be feel constrained to strip the people of this country when other nations are not contributing their fair share?

Mr. VURSELL. I am sorry to say that I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I do not see how anyone can answer the question because I cannot believe that anyone can answer it. There certainly is no valid reason why this great country which has to lend its leadership to world peace and the rehabilitation of the world, and at the same time should be brought down to a level of two-thirds of a bushel of wheat in this country as compared with several bushels in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to comment on what the gentleman has just said. Unless we produce a large spring wheat crop this year, considering the commitments that have been made out of the 1946 crop by the administration of 250,000,000 bushels, we may be headed for a decided bread famine within 9 months.

Mr. VURSELL. I think that is entirely possible.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Because they are going to ship out the winter wheat first, and our spring wheat will not be made into a crop until about 6 weeks from now.

Mr. VURSELL. We are taking a tremendous gamble with famine in the United States. It is unfair to this great business organization of bakers throughout the country and it is certainly unfair to the people who are standing in the breadlines and who will stand in the breadlines in much greater numbers unless something is done.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I think it ought to be stated at the point where the gentleman pointed out that this Government had furnished 72 percent of the money used by UNRRA that we have also furnished more than 80 percent of all of the grain that has been used by UNRRA and distributed to the foreign countries.

Mr. VURSELL. That is quite right.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 45 minutes.

THE FOOD CRISIS

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the subject of food is being brought to the attention of the House this afternoon. The food crisis in the United States is growing worse as the days pass. The people of this country expect their Congress to do something about this all-important matter. We are in a state of confusion and disorganization insofar as the handling of the food crisis is concerned. I believe if this administration had called a conference and set forth as the object the working out of a plan to produce the greatest possible confusion and disorganization in the handling of food, they could not have done any better than they have already accomplished. It has been handled very badly from beginning to end. We have reached a point now where there are great shortages not only as far as food for livestock in this country is concerned but also food for human beings. It is essential that we taken action immediately in this particularly grave situation. I compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], who preceded me, for the remarks on this subject. He pointed out some pertinent facts in connection with the phases of this problem. He alluded to a resolution which I introduced last week. I am going to read this resolution and discuss certain sections of it:

House Resolution 665

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. The committee is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation of the commitments and agreements of the United States to furnish grains and other foodstuffs to foreign countries and to ascertain the amount of such grains and foodstuffs furnished foreign countries by the United States between September 1, 1945, and the date of the committee report to the House. The committee shall in particular study and investigate the following:

I would like to call the attention of the House particularly to the following points:

(a) The extent of our commitments and agreements to furnish grains and other foodstuffs to foreign nations.

(b) The amount of grain and other foodstuffs shipped abroad for distribution to foreign countries in pursuance of any commitment or agreement from September 1, 1945, to the date of the committee report.

(c) The amount of grain and other foodstuffs currently held in warehouses and other storage places in the United States awaiting shipment abroad to fulfill any existing commitment or agreement for such shipment.

(d) The amount of grain and other foodstuffs currently held in warehouses and other storage places abroad awaiting processing or distribution.

(e) Whether the current food shortage in the various types of grains or other foodstuffs in the United States can be alleviated by transporting grains and other foodstuffs awaiting shipment abroad to sections or areas in the United States where there is a shortage of grains or other foodstuffs.

I call attention to point (f) which is as follows:

(f) The advisability of curtailing such shipments of grains and other foodstuffs abroad as may be necessary to alleviate the food shortage in the United States.

The last two paragraphs of the resolution are as follows:

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable the results of its investigation and study together with such recommendations as it deems necessary, but in no event shall the report with recommendations be made later than one month from the date of passage of this resolution.

For the purposes of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the Chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

I have asked that this committee report within 30 days to the House of Representatives because time is of the essence.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I feel the gentleman has a very good resolution but it seems to me we already have a special committee to investigate food shortages. I happen to be a member of that committee.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is chairman of the committee. It is well within the purview of that committee to make the investigation which the gentleman seeks to have made by his resolution. I would suggest that the gentleman confer with the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of that committee, to see if the committee will go ahead and make the investigation. I am strongly in favor of it.

Mr. MERROW. I believe such an investigation should be made. I am not particular about who shall make it, but it ought be made in order that the country may know that the House of Representatives is doing something. We should have a committee and that committee should be instructed to make the investigation even before the Congress recesses.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Of course, every Member of Congress is sympathetic with the objectives which the gentleman has in mind by his resolution. I may say that in addition to the so-called Pace committee which has for its specific purpose the investigation of the identical things which the gentleman seeks to cover in his resolution, the House Committee on Agriculture for several days, covering at least a couple of weeks, has been conducting an investigation of the very things covered in the gentleman's resolution. I think the gentleman would profit by taking the matter up with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. FLANNAGAN. It was the very things the gentleman has pointed out

that caused the Committee on Agriculture to start this investigation. We seem to have commitments to furnish grain and other foodstuffs all over the world, but apparently no one knew who was responsible for those commitments, and apparently no correct investigation had been made of foodstuffs. As a consequence, someone was making commitments. We have had some of the gentlemen from the World Food Committee before our committee, trying to ascertain the things the gentleman has referred to in his resolution. Someone has made commitments. That is a long story. We could go into wheat. If we had followed out what some people term commitments on wheat, we would be two or three hundred million bushels in the red today instead of having any wheat at all.

Mr. MERROW. I appreciate what the gentleman has said and it leads me to ask him this question, since he has been speaking on this matter. Do you have any idea that the committee will be able to tell the House to what extent commitments have been made, before the Congress adjourns?

Mr. RIZLEY. I am very hopeful that we can. I would say we have had at least a half a dozen days of hearings before the committee thus far. We were trying to get Mr. Bowles and Mr. Porter, in addition to others, before the committee, but unfortunately they have been engaged elsewhere at the times our chairman tried to get them before the committee, but we hope to have them before the committee some time before long. Among others, we had Dr. Fitzgerald, who made this inspection trip with former President Hoover, who gave us a great deal of information concerning stock piles of wheat all over the country. He told us that the mills in Great Britain were running 95 percent capacity at the time they were over there, while the mills in this country were shut down. He is also a member of the World Food Committee. We obtained a great deal of information, which is in the record, from Dr. Fitzgerald, and others from the Department of Agriculture, and others connected with this food situation. We hope to have Secretary of Agriculture Anderson himself before the committee to testify. We are hopeful of getting some report made to the Congress before adjournment.

Mr. MERROW. I am glad to hear that. I suppose you do not know whether or not there are large stock piles in the United States, whether or not there are stock piles abroad that are rotting because they cannot be processed. I suppose you are not ready to make a recommendation as to whether or not the shortages in this country shall be taken care of before we ship foodstuffs all over the world.

Mr. RIZLEY. I may say to the gentleman that some of the information was brought out by the preceding speaker. Dr. Fitzgerald told us as I remember that in Great Britain their mills were running at 95 percent of capacity, that their stock pile of wheat alone was higher per capita there now than it is in the United States of America. Because of someone not understanding the facts the commitments we made on wheat, for instance, gave us a carry-over of less than three-eighths of one bushel of wheat per capita in this country. Canada was a little wiser than we. They have about a 6-bushel carry-over per capita. All of that information we are gradually accumulating.

Mr. MERROW. This would indicate to me that it might be the opinion of the committee to recommend to the Congress that we curtail shipments abroad until deficit areas in this country are cared for.

Mr. RIZLEY. Let me say to the gentleman I think it is fair to say that the different branches of the executive department of this Government apparently do not know what each other is doing; for instance, the Department of Agriculture, from information we have, did not know anything about some commitments that were made over at Potsdam and some other places; and the State Department is making some commitments for the Federal Government. The Department of Agriculture is supposed to be the one department of this Government that knows something about the food supplies of the country. We are going into those things and going to try to find out what can be done to rectify some of the things that need attention.

Mr. MERROW. I am certainly glad the committee on which the gentleman is serving is doing that work but I wish it were possible for a resolution to pass this House insisting that such reports be made to the House of Representatives before we adjourn this summer. It is all-important that this information be available to the House and the country before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is the gentleman's resolution broad enough to compel a disclosure by the Army and Navy as to the foodstuffs held by the services?

Mr. MERROW. I do not think so. I should be very happy to have such a provision in it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. First I want to compliment the gentleman from New Hampshire for the interest he has shown in providing food for his people and feed for their livestock. I have been listening to him attentively. It seems to me his problem consists of two parts: One, the general over-all picture; and two, the immediate corrective steps to be taken. I wish to read from the Journal of Farm Economics, the issue of May 1944, this statement by G. L. Nelson:

> We were consistently a net exporting Nation in these products during the period of 1912 to 1924, and a net importer during the period 1925 through 1941.

The article is about food. In other words, we were on an importing basis every year from 1925 up until 1942.

Then another sentence:

> The above comparisons point to the significance of two widely recognized facts: that United States foreign trade in foodstuffs during the past three decades has been small relative to production—

And that means production in the United States—

> and that except for the two war periods the country has been a net importer of foodstuffs.

The fact that we have been in a food-import position for so many years makes it necessary to call attention to the problems incident to being a food-export Nation. As a matter of fact, more recent records show that even in 1944, so far as food is concerned, we imported more food than we exported. I hesitate to make that statement because I presume many people do not believe it. Probably many people have been misled because they have heard so much New Deal and administration propaganda to the contrary. That is the backlog, the base, from which we have to operate as this situation is responsible for the food problems that have arisen within the last year. Second, during the war the practice was to ship concentrated food. We imported in 1944 a quarter of a billion bushels of feed grain and exported only a few million bushels of grain, but large amounts of manufactured foods.

The people in New England had access to imported grains from Canada at that time, but none are available from that source now.

Now the situation is in reverse. Now the demand is to send the crude food materials, like wheat, and all the oatmeal that can be made. The countries want the grains and the shipping space is available now.

We still, then, have the two situations to face. One the historical background, in which we did not feed ourselves for many years. Second, all at once we are to become a food-exporting Nation. Beginning on January 1 of this year our food exports during the first 3 months were twice what our food imports were. If we are going to assume a position of being a food export nation, naturally it has to come from either increased production, or by taking food away from our stock piles, or by preventing waste of foods, or by reducing the United States consumption of food. New England faces this problem more quickly than some of the other sections no doubt.

Mr. MERROW. We feel it very keenly, yes, and I am going to give a picture of the situation in New England. I appreciate the gentleman's comment very much. I know of no one who is more familiar with the food situation than my colleague from Wisconsin who has just spoken and I am glad that he has made such an excellent contribution to the discussion of this important question.

Mr. Speaker, I read a letter I received from Alfred L. French, secretary of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation:

MAY 23, 1946.

Hon. CHESTER MERROW,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our grain situation has become so acute that we are actually desperate. We are writing out in this letter the contents of telegrams to Secretary of Agriculture and Chester Bowles. We have also appealed to

the President, giving him the content of the wires to Anderson and Bowles. We have certainly got to have something done in addition to what has taken place already or we won't be able to keep our poultry and dai[ry] industries. Can you help us to follo[w] through on this.

"Feed buyers for Eastern mills who have been in the grain production areas continuously are unable to make purchases. Our feed supply almost completely exhausted. The time has come when the Government must take action that will get grain into the deficit New England areas. This action must be immediate. We suggest these possibilities: (1) Government seizure and allocation of oats and corn. It appears there is a good supply of oats and there must be some corn; or (2) Further lifting of grain ceilings in an amount sufficient to cause offerings on the market; or (3) Complete removal of ceilings on oats and corn. Certainly oat ceilings can be removed for a time and if results are uncontrollable they can be returned; or (4) Any other action which will guarantee movement of feed grain into this area."

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED L. FRENCH,
Secretary, New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation.

CONCORD, N. H.

Here is a telegram I received from Robert F. Thurrell, Wolfeboro, N. H.:

JUNE 13, 1946.

CHESTER E. MERROW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It is regrettable that you have not been able to protect the poultry industry of this section. Pullets on range too small to market are being burned by the thousands on account lack of feed; unless OPA is eliminated this whole country is headed for disaster.

ROBERT F. THURRELL,
Cotton Mt. Farms.

WOLFEBORO, N. H.

Mr. Speaker, I did my best to eliminate the OPA. I voted against it and hope I will have a chance to do so again. I think it would have been a fine thing if we could have kicked it out a few weeks ago.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Did I understand the gentleman to say that they are burning chickens because they cannot get feed for them?

Mr. MERROW. That is the information contained in this telegram.

Mr. VURSELL. I do not doubt that statement, but it is alarming.

Mr. MERROW. I have heard that chickens have been chloroformed and drowned. Here is another communication I received from Owen Johnson, of Manchester, N. H.:

MAY 27, 1946.

Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The grain situation is getting serious to the point that we will have to shut down our logging crews if grain cannot come through.

Very truly yours,

OWEN JOHNSON,
Johnson Lumber Co.

MANCHESTER, N. H.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think OPA is only one of the contributing causes for our food problems, however.

Mr. MERROW. It goes in the black market.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. To be fair about it, I will say to my colleague I think we will have to admit that this food and feed problem goes back years before the OPA. This administration adopted a policy or program that has not encouraged agriculture to keep pace with the increase in population of our country. The present administration has not encouraged agriculture to keep pace with the industrial developments of our country. The OPA is only one of the links in the chain.

Mr. MERROW. I think probably the gentleman is right, although I will ask him this question: He would not be sorry to see the OPA ended, would he?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to see its errors corrected by constructive amendments. I think a formula for decontrol should be put in operation when a certain point is reached in production. The Gossett amendment is an acceptable approach to anyone that does not want the OPA to be a permanent institution.

Mr. MERROW. I would like to know how you are going to correct it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to point this out. The gentleman said that the poultry farmers are not able to get grain to feed their poultry, so they are burning all their chickens.

Mr. MERROW. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I happen to know the poultry producer the gentleman referred to, a very reliable and respected man. But I would like to point out to the gentleman that we have a philosophy or school of thought down in one of the agencies that they want the people to take the corn and grain directly into the human system rather than take it in as dairy products or as red meat or poultry. So this philosophy or system is going into operation and they are going to practice on the people by destroying meat and poultry and eventually they are going to feed us directly corn and wheat and barley and rye and oats into the human system, because they claim we can get more value out of it and save more than we could in any other manner.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman. I think if we do not get away from some of this control of the economic system from Washington, perhaps there may not be any America left.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. I have a very high regard for the ability of the gentleman from New Hampshire. I am sure the gentleman knows that the OPA has nothing to do with our commitments of wheat or grain to foreign countries. The commitments have just made OPA's job harder in this country. I think the gentleman also knows that as long as almost everything else is being laid onto OPA, we should not lay the blame for these commitments on OPA.

Mr. MERROW. I do not intend to lay the blame for these commitments on OPA, but I think the movement of grain into the New England area could have been facilitated if it had not been for price ceilings.

Mr. SAVAGE. The OPA can be blamed for plenty of things without blaming them for something they did not do.

Mr. MERROW. I think it was on account of the price ceilings they put on grain.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. The OPA put a price ceiling on wheat that forced the wheat to go into livestock, and we have lost several million bushels of wheat that could have been held for human consumption, and that was caused by the OPA price ceilings.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We lost over 100,000,000 bushels of grain that should have been used for human consumption, and that is solely the OPA's responsibility.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would also like to point out that the OPA is primarily responsible for the situation, because the scarcity policy of Chester Bowles as Economic Stabilizer and as Director of OPA was responsible in holding down production in this country.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I just want to keep the record straight. Last year we had one of these super-duper special committees that the gentleman is asking for, and Mr. Anderson, the present Secretary of Agriculture, was its chairman, and if you will take the time to read the report of this special committee you will see that they recommended the use of grain to fatten cattle even.

This available grain should have been kept for your people and for your poultry.

Mr. MERROW. That is right.

I want to speak briefly about a report made by the Commissioners of Agriculture of New England on the subject of poultry, and then I will move to food for human beings in New England. The following situation was found to exist when this report was made on the 7th of June:

The Commissioners of Agriculture of New England met at the State House, Boston, Mass., Friday, June 7, 1946, in conference with representatives of the State colleges and dairy and poultry industries to consider the food situation in New England.

The following situation was found to exist:

1. Laying hens have been cut 50 percent of the January 1 number; 3,200,000 hens were slaughtered between January 1 and May 1; 2,200,000 hens were slaughtered during the

month of May. This rate is 250 percent of normal, with present rate of slaughter more than 300 percent of normal. The rate of liquidation is increasing daily.

2. Present replacement flocks are down 15–25 percent from last year. Some pullets have already been slaughtered due to lack of feed. Farmers are trying to hold replacement stock. Ultimate size of replacement flocks depend upon available grain.

3. Broiler production is down 60–75 percent from last year.

4. Egg receipts at four major egg-marketing cooperatives (Hartford, Conn.; Springfield and Brockton, Mass.; Derry, N. H.) were 42 percent less during the first week of June than in the first week of May this year.

5. Considered estimates of grain supply for June will be less than 50 percent of last year. More than 3,000 carloads of grain are needed to hold present livestock and poultry number for 30 days.

This means a milk shortage greater than last year, and a shortage of eggs and poultry this fall and winter as well as serious damage to farm businesses.

Suggested solutions of this grievous problem to both consumers and producers are:

1. Loan of Government-owned corn (2,000,000 bushels).

2. Subsidy on corn, oats, barley, and other available grains except milo, either on Government or private basis.

3. Direct Government purchase of grain for shipment to deficit areas.

NEW ENGLAND COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE,
FREDERICK E. COLE, *Massachusetts.*
A. D. GARDNER, *Maine.*
STANLEY JUDD, *Vermont.*
FRANK H. PEET, *Connecticut.*
ANDREW L. FELKER, *New Hampshire.*
RAYMOND G. BRESSLER, *Rhode Island.*

So it goes. There is a great liquidation of flocks throughout New England. This is going to cut down the supply of livestock and of course it will decrease the supply of milk, and so on.

In all the larger cities of New Hampshire one can find butter lines any day. You go out into the various towns and you will not find any meat in the showcases. I have heard reports only recently that some people have not been able to purchase meat during the last 3 or 4 weeks. They have been 3 or 4 weeks and sometimes months without meat. There is a definite shortage. The food situation at the moment in my section of the country is much worse than it has been at any other time.

We have discussed OPA in reference to the food shortage. On May 8 I introduced H. R. 6374, to remove the ceiling prices on grain. I hoped that that might increase the supply of grain.

I also introduced H. R. 6322 a short time ago to remove ceiling prices on meat. The Government has so regulated and so badly handled the meat industry that very little meat is available. Much of it is moving in the black market. We are just not getting distribution of meat throughout New England.

Because of the critical food situation I introduced House Resolution 665, in which I have asked for a study and investigation of our commitments and the amount of grain and other foodstuffs shipped abroad during the past few months.

I have here and will put into the RECORD a statement which many of you have seen. It was issued on the 6th of June 1946 by the Department of Agriculture:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1946.

GRAIN EXPORTS IN MAY TOTALED NEARLY 600,000 TONS

Exports of United States grain and grain products totaled an estimated 363,000 long tons during the last 11 days of May. This raised the total for the full month to 595,000 tons (22,222,000 bushels). The total for May included (in terms of whole-grain equivalents): Wheat, 311,000 tons; flour, 209,000 tons; corn, 63,000 tons; corn products, 12,000 tons.

Department of Agriculture officials said that exports in May were reduced sharply below scheduled shipments by rail strikes and floods. Heavy concentration of shipping schedules during the last 11 days of the month, when grain was ready to move in volume, brought the projected total to 840,000 long tons for the month as a whole. Strike and flood interference affected this period of heaviest schedules. As a result, approximately 250,000 tons of May shipments had to be carried over into June.

Exports of more than 1,500,000 tons have been scheduled for June. Shipment of this volume would raise the total exports of United States grain and grain products for the period January 1 through June 30, 1946, to more than 5,400,000 tons (about 200,000,000 bushels). Added to the shipments during the last 6 months of 1945, this would bring total exports for the marketing year to close to 400,000,000 bushels. While the heavy volume of June exports has been definitely scheduled, shipment of the full amount will require continuous flow of grain and grain products up to the limit of capacity, without further interruptions or delays.

Exports of United States grain and grain products during the first 5 months of 1946 totaled 3,885,000 long tons (145,235,000 bushels). In addition about 188,000 long tons of Canadian wheat milled in bond in the United States was shipped, making total shipments from the United States during the 5 months of 4,073,000 tons of grain and grain products.

The total for the first 5 months of 1946 included: Wheat, 2,692,000 tons; flour, 1,303,000 tons; corn, 65,000 tons; corn products, 13,000 tons.

The accompanying table shows exports of wheat and flour equivalent by destinations during the first 5 months of 1946. The largest shipments were for UNRRA countries, with a total of 1,460,000 tons. France and French North Africa received 938,000 tons, United States occupation zones 434,000 tons, the British Empire 348,000 tons, Brazil 148,000 tons, and other countries smaller quantities.

I would like to see the Committee on Agriculture or a select committee determine the accuracy of the above figures and find out just how broad our commitments are; how much grain and other foodstuffs is being sent abroad; and determine whether or not we have the facilities to export this amount. We should know what is currently held in the warehouses in this country. We should find out if it is true that grain is piling up abroad and that some of it is rotting. These may be rumors, but if they are true, certainly we are not feeding the starving people of Europe because we just are not getting the materials across. Certainly we ought to take care of the sections in our own country where we have definite shortages.

I would like to know, and I would like to have a committee find out, if we possibly can find out whether or not it is advisable to curtail the shipments of grain and other foodstuffs abroad as may be necessary to alleviate the present food shortage in the United States. I am going to give some opinions on the possible curtailment of shipments of grains and other foodstuffs as may be necessary to alleviate the food shortage in the United States.

I have received the following telegrams:

JUNE 13, 1946.

Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW,
House of Representatives:

In order to save our poultry flocks from further liquidation I approve your suggestion of curtailing shipments abroad of feed grain until supplies are sufficient to meet present demands of poultry flocks in New Hampshire.

ANDREW FELKER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.
CONCORD, N. H.

JUNE 15, 1946.

Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW,
House Office Building:

Would recommend curtailment of shipments of grain abroad until critical situation in deficit areas in our own country have been relieved.

CHARLES M. DALE,
Governor of New Hampshire.
CONCORD, N. H.

JUNE 15, 1946.

Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW,
House Office Building:

Recommend curtailment shipments abroad as suggested. Hope your plan provides for replacement out of new crop. Any action should be reasonably speedy.

A. K. GARDNER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.
AUGUSTA, MAINE.

JUNE 17, 1946.

Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW,
House Office Building:

If Government agency cannot otherwise relieve deficit areas in United States recommend curtailment of grain shipments abroad. Prompt action desirable.

HORACE HILDRETH,
Governor of Maine.

JUNE 17, 1946.

Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW,
House Office Building:

Believe Government holds grain in excess of available shipping space for foreign shipment. Recommend this excess be sent now to deficit areas. Replacement later. If this plan not acceptable favor curtailment.

S. G. JUDD,
Commissioner of Agriculture.
MONTPELIER, VT.

JUNE 17, 1946.

Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW,
House Office Building:

Favor curtailment seed shipments abroad for 1 month. Rhode Island poultry situation daily getting worse.

R. G. BRESSLER,
Director of Agriculture and Conservation.
PROVIDENCE, R. I.

It would require some study probably to ascertain just how much grain and other foodstuffs are being held and just how much of it can be shipped to deficit areas in the United States. Here is a

country, the wealthiest in the world, and well able to take care of itself. I think it is time that we became interested in our own affairs to the extent of helping the deficit food areas in this country. It is time for action by this House. This is June 18. We may not adjourn until some time late next month. Certainly people in the United States are entitled to know the facts in this serious food situation. Knowing the facts, they will be able to help decide what ought to be done. If I am any judge of public opinion, I think the Nation expects action from the Congress. I think the Nation believes that we should care for our own country and our own interests, then if we have a surplus, we will try to take care of others. I believe they wish to see the curtailment of shipments of grain and other foodstuffs until the shortage in the United States is alleviated.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

Mr. LANDIS. I compliment the gentleman on the statement he is making, which is a very able one.

I would like for the gentleman to get for us how many chickens have been destroyed in the last year so that it will be valuable information to give the public. Of course, we are trying to do everything we can to save those chickens now, but when we have a severe meat shortage next winter and there is no poultry to take its place, the people will know how many chickens have been burned or chloroformed in the United States. It will be information to give the people.

Mr. MERROW. I will endeavor to secure that information. I receive reports from New England every day. When I am in the State of New Hampshire I constantly get reports from the farmers in reference to the destruction of flocks.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I would say to the gentleman that probably no section of the country is so well organized in the poultry industry as is New England. You have some of the finest authorities on poultry there that there are in this country.

Mr. MERROW. We have heard statements made by two or three members of the Committee on Agriculture this afternoon. They have indicated that the committee is trying to find the information I have asked for in my resolution. I hope there will be enough interest in this subject so that we can secure the information before adjournment. If the Committee on Agriculture will obtain it, well and good, but is there not some method by which we can insist that this information be furnished at once? Is there not something we can do to get House action on some of these important problems? I think you will agree with me that the curtailment of shipments abroad is an important phase of this whole question.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I just want to keep the record straight again. Speaking of the poultry industry, during the war we had a 50-percent increase in egg production. Everybody subscribed to the expansion of the poultry industry. Millions and millions of pounds of powdered eggs were shipped, as concentrated food. It had the universal approval of everybody. The poultry business expanded. Now the war is over. The demand now is not for these animal products, this concentrated food.

The Agricultural Department appears now to be following a policy of reducing poultry too rapidly and too drastically. This liquidation of flocks can create a serious situation if judgment is not now exercised.

Mr. MERROW. I think this liquidation of flocks that is going on should be prevented, particularly when we need food in the United States.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Certainly the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is not proposing that there is no increase in the consumption of these products? The gentleman is not suggesting that Wisconsin cheese shall go back to where it was 5 or 10 years ago? There is a demand for food at the present time which the gentleman from New Hampshire speaks about. I certainly hope the production of poultry will not go back to where it was before this increase was asked for.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield to allow me to answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], you have not heard the gentleman from Wisconsin ever ask for anything for Wisconsin that he did not want the rest of the United States to have, in the time he has been here—cheese or any other commodity. However, milk production per capita of population has not increased to any great extent.

Mr. MERROW. I must say this, I am not asking anything for New England that I would not ask for any other section of the country.

There are great food shortages in other sections. In all fairness we should alleviate our own shortages out of what we produce at the earliest possible moment. This is why I am making this statement today.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. The poultry producers of Indiana were asked to decrease their production 25 percent over last year. They have done so. I suppose it is the same in New England. The poultry producers in Indiana and New England, of course, expect to get the food necessary to maintain the 75 or 80 percent of their flocks remaining, because they have already made the reduction.

Mr. MERROW. But in addition to the poultry situation in New England the people are not securing the meat, they are not able to buy butter. There are shortages all over this country. Whereas I am entirely in sympathy with doing all we possibly can to assist a world stricken by famine, nevertheless I am opposed to seeing shortages of food develop in this country to such an extent that perhaps some time in the near future our own people will be suffering. If stocks of food are piling up they should be used and used immediately.

The people throughout the country are disturbed and, shall I say, getting angry? They expect action and they are not getting action. I think we, as representatives of the people, ought to exercise leadership in this critical period. We ought to present the facts and make recommendations. If the recommendations are made and if they are not followed, at least we will have fulfilled our duty and will have done what is expected of us.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an excerpt from a telegram.

FOREIGN INFORMATION SERVICE OF STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 669, Rept. No. 2298), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4982) to enable the Department of State more effectively to carry out its responsibilities in the foreign field by means of (a) public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people and its policies, and (b) promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and the peoples of other countries. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON RULES—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOOD AND FEED CRISIS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to make a few observations on the food situation for the benefit of those who are present. The facts are that there are bread lines, meat lines, butter lines, and other food lines forming throughout the whole United States. Napoleon said that an army travels on its stomach. That great soul-searching thinker Henry Wallace correctly said: "Food will win the war and write the peace."

This slogan is true and correct in every respect, but has the administration adequately provided for the production of food?

The administration paid no particular attention to the production of food but trusted to the patriotism of the farmers of America that they would do their job, as they did, and provide the necessary food for our armed forces and for our allies and to take care of the needs at home.

The war has been won. Now we come to the matter of writing the peace and we suddenly find that the slogan of our distinguished former Secretary of Agriculture and Vice President that food will win the war and write the peace is actually true. But what is the administration doing to help promote the program to produce the food that will win the peace or stop the world from being taken over by the Communists? Very little, because we find that the administration fails to recognize that it takes experienced manpower and adequate machinery and proper incentive for the farmers of the country to produce the food to feed the starving millions; yes, hundreds of millions, in other countries of the world and at the same time take care of our own domestic needs.

We find some of the leading farm machinery manufacturing companies in this country with their plants on strike and we also find, as I understood a few days ago, that an order is in the making by the administration to set aside and require the shipment of 7½ percent of all tractors made in the United States to Russia. That order has been kept a secret, but one of the big manufacturers told me that such an order is in the making by the Civilian Production Agency, requiring them to set aside 7½ percent of all the tractors produced in the United States for shipment to Russia.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. We all recognize that the gentleman now addressing the House is one of the greatest authorities on agricultural matters in the country. I would like to ask him whether in his studies of this question he has found any good reason why we should send tractors to Russia at this time?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have yet to find one single reason for sending anything to Russia at the present time, because Russia has an iron curtain around its area and fails to cooperate in international affairs. If Russia sincerely desires to cooperate for world peace, we will go the limit to show our friendship.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that these plants and industries manufacturing tractors and farm equipment have been on strike since last fall?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes. The main plants in this country have been on strike since last fall, and in those plants the employees are not striking for higher wages; they are striking for a closed shop and other things that have nothing to do with wages. Yet the administration is not doing anything about it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. And at a time when the production of food is vital?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes, and unless something is done to provide the farmers with farm machinery so that they can produce the essential foodstuffs we may have a famine in the United States within 9 months.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. In our neighboring States, Virginia and Maryland, I understand there are wheat fields that have not been cut and hay fields that have not been cut. How are we going to get the labor to reap the crops that have been sown? Can the gentleman inform us?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I can give the gentleman one suggestion. We have approximately 3,000,000 people on the Federal pay roll. Let us declare a 30-day or 60-day holiday and send those 3,000,000 people out on the farms of America so that they can help produce the food to feed the people of the United States and the world. I would like to join them, although I do not know that I could take it very long and I do not think they could take this kind of hard work very long either, because most of them have no realization of the hard work and the toil and the long hours that go into the production of food. Most of them think that they can turn on a spigot and get milk.

I will tell you another thing that the administration can do. At the present time they are taking essential farm workers from the farms of America and inducting them into the military service during peacetime. The farmers are not able to secure replacement labor because of unemployment benefits paid which are larger than the farmers can pay under existing price levels. If the people want food, then the administration should adopt a policy to retain essential farm workers on the farms. Our farmers who have become worn out after 4 or 5 years from hard work are getting discouraged and disgusted and confused. That is what is happening over here in Maryland and in every other part of the United States. But let me discuss for a moment the general food picture which the other two gentlemen have covered so well. I think I have something that I can contribute to what they have already said.

The failure of administration officials to make plans immediately after last year's abundant harvest to cover food and feed requirements and commitments for domestic and foreign consumption, coupled with the devastating and uneconomic scarcity policy of Economic Stabilizer Chester Bowles, is now bringing the country face to face with the most serious food crisis in history. It was not until the middle of January that the Department of Agriculture recognized the impending shortage of food and grains. Drastic action was taken to curtail domestic consumption of wheat, corn, and feed grains, in order to fill commitments made by the President at Potsdam to provide food for several hundred million starving people in Europe, the Balkans, and the Far East.

The Department of Agriculture is responsible for food planning and production. Careful planning last fall, after our farmers had produced one of the largest crops in the Nation's history, could have avoided the serious food and feed situation which realistically confronts us today. I am convinced that the failure to make necessary plans last fall for proper utilization of grain supplies was due to the fact that the President and the State Department neglected to apprise the Secretary of Agriculture until after January 15, 1946, of the food commitments which had been made by them to take care of the needs of starving people in the world.

Prior to January 15, 1946, the British, French, Dutch, and every other country in the world, purchased millions of tons of wheat, flour, corn, and other food products with dollars borrowed from the United States Export-Import Bank. Since VJ-day the Export-Import Bank has made foreign loans in an amount of $3,467,500,000, a good portion of which was spent in the United States for the purchase of food. Records of the Bank disclose the following loans were made since VJ-day: France, $1,912,500,000; Great Britain, $650,000,000; Netherlands, $300,000,000; Russia, $280,000,000; Belgium, $100,000,000; Norway, $50,000,000; Finland, $50,000,000; Greece, $35,000,000; Italy, $25,000,000; and many others in varying amounts.

I know as a matter of fact that every flour mill in the country was besieged with orders for flour from the British and other countries, and cash was paid on the barrel head. All of the food acquired by foreign interests was purchased at the OPA ceiling price, and we have authentic information to the effect that the foreign buyers of our food sold it to their own people or in other countries at prices which realized tremendous profits for the sellers in dealing with hungry people, or with those who had money to buy.

I am satisfied that the American people are not generally aware of the fact that a large percentage of the food which is being sent out of this country is being resold at fancy black-market prices to people in other countries. I have often wondered if the hungry people who have no money actually secure any material

amount of this food. We are a charitable people and stand ready to make great sacrifices to help our destitute neighbors, but we harden when we learn of some of the things that are taking place. For instance, Russia took all of the grain out of Poland after last year's harvest, and we are called upon to provide food for Poland. We do this gladly, but we wonder how much of our grains and food are left for the starving Poles. Britain takes credit for American food shipped to Greece, Italy, and other countries. Undoubtedly, the distribution of food to hungry people has now become a matter of international power politics.

During the past 12 months, approximately 400,000,000 bushels of American wheat and corn have been exported to fill foreign commitments. Failure in planning last fall to meet export requirements of grains brought about the initiation of many uneconomic and unsound policies by the Administration, which will seriously reduce the Nation's food supply for many months to come. Bread lines are already forming in most parts of the country. Flour mills are unable to buy wheat, because the Government purchased all available wheat—1945 crop—from farmers at a black-market price of 30 cents per bushel above the legal OPA ceiling price. The Government would not let our flour mills grind flour for export, and, consequently, thousands of mill and bakery employees have been thrown out of work. On the other hand, the Canadian mills are running full time in the production of flour for both domestic and foreign consumption. Canadian mills are producing their customary white flour, while mills in this country were forced to change from 72 percent extraction white flour to 80 percent dark flour, which type of flour does not keep as well in warm weather.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Would it not be a good idea to insert immediately following that statement—and I think the gentleman is doing a service to the whole country to put this in—just how much loss that meant in human-consumption food?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will try to cover that, because I think I have that here. I can bring it in as to what it meant in loss of millfeed for livestock. When it comes to spoilage of flour, I am satisfied it will run into thousands of tons.

The Government also cornered the market on corn by making purchases of all available corn—35,000,000 bushels—at a black-market price of 30 cents a bushel above the legal ceiling price established by the OPA. The cornering of the wheat and corn supplies by the Government has brought the wildest black-market operations in all other feed grains. Legitimate feed manufacturers, dealers, and farmers are unable to secure feed grains for dairy and beef cattle, hogs, and poultry. We have lost about 700,000 tons of millfeed during the last 6 months because the Government required mills to produce 80-percent extraction flour, and much more was lost when the Government refused, until a few days ago, to sell or loan wheat to mills for grinding into flour.

When the administration ceased its black-market purchases of wheat and corn, the OPA increased the ceiling price on corn by 25 cents per bushel, and also materially increased the ceiling price on other feeds, without making any compensatory increase in the ceiling price of beef, hogs, poultry, and dairy products. Of course dairy products were increased just yesterday, as you know. This policy throws feeding ratios out of balance and under it farmers will lose money when forced to pay the higher prices for corn and other feeds.

At least 7,000,000 little pigs farrowed in the spring of 1946 on American farms will never reach maturity for human consumption because Economic Stabilizer Chester Bowles and the OPA failed to adjust hog prices in line with newly established grain and feed ceilings. This manipulation of feed prices on the part of the administration was a deliberately conceived plan to force large liquidation of hogs, cattle, and poultry in this country. Because of this unsound and destructive policy we approach the coming winter with greatly reduced supplies of pork, poultry, eggs, turkeys, and dairy products. Turkey, poultry, and egg production will be cut by more than 15 percent because producers cannot buy feed at any price. The production of dairy products will be reduced by more than 10 percent for 1946 as compared with 1945.

I trust that you will appreciate by this time what I meant when I referred to the scarcity policy of Chester Bowles and his policy-making associates. The Economic Stabilizer is determined to create a scarcity of vital food, so that he can remain in power to control the lives and business of every citizen. Forcing the liquidation of livestock and poultry mean nothing to him, but it does to consumers.

I wonder if the people have forgotten what took place in the early thirties, when Henry Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture. He conceived the policy which brought about the killing of 7,000,000 little pigs and nearly a million head of cattle. We are about to witness a repetition of such a policy, but instead of killing little pigs, administration policies provide for slow starvation or premature marketing of the pigs, which means less pork and lard. At the present moment, millions of chickens and turkeys are being killed on account of the man-made feed shortage. All of which is to the detriment of the American people and starving millions in other parts of the world, and could have been avoided by proper planning.

Congress is attempting to provide remedies in dealing with the problems I have discussed. Production and more production of grain and food products and the elimination of unsound bureaucratic control are the only solution. We must have the courage to do this job, in order to avoid permanent domination over our economy by the pennywise dictators who feel they have been endowed to direct the lives and pursuits of every citizen.

If present unsound restrictions and discriminations in price policies are continued, shortages in pork, lard, poultry, eggs, turkeys, and dairy products will have their telling effect upon the American diet within the next 9 months. Wheat for flour and bread will also become critical unless a large spring wheat crop is produced, and no one can predict, at this date, what the wheat or corn harvest will be. To correct the discrimination which now threatens livestock and poultry production, I desire to make the following suggestions:

First. An immediate adjustment in the price of hog, cattle, and poultry products to compensate for the increase in the price of corn and other feeds. This must be done to encourage production.

Second. The cancellation of the 80-percent extraction order to save wheat and flour and provide at least 1,400,000 tons of millfeed in the next 12 months for domestic use. This is the plan under which Canada operates.

Third. Permit flour mills in the United States to operate full time, as they do in Canada, in the production of flour for domestic and foreign consumption, thereby providing work for Americans employed in our flour mills.

Fourth. Stop Government black-market operations in grain or any other commodity. Administration officials should not be permitted to corner the supplies of grain or any other commodity, for which acts private individuals are sent to the penitentiary.

Fifth. Encourage full production of grains, food, and civilian goods, including farm machinery, under which method price controls can and should be removed. This is the only known system whereby inflation can be prevented.

Sixth. Last, but not least, the future solvency of our country demands cutting Government spending to the bone; the reduction of Government personnel to peacetime requirements, which includes the elimination of the bureaucracy that now seeks to restrict or destroy American freedom. We must keep our country strong in its economy, if we are to take the leading role in the council of nations.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. With regard to the wheat situation, last December the Department here asked the farmers to be patriotic and sell their wheat at that time. Those who sold their wheat last December lost about 48 cents a bushel as compared with those who sold their wheat in May. How much faith would those farmers who sold their wheat last December have in the Department down here?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am inclined to think that our farmers have lost considerable of their faith in the present administration. I believe you will find when this year's crop is harvested that a good percentage of the farmers will retain their wheat in their granaries rather than have it seized by the Government.

Mr. LANDIS. In other words, if they do not take the ceiling off feed, then there should be something done to guarantee to

the farmers that they will get the same price later on as they can get now, that is, that they can get the same price all the way through.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They did that last year and up to April 3 they asked the farmers to surrender their wheat and sell it at prevailing prices and told them that there would not be any increase in price. Many patriotic farmers did that. Thereafter, the administration came out and paid the black-market price of 30 cents a bushel plus an additional 15 cents a bushel, which made some farmers who kept their wheat get 40 cents more than other farmers who had sold their wheat.

Mr. LANDIS. But in order to see that they get the same payments in July, they must have some kind of guaranty that they will get the same price that anybody else is going to get in the future.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I compliment the gentleman for doing a great service in giving this talk on the floor of the House so that it will go into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and perhaps filter out through the press to the people of the country so that they may know that there are really able men in Congress such as the gentleman from Minnesota who is telling them the truth in the hope that by having the truth through the Congress perhaps better conditions may be brought about for the agriculture of the Nation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman for his statement. But I do not want to leave the impression here today that I am not willing to make every possible sacrifice to help feed the hungry people of the world. I think it is our Christian duty to do this. But I insist that when we are called upon and want to do it we should initiate a policy in this country which would encourage all types of vital production and help the farmer of the United States to secure that production in every possible manner. Then we will be in a position to go ahead and make the proper plans and do our part.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman think the rye operations have added to the wheat confusion? Rye, which is not worth as much for man or beast as wheat, has had an open market all during these years and has sold for as high as $2.60 a bushel while the farmer was asked to sell his wheat, with its superior food value, for $1.50 or $1.60 a bushel. This has been allowed to happen. All these bucket-shop operations have been carried on in connection with rye. This was brought out a year ago on the floor of the House by our colleague from Wisconsin, Hon. FRANK KEEFE. The rye speculations, however, were allowed to go on month after month and that has just added to the confusion of the whole wheat picture. Is that not correct?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I point out to the gentleman in connection with the refusal of the administration to do anything about the May rye situation. They had to have something for their friends to speculate in. So they did not put any ceiling on rye. I know of several prominent men who purchased rye at 85 cents a bushel. They purchased millions of bushels of rye and sold it at nearly $3 a bushel, speculating with the welfare of the American people, under a policy initiated by the administration itself making such manipulation possible.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is that not what has caused considerable confusion in connection with this whole program?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is true. It also forced a great demand for other grains. But let me point out one further item: When the Government cornered the market on corn and wheat it also brought immediate pressure on all other grains—a demand for other grains. For instance, some of the big companies engaged in producing oatmeal and other breakfast foods could not buy a bushel of grain unless they went to the black market to buy it. So these plants are closed down today, just as the flour mills are closed down today. They are getting a little flour now under this so-called lend-lease arrangement which must be paid back.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think equally serious is the matter already spoken about this afternoon which I would like to have the gentleman comment on, that is, the throwing of corn and rye and oats out of balance, threw hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat into the feeding of cattle, which otherwise would have gone into food for people.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Nobody can say how much wheat was purchased before they started with this program, or how much flour. But I know that possibly $2,000,000,000 worth was purchased. Certain individuals living in different countries in the world, like Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Mexico, and other countries were loaned that much money by the Export-Import Bank, and they bought wheat and flour and other foods in the open market.

Today we are shipping wheat and other foods to South American countries. That is outside the relief program. The relief program contemplates shipping out 400,000,000 bushels of wheat and corn in the 12 months up to July 1 of this year. I would like to see the accurate figures, to find out exactly how much feed and wheat and other grains were shipped out of the United States, rather than blaming all of the disappearance of wheat on the livestock and poultry industry of this country, because I do not think they did consume it all.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Can the gentleman give us an over-all formula for a way out of this mess we are in? Is it to get rid of this controlled economy? Is it to have less direction from Washington?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I made several suggestions in my remarks earlier, but production and more production is necessary. However, we are past the planting stage. While some of the men down in the Department who make these policies think they can control the laws of nature, we recognize that we must follow the laws of nature when it comes to production, not only of grain but also of livestock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARNAHAN). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express my interest in the very important bill to the many needy aged citizens of the country, a bill that has passed the Senate and will be messaged to the House from the Senate tomorrow. I refer to H. R. 5626, as amended by that body, known as the McFarland amendment. The original bill passed this House as I recall by unanimous vote, and I am sure that if Members of this House are given the opportunity to vote there will be no real opposition to the amendment in question. The McFarland amendment merely provides an increase of $5 per month in Federal old-age assistance, without regard to any matching on the part of the States.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is that the bill that was reported by the Ways and Means Committee increasing the amount $5?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; I refer to an amendment that has been added to a bill by the United States Senate. Some of us are getting tired waiting for the Ways and Means Committee to liberalize or, rather, recommend the liberalizing of the Social Security Act. I speak of the Senate added amendment, offered by the junior Senator from Arizona. As I stated a moment ago, it proposes to increase by $5 per month the benefit payments made to the aged people of the Nation as the Federal Government's share in assistance to each State. It proposes increased payments for dependent children $3 per month for each such child. This bill would increase payments to the blind $5 per month each, also without matching. It contains the proviso that only those States that continue to pay as much old-age assistance as they did during the month of May of this year shall benefit by the extra $5 increase. In other words, a State could not lower its payment by $5 or any amount and at the

same time get the benefit of the Federal increased payment. The extra $5 per month to each aged person is, of course, not much; it is only a mere pittance, but it is something, and even such a small increase would be gratefully received. Furthermore, it is desperately needed. It has given many an aged person renewed hope since the publication of the story that this amended bill passed the Senate by a unanimous vote. These millions of aged people cannot come here, but they are looking to the Congress to do something about it and I sincerely hope that there will be no opposition and that this bill as amended will become law and not be permitted to die in a conference committee.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. Certainly the gentleman is correct when he says it is not very much; but I would like to state also that it would mean a lot to people who are trying to live on anywhere from $10 to $50 a month. $5 would mean a lot to them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes, I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman. Let me add that this little bill, if passed, will bring cheer to a lot of worthy and deserving citizens and has real merit. In fact, it is much more meritorious than the so-called Congressional streamlining bill which in its present form is a misnomer. It is worse than that, it is a monstrosity sailing under false colors. It is scheduled to be brought in here within a few days for House approval. It is going to be a real streamliner. It will streamline the pockets of Congressmen and Senators to the tune of 50 percent of our salaries while at the same time most of the Government workers got an increase of 14 percent, and give us an additional $8,000 assistant Congressman. That is not all. It will be a camouflage pension-for-Congressmen bill, despite the fact that this House recently defeated such a bill by an overwhelming vote.

This bill for the aged, though as I said, a mere pittance, is one that this Congress should pass without a dissenting vote.

It will be of some help to all the aged of the nation, whereas the so-called highly advertised congressional streamline bill as it passed the Senate turns out to be a measure primarily for the purpose of merely streamlining the pockets of Members of Congress.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I yield again.

Mr. SAVAGE. I think also that the States will very likely themselves add $5 which will probably mean that $10 will go to the aged instead of $5. Is not that right?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Some States no doubt would do so. I would wish for it to turn out that way. But even that is a very small amount considering the increased cost of living.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 763. An act to provide for the leasing of allotted lands on the Crow Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 884. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Patuxent Development Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1074. An act designating American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1150. An act for the relief of John Leberman; to the Committee of Claims.

S. 1161. An act authorizing the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain space in the Jackson (Miss.) City Hall; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 1198. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain property in the State of Michigan now occupied by the Weather Bureau and to acquire land in the State of Michigan for the erection of a Weather Bureau station; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1235. An act to authorize the use of the funds of any tribe of Indians for insurance premiums; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1236. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of oil and gas on the public domain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Lofts & Son; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1547. An act to provide for the disposition of vessels, trophies, relics, and material of historical interest by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1564. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Shadrick Ponca; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1566. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Wilma Brandon Irving; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1578. An act to clarify the terms "compensation" and "pension" under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 1640. An act to provide for the acquisition by the United States of certain real property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1672. An act to authorize the transfer to the Department of the Interior of surplus lands, improvements, equipment, and other property of Federal agencies on reclamation projects for the settlement and employment of veterans and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1695. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Louis Runs Above; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1893. An act to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1915. An act to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Fargo, N. Dak., as the Clarence Theodore Hoverson Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 1917. An act to enact certain provisions now included in the Naval Appropriation Act, 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1922. An act to revive and reenact the act granting the consent of Congress to the State highway department of South Carolina to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River, at or near Leneudes Ferry, S. C., approved August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1965. An act for the relief of the estate of C. Benjamin Stapleton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1979. An act to eliminate the restriction on the number of lots which may be acquired by settlers in the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1984. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Wabash River near Mount Vernon, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1988. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the heirs of Jesus Gonzales all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain described tract of land within the Carson National Forest, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 2018. An act to facilitate the decentralization of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 2041. An act to amend the act of May 28, 1896, as amended, relating to the appointment of assistant United States attorneys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2061. An act to provide for sundry matters affecting the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2099. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accept gifts, devises, and bequests in behalf of the general post fund for the use of veterans and for the sale and conveyance of any such property under certain circumstances and the covering of the proceeds thereof into the post fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 2100. An act to remove the limitations on the amount of death compensation or pension payable to widows and children of certain deceased veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 2107. An act for the relief of certain postal employees; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2142. An act to provide for two heads of departments of military science and tactics in the public schools of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2204. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, by giving insurance benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of that act to survivors of veterans of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 2210. An act to provide for the return of certain securities to the Philippine Commonwealth Government; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

S. 2223. An act to establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or chartering of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2235. An act to provide a system of relief for veterans, and dependents of veterans, who served during World War II in the organized military forces of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the service of the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the

military order of July 26, 1941, of the President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 2246. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire in fee or otherwise certain lands and rights in land on the island of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2247. An act to permit the Secretary of the Navy to delegate the authority to compromise and settle claims against the United States caused by vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, or for towage or salvage services to such vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2264. An act to amend the act providing for the appointment of court reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2291. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer a vessel to the American Antarctic Association, Inc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2292. An act for the relief of the Miami Herald, the Key West Citizen, and the Miami Daily News; to the Committee on Claims.

S. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution to establish the Andrew Johnson Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the preservation of the birthplace, at Raleigh, N. C., of Andrew Johnson, seventeenth President of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to amend the act of March 22, 1946, for the purpose of correcting the description of the small parcel of land authorized to be conveyed to the State of Wyoming by such act; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 233. An act for the relief of Hamsah Omar;

H. R. 797. An act for the relief of William W. Willett, Jr.;

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota;

H. R. 1258. An act for the relief of Cecil Atkinson;

H. R. 1460. An act for the relief of D. C. Todd;

H. R. 1689. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Anderson Ranch Reservoir site, Boise reclamation project, Idaho;

H. R. 2677. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to accept and dispose of real estate devised to the United States by the late Maggie Johnson, of Polk Country, Ark., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2678. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians on the Flathead Reservation in Montana, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Juan Calcaño;

H. R. 2785. An act for the relief of Will O'Brien, Mrs. Bessie O'Brien, and the legal guardian of Jane O'Brien;

H. R. 3031. An act for the relief of Walter A. Moffatt;

H. R. 3359. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Belk;

H. R. 3391. An act for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co.;

H. R. 3399. An act for the relief of Philibert L. Bergeron, Alfred Quist, and Astrid Quist;

H. R. 3401. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hattie Main Babcock, Chester N. Main, and Mr. and Mrs. Earl Norman;

H. R. 3441. An act to provide for the naturalization of Master Sgt. Gerhard Neumann;

H. R. 3494. An act for the relief of the J. B. McCrary Co., Inc., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3512. An act for the relief of Willie Lam and Edgar Lam;

H. R. 3611. An act to authorize the condemnation of materials which are intended for use in process or renovated butter and which are unfit for human consumption, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3622. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hazel M. Skaggs;

H. R. 3665. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of William Needom Rashal, a minor;

H. R. 3843. An act to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana;

H. R. 3959. An act to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War;

H. R. 3966. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands situated in Clark County, Nev., to the Boulder City Cemetery Association for cemetery purposes;

H. R. 4046. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard S. Fisher;

H. R. 4113. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain land to Mrs. Estelle M. Wilbourn;

H. R. 4118. An act for the relief of Axel H. Peterson;

H. R. 4245. An act for the relief of José Villafañe Muñoz;

H. R. 4251. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Francisca Sánchez Figueroa;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Esequiel (Frank) Padilla, and others;

H. R. 4339. An act for the relief of Fannie C. Fugate;

H. R. 4353. An act for the relief of Amy Mary Richter;

H. R. 4373. An act for the relief of Carl and Naomi Fitzwater;

H. R. 4433. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Alabama for use as a public park of the military reservation known as Fort Morgan;

H. R. 4479. An act for the relief of William E. Robertson and Estelle Robertson;

H. R. 4495. An act for the relief of William H. Roman;

H. R. 4525. An act for the relief of Oran Edmund Randall Rumrill;

H. R. 4600. An act for the relief of the estate of Patsy Ann Maheux, deceased;

H. R. 4654. An act to exempt transfers of property to the American National Red Cross from the District of Columbia inheritance tax;

H. R. 4693. An act for the relief of Richard C. Ward;

H. R. 4863. An act to establish the date of acceptance of a commission as lieutenant (junior grade), United States Naval Reserve, by William Leon de Carbonel to be June 1, 1941, and the date of reporting for active duty to be December 9, 1941, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4888. An act for the relief of Gustav F. Doscher;

H. R. 5000. An act for the relief of Marion Powell, a minor;

H. R. 5091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Honnell;

H. R. 5149. An act to govern the effective dates of ratings and awards under the Veterans' Administration revised Schedule for Rating Disabilities, 1945, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5187. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across New River near Radford, Montgomery County, Va.;

H. R. 5271. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II";

H. R. 5317. An act to amend the act establishing the Hot Springs National Park;

H. R. 5357. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River, at a point between the boroughs of Elizabeth, in Elizabeth Township, and West Elizabeth, in Jefferson Township, in the county of Allegheny, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 5387. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River between the borough of Belle Vernon, Fayette County, Pa., and the borough of Speers, Washington County, Pa.;

H. R. 5413. An act to accept the renunciation by Albert W. Johnson of pension under section 260 of the Judicial Code;

H. R. 5453. An act to authorize certain expenditures by the Alaska Railroad, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5674. An act to amend the laws authorizing the performance of necessary protection work between the Yuma project and Boulder Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation;

H. R. 5676. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real estate in Converse County, Wyo.;

H. R. 5744. An act to incorporate the Civil Air Patrol;

H. R. 5796. An act to amend title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to permit the making of contributions, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for the maintenance and operation of certain school facilities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5811. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of David Owens, Jr.;

H. R. 5896. An act to extend the term of design patent No. 21,053, dated September 22, 1891, for a badge to George Brown Goode, and assigned to the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution;

H. R. 5907. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement for highway purposes to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in certain lands in the reservation of the Veterans' Administration hospital, Lebanon County, Pa., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6069. An act to amend section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944;

H. R. 6070. An act to amend section 4 of the act of August 25, 1937, so as to provide a filing procedure in cases of adoption outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6153. An act to remove the existing limitation on the number of associate members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans' Administration;

H. J. Res. 304. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1946, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Inter-American Trade Exposition, Fort Worth, Tex., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 943. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Columbia River at Northport, Wash.;

S. 1043. An act to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma in trust for the Indians of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian Reservation;

S. 1273. An act to provide for the acquisition by exchange of non-Federal property within the Glacier National Park;

S. 1288. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States;

S. 1336. An act to transfer certain real and personal property in Ward County, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota acting by and through the Industrial Commission of North Dakota;

S. 1834. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Iowa or the Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Des Moines River at or near Farmington, Iowa;

S. 1857. An act to authorize the availability for certain administrative expenses of appropriations for the Department of the Interior; and

S. 1963. An act to authorize additional permanent professors of the United States Military Academy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 19, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

The Committee on Pensions will hold open hearings at 10 a. m., Thursday, June 20, 1946, in room 428, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 3779, H. R. 5740, and H. R. 5741, bills to increase service pensions for certain veterans and widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1399. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the continuance of the acceptance by the Treasury of deposits of public moneys from the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1400. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to permit the Secretary of the Navy to delegate the authority to compromise and settle claims for damages to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1401. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the tenth annual report of the National Labor Relations Board for the year ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Labor.

1402. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Edgar F. Russell, Lillian V. Russell, his wife, and Bessie R. Ward; to the Committee on Claims.

1403. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting a second supplementary report with respect to Government-owned synthetic-rubber plants and facilities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on Insular Affairs. H. R. 6801. A bill to provide for the retention by the United States Government or its agencies or instrumentalities of real and personal property within the Philippines now owned or later acquired and for the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, in the Philippines, subsequent to independence; with amendment (Rept. No. 2296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on Insular Affairs. H. R. 6802. A bill to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, for the purpose of making a clerical correction; without amendment (Rept. No. 2297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 669. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4982, a bill to enable the Department of State more effectively to carry out its responsibility in the foreign field by means of (a) public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people and its policies, and (b) promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and the peoples of other countries; without amendment (Rept. No. 2298). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 670. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5924, a bill to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2299). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 6810. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provisions of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 6811. A bill relating to veterans' pension, compensation, or retirement pay during hospitalization, institutional, or domiciliary care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 6812. A bill to amend section 300 and section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 by extending the jurisdiction of boards of review to include discharges or dismissals by reason of the sentences of general courts martial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 6813. A bill to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6814. A bill to amend the third paragraph of section 92 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 29, 1934; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 6815. A bill to amend the Criminal Code of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 6816. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the State of California for State highway purposes, a tract of land situated in San Bernardino County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAY (by request):

H. R. 6817. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 6818. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of $100 each to the Colville Indians of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 6819. A bill for the relief of Samuel A. Rosborough; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. Case of South Dakota:

H. R. 6820. A bill for the relief of J. P. Siebeneicher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 6821. A bill for the relief of Santiago Naveran; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6822. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen T. Koernig, Mrs. Sarah C. Merkley, and Mrs. Alice Delehanty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 6823. A bill for the relief of Berry Orville Smallwood; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 6824. A bill for the relief of the estate of Hugh Brady; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 6825. A bill for the relief of Carl August Albrecht, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 6826. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor C. Dathan; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2002. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition signed by 614 residents of the Thirtieth Congressional District of the State of New York, urging opposition to any legislation which may be proposed that will bring about partial or national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2003. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the New Jersey State Junior Chamber of Com-

merce, urging that Members of Congress, members of the Supreme Court, Cabinet officers, bureau and other key department heads be given adequate compensation and other benefits such as retirement and disability protection; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2004. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to radio broadcasting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2005. Also, petition of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the dissolution of the Committee Against Racial Discrimination in the Use of Constitution Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2006. Also, petition of the Allboro Retail Fruit Association, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the termination of OPA; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2007. Also, petition of the tribal business council, Fort Berthold Indian Corp., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the building of a dam on the Missouri River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2008. Also, petition of Bronx Zionist region of the Zionist Organization of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the admittance of Jewish refugees to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2009. Also, petition of Omaha Zionist Emergency Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to admission of 100,000 European Jews to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2010. Also, petition of the Pennsylvania Federation of Democratic Women, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of Senate bill 1717; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2011. Also, petition of the Pennsylvania Federation of Democratic Women, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of Senate bill 1592; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who committest to us the solemn trust of life, so swiftly pass the hours of our sojourn in this narrow space of time that our day mounts to noon and the signs of evening tinting the western sky warn that the night cometh ere our work is planned. Forgive us for squandering on trivial concerns the fabulous riches of golden hours. Because so much of our span is gone and so little left, may we redeem the residue by intensity of living, realizing in this new day's toil the presence of eternity. May the sun of Thy glory break through clouds that hide our earth-filled eyes from Thee. So "at noonday, in the bustle of man's work time," we would "greet the unseen with a cheer." In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 18, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5112) to authorize the city of Anchorage, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $5,000,000 for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, improving, extending, bettering, repairing, equipping, or acquiring public works of a permanent character, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1460. An act to fix the salary of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior; and

S. 1523. An act to modify the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war.

OMNIBUS FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1946—ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that beginning Monday, June 24, 1946, at 10:30 a. m., hearings will be conducted by the full Committee on Commerce in the committee room of the Committee on Commerce, northwest corner of the Capitol Building, with respect to H. R. 6597, being a bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, the omnibus flood-control bill of 1946. The hearings will continue probably 2 days. In addition to the projects contained in the House bill, the following new projects are specifically scheduled for hearings in the order named:

First. Yadkin-Pee Dee, N. C.
Second. Cardens Bottom, Ark.
Third. Polecat Creek, Okla.
Fourth. Boise River, Idaho.
Fifth. Queen Creek, Ariz.
Sixth. Tucson, Ariz.

Where there is no opposition to any project contained in the House bill, no testimony will be received by the Senate Committee on Commerce. The members of the press are requested to give notice of these hearings.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it will be necessary for me to be absent from the Senate until next Monday, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon is excused.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF UNRRA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 7163.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 116 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reasons for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Immigration.

EDGAR F. RUSSELL ET AL.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Edgar F. Russell, Lillian V. Russell, his wife, and Bessie R. Ward (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

ESTABLISHMENT OF VETERANS' CANTEEN SERVICE IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish and provide for the maintenance and operation of a veterans' canteen service in the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

DEVELOPMENT OF PARK AND PLAYGROUND SYSTEM OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

A letter from the Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act approved June 6, 1924, entitled "An act providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital," as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Sirdar J. J. Singh, president, India League of America, of New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the naturalization and admission into the United States under a quota

of Eastern Hemisphere Indians of India; to the Committee on Immigration.

A resolution adopted at the annual convention of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, Chicago, Ill., favoring the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; ordered to lie on the table.

CONDEMNATION OF SLAVERY IMPOSED BY CERTAIN ALLIED NATIONS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the Illinois House of Representatives has adopted a resolution condemning the slavery imposed by some of the Allied nations of World War II. The resolution was sponsored by Representative Nick Keller, of Waukegan, Ill. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have come to the end of another World War which was waged for the avowed purpose of liberating people from oppressive governments.

The Illinois House of Representatives, where Lincoln sat as a member for 8 years, has always espoused the cause of freedom and asserted that slavery must not exist. Some nations have enslaved prisoners of war and others retain their own laboring populations in serfdom for the purpose of selfish economic national gain and aggrandizement.

We hereby unequivocally declare that we are unalterably opposed to the enslavement of any people, in any form, by any nation. Forced labor by prisoners of war or any other person after hostilities have ended is a contemptible form of slavery and is to be abhorred by all free and democratic nations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2014. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease to Henry A. Scandrett, Walter J. Cummings, and George I. Haight, trustees of Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture range livestock experiment station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1936; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1518).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 5640. A bill to reestablish the status of funds of the midshipmen's store, barber shop, cobbler shop, and tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1519).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 6627. A bill for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for the use of the Government of the United States of America; without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. TYDINGS) introduced Senate bill (S. 2348) to authorize the continuance of the acceptance by the Treasury of deposits of public moneys from the Philippine Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2349. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Navy to delegate the authority to compromise and settle claims for damages to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WAGNER (for Mr. MEAD):

S. 2350. A bill for the relief of George Haagen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 2351. A bill for the relief of Marian Antoinette McCloud; to the Committee on Immigration.

CONTINUATION OF ACCEPTANCE BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT OF DEPOSITS OF PUBLIC MONEYS FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the continuance of the acceptance by the Treasury of deposits of public moneys from the Philippine Islands, and request that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the Acting Secretary of the Treasury recommending the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2348) to authorize the continuance of the acceptance by the Treasury of deposits of public moneys from the Philippine Islands was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 14, 1946.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the continuance of the acceptance by the Treasury of deposits of public moneys from the Philippine Islands.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to remove possible doubt as to the authority of the Treasury Department to make available to the independent government of the Philippines the same depositary services which have been extended to the Commonwealth Government under existing legislation. The continuance of such depositary services is desired by the Philippine government.

In accordance with the act of June 11, 1934, 48 Stat. 929 (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 1157), and at the request of the government of the Philippines, the Secretary of the Treasury has accepted both time and demand deposits for the Treasurer of the Philippines. A deposit of $55,000,000 has been maintained in a time account bearing interest at 2 percent per annum since October 31, 1934, and another time deposit of $100,000,000 bearing interest at 1 percent was established on March 8, 1946. The balance in the demand account of the Treasurer of the Philippines was $273,532,733 as of April 30, 1946. These accounts represent funds comprising the Philippine currency reserves, sinking fund balances, and other funds of the Philippine government which are not used in day-to-day operations. Funds for ordinary operating expenditures of the Philippine government are maintained in accounts with commercial banks.

In view of the nature of the relations between the United States and the Philippine Islands, and the request of the Philippine government that they be permitted to maintain their time and demand deposits with the Treasury Department after Philippine independence is granted, it is respectfully requested that you lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH J. O'CONNELL, Jr.
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5112) to authorize the city of Anchorage, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $5,000,000 for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, improving, extending, bettering, repairing, equipping, or acquiring public works of a permanent character, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

EUGENE MEYER

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have heard a great many favorable comments about the appointment by the President of Mr. Eugene Meyer, former editor and publisher of the Washington Post, to the important position of president of the Bank of International Reconstruction and Development. It seems to be the opinion of everyone that the President made an exceptionally fine selection. Many of the leading editors of both political parties throughout the country have printed able editorials expressing their approval of Mr. Meyer's selection. In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial, written by the new management of the Washington Post, commenting in a very fine way about the former editor and publisher of the Post.

I also ask that an excellent editorial published by the Detroit News, which is typical of others published by daily newspapers in all sections of the country, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. MEYER'S TASK

With the announcement today Mr. Eugene Meyer leaves his duties with the Post and takes on new duties as president of the Bank of International Reconstruction and Development. The appointment, as will be seen from excerpts in another column, has been applauded by the American press. This testimony to the choice of the executive directors of the World Bank gives singular pleasure to Mr. Meyer's old associates on this newspaper. They know from daily experience with Mr. Meyer the organizational gifts which he will bring to the new institution.

Mr. Meyer is used to the task of building organizations from the ground up. When he took over the Post property, the newspaper had fallen on evil days, and it was in a moribund condition. All his old friends—even those who knew of what he had done with his private business and then with the successive departments of American Government which he had established—told him that this time he had undertaken a hopeless

proposition. It was, they said, a pig in a poke. But, as the healthy condition of this newspaper testifies, Mr. Meyer builded better than perhaps he knew, and he hands over the direction of the Post to men who fully appreciate how well and truly he laid its foundations.

These comments are pertinent to the new assignment that Mr. Meyer is shouldering at the World Bank. No doubt exists in our minds that the organization he will create will be as sound as could be devised. Mr. Meyer is used to meeting organizational challenges, and, indeed, thrives on them, and he will give to the infant body the vitality that will insure sound and vigorous growth. But he will bring to his responsibility something more than his talent for organization. He will be the example to those who work with him of vision and faith. Mr. Meyer has what the poet calls "the rapture of the forward view." In time of war he foresaw, before most of his contemporaries, the need to prepare for peace. That is why he always counseled gradualness in the relaxation of controls till the American economy had been thoroughly reconverted. That is why he advocated the stock piling of food—he felt that liberation might prove a mockery if food did not come on the very heels of the liberators. Alas, there was so little preparedness for peace that the liberated countries had to go through ordeal by famine on top of their ordeal by fire.

Yet Mr. Meyer, foreseeing this, whipped up a national interest in the coming emergency, being the sponsor of the Famine Emergency Committee, which spotlighted the approaching crisis and brought home to the American people and the administration the crucial need for remedial steps. It was characteristic of him that, when this organization had taken shape, his questing and farseeing mind was concerning itself with another famine on the horizon—the famine in productive facilities. As he used to say, only the restoration of productive facilities could solve the problem of one food famine after another; in other words, of a permanent state of mendicancy in much of the world.

This was long before he had the vaguest notion that he would be one of the instrumentalities for curing this famine of productive facilities. That is the job of the new World Bank. The bank is not an eleemosynary institution for the purpose of giving money away to needy borrowers; financial aid of this kind is provided through relief agencies such as UNRRA. The new World Bank, armed as it is with the financial resources of the world of nations, will make productive loans in capital-poor countries so as to put them on their own feet and at the same time reestablish the link between capital goods producers and capital goods users. It is this link, and this link only, that can promote general prosperity. Public policy, it is said, must cater to being and well-being. This latter achievement is the aim of the World Bank, with a sphere of operations that is indeed world-wide. Mr. Meyer is thus the world's first world banker in the true meaning of this phrase. Hitherto international bankers have been nationals with foreign connections, but Mr. Meyer's loyalty is now supranational.

While Mr. Meyer will have to be more statesman than banker, it is a good omen that his appointment is favorably spoken of in both investment and banking circles the world over. In these circles Mr. Meyer is respected for a judgment and a prudence which, before he took up official life, earned him a rich success in the field of investment banking at home and abroad. This reputation will inspire confidence in the new institution on the part of the investors who will invest in the bonds that will be floated under the auspices of the World Bank when it sets up in business.

The Detroit News says:

Perhaps no other layman in the Capital has played the lead hand more frequently and with so little ostentation in the rescuing of causes which were for the national betterment.

His most recent personal project has been the rallying of national forces for the food relief of Europe. He saw months ago that while there was much talk, little was being done. He called for a definite program and he continued to ring doorbells until the program began to move.

This is the man who has been named first president of the World Bank. At 70, Meyer has the vigor and imagination of a man half his years. His new post should provide his greatest opportunity for service to society. The honor done him is richly deserved.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR RUSSELL BEFORE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA ALUMNI SOCIETY

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the University of Georgia Alumni Society, at Athens, Ga., on June 13, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR LEGISLATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BYRD

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator BYRD on June 17, 1946, on the subject of labor legislation, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HEALTH BILL — INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address in the nature of an interview with him on the national health bill, on June 12, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

TWO WORLDS OR ONE?—EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Two Worlds Or One?", published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for June 16, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

LT. COL. WILLIAM B. GEMMILL

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a press release concerning Lt. Col. William B. Gemmill, a Chicago attorney and veteran of both World Wars, who died on June 14, which appears in the Appendix.]

AWARD OF CHILEAN ORDER OF MERIT TO PHILLIP W. THAYER

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement concerning the award of the Order of Mérit to Phillip W. Thayer, cultural relations attaché of the American Embassy, by the President of the Republic of Chile, which appears in the Appendix.]

IDAHO POWER AN EXAMPLE—ARTICLE FROM ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Idaho Power an Example," written by Harry D. Wohl, and published in the St. Louis Star-Times of May 24, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LAGUARDIA PLAN FOR SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a plan designed by Hon. F. H. LaGuardia relative to the settlement of labor disputes, which appears in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD sundry editorials commending the passage of the La Follette bill relative to the reorganization of Congress, which appear in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. WHITE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials from the Boston Herald of June 12, 1946, the Manchester (N. H.) Union of June 10, 1946, the Brooklyn Eagle of June 11, 1946, and the Buffalo Courier Express of June 7, 1946, all pertaining to the subject of the reorganization of the Congress, which appear in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Hatch	Overton
Austin	Hawkes	Pepper
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bridges	Hill	Revercomb
Brooks	Hoey	Robertson
Burch	Huffman	Russell
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Byrd	Kilgore	Stewart
Capper	Knowland	Taft
Carville	La Follette	Taylor
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McFarland	Tunnell
Ellender	McKellar	Wagner
Ferguson	McMahon	Walsh
Fulbright	Magnuson	White
George	Millikin	Wiley
Gerry	Moore	Willis
Gossett	Morse	Wilson
Green	Murray	
Guffey	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from South

Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

RECEPTION TO MEMBERS OF THE EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senate will recall that several months ago an official invitation was received by the two Houses of Congress to send delegations to the Empire Parliamentary Conference which was to be held in Bermuda. By appropriate resolutions the Senate and House accepted the invitation, and sent delegations from the two Houses, which attended the conference in Bermuda all of last week.

The representatives from the Senate were the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The delegation from the House of Representatives consisted of Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Mr. JAMES P. RICHARDS, Mr. ROBERT A. GRANT, and Mr. D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH.

The members of the conference from the British Empire are on their way home from the conference, and they have come by way of Washington. They include the delegations from the British House of Commons, from the Canadian Parliament, and from the Parliament of New Zealand.

Among these gentlemen who attended the conference, and have honored us with their presence this morning, is Mr. Anthony Eden, with whom we are all very pleasantly acquainted, and of whose many visits to Washington we have very happy memories.

In order that the Members of the Senate may meet these gentlemen in person, and assure them of our appreciation of the courtesy they have shown us by calling upon us on their way to their respective homes, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for a few minutes, and that the members of the three Parliaments be kind enough to come to the front of the Senate so that Members of the Senate may greet them in person.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess.

During the recess, the visiting members of the Empire Parliamentary Conference took positions in the well of the Senate in front of the desk and were greeted by the Members of the Senate who were presented by Senator BARKLEY and Mr. Anthony Eden.

The following is the list of the delegates to the Empire Parliamentary Conference:

United Kingdom Delegates: The Right Honorable R. Anthony Eden, Member of Parliament; the Honorable A. J. P. Howard, Member of Parliament; Lt. Col. E. M. King, Member of Parliament; Mr. Alfred Robens, Member of Parliament; Mr. J. J. Robertson, Member of Parliament; Wing-Commander J. R. Robinson, Member of Parliament; Mr. Tom Smith, Member of Parliament; Prof. Eastman Sheehan, Sir Howard d'Egville.

Canadian Delegates: Mr. Gordon Isnor, Member of Parliament, chairman; Mr. Elie O. Bertrand, Member of Parliament; Mr. G. H. Castleden, Member of Parliament; Mr. J. G. Diefenbaker, Member of Parliament; Senator C. B. Howard, Mr. Mark Senn, Member of Parliament.

New Zealand Delegate: Mr. K. J. Holyoake, Member of Parliament.

American Delegates: Senators THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, HOMER FERGUSON, ALEXANDER WILEY; Representatives LUTHER A. JOHNSON, JAMES P. RICHARDS, ROBERT A. GRANT, D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4512) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PRIEST, Mr. BULWINKLE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. WINTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5356) to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a naval establishment, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DREWRY, Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and Mr. W. STERLING COLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6429) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. CURLEY, Mr. KOPPLEMANN, Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, Mr. TIBBOTT, and Mr. HORAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the most serious legislative log jam that has occurred in my experience. There is now pending before the Senate the Interior Department appropriation bill. Next in order is the Navy Department bill, to be followed by the appropriation bill for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and the Treasury and Post Office bill. Those four bills are on the calendar. There are in the Committee on Appropriations a bill to provide funds for the Coast Guard, a bill for the Labor Department and the Federal Security Agency, and a bill for Government corporations. In the House there yet remain to be passed the War Department appropriation bill, a very important third deficiency bill, and a rescission bill.

That is a total of 11 appropriation bills, and we have 11 days between now and the 30th of June in which to pass them if they are to be enacted in time to take effect on the first day of July.

With respect to the pending bill, I ask Senators who may feel inclined to make lengthy speeches to please let us get this bill out of the way, because it is very important. We are about half way through. I am sure that the chairmen of other subcommittees will make similar requests. We simply must dispose of this public business at the earliest possible time. Not only is it true that all these bills must pass the Senate, but each of them must then go to conference for adjustment with the House of Representatives, and the conference reports must be agreed to before the bills become law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair endorses everything the distinguished Senator from Arizona has said. The law requires that these bills be passed before July 1. Otherwise the money will not be appropriated for the various agencies and departments, and great confusion and trouble may arise. The Chair sincerely hopes that the appropriation bills, concerning which there is a limit of time, will be passed, and that the Senate will not debate other bills or subjects until the appropriation bills are disposed of. Under the peculiar situation which exists concerning the appropriation bills, the Chair hopes that they will get through on time. It is almost a superhuman task to get through by July 1.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely wish to say that what the Senator from Arizona and the distinguished President of the Senate have stated is absolutely true. But there is a deep fault somewhere. These appropriation bills involve many billion dollars. We have been in session since the first of the year, during which time these bills could have been considered.

They are postponed until the last two weeks before July 1, when we are called upon to rush them through without proper study. There is a fault somewhere. I hope that the congressional reorganization bill sponsored by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and others may help, once it is enacted, to remedy such situations. There is no reason why these bills should not come to the Senate long before they do; and there is no reason why the Senate should not have time carefully to consider appropriation bills involving billions of dollars.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The statement of the Senator from Arizona and the statement of the Chair, as well as the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire, accurately describe the situation, which is complicated by further time limitations. The bill for the extension of price control is now in conference, and it must be disposed of before the 30th of June. The draft bill is in conference. The time limit on that bill is June 30.

That situation leads me to suggest to Senators that they forego requests to sandwich other bills in-between the appropriation bills and the other measures which must be passed before the 30th of the month. Many Senators are interested in individual bills, and they are constantly requesting that the Senate consider this bill or that bill. It is imperative that the appropriation bills and other bills which have a time limit be disposed of before we undertake to consider legislation which can wait. In all probability there will be ample time to give consideration to bills which are not affected by dead lines. I hope the Senate will be willing to concentrate, and if necessary meet for longer hours, until the appropriation bills and other bills which have a time limit are out of the way. Then we can see what further legislation it is necessary to consider.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement about the pending measure. As it came from the committee the appropriations recommended were $21,000,000 under the Budget Bureau estimates. The House, of course, reduced the appropriations it contains to a very much greater degree, but I wish to have the Senate understand that the bill as reported is still under the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget.

In going through the bill we did not accept Budget estimates to the extent of $36,000,000, but in connection with other items we went above the Budget estimates to the extent of $15,000,000. I should like to explain to the Senate very briefly how that situation came about.

We knew that we would have some slack in the bill because there were certain Budget estimates which had been disallowed by the House, and with which the Senate also was not in accord. One was for $2,000,000, for transmission lines in connection with the Colorado-Big Thompson project. The Senators from Colorado informed us that they were very much more interested in building power plants, and that the transmission lines could wait.

In connection with the project outlined on the charts on the wall, the Southwest Power Authority, there was a Budget Bureau estimate of $23,000,000. We had extensive hearings before the subcommittee, and I am quite sure that it is the unanimous opinion of the committee that at the present time there is no adequate authority of law for building steam plants to firm up the power at Government dams. That being the case, we decided that we would not put any money in the bill for the steam plants.

As the bill came from the House, there was in it an item of $7,500,000 for a transmission line to connect a dam in Arkansas with a rural electrification line running into Oklahoma and down to Denison, Tex. That was an amendment offered by the Speaker of the House, and it amounted to $7,500,000. The majority of the committee has recommended striking out that item. We shall have a controversy over whether or not the Senate should follow the advice of the Speaker of the House or the advice of the majority of its committee with respect to this transmission line. The fact that we left out $15,500,000 gave us some slack on which to operate. With part of the slack, we said to the Reclamation Service, "Indicate to us the projects which can be finished and which we can get out of the way, so that homes may be provided for veterans." We found that there were a number of such projects which had been under construction for a long series of years and could be completed within the next year or two. So we not only restored the amount of the Budget Bureau's estimates but in some instances we went above their estimates and recommended the appropriation of sufficient funds to finish the job and get it out of the way. We thought it was good, sound business to do so, and we can still do so and leave the total under the figures of the Bureau of the Budget.

The transmission line between Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas will have to be voted upon by the Senate. It will not take us very long to determine what we shall do about that.

There is also an item involving a transmission line in California. The way the bill was reported from the committee, power will be transmitted about 25 miles from the Shasta Dam, and there it will stop, and then there will be one purchaser of the power who will transmit it from there on. Whether it shall be continued down to the Central Valley, the Senate will have to determine.

There is also some question about an item with reference to mine inspection.

Beyond those, yesterday the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] stated there were several items about which he wished to raise questions. One relates to the Geological Survey. I can state the situation about that.

An item was included for the making of topographic maps. Whenever any kind of development work is proposed in the United States, whether it be a road or a construction project, there is a demand for a map. We have learned to make maps better than ever and in less time for less money, because the Geological Survey, which was the principal map-making agency of the Government before the war, went into the service of the Army and the Navy during the war and made maps all over the world. The equipment is now available. The item in the bill provides for the transfer of the cameras and other equipment, so that the work may continue. It is essential that it be done. A map such as the Geological Survey makes is a good map, and it is good for all time. There may be changes in the cultural features, but generally speaking the map is good for all time. That is why the committee advocates the full amount of the Budget Bureau's estimate for that purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to add to what the Senator from Arizona has stated that about 2 years ago, when the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation was considering the suggestions which afterward became the so-called O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment to the river and harbor and flood-control bill to provide for the water rights in arid-land States and the cooperation of the Federal Government and the State governments in the development and utilization of water resources, testimony given before our committee showed that even then, while we were in the middle of the war, thousands of letters were being received by the Bureau of Reclamation from servicemen all over the world seeking opportunities to settle upon the public domain. The servicemen wanted homes. They wanted an opportunity to establish farms. They wanted to engage in agriculture. Members of Congress from the public-land States likewise were receiving similar communications. So one of our main purposes was to adapt the law in such manner that water could be placed upon the land, so as to afford opportunities for settlement.

The unfortunate fact is that agricultural land in the public domain which is capable of being used for homesteading and is capable of being used for the raising of ordinary crops without irrigation has long since been exhausted, and there is now no opportunity anywhere upon the public domain to provide homes for veterans, except upon the reclamation projects. So the law was passed, with the cooperation of the able senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who was acting as chairman of the Commerce Committee at the time. Then the vast program of the Missouri Basin was authorized, with opportunities for settlement in the public-land States.

A year or more ago I personally requested the Department of the Interior to submit to the committee a full statement regarding all possible projects which could be utilized for settlement by soldiers, and at that time a report was submitted. But because we were in the middle of the war, the Bureau of the Budget was unwilling to authorize the expenditures at that time.

Last year, when the deficiency bill for 1946 was under consideration, appropriations were made to begin some of these projects. This year, as the Senator from Arizona has so well stated, the committee, following the pattern of its action in previous years, requested the Bureau of Reclamation to give us a statement with respect to those projects which could be easily completed and made ready for settlement at the earliest possible date. That evidence was submitted. The committee has acted upon it, and the program is a highly desirable one, in my opinion, as well as in the opinion of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Arizona yield to me for a moment, while I make a request.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My colleague, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], is necessarily absent from the floor at the moment. As chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, he has prepared a statement with reference to a National Parks Service item in the bill. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. CARL A. HATCH, SENATOR FROM NEW MEXICO AND CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

When this bill was under consideration in the House of Representatives, there was considerable discussion over the operations of the Yosemite Park & Curry Co. which leases certain tracts of land in the Yosemite National Park and operates thereon facilities for the public including a large hotel, lodges, camps, transportation facilities of various kinds, stores and shops carrying tourist supplies.

There was criticism of the company on the ground that it had not paid enough for its privileges. The discussion fell short of explaining all of the conditions under which the company operates, nor was there sufficient review of the background or history of the contract under which it operates.

Laws governing the National Park Service are given first consideration by the Committee on Public Lands. Having the honor of being the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, it is my pleasure to preside over meetings at which current national park legislation is studied and approved or modified.

This committee, as far back as 1883, considered legislation authorizing the operation of tourist facilities in national parks by private enterprise. The early laws affected Yellowstone National Park. Under them, the Northern Pacific Railroad built the first hotels in the Yellowstone and these were subsequently sold to another operating company. As other national parks were created, authority was granted for the operation of tourist facilities by private enterprise.

Finally, in 1916, the National Park Service Act created a bureau of national parks and gave to it and the Secretary of the Interior broad authority to lease lands and grant facilities for operating of such facilities by private concerns. At no time in the history of the national parks has there been any stampede of business interests to obtain franchises to operate the really essential facilities in these national parks; that is, to provide room service and meal service to fit pocketbooks of all the people who visited these great playgrounds. There has been strong willingness on the part of many people to take over what has been called the "cream" of the business; that is, supplying post cards, bread and milk and, later on, gasoline and other supplies for motorists.

The Department of the Interior early realized that in order to provide hotels and camps and transportation service, it was necessary that these other items—the so-called "cream"—should go into the large contracts in order to sustain the more expensive operations. However, in very few national parks has there been a case where one company has provided all services.

The hazards of operating a national park have always been recognized: the short seasons, the fact that most people travel only during the school vacation; the fear of forest fires in dry seasons; threatened strikes. Then, there is the peak load problem—heavy travel on Saturdays and Sundays with more people to accommodate than it is possible to provide facilities for, followed by midweek days when there are more employees than guests.

Through the years the Department of the Interior in issuing these leases and franchises has attempted to primarily keep in mind the importance of furnishing a wide range of service at moderate rates. The success of the policy prompted Democratic administrations to follow the practice of Republicans, and vice versa. For instance, during the Wilson administration franchises issued in the Republican administrations were renewed, and later contracts entered into in President Wilson's time were renewed by his successors. Since 1933 several franchises issued in the twenties were properly renewed by the Secretary of the Interior.

So we come to the Yosemite National Park contract of 1925.

Never, at any time, has the Congress considered having tourist facilities provided by the Government itself. Obviously, the margin of profits is so small and so nearly nonexistent in many years that Government operation would have been difficult, if not impossible. To give such service to a relatively small part of the American people, the expense would have to be borne by all of the people. We have not yet reached the stage where all the people should make a contribution to provide meals, lodging, and automotive service to national park visitors; we look instead to private enterprise to do this job.

I have visited Yosemite National Park myself. There is a fine hotel there which could never be operated at much more than cost. There are lodge, camp, and other operations that have been modestly profitable, but there have been exceedingly poor business years when a Government operation would have ended in a serious deficit.

One of the things about the Yosemite Park & Curry Co. is that it has been operated by people who have a deep love for the mountains and forests, the lakes and streams of the High Sierras. The Curry family first developed a tourist camp in 1899, and the members of this fine family still direct the management of the Yosemite Park and Curry Co., whose operations have recently been so largely misrepresented and so badly misunderstood. Mrs. D. A. Curry, now 85 years old, has devoted her life to the affairs of this concern and still is its principal adviser. The National Park Service itself has, since its creation in 1916 under the bill signed by President Wilson on August 25 of that year, been extremely diligent and careful in securing operators of park facilities who are not only competent in providing the various services but who have genuine interest in the national parks. It has been the frank policy not to solicit bids with a view to getting the largest amount of compensation for the lease of a tract or tracts of land, but rather to interest in the operation competent people who are genuinely devoted to the objectives of the National Park Service and who have deep, personal interest in preserving the national parks themselves. These are the kind of people who have always operated Yosemite Park & Curry Co.

For instance, in Yosemite the most beautiful portion of Yosemite Valley is set aside exclusively for public camp grounds under great trees and beside the rushing Merced River. There you may be assigned camping space and pitch your tent. If you have no tent you can rent one. If you have no camp equipment—dishes, lanterns, and so on—you can rent those, too, at low cost.

If you prefer a tent with room service and cafeteria meals, you can have that. If you would like a well-ordered cabin with bath, you can have that. And if you want first-class hotel accommodations, as good as you will find in any city, you can have those. Whether you hike into Yosemite with your knapsack on your back or come out from the East in a special party traveling first-class all the way, Yosemite has accommodations and services to fit your wishes and your purse.

Even in the high park, up among the snow peaks, there are camps, a few miles apart, so that you can travel along the High Sierras afoot or on horseback, for a week at a time, with no other baggage than a tooth brush.

In the House of Representatives, Mr. ROONEY, of New York, speaking on May 8, described to you the many other facilities—the ski slopes, the transportation system, the recreation halls, the swimming pools, the stores, the shops, all operated under the authority and direction of the National Park Service for the public convenience, as to which I am sure he is as much concerned as I am.

In 1 month the park has served the equivalent of more than 113,000 guests staying 1 day each. All this is carried on, as in other national parks, under contract with the Government by Yosemite Park & Curry Co. with certain smaller operators.

Now what does this operating company get out of all this? Is the cost of these services—without which few of our people ever would visit or enjoy Yosemite or our other national parks—is this cost too high? Is the company making too much money? Over the 13 years that the present contract has been in effect, the dividends received by stockholders represent an average annual return of 4.49 percent on their invested capital. In the year 1931, the company's net loss was nearly $100,000 ($97,636.54) and in 1933 their net profit after taxes was only $1,495.31 on nearly $2,000,000 worth of business. Even in the last few years the company has never earned the 6 percent beyond which, under the contract, the Government recapture begins. Compare that with any hotel operation you know of, in the last 5 years.

So, in pointing out that all rates, tariffs, and charges are under the supervision and subject to the approval of the National Parks Service, I feel justified in commending that Service and the Department of the Interior, for their wisdom and watchfulness in seeing to it that the public is served at moderate and reasonable cost. And while I think it is much better to hold these costs down, as has been done, than to seek a greater return for the Government, which could only come out of our own people, I would further point out that in 1945 the Yosemite Park & Curry Co. paid, in Federal, State, and county taxes, a total of $207,000, or more than its entire net earnings ($203,000) over and above the minimum fee of $5,000 paid annually under the terms of the contract written by the Government and signed by the company.

Specifically, the operations of this company may be stated as follows:

ACCOMMODATIONS AND HOUSE COUNTS

Total capacity of company's guest accommodations is approximately 4,000 ranging from Ahwahnee Hotel to housekeeping tents.

In the travel year ended September 30, 1941, the largest in the park's history, the number of guest days varied from a low of 2,960 for the month of November to a high of 113,267 for the month of July. In the peak month of July the occupancy was 91.3 percent of capacity, while for the year it was 29 percent of capacity. At all seasons there is wide fluctuation between midweek and week ends.

INVESTMENT

Total cost of the company's facilities was $5,571,000 as of September 30, 1945.

SERVICES AND RATES

All services provided and all rates and prices charged are approved by the Department of the Interior. Complete schedules of rates are filed each season and are subjected to careful scrutiny before they are approved or modified.

Gross volume and net profits

Year	Gross sales	Net profit after taxes
1926	$2,388,037.47	$309,013.36
1927	3,094,896.32	463,533.32
1928	3,013,375.21	314,364.62
1929	2,954,782.97	287,009.85
1930	2,362,723.35	34,524.92
1931	1,880,632.47	[1] 97,636.54
1932	1,592,547.42	22,250.96
1933	1,243,181.76	1,495.31
1934	1,425,832.80	24,097.02
1935	1,796,081.87	139,725.05
1936	2,185,670.57	251,208.78
1937	2,429,584.27	228,416.05
1938	2,440,509.91	207,121.03
1939	2,648,670.60	276,895.87
1940	2,577,748.04	255,480.38
1941	2,812,590.25	262,623.74
1942	2,418,721.94	69,721.27
1943	1,649,261.35	89,812.51
1944	1,907,930.67	140,375.56
1945	2,351,122.86	203,422.72

[1] Net loss.

CONCESSION FEE TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A flat minimum fee of $5,000 per annum is provided by the contract.

For the first 10 years of the contract the Government receives 25 percent of any amount distributed to stockholders in excess of 6 percent cumulative priority in stockholders' equity.

For the second 10 years of the contract the Government receives 22½ percent of any amount earned above the 6-percent priority, whether distributed or not.

PAYMENTS TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR SERVICES

The company pays the Federal Government for electricity, water, telephone service, and garbage disposal. For the year 1941 such payments were as follows:

Electricity	$73,500
Water	10,500
Incinerator	3,600
Telephone	6,000
Total	93,600

Taxes paid by company in 1945

Federal	$148,000
California	40,000
County	19,000
Total (net earnings, $203,000)	207,000

The company has never reached the excess-profits-tax bracket.

Taxes paid by guests and employees through company

Federal (income, excise, social security)	$130,000
California (sales tax)	37,000

BRIEF STATEMENT REGARDING PRESENT CONTRACT

The original 2C-year contract was signed by Secretary Work February 4, 1926 The present contract became effective October 1, 1932, and is a revision of the former contract based on the inclusion of the Wawona properties in the park and the enlarged scope of the company's undertaking. During the first 10-year period of this contract the company paid $851,000 in dividends while it invested $1,726,961 in buildings and equipment. The second period of this contract has now run for 3 years and during that time the company has not earned its 6-percent priority.

Over the 13 years that the contract has been in effect the dividends received by the stockholders represent an average annual return of 4.49 percent on their invested capital.

All of this has come from a beginning of six- or seven-tenths through careful, economical management and by persuading other public-spirited citizens to supply funds for additional facilities, the present number of stockholders (1945) being 419.

If, in the light of experience, better leases can now be written by the Park Service, I am sure it will be done. In the meantime, we may well have in mind that in Yosemite Park alone, millions of our fellow citizens have enjoyed this splendid heritage on a schedule of rates and prices that has netted the operating company less than it would have realized by investing its money in good common stocks or other standard securities.

I see nothing for the Park Service or the Yosemite Park & Curry Co. to feel apologetic about in this record. On the contrary, I feel that both parties to the contract are to be commended for its faithful observance in the interests of the public.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk state the next committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 46, line 12, after the word "division", to strike out "$1,115,660" and insert "$2,782,659."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, in line 13, after the name "Anderson Ranch Dam", to strike out "$1,234,475" and insert "$2,847,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. The amendment just stated appears in line 13; does it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. The committee proposes to increase the appropriation for the Anderson Ranch Dam from the House figure of $1,234,475 to $2,847,000. Frankly, I am willing to take up these items individually or in a group. But there are several such projects as to which, in my judgment, at least, the increases voted by the Senate committee are not warranted. I am willing to take them up individually or I am willing to take them up as a group, in connection with the construction program items.

Let me point out that the House gave this matter very careful consideration and made a drastic cut below the figure submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. But the House had a very definite reason for doing so. We know that at the present time materials are scarce and labor is scarce. So it seems to me to be a poor time to go forward in an extended way with this work.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is violent disagreement as to the facts insofar as the scarcity of labor is concerned. The soldiers are coming back. They are being discharged in large numbers. The Senator must remember that it was months ago that the hearings were held by the House committee.

Today we receive reports from all over the United States about the returned servicemen. We have stated in our report that insofar as the Reclamation Service can do so in connection with its own work and in connection with work done for it by contractors, preference on such jobs shall be given to veterans who desire to become farmers on the projects.

There is no question at all that there is now in the United States ample manpower to undertake the work. So the allegation of manpower shortage is out the window.

The other question is with respect to the principal materials which are used on these projects. A great deal of cement is used on them. Today, cement plants in the United States are shut down because there is not sufficient demand for cement. These projects also use reinforced steel. Reinforced steel comes off the top of the pot in the steel-making process. It is not the finest kind of steel, and there is a surplus of such steel on the market.

The Senator from New Hampshire must remember that this job is to be judged, not by today's conditions, but by conditions throughout the year. I can assure him that under those circumstances he need not worry about either labor or material.

The testimony before the House committee was not to the effect that these projects could be finished and that men could be engaged in farming on those projects within a year or a year and a half. However, if the requested appropriation is made with regard to the Boise project, the project will be in position to be completed. No more Federal expenditure will be required in regard to that project, and veterans will be able to obtain farms there within a year and a half. Therefore, why should we cause any delay in completing the project?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the regular and supplemental Budget estimates for 1947 were $350,357,270, but the House voted $179,426,847, or a reduction of more than one-half. The Senate subcommittee, and in turn the full committee, restored the cuts made by the House so that the bill now provides for a total appropriation of $329,337,438, or a net restoration over the House figure of $149,910,591. I do not believe the increases can be justified. Yesterday we passed over many items in the bill. I do not believe it is necessary to take up each and every one of the three-hundred-odd committee amendments to the bill, but I do believe that the Senate committee went too far in its restorations of cuts which had been made by the House. I should like to see the Senate vote on a series of these amendments and enable us to find out whether we want to go ahead with the completion of the projects.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. REED. With the permission of the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Arizona, I should like to make about a 3-minute statement with regard to some of the items contained in the bill, and the policy which should be followed.

Not being a member of the subcommittee, or being present when the full committee disposed of the bill, I do not know in what way these projects will be affected. But heretofore a wrong policy has been followed in regard to irrigation plants, reclamation plants, flood-control dams, and construction of that type. In other words, when we appropriated, say a hundred million dollars, for certain types of projects, the practice has been to distribute the $100,000,000 among various States and congressional districts so that everybody would be satisfied. That has been a poor policy. I have expressed my opinion in committees which had to handle such matters. It makes a great deal more sense if we pick out the projects which must be completed and concentrate our appropriations upon them so that, for example, flood control would be provided. There would also be an increase in the amount of land to be irrigated. We have been dividing these funds and scattering them around among many plants and finishing the construction of none of them.

Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Arizona if the increases which we are now discussing would enable the projects affected to be completed.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly what I was talking about in respect to the projects set forth on pages 46 and 47 of the bill. The purpose in each case is to allow the Budget Bureau's estimate, plus a sum of money which the Bureau of Reclamation stated would make possible the completion of the job in a year or a year and a half, and, at most, within 2 years.

Mr. REED. If the appropriations, including the recommended increases, would enable the projects to be completed, I would hope that the Senator from New Hampshire would not urge an objection against the items which we are discussing. A policy which would make possible the completion of all these projects would be a better policy all around. We can finish building the projects at one bite at less cost than if the money were to be scattered and expended over a series of years. If we have a dozen dams which are only partially completed, we get no flood control. If we have a dozen irrigation projects only partially completed, we get nothing whatever in the way of irrigation. The most efficient policy is the one which will make it possible to complete the construction of the projects at the earliest possible date.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Arizona which of these projects would be completed and about which we would hear nothing in the future, so far as appropriations are concerned.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee stated in its report, on page 21, that the House allowed, in connection with the Boise project, Idaho, Payette division, an appropriation of $1,115,660, and that the additional funds necessary in order to complete the project are $209,659.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have the bill before me, and I should like to check the committee amendments as set forth in the bill. For example, on page 46 of the bill, what projects mentioned there would be finished if the requested appropriations were allowed?

Mr. HAYDEN. We went over the Budget Bureau's estimates in connection with the Boise project, Idaho, Payette division, and we received a statement that an additional amount of $209,659 would enable completion of the project. The Senator will also note on page 46, in line 23, the Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma. That project will be finished. The Deschutes project in Oregon is the next one. It will also be completed. The Klamath project, referred to in line 1 on page 47, will also be completed. The Yakima project, Washington, Roza division, will also be completed. The Kendrick project, Wyoming; the Riverton project, Wyoming; and the Shoshone project, Wyoming, Heart Mountain division, will be completed and will not appear again as construction items in connection with an appropriation bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, those projects involve tremendous sums of money. On page 46, at the beginning of line 13, I move to strike out "$2,782,659" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,115,660."

Mr. HAYDEN. The question first will be on agreeing to the committee amendment. The Senator does not necessarily have to make the motion which he has made. The Senate can either agree or disagree to the committee amendment, unless the Senator wants to go below the House figure.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I do not want to go below the House figure. If we could dispose of some of these amendments I would be willing to do so on the basis of the committee's recommendations. Some of the appropriations, however, include tremendous increases. Let us take each one of the amendments individually or all of them together on pages 46 and 47.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator's motion would be, would it not, to disagree to all the committee amendments on pages 46 and 47 under the heading "Construction"?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; with the exception of the amendments which pertain to projects which could be completed and disposed of.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have stated what those projects are.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments under the heading "Construction," beginning on page 46, will be considered en bloc. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the subheading "Construction," on page 46, line 12, after the word "division", to strike out "$1,115,660" and insert "$2,782,659";

On page 46, line 13, after the word "Dam", to strike out "$1,234,475" and insert "$2,847,000";

On page 46, line 14, after the name "Idaho", to strike out "$433,605" and insert "$1,000,000";

On page 46, line 18, after the name "Idaho", to strike out "$650,410" and insert "$1,500,000";

On page 46, line 19, after the name "Montana", to strike out "$41,625" and insert "$96,000";

On page 46, line 20, after the names "New Mexico-Texas", to strike out "$360,675" and insert "$831,800";

On page 46, line 22, after the name "New Mexico", to strike out "$753,605" and insert "$1,738,000";

On page 46, line 23, after the name "Oklahoma" to strike out "$901,900" and insert "$2,664,610";

On page 46, line 24, after the name "Oregon", to strike out "$563,685" and insert "$1,716,837";

On page 46, after line 24, to insert: "Owyhee project, Oregon, $125,000";

On page 47, line 1, after the names "Oregon-California", to strike out "$216,800" and insert "$1,281,605";

On page 47, line 3, after the name "Utah", to strike out "$1,345,040" and insert "$4,602,000";

On page 47, line 4, after the name "Utah", to strike out "$26,885" and insert "$62,000";

On page 47, line 5, after the word "division", to strike out "$624,650" and insert "$2,597,100";

On page 47, after the name "Wyoming", to strike out "$216,800" and insert "$1,895,000";

On page 47, line 8, after the name "Wyoming", to strike out "$650,410" and insert "$3,520,550";

On page 47, line 10, after the word "division", to strike out "$346,885" and insert "$1,917,672";

On page 47, line 12, after the word "division", to strike out "$58,970" and insert "$196,895."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 6, in the item for the Columbia Basin project, Washington, after the numerals "$1,090,000", to strike out "of the moneys deposited in the special account pursuant to section 4 of Executive Order numbered 8526 shall be transferred to the reclamation fund to", and insert "from power revenues shall."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions," on page 50, after line 23, to insert:

Utilization of power revenues: No power revenues on any project shall be distributed as profits to any individual, before or after retirement of the project debt, and nothing contained in any previous appropriation act shall be deemed to have authorized such distribution: *Provided*, That the application of such revenues to the cost of operation, maintenance, and debt service of the irrigation system of the project, or to other purposes in aid of such irrigation system, shall not be construed to be such a distribution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 20, after the word "fund", to strike out "$18,489,395" and insert "$49,572,043."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General fund, construction," on page 52, line 4, after the words "Gila project, Arizona", to strike out "$867,210" and insert "$3,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 13, after the words "Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada", to strike out "$6,504,070" and insert "$15,000,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, here again we find an appropriation which, with the amounts appropriated by the preceding amendments, involves a large sum of money. I do not want to be put in the position of standing here and fighting against something that various Senators think is for the progress of the country but I say we have got to economize, and we simply cannot do that and at the same time continue with this wild spending. We have to start trimming our sails somewhere, and it seems to me, in view of the cuts made by the House of Representatives, we should at least maintain a semblance of economy in this bill.

Today a great many persons in the Congress and throughout the country are demanding economy, but it is lip service unless they fight for it. While I shall not go into their individual merits, a great many of these projects are outstanding examples of expenditures which I do not believe can be justified at this time.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am going to move that the amendments on pages 52 and 53 down to line 17 on page 53 where the item "Water Conservation and Utilization Projects" begins, be disagreed to. For instance, for "Total, general fund, construction," the House appropriated $38,590,830, which the Senate committee has increased to $82,005,070.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I cannot agree that the amendments on the pages referred to be voted en bloc, for several reasons. One reason is that there is a disagreement with respect to the transmission line in connection with a project in California, and that ought to be segregated by itself.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well. Let us take them up individually, but I point out that the House figure on these general fund construction items was $38,590,830 and the Senate figure is $82,005,070, representing a tremendous increase.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A vote will have to be taken on the separate amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. As to the Senate committee amendment now under consideration on page 52, lines 13 and 14, the justification for it is this: We entered into a solemn treaty with the Republic of Mexico that we would complete this particular dam within 5 years in order properly to reregulate the waters from the Colorado River so as to carry out our treaty obligation. This project cannot be delayed. That is the story. It is a reregulating reservoir below Boulder Dam, which will increase the production of power, which is greatly needed. At the present time a Navy power plane is being brought into the area because of the drought there and in order to provide surplus power. In the treaty with Mexico we agreed to have this dam completed by November 195[illegible] and the dam cannot be completed if it is proceeded with at the rate which would be possible under the amount appropriated by the House. The money proposed by the amendment will be required in order to do the job under the treaty.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Arizona if the larger amount would complete this particular dam?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; it will not. It is a very expensive job. In order to finish it within the 1950 period, the appropriation must be made at the rate estimated by the Bureau of the Budget. For that reason, we are asking for the appropriation recommended by the Senate committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, can the Senator tell us what it has cost so far and what it will cost in toto?

Mr. HAYDEN. The total estimate cost is $76,661,000; the expenditures to June 30, 1945, were $4,254,000. The construction was just begun on this dam at the outbreak of the war, and because of the war and the scarcity of manpower and materials the work was stopped. In the meantime, we made the treaty with Mexico in which we agreed to apportion the waters to Mexico, and this is the place to do it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may I point out to the Senator that this is a typically good example of authorizations of a great expenditure of money in connection with which chickens come home to roost. This matter certainly was emphasized when the Mexican treaty was under consideration by the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. In reply to the Senator, let me say that this project was authorized and construction had begun on it before the war. Why? Because the quantity of power produced at Boulder Dam was not sufficient to meet the needs of the area. This is a reregulating reservoir; the power could be used twice, and more power could be obtained in that way. That is the basic reason why the project was authorized and approved before the war. In the meantime it serves the additional purpose of being the place specified in the treaty where the water is to be provided for Mexico. We agreed to do it within a given period of time, and it can only be done by appropriating at the rate recommended by the committee.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I might say that this item, the Davis Dam, was extensively discussed on the floor by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], by myself, and by other Senators who participated at that time in the debate. We have entered into a very solemn obligation with the Republic of Mexico to complete this dam, and if the United States Government should default in its obligation we would be in a most unhappy condition. Inasmuch as the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire was one of the Senators who voted for that treaty, I am sure he will want to vote to carry out our obligation.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I am glad the Senator from California has called attention to the debate that occurred at the time the treaty was under consideration by the Senate. I am sure he will remember that I pointed out at that time very definitely that when we enter into these solemn agreements we have to fulfill them. This should be another illustration to the Members of the Senate and of the other House that when we make deals with foreign nations and they may become solemn treaties we should know exactly what we will be called upon to do.

I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Arizona that this is now an obligation. The time for us to have taken the necessary action to have avoided doing things we do not want to do was before we made the treaty. I am sure the Senator from California will remember that I spent a day on the Senate floor trying to point out this objection to the Senate, but, as the Senator indicates, we did not have a sufficient number of Members of the Senate to agree with us to keep us from getting into this situation.

Mr. DOWNEY. I very distinctly remember that, and we are fortunate in now having upon the floor of the Senate the distinguished Senator from Colorado, who more than anybody else is probably responsible for what the Senate did. The distinguished Senator from Colorado, I know, will raise his eloquent voice to uphold the honor and dignity of the United States in not overturning this treaty.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest that, entirely independent from the treaty and entirely aside from the water allocations we made to Mexico, the Davis Dam is an essential part of an integrated development of the Colorado River, and that it was considered a highly desirable project and was authorized prior to the time of the treaty, and as the distinguished Senator from Arizona has pointed out, was merely suspended during the war.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I know my distinguished friend from Colorado, for whom I have a very high regard, will admit that, if we did not have this treaty and a fixed date, we could make this improvement at our leisure and in accord with the necessities of the people of the United States. The Senator from Arizona has made a very definite statement, and it is absolutely accurate. We fixed in the treaty an absolute date when we would have to do something, and so often it costs several times as much to do that something when we are compelled to meet a dead line.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Of course, this is an essential part of the treaty. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey is right when he says that when we make an agreement we have to keep it, and I do not know how to make a treaty without making some firm agreements.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly. In the light of what has been said I may say

that I withdraw my amendment to reduce the total for this dam project if it is a part of the Mexican treaty and represents a solemn obligation on the part of this country. I point out again, however, this is typical of the authorizations which are so easily enacted, and which afterward we have to pay for.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire withdraws his amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 52, line 16, after the words "Shasta Dam and Reservoir", it is proposed to strike out "$1,385,365" and insert "$2,716,000."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, we are now approaching the amendments relating to the Central Valley project. I take it that, aside from some of these amendments which were agreed to in the committee unanimously, the matter in italics, beginning in line 25, on page 52, down to and including line 5, on page 53, might go over until the other amendments in the bill have been acted on, because that is a matter which will arouse a great deal of controversy.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was about to remark that the amendments down to the one relating to the Keswick Dam, on line 21, page 52, where the amount is increased from $765,310 to $1,500,000, for the switchyards, were unanimously agreed to in the committee.

There is a disagreement, which will have to be settled in the Senate, about the transmission line, beginning with the words "transmission line," in line 21, down to the end of the paragraph on page 53. There is a difference of opinion as to about $4,000,000.

It is immaterial to me the way the matter is handled. I would just as lief proceed and dispose of it now, or, if it suits the convenience of the Senator to have it go over for a little while, we can do that.

Mr. McCARRAN. A number of Senators who have evinced considerable interest in the amendment with reference to the transmission lines are absent. The Senator will recall that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] has at all times taken a great interest in this subject. He is not present, and is not able to be on the floor today, I understand.

Mr. HAYDEN. I sincerely hope we can dispose of the bill today, because with 11 appropriation bills to be acted on, we should act on the pending bill today if possible.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator's anxiety in that regard is not greater than my own.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator suggest that we pass this matter over temporarily?

Mr. McCARRAN. I respectfully suggest that the transmission line item, and another which will come later in the bill as to the Southwest Power Authority, be not taken up until all other items in the bill have been disposed of, and then take them up at the last.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a moment?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, we will take action on the committee amendments up to the point of that relating to the transmission line?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what I am asking.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The proposal of the Senator is to have it go over only temporarily?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. He certainly would not be in favor of having this matter postponed for another day. We have had ample notice that the pending bill would be under consideration. We have an unusual condition in regard to the Central Valley in California. Both the senior Senator from California and the junior Senator are in accord and in favor of the transmission lines being constructed, as is the Governor of the State of California. So I should like to have this matter considered just as soon as possible.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a matter which has been before the Senate for a number of years. Some of us have taken quite a long and continuous interest in it, and it may or it may not get through this afternoon.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the clerk will then proceed with the reading, I will interrupt him at the proper point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments.

The next amendments were, on page 52, line 16, after the word "Reservoir", to strike out "$1,385,365" and insert "$2,716,000"; in line 17, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$6,284,020" and insert "$12,312,000"; in line 18, after the word "plant", to strike out "$970,195" and insert "$1,900,000"; in line 19, after the name "Keswick Dam", to strike out "$510,570" and insert "$1,000,000"; in line 20, after the word "plant", to strike out "$510,570" and insert "$1,000,000"; in the same line, after the word "switchyards", to insert "at Shasta and Keswick Dams"; in line 21, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$765,310" and insert "$1,500,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendments from there until the end of the paragraph may be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment after the ones referred to by the Senator from Arizona.

The next amendment was on page 53, after line 5, to insert the following:

Kings River project, California, $200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 7, after the name "Colorado", to strike out "$6,504,075" and insert "$13,000,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, here is another big item, the Colorado-Big Thompson project. The House appropriated $6,504,075, and the Senate committee jumped the amount to $13,000,000. That is a tremendous increase, and I think certainly it should be justified. I do not know whether the Senator from Arizona desires to speak on it or whether the Senator from Colorado wishes to speak about it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me state, first, that the amount suggested in the bill is $2,000,000 under the Budget estimate.

Mr. BRIDGES. I realize that.

Mr. HAYDEN. The remainder of the appropriation is necessary in order to get water out from the west of the Colorado River Basin over on to the thirsty land now partially supplied by eastern Colorado. The job must be done; it is a feasible project; and, in the judgment of the committee, the work should be prosecuted at the rate recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Of course, it can be slowed down, but, if it is slowed down, then the income the Federal Government will receive by way of returns from this development will be postponed that much longer, and the benefits to the farmers and landowners will be delayed.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to ask two questions in regard to the matter: What is the total cost of the project, and how much has been spent to date?

Mr. HAYDEN. The total cost of the project is $96,321,000. The expenditures to June 30, 1945, amounted to $21,635,000. There was a deficiency appropriation last year of $5,750,000. This makes about $27,000,000 that has been spent on the project up to date. As I have said, the total cost is to be $96,000,000. To carry on at the proper rate the Bureau of the Budget made its estimate.

I think it would interest the Senator to know that the Northern Colorado Conservation District has agreed to repay the United States $25,000,000 on the construction costs, and practically all the remaining costs are to be repaid from revenues derived from the sale of surplus electrical energy. There must be harmonious development of the project and surplus power must be delivered to the load centers in the market area as the demand arises. This is a combined irrigation-power development, with ample market for the power and a crying demand for the water.

Mr. BRIDGES. I point out again that Congress has authorized for the project $96,000,000, and that it is very easy to authorize a project, and now we have spent some $27,000,000, we are in it, and must go forward. I merely point out that this is typical of the expenditures to which we are committed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let me say that when we are considering items of $96,000,000, $86,000,000, and one thing and another, the figures are less than the cost of one battleship, which we use for a few years and then blow up with an atomic bomb to see what will happen. These great irrigation projects in the West fertilize thousands of acres of land, and they will

be of benefit to this generation and the next generation, to returning GI's who manned the battleships. I think they are worthy, yet when great armament appropriations are brought up, no one raises a voice against them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The irrigation projects in the West have an additional feature. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] referred to the cost of a battleship as being in excess of $100,000,000. Let me suggest that after a battleship is constructed there is not the return of one penny of the expenditure to the Government, while in the projects under discussion, land is developed, human beings who take up the land as well as others are cared for, and the money is returned. The Government is repaid for its expenditures.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that I am not standing on the floor of the Senate opposing the general program. I feel that we have gone at the whole matter in a sort of a hit-and-miss manner. We have authorized and begun many projects, and when we did so we could not appreciate the magnitude of the projects in toto and the magnitude of the costs. Of course, many of these projects are worth while. But when we consider that the country is endeavoring to get back to a peacetime economy, the amount here involved seems somewhat staggering.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, we all want to get back to a peacetime economy, but how are we to get back to a peacetime economy unless we take care of the people in the various sections of the country? What is proposed to be done represents a fine peacetime economy in that it puts the ex-servicemen on pieces of land which they can irrigate and farm and produce food. We have now many obligations with respect to food. We are feeding Europe and, in fact, the whole world. How are we going to do that unless we get men to raise potatoes in Idaho or raise beans in Washington and other States? That, Mr. President, is a good peacetime economy.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. May I also say, Mr. President, that with our great national debt the only way we are ever going to service it is to have a richer country, with greater production facilities, in order that there may be produced more commodities on which taxes can be paid. That will certainly be the case in these great projects in the West. I may say that the State of Idaho has lost population during the war. Men went away to the war plants. We have wide open spaces out there that can accommodate thousands upon thousands, and possibly millions of citizens from the crowded areas of the country. These projects will make markets for the manufactured products of the East. So they are certainly for the benefit of the whole country, and, as the Senator from New Mexico pointed out, these projects are self-liquidating.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I submit to the Senator from New Hampshire that, while the item in question represents a great amount of money, there is no economy in curtailing a development once it has been undertaken, and after one-third of the cost of it has already been expended. We have got to go through with it then. The time to have stopped it was before we commenced. Now that we have expended about one-third of its total cost, the sooner we can complete the project the more economy there will be to the American people. Among other things, we have drilled a 13-mile tunnel through the Rocky Mountains to carry this water. The tunnel is idle now, and awaiting the development and the building of dams to accumulate the water to be transported through that great tunnel. I sincerely hope the Senator from New Hampshire will not oppose the appropriation recommended by the Senate committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like very much to endorse the comments of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado. There also is an element of fairness to the people who come under the project which should not be overlooked. They have organized themselves into districts. They have assumed heavy obligations. They in the end will reimburse the Government. They already have made some contribution. It is not fair to drag those people along forever and not bring them the benefits for which they have contracted and which have been delayed so far because of the war.

I should like to add that this project was not entered into in a profligate spirit. I doubt whether the Senate has ever more carefully considered any project than this particular project, in part because of its dramatic novelty. It takes water from one watershed and moves it through the Continental Divide to another watershed.

The late Senator Alva Adams, and my distinguished colleague [Mr. JOHNSON], and others from Colorado have done great labor on the matter, and the appropriate Senate committees have studied it most thoroughly. We have put our hand to that plow and we have got to finish the furrow, and the faster we do it the better for all concerned.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in the light of the statements which have just been made, I will withdraw my amendment respecting this item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 53, in lines 7 and 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 9, after the name "Montana," to strike out "$867,210" and insert "$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, after line 9, to insert:

Colorado River project, Texas, $68,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 14, after "(57 Stat. 14)", to strike out "$13,008,145" and insert "$27,400,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in the case of the Columbia Basin project in Washington, again we find a tremendous increase. The House figure was $13,008,145. We are more than doubling that to $27,400,000. I think there should be a very good explanation and a justification of such a tremendous increase.

Mr. HAYDEN. No explanation was given by the House Committee on Appropriations as to why the cut was made. The sum of money we are restoring makes this item $27,400,000, which is under the Budget estimate by $2,600,000, because we do not provide for a Government town site. Aside from that, the break-down of the items is as follows:

Power facilities, that is the dam itself, $6,409,000.

Irrigation facilities, $15,000,000.

Reconditioning the spillway bucket of Grand Coulee Dam, $2,046,000.

Then there is a land-purchasing program of $2,000,000.

The Senator will understand that when this project is completed it will be the largest irrigation project in America. It will embrace the largest area of land irrigated from one source of water supply.

Mr. BRIDGES. What will be the total cost, and how much money have we put into the project up to date?

Mr. HAYDEN. The total estimated cost is $582,000,000. The expenditures up to date are $183,822,000. That is the Coulee Dam.

Mr. BRIDGES. The figure we are talking about is a tremendous one.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; there is no doubt about that at all. But it is an enormous area, highly fertile, and will provide homes for a great many Americans.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that none of us knew exactly why the House cut this item, but the break-down just given represents items which must be started. There was some controversy over the amount for land purchases, but that amount is necessary to break down some of the large land holdings there because of a law enacted by the Congress itself, under which the lands have to be held for a short period of time, and then can be sold to veterans and other people settling on the lands. The Bureau of Reclamation has to have that money under the directive of the Congress, under the law passed by the Congress.

The other items include the taking care of the power facilities; that is, particularly, the large pumps. I understand the testimony was that it would take from 2½ to 3 years to build the pumps. They are the largest pumps in the world. There is very little irrigation proper. The purpose is merely to get ready for the big project which was contemplated in the integrated development of the Columbia River, including Grand Coulee and all the other power, irrigation, navigation, and flood-control projects on the river. This project is a part of the whole. It will be the thing that will really pay off. It will be self-liquidating. If we wait another year the whole project will be delayed that much longer.

Mr. BRIDGES. When the Senator speaks of the project being self-liquidating, does he mean that the money received will eventually go into the United States Treasury, or will it go into another fund, to be spent again?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think eventually we shall come to the end of new irrigation projects. Then there will be a vast amount of money in the Treasury, or in the Bureau, which is, in effect, in the Treasury, because it can be turned over. I think we are pioneering in connection with many of these irrigation projects. They have not yet had a chance to pay big dividends, but as years go by they will pay off. We have been using most of the money for new projects, but some day we shall come to an end of new projects. The fund is in good shape. I hope the Senator will not object to this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 53, line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 15, after the word "construction", to strike out "$38,590,830" and insert "$82,005,070."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that this amendment, representing the total, go over until we determine what to do about the Central Valley project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment on page 53, lines 15 and 16, will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 53, after line 16, to insert:

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

For the construction of water conservation and utilization projects and small reservoirs, as authorized by the act of August 11, 1939, as amended (16 U. S. C., 590y, 590z-1, 590z-2), $3,340,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Fort Peck project", on page 54, line 2, after "(16 U. S. C. 833)", to strike out "$433,605" and insert "$1,000,000."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator in charge of the bill his construction of the language in connection with the Fort Peck project in Montana: "For construction of transmission lines, substations, and other facilities." I call his attention to the expression "other facilities as may be required by the Bureau of Reclamation, as authorized by the act of May 18, 1938." What does the language "other facilities" embrace?

Mr. HAYDEN. In my opinion, it embraces anything necessary to make the power generated at the Government dam available wherever it might be needed. There would have to be a transformer, to step down or step up the power. It includes anything to make the power available. That is what I understand "other facilities" to mean in connection with a Government dam.

Mr. OVERTON. In the opinion of the Senator, would it authorize the construction of steam-power plants?

Mr. HAYDEN. That question was argued very extensively in the committee in respect to the Southwest Power Authority. The term "other facilities" appears in connection with the Denison Dam and other dams. The committee reached the conclusion that at the time that legislation was enacted Congress did not have in mind that power generated at a Government dam might be firmed up subsequently by a steam plant, under the guise of the term "other facilities." If Congress intends anything of that kind, it so specifies. In the case of the Central Valley project in California, the authorizing act authorized a dam and transmission lines to be built, as well as steam plants to firm up the power. Congress affirmatively said what the policy was. It would be a strained construction, as the lawyers on our committee view it, to say that "other facilities" meant steam plants.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator. That is exactly my view.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator was one of the authors of the Flood Control Act. I do not believe that any Senator knows more about what he himself had in mind when a term like that was used.

Mr. OVERTON. I believe that the provision to which the Senator refers contains the language "and related facilities." That certainly did not authorize the construction of steam plants. I am very glad to have the Senator from Arizona agree with me in that interpretation.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not a lawyer, but we have some very able lawyers on the committee, and they seem to be of the same opinion.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand, the Senator is not combating that opinion.

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 54, line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Missouri River Basin," on page 54, line 9, after "(Public Law 534)", to strike out "$10,312,685" and insert "$25,582,202."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Advances to Colorado River Dam fund," on page 55, line 16, after "(43 U. S. C., ch. 12A)", to strike out "$433,605" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 56, line 13, after the word "fund", to strike out "$2,384,825" and insert "$7,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Colorado River development fund," on page 56, line 20, after "(54 Stat. 774)", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Colorado River front work and levee system," on page 57, line 8, after the word "available", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$100,000."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the authorization bill for this item was passed in 1940, because of a critical flood condition on the lower Colorado River due to the flood control work above that point. Since the hearings on the pending bill were held, the Congress has passed, and the President has recently signed, Senate bill 2034, which is an additional authorization for flood-control work near Yuma on the Colorado River. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona—for the benefit of other Senators, because he is well aware of the conditions—that flood-control conditions on the lower Colorado River which will be cured by this project are most critical. There is serious immediate danger from possible floods. In order to complete the project, instead of $100,000 being required, approximately $250,000 is required, and that additional amount of money is authorized in the bill which has recently been signed by the President, and to which I have referred. Because the condition is critical, and because the authorization has already been provided for, I ask the distinguished Senator if he will not take to conference an item of $250,000 instead of $100,000, as provided by the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot object to that, because it is authorized by law. I shall be very glad to take the item to conference if the Senator will offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 57, line 8, to strike out "$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$250,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] to the committee amendment on page 57, line 8.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Geological Survey," on page 57, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "thirty" and insert "two hundred and two"; and in line 19, after the

word "exceed", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$55,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 3, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "$2,626,120" and insert "$5,000,000"; in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$675,000"; and in line 13, after the word "That", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 17, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$1,200,000" and insert "$2,463,500"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$725,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in connection with the Geological Survey there is a series of increases. Instead of taking the time to go into each individual increase, can the Senator from Arizona justify to the Senate the reason for such increases at this time?

Mr. HAYDEN. I did so partially a few moments ago, with respect to topographical mapping. The other work of the Geological Survey, which we all agree is most important, is to assist in an inventory of the mineral resources of the United States. During the war we exhausted many of our great mineral resources. At least the richer deposits have been taken away and used for war purposes. By geophysical prospecting ore bodies in the ground are located. That involves work of the geologist. After it has been determined what is there, the Bureau of Mines enters the picture with the proper metallurgical processes to make the particular resource available. Thus the two bureaus work together. Our committee was of the opinion that in order to carry on the proper kind of inventory and find out what we have in the United States, we should allow the Budget estimates. We shall take the items to conference and see what we can do with the House. The House did not allow as much. Undoubtedly we shall have to compromise in some manner.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe that the increase is too large, but I shall raise no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 21, after the name "Alaska", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$312,500"; and in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$65,000" and insert "$97,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 3, after the word "resources", to strike out "$2,109,345" and insert "$2,888,000"; and in line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$220,000" and insert "$250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 4, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$216,800" and insert "$350,000"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$80,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 10, after the word "journals", to strike out "$101,500" and insert "$150,000"; in line 12, after the word "maps", to strike out "$264,080" and insert "$475,000"; and in the same line, after the words "in all", to strike out "$397,610" and insert "$657,030."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 23, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$575,500" and insert "$690,000"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$105,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 23, after the word "Survey", to strike out "$7,993,445" and insert "$13,029,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Arizona will be willing to have considered out of order an item on page 84, before we reach the items for the Bureau of Mines. Unfortunately, I must leave the Senate in a short time. It will be a courtesy to me if unanimous consent is granted, so as to permit that amendment to be considered at this time. I hope the Senator from Arizona will be willing to take to conference an item which I have discussed with him and with other members of the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am familiar with the item the Senator from Washington has in mind. The Clerk informs us that the amendment should be offered to the committee amendment on page 84, in line 16, under the item of "Propagation of food fishes."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. Mr. President, I wish to have $35,000 added to the figure reported by the committee. The committee amendment proposes the figure "$1,476,600."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not believe I have discussed it with the Senator from New Hampshire. This matter came up after the hearings had started. It involves a fish hatchery in the Olympic Peninsula. A park was started there, but the work had to be discontinued because of the war. Several thousand tourists will go there, and this item involves the construction of concrete work for trout-rearing pools. The Department of the Interior and everyone else are very anxious to have the work done.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to taking up the item now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be stated out of order.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 84, in line 16, after the word "aquarium", it is proposed to strike out "$1,315,100" and insert "$1,476,600."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I offer the following amendment: Strike out "$1,476,600" and insert "$1,511,600." My amendment thus proposes an increase of $35,000 over the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an explanation of the amendment.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISH HATCHERY, OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK, WASH.

When the Olympic National Park was established it was widely recognized that one of its main recreational assets is the trout fishing supplied by the many beautiful streams and lakes in the area. It was further recognized, however, that as travel to the park increased heavier stocking of these lakes and streams would be necessary, as is the case in other national parks, national forests, and other Federal areas set aside for recreational purposes.

The Department of the Interior foresaw this need and former Secretary Ickes agreed to the inclusion of a trout hatchery for the Olympic National Park in the postwar program of the Department. The only Federal facilities for propagating fish in the area now compromise two salmon hatcheries which can rear a few trout, but in numbers insufficient for the anticipated need. During the war years agents of the Fish and Wildlife Service have investigated possible locations for a trout hatchery within the Olympic National Park boundaries. They were not satisfied with the water supply or other features of the various locations which were investigated. It is the final conclusion of the Fish and Wildlife Service that the needs can best be met by enlarging and rehabilitating the existing salmon hatchery at Quilcene, Wash., adjacent to the park and well located for distributing the fish within the park. I have agreed that this proposal will be more practical, since the hatchery can continue to hatch and rear salmon in addition to producing the increased numbers of trout which the requirements will demand.

The Department of the Interior has not previously requested an appropriation to carry out the rehabilitation of the Quilcene hatchery because of the belief that Federal construction which would compete with the housing program should not be undertaken at this time. However, in order to avoid undue delay, I have requested the Fish and Wildlife Service to give me an estimate of the cost of the project and to show what amount could be expended in the fiscal year 1947 for types of construction which are permissible under the restrictions imposed by the Civilian Production Administration and which would not interfere with the veterans' housing program. These estimates indicate that the total ultimate cost of the project will be approximately $225,000. Of this amount, approximately $120,000 will cover types of work which will not require any quantity of critical materials or otherwise cut across the housing program. Among the items of work involved are the construction of a water-supply system comprising an intake, dam, settling basins, and some wood stave pipe. There are also included storage tanks for fire protection and domestic requirements, and retaining walls, grading, landscaping, and the construction of roadways. The largest single item would be the construction of trout-rearing pools at a cost of $35,000, and this would consist almost entirely of concrete work which will not affect the supply of critical materials required

for housing. The only structural work involved is the remodeling of existing buildings at a cost of $18,500, and possibly some of this work could be deferred if the housing situation still remains as critical toward the end of the fiscal year 1947, when this part of the work would be actually taken up. The chief benefit from this proposal is the fact that the hatchery enlargement can be partially completed so as to produce a considerable number of trout by the summer of 1947. If a start on the work is delayed proper stocking cannot be undertaken until 1948 or later, and I am confident that the increasing travel to the Olympic National Park will be in full swing by that time and the fishing pressure will be extremely heavy.

A project of this nature has been on the approved program of the Department of the Interior since before the war. It represents no new Federal activity, but is simply an expansion of an existing activity designed to meet conditions created by the establishment of the Olympic National Park. The official conservation agencies of the State of Washington have expressed approval of the project and urge that the Federal Government meet its responsibility. It can be handled so that it will not cut across the Government's efforts to channel critical materials into housing. It will satisfy the people of the Olympic Peninsula and of the State of Washington, in general, that the Federal Government intends to administer the Olympic National Park on the same basis as other national parks, and foster one of the primary attractions of the area—the fishing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment, following the point which had been reached before the amendment which has just been adopted was considered out of order.

The next amendment was under the heading "Bureau of Mines," on page 62, line 2, after the word "including", to strike out "$81,443" and insert "$101,000"; and in line 5, after the word "journals", to strike out "$176,243" and insert "$195,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 23, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "two" and insert "seven"; and on page 63, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$76,000" and insert "$111,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 24, after the word "industry", to strike out "$1,483,000" and insert "$1,178,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment was offered in the full committee by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who at the moment does not appear to be upon the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Kansas spoke to me and stated that he wished to be upon the floor when this item is taken up. In order to accommodate him, I suggest that the amendment be passed over until he returns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be temporarily passed over.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I make no objection to passing over this item at this time, but I desire to give notice that it will be my purpose to oppose the committee amendment which eliminates $305,000 for the employment of 45 coal mine inspectors. In my opinion this item is most important. It was added upon the floor of the House of Representatives, I think, for the maintenance of safety in the coal mines of the country. It should not be eliminated, and I wish to have an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I also wish to serve notice that I shall object to the committee amendment for the same reason; and I also announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] will likewise oppose the committee amendment for the same reason. This committee amendment seems to be about the only one which provides for the reduction of an appropriation as contained in the bill which was passed by the House, so far as I have been able to observe, and the amendment is the only one I have seen so far which places investments above human safety in the operation of the mines. Such an attitude was one of the primary causes of the last coal strike.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is temporarily passed over.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 15, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "two" and insert "five"; in line 17, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$397,100" and insert "$596,000"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$83,750" and insert "$137,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 22, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$140,000"; on page 66, line 4, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "one" and insert "four"; and in line 8, after the word "Interior", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$7,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "two" and insert "five"; in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$32,000" and insert "$36,000"; and in line 9, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "$381,100" and insert "$737,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "three" and insert "ten"; in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$65,000"; and in line 23, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$2,400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "one" and insert "three"; in line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$30,000"; and in line 14, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "two" and insert "five"; in line 11, after the word "employees", to strike out "$772,000" and insert "$851,500"; and in line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$55,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 20, after "(30 U. S. C. 8)", to strike out "$985,820" and insert "$1,875,410"; and in line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$70,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 23, after the word "research", to strike out "in" and insert "and"; on page 70, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "temporary"; in line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$12,500" and insert "$65,000"; and in line 12, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$36,270"; and in line 24, after the word "improvements", to strike out "$183,000" and insert "$198,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 14, after the word "foregoing", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$1,190,000"; and in line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$1,005,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 8, after the word "Interior", to strike out "$87,400" and insert "$107,000"; and in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$6,000" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Park Service," on page 75, in line 5, after the word "including", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$75,000"; and in the same line, after the word "binding", to strike out "$643,177" and insert "$779,320."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, in line 10, after the word "system", to strike out "$568,814" and insert "$750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, in line 16, after the name "Washington", to strike out "$2,384,584" and insert "$3,314,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 2, after the word "project", to strike out "$1,164,905" and insert "$1,396,615."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, in line 6, after the word "area", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$93,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 11, after the word "projects", to strike out "$44,816" and insert "$54,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 17, after the word "areas", to strike out "$79,700" and insert "$468,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, after line 17, to insert:

Travel Bureau: For all expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the act of July 19, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 18), including personal services in the District of Columbia

and elsewhere; expenses incident to participation by the Travel Bureau in international expositions and conferences dealing with travel; printing and binding; and books, newspapers, and periodicals; $38,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, in line 19, after the word "employees", to strike out "$651,967" and insert "$716,097."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, after line 19, to insert:

Acquisition of the Montezuma Well property, Arizona: For the acquisition of the Montezuma Well property, Arizona, in accordance with the act approved October 19, 1943 (57 Stat. 572), $25,000.

Mr BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have allowed a great many of the committee amendments to be agreed to because it is apparently the will of the Senate to make progress with the bill, and not to make cuts in appropriations when it seems to me such cuts could be made. But here is a small item which was considered by the committee. I do not see any economic value to it. It has to do with where the cliff dwellers lived at one time. I do not see how it is important to the country as a whole. Will the Senator from Arizona give us some justification for the item?

Mr. HAYDEN. The justification for it is an act of Congress which was approved October 19, 1943. The National Park Service operates the Montezuma Monument nearby, and it decided that it should acquire title to the Montezuma Well property. Before World War II, they took an option on it, which will expire in another 60 days. If we are ever to buy it, it can be acquired now for less money than it can be acquired for later.

Mr. BRIDGES. What is the property? Is it not on the site where the cliff dwellers used to live?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is a sink hole mesa with water 800 feet deep. Around the sink hole once resided ancient cliff dwellers. The National Park Service nearby is operating a similar property. It is frequented by tourists and the idea of the National Park Service is that two places would more efficiently demonstrate to the American people how the ancient cliff dwellers lived, and it was also the belief that the property should be preserved as a national monument.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that I have seen these great historic monuments, such as the Montezuma Well and the Montezuma Castle. They are among the most amazing prehistoric relics which we have. I believe that it would be very unfortunate if they were not acquired by the United States Government I hope that sometime the Senator will be in position to take a trip to that section of the country and see those beautiful monuments.

Mr. BRIDGES. According to the way the money of the Federal Government is being spent, it may be necessary sometime for us all to go there and live. It may be that the simplest way of life will be to go to that area and reinhabit the caves which were abandoned centuries ago by the cliff dwellers.

Mr. DOWNEY. I would not wish to recommend to the distinguished Senator that he anticipate occupying one of the caves because the entrance is in the sheer face of a precipice, and he would have to climb up the precipice about 150 feet before gaining the entrance. While it would be quite easy for younger men to climb the face of the cliffs, it would be very difficult for some of us who have reached a more dignified station in life, and it would also involve considerable hazard.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, does the Governor of Arizona approve this recommendation?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. We have never agreed to the enactment of legislation of any kind affecting such areas or monuments as would be here affected, without the approval of the State and the State officials involved.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why has not the State of Arizona taken over this property?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because the National Park Service has a number of similar monuments in Arizona, one of them being located nearby. For administrative purposes, the two should be combined. A small fee would be charged to tourists for admission to the property.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask the Senator if it is not a matter of principle that the Governor and congressional delegations of the State involved should approve when we proposed taking over property such as is involved in this amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot say what the policy is with respect to States other than Arizona. While a Member of the other House, and since I have become a Member of the Senate, I have always followed the policy, in connection with proposals to acquire lands in the State of Arizona for a public purpose such as a national monument or a national park, to consult with the proper State authorities with reference to what would be the effect on the livestock industry, for example, and we have always been able to work out an arrangememnt which was satisfactory to everyone concerned. That was done, for example, in connection with the Grand Canyon National Park. In establishing the boundary lines of the park, it was originally proposed to take in a very large area. When finally the problem was worked out there were taken into the park area the great gorge and a considerable area adjacent to it, but a great deal of range land was not included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 78, after line 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee can the Senator give me any estimate of how large the Government deficit will be in the fiscal year 1947?

Mr. HAYDEN. There would be no way to know——

Mr. TAFT. Very well, I am willing to accept the statement of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Pardon me; I thought the Senator from Ohio was directing his question to me.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Arizona is also a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HAYDEN. I could not ascertain the amount of deficit until I knew what the Senator's committee will determine with reference to the collection of taxes.

Mr. TAFT. The taxes are not being changed. The taxes up to the first of next July, a year from now, can be quite accurately estimated. They were estimated in the Budget at approximately $31,500,000,000, and now the estimate is somewhat higher. It is probably around $33,500,000,000. I have seen no over-all estimate of how much money we are to appropriate, or how much money we will spend according to the total budget. My recollection is that the President estimated a deficit of approximately three billion or four billion dollars during the next fiscal year, but most of those estimates are rather out of date, I believe, so far as I can judge in examining them. I wonder if the Appropriations Committee has made any estimates with reference to the total expenditures of the Government during the next 12 months.

Mr. HAYDEN. Some figures are available to the committee with regard to the total estimates for all purposes. I do not have them before me. But I can say that, so far as this particular bill is concerned, the total amount of appropriations will be below the Budget estimate.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator mean below the original estimate, or below the Budget and supplementary estimates made since?

Mr. HAYDEN. There are some supplemental estimates. No, the total will be below the original Budget estimates.

Mr. TAFT. I am not considerably concerned with this bill, but I should like to know whether anyone has taken a look at the financial situation during the next 12 months and is able to state whether we are increasing the national debt by three billion or four billion or ten billion dollars. When we get through making all the expenditures which we are now planning to make, I should like to know where we will be financially.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator has asked a very pertinent question. My belief is that no one can answer the question. We are going ahead in a very haphazard way and spending right and left. Our appropriation bills have been piling up, and the Senate will not be able to give the items the scrutiny which they should receive during the last few days of the fiscal year. The whole procedure is a typical example of what is basically wrong with the country, particularly in connection with the handling by Congress of appropriation bills.

Mr. TAFT. Since the President's Budget Committee submitted that there would be a deficit of about $4,000,000,000, we made an appropriation of $410,000,000 for temporary housing, and appropriated $400,000,000 in premium payments for veterans' housing, making $810,000,000 for housing alone. In addition to that,

the armed forces pay increase must run at least a half a billion dollars, if not more, over any previous estimate. The Philippine rehabilitation bill, which was not included, runs about $625,000,000.

Mr. President, those are merely instances, and I can think of many others. Of course, the British loan will involve an expenditure of certainly a billion and a half dollars during the next fiscal year. The subsidy legislation which we are considering in connection with the OPA bill may run anywhere from $500,000,000 to $2,000,000,000.

I wonder if anyone has sat down and gone over the figures and is able to say, "If you appropriate this much more money, it is going to increase the deficit over the estimated $4,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 or $10,000,000,000," or whatever the figure may be.

Mr. BRIDGES. So far as I know, no one has done so, either in the executive or legislative branch of Government. It is a very pertinent and important point the Senator has raised, and it discloses the fundamental weakness of our approach to our fiscal problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 3, after the word "including", to insert "necessary access roads for development and use of the recreational resources of Lake Texoma recreational area, Texas and Oklahoma, and"; and in line 15, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "$4,250,000" and insert "$7,400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 11, after the word "expended", to strike out "$7,500,000" and insert "$15,000,000"; and in line 17, after the word "which", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$6,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, line 7, after "(16 U. S. C. 451)", to insert "including not to exceed $362,000 for the acquisition of rights-of-way and construction of a water supply line partly outside of the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park"; and in line 10, before the word "to", to strike out "$725,000" and insert "$2,330,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, after line 11, to insert:

Glacier Bay National Monument, Alaska: For all expenses necessary for the construction of buildings and utilities, without regard to the act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U. S. C. 451), essential to the development of Glacier Bay National Monument, including expenses for the protection thereof, and the hire of aircraft, $1,250,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "twenty" and insert "fifty-four."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, after line 23, to insert:

The National Park Service is hereby authorized to acquire by transfer without exchange of funds, for 3 years beginning July 1, 1946, from the War Department, the Navy Department, or the War Assets Administration, equipment, materials, and supplies of all kinds, with an appraised value of not to exceed $2,500,000 from the surplus stores of these agencies, for use in the areas administered by the National Park Service or by any office of that Service in the United States, Alaska, and Hawaii: *Provided*, That the authorization in this paragraph for transfer of surplus property to the National Park Service shall not be construed to deny to veterans the priority accorded to them in obtaining surplus property under Public Law 375, approved May 3, 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fish and Wildlife Service—Salaries and expenses," on page 83, line 22, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "$252,364" and insert "$283,000"; and in line 22, after the word "sum", to strike out "$27,000" and insert "$45,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 7, after the word "stations", to strike out "$659,440" and insert "$780,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 20, after the word "services", to strike out "$331,400" and insert "$393,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, did not the clerk miss the amendment in line 16, page 84?

Mr. HAYDEN. That was agreed to out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment has already been agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 2, after the word "products", to strike out "$119,600" and insert "$133,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 9, after the word "service", to strike out "$780,615" and insert "$858,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 13, after "(16 U. S. C. 631i)", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 21, after the word "stations", to strike out "$136,200" and insert "$198,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 8, after the name "Alaska", to strike out "$237,875" and insert "$380,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 23, after "(16 U. S. C. 667)", to strike out "$985,650" and insert "$1,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 11, after the word "investigations", to strike out "$335,900" and insert "$417,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 18, after "(48 U. S. C. 192–211)", to strike out "$162,630" and insert "$186,900."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this was an item about which there was considerable discussion. I do not see why we need an increased appropriation at this time to enforce the game laws in Alaska. It is a relatively small item, but I do not believe an increase can be justified for the enforcement of the game laws in Alaska at this time. There is no reason for it. Was there any justification?

Mr. HAYDEN. It was claimed that there were more prospectors and farmers and others in Alaska than there have been heretofore, that there had been a killing of the game, particularly by soldiers stationed there, and that the game itself was very valuable. The statement is that the over-all value of wild game in Alaska is estimated at more than $100,000,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. Perhaps if we took the controls off meats in the OPA bill, so the people could get meat, they would not have to go forth and prey on reindeer. Perhaps that is the answer.

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be. We restored the Budget estimate, upon the theory that the game needed protection, and that the additional personnel would be required to give the needed protection.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let us have a voice vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 89, line 5, after the word "bulkheads", to insert "repair of damage to public roads within reservation areas occasioned by authorized operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service"; and in line 11, after the word "Refuge", to strike out "$766,000" and insert "$940,000, and in addition thereto the unexpended balance for special improvements on the Wichita Mountain Wildlife Refuge for the fiscal year 1944 is continued available for the fiscal year 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, line 24, after the word "therewith", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 5, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$6,235,249" and insert "$7,425,875."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal aid in wildlife restoration," on page 90, line 17, after "(16 U. S. C. 669–669j)", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$3,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, after line 20, to insert:

Wildlife management areas, California: For the acquisition, or leasing for such period of time as is deemed necessary, including the location, examination, survey, and other expenses incident thereto, of suitable areas of land or interests therein for use as wildlife management and control areas in the State of California; for the management and control of migratory waterfowl and other wildlife in connection therewith; for the administration, maintenance, and development of such areas, including the construction of dams, dikes, ditches, buildings, and other necessary improvements; for the purchase, planting, growing, and harvesting of grains and other crops for the feeding of such

waterfowl and other wildlife; and for the enforcement of applicable laws protecting lands of the United States, including the act of April 15, 1924 (43 Stat. 98), the provisions of which act specifically are made applicable to areas acquired hereunder, $750,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 13, after the word "Service", to strike out "$8,235,249" and insert "$11,175,875"; in line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$937,790" and insert "$992,790"; in line 20, after the word "of", to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "one hundred and forty-two"; on page 92, line 7, after the word "thereof", to insert "without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5)"; and on page 93, line 2, before the word "from" to strike out "for use in Alaska."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government in the Territories—Territory of Alaska," on page 95, line 3, after the word "binding", to strike out "$2,252,900" and insert "$3,790,400"; in line 4, after the word "which", to strike out "$72,000" and insert "$250,000"; in line 5, after the word "and", where it occurs the second time, strike out "$1,020,000" and insert "$2,300,000"; and in line 6, after the word "construction", to strike out the comma and "and no expenditures shall be made hereunder for such surveys and plans and for new construction in excess of three times the amount contributed by the Territory of Alaska for like expenditure."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, line 15, after the word "Alaska", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 96, line 5, after the word "Railroad", to insert "construction (not to exceed $400,000)"; on page 97, line 8, before the word "of", to strike out "ten" and insert "twenty"; and in line 14, after the word "Alaska", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That in the operation of the facilities of the Alaska Railroad, the War Department or any other agency of the United States Government having title thereto is authorized to transfer regardless of present location and without charge to the Alaska Railroad, materials, roadway, and bridge maintenance, and other necessary equipment, locomotives and spare parts, shop facilities and machinery, supplies, rolling stock, buildings, and docks, surplus to its needs and which may be certified by the Department of the Interior as necessary for the improvement, maintenance, or operation of the Alaska Railroad: *Provided further*, That the authorization in this paragraph for transfer of surplus property to the Alaska Railroad shall not be construed to deny to veterans the priority accorded to them in obtaining surplus property under Public Law 375, approved May 3, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Government of the Virgin Islands," on page 99, line 11, before the word "to", to strike out "$184,640" and insert "$208,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, after line 21, to insert:

Municipal government of St. Croix; for defraying the deficit in the treasury of the municipal government of St. Croix, V. I., because of the excess of current expenses over current revenues for the fiscal year 1947, $142,400, to be paid in monthly installments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in relation to this particular item, I call attention to the fact that I have raised a question concerning it on the floor of the Senate from year to year. This year the Committee on Appropriations has taken a constructive bit of action.

This is the case of one municipality in the Virgin Islands. We not only pay a deficit after it has occurred, but we anticipate in advance that they will incur a deficit of $142,400 and each year we proceed to appropriate the money to meet an assumed deficit, in advance.

Mr. President, I think that is a very unsound practice. I do not think there is any reason why we should step in and pay the municipal expenses of a city in the Virgin Islands, any more than we would in many other places, either in the Territories or in the States. So this year the Committee on Appropriations took what I really think was constructive action, when it provided $6,000 for a report and study to ascertain what is wrong with the financing in the Virgin Islands, and particularly the municipality of St. Croix. While I still object to the appropriation, I do think we have for the first time taken some step to meet the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 100, after line 2, to insert:

For salaries and expenses of three municipal experts, to be appointed by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, to make a study of, and report to said committee on, the fiscal affairs of the municipality of St. Croix, V. I., $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Southwestern Power Administration," on page 100, after line 14, to strike out:

Construction: For construction of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and administrative expenses connected therewith; purchase (not to exceed 10 in the fiscal year 1947), hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger automobiles; and printing and binding, $7,500,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, my understanding was that there was a request that this item go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understood, and it will be passed over. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 101, line 4, after the word "vehicles", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided*, That appropriations herein made available for the purchase of passenger-carrying motor vehicles and trucks, with the exception of one passenger-carrying motor vehicle at not to exceed $2,500, shall be available only for the purchase of used or Federal surplus motor vehicles."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, line 22, after the word "Reclamation", to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$5,000"; in line 23, after the word "Survey", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$4,000"; in line 24, after the word "Service", to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$2,500"; and on page 102, line 1, after the word "Service", to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$4,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 102, after line 7, to strike out section 7, as follows:

SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year and a day, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That in cases of emergency, caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage, persons may be employed for periods of not more than 30 days and be paid salaries and wages without the necessity of inquiring into their membership in any organization.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States

or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That in cases of emergency, caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage, persons may be employed for periods of not more than 30 days and be paid salaries and wages without the necessity of inquiring into their membership in any organization.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I understand section 7 is uniform with sections adopted in the agricultural appropriation bill and other bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 104, after line 17, to strike out section 8, as follows:

SEC. 8. Not to exceed a total of $80,000 of the appropriations contained in this act shall be available for expenditure for long distance telephone tolls, and not to exceed a total of $70,000 shall be available for expenditure for telegrams and cablegrams, and the savings effected thereby in the items "communication services," as set forth in the Budget estimates submitted for such appropriations shall not be diverted to other use and shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 105, line 3, to change the section number from 9 to 8; in line 13, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "$4,000" and insert "$7,000"; in line 14, after the word "Geography", to strike out "$300" and insert "$600"; in line 19, after the word "Mines", to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$2,500"; and in line 20, after "(including headquarters in Chicago)", to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 105, line 22, to change the section number from 10 to 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, line 6, to change the section number from 11 to 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, line 12, to change the section number from 12 to 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the bill the clerks be authorized to correct the totals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. I now offer three amendments on behalf of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The first amendment offered on behalf of the committee was, on page 74, line 25, after the word "research", to strike out the word "in" and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, line 20, after "$300", to strike out "Petroleum Conservation Division" and insert in lieu thereof "Oil and Gas Division."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 105, line 13, after "$7,000", to strike out "Petroleum Conservation Division" and insert in lieu thereof "Oil and Gas Division."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there are now three major items which were passed over. One related to the number of coal mine inspectors, and the others are power items. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is present, and the Senators from Colorado are present. I suggest we take up the question of the coal mine inspectors, on page 63, and dispose of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Under the heading "Bureau of Mines", on page 63, line 24, after the word "industry;" it is proposed to strike out "$1,483,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$1,178,000."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, an amendment adding $305,000 to the bill to enable the Bureau of Mines to hire 45 additional inspectors was adopted upon the floor of the House, and I think it represents the considered judgment of the House as to the action which should be taken by the Congress to enable the Bureau of Mines to promote safety in the coal mines.

Under the act of May 7, 1941, the Bureau of Mines was given the authority to make inspections of this kind, for the express purpose of saving the lives of coal miners operating throughout the United States. The authority given to the Bureau extends to mines employing 25 persons or more. Moreover, the Bureau of Mines has jurisdiction over all coal mines upon the public domain, no matter how many persons may be employed.

There are in the United States at least 3,100 coal mines employing 25 miners or more. The Bureau of Mines, to inspect the 3,100 mines, at the present time employs 157 inspectors. The mere recitation, Mr. President, of the number of mines employing 25 persons or more—3,100—and the number of Federal inspectors—157—makes it clear that totally inadequate provision is made for the maintenance of safety in the mines.

The amendment which was added in the House for 45 additional inspectors would increase the number to only 202. So with 202 Federal inspectors the Bureau of Mines will be expected to survey not only the 3,100 mines employing 25 miners or more, but all the mines upon the public domain.

I do not need to recite here, Mr. President, the terrible toll of life which is taken annually in the coal mines of the United States. We do not have adequate inspection. In some States it is true there are very good inspection laws. I am very proud of the fact that in my own State of Wyoming inspection is carried on by State authority at a very high standard. But that is not the case, unfortunately, in many of the coal-mining States of the Union. In small mines, where capital is not available in large amounts, the danger to the coal miner is appalling. I can see no reason, when this matter is brought so closely home to us, why we should cut down this appropriation and make it impossible for the Bureau of Mines to add 45 very much-needed inspectors.

Mr. President, I think it is hardly necessary to labor the point. It is a question of human safety, upon the one hand, and the saving of $305,000 for the Federal budget, upon the other. The maintenance of safety in the mines is worth far more to the Nation, not only from a humanitarian point of view, but, I believe, from a financial point of view. This amendment, I think, should be overwhelmingly rejected.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I want to join with the Senator from Wyoming in urging that the number of inspectors approved by the House be not curtailed.

I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. How many underground mines are there in Kansas? Are not all the coal mines in Kansas strip mines?

Mr. REED. I do not think we have any underground mines in Kansas.

Mr. KILGORE. There are no underground coal mines in Kansas?

Mr. REED. No.

Mr. KILGORE. That is the point I want to bring out. They are strip mines. Strip mines are normal construction jobs in which steam shovels are used and in which men work safely under normal conditions. Other States have underground mines, where the work is highly hazardous, where it is hard for the inspectors to see what is going on. I have pending in the Senate at present a bill to establish minimum standards for the operation of coal mines. The supervision would come under the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. President, in my State when the Government took the mines over, after the last coal shut-down, the only mines I know of which the men stayed out of were the mines concerning which the men complained that inspection was not adequate. My State—and I am proud of it—had the greatest percentage of miners returning to work of any State in the Union. The complaint on the part of those who did not return was over the matter of inadequate inspection.

I do not want to abolish State inspection. I do not want to superimpose Federal inspection upon State inspection. But I do think that the Federal inspection keeps the State inspectors on their toes. I do not see why at this time, when we are making these appropriations, we should reduce the number of inspectors necessary to preserve human life in the underground work which is so vital to the prosperity of the Nation. I do not think the proposed reduction should be made simply to save a few thousand dollars when we are appropriating millions of dollars for the establishment of power dams and for similar construction. As I stated before on the floor,

this is the only reduction I have found so far in this appropriation bill, and it is a reduction reflecting itself upon human life and its preservation. When the Senate of the United States or a committee thereof is willing to sacrifice human life and reduce appropriations which would preserve human life, while at the same time increasing other appropriations I think the Senate had better take unto itself very serious cognizance of the situation.

For that reason I very strongly oppose the amendment, and desire to add two amendments to the bill if my opposition is approved.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I find myself in thorough accord with the position taken by the able Senator from Wyoming and my able colleague from West Virginia. Usually I have been on the floor of the Senate opposing increases in the appropriation bills because I thought they were not justified. Now I find myself opposing a decrease in this appropriation bill. The reason for my opposition I consider to be entirely sound. This appropriation is primarily for the inspection of mines.

As is well known to the Members of the Senate, there are many coal mines in my State, but this matter goes not only to the protection of those who work in the mines of my State but to the protection of those who work in the mines throughout the Union. This money is to be used primarily and ultimately for the protection of human life and human health. I want to say to the Senate that when those issues are involved there is but one position to take upon them. The increase in money to be appropriated, about $300,000, is not a great amount when we consider the immense sum involved in this appropriation bill. I think a great mistake will be made if we sustain the committee amendment. If the amendment is sustained, I think that we will put ourselves in the position perhaps of bringing about a dangerous situation that may cost the loss of lives and may cost many injured bodies. I cannot subscribe to any course of that kind. I think the appropriation is fully justified because it is for inspection and for the protection of those who work in a naturally hazardous occupation. For that reason, Mr. President, I join in opposing the committee amendment which reduces the amount to be used for the inspection of mines.

Many men have lost their lives in this hazardous work. Many more have suffered injuries, the effects of which they will bear throughout the remaining years of their lives. Since we have entered this field, as properly we should as a Government, whenever anything is done to improve safety conditions I believe that such improvement should be supported. For the very reason that this is a step toward safety, and toward the protection of the lives of those who mine coal, I take my position firmly and definitely that I will not do anything which will jeopardize their safety. I take the same position with respect to the men and women who work in any occupation. Therefore, I join with Senators who have preceded me in asking that this amendment be defeated, and that there be left in the bill an appropriation which will improve inspection in the mines.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to reiterate what has already been stated with respect to this amendment. I am quite familiar with the recent history of mine explosions in the United States, one of the most disastrous of which occurred in my State only a few months ago. They frequently occur.

There are those who say that it is none of the business of the Federal Government to engage in safety activities, because it is said that such work ought to be carried on by the States. I do not share that view. The States ought to do all they can, and I dare say they are not doing enough. Some of them at least are not. But that does not relieve the Federal Government of its obligation in this connection. That obligation is recognized in this bill by the appropriation for that purpose.

I do not know under what theory the committee reduced the amount by more than $300,000, but in my judgment the amendment ought not to be sustained. The provision in the bill as it passed the House is not an extravagant amount for the improvement of safety conditions in the mining of coal or any other mineral in connection with which there is an element of danger.

Recently quite a commotion was caused by the desire of the coal miners to obtain a welfare and security fund, something which has been enjoyed for years by workers in many other occupations. It seems that that program is well on its way toward consummation. Its purpose is to provide care and attention and health benefits for those who need them. The purpose of the welfare fund is not prevention. It is not designed to improve safety conditions in the mines, or provide safety appliances. Its purposes are varied. Among them is care for those who are injured, and those who are dependent upon workers who are killed. Various other features enter into the expenditure of such a fund.

The activity provided for by the appropriation under discussion is something which only the Government can undertake. Only the Government can properly enforce safety measures. It makes no difference to the coal miner how much we may argue as to the obligation of the States and the obligation of the Federal Government. If an explosion occurs and scores of miners are killed, it does not make much difference to them who has been neglectful, whether it be the State or the Federal Government.

Therefore I hope the amendment will be rejected, and that the original amount carried in the House provision will be restored.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the two Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. REVERCOMB], and the able majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] in opposing the committee amendment.

I feel that I know the Interior Department appropriation bill. There is not an item in the bill which deserves greater consideration by the Committee on Appropriations than the item which is now under discussion.

Only a short while ago the country came to know exactly what coal mining means not only to the national economy, but to the welfare of the entire people. We are likely to become excited when the coal miners strike for what they believe to be just demands. We condemn the miner, who happens to be one of the lowest paid workers in the United States. We pay no attention whatsoever to him until a strike occurs. We do not worry about his welfare in the little mining town in Kentucky, or in my State, or in West Virginia or Tennessee.

Once in a while the newspapers carry an item to the effect that 40 miners are buried underground in a mine in Kentucky or some other State. We say, "That is too bad." I feel that it is the responsibility of Congress to make at least the meager provision suggested by the House. What the House has provided is not sufficient to protect the lives of the miners. The sum suggested by the House would not take care of one-tenth of the need for protecting human lives in the mining of coal, so that the people of Washington may have it to keep warm in the wintertime, and so that it may be available to operate the industries of the country. The Washington newspapers, my home town newspapers, and the Pittsburgh newspapers, as well as the newspapers in other cities, raise cain about a strike, but very little is said about the human being who is producing the coal, and who sometimes strikes in desperation.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Of course, the Senator is aware of the fact that the Director of the Bureau of Mines, Dr. Sayers, and others, testified that the Bureau needs approximately 45 inspectors in addition to those provided for by the House, in order to make a thorough inspection of mines and afford adequate supervision. In other words, even at best the House provision is a compromise. Even more inspectors are needed than are provided for in the House language.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Personally I do not see why the Congress should compromise when human lives are involved. I do not see why we should compromise in matters affecting the welfare of the country. What I am trying to impress upon Senators who are listening to me now is that not sufficient attention has been given to this particular class of workers, who mean so much to the national economy. We never hear this subject discussed except when the appropriation bill is before us; but when the same miners go out on strike Senators and Representatives become very much excited. I believe that if my colleagues and I were to go down into the bowels of the earth 2,000 feet or 4,000 feet and work for the wages which miners receive, we would expect at least a little attention to be given to the problem

of safety. I believe that the Government should go to the extent of accepting the responsibility for human beings. That is a part of the general welfare idea under our form of government.

Mr. President, I hope that the committee amendment will be rejected, and that at least the House appropriation will be restored.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 63, line 24.

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	Overton
Andrews	Hawkes	Pepper
Austin	Hayden	Radcliffe
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson
Brooks	Huffman	Russell
Burch	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	Knowland	Taft
Capper	La Follette	Taylor
Carville	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Tobey
Donnell	McFarland	Tunnell
Downey	McKellar	Wagner
Ellender	McMahon	Walsh
Ferguson	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Willis
Gerry	Murray	Wilson
Gossett	O'Daniel	
Green	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Kansas has the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to say in the beginning that the question of the safety of coal miners, who admittedly are engaged in one of the most hazardous occupations of any industry, is not involved at all in connection with the amendment now under discussion. I have listened with amazement to some of the remarks which have been made here today.

I happen to have a 100-percent record in regard to the safety of coal miners, so far as my service in this body is concerned. The Federal Government never had anything to do with coal mine inspection before 1941. In 1940, Senator NEELY, then a Member of the Senate from the State of West Virginia, introduced Senate bill 2420, under the terms of which, as it was later enacted into law, the mine inspections now are carried on. I was then, as now, a member of the Mines and Mining Committee. The late Senator Logan, of Kentucky, and I, in the Committee on Mines and Mining, rewrote the bill so as to remove some of the objectionable features, and it was passed by the Senate on January 18, 1940, without a record vote. I took an active part in the debate in favor of the bill. The next day a committee of coal miners, members of the United Mine Workers, who had sat in the gallery during the debate, called on me and thanked me for the efforts made to have the bill passed. It was the first move by the Federal Government looking to additional safety for the coal mines and the coal miners.

Mr. President, what is involved now is a mushroom expansion of a Federal bureau which is doing service parallel to that already done in the States. On that point I wish to refer to the debate.

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the present majority leader, said, in response to a question propounded by Senator NEELY:

> If I correctly understand the bill—

He was speaking of Senate bill 2420—

> it does not give the Secretary of the Interior authority to do anything as the result of the investigation and inspection which he makes.

Mr. President, that situation is true today. The Secretary of the Interior has no authority to do anything as a consequence of the expenditure of the money which it is proposed to appropriate. The Senator from Kentucky had previously said, and I am reading from page 476 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 18, 1940:

> As I understand the purpose of the bill, it does not seek to interfere with the agencies of any State that are now engaged in the inspection of mines?
>
> Mr. NEELY. It does not.
>
> Mr. BARKLEY. Nor to superimpose the proposed inspection above the State inspection. The measure simply authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to investigate, by inspection through his agencies, the conditions in coal mines—

And so forth. Mr. President, the subject which was discussed most fully on this floor on that date pertained to the results which might flow from superimposing Federal inspection over State inspection. While I was making my record for safety of coal miners, neither the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] nor the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] were Members of this body. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who spoke so eloquently earlier in the day, was a Member of this body, but did not participate in the debate. That statement applies also to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. President, it so happens that I was a Member of this body at that time and took an active part in the passage of the bill which first gave the Federal Government authority to make examination of conditions in coal mines, and I received the thanks of the United Mine Workers for my efforts.

I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. The State of Kansas, I presume, has a department of agriculture, has it not?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. And that department makes inspections of such commodities as meat, does it not?

Mr. REED. I believe so.

Mr. KILGORE. And Federal inspectors also inspect the meat when it gets to the packing houses, do they not?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to confine my yielding to the Senator from West Virginia for the purpose of allowing him to ask questions which I can answer in simple terms.

Mr. KILGORE. I have asked a question, Mr. President. After the meat gets to the packing house, a Federal inspector there inspects it, does he not?

Mr. REED. We do not usually have a State inspector and a Federal inspector inspect the same meat.

Mr. KILGORE. They work together, do they not?

Mr. REED. No, Mr. President; that is not true.

Mr. KILGORE. Wait a minute. Is it not natural to assume that a Federal inspection of coal-mine conditions would result in increasing the safety in coal mines? The State of Kansas may condemn cattle and require that they be destroyed if diseased. It can also inspect meat after it reaches the packing house. The Federal inspectors may also inspect the meat even after State inspectors have inspected it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, later I shall read a letter from officials of the State of West Virginia to the effect that this proposal would not further the program of coal mine safety.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, may I ask who signed the letter?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not bother him or try to annoy him while he was making his remarks in connection with this bill. My connection with the matter antedates the connection of the Senator from West Virginia by a considerable period of time. In the annals of the Senate, my record is clearer upon the safety of coal miners than is the record of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, may I answer the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas declines to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the question uppermost in the minds of the Members of the Senate back in 1940 when Senate bill 2420 was being discussed, was that of giving, for the first time, authority to the Federal Government to enter into a field which had been handled theretofore entirely by the States. The question is not one of money. It is not one of expense as opposed to human life. My record is clear on that point. The matter is one of importance so far as the Federal and State authorities are concerned and a matter of importance in obtaining results from expenditures made by the Federal Government.

I return to the record to which I have referred. In addition to what had been said by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] said, on page 477 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 18, 1940:

> In my opinion—of course, my opinion is only superficial, because this is the first time

I have looked at this measure or had an opportunity to consider it—there is a question as to whether or not we are starting out upon another road to the left and attempting either to break down or entirely disregard the constitutional separation of the two governments if we undertake to exercise a power of inspection for the purpose of passing laws regulating the conduct of the business of mining, which has been repeatedly established to be a concern of the several States and not a concern of the Federal Government.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] said, on page 479:

I have every sympathy with the purposes of the bill; but what concerns me is that we seem to be granting to one Government department complete investigatory powers which are already granted to another, so that if the bill is passed we may have two officials overlapping and doing the same work.

When it came to the question of cost, Senator Harrison, of Mississippi, offered an amendment to the bill which would have limited the expense to $25,000 a year. I asked the then Senator from Mississippi not to press his amendment. The limitation would have made the entire proposal absurd. No estimate had been made by anyone as to the expense which would ultimately be involved. But the sum we had in mind was $200,000 or $300,000, and I am able to say that Mr. John L. Lewis, who desired that the bill be passed, thought that the cost would be in the neighborhood of $250,000. I never talked to Mr. Lewis about it, but I make that statement upon what I believe to be reliable authority as to what was Mr. Lewis' position.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Kansas a question?

Mr. REED. The entire question at the time was whether or not the Federal Government, in the event that the bill became law, would start encroaching on what had been theretofore a State function, whether there would be a duplication of effort, and how much money would be spent. If I was useful in that particular debate, it was by quieting the fears of my colleagues on the point, first, that there would be no duplication, and secondly, that the additional expense would be nominal.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] entered the debate at that point. The bill carried authority for an appropriation with no limitation being fixed. In the interest of history, I believe that I should say that the bill which passed the Senate that day died in the other House. However, in the early part of 1941 the other House pased a bill which was substantially the same as the bill which had been passed by the Senate. When the bill reached the Senate, the Senate passed it.

On page 483 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 18, 1940, the Senator from Maine, speaking upon the question of cost and the authorization which was carried in the bill, said:

I disagree with the Senator as to the facts. However, whatever the facts may be, I still insist that it is unwise legislation to give authority to any official of the Government to appoint without limitation the employees he may seek. I also say that it is unwise to make an unlimited authorization. It is not common practice. I think the common practice is—and I think, if the Senator will look over the bills which receive consideration by this body, he will so find—that the authorizations are definite in amount. If they are not, they ought to be.

So, at this point, 6 years after the matter was first mentioned, I compliment the Senator from Maine upon the soundness of his position and the great necessity, if we have not always done it, of observing the limitation he suggested and writing it in the bill.

Mr. President, Senator Harrison, of Mississippi, offered an amendment to limit this expenditure to $25,000. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], who is not present at the moment, and I urged him not to insist upon the limitation; so no limitation was put into the bill.

On reliable authority I am able to say that Mr. Lewis' view of the expense—and he was the principal instigator of the bill—was that it would be $250,000 a year.

Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate cut this sum back to $1,178,000, which is the Budget estimate. The committee did not reduce in any respect, except that it cut the amount named in an amendment adopted on the floor of the House back to the Budget estimate, that is all. I say without any fear of contradiction from any reliable source that the action taken, if the committee is sustained, will not affect the safety of a single coal miner in any coal mine in any State in the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REED. I shall be happy to yield in a moment. While I am on this particular line I should like to finish.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I have here expressions of opinion from the experts at the head of the mine inspection departments of many States, and because both the senior Senator from West Virginia and the junior Senator have shown an active interest in this matter, I wish to read a letter dated June 12, 1946, this month, signed by G. R. Spindler, Chief of the Department of Mines of the State of West Virginia. Mr. Spindler's letter reads:

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
DEPARTMENT OF MINES,
Charleston, June 12, 1946.

HON. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram of May 31, requesting views with respect to the further expansion of the coal mines' inspection activities of the United States Bureau of Mines.

I am taking the liberty to enclose a copy of a paper delivered recently by Mr. J. V. Sullivan, secretary of the West Virginia Coal Association, the first part of which has some bearing on the subject and which I believe you will find to be of interest.

For your information the current annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of a State department of mines in the State of West Virginia is $386,000. The State department, charged with the responsibility for the inspection of coal mines and the enforcement of the mining laws of the State, has a staff of 60 full-time inspectors actively engaged in actual inspection and enforcement work. These are men of experience and thoroughly familiar with the mining conditions and personnel of their respective districts. On the assumption that mine inspection can be no better than the personal qualifications of the men making the inspections, I have every reason to believe these men can and do turn in a good job.

The United States Bureau of Mines has rendered a valuable service as a research, educational, and fact-finding agency and probably can continue to make its most valuable contributions in those fields. In the extension or expansion of its inspection and enforcement activities and authority, it is inevitable that there will be duplication of effort and conflict of purpose as related to the State inspection agency with the effect that the over-all program of coal mine safety will have been retarded rather than furthered. The centralization of inspection and enforcement authority in agencies far removed from the actual scene of mining operations has little to recommend it in view of the variable conditions and interests applying to the coal mining industries on a Nation-wide scale.

These views represent personal opinion and should not be construed to be unmindful of the past contributions of the United States Bureau of Mines or blind to its potentialities for future service. It is, however, my thought that division of authority or duplication of effort can serve no useful purpose and that mine inspection and enforcement of safety laws and regulations is appropriately a State function.

Very truly yours,
G. R. SPINDLER,
Chief, Department of Mines.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in connection with the letter he has just read?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand that that letter is from the chief of inspection in the State department of mines. I cast no reflection whatever on the chief of inspection. He is a State inspector. Some time ago the National Government recognized the duty, under the Bureau of Mines, to make Federal inspections.

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia that I am much more familiar with that than is the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am sure the Senator is, and I am not suggesting that he is not familiar with it. But I do say that if inspection is worth anything—and it does have value in the prevention of accidents—then certainly the addition of 45 Federal inspectors should have some effect in eliminating the dangers in mines. In West Virginia, within the last year, in McDowell County, there was a terrible accident as the result of an explosion in a mine. I do not charge that against the inspectors; but if inspection will help prevent explosions, certainly additional inspectors will work a good end toward eliminating them.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia indulges in sophistry. I do not like to use that word, but that is almost what it is. As a matter of fact, the assurance was given Senators in charge of the bill that there would be no effort to duplicate the efforts of the State mine agencies

Mr. REVERCOMB. When was that assurance given?

Mr. REED. In 1940, when we passed the bill which gave the Federal Government the first opportunity or authority to do anything along this line.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator realizes——

Mr. REED. Let me finish. Today, according to the best opinion I can obtain—which I admit is possibly open to error, but it is the best I can get—the various State mining agencies have 228 inspectors altogether, in all the States. According to figures which we obtained from the Bureau of Mines, the Federal Government has 157 inspectors. They are asking for 45 more. If they get them, the Federal Bureau of Mines will then have 202 inspectors, as against 228 for all the State mining inspection agencies. This is the most astonishing duplication of effort and waste of money that has come to my attention.

Mr. President, let me read a letter from the Pennsylvania Department of Mines. If there is one thing I have learned during my connection with this matter it is that everyone agrees that Pennsylvania has a first-class State mining inspection department, equal in all respects to the Federal Bureau of Mines, so far as comparison can be made. In a telegram dated June 6, the State mine inspector of Pennsylvania replied to a telegram as follows:

I agree with you that coal-mine inspection is the responsibility of the State. When the Bureau of Mines was organized its function was to act in an advisory capacity and do research in solving some of the intricate problems of coal mining for which the States had neither the personnel nor equipment. In that capacity they performed a duty which was invaluable. They developed the rock dusting of coal mines, investigation and research in solving some of the intricate prob-explosion-proof mining equipment, taught first aid and mine rescue, and as such rendered a real service to the mining industry. When Federal inspection law was pending this department opposed it on grounds that it was an unnecessary expenditure of money which should be used in future expanding the Bureau's research program.

That is, the research program of the Bureau of Mines.

The Bureau's activities under the Federal Mine Inspection Act was not kept within the intent and purpose of the act.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that. It is true. I am one of the Members of the Senate, the one Member presently in the Senate, most responsible for the original act, and the activities of the Bureau of Mines have not been kept within the intent and purpose of the act. The telegram continues:

There is overlapping and duplication of inspection work that should be done by the State and the increase in appropriation is going to further increase the unnecessary duplication of Federal inspection. If Federal inspection activities are expanded and this vast amount of money appropriated some States will leave the entire burden of inspection to the Federal Government who has no authority nor law to enforce their recommendations. United States Bureau of Mines can render and has rendered a great service to the mining industry; however, I urge that the policing of the mines be left to the States and that the activities of the Bureau be curtailed as originally intended, as you understood it would be when you supported passage of Federal mine inspection bill.

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF MINES,
RICHARD MAIZE, *Secretary.*

That was my understanding, that was my assurance, as one of those in charge of the bill when the original bill passed the Senate in 1940.

Mr. President, I have a letter in my hand from the chief mine inspector of Virginia, dated June 4. He was delayed in making his answer because of being away from home when the telegram from me arrived, but he wrote me as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
BOARD OF EXAMINERS, DIVISION OF MINES,
Big Stone Gap, June 4, 1946.

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I regret that I was not at home at the time of your telegram and therefore delayed in answering it. Under Virginia laws, we are required to inspect each coal mine at least every 90 days and are able to do this with our present force. We have sufficient power, under our State laws, to enforce any of our safety recommendations and have no trouble in getting full cooperation from the industry in this work.

In my opinion, there is quite a bit of duplication of efforts on the part of our inspectors and those of the Bureau of Mines. There certainly is no use of both these agencies continuing to carry on the same work and I can see no need of the increased use of Federal funds unless the State inspection forces are to be eliminated entirely.

Very truly yours,

C. P. KELLY,
Chief Mine Inspector.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD, without taking the time of the Senate to read it, copy of telegram from Harry Thomas, chief, Kentucky Department of Mines and Minerals.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEXINGTON, KY., *June 4, 1946.*

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Federal mine inspection under contract agreement between Coal Mines Administrator Krug and United Mine Workers Lewis will, of course, duplicate State inspection and State enforcement and is further encroachment on States rights. Kentucky annual appropriation for mine inspection is now $200,000 per year which we think ample for complete inspection and enforcement. Federal inspection and recommendatory and advisory basis without enforcement authority, we think of value, but also somewhat a duplication. Approximately 20 percent of Kentucky's production does not come under Krug-Lewis agreement because of being produced under Progressive Miners Union contract or no contract at all, and hence not under Federal inspection with enforcement. We do not favor so much duplication of effort and expense and insist that mine inspection is and should continue to be State responsibility. Krug-Lewis agreement will probably only apply while Government operates the mines as ratification by coal mine operators doubtful. Further increase in Federal appropriation because of temporary labor contract between Krug and Lewis which covers only UMWA mines in our opinion unjustifiable.

KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND MINERALS,
HARRY THOMAS, *Chief.*

Mr. REED. I have a similar telegram from the Alabama Mining Institute, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *June 10, 1946.*

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Senate Appropriations Committee now considering increasing Mine Bureau expenditures. Increase will certainly lead to duplication State inspection, wasted effort and confusion. It will lead to replacing State inspection with Federal inspection. We are opposed to this principle and practice, and urge you oppose increase of Federal funds for this purpose.

ALABAMA MINING INSTITUTE,
I. W. ROUZER, *President.*

Mr. REED. Mr. President, no one appreciates more than I do the difficulty of making an argument in favor of sound governmental practices, including the expenditure of money, when that argument runs head-on into a situation where those who disagree can talk about safety. I hope no one will take offense, because I do not mean it in an offensive sense, when I recall the statement of a world statesman, I have forgotten his name, who said, "Patriotism is the refuge of scoundrels." I do not mean that any of my colleagues are scoundrels. What the one who made that statement meant was that when one has no real argument, one can talk about being a patriot. I think in this case there is no real argument why the recommendation and the amendment of the committee should be overturned. The committee has followed the Budget estimate. There is sound reason for it.

Before I take my seat I wish to say that I have discussed this matter with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], who is chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining, of which I am the ranking minority member. This is a situation which ought to be investigated by a committee of the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in understanding that the amount contained in the House bill was carried in an amendment offered on the floor of the House by a very prominent Republican from my State, Mr. DIRKSEN?

Mr. REED. That is my understanding, and I think it is correct.

I discussed this matter with the Senator from Pennsylvania, as I said. The expenditure by the Bureau of Mines in connection with this work, which is largely a duplication of the work being carried on by the States, represents an increase much greater than anyone ever anticipated. Today, if we increase this

amount, the Federal Government, under authority granted only 4 years ago, will be spending almost as much money as all the States combined. The Government then will have 202 inspectors as against 220 inspectors of all States. So the Senator from Pennsylvania and I agreed that there should be an inquiry made into this matter, and I shall prepare a resolution directing the Committee on Mines and Mining to make an investigation of the whole subject and determine the extent of the duplication, and develop so far as we can the value of the service rendered by the Bureau of Mines, so that we can report back to the Senate, after careful investigation and careful thought and study, what is the proper policy to pursue.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. A few moments ago the Senator from Kansas, in arguing to sustain his position, made the statement that there was no sound argument advanced against his position by those who opposed him on the floor.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Kansas is still of that opinion.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Perhaps the Senator from Kansas is, but, from my viewpoint, he has certainly closed his ears and his thought, if I may say so, to arguments which I believe to be quite sound. The Senator from Kansas has stated that he originally sustained the idea of the passage of this law in 1940 which would allow the appointment of Federal inspectors. Is that correct?

Mr. REED. So as to give the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Mines, authority to make an inquiry and inspection of mines. That is correct; yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. When the Senator supported that bill in 1940 he believed, did he not, that mine inspections might result in good by promoting safety in the operations of the mines?

Mr. REED. I had been Governor of a State which at that time had deep-shaft mines. I am quite familiar with mine inspection, although Kansas never even remotely got into the class of West Virginia in the matter of mining coal.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator at that time had in his State deep-shaft mines, but today that State has only strip mines.

Mr. REED. When I was Governor that was true; yes. But not when the bill was passed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator certainly is not going to take the position that because there are no deep-shaft mines in Kansas that those States where there are deep-shaft mines, if they are dangerous, should not have consideration?

Mr. REED. I did not take that position in 1940, and I am not taking it now.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The able Senator from Kansas took the position in 1940 that mine inspections have resulted in much good. There have been a great number of mines developed since then, and more men are employed in the mines today, and if inspection was good in 1940, certainly an additional 45 inspectors added to the number of Federal inspectors is a good thing in 1946. Is that not a sound argument?

Mr. REED. I do not think so. I think the Federal Bureau of Mines has many unnecessary inspectors now which it should not have. They are drawing their pay, I presume, every month, but are not rendering any useful service toward the safety of those engaged in mining.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The purpose of mine inspection is to prevent dangers such as explosions, loose and falling materials, and the other dangers inherent in that hazardous work. If inspection is a guard against the dangers I have spoken of, why would not an increased number of and more frequent inspections, closer inspections, guard more efficiently against such dangers?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I should like to answer the question asked by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. CORDON. I want to ask a question in connection with that question.

Mr. REED. Very well; I yield to the Senator from Oregon. Perhaps he will answer the question of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. CORDON. Am I correct in my understanding that the only authority the Federal Government has under the act of 1940 is that of making an inspection and then making a recommendation, which recommendation may be acted upon or which may not be acted upon?

Mr. REED. That is correct. The Federal Government today does not have the slightest authority to force any action on the part of a mine operator or a State mining department under the law as it now stands.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. When the mines are being operated by the Government, the inspectors have a great deal more power than that, do they not?

Mr. REED. During a temporary period when the mines might be operated under a contract between the Government and Mr. John L. Lewis, I do not know just how they would handle that situation.

Mr. President, while I am on that subject, let me say that I doubt whether any contract that John L. Lewis could make with the Government as a temporary operator of mines can impose anything upon State law or change State law or change the authority of the States, including West Virginia, over its mines.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I agree with the view expressed that such a contract could not change the State laws. But if the power of inspection and the right of suggestion as to safety exist, certainly the State authorities are not going to ignore a dangerous condition which may be pointed out to them under Federal inspection.

Mr. REED. Most of the States have power—I know the State of Kansas has—which is lodged in the mine inspector, who carries the authority of the government, so that the mine inspector in Kansas, and I have no doubt in West Virginia, can enforce with the power of the State the findings he has made upon inspection. The Federal Government cannot do that.

Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia that the record for safety in coal mines has been constantly improving. Coal mining is still a hazardous occupation. Make no mistake about that. I think, in fact, in our whole history the blackest chapter is that which has to do with the mining of bituminous coal. The operators, with some exceptions in my active contact with them, are not very receptive to proposed safety measures. The power of the State has had to be used to force them to adopt some measures. I have always been for the adoption of such measures. I have supported such action in this body. I supported it when I was governor of my State. I have supported every law that has been written to promote the safety of miners in Kansas. But, we come to a point where there is waste and extravagance and duplication which do not result in providing additional safety for the men.

I hold in my hand a table showing casualties in the mines; fatalities, and injuries less than fatalities, measured both by the number of tons of coal mined and the number of men employed. There has been a constant improvement in the safety of the mines. Fewer men are being injured or killed per million tons of coal mined, or when measured against the number of men employed. There will never come a time when fatalities and accidents in coal mines will be entirely eliminated.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course we want improvement, but will not the Senator agree with me that so long as the danger exists in this naturally hazardous occupation, everything possible ought to be done to meet and eliminate it, and that ought to be done, whether the inspection comes under the Federal Government or the State government, or from whatever source it comes. The prime purpose is to eliminate the danger.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator from West Virginia want to spend money from which no result flows so far as safety is concerned?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course I do not, and I do not subscribe to the idea that cutting out 45 inspectors is going to increase the chances of finding dangers and eliminating them.

Mr. REED. No one is proposing to cut out 45 inspectors. The budget never allowed for them to begin with. As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] called to our attention, the amendment in the House increasing the appropriation by

$305,000 for the purpose of employing 45 additional inspectors, was inserted on the floor of the House. It did not receive the approval of the committee in the House. In the Senate the committee cut the appropriation back to the Budget estimate, and that is all it did. That is all that is now proposed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The effect of adopting this amendment would be to prevent the employment of 45 additional inspectors.

Mr. REED. Who are unnecessary.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I cannot agree with the Senator.

Mr. REED. How does the Senator know? Has he made a closer study than I have?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not know how close a study the Senator has made. I know that he has studied the question. I am deeply interested in it. It seems to me that 45 additional inspectors would certainly have some effect upon the finding of dangers and their consequent elimination of them.

Mr. REED. Why not make it 145?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am willing to do that if it would eliminate that much more danger.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 63, line 24.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the pending amendment. In the first place, the testimony before the committee shows that Dr. Sayers, the able Director of the Bureau of Mines, testified that at the time the act approved May 7, 1941, relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes, was under consideration by the committees of Congress, he and Mr. Harrington informed the committees that in order properly to carry out the duties which would devolve upon the Bureau of Mines if the bill became law, 250 inspectors would be required. In his testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which considered this bill, he reiterated the statement and stood by the original estimate that 250 inspectors were necessary if the Bureau of Mines were effectively to carry out the responsibilities which had devolved upon it as a result of the passage of the act of May 7, 1941.

It is true that the act does not give to the Bureau of Mines or its inspectors any power to enforce the recommendations growing out of their inspections of the hazardous conditions existing in mines in the United States. However, the manner in which the results of those inspections are made public has a very great effect, in my opinion, upon improving the bad conditions which every person who is familiar with the mining of coal knows exist in that industry. According to Dr. Sayers' testimony more than 50,000 Bureau of Mines recommendations relating to safety and hazardous conditions in the mines of the United States have been placed in effect. It has been claimed that the additional inspectors who would be provided by the House language are not necessary. However, Dr. Sayers testified as follows:

Dr. SAYERS. We will need about 250 to do the work that we see in front of us. There is a total between 2,300 and 3,000 relatively large coal mines in the United States—those employing 25 or more persons—there are between fourteen and fifteen thousand coal mines total in the United States. Many of those are small. Many have less than 25 employees but those are the ones that are more than ordinarily hazardous, and also the ones that are receiving minimum inspection.

I talked with one of our district inspectors yesterday as to how many of those he had in his area and he told me his organization was inspecting about 400 mines a year and he had in addition between 350 and 375 of these small mines. I asked him how many more personnel he would need to inspect those additional mines and whether they should be inspected and he felt they should be.

TWO HUNDRED FIFTY MINE INSPECTORS IS MINIMUM NEEDED

He felt that we needed as many additional men as he has now. The 250 total previously mentioned is the minimum needed if we are to carry out the intent of the law.

Referring to the act of May 7, 1941.

I attended the executive hearings when the bill was passed and I made out calculations with Mr. Harrington as to how many men would be needed and 250 is as small as we can get along with if we are to do a job.

It must be remembered that out of whatever sum is appropriated will have to come the 14-percent pay increase which was recently approved by the President of the United States. I wish to point out what Dr. Sayers had to say in that connection:

DISCUSSION AS TO EFFECT OF RECENT FEDERAL PAY ACT

It is going to cost 14 percent more than the total amount we have here if we are to do the work here. If we add another 45 men here that would be $1,483,000, of which approximately $1,125,000 would be salaries. Add 14 percent to the salaries and you need nearly $160,000. If this $160,000 must be absorbed, it will require the dismissal of about 25 inspectors.

Mr. President, the manner in which the results of these inspections are brought to the attention not only of the operators, but also of the men who work in the mines affected by the recommendations and by the results of the inspections, together with the publicity which is given to them, in my opinion has proved very effective. The results of the inspections are placed on bulletin boards adjacent to or on the property of the mines, so that the men who are employed there may know if the Federal inspectors have found conditions which are hazardous to life and limb.

I cannot agree with the Senator from Kansas, who says that this is simply a duplication of effort, and that no good has come from it. As every person knows, coal mining is a hazardous industry. It is one of the most hazardous, if not the most hazardous in the United States. We have already adopted the legislation to which the Senator from Kansas has referred, and which places the responsibility for inspection upon the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines. I submit that anyone who is familiar with Dr. Sayers' work must know that he is not given to extravagant statements or to claiming more for any particular activity of his Bureau than he can prove from the facts. When he stated that more than 50,000 of the recommendations of his Bureau had been placed in effect to improve safety conditions in this very hazardous industry, I have every confidence that he was stating the truth.

So, Mr. President, in view of the situation which exists so far as concerns the men who work in this very hazardous industry and their families, and in view of the 14 percent which will have to come out of this appropriation because of the increased pay act, I say that in my opinion the amount which the House provided is entirely justified. I contend that this work is important in helping to remove some of the hazards which exist in mines. I hope that the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, since the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] refused to answer my question, I think I owe it to myself and my State, since he also introduced a letter from the State mine inspector, to say that the very fact that the State objects to any counter-inspection by Federal authority—even in my own State—is evidence enough to me that there should be an over-all, double-check inspection. If the inspection in the State were sufficient, there would be no objection to a Federal inspection. We have had some pretty serious mine disasters in West Virginia during the past 12 months, which I think justify additional safety precautions.

When it is said that there is a duplication, I sometimes think of a recent occurrence. In my State the State department of agriculture passed a certain commodity after inspecting it, and stated that it was pure. The Federal bureau which inspected it stated that it was impure. That was a protection to the consumer.

In this work a double inspection to protect the worker is none too much. I think the Senate would do well to listen to the men who represent those who work in the mines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 63, line 24.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago a vote was taken on the committee amendment on page 63, in line 24. I am in favor of the larger appropriation for coal mine inspections.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I should like to offer one or two perfecting amendments at this point.

On page 63, line 13, I offer an amendment to strike out "$91,000" and insert "$107,000." That does not affect the total appropriation. It is simply in line with the increased appropriation for administrative expenses. This amendment was suggested to me in the Appropriations Committee as a perfecting amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The idea is to make the amount correspond, relatively, to the

increased appropriation for administrative expenses.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 63, line 15, after the semicolon, to insert the words "purchase (not to exceed five)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

NAVAL ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURCH in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5356) to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a naval establishment, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. TOBEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I suggest that we return now to the beginning of the bill and take up the amendments which have been passed over.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Before that is done, I wish to call attention to the fact that the supply bill for the Department of Agriculture contained a provision exempting an appropriation of the kind we have just made from the provisions of section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946. The Senator from Arizona will recall that the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 was amended by section 14 (a) of the act of 1946 in the following manner:

PERSONNEL CEILINGS

SEC. 14. (a) Section 607 of the Federal Pay Act of 1945 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) (1) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (b) of this section—

"(A) with respect to the departments (other than the Department of War and the Department of the Navy), establishments, and agencies (including Government-owned or controlled corporations) in the executive branch, the Director shall so determine the numbers of full-time civilian employees and the man-months of part-time employment on the basis of the relative needs of such departments, establishments, and agencies for personnel, that the aggregate number of such civilian employee (including the full-time equivalent of man-months of part-time employment) shall not exceed (i) 528,975 for the quarter beginning October 1, 1946; (ii) 501,771 for the quarter beginning January 1, 1947; (iii) 474,567 for the quarter beginning April 1, 1947; and (iv) 447,363 after June 30, 1947."

It is obvious that that provision would defeat the very purpose of the amendment which has just been made, in effect, by the vote of the Senate on the amendment as reported by the committee. So we should do what was done by the Senate in passing the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Therefore, I hope the Senator from Arizona will agree to an amendment at the proper place in the bill, as follows:

Section 14 (a) of Public Law 390, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, shall not apply to employees under such appropriations as are provided in this law, nor to persons who are employed in the protection of life, health, or property.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have given considerable thought to this subject. If we adopt to every other appropriation bill an amendment similar to the one which was added to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, we shall be right back where we started, because the amendment exempts the particular department from the effect of the law. If we add to the pending bill a similar amendment, of course, we shall have to do the same with the next appropriation bill, and the next one, and so on; and when we get through with all of them, we shall have completed the circle and shall have gained nothing.

On the other hand, I had no objection to trying it out on the one bill, the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, to see how it would work.

I am satisfied that the way this matter must ultimately be corrected is by some action upon a deficiency bill which will take care primarily of the going-away or discharge pay of employees, because the effect of the provision of law to which the Senator from Wyoming has directed our attention is as follows: If the number of Federal Government employees is largely curtailed, when they leave the service they will be entitled to be paid for all the time they have failed to use up by way of vacations, sick leave, and so forth. If that money were to come out of the remaining appropriations, it would not even be possible to employ as many employees as are authorized by law. So some question has been raised as to whether the employment limitations provided in section 14 (a) of the Federal Pay Act of 1946 may prevent the Department of the Interior from maintaining sufficient employment to carry out the programs proposed in this bill. It is my understanding that the employment limitations provided by Public Law 390 took into account the employment requirements under the Budget estimates submitted by the President, and that therefore there is no reason to presume that the Department of the Interior would receive employment limitations from the Bureau of the Budget which would prevent the Department from carrying out the programs which are authorized by this bill.

It has been suggested that a provision be added to this bill similar to section 6 of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. It would be unsound, in my opinion, to add that type of provision to all the supply bills pending before the Senate, and therefore I am not proposing such an amendment to this bill. If the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is unable to make determinations under the provisions of section 14 (a) which are sufficient to provide for the employment needs of the program authorized in supply bills enacted by this Congress, relief should be sought through the submission of necessary exemption requests to the Congress for consideration in a deficiency bill.

So, correction will have to be made, and it should be made upon a deficiency bill. I think we can settle that part of the matter in that way.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My point is, of course, to protect the 45 additional inspectors for which the Senate has just provided by the amendment it has adopted. Instead of offering the amendment which I have just recited in my inquiry of the Senator, I shall be content to offer an amendment which will apply solely to persons who are employed in the protection of life, health, or property. I thought perhaps the Senator from Arizona would agree to take such an amendment to conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. That would be a very different proposition.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I realize that.

Mr. HAYDEN. The protection of life, health, or property is one thing; but to say that we shall go through all the appropriation bills and shall add the same amendment to one appropriation bill after another would get us right back to where we started, and would have the effect of accomplishing nothing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; it would have the effect of repealing the act of 1946.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, Mr. President, I modify my amendment, and offer it in the following form:

Section 14 (a) of Public Law 390, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Federal Employees Pay bill of 1946, shall not apply to persons who are employed under any appropriation in this act in the protection of life, health or property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I now request that the Senate return to the beginning of the bill and commence to take up the amendments which have been passed over. If the clerk will turn to page 2, I believe the amendment beginning in line 21 on that page is the first one which was passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment which has been passed over will be stated.

The first amendment passed over was, on page 2, beginning in line 21, to strike out—

PETROLEUM CONSERVATION DIVISION

For all salaries and expenses necessary for administering and enforcing the provisions of the act of February 22, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., ch. 15A), and for cooperation with Federal and State authorities in the production and conservation of oil and gas, including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel expenses; contract stenographic reporting services; stationery and office supplies; not to exceed $2,500 for printing and binding; and the maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger-carrying vehicles, $216,908.

And insert:

OIL AND GAS DIVISION

Oil and Gas Division: For all expenses necessary for coordinating and unifying policies and administration of Federal activities relative to oil, gas, and synthetic fuels, including cooperation with the petroleum industry and State authorities in the production, processing, and utilization of petroleum and petroleum products, natural gas, and synthetic fuels and the compilation of technical reports thereon, for administering and enforcing the provisions of the act of February 22, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., ch. 15A); and for the liquidation of the Petroleum Administration for War; including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $10,000 for employment of a director without regard to the civil service and classification laws; travel expenses; contract stenographic reporting services; printing and binding; and the purchase (not to exceed five), maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger automobiles; $449,516.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, in addition to what I said yesterday in opposition to this amendment, let me say I think it is totally unnecessary and inadvisable. If there is a plan to be submitted, as outlined by the Secretary of the Interior, I think it should go to the appropriate congressional committee, for it to consider the matter and to give the oil industry an opportunity to present its views.

Thus far, nothing has been presented except the plan of the Department of the Interior and the proposal to retain Mr. Davies as an employee. To increase the appropriation by some 200,000-odd dollars is a total waste of money, and will serve no useful purpose, in my judgment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, to repeat the substance of what I said yesterday, let me say that the Special Committee To Investigate Petroleum Resources at a hearing on Monday had the testimony of the Under Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Chapman, and the testimony of Mr. Ralph K. Davies with respect to the purpose and effect of the proposed Oil and Gas Division. As chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate Petroleum Resources, I was anxious to be certain that the new division would not engage in the establishment of any new policies, and that its operations would be confined to the coordination of the work of the departments and agencies of the Government which have to do with petroleum. There are approximately 27 such agencies. I was perfectly well satisfied by what the Under Secretary of the Interior and Mr. Davies had to say, namely, that the purpose and policy of the new Oil and Gas Division will be precisely to confine itself to the coordination of the work of the agencies, and that if any recommendations as to policy are to be made, they will be submitted to the Congress of the United States.

At my request, Mr. Davies furnished for the record of the committee the Executive order by which the Petroleum Administration for War has been liquidated, the letter from the President requesting that the Secretary of the Interior undertake the coordination here provided for, and certain other documents.

I then addressed the following question to Mr. Davies, and I received the following reply:

The CHAIRMAN. Now, then, do I correctly interpret these various documents to mean, first, that the war controls have been definitely ended; second, that there is no purpose to set up any form of peacetime control over the petroleum industry; third, that it is the object of the administration to coordinate the executive functions of the Federal Government; and fourth, that in doing so you are seeking to bring about the appointment of an advisory council in order that there may be understanding and cooperation between the executive arm of the Government and the industry—all of this being based upon a recognition of the fact that the policy-determining branch of Government still is the Congress of the United States?

Mr. DAVIES. Senator, that expresses our purposes accurately, and I think completely.

So I think it is eminently desirable that this coordination should take place, and I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning on page 2, in line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a release issued yesterday by the American Petroleum Institute with respect to the membership of the proposed new National Petroleum Council.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP ANNOUNCED

Secretary of the Interior J. A. Krug announced appointments to a newly established National Petroleum Council, an industry committee serving without compensation, to advise him and the Oil and Gas Division of the Department on oil and gas matters.

Telegrams sent to 85 men prominently identified with the petroleum and natural-gas industries set June 21 for the first meeting to be held in Washington, Secretary Krug said.

Mr. Krug paid tribute to the invaluable assistance he had had from Ralph K. Davies, formerly Deputy Petroleum Administrator, in organizing the Council, as well as in relation to other aspects of launching the program of the Oil and Gas Division.

The Secretary explained that members of the National Petroleum Council do not serve as representatives of their companies, but as representatives of the industry as a whole. Nevertheless, he said, in selecting the membership, special attention was given to assuring a well-balanced representation as between large and small companies in all parts of the country and from all phases of both oil and natural-gas industries.

Mr. Krug pointed out that while many of the members are affiliated with the larger companies, the preponderance of representation is from the smaller, independent companies. "These small companies," he said, "in the aggregate form a large and most important segment of the petroleum industry and one of the largest classes of small business in the country."

On the list of Council appointees are 21 presidents or representatives of trade associations representing in turn many thousands of the smaller oil companies throughout the country. Also included are seven members representing the natural-gas industry. The remainder are from the petroleum industry at large.

The Council membership included 55 men who served at some time during the war on the Petroleum Industry War Council, the national industry advisory group which aided the Petroleum Administration for War in mobilizing the United Nations oil resources on a world-wide scale.

The Interior Secretary said that the PIWC membership had been used as a nucleus in organizing the National Petroleum Council both because of the outstanding caliber of the individuals who served on it, and also because of the need to take advantage of their unique experience in working with Government in the cooperative solution of wartime problems. He pointed out, however, that duplicate company representation, which had proved necessary for the wartime organization, had been eliminated in the formation of the peacetime industry council.

"The purpose of establishing the National Petroleum Council outlined by President Truman is to continue the Government-industry teamwork that proved so important a factor in the success of the war program," Mr. Krug said.

"The support and assistance of these experienced industry representatives will be invaluable as we face the problems of the postwar era."

Mr. Davies, in commenting upon the plans for the Council, said that it was contemplated that there would be established a series of national committees of the Council. This additional organization, he pointed out, will broaden further the scope of industry representation and will provide working groups of great value to Government. The composition of these committees will be considered with the Council when it meets on June 21, Davies said.

Mr. Krug's telegram to the Council members read as follows:

"Pursuant to the President's letter of May 6 directing that the Secretary of the Interior undertake to unify and coordinate the Federal policy and administration with respect to petroleum and to serve as the channel of communication between the Federal Government and the industry, an Oil and Gas Division has been established in the Department of the Interior.

"In view of the outstanding contribution which Government-industry cooperation made to the success of the war petroleum program, it is important that the value to the welfare and security of the Nation of such close and harmonious relations between Government and industry should continue. Accordingly, in harmony with the President's direction I am, in consultation with Mr. Ralph K. Davies, the former Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War, creating an industry advisory group, to be

designated as the 'National Petroleum Council,' whose membership will be drawn from both large and small interests so distributed as to insure a truly representative group.

"It is presently intended that quarterly meetings of the Council will be held in Washington to consider petroleum problems. However, approval of this schedule and other organizational and procedural matters will be on the agenda for the Council's first meeting to be held June 21 at 10:30 a. m. in room 5160, New Interior Building.

"In view of your extensive knowledge of the petroleum industry and experience in its operations, I hereby appoint you a member of this National Petroleum Council, to serve without compensation for a term of 1 year. Your telegraphic acceptance of this appointment and assurance that you will attend the June 21 meeting will be greatly appreciated by me. Particularly, do I urge your presence at this initial meeting."

The telegrams to the association presidents stated that their appointments were ex officio for their terms of office.

The exchange of correspondence between Secretary Krug and Attorney General Clark will be released at a later date, it was announced. The chairman of NPC will be named at the meeting June 21.

A list of those appointed to the National Petroleum Council is attached. Those marked with an asterisk (*) were members of PIWC:

*K. S. Adams, president, Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

H. T. Ashton, president, Western Petroleum Refiners Association, care Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., St. Louis, Mo.

*Col. T. H. Barton, president, Lion Oil Co., El Dorado, Ark.

*Burt R. Bay, president, Northern Natural Gas Co., Omaha 1, Nebr.

R. H. Blair, president, National Oil Marketers Association, care, Lincoln Oil Co., Troy, Mo.

Jacob Blaustein, Alto Dale, Pikesville, Md.

*Paul G. Blazer, chairman of the board, Ashland Oil & Refining Co., Ashland, Ky.

*W. R. Boyd, Jr., president, American Petroleum Institute, New York, N. Y.

Reid Brazell, Leonard Refineries, Inc., Alma, Mich.

*J. S. Bridwell, president, Bridwell Oil Co., Wichita Falls, Tex.

Russell Brown, Independent Petroleum Association of America, Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

W. F. Clinger, president, Pennsylvania Grade Crude Oil Association, Tidioute, Pa.

*Robert H. Colley, president, the Atlantic Refining Co., Philadelphia 1, Pa.

Stewart Crocker, president, Columbia Gas & Electric Co., New York, N. Y.

*Howard A. Cowden, president, Consumers Cooperative Association, North Kansas City, Mo.

*Henry M. Dawes, president, the Pure Oil Co., Chicago, Ill.

E. De Golyer, De Golyer & MacNaughton, Dallas, Tex.

*O. D. Donnell, president, the Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

Fayette B. Dow, National Petroleum Association, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

*J. Frank Drake, president, Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh 30, Pa.

Gordon Duke, Southeastern Oil, Inc., Jacksonville, Fla.

J. H. Dunn, president, Natural Gasoline Association of America, Amarillo, Tex.

James P. Dunnigan, Producers Refining Co., Inc., West Branch, Mich.

Leroy Edwards, president, Southern California Gas Co., Los Angeles 54, Calif.

Richard Fenton, executive vice president, California Stripper Well Association, Subway Terminal Building, Los Angeles, Calif.

*W. H. Ferguson, executive vice president, Continental Oil Co., Denver, Colo.

R. G. Follis, president, Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco 20, Calif.

*Jacob France, chairman of the board, Mid-Continent Petroleum Corp., Tulsa, Okla.

*Walter S. Hallanan, president, Plymouth Oil Co., Charleston, W. Va.

*D. P. Hamilton, president, Root Petroleum Co., Shreveport, La.

*Jake L. Hamon, Cox & Hamon, Dallas, Tex.

*B. A. Hardey, Shreveport, La.

*George A. Hill, Jr., president, Houston Oil Co. of Texas, Houston, Tex.

*W. T. Holliday, president, Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), Cleveland, Ohio.

*Eugene Holman, president, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

D. A. Hulcy, president, Lone Star Gas Co., 1915 Wood Street, Dallas, Tex.

*W. F. Humphrey, president, Tide Water Associated Oil Co., 79 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

H. L. Hunt, Hunt Oil Co., 1608 Santa Fe Building, Dallas, Tex.

*A. Jacobsen, president, Amerada Petroleum Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

*B Brewster Jennings, president, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.

Allen A. Jergins, president, San Joaquin Valley Oil Producers Association, Long Beach, Calif.

*Carl A. Johnson, president, Independent Refiners Association of California, Inc.

*Charles S. Jones, president, Richfield Oil Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.

*W. Alton Jones, president, Cities Service Oil Co., 70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.

Frank Lerch, president, Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

*Ralph Lloyd, president, Western Oil and Gas Association, Los Angeles, Calif.

*John M. Lovejoy, president, Seaboard Oil Co. of Delaware, New York, N. Y.

A. C. Mattei, president, Honolulu Oil Corp., San Francisco, Calif.

*B. L. Majewski, vice president, Deep Rock Oil Co., 155 North Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

Clyde Morrill, executive vice president, Independent Oil Men's Association of New England, Boston, Mass.

*S. B. Mosher, president, Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

*Henry D. Moyle, vice president, Wasatch Oil Refining Co., Salt Lake City 1, Utah.

*H. M. McClure, president, National Stripper Well Association, Alma, Mich.

*N. C. McGowen, president, United Gas Pipe Line Co., Shreveport, La.

W. G. McGuire, chairman of the board, Panhandle-Eastern Pipe Line Co., 1221 Baltimore Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.

Joseph L. Nolan, manager, Oil Department, Farmers Union Central Exchange, St. Paul, Minn.

*I. A. O'Shaugnessy, president, The Globe Oil & Refining Co., St. Paul, Minn.

*J. R. Parten, president, Premier Oil Refining Co. of Texas, Second National Bank Building, Houston, Tex.

*William T. Payne, president, American Association of Oil Well Drilling Contractors, Big Chief Drilling Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.

*J. Howard Pew, president, Sun Oil Co., Philadelphia 3, Pa.

Joseph E. Pogue, Chase National Bank, New York, N. Y.

Frank M. Porter, president, Mid Continent Oil & Gas Association, Oklahoma City, Okla.

H. J. Porter, 1128 Commerce Building, Houston, Tex.

*E. E. Pyles, Los Angeles 13, Calif.

*E. B. Reeser, Barnsdall Oil Co., Tulsa, Okla.

Walter R. Reitz, president, Quaker State Oil Refining Co., Quaker State Building, Oil City, Pa.

M. H. Robineau, president, The Frontier Refining Co., Cheyenne, Wyo.

*W. S. S. Rodgers, chairman of the board, The Texas Co., New York, N. Y.

Charles F. Roeser, president, Roeser & Pendleton, Inc., Fort Worth, Tex.

*Arch H. Rowan, Rowan Drilling Co., 903 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.

*G. L. Rowsey, president, Gulf Coast Refiners Association, care of Taylor Refining Co., Taylor, Tex.

*R. S. Shannon, president, Pioneer Oil Corp., Denver 2, Colo.

*Harry F. Sinclair, president, Sinclair Oil Corp., New York 20, N. Y.

*W. G. Skelly, president, Skelly Oil Co., Tulsa, Okla.

*Ferd J. Spang, president, Petroleum Equipment Suppliers Association, Butler, Pa.

*Reese H. Taylor, president, Union Oil Co. of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

*H. L. Thatcher, chairman, National Council of Independent Petroleum Associations, Chattanooga, Tenn.

*R. Van Der Woude, president, Shell Union Oil Corp., New York 20, N. Y.

W. W. Vandeveer, Allied Oil Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.

Grady Vaughn, Dallas National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

Eric V. Weber, president, Ohio Petroleum Marketers Association, Cincinnati, Ohio.

W. C. Whaley, president, Oil Producers Agency of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

*H. C. Wiess, president, Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.

*Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), Chicago 80, Ill.

*Ralph T. Zook, the Sloan & Zook Co., Bradford, Pa.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think the next amendment which has been passed over appears on page 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The amendment passed over was, on page 6, in line 24, after the word "system", to strike out "For" and insert "To enable the Bonneville Power Administrator to carry out the duties imposed upon him pursuant to law, including the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 7, in line 4, after the word "energy", to strike out "and all administrative expenses including."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on the same page, in line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "twenty-nine" and insert "thirty-nine."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on the same page, in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "one" and insert "two."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on the same page, in line 10, after "aircraft", to strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$19,086,250"; and in line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,695,400" and insert "$4,290,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 20, in line 22, to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$950,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], I move to insert on page 20, in

line 25, after the word "Colorado" the word "Montana."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. On behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I move to strike out, on page 20, in line 25, the word "Nevada" and the word "Oregon."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I send forward the amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, in line 1, after the word "reservations", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That no sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada and Oregon either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The amendment passed over was, on page 31, in line 8, after the word "Oregon", to strike out "$106,000" and insert "$224,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I offer the amendment which I send forward to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 36, in line 17, after the word "purchased" it is proposed to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That no part of the sum appropriated herein shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada and Oregon either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I believe there are only two other committee amendments still remaining to be acted upon. One relates to the Central Valley project in California, as set forth on pages 52 and 53 of the bill, and the other is the Southwestern Power Administration amendment on page 100 of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. A few days ago the Senate took final action on House bill 1095 for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota. Neither the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] nor the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are now in the city, and I have been requested to offer the amendment which I send forward to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

The full and final settlement of all claims and demands of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota in accordance with the provisions of H. R. 1095, Seventy-ninth Congress, $400,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed 5 percent of the amount herein appropriated may be used for payment of fees and expenses of attorneys employed under contract approved in accordance with existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if the Senator in charge of the bill desires to make a preliminary statement with respect to the committee amendment in connection with the Southwestern Power Administration, I shall be glad to have him do so. Otherwise, I may state that I am opposed to the language as it came from the other House, and am in favor of the amendment of the Senate committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Before that matter is taken up, I should like to ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment which I have discussed with the Senator in charge of the bill, and also with a Member of the other House who was in charge of the Interior Department appropriation bill. The Senate has passed the bill which I introduced to return to the Department of the Interior, or to the Bureau of Reclamation, some 57,000 acres of land which were taken from the Department of the Interior for the purpose of setting up certain relocation camps which were used for the Japanese. Those camps are at Heart Mountain, Wyo., the Minidoka project in Idaho, and the Tulelake division of the Klamath project in California. All that land, with the exception of about 1,800 acres which were purchased, was within the jurisdiction of the Reclamation Service before it was taken over to be used for Japanese relocation centers.

The Senate has already passed the bill which restored those lands to the Department of the Interior, but there may be some difficulty experienced because of the rush in the closing days of the Congress. Therefore, Mr. President, on page 57 of the pending bill, after line 8, I move to amend by inserting the language which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 57, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

For purposes of effecting settlement of war veterans on public land reclamation projects and to provide facilities for veteran employment in construction and operation of reclamation projects, the Bureau of Reclamation is hereby authorized to acquire by transfer, without exchange of funds from the War Assets Administration or other Federal agency in responsible charge, the lands, improvements, and equipment acquired by the War Reclamation Authority on the War Relocation Centers on the Heart Mountain Division of the Shoshone project, Wyoming; the Minidoka (Hunt) project, Idaho; and the Tulelake Division of the Klamath project, California; and the former prisoner-of-war camp at Indianola, Nebr.: *Provided,* That said lands, improvements, and equipment shall be made available under regulations of the Secretary of the Interior to veteran settlers and nonprofit organizations, in accordance with the provisions of Senate Report No. 1412, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session: *Provided further,* That the War Assets Administration is authorized to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation funds required for maintenance and protection of the transferred property pending its final disposition.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, we had two of those large Japanese relocation centers in Arizona. They were both located on Indian reservations, and the title of the land did not pass. We approved in a deficiency bill a provision that the property available there might be transferred to the Indian Service for the benefit of the Indians. I understand that the Senator from Wyoming proposes, through his amendment, that where title to certain public lands has passed, by reason of an act of Congress, such lands may be improved and made available to veterans. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, during my absence from the floor, an amendment was agreed to to section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered so that I may offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD. Under the amendment there would be exempted from the ceilings on employees as adopted in the recent pay bill all those who have anything to do with health, life, or property. That would apply to the rangers, to all the custodial employees, and to those engaged in looking after the health and life of any employee who may be so classified under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my only purpose in offering the amendment was to make certain that mine inspectors, who are pitifully few at best, shall not be affected by the provisions of the act. If the amendment which was agreed to goes further than what I intended, I shall be very happy to modify it. I suggest to the Senator——

Mr. BYRD. It certainly goes further than the Senator thinks it went.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not intend that it should go further.

Mr. BYRD. In all, only 45 employees are involved, and the ceiling is 1,600,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. At the present time there are 157 coal mine inspectors. My purpose was to make certain that none of those coal mine inspectors should be affected by the act.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator understand that the ceilings fixed freeze the

employment as of the date the act was passed? That is not the case. It establishes an over-all ceiling for all employees, but it has not been applied to the Veterans' Administration, for example, and the total employment it affects is 1,184,084. The Director of the Budget has authority to fix the allotments, and to reduce one bureau and increase others, as the case may be. I cannot imagine that there are only 45 involved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Why will not the Senator agree to rewrite the amendment so that it will apply only to coal mine inspection?

Mr. BYRD. I think it would be a mistake to do that, because if we are going to exempt all the classes of employees covered by these appropriation bills, then the ceiling does not amount to anything. I feel convinced that if there are only 45 involved, certainly, out of more than a million——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Forty-five plus 157.

Mr. BYRD. The 157 are already employed, I understand. I hope the Senator will not insist on the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offered this amendment because in reading the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture as it passed the Senate, I found this provision on page 79, section 6:

> Section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 shall not apply to employment of personnel required to do the work authorized by those appropriations for which increased funds are provided by this act.

I now understand from the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Georgia that that provision was not agreed to in conference. I did not know it at the time, but I am sure that if the Senator had been on the floor when the Senator from Arizona spoke about the amendment I offered, he would realize that the conferees on the Interior Department bill will be just as amenable to his arguments as were the conferees on the Department of Agriculture bill.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Georgia was the one who suggested the amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill. The Senator from Virginia may not be present at the conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Arizona will be present in the conference, as will the Senator from Wyoming, and I assure the Senator from Virginia that my only purpose will be to confine this to the mine inspection. I hope the Senator will not object.

Mr. BYRD. If there are only 45 employees involved, I do not think we should establish a precedent exempting them from the ceiling. The ceiling idea is something new.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I want to exempt them from the ceiling because they are so pitifully few and the need is so appallingly great.

Mr. BYRD. In all the other branches of the Government there can be reductions in personnel much more than sufficient to take care of the 45 inspectors. I hope the Senator will not insist on it at this time. Give the ceiling plan a trial, and see whether it works, and if it does not work, we will have to consider something else. Certainly, with all the vast personnel of the Federal Government, there must be a way to reduce the number in many of these agencies and departments to take care of these 45 employees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest, Mr. President, that we permit the Senate to decide upon the amendment, as I modified it to apply solely to coal-mine inspection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. BYRD. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All in favor of the amendment will rise.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

Mr. BYRD. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	Overton
Andrews	Hawkes	Pepper
Austin	Hayden	Radcliffe
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson
Brooks	Huffman	Russell
Burch	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	Knowland	Taft
Capper	La Follette	Taylor
Carville	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Tobey
Donnell	McFarland	Tunnell
Downey	McKellar	Wagner
Ellender	McMahon	Walsh
Ferguson	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Willis
Gerry	Murray	Wilson
Gossett	O'Daniel	
Green	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HAYDEN. I now yield to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. BYRD. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. Is not the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] before the Senate? The Senator from Wyoming was perfecting his amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is before the Senate. It has not yet been disposed of.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as the result of conferences which I have had with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill, and in view of the fact that it is likely that the discussion of several other items which are still to be disposed of will take some time, I shall not press for disposal of the amendment tonight. I desire, however, to put in the RECORD now the text of the amendment, as I suggested to the Senator from Virginia it would appear.

So, Mr. President, I move that on page 63, line 24, after the word *"Provided"*, there shall be inserted the following:

> Section 14 (a) of Public Law 390, Seventy-ninth Congress—the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946—shall not apply to persons who are employed as coal mine inspectors under the foregoing appropriation: *Provided further.*

I shall not ask for action upon the amendment tonight.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to notify the Senator from Wyoming that I expect to make a point of order against the amendment because it is legislation, as it changes an existing law. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I am not opposed to Federal mine inspection. But if in each bill we start exempting Federal employees from the pay ceilings, then that will be a precedent for future action.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator intends to raise a point of order let him raise it now.

Mr. BYRD. I make that point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

> No funds appropriated by this act shall be available for the payment of compensation of any employee retained after a reduction in force, unless such employee is retained as a result of application of retention preference regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in dealing with the item of appropriation for the Grazing Service in the Department of the Interior, the House committee reduced the amount, and then when it came to the Senate the Senate Appropriations Committee reduced the number of personnel from 275 to 100. We believed then, and I am confident after years of investigation of the subject in the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, that 100 employees in the Grazing Service are ample, for the time being, at least.

When the reduction was effected, the Department sent to us a list showing how the reductions would be made. We have heard—at least, I have heard—that in my State, as a reprisal for my having brought about this reduction in personnel from 275 to 100, I am to be punished by having all the personnel that belonged to the State of Nevada immediately removed. I want the personnel to be removed in keeping with rules and regulations set up by the Civil Service Commission. That is all that the amendment would do.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I understand the amendment, it merely reiterates the existing law. I have no objection to taking it to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the next item passed over was on page 52, under the Central Valley project. The amendment passed over begins in line 21, on page 52, after the word "transmission", to strike out "lines" and insert "line"; and then to strike out lines 22 23, 24, and part of line 25, at which point it is proposed to insert "Shasta to Shasta substation, 230 kilovolt, $408,670" and certain other language. I offer on my own behalf, as a substitute for the committee amendment, an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the matter inserted by the committee amendment beginning with the word "Shasta", in line 25, page 52, and ending with the amount "$20,836,670", in line 5, page 53, it is proposed to insert the following: "and substations, $4,572,000, including Shasta to Delta switchyards via Oroville and Sacramento, 230 kilovolt, Shasta to Delta switchyards (West Side lines), 230 kilovolt; Keswick to Sacramento, 115 kilovolt; Contra Costa power distribution system, miscellaneous transmission, feeder lines and facilities, and substations; in all, $25,000,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. I may explain, Mr. President, that what I am seeking to do in this regard is to restore the Budget estimate. The effect of the committee amendment is to strike from the bill a provision which the House allowed, which would carry the line down from Shasta to Oroville, about 100 miles. That line has been practically completed, except for a contractor's claim for adjustment. Then there are from Oroville to Sacramento 56 miles which are under construction. The effect of the committee amendment is to provide that the only transmission lines that shall be available for this project will be for a distance of about 25½ miles from the Shasta Dam down to the Shasta substation, and all appropriations made for the other partially completed lines are to be transferred over to that line so that there will be a double-circuit line, as I say, of a litle more than 25 miles to the substation. That means that there will be available power at that place, and at that place only, and in my judgment, to only one purchaser, that is to say, to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., the leading utility in northern California.

I wish to state to the Senate very frankly that this is the last day, and the afternoon of the last day, so far as this transmission-line problem in California is concerned. Mr. Black, the very able president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., testified before our committee that his company was ready to construct all the necessary transmission lines, and particularly a transmission line down the west side of the Sacramento River; that they would do so within the next year, and they had $4,000,000 laid aside for that purpose. So, if the Senate now fails to make this appropriation we will know that next year the line will have been built by the private utility, and then the argument will be perfectly valid that any action taken by the Congress to build any transmission line will be a duplication of what the utility company has built.

At the present time the utility is not capable of carrying all the power generated at the Shasta Dam. Somebody has to build additional transmission lines. It is my view, and the view of the minority of the committee, and it has been heretofore the view of the Senate, that inasmuch as one-third of the power generated at this great dam is to be used to pump water to farmers in California, at least that much of the power ought to be carried down from the dam to where the pumps are located.

For that reason I have offered an amendment which adds about $4,000,000 to the bill, which is complementary to the $4,000,000 the private power company has ready to build the transmission line. If we build it first, the private power company will not have to build it. If we do not build it first they will build it, and then we will be paralleling their lines.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to speak in behalf of the amendment offered by my distinguished and able colleague from Arizona, and first at this time I wish to read a telegram which I have received which I think is quite apropos:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *June 14, 1946.*

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am advised that the United States Senate Appropriations Committee has reported to the Senate the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, recommending $20,836,670 for the Central Valley project, California, as compared to $10,840,120 recommended by the House of Representatives and $25,000,000 as requested in the President's budget submitted to the Congress. I am further advised that no funds are presently included in the bill for electric power transmission facilities beyond Shasta substation, which were requested in the President's budget, and eliminated for the most part by the House of Representatives. I am informed that Senator CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for the Department of the Interior, will endeavor to have the bill amended to include funds for such facilities. Reference is made to my telegram, dated May 14, 1946, wherein I respectfully urged you to do all in your power to bring about the restoration in Department of the Interior appropriation bill for the 1947 fiscal year the amount cut from the request of the Bureau of Reclamation for the Central Valley project. I reiterate that request, and in this instance strongly urge the restoration of funds in the bill for the construction of transmission facilities for the Central Valley project which were eliminated by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

EARL WARREN,
Governor.

Mr. President, from the very inception of the Central Valley Project it was anticipated that it would be an integrated system, consisting of dams, power facilities, and transmission lines. The policy of the State of California is very clear in this regard. In 1933 I was a member of the State legislature and was one of the original authors of the Central Valley Act at that time. In this matter the California Legislature is on record and the people of the State of California, by their direct vote, are on record. The California Water Authority, which is the official State agency dealing with this project, has gone on record. The Governor of California is very strongly in favor of the amendment. My senior colleague [Mr. DOWNEY], who will later speak for himself, is in favor of this amendment. He and I, the two representatives of California in the United States Senate, are very much in favor of it, and urge the Senate to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am very happy to know that the Governor of California has joined with the two Senators from California in support of the proposal which I am making, which is to restore the budget estimate so that the transmission lines may be constructed.

I have no desire to detain the Senate. Let me merely repeat that if this appropriation is not made at this time, when the next annual appropriation bill is under consideration by the Senate it can be legitimately stated then by the private power utility that it has constructed a complete system of transmission lines capable of carrying all the power from Shasta Dam, and that it should remain the sole purchaser.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understand that the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] desires to address the Senate. I wish to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona, but I hope that I may not be required to address the Senate on that subject this evening. Many things must be discussed with reference to this item before it can be fully understood.

Briefly, as I construe it, this is a movement on the part of the Department of the Interior to put out of business a private concern which for a great many years has supplied the great Central Valley and the communities of California with electrical energy at the lowest possible charges. The movement now is to transform that which was originally established as a reclamation project and storage project into a power project. The question should have very careful consideration. I ask that the matter go over until tomorrow, at which time I hope to address the Senate briefly in explanation of my views on the subject. I hope the Senator from Arizona will not force the question at this time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to join with the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and my colleague the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] in urging the Senate to accept the amendment presented by the Senator from Arizona. As the distinguished junior Senator from California has just pointed out, we have here

the recommendation of Mr. Warren, recently nominated by the Democrats of California as governor——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. After the telegram from Governor Warren had been read, I wondered if the Senator would rise and support the Democratic nominee for governor in his position. I assumed that that was the loyal thing to do. If there is no Democrat capable of winning the Democratic nomination in California, and a Republican must take over, I think the Senator is doing a very courteous thing in supporting the nominee of his party, who happens to be the Republican governor.

Mr. DOWNEY. I think that in this respect at least, on the issue now before the Senate, the gentleman who has been given the Democratic nomination has shown that he is worthy of confidence. I hope Senators on the other side of the aisle will accept the same theory as has been accepted by Governor Warren in this respect.

Mr. President, I believe this is the third or fourth time I have addressed the Senate on this particular issue, which to me seems quite plain. Here is a very great investment by the Federal Government in a reclamation and irrigation project. It happens to have very important incidental advantages as a great power project. The United States Government itself will be a large user of a portion of the Federal power which will be generated at Shasta Dam. Many of our communities and farm cooperatives will be users of this power. I believe that there will be ample requirements in northern California for all the power that can be developed from existing private facilities and from this great project.

We in northern California are almost a unit in believing that it would be a most unfortunate mistake to pass over to a private utility a complete monopoly of the power which will be developed by the Federal Government. I do not say that after this transmission line has been constructed by the Government—if it is to be constructed—there may not be times when a certain proportion of the power might not very well be sold to private utilities. But we in northern California are very strongly of the opinion that this power should not be bottled up in the hands of any private monopoly, so that the Federal Government would not be able to sell it to the consumers to whom it might desire to sell it.

As I have heretofore stated upon the floor of the Senate, in fairness and in candor, Mr. President, I bring no charges of misconduct or of oppression against the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. which preempts this territory at the present time. But I feel that it would be unfortunate not to have a yardstick in the hands of the public by which we in California may continue to measure what should be the true and equitable cost of power, and I think that we should at least have an opportunity to use this public power, if we desire to do so, as an instrument against oppressive and monopolistic practices.

Mr. President, not only is it true that the Governor of California and likewise the two Senators from California are in favor of the amendment, but it is likewise true, so far as I know, that all the California Members of the National House of Representatives and likewise almost all the great commercial, political, and civil organizations of California are extremely anxious that the Federal Government shall provide means, as indicated in this amendment, for a transmission line by which the Federal Government may be able to deal fairly, justly, and strategically with this power.

Therefore, I reiterate my desire to join with my colleague [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in urging the Senate to vote favorably on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I had hoped that this matter might go over until tomorrow. If it is not going over until tomorrow, I propose to discuss it, and I do not propose to limit my time of discussion. Many Senators who are interested in this item are not present at this time and, for one reason or another, cannot be here.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold for a moment his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to say that I have been conferring with Senators, and I wonder whether we may make an arrangement along the following lines: That the Senate meet tomorrow at an hour earlier than the customary time—in other words, at 11 o'clock, instead of at 12.

Let me explain very frankly to the Senator from Nevada that I am embarrassed by a request which has been made by the conferees on the part of the House, who are most anxious to leave the city. They were hopeful that the bill might be passed by the Senate today and might go to conference by 9:30 tomorrow morning, so that the conferees on the part of both Houses would be able to draw up a conference report, thus enabling the conferees on the part of the House to leave the city promptly. Of course, the Senate understands that in view of all the amendments, the bill usually takes a considerable length of time in conference. I was pressing my conclusion regarding the matter because of the request which the House conferees have made upon me.

Mr. McCARRAN. I understand, and I fully appreciate the Senator's position.

Mr. HAYDEN. How would it be to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow and vote on the Central Valley matter at noon?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to having the Senate meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow. As regards the suggestion about the hour at which to have the vote taken, I should prefer to leave that matter open. I wish it to be understood in that respect, however, that if the amendment is under consideration tomorrow, I do not intend to take more than a very limited time for a reasonable discussion of the matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. I suggested that perhaps an hour might suffice. Would an hour and a half be sufficient?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think perhaps an hour might be sufficient, but I do not like to have a limit placed, because I do not think it is necessary in this case. So far as I am concerned, I am certain that it is not necessary.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me ask the minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], what his judgment is about the matter. Does he believe it is desirable to have the Senate take a recess at this time until 11 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think there would be advantage in pursuing that course, if there could be a definite agreement about the length of debate on the matter tomorrow. It seems to me that this is not a new question. It has been discussed over and over again. Most Senators have a fairly definite conviction one way or the other; and because of previous convictions at which they have arrived, they are not likely to be influenced by what may he said now about it.

It would seem to me that instead of undertaking to fix an hour at which the Senate should vote on the amendment, we might have an agreement limiting the length of time available to each Senator to speak on it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not care to enter into such an arrangement; but I am perfectly willing to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

There is, however, another item which is in controversy. It comes immediately after the one we have been discussing, and it is of equal, if not greater, magnitude. I am certain that it will be discussed at length, because many of us are interested in it. I refer to the southwestern power situation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the next issue which will come before the Senate will be one which involves six States. Without authority of law, it is proposed to start in those six States a development which eventually will cost in excess of $200,000,000. This issue is the beginning or, rather, a continuation of the program to nationalize electric energy in the United States. Inasmuch as it is of such moment, I hold it entirely out of order to try to place a limitation upon debate.

If the Senate and the House of Representatives and the other branches of the Government desire to nationalize electricity and to take over the existing lines or to build competing transmission lines, in my opinion the Congress should thoroughly consider the matter. It should hold ample hearings, obtain the best judgment and the best evidence that can be obtained, and bring in a bill establishing a policy. In the event that the Congress should decide to nationalize

electricity, instead of starving to death the existing lines or competing with them, why would it not be well for the Government to do as it did in the case of the Tennessee Valley, namely, purchase the existing lines and turn the whole matter over to a program?

That is the issue, Mr. President. I am sure it will not take very long to present the matter with respect to the Southwest power development.

My State of Oklahoma is in the center of the proposed development. Adjacent to my State is the State of Arkansas. Those two States form the backbone of the proposed development. On the north are Kansas and Missouri. On the south are Louisiana and Texas. Those six States are now being served with ample electricity. There is no demand for the electricity which would come as a result of adoption of the amendment. Ample electricity is now available in those sections. During the war we tried to have some dams built in my State, on the theory that we might need the electricity which would be developed there. The agencies of the Federal Government investigated, and as a result of their investigation they held that there was no demand for such power, and so they froze the money and would not permit its expenditure at that time.

Two dams are now in existence in that territory. One, the Norfork Dam, is in the northern part of the area, in northeastern Arkansas. The other is the Denison Dam, on the Red River, between Texas and Oklahoma. Those two dams are hundreds of miles apart. At the present time it is not possible to obtain poles for the erection of transmission lines, and likewise it is not possible to obtain copper for the wire for the lines. However, if poles for the erection of the lines were available, it would not be possible to obtain the men to dig the holes for the poles; and if the necessary copper wire were available, it would not be possible to obtain the men needed to string the wires between the poles.

Mr. President, I wish to present the facts to the Senate. There is no authority for the proposed appropriation except one little section in the last Flood Control Act. That section of law does not authorize anyone to build steam plants or to build electric transmission lines. In that section of the law, just two words, namely, "related facilities," are relied upon as authority for the proposed development; and on the basis of those two words in that one section of the Flood Control Act the Southwest Power Administration, an agency of the Department of the Interior, is proposing to start a movement, as I have said, to cover six States with competing lines which are not necessary. Today those States are consuming all the power that can be generated from the two dams. The Denison Dam has a production capacity of only 35,000 kilowatts, and the Norfolk Dam has a production capacity of only 35,000 kilowatts. Both of these dams are operating. Every kilowatt of their production, both in wet weather and in dry weather, is now being sold. That means that both the peak power and the dump power is being sold. All of it is being sold. The lines are built to the dams.

From my viewpoint there is no occasion at this time to appropriate a single dollar for the purpose which is in view. Naturally, I am opposing the proposed appropriation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me say that it is perfectly obvious that my suggestion for a limitation upon debate has not met with an enthusiastic reception. [Laughter.]

I shall make another suggestion: Cannot we pass over this particular matter today and proceed with the other amendments which have previously been passed over, and then meet at 11 a. m. tomorrow?

Mr. HAYDEN. There are no other amendments which have been passed over; these two are the only ones remaining. So apparently the only thing to do is to have the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, let me say a further word. It is very unusual for a Senator to object to the expenditure of money in his State, and it is more exceptional to find that the Senators who represent six States are opposed to the appropriation of so large a sum of money to be expended in their States. I cannot speak for the State of Missouri. We have upon the floor of the Senate two Senators who can, and who no doubt will, speak for it. I cannot speak for the State of Arkansas or for the State of Kansas or for the other States that are involved. But their Senators are here and they will be heard from, either for or against the amendment.

It is my understanding that practically all the Senators from the six States are against this proposed appropriation. If that be true, I do not believe that the Senate should try to impose on those States the expenditure of such a large sum of money when it is not needed and when the expenditure would not be beneficial at the present time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in order that action may be taken during my absence, I want the RECORD to show that I have notified the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] of the point I raised yesterday in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill in regard to the funds to be expended in the administration of the business of the Klamath Tribe of Indians. There is no objection on my part to the adoption of the amount fixed in the report of the committee. I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that a question had been raised as to whether or not the amount was excessive, and that I was perfectly willing to follow the judgment of my senior colleague [Mr. CORDON], a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I have not had an opportunity to speak to him about it, and I want the RECORD to show that whatever judgment he reaches will be my judgment, but there is no objection to the report of the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have conferred with the Senator's colleague about the matter.

EXCUSING GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES FROM DUTY ON JULY 5, 1946

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, before the Senate takes a recess I wish to detain it for only 2 or 3 minutes, and I shall not even consume that much time unless I can obtain unanimous consent of the Senate to consider a bill which is rather limited in its scope, but must be acted upon immediately if it is to be effective. I refer to a bill which has been reported unanimously by the Civil Service Committee and is now on the calendar.

Mr. President, this year the Fourth of July falls on a Thursday, and it is proposed by the bill to give to the Federal workers a holiday on the following Friday, conditional on the desire of the head of the agency concerned, and conditional also on the employee making up the day on some succeeding Saturday in July.

Some of the heads of the agencies have reported that when a holiday falls on Thursday and the employees are required to return to work on the next day, or Friday, and then not work on Saturday, not nearly as much service is obtained from the employee as when he is allowed a 3-day holiday and makes up on some succeeding Saturday the time which has been lost. All the advising authorities have recommended the passage of the bill. The Civil Service Committees of the two Houses are in favor of it. The committee meeting was given prestige by the presence of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and the distinguished Senator from Virginia, as well as distinguished Republican Senators.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, were distinguished Republican Senators present?

Mr. DOWNEY. The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] was present.

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely wanted to make sure.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1540, Senate bill 2335.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2335) to excuse employees of the Government from work on July 5, 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, employees of the executive branch of the Government, employees of the District of Columbia municipal government, employees of the legislative branch whose basic workweek is fixed in accordance with section 604 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, employees of the Government Printing Office, and employees of the judicial branch who occupy positions subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, may, in the discretion of the heads of their respective departments, establishments, and agencies, be excused

from duty on July 5, 1946. The absence on such date of any employee so excused shall be without loss of pay or charge to annual leave or accrued compensatory time if, during the month of July 1946, such employee performs work (without pay or time credit therefor) outside of the regularly scheduled hours of duty in any administrative workweek, at a time or times, other than Sundays, to be selected by the head of his department, establishment, or agency, for the number of hours for which compensation is paid with respect to July 5, 1946. July 5, 1946, shall not be construed to be a holiday within the meaning of section 302 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, or any other provision of law or regulation authorizing payment of compensation at premium rates for holiday work, and shall not be construed as a nonworkday within the meaning of any leave regulation.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR JOHN H. BANKHEAD

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 288, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 288) submitted by Mr. HILL on June 18, 1946, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. John H. Bankhead, late a Senator from the State of Alabama, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY MILITARY OR CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate passed Senate bill 2200, which was identical with House bill 6454. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6454.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6454) to amend the act approved July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army," was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate passed Senate bill 2141, which was identical with House bill 6393. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 6393.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6393) to amend the act entitled "An act for the creation of an American Battle Monuments Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1923, as amended, in order to extend the Commission's authority to all areas in which our armed forces have operated during World War II, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I desire to enter motions to reconsider the votes by which the Senate passed Senate bill 2200 and Senate bill 2141, and I ask unanimous consent that the other House be requested to return the bills to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO PSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4512) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MURRAY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HILL, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. AIKEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

RENT CONTROL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, last Friday when bills on the calendar were being considered, Order of Business 1396, Senate bill 2219, which relates to the extension of an act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, was objected to, and the bill was passed over. The Senator who made the objection has since withdrawn it. It is important that the bill be passed, because the Rent Control Act affecting the District of Columbia would otherwise expire on the 28th of this month. It has no relation to the OPA.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1396, Senate bill 2219.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2219) to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I was the Senator who made the objection to which the Senator from North Carolina has referred. I objected to consideration of the bill on the basis that, if we were not to have any price control or rent control anywhere else in the United States, I did not believe we should single out Washington as an exception. However, if that very unfortunate situation should develop, we can then devote our attention to a further consideration of the matter. In the meantime, I have conferred with the Senator from North Carolina and believe that it would be well to have the bill enacted into law. Therefore I withdraw my objection. I want the RECORD to show that I stated, when the bill was called before, that I was not opposed to rent control. In fact, I was probably one of the foremost advocates of continuing rent control, but I have felt that we should make the control more effective than was provided for in the bill which the Senate passed the other day. That statement applies to price control as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2219) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1941, as amended, is further amended by striking out in section 1 (b) thereof the figure "1946" and inserting in lieu thereof "1947."

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6265, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia. There is an urgency for the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by its title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6265) to create a Department of Corrections in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Eldred D. Kuppinger, of Ohio, to be a foreign-service officer of class VI, a secretary in the diplomatic service, and a consul, and withdrawing the nomination of a postmaster, which nominating message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Paul V. McNutt, of Indiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of the Philippines; and

Sundry persons to be foreign-service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Fred M. Vinson, of Kentucky, to be Chief Justice of the United States; and

Nadine Lane Gallagher, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, vice Brice Clagett, elevated.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Adm. Gilchrist B. Stockton, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, while serving with the United States Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines, and to continue until release from active duty.

INTERNATIONAL SANITARY CONVENTION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably Executive D, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, a protocol to prolong the International Sanitary Convention, 1944, modifying the International Sanitary Convention of June 21, 1926, which was signed in Washington on behalf of the United States of America on April 30, 1946, with the reservation, "Subject to ratification", and I submit a report, Executive Report No. 6, thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the protocol will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

PROTOCOL TO PROLONG THE INTERNATIONAL SANITARY CONVENTION FOR AERIAL NAVIGATION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent to report Executive E, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, a protocol to prolong the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944, modifying the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation of April 12, 1933, which was signed on behalf of the United States of America on April 30, 1946, with the reservation, "Subject to ratification", and I submit a report, Executive Report No. 7, thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the protocol will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I also ask unanimous consent to report favorably Executive A, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, a certified copy of a Convention on International Civil Aviation, concluded at the International Civil Aviation Conference at Chicago on December 7, 1944, and signed in the English language by the respective plenipotentiaries of the Governments of the United States of America, the Philippine Commonwealth, and certain other countries, and I submit a report (Ex. Rept. No. 8) thereon.

In connection with this convention, the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], has been given any reasonable time he may elect to reserve to file a minority report if he wishes to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the reports will be received, and the convention will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

MODIFICATION OF CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND UNITED KINGDOM TO AVOID DOUBLE TAXATION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Executive F, a supplementary protocol, modifying in certain respects the convention between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, which was signed at Washington on April 16, 1945.

This protocol merely eliminates what the Committee on Foreign Relations thought was a discrimination against artists. The protocol has received the unanimous approval of the committee, and therefore I ask that the Senate dispose of it at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, there is not a large attendance of Senators at the moment, but in view of the statement of the Senator from Georgia as to the unanimity with which the protocol was approved by the Foreign Relations Committee, I think it to be highly appropriate that the matter be now disposed of.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe that the protocol should be disposed of, because it is really in the nature of an amendment to the treaty, but it was thought best to deal with it in the manner prescribed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the supplementary protocol?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider Executive F, a supplementary protocol, signed at Washington on June 6, 1946, modifying in certain respects the convention between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income which was signed at Washington on April 16, 1945.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The supplementary protocol is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the supplementary protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The supplementary protocol was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive F, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, a supplementary protocol, signed at Washington on June 6, 1946, modifying in certain respects the convention between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income which was signed at Washington on April 16, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the supplementary protocol is ratified.

The clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert L. Ailworth to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John White Stuart to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Holroyd McGinnis to be United States marshal for the southern district of West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY—NOMINATIONS PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that all nominations in the Army be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations will be passed over.

That completes the calendar.

SELECTIVE SERVICE REJECTIONS—ANALYSIS OF STATISTICS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, during the earlier sessions of our hearings on the national health insurance bill, questions were raised before the committee with respect to the implications of the statistics on selective service rejections, the extent of up-to-date health statistics, and the coverage of Blue Cross hospitalization plans.

In order to obtain expert analysis of these questions, I referred each of them to the Federal Security Administrator, Mr. Watson Miller.

I should now like to insert in the RECORD a set of communications from Mr. Miller commenting in detail on each of these points.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, May 17, 1946.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of April 26 requesting a report on the "statistics on selective service rejections,

together with a thorough analysis of Dr. Goin's assumptions and conclusions."

An analysis of some of the implications of selective service rejection statistics has been published by Mr. G. St. J. Perrott of the United States Public Health Service, in the American Journal of Public Health for April 1946. Enclosed is a copy of the Journal since reprints of the article are not yet available. From Perrott's analysis, the following points are to be noted:

1. It is difficult to evaluate the level of national health on the basis of rejection rates. "At any particular period the rejection rates tell only the relative number of individuals who did not qualify according to standards of that period. As has been seen, some of these standards had no relation to physical status."

2. Statistics on prevalence of defects among examined men offer a better index of the national health picture provided that all defects are properly identified and recorded. These statistics cover all the men examined, those rejected and those accepted, and disclose a great many more defects than shown by the rejection statistics.

3. Statistics on men examined between November 1940 and September 1941 reveal that 1,583 defects were found for each 1,000 men examined. Although some of the defects were minor and did not affect the individual's ability to serve in the armed forces, whatever their nature or their degree, the defects were of importance to the individuals concerned.

4. It must be noted that these examinations covered the Nation's young men, presumably our healthiest group. It follows that in the rest of the adult population the prevalence of defects must be far greater. The enormous volume of defects, in a sense, reveals that a less favorable picture exists than that furnished by the rejection figures.

5. Where comparisons were possible between statistics collected on the prevalence of defects in drafted men of World War I and World War II, little evidence was found of improvement between the two periods.

With reference to Dr. Goin's statements regarding the relationship of medical care to defects found in the drafted men, a most thorough discussion of the whole question appears in the hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate, pursuant to Senate Resolution 74. Of pertinent interest is the testimony given on July 10, 11, and 12, 1944, by such eminent medical authorities as Col. L. R. Rowntree, Maj. Gen. G. F. Lull, and Gen. W. C. Menninger, among others. Their statements do not bear out many of Dr. Goin's assertions, and provide definite answers to some of his allegations.

First of all, it is apparent that Dr. Goin gives the term "medical care" the restricted meaning of therapy, and does not include in it the broad preventive as well as rehabilitative measures which are today considered to be part of medical care. Thus, when he implies that medical care has nothing to do with the 701,700 men rejected for mental disease, he is contradicting the considered opinion of psychiatrists, including Colonel Menninger, who point out that there is need for psychiatrists and for mental hygiene programs to give the necessary preventive and early treatment to maladjusted individuals.

In the statement on the number rejected because of hernia, Dr. Goin asserts that the hernias were probably "so severe that the Army was unwilling to attempt repair." Major General Lull stated at the above-mentioned hearings that "we (the Army) have not at the present time the personnel nor the beds available to correct these defects."

I should like to point out also that the increasing expectancy of life and reduction in diphtheria rates, both of which Dr. Goin mentions, emphasize the value of mass attack on disease. These improvements have largely been brought about by work in the field of public health; the first by extension of prenatal care and of environmental sanitation, the other by immunization. The increase of life expectancy must, of course, be understood to have affected only the young and not the old; life expectancy after 40 years of age has increased hardly at all since 1900.

In sum, while it may be true that we are among the leading nations in health status, it should be clear by now that there is still a great deal of room for improvement. As the Selective Service findings clearly demonstrated, and I quote Colonel Rowntree, "We are not the vigorous people that we thought we were. The people must be educated to accept the fact that we have a high percentage of defects, deficiencies, disabilities, disorders, and diseases. We must be educated to demand medical care in proportion to the demonstrated need of that care."

Sincerely,

WATSON B. MILLER,
Administrator.

SELECTIVE SERVICE REJECTION STATISTICS AND SOME OF THEIR IMPLICATIONS

(By G. St. J. Perrott, F. A. P. H. A., Division of Public Health Methods, United States Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.)

President Truman in his health message to Congress on November 19, 1945, reported that the Selective Service System has brought the widespread physical and mental incapacity among the young people of the Nation "forcibly to our attention in terms which all of us can understand."

"As of April 1, 1945," the President stated, "nearly 5,000,000 male registrants between the ages of 18 and 37 had been examined and classified as unfit for military service. The number of those rejected for military service was about 30 percent of those examined. The percentage of rejection was lower in the younger age groups and higher in the higher age groups, reaching as high as 49 percent for registrants between the ages of 34 and 37. In addition, after actual induction, about a million and a half men had to be discharged from the Army and Navy for physical or mental disability, exclusive of wounds; and an equal number had to be treated in the armed forces for diseases or defects which existed before induction."

These facts are not new, as the President pointed out. Health authorities have been concerned about the serious state of ill health among American youth since late in 1941 when the Selective Service System published its first analysis of the health status of inductees. In this paper it is proposed to discuss the validity of the data as a measure of the prevalence of physical and mental defects and diseases, with particular reference to changes in prevalence which have occurred since 1918. The data will be examined with a view to estimating the significance of these findings to public health.

Rejection rates must be a first consideration in any evaluation of selective-service findings. These rates varied greatly during the war. In the first year of selective service, registrants were given complete physical examinations by local board physicians. Those who were found to be fit were sent to Army induction stations for final physical examination and, on the basis of this latter examination, were accepted or rejected for military service. Rejection rates for this period (November 1940, through September 1941) averaged 52.8 percent of all men examined. Following Pearl Harbor, a marked reduction was noted. This was probably due to pressure on local boards and induction stations for additional military manpower.

By January 1943 the rates reached an all-time low of 28 percent. They rose gradually during the year, however, reaching a high of 42 percent during the last 4 months of 1943. The increase is attributed mainly to: (1) a higher age average among men examined, and (2) a higher proportion of previously rejected men among examinees as local boards reclassified registrants in an effort to meet their quotas.

The decrease in the rejection rate from 42 to 31 percent by the end of the first five months of 1944 resulted largely from two conditions. The average age of men examined was lower than in the previous period, and examination facilities at induction stations were taxed by unusually heavy inpourings of selectees.

Rejection rates began again to increase by the middle of 1944, progressing steadily from 36 percent in June to 45 percent in November. The reasons were: Induction for limited service was halted in June; and in the same month psychological tests for mental capacity were modified so that some illiterates who previously would have been inducted were rejected. Moreover, during this period greater emphasis was placed on the need for inducting men suitable for combat replacements.

These changing procedures affecting the trend of rejection rates illustrate some of the difficulties involved in evaluating the level of national health in terms of acceptance or rejection for military duty. [At any particular period the rejection rates tell only the relative number of individuals who did not qualify according to standards of that period. As has been seen, some of these standards had no relation to physical status.]

In discussing rejection rates, Col. Leonard G. Rowntree, Chief, Medical Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, said: "Rejection rates based upon the number of registrants rejected for military service per 1,000 men examined have limitations in their use as criteria of good civilian health. Rejection rates are dependent upon too many factors, as for instance (1) changes in standards of induction, (2) changing deferment policies, (3) varying numbers of registrants by age, race, urban-rural areas, all of which introduce variable correctable only through the calculation of specific rejection rates, (4) whether a registrant is coming up for the first, second, third, or fourth examination, and (5) how far military standards exceed those required of normal civilian living. Selective Service, therefore, regards the rejection rate per 1,000 men examined as useful in measuring the Nation's health only in terms of the limitations placed upon such rates. The incidence of all recorded defects in accepted and rejected men is a better index of the health picture. The latter is only limited insofar as all defects may not be recorded."

In addition to this limitation, however, there are other elements that must be considered in any attempt to arrive at a true evalution. These include differences in examining techniques at various examination centers, idiosyncrasies of the examining personnel, and the attitudes of the examinees.

A comparison of the reports for November 1940 through September 1941 and for April 1942 through December 1943 illustrates the effects of these factors on selective-service findings of the prevalence of disease and disability.

In the first report 1,583 defects per 1,000 men examined were recorded; in the second, 1,000.2 defects for each 1,000 examinees. Between the two periods, the coding procedures were changed so that the complete list of defects was not always available in the 1942–43 data. Since the defects were summarized in order of significance, the limitations of coding would result in the omission of less significant defects and account, at least partly, for the drop in rate.

The effect of such omission and of the other stated factors can be gaged by a comparison of rates for specific kinds of defects.

For example, in 1940–41 when the coding was more complete and when flat feet were a cause for rejection, foot defects, with an average of 172.4 per 1,000 men, led the list of disabilities. By 1942–43, however, minor foot ailments were considered unimportant, and reporting on this category fell to 54.6 per 1,000 examinees. Similarly, dental defects—averaging 167.8 per 1,000 men—were second highest among defects listed for 1940–41. By 1942–43, the incidence had fallen to 113.0 per 1,000 examinees. This, likely, was due to the failure of examining personnel to record all cases of carious or missing teeth, or to give dental defects sufficient precedence for inclusion in the coding, since these defects no longer were cause for deferment.

Marked decreases also are found in the prevalence of throat diseases, skin diseases, and defects of the abdominal viscera as the need for more military personnel grew urgent and examining physicians tended to concentrate on the more serious defects. The relatively minor conditions were included as secondary defects only and thus omitted in the coding.

On the other hand, reports of important defects remained fairly constant in 1942–43. Eye defects, for example, varied only slightly in the two periods. There also was little change in the reported prevalence of neurological diseases, or of diseases of the lung, kidney, and ear. A large proportion of conditions in these groups of defects were outright causes for rejection; and reporting, necessarily, was fairly complete.

The great increase in the incidence of tuberculosis (9.7 to 19.1) is accounted for largely by a change in examination procedure. Chest X-rays did not become an examination routine until 1942; therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that many cases of tuberculosis among pre-Pearl Harbor inductees passed through examining stations undetected.

The wide variations in reports of educational and mental deficiency recorded for the two periods are easily traceable to different definitions of "educational deficiency" in effect during the two periods. Between November 1940, and May 15, 1941, regulations stated that registrants were acceptable who "appear to have normal understanding, whose speech can be understood, who have no definite signs of organic disease of the brain, spinal cord or peripheral nerves, and who are otherwise mentally and physically fit." During this period, illiteracy was mentioned in the records of 3.6 registrants per 1,000 examined. On May 15, 1941, however, the standards were raised to require that a registrant should be able to "read and write the English language as well as a student who has completed 4 years in an American grammar school." These standards remained in force until April 1, 1942. As could be expected, rates for educational and mental deficiency rose in the period.

Mental disease, which was high among the more serious defects in both periods, was found in 67.5 men out of every 1,000 examined in 1942–43. At the top of the list among these diseases were psychoneurotic disorders, psychopathic personality, and grave mental or personality disorders. Since serious attention was given by examining physicians to evidence of mental disease in both periods, and since the reports for the periods are consistent, it could be concluded that reporting and coding of the incidence of mental disease was fairly accurate.

These comparisons bring out the fact that the order of defects may have been closely associated with prevailing regulations for the rejection or acceptance of examinees for military service. The judgment of the idividual examiner in evaluating the relative importance of a series of defects also must be considered as a factor in determining the listing. It is likely, then, that reporting on many defects varied as selective-service regulations changed; that recording of secondary defects tended to be overlooked as coding procedures were simplified, and that the opinion of examining physicians in classifying defects according to relative importance was associated to some degree with military standards.

Review of the figures leaves little doubt that the findings for 1940–1941 more clearly approach the actual prevalence of defects, although how close that approach is can only be guessed. There seems reasons to believe that the figures present a fair picture of the prevalence of major defects—with allowances made for variations in examining techniques, in the judgment of examining physcians and in the recording and coding of defects. It also seems obvious that the many factors which influenced the recognition and recording of secondary defects detract from the accuracy of the reports.

None of the factors which have influenced the reporting and coding, however, obscures the enormous volume of defects. Since all defects—whatever their nature or degree of concern to military authorities—are of importance to the individuals affected, the findings of Selective Service pose a public health problem which must be solved before good health can be achieved for the population.

Too much emphasis is still placed on the decline in mortality as a measure of achievement in health work. Death is by no means the sole measure of the level of national health. To raise the health level, it is essential that increased attention be given to preventing and curing those conditions which cause illness or which reduce the capacity of the individual.

Since the last war the national mortality rate has declined by 3.1 per 1,000 population. Among young men 20 to 34 years, the death rate has gone down nearly 30 percent. One could feel more complacent if this reduction in mortality were associated with an equal reduction in disability. But such is not the case as comparison of the findings in World War I with those of World War II illustrates.

Reports on the prevalence of defects in the first war show that 661.9 defects were recorded per 1,000 men examined—in contrast to 1,000.2 defects per 1,000 in 1942–43 and 1,583.3 in 1940–41. Just as the differences between the 1940–41 and the 1942–43 data are due largely to the coding of the diseases, so it must be suspected that failure to record many minor defects in World War I accounts for a major part of the discrepancy in the records of the two wars. In addition, differences in the medical terminology of the two periods make it difficult to determine the exact classification of defects in many instances. Diagnosis of a number of diseases also underwent refinement in the interval between wars.

As a result, although wide variations in some general groupings will be noted, differences in specific categories, where similarity in terminology permits comparison in the two periods are not always as great as might be expected. Among diseases of the eye, for instance, 61 defects per 1,000 men examined were found in 1917–18, against 123.5 in 1940–41. Yet for bilateral and unilateral blindness—an easily defined defect which can be assumed to have been reported in the same sategory for both wars—the difference is small. Similarly, there is only small variation in recordings of the incidence of trachoma and the slight decrease noted in 1940–41 may point to some public-health accomplishment in the conquest of this disease.

Increased medical knowledge is a factor that cannot be overlooked in comparing the incidence of a number of defects. This is particularly true of asthma, cardiovascular disease, and venereal disease. Since diagnosis of these conditions is much more frequent throughout the population today than 20 years ago, it follows that the incidence among a selected group in 1940 should be greater than in 1917.

Variations in the incidence of tuberculosis are of especial interest since examination procedures in effect in 1940–41 more closely approximated those of 1917 than in any other period of World War II. Moreover, the decline in incidence rates for the two periods bear fairly close resemblance to the drop in the national tuberculosis mortality rate between 1920 (113.1) and 1940 (45.9). Since the incidence of tuberculosis increased markedly with the inauguration of chest X-rays as an examination routine—moving to 19.1 per 1,000 men in 1942–43—it seems evident that (1) considerable tuberculosis when undiscovered in 1917–18, and (2) that the incidence of the disease actually was lower in 1940 than 20 years previously.

Loss of members is an obvious defect that cannot be influenced by any of the elements affecting reporting or diagnostic procedures; therefore, these figures can be accepted at face value. The great similarity in rates for this type of defect, as well as for others which are easily observed, leads to the conclusion that the prevalence of a number of defects in 1917 was probably about the same as in 1940–41.

Certainly, evidence of great improvement is not reflected in the comparison. While slight decreases may be indicated in the incidence of a few defects and diseases over the 20-year period, they are too small to be proof of progress. Examination of the findings of World War I and World War II, then, seems to attest to the conclusion that the health level of the American people has not improved in the same degree as mortality for at least two decades.

The central fact remains that the findings of both wars show an enormous amount of ill health in the population.

During and after World War I, draft data were reviewed, analyzed, and interpreted. Over the ensuing years, medical statisticians decried the low level of health among the Nation's young men and viewed the situation with alarm. It is regrettable that the papers produced by these statisticians represent the sole use to which the findings of World War were put.

Now, once more, protests are being raised against the health level—this time based on the amount of defects found among the sons of World War I examinees. It is to be hoped that the implications of these latest wartime health reports will be regarded as an index of the degree of actual need and will be utilized in planning health services which must be supplied to bring to oncoming generations the benefits of knowledge already at hand.

Reports of defects found among young men examined for military duty in World War II can serve as signposts to health authorities in plotting future activity. Much of the past achievement in public health has been due to the application by health departments of epidemiological case finding techniques to the control of disease spread. Selective service data make available a new source of information for evaluating the relative extent of particular physical and mental defects.

The President in his recommendations to the Congress for the establishment of a national health program has used the reports on medical examinations of selectees to gage the total health needs of the country. Nation-wide programs for the prevention and cure of tuberculosis, venereal diseases, and other communicable diseases are now authorized by the Congress. State and local health authorities can use selective service findings to ascertain where existing programs should be strengthened and what additional services are required. In the past, health authorities have turned to mortality rates as

a major index for determining problems of public health significance. The limitations of these rates in evaluating health needs have been recognized. Knowledge provided by mortality statistics is confined to deaths resulting from specific diseases. A well organized attack on the whole health front requires comprehensive and current information on the prevalence of disease and defects—in short, complete morbidity reporting in every State. In lieu of this, selective service data, while not so accurate, offer an immediate and potent source of information on the prevalence of those defects which it is within the province of public health to prevent or remedy.

TABLE 1.—*Prevalence of certain recorded defects among drafted men, World War I [1] and World War II [2]*

Diseases or defects	Rate per 1,000 men examined	
	World War I	World War II
All diseases or defects	661.9	[3] 1,583.3
Eyes	[3] 61.0	[3] 123.5
Blindness, bilateral and unilateral	7.5	6.5
Trachoma	1.2	0.5
Defective vision	46.3	83.3
Ears	[3] 15.4	[3] 50.1
Defective hearing	7.1	9.4
Otitis media	7.3	8.3
Asthma	2.3	5.4
Hypertrophic tonsillitis	33.8	44.1
Tuberculosis (all forms)	24.7	9.7
Cardiovascular	[3] 50.2	[3] 83.1
Valvular diseases of the heart	29.6	12.7
Cardiac hypertrophy	4.2	2.8
Tachycardia	5.0	6.7
Hernia and inguinal rings	55.4	[3] 79.7
Hernia	27.6	34.8
Enlarged rings	27.8	34.4
Venereal diseases	46.7	38.1
Gonorrhea	36.0	7.1
Syphilis	9.5	30.8
Chancroid	1.2	0.2
Varicose veins and varicocele	8.8	32.1
Mental deficiency	12.2	15.3
Epilepsy	3.9	3.7
Mental alienation	3.8	16.3
Crippled or paralyzed members	48.7	76.8
Lost members:		
Upper extremities:		
Fingers	7.6	7.1
Other	1.6	1.5
Lower extremities	4.6	3.6
Flat feet	104.4	162.0
Curvature of the spine	7.7	15.0

[1] From table 4 in Britten, R. H., and Perrott, G. St. J., Summary of Physical Findings on Men Drafted In the World War. Public Health Reports 56:41-62, 1941.
[2] From Table 7 in Selective Service System, Causes of Rejection and Incidence of Defects. Med. Stat. Bull. No. 2 (Aug. 1), 1943.
[3] The sum of the rates for specific categories of defects does not always add to the rate for the general category because of the omission of specific categories not comparable to the two periods: World War I and World War II.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, May 29, 1946.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of April 10, 1946, requesting information on the extent of up-to-date statistics on the health of the Nation and the need for medical care.

Current or very recent data are available for numerous aspects of the medical care problem. Among these are data on mortality, the incidence of communicable disease, the findings of selective service examinations, the number of physicians, dentists, and hospitals, the use of hospital beds, membership in health and hospital insurance plans, and family expenditures for medical care.

When these data are examined, particularly in their geographical detail, a great deal of variation among States and communities is to be observed which is correlated with economic status. In the poorer States, for example, the infant and maternal mortality rates are higher, there are fewer hospital facilities, and physicians and dentists, and less hospitalization. This is clearly shown in the enclosed table. It is obvious that the populations of the poorer areas do not get as much care as those of the richer since the poorer areas do not attract sufficient medical personnel and facilities. The effects are reflected in such items as increased infant and maternal mortality rates.

That the wealthier groups in the population obtain more medical services confirms the more detailed findings of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care in 1929 and of the National Health Survey in 1935–36. Both studies, one made in a period of prosperity, the other during a depression, brought out the economic inequalities in the prevalence of sickness and the utilization of medical care facilities. This inequality is apparently always present, and is further illustrated in the pattern of family spending for medical care. Studies in 1929, 1935, 1941, and 1944, all show that the wealthier the family the greater the amount in dollars spent for medical care, yet the poorer families have to spend a greater proportionate amount of their total income for such care.

We trust that this letter answers your request, and we shall be glad to supply any data you may desire.

Sincerely,

WATSON B. MILLER,
Administrator.

Certain health indexes in States grouped according to income

	Year of data	1942 per capita buying income (in dollars)			
		Under 600	600–799	800–999	1,000 and over
Number of States	-----	14	12	11	11
Infant mortality rate (deaths under 1 year per 1,000 births)	1943	48.1	43.8	39.4	36.5
Maternal mortality rate (puerperal deaths per 1,000 births)	1943	3.3	2.4	2.0	1.9
General and allied special hospital beds per 1,000 population	1942	2.5	3.4	4.2	4.3
Persons per physician	1940	1,291	967	898	743
Persons per dentist	1940	3,787	2,120	1,775	1,573
Percent of births hospitalized	1943	47.2	74.5	83.4	89.4

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, May 29, 1946.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of April 10, 1946, asking for information relative to the testimony of Mr. William Logan Martin on private health insurance plans in Alabama.

Mr. Martin testified that in Alabama arrangements have been made "for hospital organizations to include and provide for doctors' care," and that "for a maximum payment of $49 a year, any size family from 2 to 20 can get the medical service it needs."

Mr. Martin's statements are correct in part and incorrect in part. In Alabama the Blue Cross plan—Hospital Service Corp. of Alabama—in 1945 expanded its scope of service to include physicians' services in the hospital. (It is one of eight Blue Cross plans which have done this; elsewhere the same objectives have been attained through the development of separate medical plans which are affiliated with the Blue Cross plan.) This plan offers two hospital contracts; one at a cost of $2.20 a month for a family offers care in a private room, the other at a cost of $1.50 a month for a family offers ward care. Both contracts provide 21 days of care for each member of the family in the first year of membership, 22 days in the second year, 23 days in the third, 24 in the fourth, 25 in the fifth, and 26 days per year thereafter. Both contracts define a family as husband, wife, and all children over 60 days and under 16 years of age. The hospital care furnished in addition to room and board and the general floor nursing includes use of operating or delivery room, anesthesia supplies, regular laboratory services, regular drugs and medications, and dressings and casts. There is a waiting period of 12 months for maternity care.

The plan offers a medical contract at a cost of $2 a month for a family. This covers surgery (in the hospital, office or home), obstetrical service (delivery), physicians' visits in the hospital for medical cases, and, for hospital bed patients only, anesthesia service up to $15 per admission, X-ray service up to $15 per admission, radioactive treatment up to $10, physiotherapy up to $15, allergy tests up to $10, special laboratory services up to $10, and basal metabolism or electrocardiographic tests up to $5 for each test. There is a waiting period of 12 months for obstetrical service and of 3 months for tonsils or adenoid operations. The benefits are not in the form of services but consist of indemnity allowances against the physician's charge. Thus, the allowance for a tonsillectomy is $25, for a normal delivery $50, appendectomy $100, and single hernia, $75. For physicians' visits in the hospital, $2 for each visit is allowed. The physician can charge the patient extra beyond these allowances if he wishes. In sum, for a payment of $50.40 a year, a family would receive fairly complete coverage for hospital care and physicians' services in the hospital. With ward service the same coverage could be obtained for $42 a year. However, in neither case would physicians' services in the home and office be covered.

As of January 1, 1946, 141,066 persons in Alabama—5.2 percent of the State's population—had the hospital coverage, and 7,018 persons had the medical coverage.

Nationally, the Blue Cross Hospital Service plans had an enrollment on April 1, 1946, of 20,000,000 persons. These have proved the most successful application of the insurance principle to hospitalization in the United States. However, Dr. J. W. Mountin, Chief of the Division of States Relations, U. S. Public Health Service, in his testimony on S. 1606, made the following statement about the voluntary plans, which coincides with my own views:

"An evaluation of this program compels me to point out, however, that despite the unprecedented economic prosperity of the last few years, membership in these plans is largely concentrated in a few industrialized States and that some 85 percent of our population remains without this hospitalization protection. Moreover, the insurance protection offered under this program encompasses hardly more than the 15 percent of the total medical care bill of the average American family.

"As for comprehensive medical care insurance, experience in this country so far gives even less reason to be sanguine for a significant future expansion. Despite a history that dates back to the nineteenth century, insurance for anything approaching general medical and hospital services—rarely, indeed including dental, home nursing or other

special items—encompasses less than 3 percent of our national population.

"All of these considerations have led the Public Health Service to the conclusion that only a Nation-wide program of medical care, under official auspices, holds the promise of assuring adequate medical care for all the people."

I shall be glad to furnish your committee with any other data on this subject which will be helpful in consideration of the provisions of the national health bill (S. 1606).

Sincerely,

WATSON B. MILLER,
Administrator.

BLACK MARKET IN MEAT—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON TRAVELER

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, without burdening the Senate to read it, I ask unanimous consent that a short editorial entitled "Black Market," from the Boston Traveler of Tuesday, June 18, be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLACK MARKET

The Traveler exposed the Boston black market in meat last Saturday. The OPA came along and took over some of its wares. It had them on display yesterday, as foul and menacing a display of poison as we have ever seen. This was the "food" the black market was foisting onto a hungry city.

It was no display garnered in areas where the underprivileged always live close to the border line. Much of it came from the blue-ribbon suburbs, places like Newton and Wellesley. Anyone fool enough to buy it would lose his money, fool enough to eat it, and he might lose his life.

Well, that is the American standard of living in New England, at the end of the line, in these days when Government controls have so completely overturned the normal economic laws. The planned economy has had its logical outcome, a bare counter, a throng clamoring outside it, a few prewrapped bundles of moldy meat beneath it. Man kills the thing he loves the best. We loved the rich productivity of America. We killed it.

But it is not really dead. Let us do the proper things and it will come back to life. Let us punish these rascals who would fatten on a helpless population. Let the United States attorney and the OPA hale them to justice. But then let us do the things which will insure us that they will have no successors.

Let us restore the principle of free enterprise. Let us cut loose with all the speed practical from the shackles of price control. Let us admit the mistake so much of it has been, face about and return to the past, the American past which made this country productive and prosperous. If this is postwar America, give us a prewar America.

RECESS

Mr. HAYDEN. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 20, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate June 19 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Eldred D. Kuppinger, of Ohio, to be a foreign-service officer of class 6, a secretary in the diplomatic service, and a consul of the United States of America.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 19 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Robert L. Ailworth to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia.

John White Stuart to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

William Holroyd McGinnis to be United States marshal for the southern district of West Virginia.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 19 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

POSTMASTER

TEXAS

Mrs. Oneta M. Hazel to be postmaster at Wink, in the State of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father most holy, with deep reverence we wait at the footstool of prayer, asking for courage to forsake that which is wrong and unwise and accept the things which are right and prudent. Give us the faith that will set in motion ministries that lead out into strong, healthy freedom; give us companionship that will keep us free from doubt and make us willing to stoop to the humblest and the lowliest things. O may we not seek the trumpet call of praise; let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall. Subdue any heart of hate or mind shaded with brooding thoughts of anger. O Thou who dost protect those who put their trust in Thee, lift our little life craft from the shallows and float it out into the great deep of peace that comes from the tides of a good God. At the close of this day, dear Lord, grant us to have no regrets for the past or fears for the future, and praise shall be thine forever, Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 18, 1946:

H. R. 1852. An act for the relief of R. H. White Transfer & Storage Co., of Nashville, Tenn.;

H. R. 2337. An act for the relief of H. H. Hood; and

H. R. 5718. An act to facilitate the liquidation of Washington Railway & Electric Co.

On June 19, 1946:

H. R. 1782. An act for the relief of Ida F. Braun, Alice Braun Menges, and Carl J. Braun, individually and as executors of the estate of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as legatees and beneficiaries of the will of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as the sole parties in interest by succession under the last will and testament of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and under the last will and testament of Herman W. Braun, deceased; and

H. R. 5060. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," approved May 27, 1924.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4983. An act to provide for adjustments in connection with the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 5444. An act to revive and reenact and amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near the city of Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., to a point opposite thereto in the county of Union, State of Kentucky," approved July 18, 1939;

H. R. 6195. An act to amend section 1 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 658);

H. R. 6572. An act to provide military assistance to the Republic of the Philippines in establishing and maintaining national security and to form a basis for participation by that government in such defensive military operations as the future may require; and

H. R. 6699. An act to decrease the amount of obligations, issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5626. An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2133. An act to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1460. An act to fix the salary of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2091) entitled "An act for the relief of Joseph E. Bennett," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. WILSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2192) entitled "An act for the relief of Andre Dacharry," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. WHERRY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5244) entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5605) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 66 and 67 to the foregoing bill.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

JUNE 19, 1946.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the secretary of the Commonwealth of the State of Pennsylvania, I have received the certificate of election of Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-ninth Congress from the Thirty-third Congressional District to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. Samuel A. Weiss.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.
By H. NEWLIN MEGILL.

Mr. BUCHANAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION ACT, JUNE 30, 1947

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6429) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. CURLEY, Mr. KOPPLEMANN, Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, Mr. TIBBOTT, and Mr. HORAN.

REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5356) to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a naval establishment, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. DREWRY, Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and Mr. COLE of New York.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 162]

Adams	Gifford	Peterson, Ga.
Andrews, N. Y.	Gore	Philbin
Baldwin, Md.	Gossett	Ploeser
Baldwin, N. Y.	Granger	Powell
Barden	Hall,	Reece, Tenn.
Bates, Mass.	Leonard W.	Robertson,
Bell	Halleck	N. Dak.
Bennet, N. Y.	Hancock	Roe, N. Y.
Bloom	Harness, Ind.	Rogers, Fla.
Boren	Harris	Sadowski
Boykin	Hart	Sasscer
Bradley, Mich.	Heffernan	Shafer
Buckley	Heselton	Sharp
Bunker	Hook	Sheridan
Butler	Jackson	Slaughter
Byrne, N. Y.	Jensen	Sparkman
Byrnes, Wis.	Kee	Starkey
Campbell	Keefe	Stewart
Cannon, Fla.	King	Stigler
Clason	Klein	Sumner, Ill.
Cochran	Lane	Sundstrom
Colmer	LeFevre	Tarver
Cooley	Lemke	Taylor
Courtney	Lesinski	Tibbott
Cox	Luce	Tolan
Curley	Ludlow	Torrens
Dawson	Lynch	Traynor
De Lacey	McCowen	Vinson
Dingell	McGehee	Voorhis, Calif.
Domengeaux	McMillan, S. C.	Wasielewski
Dondero	Mankin	Welch
Doyle	Mansfield, Tex.	West
Durham	Morgan	Wickersham
Engle, Calif.	Morrison	Winstead
Fallon	Norrell	Winter
Fellows	Norton	Wolfenden, Pa.
Folger	O'Brien, Ill.	Woodhouse
Fuller	O'Hara	
Gardner	Patrick	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 318 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 308, nays 2, answered "present" 2, not voting 120, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

YEAS—308

Abernethy	Barrett, Pa.	Bradley, Pa.
Allen, La.	Barrett, Wyo.	Brehm
Almond	Bates, Ky.	Brooks
Andersen,	Beall	Brown, Ga.
H. Carl	Beckworth	Brown, Ohio
Anderson, Calif.	Bender	Bryson
Andresen,	Bennett, Mo.	Buchanan
August H.	Biemiller	Buck
Andrews, Ala.	Bishop	Buckley
Angell	Blackney	Buffett
Arnold	Bland	Bulwinkle
Auchincloss	Bonner	Bunker
Butler	Hartley	O'Brien, Mich.
Byrne, N. Y.	Havenner	O'Hara
Camp	Hays	O'Konski
Canfield	Healy	O'Neal
Cannon, Mo.	Hébert	O'Toole
Carlson	Hedrick	Outland
Carnahan	Hendricks	Pace
Case, N. J.	Henry	Patterson
Case, S. Dak.	Herter	Peterson, Fla.
Celler	Heselton	Pfeifer
Chapman	Hess	Phillips
Chelf	Hill	Pickett
Chenoweth	Hinshaw	Pittenger
Chiperfield	Hobbs	Plumley
Church	Hoch	Pratt
Clark	Hoeven	Price, Fla.
Clevenger	Hoffman, Mich.	Price, Ill.
Clippinger	Hoffman, Pa.	Priest
Coffee	Holifield	Quinn, N. Y.
Cole, Kans.	Holmes, Mass.	Rabaut
Cole, Mo.	Holmes, Wash.	Rabin
Cole, N. Y.	Hope	Rains
Combs	Horan	Ramey
Cooper	Howell	Randolph
Corbett	Huber	Rankin
Cravens	Hull	Rayfiel
Crawford	Izac	Reed, Ill.
Crosser	Jarman	Reed, N. Y.
Cunningham	Jenkins	Rees, Kans.
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Resa
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Ill.	Rich
Daughton, Va.	Johnson, Ind.	Richards
Delaney,	Johnson,	Riley
James J.	Lyndon B.	Rivers
Delaney,	Jones	Rizley
John J.	Jonkman	Robertson, Va.
D'Ewart	Judd	Robinson, Utah
Dirksen	Kean	Robsion, Ky.
Dolliver	Kearney	Rockwell
Doughton, N. C.	Kefauver	Rodgers, Pa.
Douglas, Calif.	Kelley, Pa.	Roe, Md.
Douglas, Ill.	Kelly, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Doyle	Keogh	Rogers, Mass.
Drewry	Kerr	Rogers, N. Y.
Dworshak	Kilburn	Rooney
Earthman	Kilday	Rowan
Eaton	Kinzer	Russell
Eberharter	Kirwan,	Ryter
Elliott	Knutson	Sabath
Ellis	Kopplemann	Sasscer
Elsaesser	Kunkel	Savage
Elston	LaFollette	Schwabe, Mo.
Ervin	Landis	Schwabe, Okla.
Feighan	Lanham	Scrivner
Fenton	Larcade	Short
Fernandez	Latham	Sikes
Fisher	Lea	Simpson, Ill.
Flannagan	Lewis	Simpson, Pa.
Flood	Link	Smith, Maine
Fogarty	Luce	Smith, Ohio
Forand	Lynch	Smith, Va.
Fulton	McConnell	Smith, Wis.
Gamble	McCormack	Somers, N. Y.
Gardner	McDonough	Spence
Gary	McGlinchey	Springer
Gathings	McGregor	Stefan
Gavin	McKenzie	Stevenson
Gearhart	McMillen, Ill.	Stockman
Geelan	Madden	Sullivan
Gerlach	Mahon	Sumners, Tex.
Gibson	Manasco	Taber
Gillespie	Mansfield,	Talbot
Gillette	Mont.	Talle
Gillie	Marcantonio	Thom
Goodwin	Martin, Iowa	Thomas, N. J.
Gordon	Martin, Mass.	Thomason
Gorski	Mason	Towe
Graham	Mathews	Trimble
Granahan	May	Vorys, Ohio
Grant, Ala.	Merrow	Wadsworth
Grant, Ind.	Michener	Walter
Green	Miller, Calif.	Weaver
Gregory	Miller, Nebr.	Weichel
Griffiths	Mills	White
Gross	Monroney	Whitten
Gwinn, N. Y.	Mundt	Whittington
Gwynne, Iowa	Murdock	Wigglesworth
Hagen	Murphy	Wilson
Hale	Murray, Tenn.	Winter
Hall,	Murray, Wis.	Wolcott
Edwin Arthur	Neely	Wolverton, N. J.
Hare	Norblad	Woodruff
Harless, Ariz.	Norrell	Worley

NAYS—2

Lyle Poage

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Bailey Hand

NOT VOTING—120

Adams	Baldwin, Md.	Bates, Mass.
Allen, Ill.	Baldwin, N. Y.	Bell
Andrews, N. Y.	Barden	Bennet, N. Y.
Arends	Barry	Bloom

Bolton	Halleck	Ploeser
Boren	Hancock	Powell
Boykin	Harness, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.
Bradley, Mich.	Harris	Robertson, N. Dak.
Brumbaugh	Hart	Roe, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Heffernan	Sadowski
Campbell	Hook	Shafer
Cannon, Fla.	Jackson	Sharp
Clason	Jennings	Sheppard
Clements	Jensen	Sheridan
Cochran	Johnson, Luther A.	Slaughter
Colmer	Johnson, Okla.	Sparkman
Cooley	Kee	Starkey
Courtney	Keefe	Stewart
Cox	King	Stigler
Curley	Klein	Sumner, Ill.
Davis	Lane	Sundstrom
Dawson	LeCompte	Tarver
De Lacy	LeFevre	Taylor
Dingell	Lemke	Thomas, Tex.
Domengeaux	Lesinski	Tibbott
Dondero	Ludlow	Tolan
Durham	McCowen	Torrens
Ellsworth	McGehee	Traynor
Engel, Mich.	McMillan, S. C.	Vinson
Engle, Calif.	Maloney	Voorhis, Calif.
Fallon	Mankin	Vursell
Fellows	Mansfield, Tex.	Wasielewski
Folger	Morgan	Welch
Fuller	Morrison	West
Gallagher	Norton	Wickersham
Gifford	O'Brien, Ill.	Winstead
Gore	Patman	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gossett	Patrick	Wood
Granger	Peterson, Ga.	Woodhouse
Hall, Leonard W.	Philbin	Zimmerman

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Adams.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Hook with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. King with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. De Lacy with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. Folger with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Sundstrom.
Mr. Torrens with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.
Mr. Voorhis of California with Mr. Sharp.

Mr. MARCANTONIO changed his vote from "nay" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6024, I may have permission to revise and extend the remarks I intend to make and include certain pertinent material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bill which he is introducing today.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include pertinent material.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the reply thereto.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. GRANT of Alabama) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune and an editorial from the New York Sun.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five separate instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a report of the Veterans' Administration. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $120, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech of Mr. William J. Kennedy.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a resolution from the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include three newspaper editorials.

IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN FOOD PRODUCTS INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, a rather curious situation exists in the United States at the present time. The United States is being asked by many nations of the world, and it is willingly complying with that request, to feed the starving people of these nations. At the same time a large quantity of concentrated foods, even greater than the prewar quantities—including dates, figs, walnuts, almonds, filberts, cashews, and other food products—are being shipped from those countries, or from the immediately adjacent areas, to this country to be sold for American dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I have a special order on the program for tomorrow afternoon at which time I shall give some of the figures incident to this situation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—STREAM POLLUTION

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, this is Calendar Wednesday, and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has a bill on the Calendar. I assume that it will be reached very shortly, but if anything happens that it is not reached, I want to say that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has for presentation to this House one of the most important bills pending in Congress at this time. That bill is H. R. 6024, introduced by the chairman of the committee, relating to the prevention and control of water pollution and for other purposes. As a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors it has been my privilege and my duty to sit on that committee over a number of years listening to testimony that has to do with this subject.

This pending legislation, Mr. Speaker, represents a decision of the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee as a result of hearings which have been held recently. The report of the committee—Report No. 1929, Seventy-ninth Congress—sets forth the purpose of the legislation and explains the different sections of the pending bill. I am supporting this measure and hope that it may be promptly passed by the House of Rep-

resentatives so that it can be considered by the Senate before the final adjournment of Congress.

Legislation to correct the menace of pollution of our lakes, streams, and rivers is long overdue. Pollution is not limited to the disposal of sewage. Industrial establishments contribute all sorts of waste dumped into our streams and lakes, which not only works injury to the fish and wildlife but is a real menace to the health of our people.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I have attended hearings over a period of years when various bills have been presented to the Rivers and Harbors Committee. The recent hearings were interesting and informative and calculated to convince any fair-minded person that the National Government should establish a program calculated to eliminate, so far as possible, the problem of pollution. There may be some controversy as to the method to be followed, but certainly everyone ought to agree as to the desirability of the results we want to bring about.

Like many other matters of national concern, most people take things for granted until there is an emergency and then they are inclined to pass drastic legislation. The importance of the type of legislation here proposed is very little understood by the people throughout the United States. Every person is affected if the drinking water is impure. Every person who visits a large city has a very vital interest in what the municipality has done for the protection of health. I believe that this legislation which has been reported out by the committee will go a long way toward correcting the evils which now exist. The dumping of sewage into streams and lakes and the use of that water for drinking purposes is a rather gruesome procedure and will not be tolerated by an enlightened public. Likewise, the practice of large industrial plants of dumping the waste products into the streams and lakes and then having that water used for drinking purposes cannot and will not be permitted by our people when they know the facts. Unless legislation is passed, and unless progress is made in eliminating the pollution of our lakes and streams, some day we may face an epidemic of disease and danger to human life. Now is the time to prevent any such occurrence. It will be just too bad if this Congress fails to pass the legislation now pending before the House, or pass some other bill or amendment which will seek to accomplish the same purpose.

SALE OF WHEAT BY FARMERS TO THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a resolution adopted by the Grange in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, Lenawee County, Mich., is one of the best general agricultural counties in the United States. Yes; I reside in Lenawee County, but this statement of fact is supported by agricultural statistics, and is not mere talk.

This county is made up of family-sized farms. The crops are diversified, and wheat plays an important part in our rotation system. The record of Lenawee County farmers during the war has been a source of great pride, and justifiably so. These farmers ask for no special privileges. All they want is a fair chance in the economic picture and a square deal from their Government. This they feel they are not getting. Now, we all know that the Grange is a careful and conservative organization. It always thinks things through before it goes on record. It is not, as a rule, responsive to emotional propaganda. In these circumstances, an expression of this group is entitled to most careful attention on the part of the Department of Agriculture, the administration, and the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I am in receipt of a resolution passed by the Lenawee County (Mich.) Pomona Grange, assembled in regular session at Tecumseh, Mich., on June 13, 1946. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the United States Government, finding it was falling short on its commitments of food to the starving peoples of the world has again broken its word with the farmers of America by again raising the price of wheat, after stating that the price would not be raised.

On Friday and Saturday, May 3 and 4, the triple A committeemen in each township were supposed to call on each farmer and urge them to sell any wheat that they had on hand as soon as possible, as it would keep people from starving. If sold before May 25 they would receive a 30-cent bonus.

Many farmers started hauling wheat on Monday, May 6, and received $1.75⅜ plus 30 cents bonus, or $2.05⅜.

Or Friday, May 10, the following order went out from AAA headquarters: "Delay all emergency wheat payments until Monday, May 13, 12:01 p. m."

On Monday, May 13, at 12:01 p. m., the producer price for all wheat was raised 15 cents per bushel, making the ceiling now $2.20⅜ in Lenawee County.

This new order also contained this clause: "New ceiling prices are not retroactive." The producer who accepted settlement before May 10 is not eligible to the 15-cent increase or, to state it plainly, any farmer who did his patriotic duty and sold his wheat immediately as the Government asked him to do was penalized 15 cents per bushel for so doing.

We, the members of the Lenawee County Pomona Grange, demand that the Government pay those farmers who sold their wheat between May 1 and 10 the 15 cents per bushel which is due them.

For the information of anyone who does not know the full story of the unsavory wheat record of the past season, here it is: The Government promised that the ceilings would not be raised and that when wheat reached the ceiling producers might as well sell their wheat. They now deny that they ever made such a statement.

Here is the story of wheat prices for Lenawee County, Mich. (it will vary according to freight rates):

Jan. 1, 1946	$1.72⅜
Later raised	.03
May 1 bonus	.30
May 13 ceiling raised	.15
Price May 13	2.20⅜
Loss to farmers who sold before bonus and ceiling raises (cents per bushel)	.48

Whereas the plan for the new crop is, that one-half of all wheat that is put in storage will be confiscated by the Government, 25 percent to go to the Government and 25 percent to millers. This would be acceptable to producers if the Government would guarantee to pay the maximum price that wheat reached between July 1, 1946, and July 1, 1947.

In view of the treatment producers received at the hands of the Government last year, we feel it our duty to advise our members to store their wheat at home until the Government makes a satisfactory price to them.

We, the members of Lenawee County Pomona Grange, unanimously adopt the foregoing resolution.

MRS. ALICE HODDINOTT,
Secretary.

(A true copy.)

My colleagues, this resolution contains much food for thought. Clearly, an injustice has been done to certain of these wheat farmers who, relying on the Government, have complied with the requests of their Government and are thereby, and for that reason, penalized 15 cents a bushel on their wheat.

I am calling this to the attention, not only of the Congress, but of the Secretary of Agriculture and all agencies having to do with the purchase of this wheat and the payment of these bonuses at this time. I hope that the directives heretofore issued in reference to the purchase of this wheat by the Government will be changed or interpreted so that these patriotic wheat growers will get the square deal which they are demanding and to which they are so justly entitled.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4512) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. PRIEST, Mr. BULWINKLE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. WINTER.

SEVENTH REPORT TO CONGRESS ON OPERATIONS OF UNRRA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the seventh quarterly report on the operations of UNRRA and expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress.

The food crisis, foreshadowed in my last report on UNRRA operations, is now upon us. Many of the countries receiving UNRRA assistance have only a few

weeks' stocks remaining and the orderly distribution of food supplies is increasingly difficult. In many countries even minimum food rations may not be met for people who have lived too long on the borderline of starvation.

Much has been done by this and other countries to avert this tragedy and the Congress is aware of the measures taken in the United States to conserve food and to make it available to the millions abroad in urgent need of help. In spite of all that has been undertaken millions overseas are threatened with disaster. Although it may now be too late to save some, it is not too late to save many others. What can be done by the American people and their Government will be done. I am confident that the Congress and the people of the United States will support any further measures which may be necessary to meet the critical situation.

The food crisis has greatly retarded progress in the devastated countries toward recovery from the war. It has weakened their ability to help themselves, for the tremendous task of reconstruction requires strength as well as determination.

Difficult as UNRRA's task has been UNRRA has at this date in the face of severe world shortages shipped over 10,000,000 tons of vitally needed supplies which have enabled the countries receiving assistance to survive the winter. In addition to the food which has been provided, transportation facilities have been vastly improved in the year since war's end and seeds and agricultural equipment in substantial quantities are now available where they are needed for the spring planting. Some of the more important basic sinews of peace have been provided or are on the way. Clouded as it is by the famine in Europe and Asia, a real job has been done of which the United Nations may be proud.

Through March 31, 1946, UNRRA shipped 8,251,736 gross long tons of relief supplies valued at $1,140,419,000. Every American can take pride in the fact that our share in this achievement was 5,917,785 tons valued at $750,563,000, which is 71.7 percent of the tonnage and 65.8 percent of the value of all UNRRA shipments.

In the crucial weeks and months ahead until the new crop comes in, we must bend every effort, leave no possibility unexplored, and take every necessary step to relieve the suffering of millions who look for assistance to the United States and the other uninvaded United Nations. We are providing assistance as a matter of humanity and as a mark of comradeship for those who fought with us to victory over our common enemy. And we are doing it in the conviction that peace and security throughout the world can only be built on cooperation and mutual assistance. We cannot look to a world of freedom and security in the midst of famine and impoverishment.

The funds which the Congress has already appropriated to UNRRA will remain available only through this fiscal year. Also, the Congress at the end of the quarter covered by this report had not yet appropriated to UNRRA $600,000,000 which it had authorized for United States participation in the work of UNRRA. Since the close of the quarter the Congress has appropriated an additional $135,000,000, leaving $465,000,000 authorized but not appropriated. I strongly urge that Congress take all further action necessary to avoid any interruption in the participation of our country in UNRRA's job.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 19, 1946.*

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

HON. CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE QUITS REPUBLICAN PARTY—WOULD JOIN DEMOCRATS IF—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are told in the press that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE], after being unanimously rejected for Senator by the Republican convention in that State, has decided to quit the party, and says he might join the Democratic Party, if they would agree to get rid of us southern Democrats.

He reminds me of the old man Pvt. John Allen used to tell about, who, when asked how many members there were in his church, said that he was the only one left. He said, "We used to have 200 or more, but they all withdrew from me the other Sunday."

As to Mr. LAFOLLETTE'S proposal to join the Democratic Party provided they will get rid of us southern Democrats, I am reminded of the old fellow down in one of the Southern States whose reputation was not the best in the world. When he died they inscribed on his tombstone this epitaph:

> Hark ye, strangers passing by,
> As you are now so once was I.
> As I am now so you must be.
> Prepare for death and follow me.

One of his neighbors read this inscription and wrote these lines under it:

> To follow you I'd not consent
> Unless I knew which way you went.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 164]

Adams	Bates, Mass.	Bulwinkle
Allen, Ill.	Bell	Byrnes, Wis.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bennet, N. Y.	Campbell
Bailey	Bloom	Cannon, Fla.
Baldwin, Md.	Boren	Cannon, Mo.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Boykin	Chapman
Barden	Bradley, Mich.	Clason
Barry	Brumbaugh	Cochran
Bates, Ky.	Buckley	Cole, Kans.
Colmer	Holifield	Ploeser
Cooley	Hook	Plumley
Courtney	Howell	Powell
Cox	Jackson	Randolph
Crosser	Jennings	Reece, Tenn.
Curley	Johnson, Calif.	Rizley
Daughton, Va.	Johnson, Luther A.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Dawson	Jones	Roe, N. Y.
De Lacy	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Dingell	Keefe	Sabath
Dolliver	King	Sadowski
Domengeaux	Klein	Shafer
Dondero	Lane	Sharp
Durham	Lea	Sheridan
Engel, Mich.	Lemke	Slaughter
Engle, Calif.	Lesinski	Sparkman
Fallon	Ludlow	Starkey
Fellows	Lynch	Stewart
Folger	McCowen	Stigler
Fuller	McGehee	Sullivan
Gallagher	McMillan, S. C.	Sumner, Ill.
Gardner	Mankin	Sumners, Tex.
Gifford	Mansfield, Tex.	Sundstrom
Gore	May	Taylor
Gossett	Miller, Calif.	Tibbott
Granger	Morgan	Tolan
Grant, Ind.	Morrison	Torrens
Gregory	Norrell	Traynor
Hall, Leonard W.	Norton	Vinson
Halleck	O'Brien, Ill.	Voorhis, Calif.
Hancock	O'Neal	Wasielewski
Harless, Ariz.	Pace	Welch
Harness, Ind.	Patrick	West
Harris	Patterson	Wickersham
Hart	Peterson, Ga.	Winstead
Heffernan	Philbin	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hinshaw	Phillips	Woodhouse

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 299 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2133. An act to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1460. An act to fix the salary of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

S. 1523. An act to modify the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO), there were—ayes 101, noes 37.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.), the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 20, 1946, at 11 o'clock.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

The Committee on Pensions will hold open hearings at 10 a. m., Thursday, June 20, 1946, in room 428, Old House Office Building, on H. R. 3779, H. R. 5740, and H. R. 5741, bills to increase service pensions for certain veterans and widows

of veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1404. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $1,500,000, to remain available until expended, for the War Department, for flood control (H. Doc. No. 671), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on Labor. H. R. 4130. A bill to increase the minimum wage rate under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to 65 cents an hour; without amendment (Rept. No. 2300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 6811. A bill relating to veterans' pension, compensation, or retirement pay during hospitalization, institutional or domiciliary care, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 6827. A bill to provide for the payment of a bonus of 48 cents per bushel for all wheat and 55 cents per bushel for all corn and 5 cents per bushel for oats purchased and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946, and providing for payment of additional bonuses if paid by the United States Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 6828. A bill to provide for continuance of the farm labor supply program up to and including June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 6829. A bill relating to the unauthorized wearing of the discharge button awarded by the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 6830. A bill for the relief of John Sheehy and Mrs. Anna Sheehy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LaFOLLETTE:

H. R. 6831. A bill for the relief of Jeffersonville flood control district, Jeffersonville, Ind., a municipal corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 6832. A bill for the relief of Betty Isabel Schunke; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 6833. A bill for the relief of Joseph Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TALBOT:

H. R. 6834. A bill for the relief of Joe O'Loughlin; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2014. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Kent Townsend Club, Kent, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of House bills 2229 and 2230; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2013. Also, petition of Council of Townsend Clubs of the Fourteenth Congressional District of Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of House bills 2229 and 2230; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2014. Also, petition of the American Philosophical Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to control of atomic energy; to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

2015. Also, petition of Pfc Hector R. Cataldi and several servicemen, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsing immediate postwar draft legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2016. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Detroit, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Gen. Draja Mihailovich; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2017. Also, petition of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the early authorization and execution of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God who ordainest each day as a fresh beginning, as wait the watchers for the dawn, so with confidence even under the distant stars wait we for the signs of Thy appearing in the quenchless hope which sees always a new morning beyond the darkest night. Turning from the dizzy world where truth so often eludes us along tangled paths, we would seek at this altar of faith the truth about ourselves, knowing that Thou canst not use us to change the crooked things that blight the earth unless our own hearts are homes of sincerity, integrity, and purity. Create in us clean hearts, O God, and renew a right spirit within us. Fit us to be forerunners for the conquering might of that One who alone can redeem the waste places, as in His name we cry aloud—

"Lift up your heads, O ye gates,
And be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors,
And the King of Glory shall come in."

Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1946.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CLYDE R. HOEY, a Senator from the State of North Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HOEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, June 19, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM ALABAMA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I present the credentials of Hon. G. ROBINSON SWIFT, appointed by the Governor of Alabama to fill the vacancy caused by the death of our late colleague, Senator John H. Bankhead.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Alabama, I, Chauncey Sparks, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint G. ROBINSON SWIFT, a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein caused by the death of John Hollis Bankhead is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, and our seal hereto affixed at Montgomery this 15th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1946.

[SEAL] CHAUNCEY SPARKS,
Governor.

SIBYL POOL,
Secretary of State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator-designate is present and ready to take the oath of office.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator-designate will come to the desk, the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. SWIFT, escorted by Mr. HILL, advanced to the desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6597) authorizing the construction of certain

public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gurney	Overton
Austin	Hart	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Barkley	Hayden	Revercomb
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Brooks	Hill	Russell
Buck	Hoey	Saltonstall
Burch	Huffman	Smith
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Swift
Byrd	Kilgore	Taft
Capper	Knowland	Taylor
Carville	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McCarran	Tobey
Donnell	McClellan	Tunnell
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	McMahon	Wagner
Ellender	Mead	Walsh
Ferguson	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Murdock	Willis
Gerry	Murray	
Gossett	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 19, 1946, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 943. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Columbia River at Northport, Wash.;

S. 1043. An act to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma in trust for the Indians of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian Reservation;

S. 1273. An act to provide for the acquisition by exchange of non-Federal property within the Glacier National Park;

S. 1288. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States;

S. 1336. An act to transfer certain real and personal property in Ward County, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota, acting by and through the Industrial Commission of North Dakota;

S. 1460. An act to fix the salary of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior;

S. 1523. An act to modify the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war;

S. 1834. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Iowa or the Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Des Moines River at or near Farmington, Iowa;

S. 1857. An act to authorize the availability for certain necessary administrative expenses of appropriations for the Department of the Interior;

S. 1963. An act to authorize additional permanent professors of the United States Military Academy; and

S. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution extending for 7 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AUDIT REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY ASSOCIATED COOPERATIVES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a letter dated June 17, 1946, from the Corporation's Audit Division of the General Accounting Office to the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, covering an audit made of the affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries and affiliates for the year ended June 30, 1945, under section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945 (59 Stat. 6) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SAFEGUARD OF INVESTORS IN UNREGISTERED SECURITIES

A letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, recommending an amendment to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, which would extend to investors in unregistered securities the protection now afforded to investors in registered securities by reason of sections 12, 13, 14, and 16 of the act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MARCH 1946 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation for the month of March 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ACTS OF LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the acts of the second regular session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, February 11 to March 31, 1946 (with an accompanying volume); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Detroit, Mich., relating to the trial of Gen. Draja Mihailovich as a war criminal; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at a community-wide meeting of Jews, citizens of Omaha, Nebr., favoring the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, at Chicago, Ill., relating to the problem of postwar restoration and rehabilitation of Great Lakes shipping and of the domestic merchant marine; to the Committee on Commerce.

A telegram from Senator Eulogio Rodriguez, Manila, P. I., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 6338) to repeal section 601 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Cong.), relative to the payment of compensation for war damage; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, at Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 48) to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; ordered to lie on the table.

MANUFACTURE AND SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Cowley County temperance rally at Winfield, Kans., on May 31, 1946, concerning the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the shortage of food products makes it necessary to conserve grains and use

them only for essential livestock and poultry feeding and for human consumption; and

Whereas the shortage of sugar and sugar products has made it necessary to limit use of these products to the bare necessities of the same: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we as representative citizens of Cowley County, Kans., respectfully ask and petition the executive and legislative branches of our Government:

First. That the use of fruits, grains, sugars, and sugar products be withheld from the industries engaged in the making of malt, fermented and distilled liquors for beverage purposes; and

Second. That the use of grains and other food products shall not be allowed in making alcoholic liquors in any areas where our armed forces are in control of foreign territory.

Whereas the twenty-first amendment to the Federal Constitution, which repealed national prohibition, provides for the protection of territory where the citizens by vote have established prohibition: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we respectfully ask and petition the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government to fulfill the provisions of that amendment, by

First. Making effective this amendment by refusing to grant Federal permission to sell intoxicating liquors in territory where they are prohibited by local laws; and

Second. That action also be taken by the Federal legislative and administrative branches of the Government to prohibit the shipping of alcoholic liquors into territory where they are prohibited by local laws.

Whereas the presence of intoxicating liquors in and near the military camps where our young men have been in training for military service, has proved to be a menace to them physically, socially, and morally: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we respectfully ask and petition our Federal Government to prohibit the sale and use of intoxicating liquors in the camps and in the places near the camps frequented by the men in the armed forces.

ABOLITION OF OPA, THE CPA, AND NATIONAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, a petition signed by 23 citizens of Pittsburg, Kans., requesting that the OPA, the CPA, and the National Housing Administration be abolished.

There being no objection, the petition was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

Hostilities having ceased 9 months ago, we, the undersigned, respectfully request that you immediately sponsor or support a movement declaring the war as ended, thereby relieving the administration of all wartime emergency powers. The OPA, CPA, and National Housing Administration should be abolished without any further delay.

We want the national budget balanced and a substantial reduction of taxes. We favor legislation that will give labor and management equal rights. Above all, we place special emphasis upon the protection of States' rights and constitutional government.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1673. A bill for the relief of the Superior Coach Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1520);

H. R. 2130. A bill for the relief of Daniel S. Bagley, Jr., and Daniel S. Bagley, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1521);

H. R. 4215. A bill for the relief of Jane O'Malley; without amendment (Rept No. 1522);

H. R. 4834. A bill for the relief of the estates of Katherine Delores Booth and Agnes Jane True; without amendment (Rept. No. 1523);

H. R. 4862. A bill for the relief of Walter R. Newcomb, Sr., Corbin A. Newcomb, and Walter R. Newcomb, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1524);

H. R. 4996. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Joan Esther Hedin, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1525);

H. R. 5026. A bill for the relief of the estate of Drury Lee Jordan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1526);

H. R. 5030. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lim Shee Chang; without amendment (Rept. No. 1527);

H. R. 5053. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jasper A. Mealer; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1532);

H. R. 5510. A bill for the relief of Newton William Lowery; without amendment (Rept. No. 1528);

H. R. 5739. A bill for the relief of Frances Fitzgerald; without amendment (Rept. No. 1529);

H. R. 5792. A bill for the relief of certain postmasters; without amendment (Rept. No. 1530); and

H. R. 5872. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Keaton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1531).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 162. A bill for the relief of Walter S. Faulkner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1533);

H. R. 1331. A bill for the relief of the Hatheway Patterson Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1534);

H. R. 3480. A bill for the relief of Miss Ruth Lois Cummings; without amendment (Rept. No. 1535); and

H. R. 5878. A bill for the relief of Elsie Elmhorst; without amendment (Rept. No. 1536).

By Mr. HUFFMAN, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 5228. A bill for the relief of Stephen Lisay; without amendment (Rept. No. 1537);

H. R. 5351. A bill for the relief of Charles Booker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1538);

H. R. 5538. A bill for the relief of Mae Maxine Stone; without amendment (Rept. No. 1539);

H. R. 5539. A bill for the relief of Andrew M. Halvorsen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1540); and

H. R. 5806. A bill for the relief of Etta Yoakam; without amendment (Rept. No. 1541).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 783. A bill for the relief of Karl E. Bond; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1542);

H. R. 2489. A bill for the relief of Gaylon Dhu; without amendment (Rept. No. 1543); and

H. R. 3455. A bill for the relief of Chatham M. Towers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1544).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3397. A bill for the relief of Claude S. Crouse; without amendment (Rept. No. 1545);

H. R. 4919. A bill for the relief of Archibald J. Alcorn; without amendment (Rept. No. 1546); and

H. R. 5884. A bill for the relief of Frances Krzys; without amendment (Rept. No. 1547).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1775. A bill for the relief of Walter J. Barnes Electric Co. and Maritime Electric Co., Inc., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1548);

S. 2224. A bill for the relief of John E. Peterson, James M. Hiler, Vivian Langemo, Floy Sibrie, and Ross Lee Brown; without amendment (Rept. No. 1549);

H. R. 3827. A bill for the relief of Fred W. Grant; without amendment (Rept. No. 1550); and

H. R. 5324. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Francoline and Mrs. Rose Wallace; without amendment (Rept. No. 1551).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3623. A bill for the relief of William A. Pixley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1552);

H. R. 4247. A bill for the relief of Jesus Lassalle and Mrs. America Bonet Medina; without amendment (Rept. No. 1553); and

H. R. 4357. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Alberto Lopez Ramos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1554).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 6689. A bill to extend, for an additional year, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar; with amendments (Rept. No. 1555).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 6741. A bill relating to the operation of section 8 of the Federal Airport Act with respect to the fiscal year 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1556).

By Mr. GOSSETT, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 2225. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Nebraska-Iowa Bridge Corp., a Delaware corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River between Washington County, Nebr., and Harrison County, Iowa," approved March 6, 1928; without amendment (Rept. No. 1557); and

H. R. 6081. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Des Moines River at or near the town of Eddyville, Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1558).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 1212. A bill authorizing the State of Texas, acting through the State Highway Commission of Texas, or the successors thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Laredo, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1559); and

H. R. 6751. A bill authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1560).

By Mr. BROOKS, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 6004. A bill to provide authorization for the village of Cahokia, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cahokia, Ill.,

and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1561);

H. R. 6041. A bill authorizing the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Wabash River at or near Montezuma, Ind.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1562); and

H. R. 6065. A bill authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1563).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 2352. A bill to authorize increases in the salary rates of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose pay is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 2353. A bill for the relief of Joseph Ochrimowski; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2354. A bill to establish and provide for the maintenance and operation of a veterans' canteen service in the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 2355. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provisions of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HATCH (by request):

S. 2356. A bill to promote the uniformity of geographic nomenclature in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2357. A bill for the relief of Johnson & Gunstone, a copartnership; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to investigate and eradicate the predatory sea lampreys of the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Commerce.

MARGARET M. ROSS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, some time ago there was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys Senate bill 1149, for the relief of Margaret M. Ross. That bill has received some consideration by our committee, but it relates to a claim against the United States. I understand that the members of the committee desire to have the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and wish to have the bill referred to the Committee on Claims. I therefore so request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Claims.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Department of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 68, line 16, strike out "(not to exceed $4,200,000)" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(not to exceed $5,757,000, $1,557,000 of which is to be exclusively for the Office of Small Business at the seat of government)."

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1947—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAYLOR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any administrator, officer, or supervisor having responsibility for forming or carrying our personnel policies and regulations who does not, in good faith, attempt to adjust the grievances of employees, or who fails to meet and negotiate in good faith with the representatives of employee organizations.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6597) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a citation of the National Jewish Welfare Board for services rendered in World War II and an address delivered by Secretary of War Patterson on the occasion of the reading of the citation, at Washington, May 6, 1946, together with a letter from President Truman, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE FOOD SITUATION IN SOUTH AMERICA—STATEMENT BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Hon. Herbert Hoover on the food situation in South America, which appears in the Appendix.]

A BALTIMORE-EQUIPPED HOSPITAL IN KIEV—ADDRESSES BY PROF. LEV. IVANOVITCH MEDVED AND TECH. SGT. LEONARD BERNHARDT

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses delivered at Baltimore, Md., on May 27, 1946, by Prof. Lev. Ivanovitch Medved and Tech. Sgt. Leonard Bernhardt, at a meeting sponsored by the Baltimore committee, Russian Relief, Inc., in connection with a project for a Baltimore-equipped hospital in Kiev, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY A. WALLACE BEFORE THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace before the American Veterans Committee at Des Moines, Iowa, June 15, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GIMBEL PLAN FOR SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by him to Lt. Gen. E. B. Gregory, Administrator of the War Assets Administration enclosing a copy of The Gimbel Plan for Surplus Disposal, which appear in the Appendix.]

CANADIAN-AMERICAN AGREEMENT FOR ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE MONTREAL GAZETTE

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "It Is Inconceivable That It Should Be Accepted at Ottawa," from the Montreal Gazette of June 10, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESERVATION OF WORLD PEACE AND SECURITY—EDITORIAL FROM CAPITOL GIST

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "How To Preserve World Peace and Security," from the June 15 issue of Capitol Gist, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE QUIETING OF TITLE TO SUBMERGED AND RECLAIMED LAND

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I received two telegrams, one from H. C. Brockel, municipal port director of the city of Milwaukee, inquiring when the Senate will take action on House Joint Resolution 225 which relates to quieting title to submerged and reclaimed lands. In his telegram he said it was important that action be taken in order that lake ports could proceed with their improvements. I ask that that telegram, and another telegram from D. W. Hoan, president, Great Lakes Harbors Association, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *June 19, 1946.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully request and urge your influence to bring House Joint Resolution 225 before Senate for action before adjournment. Senate action will quiet title to submerged and reclaimed lands and permit ports to make long-range plans for improvement without fear of Federal agency attack upon title. Senate will do great public service by terminating entire controversy by passage of House Joint Resolution 225.

BOARD OF HARBOR COMMISSIONERS, CITY OF MILWAUKEE,
H. C. BROCKEL, *Municipal Port Director.*

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *June 19, 1946.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Will greatly appreciate your assistance in securing Senate action on House Joint Resolution 225 before adjournment. Great Lakes Harbors Association by resolution at annual

meeting last week declared unanimous support of Great Lakes ports for this legislation. Senate will do great public service by terminating submerged lands controversy by passage of House Joint Resolution 225 immediately. Many thanks.

GREAT LAKES HARBORS ASSOCIATION,
D. W. HOAN, *President.*

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, with reference to the telegram inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Wisconsin, let me say that it pertains to a very important bill now on the calendar of the Senate, a bill which has passed the House by an overwhelming majority, and which has been approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee after long and comprehensive hearings. It is a bill which affects all the States which border on the ocean, and it affects some central States which have no seacoast at all, because the beds of streams and inland bodies of water are also covered by the bill. It is a bill to clear the title in the States to submerged lands, to carry out a policy which has been enunciated by approximately 52 decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States extending over a period of 100 years.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY'S PLAN FOR REPAIRS AND REMODELING OF EXISTING DWELLINGS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a memorandum in relation to the action of OPA, which has a direct bearing on the housing situation. We see much in the newspapers nowadays about OPA. Former President Hoover apparently was misquoted on the subject, and in substance stated so. Bowles threatens to resign if he does not get his way. If he had looked more after the administration of the office and did less talking, OPA would not be in the fix it is. There would have been less maladministration and we would have had more production. The memorandum which I ask to have printed in the RECORD has reference to the situation which now arises by reason of Mr. Wyatt's request that a large portion of the building material be used for repairing of buildings.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As showing how the bureaucrats work, and thwart the express will of Congress:

The Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of May 22, 1946, Public 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, puts almost exclusive emphasis, through Government aid, on (1) stimulation of building materials production for the production of new residential facilities, and (2) of fixing prices for such new construction. It will be recalled that the National Housing Expediter set a goal of several million residential units—new construction—to be completed under the plan within a specified time.

Well, the following excerpt from OPA's appropriation justification for the fiscal year 1947 (in the House) will explain itself (after pointing out that emphasis is not to be put on the remodeling of existing residential structures):

"This emphasis was caused directly by a change in the plans of the Wyatt housing program which originally placed almost complete emphasis on new residential dwellings. Since that time, it has become apparent that the goal set for the necessary number of additional dwelling units could not be met solely on a new construction basis. Therefore, Mr. Wyatt is now calling for major repairs and remodeling of existing dwellings to furnish 250,000 to 500,000 of the necessary additional units in the coming year."

Then follows this statement by OPA:

"The cost to the consumer of such remodeling is estimated to run upward of $1,000,000,000 for the next 12 months."

This shows that Wyatt has made over his plan; changed the act of Congress to the tune of more than $1,000,000,000 in expenditures for 12 months. It shows what can happen if the Reorganization Plan making National Housing Agency permanent is allowed to become operative.

SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY—ARTICLES BY JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, no subject is of more immediate interest and importance to us all than Russia. With all the dangers of postwar reconstruction on a world-wide basis, including the terrible possibilities of the atomic bomb, we are faced with the difficult reconciliation of ideologies which are both seeking to find a dominant place in the postwar thinking.

War with Russia is unthinkable, but it will take statesmanship of the highest order to prevent the slow development of the kind of misunderstandings that might ultimately lead to war. Our experience between World Wars I and II must teach us how important it is to allay international suspicions and misunderstandings.

In two recent issues of Life magazine, June 3 and June 10, there appeared articles by Mr. John Foster Dulles, the well-known international lawyer, and who has been an adviser of our State Department and particularly of our delegates at the San Francisco Conference last year. These articles are entitled "Thoughts on Soviet Foreign Policy and What To Do About It." In these articles Mr. Dulles analyzes Rusia's motives in seeking a "Pax Sovietica" and the methods by which she would impose such a peace on the world. This analysis appeared in the first number of Mr. Dulles' articles, and in the second number he suggests an approach to the whole subject from the standpoint of an enlightened American foreign policy.

This subject is so important, Mr. President, that I ask unanimous consent to have these articles by Mr. Dulles incorporated in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUGHTS ON SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT—AN INTERNATIONAL EXPERT ANALYZES RUSSIA'S MOTIVES IN SEEKING A "PAX SOVIETICA" AND THE METHODS BY WHICH SHE WOULD IMPOSE IT ON THE WORLD

(By John Foster Dulles)

No nation's foreign policy can be ascertained merely from what its officials say. More important are the philosophy of its leaders and the actual manifestations of that philosophy in what is done. By putting together such pieces, a reliable conclusion can usually be reached. In the case of the Soviet Union there are many pieces and they fit neatly together to form a coherent and logical whole.

The makers of Soviet foreign policy take seriously the fact that the world is one world and that peace is indivisible. These phrases, which are catchwords and slogans for us, are the basic premises of Soviet foreign policy. The primary purpose of that policy is to achieve peace, security, and opportunity for the Soviet Union. Those are the usual goals of every foreign policy. But since, to the Soviet leaders, the world is one world and since peace is indivisible, peace and security are considered by them to depend upon eradicating the non-Soviet type of society which now dangerously divides the one world into incompatible halves. That also, they think, will be good for the world; for the Soviet type of proletariat dictatorship, originated to promote the welfare of the masses and to end the exploitation of man by man, is considered the ideal kind of government. That, in their thinking, is true democracy. Political thinking or spiritual belief antagonistic to that is called Fascist and unfriendly.

It is necessary to understand the meaning which Soviet speakers and writers give to the words "democracy," "Fascist" and "friendly." Failure to understand that explains why we so often agree with what Soviet leaders say and then find it difficult to reconcile their acts with what we thought they meant. Thus Soviet leaders say that the goal of their foreign policy is to have everywhere democratic governments which will be friendly and which will eradicate Fascist thinking. That seems to be reasonable and nothing to which we could properly take exception—until we realize that:

Democracy in Russian means the Soviet type of proletariat dictatorship.

Fascist in Russian is a word of reproach applied to all non-Soviet faiths.

Friendly in Russian is a word of approval reserved for those who profess belief in Soviet ideals and who prove sincerity by working to promote them.

So interpreted, Soviet policy is one admittedly intolerant. It seeks to eliminate what, to us, are the essentials of a free society. It seeks this with urgency because Soviet leaders believe that, until this is done, peace is in jeopardy. Tolerance of non-Soviet thinking is, to them, weakness which is dangerous.

As Mr. Vishinsky said in his powerful refugee speech at the first session of the United Nations, "We do not want to accept tolerance. We paid too much for it." Therefore, he concludes, even the most obscure and helpless refugee, fleeing over the face of the earth, is a potential threat to Soviet peace and security if he harbors thoughts antagonistic to Soviet communism.

Soviet leaders think that the quick way to eradicate such potential threats is to have governments everywhere which accept the political philosophy of the Soviet Union. Such governments will maintain an intensive censorship and secret police to detect those who persist in other political beliefs and will make such thinkers harmless by removing them from a normal place in society. By bringing such governments into power throughout the world, the leaders of the Soviet Union would create world harmony, a great political calm which will be the Pax Sovietica.

THE SOVIET PROGRAM

For the purpose of achieving Soviet policy, the world is divided roughly into three zones. These three zones are: (1) an inner zone, the U. S. S. R. itself; (2) a middle zone, representing a belt or cordon sanitaire surrounding the inner zone; (3) an outer zone, representing the rest of the world.

THE INNER ZONE

The Soviet inner zone comprises territory incorporated into the Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics. It now comprehends the Soviet Union as originally established in 1917, plus adjacent territories subsequently incorporated on the basis of historic, strategic, or ideological considerations. This inner zone has been largely expanded. If one starts at the northwest corner of the Soviet Union as of 1917 and swings in a great arc south and east to the Vladivostok area, it will be seen that the following have been added: The north of Finland, the strategic areas of south Finland which abut on the Gulf of Finland and control access to the Baltic Sea, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the northern part of German East Prussia, the eastern half of Poland, the eastern part of Czechoslovakia (represented by the Carpatho-Ukraine), that part of Rumania which comprised Bessarabia and Bukovina, Tannu Tuva, Port Arthur, the southern half of Sakhalin Island, the Kurile Islands.

The Soviet system operates as a federal system under a constitution designed to make it easy to add new peoples and new territories. There is no reason to believe that expansion has come to an end. At the moment, the Kars and Erzurum Provinces are sought to be recovered from Turkey, and various semiautonomous adjacent states in the middle zone are looked on as ultimate additions to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

THE MIDDLE ZONE

The middle zone is territory which surrounds the inner zone which is not yet ripe for incorporation into the U. S. S. R. but which is close enough to it to be amenable to the influence of Soviet military power. This zone is, or recently has been, occupied by elements of the Soviet Army. Where there is no present occupation, there is fear of it, and the governments there, while nominally independent and in some respects actually independent, are under strong inducement to put their foreign policy, their armies and, most important of all, their secret police and censorship into the hands of persons who take much guidance from Moscow. Thus the Soviet leaders assure that the character of these governments will be friendly.

Middle-zone conditions exist in varying intensity in continental Europe east of a line running roughly from the Baltic, just east of Denmark, through the middle of Germany to the Adriatic and then south to the borders of Greece. This central European part of the middle zone includes: Poland, the eastern half of Germany, Czechoslovakia, eastern Austria, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania.

In Asia, the middle zone includes: Outer Mongolia, Manchuria (where the U. S. S. R. has rights in Dairen, and in the Manchurian trunk railway lines), the northern half of Korea, Sinkiang Province of China (where there has been considerable penetration from the Soviet Union, but as to which little reliable up-to-date information is available).

There is no reason to believe that the middle zone is fixed.

There are current efforts to extend it in relation to: Greece (where there is a bitter struggle for ascendancy between the Soviet-sponsored E. A. M. and other Greek parties), Iran (Persia, where its northern Province of Azerbaijan, which the Soviet has been occupying, is in revolt), Turkey (which is under Soviet pressure), Kurdistan (where the Kurds are being encouraged to establish an autonomous state under Soviet protection), the southern part of Korea (where there is Soviet sponsorship of local political groups).

THE OUTER ZONE

The third zone is the outer zone. It comprises the balance of the world. These areas are sufficiently distant, physically, from Soviet land power so that friendly governments cannot be achieved by direct power methods. The methods which are used vary, particularly as between self-governing and non-self-governing areas.

In colonial areas, which have an aggregate population of some 750,000,000, Soviet leaders stimulate the independence movements and give them moral leadership. They encourage revolution, rather than evolution, as being apt to result in governments which will break completely with those who now govern.

Countries which are fully self-governing constitute the other half of the outer zone. In some of these, as in France, strong Communist Parties have been built up which cooperate with Soviet leaders. In other countries it is not possible to have Communist or extreme left parties strong enough to be influential in their own right. Under those conditions influence is exerted through small, well-disciplined minorities. These work their way into positions of influence in large factional blocs and can even be a balance of power where major political parties closely divide the voting strength.

Soviet objectives are also sought to be advanced by use of freedom of the press and of speech to put into circulation "smears" of those who have a strong faith which conflicts with Soviet ideology and whose moral or political influence is feared. The threat of such smear will, it is hoped, deter such persons from public activity or make them seem to be a liability to any political party.

Some illustrations of Soviet methods in the outer zone are:

1. One of the developments which the Soviet Union wishes to prevent is a political or economic union of the western European powers which lie just beyond the middle zone, that is, France, Belgium, Holland, and the United Kingdom. It wishes to keep these nations divided lest, united, they develop an influence which might counter that of the Soviet Union in the European middle zone. Within these countries there have grown up Communist Parties which cooperate closely with Soviet communism. Some months ago a French official, speaking of increased economic unity between France and some of her neighboring countries, said that it would not be possible because it would be displeasing to the Soviet which, through Communist influence, could bring about such strikes in France as would seriously impede her economic recovery.

2. The colonial peoples have natural grievances and unrealized aspirations. These have been stimulated by war conditions and Japanese-German propaganda. The unrest readily takes the form of violent independence movements. Soviet leaders encourage that resort to violence rather than reliance on the peaceful processes of the United Nations Charter. At the first session of the United Nations they did not want the Assembly to recognize as meritorious the voluntary steps taken by mandatory powers to turn their mandated areas over to United Nations trusteeship. At the London and Paris meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers, they opposed the United States plan for Italian colonies, which would pledge early independence and, in the meantime, entrust administration to a Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

3. A part of the outer zone area upon which Soviet diplomacy and propaganda is centered is the Mediterranean area, which constitutes the historic life line of Britain to India and the Far East. The Soviet Union is seeking to take from Britain control of this area. Its efforts touch upon the entire Mediterranean coastline.

Spain, with Spanish Morocco, controls the Western portals to the Mediterranean. It is now the scene of a critically important political contest. There is agreement by all the great powers that Franco ought to go. But the issue is: How? And what will succeed him? Great Britain and the United States are working for a peaceful succession which would be liberal in character, not communistic. The Soviet leaders are not averse to civil war which would put communism into control. France has vacillated between these two pressures, but now inclines toward the Soviet program.

Soviet leaders are making strong efforts to get control of French foreign policy. At the London meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers and of the Security Council, the Soviet delegates seemed to make special efforts to embarrass Mr. Bidault, French Minister of Foreign Affairs and leader of the French Catholic Party (M. R. P.). Recently the Soviet Union, as an exceptional measure and despite their own taking of help from UNRRA, gave wheat for distribution in France through the French Communists to help them gain political influence.

In Italy, communism is being promoted as against the middle parties, and constant efforts are made to capitalize on the mistakes of Anglo-American military government.

The Arab world is being wooed. The Soviet went to extremes, before the Security Council, in proposing measures to eliminate French and British troops from Syria and Lebanon. It encourages unrest in French Morocco, Algiers, and Tunisia. It seeks advantages from Arab opposition to a Palestine policy favored by many in the United States.

4. In Latin America, many of the republics face very difficult problems of postwar economic adjustment and many of their workers—industrial and agricultural—do not enjoy good standards of living. This offers opportunity for communistic propaganda. Extreme left-wing agitators are using it to break up the hemispheric solidarity which the United States has sought to develop.

5. The Soviet Union is seeking to develop the recently organized World Federation of Trade Unions as a mechanism for exerting world-wide political influence. At present the W. F. T. U. has important constituent bodies in more than 50 nations. The national labor unions which are constituents of the W. F. T. U. represent, in the main, the left wing of labor (in the United States it is the CIO) and the Communists and Communist sympathizers among them exert concerted influence along lines favored by the Soviet Union.

6. An illustration of the smear method is the case of Sr. Ezequiel Padilla, recently Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico. At the San Francisco Conference he was a stalwart supporter of the United States in its policies and largely contributed to hemispheric unity. Upon his return to Mexico, he was viciously attacked in the left-wing press as having been bribed or having sold out to the United States for political support. The slander became widespread and was an inducing cause of his prompt retirement from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. His successor saw to it that, at the London meeting of the United Nations, Mexico frequently voted with the Soviet Union and against the United States. Thereby he became immune from a fate like Padilla's.

TECHNIQUES

Soviet techniques are those of a society which deals with an outer world which it deems impure and dangerous. Nonintercourse is the general rule and fraternization is forbidden, except as part of a planned penetration.

Between the inner zone and outer zone an "iron curtain" is maintained. This serves two purposes, one domestic and the other foreign. From a domestic standpoint it is needed to preserve that inner "purity" of political thinking which has been achieved through nearly 30 years of propaganda and purge. It also prevents internal discontent which might arise were the working people of the Soviet Union to know of better conditions of workers in many other countries, such as the United States and Great Britain.

From the external standpoint, the iron curtain permits Soviet propaganda and influence to be more effective than if the actual conditions within the Soviet Union were fully known. Economic conditions within parts of the Soviet Union untouched by invasion compare favorably with conditions in backward areas of the Middle and Far East. But intimate knowledge of the way of life within the Soviet Union would, on net balance, reduce Soviet prestige. As it is, discontented people and idealists find it easy to attribute to the Soviet experiment an exaggerated possibility of realizing their hopes and aspirations. They measure that possibility by their imagination or by a few carefully staged exhibits, not by realities. That is, for the Soviet Union, an asset of inestimable value.

To the Soviet people the iron curtain is pictured as necessary defense against an unfriendly outer world. In this connection the Soviet leaders welcome and, indeed, seek occasions which seem to show that that unfriendliness is not merely a matter of the past, but of the present. At the San Francisco Conference and at meetings of the Assembly and Security Council of the United Nations, the Soviet delegation has almost always pressed their proposals to public debate and voting, even where defeat was inevitable. That makes it easier for them to dramatize, at home and to their followers abroad, what they call the unfriendly and Fascist attitude of the outer world.

When the necessities of diplomacy or business take Soviet nationals abroad, Soviet policy requires them to observe rigorously the thesis that Soviet democracy cannot be tolerant of, or merge with, alien thinking. Soviet diplomats and, indeed, all Soviet nationals abroad, are not to mingle freely with those of opposite faith. They occasionally participate genially in purely social events, but they rarely discuss political, social, and cultural matters. If, as an exception, some seem to become intimate with, or influenced by, adherents of a different system, they are apt to be called home.

In further application of its policy, the Soviet Union moves very slowly about joining functional organization for international cooperation. Thus, it has not yet joined the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe, and the European Coal Organization. It has not so far accepted our State Department's invitation to attend a conference preparatory to the establishment of an International Trade Organization.

An apparent exception is the membership of the Soviet Union in the United Nations. Beginning with the Moscow Conference of October 1943 the Soviet Union has taken part in steps to create a world organization of which it would be a leading member. At San Francisco the Soviet delegation, under instructions from Mr. Stalin, accepted certain Charter provisions which they strongly disliked (notably those permitting free discussion in the Security Council and Assembly and the "peaceful adjustment" article 14) rather than have no general international organization or, perhaps, one without them.

The indications are that the Soviet leaders originally thought of world organization as a means whereby they, with the United States and Britain, would rule the world. That idea of perpetuating the wartime rule of the Big Three has had to be abandoned. But Soviet leaders were still glad to have a world organization which would be a preventive of an association limited to the western democracies and which would provide a means whereby the Soviet could promote, in the outer zone, its conception of world peace. Soviet leaders hope to take over from the western democracies their present preponderant influence in the United Nations. To this end they seek to develop the role of the WFTU in the United Nations and in the member nations. Meantime the United Nations can do no major harm to Soviet plans because the "veto power" of the permanent members of the Security Council largely insures against that. Soviet leaders have consistently sought to increase that insurance by making the veto all-embracing, even extending to discussion within the Security Council.

The ultimate reliance of Soviet foreign policy is its military power. There has been some demobilization. But the leaders of the Soviet Union have made it clear that they intend to maintain a strong land power, develop their air power and, as rapidly as practicable, to develop navies for use in the various waterways to which they have now obtained access, notably the Baltic Sea, the Mediterranean, and the Yellow Sea. They are working hard to learn how to use atomic energy. The leaders of the Soviet Union look upon military force as the core of sovereignty. Mr. Stalin, in his 1946 May-day statement, said it was to be guarded as "the apple of one's eye." In the discussion of peace treaties the Soviet delegates have consistently shown strong opposition to the principle of international supervision, even in relation to ex-enemies.

Soviet foreign policy is carried out in a rigid, mechanistic, and uncompromising way. The policy, both strategic and tactical, is made in and directed from Moscow, in considerable part by men who are personally ignorant of foreign conditions and foreign people and who map out moves on the basis of what, from the Soviet standpoint, seems logical. To them it is like playing a game of chess, the world being the chessboard. Soviet diplomats and private agents abroad are the pieces who move as directed by the master mind. Soviet diplomats are given practically no discretion, and even the heads of the Foreign Office, Mr. Molotov and Mr. Vishinsky, do not act on any major matter without clearing with Moscow and, presumably, with Mr. Stalin and the ruling political council, the Politburo.

POINTS OF STRENGTH IN SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

Soviet foreign policy is powerful because it is a natural projection abroad of Soviet domestic policy. Within the Soviet Union political harmony is achieved by a governing group which, publicly committing itself to promote the welfare of the proletariat, takes in exchange a right to suppress intellectual freedoms which might lead to political disharmony.

In some matters, the Soviet system is tolerant. That is notably so in relation to ethnic differences between the inhabitants of its various states. Also, within the Soviet Union, men have considerable freedom to disagree and argue about science, astronomy, biology, the arts, music, the ballet, literature, and like matters. Religion is tolerated so long as it is only a ritual of worship. But there is no tolerance about political matters. There the state is supreme, and when it speaks, that is law—not merely statute law, but moral law. Political or religious thinking which conflicts with that is considered to be evil, not to be tolerated.

The means used to achieve internal political harmony are propaganda which persuades and force which intimidates and suppresses.

Soviet leaders now seek to do on a world-wide basis what they have done at home. That is Soviet foreign policy. It is natural, it is simple, it is positive. Those are elements of great strength.

Soviet foreign policy also has the strength which comes from being revolutionary. Change is the law of life and those who seek change have the exhilaration of seeming to move with an irresistible current of history. Soviet foreign policy, because it is dynamic, attracts those who think that radical change is needed to make the world better; it attracts those who think they can gain personal advantage from overturning the existing order; it attracts the many who are discontented with their lot.

The dynamic aspect of Soviet foreign policy is the more effective because it moves into a world which seems largely a vacuum so far as faith and order are concerned. Asia, Africa, and South America are lacking in healthy societies. Most of continental Europe is in postwar demoralization, accentuated by indecisive and incoherent attitudes toward Germany. The capitalistic centers, notably the British Empire and the United States, have developed some major defects. One of these is imperialism, with its byproduct of racial intolerance. Another is the failure to maintain steady production and employment. As against these the Soviet leaders pronounce the slogans of "independence" and "full employment." It is interesting to recall that efforts to get those two phrases into the Charter of the United Nations gave rise to strong opposition, as against which the Soviet viewpoint prevailed—with some qualification. Such episodes tend to confirm Soviet leaders in their view that the outer world is void of moral leadership and can readily be won to their new and vigorous faith.

Finally, Soviet policy has gained impetus from some spectacular successes. Internally, it developed in the brave and hardy Russian people a loyalty and discipline which, to the general amazement, threw back the German war machine. Externally, Soviet policy has already enlarged the Soviet Union so that it realizes most of the extreme aspirations of the czars, in some respects surpasses them, and is still expanding. The middle zone surrounds the inner zone with governments which are subservient to the will of the Soviet leaders. In the outer zone Soviet influence is everywhere powerful. Few men in political life anywhere act without first thinking whether they will please or displease the leaders of the Soviet Union. Never in history have a few men in a single country achieved such world-wide influence. This has all occurred within a few years and has given to Soviet leadership an enormous prestige.

THE WEAKNESSES OF SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

It is understandable that Soviet leaders and their followers in many lands should feel confident of peacefully achieving their Pax Sovietica. In fact, such a conclusion dangerously misjudges the situation. It overrates initial successes plucked out of war and postwar confusion and when men are spiritually and physically tired. It underrates internal deficiencies and external resistances.

The Soviet political set-up is not adapted to carrying through grandiose, world-wide plans. The power of decision is too much concentrated at the top and there is not enough delegation of authority. Also, there is a serious shortage of personnel able to deal competently with foreign affairs.

In Europe the Soviet middle zone has been hastily put together under wartime conditions. It has not yet had to meet the full impact of intense nationalistic rivalries. Ambitious men have taken Soviet help to get or retain power. But they will not be happy to serve indefinitely as Soviet lackeys. Some of them are already beginning to make that plain.

In the outer zone, Soviet foreign policy relies excessively on mass discontents. These are always useful to help pull down an existing social order. But the period of destruction must be succeeded by a period of construction. When that phase comes, Soviet leadership will lose much of its foreign following.

Another basic weakness is the dependence of Soviet policy upon the iron curtain. That temporarily helps the Soviet leaders to represent their Union as having found the way to solve all economic and social problems. But it will not always work that way. The barrier will increasingly create distrust and suspicion. More and more people will want to look behind the curtain. If they cannot, they will conclude that the Soviet system does not work well enough to stand impartial inspection and comparison Heavy reliance upon such an artificial aid is a fundamental weakness.

Most surely of all the Soviet calculation is wrong because it underestimates the Western World's repugnance to human suffering and its attachment to personal liberties.

The Soviet system is ruthless. That particularly shows itself during the transition period when the nonconformists are being eliminated. It is not possible to perform painlessly the operations needed to conform great masses of human beings to the Soviet pattern. Thus, within the middle zone, political assassinations are frequent and many are snatched away from their homes and families by the secret police because their political beliefs are suspect. Millions are uprooted and doomed to perish by privation. Millions seek to flee from the Soviet zones of occupation and many refugees commit suicide rather than to be sent back to the middle or inner zone. People who have partaken of a humane civilization are repelled by the low estimate of human life and callousness to human misery which is involved in Soviet measures for achieving conformity.

Programs are rightly judged not merely by their avowed ends, but by their methods. Today, because the peoples of the Soviet Union fought so gallantly when Hitler attacked them, we prefer to think of them in terms of their bravery and their self-sacrificial spirit and to draw a veil over what their armies, their politicians, and their secret police (NKVD) are now doing in neighboring lands. But as those methods come to be seen more clearly, they will surely arouse a formidable resistance. Already, in Austria and Hungary, where Soviet methods are known first-hand, the Communist Parties have been overwhelmingly defeated in elections.

Most bitter of all will be the resistance to the surrender of freedoms which the Soviet program would exact. So far, Soviet successes have been primarily within countries where personal freedoms have never been widely enjoyed. Where those freedoms have been practiced, the proponents of Soviet policies dare talk only about increased freedoms from economic fear. They keep silent about the political and spiritual freedoms which would be taken away. As the repressive features of the Soviet program become more clearly revealed, the resistance will grow.

In the ranks of organized labor the Soviet is pushing its policies most actively and is promising the most. Yet it is there, and among Socialists, that the most effective resistance developed. The governments which now most strongly react against the intolerance of Soviet policy are the Labor Governments of the British Commonwealth, as exemplified by Mr. Bevin of Great Britain, Mr. Evatt of Australia, and Mr. Frazer of New Zealand. Those American labor leaders who know and value American personal freedoms are carrying on a valiant and inadequately appreciated battle to prevent Communists from infiltrating into control of labor organizations. In other words, among the peoples who have had freedoms, the Soviet program is being opposed most strongly by those who are in most intimate touch with its methods, despite the fact that they belong to the proletariat class to which the Soviet program promises the most.

It can be taken as certain that as the full implications of the Soviet system come to be better understood by the American people, it will revive in them the spirit which led their forebears to pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to secure their personal freedoms.

We must act on the assumption that the Soviet program, if persisted in, will not peacefully succeed.

PART II

If the leaders of a great nation have embarked upon a foreign policy which may lead to our violent resistance, the time to plan against that is now. The sooner we make it clear that the policy cannot succeed, the more likely it is that the dangerous aspects of that policy may be changed.

None of us likes to face up to a new major international problem just when, by victory over Germany and Japan, we feel we have earned the right to a period of relaxation. None of us like to admit of danger coming from a nation which made an outstanding contribution to that victory. Some would avoid the issue by looking only upon the good ends which Soviet policy professes to seek. Some, while perceiving the intolerant and ruthless aspects of Soviet policy, cling to the hope that these aspects are only local or temporary. Some rely on the fact that no nation wants a major war or would deliberately provoke it. Some do not want to be bothered with unpleasant prospects when it cannot yet be demonstrated with mathematical certainty that they will happen.

Those are attitudes which contribute to war. They make possible the miscalculation out of which major wars arise.

It is quite true that no nation wants a big war or one the outcome of which is doubtful. That is almost always the case. Generally, such wars get started by mistake. National leaders begin by pushing outward their national domain and sphere of influence at points where, they calculate, there will be little resistance. When their calculation proves correct and no strong reaction occurs, they go on. Those within the country who advised restraint become discredited. Leadership becomes concentrated in the hands of the more reckless, who take more chances. Finally, they find to their chagrin that they have made a bad calculation.

If we have another great war, that is probably the way it will come. No one will deliberately plan it. It will be the result of miscalculating.

Twice within 25 years the United States has been drawn into a world war because the American people finally came to feel that aggressive policies in Europe and Asia threatened our conception of democracy and our ideals of personal freedom. In each case the foreign leaders would probably have followed a different course had they, at an early stage, realized that the American people would react as they did. In not making apparent, in time, our devotion to our ideals, we were guilty of contributory negligence. We must not make the same mistake three times in a generation.

SOVIET CHANGE OF PROGRAM IS POSSIBLE

It may be asked whether anything we can do would, as a practical matter, bring the Soviet leaders voluntarily to change their foreign program. No one can answer that question with assurance. There seems to be an inevitability about Soviet foreign policy. Soviet leaders believe that certain freedoms for the individual are dangerous. They have stamped them out at home just as elsewhere governments stamp out the carriers of dangerous germs. But abroad the freedoms which they fear are rife, and they are highly contagious freedoms. So, to defend their land against contamination from without, Soviet leaders set up barriers to insulate their people. That, however, is no permanent solution. It is a form of self-imprisonment that is intolerable to ambitious and able men who know that their nation is a great power and desire it to play a world-wide role. Therefore, they seek everywhere foreign governments which will join in their campaign of purge. Only in that way will the world be safe, from the standpoint of Soviet leaders.

It can be argued that, so long as Soviet domestic policy is what it is, Soviet foreign policy must also be what it is. However, human events seldom unfold in accordance with a purely logical pattern. Soviet leaders today are not as fanatical as were their predecessors. They have made many changes of domestic policy in the interest of expediency. The so-called communism of Russia today is, economically, very different from the communism taught by Marx and inaugurated under Lenin and Trotsky. Soviet foreign policy has also changed in the sense that some years ago it would have been justified as fulfillment of a sacred mission to accomplish world revolution. Now it is justfied as a practical way to assure the security of the Soviet Union.

Under Mr. Stalin, Soviet moves abroad seem to have been marked by an effort to calculate chances. Soviet foreign representatives have sometimes taken extreme positions, but Mr. Stalin has pulled back and relieved the tension when unexpected opposition was encountered. All of that indicates that Soviet foreign policy is subject to change if it can be made abundantly clear to Soviet leaders that that policy is impractical and will not, in fact, promote the safety of the Soviet Union.

However, it is not very profitable to speculate about what will come out of the Kremlin. That is an interesting intellectual pastime, but an outsider will not, in that way, get much practical guidance. From the standpoint of action, the course is clear. We must act on the assumption that we can do something to bring Soviet leaders to change their foreign program. If we do not go ahead on that basis, we shall almost surely fail. If, for example, we assume that Soviet leaders cannot be brought to change their program, we drift into surrender or war. If the past is any guide, it will be war. Therefore, as a working hypothesis, we accept the possibility of change.

There is a second working hypothesis we must make. We must assume that it will be very difficult for us to bring about a change of Soviet foreign policy. We cannot expect Soviet leaders readily to change a policy which reflects the inner life and basic philosophy of Soviet communism and which has achieved great initial success. The difficulty is increased by the fact that Soviet leaders are not well informed about the state of the world. Therefore, any program of ours designed to bring the Soviet leaders to change their foreign policy should be a program that is wisely conceived, vigorously implemented, and unitedly supported by the American people.

AMERICAN POLICY

The basic purpose of Americans for the next few years should be to develop the facts which will make it apparent, even to those within the Kremlin, that present Soviet foreign policy will not succeed. Then they may change that policy. In that way, and only in that way, can we ward off the danger of another great war due to another great miscalculation.

It is, however, essential that we develop the right set of facts. It will be easy to go wrong in this matter. As it becomes increasingly clear that the Soviet program threatens our way of life and our cherished political and spiritual freedoms, we may react violently and foolishly. Some will want us to

place our reliance wholly on our military and economic power and to use it to coerce Soviet leaders.

Such a program would probably fail. Soviet leaders are not the kind of men who are easily coerced. They do not want another major war, particularly one which they could not win. But they are tough, they are not afraid of fighting, and they cannot be arbitrarily pushed around.

Also, such a program would divide us internally. Many Americans sympathize with the professed social goals of the Sovet experiment and feel toward it much as foreign peoples during the last century felt toward the great American experiment. They would not want to crush it.

Even if we did crush it, that would prove nothing. That would not end the challenge to a society of personal freedom. On the contrary, it would probably intensify that challenge, for the Soviet experiment would then seem to have succumbed not to our merit, but to our might. New disciples of that faith would spring up everywhere.

No program is fruitful if it is merely against someone or something. Successful programs are those which are constructive and creative in their own right. What we need at this critical juncture is an affirmative demonstration that our society of freedom still has the qualities needed for survival. We must show that our free land is not spiritual lowland, easily submerged, but highland that, most of all, provides the spiritual, intellectual, and economic conditions which all men want. Upon such a program all true Americans could agree, and it would peacefully achieve our purpose.

Every civilization faces, and ought to face periodic challenges. That is nothing to complain about. It is the way the world works. In the face of the present challenge of Soviet foreign policy, we need to demonstrate:

First, that we genuinely cherish for ourselves and others the spiritual and intellectual freedoms which the Soviet system would take away, and that we are willing to sacrifice to preserve them;

Second, that those freedoms, which in the past have gloriously served mankind, are still the means whereby men can steadily advance their own development.

There is no difficulty in finding ways to make that demonstration. I make a few suggestions, primarily by way of illustration, because it is impractical here to be exhaustive.

1. The most significant demonstration that can be made is at the religious level. The overriding and ever-present reason for giving freedom to the individual is that men are created as the children of God, in His image. The human personality is thus sacred and the state must not trample upon it. That is what our forebears believed. They set forth in their Declaration of Independence that men were "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." They fought to make that Declaration good and founded a government dedicated to preserve for the people "the blessings of liberty" and which could not trespass on the Bill of Rights. If that religious belief has gone from us, then personal freedoms become primarily a matter of personal satisfaction and their retention largely a matter of self-gratification. Indeed, under those circumstances, freedom is dangerous. Mr. Vishinsky has rightly said, "It is indispensable to bring a limitation to the will and the action of man." In a free society that limitation comes primarily from acceptance of the moral law and the exercise by freemen of the self-restraints, the self-discipline, and self-sacrifice which the moral law enjoins. If a society ceases to be a religious society or if it falls under atheistic leadership, as in the case of the Soviet Union, then it is both logical and practical to treat human freedoms like the freedoms of wild animals and to suppress those freedoms so that men, like domesticated animals, will be more amenable and more secure. But Soviet leaders would know that that project is impracticable as against a people who believe that their freedoms flow from their Creator and who also use those freedoms with the restraint which is enjoined by divine commandment.

Rededication to the faith of our fathers is thus, above all, what is needed to make apparent the futility of any world program based on the suppression of human freedom.

2. We can demonstrate that our political and religious faith is a curative thing, able to heal the sores in our body politic.

There is encouraging evidence that free societies have not lost the capacity to advance the general welfare. Western democracy is already reacting well to the Soviet challenge. The abuses against which Soviet propaganda tilts are much the ghosts of a dead past. Political imperialism and cold-blooded laissez faire economics are on their way out.

The colonial powers, by the Charter of the United Nations, made major commitments to promote the well-being and free institutions of dependent peoples. They seem ready to translate those words into deeds which, even if they are still inadequate, would go far toward liquidating imperialism. The mandatory powers, except for South Africa, have agreed to trusteeship or independence. Recent proposals of the Netherlands in respect of its East Indies, and of Great Britain in respect of India and Egypt, show acceptance of the principle that imperialism and strategic advantage must yield to the right of independence.

We in the United States have done much to humanize our economic order. Social security has begun to be a reality and the specter of unemployment is being banished.

We have done something toward eradicating the blight of bigotry. Our religious groups have tackled the problem with vigor, as have some political leaders, and while progress is slow it is real.

In such ways our system of personal freedoms demonstrates its capacity to cure social ills. We must press on in those ways. We must, however, not press so fast that we stumble. We must avoid trying to cure everything by laws and decrees which so regiment and burden our society that government becomes the master of men, not their servant. We must keep our reforms in the hands of those who not only believe in personal freedoms but understand that, in fact, they disappear with the disappearance of free economic opportunity. To preserve a free society, we must choose political leaders who are competent. We can, in this respect, learn something from the Soviet system which gives leadership to those, who, on the one hand, believe devoutly in their system and who, on the other hand, are hardheaded, competent persons.

3. Another important phase of our national life is the military phase. Most Americans would prefer that to be unimportant—some for idealistic reasons and others for selfish reasons. But if we neglect our military establishment, that may lead to a dangerous misjudgment of us by the Soviet leaders. They believe in force. They take it for granted that those who have precious things will, if they are able, maintain a force-in-being to protect them. They assume that a man who does not put a lock on the door of his house has nothing in it that he greatly values. There can be little doubt but what Soviet leaders became much more confident and ambitious when, immediately after the fighting stopped, we let our military establishments deteriorate. They infer that we have nothing left which we value enough so that we are willing to make a sacrifice to insure it against loss. So long as the leaders of the Soviet Union reason that way about the significance of military establishments, so long must we maintain a strong military establishment. That does not require us to become a militaristic people or to make a provocative use of far-flung bases. It need not stop us from seeking a general reciprocal reduction of military establishments as contemplated by the United Nations Charter. What it does mean is that we should translate into modern terms the spirit which led our founders to say, in our Constitution, that a well-regulated militia was "necessary to the security of a free State."

4. Another demonstration we can make is in the area of economic aid. If we believe in a humane society, we will help those in other lands who are destitute. If we believe in a society of human freedoms, we will keep life and vigor in those who, if they live, will support and defend that kind of society. We will show the world that it is a good thing to have free people as neighbors.

We have already done that on a truly gigantic scale. We plan to do more through extending credits to Great Britain and other nations. That is as it should be.

However, the effect of what we are doing is largely nullified by abuses of individual freedom. The result on net balance is to make people elsewhere wonder whether, after all, a society of individual freedom is tolerable. Most of them have only a small margin for survival. They can exist only if production and transportation are steady and uninterrupted. They are frightened when they see that our freedom to eat is exercised so that our food exports fall below what our Government has promised to starving people and when our freedom to strike is exercised to interrupt production and transportation vital to world recovery. In these ways we witness against our professed faiths.

Our people's apparent recklessness in the use of their freedoms and apparent apathy to the cause of world-wide freedom are primarily due to the failure of those in authority to see the true nature of the present world crisis, to tell it simply to the American people, and to propose, with foresight, policies which measure up to the need. That should be corrected in order that the American people should, by their conduct, make it clear beyond peradventure that they are prepared to accept personal sacrifice to help keep freedom alive in the world. Such sacrifice now may spare us far greater sacrifice later on.

5. Another demonstration we can make is in those parts of the world where, as a result of our military operations, we are in de facto control. We fought for the Four Freedoms and for justice as expressed in the Atlantic Charter. There are some parts of the world where for the present it is impossible for us to do much to realize those goals. But there are other parts of the world, notably in Japan, in Italy and its colonies, in the western parts of Germany and Austria, and also in China and southern Korea, where the United States could, if it would, actually give men a good chance to get the freedom and justice for which we fought.

In Japan, General MacArthur has shown what can be done. Elsewhere we act as though we were inhibited from giving men freedom and justice until formal peace treaties say we may. Actually, treaty or no treaty, life goes on and the pattern of that life is being made. We should, wherever we can, make that pattern one which reflects the ends for which we professedly fought.

The fact is that our war and postwar diplomacy, as a whole, makes it natural for Soviet leaders to feel that we are insincere. Often, and conspicuously in our dealings with the Soviet Government, we have abandoned the very principles which, when it seems to serve our convenience, we invoke against the Soviet Government. For example, we bartered away to the Soviet Union the rights of weak nations, as China and Poland, despite the Atlantic Charter. We have, in Germany, shared in policies and practices which are inhuman and unjust by the standards we use

to condemn Soviet policies and methods. At the London and Paris meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers we began to put our foreign policy on the right track, but we have a big deficit to make up.

Soviet leaders are even more suspicious of us than we are of them. They are materialistic and highly skeptical of noble professions. If we wish them to look upon us as people of righteous convictions, it is vitally necessary to adhere steadfastly to principle not merely in word but above all in deed.

WHAT THE UNITED NATIONS MIGHT DO

So far we have not spoken of the United Nations as a mechanism for preventing the violent clash we apprehend. We have talked primarily of our demonstrating that our way of life is so vigorous and deeply rooted that others will renounce, as both impractical and as undesirable, the task of uprooting it. We count upon Soviet tolerance coming through Soviet realization that international intolerance will not work.

We deliberately make that approach to the problem. The healthy quality of any society must always be its first reliance. No artificial props can be devised, no mechanistic formulae can be invented to sustain a society which has lost its vigor and its prestige. That is as it should be.

The United Nations can be useful. It has great potentialities. Also it has severe limitations. Unless we appreciate these limitations our efforts may be misdirected and our reliance may be misplaced.

Today, friendly relations among the nations are threatened by three practices which, to one nation or another, seem to be dangerous, but which the United Nations cannot control.

1. Great powers use force, or more subtle methods, to gain working control of the governments of weak states.

Two cases before the Security Council illustrate this cause of complaint. One was the case of Soviet troops in Iran. Another was the case of British troops in Greece. In both cases public discussion led to promises of early withdrawal. But the action of the Security Council did not go to the heart of the matter, namely, was the government of a presumably sovereign state being improperly influenced by penetrations and pressures from abroad?

The Security Council may be able to arouse enough public opinion to prevent power politics assuming a crude form. That is something. But it is not nearly enough if the result is merely to drive such politics underground. There are many underground ways. The United States during its expansive period used them in its relation to Texas and Panama. Since then the art has been perfected. It is one against which the Security Council can give little protection. For if the penetration wholly succeeds, the local government, under the force of penetration, condones it. If the penetration succeeds partially, the outward manifestation is apt to be a civil war. In either case there is little that the United Nations can do about it without interference in what, in form, has become a domestic matter.

This condition causes much concern to nations small and great. The peoples of small states may have imposed on them governments which in major matters serve foreign masters. That is in essence the Soviet middle zone program. Also, great nations see their place in the world menaced by such methods. The Soviet policy in the Mediterranean and Middle East makes the leaders of Britain feel that their nation is today in peril as great as when Rommel was knocking at the door of Egypt. Communist activities in Latin America are bringing the American people to sense the first serious challenge to the Monroe Doctrine and its successor, the doctrine of Chapultepec. On the other hand, Soviet leaders feel that unless they do what they are doing in the middle zone it would be done to them.

So fear grips men's souls because of international practices with which the United Nations is not yet equipped to deal.

2. Another practice which, according to Soviet leaders, causes them fear is the use of our freedoms to stir up hatred. This abuse of freedom, said Mr. Vishinsky, "leads to the commission of crime against the members of the United Nations." Mr. Molotov at the Council of Foreign Ministers in London charged that the freedom of press which we sought for Rumania reflected not so much high principle as a desire to have publicized in Rumania opinions hostile to the Soviet Union. He has pointed out that the Soviet Constitution (art. 123) says that the advocacy of racial hatred or contempt is punishable, and he demands, internationally, protection against the advocacy of hatred against, and contempt of, the Soviet Union.

Such pleas from such a source seem to us strange, for Soviet communism itself relies much on fomenting class hatred. But the concern which Soviet leaders express is probably genuine. They are used to living dangerously. But at least they get protection at home from public attack by speech or press. Now, after nearly 30 years of that kind of protection, they have developed an almost morbid fear of an outer world where men are free to criticize them and the system for which they stand. There is, of course, no United Nations machinery for dealing with such use, and possible abuse, of freedom of speech and press as to Soviet leaders seem a danger.

3. Another practice which causes international friction is the use of freedoms to destroy freedom. The Soviet program uses our freedom of press, speech, and communication in order to convert us to a society which will suppress those freedoms. It causes acute irritation when aliens make such use of our freedoms and at the same time deny us freedom to test the truth of what they portray to us. It seems as though our society should protect itself against the possible perpetration upon it of a fraud. However, to build up retaliatory barriers would increase distrust and intensify division. The real remedy is to enlarge, not contract, the freedoms of speech, press, and communication so that different peoples may learn the truth about each other. But no organ of the United Nations has authority to administer this cure.

Thus, as matters now stand, the United Nations has no power to control those practices of nations which are, above all, the present cause of international fear and dislike. Small states can be coerced and great nations may be imperiled. Freedom of speech and press may be abused. "Iron curtains" can be used to prevent enlightenment.

The United Nations will, no doubt, gradually develop ways to meet these problems. The General Assembly has broad power to encourage the development of international law. Also, through the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights, the Assembly can recommend measures to establish an international flow of information and to prevent the abuse of certain freedoms. Such developments, however, are bound to be slow. The subjects are elusive and there is not a uniform moral or political foundation on which to build. We can, at this stage, expect more from using the United Nations as a harmonizing center, as contemplated by article 1 of the Charter.

So far the attention of the members and of the world has been concentrated on the Security Council. There, the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom have provided a virtually continuous public spectacle of controversy, maneuver, and countermaneuver. This may have been inevitable and has had some good results. But the disturbance of world harmony would have been less if there had been comparable efforts through other organs of the United Nations to develop fellowship.

Members should begin to use the General Assembly as the town meeting of the world, where the real problems which weigh on their minds are discussed with courtesy, yet with frankness. Such discussion may be formal or informal. Surely the freedom of speech which we defend at home, and the right to which in the United Nations was gained only through great exertion, is a right worth using and one which, if used with sincerity and self-restraint, can help to clear up misunderstandings and promote reconciliation.

The United Nations will, however, never assure international peace merely by being a place where nations air their differences. It must also be a place where nations organize together projects of human betterment and mutual advantage. Out of that can come a sense of comradeship and increased trust and tolerance. That would strike at the root of the evils which now plague us.

That is not going to be an easy road to follow because of the reluctance of the Soviet Union to join with free states in functional tasks. But we must not accept that aloofness as final. We must be resourceful and persistent in seeking ways whereby citizens of the Soviet Union will cooperate with others. To make that more likely we must let the United Nations play a greater part in the origination of such tasks. So far the functional agencies proposed have, for the most part, been conceived and developed by ourselves, and by officials who often have been as intolerant in their ways as Soviet officials are intolerant in theirs. The Soviet Union has been invited to take or leave what we had prepared. Even the states with which we have the closest relations have privately expressed complaint over our arbitrary methods and attitudes. As a member of the United Nations, we can do much better than we have yet done to find ways whereby the nations can cooperate to their mutual advantage.

We must, however, clearly understand that the United Nations is not some postwar foolproof gadget guaranteed to keep the peace. War has not been abolished and our peace and security depend primarily on ourselves. Above all, they depend on our demonstrating that our society has such vigorous and life-giving qualities that others would not destroy it if they could and could not destroy it if they would.

CONCLUSION

We have not discussed particular matters, such as Iran, or Poland, or Trieste, or Manchuria, or even atomic bombs. That is because the first basic task is to develop an international climate which is conducive to the settlement of such particular problems.

The problem of maintaining peace in a changing world is always difficult of solution. It is not solved by identifying peace with maintenance of the status quo. But also it becomes impossible of solution if a dynamic group seeks to impose on all others practices which violate their political and religious faiths.

So long as Soviet policy seeks its own security by achieving a Pax Sovietica, the United States will be disposed to resist all expansive manifestations of Soviet policy. Under those conditions the problem of Iran is not an economic problem relating to oil, but essentially a political problem involving one more step toward realization of the Pax Sovietica. Similarly, when we consider what to do with our knowledge of atomic energy, the question is whether, if we communicate that knowledge, we communicate it to a nation whose leaders accept a live-and-let-live policy or whether they are intolerant and fearful of difference, and believe it right to use ruthless methods

to conform others to their particular pattern.

Once the Soviet leaders make it apparent that they have abandoned their grandiose program and accept a world in which the Soviet Union will be one of many nations, each representing a distinctive way of life, then accommodation becomes possible. We would each still seek by "conduct and example"—as it is put in the Federalist papers—to exert an influence in the world. We would each hope that our example would be so good that men everywhere would follow it. But we would each let the extension of our influence depend primarily on letting our light shine before men so that they may see our good works. The Soviet Union would abandon such methods as are being used by it within the middle zone and outer zone and we in turn would abandon methods which seem to us defensive, but which may seem to Soviet leaders to be offensive. Under those circumstances the tension between us would be eased and ways could be found to settle our particular differences just as we have found ways to settle like differences with Britain and France over the last 130 years. Then we could see a probability of enduring peace.

TERMINAL LEAVE PAY TO ENLISTED PERSONNEL OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, at this time I urge the Senate to consider at the earliest possible date House bill 4051, a bill to grant terminal leave pay to enlisted personnel of the armed forces.

This bill recently passed the House without a dissenting vote. I am confident there will be no appreciable opposition on the part of the Senate to its immediate passage. It is a bill to legislate plain and simple justice. It will correct one of the discriminatory practices against enlisted service personnel.

Since 1874 we have had a law on the statute books under which officers are entitled to 1 month's leave of absence a year without deduction of pay and allowances and are permitted to accumulate unused portions of such leave not to exceed a total of 120 days.

The services have adhered to a policy of permitting officers to avail themselves of this leave upon relief from active duty. Thus an officer, when relieved from duty, actually remains on the Government pay roll until such time as his accumulated leave has expired, and is paid for this time at the same rate of pay and allowances which he received at the time of separation from the active service.

Civilian employees under the jurisdiction of the armed forces have enjoyed a similar privilege, and in good faith we can do no less for our enlisted men and women.

This bill proposes no gift, no bonus. It merely corrects an injustice written into the law more than 70 years ago and allowed to remain unchanged.

In all the discussion which has heretofore taken place on the merits and the practicability of this suggestion not one person has suggested that it should not be agreed to. There has been, however, an objection raised that the enactment of this legislation would entail a tremendous task of administrative detail. Authorities of the War and Navy Departments, the Director of the Budget, and various other persons have testified that such a law would be impossible to administer. This recommendation, of course, was based on the assumption that it would be necessary to go into millions of service records of men previously discharged and tabulate their unused furlough time and calculate the amount due them for accrued pay and monetary allowances. This objection, however, has been overcome in the bill passed by the House. I quote from section 5, paragraph C of the bill:

The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy each shall make such regulations as may be necessary effectively to carry out the provisions of this act, and such regulations may authorize payments under this act to be made on the basis of sworn statements of the material facts contained in certificates executed by applicants therefor. The decisions of the Secretary of War, of the Secretary of the Navy, and of the designees of each of them shall be final and not subject to review by any court or by any officer of the United States. There shall be no difference under the provisions of this act or the regulations thereunder in the method of computation of the amounts payable hereunder between officers and enlisted men, nor between the several branches of the armed service.

Thus the individual concerned may certify the amount due him in a sworn statement which sets out the fact in connection with his application for payment. This will eliminate the necessity for making an individual inspection of every service record now closed and in storage in Government warehouses.

Mr. President, as I said in the beginning, I do not believe there can be any serious objection on the part of any Member of the Senate to this bill in its present form.

It is not my desire to dictate to the members of the Military Affairs Committee. However, I do hope that this group can see its way clear to report this bill immediately in order that during this session of Congress we may pass this legislation and thereby confer these deserved and earned benefits on our enlisted men and women who have served with honor and distinction in the recent war.

As I stated a few moments ago, this is nothing but justice to our enlisted men and women, and we ought to pass the bill now and give them the help which they so greatly need as they are coming back and trying to rehabilitate themselves in society. So I urge that the Senate take up and consider this proposed legislation and pass it at this session of Congress.

SANTEE, OHIO, AND WABASH RIVER BRIDGES

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, during the call of the Calendar on June 14 the Senate passed three bridge bills, S. 1922, to revive an act granting the consent of Congress to the South Carolina State Highway Department to construct a bridge across the Santee River;

S. 1983, a bill authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to build a bridge across the Ohio River near Mauckport, Ind.; and

S. 1984. A bill authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Wabash River near Mount Vernon, Ind.

The House has also passed similar bills, which are now in the Committee on Commerce, the bills having crossed.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce may be discharged from the further consideration of the House bills, and that they may be considered as having been read the third time and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. What is the status of the bill introduced by the Senators from Delaware, New Jersey, and Maryland, in connection with the Delaware River Bridge?

Mr. OVERTON. That bill has been referred to a subcommittee, and hearings are scheduled to begin tomorrow morning at 10:30 o'clock, in the rooms of the Senate Committee on Commerce. There was some opposition, I understand, from some residents of the city of Philadelphia, and we are giving them an opportunity to be heard. I hope that those who favor the bill also will appear. However, extensive hearings were held, as the Senator will recall, on the same bill in 1938, and the committee will have all those hearings before it, and probably it will not be necessary to have any long hearings.

Mr. SMITH. I understood that the War Department and Navy Department had withdrawn their objections to the bill, provided, of course, the plans for the structure were submitted for their approval.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5748) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the South Carolina State Highway Department to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River, at or near Leneudes Ferry, S. C.," similar to Senate bill 1922.

A bill (H. R. 5736) authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Ind., similar to Senate bill 1983.

A bill (H. R. 5606) authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Wabash River near Mount Vernon, Ind., similar to Senate bill 1984.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Louisiana is agreed to.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall discuss briefly, I hope, the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the pending bill, which amendment deals with the subject that is familiarly known to those of us who have been for some years members of the Appropriations Committee as the Central Valley project. The matter presented by the amendment of the Senator from Arizona has been, in one form or another, before the Appropriations Committee for the past several years. In the main, Mr. President, it addresses itself to the question of whether the policy of the Federal Government is to discourage or destroy or impair or impede private enterprise when private money, the money of the public generally, is invested in the great private enterprise of developing electrical energy. It may well be stated as a preliminary to my remarks that for many years the people of northern California, that is, north of the Tehachapi Range of mountains, have been served, so far as electrical energy is concerned, by an enterprising private concern known as the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. I doubt whether anyone, however zealous he may be in connection with this subject, will deny that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., supplying the needs of northern California, has expended its money in ventures in the way of construction work of all kinds so as to enhance its activities in supplying the needs of the people of northern California. I say without fear of contradiction that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. which supplies electrical energy to northern California is supplying it now as cheaply as the Department of the Interior will, if it becomes the supplier of electrical energy growing out of the Central Valley project. Mr. President, I have heard that admitted repeatedly by the representatives of the Department of the Interior in their statements before the Appropriations Committee.

My position in opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona is taken because of my inherent feeling that this country can best succeed by encouraging private enterprise, that when we destroy private enterprise, when we destroy the legitimate investment of private funds, we destroy the source of business which will sustain this Government by way of taxation for the years to come. Hence, I am opposed to setting up governmental control agencies against private enterprise for the purpose of destroying private enterprise, where such private enterprise has and can and will not only pay taxes but will serve the people as economically, as cheaply, and as efficiently as the Government admits it could do under the circumstances.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Is not this the same, identical proposition which was before the Senate last year?

Mr. McCARRAN. It has been before the Senate in one form or another for the past 4 or perhaps 5 years.

Mr. WILEY. The Senate has voted it down each time, has it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not recall that.

Mr. WILEY. I am seeking light.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the committee has disapproved the item. I shall take last year as an example, because my memory is best as to what happened last year. At that time the committee disapproved the item. I think it was brought up on the floor of the Senate, and the Senate approved the item. That is my recollection, and what I have just stated may be true for the past 2 years. But in the interim, there were entered into between the Interior Department and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. agreements which were for the duration of the war, as I recall, they are still in full force and effect.

Mr. WILEY. Do any changed factors enter into the picture? Are the factors affecting the situation any different from those which applied to it last year or the year before, when we had some debate on this subject?

Mr. McCARRAN. My answer is that, by and large, except for the fact that the impounding construction work and the building of impounding facilities have gone on with the appropriations, as they have been made from year to year, and with the further exception that canals for irrigation purposes have been provided for, as they are provided for in this measure—and they, too, have been carried on with greater or less activity—aside from those items, generally speaking the conditions have scarcely changed to any considerable extent.

Mr. WILEY. Then is it the gist of the Senator's argument that if this appropriation is made, it will operate to the detriment of the investors who have relied upon the situation as it existed in California, and is it his opinion that it will not in any way benefit the general public if the appropriation is made by the Government?

Mr. McCARRAN. By and large, that is a part of my contention. My contention goes further than that. The proposal will inure against the welfare and benefit of the people of California, and it will tend to put out of business a private enterprise. Secondly, it will remove from the realm of taxation a great private enterprise which is paying an enormous sum of money toward the upkeep of the State of California. I shall go into that subject in figures and amounts before I conclude.

Mr. President, let us consider the amendment for a few moments. First of all, before doing so, let me say that in the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations this matter was considered at length, and by a substantial vote the subcommittee refused to make appropriations for the building of parallel transmission lines. We did make a provision for the building of transmission lines from what is known as the Shasta Dam, which is the impounding works, to the Shasta substation which is the place where the substation is to be located for the distribution of power after it is generated. We made provision in the bill for going forward with the construction of the impounding works at Shasta Dam, with the construction of the substation, and other works pertaining to it. We recommended for irrigation all the appropriation which had been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. We made all the appropriation which was necessary to conduct the entire enterprise for a period of the next several years. However, when it came to appropriating for a duplication of transmission lines the subcommittee, and the full committee as well, believed that it was time to stop because the transmission lines of the private enterprise already in existence were taking the power as it was generated under an agreement entered into between the power company and the Department of the Interior, and was transporting the power to the people who were to be served. The company was serving the people and is serving the people at the present time to the full capacity of the power generated. That statement is not only true with respect to the power generated by the Shasta and Keswick Dams, but also the power generated by the private enterprise itself.

In other words, Mr. President, the power generated by the Central Valley's project is not sufficient to supply the needs of the people of northern California. There must also be available the enormous supply of power which comes from the various facilities of the private enterprise itself in order to meet the needs of the people of northern California.

Mr. President, why are some of us who are not citizens of the State of California interested in this subject? Why, although not members of the great population of the State of California, do we take a very definite stand? It is because we believe that if we are to create in the Government a great power octopus, if you please—I use that term advisedly—the time will come when that power octopus will be a menace superseding and outreaching anything that has ever been charged against private enterprise. It were a thousand times better, in my judgment, and in the judgment of the other members of the Appropriations Committee, to let private enterprise go forward if it will serve the people as efficiently and as economically as the Government could serve them under the surrounding and attending circumstances.

The amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is chairman of the subcommittee and ranking majority member of the Committee on Appropriations, is directly contrary to the vote of the majority of the members of the Committee on Appropriations. In lieu of the matter inserted by the committee amendment, beginning with the word "Shasta", in line 25, page 52, and ending with the amount "$20,836,670", in line 5, page 53, the Senator from Arizona proposed to insert "and substations, $4,572,000, including Shasta to Delta switchyards via Oroville and Sacramento, 230 kilovolt, Shasta to Delta switchyards (west side lines), 230 kilovolt; Keswick to Sacramento, 115 kilovolt; Contra Costa power distribution system, miscellaneous transmission, feeder lines and facilities, and substations; in all, $25,000,000."

Mr. President, it is proposed to increase the amount recommended by the Senate committee for transmission lines in this bill by $4,163,330. The sums allowed for lines are not earmarked in this amend-

ment, although the Congress has specifically earmarked all appropriations for this project ever since former Secretary of the Department of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, ordered the Oroville line to be constructed out of unexpended balances after Congress had refused to appropriate money for its construction. The amendment does not specify how the $4,572,000 should be spent on the several lines listed in the amendment. None of the money, Mr. President, is earmarked for any particular line. The bureau would be free to distribute the money in any way which it pleased. But, even more important, this $4,572,000 would be only the beginning of a $44,000,000 expenditure for the construction of a transmission system which is not needed as a part of the project, and which would duplicate the transmission system which already completely serves the area.

The only purpose of such duplication would be to set up a Government-owned system to take customers away from the private utility. The Government does not have to build this $44,000,000 transmission line, nor the $26,000,000 steam plant which the Bureau plans to construct in conjunction with this system in order to generate power. The Bureau's proposed competing power system would require an unnecessary Federal expenditure of $70,000,000. The net return to the Treasury with such a competing system, even if a sufficient number of customers were obtained, would be $2,000,000 a year less than if the power were sold, as in the present contract.

Mr. President, in the debate in the House of Representatives on the appropriation Representative Havenner of California, formerly President of the State Railroad Commission, stated that the average rural electric rate in California in 1945 was less than 1¾ cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with 2½ cents for the Nation, a difference of 30 percent in favor of California. He was then speaking of the privately owned concern distributing this power to the people of northern California.

That brings to me the thought that some 2 or 3 years ago in a hearing before the Appropriations Committee, when the Commissioner of Reclamation was present, the direct question was asked him if the Government were put in the place of the private concern which now distributes this power could the Government furnish the power at any less rate than the private concern could furnish it. To that question he replied that he did not believe the Government could serve the people at any less charge than the charge which was being made by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Mr. President, 170,000 kilowatts of power are now being delivered to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and are being transmitted to consumers over existing transmission facilities. The company spent—and this is a part of the record—more than $5,000,000 for substation facilities in order to take that power into its system. This was all worked out by an arrangement with the Interior Department. The company is actively engaged in constructing—and I call this especially to the attention of the Senate—a double circuit tower line with one circuit installed on the west side of the Sacramento Valley on a right-of-way which it has owned for many years south of Shasta substation. The materials for this line were ordered last fall and the line will be completed by the end of this year. It will cost $6,000,000. This line will make it possible to take delivery of 320,000 kilowatts of Shasta power at Shasta substation.

Do we not recall, Mr. President, that the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] yesterday made the very frank statement that this is the last time this appropriation will be called for, because, he said, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has money available and is ready to install the lines, but as against that which the Senator from Arizona admits very frankly, it is proposed to take the money out of the Treasury of the United States and do what private enterprise has money to do and is ready, willing, and able to do right now. What will be the result if we carry out that policy? We will discourage private enterprise, if not destroy it, and we will remove from the taxpaying lists of the State of California this great taxpayer that is sustaining or aiding in sustaining a sovereign State.

The Bureau will not have—and I draw the attention of the Senate to this point—the Bureau will not have 320,000 kilowatts available until the middle of next year, 6 months after the company's line has been completed. That is an admitted fact.

Let me dwell on that point for a moment. The power will not be available at Shasta substation coming from the Shasta Dam until 6 months or more after the line will have been completed by private enterprise. The Government could be spared the expenditure of some forty-odd million dollars which must eventually be provided to complete the whole project, including $4,000,000 proposed to be appropriated at the present time.

Only one more transmission circuit is needed to transmit the full capacity of the Shasta and Keswick plans. That circuit can be installed on the vacant position on the towers now being erected for a cost of $4,000,000. That is private enterprise going forward with all speed ahead. The full capacity of the power plants will not be installed until the end of 1947.

The amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona would provide funds to begin the construction of three 230-kilovolt lines. One of these would duplicate the line now used in connection wtih Shasta power south of Oroville; another would duplicate the line on the west side of the valley which the company will complete this year, and the third line would be far more costly than the line which the company could install in the vacant position now on the new west side tower. In other words, the company has already set up its towers to carry this extra line. Photographs of the towers were presented to the Committee on Appropriations showing one line in place and the brackets out for another line ready to be installed. Those are company towers and those are company brackets, which were installed at company expense. Moreover, any line from Oroville to Sacramento and to the pumping plant will be a clear duplication of a company line which is already in operation and is now used in connection with the transmission of Shasta power. There is also a vacant position on the towers which carry this line on which the company can install additional wires at a cost of $900,000. With this expenditure the company can do what, according to the estimates, would cost the Government $3,500,000.

Again I draw the attention of the Senate to the discrepancy between that which would be taken out of the Treasury of the United States and the much smaller expenditure which private enterprise would use to accomplish the result—$900,000 as compared with $3,500,000 to be taken out of the Treasury. Here is a waste of $2,600,000, which must be carried by the water users on the project, or the Federal taxpayers of the Nation.

Those of us who are interested in reclamation, those of us who are interested in reclaiming the lands of the West, those of us who, from month to month and from day to day, here on the floor of the Senate have said we want to provide opportunity for the boys returning from the service to take up land and become agrarian, if you please, have to consider whether or not the burden which they must carry when they take up lands are such as they can carry, or are such as to make it impossible for them as agriculturalists to go forward successfully.

All the moneys expended by the Federal Government become a charge against the land which goes into the reclamation project, and the reclaimers of the land—the farmers who propose to take up 160 acres or 240 acres of land in that valley—must know when they take it up that they will have to repay into the Treasury that which the Government put into these lines.

Shall we say that $900,000 expended by private enterprise is equal to $2,600,000 which the Government is going to expend out of the Treasury of the United States, which must be paid back by the reclaimers of the soil? Shall we say to the returning soldiers boys who want to take up these farms, "We could have afforded you an opportunity to take up this land with a charge of only $900,000 regarding this particular item, but we saw the light in another direction, and we imposed a tax of $2,600,000 against your land which you and your progeny must meet over a period of years"?

Mr. President, I am laying this matter before the Senate, not because I have the least personal interest, not because I am a citizen of the State of California, for I am not, but because I am interested in the development of the West, because this is a western project, because the development of the West calls upon those who see economic opportunity in the West to take advantage of it and to come to the West and engage in a great enterprise which will make homes for men and women who can go back to the soil and sustain the Government and the world.

So, Mr. President, I bring these matters to the attention of the Senate because

I believe that which aids one State in one locality aids all other States, and that which will make an enterprise economic in the State of California will make it economic in its neighbor State of Nevada, its neighbor State of Oregon, its neighbor State of Arizona, its neighbor State of New Mexico, and other Western States of similar character.

Reference was made on the Senate floor to the desirability of a public-power yardstick to act as a check on the private power monopoly. I think it was the very able senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] who used that expression yesterday. I am sorry the Senator, who was here a moment ago, has been called from the Chamber. Nothing was said, however, about the control over the private monopoly which the State of California exercises through its duly authorized commission. In the State of California that which some States call a public-service commission is called the railroad commission. The Railroad Commission of the State of California has, by statute of the State of California, jurisdiction over all subjects such as that we are discussing.

The commission has broad regulatory powers, including jurisdiction over capitalization, consolidations, mergers, valuation, accounting practice, rates, service standards, and the issuance of certificates of public convenience and necessity. It is continually investigating rates, and under that policy the rates in northern California have been reduced periodically. Since 1936 rate regulation has resulted in decreasing the rates to the extent of $15,000,000 a year.

The only effective way of providing electric service to an area is to do it with a completely integrated power system which avoids duplication and uses facilities to the best advantage. The power industry and the regulating bodies which control it have long realized this, and have encouraged and fostered such integration. During the war the War Production Board also fostered such integration, with results which contributed substantially to the war effort.

The result of this policy is that today most areas are served by a single operating agency, publicly or privately owned. A competitive yardstick was proposed for the TVA, but, as I hope Senators will recall, it finally had to take over all the utilities in the area in order to operate with any degree of effectiveness.

The same purpose is evident in all the other areas where public power yardsticks have been set up. If northern California gets a public power yardstick, it is safe to say that there will be similar results. The yardstick will grow until there is no private utility, and the result will be that the so-called private monopoly, now effectively regulated and controlled by the State of California, will be replaced by a public monopoly dominated completely by a Federal bureau, over which the State of California will have no control whatever, and from which the State of California will not derive any revenue by way of taxation.

In 1945 the private utility paid $13,845,000 in State and local taxes. Let me repeat that, because it seems to me that in this hour, when we are continually looking for sources of revenue by way of taxation to sustain Federal and State organizations and governments, it might be well to look at the source. I repeat, in 1945 the private utility, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., now about to be put out of business by a vote of the Senate if it adopts the pending amendment and it remains in the bill, paid in to the coffers of the State of California and its counties $13,845,000 in State and local taxes. In a number of counties it paid more than half the total taxes collected for county purposes.

Let us pause for a moment to think of that. This enterprise, which it is now proposed to lay the foundation to destroy, in a number of counties of the State of California paid more than half the total taxes collected for country purposes. None of those taxes would be paid if a public power monopoly grows out of the "yardstick," the term used by the able senior Senator from California.

In 1945 this private utility paid the Federal Government—and again I draw the attention of the Senate to this startling figure—in 1945 this private utility paid the Federal Government $26,348,000. Where will that amount of money come from, may I ask, when this private enterprise is put out of business? From what source will it come? Will it come from the Interior Department? If so, it will have to come by way of appropriation, and I doubt very much if that much money will come from that source.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Can it not also be said that this private enterprise paid to its stockholders large sums of money from which also taxes were derived by the Federal Government?

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator for that suggestion. I was going to touch on that subject in a moment. I will follow the lead given me by the able Senator from Oklahoma because I happen to have the figures here at hand. The company, which is an operating company in California, has 79,000 stockholders in California. Think of that, Senators—79,000 stockholders in California out of a total of 121,000 stockholders in all. There are stockholders of the company in every county in the Central Valley, that is, the Central Valley in the State of California, in which it is proposed by the initial step proposed by the pending amendment to read this private facility out of business eventually. In the counties in which it is expected the bulk of Central Valley power will be used, Contra Costa, Alameda, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara, there are more than 46,000 holders of stock in the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Their holdings represent a par value of more than $100,000,000. Approximately 90 percent of the company's properties have been constructed or acquired under regulation by the California Railroad Commission, which is the public-service commission of the State of California. All the outstanding bonds of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., and almost 90 percent of its outstanding stock, have been issued under authorization of the Commission since 1912, when strict regulation over public utilities was established in California under the then Governor, the late Senator of happy memory, Hiram W. Johnson.

Mr. President, I had hoped when there was a change some months ago in the Department of the Interior, and thus in the Bureau of Reclamation, that the policy of the avaricious power czar who had been in charge of that Bureau for a number of years would be changed. When Mr. Ickes left the Government service I had hoped that no longer would avarice for power prevail in the Bureau of Reclamation. But it appears as though the echoes of his footsteps are still resounding, and we see somewhat of his activity still continuing toward Federal monopoly of power, Federal control of great power projects. When the power of a region is controlled, when the power which drives the wheels of industry is controlled, it is not much trouble to go a little further and control the votes of the particular region. That has been established in more ways than one and at more times than once in the history of this country.

I for one want to keep the West free. I want to keep free that region, which to my mind will be the haven of happiness for oncoming generations, a place where ex-servicemen and their sons and daughters may find support and sustenance and homes. I want the opportunity to exist there for free enterprise and for the investment of venture money, if you please, and for private capital in every respect. So I take the position that I do here, the same position I have taken for the past 5 years when this problem has been before the Senate.

The Bureau of Reclamation is again seeking appropriations for transmission lines and switchyards for the Central Valley project in California. In the pending bill it requests $4,572,000—and that is this amendment—for transmission lines and $1,500,000 for switchyards. The Appropriations Committee allowed the item for switchyards; it allowed the item to enable the switchyard to be installed and to enable transformers and transmission facilities to be provided close to the consumers, and the bill specifically designated that such switchyards should be at Shasta and Shasta substation. The House committee cut the request for transmission lines to $414,090, and the request for switchyards to $765,310. The amounts allowed in the House for transmission lines were $5,420 for additions to the existing Shasta-Oroville line, $382,655 for an extension of the line from Oroville toward Sacramento, and $26,015 for distribution or tie lines on the Contra Costa canal. The $765,310 allowed for switchyards covers installations at Shasta and Keswick Dams and the initiation of construction at Sacramento and at the Delta-Mendota pumping plants. The sums allowed for the further extension of the Oroville line and for the construction of lines along the Contra Costa canal are unnecessary, in my judgment, and a waste of public funds.

Mr. Black, the president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., in testifying before

the Committee on Appropriations, clearly presented his position and the position of his company. I doubt very much if anyone, however zealous he may be on this subject—even Governor Warren himself, were he present and fortified with both the nominations which he now holds—would have anything but praise for the fine spirit of cooperation and the splendid management of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. under the administration of Mr. Black, who testified before the Appropriations Committee. Mr. Black said:

The market is fully served. The Bureau has no customers to justify the investment in transmission lines. The power for the project pumps is and can be supplied from the existing system.

By the project pumps he refers to the pumps which will be utilized in the irrigation system. We have made provision for them in the pending appropriation bill. Not only that, but we have made provision for everything that applies to irrigation or reclamation.

Mr. Black further stated:

Construction of the proposed transmission lines and switch yards would duplicate existing taxpaying facilities. There is no need and no justification for any expenditure for transmission lines or switch yards beyond Shasta substation, 25 miles below Shasta Dam.

Continuing, Mr. Black said:

The Bureau has repeatedly represented that it had customers for project power which would justify the construction of an extension of the Oroville line. This is not the fact. With the exception of the small city of Roseville, this company now has long-term contracts with every governmental agency which distributes or proposes to distribute electric power in the Central Valley area.

Since our appearance before the House committee we have signed a 7½-year contract with the Sacramento municipal utility district, effective when the district takes over our electric distribution properties, not earlier than January 1, 1947.

That is significant to the Senate.

For many years the Bureau claimed the district as a potential customer. Appropriations to build unnecessary transmission lines were urged.

That is true. What Mr. Black says must bring back in recollection to those of us who for years have been members of the Appropriations Committee what was repeatedly stated to the committee by representatives of the Bureau—that the Sacramento area was a potential customer for Federal power.

Mr. Black further stated:

The Bureau's one customer, the city of Roseville, uses only about 1,300 kilowatts of power, which is less than 1 percent of the capacity of the proposed transmission line. The Bureau proposes to serve Roseville for $26,680 a year and to stand ready to supply up to 1,800 kilowatts.

This same power sold to the company at our Shasta substation, 25 miles below Shasta Dam, would bring $29,000 a year, or $2,000 more than when supplied to Roseville. And that is not all.

The annual charges on that part of the transmission and other facilities required to bring the power to Roseville and assure adequate service would be in the order of $20,000. When these charges are met, the Bureau would lose not $2,000, but $22,000 a year, by serving Roseville instead of selling the power to the company at Shasta substation.

Continuing, Mr. Black said:

When appropriations were voted for the extension of the Oroville line toward Sacramento, it must have been believed that the line was required to bring power to the Delta area for project pumping. But this is not the case.

The sites for the pumps have not yet been decided upon. The rights-of-way for the $12,000,000 Delta cross-channel and the $71,000,000 Delta-Mendota canal have not been obtained. Even when the rights-of-way are obtained, it is probable that 5 years will be required to construct the canals and set up the pumps. The Bureau's own reports show that the pumping plants will not be in full operation for 15 or 20 years.

Let that be considered by the Senate when it comes to vote this initial appropriation, which must result eventually in an expenditure of more than $40,000,000 to carry out what would be initiated.

The Bureau's own reports show that the pumping plants will not be in full operation for 15 or 20 years.

Power to drive these pumps, whenever they are ready, can be supplied from transmission lines of the company located about 10 miles away. We have offered to furnish power from these lines on an exchange basis, the company to be reimbursed in power from the Shasta and Keswick plants, delivered to us at our Shasta substation.

We have agreed that the cost never shall be greater than if the power were transmitted to the pumps from Shasta and Keswick Dams over a tax-free, fully loaded, Government-owned transmission line.

There we have again the outstanding and emphatic declaration that a private enterprise is ready, willing, and able to furnish power for irrigation purposes and for pumping purposes, at a price equal to that which the Government must charge if it has these transmission lines fully installed, which transmission lines will eventually cost many millions of dollars. As a matter of fact, private enterprise is ready to install them now at its own expense and pay taxes on the enterprise from year to year for the sustenance of the State of California.

Mr. Black further said:

For many years the cost will be very much less. We have guaranteed never to charge for this service more than one mill per kilowatt hour.

Mr. President, let me repeat that statement, which comes from the president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. That company has been under contract with the Bureau, and for half a century it has sustained the State of California by its services. Mr. Black said:

We have guaranteed never to charge for this service more than 1 mill per kilowatt-hour.

In that statement he refers to the service for the power furnished for pumps for irrigation and reclamation.

Mr. President, I doubt whether in all the power history of this country there has been such a guaranty. I doubt whether in all the length and breadth of this country there is any such assurance of economy.

Mr. Black then said:

Under the exchange basis the annual cost of service would depend entirely on the amount of power used by the pumping plants. But if the Bureau constructed a transmission line to serve the pumps, the annual charge would be fixed, no matter how little power was required.

Again I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there must be fixed charges because the land which bears the expense of these installations must pay it back over a period of years, and hence the charges must apply on a fixed basis to every acre of land reclaimed in the Central Valley.

I read further from the statement which Mr. Black made before the Appropriations Committee:

Annual charges on the Oroville extension and appurtenant substations would be fixed at about $400,000. Over a 15-year building-up period, these charges would total $6,000,000. Under the exchange method, with annual charges confined to the actual use of power, the total would be less than $3,000,000. This means that the exchange method would save the water users, or the Government, more than $3,000,000 in the 15-year period that pumping demands were building up.

Mr. President, this item in itself is not a small one. During the period when such irrigation projects were being built there would be a saving of some $15,000,000 to the Government, and of course a saving to the Government in connection with a matter of this kind means a saving to the man who goes on the land, uses the power, irrigates the land, builds his home there, and looks to the future time when he may bring the charges down to the very minimum by paying off the cost over a period of 40 years, if that be the period fixed. No, Mr. President; there are many persons who believe—and especially I have found the belief to prevail in the Eastern States; indeed, I have found it to prevail here on the floor of the Senate and in the committees—that these reclamation projects, for which Government land and Government money are used, never pay off. Many persons believe that the money is a gift to the people who settle on the land. The history of reclamation projects in the United States is a most commendable one; indeed, reclamation projects rank No. 1 of all creditors of the Government, in respect to paying off their obligations. They pay off over a period of years. They carry the burden as a continual burden during those years, and it is a first mortgage, so to speak, against the product of the soil which they bring forth by their toil, their patience, and their vigilance.

I continue to read from the statement which Mr. Black made before the Appropriations Committee:

The existing line from Shasta substation to Oroville was constructed by the Bureau against the will of Congress.

No one knows that better than does the Senate Appropriations Committee, because we had it brought very vividly to our attention that the Secretary of the Interior just thumbed his nose at the Congress, and utilized money which had been appropriated for other purposes and built that substation.

Mr. Black further said to the committee:

Congress denied a specific appropriation for this line, but the Bureau ignored the denial

and proceeded to build the line out of "unexpended balances."

As the committee knows, this line was leased by the Bureau to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. before it was completed and now is operated by us as a tie-in line between two of our transmission systems. Depending on load requirements, it is used to transmit company or project power. This line should have been built by the company; the company was prepared to build it and would have built it had we not been denied the priorities required during the war period.

Mr. President, I returned to the statement made by the able Senator from Arizona on yesterday, when he reminded the Senate that this is the last time this matter will come before the Senate, because, as he said, and it is a fact, the company is ready, willing, and able to build the line which the Government is now called upon to build, and the company has the money to build the line ready to expend.

Mr. Black further said:

Extension of this line from Oroville to the proposed Delta pumps by way of Sacramento will cost $3,500,000. Including switchyards the total cost will be more than $7,000,000.

This proposed extension will be a clear duplication of a company line already in operation and used in connection with Shasta power. Survey stakes set by the Bureau show that the proposed extension will parallel the company line in places at a distance no greater than 85 feet.

Let me emphasize that statement. It has been intimated that the proposed new line will not be a parallel line. But stakes set by the survey crews, and now in place, show that the line is proposed as a parallel line, in some places is not more than 85 feet distant from the company line. Mr. Black then said:

At other points it will run less than a mile from our line. Photographs which we will submit to the committee——

And he did submit them——

Vividly portray this duplication and emphasize the waste of Government funds which will attend the construction of the line.

The company line, which the Bureau proposes to duplicate, is used to transmit both company and project power from Oroville south by way of Sacramento.

Continuing, Mr. Black:

We have spent more than $5,000,000 for substation facilities in connection with this line and to handle Shasta power under the existing contract.

The towers on this line have space for still another line. Wires for the additional line can be installed for $900,000. But the transmission line proposed by the Bureau would cost $3,500,000. This means the company can do for $900,000 what would cost the Government $3,500,000. Here alone is a waste of $2,600,000, which must be carried by the water users or by the Federal taxpayers of the Nation.

I read further from Mr. Black's testimony.

The Bureau requested $50,000 and the House committee allowed $26,015 to commence construction of a short and detached section of transmission line along the Contra Costa canal. The purpose of this line is to transmit power, which we now deliver to existing pumps, to two small additional pumping plants to be installed about 25 miles down the canal. When completed, this line will cost $159,000.

The line is wholly unnecessary because the contract now in effect with this company provides that power on an exchange basis shall be delivered "at such other points on the Contra Costa canal as may be designated by the United States and agreed to by the company." The company is prepared to meet this provision of the contract. Its existing lines are located 0.6 and 0.8 mile from the two additional pumping plants which the Bureau proposes to install. These lines can be extended for an expenditure of less than $20,000, which the company is prepared to make.

Mr. Black stated further before the committee, as follows:

What we have said about expenditures for the proposed Oroville extension and for the line on the Contra Costa canal in true for all the transmission lines proposed by the Bureau. Any expenditure for transmission facilities south of Shasta substation would be wasteful of public funds. The company can provide all the facilities required for the absorption of the output of the Shasta and Keswick plants south of Shasta substation for $22,000,000. It can do this by using vacant positions on existing towers; by employing spare capacity on existing transmission lines and in existing substations, and by combining and coordinating future facilities. According to its own estimates, which are unquestionably low, the Bureau would have to expend $44,000,000 to accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. President, those statements which were made by Mr. Black before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate stand unchallenged. They must be accepted by the Senate as facts. They stand unchallenged on the record of the Appropriations Committee and, indeed, before the Senate.

But this is not the only advantage of coordination—

Says Mr. Black in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee—

The Bureau would have to obtain its customers in competition with the company and during this period operating losses amounting to many millions of dollars would be inevitable. These losses would not be incurred under our offer of cooperation.

It should scarcely require a statement of figures, nor would it require an expression of an expert to make the Senate realize that the last statement by Mr. Black must of necessity be true. Here is a company serving the people. Here is a company amply facilitated with equipment and funds, ready, able, and willing to install all necessary facilities for additional service when such service is required.

Mr. President, I realize that this is the hour when many Senators are absent from the Chamber. We are dealing with a most important matter. It is at least sufficiently important for some of us to occupy the floor for hours, believing, as we do, that we are sustaining a great American principle. It seems to me that we should have a better attendance. I respectfully suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gurney	Overton
Austin	Hart	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Barkley	Hayden	Revercomb
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Brooks	Hill	Russell
Buck	Hoey	Saltonstall
Burch	Huffman	Smith
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Swift
Byrd	Kilgore	Taft
Capper	Knowland	Taylor
Carville	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McCarran	Tobey
Donnell	McClellan	Tunnell
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	McMahon	Wagner
Ellender	Mead	Walsh
Ferguson	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Murdock	Willis
Gerry	Murray	
Gossett	O'Daniel	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, during the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Black, president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., presented a memorandum for insertion in the record, and the insertion was made by the Senator from Arizona as chairman of the subcommittee having charge of the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The insertion shows the load which must be carried by those who reclaim the lands or utilize the power for reclamation in the Central Valley if the project is constructed as proposed to be initiated by the amendment now pending. Senators should remember that the pending amendment is but the toe in the door, so to speak, for a vast series of appropriations yet to come if we take this initial step.

The memorandum submitted by Mr. Black, found in the hearings at page 1013, is exceedingly interesting when we come to consider what load must be borne by those who reclaim the lands in the Central Valley if these appropriations go through, as distinguished from that which they may bear if the power required is furnished by private enterprise already in existence.

The memorandum states:

The Bureau estimates the total cost of the Central Valley project at $384,314,000. It proposes to allocate $49,527,000 to navigation and flood control, which is nonreimbursable, and $334,787,000 to irrigation, municipal water supply, and commercial power, which is reimbursable. The Bureau assigns $26,874,000, or 23 percent of the cost of Shasta Reservoir, to commercial power. This amount would be $52,004,000, or 45 percent, if the cost of project power delivered to load centers were made equal to the cost of steam-electric power.

The Bureau estimates that the revenue from sale of water and power would be sufficient (1) to pay operating expenses and (2) to repay a total of $316,441,000 of the reimbursable cost, without interest by the year 2006.

So, by the year 2006, Mr. President, those who reclaim these lands in the Central Valley may have hope, if they or

their progeny are still on the lands, that they may be relieved of the mortgage which the Government holds on the land by reason of the expenditure of money, the initial appropriation of which is about to be made if this item is adopted by the Senate; they may have some lingering hope that they may be relieved of the obligation, and they may tell their children to tell their children that they expect that at that time or thereabouts the load may be taken off.

The memorandum of Mr. Black inserted in the hearings continues:

Under the reclamation law as we understand it, the Bureau should also return to the Federal Treasury, interest at not less than 3 percent on the investment made in the facilities for municipal water and for commercial power. The Bureau allocates a total of $130,948,000 to these purposes. On the basis of 50-year amortization, and 3 percent interest on the unamortized investment, the Bureau should return $98,211,000 in interest to the Federal Treasury in the 50-year period. If the Bureau had allocated 45 percent instead of 23 percent of the cost of Shasta Reservoir to commercial power, the interest would be increased to $117,059,000.

To summarize, even in the year 2006 the Bureau's plan would fall short of meeting the reimbursable cost of the project by $18,346,000, without including interest.

So I think I was mistaken, because there will still be a mortgage on these lands in 2006 if the Bureau completes this project as planned.

The memorandum inserted in the record of the hearings continues:

If interest were included, the Bureau's plan would fall short by $116,557,000. If the allocation of the cost of Shasta Reservoir to commercial power were increased from 23 percent to 45 percent and interest included, it would fall short by $135,405,000.

On the other hand, under the company's proposal, it would not be necessary to invest $69,535,000 in transmission facilities and steam plants.

Of course, $69,535,000 may perhaps not mean so very much in the year 2006. Those who are living in the year 2006 may not regard that as a large amount of money. Little by little we are going in the direction where millions of dollars do not bother us much; in fact, we are not much concerned over billions of dollars until they begin to accumulate toward the trillion mark. The memorandum continues:

This would reduce the total reimbursable cost of the project from $334,787,000 down to $265,252,000.

That is under the plan proposed by private enterprise.

The revenue—

Says the memorandum—

which the project would receive would be sufficient to pay all operating expense, to repay the full reimbursable cost without interest and leave a surplus of $80,752,000. This is $98,818,000 more than the Bureau would repay on a noninterest basis.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the figures here presented should convince anyone that economy demands that we do not initiate this enormous expenditure by putting a private enterprise out of business, destroying the tax structure of a State, and discouraging the development of the great western empire to which humanity is looking so hopefully.

The memorandum continues:

However, as stated before, we believe that the reclamation law requires that interest be paid on the Government's investment in facilities allocated to municipal water and commercial power. Under the company's proposal the Government's investment would be substantially reduced. Consequently interest charges would amount to only $54,251,000 if 23 percent of the cost of Shasta Reservoir is allocated to commercial power and to $73,099,000 if 45 percent is so allocated. The company's proposal is therefore sufficient to repay to the Federal Treasury by the year 2006 all of the reimbursable costs of the project as it would be with the unnecessary transmission facilities and steam plants eliminated, including interest on the cost of the facilities allocated to municipal water and commercial power, and leave a surplus of $7,373,000.

How can any Member of the Senate read that report and not be convinced that the whole plan should be revised, and that a further study of the subject should be made on which to base our decision as to whether we should take this step which it is proposed to take, and invest such enormous sums of money.

The memorandum continues:

The advantage of the company's proposal to the Federal Treasury is obvious. By the year 2006, it would return $98,818,000 more than the Bureau's plan, even if the repayment of interest on the facilities serving for municipal water and for commercial power is not required. If, as we believe, the reclamation law requires that interest on the cost of such facilities also be returned to the Treasury, then the company's proposal is better than the Bureau's plan by $142,778,000, for by 2006 it would repay all costs, including interest, and leave a surplus of $7,373,000, while the Bureau's plan would be deficient by $135,405,000.

Mr. President, that memorandum was inserted in the RECORD at the request of Mr. Black during the time he was testifying. I shall now continue to read Mr. Black's statement made before the committee, which appears to be unchallenged in the RECORD. Said Mr. Black:

What we have said about expenditures for the proposed Oroville extension and for the line on the Contra Costa canal is true for all the transmission lines proposed by the Bureau. Any expenditure for transmission facilities south of Shasta substation would be wasteful of public funds. The company can provide all the facilities required for the absorption of the output of the Shasta and Keswick plants south of Shasta substation for $22,000,000. It can do this by using vacant positions on existing towers; by employing spare capacity on existing transmission lines and in existing substations, and by combining and coordinating future facilities. According to its own estimates, which are unquestionably low, the Bureau would have to expend $44,000,000 to accomplish the same purpose.

But this is not the only advantage of coordination. The Bureau would have to obtain its customers in competition with the company and during this period operating losses amounting to many millions of dollars would be inevitable. These losses would not be incurred under our offer of coordination.

We emphasize again that the territory in which Shasta and Keswick power must be used is already completely served by this company. The company's system is the natural outlet for the project power; there is no other outlet unless wasteful, duplicating transmission lines and other facilities are constructed by the Bureau in order to compete for the market which the company now serves.

We have offered repeatedly to take all of the project's power into our system at our Shasta substation, 25 miles below Shasta Dam, under the general terms of the existing contract. We have expressed our willingness to make a long-term or short-term contract, whichever best meets the Bureau's requirements, and to provide for withdrawals of whatever power may be needed to meet the obligations of the Bureau.

We have offered to submit any difference as to price to the Federal Power Commission or the California Railroad Commission and abide by the decision, although the price in the existing contract was set by the Bureau and declared by the former Secretary of the Interior to be "fair and equitable." This would assure the Government a fair price fixed by an independent and impartial governmental body.

We often have advised the Bureau that we will have transmission facilities ready when additional power is available. For years we have owned a right-of-way for another transmission line between our Shasta substation and the Bay area. We proposed to construct a line along this right-of-way when we built our pit 5 hydro plant, but were denied the necessary priorities.

Now that the war is over, we have ordered materials and equipment for a double-circuit transmission line along this route and the line now is under construction. With the reinforcement of existing transmission lines and the addition of necessary substation equipment, this line will cost $6,000,000, and when in operation late this year we will be able to absorb 320,000 of the ultimate 450,000 kilowatts of Shasta power in our system. We have offered and are prepared to build promptly all additional facilities required to absorb the full output of the plants.

WARTIME CONTRACT BRINGS LARGE REVENUE TO BUREAU

The only substantial revenue which the Government now receives from the Central Valley project is that which we pay for the power available from the two generators installed during the war years. We have paid the Bureau $5,035,129 from June 26, 1944, when power first became available, to April 30, 1946. In 1945 alone we paid $3,235,796. In addition, we have delivered more than 2,000,000 kilowatt-hours to the Contra Costa pumping plants on the exchange basis provided for in the contract.

While the contract provides for only 150,000 kilowatts, we have found that our transmission lines can take and that the Bureau can deliver 170,000. We have directed the Bureau's attention to this situation and have offered to take and pay for 170,000 kilowatts. Acceptance of our offer would add $200,000 a year to current power revenues.

Representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation have recently stated that under their plan the farmers would receive power at lower cost than they now pay. This claim was challenged before the House committee by Mr. J. J. Deuel, director of the public-utilities department, California Farm Bureau Federation, a voluntary organization of farmers, representing 33,000 farm families. He stated that the claims made and widely publicized by the Bureau were grossly misleading.

Then Mr. Black referred to the House hearings on page 547, which hearings are available to Members of the Senate. Mr. Black continued:

Mr. Deuel commented on agitation for cheap power carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation in the San Joaquin Valley, where the farmers now pay from 12 to 13 mills per

kilowatt-hour. He pointed out that the Bureau had claimed that it could supply this power for less than 5 mills. However, Mr. Deuel showed that under the load factor in that area the Bureau's wholesale charge actually would be more than 10 mills instead of 5, and that in addition the farmers would have to construct a distribution system and each individual farmer would have to supply his own transformer and metering equipment, all of which are now furnished by the company. He also pointed out that when all of these costs are added, the cost of power delivered to the farmer would be greater than the charge now made by the company—this in spite of the fact that the company's revenue would be taxed while the Bureau's would be tax-free.

Mr. Deuel is a representative and director of the California Farm Bureau Federation, and he made the statement to the House committee. His statement draws a contrast between the two costs of power, and shows that the farmers would be required to pay more under the Bureau's plan than they would be required to pay if the company furnished the power. Mr. Deuel's organization represents the farmers who live in the State of the Senator from California and who have been referred to so ably by the Senator from California. But those farmers, through their organization, do not agree with the premise laid down by the Senator from California. They pay the bill and they know the cost. The Senator from California should remember that the man who has to dig into his pocket has the experience.

Mr. Black further said:

Mr. Deuel directed attention to the fact that the benefits which farmers have received for many years are obtained because of the diversity between city- and rural-power demands.

The character of urban- and rural-power demands is different, agricultural demands being high in summer and low in winter, and urban demands low in summer and high in winter. He said that when taken together they complement each other and make lower rates for each possible. He opposed any move by either private or public ownership which would destroy combined or coordinated city and rural operation to the detriment of rural people.

Speaking for the directors of the Farm Bureau, Mr. Deuel said:

"We hope * * * that all requests for funds for the construction of transmission lines and steam plans be rejected as the only means whereby California farmers can secure the greatest beneficial results from this project.

"We take no stock in the Bureau's claim for cheap power. Our main reason for opposition to appropriations for transmission lines and steam-plant construction is based on the fact that the Bureau can get more money for the power delivered at the dam than at any other point, thereby permitting power to make a greater contribution in aid of irrigation.

"This is an expensive project and without all the aid possible from power revenue, water users will never be able to stand the cost of water."

The preceding statement is to be found on pages 546 and 547 of the House hearings:

That statement was made by the representative of the California Farm Bureau Federation, which includes the farmers of the Central Valley. It seems to me that his statement, of itself, should arrest the attention not only of the Senate but, and I say this with all due respect, of the able Senators from California.

Mr. Black further said in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee:

The Bureau continues to promise a low rate when its system is established. But the difference between its rate and the company's represents a subsidy by the taxpayer. Rates already are low in California. The California Railroad Commission frequently describes them in its official publications as "among the lowest in the country."

In its last annual report the commission says:

"Our engineers report that San Francisco again retains its position as first for having the low-cost utility services of any of the 25 major cities in the Nation, while Los Angeles again ranks third among the 25 cities and has the lowest cost of any city of more than 1,000,000 population."

How the Bureau's rate has been determined never has been explained.

I may say that is true, because in the years that representatives of the Bureau have come before the Appropriations Committee, I fail to recall any plausible or feasible explanation on their part or, indeed, the fixing of any definite rate by the Bureau.

Mr. Black further said:

The California Railroad Commission recently pointed out that "no cost studies of the Shasta project have been made available to the public."

If cost studies had been publicized or put out by the Bureau of Reclamation, Mr. President, certainly the first one to group such studies and to look into them would be the California Railroad Commission, because that Commission must of necessity be interested in the subject, inasmuch as it is one of the subjects in which the Railroad Commission of California has special jurisdiction.

Mr. Black also said:

We believe in low rates. Prior to the war we regularly made reductions in rates and now that Federal taxes are being reduced we are returning to that policy. Since the first of the year reductions have been made in both our gas and electric rates. The electric rate reduction has been described by the California Railroad Commission as "saving the consumers an estimated $3,310,000 annually."

Under the proposals we have made the Bureau will net $4,000,000 a year at Shasta substation when the project pumps reach full operation. In addition, power will be provided for the operation of the pumps on an exchange basis.

Nevertheless the Bureau proposes to spend $70,000,000 for an unnecessary competitive system. If and when constructed, this competitive system would bring a net of only $1,700,000 compared with the $4,000,000 assured under our proposal—a loss of $2,300,000 a year at Shasta substation. Even the $1,700,000 would not be available unless the Bureau could get all the customers it needed to load up the system. This it could not do without a wasteful and competitive campaign, during which it would lose many millions of dollars. The annual loss really would be much greater than $2,300,000 because $70,000,000 would not be sufficient to accomplish the Bureau's purpose. The competitive system which the Bureau plans would more likely cost over $100,000,000, even on the basis of prewar costs.

It will be many years before the project's pumps reach full operation. In the meantime, the company's offer would bring not $4,000,000, but $6,000,000 per year at Shasta substation. Our estimates show that during these years the Government, even if it could load up its plant, would sacrifice more than $3,000,000 a year by failing to dispose of its power through the factilities of this company.

The Bureau does not deny that the Government would obtain more revenue by selling to the company. In fact, a spokesman for the Bureau in California, U. J. Gendron, executive assistant, wrote a letter to the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco under date of August 27, 1945, in which he said that "problem studies" long under way by the Bureau "appear to show that the P. G. & E. contract will result in a greater return than through sales to others under our interim rate schedule."

The act of 1937, which authorized the Central Valley project, provides that electric energy shall be generated and sold "as a means of financially aiding and assisting" the water features of the project.

In a few minutes I shall refer to the act itself. I read further from Mr. Black's testimony:

Congressional committees have frequently emphasized the importance of obtaining the maximum revenue from the sale of power in order to reimburse the Federal Treasury and thus keep down the cost of water to a figure the farmers of the Central Valleys can afford to meet. Good business judgment and due regard for the taxpayers of the Nation should induce the Bureau to obtain the highest revenue from power. Only in that way can the demands upon the Federal Treasury be kept to a minimum.

When it comes to the repayment to the Federal Treasury of the public funds invested in the project, the company's plan of coordination offers the Government great advantages over the Bureau's program. On the basis of 50-year amortization, the company's plan would assure repayment of all the reimbursable costs of the project, including interest, and leave a surplus of more than $7,000,000. The Bureau's plan would fail to meet the reimbursable cost by $18,000,000.

It would further fail to meet the interest requirement, which would be about $117,000,000.

Under the company's plan of coordination the Federal Treasury would receive $142,000,000 more than it would under the Bureau's plan.

Further details on this point are covered in a short memorandum—

Said Mr. Black—

which I will file with my statement.

That is the memorandum from which I have read.

When this project was first submitted to Congress the cost was estimated at $170,000,000. Now the estimates exceed $380,000,000. In the same period estimates of the power features have risen from $31,000,000 to $110,000,000—three and a half times the original figure. When revised to meet present-day cost, these estimates will be much higher.

Continuing, Mr. Black said:

Recently the Bureau reported a "comprehensive plan" for the development of the Central Valleys, which on the basis of prewar prices would cost $1,810,000,000. Of this vast sum the Bureau proposes to spend $390,000,000 for power facilities, of which $250,000,000 would be spent for a widespread system of transmission lines and steam plants. Appropriations for extension of the Oroville line are but the first step in the Bureau's plan to carry out this grandiose scheme.

Mr. Black continued:

The Government has no funds for undertakings of this kind except those it borrows

from the people or collects from the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. President, how true that statement is. I believe that the members of the Appropriations Committee and, indeed, all the members of the Senate, will underscore it as being an undeniable statement of fact.

Whenever the Government duplicates existing facilities it destroys taxpaying properties.

What statement could be truer?

In our opinion the properties of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. should be preserved as taxpaying properties and not unnecessarily damaged or retarded by competition with nontaxpaying governmental facilities. The company pays taxes in 47 of the 58 counties in the State of California. In a number of counties it pays more than 50 percent of the total taxes collected for county purposes.

Since 1940, when the country began to prepare for war, to and including 1945, a period of 6 years, the company paid more than $117,000,000 into the Federal Treasury in taxes. In the same period it paid in State and local taxes more than $76,000,000. Taxes accrued for 1945 alone were: Federal, $26,348,052; State and local, $13,845,256.

Mr. Black continued as follows:

We remind the committee that the company is closely regulated by the State of California. The railroad commission of the State has jurisdiction over our service, our rates, and our financing. More than 90 percent of the company's properties have been constructed or acquired under regulation of this commission. All its outstanding bonds and almost 90 percent of its outstanding stock have been issued under authority of the commission.

Under regulation, as it is applied in California, payments made by the company to the Bureau for project power are entered as an operating expense on the company's books. Such payments are allowed in rates only to the extent that the commission deems the amounts paid to be reasonable. The company can make no profit on the power it purchases. All that it can earn is a fair return upon the investment it makes itself in facilities used and useful in the service to the public. Any benefits from purchased power must be passed on to power consumers in the form of lower electric rates.

The Railroad Commission of California recognizes the advantages and economies to be found in the cooperative use of power facilities. In a case decided as late as January 22, 1946, involving contracts under which the Southern California Edison Co., Ltd., and others cooperated in the transmission of power developed at Boulder Dam, the commission held that the contracts would "contribute to an economical use of capital expenditures."

It said further:

"Fixed charges associated with heavy capital investments constitute a substantial portion of electric rates and the commission believes that many economies can still be made by promoting the joint or cooperative use of inescapable investments in capital facilities to the optimum degree. Splendid results have been achieved during the war as a result of pooling generation and transmission resources. The public interest requires that such activities be encouraged, continued, and expanded and that needless duplication of electric capital investments be discouraged and, insofar as we have jurisdiction, prevented."

The appropriations requested by the Bureau in the present bill are intended to commit Congress further to an unnecessary and wasteful—

Mr. President, I hope all Members of the Senate will give heed to this statement:

The appropriations requested by the Bureau in the present bill are intended to commit Congress further to an unnecessary and wasteful expenditure of at least $70,000,000, estimated under prewar costs; $44,000,000 for a transmission system and $26,000,000 for a steam plant. To allow these appropriations would launch the Bureau into a tax-free competitive power operation; existing property values would be destroyed; further investment in taxable property would be discouraged; and money raised by the Federal Government, either by borrowing or by taxation, would be wastefully expended.

We submit that all the appropriations requested for transmission lines or for switchyards south of Shasta substation should be denied and that the Bureau of Reclamation be requested or directed to suspend the expenditure of the $780,000 appropriated in the 1946 deficiency bill until the present Secretary of the Interior can cause a further study to be made of the whole subject of transmission lines for the Central Valley project.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to make a brief statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I have been very much interested for many years in the question concerning the transmission lines in the Central Valley. It is my considered opinion that any appropriations which the Federal Government makes for the construction of transmission lines in the Central Valley, as described in the amendment, will not bring electricity to one more user than is presently provided by the lines of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

It was brought out in the evidence, as I understood it, that there would be no reduction in the rate charged to consumers of electricity transmitted over federally financed lines. In other words, electricity would not be furnished to more users than are now using electricity, and would not be furnished at a rate less than that which is now being charged. So far as bringing water is concerned to the lands in that section which must be irrigated, nothing of that kind will be accomplished as a result of the proposed appropriation.

It is fairly well established, in my opinion, that the electricity for pumping water can be transmitted over the presently established line of a privately owned tax-paying utility which is already furnishing electricity to the citizens of California at very low rates. So if the amendment were adopted the tax income from that large company would be lost. Electricity would not be provided to the users at a lower rate, but the Federal debt would be increased, and there would be no chance of getting back the money for a long period of years. Therefore, I am inclined to ask the Senate to uphold the committee-approved amendment and to vote against the amendment which is now pending.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from South Dakota for his contribution. He has zealously made a study of this subject as a member of the Appropriations Committee; and he and I have seen the subject eye to eye, and I am exceedingly grateful that he joins me in this presentation.

I hope to conclude within a reasonable time now, Mr. President. I could not permit this matter to pass without having the Senate have a full and complete vision, if it desires to have one, of the whole picture of the expenditure that is about to be undertaken in the Central Valley project of California. I could not permit this occasion to pass and to have the Senate vote on this question without advising the Senate that in many respects an untrue picture has been presented by certain factions and certain groups, and, in my judgment, an untrue picture has been presented by the Bureau of Reclamation, both publicly and privately.

Mr. President, I repeat that my thought is that this country, if it is to sustain itself and pay off its national debt of nearly $300,000,000,000, must encourage private enterprise. By making appropriations of this kind, by setting up the Federal Government in competition with a group of men who invest their money, pay taxes, and sustain communities, we are not encouraging private enterprise. On the contrary, we are discouraging private enterprise. If it be that we are on the verge of socializing everything in the way of enterprise, then, indeed, would it not be best for this body and the other branch of Congress to make a thorough study of the subject?

If the Congress, in keeping with the will of the people, were to see fit to socialize all public utilities, to tell private enterprise, "You can no longer have any interest in public utilities," would it not be best for us to make a thorough study of the subject first, rather than to go into it piecemeal? For if we rush into the matter without making a thorough study of it, eventually we shall find that as a Nation we have destroyed the very structure of our own Government by wrecking the agencies and instrumentalities which will pay our obligations, namely, the taxpaying agencies in private enterprise. In that event our bonded indebtedness, now extending into the billions of dollars, will be jeopardized.

Shall we say to those who hold Federal bonds, "We are now inch by inch, little by little, creeping into such a situation that finally when the entire purpose shall have been accomplished we shall wonder where we shall get the money to pay even the interest, much less the principal, of the bonds which you hold in trust and so sacredly"?

Mr. President, I belong to a school of thought that has given a great deal of study to this subject. I feel in my heart that I am correct in the position I take regarding it. I feel that my country depends for its future success upon having our country continue to follow the great principle of private enterprise, and I believe it would be disastrous, indeed, if we were to destroy that system or even take the first step in that direction.

So I have opposed this item in the appropriation bill, as I shall oppose the other item which will come up later in

the day and which proposes to set up what is known as the Southwestern Power Administration.

I propose to encourage the investment of private money and to encourage private adventure and private study and private research, so that men may live in a realm of freedom and so that the Government of the United States may never be charged with setting itself up to enslave mankind in any area of this great Nation. I propose, insofar as I can, to prevent the Federal Government from ever occupying such a position that men and women, striving to sustain themselves, must kow-tow, if you please, to the agent of some Federal authority. If this is the land of the free and if it is to be maintained as the land of the free, then certainly the Congress of the United States should be the first, when private enterprise is ready to go forward, to maintain freedom of action and freedom of investment.

Mr. President, I shall come to a conclusion by a résumé of the whole subject. On yesterday the able junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], in making mention of his fine service in the legislature of his native State, dwelt on the subject of the Central Valley Act, and said that he was a member of the legislature of his State when the Central Valley Act was passed. Let me say that the California act which originated this project now has nothing to do with it. California found out long ago that it could not finance the building of the dams and the canals, and it came to Washington to persuade the Federal Government to take over. The Federal Government did take over in 1935, 11 years ago. Since that time the project has been a Federal undertaking, with the Federal Government assuming all the burden and all the risk.

As a Government undertaking, the project has been changed in many particulars. It has been enlarged. New facilities have been added. Old ones have been eliminated. The estimates have increased from $170,000,000, as they were originally, to $384,000,000 now. About all that is left of the California project is the name. Under the Federal plan, navigation, flood control, and reclamation are the three primary purposes. Power is incidental. Let me repeat, without fear of contradiction, that under the Federal plan, navigation, flood control, and reclamation are the three primary purposes. Power is incidental.

The project was first adopted as a Federal project under an Executive order in 1935. Then it was authorized by Congress in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1937. It is being constructed under that authorization. Repayment of the funds provided by the Federal Treasury is required by the act in accordance with Federal reclamation laws. The act of 1937 declared the purpose of the project to be "improving navigation, regulating the flow of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, controlling floods, providing for storage and for the delivery of the stored waters thereof, for the reclamation of arid and semiarid lands and lands of Indian reservations, and other beneficial uses and"—incidentally, I say—"for the generation and sale of electric energy." What for, Mr. President? The statute says, "As a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings and in order to permit the full utilization of the works constructed to accomplish the aforesaid purposes."

In other words, the Congress set up this project, not primarily to be an agency through which power would be sold, but, rather, to be an agency by which power would be generated and sold for the purpose of carrying out the original purposes, namely, reclamation and flood control and water storage.

The act also provided that—

> The said dam and reservoirs shall be used, first, for river regulation, improvement of navigation, and flood control; second, for irrigation and domestic uses; and, third, for power.

I call particular attention to the fact that the act stated they should be used, first, for river regulation, improvement of navigation, and flood control; second, for irrigation and domestic uses; and, third, for power.

Again I say the power feature of this great project, with its hundreds of millions of dollars of expended public money, is the incidental thing, and not the primary purpose. Yet, today what are we doing? We are attempting to lay the foundation for the expenditure of millions upon millions of dollars to set up a great power empire in the Central Valley of California, to take over control of the lives and being of the people of California and of those who would reclaim the lands of that great fertile State, so that they would be the servants—the serfs, if you please, as some would make them—of those sitting in Federal power, who would control the lives of men and women in the everyday walks of life. Mr. President, I pray God that that will not take place. I hope the Senate of the United States and the Congress as a whole will see the light and will stop this thing before it goes too far, because, Mr. President, my country and your country demands a greater place in the family of nations than it would have if there should be a socialistic regime set up in the Western Hemisphere. Today on every hand and at every portal of our Nation, communism is crying aloud to be let in in order that it may take over. These are the steps which will pave the way for the taking over.

The act of 1937 does not require construction of transmission lines. It merely authorizes them if they are necessary to provide a market for the power. Transmission lines can only be justified if they make possible a more advantageous sale of power than is now available.

The contract which now covers the sale of all available power is admitted by the Bureau of Reclamation to be a favorable contract, and that contract is with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. It was further established at the hearings that sale of the total power output to the private utility under that contract will yield the Government over $2,000,000 a year more than can be secured from transmission of the power by the Bureau throughout northern California under the rates already established by the Bureau.

Construction of the competing transmission system planned by the Bureau of Reclamation would require the Government to invest more than $70,000,000. This investment is wholly unnecessary under the offers made by the private utility. It would be sheer folly on the part of the Government to make such an investment when it is wholly unnecessary and would result in a loss of more than $2,000,000 a year in returns to the Federal Treasury.

Testimony before the committee showed that with a competitive power system the full cost of the project would not be repaid and also that interest on the Government's investment in power facilities would not be returned to the Federal Treasury. With a competitive system the return to the Treasury in a 50-year period would be $142,000,000 less than if the power were disposed of in the manner provided in the contract under which the power now available is being marketed.

TRANSMISSION LINES IN PRESENT BILL

There now are two generators installed at Shasta Dam and their output is being transmitted over a single line 25 miles long to Shasta substation, a point of connection with the existing system. These two generators load that line to capacity. Two more lines paralleling that 25-mile line are needed to get the output of the additional generators to the market.

The bill passed by the House does not allow any funds for the construction of these two necessary lines from Shasta Dam to Shasta substation. The Senate committee's report corrects the situation by allocating House appropriations to the construction of these lines and by adding thereto any unexpended balances available from amounts heretofore allowed for other transmission lines.

The line from Oroville to Sacramento for which the House allowed funds in a duplicating line which is entirely unnecessary. Even in an independent competitive operation it could serve no useful purpose for years to come. The project pumps which might be served from this line will not be ready to operate for 4 or 5 years. The public agencies which might be supplied with power from such a line all have long-term contracts with the power company.

The Sacramento Municipal Utility District, which has long been claimed as an important outlet for Shasta power, recently signed a contract with the company for 7½ years. In fact, the contract was signed after testimony was taken on the possible outlets for Shasta power. When the House committee passed on these appropriations it did not have before it the fact that the Sacramento Municipal Utility District was no longer available as an outlet for Shasta power.

The only customer which the Bureau has or has in prospect is the small city of Roseville, which would use less than 1 percent of the capacity of the Oroville-Sacramento line. The Government cannot justify an extension of the Oroville line merely to serve Roseville, which is already served by the power company and has ample power available from that source.

The line on the Contra Costa canal is also unnecessary. The amount allowed by the House would have to be multiplied six times to complete it. The pumps on this canal are now being supplied on an exchange basis under a contract which former Secretary Ickes made in 1943. The terms of that contract cover service to other pumps which may be installed on the canal. That means that power is now available for all additional pumps to be installed as fast as they can be installed. With power now available the Government would be spared the investment in this line. Under the existing contract power is available to the new pumps at a lower cost than if the line were built.

The additional generating units at Shasta Dam will commence operation before the end of the fiscal year. The bill passed by the House does not provide an outlet for this power. The Senate committee proposes to provide that outlet with the funds which the House allowed for lines which are not needed.

It does this by making the House appropriation available for the first 25 miles from the dam. Without the construction of these lines, power will be under production with no means of getting it to market. The committee's plans will get it to market. The House bill would allow it to develop at the dam, but would provide no way of getting the power beyond that point.

Mr. President, I have with all the fervor I possess presented the matter, not because I am alone interested in California, but because I am interested in the development of the whole of the great region of the West. If there is a region where individual freedom prevails it is in the land of the West. If there is a land to which the present and future generations may look for the establishment of homes, for the setting up of businesses and the development of enterprise, it is the great wide open spaces of the West, where fertile lands and freedom abound, where what we need is the application of water, the purpose for which the project was originally begun, and which the provisions of the pending bill will forward.

Mr. President, if in building reclamation projects some designing mind sees an opportunity for the setting up of a great power empire, then indeed the primary object of the reclamation acts will have been lost, and power, electric energy, will become the thing by which men will control the lives of others, by which the development of our Nation and its future will, in my judgment, be seriously curtailed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada has correctly stated my position with respect to this bill, though not in my own words. I feel that there is a great distinction between private enterprise and private monopoly. My objection to the committee amendment is that it makes it certain that there shall be but one purchaser for the power from the Shasta Dam. It provides for the construction of a transmission line about 25½ miles long from the dam in the canyon, and from there on the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is the sole purchaser of the power developed.

The benefits of this project are about one-third for flood control and reclamation, about one-third for irrigation, and a third for power, but power must pay two-thirds of the cost. We all understand that. The question is, then, how can we get the best price for the power—by selling it in the mountains to one customer, or transmitting it to the central part of the State, where more than one customer would have an opportunity to buy it? That is all there is to the issue.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAWKES in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator has just made the statement that there is more than one customer in the Central Valley. Will the Senator name a customer in the Central Valley, or anywhere in northern California, other than the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.?

Mr. HAYDEN. What the Senator means to say is that temporarily the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., as a good monopoly, has tied up a number of the cities and towns with contracts, and that they cannot immediately purchase the power sought to be provided through the pending measure. But that will not apply for all time to come, and it certainly does not apply to one-third of this power which is required to pump water for the farmers for the irrigation of their lands.

I cannot for the life of me see how it is possible to work out an arrangement whereby 1¾ kilowatts of power can be turned into the transmission lines of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. at the dam, and get only 1 kilowatt when it comes to pumping for the farmer, and call that a good bargain; and that is the present arrangement.

There is no use in our disussing the question. I think the Senate thoroughly understands it, and if it is agreeable to the Senate I should like to call for a quorum, and then would like to have the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. A similar proposal confronts my section of the country, and before the Senate votes on either of these questions I think it would be in order for me to present my views so that the Senate can vote on one, and immediately following that vote on the other. I think we should have the two pictures before the Senate before the vote is taken, because they are similar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should personally prefer that the matter of the Central Valley project be voted on at this time, after the discussion of the Central Valley situation. The discussion of the other project may go on for a considerable period of time. I believe the situation pertaining to the Central Valley is entirely different from that which my able colleague from Oklahoma intends to discuss. In the case of the Central Valley project, both Senators representing the State of California are in favor of it, the legislature of California has gone on record in favor of it, the Governor of California, who has just been renamed by both political parties, sent a telegram, which I introduced into the RECORD yesterday, in favor of the project. There is almost unanimity among the Members of the House delegation from California in regard to the project. No other State is directly concerned, whereas in the situation to be discussed by the able Senator from Oklahoma a number of States are involved, and Senators from those States have different opinions.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I urge that the vote on the Central Valley project be taken at this time, while the matter is fresh in the minds of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion for a moment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Certainly.

Mr. HAYDEN. I desire to make a suggestion to the Senator from Oklahoma similar to that presented by the Senator from California.

There is no question about the authority of law to build the transmission lines in Central Valley. The authority is provided in the statute so far as the Central Valley project is concerned. There is a very grave question of law about the building of dams, steam plants, and things of that kind, in connection with the other project. So does not the Senator from Oklahoma really think that the two cases are so dissimilar that it would be better to vote on one now and on the other later?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I think I should pursue the course which I deem the best, not only for my State, but for sister and brother States, and for the United States. If I am recognized, I shall proceed.

Mr. President, the absence of a quorum was suggested, and I do not wish to resist that, but I wish to have the floor immediately after the quorum is developed.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understood the Senator from California had withdrawn his request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I withdraw it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Nevada to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Donnell	Hill
Andrews	Downey	Hoey
Austin	Eastland	Huffman
Ball	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Barkley	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Bridges	Fulbright	Kilgore
Brooks	George	Knowland
Buck	Gerry	La Follette
Burch	Gossett	Lucas
Bushfield	Green	McCarran
Butler	Gurney	McClellan
Byrd	Hart	McKellar
Capper	Hatch	McMahon
Carville	Hawkes	Mead
Chavez	Hayden	Millikin
Cordon	Hickenlooper	Moore

Murdock	Russell	Tobey
Murray	Saltonstall	Tunnell
O'Daniel	Smith	Tydings
O'Mahoney	Stewart	Wagner
Overton	Swift	Walsh
Pepper	Taft	White
Reed	Taylor	Wiley
Revercomb	Thomas, Okla.	Willis
Robertson	Thomas, Utah	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I should like to make my remarks, which are in the nature of an explanation, as brief as is humanly possible.

Two amendments to this bill are yet to be decided. One is the amendment with respect to the Shasta Dam. The committee cut the estimate quite a bit, and the chairman of the committee and other Senators are not agreeable to the reduction.

The second amendment which still remains to be decided is with respect to the Southwestern Power Administration. The bill as it was introduced in the House called for $23,000,000 to be appropriated with which to start construction of a vast electrical empire in the southwestern area of the United States. On the wall in the rear of the Chamber hangs a map which I am advised was prepared by the Southwestern Power Administration. It shows in outline, in the central and western part, the State of Oklahoma. It embraces the major part of six States, namely, the States of Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, and Louisiana.

There is a request before the Senate and the House for the sum of $23,000,000 with which to start construction of a competing, duplicating system of electric wires and power plants in that area of the country. In the House of Representatives, where this bill originated, the House subcommittee reduced the $23,000,000 to $3,000,000 plus. On the floor of the House of Representatives, at the instance of the Speaker of the House, the $3,000,000 recommended by the committee was increased to $7,500,000.

The program of the Southwestern Power Administration calls for the expenditure of more than $200,000,000. The first estimate is $202,000,000. By way of comparison, when the Shasta Dam in California was first proposed the whole project was estimated to cost $184,000,000. With the appropriations this year, more than $200,000,000 will have been expended on the project, and the total estimate now is approximately $400,000,000. If the costs of the Southwestern program mount in the same proportion as the costs in California mounted, when this project is completed it will cost half a billion dollars.

The power lines which we now have in this area cost $1,000,000,000. Eleven integrated existing power companies own these power lines in the southwestern part of the United States, in the six States which I have named, and they have the whole territory blanketed with electric lines.

An examination of the map reveals that the black lines show the existing power lines, and the red and yellow lines show the lines which the Southwestern Power Administration desires to build in this section of the country. Only two public dams in that area are now creating power. One is the Denison Dam, built on the Red River between Oklahoma and Texas. The second dam is at Norfork, in northern Arkansas. Those are the only two dams owned by the Government which are now producing power. The dam at Denison is producing 35,000 kilowatts a year. At Norfork the same amount of energy is being created. Thirty-five thousand kilowatts at Norfork and 35,000 at Denison make a total of 70,000 kilowatts being created at those two dams at the present time. It is true that we are building other dams, but no other dam will be built which can produce power for a year or 2 years, or perhaps 3 years. The Government now has the power produced at Denison and Norfork contracted for for the next 3 years. A contract is now in existence to sell all the power that can be generated at those two dams until June 1949. So the Senate need not be in a hurry. We have 3 years to consider this matter.

It is contended by some that the Denison Dam and the Norfork Dam should be connected. Those dams are more than 300 miles apart. The testimony before our committee was that there was a great loss in the transmission of electrical energy for a distance of 300 miles. It was testified that the loss was at least 10 percent, and some witnesses said it was greater. So if we build a line from Norfork to Denison, a distance of 300 miles, to transmit power from Norfork to Denison, there will inevitably be a line loss. All the power will not be delivered by at least 10 percent. But it is not proposed to build a straight line. It is proposed to build a line from Norfork to an already existing line, called the Ark-La line, and from that line over into Oklahoma to the point called Markham Ferry, just south of the Pensacola Dam, which is a State-owned dam in my State of Oklahoma. The line now proposed to be built connecting those two dams would be more than 500 miles long. How much loss of power would there be in the transmission of electricity for 500 miles—25 percent, 40 percent, or 50 percent? I am not an engineer, and I cannot tell. It would be upward of that percentage.

Mr. President, there is no excuse at the present time for making this connection. Later we shall have a power dam at the point known as Fort Gibson. Its construction has just been started. Three or four years will be required to finish it. Later we shall have power at the Tenkiller Ferry Dam, which has just been started. Three or four years will be required to complete it. Later we shall have some power dams in Arkansas, but they are not ready now.

In my opinion no legislation authorizes the appropriation of $23,000,000 with which to start this project. Before I discuss that question, I wish to give to the Senate a visual argument which to me is all-controlling. This question has been pending in the Congress for only a few months. I wish to exhibit to the Senate all the requests from my State in favor of the expenditure of $23,000,000 now, and later $200,000,000 to build this system of electric lines and steam power plants. I have here 32 telegrams and letters. Those are all the communications I have received from my constituents in favor of this vast expenditure of money in that section of the country.

On the other hand, I exhibit to the Senate more than 2,000 telegrams and letters from my State of Oklahoma in opposition to this project. Senators are welcome to examine them if they care to do so, and see the arguments for and against. With that sort of reaction from my State, I have no alternative except to represent the viewpoint expressed in the letters and telegrams.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator remember when we had the so-called death sentence provision in the Securities and Exchange Act? I received from constituents in Arizona approximately 4,000 letters asking me to vote against the death sentence. I decided I should not vote in the way my constituents had asked me to vote, and I received no criticism. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma will exercise his own independent judgment, as he always does, and will not be influenced one way or the other.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I wish to invite attention of Senators to another matter. I exhibit a booklet consisting of 145 pages which contains copies of laws with relation to the Federal Power Commission. The Commission was created by the Congress, and from time to time the authority of the Federal Power Commission was enlarged and made more certain. I exhibit to Senators 145 pages of legislation which controls the Federal Power Commission.

I next exhibit to Senators a copy of the law which created the Tennessee Valley Authority. I voted for the law. It was passed in 1933. The law consists of 15 pages. The Congress saw fit to pass a law and establish a definite policy with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority. I ask Senators, Where can there be found any law authorizing the appropriation of $250,000,000 to build transmission lines along the route which is shown by the red lines on the chart? There is no law on the subject except a bare mention. I will state what it is. When considering the last Flood Control Act we realized that after a while, under its terms, some dams might be completed and made ready to operate. We knew that there would be created some extra power which would have to be disposed of. So, in one part of the last Flood Control Act, Congress incorporated section 5. I exhibit to the Senate section 5 which has been cut from the hearings and pasted on a post card. From an inspection of the card it may be seen how small the section is. It covers only two-thirds of one side of the post card. We are asked to approve an appropriation of approximately $200,000,000. In my opinion, when the project once gets under way, the cost will be at least half a billion dollars.

Mr. President, the section to which I have referred provides that when the dams are completed and there is extra power to be disposed of, the War Department must turn the power over to the Secretary of the Interior.

The section further provides that the Secretary of the Interior may then resell the power wholesale—not retail. The language specifically uses the word "wholesale." The Secretary of the Interior may sell the power wholesale. In my State there are 11 what might be termed major electric-energy producing companies. They are all integrated. In my section of the country the dams which are generating power have, as an outlet for their power, 11 large companies that are ready to buy and are buying the power. Every kilowatt of power which is being generated today at Denison and at Norfork is being sold. When a big flood occurs, all of the flumes are opened and the power machinery at the end of those flumes begins to turn and a great amount of electricity is generated. The power is distributed among the company's customers, and the steam plant is shut down.

Mr. President, the question may be asked, Where is there authority in law for the appropriation of money with which to build the system as outlined on the map? There are two words in the section to which I have referred. They are, "Related facilities." The same words are used in the language which we have been discussing. The power may be sold at wholesale, and the Secretary may then use such money as the Congress may give him to construct related facilities.

What does the term "related facilities" mean? I read from the evidence before the committee. The chief counsel for the Southwestern Power Administration is of the opinion that the words "related facilities" give to the Secretary the authority to build lines, to buy lines, to buy stand-by plants, to build stand-by plants, or do anything. Here is what the chief counsel says:

> It is a very inclusive term embracing anything which aids or makes easier the performance of a duty.

That is the interpretation which the chief counsel for the Southwestern Power Administration places upon the term "related facilities." If that term is all that is required on which to base appropriations which may aggregate a half billion dollars for the purpose of building lines, steam plants, roads, buying transformers, and doing other things, we have made a terrible mistake during the past few years, and we are making a mistake now in writing long bills. If, by the use of only two words, we can lay the foundation for the proposed new electrical empire, what is the purpose of trying to achieve the same result by writing a long bill? If legislation can be made that simple, we have made many mistakes. We have approximately 11 appropriation bills which must be disposed of. If we can legislate properly by the use of so few words, we can pass those bills very quickly. If we can build the proposed electric empire with only two words, we can appropriate all the necessary money for the Department of the Interior by merely saying, "Be it enacted, for the Department of the Interior, 1947." That is all that would be necessary. The term "related facilities" covers everything. It will cover, at least, everything that the Department of the Interior requires. We can appropriate for the War Department very simply. All we need to do is merely say, "Be it enacted, appropriate for the War Department, 1947." In the last few days we had before us a draft extension bill. All the Congress needed to have done was to pass a simple law reading, "Be it enacted, draft extended." A few days ago we also had before us the OPA extension bill. Why did we not merely say, "Be it enacted, OPA bill extended?"

Mr. President, I exhibit to the Senate the post card to which I referred a few moments ago. The space which it covers is very small.

In order to make the situation as ridiculous as I can, I exhibit to the Senate all the law which I can find which it is claimed is a basis for the proposed authority. Senators have heard about angels dancing on the point of a pin. I cannot put the law on the point of a pin, but I have put it on the head of a pin. I have put the pin on the head of a pencil and have cut out the two words "related facilities" and pasted them on. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a page take this law and this magnifying glass around to the Members of the Senate so that they may see the basic law on which they are asked to appropriate $200,000,000 to blanket my State, the State of Arkansas, and other States as well, with competing power lines.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REVERCOMB in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I notice on page 100 of the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior the heading in quite large type "Southwestern Power Administration." I note also that from time to time we have had before the Senate a bill to create the Missouri Valley Authority. The bill went into a great deal of detail with respect to the functions of the Authority, the persons who would administer it, and so forth. I ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether or not there is any statute on the books of the United States which creates, by name, an organization known as the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator asked that question. I shall give very briefly the history.

The first Executive order was to the Federal Power Administration, and for the purpose of this activity the Administration was authorized to appoint a man to act, and he is called the Administrator. So the first one of these Executive orders directed that the Federal power authority, or the Director, take charge of the power at the different dams in my section of the country. Then some other orders were issued by the President providing how the power should be managed.

In 1943, when Congress passed the Flood Control Act, which was approved on December 22, 1944, in one section the law directed the War Department to turn over to the Secretary of the Interior all the power that was developed at flood-control dams. So when the Congress acted and directed that the power should be turned over to the Secretary of the Interior, the President modified his existing order and directed that all the power from all the other dams should be turned over to the Secretary of the Interior also.

Then the Secretary of the Interior, having the power conferred by the Congress and by Executive order, in turn created the Southwestern Power Administration. That was done by an Executive order drawn by the Secretary of the Interior, approved by the President. So the Secretary of the Interior, by his own order, under the authority conferred on him under section 5 of the Flood Control Act, created the Southwestern Power Administration and gave it jurisdiction over the Norfolk Dam, the Denison Dam, and at that time the Pensacola Dam, which is a State dam. It is still under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, but I hope it will be turned back to the State in the next few days.

Mr. President, that is a chronological statement of how the Southwestern Power Administration came into existence. It was not created by the Congress; it was created by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that under the program which is now being followed in selling this power to the existing 11 companies—they were all integrated during the war and are all connected—all the power generated from the Denison Dam and the Norfork Dam goes into the system of these 11 companies. They are buying it all.

It is true that in our section of the country hydroelectric energy cannot be created as cheaply as can steam energy. That is to be readily understood. In our section we do not have dependable water, we do not have water in sufficient quantity to store it in a great body, and then keep a dynamo or generator running throughout the entire year. We might do it in some years, even for 2 or 3 years, and then have a drought which would cause the dam to be practically dry for 2 or 3 years, as I have noticed during my residence in the southwestern section. So, in order to get the most out of the dams, it was decided to sell all the power to the existing 11 companies. They take it all.

If the time comes when there is no power from both these dams, the steam companies will fire up their plants and begin to serve that section of the United States. There is no shortage of power there. During the war, when in the different States there were great numbers of camps, and air fields, and factories of one kind or another, there was ample

power to serve each of them. At the beginning of the war it occurred to me we might not have enough power, and I suggested to the Administration that one or two additional hydroelectric plants be built in order to be sure to have plenty of power to carry our end of the war.

Congress appropriated the money to build the project at Fort Gibson and the project at Markham Ferry, but before any contract was let, it was discovered the Government did not need the power, so the authorities said they would not build the dams during the war because it would take men, cement, steel, machinery, and lumber that were not available. So because the power was not needed during the war—and that was only 2 or 3 years ago—the plants were not built at that time. They have since been started. There is no shortage of power there. There is no shortage of lines over which to transmit all the power we have and need to all the cities and towns and REA's in the section. There are about 15 or more REA establishments in Arkansas which are all being served now. There are about 23 REA's in my State of Oklahoma, which are all being served now. They are getting power from the integrated system of the 11 companies.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MOORE. The provision being discussed contemplates, of course, does it not, the building of steam plants on the part of the Government itself to supplement the power of hydroelectric plants?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It does.

Mr. MOORE. Does not that mean that it contemplates that all the private utilities in the six Southwestern States will be supplanted by Government-owned electric power?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the Senator will examine the map on the wall, it will be obvious to him that whoever planned the map had in mind the building of more hydrcelectric plants, then the building of additional steam stand-by plants, then the building of lines so that they could begin to serve the cities which are already there, and serve the municipalities and the REA's. The proposed system will be in competition with the 11 systems already in our section of the country.

Mr. MOORE. No system, whether it is Government or private, could possibly serve that section of the country without supplemental steam power.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is axiomatic; everybody who knows a thing about power is aware that a hydroelectric plant in most places is of no value without a steam stand-by plant. Twenty years or more ago, when we started to build the Muscle Shoals plant on the Tennessee River—I was not a Member of the Senate at that time—we immediately started to build the Gorgas steam plant, so that when the dam was completed a steam plant would also be available, so that if the Tennessee River fell somewhat, the boilers in the Gorgas steam plant could be fired and electrical energy could be generated by steam.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma has overlooked the possibility that this appropriation is to generate political power. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator from Nevada spoke of that a while ago. I made the statement yesterday that there now is a very definite movement on foot to nationalize electrical energy, commencing at Maine, going down to Key West, Fla., along the Atlantic coast, and going clear across the Nation, and those behind it have gotten pretty well along with the program. For example, in the Tennessee Valley a large area is already nationalized. There are no private plants to speak of. There may be a small municipal plant or other small plant in the Tennessee Valley area that is still privately owned, but in the main the plants in the Tennessee Valley have been taken over, and electrical energy is nationalized in that area.

If they take 6 States in our section of the country—there being some 48 States, and 6 being only a small percentage of the whole—and nationalize electricity there, and if they go out into the Northwest, to the Bonneville, the Grand Coulee, and some other plants which will probably be built, and nationalize electricity, I have no complaint, if that is desired. Then, if in California they want to nationalize electricity through the Shasta and the Keswick plants, and the others, I have no objection, if that is desired. But when that is done, what do we have? We have the nationalization program well on its way, and every Congress will be importuned for money to extend the system.

If by "related facilities" is meant what it is said to mean, when the various systems are built, each of them will take over plants in Kansas, and reach over and take over the plants in Missouri, and take over the electric-light plant in Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. REED. I express my complete agreement with the argument the Senator is making. I expect to follow him and make a few brief remarks, but the Senator from Oklahoma is correctly stating the situation. So far as I am able to speak for Kansas, one of the six States affected, we do not want any part of the southwestern power project.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I appreciate the statement of the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator be kind enough to tell us whether, if these transmission lines and related facilities should be constructed and installed, there is any provision of law which imposes upon any committee, or commission, or board created by Congress, the management of such facilities, or is that left entirely to the Secretary of the Interior, under the law as it now stands?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I am not on the inside, but I have a suspicion that quite a controversy is going on now between the Federal Power Commission, created by Congress to handle this class of work, and the Southwestern Power Administration, which is sticking out its hands trying to get control of all these facilities.

Mr. DONNELL. Section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, from funds to be appropriated by Congress, to construct or acquire, by purchase or other agreement, certain transmission lines and related facilities, it being limited by the expression—

> only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

The question I desire to ask the Senator from Oklahoma is, Who, under the present law, is authorized to administer all this investment and to operate the business that would be created by the acquisition and control of these various transmission lines and related facilities? Is it left to any board or commission in which the respective States and their inhabitants have any interest or representation, or is it left to the Federal Power Commission, or is it left to the Secretary of the Interior, or is there doubt under the law as to who would be the manager and controller of that investment?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, it is my opinion that the public generally believes that the Federal Power Commission has control over all the power matters that are interstate in character, but that is not true. They have only one thing to do with this power, and that is to approve the rate that may be submitted to them. Under the law the Southwestern Power Administration must submit its rate at any given place to the Federal Power Commission and have it approved by the Commission. So far as I know, that is the only duty the Federal Power Commission has with respect to electric rates and electric matters in the United States.

Mr. DONNELL. I wish to ask a further question. Is it the Senator's position that as the law now stands, if this investment be made and these various properties are acquired and constructed, the actual management will be vested in the Secretary of the Interior, without any supervision by any board or commission in which the respective areas shall have representation?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Save the approval of the rate schedule. The Southwestern Power Administration will have full control over the particular area in question.

Mr. DONNELL. And the Southwestern Power Administration is simply a name that is applied to a branch of the Department of the Interior, which branch has been set up under an Executive order, as the Secretary has indicated? Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. REED. I want to say a word with respect to what the Senator from Oklahoma has said as to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. I happen to be one of those having had something to do with the creation of the Federal Power Commission in the first instance some 25 years ago. It came into being because some electric power with an interstate character was beyond the regulation of the State authority, and the Federal Power Commission was created to deal with such interstate power transmitted across State lines beyond the power or authority of State commissions to control. I think, as I recall the law, that the Federal Power Commission is charged with some responsibility as to hydro-power sites which are on navigable streams or on the public domain.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Including national parks, military reservations, and forest reserves; the Senator is correct about that.

Mr. REED. Yes. But so far as the Federal Power Commission is concerned, it has no general powers, except as to the regulation of rates and the determination of reasonable rates, and the regulations that go with such a public duty. As I understand the present situation, the entire administration of the power in this instance would be under the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator from Kansas is correct, from my viewpoint.

Mr. President, I desire to put into the RECORD a comparison between the size of the area embraced in the Southwestern Power Administration's territory and the so-called TVA. In order to make that as clear as I can I desire to read from a statement.

If the duplicating, competing, transmission grid proposed by the SPA—that is the Southwestern Power Administration—were to be built, only SPA customers would receive the power benefits from the dams to be built, at a cost to all taxpayers, and piecemeal, of a billion dollars. That is, in the whole territory. A billion dollars have already been expended there, and if SPA should take over the territory and not buy what is there, and build their own plants, it would cost another billion dollars and more.

The private companies in the six southwestern States operate 15,000 miles of transmission lines of 66,000 volts and above per line. SPA proposes to build 15,000 miles of transmission lines in the same area. In other words, 15,000 miles of lines are proposed to be built in their territory, and there are only 6,500 miles built in the TVA territory. These lines will not reach additional customers; they will not reach any who do not now have service available.

The TVA territory covers 83,000 square miles. The SPA territory covers 300,000 square miles.

If this administration is created, and if the opening wedge is driven by appropriating the amount proposed in this bill, the camel will have his nose under the tent. Next year the officials will come back and want a few more million dollars, and they will get them. The year after that they will come back and ask for several more million dollars, and they will get them. When they get through a billion dollars may have been expended in that section of the country.

As I said, the TVA territory covers only 83,000 square miles, whereas the SPA area covers 300,000 square miles. TVA has 6,500 miles of transmission lines, whereas it is proposed in the SPA area to build 15,000 miles of transmission lines—two and a half times as much as in the TVA territory. I think the RECORD should show that because I think Senators should understand just what the issue is on which they are going to vote.

Mr. President, there is much talk about cheap power. Some individuals come to my section of the country and say, "You must appropriate the money to build these lines so that you can have cheap power." What is cheap power? In areas which do not have available plentiful supplies of coal and gas it costs 5 or 6 or 7 mills to generate 1 kilowatt of power. In our section of the country, in Oklahoma and Arkansas, where coal and gas are available practically everywhere power can be provided by steam for approximately 3½ or 4 mills a kilowatt. Hydroelectric power cannot compete with the steam plants in my section of the country. No one would put a dollar into a hydroelectric plant in Arkansas or Oklahoma if there were no other incidental values to it. These dams are being built to control floods, and only when there is incidental power is power being harnessed and sold. It would cost 6 or 7 or 8 mills per kilowatt to develop hydroelectric power. Yet the REA's are buying power in my State at from 5 to 6 or 7 mills per kilowatt.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. It has been pretty well established now that combination dams for flood control and power purposes are not very practicable.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The hydroelectric dams are worthless without steam stand-by plants because there can only be sold what is called firm power. Let us consider Denison Lake Dam as it is, with 35,000 kilowatts capacity. The operators of that dam cannot contract to deliver to Durant or to Sherman or to Denison, Tex., so much power a day for the next 10-year period. There might come a drought lasting 4 or 5 years. The Texoma Lake bed might be dry, as I have seen it, with dust flying up the channel of the stream. No one would dare to make such a contract. In some sections, as in the Columbia River area, where there is a dependable source of water coming from the snow-covered mountains, and the Shasta Dam area, the situation is different. But even in that section they want money to build steam stand-by plants to firm up the power which is going to be generated both at the Keswick Dam and the Shasta Dam. So a hydroelectric plant is of no benefit whatever unless it has stand-by steam plants, and under the present authority of law not a dollar can be appropriated to build or buy steam plants. No one contends it can except the general counsel for the SPA, and if he can get by Congress, of course, the law does not amount to anything. If he can get the Congress to appropriate money without authority of law, of course, the SPA would use the money to buy or build stand-by steam plants.

Let us consider the matter of taxes, Mr. President. The Senator from Idaho made some mention of taxes. In my State of Oklahoma, represented by my colleague [Mr. MOORE] and myself, we have two large utility companies, the Public Service Co., at Tulsa, and the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., operating out of Oklahoma City. In the main, they cover the State. They pay into the Federal Treasury, into the State treasury of Oklahoma and into the county and city treasuries almost $10,000,000 a year. If they are driven out of business, if they cannot survive, if they have to go into bankruptcy, then the Federal Government, the State of Oklahoma, and the several counties and the several cities and the several school districts will lose their respective shares of those taxes.

I have here a statement as to the entire area. I did not prepare this statement, and I have not verified it. It was prepared by the manager of one of the large companies, and I do not think he could afford to prepare a statement as to figures, and put it in my hand, which was not correct or as nearly correct as he could make it. I find from the statement that private utilities in the SPA area last year paid $58,000,000 in taxes. (See Senate hearings on p. 676.) If the private utilities are not driven to the wall and are permitted to continue in business, they will pay $78,035,250 in taxes to the Federal, State, and local governments in 1950. That is based upon the increase in the taxes of those companies in the past few years. In 1965, which is only 20 years hence, the total taxes, if the rates increase as they have increased over the past few years, will be $144,903,000.

Mr. President, if this prairie-fire movement for the nationalization of electrical energy sweeps the Nation, the Federal Government will compete with existing companies worth $18,000,000,000. If the Congress goes into the business of competing with them, they will have to go bankrupt, because they cannot compete with the Government, whose agencies pay no taxes and no interest and can make rates as low as necessary to freeze out any company with which they come in competition. At present $18,000,000,000 is invested in electrical utilities. If we are going into the power business, I hope that these appropriations will be postponed until next year. Let the proper committee of the Senate and the proper committee of the House consider this question, make an investigation, and hold hearings, having the most competent electrical experts in the world come before them and testify. Then let the legislative committee bring in a bill declaring the policy. If that policy should be to nationalize electricity in the United States, my voice would be

silenced, and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I would reluctantly vote for appropriations to build competing lines or to buy lines now in existence.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 begins with this sentence:

Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof, at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission.

Does the Senator understand that as the matter stands today, the only reservoir projects, within the meaning of that sentence, which are in existence are those at the Denison Dam and the Norfork Dam?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Those are the only ones we have. Others are being built, but they will not be ready for 2, 3, or 4 years.

Mr. DONNELL. The only two we now have are at Denison and Norfork.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. That leads me to this further inquiry: In the same section of the 1944 Flood Control Act is this language:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, from funds to be appropriated by the Congress, to construct or acquire, by purchase or other agreement, only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

I ask the Senator what his understanding of the fact is, as to whether or not there is evidence showing that the acquisition of the transmission lines and related facilities sought to be acquired by the contemplated appropriation is, to quote the language of this section—

necessary in order to make the power and energy generated—

At the Denison and the Norfork Dams—

available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

What is the evidence before the Senator as to whether or not it is necessary that the transmission lines and related facilities involved in this discussion today should be acquired—

in order to make the power and energy generated * * * available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The answer is very simple. The intent of that section was to provide an outlet for such power as could be created at those dams. That is the purpose of that section.

Referring to the map on the wall, the Denison Dam is located only a few miles north of Denison, Tex., and Denison, Tex., is located only a few miles north of Sherman, Tex. In order to make the power from the Denison Dam available to Texas, the Government built a transmission line from the dam down to Sherman. That line is now in place. It was built by the Government. It is owned by the Government. Over that line power from the Denison Dam is being furnished to the interrelated companies in the State of Texas. There is a line running north from Denison up into Oklahoma, but most of the towns in that section have their own municipal plants. There are no large institutions in that area, and there is no particular demand in my State for power from the Denison Dam. But there is a line in existence, and if anyone wishes power from the Denison Dam, it may be obtained from an existing line. So it is not necessary to appropriate a single cent to purchase or condemn anything to dispose of all the power from the Denison Dam.

Take the Norfork Dam——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point, while we are still at Denison?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it the Senator's opinion, from the information in his possession, that insofar as the power and energy generated at the Denison Dam are concerned, the acquisition of further transmission lines and related facilities is unnecessary?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. We do not need to spend a single mill to dispose of all the power that is being generated at the Denison Dam, or that can be generated in the next year.

Mr. DONNELL. As I understand the Senator's view, using the language of the statute, it is not necessary that any further transmission lines and related facilities be acquired by the Government in order to make the power and energy generated at the Denison Dam available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. My answer is that it is not necessary to appropriate a single cent to enable the Government to dispose of all the power it can create at the Denison Dam, in Texas and Oklahoma.

The Norfork Dam is in northern Arkansas. There is in existence a line to the Norfork Dam, and all the power that has been generated at Norfork, all the power that is being generated there, and all the power that can be generated there, is being disposed of and will be disposed of under a contract which still has 3 years to run. So the Government does not need to spend a single penny at Norfork to make its power available to Arkansas, Texas, and other surrounding States.

Mr. DONNELL. Summarizing the statements made by the Senator, am I correct in my understanding that it is his judgment and opinion, from the information at hand, that at neither of the two projects now in existence, the Denison Dam and the Norfork Dam, is it necessary to acquire further transmission lines or related facilities in order to make the power and energy generated at those projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies? Do I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There is no need for the expenditure of a single mill.

Mr. DONNELL. In order to accomplish that result.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is true. I suppose I might be attacked for making that statement. There are REA cooperatives in Arkansas and in my State that are not connected with either of these dams, but they are connected with the existing power systems, and the power from those dams is being fed into the present integrated power system. Eleven companies are already joined together. They pump power into the system, measure it, and are paid for it. The power comes into the system from Denison or Norfork, covering that whole area. No one knows where the power goes. I am safe in saying that no one can disprove the statement that the power from those two dams going into the interrelated system in turn goes into the REA system throughout the State. One cannot distinguish electrical energy once it gets into a system.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, what the Senator from Oklahoma has said with respect to the two dams which have been completed and are now in operation, namely, the Denison Dam and the Norfork Dam, will apply to all the dams when they are constructed. The 11 private utility companies have agreed, or are attempting to agree with the Government or with the power authority, to purchase all power produced at those dams for years to come. That plan is in contemplation on the part of the private utilities. It has not yet been consummated, but I believe the offer has been made.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The evidence so shows.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The evidence so shows. As I understand, that contemplates all the dams, the two existing dams and all the dams that will be constructed, as authorized by Congress.

That brings us back to the basic issue with which we are confronted. Objection is made on the part of the Southwestern Power Administration and on the part of those who favor public power over private power, that, of course, the private utilities will buy power to keep down competition, and to maintain a

monopoly. The power companies contend that by buying the power they will make distribution of it free of any cost to the Government, and that it will not be necessary for the Government to invest $200,000,000 or more. The private utilities already have the distribution system. If it is not wholly adequate, it can be complemented as the demands require.

The opposing argument is that such a system gives private monopoly the benefit and advantage of cheap power produced by the Government at the taxpayers' expense, and that in the distribution of the power the private utilities make a profit as middlemen in the distribution of power generated at Government cost, and at the expense of the taxpayers.

The further contention is made that private utilities will not pass on to the ultimate consumer of the power any advantage which the private utilities gain by purchasing at wholesale the hydroelectric power produced by the Government.

Those are the arguments made. If I interpret section 5 of the statute correctly, I think a little more than the words "related facilities" is involved. I mention this point simply in passing, because I believe this section is sufficiently broad to authorize, and I believe it does authorize, the making of appropriations for transmission lines. I believe that is a correct statement of what the section does. However, I am not at all satisfied that under this section it was contemplated by the Congress, that steam plants would be built. I think the Senator from Arizona agrees with me that there is serious question whether the words "related facilities" are sufficient enough to authorize the construction of steam plants.

But with reference to transmission lines, let me point out that section 5 provides as follows:

> The electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department, and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects, shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy.

Of course, the power could be disposed of at the bus bar. At that point it could be turned over to private utilities or to cooperatives, or whoever cared to build transmission lines to the site of delivery at the bus bar. This governmental agency, the Southwestern Power Authority, could dispose of the electrical energy at wholesale there. If the act used only the word "dispose" at that point, certainly no transmission lines would have been contemplated. But when the act provides "transmit and dispose," it was certainly contemplated that some transmission lines would have to be built. So I think there is authority for the Congress to make whatever appropriations it believes it is necessary to make for the construction of transmission lines which may be required to carry the power from the project and to give the greatest service and benefit to the ultimate consumers. Of course, the act does not use exactly that language, but the language used, is, in my opinion, susceptible of that construction.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator agree that two matters are involved? Not only is there involved the matter of getting the power to the ultimate consumers, but the proposition that where the Government or a private power company has an investment in two or more dams, by tying the output of the dams together by means of transmission lines, it is possible to improve the investment. In other words, if there is a dam on one river and, some distance away, a dam on another river, or perhaps at some distance down the same river, when the power is low at one dam it may be high at the other dam. By connecting the two dams with a transmission line it is possible to switch the power back and forth.

Of course, we must bear in mind that there are two kinds of power. One is prime power, which is the power that is generated and is available every minute of every hour of every day throughout the year. The other kind is what we call secondary or dump power. That is power which is not available every day of the year. It may be available for 6 months or 9 months of the year, largely dependent upon how much rain falls in the particular watershed from which comes the water which generates the power. If it is possible to connect the secondary power at one dam with the secondary power at another dam, the result will be to step up some of the secondary power to prime power, and thus greatly increase and improve the benefits from that dam, because we all realize that most consumers, both individuals and businesses, who buy power must have prime power, and a much greater return is obtained for prime power than for secondary or dump power.

If the Senator will permit me to make a further remark, let me say that it seems to me it is not a question of building transmission lines to carry power here or there. We must remember that the amendment provides only approximately $4,500,000 for transmission lines.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask the Senator to wait just a moment. Let me say that, as the bill now stands, the amount provided is $7,500,000.

Mr. HILL. Yes; but now I am speaking of transmission lines. I understand that the measure carries approximately $3,000,000 for feeder lines; but we have been speaking about transmission lines, and the bill provides approximately $4,500,000 for them. Those lines tie together the output of three dams.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There are only two dams.

Mr. HILL. I shall explain what I mean. There are two dams, the Norfork Dam and the Denison Dam, which the Government of the United States now owns. There is another dam, and it belongs to the State of Oklahoma. The Federal Government has either turned it back to the State of Oklahoma, or is about to do so. That dam is known as the Grand River Dam or the Pensacola Dam. That dam belongs to the State of Oklahoma. As I remember, it cost approximately $26,000,000. Of that amount, $14,000,000 was Federal money, money which came from the Federal Government. As I understand the situation, that $14,000,000 has not yet been paid back to the Federal Government.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. But the bonds are in existence and the State is paying interest on the bonds.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate that. However, the situation is that $14,000,000 of Federal funds went into that dam. I understand that my distinguished friend the Senator from Oklahoma considers the whole matter a conference proposition. If I am wrong, I wish to be corrected, of course. The Senator spoke yesterday, but I was not able to hear him then, because I had to attend a conference committee and also a meeting of the Committee on Education and Labor. I understand, however, that the Senator from Oklahoma spoke about the matter as a conference proposition.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. But that money does not cover the dams. It covers merely the transmission lines, because the money for the dams comes from flood-control appropriations, and the dams are built by the Army engineers.

Mr. HILL. But we are not speaking of that program. We are speaking now about the $7,500,000 and about tying together the output of dams which the Federal Government owns or in which the Federal Government has a great financial interest. I wish to say that as I read the hearings, it seems to me they show that by tying together the output of these three dams it will be possible to increase the monetary return from those dams by between 10 and 20 percent.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I cannot allow that statement to stand in the RECORD without being challenged, because now all the power—both dump power and prime power—which it is possible to create at the dams is being sold. So to tie them together would not create more power.

Mr. HILL. Yes; it would. Of course, they are selling the dump power. But when the dump power from two or more dams is combined, a certain amount of it becomes prime power, and a greater monetary return is obtained for prime power than for dump power.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. They are doing that now.

Mr. HILL. But they are not doing it as they will be able to do when they combine the output of the three dams.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. But they are doing it now. If there are rains in Colorado, Kansas, and West Texas, the floods come into Oklahoma and Arkansas and reach the dams. When the floods reach the dams, all the gates in the dams are opened, and the dams generate their maximum amount of power and shoot it into the systems, and all of it is firm power.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma will yield further, let

me say that the testimony of Mr. Davis, of the Oklahoma Light & Gas Co., I believe, was that by tying together the three dams it will be possible to increase the return from them approximately 10 percent. The testimony of Mr. Wright, who is the Administrator of the Southwest Power Administration, was that in his opinion it would increase the return, not 10 percent, but 20 percent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator.

Let us get down to the real issue before us. The $7,500,000 is a definite part of the $200,000,000 program, proposed by the Southwest Power Authority. The $200,000,000 plan has been formulated and submitted, and request was made for $23,000,000 of it to be appropriated now. I do not say that the $7,500,000 item cannot be disassociated from it; I am not prepared to say that. I have not been fully satisfied in my own mind that if we are not to carry out the $200,000,000 program we could dispense with the $7,500,000 item. Possibly we could dispense with part of it. If we make this expenditure as a part of the $200,000,000 program, then the next step we will be asked to take is to authorize the constuction of steam plants to firm up the power. That will come next. For anyone to say that it will be possible to spend $7,500,000 and stop there, is a statement which might be debatable. If the Government is going to obtain the maximum benefit from it, it may need to firm up the power by building steam plants. The next step after that is done is to build transmission lines to go into every community where the people wish to have public power.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield, to permit me to propound an inquiry to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Arkansas has referred to the formulation of a plan involving $200,000,000. Was that plan submitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee; and if so, by whom?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It was submitted to the House committee, I am not certain that it was submitted to the Senate committee. I have not read the Senate hearings, but I have read the House hearings. It was submitted by Mr. Douglas Wright, Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. DONNELL. He is employed under the Department of the Interior, is he not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. I am endeavoring to give the whole picture. We are either going to build this gigantic power system, or we are not going to build it, and we should vote, I believe, with that fact in mind. We do not have to tie these dams together now, although it may be good business to tie them together later, assuming that the $200,000,000 program will not be carried out.

I wish to read what Mr. Wright said about this program with respect to the appropriation of $23,000,000. He spoke, as is set forth on page 53 of the hearings before the House Appropriations Committee.

> I think we have not asked for anything as shown on that map in red and previously described, that can be omitted and still secure a complete operating unit. If you omit any part of it the proper function will be seriously hindered. The question is, it seems to me, personally, that if you are going to appropriate any money for construction of transmission lines and related facilities you should either appropriate the amount requested to build the portions of the system that we have laid out, or you should give us no money for construction.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Was there a map furnished to the Appropriations Committee of the House by the Department of the Interior, showing generally the project involved in the $200,000,000 program?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. That is the same map as the one now hanging on the wall?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is a map just like the one now hanging on the wall.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Representative JOHNSON from Oklahoma, in response to the statement that the Congress should either give all the money or nothing at all, said:

> Let me say I am surprised that you take that position.

Then follow arguments back and forth. I read from page 54 of the hearings where Mr. Wright said:

> And this committee is going to know every year, because I am going to leave this map in the files of this committee, and I am going to come and present a similar map to this one every year, so that you will know I am not welshing on this one, and every member of this committee is going to have an exact duplicate of this map so that next year, when I come back here, if you see fit to give me this money, there are going to be green lines showing what is still under construction, and another color to show you what we are proposing to do next year.

In other words, Mr. President, the $23,000,000 requested was to be the beginning of a 20-year program which will require an estimated expenditure of $200,000,000 in order to build a power generating and distributing system.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a further inquiry?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Was the amount of $200,000,000 mentioned in the hearings before the House committee?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The amount is $202,000,000, to be exact.

Mr. DONNELL. Who mentioned that figure, if the Senator recalls?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall not attempt to say who the person was, but the figure as I have stated it is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. The best judgment of the representative of the Department of the Interior is that the entire project will cost about $200,000,000?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; $200,000,000.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The plan is for a 20-year development program in that area.

There is one question with reference to which I should like to satisfy myself. The request for the $23,000,000 appropriation at this time is made on the basis of initiating a 20-year program. There is no mistake about that, according to my understanding. Is that the understanding of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is my understanding; although I believe that the 20-year estimate will prove to have been considerably extended. The ones who are requesting the money want it to be provided to them much faster than over a 20-year period.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But the requested $23,000,000 is to start the program which will involve eventually more than $200,000,000.

Assuming that the Congress feels the program is too ambitious, that there is no need for it, and that we would be building up a public power empire to compete with and destroy private utilities in that area, here is my suggestion: Instead of going through the back door to drive the private enterprises out of business, if that is the plan, I feel that instead of building many duplicating lines and utilities we should merely create an authority to take over the power-generating systems just as did the Tennessee Valley Authority, pay a fair price for them, and establish a public power empire to provide the cheapest possible power which can be provided by a governmental agency. That would be the direct and honorable way to do it, if the purpose is to provide the cheapest power which could be produced. I believe that the two interests, namely, the public enterprise and the private enterprise, should operate without one destroying the other. I do not believe in destroying private enterprise. We can spend tax money and compete with and undersell any private enterprise. We all know that. Whether the power which is to be developed can be passed on through the private utilities, I am not prepared to say. I have been inclined to believe that it could be done.

Mr. President, I return to the project. If I can be satisfied that I would not be committing myself to vote for the $200,000,000 program, and if the program were rejected by the Congress the proposed expenditure would produce the necessary power and make the system a better one, I will vote for it. But I want to make it clear that I am now committing myself to a $200,000,000 program without having an opportunity to study it further, and understanding whether the final objective is to build a public power empire for the purpose of driving private enterprise out of business. I want to know more about it before I commit myself that far. However, I do believe that, under the proposal, there is authority for Congress to appropriate money to build transmission lines to whatever point may be determined, and to sell the power wholesale so as to obtain the best advantage.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I may suggest that at the pres-

ent time lines are in existence to each of the dams and all the power developed is being sold. So it is not necessary to appropriate a single cent to extend more lines.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The line from Pensacola to Lake Catherine in Arkansas is a cooperative line, and approximately $1,600,000 of the proposed appropriation is to be used to buy that line.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That line is now owned by the Government. It is owned by the Defense Plant Corporation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; but it is proposed to buy it as a part of the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Southwestern Power Administration sell power from each individual dam, or is it sold just as though it were produced by one dam?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Southwestern Power Administration has a contract with the 11 companies which operate in that area. The contract will not expire until in June 1947. Under the contract all power generated is taken by the 11 companies to which I have referred and is redistributed throughout that area.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand that. But let us take, for example, the power generated by one dam at Norfork. As I understood the Senator from Alabama, if the power can be marketed through one outlet the power would be more firm than secondary. That might be some advantage from the dollars-and-cents point of view. I was wondering what the Senator would think of that.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I think I have covered that, but I shall recapitulate briefly. Every kilowatt of power that can be developed at these 2 dams is being developed, and every kilowatt of power that is being developed is sold to the 11 companies.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand that. I do not think the Senator understood my point. Is there not a difference between selling power from three sources through one dam, and selling it at the individual dams?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I do not think there is any difference if they are selling all they can produce. The State of Arkansas takes all the power that can be developed at the Norfork Dam, and my State of Oklahoma and the State of Texas take all the power that can be developed at the Denison Dam. It is my contention that the Government is getting far more through the sale of power by selling it all than it could possibly get by selling merely the firm power. If they ever resort to selling firm power, they cannot make a contract and sell anything. There must be stand-by steam plants, and the private companies have stand-by plants.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are the private companies now paying the same amount for the secondary power as for the firm power?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. They take it all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is it at the same rate?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I understand it is at the same rate. They have this kind of an agreement; all the power is sold to these companies. Then, in case the dams run low and they want power, they buy it back from the existing companies to serve their customers. For instance, when the Grand River Dam became low, they had no power, and they had to call upon the private companies to sell them power, to be shot down over the lines to their customers.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Olahoma. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. With reference to the question which was asked as to the price paid by the power companies to the Southwest Power Administration for power, on page 674 of the hearings on the Interior Department appropriation bill appears this statement by the representative of the power companies:

> We pay for that power 5 mills per kilowatt-hour for all the firm power.
>
> We pay some 1½ to 2½ mills for the dump power, depending on the time of the year and the time of day at which it is bought.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is all covered by contract.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Before the Senator from Arkansas gets too far away, I want to break in on the Senator from Oklahoma with reference to the question of rates. Under our system of administration of power rates, what is a reasonable rate is determined either by the State commission or by the Federal Power Commission, depending on whether the power is intrastate or interstate.

Taking a broad picture, such as suggested to my mind, at least, by the senior Senator from Arkansas, if the private power companies took power from these dams, or from any source, so long as it was intrastate, the State commission would have power to determine what was a reasonable rate and what the conditions of transmission and delivery of power should be. If it were interstate, beyond the reach of a State commission, the determination of a reasonable rate would be made by the Federal Power Commission.

The power companies, either intrastate or interstate, are always subject to the powers of the State and the Federal authorities to regulate their rates.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let me suggest that in my State the two main companies are tied into lines that furnish power in Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, and Texas. So the power generated in my State is interstate power, and, being interstate power, the rates are covered entirely by the schedules filed with the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. REED. That would be the wholesale rate for delivery to the local distributing companies.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I was greatly impressed by the point made by the senior Senator from Arkansas to the effect that if it be true that the Federal Government is going to embark upon a $200,000,000 project, and if it be advantageous from the standpoint of the price of power to the consumer for it so to do, the advisable and honorable course, as the Senator put it, in substance, is for an authority to be created to acquire by purchase, which I take it means also by condemnation, the property of existing companies.

My inquiry of the Senator from Arkansas, or the Senator from Oklahoma, is whether or not that point was made in the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and, if so, did the Department of the Interior make any answer to the proposition that was so clearly put forward by the Senator from Arkansas along that line?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have read most of the hearings before the House committee, but I have not read the Senate committee hearings, and cannot answer whether the question was directly put or not. But I would say to the Senator that it is my understanding that, of course, the Southwestern Power Administration, and possibly the Secretary of the Interior or the Interior Department, will contend it has no such intention. I do not think anyone is going to admit that the objective is to put the private power companies out of business.

Mr. DONNELL. But they do assert, I understand, that they intend to work out a plan involving an expenditure of approximately $200,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Very definitely, and they are going to come back year after year and show how much has been completed, and ask for so much more. That is what this presents to me.

Can we spend that much money, practically duplicating all the distribution systems now in existence? Can we do that and support it and back it up without actually placing in financial jeopardy the systems now in existence in those areas?

If there could be some line of demarcation and we could say that public power will be served in one area and a private enterprise can operate in another, without this conflict of competition, and so on, then the two might exist together. But if we put the private and the public together, and make the rates to the public so low that private utilities cannot compete, it will not be long before all power will be public. Public power authorities will be expanding, building more steam plants, making expenditures necessary to provide the capacity so as to meet the demand. That means that the Federal Government will be in the public power business. We might just as well admit, because that is a fact.

Mr. DONNELL. So far as the Senator is advised, has the Department of the Interior suggested any means by which the investment of a huge sum, such as $200,000,000, and the consequent operation of these facilities by the Government, could be so segregated in the operation as to permit the private enterprises still to exist?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not understand it has. Its contention is that of course we should provide competition for the private utilities, that that would bring the power rates down, and no doubt it will; and they can be brought down to such a point that the private utilities cannot survive. It could be done. If we are to continue to build, and build a power empire, we should support it and carry it through and give the people the cheapest power, not just try. The Senator knows we are going to spend money to undersell the private utilities, and give the people cheaper power, and that is why we are doing it, and if so we should say so and go about it in a direct way, as we did in the case of the TVA. TVA put the private utilities out of business or bought them. There is a public power enterprise in the Tennessee Valley, and if we want to do that in the southwest region we should go in the front door and say that is what we are doing, and do it and get it over with.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas knows that the rates, which may be reduced by competition if the Government builds plants, are already provided for by State regulatory bodies where they are intrastate, and where they are interstate they are provided for by Federal power. It is not necessary, then, to build a competing line to control rates.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The private utilities do have in a sense a monopoly, of course, but they are also regulated. Their rates are fixed, and when they make too much money they are required by regulatory bodies to make adjustments and make refunds to their customers.

I have no interest in any private utility, I own no stock in a private utility. I believe in the building of dams. I have supported all of them. I want to see the water resources of this Nation developed to their maximum usefulness for humanity.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Would not the Senator rather spend this money in building dams and getting the power developed than building power lines before the dams are even started?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That would be my preference, and the Senator knows I am doing everything I can to get the dams built on the streams of my State. I am most enthusiastic about developing these dams in order to get power. This is where the issue comes. As I said a few moments ago, when we get the power developed, if we let the private utilities have it at wholesale, we are charged with letting a monopoly have the benefit of what the Government has spent the taxpayers' money for, so they can make a profit from it. As I said, I had thought that we could sell to them where they had distribution facilities, but require them to pass the benefit on to the consumer. Year before last, when we had the 1944 flood-control bill up for consideration, having that in mind, I offered an amendment to this section, section 5, which was voted down. Mr. Wright in his testimony referred to it in the hearings before the House committee, and I shall take only a moment to read it. Senators will recall that we had up an amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to section 5 of the Flood Control Act, which would have required this power to be wholesaled at the bus bar and it would have prevented the building of any transmission line anywhere. That amendment was defeated. Then I offered the following amendment:

It shall be stipulated in connection with any sale that any and all savings realized by the purchaser—

That was the private utilities—

shall be passed on under Federal regulations where no State regulation exists, to the consuming public.

What I was trying to do was to require that the saving be passed on to the ultimate consumer; that any benefit which arose from the sale of this electricity by reason of the Government having built the dam to generate the electricity should be passed on to the ultimate consumer. In other words, if it cost the private utility 5 mills a kilowatt to produce the electricity by steam or by any other means, and the Government could produce it and sell it to that power company for 3 mills per kilowatt, then the 2 mills saved would be passed on to the ultimate consumer. In other words, whatever saving resulted from the cheap power produced at the dam, instead of giving the private utility that profit I wanted it passed on to those who actually consumed the power.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his contribution to the debate. I yield now to the Senator from Kansas, who has been on his feet for some time. But let me say that I have only a few more sentences to add to my statement and I shall have concluded.

Mr. REED. I do not want to try the patience of the Senator from Oklahoma too much. But he has made such a magnificent presentation of the case that I wanted to supplement it with this suggestion: Let no member of this body labor under any illusions as to what we are going to do. If we make this $23,000,000 appropriation we are going ahead with a $200,000,000 program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is the $23,000,000 the Senator referred to? I thought the amount involved here was $7,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let me make a statement which will clarify that point. The administration asked for $23,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget approved $23,000,000. They went to the House and asked for $23,000,000. The House committee cut that down to a little over $3,000,000, but on the floor, and at the instance of the Speaker, it was raised to $7,500,000. So the bill as it comes from the House carries seven and a half million dollars. But, as I understand, the chairman of our subcommittee wants to put in the bill $23,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the point that keeps coming up. I should like to have that made clear.

Mr. HAYDEN. I want to make it clear. Does the Senator from Oklahoma know of a single Senator who is a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations who advocated building any steam plants?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; I know of none.

Mr. HAYDEN. There was no such proposal. The argument was very firmly made throughout all the hearings by the committee that there was at the present time, in the opinion of the committee, no authority of law for building steam plants to firm up this power, and it was the judgment of the committee that if the power was to be firmed up by steam plants it should be done by appropriate legislation approved by the Congress. The issue here is, Shall three dams be connected together by a transmission line?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is exactly the point on which there is a difference of opinion here.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; there is no difference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The senior Senator from Arkansas made the point, as I understood him, that if he thought that was all this item was meant to do, that he might be in favor of it.

Mr. HAYDEN. At the appropriate time I shall read to the Senate the words of the Speaker of the House in asking for $7,500,000. What I have just said is in substance what the Speaker said.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator feel that if we appropriate $7,500,000 we shall then be committed to appropriate the rest of the money asked for?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. So far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned, not a member of it, to my knowledge, or to the knowledge of the Senator from Oklahoma, says that it would be a commitment to build steam plants or to go any further than to connect these three dams together with a transmission line. That is all there is to it. Furthermore, if that program is to be carried out, it shall be done by legislation reported by an appropriate committee and not on an appropriation bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Answering the argument made by the Senator from Arkansas, I will say that there is no excuse in the world to appropriate a single penny to connect the three dams, because they are now selling through existing lines all the power they can generate, and there will be no more dams completed—certainly not for a year, probably not for 2 or 3 years. So we will have all that time to work out a system, through legislation; and then if it is desired to connect these dams and go into

the business of providing electric power, such an opportunity will be afforded. There is no excuse now to connect these dams together. They are selling all the power that is being generated, and the Government is getting more money for it than if it relied on firmed power.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator controverts what I said earlier about tying these dams together.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let me answer that. Senators will see on the map the city of Norfork. Yonder is Denison. The line that connects those two dams is over 500 miles long, and the testimony is that on a 300-mile line the line loss is 10 percent, and on a 500-mile line, while I do not know how much the loss would be, perhaps it would be 30 or 40 percent. There is no sense in doing such a thing. No businessman would do such a thing at the present time.

Mr. HILL. The testimony of Mr. R. K. Lane, who is president of the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, a private power company, was that if these dams are tied in there would be at least a 10-percent increase resulting. As I said earlier, Mr. Wright, who is the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration, put the percentage increase as high as 20 percent. Mr. Lane quotes him as saying 25 percent, but in his own direct testimony he said 20 percent. So there we have both the private power company president and the head of the Southwestern Power Administration agreeing that by tying these dams in, a great improvement will be made.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. On the theory that they have no other connection that might be true. If there were only these two power dams and if electricity were to be distributed from these power dams, that might be true. But that is not true. All the power that is being developed is being sold. They are making more money than they could make if they tied them together. They are selling 100 percent of the electricity. That cannot be improved upon.

Mr. HILL. As I explained before, they may be selling electricity, but there is a vast difference between whether they are selling it as secondary electricity or whether they are selling it as prime electricity because there is so much more paid for prime electricity—at least three times as much, as the Senator from Arkansas suggests, as is paid for secondary electricity.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. All these suggestions and interruptions and questions and answers convince me that we do not have any power experts on the floor of the United States Senate. That being true, it is evident to me at least that this matter should not be acted on now. Let us strike all this money out of the bill because it is not necessary. Let the matter go over until the next Congress convenes. Then let a bill be prepared dealing with the Southwestern Power Administration, let it be brought to Congress and referred to the proper committees, and let hearings be held on it. Get the best experts that can be had in the world, bring them before the committees, and then let the committees submit reports, to which I would give credence and respect. That is my position in this matter. At the present time there is no need for this expenditure. We might make a mistake in expending this money.

Mr. President, the people of my section of the country are now getting cheap rates. They cannot get cheaper rates, I do not care what is done. A billion dollars can be spent in Oklahoma and Arkansas and the people there will not get cheaper rates. I am a subscriber to an REA cooperative. I am paying 10 mills a kilowatt for the first few kilowatts. If I were a large consumer the cost would be less per kilowatt. If the Government were to make this electricity and give it to my cooperative, that cooperative still could not sell it to me for very much less than I now pay, because there are administrative expenses which must be met. We have storms and sleet and the lines are broken down. They have to be repaired. It takes money to do that.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me show how cheaply the people are getting their power in Arkansas and Oklahoma. In Arkansas there are, I think, about 30 electric cooperatives. They buy power from the Arkansas Power & Light Co. The Arkansas Power & Light Co. in turn buys a large part of it from Norfork. Arkansas takes all the power that is produced at Norfork, which is transmitted to the Arkansas Power & Light Co. Then in turn that company sells to the 29 or 30 REA's in Arkansas. Last year the total bill to all the REA's in Arkansas amounted to $103,543. That is the total amount that all of the REA's paid to the power company in Arkansas for all the power they consumed last year. That is at the rate of 5.7 mills per kilowatt. That is how cheaply the REA's in Arkansas are getting their power. They get it for less than 6 mills per kilowatt.

Let us compare that with the TVA. If the Arkansas REA's were getting their power from TVA they would have to pay $119,543 for the same amount of power. The rate would have been 6.6 mills. So in Arkansas under this system the REA's are getting their power for a mill less than it costs in the Tennessee Valley, according to this computation.

Mr. President, it can be seen that the REA's in Arkansas are getting cheaper power than they would from the TVA. If the Government were to produce the power and give it to them, they still would not get the power for nothing. The REA's must pay interest to the Government on its investment. They must have administrators, linemen, supervisors, and employees to read the meters. If a destructive storm occurs, they must rebuild. That costs money. They are now getting as cheap electricity as they can ever hope to get. In some sections of the country power cannot be produced for the rate at which it is being sold in Arkansas. In my State the rate is a little higher. It is between 6 and 7 mills to the REA's. That is a little higher than the rate in Arkansas. But even in my State the private companies are charging the REA's only about $450 a year over-all more than the SPA rate which has been filed with the Federal Power Commission. So if we spend $200,000,000, or $23,000,000, and the REA's in my State have to pay the rate filed with the Federal Power Commission, the 23 cooperatives can save about $450 a year.

Let me recapitulate. There is no excuse today to appropriate a single dollar. All the power that can be generated is being sold, and can be sold for the next 3 years. In the future, as we build more dams, the Congress will be here and we can develop our policy. There is no policy now. The only policy is found in one section of the Flood Control Act.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the appropriation of any money at this time, in the hope that by this time next year the proper committee will investigate this matter and report a bill declaring a policy. If the policy should be to go into the power business on a grand scale, or any scale, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I shall go along with the deliberate opinion of the Congress, with this reservation: If the Congress decides to go into the public power business, serving power to all the people of the United States, instead of building competing lines in our section at a cost of $200,000,000 I shall favor the appropriation of money to take over existing lines. We can get them for half what they would cost to build now. Some of them have been there quite a while. Old things are cheaper than new things. So if we wish to go into the power business, why not take over the existing system and operate it. I shall vote against any appropriation for the purpose contemplated by this provision. It is not necessary. No one would be benefited by appropriating any money.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MOORE. I do not wish to try to add to what my colleague has contributed in his discussion of this question. I think he has covered it thoroughly. Certainly his analysis has made it perfectly plain—especially that portion of it which has to do with the testimony of Senators on the fine points which are raised. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] seems to hold that if we could have this appropriation with which to build transmission lines we could firm up, as he calls it, sufficient power to make the investment profitable.

My colleague has shown very definitely that we have a 100-percent market for the power which is being developed at the dams to which reference has been made. We do not need to spend a cent.

From the discussion here today, yesterday, and the day before with reference to power, it is perfectly apparent to me that the question before the people today is whether private enterprise in the production and distribution of power is to remain in existence, or whether we are going over completely to public power. That is the question presented today by the Senator from Nevada [Mr.

McCARRAN] in connection with the California project. I believe that the two projects are very similar. From the discussion of the Southwestern Power Administration the only difference I can see between the two projects is that there is no law which authorizes the expenditure of money for the Southwestern project.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question with respect to rates?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I happened to be reading the record of the House debate. Mr. RANKIN, a Representative from the State of Mississippi, who I think everyone knows is a long-time expert on rates, stated, on page 5135 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 16:

> In 1944 the overcharges for electricity in the State of Arkansas were $11,086,113, according to the TVA rates. According to the Bonneville rates, the overcharges were $10,920,000, and $12,997,798, according to the Ontario rates.

He evidently means that our rates are substantially higher than those of the TVA. How does the Senator reconcile that with his statement that our rates are cheaper than the TVA rates? I wonder what the explanation is.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thought I made it clear that I did not compile these figures. They are not the result of my research. I further stated that I did not believe that the responsible head of a power company would compile figures and place them before the committee unless they were accurate. If they are not accurate, it is the fault of the official who presented this set of figures to the Appropriations Committee. This chart was prepared by the Arkansas Power & Light Co. It is entitled "Comparison of Billing of Present Rate With Rates Charged by TVA, and Proposed Rates of the Southwest Power Authority for the 12-Month Period Ended March 1946."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think Mr. RANKIN was speaking of the over-all rate paid by the public generally in one State and in another. What the Senator from Oklahoma is discussing is a statement of the wholesale cost of power to a rural electrical cooperative in Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not understand. Are those the figures for REA rates?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think another element enters into the question. I do not doubt that the figures which both Senators have cited are correct. The TVA has sold power to the REA's for a great many more purposes than those for which private companies in Arkansas and Oklahoma have sold power to the REA's. In the contracts with REA cooperatives in Arkansas and Oklahoma there is a very restrictive clause which limits the use of power sold to REA's strictly to farm purposes, so to speak, or domestic purposes, whereas we realize that the TVA, which takes the place of private power companies, sells power to farm cooperatives not only for home and farm purposes, but also for operating cotton gins, rice pumps, mills, and alfalfa dehydrating plants. So different factors enter into the rates of the TVA from those which enter into the rates of private power companies in Arkansas and Oklahoma. I think that is where the difference lies.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In Arkansas an REA cooperative cannot sell power to a gin.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Or to a lumber mill.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator knows, in that connection Mr. Ellis and a number of other witnesses representing REA cooperatives appeared before the subcommittee urging this very appropriation, because they said they could not obtain power for these various uses.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is now half past 4. I continue to hope that we may obtain a vote on the two remaining amendments to the bill. The pending amendment relates to the Central Valley project in California, and appears on page 53 of the bill. I have offered a substitute for the committee amendment.

The amendment which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has been discussing appears on page 100 of the bill. If there are no more speeches to be made, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum and see if we cannot have a yea and nay vote on these two questions and dispose of them tonight.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to be sure that I understand the situation. What the Senator is asking is a vote upon his amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the pending question before the Senate. As soon as that is disposed of, I think we should vote upon the remaining amendment, on page 100.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], my colleague, is absent from the Senate on public business. He requests that he be excused until July 2.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word in connection with these amendments. I have heard a great deal in the Senate and elsewhere about economy. I have heard a great deal in the Senate about protecting private enterprise. I have listened in the Appropriations Committee to the same type of discussion. Now we have these two amendments or two issues at stake. One of them has been outlined to us by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the other has been outlined to us by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. Both issues are very plain. Senators who really are in favor of economy, who really believe in private enterprise, and who are not in favor of the complete socialization of the electric industry, have only one choice in respect to their vote on this issue. Senators who do not believe in private enterprise, who do not believe in economy, and who are in favor of the gradual socialization of industrial enterprises in the United States will vote for the amendments. That is the issue.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Murdock
Andrews	Gurney	Murray
Austin	Hart	O'Daniel
Ball	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hawkes	Overton
Bridges	Hayden	Pepper
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Reed
Buck	Hill	Revercomb
Burch	Hoey	Robertson
Butler	Huffman	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Stewart
Carville	Knowland	Swift
Chavez	La Follette	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Tunnell
Ellender	McMahon	Wagner
Ferguson	Magnuson	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	White
George	Millikin	Wiley
Gossett	Moore	Willis

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it correct that on the first amendment, which is the Hayden amendment, a vote of "nay" will be a vote against the Hayden amendment and for sustaining private enterprise and for economy?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me say that, so far as the Hayden amendment is concerned, it is in opposition to private monopoly.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I should like to make one statement. In the Senate Appropriations Committee, both the subcommittee and the full committee made a careful study of this matter. I hope the Senate will sustain its Appropriations Committee. If it does so, the Senate will vote against approval of the Hayden amendment.

Mr. CORDON and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon, who first addressed the Chair, is recognized.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I desire to make a short statement before the vote is taken. I understand that the first vote will be on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], which amendment authorizes

the building of certain transmission lines from the power plants in California as far south as Sacramento.

Mr. President, I recognize the force of the arguments which have been made here, and particularly those going to the proposition that the time has now come for the Congress to reexamine the whole problem of the production, transmission, and sale of electric power by the United States Government, and in the light of that examination to make definite determination as to what policy should be followed. I think that should be done, and done without delay.

However, so far as the Central Valley question is concerned, my view is that were it not for the fact that, so far as I can determine, a decision has been made by the people of California with reference to what they want in the premises, I should oppose the amendment of the Senator from Arizona. But it has been asserted here that both Members of this body from the State of California favor the Senator's amendment, that the Legislature of California has passed upon the whole program, including the portion now under consideration, and has approved it, and that the Governor of California has signified his wholehearted approval, not only of that part of the program, but even of additional funds for a more ambitious program. Recently the Governor of California received the nomination of both major parties in the State of California, as we have been advised by the press, and unquestionably, and to my own personal knowledge, his views with reference to this improvement were well known in California.

So as I view the Central Valley picture, the State of California and the people of California have decided the question insofar as they can decide it. Because I believe wholeheartedly in State sovereignty and the right of the people of a State to determine for themselves what shall be done within their State, and in the light of the fact that they seem to have made that determination with reference to the Central Valley project, I shall vote for the amendment, although in committee—and I wish my position to be perfectly clear in the matter—I voted to cut out the appropriation for the transmission lines. But in the face of the uncontroverted evidence regarding the position which the people of California take and my belief that they have a right to determine the matter for themselves, I shall vote in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the committee, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the matter inserted by the committee amendment beginning with the word "Shasta", in line 25, page 52, and ending with the amount "$20,836,670", in line 5, page 53, it is proposed to insert the following: "and substations, $4,572,000, including Shasta to Delta switchyards via Oroville and Sacramento, 230 kilovolt, Shasta to Delta switchyards (West Side lines), 230 kilovolt; Keswick to Sacramento, 115 kilovolt; Contra Costa power distribution system, miscellaneous transmission, feeder lines and facilities, and substations; in all, $25,000,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BURCH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is absent on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is paired on this question with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent on official business. The Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who would vote "yea" if present, has a pair on this question with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—36

Aiken	Hayden	Murdock
Andrews	Hill	Murray
Barkley	Huffman	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Cordon	Kilgore	Russell
Downey	Knowland	Stewart
Eastland	La Follette	Swift
Ellender	Lucas	Taylor
Fulbright	McKellar	Tobey
Gossett	McMahon	Tunnell
Green	Magnuson	Wagner
Hatch	Mead	Walsh

NAYS—31

Austin	George	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bridges	Hart	Robertson
Brooks	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Buck	Hoey	Taft
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McClellan	White
Capper	Millikin	Wiley
Carville	Moore	Willis
Donnell	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	Overton	

NOT VOTING—29

Bailey	Hickenlooper	Smith
Bilbo	Johnston, S. C.	Stanfill
Brewster	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Briggs	McFarland	Tydings
Burch	Maybank	Vandenberg
Bushfield	Mitchell	Wheeler
Capehart	Morse	Wherry
Connally	Myers	Wilson
Gerry	Radcliffe	Young
Guffey	Shipstead	

So Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. I move that the motion be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that the House of Representatives having proceeded to consider the bill (S. 524) to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of war veterans, it was

Resolved, That the enacting clause of said bill be stricken out.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate from tonight until Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 52, beginning in line 22, to strike out the language beginning with the words "Shasta to Oroville" and ending in line 25 with "$10,840,120."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a correction must be made in the committee language on page 52, in line 21. I send forward an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 52, at the end of line 21, it is proposed to strike out the word "line" and insert "lines."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. The total amounts for Reclamation Service must also be corrected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The correction will be made by the clerk.

Mr. HAYDEN. The next committee amendment to be considered is on page 100, after line 14.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 100, after line 14, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Under the heading "Southwestern Power Administration," on page 100, after line 14, it is proposed to strike out:

Construction: For construction of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and administrative expenses connected therewith; purchase (not to exceed ten in the fiscal year 1947), hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger automobiles; and printing and binding; $7,500,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. On this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and called Mr. AIKEN's name.

Mr. AIKEN. May we have that question made clear? As I understand it, a vote "nay" will be against the committee amendment, and in favor of the appropriation for the construction as provided for in the amendment. Am I correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Then I vote "nay."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Before we vote on this amendment, I desire to get clarification. I should like to ask the able Senator from Nevada a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May we have order?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is the proposed appropriation of $7,500,000 for the purpose of building a line from Norfork down to connect with the Ark-La and then from Markham's Ferry on down to connect with Denison?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct, except that it is also proposed to take over the Ark-La line between the two points indicated by the Senator. The line belongs now to the Federal Government. It is like taking money out of one pocket and putting it in another. But the money has to be appropriated. Of the 7½ million, about 2½ million are involved in taking over that Ark-La line.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, this line is already owned by the Government. It is largely a matter of transfer?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. From one agency to another?

Mr. HAYDEN. As a bookkeeping transfer of the 7½ million appropriated, it takes about 2½ million to do that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thought the item was $1,600,000 and some dollars for the purchase of this line.

Mr. HAYDEN. Perhaps the Senator is correct. My recollection was that it was what I stated, but the clerk of the committee tells me the Senator is nearer right than I am.

Mr. McCLELLAN. All I want to get clear in my mind before voting is one thing. There has been some confusion in my mind because $23,000,000 was asked for and then the House committee allowed about $3,000,000, and that has been increased to $7,500,000. I wish to determine, if I can, just what that money is to be spent for. As I understand, it is to be spent for the connection of these projects as indicated by the large green line on the map.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is there any other purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. There may be some small feeder lines. The statement after this was:

	Budget estimates	Bill as passed by House
4. Markham Ferry-Lake Catherine line, 194 miles	$1,633,880	$1,352,415
5. Markham Ferry substation, 80,000 kilovolt-amperes	477,560	477,560
6. Lake Catherine substation, 100,000 kilovolt-amperes	573,240	----------
7. Markham Ferry-Tulsa line, 45 miles	378,880	378,880
8. Tulsa substation, 100,000 kilovolt-amperes	630,020	----------

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think it is as represented on this map. That is what I wanted to be clear about.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the roll call had commenced and the Senator from Vermont had voted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yielded a few moments ago in order that a quorum might be called and the other amendment might be voted on. It was the understanding that I was to have the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well, then. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed as long as he wishes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not desire to have the floor by unanimous consent. If I am not entitled to it, I do not want it. I was on my feet asking for recognition at all times. If I am not entitled to the floor, I do not want it, and I do not want any special favors to get it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that after the vote on the other amendment——

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Just a moment. After the vote on the other amendment, the roll call started on the pending amendment. However, the Chair recalls that before the vote was had on the first amendment, the Senator from Arkansas was about to speak, and he did not ask for recognition at that time. The Chair did not know he intended to speak on the pending amendment. The Senator from Arkansas can speak by unanimous consent, if it is not objected to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall not ask unanimous consent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The roll call had begun, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] had responded.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas be permitted to speak.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I did not care to consume a great deal of time. I wanted to say for the RECORD that as the able Senator from Arizona well remembers, when I had the floor, he wanted to make a point that a quorum was not present. I desired to make some remarks on the pending amendment, and I yielded so that he might do so, and get a quorum, and have a roll-call vote on the amendment which has just been disposed of. Then I wanted to make some brief remarks before a final vote on the pending amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Chair. I desired to clarify just what these appropriations were for, because the request was for $23,000,000, and those making the request said they had to have all of that amount.

I have always believed that these projects should be connected. I am not an electrical engineer, and I do not know just how much value there is in it, but I thought they should be connected, and I still feel that way about it. I am willing to vote for an appropriation to have that done, but I want to make the record as clear and as positive and unequivocal as I can, and that is why I brought up this issue this afternoon. I am unwilling by this vote to commit myself to this gigantic program without having an opportunity to study and know more about it.

I think possibly this appropriation can be made and these projects tied together, if we stop there, without it being a waste of Federal funds, and it may improve the system. To that extent I do not agree with the Senator from Massachusetts when he says that we are either voting completely on one side of the issue with respect to public power and economy, or are voting against it. I do not agree with that. I do agree with him that if we are going to build this tremendous transmission system and make it absolutely competitive with private enterprise, it can be carried on with the purpose and objective of destroying private enterprise, and that is where I draw the line. I am not ready to go that far. I am unwilling to commit myself to this huge program and plan that has been submitted until I can see further into it. So far as merely making an appropriation to tie the projects together is concerned, I am willing to have that done.

Mr. President, in that connection, I believe there is only one objection to doing it now. I think this is an inopportune time. I do not want to vote against doing something which I think ultimately should be done, but the reason why this is an inopportune time to do it is that there is at present a critical shortage of material that will be used in the building of the lines. That material is today needed by consumers, or would-be consumers, who are seeking power connections so that they can get rural electrification and get service into their homes. We may deprive some of them, may be doing them some injustice, by building this line at this time, or until such time as more materials may be available.

If I vote for this appropriation, I want it known by everyone interested now and in the future that I am merely voting to connect these projects, and not for a program to expand this activity with destructive intent so far as it affects private enterprise.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the best evidence as to what the amendment means is the statement of its author, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. RAYBURN, and I should like to quote very briefly his remarks, if the Senator will permit me. The Speaker said, when he offered the amendment on the floor of the House:

> The Government owns or controls three dams that generate power. I am simply asking this committee to give enough money in addition to the $3,198,000 to tie these three dams together, which you would do, I am sure, if they belonged to you; which I would do, or want to do, if they belonged to me; and which I think the Government ought to be allowed to do.
>
> There is a question about the Grand River Dam. It appears that that is going back to the State of Oklahoma, but the Government has, as an estimate, something like thirteen or fourteen million dollars in that dam.
>
> Even though the State of Oklahoma is to take over that dam, talking to the Governor of that State this week, he wants it tied in with the Denison Dam and with the Norfork Dam. Whether or not this power is distributed by the Government through an administration is one thing; whether or not they continue to sell it to the power companies is another thing. The great Southwest does not have too much power, even with the power that the power companies themselves can generate and the power that may be generated at these three dams. Therefore, my proposal is not to go out and compete with anybody in building any more transmission lines at this time because some transmission lines are provided in this committee report. I simply want to do the thing I think anyone would do if they controlled these dams, and that is to tie them together so that a greater proportion of the power may be distributed throughout that great area.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, the yeas and nays were ordered, the call of the roll was begun, and one Senator at least had responded to his name. I understand that by unanimous consent the Senator from Arkansas was permitted to speak.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Did the unanimous consent comprehend or apply to any other Senator than the Senator from Arkansas?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It did not.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think we clearly violated the rule in the case of the Senator from Arkansas, and that a request even by unanimous consent that he be permitted to speak should not have been entertained by the Chair. I think it is so important that when a roll call is started it shall proceed to its termination, that I shall object to any speeches or any other business being transacted by any other Member of the Senate until this roll call is completed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate. When I am on my feet and asking for recognition, after I yielded in order to expedite the termination of the discussion, I do not feel that the implication is justified that I am violating any rule of the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. I am not undertaking to take from his feet the Senator from Arkansas. I am merely serving notice that I think the permission granted the Senator was in violation of the rules of the Senate, and that the unanimous consent request should not have been entertained by the Chair. I am merely giving notice that I shall object to any other Senator speaking until the conclusion of the roll call.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, so far as I know——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in order that the Senator from Maine may be set right respecting this matter I will say that I happen to have played a part in the situation. The Senator from Arkansas was on his feet and was ready to make some remarks when the Senator from Arizona, following the Senator's expression that he wanted a roll call, made the suggestion of the absence of a quorum. I then suggested to the Senator from Arkansas that he defer until the roll was called, and he was on his feet at that time, and it was I who addressed the remarks to him suggesting that he defer his remarks until the roll had been called. He should have been recognized immediately after the roll was called.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think the proper procedure was for the call of the roll to have been concluded, and then if the Senator from Arkansas or any other Senator wanted to speak in explanation of his vote he could be recognized for that purpose. But unless we are going to insist upon this basic rule of the Senate that roll calls ordered and begun shall not be interrupted, we will have this thing happen over and over again, and we will never be sure, when a roll call is started, that after 10 or a dozen names have been called, some Senator will not want to discuss the merits of the matter upon which the vote is being had. I think it is so unsound a practice, I must voice my protest.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in conclusion and then I shall yield the floor. I wish to say that when a Senator is on his feet seeking recognition and the Chair orders a roll call, that is the Chair's error, although it is unintentional, but that sometimes occurs. I have never known it to have occurred before that when only one name was called, and a Senator was on his feet and had called that fact to the attention of the Chair, that the Senator was obliged to receive unanimous consent to proceed. If that is the rule I will of course observe it. So far as I know I did not violate it. I do not seek to do so now. I have tried to cooperate and to expedite consideration of this measure to a vote. I am now willing to yield the floor, but I want to serve warning that other Senators must also observe the rule. When I am interested in some vital measure, then I shall avail myself of the privilege of invoking the rule if any Senator shall undertake to violate it. At this time I do not think I ought to be charged with having violated a rule of the Senate.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Due to the peculiar situation with which we are now confronted, let me ask if it is not a fact that in order to vote against the appropriation it is necessary to vote "yea" on the pending question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct. A vote "yea" would be a vote to sustain the committee amendment. A vote "nay" would be to reject the committee amendment, and leave the appropriation as it is, as passed by the House.

The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer

that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and will vote. I vote "aye."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BURCH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is paired on this question with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

I announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent on official business. The Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who would vote "nay" if present, has a pair on this question with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—30

Austin	Ferguson	Overton
Ball	George	Reed
Bridges	Gurney	Revercomb
Buck	Hart	Robertson
Butler	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Byrd	Hoey	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	Millikin	White
Cordon	Moore	Wiley
Donnell	O'Daniel	Willis

NAYS—36

Aiken	Hill	Mead
Andrews	Huffman	Murdock
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kilgore	Pepper
Eastland	Knowland	Russell
Ellender	La Follette	Stewart
Fulbright	Lucas	Swift
Gossett	McClellan	Taylor
Green	McKellar	Tunnell
Hatch	McMahon	Wagner
Hayden	Magnuson	Walsh

NOT VOTING—30

Bailey	Guffey	Smith
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Stanfill
Brewster	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Briggs	McFarland	Tobey
Brooks	Maybank	Tydings
Burch	Mitchell	Vandenberg
Bushfield	Morse	Wheeler
Capehart	Myers	Wherry
Connally	Radcliffe	Wilson
Gerry	Shipstead	Young

So the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, when I invoked the point of order, which was of course a very clear point of order, I did not know that the Senator from Arkansas had been on his feet and had been demanding recognition, and as soon as I was advised of the substance of the statement made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] I immediately asked unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas might proceed with the discussion of his views on this matter. I merely wanted to make that statement. However, Mr. President, I think it most unfortunate that a roll call be interrupted in order to permit further speeches on any question. But in the circumstances I was glad to make the request for unanimous consent, and had I known the circumstances I perhaps would not have invoked the rule of the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I say a word? I think I made it clear—I endeavored to—that I was not trying to cut off the Senator from Arkansas, and that I was content to remain quiet and allow the unanimous-consent request, so as it applied to him, to be respected. I simply voiced my protest against any further violation or departures from the rule.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, to restore the language as it was when it came from the Bureau of the Budget it is necessary to insert the words "and acquisition" after the word "construction" and before the preposition "of", in line 15 on page 100. It was contemplated that the rural electrification line that already belongs to the Government be transferred to this Authority.

I now move to insert, after the word "construction", the words "and acquisition", in line 15 on page 100.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then there was another Budget provision in these words:

Without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; including temporary employment of organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1923 as amended.

The idea is that this Authority wants to do just as does the Corps of Engineers, employ engineers by contract to aid in the work. This is a customary provision in construction work. That language was included in the presentation by the Bureau of the Budget. I send that amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 100, line 17, after the word "therewith", it is proposed to insert the following: "Without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; including temporary employment of organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is not the amendment legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no question about it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I make the point of order against the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is well taken.

The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, returning to page 20 of the bill, under the item "Acquisition of Lands for Indian Tribes," the bill provides an appropriation of $950,000, but also includes the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing reservations.

I should like to offer an amendment including the State of Washington.

Mr. HAYDEN. The bill is open to amendment. The Senator may offer his amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On page 20, line 25, after the name "Oregon" I offer an amendment, to insert the name "Washington."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The name "Oregon" has been stricken from the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator's amendment would come after the name "New Mexico."

Mr. MAGNUSON. My amendment is, after the name "New Mexico" in line 25, on page 20, to insert the name "Washington."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the

amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be clear, the name "Oregon" was stricken, but it was inserted, together with "Nevada" in another amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter explaining my position.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLIC, WASH., *June 10, 1946.*

Senator HUGH B. MITCHELL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MITCHELL: I have sent you a telegram today, joined in by the chairman of the public lands committee of the County Commissioners Association of the State and the president of the Ferry County Livestock Association. You will undoubtedly receive one from the chairman of the board of county commissioners.

The claim of the Indian department that they only repurchase allotments is absolutely false, and the records in the county assessor's office and the county auditor's office in this county show that 75 percent of all property allotted for use of the Colville Tribe in Ferry County, Wash., during the last 4 years has been deeded land acquired on the reservation by people other than Indians at the time while the same was open for purchase and homesteads, and serious damage has been done to the tax structure. As they take this off of the tax rolls, and their purchases have been in all cases from persons other than Indians who have legally acquired this land, and have been paying taxes on it under the Federal Constitution, being clause 17 of section 8, article I, the Federal Government of the United States is only allowed to purchase an area of 10 miles square for capital purposes and land for arsenals and matters pertaining to defense. We feel that the Constitution is still binding upon us and that we should be entitled to protection, and by reason of the various bureaus disregarding the object set out in the Federal Constitution, and not having obtained the consent of the States to these purchases, we feel that they are not entitled to make the same.

We further feel that it is only a question of a short time until the Colville Indians will follow in the footsteps of the Klamath Indians and liquidate their reservation. The sentiment is growing very fast. In fact, I have been asked by a number of Indians to draft a bill for them, and therefore I think now is the time for the Government to stop the use of the money belonging to the Indians to purchase additional land instead of distributing same to the Indians who are entitled to this money as members of the tribe. Not only is an injustice being done to the local tax structure of the various counties, but to the Indians themselves by giving the Bureau the right to hold money belonging to the Indians for purchasing lands. For it is only a question of time, if the tribe is liquidated, for the Government to have to pay back to the Indians their money which is being used, and they will have to do this out of Government funds, so the whole thing is an artificial economy and should be stopped.

Very truly yours,

OSEE W. NOBLE.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in connection with this particular bill we have just witnessed a very sorry spectacle. The bill is the worst money grab the Senate has enacted for a long time. The House passed a bill cutting down the Budget estimates, and making appropriations of $179,426,846. We have restored probably $155,000,000 or more. We have deliberately taken a slap at private enterprise and at economy. We have moved toward the socialization of the electrical industry all along the line. I should like to see a yea-and-nay vote on the bill. Let us put Senators on record. All we have had is lip service to economy, lip service to private enterprise, and lip service against socialization of business and industry.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who would vote as I intend to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. REED (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who would vote as I have voted, and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent on official business. The Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily detained.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Hatch	Millikin
Andrews	Hayden	Murdock
Barkley	Hill	Murray
Burch	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Butler	Huffman	Overton
Carville	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cordon	Knowland	Stewart
Donnell	La Follette	Swift
Downey	Lucas	Taylor
Eastland	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McKellar	Tobey
Fulbright	McMahon	Tunnell
Gossett	Magnuson	Walsh
Green	Mead	

NAYS—19

Austin	Gurney	Saltonstall
Ball	Hart	Taft
Bridges	Hawkes	White
Buck	McCarran	Wiley
Byrd	Moore	Willis
Capper	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	Reed	

NOT VOTING—33

Bailey	Capehart	Kilgore
Bilbo	Connally	Langer
Brewster	George	McFarland
Briggs	Gerry	Maybank
Brooks	Guffey	Mitchell
Bushfield	Hickenlooper	Morse

Myers	Smith	Wagner
Radcliffe	Stanfill	Wheeler
Revercomb	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Robertson	Tydings	Wilson
Shipstead	Vandenberg	Young

So the bill (H. R. 6335) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Interior Department appropriation bill may be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I point out to the Senate that the 19 "nay" votes on this bill represent more votes against an appropriation bill than there have been against any appropriation bill during my service of 10 years in the Senate. That vote represents a protest registered against a money-grabbing type of bill which is a slap at economy and free enterprise.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Why does not the Senator say it is also communistic?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let us get on to something else.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, and Mr. CORDON conferees on the part of the Senate.

TITLE TO LANDS BENEATH TIDEWATERS AND NAVIGABLE WATERS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I realize that because of the condition of the calendar of the Senate the motion which I should like to make at this time would not have the approval of the leadership.

There is pending on the calendar what to my mind is a very important measure. I refer to House Joint Resolution 225, generally known as the submerged land bill. There is a call from all over the country for the consideration of this measure by the Senate. Telegrams are coming to me daily and people are calling on me frequently, asking me to bring the joint resolution, which I had the privilege of reporting from the Committee on the Judiciary, before the Senate for consideration. I realize that the importance of appropriation bills now pending is exceedingly high. Therefore, I shall not at this time try to bring up the joint resolution; but I wish the Senate to know that as soon as the appropriation bills are disposed of, I shall make an attempt to bring the House joint resolution before the Senate for consideration.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who is away on official business, be excused from attending the Senate during his absence. I neglected to make this request heretofore, and therefore make it now to apply retroactively.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, some time ago the President of the United State appointed an Evaluation Commission to attend the atomic bomb tests in the Pacific. Those tests will be held during the first part of July. As a member of the President's Evaluation Commission, I find it necessary to leave Washington not later than the coming Saturday. That is the latest possible time that I and other members of the Commission will be able to leave, in order to be present at the tests. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate after tomorrow, until the mission to which we have been appointed has been completed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico has just requested leave of absence beginning on Saturday, because of appointment on the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the atomic bomb experiment in the Pacific. I, too, am a member of that Commission, and I desire to make the same request which he has made, namely, that after the session tomorrow I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until my mission with that body has been completed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2141. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the creation of an American Battle Monuments Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American Soldier in Europe, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1923, as amended, in order to extend the Commission's authority to all areas in which our armed forces have operated during World War II, and for other purposes"; and

S. 2200. An act to amend the act approved July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army."

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COFFEE, Mr. GARY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. HORAN, and Mr. CANFIELD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Adele Nahas;

H. R. 3185. An act for the relief of George Lassila, administrator of the estate of Senia Lassila;

H. R. 3454. An act for the relief of William Clyde McKinney;

H. R. 4160. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto;

H. R. 4419. An act for the relief of Mrs. James Plumb;

H. R. 4983. An act to provide for adjustment in connection with the Crow Irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4997. An act for the relief of Ernest I. Wade and Alma Wade;

H. R. 5071. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Foster;

H. R. 5444. An act to revive and reenact and amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near the city of Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., to a point opposite thereto in the county of Union, State of Kentucky," approved July 18, 1939;

H. R. 5605. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6195. An act to amend section 1 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 658);

H. R. 6265. An act to create a Department of Corrections in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6393. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the creation of an American Battle Monuments Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1923, as amended, in order to extend the Commission's authority to all areas in which our armed forces have operated during World War II, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the act approved July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities of the War Department or of the Army";

H. R. 6572. An act to provide military assistance to the Republic of the Philippines in establishing and maintaining national security and to form a basis for participation by that Government in such defensive military operations as the future may require;

H. R. 6601. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and

for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6699. An act to decrease the amount of obligations, issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time; and

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of atomic weapons upon such vessels.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6496, being the Navy Department appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senator from Louisiana whether he desires to have the Senate continue with the consideration of the bill this afternoon.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not think there will be an opportunity to complete consideration of the bill today, unless we hold a late night session. There is one controversial item, and probably it will require an hour's debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, could we consider the noncontroversial items today?

Mr. OVERTON. Such a course would be agreeable to me. It will not take long to consider the noncontroversial items.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure that the consideration of those items would not take long.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would expedite matters somewhat to do that, and then let the controversial item go over until tomorrow.

Mr. OVERTON. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I may say that in view of the necessity to pass all the appropriation bills and to dispose of other matters before the 30th of June, it may be necessary for the Senate to have an evening session tomorrow. I hope Senators will keep that in mind, if it becomes necessary to hold an evening session then. An evening session will not be urged unless one becomes necessary, let me say.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the naval appropriations bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Naval Establishment—Title I—Office of the Secretary—Miscellaneous expenses," on page 3, line 2, after "(5 U. S. C. 118a)", to insert "special cost of living allowances for employees abroad"; and in line 25, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$13,205,000" and insert "$14,483,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingencies of the Navy", on page 4, line 11, after the figures "$100,000," to insert a comma and "of which $15,000 shall be immediately available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Naval Personnel—Training, education, and welfare, Navy," on page 7, line 17, after the figures "$8,136,000", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for or on account of any expense incident to giving special educational courses or postgraduate instruction to officers with view to qualifying them or better qualifying them for the performance of duties required to be performed by or in pursuance of law by officers of the Supply Corps, the Corps of Civil Engineers, and officers assigned to engineering duty only, except present students and except such officers who are commissioned in such corps or have been assigned to engineering duty only."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Ships—Maintenance of Bureau of Ships," on page 11, line 20, after the word "craft", to insert "charter and hire of vessels for auxiliary purposes where considered necessary by the Secretary of the Navy"; and on page 12, line 15, after the word "Bureau", to strike out "$443,750,000" and insert "$446,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Ordnance—Ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy," on page 13, in line 3, after the word "developing", to insert "and for research incidental thereto,"; and in line 15, after the word "at", to strike out "four ordnance stations" and insert "Dahlgren, Va.; Indianhead, Md.; Hawthorne, Nev.; Inyokern, Calif.; and Solomons, Md."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, in line 18, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$246,390,000" and insert "$247,990,000, of which $350,000 shall be available for placing the equipment at the Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, R. I., in condition for operation"; and in line 21, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the manufacture, assembly, repair, or overhaul of torpedoes at the Naval Ordnance Plant, Forest Park, Ill."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, that whole amendment, beginning with the comma after "$247,990,000", in line 18, should be passed over, because it is the controversial amendment in the bill which I understand is to go over until tomorrow. Is that correct?

Mr. OVERTON. I did not know it was in controversy. But if it is, it will go over. I did not know there was opposition to it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Louisiana if the amendment just read includes the movement of the torpedo ordnance plants from the Newport, R. I., and the Keyport, Wash., stations.

Mr. OVERTON. It is the amendment on page 13, in line 18.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Rhode Island and I wish to say something on that item, and I wonder whether it should go over.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; it should go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was under the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts—Pay and subsistence of naval personnel," on page 18, line 6, after the word "advisable", to strike out "$500,000,000 from the naval stock fund" and insert "not to exceed $500,000,000 from the naval stock fund: *Provided,* That the cash working capital of the naval stock fund shall not be reduced below $100,000,000 as the result of such transfer."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 22, after line 17, to insert:

NAVAL PROCUREMENT FUND

For the purpose of settlement of war contracts under the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, and during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, advances by check or warrant and reimbursements to the Naval Procurement Fund from naval appropriations may be made on the basis of the estimated cost of a project without further accounting distribution of expenditures to the individual appropriations involved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Yards and Docks—Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 24, line 10, after the word "at", to strike out "navy yards" and insert "naval shipyards."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 25, line 17, after the word "personnel", to insert "in the Bureau of Yards and Docks)"; in line 18, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$83,000,000" and insert "$35,966,300"; in the same line, after the word "That", to insert "for obligations other than architectural or engineering contracts"; in line 20, after the word "than", to strike out "5" and insert "10"; and in line 22, after "Statutes", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for hospital construction: *Provided further,* That wherever there are architectural and engineering services in any State in which a project is located qualified to do the work, such services shall be utilized."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 8, after the word "personnel", to insert "in the Bureau of Yards and Docks)"; and in line 9, after the figures $60,052,000", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That all of the foregoing amount may be expended

without regard to the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 15, to insert:

In all, $96,018,300, to remain available until expended, and the money herein specifically appropriated for public works and public utilities shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That this fund shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the provisions of section 3 of the act approved April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 591).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Aeronautics—Aviation, Navy," on page 26, line 7, after the word "plants", to strike out "$314,360,000" and insert "$310,776,000"; in line 19, after the name "Navy", to strike out "$367,600,000" and insert "$377,643,800"; in line 21, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$100,626,000"; and in line 22, after the words "in all", to strike out "$805,760,000" and insert "$812,845,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Marine Corps—Pay, Marine Corps," on page 30, line 20, after the word "law", to strike out "$15,634,000" and insert "$5,963,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 25, after the words "In all", to strike out "$237,665,000" and insert "$227,994,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Pay of civil force, Marine Corps," on page 31, line 8, after the word "Corps", to strike out "$1,175,000" and insert "$1,304,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 11, after the word "Corps", to strike out "$310,000" and insert "$341,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 13, after the word "Corps", to strike out "$670,000" and insert "$742,000"; and in the same line, after the words "in all", to strike out "$2,155,000" and insert "$2,387,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General expenses, Marine Corps," on page 34, line 2, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$4,800,000" and insert "$2,857,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 3, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$126,090,000" and insert "$124,147,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 5, after the word "Corps", to strike out "$365,910,000" and insert "$354,528,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—Salaries," on page 35, line 13, after the figures "$7,000", to strike out "$4,500,000" and insert "$5,070,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 14, after the words "General Board", to strike out "$13,000" and insert "$18,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 15, after the word "boards", to strike out "$16,000" and insert "$19,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 16, after the word "Library", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$74,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 17, after the word "General", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 18, after the word "Operations", to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,785,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 20, after the word "Survey", to strike out "$24,000" and insert "$38,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 21, after the word "Communications", to strike out "$1,200,000" and insert "$1,650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 23, after the word "Intelligence", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$1,035,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 24, after the word "Personnel", to strike out "$3,350,000" and insert "$3,902,000"; and in line 25, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "and the compensation of the employee in charge of the Naval Academy Section shall be at the base rate applying to grade 13 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent" and insert "and the compensation of the employee in charge of the Naval Academy section shall be as to base in accordance with the rates applying to grade 13 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 9, after the word "Office", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 11, after the word "work", to strike out "$360,000" and insert "$407,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 12, after the word "Ships", to strike out "$5,700,000" and insert "$6,580,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 13, after the word "Ordnance", to strike out "$3,200,000" and insert "$3,713,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 14, after the word "Accounts", to strike out "$4,400,000" and insert "$5,010,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 16, after the word "Surgery", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 18, after the word "Docks", to strike out "$1,900,000" and insert "$2,190,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 19, after the word "Aeronautics", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$2,930,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 24, after the name "Navy Department", to strike out "$32,803,000" and insert "$38,321,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses—Hydrographic Office," on page 38, line 6, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$1,425,000" and insert "$1,650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions," in section 104, page 39, line 19, after the word "work", to insert "unless representatives of the employees are given the opportunity to check any such time studies as may affect the amount of work asked of them and to protest under the established grievance procedure any work requirements believed unreasonable"; and on page 40, line 10, after the word "Government", to strike out "navy yards" and insert "naval shipyards."

Mr. OVERTON. I understand this to be a controversial item. Perhaps it should be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be passed over. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 2, to strike out section 109, as follows:

SEC. 109. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 109. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advo-

cates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think there will be some discussion of this amendment. Will the Senator from Louisiana ask that it be passed over?

Mr. OVERTON. It may be controversial, but I did not understand that it would be. The same provision has been inserted in the agricultural appropriations bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that, Mr. President. I did not know, however that it had been incorporated in the Navy bill. It is the first time that such a provision has been included in the Navy appropriations bill. It is practically the same matter as that which we discussed in connection with labor bills which have been before the Senate. I know that there are three or four Senators who would like to have an opportunity to discuss the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. The same provision was agreed to a few minutes ago in the Department of the Interior appropriations bill. I believe that it has been included in all appropriations bills which have been heretofore considered by the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have had no opportunity to read it. I should like to have an opportunity to read and study it. I may have no objection to it whatever.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be passed over.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, in section 115, page 47, line 18, after the word "employ", to insert "at the seat of government and elsewhere."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 23, to strike out section 119, as follows:

SEC. 119. None of the funds appropriated for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, shall be available for any expense whatsoever attendant upon the maintenance of any property, material, or equipment after a formal declaration has been issued by the Navy Department declaring any such property, material, or equipment surplus to the needs of the Navy Department and vesting title of any such property in any surplus disposal agency of the Government: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not be held to apply if any governmental surplus disposal agency shall reimburse the particular appropriation account of the Navy Department from which any such expense would, save for the foregoing limitation, normally be paid, for the expense involved in the maintenance of any such property, material, or equipment after title thereto has been transferred to any such governmental surplus disposal agency by declaration of surplus.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 119. None of the funds appropriated in this act for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, other than funds for which reimbursement is made hereunder, shall be available for any expenses (including the pay, allowances, and subsistence of naval and Marine Corps personnel) for care, upkeep, repair, handling, and assistance in the sale of any property, material, or equipment subsequent to the date of a declaration of surplus covering such property to a disposal agency, or, if procedures are prescribed whereby declarations of surplus are made at approximately the time of disposal or removal, subsequent to the date of notice by the owning agency to the disposal agency that property has been determined to be surplus and is subject to such procedures. With respect to all such expenses, disposal agencies shall provide reimbursement to the Navy Department, for credit to the appropriations from which such expenses would be normally paid: *Provided*, That advance payments based on the estimated expenses of the Navy Department may be made by any disposal agency: *Provided further*, That in lieu of ascertaining the direct expenses and the applicable portion of the indirect expenses, the Navy Department and the disposal agencies may agree on any basis for determining such expenses as will equitably accomplish the purpose of this section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 15, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 120. The Secretary of the Navy may delegate to the commandants of the naval districts, for administration within their respective districts, his authority (1) to employ persons in the departmental service of the Navy Department, wherever located, and (2) to authorize payment of the expenses of the transfer of household goods of employees, and of the costs of transportation of their immediate families on change from one official duty station to another.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—War Shipping Administration," in section 202, page 56, line 12, after the word "liquidation" to strike out "by December 31, 1946" and insert "as hereinafter provided", and in line 17, after the numerals "1946" to strike out "and continuing only during the period ending December 31, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana a question? There were several bills pending in the Naval Affairs Committee on problems of education with respect to the Navy. By a hasty examination I cannot ascertain how they are handled in this bill. Can the Senator enlighten me?

Mr. OVERTON. There is a provision in the bill authorizing the Bureau of Ordnance to establish schools in isolated places where projects are under way, so that the children of parents who are working on the projects will be able to obtain proper schooling.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have in mind, Mr. President, the question of a new naval college on the west coast, the naval academy at Newport, and the graduate school at Annapolis.

Mr. OVERTON. Nothing is contained in the bill relative to those institutions.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment, in line 17, on page 56, after the word "effective", to strike out the words "July 1, 1946" and insert in lieu thereof "October 1, 1946." I can offer that amendment now or offer it later.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator will withhold his amendment until we complete consideration of the committee amendments, he may offer it then.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 9, after the word "fund", to strike out the comma and "as of the close of business on December 31, 1946", and in line 11, after the word "Treasury", to insert "not later than the close of business on March 1, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. Does the Senator from Connecticut now wish to offer his amendment?

Mr. HART. I will offer it later, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, consideration of the bill will not be completed today, so if the Senator wishes to offer his amendment tomorrow, he may do so then. However, there is a disposition to dispose today of all noncontroversial amendments to the bill.

Mr. HART. I do not know whether there will be much controversy about the amendment which I wish to offer.

Mr. OVERTON. Personally, I am willing to accept it. Will the Senator state the amendment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator state his amendment?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on page 56, in line 17, after the word "effective", I move to strike out "July 1," and insert "October 1,". The effect of the amendment would be to delay by 3 months the date on which the functions of the War Shipping Administration would be transferred. The amendment is in the interest of smoother administration. The Maritime Commission is undergoing the process of reorganization under a new chairman. The change which I have suggested was recommended through the President some months ago by the Maritime Commission then in office. However, no preparations were instituted by the administration which was then in power, and it has now been found that it

will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to make the necessary change in the short time which remains. The amendment would involve no change in funds whatever. It would merely continue for an additional 3 months the situation which now exists, and would permit the Maritime Commission to get ready for the change.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. I should like to have the clerk read into the record a letter addressed to me by Mr. John W. Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION
AND RECONVERSION,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1946.

Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON,
Chairman, Navy Department Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR OVERTON: Section 202 of the bill, H. R. 6496, making appropriations for the Navy Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, now pending on the Senate calendar, provides for the transfer of all the functions, powers, and duties of the War Shipping Administration to the Maritime Commission on June 30, 1946, and the termination of the existence of the War Shipping Administration on July 1, 1946.

I recommend that the date of September 30, 1946, be substituted for the date July 1 1946, in order to provide reasonable opportunity to properly meet many problems which face the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission, to afford the time necessary for perfecting an organization which would permit the Maritime Commission to absorb and liquidate the functions of the War Shipping Administration, and in the interest of good administration and orderly liquidation of merged activities.

My recommendation does not make any increase in the funds or appropriations for the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, nor does it make any change in the requirement of section 202 that unobligated balances of the War Shipping Administration revolving fund be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury not later than the close of business on March 1, 1947.

This recommendation is made after consultation with the chairman of the Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administrator, and representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, all of whom concur therein.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. SNYDER,
Director.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in view of the statements which are contained in the letter just read by the clerk, I modify my amendment so as to read "September 30," instead of "October 1."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut on page 56, in line 17, after the word "effective", to strike out "July 1," and insert "September 30."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, on page 57, in line 3, "July 1" appears twice. It should also be changed in accordance with the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will make the change.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question. The Senator from Louisiana is familiar with the situation which exists in connection with Alaskan shipping. The committee amendment on page 57, in line 11, which has been agreed to, would allow the Maritime Commission, if it so desired, to continue operating the Alaskan trade until March 1, 1947.

Mr. OVERTON. It is my understanding that they can do that. They are in liquidation until March 1, 1947, and they can operate the ships.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Up to that point.

Mr. OVERTON. To Alaskan ports; yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wish to say for the RECORD, so that this amendment will be understood, that the situation in the Alaskan trade, as I have reiterated to the Senate on many occasions, is still deplorable, mainly because of the fact that the surplus ships are not adaptable to the Alaskan trade. The Alaskan fleet is old, and there now exists before the Maritime Commission a rate case in which the operators contend that without further increases in rates, which are now excessive to Alaska, they cannot operate the ships. This rate case will take some time, hearings must be held in Alaska and other places, and in the meantime the operators do not want the ships back. Until the matter is settled, and without completely tying up the whole Alaskan trade, on which all Alaskans rely for food, medicine, and all other supplies, it is deemed desirable for the War Shipping Administration in this case to continue operating that particular shipping to Alaska until March 1, 1947.

We suggested to the committee, and it was also suggested by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House unanimously, that the date be put over until June 30, 1947, so that we would be sure we were through and had the matter settled one way or the other, but the Senate committee decided on March 1, 1947, and I am sure that if on March 1 we are not through with this matter, and the War Shipping Administration makes a recommendation, we may come back to the committee and ask for a further extension.

Mr. OVERTON. The main purpose of specifying the March date, in place of the date contained in the bill, December 31, is in order that the War Shipping Administration may continue the Alaskan trade. If during January and February it is found that there is some difficulty, I think Congress will take cognizance of that fact, and will undertake to relieve the situation. I hope so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the amendments of the committee.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there is one amendment I wish to offer on page 23, line 16, after the word "Secretary," to insert the words "purchase of uniforms for guards at the Naval Hospital Medical Center, Bethesda, Md."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, line 16, after the word "Secretary," it is proposed to insert the words "purchase of uniforms for guards at the Naval Hospital Medical Center, Bethesda, Md."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to provide uniforms for the guards at the Naval Hospital at Bethesda. They are provided for all other guards, and by some oversight the guards at the naval hospital were overlooked.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over until tomorrow for the consideration of other amendments.

RESOLUTIONS RELATING TO ITALY, ADOPTED AT THE FIFTEENTH BIENNIAL CONVENTION, AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD copy of a resolution relating to Italy adopted at the fifteenth biennial convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. Among other things, the resolution urges the Government of the United States to grant long-term loans or credits to Italy in order that it may secure the raw materials and other basic economic necessities which it requires for the rehabilitation of its industry and agriculture and to give employment to its people.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. The Big Four are now meeting in Paris to frame a peace treaty for the Italian Nation;

2. With the assistance of the Allied armies, the Italian people overthrew their Fascist oppressors and, since the 1943 armistice, have given great aid and assistance in the successful conclusion of hostilities against the Fascist and Nazis and have thereby earned the right to treatment as an ally and not as an enemy;

3. The Italian people require assistance in rebuilding their destroyed economy in order to put an end to their present privation and suffering and place the Nation on a stable political and economic basis;

4. Many agencies, including the Free Italy American Labor Council, have collected funds, clothing, and food to relieve the hunger and destitution of the Italian people;

Resolved, That the fifteenth biennial convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America:

1. Urges the Government of the United States to use its good offices in the pending discussions of the Italian peace treaty to the end that the Italian Nation be treated without vengeance in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, and that it be admitted into the family of free nations;

2. Urges the Government of the United States to grant long-term loans or credits to Italy in order that it may secure the raw materials and other basic economic necessities which it requires for the rehabilitation of its industry and agriculture and to give employment to its people; and

3. Urges full support to the work of agencies and trade-unions which are furnishing

relief to the Italian people and asks the membership of the Amalgamated to continue their excellent work in this cause.

ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL FOOD AND DRUGS LAW

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram addressed to me and a letter addressed to the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], both from Mr. Charles Wesley Dunn, chairman of the section on food, drug, and cosmetic law of the New York State Bar Association. The communications refer to the fortieth anniversary of the original Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906.

There is also included a final program draft of May 27 with reference to a meeting to commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the original Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906, to be held in New York City on June 25, 1946.

This was sent to the Senator from North Carolina, who happens to be absent for a time recovering from a recent illness, and at his instance, and also at the instance of the Honorable CLARENCE F. LEA, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I am asking to have these matters inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 18, 1946.*

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You have received from Senator BAILEY'S office and Chairman LEA of House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Will communicate with you about important joint statement for incorporation in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on fortieth anniversary of original national food and drug law, which will be commemorated at historic meeting in New York City on June 25 next. This meeting is held under auspices of bar association committee of which I am chairman, and will include notable public session sponsored by leading national consumer organizations headed by General Federation of Women's Clubs and National League of Women Voters. I submitted this statement with approval of Federal Commissioner of Food and Drugs, and we shall deeply appreciate your joining Mr. LEA in placing this statement in RECORD early this week in order that it may be duly read at June 25 meeting following presentation of commemoration letter by President Truman. My letter to Senator BAILEY fully explains why this joint action is appropriate congressional action and important public service.

CHARLES WESLEY DUNN.

NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION,
SECTION ON FOOD, DRUG,
AND COSMETIC LAW,
New York, June 11, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: June 30 next is the fortieth anniversary of the original Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906; and there will be an important meeting in New York City to commemorate this anniversary, on June 25. That meeting will be held under the auspices of this section, representing the American Bar; and I enclose the distinguished program for it, which explains its great historic significance. You will note that the speakers include the Federal Security Administrator, the Federal Commissioner of Foods and Drugs, the Solicitor General of the United States (representing the Attorney General), the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, and the senior judge of the United States District Court here; and that leading public organizations will sponsor the third climactic session, headed by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the National League of Women Voters. Furthermore, outstanding executives in the food, drug, and cosmetic industries will take an important part in this meeting. In short, it will be a truly national meeting of a most distinguished character; and commemoration letters will be read from President Truman and members of his Cabinet and other high officials.

It is appropriate that Congress should take notice of this historic anniversary and the meeting to commemorate it. Therefore I attach a draft statement thereon, which I respectfully suggest that you place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce. For that committee was the Senate sponsor of the succeeding Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938; and I may add that it was the Senate Committee on Manufactures which led in the enactment of the oringinal 1906 act. I submit this statement to you with the approval of the Food and Drug Administration; but I note that it was drafted by me. You can rely on its statements.

I am writing a parallel letter to Representative CLARENCE F. LEA, Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. For that committee sponsored the House passage of both the original 1906 act and the succeeding 1938 act. We shall be deeply grateful to you for this valuable public service; and we sincerely hope that you can and will place this statement in the RECORD, at an early date.

Will you kindly wire me at my expense whether and when this has been done, in order that I may refer to this important fact at that historic meeting, over which I shall preside in large part.

I remain, with esteem and best wishes,
Cordially and faithfully yours,
CHARLES WESLEY DUNN,
Chairman.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ORIGINAL FEDERAL FOOD AND DRUGS ACT OF 1906

June 30 next is the fortieth anniversary of the original Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906. This anniversary of that great act is an historic milestone in the legislative, social, and economic progress of our country. Therefore, it invites appropriate recognition by the Congress; and it will be duly commemorated at a national meeting in New York City, on June 25, with a distinguished program.

The historic significance of this anniversary may be explained as follows: The Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906 was our first national food and drug law, in a basic sense; and it was a fundamental law of the land. For it had profound social and economic consequences in protecting the public health and improving the food and drug order; and it led to the succeeding Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1933, which is acclaimed as the strongest national law on its subject now in existence. That act broadly prohibits the adulteration and misbranding of these products; and it is supplemented by a prohibition of their false advertisement in the Federal Trade Commission Act. Therefore and in short: The original 1906 act instituted our national food, drug, and cosmetic law, which ordains that its products shall be safe and fit for use, true and valuable in composition, and marketed on the basis of an informing label and freedom from any misrepresentation whatsoever. A statement having the force that such products include the primary articles essential to the life and health of man.

In so directing attention to this historic anniversary, it should be added: The Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906 was enacted on the recommendation of President Theodore Roosevelt; and as a result of the long crusade by Dr. Harvey W. Wiley for a national pure food and drug law, which extended over a period of 20 years and more. Consequently he is justly called the founder of that great act. Dr. Wiley became Chief Chemist of the United States Department of Agriculture in 1883; he was first Chief of its Division of Chemistry; and then Chief of its Bureau of Chemistry. Under his direction the Department made a long series of investigations into food and drug adulteration, which disclosed the great need for a national law to prevent it. Thereupon he instituted an aggressive, unceasing, and far-reaching educational campaign for such a law; it was powerfully supported by national consumer, agricultural, industrial and trade organizations; and its enactment was ably sponsored by leaders in Congress, who included Senators Paddock, Faulkner, Mason, Hansbrough, McCumber, and Heyburn and Representatives Hatch, Brosius, Hepburn, and Mann. The public support for this law thus developed was so strong that Congress finally passed the Heyburn bill for the 1906 act, by overwhelming majorities in each branch. Then Dr. Wiley administered this act, as Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry and under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, until he resigned in 1912. The Bureau of Chemistry was eventually succeeded by the Food and Drug Administration in the administration of this act; and the latter was subsequently transferred to the Federal Security Agency. Thus it is clear that Dr. Wiley devoted the major part of his life to securing and administering the original 1906 act; and in doing so he was a great pioneer in pure food and drug legislation in this country.

The Food and Drug Administration well administered the Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906 and has well administered the succeeding Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. The food industry of this country recently paid a striking tribute to the Administration, when the leading association in that industry presented an award of distinction to it. For its administration of that law was then characterized as "a model of Federal law administration, for efficiency, fairness, and due regard for the welfare of all concerned"; and the Administration was congratulated "on its long record of notable public service in the field of food."

MEETING TO COMMEMORATE FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ORIGINAL FEDERAL FOOD AND DRUGS ACT OF 1906, TO BE HELD IN NEW YORK CITY ON JUNE 25, 1946

The Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended, was a fundamental law of great historic importance. For it was our first national food and drug law, in a basic sense; it had a profound social and economic significance, for protection of the public health and improvement in the food and drug order; and it was strongly revised in the modern Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended. That act broadly prohibits the adulteration and misbranding of these products; and it is supplemented by a prohibition of their false advertisement in the Federal Trade Commission Act. Therefore and in short: The 1906 act instituted our existing national food, drug, and cosmetic law, which ordains that its products shall be safe and fit for use, true and valuable in composition, and sold on the basis of an informing label and freedom from

any misrepresentation whatsoever—a statement having the force that such products include the primary articles essential to the life and health of man.

This meeting to commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the original 1906 act is manifestly indicated, because that event is a historic landmark in the social and economic progress of our country. It is also designed to discuss the basic significance of the national food, drug, and cosmetic law, which the aforesaid act instituted; and to make an appropriate public tribute to this law. And it will undoubtedly be the most important meeting yet held on such law. Consequently the proceedings of this meeting will be published in a special commemoration book, as well as in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Law Quarterly, for general dissemination and permanent record. Moreover, they will be broadcast by radio, to the available extent.

PROGRAM

Morning Session: 10 to 1 O'clock

This session is in the meeting hall of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, at 42 West Forty-fourth Street. It is held under the auspices of the section on food, drug, and cosmetic law of the New York State Bar Association, which is the first and only and a representative organization of the American bar in the field of this law. The chairman of the section will preside.

Subject: Original Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended.

Papers:

Introduction to the Act, Hon. Watson B. Miller, Federal Security Administrator.

Its Legislative History, Mr. Charles Wesley Dunn, chairman, section on food, drug, and cosmetic law, New York State Bar Association.

Its Great Founder, Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, chairman, department of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Its Distinguished Administrators, Mr. Fred B. Linton, formerly business manager, Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency.

Its Administrative Progress, Dr. Paul B. Dunbar, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency.

Its Inspection Evolution, Mr. W. R. M. Wharton, Chief, Eastern District, Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency.

Afternoon Session: 2 to 4:30 O'clock

This session is in the same place; it is held under the same auspices, and the same chairman will preside over it.

Subject: The National Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Law, Instituted by the 1906 Act.

Addresses:

A Fundamental Law of the Land, Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Solicitor General of the United States.

Its Basic Significance for Public Health, Hon. Thomas Parran, M. D., Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service.

Its Basic Value to Food Industry, Mr. Clarence Francis, chairman of board, General Foods Corp.

Its Basic Value to Drug Industry, Mr. S. DeWitt Clough, chairman of board, Abbott Laboratories, Inc.; Mr. James Hill, Jr., president, Sterling Drug, Inc.

Its Basic Value to Cosmetic Industry, Dr. H. Gregory Thomas, vice president, Bourjois, Inc.

Evening Session: 8 O'clock

This climactic session is in the same place; and it will be held under the auspices of distinguished public organizations, which are interested in the great law under consideration. They include (among others) the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the National League of Women Voters. The presiding officer will be the Hon. Thomas Parran, M. D., Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service.

Subject: The National Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Law, Thus Instituted.

Tributes:

Hon. Watson B. Miller, Federal Security Administrator.

Mrs. Harold A. Stone, first vice president, National League of Women Voters.

Dr. Frank G. Boudreau, chairman, food and nutrition board, National Research Council.

Hon. John C. Knox, senior district judge, United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

NOTE.—The seating capacity of the meeting hall, where these sessions will be held, is 400. The general admission to each session is by tickets, allotted in advance on a representative basis. There will be ample accommodations for the press, in addition.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Sundry employees for appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

John R. Steelman, of Alabama, to be Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion for a term of 2 years, vice John W. Snyder, resigned; and

Stewart Berkshire, of Texas, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of Paul A. Hankins, resigned.

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

John W. Gibson, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor;

Philip Hannah, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor;

David A. Morse, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor; and

James Joseph Reynolds, Jr., of New Jersey, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1946.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE ARMY—GEN. MARK CLARK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the Thirty-sixth Division Association of Texas has charged before the House Military Affairs Committee and the Senate Committee on Military Affairs that Gen. Mark Clark is not competent to hold the position of commander of troops which he now holds, and they protest his promotion.

Their opinion is that of military men who state that in the Rapido River fiasco General Clark violated the fundamental ABC's of military tactics. Some other military men in high position agree, and some disagree with the opinion of the men of the Thirty-sixth Division Association.

No official decision in the case has been made and there likely will be none. This is unfortunate because it places the Senate in the position of being asked to promote a man where there is serious doubt as to his ability and a man against whom very serious charges have been made by fellow members of his profession. I think it fair both to General Clark and to the Senate that this matter be settled before his promotion is voted. I, for one, am not willing to vote to place lives of our soldiers in the hands of any general where there is the slightest doubt of his qualifications.

I am willing to observe further that public reports describe a tense and uncooperative situation existing in the military zone now commanded by General Clark. Several incidents have been reported which indicate beyond question, if these reports are true, that the Russian commander opposite General Clark has little respect for him. The Russian refuses to answer protests made by General Clark and continues further provocative incidents.

Mr. President, such actions can start wars. It is my opinion that General Clark should be transferred to some other zone of command and a new commander placed in his stead—one of unimpeachable ability, and one whom the Russian commander might have respect for. I fear that if General Clark is left in this tense situation that we may have, because of his mishandling of the relations with the Russian commander, another fiasco far more tragic than the Rapido River. We may have one that will start another war.

Mr. President, I take my stand with the Thirty-sixth Division and request that the RECORD show me as voting against the confirmation of Mark Clark. I am opposed to rewarding incompetency with promotion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who is absent on official business in Paris, sent a cablegram that he desired also to be recorded as voting against the confirmation of the nomination of General Clark. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the telegram from Senator CONNALLY be inserted in the RECORD at this point, and that he be recorded as opposed to the confirmation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The cablegram is as follows:

JUNE 20, 1946.

Pair against Clark and have statement made on floor to that effect.

TOM CONNALLY.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I want to say a few words about Gen. Mark Clark. I, of course, am not in position to pass any judgment in respect to the military competence of General Clark. I did visit the Cassino battlefield last fall and saw

the Rapido scene and the general situation with respect to which this controversy has arisen. I will say that I have talked to many officers and men who were still in Italy in our armed forces, and they all expressed the greatest confidence in General Clark, and none of them seemed to feel that General Clark was responsible for the loss of life which occurred at the Rapido crossing. As I said, I am not competent to pass judgment upon that subject.

But I will say that I had occasion to visit Vienna where General Clark has been and still is in command, and to learn from many sources there of the utmost confidence in which he is held, and the reliance that is felt in him, and the excellent job he has been doing as our commanding officer. I believe he has the confidence of all the United States representatives there who are familiar with the work he is doing.

I think the way he has gotten along with the Russians has been creditable and commendable, and that his responsibility there has been discharged in the most soldierly manner and in such a way as to reflect credit on himself and upon his country.

I hope the Senate will see fit to confirm the nomination of General Clark to be major general.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not understand that the message received from the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] or the statement made by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] indicate any desire on their part to bring about any delay in the action of the Senate on this nomination. I understand they wanted their position made known in the RECORD. I know nothing about the incident or episode concerning which complaint is made regarding General Clark. I know that during the activities of our forces in Europe General Clark attained a very high reputation as a commanding officer, for initiative and decision, and he has been recommended for this promotion by the War Department and by the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate.

I hope the nomination will be confirmed without delay.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. THOMAS] was unable to be here this evening. On behalf of the Military Affairs Committee I should like to make a brief statement with respect to the gallant Thirty-sixth Infantry and Gen. Mark Clark.

A detailed analysis of the casualties suffered by the Thirty-sixth Infantry Division for the period January 20–31, which involved the follow through of every man's case by name, developed the following: Killed 319, wounded 800, captured and missing 731, total 1,850.

General Clark graduated from the Military Academy April 20, 1917, and at the time of the Rapido River battle had been a professional soldier for 27 years. He is a graduate of the Infantry School, the Command and General Staff School, and the Army War College. His service includes 4 years on the War Department General Staff, and his record is outstanding in efficiency and superior performance of assigned duties.

The point of attack was selected because it alone offered the possibility of complying with the directive from higher headquarters—Fifteenth Army Group—which called for the Fifth Army to make as strong a thrust as possible toward Frosinone. The only avenue of approach practicable was up the Liri River Valley. The terrain selected would have permitted the maximum exploitation by armored forces of any success attained in establishing a bridgehead and breaching the German defense lines.

The II Corps—General Keyes, commanding—weighed the relative merits of crossing north of Cassino—front of the Thirty-fourth Division—and crossing in the vicinity of St. Angelo. In view of the directive to exploit with armor toward Frosinone, General Keyes recommended the attack in the vicinity of St. Angelo—front of the Thirty-sixth Division.

In selecting the point of attack both the Fifth Army and the Second Corps commanders considered the area assigned the Thirty-fourth Division. The idea of a major attack in this sector was rejected because:

(a) This could not be considered a critical area for the enemy. The natural strength of the position insured its invulnerability with a minimum number of troops committed to its defense. Any local successes which did not include possession of Cassino and its controlling heights would not menace his defensive positions nor facilitate the contemplated link-up of the main Fifth Army elements with the enveloping forces to be landed at Anzio.

(b) The terrain in this area was unsuitable for the employment of armor. The river, split into several courses, meanders through a flat marshy valley. Immediately to the west of the valley lies the mountain mass dominating both the Rapido and Liri River Valleys and presenting a tremendous obstacle to any further advance of armor once it was across the river.

(c) The complete lack of roads leading to and through this rugged terrain made it impossible to provide logistic support for a major effort. The Thirty-fourth Division was forced to delay making a major attack until January 24, when an improvised road had been constructed. Even then the supply difficulties limited the strength of their attacks to one regimental combat team. It would have been impossible to move the Thirty-sixth Division into this area and deliver a coordinated major attack in time to assist the scheduled landings at Anzio. A delay in the Anzio landings was impossible as most of the landing craft involved were committed for use in the Normandy landings and their transfer to England could not be further postponed.

The experience of the Thirty-fourth Division in crossing the Rapido River in the area in question during the period January 24 to 29 demonstrated the impracticability of attempting a major thrust at this point. The division attacked January 24, without armored support but the attempted crossing failed in the face of strong German defenses. A second attack on January 26 also failed when an entire tank battalion, supporting the attack, bogged down in the flat, flooded river valley. The third attack on January 29 was successful in obtaining a foothold across the river due to the support given by 23 tanks which successfully crossed the river well to the north of the division sector and moved down the right bank of the river.

However, operations of these tanks were limited to a very restricted area some two to three hundred yards in width between the river bank and the hill mass to the west. The attempts of the infantry to force a passage through Cassino could only be supported by one tank at a time due to terrain restrictions. As is well known, the German defenses in Cassino successfully resisted all our efforts from this direction for many weeks.

The time available was limited by instructions from Fifteenth Army Group. On January 12 the Army group commander directed that "these operations will culminate with an attack by the United States Second Corps across the Rapido on or about January 20." All river-crossing equipment available to the Fifth Army was placed at the disposal of the Thirty-sixth Division.

General Clerk as Army commander assigned the task of gaining a bridgehead across the Rapido River to the Thirty-sixth Division through the Second Corps commander. The second attack was ordered by the corps commander in an effort to accomplish the assigned mission. The third attack ordered by the Second Corps commander was canceled on orders of the Army commander, General Clark.

As a point of fact the transfer of troops from the transports to the landing craft took place 8 or 9 miles seaward of the landing beaches instead of 12 to 14 miles, as stated. The decision as to where the transfer of troops from large transports to the landing craft will be made is not within the province of the Army commander of troops. It is a decision made by the naval commander of the amphibious force. The point of transfer is governed by the presence of marine mine fields and by enemy artillery and air capabilities. Transfer of troops to the smaller craft decreases their vulnerability to such enemy defensive measures.

The regiment of the Forty-third Division—One Hundred and Seventy-ninth Infantry—had not been forced out of the area but had been moved to the left on orders of the Sixth Corps commander to close a gap which existed between the British Tenth Corps and the United States Sixth Corps. To replace this unit and fill the gap thus created the corps commander ordered the only unit he had available, the Second Battalion, One Hundred and Forty-third Infantry, Thirty-sixth Division, to take position between the Sele and Calore Rivers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on confirming the nominations in the Army en bloc.

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

SUPREME COURT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Fred M. Vinson, of Kentucky, to be Chief Justice of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nadine Lane Gallagher, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul V. McNutt, of Indiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Philippines.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry other nominations in the foreign service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the remaining nominations in the foreign service be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the remaining foreign-service nominations are confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gilchrist B. Stockton to be rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, while serving with the United States Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines, and to continue until release from active duty.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 21, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 20 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Peyton R. King, Jones, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Carrie C. Crump, Samantha, Ala., in place of W. M. Crump, deceased.

CONNECTICUT

Adelaide Lauretta Plumbley, Clintonville, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

IDAHO

Evelyn R. David, Bovill, Idaho, in place of A. G. David, deceased.

IOWA

Everett V. Anderson, Story City, Iowa, in place of Peter Peterson, resigned.

KANSAS

Fred M. Allen, Burden, Kans., in place of Earl Hoefgen, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Lois S. Hiers, Canada, Ky., in place of Orison Smith, retired.

LOUISIANA

Lillie M. Scarborough, Angie, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

Burton E. Jones, Holly, Mich., in place of R. F. Allan, resigned.

Herbert R. Abrams, Wixom, Mich., in place of B. L. Fenn, resigned.

MISSOURI

Rebecca G. Walton, Hawk Point, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Kate W. Snead, Iantha, Mo., in place of O. M. King, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Louis L. Lewandowski, Ashton, Nebr., in place of F. A. Badura, transferred.

NEW MEXICO

Herbert Dale Dodds, Tularosa, N. Mex., in place of Vera Clayton, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Barthold G. Schubert, Parshall, N. Dak., in place of Ruth Cooper, resigned.

OREGON

Glen P. Kelsay, Spray, Oreg., in place of J. M. Morse, resigned.

Bertha Darnielle, The Dalles, Oreg., in place of R. B. Bennett, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Carmine A. Perriello, Koppel, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Besse Keener, Livermore, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Emma Erbe, Bowdle, S. Dak., in place of A. L. Rositch, resigned.

TEXAS

Gorman Moore, Kildare, Tex., in place of C. M. Nelson, resigned.

Uple L. Clifton, Laird Hill, Tex., in place of M. C. LaVere, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Fred Ray Johnston, Marion, Va., in place of J. E. Thomas, resigned.

WYOMING

Florence H. Shriver, Ten Sleep, Wyo., in place of C. M. Elbert, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 20 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

SUPREME COURT

Fred M. Vinson to be Chief Justice of the United States.

FOREIGN SERVICE

Paul V. McNutt to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Philippines.

TO BE FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICERS, UNCLASSIFIED, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Frederic S. Armstrong, Jr.
William T. Briggs
Charles C. Carson
Williams Beal
Wilbur P. Chase
John H. Clagett
Donald E. Emerson
Hubert F. Ferrell
Fred L. Hadsel
Richard M. Hughes
Thomas M. Judd
Donald S. King
William C. Lakeland
Jerome R. Lavallee
LeRoy F. Percival, Jr.
James W. Pratt
Norman K. Pratt
Robert J. Redington
Miss Rebecca M. Stribling
John H. Stutesman, Jr.
Carlin A. Treat
Norman E. Warner
Richard R. Wilford
Robert A. Wilson

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Nadine Lane Gallagher to be associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia.

IN THE ARMY

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Robert Charlwood Richardson, Jr.
Courtney Hicks Hodges
Jacob Loucks Devers
George Churchill Kenney
Carl Spaatz
Ira Clarence Eaker
Robert Lawrence Eichelberger
Thomas Troy Handy
Walter Bedell Smith
Mark Wayne Clark

To be brigadier generals

Wilhelm Delp Styer
Harold Lee George
William Hood Simpson
James Harold Doolittle
Lucian King Truscott, Jr.
Richard Kerens Sutherland
John Clifford Hodges Lee
Leonard Townsend Gerow
Albert Coady Wedemeyer
John Kenneth Cannon
Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg
Oscar Wolverton Griswold
Walton Harris Walker
Wade Hampton Haislip
Joseph Lawton Collins
Lucius DuBignon Clay
Alvan Cullom Gillem, Jr.
Barton Kyle Yount
Matthew Bunker Ridgway
LeRoy Lutes
John Reed Hodge
John Edwin Hull
Raymond Stallings McLain
Manton Sprague Eddy
Curtis Emerson LeMay
Lauris Norstad

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Gilchrist B. Stockton to be rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, while serving with the United States Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines, and to continue until release from active duty.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 1946

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our Heavenly Father, that back of all the issues of life are infinite wisdom, power, and goodness. As Thou hast dignified Thy children with choice and holdest us responsible that the seed we now sow will be the harvest of some subsequent tomorrow, with faith in Thy providence, help us to submit ourselves to the vicissitudes of life. We pray

that the kingdom of earth may become the kingdom of our God, with no more tumult and strife, when all honest toil shall be a fruitful vine and the leaves of the tree shall be for the healing of the nations. Let there be a replenishing of our ideals, strengthened by the spirit of penitence and prayer. We pray that we may be generous, distributing the treasures of encouragement for those who have failed, and at the last may it be said that we labored, toiled, and achieved, for it is better to have saved a life than to have founded a kingdom. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5265. An act to create a Department of Corrections in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6393. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the creation of an American Battle Monuments Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1923, as amended, in order to extend the Commission's authority to all areas in which our armed forces have operated during World War II, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the act approved July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2219. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; and

S. 2335. An act to excuse employees of the Government from work on July 5, 1946.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Secretary be directed to request the House to return to the Senate bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2141. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the creation of an American Battle Monuments Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1923, as amended, in order to extend the Commission's authority to all areas in which our armed forces have operated during World War II, and for other purposes; and

S. 2200. An act to amend the act approved July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities of the War Department or of the Army."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4512) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HILL, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. AIKEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5356) entitled "An act to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a naval establishment, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. TOBEY, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of State.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. Department of War.
6. Federal Security Agency.
7. Federal Works Agency.
8. Interstate Commerce Commission.
9. National Archives.
10. National Housing Agency.
11. Petroleum Administration for War.
12. United States Tariff Commission.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 165]

Adams	Domengeaux	Jensen
Allen, Ill.	Douglas, Calif.	Kee
Andrews, N. Y.	Douglas, Ill.	Keefe
Baldwin, Md.	Durham	Kelly, Ill.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Earthman	King
Barden	Engle, Calif.	Klein
Bell	Fellows	Lea
Bennet, N. Y.	Folger	LeCompte
Bennett, Mo.	Gardner	Lemke
Bonner	Gifford	Lesinski
Boren	Gore	Lewis
Boykin	Gossett	Luce
Bradley, Mich.	Granger	Ludlow
Canfield	Grant, Ala.	McGehee
Cannon, Fla.	Green	McGlinchey
Celler	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McMillan, S. C.
Clark		McMillen, Ill.
Cochran	Hall, Leonard W.	Mankin
Colmer	Harris	Mansfield, Tex.
Courtney	Hébert	Morgan
Cox	Heffernan	Morrison
Curley	Hobbs	Murphy
Dawson	Hook	Norrell
De Lacy	Jackson	Norton
Dolliver	Powell	Peterson, Ga.
Reece, Tenn.	Slaughter	Voorhis, Calif.
Richards	Somers, N. Y.	Welch
Rivers	Starkey	West
Robertson, N. Dak.	Stewart	White
Roe, N. Y.	Stigler	Wickersham
Rowan	Sumner, Ill.	Winstead
Sadowski	Taylor	Wolfenden, Pa.
Sheridan	Tolan	Worley
	Torrens	
	Vinson	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that the time for requests that Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD or to address the House for 1 minute has passed. We will have two votes in connection with unfinished business, and we have a full program for the remainder of the day.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I believe it would be well for the Speaker to state for the information of the House the two matters of unfinished business immediately pending and the order in which they will be taken up.

The SPEAKER. The first order of business is the vote on the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole that the enacting clause be stricken from the bill S. 324, the national cemeteries bill. The next unfinished business is the vote on the passage of the bill H. R. 6579, the flood-control bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is the final vote on that bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

NATIONAL CEMETERY BILL

The SPEAKER. The question is on the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the enacting clause be stricken out of the bill S. 524.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. As I recall, that is the so-called cemetery bill.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I understand in Committee of the Whole the motion to strike out the enacting clause was adopted by both a voice vote and a teller vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry.

All those who favor taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and remain standing until counted. [After counting.] Thirty-three Members have arisen. In the opinion of the Chair, that is not one-fifth of those present.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SIKES) there were—ayes 168, noes 82.

So the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the enacting clause be stricken out was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

FLOOD-CONTROL BILL

The SPEAKER. The next unfinished business is the question on the passage of the bill H. R. 6597, the so-called flood-control bill.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 202, noes 38.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACTS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1362) to amend the Railroad Retirement Acts, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1362, with Mr. PATMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. For the information of the Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] has 45 minutes remaining, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] has 43 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] has 1 hour and 24 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN].

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill. I am a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; I am a new member; this is my first term, and this was the first bill to come before the committee during the period in which I have been a member.

The Congress is the legislative branch of our system of government, but I find from listening to the testimony and listening to the reports on this bill that the duties of a Congressman are not only legislative in nature; they are quasi-judicial in nature. We listen to the testimony of witnesses and try to form a decision. That part of our duties is quasi-judicial. Now, I tried to approach this bill in a judicial manner. I had no preconceived notions as to whether the bill proposed by the gentleman from Ohio was a good one or a bad one; I had no idea whether it was feasible or not feasible; I arrived at a conclusion after listening to the testimony of the witnesses. The testimony was quite complicated; it involved a great many facts; it involved a great many figures; we had the testimony of actuaries and we had to consider their testimony very carefully. I am no actuary. I do not pretend to be able to give you an analysis of the figures presented by those actuaries. I could if I took the time and effort to do so but I would not attempt to do it on the floor here today. Let me say, however, that after listening to the testimony of the witnesses, I came to the conclusion that the Crosser version of the railroad retirement provisions was the one that I was ready to support and willing to support. I came to that conclusion despite the fact the majority of the committee thought otherwise.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABIN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has made reference to this matter as being complicated and involved. I certainly agree with him that it is. In view of that fact does not the gentleman believe that the careful study given to the matter by the subcommittee and then by the committee with the recommendation coming from a great majority of the committee should carry great weight with the House of Representatives in determining what ought to be done?

Mr. RABIN. Yes; I agree with the gentleman, I think it should carry great weight; but I do not accept the proposition that the majority is always right. The minority could be right and the majority could be wrong. That is why we have minority opinions and minority reports. I do not think we must accept as a basic proposition that the majority is always right. If we did there would be no need for debate on the floor. After listening to the testimony I believe in this instance the majority is not right.

I shall not now enter into a debate on social philosophies. I believe in the liberalization of the Railroad Retirement Act. I believe we are making progress in social security.

The issue between the majority and the minority is merely one that goes to the matter of feasibility. Is the Crosser bill a feasible bill? Is the Crosser bill practical from the standpoint of cost?

The majority dissent—if I may put it that way, because the Crosser bill was the one originally introduced, is based on the theory it is actuarially unsound. That is the chief point at issue. The report of the committee turns on that point primarily.

Sitting as a judge, what did I hear? I heard the testimony of Mr. Latimer in support of the Crosser bill. Now, who is Mr. Latimer? Mr. Latimer is the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board. He is also an economist. He was chosen by President Roosevelt to prepare the figures on the basis of which this Board was founded and he has been in charge of the work of the Railroad Retirement Board from the time of its inception. He testified—giving figures—that the Crosser bill is sound, that the Crosser tax requirements can support the liberal features that are contained in the Crosser bill. However, we are told that Mr. Latimer is a partial witness. After a judge listens to a case, and decides it for one party, I think it is hardly fair to say that the judge is partial because of his decision. Only on that ground may Mr. Latimer be deemed to be partial. After he had worked on the Railroad Retirement Board for the number of years he did—from the date of its inception—he made his finding, based on the figures produced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, we cannot properly say he is partial merely because of his conclusion. However, the majority of the committee thought it wise to employ the services of another actuary.

The committee employed one Robert J. Myers, an actuary, and asked him to give his opinion. The report of the majority of the committee is based on the opinion of Mr. Myers. Now, let us look at Mr. Myers' opinion and see what he says about the testimony given before the full committee. Mr. Myers did not testify before the full committee. He did not testify at the open hearings at all. He was called in merely to report. What does he say? He said that—

> In general, extensive cost estimates were presented only by Mr. Latimer and Mr. Corbett, the latter dealing solely with the retirement system. All other discussions of cost were based on these figures or modifications thereof. Expert testimony of two prominent actuaries, Mr. Williamson and Mr. Booth, was taken in regard to retirement cost data. These witnesses primarily affirmed that Mr. Latimer's estimates were adequately prepared and that the results fell within a reasonable range, but they did not specifically set forth their own views as to the likely costs.

Mr. Myers upon whom the committee relies, states that Mr. Latimer was the only witness who testified to the figures from an actuarial standpoint and that his figures were supported by men whom Mr. Myers calls prominent actuaries—Mr. Booth and Mr. Williamson.

Who is Mr. Williamson? Mr. Williamson is an actuarial consultant with the Social Security Board and has been associated with that Board since 1936. From 1910 he was with the Travelers Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn., and since 1916 assistant actuary of that company, specializing in pension plans.

Who is Mr. Booth? Mr. Booth is connected with the actuarial department of the Travalers Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn., and has been with that institution for more than 30 years. He is a fellow by examination of the Actuarial Society of America and the American Institute of Actuaries.

I shall not discuss figures. I shall not discuss the pros and cons. After all, an actuary's estimate is based upon prognostications. He may be wrong in some degree. He may be a degree to the right or a degree to the left, but we must rely on those figures.

Here we have the testimony given by the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board supported by eminent actuaries—Mr. Williamson and Mr. Booth.

We have the testimony of Mr. Myers, who was called as an expert by the committee, in support of their qualifications.

As a judge, I accept their testimony. Accepting that testimony I must assume at the outset that the Crosser bill is a feasible bill; that the Crosser bill is practical; that the Crosser costs are correct, and that the proposed taxable features contained therein are sufficient to support the Crosser bill. I urge you to support it.

BLIND AIDED BY RANDOLPH ACT

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the subcommittee of the House Labor Committee on aid to the physically handicapped, it was brought to my attention that today is the tenth anniversary of the enactment of the Randolph-Sheppard bill, a measure to effectuate the rehabilitation of the blind. During that period between 7 and 10 thousand blind persons have been placed in profitable employment. I thought that the Members might wish to know about this matter in order to join with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the coauthor of this bill, in the satisfaction he receives from the enactment of this high hype legislation which has done so much for blind persons.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in the past there has been a good deal of discussion about the method that was used to get expeditious action on this legislation. It is true that the first bill, the Crosser bill, was introduced over 2 years ago. Soon after the introduction of that bill hearings of a brief nature were held. Then from time to time during the entire 2 years there has been devoted to this legislation a great deal of attention. I know at one time over a period of about a month we met every day to hear witnesses for and against this legislation. The proposals have been very thoroughly studied. There came a time when some of us even on the committee wanted to get action on the legislation. Also, there were some Members of Congress not on the committee who wanted to get action on the legislation. Accordingly, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] placed a petition on the Speaker's desk and invited Members to sign that petition.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not true that at the time the discharge petition was put on the Speaker's desk the committee had completed its labors on the bill and directed the Legislative Drafting Service to put it in order to report it to the House?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is substantially correct. It is also true that up to the time the petition was placed on the Speaker's desk we never had been able to get out a bill, and about 2 years had elapsed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Considering the fact that for more than 2 years the committee had failed and refused to act on this important legislation, does not the gentleman think the fact that the petition in question was finally placed on the Speaker's desk and quickly signed by 218 Members, might have had something to do with the committee's decision to report out its substitute for the Crosser bill?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I want to finish my statement. I will yield in just a moment.

The petition was placed on the Speaker's desk and about six or seven members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce signed the petition. At least six signed it; incidentally, one of them was and is a member of the transportation subcommittee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]. To my certain knowledge he had studied the legislation a great deal.

But this situation is not without a parallel. It so happened that more than 2 years ago I introduced a terminal leave bill. I asked for consideration of that measure by the House Committee on Military Affairs, and from time to time they did work on it. I was told they were busy, and I am sure they were busy. The point I want to make is this: A member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], a very able and fair-minded man, who did a good job of work with reference to the terminal leave legislation, placed a petition on the Speaker's desk about the same time. It was signed by 218 Members of Congress. Incidentally, if I am not badly mistaken, it was signed by at least one member of the House Committee on Military Affairs. To assume that anything strange has taken place with reference to getting this legislation before the House is an incorrect assumption. The parallel runs true also in this connection. Soon after both petitions were signed we got action. I am not alleging that anybody has done anything wrong—not at all—but the petition method is one of the methods that is used to get expeditious action on legislation from time to time.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I asked the gentleman to yield to correct a very subtle and a very unfair suggestion made by the gentleman from Oklahoma that the filing of the petition had something to do with this bill's being reported by the committee. The committee had already ordered the bill reported before the petition was ever filed. Therefore, such a charge is unfounded, and I resent it.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am not trying to reflect on anybody. I am simply stating that the parallel does exist as between our committee and the Committee on Military Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I will yield in just a moment. I want to make one or two observations about the legislation.

There is one particular phase of this legislation in which I am very personally interested, because I happen to know something about an individual case which I am sure is not dissimilar to a good many other cases. It so happened that when I was at home last summer a friend of mine came to see me. He has worked for the railroad 18 years. He apparently is suffering from cancer. He told me that he had spent all of his savings, has sold his home and spent everything he had been able to get together trying to cure the disease he has. I seriously fear under the provisions of the committee amendment that this friend of mine cannot get any type of aid. Yet he writes me often as to how badly he needs help. The reason I say what I have said is this—and I hope I am incorrect because the man ought to have help and those like him ought to have help—if I understand the committee version of the bill that has been reported, he would have to show that the cancer was occupationally caused; in other words, that the disease came about because of his occupation. I do not know this positively, but I believe the legislation will be so interpreted. If that is true, he would not get any help whatsoever because it is very difficult to show in many instances that a given illness or injury came about as the result of one's occupation.

It is for this purpose that I took the floor to say something about the legislation, because I do hope somewhere along the line we will be able to get a provision in this legislation to take care of just this kind of case. If a man who has worked for the railroad 18 years and has contributed to the retirement fund cannot look to that fund for help when he gets in a situation like that of the friend I am talking about, where can he expect to get any help?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I desire to say that I think the gentleman's interpretation of the committee bill is absolutely correct. I do not believe any lawyer would seriously question that. I will add that I have several cases in mind similar to the one mentioned by the gentleman from Texas. The heartless manner in which some have been treated,

after years of faithful service, is shameful.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am sure the gentleman is correct in making that statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. With the gentleman's permission, I would like to add a word with reference to the petition that forced this bill here for consideration. Some members of the committee feel outraged that anyone should even intimate that the petition signed by 218 Members within less than 24 hours had the slightest connection with the sudden action of the committee. We were told the same about other bills. The committee was just about ready to act on this bill to pay enlisted men terminal leave, according to members of the committee. But Members know that in that instance, as well as in regard to the pending bill, it got action. If the petition did not get results, it proved to be a powerful factor in reminding the committee that Members of this House meant business and was tired of delay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Ohio will use his time in proportion as time is used by the proponents of the amendment, because we must reserve a sufficient amount of time to close the debate. If the gentleman from Ohio does not desire to use time further, then at the proper time I shall ask that the Clerk read the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I think the House is fully aware of the very complex nature of the legislation before us. At this time, however, it might be well to cite one or two instances that will further emphasize the fact that we are not dealing with legislation that can be properly handled in an easy manner.

As a member of the subcommittee that worked for many weeks on the pending bill, I can state that personally I have spent more time and effort on this bill than perhaps any other proposal that has come before our committee in many months.

It has been stated in this debate that the present retirement system resulted finally from collective bargaining between the carriers and employees.

The present bill was an exception to that earlier procedure and it places on the committee and the Congress the greater responsibility to proceed with care in an effort to bring out sound legislation.

It is difficult to write a bill of this nature on the floor, because of the complexity of the proposals before us. For example, the Crosser bill as it was introduced proposed, as you know, 92 amendments to existing law. Now, keep that in mind. There were 92 amendments proposed to existing law by the Crosser bill when the hearings were started before the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As the hearings proceeded on the bill before the committee we heard the testimony of Mr. Latimer, Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, for several consecutive days. Mr. Latimer gave a very comprehensive actuarial progression to the committee, based on his assumptions and with his conclusions that followed after projecting these figures into the year 2000. But during the course of Mr. Latimer's testimony he proposed—and I hope you will get this—he proposed 76 amendments to the Crosser bill. The bill, as I said, proposed 92 amendments to existing law, and then Mr. Latimer in his testimony proposed 76 different amendments to the bill that was before the committee. If you care to check the hearings on his proposals for amendments to the Crosser bill, you will find them in the hearings beginning on page 1067.

I regret very much, Mr. Chairman, that the consideration of this bill has run into so many cross-currents of opinion and so much controversy within the committee and on the floor of the House. I believe that every Member of the House shares with me and with the committee a desire to accomplish by legislation those things that will most assist the men who work on railroads and that will do this in keeping with our general program of social security in this country.

I have found and I believe others have found by checking with the men and women who work on railroads that among the things they most desired in the very beginning were, first, a reduction in the number of years of service required for permanent and total disability benefits. The Crosser bill proposed to reduce that to 10 years. The committee bill makes a similar provision but requires that the disability shall grow out of service in some manner. In other words, the committee bill does not provide total and permanent disability after 10 years of service, regardless of age, for any sort of disability that might result in no way related to the occupation.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Just to make inquiry along the line that I spoke about a moment ago; does the gentleman feel that the legislation as it is now written would prohibit the man I described getting anything?

Mr. PRIEST. I am sorry to say to my colleague from Texas that I did not hear all of his remarks. I came from a telephone call at the time he was discussing the matter and I did not hear what he said about this particular man.

Mr. BECKWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, the man worked for 17 years for the railroad. He now has a bad cancer. I am just wondering, under the provisions of the bill, whether or not he would get anything. He is absolutely disabled.

Mr. PRIEST. May I ask the gentleman in connection with that case, is this man employed at the present time?

Mr. BECKWORTH. This employee cannot work at the present time, but he has got nothing.

Mr. PRIEST. Unquestionably there are instances such as the gentleman describes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Suppose he were to find tomorrow that he was entirely unable to work any longer?

Mr. PRIEST. That would depend on whether or not it could be shown that this condition had some connection with or was aggravated by the employment. I think the gentleman is correct there. It would depend on that showing and on the interpretation given it in my opinion.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does the gentleman not agree that very often it is difficult to associate a particular injury or disability with a given line of work because there are so many diseases like heart disease, arthritis, and so forth, that cannot be attributed to anything definite, yet that are disqualifying?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Answering the gentleman from Texas, he should remember that there is no disability under social-security laws. This goes further than social security even in the committee bill.

Mr. PRIEST. I was about to say further in response to the gentleman from Texas that I think there would be very little difficulty to show that an injury was connected with the service. When it comes to the matter of some other types of illness, it would be more difficult, but as the gentleman from North Carolina has stated, this does go further than social security.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is not this true: That any war veteran has to show that his disability was service-connected in order to draw a pension, and that if this man were a veteran under the circumstances he would not draw benefits?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I wanted to comment that I think that the veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War II receive pensions for total disability whether service-connected or not.

Mr. PRIEST. For total disability; yes.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RABIN. Is not the requirement that the disability be service-connected merely a principle of workmen's compensation as distinguished from self-insurance?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BULWINKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee one additional minute.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sorry my time will not let me go into these questions fully. I had a few more words I wanted to add. The men who work on the railroads are interested in this disability provision, are interested in an increase of the minimum annuities which are provided in the bill. They are interested in widows' and sur-

vivors' insurance which also are provided in the bill. These are things they have been fundamentally interested in. Under existing law, a widow or survivor has no benefit except as it may be by election of the employee himself.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Is the committee bill satisfactory to the men who work on the railroad?

Mr. PRIEST. I am not sure whether it is satisfactory or not. I think it is fair to say that to some it is and to others it is not. The original bill was not satisfactory to two of the brotherhoods in the beginning—two of the major brotherhoods opposed it, but later changed their viewpoint.

Mr. Chairman, I hope, out of the consideration of the proposals now before us, we will be able to enact amendments that will properly liberalize the benefits and that will maintain the railroad retirement system on a sound financial basis. Our first responsibility is to see that this is done, and then we may proceed to liberalize benefits to the extent of the ability of employees and employers to pay under the taxing provisions of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, it is certainly not my desire to take any part in any recriminations about this legislation. I am certain that everybody connected with it has acted with worthy motives; and it is from that viewpoint that I am going to speak. But I am going to speak in favor of the Crosser bill, and I do it for reasons that run pretty deep in my thinking.

I do not think anyone will deny that it is the Crosser bill upon which the major portion of work has been done, that it is on the Crosser bill that the most of the actuarial study has been made; that it is the Crosser bill that has the support of the men in this industry. It was not so many days ago that this House heard a message from the President of the United States and voted upon a piece of legislation vitally affecting every railroad worker in the country. I do not know how the rest of the Members voted, but I voted in favor of that bill because I believed it was a basic principle in this country that the Government of the United States had to be able in an emergency to assure the Nation of the continuous operation of absolutely vital services. Regardless of whether the means taken were altogether correct, and I do not believe they were, I felt that way then and I feel that way now.

I believe that the men who work on the railroads of this country only a couple of weeks ago were in effect told by us that their services were so essential to this Nation that the railroads had to run. If you tell a group of men in effect that, then you are telling them also that we cannot afford to have them stop work—even under circumstances where they believe the conditions and the wages that pertain at that particular time are not what they ought to be. Further than that, you are taking from them a portion of their collective-bargaining powers under these circumstances. There are no two ways about that fact. Therefore, it seems to me it becomes incumbent upon this body in a very different way than would be the case in other industries to recognize the men on the railroads as quasi-public servants and, as a matter of fact, entitled to such considerations and conditions as would be accorded the people of America in that position. I believe in good conscience that it is up to the House to legislate on this question by assuming on its own motion the responsibility for doing justice by a group of men as to whom general American public opinion has said, "You must not resort to the ultimate power of a group of workers, namely, the right to strike."

Under these circumstances, therefore, it seems to me that the bill, which has been considered very carefully to see whether its provisions would adequately meet the needs of the men in this industry, should be the one favored by the House rather than one which the organizations of the men pretty generally say they do not think will meet the situation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Mr. Latimer, of the Retirement Board, has stated, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] has suggested, that this bill as it is today needs 76 amendments to it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman from Tennessee has explained to the House already that this is a complex situation. I fully realize that fact. I only submit to the gentleman from North Carolina that if the Crosser bill be a complex piece of legislation, so necessarily is the committee bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am not talking about the complexities of either one. I am talking about the 76 amendments to perfect it.

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEELAN. May I ask the gentleman from North Carolina whether the committee adopted the recommended changes by Mr. Latimer in its version of the bill?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No; because we made amendments to existing law and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] had 96 amendments to existing law.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed, there is a general impression abroad in the country that the pay of railroad men is a very high rate of pay. As a matter of fact, imperatively that is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California two additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, in the consideration of railway disputes before the Mediation Board the point is always raised that railroad men have other advantages which workers generally do not have and the attempt is always made to justify a somewhat lower wage scale on that ground. Clearly, therefore, we ought to make certain in fairness that those other advantages are actually present.

There is a common impression that railroad employees are among the higher paid workers in the country. This impression perhaps derives from loose comparisons of the rates of pay for a few of the most responsible railroad jobs with the average in other industries. But the fact is that wage rates in the railroad industry are substantially lower than for comparable jobs in outside industry.

In the postwar movement of wages the railroad employees have received no greater increases than the national pattern of 18½ cents. Consequently there has been no correction of the discrepancies and inequities that developed during the war years and preceding years. According to the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics the average hourly earnings of employees in all manufacturing industries increased 56.1 percent in the period 1939 to September 1945. In this same period, according to the figures of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the average hourly earnings of railroad employees increased only 31.7 percent. In consequence of these developments the straight-time average hourly wage rate for railroad employees, which in 1939 corresponded almost exactly to the rate in durable goods manufacturing industries, stood, in September 1945, at only 87 cents, whereas the straight-time average hourly rate for durable goods manufacturing was $1.037. The railroad employees had, on the average, fallen over 16 cents an hour behind manufacturing wages, but in the postwar wage movements received no greater increase than employees in other industries.

No doubt a variety of factors contributed to the development of these inequities. Two of the most important are: First, the public-service character of railroad employment operates to preclude the full exercise of railroad employees' collective bargaining strength; and, second, in wage cases the railroads defend their lower wage rates on the grounds that railroad employees have other compensating advantages, such as better retirement protection. Both these factors place upon Congress an obligation to see to it that these employees are given really adequate protection against want after retirement and during periods of unemployment.

Just one word, Mr. Chairman, on the question of disability. Whereas it is true that the Social Security Act at present does not provide any type of unemployment insurance for a man who is unemployed because he is sick and cannot work, but only provides it when he is well, nevertheless there are States in the Union, of which my own State is one, which have recently passed legislation

providing for disability insurance. If this railroad legislation is going to be adequate it ought to be complete in its coverage and ought not to create a situation where a man receives a portion of his protection under the Railroad Retirement Act and another portion of it under other legislation, because, as a matter of fact, he may then have difficulty in finding it at all. So I would think, in judging the case, that it would be wiser on general principles to make the provisions of the bill all inclusive.

I also question, as another specific matter, the wisdom of reducing the fund to be employed for the payment of benefits, reducing the taxes for the building up of that fund until such time as it has been depleted, because in all probability the time that it will have been depleted will be a time when the drain will be greatest and the possibility of tax revenue will be less. So it does not seem to me that that is a wise policy.

I conclude simply by pointing out that in connection with this legislation a duty rests upon this body that would not be the same were we considering a different group of workers in a different kind of position in the country as a whole.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, this bill was presented by me about 2 years ago. The situation which has been brought about by those who have been opposing it under the parliamentary situation gives them 2½ hours' time to my 2. I think that the time should be equalized, because, after all, what I am trying to do is to present answers to the inquiries they bring up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule that the Chair will recognize any of the three who desire to use time. It is hoped by the Chair that they will alternate. If no one desires to use time, obviously the Clerk will be called upon to read.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss the problem of survivor protection—which I believe to be a very important matter in our consideration of this proposed legislation.

Both the original Crosser bill and the proposed committee substitute would provide benefits to survivors of railroad men who die and in both cases the general pattern is the survivor benefits provided in other industries under the Social Security Act. It may be taken as agreed, therefore, that railroad men should no longer have the distinction of being the only industrial group without such protection.

But there is a vast difference between the kind of protection that the Crosser bill would give and the illusory protection that the committee substitute offers. The committee substitute is highly deceptive in purporting to follow the social-security pattern.

In the first place the committee substitute takes no account of the higher taxes that railroad men pay. It may be said that they receive better retirement benefits for these higher taxes and that is true as to the men who live to receive retirement benefits.

But there are each year many railroad men who die without having reached retirement age. These men during their periods of service have paid not the 1 percent of their pay that is paid by persons under social security but three and one-half times that amount under present law and six times that amount under the committee's proposal. Unless the survivor-benefit provisions take some account of this difference in tax rate, the railroad men who die before retirement age will have been charged six times over the charges paid by employees covered under social security—and for no greater protection.

The Crosser bill recognizes that these higher tax rates are primarily attributable to the higher retirement benefits under the railroad system and consequently does not propose that the survivor protection be proportionately better than that provided under social security. Under the Crosser bill the survivor benefits would be only about one and one-fourth times the social security benefit rate even though the taxes paid by the railroad men would be six times the taxes paid by employees under social security. The committee substitute, however, would junk even this modest recognition of the higher tax rate paid by the railroad men.

All that has been said so far would be true on the assumption that the committee proposes to give railroad men the same survivor protection that is furnished under social security. In fact, however, the committee proposal gives much less protection. Eligibility for survivor benefits depends upon maintaining an insured status and an insured status is lost by the mere lapse of time not spent in covered employment. An individual under the social-security system can shift his employment to any other covered industry without impairing his insured status.

The Crosser bill proposes to add the railroad industry to the other industries for this purpose so that individuals who had the necessary employment would have their survivors protected regardless of the industry or industries in which they had been employed; if they were in the railroad industry at death their survivors would be paid under the railroad system and if they were in other industry at death their survivors would be paid under the social-security system, but in either event their survivor benefits would take account of all covered employment regardless of which system covered it.

Under the committee substitute, however, anyone who would work in the railroad industry and pay the 6-percent tax long enough to attain an insured status and who thereafter shifted to another industry covered by the social-security system would immediately begin losing his railroad insured status and even if he attained insured status under the social-security system before he lost his insured status under the railroad system he would not receive any survivor benefit credit for the taxes paid into the railroad fund. It has been estimated that the total number of people who in the long run may lose by virtue of this feature may be as much as 90 percent of the total number who pay some taxes under the railroad system .

The committee substitute is a cruel disappointment in yet another respect. Since the railroad retirement system was set up some 117,500 pensioners and annuitants and some 125,000 active employees have died. The committee proposal would provide no benefits whatever to the survivors of these persons. The Crosser bill would protect them.

Here again the committee purports to follow the pattern of the Social Security Act. But here again circumstances make a big difference. The Social Security Act was amended in 1939 to provide survivor protection; this was fairly shortly after old-age benefits had become payable. The problem of survivor protection with respect to deaths occurring in the interim was consequently not a large one. By contrast we are now dealing with the survivor protection problem in the railroad industry some 10 years after retirement benefits began to be paid.

We simply cannot shut our eyes and leave in the cold the survivors of some 240,000 railroad men. We must reject the committee substitute and enact the Crosser bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER].

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Chairman, this is a serious matter, and I hope the Committee will not get off on the wrong track in the argument as to what happened in the committee or what did not happen, or anything about a discharge petition. That is water over the dam. It does not make any difference to me whether you signed a discharge petition or whether you did not. That is your right as a Member of Congress, and I have no quarrel with those who did. If you want to do those things, it is perfectly all right. But there is a vast difference in the area of disagreement between the original Crosser bill and the committee amendments to the original act, and the Members should get those differences clearly in your minds in determining what action and what position you are going to take on this legislation.

There is one thing that is certain. If you adopt the Crosser bill as introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] and as he is insisting on now, you might just as well get ready not only to increase these taxes on the employer and the employee but to triple them over what they are today, if you are even to begin to pay the benefits provided by the Crosser bill. It just simply cannot be done by automatically passing the Crosser bill and expecting the men to get those benefits.

There are five major differences between the Crosser bill and the committee amendments. The first one I want to call your attention to is that of coverage. Under the original law, under the law as it is today, the railroad men who are employed generally in railroad service are covered; and that is all. The taxes are levied in order to take care of those men and women who are engaged in railroad work. But what does the Crosser bill do? What is the coverage of that bill? It provides for an increase in the

coverage to include many independent activities not related to the railroad industry at all, such as longshoremen, ice company employees, warehouse employees, trucks drivers who may be servicing cars and helping to ice cars, and even may go so far as to cover laundry employees who are servicing Pullman cars. We may just as well be honest with ourselves. You and I know that if you extend the coverage to include the number of people in a category such as that, there is only one way it can be done, and that is to materially increase the tax rate against both the employer and the employee.

Now, what does this bill do? We propose in the committee bill that there shall be no change in this coverage whatever as provided in existing law. I might add here that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN], for whom I have the highest regard, said that actuarial men had testified before our committee, and that he was taking their word for it, that this fund would be solvent. Mr. Latimer is one of the original sponsors of railroad retirement legislation who testified before the committee when this original Railroad Retirement Act was enacted and he helped set up the formula for the tax basis. He was dead wrong then, and I say to you that he is dead wrong now. You Members of Congress paid for the actuarial report which was made to your committee by a disinterested person. The actuary did not take just Mr. Latimer's word and the word of the other actuaries that he referred to. He took the testimony of every witness who appeared before the committee. He considered the bill and worked out from the bill and the testimony just exactly what it would cost so we could present this matter to the Congress and to the people of the railroad industry so they would know what they would have to pay to support the Crosser bill. It would require an increase of 2.4 percent above that which Mr. CROSSER's bill provides to give all of the benefits covered by the Crosser bill and still keep this fund solvent.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman tell us what the rate of assessment is on the employer and employee under the committee's proposal and under the Crosser proposal and what the difference is between the two?

Mr. WINTER. Under the original Crosser bill, beginning on January 1, 1946, which, of course, would not apply now, it would be 5¾ percent. Under the committee bill, to December 31, 1946, it was left the same as it is now, namely, 3½ percent on the employer and employee. Under the Crosser bill it jumps in 1947 to 5¾ percent on the employee and employer. Under the committee bill, it is 6 percent on the employer and 6 percent on the employee. Then right down through 1949 and thereafter, it is 6¼ percent to the employee and employer under the Crosser bill; and 6 percent to the railroads and 6 percent to the employees under the committee bill.

Mr. MAY. Under either bill as adopted is the fund equally divided between the railroad and the employee? In other words, do they participate on an equal basis?

Mr. WINTER. On the retirement they do, yes; but not on the unemployment-insurance features. The railroad pays all of that, which is now 3 percent.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Did the actuary of the Retirement Board agree that the fund as at present set up, and the taxes, would not be adequate?

Mr. WINTER. I might say to the gentleman that practically every actuary, every person familiar with the facts surrounding the insurance provisions of this Railroad Retirement Act testified before our committee and admitted that, as presently constituted, the fund was insolvent; that is, the retirement fund.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Then, Mr. Latimer did state it would require 1½ percent more to make it solvent?

Mr. WINTER. That is right, as far as Mr. Latimer is concerned.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But the committee claims it would require 2½ percent more?

Mr. WINTER. Three percent more.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Did the committee provide for that?

Mr. WINTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Williamson, about whom we have heard this morning, said it should have 4 percent more.

Mr. WINTER. That is correct.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does any member of the committee or does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] or anybody else contend that if you do have a fund, the assessment ought to be big enough to make it solvent?

Mr. WINTER. There is no one that I know of who contends that except those sponsoring some of these amendments sponsored by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], which would bankrupt this fund in a period of years if the tax is not big enough to carry the load.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. In view of the fact that on this occasion, as different from all previous occasions, when this plan was worked out by agreement between management and the men, when the Congress now assumes the responsibility to make this fund solvent and to enlarge the benefits, we carry the responsibility to see to it that the taxes are high enough to pay all of these benefits.

Mr. WINTER. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. It is our responsibility. The gentleman from Kentucky inquires about the suggestion that funds be gotten somewhere else. It is the fundamental principle of this proposition that it be a solvent fund, actuarially sound, and self-sustaining, but if the Congress, acting for the Government, sets up the operation and provides benefits that are not taken care of by reason of sufficient funds, then someone might urge that, since the Congress has done that, there is some responsibility on the Congress to supply the deficiency.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Now, I would like to proceed for a moment without interruption.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. WINTER. I cannot very well discuss in 1 minute what I desire to, but I want to just say this to the committee, that there is no use kidding ourselves. This is purely and simply a business proposition. If you want to give the benefits that Mr. CROSSER's bill provides, over and above the committee bill, well and good; but have the intestinal fortitude to pass the necessary tax legislation along with it to make the fund solvent, or else these railroad men 15 or 20 years from now are going to find a bankrupt fund, and will get nothing.

I hope that this Committee will stay with the committee bill, because these members, particularly the members of the subcommittee, have worked hard and studied this situation out, and are doing what they think is best for the men and the industry and the people of this Nation as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss the details of either one of these bills. I want first of all to speak in behalf of the railroad employees of this Nation, particularly the brotherhoods. You will recall that during the war the labor organizations throughout the country made a pledge to President Roosevelt that there would be no strikes. Some of those organizations—one, at least, the American Federation of Labor, kept its pledge to the best of its ability. Another one, the CIO, struck in spite of the pledges, but the railroad brotherhoods continued to work. There was not a strike in this country on the railroads during the war. They kept the trains rolling and they kept the men and goods moving to the front.

At the same time that other labor organizations were getting increases, the railroad employees were getting a small portion of what they asked. They are entitled to consideration here today and they are entitled to some of the things that they want.

I wish to mention three pieces of legislation to you so that you can see the difference between the way we are acting today on this legislation and the way we acted on the others. I was talking to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a moment ago. According to his recollection, the so-called land-grant bill was introduced early in 1945 and about 5 months later we had passed that bill, which means hundreds of millions of dollars in

the long run to the railroads of this country. I voted for that bill. It did not take us long to get that bill passed. Just a few days ago—in fact, on the 24th day of May—because of the fact that two men who were representing the railroad brotherhoods did not, I suppose, realize the crisis we were facing, they held up agreements between the railroad and the brotherhoods on the settlement of strikes, and because of that this Nation's transportation system was paralyzed. The President of the United States came into this Chamber. I watched the clock. One hour and fifty-five minutes after he had taken the microphone we had passed the most drastic piece of antistrike legislation we have ever passed. I do not believe anyone can deny that statement. There were only 13 votes against that bill. For this I do not apologize, because it was necessary to meet an emergency. Now, remember that. We passed a bill in 6 months which returned hundreds of millions of dollars to the railroads. In 1 hour and 45 minutes we passed the most drastic piece of antistrike legislation we have ever passed, and it was directed at the railroad brotherhoods. I may say to you today that I never was so sick about a piece of legislation which I was forced to vote upon as that one. I hated everything about it; I hated the vote that we had to cast against those men who had done such a fine job during the war.

The pending legislation has been in the legislative hopper for over a year and a half. We petitioned not this piece of legislation which is on the floor, but we petitioned the Crosser bill out of the committee and it was supposed to come up on the 13th of May. In the meantime, however, the committee, through the simple expediency of striking out all of the Crosser bill, using the same title and bill number, reported a bill that took the control away from Mr. CROSSER.

I want to say to the Members of the House that I have talked with the railroad employees and the representatives of the brotherhoods. They do not want the piece of legislation which we have here today, they want the Crosser bill. As I said before, they did an excellent job during the war. It did not take so long to pass legislation to return hundreds of millions of dollars to the railroads. It took us only 1 hour and 55 minutes to slap the railroad brotherhoods in the face with the most drastic piece of antistrike legislation we have ever proposed; and I say to you here that I am going to support the Crosser bill. I do not know what I will do about the other one. The railroad brotherhoods feel that this bill we have before us now is little less than nothing. I want to say to every Member of this House that if you want to do something to help the railroad brotherhoods—and I believe they are entitled to it—then follow the procedure requested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] and you will help them. That is what I propose to do.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] will use some of his time to equalize our time?

Mr. CROSSER. No.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, then I ask that all debate close.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I object to that.

Mr. BULWINKLE. And that the bill be read for amendment.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. If no other time is requested, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I promised to yield time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY]. I yield him 12 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the membership of the House to support the Crosser bill as introduced and to reject the substitute recommended by the committee.

I wish to make clear at the outset that the committee proposal, although it is reported on behalf of the committee, does not embody the view of the committee as a whole. This is not a case in which legislation is being urged on the floor over the objections of a unified committee view. I am a member of the committee; so is the gentleman from Arizona, who spoke on behalf of the Crosser bill when the subject was before us last week; and I understand that a number of other members of the committee intend to address the House urging the adoption of the Crosser bill.

The hearings on the bill were conducted before the full committee. All the members had an opportunity to hear the evidence for and against the bill. When the hearings had been concluded the suggestion was made in committee that consideration of the bill be referred to the subcommittee on transportation. That subcommittee did not include most of the members of the committee who most heartily supported the Crosser bill. For this reason many of the supporters of the bill objected to a reference to the subcommittee and in the first determination of the committee their views prevailed. It was decided that the bill would be considered in full committee. However, when the committee again met with somewhat different personnel in attendance the question was reconsidered and this time the bill was referred to the subcommittee. I mention the incident as illustrative of the very close division in the committee itself.

The composition of the subcommittee and the consideration of the bill by it also undoubtedly had some bearing on the final action of the committee. When the subcommittee made its report, nearly a year had elapsed since the conclusion of the hearings, and the members of the subcommittee who were generally unfriendly to the proposals of the bill had an advantage in exposition over the supporters of the bill who were not on the subcommittee and hence had not had the subject under active consideration for a long time. Nevertheless, on the most important issues the division within the committee was again very close. For example, the motion to have the substitute drafted was carried by a vote of 12 to 11. At the executive sessions of the committee there were always some absences, and it was seldom that a majority of the full committee membership was recorded in favor of action which became the action of the committee.

For these reasons those of us who are in disagreement with the recommendation of the committee feel that our views are entitled to consideration as well as the official action of the committee.

We feel that the Crosser bill should be adopted because it expresses what, after careful and painstaking consideration, the railroad men want, and what they want is sound and equitable. We ought never to forget that there are some million and a half railroad men now in service and hundreds of thousands of others who have been in railroad service and have rights under the legislation we are considering. If each of the affected individuals were to formulate his notions in isolation as to what he thought Congress should do by way of improving the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Acts you would probably get about as many different notions as there are different individuals. Fortunately for us, the railroad men do some concerted thinking about these matters and do not as a rule formulate their notions in isolation.

Notwithstanding the degree to which concerted thought has been brought to bear on these questions, we have all had the experience of having a great variety of proposed amendments brought to our attention. Individuals and groups throughout our districts have from time to time implored us to make one change or another in endless variety. Sometimes these suggestions have been based on a single case in which the individual did not fare as well as he thought he should under the present law. In other instances the generating impulse is a real and widespread inequity; but the proponents of a cure might or might not be adept at devising a cure that would meet the essence of the problem. Members of Congress who are anxious to do what is fair and equitable by way of improving the functioning of this legislation have been in no position by their own efforts to ascertain what the men affected really want, nor do we have the expert assistance necessary to appraise the soundness and practicality of any particular suggestion.

I consider that the railway labor organizations have done the Congress a real service in developing and sponsoring the amendments proposed in H. R. 1362. In 1940 the Railway Labor Executives' Association, representing 19 of the 21 standard railway labor organizations and representing over 80 percent of the railroad employees, set up a committee to deal with the problem of improving the retirement and unemployment insurance laws. The chairman of the committee is Mr. D. B. Robertson, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, one of the most experienced and most level-headed labor leaders in this country. He had the able assistance of Mr. L. M. Wicklein, vice president of the Sheet Metal Workers International Association, and of Mr. E. E. Milliman, president of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.

That committee did several things that have been of immeasurable value to the Congress. They undertook first to sift out from among the great welter of varying suggestions for amendments those relatively few proposals which in their judgment met the most widespread needs, and for that reason would gain the acceptance of the great body of railroad men as expressing their views of what needed to be done. They invoked the assistance of the experts in the Railroad Retirement Board in developing cost estimates that would assure the financial soundness of any proposals developed and in casting their proposals in such terms as to assure administrative feasibility. From time to time they reported the progress of their efforts to the association where they could obtain the constructive criticism and suggestions of the chiefs of all the organizations.

Their job was a long and arduous one, but they saw it through. When fairly concrete proposals had been developed they were given wide circulation among the rank and file of the railroad men throughout the country. The proposals were thoroughly aired in local lodge meetings, regional meetings, and conventions of the various organizations. In many instances referenda of the membership were conducted. When final conclusions had been reached by this process and unanimously approved by the chiefs of all the organizations represented in the Railway Labor Executives' Association, expert legal counsel was engaged to draft the bill.

It is out of this prodigious work of the railway labor organizations that the bill H. R. 1362 developed. When the bill was introduced, President Roosevelt wrote the chairman of the committee expressing his endorsement of the bill and urging prompt action. The first witness to appear before the committee in support of the bill was Mr. Robertson. He explained to the committee simply and concisely what the major objectives were and how the bill would attain them. The next witness was Mr. Murray W. Latimer, then Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board. Mr. Latimer is an outstanding expert on the subject matter before the House. He was brought into the service of the Federal Government by the late Joseph B. Eastman, then Coordinator of Transportation, back in 1933, to assist the Coordinator in finding some solution to the very troublesome railroad pension problem that was later solved by the enactment of the Railroad Retirement Act. Mr. Latimer was selected by Mr. Eastman for that purpose because he was even then recognized as the outstanding authority on industrial pension systems. Upon the enactment of the first Railroad Retirement Act in 1934, Mr. Latimer was appointed Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board and continued to serve in that capacity until a few months ago. Incidentally, also, he served as a member of the President's committee that developed the plans for the social-security system and he set up the administration of the old-age benefit provisions for the Social Security Board.

Mr. Latimer gave the committee a detailed exposition of how the various amendments would work, the existing inequities that would be corrected, and what the cost would be. He showed that the proposals were equitable, feasible, and actuarially sound.

That Mr. Latimer should recommend enactment of the bill was inevitable from the process by which its content was developed. Such revisions and adjustments as were necessary to meet Mr. Latimer's views as to equity, financial soundness, and administrative feasibility were made before the bill was introduced. For that the sponsors of the bill are to be commended rather than to have their supporting testimony discounted with a label of partisanship.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. There is one thing about which I am not clear. There seems to be some dispute here as to whether or not if we adopt the Crosser bill, and I am inclined that way, we will bankrupt this fund unless we raise the rates much higher than has been suggested in either of the bills. I know the gentleman can give us information on that, and I should like to know.

Mr. MURPHY. When opponents of the bill argued against the soundness of the Latimer cost estimates, the chairman of the committee called the chief actuary for the Social Security Board to express his judgment on the estimates. He said that they had been soundly and carefully worked out. To remove any possible doubt as to the financial soundness of the proposals, the railway labor organizations engaged an outstanding, independent actuary, Mr. Ralph I. Booth, the actuary for the Travelers Insurance Co., and a fellow of the Actuarial Society of America and of the American Institute of Actuaries. He was asked to review the cost estimates made by the Railroad Retirement Board experts and presented by Mr. Latimer. He, too, concluded that they were sound and so testified before the committee.

Counsel for the railway labor organizations who had drafted the bill also appeared before the committee and explained the provisions of the present law that were being amended, the deficiencies of the present law, and the manner in which these deficiencies would be cured by the provisions of the bill.

After sitting through the extensive hearings on the bill, I do not see how any Member who approaches the matter fairly and open-mindedly could escape the conviction that the railway labor organizations who developed the bill did a thorough, conscientious, and public-spirited job. Since two of the railroad brotherhoods are not represented in the Railway Labor Executives' Association, the bill as introduced had not been approved by the chiefs of those organizations. Representatives of those organizations in their appearances before the committee expressed some disagreement with some of the provisions of the bill. Consequently, for a time, opponents of the bill sought to capitalize on the lack of unanimity of view among the railway labor organizations. Subsequently, however, the chiefs of these two brotherhoods joined with Mr. Robertson in a letter to the chairman of the committee suggesting a few slight amendments of the bill and stating that with those amendments the bill would meet with the approval of all the 21 standard railway labor organizations. The committee makes no reference to these suggested amendments in its report, and I understand that Mr. CROSSER intends to offer them on the floor as an amendment to his bill.

We as Members of Congress are entitled to assume, and from what we know of the way railway labor organizations operate, we can be sure it is a correct assumption, that these railway labor organizations speak for the railroad men. They have relieved us of the onerous responsibility of trying to formulate something on our own that would meet with widespread approval among the railroad men. Of course, there will be dissentient voices here and there, and some of these have perhaps been insistent enough to cause some members to doubt whether the bill advocated by the organizations would meet with the approval of the men. The processes by which the provisions of the bill were formulated and the assumption of responsibility by the chiefs of the organization is our guaranty that in enacting H. R. 1362 we will be doing what the men want us to do.

By contrast to the careful formulation of the provisions of H. R. 1362 the committee substitute was hastily prepared, making minimum concessions to the requests of the employees.

When the parliamentary situation develops to the point where a vote may be taken I shall cast my vote for the principles generally embodied in the Crosser bill.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania addressing the Committee is a member of the committee that considered this bill. I might add that he is a former railroader himself and lives in a great railroad district. He knows whereof he speaks. I might say also that this bill the gentleman from Pennsylvania is describing is the bill desired by the railroad workers, and I concur in his position.

In my district of Luzerne County, Pa., there are thousands of railroad workers belonging to all of the unions related to railroad work. I was born and raised among these workers and their families. I know their ways, their desires as to benefits from legislative action, and let me say to this honorable body that the Crosser bill is the bill they want, and definitely not the committee substitute. As another great friend of the railroad workingmen once said, "Let's look at the record." Well, the record will indicate that the spokesmen for the Railroad Retirement Board advocate the passage of the Crosser bill. Mind you, this is the administrative agency charged with the administering

of whatever bill is passed by the Congress on his subject. Certainly this Board would not place the stamp of approval upon the Crosser bill if that bill was not a proper one, a workable one, and a bill which the Congress could well and properly legislate under all the circumstances.

During the course of this debate today someone will certainly argue in support of the committee bill that its provisions are the same as the Crosser bill, or better for that matter, and will argue further that the provisions with particular reference to that part of the bill of the committee dealing with payments for injuries is the same as in all similar Federal laws on the like subject. Well, we know full well the catch in that argument; we know that in effect the very provisions of the committee bill are nullified because of the impossibility of proving the injuries in so many cases to be the result of employment connection. It is the practical result we must look at when concerned with the interests of these men who serve the railroads of the Nation. And surely there is no other group of workers more loyal or faithful to the needs of our Nation. Long and well, during war and peace, in fair weather and foul, these patriotic and tireless workers met the full demands of the service and beyond. A proud record equalled never before in this or any other nation in the world at any time.

We must keep our eye on the ball here today. The opponents of the Crosser bill have succeeded in confusing the purposes of this legislation by creating a parliamentary tangle based upon a series of amendments. But we must not be sidetracked or wrecked by crossed-up signals. The green light for the main track and a clear right-of-way belongs to the Crosser bill as sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, my good friend and the friend of all railroad workers and their friends [Mr. CROSSER].

I have heard several members of the committee speak for the Crosser bill and against the committee bill; that indicates to me that there is strong support even in the committee for the Crosser bill in what amounts to a strong minority report on the floor of the House, and it is significant to notice that it is the friends of the workingman who join in this position.

The Crosser bill is the law that every member of every railroad union who was ever in my office wanted. They feel and I feel that it is fair and just. We must not lose sight of the fact that in the neighborhood of 2,000,000 railroad workers in and at one time or other in the service are affected by this proposed law, and it is a safe bet that you could get that many ideas about a law if you asked for it. For never let it be said that my friends who are railroaders do not know their rights and you can be sure they can discuss them with you or anyone else with ability and vigor. But one of the great virtues in the field of organized labor is the presentation of a case for the members that is for the best interest of the greatest number of them all—and that is the Crosser bill—and on that they all agree with few, few exceptions. Let me say at this point that the Congress should be duly appreciative of the help given to its Members in the proper preparation of this bill in its complex technical structure and helping the Members of the House to get a clear grasp of the full intent and meaning of its provisions. This is a long bill and a highly important one and I for one am personally grateful for the aid I have received from the representatives of the railway labor groups in my efforts to deal fairly, equitably, and properly with the complicated problem of dealing with the retirement and unemployment insurance laws as evidenced by the amendments proposed in H. R. 1362.

I want to join my friend and neighbor my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] in his tribute to Mr. Robertson, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; Mr. Wicklein, vice president of the Sheet Metal Workers International Association; and Mr. Milliman, president of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees. That last group have a fond spot in my heart because I worked on a navvy gang on the Lehigh Valley back in the summer of 1920 when I was going to college and I will never forget rock ballast, tamping bars, cant hooks, and creosoted bridge ties in the hot summer weather as long as I live.

The proposals now made through the Crosser bill meet the most pressing and generally accepted conditions that need correction and improvement and meet the general approval of the vast majority of the men concerned after a fine educational program and widespread discussion among the workers throughout the Nation.

I am convinced that the testimony presented with further reference to the amendments make it clear that the problems of the actuary have been well met. The proponents have the best expert testimony showing that these amendments can and will operate and clearly establishing the element of costs thus removing any contention of bankrupting the fund unless the rates are raised to fantastic heights.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of the Crosser bill.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], for his kindness and I also thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], for the very clear statement he has made in behalf of the Crosser bill, H. R. 1362, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act. I am not a member of the committee but I have been convinced for years that legislation is needed to improve the Railroad Retirement Act, and I propose to vote for it. I feel that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should have presented a proper bill to this House many months ago.

Railroad workers of this Nation did a superb and miraculous job during the war. They, like every other segment of the population in America today, are entitled to a square deal. The Crosser bill may not be perfect; the committee bill I know is not perfect; but under the circumstances, it seems to me the thing for this House to do is adopt the Crosser bill, and I propose to vote for it. It affords a better legislative vehicle for the effort which we are making to improve the railroad retirement system.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] addressed the House in my absence.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order for 1 minute.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], I object.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I was not present at the time he addressed the House.

Mr. CHURCH. Under the circumstances, I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Well, well, well, I am so glad the gentleman from Illinois is so solicitous for the gentleman from Mississippi. I think the Crosser bill is a very nice bill. I was just going to say that people sometimes try to read my mind. They did yesterday, but I do not think it was very adequately done. If I am going to take a course I usually want to look around and see who is following me. I have a little poem here which is probably applicable to the Crosser bill and a good many other things. There is a gentleman who used poetry here so I will use some. If I go any place, here is what I have to say:

If I shall start a new goal to seek,
From time to time over my shoulder I'll peek.
And if perchance I find JOHN RANKIN behind,
I'll know I'm wrong and change my mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, as the hearings on this bill proceeded, I, who have a very large population of railroad workers in my district, sent the transcript and copies of statements made by the various witnesses home to a number of these railroad workers whom I know personally. Finally, when the hearings were printed, I sent a good many sets of the printed hearings to those men, that they might read and study just as we do here the subject that is before the House. Shortly after that, a matter of several weeks, when I went home and met with these men, they showed me the files of mimeographed statements and the copies of the hearings, of three volumes, and they were thoroughly dog-eared. They had been passed from hand to hand and had been read in the cabs of engines, in the shanties, and in the roundhouses, and all around throughout the railroad world. Not very long thereafter I received a petition signed by a good many hundreds—several thousand, as a matter of fact—of these railroad workers in my area, addressed to the members of the Com-

mittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If I may, I would like to read the paragraph at the top of the petition to indicate how these men—the men themselves, and not the chiefs of the brotherhoods—feel about this bill. I have heard a good many statements as to how the men feel, but they all were related to what the chiefs of the brotherhoods said, and not what the men themselves said. The paragraph is as follows:

Honorable SIMS: We, the undersigned railroad employees, wish to register a complaint against H. R. 1362. We do not approve of the majority of the changes proposed by this bill. We are in favor of the following changes to the Railroad Retirement Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act: First, a reduction in age for retirement to 55 years; second, a reduction in years of service to 20 years; third, a more adequate pension, at least $100 per month; fourth, liberalization of disability provisions; and, fifth, the widow's pension.

We realize that some increases in our taxes will be necessary to pay for these changes and we are willing to pay any reasonable amount for them.

Now, that is the expressed viewpoint of something like 4,000 railroad workers in the area which I represent. In the course of the committee's consideration of this matter, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] offered an amendment to the bill, which I supported. The amendment was offered to both bills, for that matter, reducing the retirement age from 65 to 60 years. The proponents of the Crosser bill aided in the defeat of that motion in the committee. The proponents of the Crosser bill, as well as some others, are not in agreement with the provisions set forth in this great petition that I hold in my hands, or with the men whose names appear thereon. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] has been so eager to get his bill out that there has not been time to make the careful actuarial studies necessary to tell what the system desired by the men will cost, and I think they and we should all know what the cost would be to reduce retirement to age 55 after 20 years of service. It might cost several times the figures used in the present bill, namely, 12 percent of pay roll.

I am not a member of the Transportation Subcommittee and hence am not too familiar with all the technical details of this bill, but I would like to mention one or two interesting and important features developed by the testimony.

Mr. Williamson, who came before the committee, is consulting actuary for the Social Security Board. I rate his viewpoint and testimony as high as any of the actuaries whom we heard or consulted. I think he ranks at least as high as Mr. Latimer and probably higher. Mr. Latimer is the man who submitted the figures upon which the railroad-retirement system was based in the first place and they were found to be wrong. The system, as is well known and admitted, is insolvent today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Williamson made a very significant statement, in my humble opinion. He pointed out that the figures upon which all of these statements were based were based on tables that had been prepared from life experience of years gone by. He made this very significant point, that no one can foretell what future effect such things as penicillin will have upon the possibility of surviving the age of 65. He anticipates that at least twice as many people will survive the age of 65 and grow older than ever before, with the advent of these new drugs and treatments that have been found by the medical profession. Under those circumstances there is no possibility of our sitting here at the moment and forecasting what the future cost of either social security or the railroad-retirement system will be, but I say to you we had better make it adequate—as nearly adequate as we can figure it.

The trouble with the Crosser bill, as far as the committee could see, was that it called for a number of new features which, as I told you, the men themselves do not want. They have a wholly different idea. The Crosser bill calls for a number of new features that will cost money. Those features the men do not want. Furthermore, it is my personal opinion, after listening to the testimony and examining the actuarial reports made to the committee, that the tax provided in the Crosser bill is not adequate for the purposes for which the Crosser bill is set up. I do believe that fund to be established by the committee substitute, which is not perfect, is more nearly adequate, and has a better chance for being solvent 10 or 15 years from now. I highly commend it to the consideration of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to use time?

Mr. CROSSER. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has 34 minutes remaining.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, during this debate on railroad retirement legislation, many confusing statements have been made on the floor by the advocates of the committee substitute bill in opposition to the original Crosser bill. I have spent considerable time studying both of these bills which the House will pass upon today. Time will not permit a comprehensive analysis of the many complex aspects of the committee's substitute bill. I am thoroughly satisfied that any Member who is desirous of extending proper security to the railroad workers of this country should support and vote for the original bill introduced by Congressman CROSSER.

His bill has been pending before the Interstate Commerce Committee for almost 2 years. During this time, I have received numerous letters and personal requests from railway employees, not only in my district but throughout the State of Indiana, urging that the committee take action and report favorably on this legislation.

Several weeks ago I gladly assisted Congressmen CROSSER and NEELY in securing sufficient signatures on the discharge petition so that this bill could be brought on the floor for action.

For several years, legislative representatives of the various railway brotherhood organizations have devoted long hours of work and study to write a fair and equitable retirement bill. Even the opponents of the Crosser bill admit that something should be done to aid the railroad men, but they contend that they are better qualified to write this legislation than the men themselves or their responsible representatives.

I could outline several reasons why the Crosser bill is advantageous to railroad employees whereas the committee's substitute will penalize them. First, the Crosser bill provides benefits for surviving widows and minor children so as to give the workers some consideration of the higher taxes they are now paying. The committee's substitute would impose a similar tax, but would limit such survivor benefits to the same amount that is now paid under social security. The committee's substitute rejects all improvements in unemployment benefits. The Crosser bill provides, when a worker is totally and permanently disabled for any kind of work, aften 10 years of service, he may get an annuity, and when after 20 years of service he is unable to engage in his regular occupation, he may get an annuity. On the other hand, the committee's substitute provides increased disability benefits only for workers disabled by causes arising out of their employment.

Every railroadman knows that the retirement provisions as set forth in the Railroad Retirement Act are wholly inadequate. A railroad worker cannot retire on full pension until he has over 40 years of service, unless he comes under a total disability classification—and then only after he has 30 years of service; few industries today require 40 to 45 years before employees become eligible for a pension.

Railroad work on the average is highly hazardous; it requires long and uncertain hours and the average man, after 20 years' service, has endured an exceptional mental and physical strain unlike other lines of endeavor. He should be given an opportunity to retire with satisfactory security for himself and his family at an age before his health has not been completely broken down.

We must realize today in considering legislation of this kind that the workingman's dollar has but 50 percent of the purchasing power it had eight or 10 years ago. No one has the right to expect labor to receive a low living wage or inadequate security after retirement.

The railroad workers of America contributed outstanding service to help win the war; as a group they have contributed more to the growth, advancement, and expansion of our country than any other organization.

The Congress has an opportunity today to place upon our statute books a

satisfactory retirement law for America's railroad workers by voting for the original bill introduced by Congressman CROSSER and rejecting the substitute offered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who signed the petition to bring this bill to the floor of the House. I think the Crosser bill deserves most earnest and sympathetic consideration of this House. The railroad men who are directly concerned with this bill have worked on it a long time and I am reliably informed that this meets the approval of the railroad employees. When I signed the petition to bring up the Crosser bill, I not only desired that the Crosser bill be considered, but I wanted it done at this session of Congress. I think the railroad employees are entitled to this consideration. I am therefore supporting the Crosser bill.

The Crosser bill may not embrace all of the amendments which should be made to the Railroad Retirement Act, but I understand it is what the railroad employees are asking for at this time and I urge favorable consideration. There are other amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act not included in the Crosser bill which I hope will have consideration in due time. I refer particularly to decreasing the retirement age. But, the matter before us now is the Crosser bill and I trust that when the time comes to vote, the House will give that bill its approval.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a complicated matter and the parliamentary situation is also rather involved. Not being a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have had little opportunity to study the details of the proposals before us. Therefore, I shall rely very largely upon the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] in regard to the correct vote on this legislation.

It is not the first instance in which I have relied upon the advice of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] in regard to railroad bills and legislation. When I first came to Congress in 1937 I found that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] and our former colleague, Congressman John Martin, of Colorado, now deceased, were unusually well informed on all matters pertaining to railroads, and I must say that both have given me, during the years of my service, valuable help and counsel in regard to proper legislation in this field. For that reason I am supporting the Crosser bill in this instance rather than the committee bill.

It may be that both bills need amendment and I shall hope to see each properly amended as the parliamentary situation permits. I feel that the Crosser bill, as amended, will probably come nearer meeting the needs of railroad men. If by any chance the Crosser bill is not brought before us and accepted for final passage, I feel inclined to vote for the amended committee bill as being better than no legislation at all to meet the crying need of this class of employees and their dependents.

I have taken note of what was said by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] in regard to the much favorable legislation which Congress has recently enacted for railroad companies, and also what he said concerning drastic and unfavorable action which this body took recently toward one group of railroad men, which action seemed poor recompense to a great majority of men who rendered such faithful service during the recent war. He expressed the thought that was in my mind by making this contrast of friendly action toward railroad companies and severity toward the employees.

I, too, have voted for many provisions favoring railroad corporations. I recognize that the railroads are tremendously important to the country in general and they are particularly important to the remote parts of the country, like the intermountain region in which my State lies. For that reason I am always alert to aid in improvement, the efficiency, and the prosperity of the railroads.

Having said that I must add that I cannot for 1 minute sanction anything preventable that will stop, or even retard, the operation of the railroads. Accordingly I have great respect for the men who operate the railroads, and having seen the marvelous work done by them during the war in accomplishing the impossible, I want to see the country recognize that obligation by doing the best possible thing by this group of faithful employees. It is with this in view that I seek to follow the leadership of Congressman CROSSER in shaping the legislation before us.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] 10 minutes.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, the laws which provide retirement pay and unemployment compensation for railroad men and women were enacted, respectively, in 1937 and 1938. At that time they were apparently as liberal as the financial condition of the railroads permitted them to be made; they were then reasonably satisfactory both to employers and employees. But during the years that intervened between 1938 and the present the wealth of the railroad companies, as indicated by the market value of their stocks has increased, on the average, more than a hundred percent. Since the first of January 1941—only five years and a half ago—the cost of living in this country has increased 50 percent. Thus while the railroad companies have become more than a hundred percent richer, their employees who are dependent upon retirement pay and unemployment compensation have, in effect, become 50 percent poorer than they were before the skyward flight of the cost of living began.

Let me corroborate my statement concerning the increase in railroad company wealth by the following quotations from the Wall Street Journal, one of the world's outstanding financial publications:

On the 24th of January 1938, the day before the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Law became effective, the closing price on the New York Stock Exchange of the common stock of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad Co. was 31½. Yesterday on the same exchange this stock closed at 124¼—an increase of more than 287 percent. During the same period on the same exchange the market value of the common stock of the Atlantic Coast Line increased more than 300 percent; that of the Pennsylvania Railroad increased more than 133 percent; the common stock of the Union Pacific increased more than a hundred percent; the common stock of the Southern Pacific increased more than 385 percent.

There has been a phenomenal increase in the market value of the stock of practically every other railroad in the United States. Within the last week many newspapers informed the country that railroad stocks had just reached the highest market value they had attained in 15 years.

The popular newspaper PM carried an article dated the 17th of May under the title "Poverty-Stricken Railroads Boost Dividends 23 Percent," in which the following appears:

> The railroads, which are pleading poverty before the Interstate Commerce Commission in a demand for a 25-percent jump in freight rates, actually increased their publicly reported dividend payments during this year's first quarter by 23 percent over the similar period last year.
>
> The Commerce Department advised today that the dividend payments reported by the railroads were $49,400,000, as compared with $40,100,000 for the same period a year ago, when they were enjoying peak war business.
>
> The Commerce Department reported that the railroads showed the biggest increase in dividends of any segment of industry. Corporations generally increased dividend payments from $839,000,000 to $904,000,000, or only 7 percent.

The foregoing should convince the entire membership of the House that it can do justice to the railroad employees in the pending matter without the slightest danger of imperiling the financial stability of the great railroad industry.

The impoverished beneficiaries of the laws in question, after many years of uncomplaining endurance of the persistent, distressing shrinkage of their retirement pay and unemployment compensation, were at last forced to appeal to the Congress for legislation sufficient to offset at least a part of the loss they had sustained under the devastating operation of the inflated cost of living upon their uninflated benefits. The Crosser bill, for which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce substituted the measure now before us, proposes the minimum amount of relief which, in the opinion of the railroad employees and their chieftains, will satisfy the inexorable requirements of the present day as well as those of an unpredictable number of future years.

The brevity of my allotted time will permit me to discuss but a few of the

factors in the complicated legislative equation before the House. The most vital of these I conceive to be as follows:

1. SURVIVOR BENEFITS

The Federal Social Security Act humanely provides survivor benefits, but the railroad law under consideration authorizes no benefits whatever for the widows, minor children, or parents of railroad employees, notwithstanding the fact that these employees pay a tax 3½ times as great as that which is paid by other employees for protection under the social-security law.

The committee substitute proposes to increase the present taxes of the railroad employees 2½ percent—the effect of which would be to compel these employees to pay six times as much for their benefits under the pending measure as other employees pay for equal benefits under the Social Security Act.

The Crosser bill provides that in return for the higher taxes paid by railroad employees, the benefits to their survivors shall be, on the average, 25 percent greater than those provided by the social-security law.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEELY. If for a brief question, of course.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has touched on something that I think should be understood. The provisions of both the Crosser bill and the committee bill for survivors' benefits are the same as to eligibility and how they are brought in. The only difference is that the committee bill fixes the benefits at the level of the Social Security Act, whereas the Crosser bill would fix them at 25 percent higher than the Social Security Act.

Mr. NEELY. Yes; the Crosser bill proposes to reward railroad employees for paying a tax 500 percent greater than that paid by the beneficiaries of the Social Security Act. So far as the committee substitute is concerned, this most generous payment of taxes is entirely ignored.

2. DISABILITY ANNUITIES

The Crosser bill provides annuities for employees who are not totally and permanently disabled for all work but who, nevertheless, are unable to pursue their regular occupations, provided they have attained the age of 60 or have 20 years of service to their credit. The bill further proposes to reduce the present requirement of 30 years' service to 10 years' service in order to render eligible for an annuity an employee who is totally and permanently disabled for all work, and is under the age of 60. Under the Crosser bill it would not be necessary in either of these cases to prove that the disability for which an annuity was sought was service-connected.

It has been contended that the committee substitute is designed to accomplish the foregoing purposes. But, unfortunately, this contention is fatally erroneous, because under the committee substitute it would be impossible to establish eligibility for the annuity under consideration, except for a service-connected disability. Comparatively few railroad employees would profit from the provision of the substitute because in a majority of cases the total incapacity of railroad men is the result of old age, or physical ailments such as heart disease, arthritis or other nervous disorders, which cannot be proved to be the result of their employment.

3. UNEMPLOYMENT DUE TO SICKNESS

The Railroad Retirement Board has estimated that the present accumulation of over $700,000,000 in the railroad unemployment insurance account will, with the continuation of the present 3-percent taxation of employees, be sufficient not only to pay insurance benefits for all unemployment due to lack of work but also for that due to sickness. This estimate of the Board, the Crosser bill proposes to translate into reality. But the committee substitute provides for the return to the railroads of a large part of this accumulated fund by way of reducing their present tax rate of 3 percent to one-half of 1 percent—the latter rate to prevail as long as the fund in the unemployment insurance accounts amounts to $350,000,000 or more. If this provision of the committee substitute should become operative, it would, in effect, eventually make a gift of millions of dollars to the railroad companies instead of utilizing the surplus in the unemployment insurance account for the payment of unemployment benefits to those whom sickness had incapacitated for service.

4. INCREASE IN COMPENSABLE DAYS OF UNEMPLOYMENT FROM 20 WEEKS TO 26 WEEKS

The Crosser bill proposes to extend the period for which unemployment insurance benefits may be paid in any year from a hundred days—20 weeks—to a hundred thirty days—26 weeks. This proposal is in harmony with the recommendation of the board of managers of the Council of State Governments and also with the recommendation of the Federal Social Security Board. Under the committee substitute there would be no extension of the period for which unemployment insurance benefits are now paid.

5. TWO NEW DAILY BENEFIT RATES

Under the present law the maximum benefit payable to an employee who earned $1,600 or more in the preceding calendar year is at the rate of $4 a day. Under the Crosser bill the $4-a-day benefit would be increased to $4.50 for an employee whose earnings were between $2,000 and $2,500 a year. And the daily benefit of an employee whose earnings were more than $2,500 a year would be increased to five dollars.

The committee substitute makes no provision for the foregoing or any other similar increases.

For the reasons indicated and for many additional ones which the expiration of my time and the prevailing limitations on debate will not permit me to specify, it is my sincere hope that the committee substitute will be decisively defeated and that the Crosser bill will be approved by an overwhelming majority.

Let us consummate the objectives of the Crosser bill and thus at once render an outstanding public service, and demonstrate our undying gratitude to a vast army of railroad men and women whose patriotic, efficient, faithful service to the Nation in war and peace has never been surpassed by any other children of men.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Members of the House generally approach this legislation with the same serious concern that I did as a member of the committee, and as I assure you the membership of the committee did, because I think we all recognize the fact that we are not passing some temporary legislation which is of little moment but rather we are dealing on a long-term basis with the rights and security of working men and working women involving the application and the use of funds which are not only contributed to by the railroads under our Railroad Retirement Act but also by the men and women who toil and who want the guaranty of some security and safety for what they pay out of their hard-earned money.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention to the fact that we had exhaustive hearings beginning on the 31st of January 1945, running almost continuously down to the 28th day of April 1945. As a member of that committee I attended practically every one of the hearings which were conducted before the entire committee. Not being a member of the Transportation Subcommittee which heard the further testimony, I was able to be present only on the occasions when the full committee met.

I have tried to deal with this matter from an objective viewpoint and have been actuated in supporting the committee report on the basis of living with and knowing in a small town the working railroad men, from the maintenance-of-way men to the men who operate the trains, the engineers, the firemen, the conductors, the brakemen, the section men, and I consider them my neighbors and friends.

My distinguished colleague from Tennessee spoke of the number of amendments proposed in the original Crosser bill in addition to those proposed by Mr. Latimer. Unfortunately, in the consideration of this very involved subject, I think some of the proponents of the bill originally went into very ramified and extended ideas of social benefits. Among the suggestions of the very able and very brilliant Mr. Latimer, whose knowledge of railroad retirement law is most amazing to me, were maternity benefits. During the course of the proceedings I asked him if some of his views on this subject did not include the Beveridge plan. He frankly confessed that it had the elements of "cradle to the grave" security in railroad legislation.

I do not believe the railroad men themselves are interested in that type of legislation. I think there are a few simple fundamentals involved in this legislation in which the railroad men themselves are interested. They want a solvent retirement fund. They want some

benefits for their widows. They perhaps want further benefits in the way of sickness and disability benefits. I think we could perhaps have done a little better and not gotten into the controversy we did get into if we had approached this very complex subject on the basis of four, five, or six fundamental matters.

The difficulty is that when you deal with a subject which involves insurance, either as to life or disability, somebody has to pay the bill. What we are faced with here is an attempt to bring out the soundest possible legislation at this time. I am sorry to say there are one or two things in the committee bill I should like to see amended. I am earnestly trying, and I credit my colleagues with the same motive, to bring out the soundest legislation possible. That is why I am supporting the committee bill. With all due respect to my good and sincere friend from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], I believe the committee bill to be the more practical. I hope that when we get to the stage of amending this measure there can be offered one, two, or three amendments which will strengthen it and make for greater benefits and soundness to the railroad workers. It is the practical and the human elements involved which commends this legislation to your most serious consideration.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I suspect I am the only person to speak on this bill who is the son of a railroad man. My father for many years was an employee of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. I was more or less raised on the B. & O. platform down in the little town of Blanchester, in southern Ohio. Probably I have been kicked off more engines and have been saved from being killed in the railroad yards more times than any other Member of the House. So I speak on this bill today from the heart, because I know hundreds and thousands of railroad workers; not just union leaders or brotherhood chairmen—hundreds and thousands of these workers by their first names. I am happy and proud to be able to call them my friends. I believe I know something about what these men are thinking of this legislation.

As we approached the consideration of this bill in the committee I voted against referring it to the Subcommittee on Transportation, of which I am a member, because I realized fully the difficulties that would be encountered and the hard work that would be required in considering the legislation.

I have known the proponent of this bill, a grand old man, since 1912. He comes from my State. I said to him in the beginning that probably when I finished my labors on this bill as a member of the Transportation Subcommittee no one would be happy with the position I had taken, including myself, and that probably the final draft of the legislation would not please anyone. I say to you, with all the sincerity at my command, that this piece of legislation is the most involved and technical bill I have ever worked on in my 30 years of public service. I do not believe there is anyone within the sound of my voice who understands fully everything that is contained and provided in this bill. As we met in the sessions of our committee, we would often have to go back, for 30 minutes or more, and review that which we had done in order to again pick up our trend of thought and to get back into our minds the problems which we had previously discussed. Yes, this is a complicated bill. It is one that is hard to understand.

The first thing I wanted to do, as the son of an old railroader and as a friend of hundreds and thousands of railroad workers—many of whom were good to me when I was a boy, just a kid playing around the railroad yards—and many of whom are now retired, was to see to it that those men are able to continue to draw their retirement pay.

The first thing I determined in my mind I wanted to be absolutely certain was that those men we have already promised would receive their retirement benefits would continue to receive them. In other words, I wanted to be absolutely certain that this retirement fund and system, as established, should be made solvent and sound in order that we could guarantee to these men we would keep the pledge and the promise we made them through the original enactment of railroad retirement legislation a number of years ago. I believe most of you agree with me that none of us is interested in paying insurance premiums to any insurance company which does not pay off. So that was my first inquiry.

In starting our investigation, we ran into a rather peculiar situation. When we established this retirement system we set up a Railroad Retirement Board, as an agency of the Congress of the United States, and we had the right, in my opinion, to go to that Board to obtain from the members thereof unbiased advice, and impartial information. After all, they were supposed to be representing us. But, lo and behold, when this bill was presented before the committee, the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, Mr. Latimer, appeared as its chief proponent. So I was not sure whether I wanted to follow Mr. Latimer's judgment on the bill, or not. I first wanted to know what somebody else had to say about it; for we soon fell into a discussion as to whether or not this fund as now established, this system as has been set up, was actually solvent. Everyone, without exception, Mr. Latimer and all the rest, agreed that the present fund and the present system was not sound actuarially, was not sound financially, and that some additional levies would have to be made in order to guarantee its soundness. I therefore went along with the distinguished chairman of this committee and others who decided that under the circumstances, with the railroads saying one thing, the brotherhoods saying another, and the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board appearing before us as a proponent of the bill, that the only thing we could do was to go out and get the best actuary we could find, let him go into this account and into this fund thoroughly and advise us as to his findings; and that is exactly what we did.

As a result of these findings we decided that it was absolutely necessary to levy additional charges against both the railroads and the workers, or the employers and the employees, to make the fund solvent. That was our first responsibility, the first duty we owed these men who are dependent upon us to protect their interests. That is exactly what was done. Having decided what was necessary to be done to make the fund solvent, to keep our faith and our promise to these aged men who had retired and others who were approaching retirement from age, the next thing was to see what other benefits we could give them. So after we checked the fund first, as any men of common sense and good judgment would do, we decided, of course, that the next thing that was necessary, because of the increased cost of living, was to increase the retirement pay.

Next we decided that widows ought to be covered and protected, and that there should be some provision written into the law so that railroaders would no longer have to accept smaller retirement pay in order to protect their widows. We therefore provided in the committee bill that from now on if this measure is adopted the retired railroad worker will not have his retirement pay reduced in order to protect his widow, but will receive the same amount of retirement pay he would receive if he were unmarried, and that in addition his widow would be protected.

We went on down the bill to determine what we could fairly and logically do. We found provisions for such things as maternity benefits, which we just threw out the window as impossible because we realized that if we authorized them the rate of charge against the employee would be so high that he could not afford to pay it. The men do not want such coverage provisions, as hundreds of thousands of letters and petitions from railroad workers all over the country so vividly testify.

I have before me a newspaper put out by the railroad brotherhoods called Labor. It is a fine publication. It renders a splendid service. We had completed our work on May 11, the date this paper was published, for I want to say to you that this committee did work diligently on this measure. We gave more time to it than to any other piece of legislation that has been before our committee since I have been a Member of Congress. We were sincere in our efforts, and anyone who challenges the integrity of the men who served on that great Subcommittee on Transportation does not know whereof they speak, because there are no better men in the House than those who serve on that committee. I am proud to have been associated with them.

But what does Labor of May 11 say about the efforts of our committee and the bill which we had reported, at the time we had already prepared our report and had it in the hands of the drafting service, and before the petition was

placed here on the Speaker's table, and many Members of Congress were told that our committee had refused to do anything about this legislation. Here are some of the things said about the bill by Labor, the official publication of the railroad brotherhoods—

First. That widows of railroad workers are to have pensions, as a matter of right. Such provision is to be found in practically all modern social-security legislation.

The committee bill does that. We have provided that in the committee bill.

Second. A minimum pension of $50 a month is fixed for low-paid railroad workers wh have devoted their lives to the industry.

We do that.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The provisions in that regard in the committee bill are exactly the same as in the Crosser bill?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes.

Third. The totally disabled railroad worker, the man who, because of what he gave to the industry, is no longer able to hold a job in the industry, is treated somewhat more generously than at present.

We have done that.

Fourth. The tax is increased so as to make the railroad retirement system, as well as the railroad unemployment-insurance system, absolutely sound.

We have done that.

The newspaper Laber then states:

These are the essential amendments. There are other slight changes, but they are not important.

If you will turn to the committee bill submitted to you, you will find that in section 4, pages 72 to 81, we have taken care of all the requirements for widows as mentioned in this publication, Labor.

If you will turn to section 3, pages 71 and 72, you will find that we have taken care of the $50 minimum pension exactly as requested in the Crosser bill and as mentioned in this publication.

If you will turn to section 2, subparagraph 5, page 67, and subparagraph 6 on page 68, you will find that we have taken care of the totally disabled railroad worker who is disabled as the result of his service.

If you will turn to section 301, pages 98 and 99, you will find that we have increased this tax so as to make this measure sound.

Mr. HALLECK. In respect to the disability provisions, the significant difference between the Crosser bill and the committee bill is that the committee bill provides that the disability shall arise out of the course of employment. I direct the gentleman's attention to the article in the paper Labor which he has just read and particularly to these words: "The totally disabled railroad worker, the man who, because of what he gave to the industry, is no longer able to hold a job in the industry." Do those words "who, because of what he gave to the industry" indicate to the gentleman that apparently they had in mind what is known as service connection, the policy that prevails throughout every system with which the Government has to do, so far as I know?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes. I am certainly of that opinion, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. What is going to happen to the man who has paid into this fund, say, 20 years or more, and then is injured away from his employment? What is going to happen to the fund that he paid in?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Exactly the same thing that happens to the man that paid into any other fund on that basis. There is no pension or retirement system anywhere in this land of ours that takes care of persons who suffer total injury outside of their unemployment prior to a certain time. If the length of employment is 20 years or more it is taken care of here, but if it is less than 20 years he is not, and there is no law or retirement system that does take care of him if it is not in line of duty.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The gentleman means that all he has paid in is lost to him?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, no. He will be on the same basis if his age limit is reached as before.

I want to mention one or two other problems that came before us that I think the Members ought to know about. They are very serious problems. When we began to think about how much we could levy in the way of charges against these workers and against the railroads, we were faced with this dilemma.

The railroads were already before the Interstate Commerce Commission requesting increases in freight rates and in other charges to the public, and we realized that if we increased the cost of operation of the railroads of the United States by $150,000,000 or $200,000,000 a year, immediately there would be a greater pressure and a greater demand for increased rates to be paid by the consuming public.

So we began to think of some way that we could meet this great problem, and we met it by looking into another railroad fund, and that is the unemployment fund. The railroads have paid all of the tax to take care of unemployment compensation for the workers. The railroad workers have not paid a single penny therefore. In that great fund there has already been amassed over $700,000,000, enough to take care of full unemployment compensation for all the rail workers and then have many millions left over. So it was determined that the wise thing to do, in order that this burden would not be passed onto the general public but would be paid by the railroads under their present structure of rates, was to give the railroads the same benefits of earned deductions because of a good employment record that is now given under social-security law and under the State laws of this Nation to our industries who are paying unemployment compensation and fees to support such a fund. We then provided that the present rate would be reduced to one-half of 1 percent so long as at least $350,000,000 remained in that fund, and whenever it dropped below $350,000,000 we would increase the rate one-half of 1 percent, and as it dropped $50,000,000 more we would increase it another one-half of 1 percent. The fact is that the interest on this present fund amounts to $14,000,000 a year, a sum which is already meeting all of the unemployment compensation requirements and will take care of any normal situation that may arise. Even if you went into a great depression, such as you had in the thirties, it would never use up the first $350,000,000 unless the railroads simply laid off all the workers and then, of course, the rate would automatically go up.

I want to say one other thing about this bill and I want to say it with all the charity and all the kindness in my heart for my fellow man, and that is this: Strangely, outside of the proponents of the bill, all of the opposition to the committee measure has come from those who did not serve on the Subcommittee on Transportation and did not labor with this very complex legislation for many, many weeks, and many, many months.

I say to you very frankly that, if I had my way, there are other things that we would do for these men. I would like to give a lot of these old railroaders almost everything in the world. I think they deserve the best treatment we can possibly give them. But I do not want—and I do not believe any Member of this House wants—to be in the position where we are going to say to these workers, "We are giving you greater benefits. We are passing a bill here that will cover the whole water front. We are giving you everything in the world," and then, 5 years from now, or 10 years from now, have them saying to each of us, "Well, you weren't my friend. You misled me. You passed legislation that wasn't sound, and now here I am old and broken, and I am not getting any retirement pay because you passed a law that would not stand the test actuarily and financially."

So, I say to you, the real friends of these workingmen—the real friends of the men who have worked on these railroads and are covered by this act—will see to it that this committee bill, which is sound and which is proper, is enacted into law in order to guarantee and assure them that the promises made them will be kept and the retirement pledged them will be paid when it becomes due.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, 2 minutes is not very long to discuss a bill as important as this one. As a person who was raised in a railroad atmosphere and served the railroads and knows something of the difficulties of following a railroad career, I have always looked upon the Railroad Retirement Act as one of the greatest pieces of constructive legislation

ever enacted by the Congress. If I had the time I could tell you something of the privations and the service of railroad men.

I listened to the gentleman from Ohio tell us about going along with the committee, the committee that has kept this bill from being considered by the House the length of time it has. Forcing the House to exercise its will to bring out legislation by petition by taking the bill from the committee and then pulling the parliamentary tricks that have been pulled on the railroad men of this country does not reflect credit on any member of the committee. Why did we have to put a petition up here and why was it signed within 24 hours by 218 Members of the House if the committee has acted fairly in the matter? Then let them explain to the railroad men of this country why. The railroad men have gone along with the committee and want them to do the fair thing, but they are trying to defeat this legislation by unfair tactics.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I will yield to the gentleman the way he did to me. No.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman does not want an answer.

Mr. WHITE. I have heard railroad attorneys trying to avoid the railroad responsibility in connection with accidents, and I know a railroad lawyer when I see him. I do not think the railroad men or the people of this country have been treated fairly in the handling of this piece of legislation. We are here today to vote down the committee bill and vote up the Crosser bill. That will please the people of this country and please the railroad men.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the House has at last been given the opportunity to consider amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. We are faced today with a choice of either the Crosser or the committee bill. While the Crosser measure does not have all the features I would desire, I am going to vote for it in preference to the committee bill because I think it is more fair and more worth while. I wish it were possible for the "rails" to be able to draw their pensions even though they were earning additional money. This, I contend, is fair because these people are not living on something they did not earn but on something which they had contributed to and were entitled to. I feel strongly also that the age of widows should be lowered to 60 years because they are just as much entitled to a pension as their husbands and their responsibilities, their children, and their bills stay with them, in many instances, until they pass on. In my opinion the disability provisions should also be broadened and made more beneficial regardless of age or amount of service.

I want to take this means to protest also at the delay and dilatory tactics that have marked the introduction and consideration of this legislation. Almost 2 months ago we got 218 signatures to a discharge petition and only today are we moving toward final action. This bill was first debated 2 weeks ago and should have been finished last Friday. Delaying tactics have been employed but this measure will not, and should not, be stymied.

I am hopeful that the Senate will consider this bill at the earliest opportunity and amend it to the benefit of the "rails" and their widows so that justice may be done and the real needs of one of the finest groups in America given full and adequate recognition.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. Mr. Chairman, transportation has been properly regarded as the circulatory system of commerce; it may be truly said also that it is the most important of all industries for the reason that all other industries are dependent upon it. Without transportation we could have practically no commerce.

Mr. Chairman, for about 60 years the Federal Government has exercised broad authority over the railroads of this country. Legislation by Congress relating to railroads has almost always applied especially and exclusively to the regulation in one way or another of the railroad transportation systems of the United States.

It was proper for Congress to treat the railroad transportation industry as a particular and distinct kind of business. The railroads, regardless of diversity of ownership, must be regarded, as nearly as possible, as a unit in order to assure satisfactory service.

Almost all of the important legislation enacted by Congress in regard to railroads has applied specifically to that industry and properly so.

Although it is not a complete list of such acts, the principle to which I have referred is illustrated by the following named statutes, to wit:

	Year
1. Act of Oct. 1, 1888	1888
2. Safety Appliance Act	1893
3. Safety Appliance Act	1903
4. Erdman Act	1898
5. Employers' Liability Act	1908
6. Hours of Service Act	1908
7. Ashpan Act	1908
8. Boiler Inspection Act	1911
9. Newlands Act	1913
10. Transportation Act	1920
11. Railway Labor Act	1926
12. Emergency Transportation Act	1933
13. Railroad Retirement Act	1934
14. Railway Labor Act, as amended	1934
15. Railroad Retirement Act	1935
16. Sec. 25, pt. I, Interstate Commerce Act	1937
17. Railroad Retirement Act	1937
18. Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act	1938
19. Transportation Act	1940
20. Amendment to Stabilization Act	1944

A number of factors are involved in the conduct of the railroad industry. It must be obvious, however, that the skilled, trained, and experienced personnel of the railroad industry is the most important factor in the rendition of transportation service to the American people. Nothing else compares in importance with personnel in the operation of the railroads of the country. Without the highly qualified personnel the much vaunted achievements of the railroads in connection with the late war would not have been possible. That being true, it is clear that we must do everything possible to increase the efficiency of railroad operatives.

The first railroad retirement law enacted by Congress was the first attempt to give by law to those devoting their lives to the railroad service assurance that they will not be altogether in want when unable to continue to work as railroaders.

Not only does the modest retirement annuity measurably relieve worry due to the fear of want but it enables them to devote all their attention to the proper discharge of their duties and the safety of lives entrusted to their care. Such assurance for their old age also encourages men to make railroading a career. The benefits provided in the retirement and unemployment insurance laws are really deferred payments of part of the compensation for the services of railroad workers.

The pending bill, H. R. 1362, introduced by me is for the purpose of amending the railroad retirement law and the unemployment insurance law in order to make them serve more fully the requirements of proper retirement and unemployment insurance laws.

It may be asked why the original retirement and unemployment insurance laws did not make more adequate provision for those entitled to benefits. Anyone who was in Congress when the first railroad retirement bill was presented for consideration will tell you that it was considered impossible to secure the enactment of any kind of retirement bill for railroad men.

The railroad retirement system is now, however, regarded by most persons as something that has always existed. It is interesting to note during the discussion of this bill that those who are opposed to its principal provisions claim to know better what the railroad workers desire than do the representatives of the men themselves. It is strange that the membership of the railroad labor organizations are regarded by the opposition as not knowing what they desire and to have selected heads of these organizations who do not know what the members electing them desire. Notwithstanding the vote of the local branches of the railroad labor organizations, still, according to the opposition, the national officers of these organizations do not speak authoritatively for the rank and file of the workers. I think I know as many railroad men as anyone and I say to you that 95 percent, if not more of them, favor the bill now before the House. It was on May 15, 1944, when I introduced a bill (H. R. 4805) to liberalize the railroad retirement law and the unemployment insurance law. We held several days' hearings on that bill, but I could not secure a definite disposition of the measure.

A great deal has been said during this discussion as to the fairness manifested toward me and to the supporters of the bill in the proceedings relating to the measure while it was in the committee.

It is not unreasonable to expect that others have standards differing from ours as to what constitutes fairness or lack of fairness, but it is neither neces-

sary nor proper to question the sincerity of their statements as to what is fair. I do say, however, that unbiased minds cannot avoid the conclusion that the actions and course to which I now refer disregarded entirely truly democratic and judicial principles.

The bill H. R. 4805, introduced in the last Congress, had been on hearing only a very short time. Arrangement was made to have prepared a comparison of the bill with the existing law. The comparison should be made by one without bias. Nevertheless, to prepare the impartial comparison the chief counsel for the American Shortline Railroad Association was requested to prepare a document which would compare the bill with the existing law. That document prepared by the chief counsel of the said railroad association weighed 7½ pounds avoirdupois and the cost of printing the same was paid from public funds. I did not complain, however, as to the nature of the assistance we were receiving for our illumination, in regard to the bill, by one of the lawyers for the opposition. I do say, however, that is contrary to the course usually pursued to insure impartiality and fairness.

After receiving the 7½-pound document about the middle of 1944, very little additional consideration was given to the bill and no action was taken. That, to say the least, was disconcerting to me as the spokesman for the measure. Early in the present Congress, that is on the 11th of January 1945, I introduced H. R. 1362. It covered only about one-third the space devoted to H. R. 4805 in the previous Congress, and I desire to explain why that was the case. I suggested the elimination of the language used in H. R. 4805 for the purpose of codification because members of the committee complained of the length of the bill. I then introduced the present bill, which is only about one-third the length of the bill (H. R. 4805) introduced in 1944. I think that it was desirable to codify the laws which it was proposed to amend, but the elimination of the codification matter removed the objection as to the length of the bill.

The codification and clarification was desired in order to expedite the decision and disposition of claims. Much delay had resulted because of ambiguities.

The railroad workers' representatives spent several years in determining upon amendments which, considering all parties concerned, were just and proper. They then sought the expert opinion and advice of the agency which has administered the retirement and unemployment insurance laws, and then H. R. 4805 was introduced to carry out the program as modified according to the suggestion of Retirement Board officials. As already stated, there was complaint by Members that the bill was too long. The pending bill is less than one-third in volume that of H. R. 4805, and there can be, therefore no longer objection as to the length of the bill.

The pending bill H. R. 1362 was introduced on the 11th day of last January 1945, more than a year and a half ago. Hearings were begun on the 31st of January 1945, and without any protest on my part testimony was continued day after day, some of it having little relevancy to the issues. The hearings were continued to and including the 26th day of April 1945, when the hearings were declared closed by the chairman of the committee. Ordinarily you would then assume that there had been introduced all the evidence that was to be considered by the deciding tribunal. Certainly I did not urge closing the hearings before the opposing parties had submitted all the testimony they desired to offer.

As I have already said, people honestly differ as to standards for deciding what is fair and it is not necessary, therefore, to question the sincerity of the actors involved in the course of action to which I now refer. I am sure, however, that unprejudiced persons cannot but conclude that the course of action, which I now discuss, does not, according to ordinary standards, constitute a shining example of fairness or magnanimity. The course, here briefly reviewed, certainly disregarded the fundamental principles of democracy.

Before reciting the facts just mentioned, let me call attention to the fact that for the American people, the most perfect symbol of justice has always been the balance scale. Idealistic persons always desire to be known as never being willing to operate to their own advantage, or to the injury of another, the democratic mechanism, the scales of justice. The American is usually confident of the correctness of his opinions in regard to public measures, but it is also his great pride always that he merits the reputation for insisting that, above all else, the mechanism of democracy be as perfect as possible and operated with such painstaking fairness that his own opinions or desires as to public policies may prevail only when the greater weight of opinion is clearly in accord with him. Even when he is absolutely certain that he is right, he is most desirous of securing approval of his position without availing himself of any undue advantage.

Prior to the discussions and hearings on H. R. 1362 it had been customary for the committee, through its chairman, to inform the heads of the various agencies of the Government which might appear to be especially affected by a measure referred to the committee that the committee would appreciate a report, together with such comment as the agency might desire to make.

I have been a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for 23 years, and during all that time the regular procedure was to refer bills for report by the use of a printed form letter.

The following is a copy of the form letter heretofore used:

SIR: We beg leave to submit to you the enclosed bill, H. R. ———, upon which the committee would appreciate a report, together with such comment as you may desire to make.

Will you kindly transmit your reply in duplicate?

Respectfully,

———, *Chairman.*

It is clear that, in preparing the language of this form letter, care was exercised to avoid indicating, much less urging, any viewpoint of the committee. The form letter, in the past, clearly indicated the desire to have a statement, from the agency, uninfluenced by the committee. It was not considered proper to urge upon an agency one viewpoint or another in regard to a measure. That, I submit, is a fair and dignified method of procedure. I feel that it should continue to be the practice of the committee.

If, however, a more robust partiality to a given viewpoint is to be manifested to the agency from which a report is desired, surely the dignity of the committee itself and fairness to the individual members of the committee would require formal committee action to change the custom for securing reports. If we are to argue the merits of all measures to all of the agencies whose reports are desired, then we should formally change the procedure heretofore regularly followed.

I have carefully examined the hearings on H. R. 1362 and find no record of any action whatever by the committee, either directing or authorizing a change of policy or procedure, in regard to securing reports from the agencies supposedly affected.

I find, however, the following copies of a letter and memorandum mentioned therein, to wit:

MARCH 29, 1945.

MR. HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
State Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I enclose a copy of H. R. 1362, which proposes amendments to the Railroad Retirement System. The committee cannot act intelligently upon the proposals of this bill without relating them to the general social-security program of the Nation.

Grave doubts have arisen as to the cost that the provisions of this bill would create.

We are concerned as to the policies involved. Looking upon your organization as one concerned in the social-security program, we would welcome a review of this proposed legislation and such report as you can make to our committee in aid of its efforts in connection with this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman of the Interstate and
Foreign Commerce Committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND
FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1945.

MEMORANDUM AS TO H. R. 1362

We have pending before our committee H. R. 1362, which proposes to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Carriers Taxing Act. This bill, in its broad effect, would establish an independent social-security program for railway employees and the employees of certain related industries.

It is difficult to act intelligently upon this bill without considering its relation to the general social-security program. There is a prevailing opinion that the general Social Security Act is to be enlarged from the standpoint of the number of beneficiaries to which it will apply and also by increasing the benefits available under that act. Inequities create discontent and agitation to move benefits up to the higher level, whether right or wrong.

If 20,000,000 or so more persons are to be added to the beneficiaries of the Social Security System, its burdens will become of great importance to the country. If too

great, they will probably break down the whole social-security program.

Our committee has the responsibility of acting upon the various proposals of the pending bill. We have no expert actuaries or advisers in our own employment. There is a broad conflict as to the extent of the burdens that would be created by proposed amendments to this act. There is a problem as to what extent the proposals of this act can properly be related to the general social-security program so as to avoid extreme inequality of treatment. Of course, there is also the question as to how far a benefit program can go consistent with the contributory burdens of the employees and the cost burdens of the employers.

If we go on the assumption that social-security benefits are burdens that must be borne by the consumers of the Nation, and that benefits are going to be conferred upon a large part of the beneficiaries from sources other than employers, then the question arises as to the proper apportionment of cost.

If the humane need forms the basis of granting social-security benefits, whether or not there is an employer and employee able to make the contributions to meet the burdens, then should not the liability be placed upon the consumers generally through the taxing power of the Government rather than by contributory plan as between employers and employees?

As it is, all consumers, directly or indirectly, contribute to social-security benefits and only part of those who are equally entitled receive them. If the burden becomes great, how is it to be equitably distributed unless it be through a general tax system?

Assuming that your organization is to participate in formulating and approving a social-security program for the Nation, I thought it advisable to call these questions to your attention as matters which are to concern the committee legislating upon the subject.

CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman.

On April 13, 1945, Director Smith replied to Chairman LEA's letter. In addition to the argument set forth in the letter and memorandum of March 29, 1945, to Director Smith from the chairman of the committee, it is evident from Mr. Smith's reply that oral presentation of the matter had also been made to Director Smith, for nothing was said in the chairman's letter or accompanying memorandum about the conference method of legislating. Nevertheless, all but the first sentence of paragraph 3 of Director Smith's report of April 13, 1945, by way of reply to the chairman's letter and memorandum of March 29, 1945, consists of a reiteration of the arguments urged many times in and before the committee in support of the novel and astounding notion that before spokesmen representing conflicting views may be certain of a patient hearing in support of their program, they must resort to collective bargaining. Apparently the exponents of this amazing conception were unmindful of the fact that Congress might desire to legislate upon a subject regardless of the lack of agreement between groups of citizens.

All members of the committee do not, of course, agree that before either party could expect a kindly hearing by the legislative representatives of the American people, representatives of conflicting views, concerning a subject of legislation, should be urged to strive with the opposition as to formal terms, until forced to a vocal armistice.

Aside, however, from the merit or lack of merit of the contention just discussed, there is another important aspect of the Director's recommendation. Clearly, at most, the function of the Director as contemplated by the statute establishing his office is to express an opinion as to the value of proposed legislation. He is supposed to examine a measure referred to him, in order to enable him to pass judgment as to the wisdom or unwisdom of the measure, so that he may state whether or not it is in accord with the program of the President.

Heretofore, members of the committee have generally condemned any tendency on the part of bureau or department officials, to assume a supervisory attitude toward the Members of Congress in the discharge of their duties.

Here, however, we find not only some reference to the merits of H. R. 1362, but, much more emphatically and explicitly, we are advised as to the proper method of informing ourselves and as to the modus operandi which we should observe in determining the merits of legislative proposals presented to us for our decision. To what extent may such presumption be allowed to increase without reducing the representatives of the people to the status of mere factotums of bureau satraps?

If we encourage or even tolerate this sort of unwarranted assumption of authority then it will not be long before the Members of Congress will be mere flunkies. We should not, and I know we will not, tolerate, much less encourage, the growth of an unauthorized power which can interfere with the free and dignified effort of Members of the legislative body to represent truly the will of the people.

Now let me call attention to another example of fairness. After the closing of the hearings, the testimony was printed. The printed testimony filled three volumes. I then tried earnestly to have the bill considered by the committee.

Generally speaking there is no objection to proceeding to the consideration of a bill immediately after the closing of the hearings upon the same. But in regard to H. R. 1362 it was urged that we should have the printed hearings before taking up the bill for consideration. There was something to be said for that position, and I did not object; but the hearings were closed on the 26th of April and were printed not many weeks after that. Notwithstanding that fact no definite action as to consideration was taken until the 3d of July 1945. On that day a motion was made to refer the bill to the so-called committee on transportation. The clerk of the committee had advised the members in writing in June 1945 that the committee had been named.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. No. There is no use interrupting. I will not yield. I have been yielding for 2 years, and I shall now use the little time I have to state the facts without interruption.

As I was about to say, there was a committee appointed consisting of 12 members. Ordinarily we have subcommittees consisting of five members, or sometimes seven, which is certainly sufficient. In this case, however, we had 12 members on the subcommittee, the appointment of which was never authorized by the whole committee.

Excepting myself there was no active supporter of H. R. 1362 on that subcommittee. Mr. HARRIS during the consideration of the bill became an earnest believer in the measure.

Now if I were allowed to select from the entire membership of the Interstate Commerce Committee, consisting of 28 members, I could in all probability select a subcommittee which would favor the side of the controversy in which I might believe. Their sincerity, in all likelihood, would be unquestioned.

The motion to refer the bill to the aforesaid subcommittee was, on a record vote, defeated. Later there was a motion offered for the consideration of the measure by the whole committee. The whole committee had sat during all the hearings and were familiar with the measure. That motion was carried by a record vote.

It was then decided that consideration would be postponed until after the recess. The recess of Congress was to begin shortly after the Fourth of July. It was understood that the pending bill would be the first order of business and would be taken up by the committee immediately after the recess. We assumed, therefore, that immediately after the termination of the recess, we would proceed with the consideration of the bill according to the decision of the committee. To my astonishment, however, a motion was made by a member who had not voted with the prevailing side of the question at the previous meeting. This motion to refer the bill to the subcommittee was made when a large number of the supporters of the bill were absent and the motion was declared carried.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I wish to point out that we agreed to take it up immediately after the recess. The word "immediately" was in the motion.

Mr. CROSSER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. I cannot yield; my time is very short.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will yield the gentleman one additional minute if he will yield to me.

Mr. CROSSER. No; I will not yield right now.

Mr. Chairman, after we had proceeded in this subcommittee for weeks and weeks and with delay after delay in regard to a bill which had been introduced on January 11 of the previous year, we were told that there had been prepared a document to help illuminate our minds in regard to the bill. We were then presented with a typewritten document 35 pages long prepared in fairness to me and the railroad workers by the attorneys for the Association of American Railways. The first 17 pages of the document was merely a restatement of their arguments presented to the whole committee during the hearings.

Was it expected that the lawyers for the opposition could be absolutely impartial in the presentation of the subject?

After we had been in possession of the illuminating document prepared by the lawyers for the Association of American Railways for some time, we were told that we required still more light.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Latimer, the man whose advice as to rates and other technical matters was sought by the railroad workers, is considered to be a leading authority on retirement systems. He not only recommended a remarkably well calculated schedule of rates at the beginning of the retirement system, but he gave detailed and convincing reasons in support of the rates of assessment carried in the pending bill. Those opposed to the measure called as a witness Mr. Williamson, chief actuary of the Social Security Board. They apparently assumed that he would uphold their contention in opposition to Mr. Latimer.

Mr. Williamson, however, speaking of the figures of Mr. Latimer, said:

> I think in the aggregate the figures are reasonable. I think they are carefully developed. I think they can be looked on with this limitation, that there is a wider range of tolerance than they felt wise to show in the tables.

In other words, he thought that the unofficial technical advisers of the railroad workers and Mr. Latimer had done a good job. The railroad men also secured the services of an actuary who had been for 30 years an actuary for the Travelers Insurance Co., a man whose ability nobody could dispute. He confirmed Mr. Latimer's views.

The only real actuarial and statistical authority had been presented by the proponents of the pending bill. The railroads had not presented a single actuary. They make no claim that they have presented actuarial experts. Referring again to the matter of fairness, the moving spirits of the opposition in the committee, notwithstanding the absence of actuarial testimony, announced that the committee must have more illumination, must have an actuary selected by them to make a statement. Two actuaries had already accepted Mr. Latimer's position and Mr. Latimer is the outstanding authority in regard to retirement systems. The railroads called no actuaries in opposition. Nevertheless the several members leading the opposition insisted that the committee must have another actuary. Their own views had no actuarial support in the hearings.

In regularly presuming to say what the committee desired, these committee members remind me of the three tailors of Tooley Street. Each of the three tailors lived on Tooley Street, London. During the administration of Prime Minister Canning, the three tailors met in the house of one of the tailors for the purpose of redressing popular grievances. They drew up a petition to the House of Commons which began with the words "We, the people of England." Yes; the several members undertaking to speak for the committee said, "We, the committee, must have another actuary." So they went about, so to speak, trying to find a man who would support their preconceived notions as to what is necessary in the way of a tax. Finally they found stationed in the Surgeon General's office of the United States Army a man who had been an assistant to Mr. Williamson, whom I have quoted. He was an assistant to Mr. Williamson in the Social Security Board. During the war he was in the military service, stationed in the Surgeon General's office. A letter was written to the Surgeon General on the 7th of November 1945, by the Social Security Board, saying:

> There is a job for Mr. Myers as an actuary down here at $5,000 a year when he can come back.

On the 8th of November, the next day after that, a letter went to the Surgeon General from the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, containing the following language:

> We have employment for a man for special purposes in connection with the railroad retirement law.

Myers was immediately permitted to leave the Surgeon General's office. Remember that Mr. Myers was a former assistant to Mr. Williamson, of the Social Security Board. I have already quoted Mr. Williamson's testimony before our committee, and you will recall that it supports Mr. Latimer. It was quite evident that the controlling personages on the committee desired to secure the testimony of some actuary who would support the contentions of the ruling spirits, which were unsupported by any actuary during the 3 months of formal hearings when both the proponents and opponents of the bill had an unlimited opportunity to present their testimony. When the quest for actuarial support of the position taken by the leaders of the opposition on the committee had been rewarded, the bill was ordered changed in accordance with their actuary's statement prepared free from cross-examination. It was planned then to have a so-called clean bill introduced. I then stated that I would not introduce such a bill. They then prepared to have it introduced by someone else. A copy of the committee print of the proposed bill which completely emasculated the Crosser bill, H. R. 1362, makes it perfectly clear that they did not intend to report H. R. 1362. They may have felt, of course, that this was also fair to the introducer of 1362, but the House can pass its own judgment in regard to the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, a petition to discharge was filed and the required 218 signatures were attached within 48 hours. Under the rules the motion to discharge the committee would have come before the House on the 14th of May for consideration. In the week of May 6, 1946, I was compelled to be in Cleveland for the primary election at which I was a candidate and while I was in Cleveland action was taken by the committee. I requested a delay of 1 day to permit me to return after the primaries. That request for 1 day's postponement was refused.

They refused to wait 1 day. So they took action before I could reach Washington, although I hurried back as quickly as possible. They reported a bill bearing the number H. R. 1362 and carrying the statement that Mr. CROSSER introduced the following bill instead of reporting the bill they had planned to introduce under a new number and by a different author.

This gave the opponents of H. R. 1362 control of proceedings in regard to the bill. That also gave them the parliamentary right to close the debate. Since, however, the real question was whether or not there shall be passed the Crosser measure for the improvement of the retirement and unemployment insurance laws, good ethics would have required that the proponents of the measure should have been allowed to close the discussion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSSER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. What recommendations does the gentleman make to the House as to how we should proceed?

Mr. CROSSER. My earnest recommendation is to vote against the substitute, because it is worse than the present law.

Mr. Chairman, during the 2 years' effort in support of H. R. 1362 I have at times been annoyed but not discouraged. I have tried earnestly to advance the principles of democracy and of justice.

Antagonisms by some who have been in opposition will not be reflected by me. There was no desire on my part to arouse such antagonism. No one, however, can justify abandonment of principles in order to avoid displeasing others much as he may be distressed because of such displeasure. In human relations, disagreement is at times unavoidable. The democratic mechanism was established to make possible the ascertainment and effectuation of the will of the majority. If the majority should be mistaken, truly democratic institutions provide for a corresponding change in policy. As to the proper course for the individual, it may be said that earnest devotion to one's highest conception of right is the sublimest expression of life.

In his poem entitled "Freedom," James Russell Lowell said:

> Is true freedom but to break
> Fetters for our own dear sake,
> And with leathern hearts forget
> That we owe mankind a debt?
> No! True freedom is to share
> All the chains our brothers wear,
> And, with heart and hand, to be
> Earnest to make others free!
> They are slaves who fear to speak
> For the fallen and the weak;
> They are slaves who will not choose
> Hatred, scoffing, and abuse.
> Rather than in silence shrink
> From the truth they needs must think;
> They are slaves who dare not be
> In the right with two or three.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], chairman of the committee.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, it would be unfortunate if this Congress, considering a measure of this far-reaching importance, would be diverted from a proper consideration of what is involved here by trivialities and pusillanimous criticism hurled at this committee. I want to say, in the first place, that the contentions and the misrepresentations made to this House that the committee did not intend to report a bill are absolutely false. I did not attend 31 hearings of this committee and attend 22 executive sessions of the subcommittee and 5 sessions in full committee executive meetings for the purpose of not reaching a proper solution. The fact is that the proposal to discharge the committee was never made until after the committee had decided to report a bill and had instructed the legislative counsel to prepare a report. The legislative counsel said it would take 2 or 3 weeks to prepare it because of the complications involved.

Let us look at this bill from its realities. It is not a trivial question now presented to you. What is done here today may have far-reaching consequences on the social-security system of this country. In my judgment the bill proposed here by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] is an improvident bill.

When we looked into this bill we found there were three principal things we had to do if we did our duty to this House. We had an admission from everybody that the present system was financially unsound. Our first duty was to make this system sound so that the time will not come when its inadequacy would bring disappointment and grief to those who now contribute their support in the belief that it assures them their promised security.

Another thing soon developed. We had a duty, as I see it, to eliminate from H. R. 1362 undue and unwarranted burdens it would place against the social-security system of the railroads. We have a social-security system for the employees of the Federal Government. We have a general social-security program and we have a railroad system of social security.

In the third place, we felt that there was an opportunity and a duty to place constructive improvements in the retirement plan.

The bill we present carries $65,000,000 per year of benefits to the railway employees and their beneficiaries in addition to those now included in the law. An examination of H. R. 1362 will show that it is indefinite in many particulars, so much so that Mr. Latimer, who largely was responsible for the preparation of it, proposed to the committee 76 different amendments to that bill. Who is going to stand here today and say that we should deprive this House of the opportunity to have the benefit of the consideration of this bill by the committee? Can we ignore the 76 amendments proposed by the author of it, and claim that committee consideration of the measure is not needed?

The original bill presented to the committee contained 210 pages. We got a comparative print of that. The Government paid for it. It cost $1,400 to get a comparative print of the three acts involved in this bill. This is not a question of one piece of legislation; there are three different acts involved. We paid $1,400 for that comparative print. Mr. Clarence Miller, a very able attorney, a partisan against this bill, but still a man with a fine reputation for research, prepared the comparative print. His services, if paid for, would have required several thousand dollars according to the ordinary fees of attorneys. He did that for nothing. Then, after we filed that comparative print, the bill was changed so that the comparative print became of no use. We had to throw it away.

Realize for a minute what the task of this committee was. The Committee on Ways and Means had a problem similar to what we had when they dealt with social security. Social security covers a broad field, but the plan we have here covers a comparable field applicable to railway employees. There are between five and six million potential beneficiaries under this bill. When the Committee on Ways and Means was assigned the duty of studying social security it employed experts. The House gave it $50,000 for that purpose. It employed a staff of experts and that staff worked nearly a year before they reported. Their report is a large volume. The committee was doing its duty to this House.

When we asked for one disinterested expert we had to fight along for weeks, yes, months, before we finally got that expert. Who was opposing it? The proponents of this bill.

If anybody is doubtful about our giving time to this matter all he needs to do is look at the report of this committee. He will find that this committee has done a fine work, one that required a great deal of patience under difficult conditions, partly in wartime and later under the aggravating conditions since the war. If we receive no credit for that, I will tell you why it is.

This is special legislation that seeks to create special privileges for a pressure group in this country. The country has seen demonstrations by these special groups that ought to put us on our toes today. What is the fact today? This pressure group is trying to defeat members of this committee who have ably and conscientiously tried to do their duty to present a proper bill to this House. They are out over the congressional districts of this country. We saw an announcement that $2,500,000 is ordered to be spent by one of these groups to defeat Members of Congress who do not come in and put their necks under the yoke of these special groups. Now is a good time to show these special groups that they do not dominate the Congress of the United States, that we still have enough free men here to protect the public of this country against the excesses and venalities of any groups.

Let us look at the situation. Last year the tax levied against the men and the railroads under the existing law, was $410,000,000 out of a pay roll of a little over $4,000,000,000.

If you put the Crosser bill as it is written into effect and measure the cost of it by the present pay roll, the raise would bring up the total burden of the bill to $760,000,000 a year against the pay roll of $4,300,000,000. Is that not enough to make a man sit up and take notice when he assumes to act for the public in deciding what to do with such a proposal? There is a raise of much over $300,000,000—the third raise in 10 years. We now have a deficiency in the retirement fund amounting to $120,000,000 a year based on the tax level plan of meeting the liabilities under that act. Ten million dollars a month is being charged against the future retirement fund under existing law. Now the Crosser bill comes along and proposes a cent and a half tax, or $60,000,000 a year, toward meeting that annual deficit of $120,000,000 a year. Is there anything suspicious about these figures? I am not depending alone upon Mr. Myers for what I say. I can bring to you the report of the actuarial committee of the Railroad Retirement Board covering the 3-year period up to the 1st of January 1942. The Board, in effect, estimated the deficiency would require 3.14 percent to put it on a solid basis on the level payment plan. Mr. Myers suggested to us .14 of 1 percent less than the actuaries of the Retirement Board proposed.

In addition to that, this bill proposes expanded benefits amounting to $260,000,000 a year. It further adds $64,000,000 to the unemployment benefits as well as adding to the retirement benefits. The bill is short. Even as it is written it is short $100,000,000 a year.

Under the committee bill we propose a 3-percent tax—.14 of 1 percent less than was proposed by the actuarial board—to take up this deficiency in the retirement system. That means $120,000,000 additional tax a year to place the retirement fund on a sound basis.

There is a phase of this that the Congress and the country ought to think about. I want to give you a little information. Mr. Williamson was spoken of here and it is claimed how he was satisfied with this bill. Well, Mr. Williamson recommended the appointment of Mr. Myers as the best one available to do the work. When I was asked by the committee to appoint an actuary I contacted the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK], who seems to have the reputation of being one of the best informed men on this subject in the country. He said he could not possibly accept. So Mr. Myers, who has been on the actuarial board of the Railroad Retirement Board, was selected.

Rainard Robbins, who was an actuary serving on the staff of the Committee on Ways and Means, made the comment I am going to read. I ask you to listen to it because there is a very interesting feature involved in it. Turning to the comment in the report of the Board, that is, the Retirement Board, regarding the cost of the plan contemplated by the 1944 bill, which is the one we have been referring to here, he says:

> We find: The estimated cost of the new proposal is 3½ percent of the taxable pay roll. Bearing in mind the Board's 1940 statement that disbursements under the retirement plan may reach 14 or 15 percent of pay roll and adding 3 percent for unemploy-

ment, and 3½ percent for new proposals, we have the Board's estimate of the eventual cost of the benefits under the new bill—from 20½ percent to 21½ percent of taxable pay roll.

With these facts before us it is of interest to recall the 1940 opinion of the Board that if special taxes are raised much above the then total of 6 percent, a progressive form of taxation should be substituted for at least in part for wage taxes.

If you will look up the record, if you have time to go through it, you will find there is a strong group in this country that wants to place this surplus burden on the Treasury of the United States. One of the methods of trying to accomplish that purpose is to create liabilities beyond the tax responsibility, so that eventually, when these people begin to cry about being deceived and misled, the Treasury of the United States shall step in and assume that responsibility.

This statement of Mr. Robbins further says:

It seems worthy of note that after each of two successive actuarial examinations, the Board admitted that rates were deficient to no minor extent but each time concluded to recommend no change.

Then, referring to the Board's report in 1940, the Board said:

We recommend further that Congress outline a definite policy with respect to paying contributions from the general revenue.

Mr. Robbins says:

It is remarkable that while the new bill would liberalize unemployment benefits by increasing the maximum period for payment in a benefit year from 100 to 130 days and would add liberal sickness and maternity benefits, it suggests no increase in the contributions over 3 percent to cover these extensions and the Board makes no comment on this point. It also seems optimistic to estimate that the suggested survivors' benefits can be covered by 3½ percent of pay rolls.

It is, of course, consistent with the Board's philosophy that part of the costs should be paid by general taxation to suggest increases in wage taxes that would be less than sufficient to cover the new benefits; but, for clear thinking, it is essential that we have an idea what the total cost of these benefits may be regardless of how the cost is to be met.

Now, we have this situation: An unsound bill before us. Shall we continue that unsoundness? We have one of three alternatives. One is to provide revenue to meet the obligations. Another is to let it go as it is and disappoint the beneficiaries under this legislation. A third is to delay until finally the Government steps in to assume a responsibility.

Now, whose advice are you going to take? It is up to this Congress to decide. Under the present management, Mr. Latimer at the head of the Railroad Retirement Board, we are operating under a deficit of $120,000,000 a year. We are following his advice. He, perhaps more than any other human being, was responsible for a mistake of $120,000,000 a year in estimating what it was going to cost for retirement. Then, when he comes to unemployment, which is payable by the railroads alone, the liability under that phase was estimated at 3 percent, which would be $120,000,000 a year on the present pay roll, while as a matter of fact, it is now pretty well agreed that 2 percent would cover it. What is proposed now is to add $80,000,000 to the unemployment fund and provide nothing to take care of that increased addition.

Our committee, I believe, deserves credit. We faced the issue. We did not dodge it. We refused to yield to those who tried to compel us to jump through the hoop. I believe the committee deserves your support.

The committee deserves the credit of standing up and trying to protect the public of the United States. Consider it from this standpoint: Every phase of social security has relation to the ultimate program in this country. I believe there are 55,000,000 employees in the United States at the present time. We have those who believe with a lot of merit in the argument that there are many other millions of people in this country who deserve social security just as much as those who have it now; and no doubt in years to come we are going to expand it. What is social security going to be in the years to come? Is it going to be the great benefit to the American people in the progress of civilization of which we might conceive, or are we by overdoing the thing to these millions of possible beneficiaries going to convert them to that point of citizenship where they are more interested in seeing free benefits from the Government than they are the other great problems of this country? If that time ever comes, social security instead of being a beneficent thing is going to be a viper nurtured in the breast of this Republic.

The railroad employees constitute less than one-twentieth of all the employed in the country, far less than one-twentieth. Suppose we start in the interests of justice to all the people of the country, by assuming that we were to be fair to all classes and treat them as nearly alike as possible; do you know what it would cost? If we tried to do for the rest of them what this bill proposes for the railroad employees it would cost this Nation over $20,000,000,000 a year to pay the bill. In other words, reduced to mathematical certainty, you have the unfairness and the special privilege nature of this legislation.

A good deal is said about unemployment. This bill proposes to increase unemployment benefits to 26 weeks from 20, and to pay $25 instead of $20 a week. That amendment will cost $12,000,000 a year. Then, under the guise of unemployment insurance it would include maternity benefits for 16 weeks. It gives benefits the same as for unemployment. I just call attention to that provision because it characterizes the nature of this bill and the purpose of those who have dominated its framing. I do not mean to say that the men generally speaking over the country are responsible for it but a few of these overzealous leaders. If a woman is going to become a mother she is to receive unemployment benefits for 16 weeks even though the pregnancy occurred a year after she left the railroad. If that is not going somewhere down the left side of the line I do not know what it is.

Sick benefits are put in the bill, and the picture is drawn of a man in serious condition. He is employed by a railroad. Must we assume that every employer in this country is to take on responsibility for all men who pass into his employ? Do you recall that in the old slavery days the law prescribed the liability of the master? He must provide food, clothing, shelter, and medical care. There was no getting away from that. But when that burden was placed on the master it was in the days of slavery. Now in the days of free enterprise in which we live are we going to say that the employer must be charged with taking care of all the misfortunes of his employees? You cannot do that without making somebody pay for something he does not get.

We allowed only $20 for unemployment for the soldier who came back from foreign wars. We allow $20 under social security. Are we going to allow $25 for these men who have this favored system of unemployment benefits. Are we going to add sick benefits, that are added to no other industry in this country? The States of California and Rhode Island pay sick benefits, but the money that does it is collected from the men themselves, not from the employers.

Do you want to strike out in a new field here and under the pretense of unemployment fix a responsibility on the employer for sickness, no matter what the occasion of it is? The employee may have committed a crime, it may be due to his own misconduct, it may have no relationship whatever to employment; but the sickness would be charged to the carriers. They would pay every dollar of it. You do not even provide for the men making a little contribution toward carrying that cost.

Now in reference to the proposal to increase the duration, I was chairman of the subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that wrote the first Railroad Retirement Act in 1935. In examining that bill and from what little knowledge I had I found out it was fixed up so that the old employees took the cream of it and the little fellows took the other end. In subcommittee we had lobbyists that were lining the halls outside. A motion was made to report the bill. I wanted to present that phase of it. We took it up in the main committee. When it finally came out and was enacted into law, we cut 35 percent, according to the experts, out of the bill, and not a cent came from the little fellows. It was all taken away from the men who had designed the legislation in their own favor.

At that time we established an 80-day unemployment benefit. Some time went on, I believe about 2 years, and the Congress raised that to 100 days. Now they are back here again asking us to raise it to 130 days, illustrating what we can expect to have in connection with all this legislation that is written primarily for the interest or concern of particular groups and without regard to the general need and the proper relation to the affairs of the country as a whole.

These sick benefits under the guise of unemployment create a liability of $64,000,000 a year.

Mr. Altmeyer, who is head of the Social Security Board, recently made a statement in which he proposed a 2 percent tax to cover unemployment insurance. That is what our actuary told us

would be sufficient to carry unemployment insurance under the bill as it stands now. But if we add these other benefits, maternity and sick benefits, and increase the pay days for unemployment, it will add considerably more.

Besides H. R. 1362 proposes that this unemployment charge due to sickness may alternate with unemployment due to inability to work for lack of a job. In other words, an employee could collect 6 months for unemployment and follow that with similar benefits for 6 months more on account of sickness.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the Crosser bill was introduced and considered by the committee; that a petition was placed on the desk in reference to the Crosser bill, which was supposed to come to the floor for consideration and amendment; that a bill striking out everything after the enacting clause of the Crosser bill was substituted for that bill, which is now before the House. I want to know if there will be a chance to consider amendments to either of the two bills, the committee bill or the Crosser bill, and if there will be a chance to be heard on the provisions of either of these bills by Members of this House?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair will endeavor to answer the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry.

The first section of the bill will be read. At the end of the reading of the first section, the committee substitute will be read for amendment. Then the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will act on the committee substitute. If the committee substitute should be rejected, then the balance of the bill will be read for amendment; the so-called Crosser bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE. After the first section of the bill is read, if an amendment is desired to be offered will an amendment lie and will there be discussion allowed on the amendment under the parliamentary situation?

The CHAIRMAN. The first amendment to be considered will be the committee amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting the committee amendment for the pending bill.

Mr. WHITE. Will each section as it is read be subject to amendment and discussion?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee amendment will be subject to amendment as it is read.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NEELY. Would not the adoption of the committee substitute mean the death of the Crosser bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It would mean that the committee has completed its action and has adopted the committee substitute for the pending bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DIVISION I

SEC. 1. Section 1 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and section 1 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) The term 'employer,' except as otherwise provided in this subsection, shall mean—

"(1) Any carrier: A 'carrier' is any express company, sleeping-car company, or carrier by railroad, subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act;

"(2) Any person, other than a carrier regulated under part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, which, pursuant to arrangements with a carrier or otherwise, performs, for hire, with respect to passengers or property transported, being transported, or to be transported by a carrier, any service included within the term 'transportation' as defined in section 1 (3) of the Interstate Commerce Act, whether or not such service is offered under railroad tariffs;

"(3) Any freight forwarder: A 'freight forwarder' is any person, other than a carrier, which holds itself out to the general public to transport, or provide transportation of property for hire, and which in the ordinary and usual course of its undertaking assembles and consolidates, or provides for assembling and consolidating, shipments of such property, and performs, or provides for the performing of, break-bulk and distributing operations with respect to such consolidated shipments, and assumes responsibility for the transportation of such property from point of receipt to point of destination, and regularly and substantially utilizes, for the transportation of such shipments, the services of one or more carriers;

"(4) Any person engaged in rendering, pursuant to any arrangement for one or more carriers, any service which (i) is of such a nature as to be susceptible of indefinitely continuous performance and (ii) constitutes a part of or is necessary or incidental to the operation or maintenance of way, equipment or structures devoted to transportation use, or constitutes a clerical, sales, accounting, protective, or communications service necessary or incidental to the conduct of transportation carried on by a carrier, or is rendered with respect to passengers or property transported by railroad, at point of departure or shipment or at destination or between such points;

"(5) Any person which, through any form of property interest, is directly or indirectly subject to control by or to common control with a carrier and which (i) is engaged in acquiring or holding title to managing, maintaining, or operating any property devoted substantially to use in the transportation conducted by such carriers; or (ii) is engaged in performing services necessary or incidental to the conduct of the transportation carried on by such carrier, or services in the manufacture of equipment or equipment parts or in the processing of materials for use in the operation, servicing, or maintenance of way, structures or equipment devoted to use in transportation, or services in connection with the storage, elevation, or handling of property transported, being transported, or to be transported if such storage, elevation, or handling services are provided with respect to property accorded privileges of storage in transit, or for the promotion or facilitation of transportation conducted by such carrier; or (iii) is engaged in transportation by motor vehicles;

"(6) Any railroad association, traffic association, tariff bureau, demurrage bureau, weighing and inspection bureau, collection agency, and other association, bureau, agency, or organization controlled and maintained wholly or principally by two or more employers and engaged in the performance of services in connection with or incidental to railroad transportation;

"(7) Any railway labor organization, national in scope, which will have been or may be organized in accordance with the Railway Labor Act, and such organization's State and National legislative committees, general committees, insurance departments, and local lodges and divisions, established pursuant to the constitution and bylaws of such organization;

"(8) Any organization maintained or controlled by one or more employers, and principally engaged in furnishing medical, hospital, educational, recreational, or other welfare services to employees, or in providing for the payment of life, sick, accident, or other benefits to such employees or the dependents or survivors of such employees; and

"(9) Any receiver, trustee, or other individual or body, judicial or otherwise, when in the possession of the property, or operating all or any part of the business of an employer as defined herein.

"(10) Exclusions: Except with respect to persons covered by clause (iii) of paragraph (5), the term 'employer shall not include any person (i) by reason of operations in the conduct of which such person holds itself out directly to the public as a common carrier by water, air, or motor, or animal-drawn vehicle, or as a contract carrier by any of such means other than contract carrier service regularly offered to railroad passengers, shippers, or consignees pursuant to arrangements with an employer such as defined herein; or (ii) by reason of the performance of any operation which is insubstantial or is to irregular or infrequent as to afford no substantial basis for an inference that such operation will be repeated; or (iii) by reason of its being engaged in the mining of coal, the supplying of coal to an employer such as herein defined where delivery is not beyond the mine tipple, and in the operation of equipment or facilities therefor, or in any of such activities, or in logging or the milling of lumber to standard commercial sizes, or in furnishing supplies to a carrier; or (iv) by reason of the operation of a street, interurban, or suburban electric railway, unless such railway is operating as a part of a general steam-railroad system of transportation, or is a part of the general steam-railroad system of transportation now or hereafter operated by any other motive power. The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby authorized and directed, upon request of the Board, or upon complaint of any party interested, to determine after hearing whether any line operated by electric power falls within the terms of this clause. The term 'employer' shall not include any individual by reason of the performance of any service by such individual personally.

"(11) Segregation: Any person who is an employer as defined in this subsection shall be an employer with respect to all activities carried on by it, except that (i) any person who is an employer by reason of paragraph (9) shall be an employer only in the capacity described in that paragraph; (ii) if the Board finds that a person is principally engaged in activities other than employer activities and that its employer activities are conducted as an operation or operations separate and distinct from the operations in which it is principally engaged, such person shall be an employer only with respect to such employer operation or operations; and (iii) if the Board finds that a person who is an employer solely by reason of paragraph (2) or (4) of this subsection, is principally engaged in activities other than employer activities but does not, pursuant to clause (ii) find that the employer

activities of such person are conducted as an operation or operations separate and distinct from the operations in which it is principally engaged, such person shall be an employer only with respect to all work performed in its employ by individuals who regularly and substantially perform work on property structures or equipment devoted to transportation use. If to a substantial extent the individuals working in employer activities regularly work also in the operations in which a person is principally engaged, such employer activities shall not be deemed to be conducted as an operation or operations separate and distinct from the operations in which such person is principally engaged. For the purposes of this subsection, a person shall be deemed to be principally engaged in activities other than employer activities if the man hours devoted to such other activities are more than one-half of the total man-hours devoted to all activities carried on by such person, except that if the Board finds that a determination on such basis is impracticable or inappropriate the Board shall make the determination on the basis of such factors as in ts judgment are relevant and appropriate. The term 'employer activities' as used in this subsection shall mean all such activities as are conducted by a person as a carrier, or as are described in paragraph (2) (3), (4), (5), (6), or (8). When a final determination will have been made as to whether a person is principally engaged in employer activities, the matter shall not be redetermined except upon the basis of operations conducted for a period of not less than 3 years following the last operations considered in making the previous determination, unless the Board finds that substantial activities will have been abandoned or substantial new activities will have been undertaken Upon any such redetermination the conclusion shall be governed by the previous determination, unless the Board finds that on the basis of the factors on which such previous determination will have been based, the activities in which the person previously was principally engaged constitute less than 40 percent of such person's activities."

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the committee substitute be dispensed with and that it be printed at this point in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the part not read contains a vast number of sections and I want to know if amendments will be in order if that unanimous consent request prevails?

The CHAIRMAN. Amendments will be in order to any part of the committee substitute.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The committee substitute is as follows:

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

ADDITION OF CERTAIN DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. Section 1 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(o) An individual has 'a current connection with the railroad industry' on a particular date if, in any 30 consecutive calendar months before the month in which such date occurs, he was in service as an employee in not less than 12 calendar months and, if such 30 calendar months do not immediately precede such month, he was not engaged in any regular employment other than employment for an employer in the period before such month and after the end of such 30 calendar months.

"(p) The term 'occupational injury or disease' means (1) accidental injury arising out of and in the course of employment as an employee, (2) such occupational disease or infection as arises out of such employment or as naturally or unavoidably results from such accidental injury, or (3) injury caused by the willful act of a third person directed against an individual because of his employment as an employee.

"(q) The term 'wages' (except when used in section 5 (d) (1)) means all compensation earned by an employee after December 31, 1936, excluding that part of such compensation which, after compensation equal to $3,000 had been earned by an employee during any calendar year, was earned by such employee during such calendar year; but in computing such compensation no part of any month's compensation in excess of $300, earned before January 1, 1947, shall be recognized.

"(r) The term 'survivor benefit credit' means an amount equal to the sum of the following—

"(1) (A) 40 percent of the amount of an individual's average monthly wage if such average monthly wage does not exceed $50, or (B) if such average monthly wage exceeds $50, 40 percent of $50, plus 10 percent of the amount by which such average monthly wage exceeds $50 and does not exceed $250, and

"(2) an amount equal to 1 percent of the amount computed under paragraph (1) multiplied by the number of years in which $200 or more of wages were earned by such individual.

Where the survivor benefit credit thus computed is less than $10, such credit shall be $10.

"(s) The term 'average monthly wage' means the quotient obtained by dividing the total wages earned by an individual before the quarter in which he died, became entitled to receive an annuity under paragraph 1 of section 2 (a), or attained the age of 65 if he became entitled to receive an annuity under section 2 (a) before attaining the age of 65, whichever first occurred, by three times the number of quarters elapsing after 1936 and before such quarter in which he died, became so entitled, or so attained the age of 65, excluding any quarter prior to the quarter in which he attained the age of 22 during which he earned less than $50 of wages.

"(t) The term 'completely insured individual' means any individual with respect to whom it appears to the satisfaction of the Board that—

"(1) He had not less than one quarter of coverage for each two of the quarters elapsing after 1936, or after the quarter in which he attained the age of 21, whichever quarter is later, and up to but excluding the quarter in which he attained the age of 65, or died, whichever first occurred, and in no case less than six quarters of coverage; or

"(2) He had at least 40 quarters of coverage.

As used in this subsection, and in subsections (u) and (v) of this section, the term 'quarter' and the term 'calendar quarter' mean a period of three calendar months ending on March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. When the number of quarters specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection is an odd number, for purposes of such paragraph such number shall be reduced by one. In any case where an individual has earned in a calendar year $3,000 or more in wages, each quarter of such year following his first quarter of coverage shall be deemed a quarter of coverage, excepting any quarter in such year in which such individual dies or (having attained the age of 65) is or becomes entitled to receive an annuity under section 2 and any quarter succeeding such quarter in which he died or was or became so entitled.

"(u) The term 'partially insured individual' means any individual with respect to whom it appears to the satisfaction of the Board that he earned wages of not less than $50 in each of not less than 6 of the 12 calendar quarters immediately preceding the quarter in which he died.

"(v) The term 'quarter of coverage' means a calendar quarter in which the individual earned not less than $50 in wages; except that for each calendar year during the period beginning January 1, 1937, and ending December 31, 1946, an individual's number of quarters of coverage shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

If during the calendar year the individual earned wages in the following number of calendar months—	And the total wages earned during such calendar year is—			
	$50 but less than $100	$100 but less than $150	$150 but less than $200	$200 or more
	Then the quarters of coverage for such calendar year shall be—			
1 but not more than 3	1	1	1	1
4 but not more than 6	1	2	2	2
7 but not more than 9	1	2	3	3
10 or more	1	2	3	4

For the purposes of subsection (s) and (u) of this section if an individual's quarters of coverage in any calendar year before 1947, as determined from the table—

"(1) is one, his wages for such year shall be deemed to have been earned in the last calendar quarter of such year;

"(2) are two, one-half of his wages for such year shall be deemed to have been earned in each of the last two calendar quarters of such year;

"(3) are three, one-third of his wages for such year shall be deemed to have been earned in each of the last three calendar quarters of such year; and

"(4) are four, one-fourth of his wages for such year shall be deemed to have been earned in each calendar quarter of such year.

"(w) The term 'widow' (except when used in section 4 (e)) means the surviving wife of an individual who either (1) is the mother of such individual's son or daughter, or (2) was married to him prior to the beginning of the twelfth month before the month in which he died.

"(x) The term 'child' (except when used in section 4 (e)) means the child of an individual, and the stepchild of an individual by a marriage contracted prior to the date upon which he attained the age of 60 and prior to the beginning of the twelfth month before the month in which he died, and a child legally adopted by an individual prior to the date upon which he attained the age of 60 and prior to the beginning of the twelfth month before the month in which he died.

"(y) In determining whether an applicant is the widow, child, or parent of a completely insured or partially insured individual, the Board shall apply such law as would be applied in determining the devolution of intestate personal property by the courts of the State in which such insured individual was domiciled at the time of his death, or if such insured individual was not so domiciled in any State, by the courts of the District of Columbia. Applicants who according to such law would have the same status relative to taking intestate personal property as a widow, child, or parent shall be deemed such.

"(z) A widow shall be deemed to have been living with her husband at the time of his death if they were both members of the same household on the date of his death, or she was receiving regular contributions from him

toward her support on such date, or he had been ordered by any court to contribute to her support."

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2 OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"ANNUITIES

"SEC. 2. (a) The following-described individuals, if they shall have been employees on or after August 29, 1935, shall, subject to the conditions set forth in subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), be eligible for annuities after they shall have ceased to render compensated service to any person, whether or not an employer as defined in section 1 (a) (but with the right to engage in other employment to the extent not prohibited by subsection (e)):

"1. Individuals who on or after August 29, 1935, shall be 65 years of age or over.

"2. Women who on or about January 1, 1947, shall be 60 years of age or over and have completed 30 years of service.

"3. Individuals (other than those covered by paragraph 2) who on or after August 29, 1935, shall be 60 years of age or over and have completed 30 years of service, but the annuity of such an individual shall be reduced by one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month that such individual is under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue.

"4. Individuals who on or after August 29, 1935, shall be either 60 years of age or over or shall have completed 30 years of service, and whose permanent physical or mental condition is such that they are unable to engage in any regular employment for hire.

"5. Individuals who on or after January 1, 1947, have completed 10 years of service and whose permanent physical or mental condition, as the result of occupational injury or disease, is such that they are unable to engage in any regular employment for hire.

"6. Individuals who on or after January 1, 1947, have, on the date as of which the annuity begins to accrue, a current connection with the railroad industry and, on such date, either have completed 20 years of service or have attained the age of 60, and whose permanent physical or mental condition, as the result of occupational injury or disease, is such as to be disabling for work in their regular occupation as employees. The Board, with the cooperation of employers and employees, shall secure for purposes of this paragraph the establishment of standards determining the physical and mental conditions which are permanently disabling for work in the several occupations in the railroad industry, and the Board, employers, and employees shall cooperate in the promotion of the greatest practicable degree of uniformity in the standards applied by the several employers. An individual's condition shall be deemed to be disabling for work in his regular occupation as an employee if he has been disqualified by his employer because of disability for service in his regular occupation as an employee in accordance with the applicable standards so established; but if the employee has not been so disqualified by his employer, the Board shall determine whether his condition is disabling for work in his regular occupaton as an employee in accordance with the standards generally established; and, if the employee's regular occupation as an employee is not one with respect to which standards have been established, the standards relating to a reasonably comparable occupation shall be used. If there is no such comparable occupation, the Board shall determine whether the employee's condition is disabling for work in his regular occupation as an employee by determining whether under the practices generally prevailing in industries in which such occupation exists such condition is a permanent disqualification for work in such occupation. For the purposes of this section, an employee's 'regular occupation' shall be deemed to be the occupation in which he has been engaged as an employee in more calendar months than the calendar months in which he has been engaged in any other occupation as an employee during the last preceding five calendar years, whether or not consecutive, in each of which years he has earned compensation, except that, if an employee establishes that during the last fifteen consecutive calendar years he has been engaged in another occupation as an employee in one-half or more of all the months in which he has earned compensation, he may claim such other occupation as his regular occupation as an employee.

"(b) Such satisfactory proof shall be made, as prescribed by the Board, of the physical or mental condition referred to in paragraph 4, 5, or 6 of subsection (a), and from time to time, of the continuance of such condition (determined in accordance with the tests applied in the original determination of such condition) until the employee attains the age of 65. If the individual fails to comply with the requirements prescribed by the Board as to proof of the continuance of such condition until he attains the age of 65 years, his right to an annuity by reason thereof shall, except for good cause shown to the Board, cease, but without prejudice to his rights to have subsequently awarded to him any annuity to which he may be entitled. If before attaining the age of 65 an individual in receipt of an annuity under paragraph 4, 5, or 6 of subsection (a) is found by the Board to be no longer in the physical or mental condition referred to in such paragraph his annuity shall cease upon the last day of the month in which such condition is found by the Board to have ceased to exist, but without prejudice to his rights to have subsequently awarded to him any annuity to which he may be entitled.

"(c) An annuity shall be paid only if the applicant has relinquished such rights as he may have had to return to the service of an employer and of the person by whom he was last employed; but this requirement shall not apply to the individuals mentioned in paragraphs 4, 5, or 6 of subsection (a) prior to attaining the age of 65.

"(d) An annuity shall begin to accrue as of a date to be specified in a written application (to be made in such manner and form as may be prescribed by the Board and to be signed by the individual entitled thereto), but—

"(1) not before the date following the last day of compensated service of the applicant, and

"(2) not more than 60 days before the filing of the application.

"(e) No annuity shall be paid with respect to any month in which an individual in receipt of an annuity hereunder (1) renders compensated service to an employer, (2) renders compensated service to the last person by whom he was employed prior to the date on which the annuity begins to accrue, or (3) in the case of an annuity under paragraph 6 of subsection (a), earns more than $75 in service for hire or in self-employment. Individuals receiving annuities shall report to the Board immediately all such compensated service and earnings."

PROVISION RELATING TO MINIMUM ANNUITIES

SEC. 3. Subsection (e) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) If an individual entitled to an annuity—

"(1) was an employee when he attained age 65 and has completed 20 years of service, or

"(2) had, on the date as of which such annuity began to accrue, a current connection with the railroad industry and had, on such date, completed 5 years of service.

the minimum annuity payable shall, before any reduction pursuant to paragraph 3 of section 2 (a), be whichever of the following is the least: (1) $3 multiplied by the number of his years of service, (2) $50, or (3) his monthly compensation."

REPEAL OF SECTIONS 4 AND 5; ADDITION OF SECTION PROVIDING FOR SURVIVOR BENEFITS

SEC. 4. The Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out sections 4 and 5 thereof, and by inserting in lieu of such sections the following:

"SURVIVOR BENEFITS

"Child's insurance benefits

"SEC. 4. (a) (1) Every child (as defined in section 1 (x)) of an individual who died a completely or partially insured individual (as defined in section 1 (t) and (u)) after December 31, 1946, if such child (A) has filed application for child's insurance benefits, (B) at the time such application was filed was unmarried and had not attained the age of 18, and (C) was dependent upon such individual at the time of such individual's death, shall be entitled to receive a child's insurance benefit for each month, beginning with the month in which such child becomes so entitled to such insurance benefits, and ending with the month immediately preceding the first month in which any of the following occurs: such child dies, marries, is adopted, or attains the age of 18.

"(2) Such child's insurance benefit for each month shall be equal to one-half of the survivor benefit credit (as defined in section 1 (r)) of the individual with respect to whose wages the child is entitled to receive such benefit, except that, when there is more than one such individual such benefit shall be equal to one-half of whichever survivor benefit credit is greatest.

"(3) A child shall be deemed to have been dependent upon a father or adopting father at the time of the death of such individual unless, at the time of such death, such individual was not living with or contributing to the support of such child and—

"(A) such child is neither the legitimate nor adopted child of such individual, or

"(B) such child had been adopted by some other individual, or

"(C) such child was living with and supported by such child's stepfather.

"(4) A child shall be deemed to have been dependent upon a mother, adopting mother, or stepparent at the time of the death of such individual only if, at the time of such death, no parent other than such individual was contributing to the support of such child and such child was not living with its father or adopting father.

"Widow's insurance benefits

"(b) (1) Every widow (as defined in section 1 (w)) of an individual who died a completely insured individual after December 31, 1946, if such widow (A) has not remarried, (B) has attained the age of 65, (C) has filed application for widow's insurance benefits, (D) was living with such individual at the time of his death, and (E) is not entitled to receive an annuity under section B or is entitled to receive an annuity under section 2 which is less than three-fourths of the survivor benefit credit of her husband, shall be entitled to receive a widow's insurance benefit for each month, beginning with the month in which she becomes so entitled to such insurance benefits and ending with the month immediately preceding the first month in which any of the following occurs: she remarries, dies, or becomes entitled to receive an annuity under section 2 equal to or exceeding three-fourths of the survivor benefit credit of her husband.

"(2) Such widow's insurance benefit for each month shall be equal to three-fourths of the survivor benefit credit of her deceased husband, except that, if she is entitled to receive an annuity under section 2 for any month, such widow's insurance bene-

fit for such month shall be reduced by an amount equal to the annuity under section 2 to which such widow is entitled.

"Widow's current insurance benefits

"(c) (1) Every widow (as defined in section 1 (w) of an individual who died a completely or partially insured individual after December 31, 1946, if such widow (A) has not remarried, (B) is not entitled to receive a widow's insurance benefit, and is not entitled to receive an annuity under section 2, or is entitled to receive an annuity under section 2 which is less than three-fourths of the survivor benefit credit of her husband, (C) was living with such individual at the time of his death, (D) has filed application for widow's current insurance benefits, and (E) at the time of filing such application has in her care a child of such deceased individual entitled to receive a child's insurance benefit, shall be entitled to receive a widow's current insurance benefit for each month, beginning with the month in which she becomes so entitled to such current insurance benefits and ending with the month immediately preceding the first month in which any of the following occurs: no child of such deceased individual is entitled to receive a child's insurance benefit, she becomes entitled to receive an annuity under paragraph 1 or 2 of section 2 (a) equal to or exceeding three-fourths of the survivor benefit credit of her deceased husband, she becomes entitled to receive a widow's insurance benefit, she remarries, she dies.

"(2) Such widow's current insurance benefit for each month shall be equal to three-fourths of the survivor benefit credit of her deceased husband, except that, if she is entitled to receive an annuity under section 2 for any month, such widow's current insurance benefit for such month shall be reduced by an amount equal to the annuity under section 2 to which such widow is entitled or by an amount equal to such current insurance benefit, whichever amount is less.

"Parent's insurance benefit

"(d) (1) Every parent (as defined in this subsection) of an individual who died a completely insured individual after December 31, 1946, leaving no widow and no unmarried surviving child under the age of 18, if such parent (A) has attained the age of 65, (B) was wholly dependent upon and supported by such individual at the time of such individual's death and filed proof of such dependency and support within 2 years of such date of death, (C) has not married since such individual's death, (D) is not entitled to receive any other insurance benefits under this section or any annuity under section 2, or is entitled to receive one or more of such benefits or annuity for a month, but the total for such month is less than one-half of the survivor benefit credit of such deceased individual, and (E) has filed application for parent's insurance benefits, shall be entitled to receive a parent's insurance benefit for each month, beginning with the month in which such parent becomes so entitled to such parent's insurance benefits and ending with the month immediately preceding the first month in which any of the following occurs: such parent dies, marries, or becomes entitled to receive for any month an insurance benefit or benefits (other than a benefit under this subsection) or an annuity under section 2 in a total amount equal to or exceeding one-half of the survivor benefit credit of such deceased individual.

"(2) Such parent's insurance benefit for each month shall be equal to one-half of the survivor benefit credit of such deceased individual, except that, if such parent is entitled to receive an insurance benefit or benefits for any month (other than a benefit under this subsection) or an annuity under section 2, such parent's insurance benefit for such month shall be reduced by an amount equal to the total of such other benefit or benefits or annuity for such month. When there is more than one such individual with respect to whose wages the parent is entitled to receive a parent's insurance benefit for a month, such benefit shall be equal to one-half of whichever survivor benefit credit is greatest.

"(3) As used in this subsection, the term 'parent' means the mother or father of an individual, a stepparent of an individual by a marriage contracted before such individual attained the age of 16, or an adopting parent by whom an individual was adopted before he attained the age of 16.

"Lump-sum death payments

"(e) Upon the death, after December 31, 1946, of an individual who died a completely or partially insured individual leaving no surviving widow, child, or parent who would, on filing application in the month in which such individual died, be entitled to a benefit for such month under subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d) of this section, an amount equal to six times the survivor benefit credit of such individual shall be paid in a lump sum to the following person (or if more than one, shall be distributed among them) whose relationship to the deceased is determined by the Board, and who is living on the date of such determination: To the widow or widower of the deceased; or, if no such widow or widower be then living, to any child or children of the deceased and to any other person or persons who are, under the intestacy law of the State where the deceased was domiciled, entitled to share as distributees with such children of the deceased, in such proportions as is provided by such law; or, if no widow or widower and no such child and no such other person be then living, to the parent or to the parents of the deceased, in equal shares. A person who is entitled to share as distributee with an above-named relative of the deceased shall not be precluded from receiving a payment under this subsection by reason of the fact that no such named relative survived the deceased or of the fact that no such named relative of the deceased was living on the date of such determination. If none of the persons described in this subsection be living on the date of such determination, such amount shall be paid to any person or persons, equitably entitled thereto, to the extent and in the proportions that he or they shall have paid the expenses of burial of the deceased. No payment shall be made to any person under this subsection, unless application therefor shall have been filed, by or on behalf of any such person (whether or not legally competent), prior to the expiration of 2 years after the date of death of such individual.

"Application

"(f) (1) An individual who would have been entitled to a benefit under subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d) for any month had he filed application therefor prior to the end of such month, shall be entitled to such benefit for such month if he files application therefor prior to the end of the third month immediately succeeding such month.

"(2) No application for any benefit under this section filed prior to 3 months before the first month for which the applicant becomes entitled to receive such benefit shall be accepted as an application for the purposes of this section.

"(3) An application for any payment or benefit under this section shall be made and filed in such manner as the Board may by regulation prescribe.

"Family payments

"(g) The Board may, in its discretion, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury any two or more individuals of the same family for joint payment of the total benefits and annuities payable to such individuals under this act.

"Benefits due but not paid at death

"(h) The amount of any monthly benefit or lump sum due any individual under this section but not paid to such individual before his death shall be paid to the same persons, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as though (1) such amount constituted a lump sum payable under subsection (e) by reason of the death of the individual with respect to whose wages such amount was payable, and (2) the individual with respect to whose wages such amount was payable had died on the date of the death of the individual to whom such amount was due.

"Assignment

"(i) The right of any individual to any future payment under this section shall not be transferable or assignable at law or in equity, and none of the moneys paid or payable or rights existing under this section shall be subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process, or to the operation of any bankruptcy or insolvency law.

"When an individual is deemed entitled to receive an annuity

"(j) For the purposes of this section and subsections (s) and (t) of section 1, an individual shall be deemed to be entitled to receive an annuity for any month if an annuity is, or thereafter becomes, payable to him for the accrual during such month.

"REDUCTION AND INCREASE OF INSURANCE BENEFITS

"SEC. 5. (a) Whenever the total of benefits under section 4, payable for a month with respect to an individual's wages, is more than $20 and exceeds (1) $85, or (2) an amount equal to twice the survivor benefit credit of such individual, or (3) an amount equal to 80 percent of his average monthly wage (as defined in section 1 (s)), whichever of such three amounts is least, such total of benefits shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (d), be reduced to such least amount or to $20, whichever is greater.

"(b) Whenever the benefit or total of benefits under section 4, payable for a month with respect to an individual's wages, is less than $10, such benefit or total of benefits shall, prior to any deductions under subsection (d), be increased to $10.

"(c) Whenever a decrease or increase of the total of benefits for a month is made under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, each benefit shall be proportionately decreased or increased, as the case may be.

"(d) Deductions, in such amounts and at such time or times as the Board shall determine, shall be made from any payment or payments under section 4 to which an individual is entitled, until the total of such deductions equals such individual's benefit or benefits for any month in which such individual:

"(1) rendered services for wages (as defined in section 209 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended) of not less than $15; or

"(2) if a child under 18 and over 16 years of age, failed to attend school regularly and the Board finds that attendance was feasible; or

"(3) if a widow entitled to a widow's current insurance benefit, did not have in her care a child of her deceased husband entitled to receive a child's insurance benefit.

"(e) If more than one event occurs in any 1 month which would occasion deductions equal to a benefit for such month, only an amount equal to such benefit shall be deducted.

"(f) Any individual in receipt of benefits subject to deduction under subsection (d) (or who is in receipt of such benefits on behalf of another individual), because of the occurrence of an event enumerated therein, shall report such occurrence to the Board

prior to the receipt and acceptance of an insurance benefit for the second month following the month in which such event occurred. Any such individual having knowledge thereof, who fails to report any such occurrence, shall suffer an additional deduction equal to that imposed under subsection (d)."

RETURNS AND RECORDS AS TO COMPENSATION EMPLOYEES

SEC. 5. Section 8 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"RETURNS OF COMPENSATION AND CONCLUSIVENESS OF RECORDS OF COMPENSATION

"SEC. 8. Employees shall file with the Board, in such manner and form and at such times as the Board by rules and regulations may prescribe, returns under oath of compensation of employees, and, if the Board shall so require, shall furnish employees with statements of their compensation as reported to the Board. The Board's record of the compensation so returned shall be conclusive as to the amount of compensation earned by an employee during each month covered by the return, and the fact that the Board's records show that no return was made of the compensation claimed to be earned by an employee during a particular calendar month shall be taken as conclusive that no compensation was earned by such employee during that month, unless the error in the amount of compensation in the one case, or failure to make or record return of the compensation in the other case, is called to the attention of the Board within 4 years after the last date on which return of the compensation was required to be made."

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE NECESSARY BY PRECEDING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 6. (a) The third sentence of paragraph (h) of section 1 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out "for the purposes of subsections (a), (c), and (d) of section 2 and subsection (a) of section 5" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the purposes of subsections (a), (d), and (e) of section 2, and for the purposes of section 4,".

(b) Subsection (f) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Annuity payments due any individual but not paid to such individual before his death shall be paid to the same persons, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as though such payments constituted a lump sum payable under section 4 (e) with respect to the death of such individual."

(c) Subsection (h) of section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out "except as provided in subdivision 3 of section 2 (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "except that if, under subsection (b) of section 2, an individual's annuity ceases the provisions of this subsection shall not apply with respect to any annuity subsequently awarded to which such individual may be entitled."

(d) Subsection (m) of section 3A of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby repealed.

(e) (1) Subsection (n) of section 3A of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out the phrase "annuities, pensions and death benefits" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "annuities, pensions, death benefits, insurance benefits, and lump sum payments".

(2) Section 9 of such Act is amended by striking out the phrase "annuities, pensions, or death benefits" wherever it appears in such section, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "annuities, pensions, death benefits, insurance benefits, or lump sum payments."

(3) Subsection (b) 1 of section 10 of such act is amended by striking out the phrase "pensions, annuities, or death benefits" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "annuities, pensions, death benefits, insurance benefits, or lump sum payments."

(4) Subsection (b) 5 of section 10 of such act is amended by striking out the phrase "annuities or death benefits" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "annuities, death benefits, insurance benefits, or lump sum payments."

(5) The third sentence of section 11 of such act is amended by striking out the phrase "annuity, pension, or death benefit" wherever it appears in such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "annuity, pension, death benefit, insurance benefit, or lump sum payment."

(6) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 15 of such act are amended by striking out the phrase "annuities, pensions, and death benefits" wherever it appears in such subsections, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "annuities, pensions, death benefits, insurance benefits, and lump sum payments."

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 7. (a) The provisions of paragraphs 2 and 4 of section 2 (a), and of section 3 (e), of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as in force after this title take effect, shall be applicable to individuals who became eligible for annuities before January 1, 1947, without further application therefor, but such provision shall not result in the payment of any annuity, with respect to any calendar month prior to January 1, 1947, in a higher amount than would be payable under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 as in force prior to the date on which this title takes effect. If an annuity increased pursuant to such provisions is a joint and survivor annuity, the increase shall be in the same form, the actuarial value being computed as of the date the increase begins, unless on that date there is no spouse living for whom the election was made, in which case the increase shall be awarded on a single life basis. If the increase affects a survivor annuity only, the increase shall be so determined as to bear the same ratio to the survivor annuity as the increase in the basic annuity would bear to such basic annuity if the employee annuitant were living and had made no joint and survivor election. For the purposes of section 3 (e) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended by this act, an individual to whom an annuity began to accrue before January 1, 1947, if such annuity was based on not less than 5 years of service, shall be deemed to have had a current connection with the railroad industry on the date as of which such annuity began to accrue.

(b) Notwithstanding the amendment by this act of section 3 (f) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, in any case in which the individual referred to in such section died before January 1, 1947, such section shall continue in effect as though this act had not been enacted.

(c) Notwithstanding the repeal by this act of section 4 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, in any case where an election was made under such section 4 prior to January 1, 1947, the election shall be given effect as though this act had not been enacted; except that—

(1) If the annuity of the individual who made the election did not begin to accrue before January 1, 1947, the election shall be considered not to have been made unless the individual, prior to January 1, 1948, reaffirms such election in such manner as the Railroad Retirement Board shall by regulations prescribe.

(2) If the annuity of the individual who made the election began to accrue, but was not awarded, before January 1, 1947, the election shall be considered not to have been made if such individual, prior to January 1, 1948, revokes such election in such manner as the Railroad Retirement Board shall by regulations prescribe.

(d) Notwithstanding the repeal by this act of section 3A (m) and section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, such section 3A (m) and such section 5 shall continue in effect with respect to compensation earned after December 31, 1936, and before January 1, 1947, by an individual as an employee, as though this act had not been enacted, in the following cases:

(1) If such individual dies before January 1, 1947.

(2) If such individual dies on or after January 1, 1947, and died neither completely nor partially insured within the meaning of subsection (t) or (u) of section 1 of the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended by this act.

(3) If such individual dies on or after January 1, 1947, and a lump-sum death payment under section 4 (e) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended by this act, is payable, except that the death benefit shall be reduced by the amount of such lump-sum death payment.

(4) If such individual dies on or after January 1, 1947, leaving a surviving widow, child, or parent who would, on filing application in the month in which such individual died, be entitled to a benefit for such month under subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d) of section 4 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended by this act, except that (A) the death benefit, if any, shall not be due before (i) the first day of the month next following the last month with respect to which any benefits under such subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d), based on an application filed in the month in which such individual dies, would be payable, or (ii) the first day of the month next following the month of the death of a spouse entitled to a survivor annuity pursuant to an election made under the provisions of section 4 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 before its amendment by this act, whichever is later; and the 2-year period within which an application for the death benefit, if any, must be filed pursuant to the provisions of such section 5, shall not begin before such first day of the month described in clauses (i) and (ii) above, and (B) the death benefit shall be reduced by the aggregate amount of benefits paid, or due but not paid, under section 4 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended by this act, on the basis of such individual's death.

(e) Notwithstanding the amendment made by this act to section 8 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, a return made in accordance with such section, covering monthly compensation of an employee, with respect to any period before January 1, 1947, shall be conclusive (in the same manner and to the same extent as provided under such section 8 prior to its amendment by this act) as to the amount of compensation earned by such employee during each month covered by the return; except that after March 31, 1951, the Railroad Retirement Board's record of the amount of the compensation earned by such employee during each month covered by any such return shall be conclusive.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

TERMINATION OF PERIOD WITH RESPECT TO WHICH CONTRIBUTIONS SHALL BE PAYABLE

SEC. 201. So much of the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 8 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, as precedes the proviso is amended to read as follows: "Every employer shall pay a contribution, with respect to having employees in his service, equal to 3 percent of so much of the compensation as is not in excess of $300 for any calendar month payable by him to any employee with respect to employment after June 30, 1939, and before January 1, 1947:".

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACCOUNT

SEC. 202. (a) Subsection (a) of section 10 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall maintain in the unemployment trust fund established pursuant to section 904 of the Social Security Act an account to be known as the railroad unemployment insurance account. This account shall consist of (i) 90 percent of all contributions collected pursuant to section 8 of this act, together with all interest collected pursuant to section 8 of this act, and 90 percent of all taxes (together with all interest, civil fines, civil penalties, additional amounts, and additions to the tax) collected pursuant to the Railroad Unemployment Tax Act (part II, subchapter B, chapter 9, Internal Revenue Code); (ii) all amounts transferred or paid into the account pursuant to section 13 or section 14 of this act; (iii) all additional amounts appropriated to the account in accordance with any provision of this act or with any provision of law now or hereafter adopted; (iv) a proportionate part of the earnings of the unemployment trust fund, computed in accordance with the provisions of section 904 (e) of the Social Security Act; (v) all amounts realized in recoveries for overpayments or erroneous payments of benefits; (vi) all amounts transferred thereto pursuant to section 11 of this act; (vii) all fines or penalties collected pursuant to the provisions of this act and all criminal fines or criminal penalties collected with respect to the tax imposed under the Railroad Unemployment Tax Act; and (viii) all amounts credited thereto pursuant to section 2 (f) or section 12 (g) of this act. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all moneys at any time standing to the credit of the account shall be mingled and undivided, and are hereby permanently appropriated to the Board and to the Bureau of Internal Revenue to be continuously available to the Board and to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, without further appropriation, for the payment of benefits provided for by this act, and for the payment of refunds (including interest thereon) pursuant to this act or the Railroad Unemployment Tax Act, and no part thereof shall lapse at any time, or be carried to the surplus fund or any other fund."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 10 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) All moneys in the account shall be used solely for the payment of the benefits provided for by this act, and for the payment of refunds (including interest thereon) pursuant to this act or the Railroad Unemployment Tax Act. The Board shall, from time to time, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the name and address of each person or company entitled to receive benefits or a refund payment under this act, the amount of such payment, and the time at which it shall be made. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall from time to time, furnish to the Secretary of the Treasury a schedule of overpayments in respect of the tax (or any interest, penalty, additional amount, or addition to the tax) under the Railroad Unemployment Tax Act for the purpose of causing refunds under such act to be made from the account. Prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, the Secretary of the Treasury, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department, shall make payments from the account directly to such person or company of the amount of benefits or refund so certified by the Board and to the person or company shown to be entitled thereto of the amount of the refund under the Railroad Unemployment Tax Act so scheduled by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue: *Provided, however,* That if the Board shall so request, the Secretary of the Treasury, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department, shall transmit benefit payments to the Board for distribution by it through employment offices or in any such other manner as the Board deems proper."

(c) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 904 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "Board" the words "or the Bureau of Internal Revenue."

(d) Subsection (f) of section 904 of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof the following sentence: "The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make out of the fund such payments as the Railroad Board may duly certify and such refunds under the Railroad Unemployment Tax Act (part II, subchapter B, chapter 9, Internal Revenue Code) as may be duly scheduled for payment by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, not exceeding the amount standing to the credit of the railroad unemployment insurance account at the time of such payment or refund.".

AMENDMENT RELATING TO THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION FUND

SEC. 203. The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 11 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end of clause (i) of such sentence the following: ", and 10 percent of all taxes (exclusive of all interest, fines, penalties, additional amounts, and additions to the tax) collected pursuant to the Railroad Unemployment Tax Act (part II, subchapter B, chapter 9, Internal Revenue Code)".

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE NECESSARY BY PRECEDING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 204. (a) Subsection (g) of secton 2 of the Railroad Unemployment Ipsurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Benefits accrued to an individual but not yet paid at death shall, upon certification by the Board, be paid, without necessity of filing further claims therefor, to the same person or persons, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as though such benefits constituted a lump sum payable under the provisions of section 4 (e) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, with respect to the death of such individual."

(b) Subsection (g) of section 5 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "refund" where it first appears in such subsection the words "under this Act."

(c) Subsection (h) of section 8 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(h) All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable with respect to any tax imposed by section 1800 or 2700 of the Internal Revenue Code, and the provisions of section 3661 of such code, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, shall be applicable with respect to the contributions required by this act and the payments required by the second sentence of section 2 (f) of this act: *Provided,* That all authority and functions conferred by or pursuant to such provisions upon any officer or employee of the United States, except the authority to institute and prosecute, and the function of instituting and prosecuting, criminal proceedings, shall, with respect to such contributions and payments, be vested in and exercised by the Board of such officers and employees of the Board as it may designate therefor."

(d) Subsection (d) of section 9 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) All fines and penalties imposed by a court pursuant to this act and all criminal fines and criminal penalties imposed by a court with respect to the tax imposed under the Railroad Unemployment Tax Act (part II, subchapter B, chapter 9, Internal Revenue Code) shall be paid to the court and remitted from time to time by order of the judge to the Treasury of the United States to be credited to the account."

(e) Subsection (e) of section 12 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "refund" where it first appears in such subsection the words "under this act."

SAVING PROVISION

SEC. 205. Notwithstanding the amendment made by this act to subsection (g) of section 2 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, in any case in which the individual referred to in such subsection died before January 1, 1947, the accrued benefits referred to in such subsection shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of the subsection as it was in effect before it was amended by this act; and the references in that subsection, as it was in effect before such amendment, to sections 3 (f) and 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 shall be considered to be references to such sections as they were in force before the date on which title I of this act takes effect.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

INCREASE IN RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX RATES

Rate of employees' tax

SEC. 301. (a) Section 1500 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out clauses numbered 4 and 5 and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"4. With respect to compensation earned during the calendar year 1946, the rate shall be 3½ percent;

"5. With respect to compensation earned after December 31, 1946, the rate shall be 6 percent."

Rate of employee representatives' tax

(b) Section 1510 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out clauses numbered 4 and 5 and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"4. With respect to compensation earned during the calendar year 1946, the rate shall be 7 percent;

"5. With respect to compensation earned after December 31, 1946, the rate shall be 12 percent."

Rate of employers' tax

(c) Section 1520 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out clauses Nos. 4 and 5 and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"4. With respect to compensation paid to employees for services rendered during the calendar year 1946, the rate shall be 3½ percent;

"5. With respect to compensation paid to employees for services rendered after December 31, 1946, the rate shall be 6 percent."

RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT TAX

Technical amendments

SEC. 302. (a) Subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is further amended—

(1) By striking out the words and figures "Part I", "Part II", "Part III", and "Part IV" in the subheadings in such subchapter and by inserting in lieu thereof "Subpart I", "Subpart II", "Subpart III", and "Subpart IV", respectively;

(2) By striking out the word "subchapter" in the heading of section 1537 of such subchapter and by inserting in lieu thereof "part";

(3) By striking out the words "this subchapter" wherever they appear in such subchapter and by inserting in lieu thereof "this part";

(4) By inserting immediately after the heading of such subchapter the following new subheading:

"Part I—Railroad Retirement Tax Act";

(5) By adding at the end of such subchapter the following:

"SEC. 1538. Title of part.

"This part may be cited as the 'Railroad Retirement Tax Act'."

Railroad Unemployment Tax Act

(b) Subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Part II—Railroad Unemployment Tax Act

"SEC. 1550. Rate of tax on employers.

"In addition to other taxes, every employer shall pay an excise tax, with respect to having individuals in his service, equal to the percentages set forth in the following table of so much of the compensation as is not in excess of $300 for any calendar month payable by him to any employee for services rendered to him after December 31, 1946: *Provided, however,* That if compensation is payable to an employee by more than one employer with respect to any such calendar month, the tax imposed by this section shall apply to not more than $300 of the aggregate compensation payable to said employee by all said employers with respect to such calendar month, and each such employer shall be liable for that proportion of the tax with respect to such compensation which the amount payable by him to the employee with respect to such calendar month bears to the aggregate compensation payable to such employee by all employers with respect to such calendar month:

If the balance to the credit of the account as of the close of business on Sept. 30 of any year, as determined by the Secretary, is—	The rate with respect to compensation payable to employees for services rendered during the next succeeding calendar year shall be—
$350,000,000 or more	½ percent.
$300,000,000 or more but less than $350,000,000.	1 percent.
$250,000,000 or more but less than $300,000,000.	1½ percent.
$200,000,000 or more but less than $250,000,000.	2 percent.
$150,000,000 or more but less than $200,000,000.	2½ percent.
Less than $150,000,000.	3 percent.

On or before December 31, 1946, and on or before December 31 of each succeeding year, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the balance to the credit of the account as of the close of business on September 30 of such year.

"SEC. 1551. Adjustments.

"If more or less than the correct amount of the tax imposed by section 1550 is paid with respect to any compensation, then, under regulations made by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, proper adjustments with respect to the tax shall be made, without interest, in connection with subsequent payments of tax under this part made by the same employer.

"SEC. 1552. Overpayments and Underpayments.

"If more or less than the correct amount of the tax imposed by section 1550 is paid with respect to any compensation and the overpayment or underpayment of the tax cannot be adjusted under section 1551, the amount of the overpayment shall be refunded, or the amount of the underpayment shall be collected, in such manner and at such times (subject to the statute of limitations properly applicable thereto) as may be prescribed by regulations under this part as made by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary.

"SEC. 1553. Collection and Payment of Tax.

"(a) Administration: The tax imposed by this part shall be collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and shall be deposited by it with the Secretary, 90 percent thereof to the credit of the account and 10 percent thereof to the credit of the fund; except that 100 percent of the interest, civil fines, civil penalties, additional amounts, and additions to the tax, collected pursuant to this part, shall be credited to the account.

"(b) Time and manner of payment: The tax imposed by this part shall be collected and paid quarterly or at such other times and in such manner and under such conditions not inconsistent with this part as may be prescribed by regulations made by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary.

"(c) Addition to tax in case of delinquency: If the tax imposed by this part is not paid when due, there shall be added as part of the tax (except in the case of adjustments made in accordance with the provisions of section 1551) interest at the rate of 1 percent per month or fraction of a month from the date the tax became due until paid.

"(d) Fractional parts of a cent: In the payment of any tax under this part, a fractional part of a cent shall be disregarded unless it amounts to one-half cent or more, in which case it shall be increased to 1 cent.

"SEC. 1554. Definitions.

"As used in this part—

"(a) Employer: The term 'employer' means any carrier (as defined in subsection (b)), and any company which is directly or indirectly owned or controlled by one or more such carriers or under common control therewith, and which operates any equipment or facility or performs any service (except trucking service, casual service, and the casual operation of equipment or facilities) in connection with the transportation of passengers or property by railroad, or the receipt, delivery, elevation, transfer in transit, refrigeration or icing, storage, or handling of property transported by railroad, and any receiver, trustee, or other individual or body, judicial or otherwise, when in the possession of the property or operating all or any part of the business of any such employer: *Provided, however,* That the term 'employer' shall not include any street, interurban, or suburban electric railway, unles such railway is operating as a part of a general steam-railroad system of transportation, but shall not exclude any part of the general steam-railroad system of transportation now or hereafter operated by any other motive power. The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby authorized and directed upon request of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, or upon complaint of any party interested, to determine after hearing whether any line operated by electric power falls within the terms of this proviso. The term 'employer' shall also include railroad associations, traffic associations, tariff bureaus, demurrage bureaus, weighing and inspection bureaus, collection agencies, and other associations, bureaus, agencies, or organizations controlled and maintained wholly or principally by two or more employers as hereinbefore defined and engaged in the performance of services in connection with or incidental to railroad transportation; and railway labor organizations, national in scope, which have been or may be organized in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, and their State and national legislative committees and their general committees and their insurance departments and their local lodges and divisions, established pursuant to the constitution and bylaws of such organizations. The term 'employer' shall not include any company by reason of its being engaged in the mining of coal, the supplying of coal to an employer where delivery is not beyond the mine tipple, and the operation of equipment or facilities therefor, or in any of such activities.

"(b) Carrier: The term 'carrier' means an express company, sleeping-car company, or carrier by railroad, subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

"(c) Company: The term 'company' includes corporations, associations, and joint-stock companies.

"(d) Employee: The term 'employee' means any individual in the service of one or more employers for compensation: *Provided, however,* That the term 'employee' shall not include any individual in the service of a local lodge or division defined as an employer in subsection (a). The term 'employee' includes an officer of an employer. The term 'employee' shall not include any individual while such individual is engaged in the physical operations consistng of the mining of coal, the preparation of coal, the handling (other than movement by rail with standard railroad locomotives) of coal not beyond the mine tipple, or the loading of coal at the tipple.

"(e) Service: An individual is in the service of an employer whether his service is rendered within or without the United States if he is subject to the continuing authority of the employer to supervise and direct the manner of rendition of his service, which service he renders for compensation: *Provided, however,* That an individual shall be deemed to be in the service of an employer, other than a local lodge or division or a general committee of a railway-labor-organization employer, not conducting the principal part of its business in the United States only when he is rendering service to it in the United States; and an individual shall be deemed to be in the service of such a local lodge or division only if (1) all, or substantially all, the idividuals constituting its membership are employees of an employer conducting the principal part of its business in the United States; or (2) the headquarters of such local lodge or division is located in the United States; and an individual shall be deemed to be in the service of such a general committee only if (1) he is representing a local lodge or division described in clauses (1) or (2) immediately above; or (2) all, or substantially all, the individuals represented by it are employees of an employer conducting the principal part of its business in the United States; or (3) he acts in the capacity of a general chairman or an assistant general chairman of a general committee which represents individuals rendering service in the United States to an employer, but in such case if his office or headquarters is not located in the United States and the individuals represented by such general committee are employees of an employer not conducting the principal part of its business in the United States, only such proportion of the remuneration for such service shall be regarded as compensation as the proportion which the mileage in the United States under the jurisdiction of such general committee bears to the total mileage under its jurisdiction, unless such mileage formula is inapplicable, in which case such other formula as the Railroad Retirement Board may have prescribed pursuant to subsection (e) of section 1 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, shall be applicable: *Provided further,* That an individual not a citizen or resident of the United States shall not be deemed to be in the service of an employer when rendering service outside the United States to an employer who is required under the laws applicable in the place where the service is rendered to employ therein, in whole or in part, citizens or residents thereof.

"(f) Compensation: The term 'compensation' means any form of money remuneration earned by an individual for services rendered as an employee to one or more employers, including remuneration for time lost as an employee, but remuneration for time lost shall be deemed earned on the day on which such time is lost. Such term does not include tips, or the voluntary payment by an employer, without deduction from the remuneration of the employee, of the tax imposed on such employee by section 1500.

"(g) Account: The term 'account' means the railroad unemployment insurance account established pursuant to section 10 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, in the unemployment trust fund.

"(h) Fund: The term 'fund' means the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund established pursuant to section 11 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended.

"(i) United States: The term 'United States', when used in a geographical sense, means the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

"(j) State: The term 'State' means any of the States, Alaska, Hawaii, or the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 1555. Penalties.

"(a) Prohibition on deduction of tax: The tax imposed by this part shall not be deducted by the employer, in whole or in part, from the compensation of employees in his employ. Any employer, or officer or agent of an employer, who violates any provision of this subsection shall, upon conviction, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both.

"(b) Prohibition on requiring employee to bear tax: Any agreement by an employee to pay all or any portion of the tax imposed on his employer by this part shall be void, and it shall be unlawful for any employer, or officer or agent of an employer, to make, require, or permit any employee to bear all or any portion of such tax. Any employer, or officer or agent of an employer, who violates any provision of this subsection shall, upon conviction, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 1556. Rules and regulations.

"The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, shall make and publish such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of this part.

"SEC. 1557. Other laws applicable.

"All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable with respect to any tax imposed by section 2700 or section 1800, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this part, shall be applicable with respect to the tax imposed by this part.

"SEC. 1558. Title of part.

"This part may be cited as the 'Railroad Unemployment Tax Act'."

DEPOSIT OF COLLECTIONS

SEC. 303. Section 3971 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(4) Tax collected under Railroad Unemployment Tax Act: The gross amount of all taxes (including all interest, civil fines, civil penalties, additional amounts, and additions to the tax) collected pursuant to the Railroad Unemployment Tax Act shall be deposited directly with the Secretary, or with any Federal Reserve bank or member bank of the Federal Reserve System designated by him to receive such deposits, by the officer receiving or collecting the same, without any abatement or deduction on account of salary, compensation, fees, costs, charges, expenses, or claims of any description, to be credited in accordance with section 1553 (a)." A certificate of such deposit, stating the name of the depositor and the specific account on which the deposit was made, signed by the Secretary, designated depositary, or proper officer of a deposit bank, shall be transmitted to the Commissioner.

TITLE IV—EFFECTIVE DATES OF TITLES I AND II

SEC. 401. Titles I and II of this act shall take effect January 1, 1947.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and for other purposes."

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the sections of the committee substitute be considered seriatim for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In the event the committee substitute is adopted, then that may be considered as a separate amendment in the House; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. It is all one amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In the event it is adopted, it will be considered as a separate amendment in the House upon which a separate vote may be had?

The CHAIRMAN. If the committee substitute is adopted in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, the committee substitute will be reported to the House as an amendment to the bill.

Is there an amendment to be offered to section 1 of the committee substitute?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as an employee of the railroads in the past it has been my responsibility to be a witness in some railroad damage cases. I have always found very astute and adroit counsel on the railroads' side. I am reminded of that experience in considering the conditions met here in the House today. We are confronted with a very unique situation.

A perfecting amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act was introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] and was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That bill has been pending for over a year. I checked from time to time on the progress of that bill with its eminent author, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], and was assured that it was receiving consideration in the committee. It develops today that on both sides of the House in charge of the debate we find a preponderance of opponents of the Crosser bill. Under the parliamentary situation, which has been very astutely and adroitly managed, the real author of the bill is not in control of any time and has had very limited opportunity to present his case. None of the proponents of the bill have had a fair show here to speak in behalf of the bill. If we do not get in under the 5-minute rule and talk a little bit on the side of the railroad employees and the constructive provisions of the original bill and refute some of the exaggerated statements that have been made by the proponents of the opposition, the gentleman from California and others, then the case goes by default.

A minute ago a statement was made on the floor as to the money the railroads had to pay into the fund. I wonder how much money the Federal Government is paying into the retirement fund for Federal employees. Of the millions and billions that the taxpayers are paying into the Treasury of the United States, how much is set aside in the retirement fund for Federal employees?

I want to tell you something about the railroad men and the work they do and the conditions under which they work. The men who bring us into Washington on the transcontinental railroads, many of the conductors and trainmen on the B. & O., have homes at Garrett, Ind., and have to travel 100 miles to get home after making their run, they deadhead back 100 miles to get to their homes. Railroad men in the nature of their service are detached from their homes. They are in transit. They do not just serve during a war and get a liberal pension, after the war is over, they serve all the time. They have done a magnificent job in this war.

When I was a youth a railroad train consisted of 16 cars of 30,000 pounds capacity, manned by a crew of five men. Today there are about 120 cars of 80,000 and 100,000 pounds capacity, and it still requires only 5 men to handle a train. Jim Hill made the boast that he could start one of his big mammoth locomotives with a train from the east end of his line and run the engine into the bay at the west end of the line and not lose a dollar by the transaction. The freight charges on the trainload of freight would have paid for the new locomotive. I have seen many a poor old railroad man turned out to shift for himself after a lifetime of railroad service, too old to learn how to do anything else. There is a long story and a long record behind this bill. The Railroad Retirement Act was one of the most beneficial pieces of legislation ever enacted by Congress. Let us perfect it by passing the Crosser amendment. So I say vote down the committee bill and give the real bill—the Crosser bill—a chance.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that this somewhat complicated and confused legislative proposal should come to the floor with so much difference of opinion with respect to its contents, as well as its objectives.

We have before us H. R. 1362, submitted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], and described as the Crosser bill. Then we have a substitute by way of amendment supported by a majority of the committee having the legislation in charge. The proponents of the amended version claim the real objectives of railway employee organizations would be attained under the amended measure. Unfortunately, considerable discussion has been with regard to the manner in which the legislation has been handled rather than with respect to the legislation itself. It is unfortunate this legislation has been long delayed.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a very important legislative proposal. It

affects hundreds of thousands of employees, who have the tremendous, and in many cases hazardous, responsibility of carrying on the operation of the great railroad systems of this country. Many thousands of them work under trying conditions. Day and night, in heat and cold, in storms and sunshine, the trains must go.

This bill contains more than a hundred pages. I believe the legislation the rank and file of railroad employees really want, and which they should have, could be set out in a comparatively small bill. The proposals could be included in about four categories.

They want and should have more liberal and better protection for the widows of employees. They are willing to contribute to funds to provide better security for their families in event of death of employees. They want better protection in the way of annuities. They want a minimum of $50 per month retirement pay for lower-paid workers who have devoted the better part of their lives to the railroad service. Thousands now receive much less than $50 per month, but who spent long years in the service. Personally, I think there should be additional increases in annuities, than is now being paid to those who receive wages from $100, $200, and $300 per month. I shall discuss that point more fully later on.

Then a very important matter is to afford fair and proper protection for those who, through no fault of their own, become totally disabled before they reach the required age and years of service for retirement. They want to know that men disabled in service are not pushed aside because of technical or other reasons when they ought, as a matter of right, be allowed a fair pension. Men in railroad service, in so many instances, do hazardous work and want to be fairly protected.

They want to know the tax is sufficient to keep the railroad retirement system, as well as the unemployment insurance system solvent. They are willing to pay their share of the tax to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I think there are some provisions in the Crosser bill that could be omitted and thereby hold down a great deal of increased expense that is unnecessary. The maternity provision is expensive and could be omitted. I have talked to the author of the bill. He indicated he would not object to it being stricken out.

Employees under the Crosser bill who are not directly engaged in the railway service, such as employees who work for contractors engaged in icing cars, should be omitted from this legislation. Only those directly employed should be included in this proposal.

I would like to add parenthetically, that in discussing this problem with men in the railway service, some of them seem to feel that the Railway Retirement Act could be administered more economically. After all, it is a part of their contributions that is being used to carry out the terms of the act. It should be administered as economically as possible, giving consideration, of course, to proper service to the employees.

At the beginning of my statement, I called attention to increasing annuity benefits for retired railroad employees with average wages of $50 per month. In my studies of both the original Crosser bill and the bill reported by the committee, I notice there are no provisions which would increase annuity benefits for retired railroad employees with average wages of more than $50 per month. I mention the $50 average wages because of the proposed increased minimum annuity benefits in both proposals before us.

All employees are required to pay the same percentage of taxes on their wages, whether they average $25, $100, or $300 per month.

There is no good reason why the railroad employee who develops greater ability than one receiving a lower wage, or why one who assumes greater responsibility than the lower-paid worker, should not receive a more nearly uniform rate on the taxes he pays than is provided under the present act or either of the proposals submitted in the Crosser bill or the committee bill.

I have an amendment to be submitted at the proper time, that would help take care of this inequity. I understand the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], a member of the committee, has a similar amendment. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] will have prior right to the floor in the event he offers the amendment. I shall, of course, support it and I trust the membership on the floor will likewise support this worthy proposal. The matter was discussed before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by Mr. John T. Corbett, the very capable and able representative of the Railroad Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. This amendment, of course, will create some additional cost, but it is not large compared with the benefit derived therefrom, and it can be offset many times by the deletion of the so-called maternity amendment. As well as the deletion of the proposal to allow benefits to employees not directly connected with the railroad service.

The formulas or amendment I have in mind, to provide for increased benefits to those provided in the legislation before us, would read substantially as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) The annuity shall be computed by multiplying an individual's "years of service" by the following percentages of his "monthly compensation": 2 percent of the first $50; 1½ percent of the next $100; and 1 percent of the next $150.

Mr. Chairman, legislation on the matters outlined in my statement is long overdue. I trust there will be no unnecessary delay with respect to this legislation. We ought to deal with this problem fairly and constructively and try to do the right thing by the thousands of deserving people employed in the railroad service in this country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, for those of us who have worked with it, this has been a very difficult problem. As I stated when I addressed the House on the rule, heretofore this legislation has been enacted by Congress after agreement between the management and the men as to the terms. I might say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] that that situation did not exist with respect to this legislation. So of necessity, the responsibility devolved upon the committee to resolve the differences and to try to bring out a bill that was fair and right and defensible, and would do what the railroad men themselves wanted, having regard to the rights of other people interested in the railroad industry and to our economy and to our people generally.

I might also say to the gentleman from Kansas, if I understood him correctly, that the very things he said he found the railroad men wanted are substantially provided in the committee bill.

This proposal is before us by reason of the insistence of the railroad brotherhoods that consideration be given to it. You will find in the hearings that railroad management would have preferred that nothing be done about it. But the committee in that circumstance, has undertaken the job and I think has done a job that should commend itself to the membership of the House if you believe that the committee system is right and that fair and careful consideration was given to this measure.

Let me point out again to you that the committee bill was adopted in the committee by a vote of 15 to 6, which should be some indication of the support for it there.

The first thing we had to do was to raise enough taxes to make this retirement fund, as now constituted, solvent. We determined that it took 3 percent to do that. The Crosser bill said 1½ percent. I am thoroughly convinced that it takes 3 percent. In the absence of agreement, under which we might be relieved of a considerable share of the responsibility for making that determination, let me suggest we had better be sure, particularly in view of the fact that we are providing for increased benefits, that the rate to be applied is enough to make the present fund actuarially sound.

There are other reasons why there is a responsibility in connection with this legislation. This is a separate system for a separate group of employees. But bear in mind that at least insofar as that part of the fund contributed by the railroads is concerned, it represents a general charge on all of the public. I see the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee before me. That committee is now studying and trying to determine what generally should be done about social security. That is what this measure does for a particular segment of our country. The committee had to determine for itself, under its responsibility to the Congress, how far above the level of general social security should we make this pro-

gram? One representative of a large railroad brotherhood, Mr. Miller of the trainmen, appeared before the committee. I ask you to look on page 335 of the hearings. Here is what he said:

The CHAIRMAN. Would you consider that it is necessary or desirable to try to harmonize any social-security benefits established by this bill with the general social-security program of the country?

Mr. MILLER. Well, it is my personal opinion that we must not get too far out of line with the rest of the Nation, because if we do, there will be a lot of contention which should not exist.

I do not believe that the railroad empoyees, as railroad employees, are any better employees than the employees of any other industry. We work under peculiar circumstances; circumstances that are different; we have a different kind of work; but as one employee to the other, I think we are equal to any employee, but I do not and would not attempt to say we are better because we are railroad employees.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not claiming any special advantage over the general run of people of the Nation?

Mr. MILLER. No; no; definitely not.

The CHAIRMAN. I take it that you would not be in favor of a system that would cause a general agitation of discrimination in favor of railroad men insofar as the social-security program is concerned.

Mr. MILLER. I would not be in favor of anything that would cause any unfair discrimination as between employees of one industry over employees of another industry.

What were the things the gentleman from Kansas has talked about that these men say they wanted? One of the things they said they wanted was a higher minimum pension. Now, let us look at the Crosser bill. I wanted the gentleman from Ohio to yield to me in order that he could clarify some of these matters himself, but he would not yield and now I will try to clarify them as best I can.

Among the things the railroad workers said they wanted was a lower retirement age for women, that would entitle them to benefits after they had reached age 60. On that score the Crosser bill and the committee bill are exactly alike.

I realize that some Members are going to vote the way they feel and not the way they think, but I am telling you this is one of the very serious problems that confront us and I trust I can afford some enlightenment in my efforts. We have heard the criticism that the debate and argument had not been specific enough in the matter of pointing out the differences between the two bills. I shall do what I can to point out such differences.

The next thing the railroad workers said they wanted—and incidentally I have been riding trains many thousands of miles and I take advantage of every opportunity to talk with the men working on the trains or wherever I can find them to know just what their working conditions are and what they want—is pensions for widows and dependent children as a matter of right. The committee said, "All right, we will give them to you," and the provisions in the committee bill are the same as far as eligibilities are concerned in that regard as the Crosser bill.

There is this difference, and I bring it up in order that you can resolve it in your own minds. The Crosser bill would have provided approximately 25 percent higher benefits for the dependents of railroad workers than the provisions in the Social Security Act provide for workers generally. The committee thought that if we extended the benefits as wanted by the men but kept it at the level of the Social Security Act that would be sufficient; and that is what we have done.

There is another thing that the railroad men who have talked to me have said they wanted. They want something to protect them if they get knocked out, disabled as a result of their work on the railroad; so there are two provisions in the committee bill. One of them has to do with disability after 10 years of service for any occupation, and the other has to do with the payment after 20 years of service for disability that prevents a man from engaging in his regular occupation.

The Crosser bill would have provided a complete departure from every other similar governmental system about which I know, being one imposed by law on private employers, and if I am in error I ask anyone to correct me. It involves this departure, that instead of paying a man disability benefits for disability, sickness or accident arising out of and within the scope of his employment, the Crosser bill provides for this payment if a man were hurt in an automobile accident or, as his been pointed out, were injured as a result of his own misconduct or violation of the law. That is the issue. We are giving the men that additional protection that they said they wanted. The committee, in its wisdom and discretion, has seen fit to go to this extent.

Let me make the one additional point that under the sections of the bill having to do with the railroad retirement system, there is no provision in the Crosser bill that is not in considerable part met by the committee bill. So why all of this talk that the committee bill is worse than nothing? I say that you can go to your districts and talk to the men there who want some action, whose representatives wrote in their paper, Labor, a statement of the fundamental essential things that they wanted and point out to them in the committee bill the provisions that are in line with what they have been seeking. According to that article, here is what they say:

The extremely modest amendments proposed by the railroad unions are very briefly, but accurately, stated:

1. Widows of railroad workers are to have pensions as a matter of right. Such a provision is to be found in practically all modern social-security legislation. Nothing revolutionary about that.

2. A minimum pension of $50 a month is fixed for low-paid railroad workers who have devoted their lives to the industry. Thousands of them are now getting pensions of less than $50 a month.

3. The totally disabled railroad workers—the man who, because of what he gave to the industry, is no longer able to hold a job in the industry—is treated somewhat more generously than at present.

4. Finally, the tax is increased so as to make the Railroad Retirement System, as well as the Railroad Unemployment Insurance System, absolutely sound. The figures in every instance are based on the advice of the most competent actuaries in this country.

These are the essential amendments. There are other slight changes, but they are not important.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal from the opponents of the Crosser bill who are now proposing the committee amendment, to the effect that the Crosser bill is not workable, to the effect, as the chairman of our committee said, the Crosser bill would undermine and do great damage to social security in this country. Those statements should be taken in light of the opinion of those who are administering and will continue to administer the Railroad Retirement Act and I think their opinion should have great weight with us in determining whether or not we should adopt the Crosser bill or the committee bill.

May I call your attention to a speech made by Mr. William J. Kennedy, Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, which he delivered as late as May 23, 1946. This speech appears in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A3604. Mr. Kennedy in his speech discussed various problems in respect to railroad employees. He pointed out the problems of retirement, pensions, and so forth, the very matters with which we seek to deal by this legislation.

Let us see specifically what he says in respect to the Crosser bill. He stated as follows:

As I said earlier, the solution to these problems requires congressional action.

On that we all agree.

I understand that Congressman CROSSER, of Ohio, has introduced a bill which would not only take care of all the difficulties I have just enumerated, but also many other difficulties which I have had as yet no opportunity to learn much about in the short period I have held office.

I understand also that the Railroad Retirement Board is officially on record as favoring the enactment of the Crosser bill. I take this opportuity to say that I am heartily in favor of it myself, that had I been a member of the Board at the time the Board made its recommendation on this bill, I would have been very glad to join in the Board's recommendation. The bill, as I understand it, has been reported out, in a drastically amended form, by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the House itself.

That is the statement of William J. Kennedy, Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board. That is the Board that has been administering the railroad retirement legislation. That is the Board that is going to administer this bill, whether it passes in the Crosser form or in the committee form. He is giving you the opinion of real experts. He is giving you the opinion based on the experience of the Board, and I submit that this is a complete answer to all of the flagrant and frivolous criticisms that have been made here today against the Crosser bill.

I do hope that the members of the committee will give weight and consid-

eration to the opinion of the Railroad Retirement Board as well as to the expression in support of the Crosser bill given by its chairman.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said here this afternoon about all the railroad men being in favor of the Crosser bill. When the committee had its hearings, Mr. Miller, representing the trainmen, and Mr. Corbett, representing the engineers, appeared before the committee. May I not just briefly give you some idea of the statements that they made, and especially in regard to the retirement fund. Though now these organization engineers and trainmen are for the Crosser bill.

Mr. Corbett said—

have one general rule which train service employees are required to become familiar with and which they are required to follow. It is as follows: Safety is given first consideration. This statement is presented to your committee with the hope that the safety of the funds of the Railroad Retirement Act may be considered as of first consideration in its consideration of this legislation. I submit further the opinion that any proposal to gamble with the funds of the Railroad Retirement Act merits thoughtful attention and consideration.

I could give you other passages from these two men and statements that were made by them. That was the first thing in the hearings that called it to my attention, when Mr. Latimer came before the committee and said that the present retirement fund was not actuarily sound; that it would take one and one-half percent of the pay roll to make it sound.

Furthermore, Mr. Williamson, who was quoted here this afternoon, said it would take probably 4 percent. I call this to your attention because in this Crosser bill, which the committee substitute is offered for, Mr. Latimer himself proposed 76 amendments. Neither did we hear a single one of those amendments offered in committee by any of the proponents of the Crosser bill, nor did we hear of any amendments reducing the coverage under the Crosser bill, which takes in many, many, many thousands and maybe hundreds of thousands of peoples on the outside.

I say to you in all sincerity that this committee worked hard and long. Of course, some of these gentlemen who do not belong to the committee are telling what we did, as one did a few minutes ago. Ignorance is perfect bliss.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the 90 or 76 amendments—the number changes—about which the opposition talks, are a few, with a few exceptions, merely corrections in language. There are very few amendments of a substantive nature, and the talk of almost a hundred amendments is balderdash. I was responsible for some of the changes in language. It has seemed to me proper that the text of bills should be in good English. Some friend who knows my views on that subject, apparently prompted the chief lawyer of the railroads to speak slightingly of what he inferred were trivial changes. Considerable of his time was devoted to the fact that corrections of English had been made. Some of the committee opposed to the bill have spoken of having spent a great deal of time at meetings of the committee in reference to H. R. 1362. I can say that I was more constantly present at meetings concerning the bill than any other member of the committee. Moreover, since they have raised the question, I may say that I spent many hours of my time in the committee room awaiting action.

Coming now to the subject of the tax, let me call attention to the fact that it would be humanly impossible, regardless of mathematical ability, to determine upon a tax for the future that would be exactly correct—neither too high nor too low. I have talked with experts on the subjects of retirement and insurance, and they say that Mr. Latimer, who in 1937 was compelled to recommend a schedule of rates for a period of many years, was remarkably accurate in his proposals, in view of the fact that only 1½ percent additional tax is required to put the retirement fund in proper balance.

Now, as to the professional standing of Mr. Latimer, let me call attention to the fact that Mr. Latimer's entry into the Government service was due to the influence of Mr. Joseph Eastman. I am sure that every Member of Congress who knows or knows of Mr. Eastman regarded him as the outstanding authority on transportation, and his passing from this earthly scene was a serious loss to the public.

I repeat that students of the subjects of retirement and insurance regard as remarkable the fact that after 10 years the fund is within 1½ percent of being exactly in balance. In fact, some refer to Mr. Latimer's achievement as marvelous.

Actuaries employed by private concerns have heretofore felt it necessary to keep in mind profits for their employer. As a consequence, such an actuary, in order to make sure of a proper profit for his employer, naturally is disposed to propose rates that are somewhat higher than is ultimately found to be necessary.

In a statutory system, however, if we provide for a tax that is too high, then the workers who are subject to the retirement system at the time such rates are established will be paying part of the cost—all of which should be paid by those becoming subject to the retirement system in the future. If we make the rate too small, then those coming after will pay part of the cost which should be paid in full by those in service at present. It would be impossible to establish a rate for a dozen years in the future that would be absolutely accurate, but I repeat that Mr. Latimer's calculations of 10 years ago as to the amount needed today for the railroad retirement fund was almost a miracle as to accuracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSSER. Again let me say that if we establish unnecessarily high rates for the present, we must not forget we shall be compelling railroad workers engaged in railroading today to pay a part of the cost for benefits for persons entering the railroad service in the future. That would be wrong. It is just as bad to have rates of assessment too high as to have them too low. One and one-half percent is considered by Mr. Latimer, an outstanding authority on retirement systems, and by Mr. Booth, the actuary employed for 30 years by Travelers Insurance Co. I have also called your attention to the testimony of Mr. Williamson, actuary for the Social Security Board.

My friends, one of the committee members opposing this measure has inferred that the railroad men desire to have the cost of the railroad retirement system assumed by the Government. Nothing could be further from the fact than such a statement. The fact is this is the outstanding retirement system in the United States. The men pay one-half and the companies pay the other half of the cost of maintaining the system and the Government does not pay one penny. The railroad workers do not expect that the Government will ever pay part of the cost. They do not desire to have the Government pay any part of the cost. They are glad to pay what they now pay, 3½ percent, and they are more than pleased to pay the additional assessment necessary to pay their share of the cost of maintaining the railroad retirement system. The real aim of the opposition has not been stressed. If we adopt this monstrosity, the substitute, we shall be reducing the present railroad unemployment insurance tax, which is a fair tax. The unemployment insurance tax has been 3 percent from the beginning of the railroad unemployment insurance system in 1938. With rare exceptions, unemployment systems are maintained solely by a tax on the employer. The opposition proposes to reduce the tax from 3 to one-half of 1 percent on the ground that there is now a large unemployment insurance fund which has accumulated in recent years. During the war employment was so constant that few, if any, payments of unemployment benefits were paid. It is during prosperous times that employment insurance taxes should be levied, for when times are hard it is difficult to pay the taxes, and yet it is just when times are hard and involuntary unemployment is greatest that the need for unemployment benefits is greatest. What the opposition apparently has in mind is to relieve the railroads of 2½ percent of the pay-roll tax now paid for unemployment insurance. Two and a half percent of the pay-roll tax is what the bill proposes as the increase which both employees and the railroads deem necessary to pay the additional bene-

fits provided by the amendments of the retirement law.

If the employers should be relieved of 2½ percent of the pay-roll tax for unemployment insurance, that 2½ percent reduction in the unemployment insurance tax would pay the 2½ percent pay-roll tax which the bill provides as the employers' contribution to pay for the increased benefits provided by the amendments of the railroad retirement law. The result of such an amendment of the bill would be to add 2½ percent to the tax to be paid, under the bill, by the employees while the railroads would not be paying into the retirement fund $1 more than they now pay.

We have heard much about collective bargaining as the proper method of determining upon the terms of the bill to be enacted by the Congress. They cite to us the amendment of the railroad retirement law in 1937. That amendment provided for the payment of the benefits which the retired workers had been receiving from the railroads under the gratuity plans which the railroads established prior to the enactment of the railroad unemployment insurance law and also provided that the railroad employees would not undertake to have enacted legislation that would change the proportion paid by the employees and employers alike to maintain the retirement system. The railroads agreed not to question, in the courts, the constitutionality of the statute. Personally, I did not approve of the agreement for several reasons. The chief inducement urged for the making of the agreement was that it would avoid the questioning of the constitutionality of the statute. I was, however, confident that the Supreme Court would hold the 1935 act constitutional and felt that it was unwise to make the agreement to which reference has been made,

The Supreme Court did hold to be constitutional the social-security law and there was absolutely no difference in principle between that law and the railroad-retirement law. The only promise made by the representatives of the employees was that they would not ask for any change in the proportion of the taxes to be paid by them and the railroads. The employees say now that they will not ask for such a change.

Mr. Chairman, as I have heretofore pointed out during the discussion of this bill, the railroads have almost always opposed reforms, notwithstanding the fact that they were greatly benefited by the operation of the same. Early in this discussion I gave a partial list of such acts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, everyone concedes that social-security legislation should not be allowed to remain static; that from time to time such legislation as we have in the Railroad Retirement Act should be adjusted and improved upon. However, I do not think the committee amendment would be a very great improvement. There is an attempt here today to convey the impression that both the Railroad Retirement Board and the brotherhoods, if you please, favor the committee amendment. Nothing could be further from the facts in the case. The distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], offered the argument that it would not be wise for the House to reject the recommendations of a committee. You and I know that we do that every day in the week. The fact that a committee brings in a bill is not an all-compelling reason for the House to accept it. There is nothing sacrosanct about the recommendations of a committee, as we witnessed right here today when the House by an overwhelming vote rejected entirely a bill which was brought to the floor of the House by a committee. That happened today. There is no argument at all to say that the recommendations of a committee are the wise ones.

Mr. CROSSER's name is on this bill. There is a great deal of confusion as to what we should vote for if we are desirous of achieving certain objectives. Let me say with regard to those who attempt to convey the impression that what the brotherhoods' objectives are embodied in the committee amendment, last week a committee of 3 representing 21 brotherhoods in my State of Pennsylvania came to me and said emphatically that they, representing their bodies, were authorized to say the brotherhoods were wholeheartedly in favor of the Crosser bill and the amendments which he would propose to that. The parliamentary situation, if we wish to consider the Crosser bill, must be brought about through the defeat of the committee amendment.

The distinguished gentleman from Ohio who has labored long and arduously on behalf of the railroad employees of this country has several amendments he proposes to offer to his original bill. They are not applicable to the bill the committee seeks to substitute if they are successful in striking out all after the enacting clause. To be able to give consideration to his amendments we must go back to a situation where his bill will be before the Committee of the Whole. To do that we must vote down the committee amendment. I hope the Members will vote down the committee amendment so we can consider the Crosser bill and that it will then be in order for any amendments that even the committee wishes to present.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. CROSSER. I propose to offer amendments to my own bill, one to remove this entire maternity coverage; and others.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. But the gentleman cannot do that unless his bill can be brought before the Committee of the Whole for amendment. To do that we will have to vote down the present committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT FUND

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, is the Railroad Retirement System what railroad employees have been told and believe it to be?

Is the manner of financing it sound?

Do railroad employees have a real reserve, in the form of a trust fund, in the United States Treasury?

Is the Railroad Retirement System an independent service separate from the so-called social-security plan?

The politicians in control of the Government since the passage of the Railroad Retirement Act have assured railroad employees that they have a genuine retirement plan, soundly financed in every way, amply supported by a well-guarded and administered trust fund, and that it is set up independently of the so-called social-security or other Federal retirement plan.

The Railroad Retirement Board, in its annual reports, paints a glowing picture for railroad employees. It presents elaborate tables and charts to show employee annuities, pensions, and survivor benefits currently disbursed and accruing for future payments.

On the surface the plan has a good appearance. The trouble is, railroad employees do not get the whole picture, and what is given them is greatly distorted. I think it is high time that the mask be torn from this so-called railroad-retirement plan so that the railroad employees may know just what it really is.

The fact is that when this plan is carefully examined it will be seen that it is more particularly a scheme to tax railroad employees and employers to pay Government operating costs than a retirement plan. This will no doubt come as a surprise to most railroad employees and may be difficult for some of them to believe. Nevertheless, from my study of this subject I am convinced that this is a fact. How any unbiased and disinterested person can really think this subject through and come to any other conclusion is difficult to conceive.

From the time the railroad-retirement plan went into effect in 1937 through March 1946 the Government collected from railroad employees and railroad companies taxes for the retirement account amounting to $1,742,500,000. During this time it collected from the general public, of which railroad employees form a part, and therefore must help to pay hidden in the prices they pay for the necessaries of life, taxes for the "interest" on their so-called trust fund amounting to $43,800,000. A total of $1,786,272,000.

Of this amount, $1,064,500,000, or approximately 59 percent, went for current benefits; $642,000,000, or approximately 36 percent, remained in the Treasury and

was spent for general Government operating purposes; $24,672,000, which equals about 2.3 percent of the benefit payments, was used for administrative expenses. The balance, $55,200,000, remains in the General Fund and disbursing officers' account.

Railroad employees are told by the politicians in Washington that this $642,000,000 is a reserve, that they, acting as trustee for the railroad employees, hold it as a trust fund, and that it draws 3 percent compound interest. They are also told that this reserve is available at all times in the future to be drawn upon as need arises.

As a matter of fact, railroad employees have no such trust fund in the Treasury. Virtually all they have to show for this $642,000,000 is an I O U which appears on the books of the Treasury as a credit for Government securities.

Railroad employees have been given the impression that after they have been taxed 3½ percent of their wages—the amount was less to start with—that they were through contributing to their retirement plan. In this they are mistaken. They must continue to pay and pay and pay. Furthermore, they do not realize that they are being heavily taxed to pay for so-called social security old-age and survivors' insurance and civil-service annuities. But more on this subject later.

For the moment, it is important for the railroad employees to realize that they have irretrievably lost a large part, perhaps most, of this $642,000,000. They will receive what is called interest on this amount, a part of which, as just stated, they themselves will have to pay. But the principal involved has been spent by the Government, permanently sunk into political ventures of one kind or another.

Designating this $642,000,000 a reserve has given railroad employees a grossly false impression. Many of them have been led to believe that this so-called reserve actually composes the money they and their employers paid into the account. They do not know that this money has been used up to pay Government expenses. Very few realize that since this money has been so spent that the general tax which must be levied upon the public to replace any portion of the $642,000,000 that might be needed to meet benefit payments, will partly fall upon their own shoulders. They have no realization whatever that they will be compelled to pay twice for a goodly portion of any retirement benefits they will ultimately receive. This point will be developed more fully later. For the moment it is necessary to understand that this $642,000,000 is not a true reserve.

It is a political and not an economic concept to regard the taxes collected from railroad employees and the carriers which are paid into the Treasury and disbursed by it for operating the Government as a trust fund. There is nothing about the transaction which has any of the characteristics of what has commonly been considered a trust fund.

Black's Law Dictionary defines a trust fund as follows:

> A fund held by a trustee for the specific purpose of the trust; in a more general sense, a fund which, legally or equitably, is subject to be devoted to a particular purpose and cannot or should not be diverted therefrom.

Certainly railroad retirement taxes which the Government appropriates to its own use cannot even be said to be held by it, much less held by it as trustee for any specific purpose. The specific purpose for which the politicians in control of the Government are supposed to hold these funds, and for which railroad employees believe they are held, is retirement benefits, assuredly not to pay operating expenses of the Government.

Funk & Wagnall's Standard Dictionary defines the term "investment" as "the act of investing capital productively, also the money so invested, or the property so produced."

It would be the height of absurdity to pretend that this money is productively invested, in any commonly accepted sense of the term as it is used in connection with trust funds. This money is spent for political or other nonproductive purposes, and in a vast number of cases of the most destructive kind.

Here is what really happens: The administration in charge of the Government taxes railroad employees and employers, ostensibly to provide such employees with a retirement system. As a part of the scheme it pretends to invest that portion of such taxes not used to pay administrative costs and to meet current benefit payments in a trust fund.

But the administration spends this money to pay general debts incurred in the operation of various governmental functions. It simply uses the money to wipe out a certain amount of current general public indebtedness and creates in its place a like amount of long-term special public indebtedness.

Instead of taxing the general public to pay $642,000,000 of current operating debts the administration in charge of the Government taxes a special group, railroad employees and employers, to pay such debts.

In the guise of providing a retirement system for railroad employees the forces in control of the Government tapped a new source of revenue to provide them with more spending money.

Without the Railroad Retirement Act the administration would have been compelled to either reduce the general operating costs of the Government by $642,000,000, a dire necessity, or tax the general public for this amount.

With this act they have been relieved of that difficulty. They just "borrowed" possibly, in perpetuity, from railroad employees $642,000,000 with which to pay off an equal amount of current general public indebtedness. But whether to the end of time or not the net effect upon the pocketbooks of railroad employees would eventually be the same.

It is crazy to talk about this being a trust fund. It is nothing of the sort in any sense of the term. Who ever heard of a trust fund where the trustee was permitted, even authorized, to spend all of the capital placed in his custody to discharge the fund's operating debts, yet paid interest on such outlay?

The all-important consideration in placing one's money in a trust fund is the safety of the principal. A trust fund that swallows up the money entrusted to its care, like the Government swallows up the taxes which it collects from railroad employees and employers, just is no trust fund.

Nor is a trust fund such in reality unless the capital entrusted to it is put to productive use. That is the sine qua non, the thing absolutely necessary to make it a trust fund.

It is the rule rather than the exception for government debt to be wealth destroying. That is why it should be prohibited as much as possible. This is basic to the preservation and maintenance of a sound social and economic body; that is, a free economy.

It cannot be too much impressed upon wage earners and the lower income groups in general that they are the ones who always feel most the evil effects of extravagant governments.

Overspending by governments always leads to currency disorders, than which there is no greater curse upon the working people and poor. Later I shall show how this is destroying the value of the railroad men's pension dollar.

When one purchases an endowment policy from a life-insurance company the premiums one pays in go into productive enterprise. They are used to produce tangible wealth. The public benefits by the newly created wealth, the company receives compensation for its service in putting the premiums paid in to work, and the holder of the policy receives compensation in the form of dividends for the use of his money. Thus we see all parties concerned benefit by the transaction.

The premiums, capital, paid on an endowment policy are always safe and can be recovered by the policyholder, if the insurance company is sound and solvent. Here are embodied the principles of a true trust fund.

But not so with the money paid into the Railroad Retirement Account. No new wealth whatever is created. In fact, this money is in the first instance in large measure taken out of productive enterprise and then put into wholly unproductive Government projects. This point is vital.

I cannot conceive any justification for ever taking capital out of productivity and putting it into unproductivity. Yet, that is precisely what is done when the Government taxes railroad employees and employers in the guise of providing a pension system, and uses such tax receipts to pay its operating costs.

It may be thought that this is applicable to all taxes, which is not true. It is applicable only to those taxes which are exacted from the people to maintain a surplusage of Government. Taxes to maintain the necessary forces to protect us from external aggression, to adequately preserve order and provide justice internally cannot be said to be taken out of productive use and put into unproductive use. But the taxes imposed to maintain a Federal bureaucracy with millions of employees, and to provide the enormous amount of political pork that is annually dispensed, are taken out of productivity and put to unproductive use, and with respect to a great portion of

governmental activities to the most destructive kind of use.

Certainly one of the major elements of the underlying disease which afflicts the Nation today is that capital has so largely been taken out of productive use and put to political use, that is unproductive and destructive use. I am not necessarily referring to the use to which capital has been and is being put in the production of war materials and the maintenance of military forces, though this has recently been playing the dominant role in diverting capital from productive to nonproductive use. The political process of abstracting capital from productive use and applying it to nonproductive governmental projects has been insidiously developing for many years. One of the outstanding developments in this respect was the institution in 1916 of the graduated income tax. This has been a most powerful cause in destroying capital formation, to the detriment of the Nation as a whole, though perhaps falling most heavily upon the laboring classes and the poor.

We mentioned that railroad employees must bear a portion of the interest charge on their so-called trust fund. This is comparatively small, but the aggregate over the years will amount to a substantial sum. This will be appreciated more fully later as we consider the size this account is ultimately expected to reach.

But this is, as already stated, not the only tax railroad employees will be compelled to pay in addition to their 3½ percent contribution.

Railroad employees have prided themselves on having their own retirement system, separate from and independent of the Social Security or any other Federal retirement plan. But the distinction they make is a superficial one. They have their own agency, the Railroad Retirement Board, to administer their benefits, but that is all.

What really counts is the financial structure of the plan, and who manages the financing. When these features of the scheme are examined it will be seen that the Railroad Retirement Plan rests on substantially the same basis as the social security and civil service retirement plans.

The management of the finances of all three is in the hands of the politicians who happen to be in the control of the Government.

All the taxes which the Government collects under these plans go into a common pool along with all other Federal taxes, namely, the General Fund of the Treasury.

Like the taxes collected for railroad retirement benefits, all the taxes collected for social security and Federal civil service retirement benefits, except those required for administrative costs and current benefit payments, are spent by the Government for general operating purposes, and there is nothing to show for these contributions but I O U's.

Just as railroad employees are told that they have a reserve in the form of a trust fund in the Treasury which draws interest and can be resorted to at any time in the future to provide retirement and other benefits, so persons coming under the so-called social-security old-age and survivors insurance and the civil service annuity plans are told the same thing.

As in the case of railroad employees who are assured that a tax of 3 percent compound interest on their so-called reserve or trust fund will be levied upon the public to build it up, so also those coming under these other plans have a like assurance.

In the case of social security, the tax would be equal to more than 2 percent compound interest, and in that of the civil service annuity plan 4 percent compound interest, on the respective amounts of funds paid into these accounts.

The point here is that railroad employees are not only being taxed, through hidden taxes added to the necessaries of life, to help pay the interest on their own false trust fund, but they are also being taxed in the same way to help pay the interest on the illusory trust funds held by the Treasury for employees covered under social-security and the Federal civil-service retirement plans. They are further being taxed, in the form of hidden taxes on the necessaries of life they buy, to provide the contributions made by their own employers and those coming under social security. And they are being taxed to pay the 8-percent contribution which the Government makes toward the civil-service retirement plan.

Thus, we see that all of these plans are but parts of a whole. It is through the payment of consumer taxes by the public that employers coming under the Railroad Retirement and Social Security Acts are provided with the funds to make their contributions to the retirement plans provided by such acts. This feature alone strongly identifies these plans with each other.

To understand the railroad retirement system it is necessary to study it in connection with the social-security plan and also the Federal civil-service retirement system.

We stated that railroad employees have nothing to show for the $642,000,000 which they and their employers paid into the Treasury and which was used to pay Government expenses but an I O U; that is, a credit on the books of the Treasury for $642,000,000 of Government securities. Now it is claimed this credit is a true reserve, that it can be converted into cash at any time by actually issuing the securities and selling them to investors. That is, the Government could levy a general tax upon the public to raise the cash to replenish the railroad retirement account, because selling to investors the securities held against the $642,000,000 is, as previously stated, only deferred taxation.

This raises the important question as to who composes the public. Just who are the folks that will have to pay the taxes to replenish the spent funds of the railroad retirement, social security old age, and unemployment and civil service annuity accounts when it becomes necessary to restore the funds to such accounts to meet required benefit payments? But before answering this question let us be sure that we have a clear understanding as to just how the several beneficiary groups coming under these plans provide the taxes which the employers pay into these retirement accounts and also the so-called interest which the public pays on these accounts.

It is very important that railroad employees fully understand that the taxes which railroad companies contribute to their retirement account are not really paid by them. Those taxes are shifted on to shippers and others who use their services. In turn they are passed on to distributors, wholesalers, retailers, and so forth, and finally charged to the consuming public.

The same is true, of course, with respect to the taxes paid into the social-security account by producers of raw materials, manufacturers, and the several handlers involved in getting finished products to their ultimate destination where the consumer finally takes over the tax load. That these taxes are ultimately paid by the consuming public is not theory but obvious fact.

The dollars which railroad employees and the employees coming under social security and Federal civil service pay out for the necessaries of life, food, clothing, shelter, heating, lighting, telephone service, automobiles, and so forth, contain, hidden from the eye, taxes which railroad employers pay into the railroad retirement account, and which employers in manufacturing, processing, utility, and other plants pay into the social-security account. Some but not all of the taxes paid into the Federal civil-service annuity account are provided through consumer taxes.

There are about 1,500,000 railroad employees covered under the Railroad Retirement Act, and 40,000,000 fully covered and a great many more partially covered under the so-called Social Security Act. It will be seen that these groups form a large part of the taxpaying public.

It is unnecessary to speculate on the relative amount of consumer taxes these groups pay. But the proportion is so great as to make it practically impossible for railroad employees over the years to receive in the form of retirement and other benefits as much, or perhaps nearly as much, as they originally paid in.

Under the Railroad Retirement Act, employers and employees each have been paying into the retirement account from 2¾ to 3½ percent of the pay roll. Employers have been paying into the unemployment fund 3 percent of the pay roll. Employees do not contribute to the unemployment fund.

Under the Social Security Act, employers and employees each pay into the old-age and survivors' insurance fund 1 percent of the pay roll. Employers pay into the unemployment fund 3 percent of the pay roll. Employees do not contribute to the unemployment fund.

Under the Federal Civil Service Retirement Act, the Government—taxpayers—which means you, now contributes approximately 8 percent of the Federal pay roll to the civil-service retirement fund, while the employees contribute only 5 percent. Civil-service employees have no unemployment fund.

To what extent have railroad employees, as well as those covered under

so-called Social Security and the Federal Civil Service Retirement System, already been bound by the Government to pay twice for the retirement and other benefits promised them, or been obligated to pay considerably more than they have been led to believe was their only contribution?

How much taxes has the Government collected from these groups for such benefits, but spent on itself? How much in I. O. U's has the Government exchanged for this cash? Following are some revealing figures and were as of March 31, 1946:

So-called trust funds held by the Treasury	
Railroad retirement trust fund	$642,000,000
Federal old-age and survivors' insurance	7,224,400,000
Unemployment trust funds (includes railroad unemployment fund, Federal and State unemployment funds under Social Security Act)	7,378,200,000
Federal civil-service retirement fund	2,159,900,000
Total	17,404,400,000

Railroad employees and their employers, industrial workers coming under social security and their employers, Federal employees and the Government—taxpayers—have already paid around $17,400,000,000 in taxes for retirement and other benefits which the Government has spent for other purposes.

The employees who contributed a large part of this sum, and for whose benefit the remainder was contributed, have nothing but I O U's from the Government to show that this money has been handed over to it.

The Government must this year collect taxes from the public in an amount equal to approximately 2.3 percent of $17,400,000,000 or more than $400,000,000. Railroad employees will have to pay their share of this in the form of hidden taxes.

But we are only at the beginning of the program. How much more will the employees and employers coming under the several Federal Government retirement plans have to hand over to the Government to finance its operating costs?

Railroad employees and employers have already directly paid taxes to the Government which it has spent for operating purposes amounting to $642,000,000—minus $43,000,000 which was collected from the public and paid into the account as interest. It is my understanding that the present Railroad Retirement System is insolvent. I also have information that the System would be insolvent if the Crosser amendments were passed.

Suppose the committee amendments should pass. The railroad employees and employers would each have to pay 2½ percent more than they are now contributing. According to the actuarial studies made in connection with the committee bill, with this increased cost of 5 percent for employees and employers combined, the railroad retirement account would ultimately reach a figure of between $10,000,000,000 and $15,000,000,000!

Railroad employees would be bound to pay in direct and hidden taxes more than half of this $10,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000 to the Government which would be spent by it for operating purposes. In any event railroad employees would accumulate a total of I O U's amounting to between $10,000,000,000 and $15,000,000,000.

The Social Security Board in its actuarial study No. 19 estimates the amount of social-security taxes that may be required to keep this account solvent will ultimately reach a figure of $92,000,000,000. Workers coming under social security would finally have an accumulation of I O U's amounting to the above figure because the Government will have spent the money for operating purposes.

It is my understanding that the so-called civil-service trust fund will reach a figure of approximately $5,000,000,000 before it begins to level off. Civil-service employees will then have an I O U to that amount because here again the Government will have spent this money on itself.

It will be noted that civil-service employees have a great advantage over railroad employees and those coming under social security because the Government's—taxpayers'—share of this is so much greater than that of the civil-service employees. The Government pays 8 percent while employees pay only 5.

Then there is the so-called unemployment trust fund composing the railroad unemployment insurance account and the State unemployment insurance activities account, which amounts to roundly $7,500,000,000. No one can know how much higher this debt will go.

Here, then, we have projected a total of, say, $120,000,000,000 of Federal debt which is to serve as a financial foundation for the Railroad Retirement System, social-security and old-age-survivors' insurance, and civil-service annuity plans.

Security for aged railroad employees resting upon a $120,000,000,000 nonproducing debt.

With all deference to the thinking of those who contrived this scheme, to me it appears so fantastic and irrational that I cannot conceive how it was possible that it ever saw the light of day. The only security a public debt such as this could possibly provide would be political security.

To be sure the argument runs that the Government merely borrows these funds from railroad employees and other employees coming under these retirement plans, that if it did not borrow from such employees it would be compelled to borrow from the general public. So we are told that the indebtedness of the Government would be the same in either event.

This is, of course, a specious argument and can come only from an unwise and improvident personnel in control of the Government, from one that is forever running the Government into debt. The very idea of deliberately planning to create a public debt of $120,000,000,000 in and of itself conclusively proves this, in my judgment.

It should be borne in mind that the war had nothing to do with the planning of this debt. It was planned when the railroad retirement and social security plans were set up, which was years before the war.

A frugal and judicious government would know that a large public debt, regardless of the purpose for which it might be created, can never be a benefit to a nation as a whole or to a substantial portion of the community like that composing the groups coming under the several retirement plans here under consideration. Such a government would be aware that a large public debt is always a menace to the general welfare and would strenuously discountenance its creation.

Of course, those railroad employees who happen to be old enough to retire and to exercise their pension rights during the earlier part of this retirement plan will seemingly fare pretty well. This aspect of the plan is very deceptive. The impression is given that future benefits will be the same as they are now. This is altogether out of the question. As time goes on the net returns to retired railroad employees must necessarily continuously diminish.

Even those who are already on the retired list are not as well off as it might appear. They are finding it difficult to make ends meet with the income they derive from the retirement system. The cost of living is constantly rising. The dollars which were paid into the retirement plan have since the start of it been steadily losing in value or purchasing power. The tax dollar collected from railroad employees for the retirement fund during the first few years after the plan was put into operation will purchase no more than 60 cents worth of what they did then.

This loss of purchasing power of the dollar will obviously have an important bearing upon future retirement benefits. How long the dollar will continue to lose in buying power before it becomes stabilized, there is no way of telling. Present indications are that this can continue for many years. This will strongly operate to further reduce the net benefits accruing to railroad employees under their so-called retirement system.

We should pause here for a moment to meditate on why the dollar is losing its purchasing power. We need not go into details. The steady loss of purchasing power which the dollar is undergoing is directly caused by the Government's policy of financing Government deficits with printing-press money. The banks alone hold more than $100,000,000,000 of this printing-press money. There is very much more than this in existence. It is this enormous volume of Government printing-press money which really constitutes inflation. Rising prices are but a symptom of inflation. This ought to explain why some Members of Congress have worked so strenuously to stop deficit financing and make the men in control of the Government live within the income they derive from taxes. Here is to be found the reason why those men in Congress believe they are on the side of

the working people and poor—when they insist upon economy in Government spending.

After all the financial structure of the Railroad Retirement System can be no sounder than that of the Government itself. Inevitably, also, the finances of the Government can be no sounder than the dollar. Printing-press dollars are not sound dollars.

It would be unfair on my part as Representative to Congress not to mention that farmers, self-employed, and others not covered by any of these Federal retirement systems, help to pay in the form of consumer taxes the contributions which railroad and other employees pay into the accounts of such plans. They must likewise also help to pay the so-called interest on the several so-called retirement funds.

Why should these citizens who derive no return whatsoever from these plans be compelled to support them in this manner? I am sure that railroad employees do not wish this. Few, if any, of them even know that this is taking place. Such an injustice as this cannot be condoned by any fair-minded and honest person. Only corrupt politics can forgive such a fault as this. But even with this help railroad employees still stand to become heavy losers.

Railroad employees have no trust fund in the Treasury. The $642,000,000 which went into what is called a trust fund has been spent by the politicians to pay operating expenses of the Government and replaced by I O U's. The ten to fifteen billion dollars which would be paid into this account, mostly by railroad employees and employers, as provided in the committee amendment, would also be used to pay operating costs of the Government and replaced by I O U's. As heretofore shown, this fund can only be replenished by taxing railroad employees twice. Railroad employees can never hope to get back as much as they paid in. The railroad retirement system is essentially a scheme to provide more taxes for Government spending.

I wish railroad employees to understand that it is not with any pleasure that I have made this analysis of their retirement system and arrived at the conclusion herein set forth. But being in a position where I am compelled to stand up and be counted, no choice has been left to me but to tell the truth as I see it so that railroad employees may understand my vote on this measure, H. R. 1362.

In view of my understanding of the operations of the railroad-retirement system, I cannot possibly vote to force railroad employees to pay any additional taxes into their so-called retirement account, as this bill provides, because this additional contribution would be sunk into public debt in the manner heretofore indicated with inevitable loss to future beneficiaries. In the interest of the aged railroad employees themselves, and the public in general, I am conscience-bound to withhold my approval of this measure.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman made reference to security to the politicians. There is no security to the politicians. Everywhere they have had a totalitarian government, sooner or later they liquidated their friends.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Let me speak for a moment in relation to a matter that has been discussed by the able and always persuasive gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. He stated, in effect, that there is no governmental system under which an employee can receive compensation for a disability that is not service-connected.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to correct a misstatement: "or a certain minimum length of time had first been served." That was also in the gentleman's statement.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, the addition suggested by the gentleman from Ohio will neither diminish nor increase the effect, if any, of what I purpose to say.

By way of refutation of the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, attention is invited to section 710 of the Federal Civil Service Retirement Act, which provides for the payment of a disability annuity, "after 5 years of service," to a Federal employee who becomes totally disabled for useful and efficient service in the grade or class of position occupied by him, "by reason of disease or injury not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on his part." This section contains a proviso to the effect that proof of freedom from such vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct for a period of more than 5 years next prior to becoming so disabled for useful and efficient service shall not be required.

But the system of benefits involved in the debate which is in progress is wholly free from governmental cost; it is financed entirely by railroad employers and railroad employees.

And what are the relevant facts concerning the payment of disability benefits under private pension plans now in operation throughout the country? Volume 1 of Industrial Pension Systems, published in 1932 by the Industrial Relations Counselors, New York, sets forth the results of a study of over 300 retirement pension plans. It is shown that 235 of these plans, which are sponsored by 44 railroads, 43 public utilities, 108 manufacturing establishments, 28 banking and insurance companies, and 14 other concerns all provide for the payment of retirement pensions for disability. It appears that under many of these plans there are no age requirements and in others that the age requirements range from 50 to 65 years. The service requirements range from 1 to more than 10 years.

It is further shown that only one of the 235 plans requires that the disability for which the pension is paid shall result from an accident in line of duty; and only 7 of the plans require that the disability result from incapacity incurred in line of duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia be permitted to proceed for one additional minute in order that he may yield to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman for calling this matter to the attention of the Committee. May I say to him that my statements in regard to this proposition and the solicitation of opinion about it were made in good faith, and I think correctly. If the gentleman will recall what I said, I had reference to governmental planning, not private planning. I recognize, of course, that many such private systems, agreements between management and men, undoubtedly have been worked out, but that does not follow the pattern here, where by governmental action we impose on the employer a burden to which he does not voluntarily assent. The civil-service provision, of course, is a situation under which the Government stands in the position of the employer. As the gentleman has pointed out, it more nearly approximates the situation of the private plans about which he has talked than, say, the social-security plan, which by governmental action imposes on employers a burden to provide benefits for employees. I thank the gentleman for calling this matter to the attention of the Committee in order that a more thorough understanding may be had of it.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, please let me assure the gentleman that, so far as I am concerned, his good faith was never doubted.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. The figures the gentleman has been giving us come from what document or book?

Mr. NEELY. My first reference was to section 710 of the Federal Civil Service Retirement Act. The second was to volume 1 of Industrial Pension Systems, published in 1932 by Industrial Relations Counselors, New York. The data to which attention has been invited may be found at pages 493 to 497, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of an increase in railroad-retirement benefits as proposed by the two measures on the subject that are receiving consideration by the House.

In my congressional district we have thousands of retired railroad employees who in normal times did not receive a sufficient pension or annuity to meet the cost of living. At the present time, due

to inflated prices, these retired employees are actually in want. Many are faced with seeking employment or depending upon charity to secure the necessities of life.

Many retired railroad employees are suffering from disabilities that are not covered under the existing Railroad Retirement Act. These employees are not eligible for pension or annuity benefits, and in a spirit of justice and fair play the present law should be amended to cover these cases.

I am sincere in my desire that the existing Railroad Retirement Act be amended so that benefits may be liberalized, as I feel they are inadequate in view of the increasing cost of living. As evidence of my interest in the increase of pension and annuity payments, I was among the 218 Members who signed the discharge petition to bring railroad-retirement legislation to the floor before the Seventy-ninth Congress adjourns. Therefore, it is my earnest hope that we will approve liberal changes in the present law as the plight of retired railroad employees demands positive action and abandoning mere lip service and pious expressions.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Crosser amendment because of my personal knowledge of the working conditions of railroad employees.

At the time of my birth my father was an employee of a railroad and continued with them for about 20 years. As a small boy, and during the time I attended high school, I was well aware of the inadequacy of the pay as well as other conditions, by no means favorable, under which my father worked. In addition to my father's connection with the railroad, two of my uncles who lived in our home also worked with railroads and at different times two of my brothers were so employed. At present, one of my brothers is working for a railroad and has been so employed for about 30 years.

I also have a personal knowledge of the subject before us, for when I was about 15 years of age, during summer vacation from high school, I was employed by a railroad. I worked in the storeroom of a railroad shop as delivery boy, at the handsome wage of 12½ cents per hour, 10 hours per day, 6 days per week. The work I was called upon to perform would have caused a draft horse to balk.

When I finished high school, I secured what I thought was a real position in a railway yard office. On this job I worked 8 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, and in leap year, for good measure, 366 days. I earned $133 per month, and straight time was paid for overtime, but I earned no overtime unless I doubled, which meant a 16-hour day. Of course, any time I took off was deducted from my pay. At that time no retirement benefits were provided for railroad employees, and no provisions were made for employees who became ill.

When I had been employed on this job for about 2 years, the case of a fellow employee caused me to stop and think. He had been with the company for about 25 years and received the same salary I did. He became ill and was forced to take time off. This time was deducted from his pay, and as he had a family to support, he began working when he should have been home in bed. After a few months he died. I decided to look for another job and in a few months left the employment of the railroad.

We all know that the working conditions of railroad employees have improved during the last few years, but there is still room for much improvement. The railroads now have a so-called retirement plan, but those who are really familiar with its provisions will tell you that it is no better than social security. Most railroads now give their employees a week's vacation, and some give even 2 weeks to employees who have been with the company for as long as 5 years. At the age of 65, employees are allowed to retire, provided they have 30 years' service.

I feel sure you will agree with me that a man who has worked for 30 years under the conditions I have just described to you is entitled to retirement regardless of age. I have known many men who have reached 65 years of age and completed 30 years of service and retired, but I can vouch for the fact that only a very few lived for more than 2 or 3 years after retiring. Why compel a man to work until he is practically dead before allowing him to receive the benefits for which he has toiled so long and for which he actually has paid his hard-earned money?

The employees of all the railroads in America deserve a rising vote of thanks from the entire population of the United States for the wonderful contribution they made to the war effort. These men and women actually performed miracles in the vital field of transportation at a time when they could easily have changed employment and increased their compensation, in many instances, twofold. Therefore, I am convinced that Congress owes this group of loyal citizens a fair and decent retirement program. I hope the Members of the House will show their appreciation by voting for the Crosser amendment and thus bestow upon the employees of the railroads of America a "well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the remarks of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] and I regret that he did not have more time to explain some of the retirement systems in force and referred to in the documents from which he quoted during his remarks just a few moments ago.

I believe that the present railroad retirement legislation should be improved and perfected. In my opinion the Crosser amendment will serve that purpose. It has had careful study by the railroad employees. After all, the employees probably know more about the provisions of existing law, and the needed amendments, than anybody else. The Crosser amendment meets the situation so far as giving adequate protection to employees and dependents is concerned.

From time to time I get letters from employees who have been retired under existing law or from their survivors. They certainly point out the defects under the law as it now stands and in my opinion the Crosser bill about which they have written me takes care of many of these hardship cases.

When employees become disabled by reason of sickness or from other causes, they should become eligible for something in the way of retirement benefits. The railroad men know this and they want the law changed to accomplish that purpose.

Then they are very much concerned about the wife if either death or disability should come to them. They feel that the law should meet such a situation. I agree with them in that conclusion and I hope that the Crosser amendment prevails.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer sundry amendments to the committee substitute correcting typographical errors.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BULWINKLE:

Page 63, in line 11, after "subsections" insert "(s)."

Page 70, line 23, strike out "or" and insert "and."

Page 74, line 11, strike out "section B" and insert "section 2."

Page 83, line 19, insert quotation marks at the beginning of the line and strike out "Employees" and insert "Employers."

Page 93, line 21, insert a comma after the word "shall"; and on page 94, line 14, strike out the word "any."

Page 95, line 20, strike out "secton" and insert "section."

Page 99, strike out lines 23, 24, and 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following indented paragraph:

"(3) By striking out the words 'this subchapter' and 'This subchapter' wherever they appear in such subchapter and by inserting in lieu thereof 'this part' and 'This part', respectively."

Page 102, line 19, strike out the period which appears after the word "part" and insert in lieu thereof a comma.

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 1 of the committee amendment?

Are there any amendments to be offered to section 2 of the committee amendment?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW: On page 67, strike out lines 6 to 15 inclusive and insert:

"2. Individuals who, on or after January 1, 1947, shall be 60 years of age or over and have completed 30 years of service."

Renumber succeeding paragraphs in quotes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of offering this amendment is to bring the bill closer in line with what the railroad workers themselves actually want, and in line with the provision that is made in the bill for women railroad workers. As you will note, the women are treated differently than the men. They are entitled to retire at the age of 60 years if they have completed

30 years of service, whereas the men shall be 65 years of age, and if they retire earlier than that and after the age of 60, the retirement annuity which they will receive shall be reduced by one one-hundred and eightieth for each calendar month such individual is under the age of 65 when the annuity begins to accrue. It is interesting and important to note that at age 60 a woman has a 10-year longer life expectancy than a man, and hence her annuity will cost more than a man's.

This is very complicated. I should like to have seen the committee have time enough to obtain an actuarial report on various combinations of facts in connection with this legislation.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] was very eager to have the bill brought to the House. The funds of the committee were not adequate for a full and complete actuarial study. Consequently, several of us who wanted to find out what these things might cost the men and roads were unable to obtain those reports and bring them to the floor of the House.

Actually the men in the railroad service are interested in very, very few things for themselves, according to my observation and from my talking with a great many of them, in fact several hundreds of them in meetings. The thing they are most interested in is adequate retirement plan at the proper age, that is thoroughly well financed; that is actuarially sound and solvent and that will permit them to retire after some reasonable number of years of service. If it were possible to do so, I should like to see a differential made at least in favor of the operating employees, those men who are out in all kinds of weather, trainmen, locomotive engineers, firemen, conductors, and the ground personnel. They really take it on the chin in all kinds of weather and they get to be old men, even though they are active, long before their time. In the late war, men returned to the service, called to help Uncle Sam in this war, and worked even at 72 and 74 years of age and occasionally older. They did a wonderful job, but I want to tell you this, that seniority is very important to the railroad workers, for it is the older men who get the faster runs and better schedules; and it is those men who should be permitted to retire at an earlier age in order that the public who use the roads may live longer and ride in greater safety and that these people who serve the public in the cabs of the engines and on the trains may have a chance to retire and live to a ripe old age.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Has the gentleman estimated the cost of this?

Mr. HINSHAW. I just stated that I had not estimated the cost. As a matter of fact we do not have a complete actuarial study of the various propositions.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I may say to the gentleman that it will run between eighty and a hundred and twenty millions.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not know; the gentleman may be correct. We did not have any definite actuarial figures. It is quite possible that I should not offer this amendment, but I wanted to do so in order to indicate to the Committee that what the men who work on the railroads themselves really want is not the Crosser bill, it is something like this amendment I have proposed.

Mr. BULWINKLE. If the gentleman will yield further, it will cost between 2 and 3 percent of the pay roll.

Mr. HINSHAW. Possibly so, but the men say they are willing to pay whatever is necessary to finance such a plan.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the gentleman from California, my colleague, that I offered a similar amendment in the committee which was to be taken up at a later date. I am certainly very glad to support the gentleman's amendment, because it is not a compulsory retirement but a voluntary retirement to those who feel they are not qualified to serve longer.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right; and the amendment was opposed in the Committee by those who supported the Crosser bill.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. I wish to ask the gentleman as a member of the committee who has studied both bills, whether the rate provided in the bills together with the additional benefits that are conferred in both bills is sufficient to take care of this fund without creating shortages.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe the rates are inadequate in the Crosser bill. I know they are intended to be adequate in the committee bill. If there is one thing the men insist upon, it is that their retirement system be financially sound so that their annuities can be paid without question when they retire. At present the system is declared insolvent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: Page 71, line 17, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 3. Section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3 (a). The annuity shall be computed by multiplying the individual's years of service by the following percentages of his monthly compensation; 2 per centum of the first $100, 1½ per centum of the next $100, and 1 per centum of the next $100.'"

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I have submitted this amendment to provide some slightly higher retirement annuity benefits for railroad employees who have averaged wages of more than $50 per month, minimum annuity benefits for the employee with a current connection with the railroad industry which provided for railroad employees with average wages of $50 per month or less under section 210, page 23, of the Crosser bill, also at page 72 of the committee bill.

The amendment which I have offered proposes certain annuity benefits for the employee whose average wages may be in excess of $50 per month. Under the present Railroad Retirement Act and under the provisions of H. R. 1362, the formula for providing annuity benefits, as you will note, is based and computed by multiplying an individual's years of service by the following percentages of his monthly compensation: Two percent of the first $50, 1½ percent of the next $100, and 1 percent of the next $150.

The amendment which I have submitted merely extends the present 2 percent to $100 in average wages, instead of the first $50 of average wages; extends the 1½ percent provision for the next $100; and provides for the present 1 percent on the next $100 of average wages, instead of the present last $150 of average wages.

I believe that there must be some proper recognition given the increased cost of living conditions and the fact that those increased living costs apply to the retired employees as well as to the employee who continues in his regular employment and at wages which are considerably more than would be provided him if he is to retire.

There also appears the need to increase the annuity benefits—as proposed in this amendment—in order to lessen the differential between the income received by the employee while he is in service and the amount of annuity benefits he may expect to receive on retirement so that he may retire as promptly as possible when his retirement age arrives and provide opportunities for the younger employees to secure promotion or advancement in their positions.

For example, the employee who has worked up to a position in which he receives some $200 per month might hesitate at this time to retire when he becomes 65 years of age if he is to receive benefits of but $90 per month but would probably be more inclined to retire promptly at the age of 65—if he might receive at least one-half as much in retirement benefits as he would receive in wages.

This amendment would increase the annuity benefits of the employees approximately 10 percent, on those whose wages were $80 per month, or more.

May I say to the membership of the House that no one can tell exactly what this amendment will cost. I sincerely hope it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, of course we are all interested in the general principle of railroad retirement. During the course of the years this law has worked very well and has given benefits to hundreds of thousands of railroad and former railroad men.

For sometime it has been evident that changes and liberalizations of the railroad retirement law should be undertaken. I understand that considerable study has been made of this subject, but of course the law is very technical and change of this act should be made only with full knowledge of what effect each change may have upon every portion of the law. Some time ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] introduced H. R. 1362, having for its purpose the amendment to the Railroad Retirement Acts and it is my opinion that we should support the original Crosser bill. I, therefore, am taking this time to express the hope here today that it will be favored in the coming test vote as to the type of liberalization legislation which we should have.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that during the war the railroadmen of this country worked tirelessly, patiently, and patriotically. They did their full part in the industrial field to carry the supplies to the various point in this country and to the seaboard that they might be delivered to our armies across the seas. In spite of dissatisfaction with archaic provisions of the original railroad retirement bills they nevertheless carried the full burden of their responsibility without complaint and are, therefore, entitled to full consideration in any changes which may be made to retirement legislation. They are the people who are to be served by this retirement legislation and are called upon to make contributions in support of it. Without the full approval of the railroad men, I doubt that any amendment will be very satisfactory.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The gentleman in closing his statement said there was no estimate possible of the cost of his amendment. That estimate will run right around $52,000,000.

Mr. O'HARA. I meant to say no exact estimate. I do not think the gentleman means it will cost that.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I thought before anyone voted they should know what they are voting on.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment. It is fair and equitable. It should be adopted. It is similar to the one that I suggested a moment ago when I talked under the 5-minute rule. This amendment simply provides a little more equitable annuity payment to the man who receives higher pay. I think he is entitled to it. The cost is not so great compared with the total amount that we are expending for annuities.

The man who gets $50 a month in annuities now, or $200 per month, pays the same rate under the present law. That particular feature is not changed under the measure here presented. A man whose monthly wage is $100 now would get monthly annuity payments of $52.50 under the present law. Under this amendment we increase that amount only up to $60. If he is paid $150 salary, he now receives $75, and under the pending amendment this would put him up to $82.50. If he is making $200 salary his annuity would be increased from $87.50 to $105 per month. If his pay is $250 he now receives an annuity of $105. This amendment would increase it to $120. And the employee who receives $300 per month, and whose annuity is $120, would be increased to $135 per month.

This is just a little recognition that is fair and equitable. This amendment ought to be adopted. I am satisfied that if the Members were familiar with the situation, they would support this amendment without any objection at all. The only possible objection, if there is one, is the additional cost of approximately $50,000,000, but $50,000,000 is only a small portion of the amount involved in this legislation, as you well know. The employers and the employees share these payments, so it is not a public burden. It is equitable. It accords a little more recognition to the man who receives a little higher wage than the minimum of $50 or $60 a month and who contributes substantially to the retirement fund.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, who also is very much interested in this problem.

Mr. PITTENGER. Was this amendment considered in the committee?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The amendment was very ably and clearly presented by Mr. John T. Corbett, who is national representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. You will find his complete statement in the hearings. I believe at page 404.

I now find that no action was taken by the committee on the proposed amendment. I have read the hearings and do not find any testimony against it. As I have just stated, the amendment before us now is similar in language as the one submitted by Mr. Corbett. The locomotive engineers, the trainmen, and other railroad-employee organizations are in favor of this amendment. It ought to be adopted. I trust the membership will support it.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, an able member of the committee in charge of this bill.

Mr. PRIEST. May I inquire if the gentleman has information as to what percentage of pay-roll tax increase would be necessary if the amendment is adopted?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The tax on this particular item will be increased a little. But it will be more than offset by savings I have heretofore pointed out. I should add, you are going to need to increase the tax in larger amounts than required by this amendment in order to take care of a deficit in this fund, which deficit, I am informed, is getting bigger at the rate of $10,000,000. This seems incredible to me, but such statements have been made by members of the committee having this legislation in charge. Railway employees are deeply concerned with respect to the solvency of this fund, but this increase is so small as compared with other expenditures under this legislation. I trust you will support this amendment.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, $50,000,000 would be about 1¼ percent of the pay roll. I understand that those who are supporting H. R. 1362 have not asked for this provision. It is apparent here that we are about to create a great burden, at best, on account of this legislation. The committee has tried to minimize the cost as much as we thought was consistent with this constructive piece of legislation. It is necessary, if we are going to stay within reasonable bounds at all, to reject many of these enticing amendments that on the face seem important and humane. We must face this problem in a very practical way if we are going to keep this legislation within reasonable bounds. Therefore, I regretfully feel that I cannot support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to section 2?

Are there any amendments to section 3?

Are there any amendments to section 4?

Are there any amendments to section 5?

Are there any amendments to section 6?

Are there any amendments to section 7?

Are there any amendments to section 201 on page 91?

Are there any amendments to section 202?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BULWINKLE:

Page 93, line 8, after the word "fund" where it appears the second time, and before the period, insert "other than as provided by section 11 (e) of this act."

Page 93, in line 14, strike out "and"; and in line 16, after "act" and before the period, insert the following: ", and for the transfer of amounts to be credited to the fund pursuant to section 11 (e) of this act."

Page 94, in line 25, strike out "and" and insert in lieu thereof a comma; and on page 95, in line 4, after the comma insert "and such transfers as may be required pursuant to section 11 (e) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act,"; and on page 95, in line 6, strike out "payment or refund" and insert "payment, refund, or transfer."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to section 202?

Are there any amendments to section 203?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BULWINKLE:

Page 95, in line 7, strike out "amendment" and insert "amendments"; and in line 9, insert "(a)" after "203."; and in line 13, strike out "and"; and in line 17, insert after the parenthesis and before the quotation marks the following: ", and all amounts

transferred to the fund pursuant to subsection (e) of this section."

Page 95, after line 17, insert the following:

"(b) Section 11 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by adding after subsection (d) thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) If the aggregate amount credited to the fund during any calendar year pursuant to the Railroad Unemployment Tax Act and section 8 of this act is less than $3,000,000 there shall be transferred from the account and credited to the fund, on or before January 31 of the next calendar year, an amount equal to the amount by which $3,000,000 exceeds such aggregate amount.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to section 203?

Are there any amendments to section 204?

Are there any amendments to section 205?

Are there any amendments to section 301 on page 98?

Are there any amendments to section 302?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BULWINKLE:

On page 110, strike out lines 2 to 19, inclusive, and insert the following: "paragraph:

"'(4) Tax collected under Railroad Unemployment Tax Act.—All taxes (including all interest, civil fines, civil penalties, additional amounts, and additions to the tax) collected pursuant to the Railroad Unemployment Tax Act shall be deposited directly with the Secretary, or with any Federal Reserve bank, or with any other bank designated by the Secretary, pursuant to section 10 of the Act of June 11, 1942 (56 Stat. 356; 12 U. S. C., Sup. IV, 265) or pursuant to the Act of June 19, 1922 (42 Stat. 662; 31 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 473), to receive such deposits, by the officer receiving or collecting the same, to be credited in accordance with section 1553 (a).'"

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago 218 Members of this House signed a discharge petition to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 1362, which is not the bill we have before us. Only part of that bill with reference to which we signed the petition is before you, and that is the name of the man who introduced it, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. That bill is not here. I take it for granted that the 218 Members who signed the petition did so because they wanted to do something for the railroad employees. I just want to make it clear that you do not have that bill before you. This bill does not satisfy the railroad employees. I do not mean that we have to satisfy them 100 percent because I do not think anyone ever is. The bill we have before us is little less than nothing. The railroad employees want us to act on the Crosser bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman does not mean to say that the bill is worth less than nothing when it contains survivor benefits which are not provided by existing law and when the bill takes care of widows. Surely the gentleman is wrong on that.

Mr. HENDRICKS. If the gentleman wishes to make an observation, why he can make it. I am saying just exactly what I think and what the railroad employees think, and they are the ones who are interested in this bill as well as the railroads.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield for an observation if the gentleman wishes to make an observation.

Mr. LEA. This bill proposed by the committee provides benefits to the railroad men and their beneficiaries or dependents of $65,000,000 a year. It provides a system more liberal than any other under the social-security program.

Mr. HENDRICKS. As I was saying when I was interrupted, the bill, which we signed the petition to discharge, is not before us. I am trying to give you the privilege to vote this bill down so that we can act on the bill which you voted to discharge.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I simply wanted to say in reply to the gentleman who interrogated you that the Railroad Retirement Board has endorsed the Crosser bill 100 percent.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Well, we know that the railroad employees know something about what they want. The railroad employees are entitled to something. As I said this morning, a few months ago we voted on the land-grant bill, which returned hundreds of millions of dollars to the railroads. Just a few days ago when the President appeared before us, as I stated this morning, in 1 hour and 55 minutes we voted the most drastic antistrike legislation we have ever voted on, slapping the railroad employees in the face. I voted for that legislation, and I am not apologizing, because we were facing a crisis, but now it is time to help these men who did such a good job during the war. We do not have the Crosser bill before us. If you want to vote on the Crosser bill and help the railroad employees, then vote down this committee amendment, and the Crosser bill will be before us so that we can take action on that bill which we petitioned out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and which the railroad employees want.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I was going to ask the gentleman if the parliamentary situation was not such that the committee amendment is offered as a substitute for the Crosser bill, and unless the substitute is defeated, the Crosser bill would not come up.

Mr. HENDRICKS. It is offered as an amendment, but you are correct as to the proper parliamentary procedure. If you want to vote on the Crosser bill, vote down this committee amendment, and then the Crosser bill will be before us and we can amend that if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I hesitate very much to detain the House any longer at this hour, but I feel that a few words should be said following my good friend from Florida.

It has been explained on the floor a number of times already the procedure by which the committee proposal came before the House. It is the procedure, I am certain, that is followed by every committee of the House. The Committee on Military Affairs followed somewhat similar procedure just a few days ago with the terminal leave pay bill. In the case of the pending bill a discharge petition was placed on the Speaker's desk and signatures obtained, after the committee, by a majority vote, had instructed the legislative counsel to put into form the recommendations drafted by the subcommittee and approved by a majority of the committee. Then, the Crosser bill was reported by the full committee with the amendment that is now pending, under the rules of the House.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I may say to the gentleman that I have not condemned the committee on its procedure. I was simply explaining that the Crosser bill was not before the House, and the way to get it before the House.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman will agree with me, then, that the procedure is the regular procedure?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Of course.

Mr. PRIEST. Now, just in a very few minutes, in an effort to give the House a few comparisons, I would like to point to five or six main points in existing law and in the Crosser bill and in the committee substitute.

Under the present law the question of coverage is designed, generally speaking, to cover all persons who are regularly regarded as railroad workers. The Crosser bill would add freight forwarders, railroad-controlled motor truck companies, and extend the coverage to include many others. I am aware of the fact that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] has said that if he had an opoprtunity he would offer an amendment to clarify that. But as it is in the bill today the coverage is almost unlimited. The committee bill stands by existing law on the question of coverage.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I yield briefly.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is not the first time, however, the gentleman has stated that the brotherhoods came before the committee. They also stated that it was not their purpose to include anyone except a person who actually and truthfully was predominantly a railroad employee. That has been greatly exaggerated.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman. I want to go ahead for a minute or two.

Retirement benefits: Under existing law men and women at age 65, irrespective of length of service, may retire; both

men and women at age 65, after 20 years but with a cutback of one one-hundred-and-eightieth each month by which their age is under 65. The Crosser bill provides the same as present law except retirement of women at age 60 with no cutback would be permitted. The committee bill is exactly the same as the original Crosser bill on the question of disability retirement. That has been explained. Under existing law, persons with 30 years or more of service who become totally and permanently disabled, occupationally or otherwise, may retire regardless of age. If a worker has less than 30 years of service he may claim a pension at age 60 subject to the reduction of a cut-back for each month under 65.

The Crosser bill proposes individual disability, occupational or otherwise, for work in regular employment after age 60 or with 10 years of service and no cutback. It provides for an occupational disability for regular occupation after 20 years if they have a current connection. The committee bill provides for the cutback provisions of the present act for disability for employment for hire at age 60 and less than 30 years of service. An additional amendment was adopted which required the disability to be connected with the employment.

On the matter of computation of retirement annuities, there is no change in the present act, either in the Crosser bill or the proposal of the committee.

Maximum benefit provisions are the same in both bills and are in accordance with existing law. The Crosser bill increases minimum benefits above present law, and the committee adopted the Crosser bill provisions in that respect.

The committee bill provides for survivor benefits on the same basis as social security, while the Crosser bill runs around 25 percent higher.

The greatest difference, perhaps, is the matter of unemployment-insurance benefits. The committee left existing law as it is, while the Crosser bill provided for increases in weekly compensation up to $25 for 26 weeks, and provided for sickness and maternity benefits as unemployment. These are the fundamental differences in the law today and the proposals before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will vote down this committee substitute overwhelmingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute for the pending bill.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt the Committee divided and there were—ayes 119, noes 123.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BULWINKLE and Mr. CROSSER.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 129, noes 136.

So the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 123, noes 78.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1362) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code; and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1947

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand an amendment has been placed in the bill raising the Federal contribution from $6,000,000 to $10,000,000. Does the gentleman understand and expect that the conferees will bring back that amendment in disagreement for a separate vote?

Mr. GARY. That is the intention of the House conferees. I can assure the gentleman that the amendment will be brought back to the House in disagreement for a vote.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. When this bill came to the floor of the House it came without an increase in the Federal contribution. The Senate, so we understand, increased that item from $6,000,000 to $10,000,000. An understanding has been reached this afternoon that in order to facilitate the disposition of the appropriation bills the conferees on this bill will bring the bill back in disagreement on that item in order that the House may have a separate vote on it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COFFEE, GARY, FLOOD, O'NEAL, ANDREWS of Alabama, STEFAN, HORAN, and CANFIELD.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1947

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2311), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan reserved all points of order on the bill.

TRAINING OF OFFICERS FOR THE NAVY

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 638, Rept. No. 2312) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 5426, a bill to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two brief editorials.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BILL

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CROSSER. I understood that when this bill was put over until today from a week and a half ago because of some exigencies that arose in the East we were to continue its consideration until it was disposed of after we did take it up. Am I correct in that statement?

The SPEAKER. That may or may not be the situation. The Chair cannot answer the gentleman at this moment. It may be the next order of business. The next order of business will probably be the War Department appropriation bill and then this bill. That may be the situation or it may not be.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ZIMMERMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Did I understand the Speaker to say that the military appropriation bill would be the first thing up tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. The Chair said that it probably would be. He did not say positively that it would be the first thing up.

Mr. TABER. I simply ask the question for the information of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he delivered at a Flag Day program in Chelsea, Mass.

Mr. BUCKLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GRANAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

Mr. CROSSER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the Amvets.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today.

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Railroad Retirement Act.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENT COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Senate:

In the SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
June 19, 1946.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 2141), to amend the act entitled "An act for the creation of an American Battle Monument Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes", approved March 4, 1923, as amended, in order to extend the Commission's authority to all areas in which our armed forces have operated during World War II, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE OR LOSS OF PROPERTY OR PERSONAL INJURY CAUSED BY MILITARY PERSONNEL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request from the Senate:

In the SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
June 19, 1946.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House to return to the Senate the bill S. 2200 entitled, "An act to amend the act approved July 3, 1943, entitled 'An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army.'"

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times, Railroad Bill Protested.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, in justice to those who follow me, I intend to ask for a little more time, and so I ask unanimous consent that I follow the other special orders and that they be taken up first.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

STARVING PEOPLE OR AMERICAN DOLLARS

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I took advantage of the 1-minute period on the floor of this House to suggest that a rather curious situation exists in the United States at the present time, and to say that I intended to give some figures and some information regarding it today.

The United States is being asked by many nations of the world, to help feed the starving peoples of those nations. There are times when this interest in the food supplies of the United States goes beyond the customary terms of a request. As an example, I suggest the advertisement which appeared in the New York papers some days ago, inserted by the India Famine Emergency Committee, asking the Members of Congress, by that public but indirect method, eight questions; among them: How much wheat is the United States going to ship to India in June, July, and August?

And why are we feeding our grain to livestock in the United States, when it could be used to feed human beings? And why we do not make the white bread of the United States darker than we have made it? And why we don't reestablish rationing in the United States? And why we do not eat potatoes and other substitutes for wheat, so that the wheat produced in the United States may be shipped abroad? And, finally, what statements we have made individually or collectively in Congress, and what action we have taken, or what action we intend to take, on the urgent need of increasing our help, not only to India, but to the peoples of other countries who are in dire need?

This is not said with any thought of criticism or depreciation of the urgent needs of starving people. I am calling attention only to the fact that other nations are requesting, sometimes very pointedly, that the United States come to the aid of these other nations. We have always complied willingly, in this country, with the requests from any nation in the world where there are starving people. In fact, we seldom wait for requests.

In the Times-Herald of April 27, 1946, Acting Secretary of State Acheson was reported as advocating the seizure of the wheat and flour needed to fulfill the promises made by American officials to send food to the starvation areas. I quote:

> Acheson told reporters that, if you want to get wheat or flour, what you have to do is to go out and take them.

The Washington Post, on May 28, reported the setting up of a 20-nation council for the control of the food of the world; to control food and allocate it in a time of world need.

I mention these things to show the general acceptance of the fact that a desperate food situation exists in the world, and that as usual the United States is expected to supply the food or the money for its solution.

At the same time we are supplying these foodstuffs, in practically all cases at our own expense, some of the nations involved are shipping large quantities of concentrated foods, either directly from the starvation countries, or from areas immediately adjacent to the starvation countries, into the United States to be sold for American dollars.

The concentrated foods, to which I refer, include dates, figs, walnuts, almonds, filberts, cashews, and other food products.

The quantities in which they are being shipped into the United States equal, and in some cases exceed, prewar shipment figures. Let me give you the figures on several of these items for the last 7, 8, or 9 months. These are the most recent figures I have been able to obtain. I will show in this first table the average prewar and the current rates of importations, and then project that to an annual rate, concerning which I will speak later.

	Average, 1935–39	Latest period available		Projected annual rate	Percent of prewar
		Months	Quantity		
	Tons		*Tons*	*Tons*	
Almonds	2,678	8	7,817	11,725	438
Filberts	1,085	7	3,575	6,128	564
Cashews	12,896	9	11,819	15,759	122
Dates	25,867	7	17,632	30,228	117
Figs	2,835	7	1,748	3,000	106
Total	45,361		42,591	66,840	[1] 147

[1] Average.

A question has been raised by the opponents of this proposal to feed these commodities to starving people, rather than ship them to this country for sale, concerning the accuracy of these projected percentages.

I have therefore obtained another table, which I will now insert in the RECORD, showing the month-by-month comparisons. This table is even more interesting than the first, which was challenged:

Specified edible tree nuts—Comparison of 1935–39 average imports with 1945–46 current imports by months and by totals through April 1946

[Shelled nuts only—short tons]

	Almonds		Filberts		Cashews	
	1935–39 average	1945–46 season	1935–39 average	1945–46 season	1935–39 average	1945–46 season
July					884	345
August					1,075	1,429
September	234	470	77	651	1,208	2,711
October	358	1,049	129	267	1,318	1,644
November	458	604	142	535	1,374	1,415
December	331	1,368	137	729	1,235	251
January	260	1,381	99	696	968	2,169
February	205	710	78	341	792	1,045
March	186	707	79	356	950	815
April	170	876	77	181	831	911
May	127		68		885	
June	97		59		1,234	
July	111		69			
August	139		67			
Year's total	2,678		1,081		12,754	
Total through April	2,202	7,165	818	3,756	10,635	12,735
Percent of 1935–39 average		325		459		120

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield willingly to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In the matter of the shipment of these different products into the United States the gentleman knows that when the people in other countries buy our grains and fats in the United States the Export-Import Bank puts up the money.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I was going to ask the gentleman if he used the word "buy" advisedly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They buy with our money, but when they ship their other things in here, of course, they get paid by American consumers. They therefore have everything to gain. They double up their dollars here in the United States from the domestic sources.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman may be interested to note the comparisons in the table I have just inserted between the 1935–39 period and the 1945–46 period. The table shows that present shipments to this country of almonds, filberts—which should interest the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD]—of almonds, filberts, and cashews are respectively 325 percent, 459 percent, and 120 percent of the prewar shipments.

The commodities I have mentioned—dates, almonds, filberts, figs, and so forth, all have exceptionally high food values. Nuts average more than 3,000 calories per pound. They contain valuable properties: Oils, proteins, vitamins, and minerals. For example, almonds alone contain more protein than meat, more calcium than whole milk, more iron than bread, raisins, or oranges.

I have seen an advertisement from the California Almond Growers Exchange, which showed the equivalents of a pound of shelled almonds. You might be surprised, Mr. Speaker, to realize that a pound of shelled almonds is the equivalent of 4 quarts of milk or 2 dozen eggs, or 2 good-sized chickens, or of approximately 3 pounds of beef, or of more than 4 pounds of fish.

Suppose we translate the above figures, 42,591 tons, showing the nuts, dates, and figs imported into the United States for a period of not over 7 or 8 months, into understandable calories and food values.

Forty-two thousand five hundred tons of these foods contain 181,000,000,000 calories. The food value of these few imports alone would supply the entire District of Columbia for more than 2 months, with 3,000 calories each day per person.

It would supply 1,000,000 people with 2,000 calories per day, for more than 90 days. That is the European nutritional objective and it is the equivalent of 1,850,523 bushels of wheat.

It is, therefore, the equivalent of 185,052,352 full pound loaves of bread, or enough to supply every family in the District of Columbia with a loaf of bread each day for more than 2 years.

It will interest my friends from the west coast and the New England area to know that it is the equivalent, in wheat, of the food for approximately a million and a half hens for 1 year. It would produce almost 28,000,000 tons of poultry meat, or it would raise approximately 2,000,000 turkeys.

Peanuts are produced in the United States in large volumes, increasing volumes, I might say; more than enough to supply the domestic consumption. The probable almond production for the coming season is indicated as three times the average annual prewar consumption.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I assume somebody will use the argument that a person cannot live on nuts alone.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I take that up in a moment. The point has been raised by the opponents.

Walnuts have been on an export basis since 1933. Filberts are being produced in a quantity equal to a prewar consumption. The prospective production of pecans is 20 to 25 percent above prewar consumption.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, to be the simplest sort of common sense, to suggest that at a time when famine has laid its cold hands on the peoples of so many nations, that all food commodities available anywhere in the world should be channeled into the food-deficit areas, particularly when these concentrated foods come from or near the famine countries. There would be obviously a substantial saving in transportation costs. The use of these foods might reduce the quantities of foodstuffs that the United States is planning to send to the deficit areas. I do not need to add that it would decrease the costs to the United States, and consequently help meet issues which are of rising interest to people of this country. These are the increasing national debt, and the annual governmental deficits.

It is difficult to make an accurate comparison of the values of these imports, and food being sent from this country to the famine areas. It is possible to make approximate comparisons based on prices at which the imported commodities are being offered currently, and on the wholesale prices of the commodities which the United States is exporting to the food-deficit areas. Almonds, which I used as a previous example, are being offered on the New York market at approximately 50 cents per pound. Deducting duty, freight, and shipping charges, and deducting 10 percent for commissions and insurance, would leave a dollar value of about 31 cents per pound for almonds in Italy. If, on the other hand, we take the wholesale market price at New York, of the foods we are shipping to Italy, and add freight and shipping charges, we can get some rough idea of the value in American dollars of the foods laid down there. We can then translate that into equivalent caloric values, to get the following table:

Foreign cost almonds compared with cost of equivalent food value in export commodities

	Cents
Almonds, 1 pound, cost in Italy	31.00
Equivalent food value in:	
Wheat flour	10.00
Canned ham	67.26
Canned pressed pork	70.95
Fresh meat, round, grade A	90.58
Fresh meat, round, grade B	72.54

The table shows that it is cheaper to use wheat, and nobody denies that, any more than anybody is suggesting that we stop the shipment of wheat or flour. The table does show, however, that based on equal caloric values, almonds in Italy are much cheaper than the canned or fresh meats we are also shipping to that country.

This is not a temporary matter. There are indications that imports of these nuts, dates, and figs, will increase in the next few months at a rapidly accelerating rate. There are large stocks in the

warehouses in Europe, carried over from the last crop year, and crops are reported maturing this season in excess of previous seasons.

As we read the figures that I am putting into the report today, we should remember, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a localized matter. I mention that specifically because, as I approach a revelation of the opposition to the proposal that we use these foods in the famine areas, it will be discovered that one of the arguments presented is the rather curious argument that this is a local matter, affecting only California, or perhaps only California and one or two other States.

I have not been able yet to see what that has to do with the question of using the most readily available food to feed starving people, but I can assure you that, whether the argument is good or bad on its own merits, it is certainly an error geographically.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon. I acknowledge his interest and help in the investigation of this problem.

Mr. NORBLAD. This also very vitally affects the northwestern portion of Oregon.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman, because I see no reason for the argument having any ground as to whether or not it is local, but even if there were grounds for it, it certainly is not correct.

Peanuts are raised in the United States in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. Pecans are grow in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Texas. Walnuts are grown in California and Oregon. Filberts are grown in Oregon and Washington. Almonds, so far as I know, are grown only in California commercially. Dates are grown in California and Arizona, and in very small quantities in a few other States. Figs are grown in California and Texas. It will be observed, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that 19 of the 48 States are interested in the statements I am making on the floor of the House this afternoon. These 19 States are represented by 180 Members of this House. I assure you it is not a local matter.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. What is the situation as far as peanuts are concerned. I did not get the situation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have no figures for the importation of peanuts. I do not think we have imported any in the past year.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would say that during many years we have heard a lot of adverse statements about the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, and how bad it is and has been. It has always been amusing to me to note that the peanut people have been able to keep a duty that was more than the crop raised 25 years before the war.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The duty is 7 cents.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. It is sectional favoritism that has not been accorded other nuts.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I should add, I think, that I have here a telegram from Mr. H. E. Wallace, of the Georgia-Florida-Alabama Peanut Association, joining with the producers of other nuts, and of dates and figs, in the protests I speak of today.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think it should be stated that when the gentleman says "7 cents" he means 7 cents a pound or $7 per 100 pounds, which is a very fancy tariff, indeed, on peanuts.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If we were to take the production of nuts alone in the United States, we would find at least 75,000 individual nut growers, with an investment in orchards, harvesting equipment, and processing plants, of approximately $1,000,000,000.

The second argument against using these concentrated foods to feed starving people, is the one that American growers are seeking to maintain the high-price levels which have prevailed during the war years. There is no truth in this statement, as every member of the House Committee on Agriculture knows. During the presentation of the case for the producers of nuts, dates and figs, not one word was said about prices in the United States, nor about attempting to maintain the price level. In fact, the wholesale market in the United States is already 25 cents to 40 cents below the wholesale price ceiling fixed by OPA, under the Price Control Act.

I think it would be well, at this point, if I were to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a complete table of the imports of five of these foods; almonds, filberts, cashews, figs and dates, from seven specified countries, including Spain, Turkey, Italy, Portugal, France, and India. The table shows the importations from these countries over a specified time—up to the most recent figures available—and then translates the quantities shipped into this country into caloric values and the equivalents in bushels of wheat:

TABLE 1.—*Imports, in tons, of specified foods, showing caloric content and caloric equivalent in bushels of wheat*

Country of origin	Almonds, Sept. 1, 1945, to Apr. 30, 1946	Filberts, Sept. 1, 1945, to Mar. 31, 1946	Cashews, July 1, 1945, to Mar. 31, 1946	Figs, Sept. 1, 1945, to Mar. 31, 1946	Dates, Sept. 1, 1945, to Mar. 31, 1946	Total	Caloric content (millions)	Caloric equivalent in bushels of wheat
Spain	7,168					7,168	41,574	425,096
Turkey		3,393		1,748		5,141	25,402	259,729
Italy	73					73	423	4,329
Portugal	493					493	2,859	29,237
France	28					28	162	1,661
Iran-Iraq					17,632	17,632	43,904	448,913
India			11,819			11,819	65,231	666,982
Other countries	55	182				237	1,426	14,576
Total	7,817	3,575	11,819	1,748	17,632	42,591		
Caloric content (millions)	45,338	21,736	65,231	4,772	43,904		180,981	
Caloric equivalent in bushels of wheat	463,585	222,249	666,982	48,794	448,913			1,850,523

I would also like to insert, based on information secured from the Department of Agriculture—almost all of it is contained in Agriculture Bulletin 549, Approximate Composition of American Food Materials, June 1940—a translation of the values of almonds, filberts, pecans, walnuts, brazil nuts, cashews, pistachio nuts, dates and figs into calories per pound, and then a similar translation for bacon, beans, beef, cheese, eggs, flour, ham, pork, prunes, potatoes, raisins, sugar and salmon. I offer these only as of general interest in an intelligent discussion of the subject.

TABLE 2—*Calories per pound*

TREE NUTS	
Almonds	2,900
Filberts	3,040
Pecans	3,385
Walnuts	3,185
Brazils	3,150
Cashews	2,760
Pistachios	2,865
Average all nuts	3,040
Dates	1,245
Figs	1,365
OTHER FOODS	
Bacon, medium	2,670
Beans, dried	1,585
Beef, round, medium	780
Cheese, American	1,785
Eggs, whole	635
Flour, wheat	1,630
Ham, smoked	1,510
Ham, canned	2,100
Milk, whole	310
Prunes, dried	1,150
Potatoes, white	325
Raisins	1,355
Sugar	1,805
Salmon, canned	750

Source: Bulletin 549, Department of Agiculture, U.S.A., Proximate Composition of American Food Materials, June 1940.

Finally, while I gave part of this next table in the discussion, I think it might

be well to insert as table No. 3, a comparison of the money values, of almonds versus wheat flour and meats, here and abroad, to show the basis on which the abbreviated summary, already used, was computated.

TABLE 3.—*Comparison of money values, almonds versus wheat flour and meats*

ALMONDS, IMPORTED

	Per pound
Price offered in New York	$0.52
Deduct:	
Duty	.1650
Freight from west coast Italy to New York ($31.25 per 1,000 kilos (2,204 lbs.))	.0142
Commissions and insurance estimated at 10 percent	.0308
Total	.21

Indicated dollar value of 1 pound of almonds in Italy at port of export, 31 cents.

WHEAT FLOUR

	Per hundredweight
New York wholesale price (MPR 296)	$4.62
Freight from New York to west coast Italy	.75
Trucking, loading, unloading, and other charges estimated at	.25
Total per hundredweight	5.62

Equivalent to 1 pound almonds (2,900 calories), wheat flour (1,630 calories), 1.78 pounds cost, 10 cents.

CANNED MEAT

Canned ham:	
New York wholesale price (MPR 156)	$47.15
Freight rate—New York to west coast Italy $30 per long ton	1.34
Trucking, loading, unloading, and other charges estimated at	.25
Total per hundredweight	48.74

Equivalent to 1 pound almonds (2,900 calories), ham (2,100 calories deviled ham canned), 1.38 pounds, cost, $0.6726.

	Per hundredweight
Pressed pork:	
New York wholesale price (MPR 156)	$36.15
Freight rate, New York to west coast Italy, $30 per long ton	1.34
Other charges as above	.25
Total per hundredweight	37.74

Equivalent to 1 pound almonds (2,900 calories), pressed pork (1,540 calories), 1.88 pounds, 70.95 cents.

A war-food order was issued May 28, 1946, by the Department of Agriculture requiring meat canners to offer all canned meat in cans larger than 10.5 ounces to the Government for purchase for UNRRA.

FRESH MEAT

	Per hundredweight
Round, grade-A, good:	
New York wholesale price (MPR 169)	$21.75
Freight rate, New York to west coast Italy, under refrigeration	2.25
Trucking, loading, unloading and other charges estimated at	.35
Total	24.35

Equivalent to 1 pound almonds (2,900 calories); beef, round, grade-A (780 for medium) 3.72 pounds, 90.58 cents.

Round, grade-B, commercial:	
New York wholesale price (MPR 169)	$19.50
Freight rate, New York to west coast Italy, under refrigeration	2.25
Other charges as above	.35
Total	22.10

Equivalent to 1 pound almonds (2,900 calories); beef, round, grade-B (780 for medium) 3.72 pounds, 72.54 cents.

SUMMARY

	Cents
Almonds, 1 pound, cost in Italy	31.00
Cost laid down in Italy of equivalent value in:	
Wheat flour	10.00
Canned ham	67.26
Canned pressed pork	70.95
Fresh meat, round, grade-A	90.58
Fresh meat, round, grade-B	72.54

Now, Mr. Speaker, with all this information before us, and with an earnest desire on the part of the United States to see starving people fed, what is the opposition to the suggestion that this food should be used, so far as possible, to feed starving people rather than brought to the United States over great distances to be sold here for American dollars?

I have not even suggested, so far, that the people of the United States are also interested in American dollars, particularly when they are being asked to take their own American dollars and spend them for food to be shipped to the famine countries. I take for granted that nothing more need be said about the urgency of that campaign. The ambitious Mr. Bowles is annoying the air waves constantly with his attempts to connect the continuation of the Emergency Price Control Act and the need for food for starving people. He and Mr. Clayton went so far as to attempt, unsuccessfully, to draw Mr. Hoover into the argument. School children are being asked to collect canned goods, and so are members of various women's organizations. The former head of UNRRA, Mr. Lehman, is the sponsor of a movement to collect packaged and canned foods and turn them over to UNRRA, now under the direction of Mr. LaGuardia, so that these foods may hopefully be sent to famine countries. We are reducing the carry-over of grains in the United States to a point where drought or crop failure could produce an embarrassing situation, while other countries, with greater interest in some cases, in the countries where the famines exist, are carrying greater stocks and surpluses of the same grains. I am trying to point out that the American people have a very direct interest in what I am talking about.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I wondered about that, and I wondered if Mr. Clayton was so interested in feeding the people, why he would not raise some food instead of raising so much cotton that we have to pay $20 a bale to get rid of it after we raise it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the trouble with Mr. Bowles has been that he has been spending so much time indulging in hysterical outbursts on the radio that he has no time to administer intelligently the job the President gave him, and perhaps the same thing applies to Mr. Clayton.

Mr. Speaker, the answer to my own question, concerning the origin of the opposition, is that human nature is a very interesting thing. Seventy-five years ago Charles Kingsley said: "There is a great deal of human nature in man."

And everyone who has at any time served in any legislative body will unhesitatingly confirm that epigram. There has been a striking display of human nature, in some of its more selfish aspects, both before the Committee on Agriculture, and privately in the offices of members of that committee, over the past few weeks, in connection with the discussion over nuts, dates, and figs.

You would suppose that everyone in the United States would be willing that all concentrated foods should be used, as I said, so far as possible, to feed starving people. Evidently the importers of nuts, and the salters, and the confectionery industry, and to a less extent, the drug industry, have not felt that way. About a week after the first hearing before the Committee on Agriculture, at which the case was presented, just about as I have presented it above, I was visited by the Washington representative of the National Association of Retail Druggists, who told me that he had been instructed by his national office, to oppose the proposal of the nut producers for "a bill to stop the importation of foreign nuts," or to put a quota upon them. I suggested to him, in the simple language of a Congressman, that he should not stick his neck out too far, as first of all, there was no such bill, but merely a hearing before the Committee on Agriculture, with the presumption that a committee resolution would result, directed to the State Department, or UNRRA, or to the people of the United States at large, saying what the situation was, and suggesting that all of these various agencies, and the foreign nations themselves, unite in some sort of an arrangement to limit exports to this country, and to use the available foods close at hand.

I also said that I thought the druggists in my district would feel—as I think the American people of all professions and all businesses, everywhere, would feel—that so far as possible; first, this food should be used primarily for people who need food; and, second, that while we have a sufficient quantity of home produced commodities, there should be some reasonable limitation placed upon the importation of competing commodities in a surplus market, or a market which is approaching a surplus market. I told him that I was quite sure that the retail druggists in my district would take that attitude. I observe, however, that so far as the Washington office of the National Association was concerned, my druggists are still being represented as opposed to the proposal now before the Committee on Agriculture.

That was only the opening of the door. The next step was a request, to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, that a hearing be given to the opponents of the bill. That was a very reasonable request, except that when the attorney for the peanut salters appeared before the committee, his first statement was the familiar one, as I recall it, that he had not had sufficient time to prepare a statement, nor had he been advised of the bill nor of the hearing.

After long years of service in any legislative body, certain tactics become rather familiar, and the usual dilatory tactics are among the most familiar. As a matter of fact, an editorial on this subject appeared in the Pacific Rural Press for May 11, 1946. The proposers of some reasonable consideration, have made their attitude known publicly for some time.

I will insert, at this point in the RECORD, the editorial I have just referred to from the Pacific Rural Press:

WHILE THEIR CHILDREN STARVE

In the matter of feeding her starving peoples, Europe, as ever, carries a prayer book in one hand and a cash book in the other.

The same is true of the politicians in starving India.

Let's set out the facts and look at them.

Europe had a big yield of almonds last year, 81,000 tons shelled basis.

Those almonds are good food; they contain about 2,800 calories per pound, which is twice as many calories as the charity leaders say is necessary to save European lives.

Is Europe using those almonds to save the lives of her hungry people?

Indeed not. She is shipping them to us by the boatload. On the docks of Italy starving children watch them being loaded out for the United States. Our own 1945 crop of almonds was large, and we had no need for imports, but they want our dollars, and they undersell us in our home market to get our dollars.

And we give them food.

Up to the 1st of February, India had dumped in the United States cashew nuts equal in tonnage to our entire 1945 almond crop. The tariff is negligible.

And we will give India free food to replace the cashew nuts sold to us.

This is not by way of criticizing our charity. To feed these hungry people is our duty and our privilege.

But criticism is due the greedy folk abroad, and Uncle Sap, who lets them get away with it and who gives away our home market to these greedy foreigners to the detriment of our producers at home who carry the load of feeding the world.

The flood of foreign nuts into our market is already big and getting bigger. India dumps most of her cashews into this country. Europe dumps almonds and filberts in the good old easy United States. That hurts the walnut and almond crops of California, the walnut and filbert crops of the Northwest, and the pecan crop of Dixie.

We have a law against dumping in this country, but the State Department has never enforced it.

It is apparent the prayer book is to be used only on Sunday.

The Committee on Agriculture plans to hold a second hearing, for the opponents of the idea, the end of this week or the first of next. I hope it may be held soon, because the sooner it is held the sooner we will know exactly the position that the retailers and the wholesalers and the importers and the salters wish to take in this matter. I think it is a matter of interest to the American people.

During the 2 weeks that have elasped the opponents have not been idle. I will now insert in the RECORD, at this point, a letter from the office of the Red Line Commercial Co., Inc., dated June 11, 1946, and addressed to one of their customers in Minneapolis:

RED LINE COMMERCIAL CO., INC.,
June 11, 1946.

GENTLEMEN: Certain Pacific coast interests have put recommendations before the House Agriculture Committee to prohibit or allocate, or place under quota, the import of foods into this country or the export from foreign countries. The object is that no food should be exported from famine areas and countries that are not famine areas should export their surplus to famine areas, and nothing should come to this country. They stress the value of nuts as a food and, of course, the main object is to keep all imported nuts out of this country so that the domestic tree nut interests have this country for themselves without competition from foreign nuts.

Needless to say, there are many arguments against a program of this sort. It would kill foreign trade; it eliminates the opportunity for these foreign countries to obtain dollars for the purpose of importing other necessary and vital foodstuffs or products; it would be worse than a tariff barrier because it would be a prohibition and a restriction of imports, resulting in continued Government regimentation and regulation. Last, but not least, it would kill the salted-nut business, severely handicap the manufacturing confectioner, and deprive the public.

The imported nut section of the Association of Food Distributors, the Manufacturing Confectioners' Association, the Peanut and Nut Salters' Association, and many other associations will be heard, and, of course, all these associations will protest against such recommendations at the hearing.

Unfortunately, however, it is the individual Congressmen who have to be convinced that they must vote against these recommendations. Today, only 2 out of 30 Congressmen on the committee are on our side. We have to see to it that at least 15 out of the 30 are on our side. The only thing that can change Congressmen is hearing from their constituents.

It is, accordingly, urgent that you, as our representative contact immediately 10 of your customers and get them to send wires to their Congressmen. This must be done this week because the hearing will be early next week. If a Congressman gets 10 telegrams from 10 constituents, it is likely to alter his position and that is the only way his position can be altered. Unfortunately, it cannot be altered to the same extent by hearings.

Please get busy immediately and have 10 of your customers send telegrams to their Congressman. The telegram can be brief, and, of course, the important part of it is: "We oppose" or "We are against." For example, a simple telegram would be:

"We urgently request you oppose pressure of domestic tree-nut interests to prevent importation of nuts. If domestic nut interests are successful it will prevent export of many United States manufacturers. As nuts are luxury food of foreign countries can use dollars paid for nuts to purchase from our domestic food surpluses about 10 times the food value of nuts shipped here."

We repeat, please do this job immediately; if possible. Have those who are sending the telegram send a copy to us.

Yours very truly,
RED LINE COMMERCIAL CO., INC.

P. S.—In your State the Congressmen on the House Agriculture Committee is Congressman AUGUST H. ANDERSEN and wires should be sent to him care House Agriculture Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

You will observe the frankness of the letter. After reciting the few general arguments, familiar to all of us regarding foreign trade, and the desire of foreign countries to obtain dollar exchange for the purpose of importing other commodities, including other foods, the letter says:

Last but not least, it would kill the salted-nut business, severely handicap the manufacturing confectioner, and deprive the public.

Mr. Speaker, with an even more charming frankness, the letter continues:

It is the individual Congressman who have to be convinced that they must vote against these recommendations.

The letter refers to the proposed recommendations that we use this concentrated food to feed starving people.

Today, only 2 out of 30 Congressmen on the committee are on our side.

There are only 26 members of the House Committee on Agriculture, and there has been no indication whatever as to how the members of the committee feel on this subject, or intend to vote. The Red Line Commercial Co. must have a crystal ball.

We have to see to it that at least 15 out of the 30 are on our side. The only thing that can change Congressmen is hearing from their constituents.

I thought, Mr. Speaker, that you would be very much interested in seeing how laws are made. The letter continues:

If a Congressman gets 10 telegrams from 10 constituents, it is likely to alter his position, and that is the only way his position can be altered. Unfortunately, it cannot be altered to the same extent by hearings.

That is to say, Mr. Speaker, that if you have a case which cannot be presented before a committee in such a way as to appear to the members of that committee to be sound and to justify the support of the committee, then you may be able to get what you want by sending 10 telegrams to each member of that committee. The letter is even thoughtful enough to suggest how the telegram should be worded:

The telegram can be brief and, of course, the important part of it is "we oppose," or "we are against."

And then finally, as you will observe from the postscript to the letter, no doubt is left in the mind of the person who received it, as to how the telegram should be addressed. This telegram, sent to people in Minneapolis, naturally suggested that the 10 telegrams from 10 different constituents, should be sent to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr.

ANDRESEN], although I would point out respectively to the Red Line Commercial Co., that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] spells his name Andresen, and not Andersen, and that there is an old political axiom that it does not make much difference to a man in public life what you say about him, just so you spell his name correctly.

That is not the only letter I have. I have another, sent by another wholesaler or salter, to one of his customers in Philadelphia. It just happens that I used to live in Philadelphia, and still know some people there. I have the name of the firm to which this letter was sent, and of the firm sending it, but I said that I would not insert this information in the RECORD, and consequently I print the following letter without salutation or signature. You will notice a marked similarity between this letter and the one before it:

IMPORTANT

GENTLEMEN: Some of the Pacific-coast interests have made recommendations to the House Agriculture Committee, which would result in the prohibition or allocation, or placing under quota, the import of foods into this country, or the export from foreign countries. Their idea is to prohibit food being exported from countries, within the famine area.

They particularly allude to nuts as a food, and the main objective is to keep all imported nuts out of this country, so that the domestic nut growers have the American market for themselves, without competition from foreign nuts.

There are, naturally, many sound and strong arguments against such a program. First of all, it would kill foreign trade, as it would eliminate the opportunity of these foreign countries to obtain dollars needed in the importing of other necessary and vital food, farm machinery, etc. It would really be worse than a tariff barrier, as it would be continued Government regimentation and regulation, and what is more important, it would kill the salted-nut business, and work a terrific hardship on the manufacturing confectioners, bakers, grocers, and many other industries.

The Manufacturing Confectioners Association, the Peanut and Nut Salters Association, the imported nut section of the Association of Food Distributors, and other associations will be heard at a hearing of the Agricultural Committee of the United States Congress, all of them protesting against such a recommendation. There are 30 Congressmen on the committee and only 2 of them can be definitely counted on our side. Therefore, we have to see that at least 15 are convinced that such a program would be disastrous. The only way a Congressman can make up his mind on an issue is to hear from his constituents.

We, therefore, urge you, as our representative to contact immediately 20 of your customers, and see that they send wires to the Congressman from your State on this committee, namely, J. ROLAND KINZER. It is imperative this be done this week because the hearing is set for early next week. The telegram should be in different wording, but the main part is "we oppose" or "we are against." For example, a simple telegram would be:

'We strongly oppose the recommendation of the Pacific coast tree-nut industry to prohibit or allocate or place under 'the import of foods into this country or the export of food from foreign countries.' We respectfully request you to oppose the taking of any action in this direction."

But please change the wording on each wire, and we repeat, please do this immediately and advise us by return mail who is sending the telegrams. This is for the benefit of all concerned, and the country, in general.

Yours very truly.

It takes twice as many telegrams to influence the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as it does to influence the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Certainly it does not take very many telegrams to influence me if it only takes 10.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I can say for both the gentleman from Minnesota, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that no matter how they vote on any issue which results from this discussion, their decisions will be based on the merits of the case, as they see them, and not on 10 wires, nor on 20 wires, from 20 of the customers of the firms to whom such letters were sent. I am equally sure that both gentlemen still believe in the constitutional method of committee hearings, and do not agree that the only way a Congressman can make up his mind on an issue is to hear from his constituents.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. So I came to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the importers of foreign nuts, the salters, and a few people whom they have been able to draw into the picture, like the confectioners, in an entirely unselfish and impersonal way, wish, so far as possible, to get imported nuts, in the greatest possible quantities, and at the lowest possible prices, in competition with nuts, dates, and figs, grown in the United States. If this means that concentrated foods are to be brought from areas near famine counties, then, unfortunately, that is too bad for the starving people, but should not be taken into consideration by the druggists, the confectioners, the wholesalers, the salters, or the others in this broad-minded and unselfish group.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to remark, without any hesitation whatever, that this attitude and this position do not represent the feelings of the people in those business groups who live and do business in the Twenty-second District of California.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, there has been some misunderstanding in the national offices.

Who else, Mr. Speaker, opposes or questions the proposal of the American producers of nuts, dates, and figs? I doubt if very many others do oppose the suggestion, but in order that the record may be complete, I will insert under the privilege of extending my remarks, a letter from the Department of State, signed by Mr. Winthrop E. Brown, Chief of the Division of Commercial Policy, addressed to the manager of the California Almond Growers Exchange, and also a reply from the manager of that exchange, Mr. D. R. Bailey, to Mr. Brown.

Under the same privilege I will insert a letter from Mr. L. A. Wheeler, Director of the Office of Agricultural Relations, of the Department of Agriculture, here in Washington, addressed to the California Almond Growers Exchange, and the reply of Mr. Bailey to that letter. I will also insert a letter written by Mr. J. W. Parks, of the Dried Fruit Division, Fruit and Vegetable Branch, Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture here in Washington, also sent to the California Almond Growers Exchange, and again I will add the reply of Mr. D. R. Bailey, general manager of the California Almond Growers Exchange, to that letter.

This, I think, Mr. Speaker, should conclude the material necessary to present today to you and to the Members of this House. I might ask myself a few questions and give myself the answers:

Question 1: Is it proposed that a bill be introduced in this House to control the importation of foreign foods, particularly nuts, dates, or figs? Answer: No such bill has been proposed.

Question 2: Is it suggested by the producers of any of these commodities that the importation of these foodstuffs be shut off, temporarily or permanently? Answer: No such proposal has been made.

Question 3: What is the reason for the suggestion that this matter be discussed before the Committee on Agriculture? Answer: The reason, as explained by the representatives of the several commodities listed, is because nuts, dates, and figs are concentrated foods of great value, and are grown in the countries to which we are being asked to ship food—quite often as a gift—or are grown in nearby areas. It seems to the producers of these foods, as it seems to me, that it would be a sensible thing to use all foods which are quickly and readily available to feed hungry people.

Question 4: What is the secondary object of the proposal? Answer: The secondary object is to discuss and perhaps works out some solution governing the importation of nuts, dates, and figs into the United States in quantities greater than prewar importations, at a time when these same commodities grown in the United States are approaching surplus.

Question 5: Is it proposed that all nuts, dates, or figs be consumed in the countries producing them? Answer: No such thing has been proposed. It would be impossible.

Question 6: Is it proposed that starving people should live on nuts, dates, or figs to the exclusion of other foods, or when starvation cases require nutritional care? Answer: This is the familiar red herring. It was never thought of by the advocates of the proposal.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman know of any instances where nuts that came into this country have been sent back again to feed the people who raised them?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No. That is a very interesting question. I should like to explore that and I shall do so. I continue the questions:

Question 7: What proposal has been made by the American producers, in the

way of solution? Answer: No specific proposal has yet been made. I have an idea that the proposal, when left to the members of the Committee on Agriculture, will approximate one or both of the following: First. That the various agencies of the United States Government, such as the State Department, the Department of Agriculture, and UNRRA, be asked, so far as possible, to work out a program making the greatest possible use of foodstuffs in the countries to which we are shipping relief food, or readily available to them; and, second, that the State Department consider the idea of limiting voluntarily the importations of these nuts to perhaps 110 percent of the prewar average, just as the State Department made a similar arrangement voluntarily with the manufacturers of Swiss watches, regarding the importation of that particular commodity.

Mr. Speaker, if the importers and packers of cheap imported nuts wish to maintain that source of supply, so they can put on the market a little package of mixed nuts containing a few American-grown nuts together with a larger quantity of imported nuts, particularly cashew nuts—which we do not raise in the United States—rather than putting on the market a little package of American-grown pecans, or almonds, or filberts, simply because the package containing the imported nuts means a larger profit to the wholesaler, packer, and perhaps to the retailer, that is their privilege. But I do want you, Mr. Speaker, and the Members of the House to know what is going on, what the facts are regarding the importation of these nuts, dates, and figs into the United States, and finally just what sort of a campaign is being carried on, not openly before the Committee on Agriculture, where the Constitution says these people have a right to be heard, but underhandedly through the method I have just revealed above.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to present this case dispassionately. I would like to keep this discussion on the reasonable plane of whether we should use food for starving people, or to increase the profits of importers and wholesalers. However, if I hear much more about this outside-of-the-committee method of wrecking a proposal whose advocates have consistently kept it in the open and before the committee, I could be aroused to the point of discussing it on other grounds, as for example, the comparative sanitary conditions of imported dates with dates grown in the United States, and the relative sanitary conditions of the nuts and other products involved. I might even get to the point of calling upon the United States Public Health Service to do those things in this connection which the law requires it to do, but which are apparently overlooked. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if brought to that extreme, I could make this a really interesting discussion.

The letters to which I have referred follow:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 7, 1946.

MY DEAR MR. BAILEY: I have your letter of May 18, 1946, and your similar letter of even date addressed to the President. With your letters you enclosed copies of the resolution adopted by a group of nut growers' and processors' associations asking that the United States representative on the UNRRA oppose exportation of foodstuffs from countries receiving gifts of foodstuffs from the organization and that European countries receiving such gifts prohibit exports of foodstuffs as long as assistance continues.

This resolution in effect attempts to answer the very complex question whether the United States should insist upon diversion of other countries' productive and distributive facilities to emergency food provision as a prior condition to aid. It seems to the Department of State that the answer to this question is not as simple as is suggested in the resolution and that such an extreme policy is contrary to our own best interests.

It is reasonable that the countries in which famine conditions exist should in general utilize their own stocks of foodstuffs before seeking outside assistance and it is my understanding that in planning the supply program for a given area, the UNRRA takes into account all indigenous food supplies, including edible nuts. The relief program provides only the difference between estimated minimum requirements and indigenous supplies. Any export of edible nuts would, therefore, result in a decrease in the total relief provided, since relief supplies would not be increased to offset exports.

It is, however, quite a different matter to ask countries, some of them having at best very low standards of living, to divert their entire output of major export crops of specialty foods to local consumption, since complete prohibition of such exports would curtail the ability of the countries in question to earn foreign exchange needed for the purchase of foreign goods essential to reconstruction and rehabilitation. Any delay in recovery in these countries might easily extend the period of abnormally low staple-food production by aggravating shortages of such things as seed, farm equipment, or building materials which could have been imported and paid for out of the receipts from the sale of export crops abroad. Delayed recovery of normal food production would in turn add to the quantities of American foodstuffs needed for direct relief.

Furthermore, the approach suggested by the resolution is comparable to the still more extreme view that to qualify for relief-food shipments a country should divert all of its agricultural production to foodstuffs. Any attempt to convert land and labor skills normally used for production of goods, such as flax, cordage fibers, rubber, and other non-food specialty crops would result in encouragement of much high-cost and inefficient food production, large net losses in total world production, and a great impetus to agricultural self-sufficiency generally.

Encouragement of agricultural self-sufficiency is quite likely to result in reduction of opportunities for American agricultural exports in the future, when we may again urgently need export markets, since self-sufficiency programs once started are difficult to terminate.

The policy suggested would certainly react disastrously upon our broad program to relax trade barriers in which great hope is being placed, both here and abroad. At present the United States is the leading exponent of this program, and without our leadership and whole-hearted cooperation it could not be carried through. If we now asked other countries to curtail their ability to reestablish more economic patterns of production, they would certainly be unwilling and in most cases unable to contemplate any relaxation of import controls which we might otherwise obtain at the forthcoming conferences on trade and employment. I am sure you know the importance of this program and hope that upon further consideration the associations which have adopted this resolution will appreciate the reasons why a policy of long-run self-interest requires that we promote rather than discourage effective production and expansion of international trade.

For the Secretary of State:

Sincerely yours,

WINTHROP G. BROWN,
Chief, Division of Commercial Policy.

CALIFORNIA ALMOND GROWERS EXCHANGE,
June 12, 1946.

Mr. WINTHROP G. BROWN,
Chief, Division of Commercial Policy,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: Thank you for your letter of June 7, with your comment on the nut industries' resolution dealing with the exportation of foodstuffs from the food deficit areas of Europe and Asia into food surplus areas such as the United States. I am gratified to note that you call it reasonable to expect that "the countries in which famine conditions exist should in general utilize their own stocks of foodstuffs before seeking outside assistance." Comments on our resolution have come to us from many sources—congressional, editorial, and from individual citizens—all of whom agree on the validity of this basic point.

In your own analysis of our resolution, as expressed in your letter, I believe you have misinterpreted in some degree the intent and nature of our proposal. We do not suggest that a country should "divert all of its agricultural production to foodstuffs." Nor do we ask that the United States should "insist upon diversion of other countries' productive and distributive facilities to emergency food provision as a prior condition to aid." We only question the propriety of food shipments from countries whose citizens are starving and who claim relief from the United Nations.

It is, of course, possible that here on the Pacific coast we have been too seriously impressed with our Government's insistence that people abroad are starving and that every effort must be made to supply them with wheat and meat, even though it may involve the closing of our own flour mills and the liquidation of our own poultry flocks. Our school children are asked to contribute canned goods, a single can, if you please, in order that children abroad may eat. The advertising council, with the approval of the United States Department of Agriculture, has released advertising to drive home the fact that people are starving. The headline on one advertisement asks, "I wonder how many people will starve this year?" and answers this headline with the statement, "The President says maybe even more than during the war."

With these facts in mind, I am sure you will not be surprised at the average American's feeling that the emergency is now, that people are starving now, and that even the Department of State's long-range program to raise the standard of living in other countries, and to promote the resumption of normal international trade, might yield to the pressing and immediate need for food.

We do not believe that the policy we have suggested "would react disastrously" upon your "broad program to relax trade barriers, in which great hope is being placed both here and abroad." In view of the emergency situation mentioned in the preceding paragraph, we are inclined to think that a greater hope might be afforded the hungry people of Europe and Asia if food could be made available to them in sufficient quantities right now. Food is a weapon, we have been told. Surely our leadership in world relief is of equal importance with our long-range program for international trade.

Your interesting letter brings up the subject of dollar exchange. On this point we

would suggest two things; first, that the desire of other nations for dollar exchange should not be permitted to disrupt the marketing of domestically produced commodities, and second, that the people now receiving relief supplies cannot eat this dollar exchange. It is our understanding that this country, and all other such fortunate nations, are already making an all-out effort to supply needed foodstuffs. We do not see where the possession of dollar exchange would increase by a single ounce the total volume of food available. The sole question revolves around our available supply of food and this is already stretched to the limit. Under these conditions, may we not rule out the matter of dollar exchange in considering this world food crisis? The only way to increase available supplies in Europe is for Europe to retain and use its own available food supplies.

It seems to us here on the coast that there has been a great deal of misunderstanding about this matter of dollar exchange. We have been led to believe that UNRRA is supplying relief and rehabilitation supplies, not only foods, but seeds, agricultural equipment, and other items necessary to restore the economy of the war-shattered countries. Certainly there are other Government agencies engaged in making monetary gifts or loans to these countries. Surely no hungry nation is required to sell us her own food supplies in order to get dollar exchange.

May I suggest that the Department of State's whole long-range program for international trade involves a philosophy which not only fails to meet the immediate needs abroad, but is regarded by hundreds of thousands of American producers as a threat to their own security. Scores of American industries have already gone on record in direct and complete opposition to the theory that American industry, American farmers, and American labor must compete directly with low-cost peasant and coolie labor abroad, and that the national interest or world interest will in any way be served by the elimination of the countless industries in which our citizens have invested their lives and fortunes. The logical outcome of this policy would make us a nation of specialists, engaged only in certain mass production enterprises, and dependent upon producers abroad who are admittedly more efficient—if low costs due to cheap labor constitute efficiency—in the production of shoes, textiles, chemicals, ceramics, sugar, cotton, wool, and other commodities on which our national life depends.

This present situation, pertaining to the importation of edible nuts, dates, and figs, well illustrates the consequences of such a policy. Due to disturbed currency exchange rates and the total disruption of normal markets for Europe's production of edible nuts within her own borders, the United States market is now being deluged with an unprecedented volume of imports. Estimates for the year's total indicate almond, filbert, and cashew imports amounting to 564 percent, 438 percent, and 122 percent, respectively, of the normal volume during the four prewar years 1935–39. We feel that no other nation in the world would permit its domestic markets to be so disrupted, nor would remain indifferent to the welfare of its own citizens. Nor do we believe that this condition suggests such an attitude on the part of our own Government, but results rather from the failure of Government authorities to fully realize the seriousness of the situation.

We sincerely urge that a constructive approach to this whole situation lies in a common-sense effort to allocate world food supplies into the distressed areas rather than into food surplus areas such as the United States. I believe that our resolution clearly indicates that this allocation is asked only for the duration of the food emergency. While this further statement is not involved in our resolution, we feel that the present dislocation of world markets and the present tendency to dump the world supply of edible nuts on the United States market may well last for a considerably longer period; and some permanent system of import quotas will undoubtedly be necessary if disturbed conditions abroad are not to totally ruin American producers for the purely temporary advantage of foreign producers of similar commodities.

We are enclosing copy of a statement presented on behalf of the edible tree-nut industries to the House Committee on Agriculture May 28, together with a summary statement thereof.

These enclosures will provide certain statistical information which may not have been available to you at the time your letter was written. We sincerely urge a reappraisal of our resolution in the light of the facts contained therein, and are confident that you will agree that action along the lines of the resolution will at least serve in the present crisis to alleviate the critical food supply problem and to afford a temporary measure of protection to our domestic producers.

Yours very truly,

D. R. BAILEY,
General Manager.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1946.

Mr. D. R. BAILEY,
General Manager,
California Almond Growers Exchange,
Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR DAVE: Reference is made to your letter of May 20, with which you enclosed a resolution endorsed by the organizations representing the almond, filbert, walnut, and pecan industries regarding the question of the shipment of edible nuts out of countries which are receiving food from abroad.

Your letter and the resolution raise two questions: The first concerns the appropriateness of shipments of nuts out of countries that are deficient in food products generally. The second concerns the effect of the importations of such nuts on the producers in the United States.

As regards the first question, I can inform you that the gist of the matter has been called to the attention of delegates attending the recent meeting held here in Washington under the auspices of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. I can assure you, also, that the question will be called to the attention of the International Emergency Food Council which was recommended by the conference to be established in the near future. May I point out, however, that nuts have not been under allocation by the Combined Food Board and so far as I know will not be under allocation by the new international food allocating authority.

As regards the second question, that is, the effect of the imports of edible nuts into the United States on the domestic producers of the same or similar nuts, I am unable to find in the record a substantiation of the charge of dumping. It is true that the imports in recent months have been at a higher rate than the imports in the years immediately preceding the war, but they have not been as large as in the early 1930's or in the decade of the twenties. Furthermore, and this is important from the point of view of the charge of dumping, these foreign nuts have been sold at virtually record high levels. The principal reason for the imports, of course, is that prices in this country have been relatively high and importers in the United States and exporters abroad have been desirous of taking advantage of the favorable market conditions here. I might perhaps also add that the dollars which are obtained from the sale of the nuts in the United States are being used by the countries receiving them to purchase essential supplies in this country, including food as well as agricultural products in surplus supply, such as cotton and tobacco.

Sincerely yours,

L. A. WHEELER,
Director.

CALIFORNIA ALMOND GROWERS EXCHANGE,
Sacramento, Calif., June 10, 1946.

Mr. L. A. WHEELER,
Director, Office of Agricultural Relations,
United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR LES: Thank you for your letter of May 29. We are pleased to note that the question of the appropriateness of shipments of nuts out of countries that are deficient in food products generally has been called to the attention of the delegates attending the recent meetings of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization and will be called to the attention of the International Emergency Council.

We have understood that nuts have not been under allocation by the Combined Food Board. It is our understanding that this Board was developed during the war for the allocation of essential commodities in short supply among the Allied Nations. We can readily understand that nuts were not placed under allocation as a war essential commodity, especially since even during the war, nuts were in rather large supply in various parts of the world, with domestic production largely covering our United States needs.

However, it seems to us that the postwar problem, particularly in relation to the alleviation of famine, is substantially different. I am sure no one will question the highly nutritious character of nuts as a food, and the fact that their highly concentrated form facilitates their transportation and distribution. The fact that the calorie-equivalent of nut, fig, and date imports to date amounts to 1,850,000 bushels of wheat indicates that had these secondary foodstuffs been channeled into the starvation areas, a considerable drain on our already overtaxed food supplies might have been avoided. We are sure that American millers, cattle producers, and poultry men will be in complete accord with this statement, and we will continue to urge that world nut supplies should be allocated by the new International Food Board so as to channel them into deficit areas rather than into food-surplus areas such as the United States.

We cannot agree with your statement that imports in recent months "have not been as large as in the early 1930's or in the decade of the twenties." Based on the monthly average for the past 8 or 9 months, the projected importation of the several varieties (except brazils) amounts to over 33,000 tons on a shelled basis for the current-crop year. While imports of brazils are just beginning, your Department has estimated a total supply of 24,000 tons, with indicated imports of 10,000 tons, which would make an indicated total of 43,000 tons of imported nuts during the current-crop year. Such a total compares with an average of 25,273 tons for the period of the early 1930's (1930–33), and with 37,644 tons for the decade of the twenties.

In considering, as you suggest, the effect of these heavy importations on United States producers, it should be remembered that not only is the supply of imported nuts reaching unprecedented levels, but that our domestic production has also increased tremendously since the 1920's. In the 4 years, 1922–25, average annual production of domestic tree nuts was only 23,247 tons; in the 4 years, 1941–44, the annual average was 58,740 tons, or an increase of over 150 percent. Similarly, our current domestic production rate

is two-thirds greater than the 25,124-ton average for the period of the early 1930's.

Insofar as almond imports alone are concerned, the volume since September 1, 1945, has exceeded 7,077 tons shelled and 225 tons unshelled, or more in an eight-month period than the total volume of any year during the 1930's. Moreover, tremendous investments in land, machinery, and irrigating facilities have nearly trebled our domestic almond acreage since 1920, and have resulted in domestic production in recent years more than 50 percent over the 1930–39 average and safely in excess of the average total United States supply for the same period, including both imported and domestically produced almonds.

Turning from the supply to the demand side of the picture, it is needless for us to point out the seriousness of the situation when the confectionery trade, which absorbs in the case of almonds some 65 percent of the total United States supply, is seriously affected by shortages of sugar, chocolate, fats and oils, and other essentials.

The effect of importations on United States producers might then be considered to involve a probable weakening in demand on the one hand a vastly increased supply on the other. The total supply of almonds for the next crop year, assuming that imports continue at their present rate, and without counting any carryover, will be approximately 29,000 tons, shelled basis. This consists of 18,000 tons anticipated domestic production and 11,000 tons of imports, or a total 65 percent greater than the total supply of almonds during the decade of the twenties, and more than three times the supply during the years 1934–1941. The filbert situation reflects substantially the same general excess of supply over past consumption.

Perhaps in my letter I did not use the term "dumping" in its technical sense. However, on May 31, the New York Journal of Commerce carried the following information:

"Reports of increased offerings of Italian shelled almonds for shipment, at lower prices, upset the general position of the nut market. * * * Reports were that Italian almonds were priced at around 51 cents."

Similarly, one of the largest importers in the United States wrote me recently to the effect that "the April 11 issue (New York Journal of Commerce) * * * clearly imparts the determination of Italy to export all it can possibly export, and I do say once more that price will be no issue."

Obviously, the producer who sees these Italian almonds offered at some 30 cents per pound under OPA ceilings is inclined to use the term "dumping."

When the domestic producer sees again that the Department of Agriculture has estimated the current Mediterranean almond production at 81,000 tons, shelled, he becomes even more concerned, especially when he knows that the almost complete elimination of normal markets for these nuts in Germany, Holland, Belgium, and the Scandinavian countries has resulted in the domestic market becoming the target for the world crop. We are under no illusions as to the possibility of maintaining what you have termed "relatively high prices" for almonds and other edible nuts, but we sincerely suggest to you that any comparison of present prices with prewar prices is misleading when we consider that grower returns today are made in what some Government officials have termed "a 59-cent dollar."

We have no quarrel with any other nation's desire to secure dollar exchange, although we do not believe that their pursuit of dollar exchange should be allowed to wreck the market for domestically produced commodities. Furthermore, we do not believe that possession of dollar exchange will feed hungry people in the food-deficit areas, nor will it increase by one iota the total volume of food available to the starving people of the world. In other words, we are now making an all-out effort to allocate our already thinly stretched food supply, and all the money in Europe will not increase this food supply by a single ton. So, may we not rule out the matter of dollar exchange as it applies to this world food crisis. We suggest that one way to increase available supplies in Europe is for Europe to retain and use its own stocks of edible nuts, figs, and dates.

Your publication, Foreign Crops and Markets, reports that India has banned peanut exports to conserve for use in India all available food stocks.

Although peanuts do not equal almonds in nutritive value, this action shows India's intention to place the welfare of her people above the considerations of dollar exchange. Logically, this ban should be extended to include cashew nuts.

Recent advertising released by the advertising council and "approved by the United States Department of Agriculture" asks in its headline, "Wonder how many people will starve this year," and continues with the statement, "The President says maybe even more than during the war."

This Government release puts the question bluntly, "How many people will starve?"

Under these conditions we cannot see the propriety of exporting a single pound of food from famine areas, especially not when our Government's desperate efforts to secure relief wheat are closing American flour mills and causing the liquidation of our poultry flocks.

We sincerely urge that a realistic approach to this situation will serve the double purpose of relieving distress conditions both in the famine areas and among our domestic nut industries. We believe that the authorities in Washington have not been fully aware of the supply situation faced by the edible tree nut industries, and particularly by the almond industry. We believe that the official estimates which have been made of both production and imports are far below what we will encounter the coming year. We urge that these estimates be carefully reviewed, and that you reappraise the situation in the light of such revised estimates.

Sincerely yours,

D. R. BAILEY,
General Manager.

P. S.—Since your letter covers a number of very pertinent points, we have taken the liberty of forwarding copies to certain interested authorities, along with copies of this reply. I feel sure this action will meet with your approval.

D. R. B.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1946.

Mr. D. R. BAILEY,
General Manager, California Almond Growers Exchange,
Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: Your letter of May 18, 1946, to Secretary Anderson, with enclosures relating to the nut import situation, has been referred to us for reply.

We have been giving considerable thought to the prospective tree-nut supply and price situation. On the basis of information available to us now, supplies in the United States for the 1946–47 season, including domestic production and imports, may be more than 10 percent greater than last year's record supply. In view of the prospective supply, some decrease in nut prices may materialize. With the exception of walnuts, prices in recent years have been considerably above parity or comparable prices.

We have brought the nut-import situation as related to world food supplies to the attention of representatives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and the Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nations. It appears that among the principal countries of origin of United States nut imports—Spain, Brazil, Turkey, and India—only the latter is considered a famine country. We are informed that shipments of American food to India have been on a commercial basis and have not been donations by UNRRA or the United States Government. It is recognized that Italy, which is a famine country, has, according to recent trade reports, made some nut shipments. In regard to the possibility of channeling nuts from nonfamine countries to the famine countries we understand that UNRRA's policy is to use its funds largely for purchase of foods, such as grains or other basic foods with lower unit costs.

It is our understanding that when you were in Washington the situation regarding nut imports was presented to the House Agricultural Committee for its consideration. We recognize the concern of the industry regarding the prospective supply and price situation and shall do everything we can to help the industry to obtain fair and reasonable prices this year.

Very truly yours,

J. W. PARK,
Dried Fruit Division, Fruit and Vegetable Branch.

CALIFORNIA ALMOND GROWERS EXCHANGE,
June 13, 1946.

Mr. J. W. PARK,
Dried Fruit Division, Fruit and Vegetable Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PARK: This will acknowledge your letter of June 7 in answer to our letter of May 18 to Secretary Anderson relating to the nut-import situation. We thoroughly appreciate your concern over the serious problems of oversupply and inevitable price decline faced by all domestic producers of edible tree nuts, and your desire to assist the industry to obtain fair and reasonable prices.

We believe, however, that Washington authorities are not yet fully aware of the extent of this emergency. I make this statement advisedly, and in particular reference to your statement to the effect that "domestic production and imports may be more than 10 percent greater than last year's record supply."

Of course, your phrase, "more than 10 percent," would cover a possible oversupply amounting to 60, 80, or 100 percent, but we suggest that a more accurate picture of the serious problem facing the nut industries will be given if more specific estimates are employed. For instance, estimates for the year's total importations of almonds, filberts, and cashews amount to 564, 438, and 122 percent, respectively, of the volume during the four prewar years 1935–39. Total importations of all edible nuts, including almonds, brazils, walnuts, cashews, and filberts, are currently estimated at 43,000 tons, shelled basis, which total is more than 65 percent above the 26,424-ton average volume of imports for the prewar decade of 1930–39. In the face of this unprecedented volume of imported nuts we have official crop estimates indicating an all-time record domestic production of almonds, and heavy crops of walnuts, pecans, and filberts.

I am sure that the Department of Agriculture is fully aware that still other factors are adding to the gravity of this present emergency. As you know, a certain amount of currency manipulation, plus the complete disruption of normal markets for Mediterranean nut production in Holland, Belgium, England, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries, have combined to make the United States market the target for the entire

world's exportable surplus of edible nuts. In view of our domestic production, which averaged 58,740 tons for the period 1941–44 and has increased 150 percent over the 1922–25 average and more than 65 percent over the 1930–33 average, it is obvious that serious marketing difficulties must occur if some immediate action is not taken, especially in view of the fact that shortages of sugar, oil, and other items have adversely affected the market for domestically produced nuts in the confectionery and nut-salting trades, which normally absorb so large a portion of our crop.

From the foregoing, it should be apparent that the phrase, "more than 10 percent," is dangerously vague and fails completely to give an accurate picture of the supply-demand problem facing our producers.

We are under no illusions as to the possibility of maintaining the edible nut market at its present level. However, we suggest that any comparison of present price levels with those prevailing in the prewar years should be considered in comparison with what some Government officials have termed our present "59 cent dollar." As a matter of fact, domestic producers of edible tree nuts have enjoyed a considerably smaller price increase over the prewar years than have producers of other basic and specialty crops.

We are aware of the fact that Spain, Turkey, and India have been the source of most of our nut imports during the past year. I believe you will find that our correspondence to date has not included Brazil on this list. As your records will show, very small quantities of Brazil nuts have reached this country, and these only in recent months. You undoubtedly know, however, that the Department of Agriculture estimates that some 10,000 tons of Brazil's current production may be expected to appear in the American market during the next few months.

Although the nut industries have felt that their position had been made completely clear, it is evident that considerable misunderstanding has developed as to their specific request for a diversion of nut imports. May we emphasize here our belief that world supplies of edible nuts, dates, figs, and all foodstuffs should be channeled into the general food deficit areas rather than into food surplus areas such as the United States. Congressional opinion, editorial opinion, and public opinion have been uniformly in accord with us on this issue.

With respect to your statement that UNRRA's policy is to use its fund largely for the purchase of food such as grain and other basic foods with lower unit costs, I would like to call to your attention the following tabulation:

Foreign-cost almonds compared with cost of equivalent food value in export commodities

Almonds, 1 pound, cost in Italy	$0.31
Equivalent food value in:	
Wheat flour	.10
Canned ham	.6726
Canned pressed pork	.7095
Fresh meat, round, grade A	.9058
Fresh meat, round, grade B	.7254

Again I want to thank you for your sympathetic attitude toward our problem. We are confident that once the seriousness of the surpluses of edible tree nuts is thoroughly appreciated by the United States Department of Agriculture, we can expect immediate action to alleviate what will otherwise develop into a deplorable market condition.

Yours very truly,

D. R. BAILEY,
General Manager.

P. S.—Since your letter covers a number of very pertinent points, we have taken the liberty of forwarding copies to certain interested authorities, along with copies of this reply. I feel sure this action will meet with your approval.

D. R. B.

(Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include tables and letters.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, may I compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] on his excellent presentation to the House. He has covered the field so thoroughly that there is little that I can add by way of statistics covering the general situation.

I do wish, however, to call the attention of the House to the fact that this situation is seriously affecting the orchardists of the State of Oregon and particularly those in the fertile Willamette Valley. Thousands of people in Yamhill, Marion, Washington, Clackamas, Polk, and Benton Counties depend upon this industry for their livelihood and unless these edible foreign nuts are consumed in the European market and their import to this country stopped, very serious harm will be done to our own people. It seems absurd to me to ship great quantities of foodstuffs to Europe and yet allow ever-increasing imports of edible nuts, which are so rich in vitamins and protein content.

It is not my desire to demand that the people of Europe should exist on these edible nuts alone as that is of course out of the question but certainly they can be used to supplement their other foodstuffs.

Our present policy which allows for importation far in excess of the prewar figure not only deprives the people of Europe of food but will place the edible nut industry in the position which it held but a few years ago. And that position was not a healthy one. As an example may I cite a personal case. My father-in-law purchased an orchard at Dundee, Oreg., shortly after the First World War for a figure in excess of $10,000. The orchard retained its value for some several years thereafter but then started to gradually diminish in value. By 1936 the valuation on this property was such that it was, in common with others, of no value for sale purposes. A few years later he disposed of it for about $2,000 after all the years of work which he put on this property. During recent years this property, along with others in the Willamette Valley, has produced a decent living and reasonable margin of profit and will continue to do so unless our Government permits continuation of these European imports.

All we ask is that our people be permitted to continue their right to make a decent living and at the same time that European nations are not allowed to build up their dollar exchange at the expense of both their starving people and the American farmer.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is almost 6 o'clock. It has been a hard day. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on next Thursday instead of this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TAYLOR (at the request of Mr. LATHAM), for balance of the week, including today, on account of death in family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2219. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2335. An act to excuse employees of the Government from work on July 5, 1946; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Adele Nahas;

H. R. 3185. An act for the relief of George Lassila, administrator of the estate of Senia Lassila;

H. R. 3454. An act for the relief of William Clyde McKinney;

H. R. 4160. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto;

H. R. 4419. An act for the relief of Mrs. James Plumb;

H. R. 4983. An act to provide for adjustment in connection with the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4997. An act for the relief of Ernest I. Wade and Alma Wade;

H. R. 5071. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Foster;

H. R. 5444. An act to revive and reenact and amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near the city of Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., to a point opposite thereto in the county of Union, State of Kentucky," approved July 18, 1939;

H. R. 5605. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6601. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supple-

mental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6195. An act to amend section 1 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 658);

H. R. 6265. An act to create a Department of Corrections in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6393. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the creation of an American Battle Monument Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1923, as amended, in order to extend the Commission's authority to all areas in which our armed forces have operated during World War II, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the act approved July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities of the War Department or of the Army";

H. R. 6572. An act to provide military assistance to the Republic of the Philippines in establishing and maintaining national security and to form a basis for participation by that government in such defensive military operations as the future may require;

H. R. 6699. An act to decrease the amount of obligations, issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time; and

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of atomic weapons upon such vessels.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on June 19, 1946, present to the President, for his approval bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 233. An act for the relief of Hamsah Omar;

H. R. 797. An act for the relief of William W. Willett, Jr.;

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota;

H. R. 1258. An act for the relief of Cecil Atkinson;

H. R. 1460. An act for the relief of D. C. Todd;

H. R. 1689. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Anderson Ranch Reservoir site, Boise reclamation project, Idaho;

H. R. 2677. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to accept and dispose of real estate devised to the United States by the late Maggie Johnson, of Polk County, Ark., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2678. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians on the Flathead Reservation in Montana, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Juan Calcano;

H. R. 2785. An act for the relief of Will O'Brien, Mrs. Bessie O'Brien, and the legal guardian of Jane O'Brien;

H. R. 3031. An act for the relief of Walter A. Moffatt;

H. R. 3359. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Belk;

H. R. 3391. An act for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co.;

H. R. 3399. An act for the relief of Philibert L. Bergeron, Alfred Quist, and Astrid Quist;

H. R. 3401. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hattie Main Babcock, Chester N. Main, and Mr. and Mrs. Earl Norman;

H. R. 3441. An act to provide for the naturalization of Master Sergeant Gerhard Neumann;

H. R. 3494. An act for the relief of the J. B. McCrary Co., Inc., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3512. An act for the relief of Willie Lam and Edgar Lam;

H. R. 3611. An act to authorize the condemnation of materials which are intended for use in process or renovated butter and which are unfit for human consumption, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3622. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hazel M. Skaggs;

H. R. 3665. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of William Needom Rashal, a minor;

H. R. 3843. An act to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana;

H. R. 3959. An act to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War;

H. R. 3966. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands situated in Clark County, Nev., to the Boulder City Cemetery Association for cemetery purposes.

H. R. 4046. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard S. Fisher;

H. R. 4113. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain land to Mrs. Estelle M. Wilbourn;

H. R. 4118. An act for the relief of Axel H. Peterson;

H. R. 4245. An act for the relief of José Villafañe Muñoz;

H. R. 4251. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Francisca Sánchez Figueroa;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Esequiel (Frank) Padilla, and others;

H. R. 4339. An act for the relief of Fannie C. Fugate;

H. R. 4353. An act for the relief of Amy Mary Richter;

H. R. 4373. An act for the relief of Carl and Naomi Fitzwater;

H. R. 4433. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Alabama for use as a public park of the military reservation known as Fort Morgan;

H. R. 4479. An act for the relief of William E. Robertson and Estelle Robertson;

H. R. 4495. An act for the relief of William H. Roman;

H. R. 4525. An act for the relief of Oran Edmund Randall Rumrill;

H. R. 4600. An act for the relief of the estate of Patsy Ann Maheux, deceased;

H. R. 4654. An act to exempt transfers of property to the American National Red Cross from the District of Columbia inheritance tax;

H. R. 4693. An act for the relief of Richard C. Ward;

H. R. 4863. An act to establish the date of acceptance of a commission as lieutenant (junior grade), United States Naval Reserve, by William Leon de Carbonel to be June 1, 1941, and the date of reporting for active duty to be December 9, 1941, and for other purposes.

H. R. 4888. An act for the relief of Gustav F. Doscher;

H. R. 5000. An act for the relief of Marion Powell, a minor;

H. R. 5091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Honnell;

H. R. 5149. An act to govern the effective dates of ratings and awards under the Veterans' Administration revised Schedule for Rating Disabilities, 1945, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5187. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across New River near Radford, Montgomery County, Va.;

H. R. 5271. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II";

H. R. 5317. An act to amend the act establishing the Hot Springs National Park;

H. R. 5357. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River, at a point between the boroughs of Elizabeth, in Elizabeth Township, and West Elizabeth, in Jefferson Township, in the county of Allegheny, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 5387. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River between the borough of Belle Vernon, Fayette County, Pa., and the borough of Speers, Washington County, Pa.;

H. R. 5413. An act to accept the renunciation by Albert W. Johnson of pension under section 260 of the Judicial Code;

H. R. 5453. An act to authorize certain expenditures by the Alaska Railroad, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5674. An act to amend the laws authorizing the performance of necessary protection work between the Yuma project and Boulder Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation;

H. R. 5676. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real estate in Converse County, Wyo.;

H. R. 5744. An act to incorporate the Civil Air Patrol;

H. R. 5796. An act to amend title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to permit the making of contributions, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for the maintenance and operation of certain school facilities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5811. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of David Owens, Jr.;

H. R. 5896. An act to extend the term of design patent numbered 21,053, dated September 22, 1891, for a badge to George Brown Goode, and assigned to the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution;

H. R. 5907. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement for highway purposes to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in certain lands in the reservation of the Veterans' Administration hospital, Lebanon County, Pa., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6069. An act to amend section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944;

H. R. 6070. An act to amend section 4 of the act of August 25, 1937, so as to provide a filing procedure in cases of adoption outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6153. An act to remove the existing limitations on the number of associate members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans' Administration;

H. J. Res. 304. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1946, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Inter-American Trade Exposition, Fort Worth, Tex., to

be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 21, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1405. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish and provide for the maintenance and operation of a veterans' canteen service in the Veterans' Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1406. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a report of the Securities and Exchange Commission containing its recommendations for amending the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to extend the protective provisions of sections 12, 13, 14, and 16 thereof to the securities of unregistered corporations having at least $3,000,000 in assets and at least 300 security holders (H. Doc. No. 672); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

1407. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on audit of Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 673); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1408. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of a communication dated June 17, 1946, from the Corporation Audits Division of the General Accounting Office to the Board of Directors of Reconstruction Finance Corporation (H. Doc. No. 674); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1409. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1410. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 116 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1411. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report of its activities and expenditures for the month of March 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2346. A bill to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen; with amendments (Rept. No. 2303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6298. A bill to protect and facilitate the use of national forest lands in township 2 north, range 18 west, Ohio River survey, township of Elizabeth, county of Lawrence, State of Ohio, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1801. An act authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Delaware; with amendments (Rept. No. 2305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 342. An act to amend section 5296 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the discharge of indigent convicts for nonpayment of fines; without amendment (Rept. No. 2306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 344. An act to prescribe and furnish to United States commissioners standard forms and dockets and to furnish United States Code and seal; without amendment (Rept. No. 2307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 345. An act concerning the method of payment of the compensation of United States commissioners; without amendment (Rept. No. 2308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 346. An act to amend section 21 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C., sec. 597), prescribing fees of United States commissioners; with amendments (Rept. No. 2309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5078. A bill relating to the admissibility of foreign documents in custody of allied authorities of occupation; with amendments (Rept. No. 2310). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KERR: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6837. A bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 638. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5426, a bill to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2312). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6213. A bill for the relief of Bvt. First Lt. Margaret Utinsky; without amendment (Rept. No. 2302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 6835. A bill readjusting the rates of postage on certain publications issued at regular intervals circulated free or mainly free; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 6836. A bill to establish and provide for the maintenance and operation of a veterans' canteen service in the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 6838. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 6839. A bill to promote uniformity of geographic nomenclature in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH:

H. R. 6840. A bill to provide for lump-sum payments for certain retired Army and Navy nurses of World War I; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 6841. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1909, so as to limit the rights to be acquired from authors or proprietors in copyrights by newspapers, magazines, and like periodicals; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. Con. Res. 158. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings to the people of Italy from the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. Res. 671. Resolution to investigate dissemination of propaganda by Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 6842. A bill for the relief of Lloyd L. Warfield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 6843. A bill for the relief of the city of Winters, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6844. A bill for the relief of W. J. Buchanan and wife, Mary Buchanan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 6845. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anthony D. Chamberlain; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6846. A bill for the relief of Antone G. Pina; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 6847. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Thelma H. Gunter, Mrs. Bertha Coker, M. Burgess Coker, and Robert M. Cason; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RYTER:

H. R. 6848. A bill for the relief of Anthony Satas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 6849. A bill for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6850. A bill for the relief of C. C. Land; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 6851. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Dove and T. T. Grimsley; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2118. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Mrs. Ruth Reynolds of Red Creek, N. Y., and 24 others, petitioning Congress to withhold all grain from distillers and brewers for beverage liquor, to the Committee on Agriculture.

2019. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Floyd E. McBride and other residents of Skaneateles, N. Y., urging legislation to prevent the use of grain in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2020. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition containing the signatures of 260 citizens of the Thirty-first Congressional District, State of New York, protesting against the enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2021. Also, petition containing the signatures of 366 citizens of the Thirty-first Congressional District, State of New York, protesting against the enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2022. By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania: Petition of Amos A. J. Myers Post, No. 28, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jeannette, Pa., and others protesting against 30 percent reduction in grains available for the manufacture of beer and protesting further any additional restrictions now under consideration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2023. By The SPEAKER: Petition of the Geological Society of Washington, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of Senate bill 1717; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2024. Also, petition of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of Senate Joint Resolution 48; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2025. Also, petition of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to postwar restoration and rehabilitation of Great Lakes shipping and of the domestic merchant marine generally; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 21, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, who renewest our sight with the fresh gladness of the morning, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth! Through the changing pageant of nature with form and color which thrill the senses, Thou makest Thyself known to us; for beauty is but Thy handwriting. Through shining lives of men and women that rise in moral splendor even as lowly vines climb to blossoming glory, we glimpse the heights of Thy holiness. We give Thee thanks for all interpreters of Thy mind who, with brush or pen or uttered word, bring even one more syllable of reality, one more gleam of the truth which makes men free.

In this our Father's world, while striving in the day's heat valiantly as men, may we keep our faith simple and our hearts happy as children. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, June 20, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], I ask unanimous consent that he may be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate while he is serving and absent as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and leave is granted.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate for such time as may be necessary in connection with the Bikini atom-bomb test.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

SENATE BILLS RETURNED BY THE HOUSE AND INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to state that, in compliance with a request of the Senate, the House of Representatives has returned two Senate bills which were passed by the Senate on June 14, and on which day the House passed identical bills, which were later passed by the Senate.

The Senate bills are S. 2141, amending the American Battle Monuments Commission Act, and S. 2200, providing for the settlement of certain damage claims by the War Department.

When the House bills were passed, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] entered motions to reconsider the votes on the passage of the two Senate bills, which had been transmitted to the House.

Without objection, the votes on the passage of the two Senate bills will be reconsidered and the bills will be indefinitely postponed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOEY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 2234. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1564).

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Immigration:

S. 1478. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Edith Frances De Becker Sebald; without amendment (Rept. No. 1565).

By Mr. DOWNEY, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 2083. A bill to amend section 6 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1566);

H. R. 3492. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1567); and

H. R. 4651. A bill to amend section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1568).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1602. A bill to confirm title to certain railroad-grant lands located in the county of Kern, State of California; without amendment (Rept. No. 1570);

S. 1839. A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the National Park Service; with amendments (Rept. No. 1569); and

H. R. 4486. A bill to abolish the Santa Rosa Island National Monument and to provide for the conveyance to Escambia County, State of Florida, of that portion of Santa Rosa Island which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 1571).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. R. 5840. A bill to authorize an exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1572).

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. R. 2423. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1573).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 1561. A bill to amend the act entitled "Compensation for injury, death, or detention of employees of contractors with the United States outside the United States," as amended, for the purpose of making the 100-percent earning provisions effective as of January 1, 1942; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1574); and

S. 1920. A bill to provide for the demonstration of public-library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; with amendments (Rept. No. 1575).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 1178. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1576).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

S. 2259. A bill to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, for the purpose of making a clerical correction; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1577);

S. 2345. A bill to provide for the retention by the United States Government or its agencies or instrumentalities of real and personal property within the Philippines now owned or later acquired and for the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, in the Philippines, subsequent to independence; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1578);

S. 2348. A bill to authorize the continuance of the acceptance by the Treasury of deposits of public moneys from the Philippine Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1579);

H. R. 5112. A bill to authorize the city of Anchorage, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed $5,000,000 for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, improving, extending, bettering, repairing, equipping, or acquiring public works of a permanent character, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1580); and

H. R. 5800. A bill to authorize school districts in Alaska to issue bonds for school construction, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1581).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 2358. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River in Clatsop County, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2359. A bill to close the Office of the Recorder of Deeds on Saturdays; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2360. A bill granting a pension to Bertha Laura Stokke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 2361. A bill for the relief of J. P. Siebeneicher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. McFARLAND):

S. 2362. A bill relating to veterans' pension, compensation, or retirement pay during hospitalization, institutional or domiciliary care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 2363. A bill to provide for payment of extra compensation for work performed by customs employees on Sundays and holidays during the period between September 29, 1931, and June 2, 1944; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

S. 2364. A bill for the relief of Patrick T. O'Malley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 2365. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities received by State, county, and municipal employees; to the Committee on Finance.

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6407) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

METHOD FOR PAYMENT OF CERTAIN COMPENSATION ON BASIS OF NIGHT RATES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on May 24, by request, I introduced Senate bill 2250, and it was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. There came to the Senate on the 18th of this month an identical bill, H. R. 6532, to provide a method for payment in certain Government establishments of overtime, leave, and holiday compensation on the basis of night rates pursuant to certain decisions of the Comptroller General, and for other purposes, and it was referred to the Committee on Claims.

I now ask that the Committee on Claims be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 6532, and that it be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

INCLUSION OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN INTERPRETATION OF "FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS" BY UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 290), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas thousands of men and women, hoping for an escape from persecution in other lands, sought during our colonial period an asylum in this country; and

Whereas the adoption of the first 10 amendments to our Federal Constitution in 1791 assured to the citizens of the United States certain fundamental freedoms, which the Government was denied the right ever to invade, among which was the freedom of religion; and

Whereas the extension of fundamental freedoms to all men everywhere is recognized in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the primary objectives to be earnestly sought for; and

Whereas the American tradition embodied in our basic law, includes freedom of religion as of first importance among the recognized fundamental freedoms: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States approve in principle Article VII in Woodrow Wilson's proposed draft of the Covenant of the League of Nations made in 1919 to the Paris Peace Conference which is as follows:

"Recognizing religious persecution and intolerance as fertile sources of war, the powers signatory hereby agree, and the League of Nations shall exact from all states asking admission to it, the promise that they will make no law prohibiting or interfering with the free exercise of religion, and that they will in no way discriminate, either in law or in fact, against those who practice any particular creed, religion, or belief, whose practices are not inconsistent with public order or public peace."

And be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to direct our representatives in the United Nations Organization to so interpret the words, "fundamental freedoms" as to include freedom of religion, and to take such action as may be necessary to secure as soon as possible favorable action upon this interpretation by the Assembly of the United Nations, to the end that religious persecution by any civil state may be outlawed throughout the world.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following report, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6064) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That all of the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, are hereby expressly reenacted, except those provisions which are hereinafter amended or repealed.

"SEC. 2. (a) So much of the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the first proviso is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of nineteen and forty-five, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of nineteen after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this Act, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States.'

"(b) The fourth proviso of the second sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows: '*Provided further*, That on July 1, 1946, the number of men in active training or service in the Army shall not exceed one million five hundred and fifty thousand, and that this number shall be reduced consistently month by month so that the Army's strength shall not exceed one million and seventy thousand on July 1, 1947: *And provided further*, That on July 1, 1947, the number of men in active training or service in the Navy shall not exceed five hundred and fifty-eight thousand and in the Marine Corps one hundred and eight thousand: *And provided further*, That the monthly requisitions on the President under this Act by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall not exceed the number of men required after consideration of the actual number of voluntary enlistments during the three months preceding that month in which the requisition is made. For the purposes of the fourth and fifth provisos of the preceding sentence, no man shall be deemed to be in active training or service or to be part of the strength of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, if—

"'(1) he is on terminal leave;

"'(2) he is a member of the detachment of patients who are to be discharged or relieved from active duty without being returned to an active duty status; or

"'(3) he is being processed, following completion of his period of service, for discharge or relief from active duty.'

"SEC. 3. Section 3 (b) of such Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Each man inducted on and after October 1, 1946, under the provisions of subsection (a) shall serve for a period of training and service of eighteen consecutive months (excluding time served while pursuing a course of instruction in a university, college, or other similar institution of learning), unless sooner discharged. Each man inducted prior to October 1, 1946, under the provisions of subsection (a) who shall have completed a period of training and service under this Act of 18 months or more (excluding time served while pursuing a course of instruction in a university, college, or other similar institution of learning) shall, upon his request, on and after such date, be relieved from his period of training and service under this Act. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, whenever, after January 1, 1946, the Congress declares that the national interest is imperiled, such periods of training and service may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interest of national defense.'

"SEC. 4. Section 3 (e) of such Act, as amended, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 5. (a) Section 5 (e) (1) of such Act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'No person shall be deferred for employment in industry except upon the

basis of his then status in an industry essential to the national health, safety, or interest.'

"(b) Section 5 (e) (3) of such Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(3) After May 14, 1946, no individual who has a child or children dependent upon him for support, or with whom he maintains a bona fide family relationship in their home, shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this Act. As used in this paragraph, the term "child" includes a child legally adopted, a stepchild, a foster child, and a person who is supported in good faith by the individual in a relationship similar to that of a parent and child but such term does not include any person eighteen years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped.'

"(c) Section 5 (e) of such Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'(4) Any man inducted under the provisions of section 3 (a) of this Act who has a child or children, as hereinabove defined, dependent upon him for support, or with whom he maintains a bona fide family relationship in their home, shall, upon his request after August 1, 1946, be relieved from his period of training and service under this Act.

"'(5) No individual shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this Act, if he has served on active duty in the land or naval forces of the United States outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska; or if he has served on active duty in the land or naval forces of the United States for a period of at least six months after September 16, 1940 (excluding the time that any such individual so served while pursuing a course of instruction in a university, college, or other similar institution of learning). The provisions of this paragraph shall cease to be effective during any period after January 1, 1946, when the Congress or the President shall declare that the national interest is imperiled.'

"SEC. 6. Section 5 (m) of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(m) No individuals shall be called for induction, ordered to report to induction stations, or be inducted because of their occupations, or by occupational groups, or by groups in any plant or institutions, except pursuant to a requisition by the land or naval forces for persons in needed medical professional and specialists categories.'

"SEC. 7. Section 16 (b) of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The provisions of the third sentence of section 3 (a) of this Act shall become inoperative and cease to apply at twelve o'clock post meridian on July 1, 1947. All of the other provisions of this Act, except the provisions of sections 3 (b), 3 (c), 3 (d), 8, and 16 (b), and the fourth and fifth provisos of the second sentence of section 3 (a), shall become inoperative and cease to apply at twelve o'clock post meridian on March 31, 1947, or on such earlier date as may be specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose, except as to offenses committed prior to such date. One day prior to the date of the termination of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as herein or hereafter specified, all remaining functions and responsibilities of the Personnel Division established under the authority of section 8 (g) of such Act, and all records and balances of appropriations which have been utilized or are available for use in the administration of such functions of the Personnel Division of the Selective Service System, shall be transferred to such agency of the Federal Government as the Congress may designate, or, if none is so designated, to such agency of the Federal Government as the President may designate.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
LISTER HILL,
SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

INCREASE IN PAY FOR PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, ETC.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following report, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6084) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That (a) the first paragraph of section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows: Enlisted men of the first grade, $165; enlisted men of the second grade, $135; enlisted men of the third grade, $115; enlisted men of the fourth grade, $100; enlisted men of the fifth grade, $90; enlisted men of the sixth grade, $80; and enlisted men of the seventh grade, $75. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of $150.'

"(b) The third paragraph of section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'Every enlisted man paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his grade for each three years of service up to thirty years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act or reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve: *Provided*, That retired enlisted men heretofore or hereafter retired with credit for thirty years' service in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps and who served beyond the continental limits of the United States between 1898 and 1912, such service having been computed under previous laws as double time toward retirement, shall be entitled to receive the maximum retired pay now provided for the grade in which retired.'

"(c) Section 11 of the Act of March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1274; 34 U. S. C. 701), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 11. That the band of the United States Marine Corps shall consist of one leader whose pay and allowances shall be those of a captain in the Marine Corps; one second leader whose pay shall be $230 per month and who shall have the allowances of a sergeant major; ten principal musicians whose pay shall be $180 per month; twenty-five first-class musicians whose pay shall be $150 per month; twenty second-class musicians whose pay shall be $120 per month; and ten third-class musicians whose pay shall be $102 per month; such musicians of the band to have the allowances of a sergeant: *Provided*, That the second leader and musicians of the band shall receive the same increases for length of service and the same enlistment allowance or gratuity for reenlisting as is now or may hereafter be provided for other enlisted men of the Marine Corps: *Provided further*, That in the event of promotion of the second leader or a musician of the band, to leader of the band, all service as such second leader, or as such musician of the band, or both, shall be counted in computing longevity increase in pay: *And provided further*, That hereafter during concert tours approved by the President, members of the Marine Band shall suffer no loss of allowances.'

"(d) Retired members of the band of the United States Marine Corps and former members of the band of the United States Marine Corps heretofore transferred to the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve shall have their retired pay and retainer pay computed as now authorized by law on the basis of the pay provided in section 11 of the Act of March 4, 1925, as amended by subsection (c) of this Act, which pay shall include increases for all active duty performed since retirement or transfer to the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve in the computation of their longevity pay: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this Act shall operate to reduce the present pay of any former member of the band of the United States Marine Corps now on the retired list or drawing retainer pay.

"Sec. 2. (a) The second and third paragraphs of section 8 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"'First mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service shall receive base pay at the rate of $2,340 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"'Chief warrant officers of the Army except masters and chief engineers in the Army Mine Planter Service, and commissioned warrant officers with less than ten years of commissioned service, of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall receive base pay at the rate of $2,520 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay for the second period: *Provided*, That a commissioned warrant officer or chief warrant officer promoted from the grade of warrant officer or warrant officer (junior grade) shall suffer no reduction of pay by reason of such promotion: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be held to affect the authority of the Secretary of War to designate permanent or temporary chief warrant officers of the Army to receive the base pay and allowances of the third and fourth pay periods as provided in section 3 of the Act approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 230, Seventy-seventh Congress).'

"(b) The seventh paragraph of section 8 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as

amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'When the total pay and allowances authorized by this section for any person shall exceed the rate of $550 per month, the amount of the allowances to which such person is entitled shall be reduced by the amount above $550.'

"SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 7 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'The annual base pay of a brigadier general of the Army or the Marine Corps, rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard, commodore of the Navy, an Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, shall be $6,600; and the annual base pay of a major general of the Army or the Marine Corps and of a rear admiral (upper half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or th Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall be $8,800. Every such officer shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters authorized in sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the sixth period.'

"SEC. 4. The second paragraph of section 1 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

'The first period, $2,160; the second period, $2,400; the third period, $2,760; the fourth period, $3,300; the fifth period, $3,850; and the sixth period, $4,400.'

"SEC. 5. The increases in pay resulting from the amendments made by this Act to the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, shall be applicable to the active duty, retired, retirement, or retainer pay of all persons whose pay is governed by, or by reference to, those sections of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, which are amended by this Act.

"SEC. 6. Hereafter the retired or retirement pay of any person whose name is borne on the emergency officers' retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States and who is entitled to receive retired or retirement pay shall, in lieu of being computed upon the basis of the pay to which he was entitled at the time of his discharge from his commissioned service, be computed upon the basis of the rate provided in the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended by this Act, for an officer of corresponding grade who is credited with the same number of years of service for longevity purposes as the number with which such person is credited.

"SEC. 7. The increases in pay provided by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following its enactment, and no increase in pay for any period prior thereto shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
LISTER HILL,
SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF PERSONS OF RACES INDIGENOUS TO INDIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BALL, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

VIEWS OF SENATOR WALSH ON INTERNATIONAL AND DOMESTIC CONDITIONS

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD views expressed by him in the form of answers to questions regarding international and domestic conditions, which appear in the Appendix.]

CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the constitution of the American Veterans Committee, adopted at its constitutional convention in Des Moines, Iowa, on June 14–16, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—LETTER FROM JAMES B. CONANT

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated June 17, 1946, addressed to him by James B. Conant, president of Harvard University, on the subject of a national science foundation, which appears in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials from sundry papers commending the movement to reorganize the Congress, which appear in the Appendix.]

SURPLUS PROPERTY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY AND NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of surplus property made by him before the Senate Small Business Subcommittee on Surplus Property on June 18, 1946, and certain newspaper comment upon the same subject, all of which appear in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. GORE, Mr. JONES, Mr. JENSEN, and Mr. DWORSHAK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, yesterday several amendments to the Navy Department appropriation bill were passed over. I now refer to the amendment to section 109 on page 43 and ask that it be considered.

I may say, Mr. President, that is an amendment known as the Overton amendment and has been in appropriation bills for a number of years, and has been from time to time amended. As it is presently written in the Navy Department appropriation bill it appears in the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, which has been passed by the Senate and the conference report agreed to by both Houses. It also appears in the third urgent deficiency bill which has been approved by both Houses; in the legislative bill as passed by the Senate; in the District of Columbia appropriation bill as passed by the Senate; and in the Interior Department appropriation bill as passed by the Senate. Certainly it ought to remain in the Navy Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 43, after line 2, it is proposed to strike out:

SEC. 109. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 109. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the

United States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, another amendment passed over is on page 39, lines 19 to 24, which is known as the stop-watch amendment. The amendment to the provision in the bill—a provision which has been incorporated in previous Navy Department appropriation bills—prohibits the use of the stop-watch—and this is the amendment—

Unless representatives of the employees are given the opportunity to check any such time studies as may affect the amount of work asked of them and to protest under the established grievance procedure any work requirements believed unreasonable.

It was thought in the committee that this would make a very workable provision because under it the Navy Department would have to work in cooperation with labor and its representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the amendment was passed over at the request of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

Mr. OVERTON. It was.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Another amendment passed over—there are two of them—are to be found on page 13, lines 18 to 21. I doubt if there will be any controversy in respect to that amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the two amendments are related, are they not?

Mr. OVERTON. They are related.

Mr. WHITE. It seems to me that there is sufficient controversy about them that there ought to be a quorum present.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection at all, and I was going to make that suggestion.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capper	Gerry
Andrews	Carville	Gossett
Austin	Chavez	Green
Ball	Cordon	Gurney
Barkley	Donnell	Hart
Buck	Downey	Hatch
Burch	Eastland	Hawkes
Bushfield	Ellender	Hayden
Butler	Ferguson	Hill
Byrd	Fulbright	Hoey
Capehart	George	Huffman
Johnson, Colo.	Murdock	Swift
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Taft
Knowland	O'Daniel	Taylor
La Follette	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.
Lucas	Overton	Tobey
McCarran	Pepper	Tunnell
McClellan	Radcliffe	Tydings
McKellar	Reed	Wagner
McMahon	Revercomb	Walsh
Magnuson	Robertson	White
Mead	Russell	Wiley
Millikin	Saltonstall	Willis
Moore	Stewart	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there are two amendments appearing on page 13 of the pending bill. The first amendment that should be considered is the second amendment on the page.

While the bill was pending in the House there was inserted on the floor of the House a proviso to this effect:

Provided, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the manufacture, assembly, repair, or overhaul of torpedoes at the Naval Ordnance Plant, Forest Park, Ill.

The effect of that amendment, of course, would be to dispense with the manufacture of torpedoes at the plant at Forest Park, Ill. That plant is built for that purpose, and the result would be to put the plant in grease.

On the other hand, for many years torpedoes have been manufactured at Newport, R. I. During the war the Navy Department concluded that it was necessary to have an additional torpedo plant. So a plant was constructed at Forest Park, adjoining the city of Chicago. The Forest Park plant is modern and, according to the testimony, one of the best in the world for the manufacture of torpedoes. The plant at Newport is not so modern. It has grown and expanded from time to time, but is not so modern as is the plant at Forest Park.

The Navy Department recommended that the provision which was inserted on the floor of the House be stricken from the bill, because representatives of the Department said in effect that better torpedoes and at less cost could be constructed and were being constructed at Forest Park than at Newport, and that it would be in the interest of the Navy Department and of the Government that the plant at Forest Park should be continued in operation. The committee apparently arrived at the same conclusion, and determined that it would be to the best interest of the Government that the plant at Forest Park be continued.

There is no necessity for both plants. Therefore the manufacturing of torpedoes at Newport would be discontinued if the plant at Forest Park were continued. However, at the Newport plant there are two activities in connection with torpedoes which still remain. One is designing and the other is testing. Therefore the continuance of the Forest Park plant would not operate as a complete closure of the Newport plant. It would continue in operation for the purpose of designing and testing torpedoes, which is a very substantial part of the activities at that plant.

There is quite a controversy between Rhode Island and Illinois in connection with the matter. The details of the situation will be presented to the Senate by the two able Senators from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BROOKS] in behalf of the Forest Park plant, and the two equally able Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. GERRY] on the part of Rhode Island and Newport.

However, I wish to make this observation: I believe that in any event the language inserted by the committee in lines 18 to 21 should be retained. The language is as follows:

Of which $350,000 shall be available for placing the equipment at the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I., in condition for operation.

If the provision which the House inserted, which is destructive of the Chicago plan, should be retained in conference, the Government then would have to go to Newport to continue the manufacture of torpedoes. It would be necessary that $350,000 be immediately spent at that plant in order that it might properly continue in the manufacture of torpedoes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In connection with the last statement made by the able Senator

from Louisiana, I should like to propound this question: In the event the Senate should sustain the report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to strike out lines 21 to 24, and the bill should go to conference with the amendment containing the $350,000 available for placing the equipment at the naval torpedo station at Newport, R. I., in condition to operate, would the conferees have the right to strike out the $350,000 in the event they should fail to sustain the position of the Senators from Rhode Island?

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly. In the event that the Senate should agree to the committee amendment striking out lines 21 to 24, and that were agreed to in conference, the conferees, I assume, would strike out the $350,000 allocation to continue operations at Newport.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, when the naval appropriation bill was under discussion in the House of Representatives, Representative FORAND, of Rhode Island, offered an amendment to the appropriation for the Bureau of Ordnance, as follows:

Provided, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the manufacture, assembly, repair, or overhaul of torpedoes at the naval ordnance plant, Forest Park, Ill.

This amendment was adopted and is part of the bill as it came from the House. When the bill was under consideration by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Navy Department, in a letter to the chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, suggested that this item be deleted from the bill. However, the subcommittee voted to retain the item in the bill. Later the full committee voted to delete it.

The Newport Naval Torpedo Station was established in 1869 and continually since that date, that is, for about 77 years, has designed, manufactured, repaired, overhauled, and tested torpedoes for the Navy with the greatest efficiency and success. During the War the Navy Department established an additional plant at Forest Park, in Illinois, and this was operated by the American Can Co. When hostilities ceased, the members of the Rhode Island congressional delegation, because of rumors that the Forest Park plant was to supplant the Newport plant for manufacturing torpedoes, conferred many times with officials of the Navy Department relative to this matter. At these conferences the Navy Department for a long time withheld information from us, at the same time carrying out a policy it had adopted, and which had not been approved by the Congress. That policy is based on the claim that the Navy Department has the right to abandon any naval establishment—temporary or permanent, and whether or not established by or with the approval of the Congress—and to establish new plants as substitutes without the authority of the Congress.

Admiral Hussey even went so far at a hearing of a subcommittee as to assert that the Navy Department could close the Naval Academy at Annapolis just as they did the torpedo manufacturing plant at Newport. To quote him directly from the hearings on this bill at pages 227 and 228, I quote as follows:

Admiral HUSSEY. I would consider it certainly within the Secretary's authority, reverting to the school question, to close the school when there was no longer any need for it without feeling that it had to come to Congress and ask for authority.

Senator GREEN. Would they have authority to close Annapolis?

Admiral HUSSEY. If the need could be met some other way; yes, sir.

Apart from this general policy, with which I disagree, and which I believe should be considered carefully by the Congress, there are other phases of the matter which I should touch upon.

What has actually happened at Newport is that thousands of permament civil service employees who have given the best years of their lives to the Government, many of whom have worked at the naval torpedo station for 20, 25, yes, even 30 years, were thrown out of work, with only the short 30 days notice required by law. These include men who have regarded their work at the torpedo station as their life work, who have established homes, bought and mortgaged houses in Newport. These include men who wanted to enter the armed services, but were urged by their superiors not to leave the torpedo station, on the ground that they could render greater service to their country there. They include men who did enter the armed service, and after years of service were honorably discharged, and came back to Newport and were told there was no more work for them there. It must be remembered in this connection that this torpedo station is the only manufacturing establishment in or near Newport, and that all of these men, young and old, civilians and veterans, are forced to seek work elsewhere. These men are not covered by present civil service retirement laws except in a few special instances, and they would have to forfeit the retirement benefits to which they had been looking forward.

In contrast to this, the Navy Department recommended at the new Forest Park establishment, which was manned by employees of the American Can Co., the blanketing in of all these American Can Co. employees, designated "war service employees," without any examination whatever. The Civil Service Commission complied with this request.

As a result, long-time employees at Newport with 20 or 30 years of honorable service, are out of work, while war-service employees at Forest Park with only 2, 3, or 4 years' service, have now permanent jobs. This is most unfair; and the civil service employees in New England, who know these facts, are coming to the conclusion that there is no future in working for the Government. It is true that the Civil Service Commission has recommended the enactment of legislation which would, in part, care for these employees. However, as yet Congress has done nothing at all to enact such legislation.

It may be true that in peacetime there is not enough call for torpedoes to warrant the maintenance of both the Newport torpedo station and the Forest Park plant in operation. They both might be needed in time of war, and for that case one of them should be placed in grease as a stand-by plant.

Many times, at hearings and conferences, Navy officials have led the Rhode Island congressional delegation to believe that the Newport plant would be kept intact and would be used as such a stand-by plant. However, within the last week it has been called to my attention that the War Assets Administration is to conduct a sale at Newport, and that prime metals, machinery, tools, some production equipment, and some miscellaneous materials are to be sold.

Admiral Hussey, chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, definitely assured Representative FORAND, of Rhode Island, this very week that no machinery was to be sold at Newport. Let me read you a letter from Mr. FORAND I have just received:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1946.

Hon. THEODORE F. GREEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Because I know of your deep interest in our efforts to secure resumption of torpedo work at the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I., I am sure you will be interested to know that after I learned on last Sunday of the report circulated in Newport that the machinery at the torpedo station was to be declared surplus and sold by the War Assets Administration, I talked with Admiral Hussey of the Navy Department on Monday morning and told him that word had been received in Newport that $3,500,000 worth of torpedo manufacturing equipment at the station was to be declared surplus, that it was being cataloged, and scheduled to be disposed of at an on-the-spot sale beginning June 24.

Admiral Hussey emphatically told me that the report was false, that there was no foundation for the rumor and that the Navy's policy relative to the torpedo station had not changed.

I then asked him if I was safe to say that the report was false and that there was no foundation for the rumor and he stated "definitely so."

In view of the persistence of the rumor a resolution was adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Newport on June 15 and a copy was sent to my office which I in turn transmitted on yesterday to the Secretary of the Navy with a request that he furnish me promptly with the facts concerning this reported sale of the machinery at the torpedo station as surplus equipment.

I am furnishing you with this information so that we may continue to work together in our efforts to restore torpedo manufacturing to Newport.

Sincerely yours,

AIME J. FORAND,
Member of Congress.

It is difficult to reconcile this letter from Representaive FORAND with another letter I have also just received, dated June 19, from Lt. Gen. E. B. Gregory, Administrator of the War Assets Administration. The letter reads as follows:

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1946.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: The following information is given in answer to your telegram of June 18.

As of May 30, 1946, our regional office at Boston had on hand in its inventory account surplus property located at the Newport Naval Torpedo Station having a declared cost of approximately $1,350,600. It consists principally of prime metals, some production equipment, and miscellaneous materials.

On March 11, 1946, Rear Adm. C. H. Cotter, Vice Chief of Material Division, Navy Department, transmitted to us a list of naval activities by States recommended for site sales. That list included the Naval Torpedo Station at Newport under category 2 of the priority clearance group for naval installations.

This Administration has tentatively scheduled a site sale at the Newport Naval Torpedo Station for August 12. Preparations for the sale are scheduled to begin June 24.

Sincerely yours,

E. B. GREGORY,
Administrator.

Let me also read to you, Mr. President, in this connection a memorandum dated June 18 from former Representative W. S. Jacobsen, now the Senate liaison officer for the War Assets Administration. The memorandum reads as follows:

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1946.

Memorandum for Senator GREEN:

This concerns your inquiry regarding the naval torpedo station at Newport, R. I.

According to information obtained for Col. Matthew Robinson, Deputy Administrator for the Office of Acquisitions, the War Assets Administration has received information from the Navy Department that the unremoved equipment and material at the above station, consisting of metals, machinery and tools, was surplus as of May 31.

The amount declared surplus at annex No. 1 is $1,423,000; the amount at Goat Island is $1,000,000.

WAA is now conducting site sales throughout the country, and I am advised that a tentative date for the sale at Newport, R. I., has been set for August 12 through Ocober 12.

W. S. JACOBSEN.

Mr. President, in view of Admiral Hussey's statement to Representative FORAND, I trust that he will take steps to cancel the sale referred to by the War Assets Administration.

In this connection I present a resolution sent me by the board of aldermen of the city of Newport. The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That the Board of Aldermen in session assembled request that the War Assets Administration, Regional Director, Boston, Mass., and the chief of the Rhode Island office of the War Assets Administration be requested to defer any contemplated sale of the machinery at the Naval Torpedo Station at Newport, R. I., until after the passage of the naval appropriation bill and same is signed by the President of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a conference be arranged between the mayor of the city of Newport and the chairman of the representative council with the officials of the War Assets Administration so that the city of Newport may have an opportunity to present the reasons for this request.

In board of aldermen, June 15, 1946.

A true copy. Attest:

HENRY B. WHALEN,
City Clerk.

The claim is made that the Forest Park plant is modern and fully equipped. This is probably true, but it must be remembered that much machinery has been shipped from the Newport Torpedo Station to Forest Park. I wish to add further that it was the skilled and trained experts of the Newport torpedo manufacturing plant who trained the supervisors and employees at the Forest Park establishment. Those same experts are now thrown out of work at Newport while those whom they trained are operating at the Forest Park plant.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it might be well to call to the attention of the Senate that the Navy Department officials have stated that the Newport plant would still be used as a research center. In view of their previous reports it is hard for me to understand what the Navy plans to do with the naval establishment at Newport. If they do use Newport as a research unit, the torpedoes will be designed there and the plans and specifications shipped to Forest Park, where they will be manufactured, and then the torpedoes will be shipped back to Newport for testing in the salt water of Narragansett Bay, and in most cases loaded on ships there. This is far from practical, and it is not good business. It is a costly arrangement for the Government to adopt.

I am making this statement that my colleagues in the Senate may fully understand the significance of this abandonment by the Navy Department of this old naval institution established and maintained by Congress for 77 years and the substitute for it of a new establishment elsewhere without the knowledge, consent, or approval of the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Rhode Island. Does the Senator have any objection to the committee amendment on page 13, allocating $350,000 for the equipment of the naval torpedo station at Newport?

Mr. GREEN. No.

Mr. OVERTON. May I ask the Senator from Illinois if he has any objection to the amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection to the amendment. If the Senate sustains the position of the Appropriations Committee in its amendment in line 21, the $350,000 item will be deleted.

Mr. GREEN. I do not wish that statement to be misconstrued later. It seems to me that the conference committee has the right to accept either one of these proposals, or to deny either one of them.

Mr. OVERTON. The conference committee will have the right, but I think the logical procedure would be to delete the $350,000 item.

Mr. GREEN. All that is a matter for the conference committee to decide.

Mr. OVERTON. It is for the conference committee to decide, but I should like to dispose of the first amendment if there be no objection to it. I refer to the amendment on page 13, in line 18, beginning after the word "Maryland," and ending in line 21 with the word "operation."

Mr. LUCAS. Before we dispose of the amendment, I may say that it would seem to me, as I understand the situation, that it would cost the Government $350,000 to open up the plant in Newport.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct. If the plant at Chicago is abandoned under the House provision, it will cost $350,000 to equip the plant at Newport.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 13, in line 18, beginning after the word "Maryland," and ending in line 21 with the word "operation."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hart	Overton
Ball	Hatch	Pepper
Barkley	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Buck	Hayden	Reed
Burch	Hill	Revercomb
Bushfield	Hoey	Robertson
Butler	Huffman	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Capper	Knowland	Swift
Carville	La Follette	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Eastland	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Magnuson	Wagner
Ferguson	Mead	Walsh
Fulbright	Mitchell	White
George	Moore	Wiley
Gerry	Murdock	Willis
Gossett	Murray	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The clerk will state the pending amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, beginning in line 21, it is proposed to strike out: "*Provided,* That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the manufacture, assembly, repair, or overhaul of torpedoes at the Naval Ordnance Plant, Forest Park, Ill."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I listened very attentively to the argument and discussion made by my very good friend from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and from that argument I reached the conclusion that the able Senators from Rhode Island want the station at Newport maintained primarily because it was established there in 1869. Everyone is proud of antiquities in his State, and I can understand why the two distinguished Senators from Rhode Island desire to keep this plant in existence in Rhode Island; but, Mr. President, in this modern world, time does move on; change takes place; nothing remains static, and when the time comes that a plant, wherever it may be located, is inadequate to do the job which is necessary from the standpoint of national defense, no argument, either on the ground of age or location or anything else, can challenge the position that at the very least it should be supplemented.

It is admitted and undisputed that the Forest Park plant, located in Chicago, Ill., is the most modern and best equipped from the standpoint of modern machine tools for the production of torpedoes of any plant that exists in the world.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the torpedo plant at Forest Park, Ill., is now manufacturing an electric torpedo that cannot be manufactured anywhere else in the United States, not even at Newport.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Is it not true that some of the machinery was taken from Newport and sent to Forest Park, and that that is the reason why today the Forest Park plant is better equipped?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not understand that to be the case. I understood that certain tools, jigs, dies, and other facilities were transported from the Newport plant to the Forest Park plant, but so far as the electric torpedo is concerned, that is something new, something which is being experimented with for the national defense.

Mr. President, why was the plant at Forest Park built in the first place? It was built there during the war because the Congress of the United States, and every responsible individual who was interested in national defense, felt that as a matter of safety and security plants which were making weapons and instruments of war should be scattered here and there throughout the United States. So this torpedo plant, at a cost of $21,000,000, was placed near the city of Chicago, and is still operating.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that it is my understanding that parts of the torpedoes which are assembled at the Forest Park plant are not manufactured there. I refer to the electrical parts.

Mr. LUCAS. All I know is what Admiral Hussey says, and what the testimony shows with respect to that. There is no doubt that the record shows that the electric torpedoes are being made in the Forest Park plant near the city of Chicago, and that is the only place in America where they are being made. If I can read the English language, I think that is what Admiral Hussey said.

Mr. President, we do not consider in this debate the relative interest or advantages between Rhode Island and Illinois. It is a question which involves the security and the safety of the entire Nation. That is all there is to the question. The Senate only last week voted to continue to have boys 18 and 19 years old taken in under selective service. Why was that done? It was because we have commitments which we have made in the past, growing out of the war, and because of conditions now prevailing throughout the world we desire to continue to be ready for any emergency which might arise.

I am told that today there are more men under arms throughout the world than there were in 1939, when World War II broke out; yet because a plant has been in existence since 1869, though it is now considered out of date by the best experts of the Navy, and who, having the country's interests at heart, desire to continue the torpedo plant near Chicago, Ill., there are those who want us to go back to the old way of doing things.

I am a little surprised that my distinguished and close friend from Rhode Island, who is as tolerant and possessed of such a world-wide outlook on international and national affairs, cannot see the great advantage of keeping this plant as it is at the present time, rather than putting it in grease, as the amendment would do. Once this plant is put in grease, that will be the end of it; it will not be a stand-by plant; it will become surplus property, and in view of the way the industries are now bidding for plants, the Navy will not have any trouble in disposing of that plant, with all its fine equipment and the tools which are in it.

There is no proposal to take away from the Newport plant everything that is there. The Navy proposes to leave two of the main departments, two of the important and up-to-date departments which have to do with designing, research and the testing of torpedoes.

The Senator from Rhode Island has made an eloquent plea for men who have worked all their lives in the plant at Newport and who might be thrown out of employment. Under the Navy plan, the Rhode Island plant will take just 600 fewer employees. Before the matter is ended, under the Veterans' Preference Act which was passed in 1944 most of those 600 will be replaced within a short time by veterans of World War II if Admiral Hussey's testimony is correct. And what is going on in Newport with respect to the application of the Veterans' Preference Act is going on all over the United States in similar plants.

What about the torpedo the Navy is making in Illinois? What about a comparison with respect to the cost, for instance? Let us consider merely one little item. The testimony shows that the average cost in Forest Park was $7,914.08, while at Newport, with the old equipment which had to be used, the torpedoes cost on an average $9,040 apiece. In other words, it was not a question of the skill of the men employed in the Newport plant. The sole question was one of having up-to-date equipment with which to do the work, and do it more economically and faster.

Mr. President, we need everything we can get to keep this country in a strong condition, in the face of present world conditions.

Much has been said in the debate, and was said before the Committee on Appropriations, about the cost of transporting the torpedoes from the plant in Chicago to the Atlantic coast. There is no torpedo plant on the Pacific coast at the present time. A great number of the torpedoes necessarily will have to be sent to the fleet, or to the proving grounds along the coast of the Pacific. If the question of cost should enter into the conclusions of Senators, remember the savings in shipping from Chicago to the west coast rather than from Newport to the west coast. But I submit the question of costs is only incidental. It is solely a question of whether or not the Senate and the House of Representatives want to keep our war equipment up-to-date, so far as the development of torpedoes is concerned. That seems to me to be the basic question.

Yet, if the Forest Park plant is dismantled and the work is concentrated at Newport or elsewhere along the Atlantic coast, the plant there will be vulnerable to attack. It is said that under modern conditions any plant anywhere is just as vulnerable as at any other place, from the standpoint of an attack by an enemy. That premise I seriously challenge. The real reason such plants were dispersed during the war was that, scattered, they would be less vulnerable to destruction by the enemy. The responsible officials tried to decentralize our industries in between the Rockies and the Alleghenies to a great extent, as a matter purely of safety and security of the plants from attack from without.

What happened to this question in the House of Representatives? How does this amendment get before us, Mr. President? The Committee on Appropriations had nothing to do with the amendment in the House of Representatives. The members of that committee did not consider the amendment which would prohibit the spending of any money in making torpedoes in Forest Park, Ill. At least, if the Rhode Island delegation appeared before the committee at that time, the committee paid no attention to their pleas. But, finally, when the appropriation bill came to the floor of the House, an amendment was offered by Representative FORAND, who said:

> We are simply asking that this new, temporary plant out there in Forest Park be put in grease.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas said:

> The gentleman means he would close up a $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 plant—the best one the Bureau of Ordnance has—and let it go to pot?

Mr. President, the vote on that question was 36 for the amendment and 27 against the amendment. Only 63 Members of the House of Representatives voted on that amendment—only 63 Representatives could be found to vote on such a vital amendment.

When the bill came to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, that committee, by a vote of 14 to 5, said that the Navy's position was sound, and that the plant should be left at Forest Park. This is in accord with what Admiral Hussey said in his report, and I quote from his statement:

> The Department is of the firm belief that it is to the best interest of national defense to carry out the manufacture, repair, and overhaul of torpedoes at the Forest Park plant and strongly recommends that the proviso quoted above be deleted.

Mr. President, I submit with all the sincerity I possess that the Navy Department is not attempting to discriminate against any section of the Nation. These men, who have been trained for the particular purpose of taking care of the country in great emergencies, are interested only in giving to the country the

best that planning can give. Mr. President, in my opinion, this question should not have been brought here at all by an amendment of this character upon the appropriation bill, in view of what the Navy has said in its testimony before the various committees.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If this language, which was put in the bill by the House, is left in the bill, does that mean the abandonment and complete uselessness of this plant?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to my able friend from West Virginia that this plant would immediately be placed in grease, as it is said. That means it would be shut down. What would happen to that plant in the future is a serious question. I undertake to say that if the Congress tells the Navy, "We want only one torpedo plant in this country to make torpedoes in time of peace, and we by our vote say: We want that plant to go to Newport, R. I.," then that plant near Chicago, in which we have an investment of some $21,000,000, will, in my judgment, be given to the surplus-property group for disposition. When that is done, out goes the finest plant that genius and capacity and industry has ever been able to build for making torpedoes. That is what I am talking about. I am not making the plea for Illinois. I am making the plea for my country. I am making the plea for national defense. If I look to our future I cannot overlook any element of security.

Mr. President, on the question of employment much can be said for both plants, if Senators want to argue that point. At the present time some 500 returned veterans from World War II are now working in the Illinois plant, and according to the telegram which I received from the American Legion post which has been organized at that plant, before the end of the year some 900 of the 1,200 employees in this plant, will be veterans of World War II.

Mr. President, Senators may talk from now until doomsday about cost, and other minor items, but the sole question for the Senate to determine is whether Congress is to say to the Navy, "We are going to supply our judgment for yours on the important question of making torpedoes." I should say that perhaps there is not a Senator on the floor who knows very much about the technique, the know-how, or what it takes to make up-to-date torpedoes which could be used in the event we had to use them.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I asked the able Senator from Illinois whether, in his opinion, if the position taken by the House is sustained by the Senate it would result in closing down the plant in Illinois, and, as I understand, the Senator said he believed it would close down the plant in Illinois. I now ask him the question: If the position taken by the Senator from Illinois is sustained, would it necessarily mean the closing of the plant in Rhode Island?

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that then the plant in Rhode Island would be put in grease. But there are three different segments of the plant in Newport, R. I. I may be wrong about this, and my friends can correct me if I am. Two of those departments are going to remain. One will be used for research work and the other for testing, and will employ a great number of men. But the third part of the plant, which makes torpedoes, will be put in grease. It is my understanding, however, that the third part of the plant is so connected with the other two parts of it, that it would not be sold to a private concern. It would be a stand-by plant for future emergency work.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Illinois made a statement regarding the original placing of this plant in Illinois. I think perhaps the record should be made clear on that point. I recall the time when it happened. The main reasons for establishing the plant in Illinois, as I recall—and I opposed such action at that time because there is also a torpedo plant at Keyport, Wash., similar to the one at Newport, except that the plant at Newport manufactures torpedoes—the main reason for establishing the plant in Illinois had to do with labor conditions surrounding both of the other plants, congestion, lack of housing, shortage of labor, and the Navy urged a speed-up in the building of torpedoes and gave all this as reason for moving inland. I appreciate that the defense angle, the dispersement of plants, was one factor involved. But what I first stated comprises the main factor. There is no question about the statement made by the Senator from Illinois regarding the question of cost.

What the Navy should have done was to enlarge the two existing plants on the east coast and on the west coast, instead of going inland and building this new modern plant. The Navy did not do that, however. Now a new question is presented here. But I think in fairness both to the Keyport and the Newport plant the Senator from Illinois should mention the cost of moving torpedoes from Illinois to both coasts.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think there is any question but that the plant on the west coast does not manufacture torpedoes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Technically we do not manufacture torpedoes. Technically we assemble them there. But technically the plant can manufacture torpedoes and has done so in case of emergency.

Mr. LUCAS. It is not the type of up-to-date plant that I am talking about. It is wholly inadequate, so far as the manufacturing of torpedoes is concerned.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We do not have the facilities to do what they do at Newport and at Forest Park, Ill.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But I contend that what the Navy should have done in the beginning was to have enlarged the two torpedo plants at Newport and Keyport instead of building a new plant inland.

There are tremendous freight costs involved, because no torpedoes are used in the Middle West. They are all used in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct, and that is one of the reasons this plant should remain in Forest Park. It would cost much less to send torpedoes from Chicago to the Pacific coast than it would to send them from Newport to the Pacific coast. While the Senator from Washington is making a defense here for the plant in his State, he knows that if the position of the Senator from Rhode Island is sound, any torpedoes that come out to the Pacific coast must come from the Newport plant, and that none of them will come from his plant. So from the angle of freight costs on torpedoes shipped to the Pacific coast, it will certainly be less expensive if the plant in Chicago is retained in operation.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. The torpedoes will have to come from Newport anyhow because they will have to be tested there.

Mr. LUCAS. Maybe so.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Is it not a fact that if torpedoes are manufactured at Newport, and if they are to be shipped to the Pacific they will be carried on Navy ships through the Panama Canal? The torpedoes would not be shipped overland. Cruisers and other Navy vessels, while they are on cruise, may as well be used to carry torpedoes through the Canal and up the west coast.

Mr. LUCAS. My friend the Senator from Connecticut may be a transportation expert. I am not. I do not know how torpedoes are shipped.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator seemed to entertain the idea that the torpedoes would be shipped overland. From what he said I thought he was an expert on that subject.

Mr. LUCAS. I am talking about how the torpedoes are to be shipped from Chicago, Ill. They will certainly have to be shipped by freight from Chicago to the Pacific coast, and they will be shipped by freight from Chicago to the Atlantic coast.

Mr. McMAHON. According to the Senator from Rhode Island, they will have to be shipped to Newport to be tested; and when they get to Newport they will be placed on battleships and cruisers and shipped through the Panama Canal to the Pacific. That will give our naval vessels something to do.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator can get any consolation from that argument he is welcome to it. I will not be diverted by the question of a few dollars of costs. In connection with the question of cost, if one were to figure the costs from all angles the chances are that the torpedoes would be made for less cost in Chicago than if they were made in Newport.

At least, the record shows that during the war they were made for $2,000 less at Chicago than they could be made at Newport. As I previously stated, that is primarily because of the up-to-date machinery and equipment. I am pleading that such machinery and equipment be not destroyed, put in grease, or sold to a private concern.

The Navy says emphatically, "We want the plant at Forest Park, Ill., continued." So far as I am concerned, that should be sufficient. Were there a war in progress we would not hesitate to follow the recommendation of the Navy if it said it wanted the plant at Forest Park. At the time the plant was placed in Illinois there was no question as to whether it was a good deal or a bad deal. No Senator objected to it then. Now, in time of peace, when we should always prepare with the best we have, we find these ancient and fallacious arguments being made as to why the plant should remain in Newport, R. I. I submit that the Senate and the House of Representatives would commit an egregious error if they did not follow the recommendation of the Navy in this case.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a telegraphic message from a very distinguished citizen of the State of Missouri which I think is entitled to weight in the consideration of the problem now before the Senate. The message comes from Lloyd C. Stark, who was Governor of Missouri from 1937 to 1941. He is a graduate of the United States Naval Academy of the class of 1908. He served as a naval officer from 1908 to 1912, serving in Turkey in 1909, in South American waters in 1910, and in the submarine service in 1911. He has not only distinguished himself in his service to the Navy, but he has also served in the Army. He was major, battalion commander, and acting assistant divisional chief of staff of the Eightieth Division, and commanded the Three Hundred and Fifteenth Field Artillery of the American Expeditionary Forces in the Argonne from 1917 to 1919.

Not only has he served with distinction in both the Army and the Navy, but his ability has been recognized among the Governors of the United States, as is evidenced by the fact that he was chairman of the Governors' Conference of the United States in 1939, served as president of the Council of State Governments in 1939, and was a member of its board of managers from 1941 to 1946.

The telegraphic message to which I refer was received in Washington on June 4. It is addressed to me, and is as follows:

LOUISIANA, MO., *June 4, 1946.*

Senator FORREST C. DONNELL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Rhode Island Congressman's amendment to $4,000,000,000 1947 naval appropriation bill prohibiting allocation any fund to operate modern naval torpedo plant at Forest Park, Ill., contrary to best interest of Navy. Passage would (1) prevent use of Navy's most modern torpedo plant; (2) return to use of older, less efficient Newport plant already closed; (3) shift torpedo storage to vulnerable coastal location; (4) force Navy to use torpedo plant it does not favor; (5) establish precedent of closing other modern midwestern naval installations. Naval authorities prefer to continue this plant. Civilian experts carefully investigated and endorsed it. Strongly urge your opposition to this amendment.

LLOYD C. STARK.

Mr. President, in my opinion the observations of this distinguished citizen of our State and of the United States are entitled to very careful consideration by the United States Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat I should like to obtain a little information from him. I believe the Senator stated that the name signed to the telegram was Stark.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does he happen to be the same Stark who ran against Harry S. Truman for Senator from the State of Missouri?

Mr. DONNELL. He ran against Senator Truman for the nomination.

Mr. CHAVEZ. While Mr. Stark was Governor?

Mr. DONNELL. While he was Governor of the State.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, Missouri had all the information the Senator from Missouri is now giving the Senate as to the wonderful service of the gentleman.

Mr. DONNELL. I think that is true.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, this amendment is very important. If we are to protect the morale of our civil servants and keep faith with what we are advertising to men who are asked to join the Navy because it is a permanent service and because it is a life work, we ought very carefully to consider the effect of abandoning the station at Newport. Civil-service employees who have been in the service for 25 or 30 years would be turned out at a time when their length of service would just fall short of entitling them to pension benefits, even though they were taken into the service with the assurance that they would have steady jobs, and while they might receive less pay—and they did—still they would always have their civil-service rights and pension benefits.

The unfortunate thing is that the Navy, by an autocratic act—and that is putting it mildly—would take these men from their work with absolute ruthlessness. They would be no longer employed. They would lose all the benefits and advantages which they have earned by their length of service. It would be done in a way which certainly would arouse criticism, because in the case of another plant, a plant that was built during the war for war purposes for the manufacture of torpedoes, they have deliberately blanketed into the civil service the men who were working in that plant. That was done quickly, and apparently with the intent of doing it before the Congress or the Naval Affairs Committee had an opportunity to object. Mr. President, I do not think that is a good picture to go out to the country, when we consider the national aspects. I do not think that is a good picture, when we are saying to our men, "If you enlist in the Navy, you will have a sure job and you will have it for life. Just look at the advantages of it." Mr. President, if the Congress were to enact legislation of this character, I, for one, would protest about giving out information of that sort, because if we are going to take the step which the Navy proposes in this case, and if we are going to set this precedent, we can do it in other cases; and when hard times come and the Congress wishes to cut down, what will be done then? These men will go out, and the action of the civil service in this case will stand out as a precedent.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit an inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. GERRY. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. Is it a fact that the plant in Illinois was not operated by the Navy until recently?

Mr. GERRY. That is correct. It was operated by the American Can Co.

Mr. WALSH. Is it true that it was operated by a private company, under a contract with the Navy to produce torpedoes for the Navy?

Mr. GERRY. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. Is it also true that during all this period of time, torpedoes have been produced at the Newport, R. I., plant by the Navy itself?

Mr. GERRY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not true that it was not until late last fall that the Navy decided to dispose of its plant or to wind up its operations in connection with the manufacturing of torpedoes, and to transfer that activity to Illinois?

Mr. GERRY. Yes; the Senator from Massachusetts is entirely correct. The Senator also will remember that we had a hearing set in regard to this matter, and the morning of the hearing the order went through.

Mr. WALSH. So the Government has no obligation whatever to the employees in Illinois because of the length of their service; does it?

Mr. GERRY. None. That is the point I am making.

Mr. WALSH. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Rhode Island is insisting that, everything else being equal, the Government owes an obligation to the old-time employees at Newport who have worked there for years and who may be approaching the age of retirement?

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Massachusetts is absolutely correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. GERRY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island to the hearings held by the Naval Affairs Committee in regard to this particular matter. I ask the Senator if he recalls that when Admiral Hussey, who was Director of Naval Ordnance, appeared before us, it developed that he, and he alone, had the responsibility of moving this age-old plant and industry from Newport, R. I., to any point in the United States to which he wanted to move it, and in the

same way he could remove any ordnance plant from one point to another, merely by the stroke of his pen, and he and he alone had that power.

Mr. GERRY. Yes; and I should like to say to the Senator from Wyoming that Admiral Hussey reiterated that statement before the Appropriations Committee, and said that the Navy Department even had the authority to close Annapolis, if it wished to do so.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not think the Congress should acquiesce in the holding or exercise of any such power in the hands of any man.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, in view of the colloquy which has taken place between the able Senator from Rhode Island and the able Senator from Massachusetts, I should like to read into the RECORD what Admiral Crisp said on the question of the employment of the men who have been at the station for a long time. I read his statement:

Senator, under the rules and regulations which have been promulgated by the Civil Service Commission, which follows the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, no veteran who has a performance record of "good" or better can be discharged from the plant until all other employees are gone, veterans and nonveterans.

With the large number of veterans, with the employment at Newport, the veterans' category predominated, and those people are now coming back, and under the Veterans' Preference Act must be given employment. We have to guarantee first of all 1 year's employment to any person who has a status in civil service, or any veteran who has a career status, who has a mark of "good" or better must be retained over all other employees, irrespective of the years of service that they have.

You will find cases of veterans having possibly 5 years' service who have a mark of "good" or better who have to replace, if reduction comes, any person in that plant, even though he has had 25 or 30 years of service, and that has happened at Newport and is happening at other shore stations. It is not confined to Newport.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator, let me say that is a confession in avoidance. It has nothing to do with action taken by the Navy Department. If anything was done in connection with the desire of veterans to return to work, it was done through an act of Congress, which Congress enacted because it wished to reward veterans, above all others. If the Navy Department was properly carrying out the work of construction of torpedoes at Newport, we would not have so much difficulty in the matter. The fact remains that, as the Senator from Wyoming has brought out, the Navy Department deliberately "cut off the heads" of those men, and did so with absolutely no feeling for them, so far as I could see. It was purely a cold-blooded proposition. In all my service in the Senate I have never seen attaching to the Navy Department such an autocratic attitude as I have seen in this case in the Navy's attitude toward the war powers which were granted to it to build plants in order to meet the necessities of the times. Such plants were built all through the country. But, Mr. President, it was never intended that those plants should be continued at the expense of old and established stations, or that the powers granted were to be construed, for example, as giving the Navy the power to close the Boston Navy Yard or to close Annapolis, if some admiral saw fit to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GERRY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it not a fact that no further expansion can be made with respect to the Newport plant insofar as the manufacture of torpedoes is concerned?

Mr. GERRY. Expansions may be made in the manufacture of torpedoes at the present time to meet future conditions.

Mr. LUCAS. My understanding has been that the officials have gone as far as they can go from the standpoint of expansion at Newport. Regardless of the conditions in the future, the plant is stymied.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator is speaking with reference to the number of torpedoes which may be made. Many plants were constructed throughout the country during the war period.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not talking only about numbers, but about the expansion of the plant. My understanding from the testimony which was given before the committee is that the plant at Newport is so located that if an attempt were to be made to expand its present facilities so that more and better torpedoes could be made, it would not be successful because of a lack of available ground for expansion.

Mr. GERRY. In Newport there is an older plant. My colleague has already brought out the fact that many machines have been taken out of Newport.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the plant at Newport was large enough during the war to employ more than 15,000 men.

Mr. GERRY. Yes; absolutely.

Mr. President, to my mind, we are asked to set a very dangerous precedent in regard to what may be offered not only to Civil Service employees but to any men who might be contemplating entering the service. If this amendment is agreed to, I would not feel like saying to any man that he could be sure of a certain job in the Navy. I have already covered that point.

Mr. President, let us get down to the hard-boiled practical side of what any business man would do. Torpedoes are designed at Newport. The craftsmen who design them, the men who make the blueprints, the men who work with the officers, are the skilled men who have worked in Newport for years and years. The Navy realizes that they must keep those men employed. They realize also that they must retain the services of those skilled men, and the facilities at Newport, in the planning and manufacturing of torpedoes if the torpedoes are properly to function.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that our torpedoes have functioned. Their efficiency has been outstanding. Torpedoes have been made at Newport ever since 1869. In passing I might say that it is worth while to remember the inventive skill which the men to whom I have referred have given to the Government. I know of one man, Mr. Moore, who worked in the station at Newport. I believe it was figured out that during his long service at Newport he gave to the Government something like $400,000 worth of patents. He never took a cent for them, and turned them all over to the Government.

Mr. President, I am afraid I am digressing, because the human side of the situation appeals to me very strongly. But when we consider the practical side we must consider also the fact that a proposal is being made to build torpedoes at Chicago on a fresh-water lake. Torpedoes cannot be tested in fresh water. They must be tested in salt water. So the fact is that all the torpedoes which are manufactured in Chicago must be transported to Newport and there tested on the range for defects, and put into final condition for shipping.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GERRY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. How much duplication of effort is there if a torpedo is tested at a fresh-water point and later tested again, repaired, and adjusted at Newport? Would the same kind of machinery be used in making the adjustments as would be used in manufacturing the torpedo? In other words, would the testing at Newport involve a duplication of machines and effort?

Mr. GERRY. Yes; and a very bad procedure would be followed. After torpedoes are designed and manufactured they must be taken out on the range and shot in order to find out what, if any, defects they may have. In Newport such tests can be made right at the back door.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, is it not a fact that four or five test runs of each torpedo are required in order to prove and adjust it?

Mr. GERRY. Yes; as a general rule. Some of the torpedoes which were shipped from the West required 20 to 30 runs before they were fit to be used at sea.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And the testing must be done in salt water, in which they will be used?

Mr. GERRY. The testing must be done in salt water, and the torpedoes must be given their runs. To my mind, the most stupid thing on earth would be to design the torpedoes originally at Newport, then have them made in Chicago, sent back to Newport, and worked over again by the same men who designed them.

So far as the cost is concerned, I have never been able to agree with the Navy Department figures. The Navy Department charges only for shipping and the box in which they ship the torpedo. The Navy Department said that the cost would be from $25 to $35. I took the trouble to investigate the figures and I came to the conclusion that it could not possibly be done under $150. The Navy Department did not add the overhead; it did not add any check-up; it did not include other items which should be included.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, is it the Senator's statement that it costs $150 to transport a torpedo from Illinois to Newport to be tested?

Mr. GERRY. Yes. The testing, the overhead, and the checking, for example, were not included.

Mr. WALSH. And they would represent an additional charge?

Mr. GERRY. They would represent an additional charge.

Mr. WALSH. That is due to the fact that the testing is at one place and the manufacture at another?

Mr. GERRY. Yes. While the claim is made that the torpedoes are being made more cheaply in Chicago in reality they are not. As a matter of fact, so far as I could ascertain from the civil service wage rates, Newport was paying a lower wage under the civil service than was being paid at Forest Park.

The Forest Park plant, according to my understanding, was established by Secretary Knox. I think the testimony before the committee shows pretty clearly that Secretary Knox put it through, and the Navy Department went along with the Secretary. I cannot conceive of this step after the assurances I was getting from officers with whom I talked at Newport about the possibility of any other plant superseding Newport. My colleague had the same assurances that there was no idea of taking the plant away from Newport.

The only argument the Navy Department makes is that the range is a little bit shorter than they desire. Frankly, I do not think there is much to that argument, because the range at Newport can be lengthened. All that it is necessary is to put the floats back a little farther and probably exercise a little greater supervision over the warning boats and the signaling.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator said that the Navy officials thought the range was somewhat short?

Mr. GERRY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. It is just as long for torpedoes built at Newport as it would be for torpedoes built in Illinois and sent to Newport.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, the range at Newport is being used and the whole Atlantic Ocean is right outside the door. Furthermore, within a short distance there was a range from Block Island to Montauk. There has never before been any question raised on that score. I have also been informed—the admiral disagreed with me, but I think he was a biased witness—that it is possible now to test torpedoes by circling, so that the alleged shortness of the range would not bother them. In any event, the range could be lengthened. Newport has facilities to design torpedoes, to build torpedoes, and to test torpedoes. When they are ready to be installed on naval vessels, they can be shipped to the Pacific coast by boat or by plane, or in any other way that may be desired.

The Senator from Illinois referred to the fact that Newport was a more dangerous location and for defensive reasons in wartime it would be safer to have the plant located at Chicago. Mr. President, that idea has been exploded since this war and before. I know that before the war it was demonstrated—I recall I made a speech on the subject for which the Navy Department gave me the figures—that modern carrier planes could lie off Newfoundland and easily bomb Chicago by following the Arctic Circle. Planes fly by the shortest route and for that reason Chicago, Detroit, and other inland cities are just as vulnerable as Newport.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when the Senator brought that matter up, I was going to point out to him and to the Senate that a plane with an atomic bomb coming from Europe would only have to go 25 miles farther to drop a bomb on Chicago than it would to drop a bomb on New York. The distance on the great circle route is only 25 miles farther to Chicago. I think it will be found that Chicagoans emphasized that point very strongly when they were desirous of having an international air base established at Chicago.

Mr. GERRY. I thank the Senator; I think he has answered the question much better than I did or could. I think that what he has said is unanswerable.

Mr. President, I cannot conceive of a business concern splitting up its plants in the way suggested in the case of the Government's torpedo plants, thus giving up the advantage of trained mechanics who have spent their lives doing a particular kind of work. Every private manufacturer I know tells me that one of the things industry wants are people who are trained in their own particular industry. So, I cannot imagine that any business concern for one moment would even consider moving from Newport and establishing a plant in Illinois.

There should also be considered the way the Forest Park plant was established by an order issued the morning before the Naval Affairs Committee met, and the order was kept secret from the members of the committee. So a protest was sent to the Secretary in a telegram which is incorporatd in the hearings.

It may be proper, more or less, to go on the theory that there is a more modern plant in Illinois because the can company which operated it conducted it very efficiently. I am not so sure the Navy Department is going to run in efficiently. But apart from that, I cannot see the validity of the argument that the Illinois plant must be maintained, unless it is thought we are going to war in about 5 years. We have not even had the atomic bomb test; we have not the faintest idea what kind of torpedo we are going to need or to make in the future. Not only that, but the Forest Park plant does not manufacture all the parts required. It does not make electrical battery parts. They are made by another corporation, and when they are put in at Forest Park they have to come back to Newport, and generally we find that they have not been installed properly, and we have to do the work over again.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me, unless we are willing to abandon all the advantages that Newport has and always has had, which to my mind far offset any temporary gain which might be obtained from a more modern plant in Chicago, the committee amendment should not be agreed to. With atomic energy, and all the other developments, if any new kinds of torpedoes are built within a year the Forest Park plant will have to be retooled.

The whole idea is fantastic. It is not only fantastic, but if the committee amendment shall be agreed to, we will have established the very unsound proposition that any bureaucrat in the Navy Department can close up any station anywhere without consulting the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, if there is one danger from which we are suffering now it is that we are delegating too much power, we are letting this person and that person have powers he should not have, instead of letting Congress have the control as it should have, and which it has unfortunately so largely given away.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the call.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Overton
Andrews	Hayden	Radcliffe
Austin	Hill	Reed
Ball	Hoey	Robertson
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Capper	Knowland	Swift
Carville	La Follette	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Tunnell
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ellender	McMahon	Wagner
Ferguson	Magnuson	Walsh
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Moore	Wiley
Green	Murdock	Willis
Gurney	Murray	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Louisiana a question. As I understand, we are about ready to vote on the amendment on page 13, from line 21 to line 24, inclusive, which strikes out those four lines. If those four lines should be stricken from the bill it would mean that the Navy could continue to make torpedoes in the plant in Chicago; so if we want to sustain the Navy's position, then the vote would be "yea" on this amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. President, before a vote is taken on the amendment I think I should read some excerpts from the record which I consider controlling, and which influenced the committee in arriving, by a very large majority, at the conclusion it reached. The question was asked of Admiral Hussey by myself:

> Senator OVERTON. I assume that the Illinois plant is superior to the Rhode Island plant for the manufacture of torpedoes.

That was suggested by his previous testimony.

> Admiral HUSSEY. Yes, sir.
> Senator OVERTON. Is it very much superior?
> Admiral HUSSEY. Yes, sir.

Senator OVERTON. Would you mind elaborating on that?

Admiral HUSSEY. It is a completely modern plant built and laid out for the manufacture of all types of torpedoes, including electric torpedoes. It has the most modern equipment with space for additional installations should they ever become necessary. The plant is built according to the best present-day building standards for factories.

Further on I asked this question:

Senator OVERTON. Now, you have shown what a modern plant you have in Forest Park. Let us compare that with the Newport plant.

Admiral HUSSEY. The naval torpedo station at Newport, I am speaking solely of the factory part of the plant.

Senator OVERTON. That is the issue here. The manufacturing part of the plant.

Admiral HUSSEY. Yes, sir. It is a result of a growth since 1869. The factory has been added to year by year as new demands arose for torpedoes, as new demands arose for new items, particularly the matter of fuzes and primers, tracers, and as a sufficient justification to be made to Congress for additional buildings.

The island, Goat Island—

That is where the plant is situated—

is a cramped space, and it has been necessary to fit the buildings in like the pieces of a picture puzzle. The equipment in the shops is very crowded in a great many cases, and the shops are by no means as well lighted as are the shops at Forest Park. It is not possible to light them as well as Forest Park without very extensive improvements in day lighting which could not be accomplished in many cases, or without expensive improvement to the electric lighting systems.

Further on I asked a question in reference to the cost of manufacture, and Admiral Hussey made this statement:

The cost of building aircraft torpedoes in Forest Park, with 2,400 torpedoes, average $7,914.08 per torpedo. The cost analysis made by Newport on the same type was $9,040.44.

A difference of $1,000 between the cost of manufacturing aircraft torpedoes in Newport and in Forest Park.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. I dispute those figures given by Admiral Hussey. I think they are absolutely unfair. The only thing the admiral took into account in shipping the torpedoes was making crates to put them in and the carriage charge.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator will pardon me, what the admiral said had to do with the cost of manufacture of torpedoes. There was a thousand dollar difference in the cost. The cost of transportation of the torpedo after it is built is insignificant as compared with the savings made in the Chicago plant, as I understand the situation.

Mr. GERRY. I think the Senator is mistaken in that respect, because I think the cost of shipping the torpedoes is about $150 apiece.

Mr. OVERTON. Suppose it is; there we have $150 compared with a saving of $1,000 in the cost of manufacture. I have no interest in the matter, but I simply stated that that was the reason why the committee was of the opinion that the recommendations of the Secretary of the Navy should be adhered to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. In that contemplation, did they not include the whole overhead of all the departments at Newport?

Mr. OVERTON. They included the cost of manufacturing in the analyses made at both plants.

Mr. GREEN. I think on examination Admiral Hussey brought out the fact that the entire overhead of all the departments, designing, testing, and so forth, as well as the manufacturing of torpedoes, was included in the cost of the torpedoes at Newport, which would account for the difference, especially as I brought out in the examination that the cost of labor in Chicago was higher in every department than it was at Newport.

Mr. GERRY. I see some Senators have come into the Chamber who were not present a short while ago. Therefore I wish again to call attention to the point that the real question at issue is that while the American Can Co. manufactured parts of the torpedoes, they did not manufacture all of them. Parts were manufactured in other places. The important point really is that after the torpedoes were manufactured in Chicago the company had to send them to Newport to be tested, and they were sometimes tested as many as 20 or 30 times, if my recollection is correct. I do not have the figures here, but I know that some torpedoes were tested a great many times, which, of course, greatly increased the cost at Newport.

Mr. President, I cannot see how any business concern could justify the manufacture of parts of a torpedo at one plant, and then send to other plants for other parts, and assemble them into a torpedo, send the torpedo to another plant many miles away to be tested and put into final shape, when all that could be done in one plant at Newport.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the figures which the Senator from Louisiana gave it seems to me do not represent a true comparison. As I understand the situation, the torpedoes manufactured at Newport, R. I., were manufactured by the Navy, whereas those manufactured in Chicago were manufactured by the American Can Co. Now what will be the cost of those torpedoes if the Navy takes that plant over and operates it itself? It is a well-known fact that the operation by a Government department, such as the Navy, is very much more expensive than the operation by a private concern. I can illustrate that probably more fully by giving the difference in the cost of the building of two battleships, the *Indiana* and the *Alabama*. They were built within 20 miles of one another at Norfolk. The *Indiana* was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding Co., a private company, and the *Alabama* by the navy yard at Norfolk. They were sister ships, our latest battleships. The *Alabama* cost $9,000,000 more than the *Indiana*. That indicates the cost of Navy building as compared with private building. I believe that the same thing would apply to torpedoes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. OVERTON] has made a statement indicating that the fundamental question is where torpedoes can be manufactured cheapest, I desire to express a different view. I believe that the fundamental question is whether the Secretary of the Navy—and the same thing would apply to the Secretary of War—has the right to discontinue an important naval establishment which has had the approval of Congress, and set up something in its place. If so, we recognize his right to close all the existing establishments and start anew, according to his individual will. The same argument would apply to Army establishments. I do not believe that the Congress should condone such action.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the debate, but in view of the fact that some question has been raised with respect to cost, I desire to read into the RECORD part of a letter which was written by Admiral Hussey to my colleague [Mr. BROOKS] on June 8. Admiral Hussey stated as follows:

The costs involved are at Forest Park, the labor of putting the torpedo air flask and afterbody into their separate boxes, closing the boxes, and loading them into freight cars; en route, the freight costs; and at Newport, the unloading from the cars, unboxing, assembling the afterbody and air flask, and delivering to the range. As indicated in the table, the sums of these several items for each type of torpedo vary from four-tenths of 1 percent to fifty-five hundredths of 1 percent of the cost of producing the torpedo at Forest Park, including the overhead of the plant.

You may recall that during the hearing on Tuesday I stated that the cost of aircraft torpedoes at Forest Park had averaged $7,914.08, while at Newport the cost analysis, also including overhead, showed $9,040.44 for the same type of torpedo. The manufacturing cost at Newport is thus 14.2 percent greater than at Forest Park, against which comparison approximately a half of 1 percent for shipping is insignificant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 13, line 21, after the word "operation", to strike out "*Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the manufacture, assembly, repair, or overhaul of torpedoes at the naval ordnance plant, Forest Park, Ill."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HART (when his name was called). Present.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who, if present and voting, would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr.

THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BURCH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

I also announce the following general pairs: The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]; and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—28

Ball	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Butler	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Capper	Gurney	Knowland
Donnell	Hatch	La Follette
Downey	Hoey	Lucas
McKellar	Russell	Tydings
Moore	Stewart	Wiley
Murdock	Swift	Wilson
Overton	Taft	
Reed	Thomas, Okla.	

NAYS—26

Aiken	Green	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hayden	Robertson
Austin	Hill	Taylor
Byrd	McCarran	Tunnell
Carville	McClellan	Wagner
Chavez	McMahon	Walsh
Eastland	Magnuson	White
George	Millikin	Willis
Gerry	Murray	

VOTING "PRESENT"—1

Hart

NOT VOTING—41

Bailey	Gossett	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Guffey	Pepper
Bilbo	Hawkes	Revercomb
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bridges	Huffman	Shipstead
Briggs	Kilgore	Smith
Brooks	Langer	Stanfill
Buck	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Burch	Maybank	Tobey
Bushfield	Mead	Vandenberg
Capehart	Mitchell	Wheeler
Connally	Morse	Wherry
Cordon	Myers	Young
Fulbright	O'Daniel	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, today the Senate convened at 11 o'clock. The Senator from Washington wished to speak in regard to one of the amendments, and he arrived in the Chamber at 11:05, or shortly thereafter, but by that time the amendment had already been considered and agreed to.

I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Louisiana, and I now ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment, on page 39, in lines 19 to 24, was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered, and the amendment is before the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is the committee amendment on page 39, beginning with the word "unless", in line 19 and ending with the word "reasonable", in line 24.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Am I to understand that the Senator from Washington is now opposing the committee amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I understand that the committee amendment has already been adopted, and I have asked unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which it was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote by which the amendment was adopted has been reconsidered, and the amendment is now before the Senate.

The question now is on the adoption of the committee amendment on page 39, in lines 19 to 24.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to say something about this matter, Mr. President. Prior to 1916 the Navy used in its navy yards a system involving a so-called time check on the workmen. The system is known by various names, but the most common name is the so-called Taylor time-check system. When the system is abused by an employer, it can become very vicious in practice. Most people in labor oppose it. Since 1916 almost all labor-management groups have completely abolished the so-called time-check system. It became so bad in the navy yards prior to that time that the late Senator Borah, who then was chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, called for a Senate investigation of the matter. The investigation was made, and as a result a lengthy report was filed. The report pointed out the vicious practices which had been engaged in under the system. The report was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last year, following an amendment of similar import which was then proposed. In the report we find stated practically all the reasons why the so-called time-check system should be abolished in modern industrial practice.

The result of the so-called Borah report—and, incidentally, it was a unanimous report by the Committee on Education and Labor in 1916—was to place in all naval appropriation bills the content of section 104 of the pending bill, but without the committee amendment beginning in line 19 of this bill. This section has been a part of all naval appropriation bills for 30 years, since 1916. At various times Senators have attempted either to strike out or to modify amendments similar to this one. Section 104, which has been a part of all naval appropriation bills for 30 years, provides that no time-measuring device or time-measuring system or time study shall be imposed on the workmen in the navy yards. Last year the distinguished Senator from Minnesota sponsored in the committee an amendment which completely struck out that section, which is a prohibition of using the time-check system.

I understand that this year the Senator from Minnesota and perhaps other members of the committee have attempted to modify that restriction. That attempt has resulted in the committee amendment which provides, in substance, that no time-check system or time-measuring device shall be used in regard to the work of any employee unless representatives of the employees are given an opportunity to check any such time studies as may affect the amount of work asked of them and to protest under the established grievance procedure any work requirements believed to be unreasonable.

So the committee amendment would permit the Navy to use this system if it wishes to do so, and if the employees do not like it they can go to their grievance committee and protest. The result will depend upon the person in the navy yard to whom the protest is made. The Navy industrial management could say, "Well we are still going to use the system." Under an abuse of the wording of the amendment, it would be possible to go back to where we were in 1916, when the

Committee on Education and Labor stated unanimously in the Borah report that no time-check system should be used.

The committee amendment does nothing to obviate the chance or the opportunity or the temptation on the part of Navy industrial management to use such a system. Labor and laboring groups, and also some persons in the naval shore establishments, have always thought that such a system should never again be inaugurated in the navy yards. It has been abolished in most private industries.

I do not know who in the Navy came before the committee and advocated the amendment, but I wager that no man in the shore establishments of the Navy Department will claim sponsorship of the amendment. Although they will testify, "We would like to have it, to be able to use it, if and when we may wish to use it," nevertheless, the Navy Department will never come before the Congress and actually sponsor such an amendment as this.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The amendment actually was proposed this year by a Reserve commander in the Navy who was an industrial engineer in private life, and who, from his experience in the Navy while engaged in production, confessed that this method was unsound, and that the pending amendment, which conforms to the established practice in all industry, would result in great benefit to the Navy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that I believe the same gentleman called on me and I told him that he was just about 30 years too late. I told him that 30 years ago we abolished the time-check system in all private industry and in the navy yards.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know what the Senator will say. He will say that in some industrial establishments there still is employed a system of time checking.

Mr. BALL. It is written into many bargaining contracts that the management, with the union participating, shall have the right to make time studies in order to determine how long a particular job will require, and determine other matters as well.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that some collective bargaining contracts have been so drawn. I understand, further, that in most of such contracts there are contained prohibitions such as we have put into all appropriation bills for the past 30 years against the old system of time checking. Of course, in those few contracts in which the provisions are contained, if the union representatives do not like the way in which the system is operating, they have a right to do something about it. But in the navy yard the only right which the men have is the right to go to the grievance committee. The grievance committee in turn says to the management, "We do not like the way you operate this time-check system" and the management says, "Well, that is too bad," and that is the end of it. In another provision of this bill—I do not know whether the Senator from Minnesota had anything to do with it or not—if the men do anything about the condition with reference to which they have made complaint—that is, if they walk out, for example—they may be sent to jail because they would be striking against the Government.

Mr. BALL. Can the Senator from Washington refer to any collective-bargaining contract which contains a prohibition against time studies?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand there are several such contracts.

Mr. BALL. I have examined many union contracts, and I have never seen such a provision in any of them. I have seen, on the other hand, in many such contracts provisions by which the union cooperates with management in making time studies.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have seen contracts with machinists' unions which contained prohibitions against the old-time checking system.

Mr. President, last year when this matter was brought before the Appropriations Committee the Secretary of the Navy testified. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] said:

> My attention has been called to section 105 of this bill, which is a prohibition on the Navy Department spending any of its appropriation on efficiency studies, in navy yards, for example. As you know——

The Senator went on to say that the Mead committee went to Norfolk and they were not tremendously impressed with the efficiency there. The Senator continued:

> Will you have any objection to striking it out of this bill?
>
> Mr. FORRESTAL. None.
>
> Senator BALL. Is there another statute?
>
> Mr. FORRESTAL. I think that is the case. As far as the question of time studies is concerned, it would be useful if we were able to have them. They are not a cure-all, as you appreciate, but it is one instrument that is available in any normal industrial operation.
>
> Mr. BALL. Will you let me know about that?
>
> Mr. FORRESTAL. Yes.
>
> Mr. GERRY. It was put in, Mr. Secretary, according to my recollection, in order to prevent this speed-up plan for labor that was being discussed at that time.
>
> Mr. FORRESTAL. I was about to add that it would be objectionable to the labor interests.
>
> Mr. BALL. The Bedaux speed-up plan?
>
> Mr. GERRY. It was a speed-up proposition.
>
> Mr. FORRESTAL. In the hands of an unscrupulous man or a man with a grudge against labor it could be an unfair weapon, all right.

That is the reason that, for 30 years, the Senate has been including in bills of this kind the prohibition about which we are speaking. The amendment, although there may be an attempt to modify it, means nothing. The Navy could go ahead and use the so-called time-checking and speed-up system. I do not believe I need to tell Senators how that system has been employed in the past, and how, time and time again, a fight has been made against the so-called Bedaux system and the so-called Taylor system. In times past, since the day of Senator Borah's report to the Senate in 1916, any examination of this system made in industrial establishments has proven that it should be abolished, and was abolished in most instances. I think the Government should follow through in connection with the contracts of the Navy Department. I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington has, throughout his argument, referred to conditions which prevailed back in 1916, 30 years ago. I hope that we are not to operate our whole Navy on the basis of conditions which prevailed 30 years ago. It is quite true that the so-called Bedaux system and the so-called Taylor system which were being advanced in industry at that time, constituted a deliberate speed-up which forced workers to speed up their work and not be rewarded by additional compensation as a result of increased production. I agree with the Senator from Washington that that system has been, so far as I know, completely abandoned by industry.

During the 30 years since 1916 a whole new profession of industrial engineering, without which we could not have in America the tremendous efficiency and mass production which we have, has been developed. An essential part of engineering and production of items in a factory is in time operations with a stopwatch. Generally, time studies in industry are made in cooperation with the union which represents the employees. The employees have a right to protest if they believe that they are being unfairly treated in connection with changes in the work schedule, or in connection with any particular operation which is changed as the result of the time studies.

The policy of the Government is not to have a contract with a union, but there are organizations of employees within every naval establishment. The workers have their regular grievance committees. On those committees are wise representatives of the men. The amendment merely provides that the employees shall be given an opportunity to check any time studies which the Navy decides may improve the efficiency of the naval establishment and its manufacturing facilities. The amendment is merely an attempt to increase production in naval establishments, and to improve the techniques by which increased production may be attained. It would be a good thing if we could get away from any kind of incentive payments in connection with naval employment. But greater productivity is the only proper basis on which we can continue to raise our standards of living in this country. It is in that situation, Mr. President, that the committee adopted this modification of the language of section 104. I hope the committee amendment will prevail.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think it should be pointed out that the reason why this provision has been in the naval appropriation bills for all these years is that if this system is abused, or used viciously against an employee and his fellows, an employee may go to a grievance committee, and if the Senator from Minnesota understands how the grievance committee works, he knows the

grievance committee will say to the navy yard management, "You are using this system in the wrong way" the management will say, "We think we are using it in the right way," and the employee has no right to do anything further about it. He has no contract. He is there under civil service. He has certain rights, and if he does not like his position he can quit; but he cannot well quit, because he has made that his life's work, and has seniority rights. Often, as it is used in private industrial practice, there is opportunty to misuse the system. In navy yards with the lack of opportunity on the part of the navy-yard worker to do anything about it, the chance of it being misused is even greater. That is why this prohibition has been in all naval appropriation bills. I do not see why we should go back to the conditions of 1916. The record of production in the navy yards can stand up with any private production records during the whole war, and the navy yards have operated for 30 years with this prohibition in the law.

The modification is not of any assistance. It practically nullifies the prohibition. I know some industrial Navy officers who would like to go back to the Taylor and Bedaux vicious time-check systems, but under the amendment, if they did it, and a grievance committee or an employee did not like it, they could lump it; there would be nothing they could do about it.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, apparently the Senator from Washington has very little confidence in the management of the Navy in its industrial establishments. I think the industrial management of the Navy is as enlightened as any other industrial management, and knows that an absolute requisite to getting production is getting along well with employees. I cannot see any danger in this proviso, such as the Senator sees, when the employees must be consulted as to any great abuse in the system.

As for efficiency in the navy yards, I have gone through several of them, and if what I have seen of men loafing on the job because the flow of materials has not been organized properly is a sample of Navy efficiency, I think it can stand a great deal of improvement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it seems to me that perhaps the Senator has not any confidence in the way the navy yards operate. I have a great deal of confidence that most of the men who operate the navy yards would not abuse this system, but we are thinking of the men who would abuse it, and that is why the time-check systems, the Bedaux and Taylor and all the other systems, have long since been abandoned. That is the reason for the prohibition.

I do not know who would use the system, but under the suggested amendment it could be used, and just as surely as this provision is put in the law, we will find some industrial manager of some navy yard abusing the system, or using it the wrong way, going back to 30 years ago, when we finally had to have a Senate committee investigate the whole matter, and the Senate practically unanimously agreed with the late Senator Borah, of Idaho, that the system should be abolished.

Mr. BALL. Industry long ago abandoned any thought of the Bedaux speed-up system, and it was abandoned; nevertheless, the time study has come to be an efficient part of the operation of industrial organizations, and I do not know why Congress should deny to naval industrial establishments the privilege of using modern techniques.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Overton
Andrews	Hoey	Pepper
Austin	Huffman	Radcliffe
Ball	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Capehart	Knowland	Russell
Capper	La Follette	Saltonstall
Carville	Lucas	Stewart
Donnell	McCarran	Swift
Ellender	McClellan	Taft
Ferguson	McKellar	Taylor
Fulbright	McMahon	Tunnell
George	Magnuson	Tydings
Gossett	Mead	Walsh
Green	Millikin	White
Gurney	Moore	Wiley
Hart	Murdock	Willis
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to make some inquiries of the distinguished Senator from Washington. Was not a somewhat similar proposal to this before the Senate in 1945?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, there was.

Mr. WALSH. I have before me the RECORD of May 15, 1945. A motion was then made to strike out what I assume to be the same language as is contained in this section, without the language added by the committee and now the pending amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And that was defeated by a vote of 21 to 40.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. No attempt is being made now to strike out the language which was retained in the bill last year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. WALSH. But a new provision, or new language, is inserted, the purpose of which is either to modify or destroy or limit the language which is in the present law, and which was in the bill a year ago?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. Now will the Senator briefly and concisely state just what this language is and just what it does?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say first to the Senator from Massachusetts that section 104 is the prohibition on the use of time-study systems, time-check systems, in navy yards. That has been in these bills for many years.

Mr. WALSH. And from time to time efforts have been made to eliminate that language, but without success?

Mr. MAGNUSON. But without success. The present attempt, in my opinion, I will say to the Senator, in effect would strike it out. I will read the language of section 104:

SEC. 104. No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person or persons having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work.

Mr. WALSH. That is the present law.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, that is the present law. But the committee has added this language:

Unless representatives of the employees are given the opportunity to check any such time studies as may affect the amount of work asked of them and to protest under the established grievance procedure any work requirements believed unreasonable.

In other words, by that language it is said: "You can go ahead and use the time-study and time-check devices if the employee is given an opportunity to protest to the grievance committee."

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator from Washington believe that the amendment would nullify the existing law?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it would nullify the existing law, because the practical effect would be, as I said before, that if the worker did not like what was being done, he would go to the grievance committee, and the management would say, "Well, we are sorry, but we are going to continue this practice," and the worker has no redress.

Mr. WALSH. Then, those of us who favor the present law should vote "nay" on the amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I desire merely to say that the Senator from Washington and I differ completely as to whether the amendment would nullify the present law. I think all the amendment proposed by the committee would do would be to put navy yards in line with the best practice in use in efficient private industrial plants, where such studies as these are made in cooperation with the employees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand the question now before the Senate is on the adoption of the committee amendment on page 39, and that a vote "yea" would be a vote to adopt the language in italics in the bill on that page, and a vote "nay" would be a vote against the so-called time-check system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words about this issue. As Senators will recall, this prohibition was placed in the law some years ago, and has been continued since that time as the result of a thorough investigation which consistently demonstrated the abuses which were being made of the time-check system.

I disagree completely with the statement of the Senator from Minnesota

that the situation in a private plant, where the employes are organized, and have a collective bargaining agreement, and the right to strike against the employer if the abuses become intolerable, is analogous to the situation in a Government navy yard, where, it is true, the employees are permitted to organize, but where they do not have collective bargaining power such as they have in private employment. It is for that reason that it is important to retain this prohibition to prevent abuses which developed in the past, and are very likely to develop again in the future, because merely giving the employees the right to go to a grievance committee, without their being able to use their economic power as a collective group, is tantamount, in my opinion, to blowing a hole in the prohibition through which a 10-ton truck could be driven.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 39, beginning in line 19, and ending in line 24.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BURCH] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are detained on official business at important conference committee meetings.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

I also announce the following general pairs: The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]; and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I announce that if present and voting, the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—28

Andrews	Gossett	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Russell
Ball	Hart	Stewart
Bushfield	Hatch	Swift
Butler	Hawkes	Taft
Capper	Hoey	White
Ellender	McClellan	Wiley
Ferguson	McKellar	Willis
Fulbright	Moore	
George	Overton	

NAYS—27

Aiken	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Carville	Lucas	Pepper
Donnell	McCarran	Radcliffe
Green	McMahon	Robertson
Hill	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Huffman	Mead	Taylor
Johnson, Colo.	Millikin	Tunnell
Johnston, S. C.	Murdock	Tydings
Knowland	Murray	Walsh

NOT VOTING—41

Bailey	Downey	Revercomb
Barkley	Eastland	Shipstead
Bilbo	Gerry	Smith
Brewster	Guffey	Stanfill
Bridges	Hayden	Thomas, Okla.
Briggs	Hickenlooper	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	Kilgore	Tobey
Buck	Langer	Vandenberg
Burch	McFarland	Wagner
Bryd	Maybank	Wheeler
Capehart	Mitchell	Wherry
Chavez	Morse	Wilson
Connally	Myers	Young
Cordon	O'Daniel	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any administrator, officer, or supervisor having responsibility for forming or carrying out personnel policies and regulations who does not, in good faith, attempt to adjust the grievances of employees, or who fails to meet and negotiate in good faith with the representatives of employee organizations.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, it seems to have become the accepted thing to include in every appropriation bill—

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not know whether the Senator will be so happy, because I am going to make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Louisiana for the purpose of making a point of order? He is not compelled to do so.

Mr. OVERTON. I can make the point of order later in my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana can make the point of order in his own time later. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Louisiana for the purpose of making the point of order at this time?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to ask the Chair if the rule has not been that an amendment is not subject to a point of order because it carries legislation within it if it imposes limitations upon the use of an appropriation. I ask the Chair if he can distinguish the character of the pending amendment from that of the amendment which has been adopted in several appropriation bills, providing that no part of the funds carried by the appropriation may be used to pay any worker who belongs to an organization which asserts the right to strike against the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Chair to understand that the Senator from Idaho has yielded for the purpose of enabling the Senator from Louisiana to make the point of order?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the Chair holds that the point of order——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I made a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is what the Chair was about to answer.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to hear the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the point of order is well taken. If the Senator will read the amendment, he will find that the amendment involves the question of good faith, and no one is designated to pass upon the question of good faith. The amendment necessarily provides for legislation, which provision is not present in the other amendments which have been adopted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Am I to understand the Chair to rule that what makes the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho subject to a point of order is that it contains within it, in line 5, the words "in good faith," and that if those words were deleted it would not be subject to a point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not at all. That is only one of the things to which the Chair was inviting the attention of the Senator from Florida. The amendment involves legislation. As evidence of that fact the Chair invites the attention of the Senator from Florida to the fact that it refers to an administrator, officer, or supervisor "having responsibility for forming or carrying out personnel policies and regulations who does not, in good faith, attempt to adjust the grievances of employees, or who fails to meet and negotiate in good faith with the representatives of employee organizations." There is no provision for anyone to pass upon the question of good faith, and there is no way to determine it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. I invite the attention of the Chair to section 109 of the bill, reading as follows:

SEC. 109. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Does the Chair hold that that section is not subject to a point of order, by virtue of being legislative in character?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Florida that that question is not before the Chair. No point of order was raised in connection with section 109. The Chair invites the attention of the Senator from Florida to the fact that section 109 is a substitution for the language adopted by the House, and deals with the same subject, but uses different language. That is not the question now before the Chair, because that amendment has already been adopted. No point of order was raised in connection with it. The point of order raised by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is sustained.

The question now is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before that step is taken, I wish to say that, as I understand, the Chair has also advised that section 109 is a substitute for a section in the bill as passed by the House, and that therefore the section would be subject to consideration by the conference committee because the provision adopted by the Senate is substantially different from that adopted by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not wish to delay action on the bill, but I can see in section 109 several practical problems regarding this language which I think should be answered, particularly in the conference committee before it is finally adopted.

For instance, it provides that any person who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States shall be subject to punishment for the commission of a felony, by being placed in jail for 1 year or by being fined $1,000, and shall also be subject to losing his pay. Such a provision might be seriously abused. A man might belong to an organization and yet not know whether it advocated the right to strike against the Government.

There are several other aspects of this matter. A man might have to accept his pay check while he was making an investigation of the organization. It might be necessary for him to accept his pay check before he made such an investigation, for he might need the money in order to live.

As I have said, this matter has several other practical aspects. Several have been presented to me, and I have written out some of them. Although there is no objection to prohibiting strikes against the Government of the United States, and as a matter of fact, most of the American Federation of Labor unions have in their charters a prohibition against strikes against the Government and most of the local unions have in their bylaws such a prohibition, nevertheless this language may cause much trouble if it is adopted as it now stands and if it is strictly enforced.

There are many questions which should be answered. For instance, a number of organizations of Government employees are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and they have in their constitutions and by-laws, as I have said before, prohibitions against strikes against the Government. Presumably such organizations, by remaining affiliated, subscribe to the policies of the parent body. The United Mine Workers, for instance, resumed its strike in the coal industry after the Government had taken it over. Their position was sustained by some of the officials of the American Federation of Labor. Section 109 might be interpreted as prohibiting employees from belonging to organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The United Mine Workers are now an affiliate of the A. F. of L.

Suppose a man belongs to a union and suppose the union had said nothing about this matter, but suppose the United Mine Workers or some other union had in its charter a provision which gave it the right to strike against the Government, and suppose it did strike against the Government. Under this section, as I read it, if it were strictly enforced, if a man took his pay check for that month and if he did not previously examine the constitutions of the various organizations, he might be subject to being put in jail or to being fined $1,000.

So I think there are many questions to be considered in this connection, and I ask unanimous consent that the questions which I hold in my hand may be printed in the RECORD at this point, and I ask the Senator from Louisiana that they be considered in the conference in regard to this particular language, because the conference committee will have an opportunity to correct any practical abusive effects which the language might have.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Those who sponsor the language of section 109, above referred to, should be requested to state on the floor of the Senate how far they propose a Government employee may be held liable to the inhibitions and penalties of the section, if he belongs to an old-line trade-union which is, has been, or may become affiliated with the A. F. of L. The clearing up of the following points would be helpful.

A number of Government employee organizations which are affiliated with the A. F. of L. have provisions in their constitutions and bylaws which prohibit strikes against the Government. Presumably, such organizations by remaining affiliated subscribe to the policies of the parent body. The United Mine Workers resumed their strike in the soft-coal mine industry after the Government had taken over. Their position was sustained by officials of the A. F. of L. Does section 109 prohibit employees from belonging to organizations affiliated with the A. F. of L., even though the affiliated organization renounces the right to strike against the Government on the part of its own members? Are Government em-

ployees belonging to the national labor unions whose constitutions and bylaws are silent on this subject of strikes against the Government prohibited from belonging to such organizations? Will it satisfy the requirements of section 109 if such Government organized groups refrain from asserting the right or renounce the right themselves to strike against the Government?

Section 109 appears to require that employees fill out affidavits that they are not members of organizations that assert the right to strike against the Government. Such employees may be of the opinion that their organization has not asserted such a right, but upon investigation, the authorities may find that at some time in the history of the organization, such a pronouncement has been made and not subsequently rescinded. Would an employee who finds himself mistaken in the opinion of the construing authorities be subject to a fine up to a thousand dollars and imprisonment up to 1 year, or both?

Section 109 appears to be subject to a point of order, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill; because even though similar language has been applied to other appropriation bills, they do not cover the naval appropriation bill. Hence, it is legislation on that bill and, under the Senate rules, can be adopted only by suspending the rules by a two-thirds vote.

Section 109 also appears to be unconstitutional, in that it compels the Government employee, in effect, to testify against himself, and makes a felony of a mere misunderstanding which has not resulted in the individual either striking or personally sanctioning a strike against the Government.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, so far as the Senator from Louisiana is concerned, he has no objection to the request the Senator from Washington has made.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, while this matter is under discussion, let me say that I had something to do with the drafting of the original amendment of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Georgia. I know that in the minds of some employees some question has arisen, because a number of AFL unions, such as machinists' unions, carpenters' unions and so forth, have members who are employees of the Government.

I should like to make my interpretation of the amendment clear, and I think it is the interpretation which is made by the other sponsors of the amendment. My interpretation is that the language "who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States" means that the organization must be primarily an organization of Government employees. As a matter of fact, I do not think there is any secret that we were thinking primarily of the United Public Workers of America, the newly formed CIO organization, the constitution of which has been interpreted by the Washington newspapers as definitely asserting the right to strike against the Government of the United States. That is the important aspect of this language, as I read it. I do not think it would affect the A. F. of L. unions, which always have contended that there is no right to strike against the Government. Although they assert the right to strike against private employers, of course, they have never asserted a right to strike against the Government of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it intended that the provision against the right to strike against the Government of the United States, as contained in this bill, particularly on page 44, would be sufficiently broad to apply to an organization which asserted that it had the right to strike, for example, against the United States Steel Co. or against a mine owner, if the steel company or the mines happened to be in the custody and possession of the Government, due to an act of the President in taking them over, under the Smith-Connally Act or otherwise?

Mr. BALL. In answer to the Senator, I say that I cannot see how this section could possibly apply in such a situation, because those employees would not be paid out of this appropriation. I do not see how the provision referred to would affect such a situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that completely answers the question. The limitations in each of these bills are confined to payments to be made under the terms of these appropriation acts, and there is no way by the wildest flight of fancy or the most vivid imagination that this provision would apply to employees other than employees of the United States who, within Government departments, are members of unions of other Government employees or of unions composed of Government employees that assert the right to strike against the Government. Certainly none of the members of outside unions who might be brought in under any seizure under the Smith-Connally Act or under the exercise of any other power the President might have are paid under these appropriation bills, and therefore this provision would not affect their right in any way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Suppose a man working in a Navy yard were involved?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator means, as he said a moment ago, that a man might be a member of a machinists' union, and yet be working for the Government of the United States. I do not think he would be bound at all. Unless it was a union of Government employees, he would not be covered. None of those unions are unions of Government employees. They are regularly affiliated CIO unions or A. F. of L. unions, and they are not unions of Government employees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, is it the purpose of the amendment to cover the so-called Government employees' union?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the language is about as clear as it is ordinarily possible to make the English language. The amendment would apply to anyone who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States. The provision would not apply to an organization which asserts the right to strike against the United States Steel Corp., or against any other private employer. It would apply only to members of a union of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States. The language is not in any way applicable unless the person affected is drawing his pay from the funds provided by these appropriations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Suppose there were a local union in a navy yard and suppose every member of that local union—let us assume it is a machinists' union—worked in the navy yard and was a Government employee. Would that be a union of Government employees?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not so construe it.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that I think that particular local might be a union of Government employees, but I do not know of any local of that type which asserts the right to strike against the Government. In fact, all of them have no-strike provisions in their constitutions or bylaws.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Here is another question which arose: Would this provision be interpreted as affecting a Government employee who belonged to an organization which refrained from saying in its constitution or bylaws anything against striking against the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. For my part, I am greatly attracted to the ideas expressed by the A. F. of L. unions, by which they expressly renounce the right to strike against the Government. But in my opinion if the constitution of the organization did not mention such a matter in any way whatever, a negative position could not be considered an assertion. If the point were not expressed at all, I do not think the limitation would apply.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, allow me to ask one further question. One provision of section 109 of the bill would require the employees to make affidavits. An employee must make an affidavit that he does not belong to an organization which asserts the right to strike against the Government. Suppose that a person wanted a job and needed it immediately. Suppose further that he belonged to a machinists' local, or to some other group, or even to a group of Government employees. He would first be required to make an affidavit, and after that it would be necessary for the authorities to ascertain the nature of the organization to which he belonged. What would then be the position of the prospective employee?

Mr. RUSSELL. In my judgment, the prospective employee should have made sure that he did not belong to a group of employees which asserted the right to strike against the Government.

Mr. MAGNUSON. However, the employee may quit as an individual.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, sometimes it is difficult to know what is the background or even the constitution of an organization. I believe that the provision of the amendment which reads "or who is a member of an organization

that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force," and so forth, might catch many of us. It is perhaps true that even Members of the Senate may, on certain occasions, have put their names to something which later turned out to be a front for some organization. I hope the language to which I have referred will not be interpreted to deny to Government employees the right to receive their pay checks.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad that the Senator has referred to the language in the bill which he just read. It relates to members of organizations which seek to overthrow the Government of the United States. Similar language has been incorporated for many years in appropriations bills, and if any injustice ever grew out of it, I have never had it called to my attention, and I do not know of it having been called to the attention of any other member of the Appropriations Committee. Language prohibiting employees striking against the Government of the United States has been in appropriation bills for many years. I have never heard of any abuses having resulted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire about the following language:

Provided further, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States * * * shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. RUSSELL. The offense there would be in making a false affidavit, would it not?

Mr. PEPPER. No. I am reading from page 44, beginning in line 14. I shall read it again:

Provided further, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment.

Mr. RUSSELL. The offense would be in accepting employment and receiving pay out of this appropriation.

Mr. PEPPER. No. The language is, "any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States." Does that not mean what it says, namely, any person who strikes against the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have never been particularly impressed with the theory that that language applied to a person engaged in a strike against the Government. What I have always been concerned with is a person belonging to an organization which asserted the right to strike against the Government.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I brought up the point because I wished to invite the attention of the able Senator from Georgia to the language of the amendment. The language would impose a penalty upon the individual, not the organization. The penalty does not apply to an organization which asserts the right to strike, and of which organization the individual is a member. The language provides that it shall be a felony for any individual person to strike against the Government of the United States. It is obvious that there is considerable question with regard to what constitutes a strike. Suppose that a certain man quits work in protest against the wage scale under which he has been paid. Would that be a strike within the meaning of the language of this amendment? Suppose one man said to another man who worked next to him, "Let us quit work because we do not acquiesce in the treatment which we have received here, or in the wage scale which we are required to observe." Would that constitute a strike on the part of that individual? Of course, many individuals would have to participate before the action could constitute a strike. I am concerned about how much we can allow to the individual in his right to quit work.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe that the language adds to or takes from the original amendment. It was my idea, although I did not resist the additional language when it was presented to the committee, that it did not help the original proposition to any degree. If a man actually strikes he is asserting the right to strike. I wanted to be sure that there could be no organization of Government employees which could strike and render the Government impotent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In speaking of the affidavit, I may point out that on page 44 the language reads, in part, as follows:

Provided, That, for the purposes hereof, an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not, contrary to the provisions of this section, engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States.

Let us assume that at some time before a person had been a member of an organization but does not now belong to the organization. Would he be barred from employment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was not the author of the language. However, I believe the Senator is splitting hairs. If a strike has ever taken place against the Federal Government up to the present time I have never heard of it. The language could not apply retroactively against employees, if there be any such, who have struck against the Government in times past.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The United Mine Workers may be cited as a case in point. After all, Mr. President, I believe this to be a very serious amendment to the bill. If the Senate agrees to it the time may come when it will have to be construed. I think we should ascertain now the legislative intent of the authors.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The proviso reads, in part, beginning in line 6, "that the person making the affidavit has not, contrary to the provisions of this section", and so forth. Obviously, he could not do anything contrary to the provisions of this section before the section becomes law. I believe that in the future, if any Government employee should engage in a strike against the Government he would be barred from receiving Government compensation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this amendment has already been agreed to, I believe, and if the vote by which it was agreed to is not reconsidered there will be no opportunity to delete any of the language. But I want to say that I believe that the men and women who work for the Government of the United States have, as citizens of the United States, civil rights. I do not believe that they surrendered their rights as citizens merely because they happened to become employees of the Government. I believe that a Government employee has a right to cease working for the Government if he wishes to do so. I believe that he has such right as a citizen of this country. If he wishes to talk to his neighbor or make a speech about the situation he has a right to do so as a citizen of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator believe that a group of Government employees has the right to strike against the Government?

Mr. PEPPER. I believe that a group of employees has the right to cease work, and I believe such employees have a right to talk about it among each other before quitting work. I believe that as citizens of the United States, under the Constitution of the United States, they have a right to act in concert if they wish so to act. I know of nothing in the Constitution which justifies a deprivation of that right.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the amendment which deprives anyone of the right of free speech. The effort has been to prevent a strike against the Government of the United States. For my part, I would never approve of any legislative suggestion which gave to any Government employee the right or power to strike down and render impotent the Government of the United States by engaging in a strike against the Government.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the reason I made the inquiry which I made a few moments ago with reference to what constitutes a strike was that I wished to have, if possible, some definition which would give us a standard that could be laid alongside the Constitution of the United States and enable one to know when one was subjecting oneself to imprisonment for exercising his constitutional rights. That is the reason that I explained a moment ago what I regard as the civil rights of the citizen to cease working, and to talk with his fellows about ceasing to work, or act collectively in the presentation of a demand for wage increases, or improved working conditions. If Senators call that striking, that will have to be their privilege, but I call doing those things the exercise of the privileges of citizenship in the United States of America.

I do not see how we can pass a measure containing the general word "strike," without any definition of what we mean being inserted, without running the risk of subjecting those who happen to work for the Government to loss of their civil rights to quit work if they do not wish to work for the Government, to present their demands in concert, to talk at public meetings, and, if they desire, to quit at the same time. I do not know whether

the authors of the provision consider that that would be a strike. I know there are many courts which are unfriendly to labor which would call anything like it a strike.

I realize the necessity of the functioning of the Government of the United States, but the Constitution did not say that the Government could make a person work for it if he did not desire to do so, except in the exercise of certain recognized authority in the Government provided by the Constitution. The Government can draft citizens into the Army and the Navy, it can make them defend the country in time of war, but I think there is some serious question as to the power of the Government to draft people into the Government service, or to keep them in it, in violation of their will. I think there is serious question as to whether the Government can subject a man to punishment in the penitentiary if he quits, with several other people, working for the Government, in spite of the fact that someone might happen to call that a strike.

Yet, Mr. President, we are passing a bill which contains a provision that any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States—and that means quitting work, I assume—subjects himself to conviction for commission of a felony, and subjects himself to punishment by a fine of not more than a thousand dollars or imprisonment for not more than 1 year.

I am not saying anything about any part of the amendment except that which relates to what I have been discussing; I am not referring to anyone who proposes to overthrow the Government of the United States by force. Of course, it is levying war against the Government when one proposes to overthrow it by force. It is almost treason when one proposes to destroy the Government of the United States by force, and when one commits an overt act in furtherance of such a purpose, that seems to me very much like treason against the Government of the United States. But I cannot put that in the same category with the act of one who by himself, or in concert with others, quits working for the Government.

It is all the more important that we should be clear in what we say, because, as the Senator from Washington has pointed out, the Government owns power plants. What about the TVA? That is owned substantially by the Government of the United States. What about all the other works the Government of the United States carries on?

As a practical matter, if employees of the Government dare to protest against the wages and working conditions in any enterprise owned by the Government, as well as the service of the Government itself, if people who are unfriendly to labor administer the law, they will hold the penitentiary over the employees' heads. That is just one more encroachment upon the civil immunities of citizens, it seems to me, upon what I thought to be the civil constitutional rights of the citizenry of this country, because I thought we had not yet gotten ready to abandon the rights of the individual in the United States of America, even against the Government of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may have misunderstood my distinguished colleague from Florida, but at least on this side of the aisle I understood him to say that advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States was almost treason. I would say it was treason.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course. It may be that there is some technical definition of the word "treason," but I meant substantially to say the same thing, that anybody who proposes to overthrow the Government of the United States by force, and commits an overt act in furtherance of that design, commits treason, it seems to me, against the Government of the United States, and of course no one desires to condone that in any possible way.

Mr. President, I merely wanted to say that the proposed action is in a direction that is dangerous to the civil rights of the American people. Due to the tendency toward reaction which is sweeping the Congress and the Nation, I have seen a disposition to yield to an encroachment upon the civil immunities and the constitutional rights of the citizenry of this country that strikes at the very heart of our Republic. I at least wanted to raise my voice in warning against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 6496) was passed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. GREEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, on a voice vote just a few minutes ago the Senate agreed to the spending of $4,100,000,000 for the Navy during the coming year. I do not suppose there is a Senator on the floor who can conscientiously say that he knows within a billion dollars whether this appropriation is right or not. I have read the hearings, I have read the committee report— which does not amount to anything—I have read the bill, and, frankly, I have not the slightest idea whether $4,100,000,000—four thousand one hundred million dollars—is the correct amount the Congress should appropriate for the Navy during the coming year.

If ever there was an illustration of the dire necessity for the enactment of the so-called La Follette bill, which would bring into operation experts who could advise the Committee on Appropriations, I think this is a perfect example.

As I looked through the hearings I read what the admirals said. What else would we expect to hear from admirals except demands for all the money they think Congress will appropriate? I don't blame them—that is their business, but it certainly is our business to double check them, and we have not the facilities for doing it.

I say to Senators that they have sat here today and, by a voice vote, put through a $4,100,000,000 appropriation, and they really do not know very much about it. They do not know whether the battleships which are carried in the appropriation bill are worth anything or not, and they have not had any advice except from the admirals. That observation applies from the first page of the bill to the last.

I hope that when a similar appropriation bill is before us next year, we will know more about it. I think the taxpayers are entitled to an informed judgment when billions of dollars are involved for defense or anything else.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1947

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5452, the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5452), making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Treasury Department—Office of the Secretary", on page 2, line 5, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$422,000" and insert "$442,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Tax Legislative Counsel", on page 3, line 12, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "$87,500" and insert "$90,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of General Counsel", on page 3, line 18, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "$175,000" and insert "$179,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Division of Personnel", on page 3, line 21, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "$190,000" and insert "$206,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fiscal Service—Bureau of Accounts", on page 6, line 1, after the word "travel", to strike out "$7,100,000, of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available immediately" and insert "$6,275,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Public Debt", on page 9, line 7, after the word "charged", to strike out "$64,700,000" and insert "$65,600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Mint", on page 25, after line 7, to strike out:

For a period of 2 years following the enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell or lease for manufacturing uses, including manufacturing uses incident to reconversion and the building up of employment in industry, upon such terms as the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem advisable, to any person, partnership, association, or corporation, or any department of the Government, any silver held or owned by the United States at not less than 71.11 cents per fine troy ounce: *Provided*, That at all times the ownership and the possession or control within the United States of an amount of silver of a monetary value equal to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be maintained by the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 21, to insert:

(a) Subsection (b) of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised," approved July 6, 1939, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) Until June 30, 1948, the Director of such mint with the consent of the owner shall deduct and retain of such silver so received 30 percent as seigniorage for services performed by the Government of the United States relative to the coinage and delivery of silver dollars. The balance of such silver so received, that is, 70 percent, shall be coined into standard silver dollars and the same or any equal number of other standard silver dollars shall be delivered to the owner or depositor of such silver. The 30 percent of such silver so deducted shall be retained as bullion by the Treasury or coined into standard silver dollars and held or disposed of in the same manner as other bullion or silver dollars held in or belonging to the Treasury.

"(2) On and after July 1, 1948, there shall be delivered therefor in standard silver dollars or any other coin or coinage of the United States, the full monetary value of the silver so delivered, less such deductions for brassage, coinage, and other mint charges as the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the President shall have determined, not to exceed the actual cost thereof: *Provided*, That such mint is satisfied the silver so delivered has been mined subsequently to June 30, 1948, from natural deposits in the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof."

(b) The following statutes and portions of statutes are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 1805 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended;

(2) Sections 6, 7, and 8, and the second proviso in section 3, of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934 (U. S. C., title 31, secs. 316a, 316b, and 734a).

(c) Until June 30, 1948, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell for domestic manufacturing uses, to any person, partnership, association, or corporation, or any department of the Government, any nonmonetized silver held or owned by the United States, at a price of not less than 90.3 cents per fine troy ounce, and thereafter at a price of not less than the legal monetary value (of silver) per fine troy ounce: *Provided*, That until June 30, 1948, no such sale shall be made unless the purchaser has certified in writing, and the Secretary of the Treasury is satisfied, that such silver is to be used in domestic industry or the arts and within a period of 6 months after any such sale: *Provided, further*, That at all times the ownership and the possession or control within the United States of an amount of silver of a monetary value equal to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be maintained by the Treasury: *And provided further*, That on the consummation of such sale of silver by the Treasury to any purchaser, the purchaser shall immediately take possession of the silver so sold and by him purchased and remove the same from the Treasury, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

(d) Hereafter, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, maximum prices shall not be established or maintained upon—

(1) standard commercial bars or other forms of silver bullion, whether foreign, domestic, or Treasury;

(2) semifabricated silver articles;

(3) silver scrap; or

(4) the processing of silver or silver scrap.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the adoption of the amendments on page 28 of the bill the following may be printed in the RECORD: A letter dated November 27, 1945, from the Secretary of the Treasury to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency; a letter dated December 13, 1945, from me to the Secretary of the Treasury in reply to the previous letter; another letter from the Secretary of the Treasury dated December 19, 1945, addressed to me; a letter from me to the Secretary of the Treasury dated February 11, 1946; and the statement made by me on May 9, 1946, before the subcommittee considering this bill.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C., November 27, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of October 26, 1945, requesting a report on S. 1508, a bill "to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States."

Enactment of the bill will enable the Treasury to continue selling silver to American industry for manufacturing uses. It is unlikely that domestic production of silver and imports of silver will be sufficient to satisfy the demands of industry for a considerable period of time. A shortage of silver for industrial use would interfere with reconversion and the maintenance of high levels of production and, accordingly, authority for the Treasury to sell silver to industry would greatly assist in the adjustment from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

With respect to leases, the bill would permit the extension, if necessary, of two leases which are now outstanding and which will terminate six months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President. The War Department holds nearly 475,000,000 ounces under lease and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation holds slightly more than 400,000,000 ounces. The silver is used in bus bars located in aluminum and magnesium plants throughout the country and in the War Department's atomic bomb plant in Tennessee.

For the reasons stated above, the Treasury Department recommends that S. 1508 be enacted.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

FRED M. VINSON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

DECEMBER 13, 1945.

Hon. FRED M. VINSON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have before me yours of November 27, written to Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate. Your letter indicates that you are favorable to the passage of S. 1508, introduced by Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island. This proposed legislation, in brief, provides for sale of Treasury silver to industry at not less than 71.1 cents per ounce. I am surprised at your attitude on this bill as expressed in your letter, and I feel that I should advise you as to my reasons.

Under existing law our metallic monetary reserves are to be carried by the Treasury in gold and silver at the ratio of three-fourths gold and one-fourth silver. Your Treasury statement of December 6, 1945, indicates that there is a great deficit in our silver reserves as compared to our gold reserves. I realize that such a deficit is the result of numerous contributing factors and I make no complaint whatever about them, but merely point out that a great quantity of silver could be added to our silver reserves and still not meet the requirements of the law above mentioned.

Under our so-called silver statutes, the Secretary of the Treasury was and is required to monetize not less than the cost value of silver purchased; but under the law, the Secretary of the Treasury could have monetized all silver in the Treasury at its monetary value of $1.29 per ounce.

I don't think that I exaggerate when I say that Secretary Morgenthau, your distinguished predecessor, was very pronounced in his opposition to the silver statutes which were placed on the statute books of the Nation during the Roosevelt administration. As a result of his opposition, to these laws, up until just previous to his leaving the Treasury, he adamantly refused to monetize silver, except only the minimum required under the law. As I recall conferences with him and the Special Silver Committee of the Senate, he took the position that to monetize silver was inflationary and unsound, and because of this, he maintained his attitude on silver right up to the time of his leaving the Treasury, except that just previous to this time, and during the consideration by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee of the Bretton Woods Agreement—after a conference with me—he did agree to monetize 300,000,000 ounces of what he said was free silver in the Treasury.

I haven't talked with you about monetary matters since you took over the duties and responsibilities of Secretary of the Treasury, but having in mind your attitude on this subject, so ably and clearly expressed by you while we were both Members of the House of Representatives, I have the hope that your attitude is not, and will not be, the same as your predecessor. Whether the silver laws now on the statute books were correct or incorrect, wise or foolish, they are neverthe-

less the laws of the land on this subject. They have not been repealed, therefore they are valid, and entitled to the same solemn respect from the executive department of Government as any other laws in the books.

The only money mentioned in the Constitution is gold and silver. Even the worst enemies of silver as money cannot, in my opinion, take the position that the issuance of a silver certificate is the least bit more inflationary than the creation of bookkeeping dollars which are created, and have been created for years, by the delivery by the United States Treasury of Government securities to the commercial banks of the country, and the establishment of demand deposits to the credit of the Government without the requirement of any reserve whatsoever. There is one very important distinction between the issuance of a silver certificate against silver in the Treasury and the exchange of Government bonds bearing interest for demand deposits in our banks. This item of distinction is the item of interest, so important to the banker.

When our Government is running our printing presses overtime in the printing of bonds bearing interest which are to be exchanged for demand deposits in the banks, it is inconceivable to me that the best interests of the taxpayer can be conserved by selling silver money from the Treasury, which belongs to the taxpayer, at 71.1 cents an ounce when its monetary value is $1.29 per ounce.

According to the Treasury statement of December 6, 1945, there are in the Treasury 449,360,347.02 ounces of silver against which silver certificates have not been issued. This silver money of the people and the taxpayers remains dormant while the people and the taxpayers pay interest on billions of dollars in bonds which have been traded for demand deposit dollars. The quantity of silver above mentioned doesn't loom large against billions of dollars owed on bonds, but if monetized for its full monetary value, at least it could be substituted for an identical amount of interest-bearing bonds, and by such substitution would save the taxpayer and the people millions of dollars in interest annually.

As a Secretary of the Treasury who, I am sure, is most interested in saving the taxpayer every dollar possible, I can't understand why every unused ounce of silver should not be monetized immediately.

During the war, silver was needed by industry for war purposes and of course it was only natural to use silver in every way possible for the winning of the war, so the law which was passed by Congress, on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, that the Treasury be allowed to sell some of its silver to industry at 71.1 cents per ounce could be justified on that basis. But now that the war is over, under what philosophy should the silver fabricating industry of this country, or any other segment of our population, or group, be allowed to profit by a sale by the Government of silver money below its monetary value? Of course, the fabricator of silver who is asking for a special privilege may answer by saying, "The Treasury didn't pay any more for the silver than we are asking it to sell silver for." But the fact that the Treasury makes a profit out of the miners of silver is certainly not a legitimate reason why this profit should be passed on by the Government to another segment of the population. The profit provided for in the law was for the benefit of all the people, and certainly not intended for some small special group.

There are those in this country, including many big bankers, who would prefer the Government to dispose of all its silver at whatever it could get for it, because silver certificates are the only form of money now in use in the United States that do not carry the tribute of interest. But the great masses of the people, if they understood the situation, I am sure would vociferously demand that the silver money in the Treasury be fully utilized, thereby saving millions of dollars in interest by substituting it for an equal amount of interest-bearing Government securities, regardless of the attitude of the silver fabricators and those who don't like silver as money.

The wisdom of the silver laws is not in question at this time; they constitute a part of our statutory law. For the present this question is behind us.

I respectfully request in conclusion, Mr. Secretary, that the Treasury's silver be used and utilized under the law for the whole population and not to satisfy a very small segment of our population who are asking that they be granted a special privilege.

Respectfully and cordially yours,

ABE MURDOCK.

DECEMBER 19, 1945.

Hon. ABE MURDOCK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ABE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 13, 1945, concerning S. 1508, a bill to extend the Green Act for 2 years.

As I told you when I appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency, I have not yet had an opportunity to prepare a reply but I shall do so shortly.

Very truly yours,

FRED M. VINSON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

FEBRUARY 11, 1946.

Hon. FRED M. VINSON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Ever since you appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in December, the silver jewelers and other fabricators of silver have continued to high-pressure Members of Congress for the passage of the Green silver bill. To allow any group or segment of the population to purchase our metallic money from the Treasury at less than its monetary value would establish an incongruous, unjustifiable, unreasonable, and unbusinesslike policy.

There was some little excuse for the temporary allowance of the purchase of silver from the Treasury during the war, but it would seem that the silver jewelers and fabricators, having been granted this convenience as a temporary war measure, are very reluctant to give it up now that the war is over. In other words, the camel got his nose under the tent, and probably won't be satisfied until his whole carcass is permanently enthroned in the Treasury.

Would you, as Secretary of the Treasury, consider at all the sale of any part of our gold reserve at less than its monetary value? We are sure your answer would be emphatically and definitely "no." It is, therefore, impossible for us to reconcile selling our silver reserve at anything less than its monetary value. There is a school of thought in this country that considers metal reserves as antiquated or anachronistic, but so far as the Congress is concerned, our statutes definitely provide for gold and silver metallic reserves.

We call your attention to the fact that on February 6, according to the Treasury statement, there was in the Treasury 330,009,914.4 ounces of idle silver against which silver certificates could be issued on the basis of the monetary value of silver of $1.29 per ounce. This totals $425,712,789.57. The annual interest on this amount, at 2 percent per annum, is $8,514,255.79. This interest item, compared to our vast national debt, is insignificant, but, nevertheless, in the mind of our average taxpayer it is a very sizable amount.

This amount of interest could be saved to the taxpayers of the Nation annually if our idle silver was monetized and used. The unjustifiable policy of Secretary Morgenthau, during the numerous years he was Secretary of the Treasury, in refusing to monetize idle silver, while at the same time he was borrowing by the billion, cost the taxpayers of this country hundreds of millions of dollars in unnecessary interest payments. It is our hope that the same charge cannot be brought against the present Secretary of the Treasury.

All the pressure now being exerted on Members of Congress—and we assume the same pressure is being exerted on the Treasury—for passage of the Green silver bill could be terminated immediately if this idle silver was monetized. What reason is there for not doing this? What excuse can be made for holding idle money in the Treasury instead of using it to retire interest-bearing Government securities?

The Senate will soon be considering the proposed British loan, which, without doubt, will be funded through exchange of interest-bearing securities for demand deposits in the Federal Reserve banks. A lot of Senators will, at that time, be asking the question why our idle silver has not been put to use. We respectfully urge you, Mr. Secretary, to forthwith monetize every ounce of idle silver in the Treasury. Relieve yourself of criticism that can't help but come from the policy of holding idle money in the Treasury instead of using it to retire interest-bearing securities, and relieve yourself and Members of Congress from the unjustifiable pressure now being exerted by a small group of jewelers and fabricators in their efforts to continue an unconscionable policy of selling the people's money at less than its statutory monetary value.

Sincerely and respectfully yours.

ABE MURDOCK.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABE MURDOCK, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF UTAH, APRIL 9, 1946

ONLY SILVER IN TREASURY IS MONEY

Senator MURDOCK. It seems to me that the witness certainly answered the question that was propounded to him, and it seems to me that we cannot lose sight of the fact that the only silver in the Treasury is money.

Under the Silver Purchase Act the minute or second that silver goes into the Treasury, it becomes a part of the monetary stocks of this country and ceases to be a commodity in the ordinary sense of the word.

Senator HAYDEN. Therefore you argue that it is improper to sell it for less than the monetary value?

Senator MURDOCK. To sell money for less than its fixed monetary value is not only improper but absurd and unconscionable. Here is my position, and I think it was well stated by the witness: When this country is being operated, Mr. Chairman, on borrowed money, as it is today and has been for several years, when the Secretary of the Treasury is advocating and spending thousands of dollars in his advertisements for the people to buy bonds, that is, loan their money to the Treasury at a fixed interest rate, how can we, as Members of Congress, lose sight of the fact that there is idle money in the Treasury listed today, or on April 4, at 267,000,000 ounces, plus, of monetary silver?

Now, the witness points out——

Senator MCCARRAN. That is money.

Senator MURDOCK. That is money and made so by statute enacted by Congress and approved by the President. Because they have treated silver monetary stocks as a commodity instead of money, as provided by law, and our Secretaries of the Treasury since the enactment of silver legislation in 1934,

in my opinion, have failed to live up to and conform to the law.

QUESTION AS TO WHAT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE PRICE FOR SILVER

I want to repeat, and I am not going to talk very much; I have not done much talking in this committee; I have done a lot of listening, but I still think the crux of this problem is the price which would be a fair price which the fabricators could pay, and which the Treasury could accept without injury to the silver producers in this country.

PROVISION FIXES LOWEST PRICE AT WHICH SILVER COULD BE SOLD BY TREASURY

Senator GREEN. I think a great deal could be said in favor of that point of view, but this law does not require it to stay at 71 cents; it simply makes it permissible for the Treasury to sell, but not less than that, because that was fixed, because that was the amount it paid.

In other words, we will say the Treasury can, if it deems it desirable, in the interests of the national economy, sell some of this unused silver which it has at not less than it costs. As a matter of fact, on a great part of it, it would make a profit even at that price.

That is the point which we ought to emphasize in a discussion of this.

Senator REED. Senator, you would not advocate that the Treasury should sell silver at a price lower than the cost at this time which would have the effect of holding down the price of silver in a free market?

Senator GREEN. I think all those facts ought to be taken into consideration by the Treasury.

Senator REED. What I am trying to do is get this consideration of the committee down to a realistic basis.

If we can reach the solution on this price question, I take it there is no particular objection to that.

QUESTION AS TO RAISING PRICE OF SILVER TO $1 AN OUNCE

Senator HAYDEN. I would like to ask a question. You heard the suggestion made by American Smelting & Refining Co., through Mr. Brownell, that the price might be raised to sell at $1 an ounce. It was suggested at $1 in the letter written to Senator MCCARRAN.

How does that strike you?

Mr. SNYDER. That boils down to the matter of whether you get the values that are needed in these western ores to preserve that industry. Whether you get it in silver, gold, lead, or zinc.

The reason I suggested that the price be allowed to go to the monetary price was because the over-all cost of consumers—getting back on this inflation idea—would be less in increasing the price of silver to $1.29 than it would be in increasing the prices of lead and zinc, because the prices of lead and zinc are pyramided more in fabrication to the ultimate consumer, according to OPA. I do not know.

Senator HAYDEN. I can understand that point.

Mr. SNYDER. It looked to me like that was the easiest and best way of doing it.

Of course, I would like to see any industry protected and preserved if it is possible, because we need them all.

Now, the witness has pointed out here, and I think in a very intelligible way, that when the Government is borrowing money every day, as we are, how can the Representatives of the people, of the taxpayers, take the position, Mr. Chairman, that the money of the people should be allowed to remain idle or sold at 1 cent, or a fraction of a cent less than its monetary value?

That is the point, I think, that we, as Senators, must bear in mind. The Treasury of the United States is not a commodity market; it is the depository of the money of the people of the United States.

Now, if that money, Mr. Chairman, can go right out into the market places and purchase dollar for dollar what your borrowed money can, then what right have we as Representatives of the people to sell that money at less than its monetary value?

Senator WILLIS. In other words, that 250,000,000 we have there, we cannot sell at less.

Senator MURDOCK. That money belongs to the people of Indiana, of Kansas, of Nevada, of Rhode Island, and every other State, and I challenge any Senator here to go back to his own constituents and tell them that, "I, as your Senator, supported legislation to sell your silver money there in the United States Treasury for 71 cents an ounce that is worth $1.29 an ounce, and at the same time I am fully aware that the Secretary of the Treasury is borrowing money and paying interest on it to carry on the Government, and that you people as taxpayers are paying for it."

POINT AT ISSUE IS CAMOUFLAGED

The people would rise up, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, and condemn such action in no uncertain terms. But the trouble is, the point that is really at issue here is camouflaged to the extent that the people out in our States are being led to believe that the only question involved is the relief of the jewelry and silver-fabricating industry without disclosing to them the unfair windfall that they would get at the expense of all the taxpayers.

My answer to Handy & Harman, my answer to the other silver fabricators and brokers of this country, is this: There is a place where you can get silver, just like the mining industry of the country produces it. That is out there in the hills and deserts of the West.

If you need silver so badly, why do we not see a few of you out there, with your burros, prospecting for the ore that is out there, and available to you if you have the fortitude and the gambling spirit that it takes to go out and produce metal. It is out there if you want to go after it instead of siting in your fine offices hatching up schemes to make you the beneficiaries of the profit the Government has made out of the metal-mining industry.

PROFIT TAKEN FROM MINERS TO BE GIVEN TO SILVER FABRICATORS

I want to make one further observation. After the metal-mining people of the country have brought silver into the Treasury, and have allowed the people of the United States to make the profit on it that is taken from the miner under the law, then I say it is unconscionable, Mr. Chairman, for a small segment of the population, to wit, the silver-fabricating industry and silver brokers to come in and claim the profit that has been taken away from the miners, the raw-material producers, that bring it in.

FAIR PRICE FOR SILVER

Senator REED. Mr. Snyder, I take it you agree with Mr. Brownell, of the American Smelting & Refining Co., that you desire to retain the fabricators as a customer.

Mr. SNYDER. Certainly.

Senator REED. But the question in your mind is what would be, or could be, a fair price at which they can obtain silver?

Mr. SNYDER. As stated previously, I think that a fair price, and one that would not in any way injure them is the monetary price at which they can buy all the silver they want.

SILVER FABRICATORS HAVE ABSORBED INCREASED PRICE IN SILVER

Senator GREEN. May I bring another fact to Senator Reed's attention because I know he is very sincere in his attitude and I appreciate it. That is the silver industry—those who are using silver, the silver users—are now paying 37 cents more per ounce, without any mark-ups. They pay that much more for silver and do not get any mark-ups.

Senator REED. Senator, they are not allowed any profit.

Senator GREEN. No; they have taken it all, although the price of silver has increased.

Now, if they had silver at a dollar, that would mean a 200-percent increase in the metal price to all the silver users, and that is absolutely out of the question.

Senator REED. I tried to cover that point.

Senator GREEN. I know, but I thought you might like to know what the result would be.

Senator REED. What I am struggling for is a solution. I have, perhaps, as little prejudice, and can look at this thing as any man on this committee, which I am trying to do.

I have full sympathy with my friend to the west of me, and I have a great desire to see the silver industry have their raw materials to enable them to employ their people and sell their products.

Senator GREEN. One more thing in this discussion, which has ceased to be a hearing——

Senator REED. We may make more progress.

Senator GREEN. That may be true.

PURCHASE OF SILVER UNDER THE LAW BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Neither the Secretary of the Treasury nor the Congress itself has regarded the purchase as it will be monetized.

Senator MURDOCK. All you have to do is read the law, Senator. I think probably it should be inserted.

Senator GREEN. All you have to do is see the way the Treasury is acting and the way the Congress is acting.

Senator MURDOCK. The Secretary of the Treasury has, in my opinion, been indifferent to the law.

Senator GREEN. As far as this law is concerned, that criticism is not pointed at the law; it is pointed at the Secretary of the Treasury.

Senator MURDOCK. Yes.

Senator GREEN. It is the same.

Senator HAYDEN. Are there any further questions of the witnesses?

Senator MCCARRAN. There may be some on reconvening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Procurement Division," on page 33, line 7, after "correspondence models)", to strike out "$70" and insert "$77"; in the same line, after the word "inches", to strike out "$75" and insert "$82.50"; in line 8, after the word "inches" where it occurs the first time, to strike out "$77.50" and insert "$85.25"; in line 9, after the word "inches", to strike out "$82.50" and insert "$90.75"; in the same line, after the word "inches", to strike out "$87.50" and insert "$96.25"; in line 10, after the word "inches" where it occurs the first time, to strike out "$94" and insert "$103.40"; in the same line, after the word "inches" where it occurs the second time, strike out "$95" and insert "$104.50"; in line 11, after the word "inches", to strike out "$97.50" and insert "$107.25"; in line 12, after the word "inches", to strike out "$103.50" and insert "$113.85"; in the same line, after the word "inches"; to strike out "$104" and insert "$114.40"; in line 13, after the word "inches" where it first occurs, to strike out "$105" and insert "$115.50"; in the same line, after the word "inches" where

it occurs the second time, strike out "$107.50" and insert "$118.25"; in line 17, after the word "inches", to strike out "$80" and insert "$88"; in line 18, after the word "inches" where it occurs the first time, to strike out "$85" and insert "$93.50"; in the same line, after the word "inches" where it occurs the second time, strike out "$90" and insert "$99"; and in line 19, after the word "inches", to strike out "$95" and insert "$104.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Post Office Department—Post Office Department, Washington, D. C.—Office of the Postmaster General," on page 34, line 22, after the word "Columbia", strike out "$319,900" and insert "$329,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries in bureaus and offices," on page 35, line 6, after "Office of the First Assistant Postmaster General", to strike out "$940,000" and insert "$964,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 8, after "Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$774,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 10, after "Office of Third Assistant Postmaster General", to strike out "$1,148,000" and insert "$1,175,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 12, after "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General", to strike out "$630,000" and insert "$659,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 14, after "Office of the Solicitor for the Post Office Department", to strike out "$147,500" and insert "$170,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 15, after "Office of the chief inspector", to strike out "$368,000" and insert "$393,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 17, after "Bureau of Accounts", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$544,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Chief Inspector," on page 38, line 13, after the word "Service", to strike out "$1,073,500" and insert "$1,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the First Assistant Postmaster General," on page 39, line 18, after the word "offices", to strike out "$11,440,000" and insert "$11,725,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," on page 45, line 1, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$6,384,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 3, after the word "offices", to strike out "$12,525,000" and insert "$12,825,00."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 5, after "Motor Vehicle Service", to strike out "$33,650,000" and insert "$33,381,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Buildings, maintenance and operation," on page 48, line 3, after the word "service", to strike out "$37,000,000" and insert "$37,310,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 8, after the word "prevention", to strike out "$6,650,000" and insert "$6,797,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 11, to insert:

During the fiscal year 1947, the Postmaster General shall make quarterly reports to the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, showing for each quarter the amount paid from each appropriation for overtime, the number of employees receiving such overtime, and the number of hours of overtime worked by such employees, together with a statement as to the necessity for such overtime work.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—General provisions," on page 50, after line 6, to strike out:

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment, the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5452) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. WHITE, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. REED, conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that I thank the Senate very much for its approval of this bill and to say that in the Treasury Department the increase made by the Senate was $119,000, and in the Post Office Department, which brings in practically as much money as it costs to operate it, the amount was increased by the Senate just a little over $1,390,000.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1947

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 6056, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capper	Ferguson
Andrews	Carville	Fulbright
Austin	Chavez	George
Ball	Cordon	Gerry
Barkley	Donnell	Gossett
Bushfield	Downey	Green
Butler	Eastland	Gurney
Byrd	Ellender	Hart

Hatch	Magnuson	Stewart
Hawkes	Mead	Swift
Hayden	Millikin	Taft
Hill	Moore	Taylor
Hoey	Murdock	Thomas, Okla.
Huffman	Murray	Tobey
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Tunnell
Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Knowland	Overton	Wagner
La Follette	Pepper	Walsh
Lucas	Radcliffe	White
McCarran	Reed	Wiley
McClellan	Robertson	Willis
McKellar	Russell	
McMahon	Saltonstall	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE INHERENT RIGHT OF THE CITIZEN TO WORK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senate passed two large appropriation bills. In the discussion relating to one of those bills the right to strike against the Government was discussed. That is a subject on which I have positive convictions. Definitely there is no such right. Franklin D. Roosevelt said the same thing in substance. Another great President, Calvin Coolidge, when he was Governor of Massachusetts, said the same thing.

What causes me to rise at this time is a telegram which has just been handed to me, and which I wish to read into the RECORD. It shows a situation which we have neglected very seriously.

The telegram comes from W. F. McKee, secretary and treasurer of Wilson Bros., Sheboygan, Wis. I ask Senators to pay attention to this, because in my humble opinion it presents the beginning of a new and serious situation relating to strikes.

Last week I was in conference with British delegates. One of the leaders of that delegation with whom I was speaking said, "We do not approve the attitude of a certain group of your labor leaders. In England we know that there is only one way to get out of the dilemma we are in, and that is to work and produce."

The telegram reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 20, 1946.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.:

As a citizen and resident of the State of Wisconsin, and as secretary and treasurer of Wilson Bros., national manufacturers of men's wear, I am appealing for your advice and any assistance to prevent the closing down of our 10 factories in 6 States and loss of work to our 1,800 employees through a technicality in the Wagner Labor Act, which is being imposed upon us by the CIO, Mr. Sidney Hillman's Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union. We have never had strikes or labor problems and have been unionized in our main plant at South Bend, Ind., for many years and at Troy and Cohoes, N. Y. Several of our small branch plants do not belong to the union. LaGrange, Ind., plant employing mostly Amish and Menonites who state it is against their religion to belong to any association of any kind, have refused to join the union. Likewise, a newer plant at Sheboygan, Wis., 6 months in operation, have refused to attend any labor meetings, although we have done everything possible under the Wagner Act to indicate our cooperation with the union. The union head in Chicago, Mr. Joe Kaminsky, last week states that we would either force the employees of our nonunion shops to join their union or else. Starting this week, our subcontractors and suppliers have been told by the union in the East and the Middle West to stop shipping us and stop manufacturing for us. Two Chicago contractors were told yesterday and today to cease work for us. Our plant manager was also told today that all contractors would be forced to stop shipments to us. We are continuing under contracts to the United States Government heavy- and light-weight underwear for the armed forces, and, undoubtedly, these contracts may also be affected if this policy spreads further to our other plants. The union subordinates of Mr. Sidney Hillman, mainly Mr. Joe Kaminsky, of Chicago, are adamant and threatening in their demands to force us to break the Wagner Act, which we cannot allow ourselves to do. I am sure Mr. Sidney Hillman would not approve of such action if he were aware of the circumstances. As a citizen, I am appealing to you to intervene to prevent the first labor disturbance in our 82 years in business.

W. F. MCKEE,
Secretary and Treasurer, Wilson Bros., Sheboygan, Wis.

Mr. President, the situation portrayed in the telegram presents a challenge to Government. We have just heard a lukewarm argument on the point that it is not right to strike against the Government. But here are American citizens who do not want to join unions. Here is a concern with 12 factories, which is threatened unless, contrary to the Wagner Act, it compels certain Amish and Mennonite people, and a group of people in my own State, to join a union. If they do not join the union, all 12 factories will be shut down. Here we have an instance of union officials telling contractors that they cannot work for this concern. They would compel people to join unions.

If the President of the United States had not vetoed the Case bill we would have the answer; but the Case bill was vetoed, and so we have the beginning of another reign of terror, because there seems to be within the Government a supergovernment sufficiently strong to take from the individual the inherent right, not to strike, but to work. I ask the consideration of this body for the situation which I have described.

Immediately upon receipt of the telegram which I have read, my secretary, at my instance, sought to get in contact with certain labor officials of the Government. The result was that the following telegram was sent to Mr. McKee:

Telegram received. Howard C. Colvin, Assistant Dirctor of Conciliation, promised have their commissioner of conciliation in Chicago get in touch with you also with the union to see what can be done to help.

That is using the language of Mr. Colvin.

Chapman, of National Labor Relations Board, suggests you contact their regional director, George Bott, Midland Building, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago. Telephone Central 9660. Advise if can be of further assistance.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator.

A little while ago we discussed for 3 weeks or more the rights of the public. The Government needs the material involved in this case. The armed forces may be compelled to do without it. Why? Because labor racketeers dominate the situation. Are we going to sit quietly by? Some of us will not. The situation is so serious that 1,800 men may be thrown out of work. The public will lose the benefit of the income resulting from this industry, and the armed forces will not get the material for which they have contracted, all because a labor racketeer, Kaminsky, in Chicago, has the power to take away from men the right to work. If there is any inherent right, it is the right of every man to earn his own bread.

In one plant in Indiana certain Amish people did not want to join the union because it was contrary to their religion to do so. But Kaminsky, in Chicago, said, "You join. Live under my dictates. Take my orders, or you do not work"—to say nothing of the effect upon the investment of the stockholders, including widows and eleemosynary institutions which own the bonds of these organizations.

Mr. President, the situation calls for action. I trust that before Congress takes a recess it will do what I have suggested on other occasions. I hope it will have "guts" enough to write into a bill the spirit and the letter of American fair play, which will protect the rights of management and labor, but, above all, will protect the rights of the public and see that they are not submerged and neglected.

AUDIT REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, before the Committee on the Judiciary this morning there came to my attention, in connection with the reorganization bills, a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a letter dated June 17, 1946, from the Corporation's Audit Division of the General Accounting Office to the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, covering an audit made of the affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries and affliates for the year ended June 30, 1945, under section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945. The letter and accompanying papers have been filed with the Senate and have been referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry; but prior to doing so, I wish to state that upon consideration of the intelligence disclosed in the communication to which I have referred, it was decided that it was of such seriousness and moment that it should be transmitted to the Senate as an interim report, as well as taken up administratively with the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The audit is proceeding with the utmost diligence and dispatch; but the conditions stated in the communication to which I have just referred make it impossible for us to say when the audit will be completed and when our ultimate report will be rendered. The letter is signed by the Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay C. Warren.

The following statements appear in the communication which has been transmitted to the Senate:

Indeed, it has been found that a satisfactory audit cannot be made and that no

certification may be given of the financial statements of the companies at the close of June 1945. It is even doubtful that a satisfactory audit and certification of the statements of June 30, 1946, will be possible.

The reason for that is stated to be as follows:

Specific examples of the failure of the accounting function in RFC are presented in the paragraphs immediately following. These paragraphs point out that:

1. The company does not control its $7,000,000,000 investment in properties;
2. The company does not control its $800,000,000 investment in inventories of Defense Supplies Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, and United States Commercial Company;
3. The company does not control its cash receipts;
4. The company does not control rentals earned on its properties;
5. The company does not control certain important liabilities;
6. The company does not control recoveries due it on plant extensions built for utility companies;
7. The company has not controlled its surplus-property-disposal activities; and
8. The company has had no control over the activities of its affiliate, United States Commercial Company.

Mr. President, I shall not go into the details of the report, but I desire to propound the following parliamentary inquiry: Will this report be printed as a matter of course, or will it be necessary that a motion be made to have the report printed as a public document?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the report was laid down yesterday, but that no order to have the report printed was entered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I now move that the report be printed as a Senate document.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Earlier today I moved that a certain document be printed as a Senate document. Since then it has been called to my attention that the House of Representatives has ordered the same document printed as House Document No. 674. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the previous order be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order previously entered will be rescinded.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1947

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of State—Office of the Secretary of State," on page 2, line 5, after the word "laws", to strike out "$17,400,000" and insert "$23,861,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 10, after the word "through", to insert "individuals, including aliens, or"; in line 11, after the word "agencies", to strike out the comma and "foreign or domestic" and insert "foreign or domestic,"; in line 14, after the word "time", to insert "except that funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 per centum of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee"; on page 3, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$525,000"; and on page 4, line 6, before the word "Provided", to strike out "$6,100,000" and insert "$10,221,221."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 9, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,433,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 22, to insert:

Surplus property disposal: For all expenses necessary to enable the Department of State to carry out its functions and activities relative to disposition of surplus property pursuant to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (Public Law 457), as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and employment of persons outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to civil-service and classification laws; travel expenses, including attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the activity for which this appropriation is made; transportation of prospective customers (not to exceed $9,000); cost of living and living quarters allowances and transportation of families and effects including cost of living allowances for military personnel assigned or detailed to the Department, all under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; stenographic reporting, translating, appraising, and other services in foreign countries by contract, all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; purchase and exchange of books, maps, periodicals, and newspapers; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); entertainment (not to exceed $50,000); hire, maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger automobiles; advertising without regard to section 3828 of the Revised Statutes; maintenance and operation of aircraft; $7,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Foreign service," on page 10, line 2, after the word "duties", to strike out "$1,875,000" and insert "$2,003,808."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 12, after the word "quarters", to strike out "$4,750,000" and insert "$5,279,000"; and in line 23, after the word "posts", to strike out "at Cairo, London, Ankara, Madrid, Rio de Janeiro, Panama, and Habana" and insert "in Egypt, Great Britain, Spain, Brazil, Panama, Cuba, Turkey, Switzerland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, and The Netherlands Possessions."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 5, after "(Public Law 48)", to strike out "$2,900,000" and insert "$3,414,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 8, after "(Public Law 48)", to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$902,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 21, after the word "services", to strike out "$8,600,000" and insert "$10,576,380."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 18, after the word "necessary", to strike out "$4,600,000" and insert "$6,255,480."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 17, after the numerals "1942", to strike out "$2,400,000" and insert $3,656,913."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 4, after the word "for", to strike out "dispatch" and insert "despatch"; on page 16, line 18, after the word "necessary", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$9,171,890"; on page 17, line 9, after the word "That", to strike out the word "all"; and in line 11, after the word "stock", to strike out "only" and insert "if suitable vehicles are available from this source: *Provided further*, That pursuant to section 204 of Public Law 334, Seventy-ninth Congress, automobiles in possession of the foreign service abroad may be exchanged or sold and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales applied to replacements, and such replacements shall not be chargeable against the numerical limitations hereinbefore set forth."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 15, before the words "of which", to strike out "$8,500,000" and insert "$9,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International obligations," on page 21, line 3, after the figures "$23,000" to insert "Cape Spartel and Tangier Light, Coast of Morocco, $800; International Bureau of Permanent Court of Arbitration, $1,722.57"; in line 15, after the words "in all", to strike out "$3,102,108" and insert "$3,104,631."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 22, after the name "United Nations", to strike out "For all necessary expenses of participation by the United States in the United Nations for the fiscal year 1947, pursuant to the provisions of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, including attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the United Nations" and insert "For all necessary expenses authorized by section 7 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 incident to the participation by the United States in the United Nations pursuant to the provisions of said act, including attendance at meetings of societies or

associations concerned with the work of the United Nations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of Justice—Legal activities and general administration," on page 35, line 16, after the name "Board of Parole", to strike out "$633,250" and insert "$667,250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 17, after "Administrative Division", to strike out "$1,150,000" and insert "$1,190,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 20, after "For the Criminal Division", to strike out "$840,000" and insert "$898,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 5, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$350" and insert "$850."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 8, after the word "services", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$2,650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 25, after the word "attorney", to strike out "$4,530,000" and insert "$4,560,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 10, after the word "vans", to strike out "$4,570,000" and insert "$4,642,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Immigration and Naturalization Service," on page 46, line 10, before the word "*Provided*", to strike out "$24,500,000" and insert "$25,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Prison System," on page 50, line 1, after the figures "$600,000", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That $635,000 of the amount transferred to this appropriation by the Navy Department under the authority contained in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1943, shall be available for the construction of dwellings at existing institutions."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary," on page 53, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$105,000" and insert "$130,000"; and in line 8, after the word "binding", to strike out "$3,400,000" and insert "$4,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Census," on page 54, after line 13, to strike out:

Census of Business: For the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing (including printing and binding) the census of business or distribution, as authorized by the act of March 14, 1903 (5 U. S. C. 604), including the employment by the director of personnel at the seat of government and elsewhere without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, $10,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 20, to strike out:

Census of Manufactures: For the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing (including printing and binding) the census of manufactures, as authorized by the act of March 14, 1903 (5 U. S. C. 604), including the employment by the director of personnel at the seat of government and elsewhere without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, $5,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 3, after "(not exceeding $200)", to strike out "$13,000,000" and insert $11,000,000"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That all functions necessary to the compilation of foreign trade statistics shall be performed in New York, N. Y."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Administrator, of Civil Aeronautics," on page 56, line 22, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,353,102."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 11, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$18,100,000" and insert "$20,812,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 3, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$35,541,000" and insert "$36,544,418."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 8, to insert:

Maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities (Executive Order 9709): For all necessary expenses of maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities, by contract or otherwise, in foreign countries and in territories and possessions of the United States, in accordance with Executive Order 9709, dated March 29, 1946, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $2,874,000, of which not to exceed $200,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "General administration, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics", for necessary expenses in connection with the general administration of the program.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire about this item. I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the bill the purpose of the appropriation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a number of air bases in foreign countries have been turned over to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and up to the present time those air bases have been maintained and operated by the Army or the Navy, as the case may be. By reason of the separation of personnel from the military forces, it was necessary to turn over those bases, some of them in Europe, and some of them in other parts of the world, to some authority. Therefore, it was and has now been felt best to turn them over to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The matter came before the Appropriations Committee, in the first instance, by way of a special message from the White House requesting a deficiency appropriation. We refused to go along with that request. The matter then came up in this regular appropriation bill, and the amount has been much reduced from the amount which was requested in connection with the proposed deficiency appropriation. The item is not a permanent appropriation or a permanent activity; but we must maintain those bases in order to secure safety in travel by air to our own people and to other passengers, until such time as the nations in which these particular bases are located arrange to take them over. These bases now are 23 in number. The Army still maintains some bases, but the 23 have been or will be turned over to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

It will be found that a somewhat similar item appears for the Weather Bureau, because the Weather Bureau must furnish information to those who operate these bases.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a matter, but I am not sure what provision of the bill covers it. Is there an appropriation in the bill for the maintenance of a repair shop for the repairing of airplanes?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; that provision is on page 60 of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. What is the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think it would be well to have it read when we reach it. Will the Senator defer until we have reached it on page 60?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 58, after line 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 7, after the word "specifications", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$1,000,000, together with the unexpended balance of this appropriation for the fiscal year 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 16, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$6,200,000" and insert "$7,075,000, of which not to exceed $39,000 may be transferred to the appropriation 'General administration, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics,' and not to exceed $3,000 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Printing and binding, Department of Commerce'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 9, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$1,200,000" and insert "$1,593,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page, in line 18, after the word "Provided", to strike out "That no funds in this paragraph shall be expended for the pay of any employees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the maintenance of more than one parts warehouse, nor for the repair or overhaul of aircraft costing more than $100 per airplane" and insert "That no funds in this paragraph shall be expended for the pay of any employee of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the maintenance of more than one major parts warehouse, or for the repair or overhaul of aircraft when such repair or overhaul cannot be performed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration through exchange or sub-

stitution of parts or materials maintained by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the cost of parts and materials not maintained in stock would be in excess of $100: *Provided further*, That all repair and overhaul of aircraft of the Civil Aeronautics Administration which cannot be performed within the foregoing limitation shall be done on contract after submission of bids."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is the item to which the Senator from Georgia referred a few moments ago. It provides for the maintenance and operation of aircraft by the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The item to which the Senator's attention has been called is inserted by reason of the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Authority proposes to acquire parts of airplanes which have been declared to be surplus. It is proposed to have one repair station in the United States, to be located at Oklahoma City. At that point the planes would be repaired by the use of these parts. I may say that the proposal has attracted considerable attention and some opposition on the part of mechanics and repair-shop owners throughout the country, who claim that it is proposed to put the Government in competition with private industry.

The language which the committee inserted in the bill was to militate against such complaints. It reads as follows:

That no funds in this paragraph shall be expended for the pay of any employee of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the maintenance of more than one major-parts warehouse, or for the repair or overhaul of aircraft when such repair or overhaul cannot be performed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration through exchange or substitution of parts or materials maintained by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the cost of parts and materials not maintained in stock would be in excess of $100: *Provided further*, That all repair and overhaul of aircraft of the Civil Aeronautics Administration which cannot be performed within the foregoing limitation shall be done on contract after submission of bids.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have already yielded to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Later I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator be kind enough to state the estimated cost of this service?

Mr. McCARRAN. The entire estimate for the parts and service is, as I understand, $1,593,000. The Senator will note that we have increased the amount recommended by the other House, namely, $1,200,000, on page 60, in line 9, to $1,593,000.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know whether my information is correct, but I have been advised that this entire work has heretofore been performed, even during the past year, at a cost not exceeding $90,000, and that a considerable increase over that figure is provided for by authorizing the CAA to carry on that operation.

Mr. McCARRAN. What the Senator has said has been a contention which has been made to the committee. The committee, in view of the explanation which had been given to it, thought that it was imperative that the CAA be permitted to acquire these parts. It seemed to the committee that the CAA should have the privilege of acquiring and using parts which will be declared surplus, and that it should have the right to repair its own craft by the use of such parts.

There came from the other House a contemplation of two separate places where repairs could be made. Those two places have now been reduced to one, which will be Oklahoma City, where all the work will be centralized, and economies will be effected.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, since the amendment was agreed to the other day in the committee, I received the following telegram:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *June 19, 1946.*

Senator KENNETH D. MCKELLAR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

If Senate appropriations bill is passed granting CAA sum asked to operate repair stations not only fixed base operators but all small businesses and therefore Nation's backbone ultimately doomed, as explained in letters and editorial pages 647 and 648 Senate appropriations hearings. We earnestly and respectfully ask your help in this crisis by insisting language Randolph amendment be restored.

SOUTHERN AIR SERVICES,
WILLIAM R. KENT.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to read from the report an excerpt which may enlighten the Senator. It appears under the subheading "Maintenance and Operation of Aircraft," and is as follows:

The committee has received numerous letters protesting against the Civil Aeronautics Administration establishing and operating facilities for the repair of aircraft in competition with private concerns. The committee went into the matter very thoroughly. Mr. Wright in his testimony stated the position of the Civil Aeronautics Administration as follows:

"Mr. WRIGHT. That letter is very relevant to what I was about to say."

I had presented to Mr. Wright a letter which protested in considerably the same way as did the telegram which was read by the Senator from Tennessee.

I continue reading from the report:

The point of view taken by this gentleman, and by many others, has been at variance with what we feel.

We agree entirely that Government should not compete with private industry, and it is not our intention to do that, or to get a wedge in the door, as expressed in the press, that would permit the Government to get into that business.

We call your attention to the fact that our maintenance and operation of aircraft is based on the use of spare parts made available, at no cost, from surplus.

Therefore, it is an entirely different situation from that which would maintain in a normal time when we would be using aircraft currently available from manufacturers.

We are using principally surplus military aircraft that are out of production now.

Therefore, we ask the Congress for language that would permit us to service them by means of spares over a period of 5 years.

What we want is a storage depot for those spare parts, plus the authority to take a liberal attitude in throwing away a wing or other damaged part, and putting on a brand new spare part we are getting for nothing, whereas, in normal times we would have that wing repaired through a contract with a commercial company.

Therefore, we maintain we are saving the taxpayers a substantial amount of money in this manner, and we are not putting a toe in the door to compete with industry.

I now read further from Mr. Wright's testimony, as set forth on page 654 of the printed hearings:

Mr. WRIGHT. That was what I meant when I said at the various regional headquarters we would have to do the 100-hour inspections and install such spare parts as would be necessary because of the fact that the airplane was so crippled it could not fly to Oklahoma City.

Now, I do not know whether this should be on the record or not, but we have discussed this with Mr. Randolph, and we have proposed to him language that I think would take care of the objection raised here, and we would like to put it on the record as to what we would do.

That is the language which is now found in the bill at the bottom of page 60, reading, "no funds in this paragraph shall be expended," and so forth. I read the language a moment ago.

I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee, and also to the Senator from Georgia, that there still remains some misapprehension with reference to the language. I am not at all wedded to it. I wish only to allow the Civil Aeronautics Authority to use the spare parts, because I believe that for them to do so would be economical. I wish also to give to the Civil Aeronautics Authority the right to have space where they may centralize and store the spare parts. I have no desire that they engage in competition with industry, and if I believed that the language of the amendment permitted such, I would not support it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator be good enough to advise whether the proviso stricken out in line 18, page 60, of the bill, is the so-called Randolph amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. The provision from lines 18 to 22, inclusive, is the so-called Randolph amendment. It came over from the House, and was put in, as I understand, on the floor of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. The only information I have with regard to this is the telegram which I have read. The matter will go to conference, and we will discuss it there.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my idea, and if there is anything wrong about it, it can be corrected.

I wanted the Senator to know what my frame of mind was, that I would not permit the Civil Aeronautics Authority to go into competition with private industry, while at the same time I want them to have a chance to use these spare parts.

Mr. GEORGE. I think some consideration also should be given to the relative costs. If the information which has come to me is correct, the actual cost to be incurred, will be considerably in excess of what it would be if the repairs were made in private shops and facilities throughout the country. I think that is a matter which also should be considered.

Mr. McCARRAN. I agree with the Senator, and I certainly shall give it consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the

Committee on Appropriations on page 60, line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 22, to insert:

Preliminary planning and surveys, Federal Airport Act: For all expenses necessary for preliminary planning and surveys required for the initiation of the Federal-aid airport program as authorized in section 5 (a) of the Federal Airport Act, approved May 13, 1946 (Public Law 377), including personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase (not to exceed 15), repair, and operation of passenger automobiles; and the purchase of seven aircraft; $3,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, of which amount not to exceed $15,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Maintenance and operation of aircraft, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics," to provide for the maintenance and operation of aircraft purchased under this appropriation, and $5,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Printing and binding, Department of Commerce."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 13, to insert:

Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of May 13, 1946 (except section 5 (a)), $52,000,000, to be available until June 30, 1953, of which $50,000,000 shall be for projects in the States in accordance with sections 5 (b) and 6 of said act, and $2,000,000 shall be for projects in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in accordance with section 5 (c): *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,600,000 of the foregoing amounts shall be available for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase (not to exceed 35), repair, and operation of passenger automobiles; and the purchase of nine aircraft; of which $2,600,000 not to exceed $25,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Maintenance and operation of aircraft, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics," to provide for the maintenance and operation of aircraft purchased under this appropriation, and $30,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Printing and binding, Department of Commerce."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey," on page 65, line 23, after the word "periodicals," to strike out $3,000,000" and insert "$3,014,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 8, after the word "seismographs", to strike out "and reimbursement, under rules prescribed by the Secretary, of officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for food, clothing, medicines, and other supplies furnished for the temporary relief of distressed persons in remote localities and to shipwrecked persons temporarily provided for by them (not to exceed a total of $500); $3,800,000"; and in line 13, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$3,800,000" and insert "$4,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce", on page 68, line 19, after the words "of law", to insert "including the purchase of commercial and trade reports; employment of aliens; temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil service and classification laws (not exceeding $50,000)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, after line 14, to insert:

Export control: For all expenses necessary, fiscal year 1947, to carry out the purposes of section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940, as amended (56 Stat. 463), and as further amended (by Public Law 389 approved May 23, 1946), including personal services in the District of Columbia, travel, newspapers, periodicals, and books of reference, $500,000, of which not to exceed $57,000 shall be available for printing and binding, and not to exceed $21,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Penalty mail, Department of Commerce."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Patent Office", on page 70, line 10, after the word "elsewhere" to strike out "$4,800,000" and insert "$5,620,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 18, after the word "mounts" to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$660,000"; in line 21, after the word "That" to strike out "hereafter" and insert "on July 1, 1946, and thereafter", and in line 24, after the word "patents" to insert "and 10 cents per copy for design patents and certificates of trade-mark registration."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 17, after the name "Patent Office" to strike out "$77,000" and insert "$147,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 21, after the word "indices" to strike out "$740,000" and insert "$875,000"; in line 22, after the word "binding" to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$77,000", and in line 23, after the words "in all" to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$952,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Weather Bureau," on page 77, line 21, before the words "of which", to strike out "$16,303,000" and insert "$18,338,000"; in line 22, before the words "may be", to strike out "$1,485,000" and insert "$1,525,000"; on page 78, line 8, after the words "That the", to strike out "War Department is" and insert "War and Navy Departments are"; and in line 12, after the word "soundings", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That in the conduct of meteorological investigations in the Arctic region, pursuant to Public Law 296, approved February 12, 1946, the funds herein appropriated shall be available for the appointment of employees at rates to be fixed by the Chief of the Weather Bureau without regard to the civil-service laws and Classification Act, but the maximum base rate of pay shall not be in excess of $7,500 per annum and at no time more than three employees shall be in a pay status at such rate of pay, and no other employees shall receive in excess of the base rate of pay of $5,000 per annum; the furnishing of food, shelter, and protective clothing and equipment, without repayment therefor, to employees of the Government assigned to Arctic stations; and the War and Navy Departments are authorized in the fiscal year 1947, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to transfer without charge to the Weather Bureau materials, equipment, and supplies, surplus to the needs of the War and Navy Departments and necessary for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of Arctic weather stations: *Provided further*, That the unexpended balance of the amount appropriated for Arctic weather stations under authority of said act for the fiscal year 1946 is hereby merged with this appropriation and continued available for the purposes thereof until June 30, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, after line 12, to insert:

Maintenance and operation of meteorological facilities (Executive Order 9709): For all necessary expenses of maintenance and operation of meteorological facilities, by contract or otherwise, in foreign countries and in Territories and possessions of the United States, in accordance with Executive Order 9709, dated March 29, 1946, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $2,000,000, of which not to exceed $40,000 may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 9, after the word "station", to insert "and the payment of expenses of transportation of the immediate families of such officers and employees."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, after line 12, to strike out:

The appropriations "Maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities", Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics; "Salaries and expenses", Civil Aeronautics Board; and "Salaries and expenses", Weather Bureau, shall be available, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, for furnishing to employees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Weather Bureau in Alaska free emergency medical services by contract or otherwise and medical supplies, and for the purchase, transportation, and storage of food and other subsistence supplies for resale to such employees, the proceeds from such resales to be credited to the appropriation from which the expenditure for such supplies was made and a report shall be made to Congress annually showing the expenditures made for such supplies and the proceeds from such resales; and appropriations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Weather Bureau, available for travel, shall be available for the travel expenses of appointees of said agencies from the point of engagement in the United States to their posts of duty at any point outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, after line 8, to insert:

Appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1947 shall be available, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, (a) for furnishing to employees of the Department and their dependents in Alaska and other points outside continental United States where in the judgment of the Secretary the furnishing of such supplies and services is necessary, medical supplies and emergency medical services, by contract or otherwise, such supplies and services to be furnished without charge, and

food and subsistence supplies for sale to employees at the reasonable value thereof as determined by the Secretary; (b) for furnishing meals to civilian and military personnel of the Government and their dependents in Alaska and other points outside continental United States in accordance with section 3 of the act of March 5, 1928 (5 U. S. C. 75a), where such service is not otherwise available, the furnishing of such meals to personnel of other departments to be considered as "services" rendered to "any executive department or independent establishment of the Government", within the meaning of section 601 of the Economy Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U. S. C. 686): *Provided*, That meals may be furnished to such personnel when in a travel status on a cash basis at a reasonable value, the proceeds derived from the sale of food and subsistence supplies hereunder to be credited to the appropriation from which the expenditure for such food and supplies was made, a report of which shall be made to Congress annually showing the expenditures made for such food, supplies, and services and the proceeds therefrom; and (c) not to exceed $20,000 for furnishing food, clothing, medicines, and other supplies for the temporary relief of distressed persons in remote localities, reimbursement for such relief to be in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, after line 17, to insert:

Appropriations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Weather Bureau, available for travel, shall be available for the travel expenses of appointees of said agencies from the point of engagement in the United States to their posts of duty at any point outside the continental limits of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—The Judiciary—United States Supreme Court," on page 83, line 8, after the word "Court", to strike out "$591,200" and insert "$598,590."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous items of expense," on page 88, line 4, after the words "in all", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—General provisions," on page 94, after line 21, to strike out:

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment, the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be offered?

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 35, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, on or before June 30, 1947, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the foreign service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States, but such termination shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government if declared eligible for such employment by the United States Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I send forward another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 67, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

The Navy Department is authorized to transfer without charge to the Coast and Geodetic Survey two AGP seaplane tenders, two PCS submarine chasers, and three SC submarine chasers from the reserve or surplus to the needs of the Navy Department, each of the seven vessels equipped with the necessary launches and ship's outfit.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I send forward another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment of the committee on page 62, line 4, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "fifteen" and insert "thirty-eight", and in line 25, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "thirty-five" and insert "one hundred sixty-seven."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment of the committee, beginning on line 23, page 61, was agreed to will be reconsidered. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Nevada to the amendment of the committee.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask the able Senator from Nevada if that completes the committee amendments.

Mr. MCCARRAN. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and myself I wish to offer an amendment on page 37, line 11, to strike out "$1,700,000" and insert "$1,900,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 37, line 11, after the name "District of Columbia", it is proposed to strike out "$1,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,900,000."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to make only a brief statement concerning the amendment.

The effect of the amendment would be to increase the appropriation for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice to the amount of the Budget estimate. The House cut the item $200,000 under the Budget estimate.

As everyone knows, the war has had the effect of further concentrating economic power in the United States. I feel very definitely that it is of vital importance that the Antitrust Division should have at least the funds recommended by the Budget Bureau. In my opinion, an error was committed by the Budget Bureau in not recommending more funds for this Division in the original Presidential estimates.

The effect of the cut by the House would be to reduce anywhere from 25 to 35 the number of persons available to the Antitrust Division to carry on the responsibilities imposed upon it by the statutes in its field of operations. Moreover, it would mean a further curtailment in personnel, because, of course, this Division must accept the curtailment which flows from the 14-percent increase in pay granted in the act recently signed by the President.

The House committee in its report justified this reduction on the ground that the Antitrust Division was conducting investigations which were in the nature of a harassment of small business. I should like to point out that the Antitrust Division now has pending or in process very vitally important cases, of which I shall enumerate only a few.

If this cut remained in the bill it would adversely effect cases and investigations, some of which involve plumbing supplies, small-loans cases, the flat-glass cases, the anti-friction-bearing case—which affects the General Motors Corp. and five other companies.

There are also two cases dealing with plastics, and the fluorescent- and incandescent-lamp case, affecting the General Electric and Westinghouse companies. There are also cases affecting the Association of American Railroads, the Imperial Chemical Industries, which is a du Pont organization, stainless steel, the Safeway and Kroger stores, television, and medical and dental supplies.

These are some of the cases which are involved, and I submit, Mr. President, that nothing can be found in this very important list of cases which falls in the category of harassment of small enterprise.

I should like to call attention also to the monograph of the TNEC No. 29, on page 348, which gives a list of the 200 largest nonfinancial corporations as of December 31, 1937. Of the 200, there are 53 which are now defendants in antitrust cases being carried on by the Antitrust Division.

My plea for this increase, Mr. President, is predicated upon my firm belief that in order to provide employment in the United States we must indeed and in every true sense of the word have free enterprise. We cannot have free enterprise by merely giving lip service to it while we permit monopoly and monopolistic practices to continue unrestrained. In this period of reconversion from war to peace it is vitally important that the tremendous advances in research and new techniques which have been brought about as a result of the expenditure of the taxpayers' money in wartime research, should be utilized and made available to all the smaller enterprises in the independent segment of our economy in order that we may have the widest possible diffusion of industrial activity and keep open the door of economic opportunity in the United States.

Mr. President, as a part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Program To Smash Monopoly," written by me and published in the Progressive of March 4, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROGRAM TO SMASH MONOPOLY

(By Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.)

Public attention is focused more intensely than ever on reconversion problems. And rightly so. Our first job is to release the brakes and get our economic machine rolling.

But the time has come also to look at the road ahead. Some of the obstacles and hazards we face almost immediately are the familiar monopolistic restraints on free competition.

The vigorous antitrust program of the Department of Justice was partially choked off during the war. Proposed patent law reforms fizzled in the Congress for lack of direct bearing on the war. Now, 4 years later, we face some of the same problems, intensified by intervening events.

Many antitrust cases pending early in the war were postponed by the Army and Navy on the flimsy excuse that key personnel could not be spared from war duties to participate in the trials. In addition, wartime activities necessitated special economic controls such as priorities, allocations, rationing, and price-fixing. These controls superseded normal competitive markets for a large segment of our economy. Instead of antitrust cases, renegotiation and war-fraud cases became the vehicles by which the Government, as the principal buyer, sought to protect itself.

As soon as the final phases of the labor-management controversy over wages are ironed out, we should be on the high road to peacetime production. We have emerged from the war with an inflated price structure. We have emerged from the war with vastly improved industrial techniques and technological progress.

Much of the progress was sponsored and developed under direct or indirect subsidy from the Government. We have opened many new avenues for industrial development. Under a free and competitive system these benefits will be passed on to the general public in the form of more, better, and cheaper products, on the one hand; and higher wages and dividends on the other.

Hence, it is vital that the Department of Justice discharge its obligation in the months ahead to free our economy of monopoly and monopolistic practices so that industry and trade can operate freely and these benefits can accrue to the public.

Readers of the Progressive are familiar with many of the sensational revelations of antitrust proceedings and congressional investigations of patent monopolies in recent years. Columns of the Progressive have related how reputable American industries made international agreements to divide world markets, set unreasonable prices, restrict production, crush competition, suppress patents, adulterate their products when it served their purposes.

Often, in the process, they served the ends of foreign governments by giving but not receiving information or in withholding from American markets or our armed services superior products or techniques. In effect, they often set themselves up as super-governments with greater allegiance to their industry than to their Government.

The full story of the war and cartels remains yet to be told. Many of the sordid details are told in the fascinating book Cartels, which was written by the present chief "trust buster" of the Government, Mr. Wendell Berge, an Assistant Attorney General of the United States.

This much is certain: For all our vaunted technological genius and bountiful supply of raw materials, we were nearly impotent early in the war because of shortages directly attributable to monopolies and international cartels. Aluminum, magnesium, rubber, optical goods, drugs, and medicines were especially critical. Others were: Explosives, paints, nylon, plastics, matches, diamonds, storage batteries, tanning extracts, miscellaneous chemicals, photographic supplies, and petroleum products. It is probable that further cartel-controlled products will be discovered in the examination of confiscated industrial records in Germany and Japan.

The antitrust cases postponed during the war involved primarily consumers goods, such as fluorescent lighting and other electrical goods, plastics, various chemicals, eyeglasses, and aircraft accessories. It is generally conceded that the Antitrust Division has only scratched the surface in dealing with the extensive monopolistic practices involving consumers goods.

The consumer is not the only one who is interested in curbing such restraints. Too often new industrial enterprises and small businesses are up against insuperable odds in bucking these vested interests. Too often the farmer and small producer are blamed for high prices which are really due to the monopolistic middleman who garners an unreasonable profit between the producer and consumer.

There is only one answer: Alert and aggressive enforcement of the antitrust laws. Such enforcement is the best possible deterrent to future violations. Moreover, if prompt action is taken the situation quickly remedies itself and no one is permanently injured. Without prompt action there may be ultimate fines and reprimands and promises, but also bankrupt competitors.

As stated previously, many antitrust cases involving prices must be postponed until genuine shortages are eliminated and Government price control is removed. However, even before that condition is reached, there is another antitrust aspect that requires close scrutiny: whether or not alleged shortages are genuine, or merely resulting from a conspiracy to withhold commodities from the market in the hope of breaking price ceilings or obtaining larger profits later. There is some evidence which indicates that conspiracies are involved, for example, in the merchandising of men's clothing. The Justice Department announced last week it was conducting investigations.

Similarly, in the field of international trade we are faced with the prospect of Government-controlled monopolies dealing in shortages. For example, importers of tin are complaining in the financial press that they expect to encounter monopoly and price discriminations in buying tin in the Far East. Nothing could do more damage to the cause of world peace and international cooperation than the revival of international monopolies in raw materials.

The pattern of monopoly is usually very simple. The conditions of production, supply, or sale are controlled. The control may be achieved by various agreements, gentlemen's or otherwise. Industries with large aggregations of capital, or those built on a complex patent structure, such as chemical and electrical industries, are particularly susceptible. Industries which control a strategic item or very limited sources of supply are also frequent offenders.

It took almost 10 years of litigation in the courts, and a war, to break the aluminum monopoly in this country. Only a few weeks ago, in the disposition of surplus aluminum war-plants, the Government was able to force certain agreements that probably will insure real competition in aluminum production in the future. The prospect of such free competition and reasonable prices has already stimulated other industries to investigate new uses for aluminum. The opposite condition was true only a few years ago when the automobile industry almost abandoned aluminum entirely because of the pricing and autocracy of the aluminum monopoly.

The Antitrust Division has a very important prerogative and duty in reviewing the proposed disposition of all Government war plants selling for more than $1,000,000. The judicious use of this power can help appreciably in combating present or prospective monopolies.

The Sherman antitrust law has been on the books since 1890. We paid lip-service to it, but did little about it until less than 10 years ago, when the Antitrust Division was revitalized and the famous TNEC Committee began to unearth amazing informa-

tion on the prevalence of monopoly and conspiracy in American industry. The economic data supplied by that committee provided basic source-material for an accurate insight into modern industrial organization and activity. To insure ourselves of a continuous flow of such vital information, Congress should give consideration to an early revival of a congressional-departmental committee such as TNEC.

Patent law reform is also imperative. Many of the dire consequences of monopoly could be avoided by the simple requirement that, under heavy penalty, all patent agreements must be recorded. This would expose many secret, improper, and illegal agreements. Provision for outright patent cancellations under extreme circumstances would put teeth in such a law.

Similarly, whole-hearted support should be given to the activities of the Antitrust Division. The President's budget for the Division was a great disappointment. He recommended only $1,900,000 for this purpose in the next fiscal year. Although slightly higher than last year, this amount is $425,000 short of the amount Congress provided in the last prewar budget.

Experience has shown that vigorous law-enforcement in this field pays big public dividends. Actually, for each dollar in appropriations, the Treasury gets back a great deal more than that in fines. But, more important, the public gets huge dividends in reduced prices, improved products, and the privilege of doing business in a free economy.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Nevada will feel free to accept the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely wish to express the same hope, that the distinguished Senator from Nevada will accept the amendment and take it to conference and let it be worked out there. I think there is a very great deal in what has been said in this respect, and that we ought not to take any chances in this matter.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin on behalf of himself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 68, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "(not to exceed $4,200,000)" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(not to exceed $5,757,000, $1,557,000 of which is to be exclusively for the Office of Small Business at the seat of government)."

Mr. MURRAY. This amount is to maintain the Office of Small Business in the Department of Commerce. The Senate will recall that a short time ago the operations of the Smaller War Plants Corporation were turned over partly to the Department of Commerce and partly to the RFC.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. MURRAY. Very well. I should like to point out that of course small business has been very severely affected during the progress of the war. A day or so ago I submitted a report from the Small Business Committee which showed the tremendous concentration of business that is going on and the need for maintaining the Office of Small Business to be maintained in the Department of Commerce. I stated at that time the facts in connection with the report briefly. I think it is very important that this restoration should be made to the Commerce Department, because, without it, it would be absolutely impossible for it to continue its efforts in support of small business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The fund the Senator is proposing to increase will also enable the Office of Small Business to retain some of the field offices, will it not?

Mr. MURRAY. No, Mr. President; that is a separate amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will permit me, I will say that the amendment the distinguished Senator from Nevada has just accepted provides only for the personnel of the Washington office. Since the Senator from Nevada is willing to accept that amendment, I am sure he will also accept an amendment providing for the field offices, which are much more important, I take it, and that he will take that amendment to conference.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator state his proposed amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. On page 69, line 14, I propose to change the figure from two and a half million dollars to $6,500,000 so as to provide for the field offices. I do not think there is any question that the field offices are much more important than the personnel in the Washington office.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that I will take his amendment to conference also.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a resolution adopted by the Small Business Advisory Committee of the Department of Commerce. This committee is made up of 21 representatives of small businessmen from the 12 Federal Reserve Districts, each committee member serving without compensation and paying all his own expenses. The committee has been in session for the past 2 days working with the Department of Commerce on improving and intensifying the Department's services to the small businessman.

I ask that the resolution adopted by the Small Business Advisory Committee on June 19, 1946, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Small Business Advisory Committee of the Department of Commerce, made up of 21 representative small businessmen from the 12 Federal Reserve Districts, each committee member serving without compensation and paying all his own expenses, has been in session for the past 2 days working with the Department of Commerce on improving and intensifying the Department's services to the small businessman.

The Small Business Advisory Committee regrets that the Department of Commerce appropriations bill for funds for the aid of small business has been cut sharply below the level of the recommendations of the President and the Bureau of the Budget.

The Small Business Advisory Committee feels that the amount recommended to the Congress by the President was a minimum amount necessary to carry the essential services of the Department of Commerce to the small businessman in his local community and to help to preserve and to strengthen the competitive position of the small businessman.

The small businessman, including many returning veterans, has neither the time nor the money to come to Washington to search out and profit by the essential business services, the statistical and the technical information necessary to his business. These services and this information are all available in the Department of Commerce and should be made available to the small businessman in his local community.

The program for small business which can only be carried out if these appropriations are restored by the Senate and the House, in the opinion of the committee, would go a long way toward preventing business failures which have been such a heavy drain to our business system.

We believe that support of the restoration of the funds recommended by the President and the Bureau of the Budget is evidence of support of the position of the small businessman.

The Small Business Advisory Committee, now in its second year of unpaid advisory service, respectfully and urgently request that the Senate and the House restore the original appropriations as recommended by the President and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I draw the attention of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Montana to the fact that I believe they should also provide for increasing the amount on line 2, page 69, so as to make the amendment complete.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that is correct. I thank the Senator from Nevada for calling that matter to our attention. Does the Senator have the figure of the amount that is necessary?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; I do not.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerks may be directed to make the necessary correction in the figure on page 69, line 2, after the bill is passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state the correction that is asked to be made?

Mr. McCARRAN. In line 2, page 69, the sum of $4,600,000 should be changed to a figure which I do not have at hand at the moment. The change should be made so as to make that figure conform to the amendments proposed.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment of the Senator from Montana provides for an increase of $1,557,000. It merely combines the total of the two amendments: the one offered by the Senator from Montana and the one I offered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerks are directed to make the correction requested.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on page 68, line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Laurence F. Arnold, beginning on page 794 of the hearings, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS—STATEMENT OF LAURENCE F. ARNOLD, ACTING DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE, OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS

Senator MCCARRAN. Mr. Arnold, in keeping with our practice, will you kindly state for the record and for the enlightenment of the committee, your background, training, and qualifications which you hold, which is, as I understand it, Acting Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Office of Small Business.

BACKGROUND

Mr. ARNOLD. I was born in Newton, Ill., June 8, 1891, graduated from high school, then business college. I worked as a stenographer, went back to Newton and studied law in a law office. I was deputy county tax collector and clerk of the board of tax reviews, and then my stenographic work led me into business which I followed from 1916 to 1936. I worked for 4 years as a stenographer in a wholesale hay and grain distributing firm and then was engaged for 20 years in that business. The scope of the business was Nation-wide.

From 1923 to 1927, I served as a member of the House of the House of Representatives of the Illinois General Assembly, and then completed 3 years of study in political economy and political science in the University of Chicago.

On June 12, 1932, I became president of the People's State Bank, Newton, Ill. I again served 4 years in the Illinois House, 1933 to 1937, and then came to Congress, serving three terms, 1937 to 1943. Then for 2 years was again actively engaged as president of the People's State Bank in my home town.

In 1945, February 19, I came to Washington as a director of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. I served in that capacity until it was merged under the Executive order of January 28, since which time I have been Acting Director of the Office of Small Business.

Senator MCCARRAN. You may proceed, Mr. Arnold.

JUSTIFICATION FOR RESTORATION REQUESTED

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that our Office should have the restoration of the funds which were eliminated in the House reduction.

This Office of Small Business was projected before it was known that the activities of the Smaller War Plants Corporation were to be taken over. I mean, the appropriation was projected last October, and it was not known until January that SWPC activities were being taken over by the Department of Commerce. Therefore, all those activities of the Smaller War Plants Corporation we have had to perform—except loans, which went to RFC—in the Office of Small Business of the Department of Commerce, and we are functioning with the personnel that is provided and must continue to do so.

1946 APPROPRIATION FOR SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

The Smaller War Plants Corporation in the fiscal year 1946 had an appropriation of $8,000,000. That was a reduction from the high point 2 years before of $10,000,000, with which to conduct for small manufacturing plants alone, the services that Congress felt, in its wisdom, small business was entitled to.

NEED FOR ADEQUATE STAFF IN FIELD OFFICES

We manufacture the programs over in my office that go to the field, and it is difficult for me to talk about the Office of Small Business without urging the necessity of an adequate field staff and a sufficient number of field offices.

My experience convinces me there should be a field office of the Department of Commerce in every State of the Union, and of course in some States where the business activities are large, more than one is necessary.

PROGRAM BASED ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF SMALL BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Our program is based on the recommendations of what is known as the Small Business Advisory Committee of the Department of Commerce. That committee consists at present of 21 prominent small businessmen from over the Nation. We were to have a meeting next week, which had to be called off because of the railroad strike, wherein it would have reviewed our present program and made any suggestions as to changes, additions or eliminations.

FUNCTIONS OF DIVISIONS

At the present time we have seven divisions in our office, and one is for business information. We give information to veterans and others who desire to go into, or are in, business, with respect to the problems ordinarily encountered in the process of establishing and operating a small business enterprise.

MANAGEMENT SERVICE DIVISION

We have a Management Service Division which provides assistance on the solution of management problems, including problems relating to purchasing, production, and selling, as well as those relating to advertising, financing, storage, delivery, research, personnel, and public relations.

TECHNICAL SERVICE DIVISION

Technical Advisory Service provides assistance with respect to the solution of technical problems of small manufacturers, distributors, or service industry operators, including the most economical use of materials, machines, and equipment by means of improved methods and techniques.

DEFINITION OF "SMALL BUSINESS"

Senator MCCARRAN. How do you define "small business," or a small business institution, as compared with a big business?

Mr. ARNOLD. The War Production Board defined small manufacturing plants as those that employ 500 or less. We are inclined to use the figure 250 employees. Also, we have a dollar volume with respect to service industries, wholesalers, and retailers. It is as follows:

"Wholesaling: Establishments with less than $200,000 annual net sales volume;

"Retailing: Stores with annual net sales or receipts of less than $50,000;

"Service establishments: Annual net sales or receipts of less than $50,000."

We also consider the relative position of a given business in its field. Obviously any definition must be flexible.

TAX, FINANCE, AND LOAN DIVISION

We have a Tax and Finance and Loan Division, providing assistance with respect to the solution of financial problems, concerning the method of financing a small business enterprise, and sources from which funds can be obtained.

COMPETITIVE STANDARDS DIVISION

Competitive Standards or Trade Barriers Division provides assistance to small businessmen with respect to their competitive practice problems in the fields of legislation and regulation, including advice and assistance upon presenting such problems to proper Government agencies.

AREA DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

The Area Development Division which renders assistance to States, municipalities, and other civic and business organizations, in making surveys of the industrial and other resources of specific areas, culminating in recommendations for the establishment of new small business enterprises which would utilize such resources.

SPECIAL SERVICES DIVISION

We also have what we call a Special Services Division, which provides direct assistance to small businessmen in obtaining scarce materials, machinery and facilities, purchasing surplus property, securing work on Government contracts and subcontracts, and reconverting to peacetime production, distribution, and operations.

EXAMPLES OF ASSISTANCE RENDERED BY DIVISIONS

I have examples of assistance we have rendered in each of these divisions, if you would be interested.

Senator MCCARRAN. Yes; I would.

CASE OF W. F. SMITH, RETURNING VETERAN

Mr. ARNOLD. Here is a case in Atlanta, Ga. A year ago, a man by the name of Will F. Smith came to our office. He was a returning veteran. He was interested in going into some type of business. It was suggested that the venetian-blind business might be one worth his consideration. After making a complete survey of the situation, Mr. Smith formed a company and began the manufacture of venetian blinds. About 3 weeks ago he called at our office again in the interests of developing sources of supply of Ponderosa pine. He was given a copy of our trade listing showing producers of Ponderosa pine in Mexico, and as a result he has contacted several Mexican firms and has made arrangements to be supplied with this lumber from Mexico, thereby relieving a critical situation in the production of his product.

Mr. Smith and the other members of his corporation state that without the assistance given him by this office they would have been seriously handicapped in establishing and operating what is now a profitable business.

The foregoing is an example of business counseling or business advice. It happened to be a veteran who was aided.

CASES RELATING TO MANAGEMENT ADVISORY SERVICE

I will now take up Management Advisory Service. A Texan asked us for assistance in establishing an educational service, supply, and equipment business in Texas, for public and private schools from nursery through college levels. We were able to recommend to him the use of a film guide, and best of all we were able to put him in touch with a fellow Texan who was an outstanding authority on audo-vision aids.

Another example, in the State of Washington, an instrument maker and repairman requested assistance in establishing an instrument sales agency. The Office of Small Bussiness was able to put him in touch with sales managers of seven manufacturers of various types of gages, instruments, and controls, all located in the Northwest distribution area.

CASES INVOLVING TECHNICAL ADVISORY SERVICE

In the Technical Advisory Service, we have had 29,000 problems presented in the 3½ years it has been in existence. That Service is a carry-over from the Smaller War Plants Corporation. We have many, many examples of technical advice given which permitted manufacturers to find the flaw in their process or develop a new process.

A St. Louis garment maker stated, "Your report certainly gave me considerable help, especially on electrical sewing-machine problems, and the sealing of edges of cloth." The party referred to the problem of overheating of sewing-machine needles and to the methods of sealing the edges of cloth without stitching.

Another St. Louis firm, manufacturing dry-cleaning equipment, stated they had contacted the firms recommended by our De-

partment concerning a coating material to stop corrosion on a machine they were manufacturing and some very valuable information had been obtained.

A manufacturer of pickles was having difficulty in properly lining curing tanks. Information on a procedure developed through the Technical Service Division has enabled this manufacturer to correct the difficulties.

A manufacturer of bedsprings complained he could not satisfactorily paint the product without expensive hand labor. Modern electrostatic equipment was brought to his attention which enabled him to compete with manufacturers larger than himself by eliminating considerable hand labor.

CASES RELATING TO TAX, FINANCE, AND LOAN SERVICE

An example of tax and finance is presented, in a case I am assisting on now. A Chicago manufacturer had three different loans with Smaller War Plants Corporation. He owed $43,000 on his last loan, made application to RFC for $113,000. He had bought a plant for $75,000 and paid for it, which depleted his working capital. He owed $45,000, bills payable. His total investment is valued by the RFC at approximately $185,000. The case had come to Washington under RFC rules, and our Commerce man in Chicago telephoned me to try to get him proper contacts with RFC to present his case here. As a result, the case was reviewed, returned to Chicago, reworked, and is now back here. The amount is for $150,000, and he has secured some stand-by agreements from creditors until he has paid off the RFC loan. In contacting RFC yesterday, it was indicated that apparently the loan would be approved. He has a contract to produce an end product, which he has heretofore manufactured, for a large merchandising firm in Chicago. It is a noncancelable $250,000 contract. Without financial aid this manufacturer is "sunk," he must go out of business. We think we have him on the right road.

LOAN MADE BY RFC

Senator McCARRAN. You do not furnish the financial aid, do you?

Mr. ARNOLD. We have no lending facilities.

Senator McCARRAN. He must get that from the RFC?

Mr. ARNOLD. That is true. We facilitate his processing of the loan.

Senator McCARRAN. Will he eventually pull out?

Mr. ARNOLD. He paid the Smaller War Plants two loans off and paid the third loan down to $43,000. The trouble was he got caught in the last half of 1945, in the reconversion period after the war, and lost $40,000. He had made $20,000 in the first half. He is now in a position to go ahead and make money if he can be financed and, as I say, it appears certain that RFC will finance him.

Another case of aid in my home town, a veteran who before the war had a Ford agency had returned. The agency had been retained for him, but he had no building wherein to conduct his business.

Knowing me, he wrote me of his plight. He needed money to construct a building. I found that for him construction was impossible. As a result, I advised him to go to a bank and try to get them to make him a loan with three-fourths RFC guaranty, which he did. He secured $6,000, bought himself a Quonset hut, 40 by 100 feet long, which the Ford Motor Co. has approved for his business building. That permits this veteran to go ahead and do business.

SOURCE OF QUONSET HUT

Senator McCARRAN. Where did he get the Quonset hut?

Mr. ARNOLD. He bought it in Charleston, Ill. I understand it had never been put up.

Senator McCARRAN. It was Army surplus property?

Mr. ARNOLD. Yes, sir; Army surplus property. When he can, he tells me he will build a brick-and-glass front and use this for his workshop, but until that time, it has satisfied the Ford Motor Co. as their place of doing business.

SITUATION OF QUONSET HUTS IN NEVADA

Senator McCARRAN. The reason I asked that question was, I know of a great quantity of those Quonset huts laying out in the elements in my State, and I know of a number of people who would like to acquire them and I have been trying to jar them loose for a long time so they could use them.

Mr. ARNOLD. You should be in touch with our office. We do that work for you.

CASE IN AREA-DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

Area development is another division.

LETTER FROM ARKANSAS RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION REQUESTING REVIEW OF AREA-DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS

We have a letter from the Arkansas Resources and Development Commission, located in the State capital, Little Rock, stating that they have gone as far into the matter of developing that State as they feel they can without some information from us. They asked us to do four things:

"(a) Review the purposes, functions, and organization of the program at both State and local levels, to make such suggestions as you can for clarification and development of purposes and responsibilities. Although the program is, as I have said, operating well, I feel that we should take advantage of such suggestions for improvement as a well-trained specialist can make.

"(b) Review our selection of extractive industries which we think can be established or further developed on the basis of our natural production resources.

"(c) Review our selection of manufacturing industries from the standpoint of factors generally considered to be necessary for the establishment of these industries as compared with conditions which exist in Arkansas. In this respect we particularly need assistance in the evaluation of markets, in the evaluation of opportunities for correlated industries, and in the evaluation of the possibilities for development of a balanced economy in the several physical provinces of Arkansas.

"(d) Suggest other aspects of a State development program to provide technical and other types of assistance to local people in the establishment and operation of new plants. In many cases we have found that local industries are not established because of the lack of local know-how. Department of Commerce plans for providing technical and managament assistance will, of course, have a bearing on our requirements in Arkansas."

COOPERATION WITH COAL-MINING AREAS

We have been working very closely in our Area Development Division with the coal-mining area which centers around Herrin, Ill., and the anthracite area centering around Scranton, Pa. Both are mined-out areas having a surplus of labor, no shortage of homes. They need some new small industries to come in and take the place of the employment that was provided by mines in the past.

EXTENT OF MERCHANDISE ASSISTANCE RENDERED

Senator McCARRAN. Are you doing anything toward getting merchandise for these small business concerns?

Mr. ARNOLD. I do not understand what you mean by merchandise.

Senator McCARRAN. Merchandise, of course, will come along as time goes on and as the product increases, but at the present time are you doing anything toward assisting small business in various sections of the country to get merchandise?

Mr. ARNOLD. We are helping in OPA matters very materially.

That comes under our special services. I have left that information for the last.

SPOT ASSISTANCE

Small business continues to need assistance in breaking bottlenecks of reconversion. Shortage of materials besets small business. Often price adjustments are needed. The type of problem requires immediate attention. We call this spot assistance.

CASES FOR RELIEF FROM OPA RESTRICTIONS

During April 263 small businessmen requested relief from OPA price restrictions—we processed 237 of these and, through cooperation of OPA, were able to bring relief in a majority of the cases.

CASES FOR PRIORITY ASSISTANCE

During April the Office of Small Business processed 2,200 applications for priority assistance. In a substantial number of cases, approximately 75 percent, we were instrumental in assisting these small firms in obtaining scarce materials.

Senator McCARRAN. Is it possible that the condition has come in this country where we are financing the Office of Price Administration to set up barriers, and then we are financing your concern to break down those barriers?

AIDS SMALL BUSINESS IN OBTAINING ALLOTMENT OF CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. ARNOLD. We do not break down the barriers, Mr. Chairman, but we see to it that small business gets part of the allotment. We see that it gets its part of the allotment. We have a working arrangement with the Civilian Production Administration whereby any small manufacturing plant may have enough of these critical materials to operate at an economic rate of production. In other words, when we certify to that fact, they accept that certification.

Senator McCARRAN. That is very interesting, because my limited experience has brought me into contact with circumstances where certain individuals or concerns seem to be able to get the merchandise, and others are not able to get it. Right in that same locality two such cases do occur. I have heard all kinds of expressions about it. I do not care to repeat them, as they would in some cases not be proper in the record anyway.

ST. LOUIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE MEETING REGARDING SPOT ASSISTANCE

Mr. ARNOLD. We conducted at the request of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce a meeting before their small businessmen; 650 people attended that luncheon, all representing, I was told, just one specific business. In other words, not three or four from any certain business. After the introductory speech by the Under Secretary and by me we then went into a workshop session on spot assistance. That is what they wanted us to come out and talk about. At least 350 of those remained for the workshop session, and at the last, at 5:30, when we quit, 200 businessmen remained. The meeting was entitled "Business Listens and Then Talks," and we were somewhat alarmed at what they would say, but each of our chiefs of spot assistance services covered in their speeches so completely what we can do that not nearly the number of questions arose that we expected.

One man by the name of Kauffman, who manufactures electrical refrigerators, arose and said, "I have not been able to get one single motor." He continued, "I am stymied. I have been trying for 3 months to buy some motors without success."

Our Chief of the Special Service Division whom he was querying asked him if he had applied for a Civilian Production Administration priority, to which he was entitled. That was the only thing he had not done.

Whereupon, our Chief stated, "Well, last week a Los Angeles manufacturer applied for 10,000 motors and we were able to get him 1,000." This St. Louis man said, "If I could get that proportion of the motors I need, I would be the happiest man in the world. What can I do to get them?" "Go to your Department of Commerce office in St. Louis, fill out your priority request, send it to our office in Washington, and we will get the motors, because it is necessary for you to have those motors to operate at an economic rate of production."

It was just those types of questions that came up; and, as I say, at 5:30, when we quit, after 5½ hours, at least 200 businessmen still remained at that meeting.

Senator McCARRAN. I imagine that would be true, because it is a very interesting subject and one that is very live right now throughout the country.

VALUE OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS OBTAINED FOR SMALL BUSINESS IN MARCH QUARTER, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. During the first quarter of this year we helped small business to obtain Government contracts with a dollar value of approximately $330,000,000. You would not believe that there is still being purchased by the Government those items which small manufacturers can produce to the amount of an annual value of $1,200,000,000. We hope through our office to secure at least $1,000,000,000 worth of that business for small business. That leaves plenty of procurement for large business.

Senator McCARRAN. Will you break that down a little bit—what lines does that go into?

BREAK-DOWN OF GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENTS

Mr. ARNOLD. Of course, the Army and Navy are still large purchasers, ships are still being built. The Treasury Department is buying very heavily for UNRRA. It consists of machinery of all kinds, both agricultural and for factories.

Senator McCARRAN. These are small items?

Mr. ARNOLD. Small electrical manufacturers are receiving procurements for items they can process and much of that type of product is in demand. In fact, some of it covers food for our Army and Navy. Most people thought that procurement was over. I do not know what the total is, but our men have figured out that there is $1,200,000,000 this year that small business can process.

Furthermore, we try to have the procurement agencies, the Army, Navy, Treasury, and others, award contracts to the large concerns who will be agreeable to subcontract to small business.

You will remember, as I do, at the beginning of this war, the procurement agencies did not buy anything to speak of from small manufacturers. The purchasing agencies thought, "If I place this with a large concern, my responsibility is ended," and that is what our bottleneck was. Small business at the beginning of the war was producing, I am told, less than 10 percent of what was required. At the end of the war small manufacturers were producing more than 30 percent of all that went into the war effort.

As I said, in checking the value of the Technical Service Division since the beginning of 1942, 29,000 requests for help in solving problems have come in. At the present time, each month several hundred more are received.

TESTIMONIAL LETTER TO SECRETARY FROM SUNSHINE GRILLS, INC.

I do not have a great deal more to present to you, Mr. Chairman. I do want to read you a letter, a testimonial letter that came into Secretary Wallace dated May 13, from Sunshine Grills, Inc., Miami, Fla. It says:

"Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE.

"DEAR SECRETARY: I think that you are going to like this letter. It is, of course, common knowledge that all we plain citizens from time to time indulge in gibes and criticisms of many of our Government agencies. I do not remove myself from this category, for I must confess that I have been more vociferous in this respect than many of my fellow-citizens. However, today I have been given very just cause to alter my opinion.

"Unfortunately, my vocabulary is too limited to pay proper respects to what your Mr. William Seltzer, of your Miami office, did for us.

"We are little businessmen who had saddled ourselves with debts and obligations which we hoped to fulfill through the erection of three small restaurants.

"Our first attempt was thwarted by the CPA rejecting our application.

"We were practically disheartened and discouraged, and having tried many ways, as a final resort appealed to your Mr. Seltzer, chiefly because we thought we would try to find out for ourselves just what this Department of Commerce would do for the small businessman.

"Let it be here stated that Mr. Seltzer not only extended to us every courtesy, not only listened to our facts very carefully, but immediately went into action and got us permission to appeal our case.

"He was not only very helpful in instructing as to the proper procedure but he also went to the mat for us on three different occasions at CPA meetings.

"The result was that today we received the O. K. to go ahead from CPA.

"We feel that we owe all this to your Department, and especially as it was so ably represented by your Mr. Seltzer."

PERSONNEL STRENGTH IN FISCAL YEAR 1946

Senator McCARRAN. How many employees did you have in 1946. That is under the 1946 appropriation?

Mr. ARNOLD. Do you mean the Smaller War Plants Corporation and the Office of Small Business combined?

Senator McCARRAN. Any way you like it.

Mr. ARNOLD. I am not sure about that.

Senator McCARRAN. What I have before me shows 256; is that correct?

Mr. ARNOLD. I am informed that is correct.

Senator McCARRAN. It now seems that for this fiscal year, it is 131.

Mr. GLADIEUX. Mr. Chairman, may I make a statement there that might properly come from the Secretary's office, I believe.

Senator McCARRAN. You may.

Mr. GLADIEUX. As Mr. Arnold mentioned before, this budget was prepared last October. At that time we did not have in contemplation the probable transfer of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. The 131 figure and the $460,799 was our own Department of Commerce small business program. In January when the major part of the Smaller War Plants Corporation was transferred to the Department, we did not ask for any supplemental appropriation or any increase. We have kept that figure at 131 and, I may say, I think we have penalized and handicapped ourselves by so doing.

Senator McCARRAN. Is the 131 for small business?

Mr. GLADIEUX. Yes. That provides for the departmental service of the Small Business Division of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and that part of the Smaller War Plants Corporation which was transferred. Frankly, had we known Smaller War Plants Corporation was to be transferred, or had it been transferred at the time we prepared this budget, we would have increased this 131 considerably because, as Mr. Arnold has said, the Smaller War Plants Corporation itself had a budget of about $8,000,000 last year. This request of 131 is just a small fraction of that amount. I think we can safely say that we do not know for sure whether we can do the job Mr. Arnold has outlined with only 131 people.

Senator McCARRAN. What amount are you asking?

POSITIONS AND AMOUNT REQUESTED FOR 1947

Mr. GLADIEUX. We are just asking for 131 people, at $460,799. We are going to try to do it with that amount, but we do not know whether we can.

Senator McCARRAN. You just know the general reduction, not what the House cut you on that particular item?

EFFECT OF HOUSE REDUCTION

Mr. GLADIEUX. We made a corresponding reduction here because the House did not say specifically where it cut.

Mr. ARNOLD. The House did not cut our appropriation specifically, but we will have to share in a portion of that cut. It is estimated that perhaps we will have to give up 33 employees, which will bring our total down to 98. If that occurs, we have decided that perhaps this spot assistance, which is a temporary service to small business but is very essential right now, might have to be given up or curtailed to a very minimum.

Senator McCARRAN. Was all this explained to the House? Of course, the House did not address its cut to this.

Mr. GLADIEUX. That is just the point.

Senator McCARRAN. Have you concluded, Mr. Arnold?

Mr. ARNOLD. Yes; I believe that is all.

Senator McCARRAN. I do not want to hurry you.

AMOUNT OF HOUSE REDUCTION FOR FIELD SERVICE

Mr. ARNOLD. I do want to say in conclusion that it is difficult to divorce what we do here in Washington from what we do in the field. The field cut was from $6,500,000 down to $2,500,000 by the House Appropriations Committee.

Senator McCARRAN. By "the field" we understand you to mean your offices like that Miami office?

Mr. GLADIEUX. That is right.

Mr. ARNOLD. That is true.

Senator McCARRAN. It seems to me that the field is where the real contact is made and where the real honest-to-God business is done.

Mr. ARNOLD. We want to render this service near to where these businessmen live. Just as in the Atlanta case I cited you, our man advised the veteran that there seemed to be a field for the manufacture of venetian blinds, and today he is a successful manufacturer of that product.

NEED FOR FIELD OFFICE IN EVERY STATE

We should have numerous field offices. The cut by the House Appropriations Committee reduced this to such a small amount that we cannot perform as the Department of Commerce should perform throughout the Nation. My experience in the Smaller War Plants Corporation leads me to know we should have one office at least in every State in the Union where small businessmen could go and get this information that is developed here in Washington by the various offices of the Government, and which otherwise will not be available to them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia has not been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that he understands it has not yet been offered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I again move, on page 69, line 14, to strike out the figure "$2,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$6,500,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber at the time, and I should like to ask the able chairman of the subcommittee what action was taken on the

floor on an amendment that may have been offered with reference to the appropriation for the State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs?

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendments offered by the committee were adopted.

Mr. MEAD. Do they give to them the appropriation they require for the continuation of the international short-wave broadcasting?

Mr. McCARRAN. Up to the amount allowed by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. MEAD. Up to the amount allowed by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. I thank the able chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I wish to make a statement in that connection.

In addition to my own opinion strongly urging the continuation of the State Department's international short-wave broadcasting to furnish the peoples of the world with a full and fair picture of America, I should like to extend my remarks to include a representative cross-section of current American newspaper editorial, feature, and press association support for the State Department's international information and cultural-affairs program.

Leading radio executives, such as Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corp. of America; Walter Evans, vice president of the Westinghouse Electric Corp., Baltimore; Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co., New York; Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, New York; J. D. Shouse, vice president of the Crosley Corp., Cincinnati; and other prominent radio executives have gone on record in support of the State Department's program of international short-wave broadcasting.

Following is the text of a United Press dispatch, dated Washington, May 18, and published in the May 19, 1946, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

UNITED STATES BROADCAST OF NEWS BACKED BY RADIO HEADS—FIVE INDUSTRY LEADERS SAY PRIVATE COMPANIES CAN'T EQUAL PRESENT PROGRAMS

WASHINGTON, May 18.—Five radio executives and two Government officials have given support to William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, in his battle to maintain the State Department's program of international short-wave broadcasting.

The support was contained in statements requested by Mr. Benton and furnished the Senate Appropriations Committee, which is considering a House sponsored reduction in broadcast funds from $19,284,778 to $10,000,000. Mr. Benton has said the cut would force the Department to abandon its short-wave program. He says the program is needed to get the truth about Americans to foreign countries.

Radio executives supporting Mr. Benton are J. D. Shouse, vice president of the Crosley Corp., Cincinnati; Frank Stanton, president of Columbia Broadcasting System, New York; Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board, General Electric Co., New York; Walter Evans, vice president of Westinghouse Electric Corp., Baltimore; and Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corporation of America, of New York.

The Government officials are Charles R. Denny, acting chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and Paul Porter, former FCC chairman and now Price Administrator.

Mr. Shouse wrote Mr. Benton that private industry could not take over the short-wave program "without a great and perhaps tragic diminution of the effectiveness of portraying to the rest of the world United States policy and thinking on matters of international import."

He said the geographic position of the United States obliged it to rely on short-wave broadcasting to get its message overseas. He assured Mr. Benton he had no fear that the international program would be used as a means of Government encroachment in the domestic field.

Messrs. Stanton, Reed, and Evans all wrote Mr. Benton that they felt the present scale of operations should not be abandoned before a permanent peacetime program is developed.

Mr. Sarnoff sent Mr. Benton a memorandum written in January 1943 which said it still represented his views. In it, he said international broadcasting did not seem to him to constitute a field for private competition. Even if it did, he added, it was doubtful it could furnish sufficient revenue for private firms to "render a public service of genuine world magnitude."

Messrs. Denny and Porter noted that the State Department would soon submit to Congress specific proposals governing international radio.

Mr. President, in registering their protest against the curtailment of the necessary funds for the continuation of the State Department's information and cultural programs, Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature; Jonathan Daniels; George Fielding Eliot, military analyst for the New York Herald Tribune; Mark Ethridge, of the Louisville Courier-Journal; Thomas K. Finletter; Ralph McGill, of the Atlanta Constitution; Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, of the Riverside Church, New York; and former Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court Owen J. Roberts telegraphed the following appeal to me and to other Members of this honorable body. The text of their statement, which also, I note with approval, appeared on the editorial pages of the New York Times of May 22, 1946, the New York Post of May 20, 1946, and in the New York Herald Tribune of May 20, 1946, is as follows:

INFORMATION AND CULTURAL PROGRAM CURTAILMENT SEEN AS DEPLORABLE

Another unfortunate manifestation of American withdrawal from her world responsibilities since the end of the war is the action of the House Appropriations Committee in cutting almost by half the budget for the State Department's overseas information and cultural program.

It seems inconceivable that we have so soon forgotten the tragic cost to us of our failure to promote an adequate understanding before the war of American policies, of American objectives, and, indeed, of the American people themselves. The popular conception abroad of America and Americans was as warped as it was harmful. Little wonder that Germany had such fertile ground in which to plant its idea seeds against the American people. Little wonder that so many millions had to be spent by us during the war in counteracting the effect of enemy propaganda against us.

The people of Europe today are hungry for information about America. They are receptive and responsive to a constructive program that can give them a better understanding of the American people and their foreign policy.

Such being the case, we find the House Appropriations Committee recommendation that the State Department budget be cut from $19,000,000 to $10,000,000 a deplorable and potentially harmful action. At a time when we should be recognizing our opportunities and our obligations, we are apparently defaulting on both. It is to be hoped that the cut will be restored in full by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

NORMAN COUSINS.
JONATHAN DANIELS.
GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT.
MARK ETHRIDGE.
THOMAS K. FINLETTER.
RALPH MCGILL.
HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK.
OWEN J. ROBERTS.

MAY 17, 1946.

Mr. President, I should like also to include in the RECORD the eloquent statement sent to me and other Members of the United States Senate on May 8, 1946, by 21 Americans experienced in world affairs and prominent as war correspondents, authors, editors, and radio commentators.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement, in the form of a telegram, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have seen the terrible impact of war at home and abroad. The shooting war is over, but the battle for peace must continue. Only through the international exchange of human understanding can the rebirth of nazism and fascism be averted. America is obligated, realistically and morally, to maintain an adequate program of international information under its State Department.

We, therefore, respectfully request the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States to restore the budget of the State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs which the House Appropriations Committee is recommending be cut from $19,000,000 down to $10,000,000.

This drastic action would cripple America's voice abroad and reduce it to a whisper at a time when the hunger in the minds of foreign peoples for an accurate picture of America's way of life is greatest.

According to Washington press reports, our Government is spending over $1,000,000 daily to manufacture and improve atomic bombs. Surely the State Department's request for less than $20,000,000 a year for an overseas information program is not unreasonable if we consider that wars first take place in the human mind. If the world is kept properly informed concerning the peaceful and democratic aims of the United States, world security would then be immeasurably strengthened.

We offer our unqualified support of the statements made by Secretary of State James F. Byrnes to sessions of the House appropriations subcommittee when he requested their endorsement of the State Department's International Information program. Secretary of State Byrnes said: "There never was a time, even in the midst of war, when it was so necessary to replace prejudice with truth, distortion with balance, and suspicion with understanding. * * * The Department's proposals constitute a modest program compared to wartime standards. * * * I am convinced an information program can contribute to our security just as can an army, a navy, and an air force * * * and at infinitely less expense."

If America slumps back into a policy of narrow isolationism, it feeds the substance of the enemies of democracy all over the world. If America turns its back to the world, it cannot expect the clock of human affairs to stand still.

For these and other cogent reasons which you can find by consulting your own good consciences, Members of the Congress of the United States, we urge you with all the sincerity at our command, to reinstate and approve the full appropriation requested by the State Department for its International Information Service. We believe that to reduce this appropriation, particularly at this time when the people of this country and indeed of the whole world ardently desire peace, would be a regrettable case of false, if not dangerous, economy.

Owen J. Roberts, former Associate Justice, United States Supreme Court; Frederick Lewis Allen, editor, Harpers Magazine, author; W. W. Chaplin, war correspondent, radio commentator; Marquis W. Childs, columnist, war correspondent, news analyst; George Hamilton Combs, commentator, former Member of Congress; Norman Cousins, editor, Saturday Review of Literature, author; Jonathan Daniels, author, former Assistant to the President of the United States; Mark Van Doren, professor, Columbia University; George Fielding Eliot, military analyst, writer; Mark Ethridge, editor and publisher Louisville Courier-Journal; Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor, Riverside Church, New York; Thomas K. Finletter, former Special Assistant to the Secretary of State; Frank Gervasi, war correspondent and author; George Hicks, war correspondent and news analyst; Ralph McGill, editor, Atlanta Constitution; Quentin Reynolds, author, war correspondent, radio commentator; Stanley Ross, war correspondent; William L. Shirer, war correspondent, news analyst, and author; Robert St. John, radio commentator, war correspondent; Rex Stout, author; Leland Stowe, war correspondent, author, and commentator.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, editorial opinion as well as the opinion of respected Americans in many fields of endeavor has also eloquently and sanely presented the case for the continuation of the State Department's International Information and Cultural Affairs program on the basis that only through mutual understanding among the nations of the world can we secure and maintain the peace which the American people so ardently desire.

I ask unanimous consent that a representative selection of editorials straight from the conscience of American newspaperdom may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 24, 1946]

HOW NOT TO RUN A SERVICE

The State Department in Washington has just made a drastic cut in its provision for the upkeep and maintenance of its representatives in Europe, as Mr. O'Reilly's report in this paper disclosed yesterday. At this moment in the history of the United States and of the world, the State Department's action is like a War Department demanding a reduction in its expenditures the day a war was declared.

The chief criticism of the State Department has always been that it has not done enough and that what it has done was not done well enough. It has never been criticized, at least in recent years, for doing too much. Many of its mistakes in the past may be said to be due directly to lack of adequate information, lack of adequate preparation, lack of competent trained personnel, all in turn partly due to a fundamental failure to grasp the tremendous job that faces American diplomacy in the world today. What Congress appropriates for a single battleship and a squadron of B-29s would be enough to revitalize the whole State Department.

Penny-pinching by the State Department, which is already operating one of the most skimpily paid diplomatic staffs in the world, is inexcusable today when the representatives of the United States in the capitals of the world are carrying so huge a burden in the organization of the peace. The frequently promised reorganization of the State Department remains just another unfilled press conference boast. The diplomatic service is not attracting enough really competent people, nor is it likely to, unless a real change is made in its mode of operation. During the war many men and women, at considerable financial sacrifice, loyally accepted jobs in the State Department. To drive them and career employees out now by the absurd rulings of a minor bureaucrat in Washington on what it costs to live in liberated Europe underlines another fact: that the State Department needs not only adequate financial compensation for its employees, but also brains to direct them.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of May 6, 1946]

A CASE IN POINT

Recently the Associated Press and United Press refused to sell their news to the State Department for factual, straight-news broadcast to Europe. Their contention was that American news would do the job through its agencies and that short-wave broadcasts of American news and opinion was unnecessary.

Also recently Mark Ethridge, Louisville Courier-Journal publisher, went to Bulgaria and Rumania as a representative of this country to investigate conditions there. He reported back that freedom of the press was not permitted. He subsequently expressed an opinion that the State Department broadcasts were vitally necessary, being the only source of news and opinion from this Nation.

An article stating these opinions was published and broadcast by the American radio. The newspapers in Rumania, opposing the Government, attempted to print it but were refused permission.

Rarely does an investigator's deductions receive such immediate vindication.

We hope Congress will give to the State Department, as urged by Secretary Byrnes, an appropriation large enough to permit them to carry on the very vital work which the news agencies cannot do.

[From the Chicago Sun of May 7, 1946]

MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING AS A BASIS OF PEACE

Substantial progress was made last week on the Bloom bill, setting up a permanent cultural relations and information program in the State Department.

A high price was paid by the administration before the House could be persuaded to move. Representative Cox (Democrat, Georgia) was able to announce that "hundreds of undesirable people" had been ousted by the State Department—meaning, unquestionably, that among the victims of the purge were patriotic, progressive citizens unjustly hounded by the Dies and Wood-Rankin committees. The House Foreign Relations Committee, furthermore, voted to prohibit State Department use of news from the Associated Press, United Press, and other news agencies.

The proposed Government news broadcasts, however, occupied but a minor place both in the present temporary program and the permanent one planned by Assistant Secretary of State William Benton. A dispute over 10 minutes of news daily should not determine the larger question of how this country shall systematize and enlarge informational activities which it has been carrying on in some form for years.

Most of the program consists of such activities as the exchange of students, promotion of cultural interchange, maintenance of information libraries overseas, and supplying background material to editors and the general public abroad.

One typical and especially praiseworthy project developed during the war is the brilliantly illustrated Russian-language magazine "Amerika," distributed exclusively in the Soviet Union. Moscow has just granted permission for the circulation of 50,000 instead of 25,000 copies of the magazine. It is so popular that copies are eagerly snatched up and have been known to fetch a sizable price in the black market.

Can anybody give a good reason why this project should not be continued? The fact that Russians are eager to learn about this country, to read of its industrial and agricultural achievements, to study its political structure and traditions, even to follow the course of women's fashions, is an augury of better understanding and better relations. We would be senseless not to take advantage of it.

So it goes with other projects afoot and planned. The goal, in the words of the Bloom bill, is to promote that mutual understanding between peoples which is one of the essential foundations for durable peace. Clear around the world, people have a thirst for information about the United States. The thirst cannot be satisfied by private agencies operating for profit. Yet the State Department program contemplates no real interference with any activities of such agencies.

It would be sound if the Senate should reverse the House decision regarding the use of news service reports. The AP and UP fear of propaganda in proposed news broadcasts has not been substantiated. But even if the House vote on that issue stands, the broad aims of the Bloom bill should be approved and sufficient funds granted to make the aims effective.

[From the Birmingham Age-Herald of May 20, 1946]

UNDERSTANDING AMONG PEOPLES

Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, in his address in Birmingham last week under the sponsorship of the Men's Club of Temple Emanu-El, stressed the urgent need for the promotion of understanding among the peoples of the world as a major means of achieving a lasting peace. Mr. McGill, who visited Russia as a member of a committee on world press freedom of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, was asked his opinion as to the prospect of achieving mutual confidence and genuine cooperation in relations with Russia. That hope, he replied, depends largely on increasing understanding among the two peoples. So few Russians, relatively, have been outside their own country. When he was in Russia, crowds of people demonstrated intense interest in his personal appearance and characteristics.

Of course, it is also true that relatively few Americans have ever been in Russia. When three Russian journalists were the guests of the American Society of Newspaper Editors

at its recent Washington convention, the greatest interest was shown by its members in these visitors. It was evident that a sense of strangeness prevailed on both sides, that there was the keenest mutual desire to become better acquainted.

The unknown always arouses a measure of uncertainty, and often of misgiving.

The feeling among the American people that they do not really know the Russians and the feeling among the Russians that they do not know us constitute one of the major obstacles to the advancement of mutual confidence and cooperation.

But it is not only among these peoples that greater understanding is urgently needed. Strangeness and a measure of distrust enter into the relations of the citizens of many nations.

On the other hand there are peoples—the British and Americans, for example—among whom a high degree of trust and friendship exists. That has grown out of obvious factors making for understanding.

It is significant that Mr. McGill, Mark Ethridge, of the Louisville Courier-Journal, and Wilbur Forrest, of the New York Herald Tribune, who recently testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in behalf of the State Department's projected program for the advancement of understanding among the peoples of the world, all have traveled widely in foreign countries within the last year. They have experienced at first hand the need for greater information about us in other lands. They know, too, of the need for more knowledge in this country of the lives and conditions of other peoples.

The State Department's program contemplates short-wave radio broadcasts, the distribution of American reports and publications, the interchange of students, and other measures for the betterment of cultural relations generally.

Such a program, soundly conceived and executed, has so many potentialities for good that we hope that it will go forward even though the State Department is not able to obtain the news services of the Associated Press and the United Press.

[From the Toledo Blade of May 4, 1946]

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION

In approving a $10,000,000 appropriation to maintain the State Department's International Information Service by an almost strictly party vote, the House refused to take a pound-wise, penny-foolish stand on international affairs.

How much good it will do to have our Government send information about our country to those parts of the world which do not get our normal news reports, we do not know. How many people will listen to short-wave newscasts beamed abroad is even harder to estimate than the number of persons who listen to regular newscasts at home. No one will ever know how much tangible benefit the United States will receive in the form of good will and better understanding from this State Department effort to tell the American story to other peoples.

But the men who led the propaganda war for us on the ideological front are convinced that there is still much work to be done in putting that story across to peoples who have had little opportunity to understand it. They believe that it will increase our influence with the peace-loving people of small nations and large. They believe it will increase our chances of maintaining a durable peace.

Whether they are right or wrong, the $10,000,000 to be spent on an International Information Service is relatively a drop in the bucket to be spent on a worthy cause. It wouldn't meet our war costs for a single day. It wouldn't even pay for a smaller first-class warship. It wouldn't, for all we know, buy an atomic bomb. And simply on the chance that it may help prevent another war, we think it is worth the money for our State Department to tell all peoples who will listen that Americans want a peaceful, prosperous world which will benefit others as much as it will themselves.

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press of May 16, 1946]

EPISTLE TO THE RUSSIANS

Because there is no true measure of either piety or sincerity the average American will have to take with the proverbial dusting of salt the recent declaration of Ilya Ehrenburg, Russian journalist now touring this country, that he would like to help make the emotional space between Moscow and Washington as little as the physical space—reduced by modern modes of transportation—by bringing the hearts and minds of the two peoples closer together. Certainly the treatment of American reporters in Russia and the diplomatic maneuvers of the Soviet's representatives to the United Nations have been anything but contributions to closer understanding.

But some things can be said of Russia that give vitality to the common hope that some day the various political commissars will relent and one of these is the recent relaxation of limitations on the number of copies of "Amerika," a magazine published by the State Department, permitted to circulate in Russia. The number has been increased from 20,000 to 50,000 copies in a domain of more than 180,000,000 people.

"Amerika" is tailored to the Russian taste, carrying special articles on the American ideal of government, the theater, movies, industry in general, plastic developments, United States railroads in the war and whatnot. The magazine is not devoted to propaganda in the usual sense but to giving correct information about the United States. There isn't anything very red-blooded in its appeal for understanding of this Nation's general ideology in such matters as democracy, liberty, the priceless freedoms of the spirit and the inherent rights of the human being, but any inroad through the rigorous censorship exercised in Russia has its own compensations.

No matter how fervently Ilya Ehrenburg may wish to bring the hearts and minds of America and Russia together it must be conceded that there isn't much he can do about it until his own country is disposed to offer Americans—especially newspaper correspondents and editors—the same freedom of action over there that Ehrenburg and his companion journalists are enjoying over here.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, nationally and internationally known news analysts of unimpeachable reputation for impartiality and objectivity in their presentation of news facts have stated in signed stories that Americans overseas, and, indeed, all the peoples of the universe, eagerly use and urgently need the documentary, scientific, cultural, and educational information made available to them only through the good offices of the American people and the American Government.

I ask unanimous consent that a number of articles may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 18, 1946]

NEWS UNIT HAILED ABROAD—HAS LITTLE HONOR AT HOME

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—America's international information program lacks honor in its own country. The House of Representatives has cut in half the State Department's down-to-the-bone blueprint of what it needs. The Senate, the Department is hoping, will restore the cut.

James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, asked for $19,284,778. The House was willing to advance $10,000,000.

If viewed suspiciously at home, however, the Government's information program is welcomed, used, and waited for abroad with unbelievable enthusiasm and fervor. Not only do the people of other nations use the information services offered—libraries, radio programs, information offices—but the heads of American missions abroad are genuinely appreciative of their contribution to better understanding.

Following are some of the reports from the field on how the program is received and used:

Ambassador Jefferson Caffery, in Paris (on hearing the House had cut the Department's information and cultural activities in France): "Such a cut would destroy effectiveness of the program and place the United States in a disadvantageous position in relation to the needs of this area and the efforts of other nations."

Ambassador Alexander Kirk, in Belgium: "Such a cut would be prejudicial to the effective and efficient operation of this mission and detrimental to American interests in this area."

Prague, Czechoslovakia: "Reception of the service in Prague has been nothing short of fantastic. In our relatively small reading room, an average of 700 to 1,000 people a day use our journals and newspapers. At times we have had to close the door and put a sign on the outside saying 'closed for 1 hour' until people would move out, leaving room for the others. We could easily have had 2,000 people if we had sufficient space. We have had numberless requests from towns outside Prague asking that we establish branches of this service."

Sofia, Bulgaria: "When the American Library at Tear Osvoboditel opened last November, crowds of Bulgarians who had long been starved for American reading matter were at the library. During the first 14 days (of which 3 were holidays) more than 2,000 readers were counted. The great crowds between 5 and 7 p. m. hardly left any standing room."

Peiping, China (Sept. 22, 1945): "Audiences at the picture exhibit are averaging 20,000 a day. The queue is sometimes 600 to 700 yards long. Our reading room is so crowded that many people have to stand or squat on the curbs in the two courtyards. We are constantly asked if more books and magazines are en route."

Kuibyshev, Russia (from a letter, July 1, 1945, by an American soldier to his grandparent in the United States): "Some months before I arrived here the OWI started getting out an American magazine printed in Russian. It is by far the best thing that ever happened for explaining the American Nation to the Russian people. Up to the time of the war all Russians knew was our bad aspects." (The House killed this magazine in trimming appropriations. However, since Moscow has now permitted printing 50,000 issues a month instead of 10,000, it should become self-supporting—and Congress may decide to continue it.)

Belem, Brazil (Jan. 8, 1946): "The Belem press has published a large amount of news items and background material furnished by us. This has been an important contribution to an informed understanding of our position in the world."

Copenhagen (Jan. 5, 1946): "We find that texts of important speeches are warmly welcomed by Danish newspapers and libraries. Authentic background material is exceedingly desirable for use in libraries, societies, and schools, and by authors and editors."

The Hague (Jan. 6, 1946): "Many editors and commentators say that they find the background material distributed to them, such as texts of official United States documents, of particular value in clarifying their views on American objectives and policies. In December 1945 a circular letter distributed to 80 Dutch newspapers offering various types of feature articles brought requests for 117 articles on American topics with illustrative photos."

Managua, Nicaragua (Jan. 2, 1946): "Articles concerning all phases of American life have formed a large proportion of the news in the local papers, sometimes amounting to almost half the news content."

Budapest (Jan. 5, 1946): "Especially useful in this crucial period of Hungarian reconstruction is all information on American Government and democratic way of life. Continuous servicing of press, Government, and public with background information, photos, and periodicals is essential."

Lisbon, Portugal (January 5, 1946): "The press office here receives more than 1,000 letters a month requesting information about life in the United States, education, science, medicine, engineering, industrial, natural, scientific, and commercial activities."

London (August 1945): "The demand for manufacturing and commercial reference books has been heavy. Business houses are constantly consulting these books for addresses, names of products, and standing of American concerns. Two regular visitors to the library, one connected with a large manufacturing firm, the other a member of the Economist staff, come in every 2 or 3 days for business and economic material."

Montevideo, Uruguay (January 10, 1945): "The general average of publication of all types of material over the last 2 years was more than 85 percent of the releases sent out. This high percentage of coverage is due to confidence in the information section and to the fact that releases were factual, honest. Newspapers continually seek biographical data concerning American personages and translation of speeches of political importance."

Wellington, New Zealand (January 12, 1946): "Articles and features were widely used by newspapers and technical and other periodicals. Numerous letters of appreciation have been received from cabinet ministers and heads of government departments and agencies."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 19, 1946]

UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE CALLED VITAL TO DIPLOMACY IN EUROPE—PEOPLE OF SOME COUNTRIES, ESPECIALLY RUSSIA, TRUST ONLY NEWS FROM GOVERNMENT SOURCES; SUCCESS OF BRITISH BROADCASTS CITED

(By Andre Visson)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—Diplomatic reports received in Washington during the last fortnight from various European capitals all sounded the same warning: Should the State Department, as a result of the unwillingness of Congress to grant the requested $19,000,000 appropriation, find itself compelled to cancel or even cut down its information and cultural activities, American diplomacy in Europe would be considerably handicapped and American interests in various European countries would be prejudiced.

This warning comes from American representatives in Communist Moscow, in Franco's Madrid, and in democratic Brussels. In all these capitals the United States is urged to continue its information services or to establish them where they still do not function.

Perhaps the most significant of all reports comes from Moscow. It describes the growing interest of Russians in British broadcasts in the Russian language and deplores the absence of similar American broadcasts, which, it is assumed, would have even greater success because the Russians generally have a much greater confidence in the United States than in Britain.

The report goes on to state further—and this will shock all Americans who naturally dislike and resent anything which smacks of Government propaganda—that the Russian people have much more confidence in news from American governmental sources than from American privately owned press or radio.

This is said to be the result of Soviet propaganda. The Russians have been continually told by their Government-owned and directed press and radio that the American capitalists were the enemies of the Soviet Union. On the other hand, the American Government, headed by President Roosevelt, reestablished diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia and helped Soviet Russia during the war. So the Russians now have a tendency to consider information from American governmental sources as more objective than from the American privately owned press or radio.

Those Americans opposing any kind of governmental information are not likely to be convinced that in order to keep the Russians informed about the American way of life the United States should use un-American methods—which they consider governmental information services to be. But the fact remains that only American Government publications are admitted into Soviet Russia. As to the short-wave broadcasts which can and do pierce the "iron curtain" drawn around Soviet Russia and her orbit, it is most unlikely that American broadcasting corporations will be interested in establishing and maintaining completely noncommercial programs. Indeed, no American exporter would be willing to advertise products for which there was no market in the countries to which the short-wave broadcasts would be beamed.

Thus, unless American radio corporations were prepared to run their short-wave broadcasts to all of eastern Europe at a constant loss, merely in defense of the principle of free enterprise, such broadcasts could function only if the men representing the American taxpayers would grant the State Department the $19,000,000 appropriation, of which $8,800,000 are required for the short-wave broadcasts.

Diplomatic reports from Madrid, insisting on the necessity of having American information services in Spain describe the information and cultural activities of the British and the French who maintain in the Spanish capital staffs of 180 and 100 persons respectively. The British information library has 15,000 volumes, and the 2 French libraries have 40,000 volumes.

As to British broadcasts to Spain, it has been officially admitted in London that the Foreign Office is using them as a vehicle of British foreign policy. Those BBC broadcasts, piercing the wall of Spanish censorship, explain to the Spaniards the reasons why the British people and their governments are opposed to the Franco regime, and express the hope that the Spaniards will themselves find—without intervention from abroad—a democratic solution for their country.

Even in genuinely democratic Belgium, where the newspapers are restricted only by the lack of newsprint, American diplomats urge the maintenance of governmental information services, pointing out the extremely important activities of the British, Soviet, and French Governments in that field.

Nobody really acquainted with conditions in Europe, can deny the need for information on America. In all Europe—in the west as well as in the east—people are most anxious to learn the truth about the intentions and the mood of the American people, whose attitude in the years to come will perhaps determine the very fate of our civilization. The great controversy is whether the American Government or the American press and radio should give Europeans the true picture of the United States?

It has been generally recognized that food and money—America's weapons for peace—can be given to European countries in adequate amounts only by the American Government. But it is still felt by many that information on America—her long-range weapon for peace—can be best handled by the private press and radio.

An objective study of European conditions indicates, however, that the American press and radio unfortunately cannot penetrate the countries behind the "iron curtain." Furthermore, 49 countries, including genuine democracies like England, are now using government short-wave broadcasts to carry the voice of their nations abroad.

Thus, if Americans believe that America's voice should be heard all over the globe, they must accept, as much as they may dislike it, the Government loud-speakers for all those countries which are beyond the reach of the private loud-speakers.

[From the New York Post of May 23, 1946]

ECONOMY MAY SILENCE UNITED STATES STORY TO THE BALKANS

(By Marquis W. Childs)

WASHINGTON.—Back in the thirties, two ambitious young men had an advertising firm called Benton & Bowles. They made a great financial success and, with that security, they started out to explore other fields of activity.

These two men, Chester Bowles and William Benton, are today both in the Government. Bowles, of course, is the embattled Director of Economic Stabilization. From behind that fancy title, he fights a rear-guard action for the economic principles in which he believes. Just now it's price control.

Less well known to the public, Benton is Assistant Secretary of State for public and cultural relations. He, too, just now is fighting a battle, and fighting it with the same fervor that Benton & Bowles put in their advertising business.

With the help of an able staff, Benton put together a program which would make the world better informed about the United States. He proposed to use short-wave broadcasting which would reach regions that now get no objective news about America. He proposed to send able young men as information assistants to our embassies and legations.

GOOD INTENTIONS

As carefully worked out, this program for the coming governmental year was to cost $19,284,778. Those who put the information budget together say it contained very little water. What the House did was to whack this figure down to $10,000,000.

Intention were good. The House Appropriations Committee was in favor of the philosophy of the program. But as so often in the past, they were not willing to give it a real chance.

This means that, unless the Senate restores the cut, the short-wave broadcasting will have to be eliminated. It means that the voice of America will not be heard at all in the Balkans and eastern Europe.

It means that the Russian short-wave radio, with competition from the British, will dominate whole areas of the globe. Several surveys, both by the Government and by private agencies, show that the volume of Russian propaganda has increased markedly since the end of the war.

This is particularly true in China. After the Japanese capitulation, Soviet propaganda was resumed there on a large scale. The official Soviet propaganda organization in China is the Tass News Agency. Tass is building up an extensive staff in many cities, far beyond the needs of news reporting, which is Tass' job elsewhere. Much of this propaganda is directed against the United States and its armed forces in China.

In the Balkans, under Communist-dominated governments, the official radio is usually critical of the United States and silent on any of this country's positive achievements. In any controversy that we have with the Soviet Union or with the local government, the American case is simply not presented. The left-wing press supporting the Balkan governments refers frequently to American imperialism.

BROADCASTS NEEDED

Propaganda is a word that we as Americans shy away from—and rightly. The world connotes distortion and untruth in the service of a political ideology. This poor old world has been battered by opposing propaganda for so long that truth sometimes seems to be the most harried of all the refugees who flee from disaster to despair.

Benton has repeatedly disavowed any intention of propaganda in the State Department information program. Despite this, the threat of propaganda is intimated in another controversy in which Benton is involved.

Under a wartime arrangement, the State Department obtained news free of charge from the United Press and the Associated Press for use in short-wave news broadcasts. They were objective broadcasts, using the raw material furnished by the great newsgathering agencies.

This arrangement was terminated after the end of the war. Benton then asked for the right to buy AP and UP news which would go into the same kind of objective broadcasts. That request was refused. Those who run the press associations seemed to feel that any relationship with the Government in peacetime would endanger their objectivity.

That seems to me a singularly short-sighted point of view. Surely the independence of our press is so strong that it cannot be jeopardized merely if the Government becomes a client of the great and powerful press services. Interestingly enough, Hearst's International News Service is providing news to the State Department as a client.

Objective news is essential in a world still half blacked-out. If no one else does the short-wave broadcasting job, the Government must.

[From the New York Post of May 20, 1946]

UNITED STATES FAILS TO SELL ITSELF IN SIAM

(By Dixie Tighe)

BANGKOK, May 22.—In this noncolonial country in Southeast Asia, the British lion waves its tail with a telling wallop, trying to brush off American influence as if it were a pestiferous fly.

In propaganda we are outweighed not only in pure body force but by the weight of indoctrination machinery. The only sign of nonaggression exists in the Joint Rice Commission, which moves with united purpose against famine conditions.

The avowed British reason for their presence in Siam is their current priorities—(1) more rice, (2) to return the Japs to Japan, (3) to repatriate internees and prisoners of war. They are accomplishing these things with admirable intent and swiftness. But in respect to propaganda, it is another story.

Unfortunately there is but a small force of Americans here to protect the story of our part in the war we helped to win and the peace we intend to keep.

Siam is being sold the British way of life as the one most likely to succeed.

TORRENT OF PROPAGANDA

In furthering her trade aspirations, I think England has let her propaganda giant hit below the belt. If some of its strength lies in our weakness, it is being taken advantage of. Newspapers frequently publish stories, credited to a British news agency, heralding the quality of English goods as far superior to American. The words "better than U. S. A." are resorted to, and there is a marked "always belittling campaign."

To counteract this we maintain a small group in Siam, without whom this country would have no conception of the American viewpoint. No American news agency operates into Siam, but Britain's Reuters pours in its story of empire.

However, the American group is in danger of having its already meager strength reduced. It should be extended to the fullest, to help make Siam aware of Americans. Siam has a distinct craving for American news. By conservative estimate, I've been stopped 50 times in streets, hotel lobbies, restaurants, and stores by inquiries concerning the United States of today.

CASTE SYSTEM PREVAILS

I've not, however, received any inquiries from Siamese officials. For I've overlooked the fact that besides rice, teak, and tin, the other major commodity of the country is snobbism. To approach Siamese officials without elegant sponsorship is like trying to become a life member of the Union League if you were born on the wrong side of the railway tracks.

I've been blackballed publicly by the Ministry of Propaganda, and have received no answer to my request for interviews with the Prime Minister and the Ministers of Commerce and Foreign Affairs. Apparently they've tested my blood and found the requisite pure blue contaminated by red and white.

This is a country with a caste system that includes the use of different pronouns for different social levels, a country where the servant uses the same gesture of obedience toward his master as towards his Buddhas.

It's also a country in which to alleviate famine, and a country in which Americans are failing to give a generous briefing on the high calorific value of democracy.

[From the New York Mirror of May 10, 1946]

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON, May 9.—Russians beam 11 broadcasts daily to the United States, but we will have no voice to compete with the Kremlin, London, Paris, or Madrid—if the action of the House in cutting the International Information Service is upheld by the Senate. The budget voted by the House is too small, and the one effective means of getting the story of America across censorship barriers to the rest of the world may have to be ditched.

[From the New York World-Telegram of May 10, 1946]

FUND SLASH MAY FORCE UNITED STATES TO END FOREIGN RADIOCASTS

(By Ned Brooks)

WASHINGTON, May 10.—Overseas broadcasts will be discontinued this summer if the Senate refuses to restore the $9,248,000 chopped by the House from the State Department's information and culture program.

Assistant Secretary William Benton has decided to silence the Voice of America broadcasts and retain other activities, such as foreign movies and libraries. If his program is held to the House-approved appropriation of $10,000,000.

Mr. Benton has urged a Senate appropriations subcommittee to restore the full $19,248,000 item recommended by the Budget Bureau.

Should the Department be forced to abandon its broadcasts, Mr. Benton may seek to have them taken over by a private foundation. He is said to be studying a plan under which a Government representative would assist in a privately sponsored undertaking.

WOULD DROP BROADCASTS

Officials have estimated that the short-wave broadcasts would cost from $6,000,000 to $7,500,000 a year, which would leave little for other activities. Mr. Benton favors abandoning the broadcasts and retaining the others as originally planned.

The whole program of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs escaped discard when Secretary James F. Byrnes assured the House critics that he was weeding out undesirable employees. The branch has been under attack because of alleged leftist sympathies of certain officials.

The House Appropriations Committee endorsed overseas broadcasts as an excellent approach to international understanding but said the Department was overdoing the entertainment features.

WHAT WOULD GO ON

Abandonment of the broadcasts would permit the Department to continue these activities within the $10,000,000 limit.

Showing of movies depicting American life and history, daily radio reports to American missions abroad on official happenings, operation of libraries and publication of the Russian magazine "Amerika."

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 15, 1946]

THREE EDITORS BACK UNITED STATES PLAN TO "TELL WORLD ABOUT AMERICA"

WASHINGTON, May 15 (AP).—Three newspaper editors are on record today as endorsing the State Department's proposed cultural-relations program and urging, particularly, an effort by the Government to "tell the world about America."

Those who testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday were Wilbur Forrest, assistant editor of the New York Herald Tribune; Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta, Ga., Constitution; and Mark Ethridge, publisher of the Louisville, Ky., Courier-Journal and Times.

The legislation asked by the State Department would provide for radiocasts and sending reports and publications to other nations throughout the world. It also would authorize interchange of students and of other projects carried on through the embassies for the promotion of better cultural relations between the nations.

The witnesses said that in recent trips abroad they found a great desire for news about America. They testified that particular need exists for short-wave radiocasts by this Government. Only in this manner, they said, can the "iron curtain" of censorship around many countries be overcome.

The three urged Congress to establish the State Department's program on a permanent basis. The House has voted $10,000,000 of the $19,000,000 the Department asked for the next fiscal year for the program, but has not acted on permanent legislation. The Senate has not acted yet on either the funds or the authorization.

Mr. McGill and Mr. Ethridge said the Department's program was threatened by the action of the Associated Press and United Press in withdrawing their news services from the Department.

"The whole thing is being misunderstood and colored by a commercial fight going on between the two press services," Mr. McGill asserted.

Mr. Forrest recommended that in all State Department radiocasts of spot news the items be attributed to the agency reporting them. William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, commented he would be willing to do this, but that the AP and UP did not like the idea, "fearing that it would identify them too closely with the Government."

[From The New York Times of May 15, 1946]

EDITORS ENDORSE UNITED STATES NEWS SERVICE—MCGILL, ETHRIDGE, AND FORREST HOLD AP AND UP OBSTRUCT VITAL GOVERNMENT FUNCTION—BENTON EXPLAINS STAND—HE PLEADS FOR RESTORATION OF FUNDS TO CONTINUE BROADCASTS TO EUROPE

(By Harold B. Hinton)

WASHINGTON, May 14.—Charges of obstructing a vital function of Government were made against two major wire news services of the United States today by Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, and Mark Ethridge, editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal and Times.

They testified with Wilbur Forrest, assistant editor of the New York Herald Tribune, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in favor of the State Department's program of cultural relations.

Mr. McGill told the committee that the Constitution and the Congress are adequate to guard freedom of the press in the United States.

He said that he was very fond of Kent Cooper, general manager of the Associated Press, and Hugh Baillie, general manager of the United Press, but added that "I doubt if God has appointed them to protect the freedom of the press."

RETURNED FROM WORLD TOUR

The witness regarded it as unfortunate that the refusal of the wire services to furnish their news to the State Department for use in the broadcasts in 24 languages which the State Department now beams toward Europe had come into the consideration of the cultural-relations bill.

He said that the attitude of the wire services sprang from their competitive efforts to sell their reports, and that there is not an ounce of altruism to a ton of it.

Mr. McGill told the committee how he and Mr. Forrest, along with Carl A. Ackerman, dean of the Columbia School of Journalism, had traveled to Great Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, Greece, Egypt, Turkey, Iran, the Soviet Union, India, China, and Australia in 1944 seeking to encourage freer exchange of news between all countries. Following that journey, he took another to France and the Middle East, from which he returned only a few weeks ago.

From that experience, he said, he considered the expansion of the United States Government's efforts to get its story befor the world of vital importance to the future of the country. Mr. Ethridge, who recently returned from a reportorial mission to the Balkans for Secretary of State Byrnes, agreed with Mr. McGill.

Mr. Ethridge declared that the Associated Press and the United Press are "exceedingly smug in their assumption they are the sole possessors of purity."

He also reproached all the wire services with lack of realism in imagining they can penetrate into countries "where they can't go," and found this particularly unfortunate at a time "when we are trying to win this peace—now, while we are in ideological war."

He recounted how a peasant in Transylvania had asked him to get the State Department to change the times of its voice broadcasts, because the morning one came before he got up and the evening one after he went to bed.

Mr. Forrest, who is president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, told of the compromise he had suggested to the wire services, under which the State Department would make use of their news textually, giving credit for each item broadcast.

BENTON EXPLAINS PROPOSAL

William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, who has been pushing the program and dealing with the wire services, explained that Mr. Forrest's suggestion is not now acceptable. He conceded that he had come to see the situation as being more complicated the more he became familiar with it, and outlined the position of the wire services to the committee.

His original proposal, he said, had been that the wire services accept the responsibility for preparing texts to be included in the State Department short-wave broadcasts, so as to assure themselves of the objectivity and accuracy of the reports. This was declined because the principal wire services believed such participation would brand them irrevocably as agencies of the Government.

When he understood this position, Mr. Benton said that he proposed that the State Department have access to the news reports of the United Press, the Associated Press, and the International News Service in order for its writers to have quick access to accurate news, but that the script would contain no credit for any of the news, the Government assuming full responsibility for everything broadcast. None of these three plans was found acceptable, he reported.

He told the committee, however, that its session of this morning would be only of historic interest unless the Senate appropriations subcommittee restored the cut in funds it has made in the State Department bill.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has reported the bill favorably, and it is now pending before the Rules Committee for consideration for access to the floor.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 15, 1946]

FORREST BACKS PLAN TO SPREAD NEWS ABOUT UNITED STATES—TELLS COMMITTEE OF HOUSE THAT STATE DEPARTMENT MUST AVOID PROPAGANDA

WASHINGTON, May 14.—Wilbur Forrest, assistant editor of the New York Herald Tribune and president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, endorsed today a bill authorizing the Secretary of State to establish "programs for the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills" with foreign countries. He warned, however, that in disseminating news of the United States through short-wave broadcasts, the State Department should clearly identify the source of its items and avoid the risk of having its output labeled abroad as propaganda.

Mr. Forrest, who is chairman of the ASNE's standing committee for world freedom of information, told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the State Department should not write "spot news" for foreign consumption, but instead should distribute items from news services and newspapers and credit the source in each case. He defined "spot news" as news which is "alive today and dead tomorrow."

Mr. Forrest said it would be totally impossible for the United States Government to establish a reputation for fairness in putting out news if the news were written by Government employees. Sooner or later, he cautioned, such news would become suspect abroad.

FEARS PROPAGANDA

No matter how honestly a Government employee tried to write the news for short-wave broadcasts, he could not succeed, Mr. Forrest said. "I can see the papers abroad saying, 'The American Government propaganda service says today'," he added. This, he said would nullify the effect of the news.

"The breath of government shouldn't be on live news," Mr. Forrest told the committee. "If it's independent news, people will believe it, in my opinion."

William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, said he had no objection to Mr. Forrest's suggestion, but that the Associated Press and the United Press had refused to permit continued use of their names in broadcasts to foreign listeners. He said they felt that they ran the risk of having their names tainted as Government-propaganda organs.

Mr. Benton recalled that he had proposed to the AP and UP that they prepare news scripts for short-wave use, which the State Department would transmit verbatim, or that they permit attribution of news items to them. Because they objected to both suggestions, he said, he proposed that they return their news tickers to the State Department for reference use by the department in preparing foreign broadcasts.

The bill on which Mr. Forrest testified has been approved by the committee.

URGES ADEQUATE FUNDS

Mr. Forrest said the ASNE committee's world tour last year convinced him there is a "great thirst" everywhere for knowledge of the United States. He said that the $10,000,000 voted by the House for the cultural-relations program was inadequate. The House had cut the State Department's request down from $19,000,000. The appropriation is now before the Senate.

Ralph E. McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, testified that Congress could be depended upon to see that the State Department kept its news output factual. I could appoint a committee to "ride herd" on the Department, he said.

Mark Ethridge, publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal and Times, testified it was not essential that outgoing Government news be attributed to the AP, UP, International News Service, or a particular newspaper. "The point is that it's an American Government broadcast," he said.

[From the New York Times of May 19, 1946]

MANY NATIONS USE BROADCASTS OF UNITED NATIONS—STATE DEPARTMENT AND BRITISH LINK FACILITIES TO GIVE BREADTH OF COVERAGE

The people of countries that cover two-thirds of the world are following United Nations proceedings with intense interest, reports based on foreign reaction to programs broadcast by the International Broadcasting Division of the Department of State and the European service of the British Broadcasting Co. revealed yesterday.

Since March 25, when the United Nations Security Council started meeting in New York, the IBD has broadcast the Council's sessions, news and commentaries, to 32 nations with excellent results. The broadcasts, which in many cases are relayed by the BBC, have gone to Europe, the Middle East, Scandinavia, Africa, and Latin America.

Reports on the general success of the programs have come from Dik Lehmkuhl, United Nations radio officer in London, and from foreign outposts of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, under which the IBD functions.

GREATEST IN EUROPE

Interest in United Nations events, the reports show, has been greatest in Europe, but the BBC home service has devoted hardly any attention to the Security Council meetings. Such former Axis partners as Hungary,

Rumania, and Italy are carrying as much United Nations news as possible.

At present, United Nations plans to operate an independent radio station have not been formulated, but the United States liaison section of the Department of Public Information's Radio Division intends to provide recordings of proceedings and interviews to 200 American stations, V. Duckworth Barker, chief of the Division, said yesterday.

Mr. Barker said that letters had been sent to stations all over the country, pointing out the need for the American public to understand the United Nations and its work. The letters suggested that the stations broadcast transcriptions of Security Council sessions and interviews with prominent members of the Secretariat and the delegations to the United Nations. Letters were also sent to 29 stations operated by colleges and universities.

RESPONSE ENTHUSIASTIC

In both cases, Mr. Barker said the response has been enthusiastic. "I hope to make a tour of the States soon with Christopher Cross, the United States liaison officer, to implement the program," he said.

Each time the Security Council convenes now, four BD short-wave stations are detached from their regular networks to carry the session abroad. Daily "Voice of America" programs carry United Nations news roundups in 13 languages to countries such as Australia, Argentina, Bulgaria, Chile, Germany, Guatemala, Greece, Peru, Poland, Spain, and Yugoslavia.

BBC helps relay the programs principally to countries in Europe and North Africa. Though IBD does not broadcast to Russia, the BBC recently undertook to beam in Russian general news broadcasts, including United Nations news, to different sections of the Soviet Union, several times a day. It has been impossible to measure, however, how many of the approximately 65,000 short-wave receiving sets in Russia pick up the broadcasts.

COVERAGE IN FRANCE

In France, the French broadcasting system devotes 15 minutes each weekday to United Nations coverage. However, it has specified to the IBD, that if "important United Nations decisions are taken Sunday, please cable us early," and radio time will be allotted.

The OIC reports note that Spain has not shown any desire to rebroadcast United Nations proceedings, but that Voice of America programs in Spanish are directed there for 45 minutes daily, by six short-wave stations in the United States and one relay station in north Africa.

The lowland countries, Belgium and the Netherlands, and two of the Scandinavian nations, Sweden and Denmark, are on the whole "recording as many IBD broadcasts, as conditions permit, for inclusion in programs," and scheduling portions of the Security Council sessions.

Sections of the Middle East, Turkey, Syria, and Egypt similarly have reacted favorably to the broadcasts. The Levant radio carries as many as three programs daily. The Union of South Africa Broadcasting Corp. is serving the southern half of that continent, and BBC relays programs to north Africa.

Eighteen programs, at varying times on weekdays and Sundays, are directed to Central and South America. Response to these broadcasts, the OIC reports, has been "very good."

[From Variety of May 15, 1946]

"UNITED STATES 'INFO' SERVICE TOO IMPORTANT" AS UNITED STATES CUTS ITS PROPAGANDA BUDGET

ROME, *May 14.*

Editor, VARIETY:

Am rather depressed but perhaps not too surprised at the great opposition growing back home against the information and cultural set-up abroad. I admit that some of the criticism is justified but on the whole I feel that our Congressmen show a complete lack of comprehension on the necessity of having these offices abroad. Ignorance has been one of the greatest ills of this world and the cause for so many of our ills. Carried on an international plane it has been the primary cause for wars. The one way to eliminate wars is to have education for the masses and free access to all news. Here was one concrete step toward having others see Americans as they really are.

We have been represented as a materialistic and grasping people out for world domination. All these years Italians have associated Americans with boogie-woogie, divorces, Hollywood, big fortunes, bathtubs, and many superficial aspects of civilization. In a few months in Italy, USIS has opened the eyes of many Italians by showing what Americans have contributed in the world of art, engineering, medicine, agriculture, music, and democracy. They have been very much surprised. They had associated us with the lighter things in life but now they see the United States as a matured Nation which has contributed much to this civilization of the twentieth century.

Anything that our friends in the newspaper and radio world can do to help this program will certainly be doing something to making this a better and friendlier world. OWI contributed much during the war. USIS can do much to prevent the setting up of a new OWI in 10, 20, or 30 years.

Does this sound like preaching? Perhaps it is, but I feel very strongly about it and I know that USIS is something that should be fought for. I'd feel the same way if I were to leave the outfit tomorrow.

J. D. RAVOTTE.

WASHINGTON, May 14.—Although Congress is preparing to slash to the bone funds for the new State Department Foreign Information Service, which includes use of films, British are expanding their information service, including the motion picture end.

Set-up was explained here recently by Neville Gardiner, film head of the British Information Services in this country. Gardiner disclosed that the films division of the new English "Central Office of Information" (successor to the British Ministry of Information) will be bigger than it was during the war.

Just back from 8 weeks in England, Gardiner explained that his country has set up a three-point postwar information program and has committed itself to: Provide information for its own people, continue in peacetime the wartime policy of a single information unit, and provide information for exchange with other countries.

Films play an important part in each point. The 1946 program calls for the production of 200 films, mostly shorts. Ninety percent of these will be made at the request of various ministries, and 10 percent will be originated by COI. Already in production at the request of Prime Minister Clement Attlee are films on the subject of food, problems of international trade, military government, and so forth. One, on displaced persons, has already been completed.

[From the New York Times of May 5, 1946]

DECRIES OUR SLASH IN RADIO TO WORLD—STATE DEPARTMENT AIDE GIVES FIGURES FOR BIG THREE ON WAR AND PRESENT BROADCASTING

(By Jack Gould)

COLUMBUS, OHIO, May 4.—The State Department made public here today figures to show that the United States was the only Big Three power to curtail drastically its radio facilities for explaining to world listeners the country's position on international affairs.

In a direct appeal to the public for support against congressional reduction of the Department's appropriation for international broadcasting, William L. Stone, director of the Office of International Information and Cultural Relations of the Department, issued the following statistical summary of the short-wave-radio activities of Great Britain, Russia, and the United States:

Great Britain: At the peak of its wartime operations in 1944 it broadcast a total of 109 hours 35 minutes daily in 39 languages. Today it broadcasts 97 hours 46 minutes in 40 languages.

STATISTICS FOR RUSSIA

Russia: In 1944 it was broadcasting 65 hours and 12 minutes daily in 29 languages. Today it is broadcasting 56 hours and 36 minutes daily in 32 languages. (These figures were understood not to include extensive broadcasting by Moscow to Balkan countries.)

United States: In 1944 it was broadcasting 153 hours and 20 minutes daily in 34 languages. Today it broadcasts 68 hours and 57 minutes daily in 24 languages.

"The British Broadcasting Corporation and Russia have reduced hours of broadcasts but slightly and actually increased language coverage," Mr. Stone declared. "In marked contrast, the United States has reduced hours of broadcasts by over 50 percent and we have dropped 10 languages."

Mr. Stone was the principal speaker today at the Institute for Education by Radio, sponsored by Ohio State University. In the background of his discussion was a move in the House in Washington to cut the annual budget of the Office of International Information and Cultural Relations from $19,000,000 to $10,000,000.

Mr. Stone asserted that international radio was often the only means by which the American Government could get its views before people in many troubled areas of the world.

An important speech by Secretary of State Byrnes before the opening of the United Nations Security Council in New York, he noted, was not carried by the press either in Russia or in the Balkan countries.

"Many areas of the world present political problems which have repercussions all over the world and with which the United States must reckon," he declared. "Some of these areas are now shielded by the curtain of censorship, through which only radio can pass. In many areas the short-wave program represents the only source of news which cannot be censored or controlled locally at the receiving location.

"As a means of expressing America, its culture and its ideals, short-wave radio will pay incalculable dividends to the American taxpayers. The United States cannot afford to do a second-rate job on a first-class medium of information which other nations use so extensively and intelligently to present their views to the world."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in conclusion, as men of good will, should we not heed the profound admonition contained in the first line of the new charter of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization? The charter declares:

Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed.

In this atomic era now dawning upon us a strong United States Office of International Information is one of our most indispensable and economic safeguards against the inception of a war of annihilation too terrible to contemplate.

Thus the presentation of a fair and true picture of America to the peoples of the world is the first and most vital step we must take to truly sow the seeds of universal brotherhood and peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6056) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MEAD, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. WHITE, Mr. BALL, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF THE ANTIRACKETEERING ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of moving that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of House bill 32, which is the so-called antiracketeering or so-called Hobbs bill. The bill was passed by the Senate several days ago as an amendment to the so-called Case bill. It is not my purpose now, Mr. President, to discuss the bill. I do not think any discussion of it is necessary. The Senate has already acted on it, and my only purpose now is to have it considered by the Senate and to have it voted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 32) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before this bill is taken up, should we not have a quorum? I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Murray
Andrews	Hart	O'Daniel
Austin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bushfield	Hill	Reed
Butler	Hoey	Robertson
Byrd	Huffman	Russell
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Carville	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Chavez	Knowland	Swift
Cordon	La Follette	Taft
Donnell	Lucas	Taylor
Downey	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McClellan	Tobey
Ellender	McKellar	Tunnell
Ferguson	McMahon	Tydings
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wagner
George	Mead	Walsh
Gerry	Millikin	White
Gossett	Moore	Wiley
Green	Murdock	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 32) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, at this time I wish to give notice that immediately following disposition of the bill now before the Senate I intend to call up House bill 4437, a bill to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, what bill did the Senator say he wished to call up?

Mr. MURRAY. It is the so-called USES bill, a bill providing for the return to the States of public employment offices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of House bill 32.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BALL subsequently said: Mr. President, I move that the vote by which House bill 32 was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I move that that motion be laid on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDRESS BY HON. BERNARD M. BARUCH AT OPENING SESSION OF UNITED NATIONS ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Bernard M. Baruch at the opening session of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. This is perhaps one of the most important documents that will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during this session of the Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow members of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, and my fellow citizens of the world, we are here to make a choice between the quick and the dead.

That is our business.

Behind the black portent of the new atomic age lies a hope which seized upon with faith, can work our salvation. If we fail, then we have damned every man to be the slave of fear. Let us not deceive ourselves: We must elect world peace or world destruction.

Science has torn from nature a secret so vast in its potentialities that our minds cower from the terror it creates. Yet terror is not enough to inhibit the use of the atomic bomb. The terror created by weapons has never stopped man from employing them. For each new weapon a defense has been produced, in time. But now we face a condition in which adequate defense does not exist.

WILL OF MANKIND INVOKED

Science, which gave us this dread power, shows that it can be made a giant help to humanity, but science does not show us how to prevent its baleful use. So we have been appointed to obviate that peril by finding a meeting of the minds and the hearts of our peoples. Only in the will of mankind lies the answer.

It is to express this will and make it effective that we have been assembled. We must provide the mechanism to assure that atomic energy is used for peaceful purposes and preclude its use in war. To that end, we must provide immediate, swift, and sure punishment of those who violate the agreements that are reached by the nations. Penalization is essential if peace is to be more than a feverish interlude between wars. And, too, the United Nations can prescribe individual responsibility and punishment on the principles applied at Nuremberg by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States—a formula certain to benefit the world's future.

In this crisis we represent not only our governments but, in a larger way, we represent the peoples of the world. We must remember that the peoples do not belong to the governments, but that the governments belong to the peoples. We must answer their demands; we must answer the world's longing for peace and security.

In that desire the United States shares ardently and hopefully. The search of science for the absolute weapon has reached fruition in this country. But she stands ready to proscribe and destroy this instrument—to lift its use from death to life—if the world will join in a pact to that end.

In our success lies the promise of a new life, freed from the heart-stopping fears that now beset the world. The beginning of victory for the great ideals for which millions have bled and died lies in building a workable plan. Now we approach fulffillment of the aspirations of mankind. At the end of the road lies the fairer, better, surer life we crave and mean to have.

PEACE KEY TO DEMOCRACY

Only by a lasting peace are liberties and democracies strengthened and deepened. War is their enemy. And it will not do to believe that any of us can escape war's devastation. Victor, vanquished, and neutrals alike are affected physically, economically, and morally.

Against the degradation of war we can erect a safeguard. That is the guerdon for which we reach. Within the scope of the formula we outline here, there will be found, to those who seek it, the essential elements of our purpose. Others will see only emptiness. Each of us carries his own mirror in which is reflected hope—or determined desperation—courage or cowardice.

There is famine throughout the world today. It starves men's bodies. But there is a greater famine—the hunger of men's spirit. That starvation can be cured by the conquest of fear, and the substitution of hope, from which springs faith—faith in each other; faith that we want to work together toward salvation; and determination that those who threaten the peace and safety shall be punished.

The peoples of these democracies gathered here have a particular concern with our answer, for their peoples hate war. They will have a heavy exaction to make of those who fail to provide an escape. They are not afraid of an internationalism that protects; they are unwilling to be fobbed off by mouthings about narrow sovereignty, which is today's phrase for yesterday's isolation.

The basis of a sound foreign policy, in this new age for all the nations here gathered, is that: Anything that happens, no matter where or how, which menaces the peace of the world, or the economic stability, concerns each and all of us.

That, roughly, may be said to be the central theme of the United Nations. It is with that thought we begin consideration of the most important subject that can engage mankind—life itself.

Let there be no quibbling about the duty and the responsibility of this group and of the governments we represent. I was moved,

in the afternoon of my life, to add my effort to gain the world's quest, by the broad mandate under which we were created. The resolution of the General Assembly, passed January 24, 1946, in London, reads:

"SECTION V. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMISSION

"The Commission shall proceed with the utmost dispatch and inquire into all phases of the problem, and make such recommendations from time to time with respect to them as it finds possible. In particular, the Commission shall make specific proposals:

"A. For extending between all nations the exchange of basic scientific information for peaceful ends;

"B. For control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to insure its use only for peaceful purposes;

"C. For the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction;

"D. For effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions.

"The work of the Commission should proceed by separate stages, the successful completion of each of which will develop the necessary confidence of the world before the next stage is undertaken."

Our mandate rests, in text and in spirit, upon the outcome of the conference in Moscow of Messrs. Molotov of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bevin of the United Kingdom, and Byrnes of the United States of America. The three Foreign Ministers, on December 27, 1945, proposed the establishment of this body.

Their action was animated by a preceding conference in Washington, on November 15, 1945, when the President of the United States, associated with Mr. Attlee, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and Mr. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, stated that international control of the whole field of atomic energy was immediately essential. They proposed the formation of this body. In examining that source, the agreed declaration, it will be found that the fathers of the concept recognized the final means of world salvation—the abolition of war. Solemnly they wrote:

"We are aware that the only complete protection for the civilized world from the destructive use of scientific knowledge lies in the prevention of war. No system of safeguards that can be devised will of itself provide an effective guaranty against production of atomic weapons by a nation bent on aggression. Nor can we ignore the possibility of the development of other weapons, or of new methods of warfare, which may constitute as great a threat to civilization as the military use of atomic energy."

Through the historical approach I have outlined, we find ourselves here to test if man can produce, through his will and faith, the miracle of peace, just as he has, through science and skill, the miracle of the atom.

SCOPE OF PROPOSED POWER

The United States proposes the creation of an International Atomic Development Authority, to which should be entrusted all phases of the development and use of atomic energy, starting with the raw material and including:

(1) Managerial control or ownership of all atomic energy activities potentially dangerous to world security.

(2) Power to control, inspect, and license all other atomic activities.

(3) The duty of fostering the beneficial uses of atomic energy.

(4) Research and development responsibilities of an affirmative character intended to put the Authority in the forefront of atomic knowledge and thus to enable it to comprehend, and therefore to detect, misuse of atomic energy. To be effective, the Authority must itself be the world's leader in the field of atomic knowledge and development and thus supplement its legal authority with the great power inherent in possession of leadership in knowledge.

I offer this as a basis for beginning our discussion.

But, I think, the peoples we serve would not believe—and without faith nothing counts—that a treaty merely outlawing possession or use of the atomic bomb constitutes effective fulfillment of the instructions to this commission. Previous failures have been recorded in trying the method of simple renunciation, unsupported by effective guaranties of security and armament limitation. No one would have faith in that approach alone.

Now, if ever, is the time to act for the common good. Public opinion supports a world movement toward security. If I read the signs aright, the peoples want a program, not composed merely of pious thoughts but of enforceable sanctions—an international law with teeth in it.

We of this Nation, desirous of helping to bring peace to the world and realizing the heavy obligations upon us, arising from our possession of the means for producing the bomb and from the fact that it is part of our armament, are prepared to make our full contribution toward effective control of atomic energy.

PROPOSALS FOR REGULATION

When an adequate system for control of atomic energy, including the renunciation of the bomb as a weapon, has been agreed upon and put into effective operation and condign punishments set up for violations of the rules of control, which are to be stigmatized as international crimes, we propose that—

(1) Manufacture of atomic bombs shall stop;

(2) Existing bombs shall be disposed of pursuant to the terms of the treaty; and

(3) The Authority shall be in possession of full information as to the know-how for the production of atomic energy.

Let me repeat, so as to avoid misunderstanding: My country is ready to make its full contribution toward the end we seek, subject, of course, to our constitutional processes, and to an adequate system of control becoming fully effective, as we finally work it out.

Now, as to violations: In the agreement penalties of as serious a nature as the nations may wish and as immediate and certain in their execution as possible should be fixed for—

1. Illegal possession or use of an atomic bomb.

2. Illegal possession or separation of atomic material suitable for use in an atomic bomb.

3. Seizure of any plant or other property belonging to or licensed by the authority.

4. Willful interference with the activities of the authority.

5. Creation or operation of dangerous projects in a manner contrary to, or in the absence of, a license granted by the international control body.

It would be a deception, to which I am unwilling to lend myself, were I not to say to you, and to our peoples, that the matter of punishment lies at the very heart of our present security system. It might as well be admitted, here and now, that the subject goes straight to the veto power contained in the Charter of the United Nations so far as it relates to the field of atomic energy. The Charter permits penalization only by concurrence of each of the five great powers—Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, China, France, and the United States.

SPECIFIC VETO SUGGESTED

I want to make very plain that I am concerned here with the veto power only as it affects this particular problem. There must be no veto to protect those who violate their solemn agreements not to develop or use atomic energy for destructive purposes.

The bomb does not wait upon debate. To delay may be to die. The time between violation and preventive action or punishment would be all too short for extended discussion as to the course to be followed.

As matters now stand, several years may be necessary for another country to produce a bomb de novo. However, once the basic information is generally known, and the authority has established producing plants for peaceful purposes in the several countries, an illegal seizure of such a plant might permit a malevolent nation to produce a bomb in 12 months, and, if preceded by secret preparation and necessary facilities, perhaps even in a much shorter time.

The time required—the advance warning given of the possible use of a bomb—can only be generally estimated, but obviously will depend upon many factors, including the success with which the authority has been able to introduce elements of safety in the design of its plants and the degree to which illegal and secret preparation for the military use of atomic energy will have been eliminated. Presumably no nation would think of starting a war with only one bomb.

This shows how imperative speed is in detecting and penalizing violations.

The process of prevention and penalization—a problem of profound statecraft—is, as I read it, implicit in the Moscow statement, signed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States, and the United Kingdom a few months ago.

GUARANTEE IS ESSENTIAL

But before a country is ready to relinquish any winning weapons, it must have more than words to reassure it. It must have a guaranty of safety, not only against the offenders in the atomic area, but against the illegal users of other weapons—bacteriological, biological, gas—perhaps—why not?—against war itself.

In the elimination of war lies our solution, for only then will nations cease to compete with one another in the production and use of dread "secret" weapons which are evaluated solely by their capacity to kill. This devilish program takes us back not merely to the Dark Ages, but from cosmos to chaos. If we succeed in finding a suitable way to control atomic weapons, it is reasonable to hope that we may also preclude the use of other weapons adaptable to mass destruction. When a man learns to say "A" he can, if he chooses, learn the rest of the alphabet, too.

Let this be anchored in our minds:

Peace is never long preserved by weight of metal or by an armament race. Peace can be made tranquil and secure only by understanding and agreement fortified by sanctions. We must embrace international cooperation or international disintegration.

Science has taught us how to put the atom to work. But to make it work for good instead of for evil lies in the domain dealing with the principles of human duty. We are now facing a problem more of ethics than of physics.

The solution will require apparent sacrifice in pride and in position, but better pain as the price of peace than death as the price of war.

FUNDAMENTAL PLAN OUTLINED

I now submit the following measures as representing the fundamental features of a plan which would give effect to the basis of the conclusions which I have epitomized.

(1) General: The Authority should set up a thorough plan for control of the field of

atomic energy, through various forms of ownership, dominion, licenses, operation, inspection, research, and management by competent personnel. After this is provided for, there should be as little interference as may be with the economic plans and the present private, corporate, and state relationships in the several countries involved.

(2) Raw materials: The Authority should have as one of its earliest purposes to obtain and maintain complete and accurate information on world supplies of uranium and thorium and to bring them under its dominion. The precise pattern of control for various types of deposits of such materials will have to depend upon the geological, mining, refining, and economic facts involved in different situations.

The Authority should conduct continuous surveys so that it will have the most complete knowledge of the world geology of uraninum and thorium. Only after all current information on world sources of uranium and thorium is known to us all can equitable plans be made for their production, refining, and distribution.

(3) Primary production plants: The Authority should exercise complete managerial control of the production of fissionable materials. This means that it should control and operate all plants producing fissionable materials in dangerous quantities and must own and control the product of these plants.

RESEARCH MONOPOLY URGED

(4) Atomic explosives: The Authority should be given sole and exclusive right to conduct research in the field of atomic explosives. Research activities in the field of atomic explosives are essential in order that the Authority may keep in the forefront of knowledge in the field of atomic energy and fulfill the objective of preventing illicit manufacture of bombs. Only by maintaining its position as the best informed agency will the Authority be able to determine the line between intrinsically dangerous and nondangerous activities.

(5) Strategic distribution of activities and materials: The activities entrusted exclusively to the Authority, because they are intrinsically dangerous to security, should be distributed throughout the world. Similarly, stock piles of raw materials and fissionable materials should not be centralized.

(6) Nondangerous activities: A function of the Authority should be promotion of the peacetime benefits of atomic energy.

Atomic research (except in explosives), the use of research reactors, the production of radioactive tracers by means of nondangerous reactors, the use of such tracers and, to some extent, the production of power should be open to nations and their citizens under reasonable licensing arrangements from the Authority. Denatured materials, whose use we know also requires suitable safeguards, should be furnished for such purposes by the Authority under lease or other arrangement. Denaturing seems to have been overestimated by the public as a safety measure.

(7) Definition of dangerous and nondangerous activities: Although a reasonable dividing line can be drawn between dangerous and nondangerous activities, it is not hard and fast. Provision should, therefore, be made to assure constant reexamination of the questions, and to permit revision of the dividing line as changing conditions and new discoveries may require.

(8) Operations of dangerous activities: Any plant dealing with uranium or thorium after it once reaches the potential of dangerous use must be not only subject to the most rigorous and competent inspection by the Authority, but its actual operation shall be under the management, supervision, and control of the Authority.

(9) Inspection: By assigning intrinsically dangerous activities exclusively to the Authority, the difficulties of inspection are reduced. If the Authority is the only agency which may lawfully conduct dangerous activities, then visible operation by others than the Authority will constitute an unambiguous danger signal. Inspection will also occur in connection with the licensing functions of the Authority.

(10) Freedom of access: Adequate ingress and egress for all qualified representatives of the Authority must be assured. Many of the inspection activities of the Authority should grow out of, and be incidental to, its other functions. Important measures of inspection will be associated with the tight control of raw materials, for this is a keystone of the plan. The continuing activities of prospecting, survey, and research in relation to raw materials will be designed not only to serve the affirmative development functions of the Authority, but also to assure that no surreptitious operations are conducted in the raw materials field by nations or their citizens.

(11) Personnel: The personnel of the Authority should be recruited on a basis of proven competence, but also so far as possible on an international basis.

(12) Progress by stages: A primary step in the creation of the system of control is the setting forth in comprehensive terms of the functions, responsibilities, powers, and limitations of the Authority. Once a charter for the Authority has been adopted, the Authority and the system of control for which it will be responsible will require time to become fully organized and effective. The plan of control will, therefore, have to come into effect in successive stages. These should be specifically fixed in the charter or means should be otherwise set forth in the charter for transitions from one stage to another, as contemplated in the resolution of the United Nations Assembly which created this Commission.

(13) Disclosures: In the deliberations of the United Nations Commission on Atomic Energy, the United States is prepared to make available the information essential to a reasonable understanding of the proposals which it advocates. Further disclosures must be dependent, in the interests of all, upon the effective ratification of the treaty. When the Authority is actually created, the United States will join the other nations in making available the further information essential to that organization for the performance of its function. As the successive stages of international control are reached, the United States will be prepared to yield, to the extent required by each stage, national control of activities in this field to the Authority.

(14) International control: There will be questions about the extent of control to be allowed to national bodies, when the Authority is established. Purely national authorities for control and development of atomic energy should to the extent necessary for the effective operation of the Authority be subordinate to it. This is neither an endorsement nor a disapproval of the creation of national authorities. The Commission should evolve a clear demarcation of the scope of duties and responsibilities of such national authorities.

BROAD CRITICISM INVITED

And now I end. I have submitted an outline for present discussion. Our consideration will be broadened by the criticism of the United States proposals and by the plans of the other nations, which, it is to be hoped, will be submitted at their early convenience. I and my associates of the United States delegation will make available to each member of this body books and pamphlets, including the Acheson-Lilienthal report, recently made by the United States Department of State, and the McMahon committee monograph No. 1 entitled "Essential Information on Atomic Energy" relating to the McMahon bill recently passed by the United States Senate, which may prove of value in assessing the situation.

All of us are consecrated to making an end of gloom and hopelessness. It will not be an easy job. The way is long and thorny, but supremely worth traveling. All of us want to stand erect, with our faces to the sun, instead of being forced to burrow into the earth, like rats.

The pattern of salvation must be worked out by all for all.

The light at the end of the tunnel is dim, but our path seems to grow brighter as we actually begin our journey. We cannot yet light the way to the end. However, we hope the suggestions of my Government will be illuminating.

LINCOLN'S WORDS PARAPHRASED

Let us keep in mind the exhortation of Abraham Lincoln, whose words, uttered at a moment of shattering national peril, form a complete text for our deliberation. I quote, paraphrasing slightly:

"We cannot escape history. We of this meeting will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we are passing will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation.

"We say we are for peace. The world will not forget that we say this. We know how to save peace. The world knows that we do. We, even we here, hold the power and have the responsibility.

"We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last, best hope of earth. The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just—a way which, if followed, the world will forever applaud."

My thanks for your attention.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Atomic Bourbons," published in the Washington Post of June 20, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMIC BOURBONS

The atomic-energy legislation unanimously enacted after exhaustive deliberation by the Senate has now been irresponsibly torpedoed by the House Military Affairs Committee. The effect, and apparently the intent, of this action, as the committee chairman, Representative ANDREW J. MAY, acknowledged, is to "restore the principles of the May-Johnson bill." It appears that the committee has learned nothing and forgotten nothing since it first introduced that thoroughly discredited measure. Indeed, its present proposal is a degree more offensive than what it broached originally. It would assure the military at least one, and perhaps two, places on the Atomic Control Commission, making mandatory what the May-Johnson bill merely made permissive. And it would, in fact, virtually empower the Army to ignore commission policies and directives respecting the manufacture of atomic weapons.

The issue here is not one which can be ignored or compromised for the sake of settling a problem which is plainly urgent. It is an issue which goes to the heart of the American philosophy of government. The subordination of military to civilian rule has been a cornerstone of this society—one of those vital principles the undermining of which threatens the whole societal structure. There are a good many compelling pragmatic reasons for preferring unqualifiedly civilian control of atomic development—the inflexibility of Army rule, its emphasis upon utilization of the atom as a weapon, its stultification of scientific freedom, its absurd identification of security with secrecy. But all of these are transcended in significance by the

essential principle which is at stake. The Army is an instrument of policy. If Army officers, as such, are allowed to determine the policies they are employed to defend, we shall have embraced the essential characteristic of militarism.

The Senate, recognizing this fundamental fact, first made due provision in the legislation it enacted for the Nation's defense needs and for representation of the Army's point of view, then insisted wisely that the Atomic Control Commission itself be made up exclusively of civilians. This was an arrangement which had the full approval of Secretary Patterson and Secretary Forrestal, civilians who, in accordance with hitherto inviolable tradition, are the heads of our armed forces. It was entirely satisfactory to General Eisenhower. But apparently there are members of the Military Affairs Committee more militarist than the military. They have now put us right back to where we started—back to where it is necessary to argue all over again democratic fundamentals which ought never be brought into question.

We hope that the House, most democratic of all our instruments of government, will follow the lead of the Senate and set aside the recommendation of its Military Affairs Committee. There is no time left for a second protracted debate on this legislation. Even now the United Nations Commission on Atomic Energy is considering an American proposal to establish a world atomic development authority. Establishment of atomic control at home is an absolute prerequisite. We can no longer afford to leave this most potent of the earth's forces unharnessed and undirected.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO HON. FRED M. VINSON AS CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to read a letter from the secretary to the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 21, 1946.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The President has much pleasure in inviting you and, through you, the Members of the United States Senate to attend the exercises at the White House on Monday, June 24, next, at 11 a. m., when the oath of office will be administered to the Honorable Fred M. Vinson as Chief Justice of the United States.

Please ask the Members to enter the White House by the east entrance.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW J. CONNELLY,
Secretary to the President.

EXTENSION OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT OF 1942

Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. BALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is the present parliamentary status?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is nothing before the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration——

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that before the present occupant of the Chair assumed the Chair, the former occupant had recognized the Senator from Montana.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to bring up House bill 4437, a bill to provide for the return to the States of public employment offices. While another bill was before the Senate I gave notice that immediately upon the conclusion of consideration of that bill I wished to make this bill the order of business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will indulge me, let me say that I have had an understanding with the leadership that as soon as the appropriation bills are out of the way we would proceed to the consideration of the bill to extend the Second War Powers Act. The act expires at the end of the month. I feel that it probably would not require much time.

Mr. MURRAY. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1441, House bill 5716.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5716) to amend the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. What is the present parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The parliamentary situation at the present time is that House bill 5716, a bill to amend the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended, is before the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Let me inquire what change is proposed in the Second War Powers Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to make that explanation the moment I am permitted to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Second War Powers Act, as it was originally passed, consisted of 14 effective titles. The House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary have progressively cut down the act and have eliminated from its provisions about 50 percent of the titles which were originally included in it.

The bill as passed by the House extends for a period of 9 months titles I, II, IV, V, VII, and XIV, and it repeals title XI as of June 30, 1946, and extends title III, the priority title, until the 30th of June 1947. As I have said, of the 14 substantive titles contained in the act, two have already expired, namely, title VIII and title XII. Title IX has been replaced by permanent legislation; Titles X and XIII were also enacted as permanent legislation by a previous Congress, and they required no extension. Title VI expires as of the 30th of June, 1946, and this measure contains no provision to extend it.

So it transpires that of the original 14 titles in the act, only 7 remain; and of those, title III is the most important. It enables the Civilian Production Administration to continue the allocation of materials.

It was deemed essential by the committee that that power be extended, because there still are several commodities which are in excessively short supply—for example, sugar. The power to ration sugar is contained in title III of the act. I think every Member of Congress knows that before the war the United States received annually from the Philippines approximately 1,200,000 tons of sugar. There was a general hope that by the end of hostilities with Japan the production of sugar in the Philippines might be reestablished and that the United States would shortly obtain supplies from that source. It now appears, however, that such hopes have been completely disappointed. The Philippines will not send to the United States, either next year or the year after that, and probably not for 3 or 4 years, anything to compare with the original supplies of sugar which we were accustomed to receive from them. For example, it is estimated that not to exceed 1,400 or 1,500 tons of sugar can be received from the Philippines next year. So the rationing power must be retained.

Then let us consider the case of tin. The representations made before the committee are to the effect that there are not more than 30,000 tons of tin available in the United States. Under the allocation power the Civilian Production Administration distributes the tin. I may say to the Senator, briefly, that the Civilian Production Administration has been diligent in eliminating directives and orders under the War Powers Act. The Civilian Production Administration is the successor, as the Senator knows, of the War Production Board. At VE-day there were some 660 or 670 orders and directives in effect. There now remain in effect only 66.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the act contain the power to ration or allocate any foods other than sugar? Is the authority to ration contained in this act or in the Stabilization Act?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It contains, for example, the power under which the purchase of grain was made.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. But does this act end the power of so-called consumer rationing? It contains provision for the extension of priorities and, I take it, the allocation of certain materials.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the purpose for which it has been used. No other rationing has been put into effect, and none is contemplated.

Mr. AIKEN. But the orders as to fats and other foods were authorized by the

Price Control and Stabilization Act; were they not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. The rationing power was not authorized by the OPA, but by the Civilian Production Administration. But it was enforced by the OPA.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the extension of this act is absolutely necessary for the continuation of rationing; is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. President, I have before me a list of various Civilian Production Administration orders which were in effect as of May 1, 1946. It appears on page 51 of the hearings. I ask unanimous consent that that list, together with the table showing the number of orders in effect monthly from December 31 last up through May 1946 may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The orders and schedules, and the CPA orders in effect as of May 1, 1946, are as follows:

	Orders	Schedules	Total
December 31	43	18	61
January	42	17	59
February	43	18	61
March	42	18	60
April	48	18	66
May [1]	49	18	67

[1] War Production Board peak (approximate), 700.

CPA ORDERS IN EFFECT AS OF MAY 1, 1946

Automotive branch: L–352, export of automobiles and trucks.

Chemicals Division: L–353, cane alcohol; L–354, lead chemicals (new); L–355, ethyl fluid (new); M–131, cinchona bark and cinchona alkaloids; M–300, chemicals and allied products; schedule 118, penicillin; schedule 119, streptomycin; M–333, tapioca flour; M–387, rosin (reporting requirements only); M–390, hide glue stock; M–54, molasses.

Forest Products Division: L–103, glass containers and closure simplification; schedule A, distilled spirits; schedule B, malt beverages; schedule C, certain food products; schedule D, wines; schedule E, protective coatings.

Miscellaneous Minerals Branch: M–285, uranium.

Production scheduling: M–293, scheduled products.

Rubber Division: R–1, rubber, synthetic rubber, balata, and products thereof; appendix I, rubber, synthetic rubber, balata, and products thereof; appendix II, manufacturing regulations.

Imports Division: M–63, imports of strategic materials.

Solid Fuels Administration: M–316, bituminous coal; M–318 anthracite coal.

Steel Branch: M–21, iron and steel production.

Textile Division: L–85, apparel for feminine wear; schedule 1, women's, misses', and junior misses' dresses; schedule 2, women's, misses', and junior misses' blouses; schedule 3, women's, misses', and junior misses' coats, fur coats, toppers, suits, jackets, shirts, slacks, overalls, coveralls, play suits, and shorts; schedule 4, feminine neckwear; schedule 5, children's apparel for outer wear; L–99, cotton-textile production; L–116, feminine lingerie and certain other garments; L–118, feminine lounging wear and certain other garments; L–181, men's work clothing; L–224, clothing for men and boys; M–47, burlap and burlap products; M–84, cordage fiber, cordage yarn, and cordage; M–85, kapok; M–217, footwear; M–221, textile bags; M–277, vegetable tanning materials; M–310, hides, skins, and leather; M–317, cotton-textile distribution and sale yard products; M–317A, cotton fabric preference ratings and restrictions; M–317C, cotton sale yard production and distribution (new); M–328, provisions applicable to textiles, clothing, and related products; M–328B, special programs: textile clothing and related products; schedule C, special program for cotton fabrics for civilian apparel items; schedule F, special program for work gloves; schedule J, special program for rayon civilian items; schedule K, special program for wool civilian items; M–375, work gloves; M–391, rayon fabrics (new).

Tin, Lead, and Zinc Branch: M–38, lead; M–43, tin; M–81, cans; M–112, antimony; M–325, tinplate scrap.

Utilities Branch: U–2, communications.

Wholesale and Retail Branch: L–63, suppliers; L–219, consumers' goods inventories.

Forty-six orders (excluding directions), 18 schedules and appendixes; total, 64.

L. F. FOSTER,
Director, Controls Readjustment Division, Bureau of Reconversion Priorities.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senate committe reported the bill in exactly the same form in which it was passed by the House; the committee has proposed no amendment. I understand that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] has prepared an amendment which has been printed. I have not had an opportunity to see it as yet. But if it is what the Senator described it to me to be, I shall have no objection to the amendment. The purpose of it is to make certain that the powers granted by this act shall not be used for the purpose of price stabilization. They were not intended for such use, and I see no objection to the adoption of such an amendment.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which lies on the desk, and I ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 15, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Title XV of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 1503. Nothing contained in this act or any other act (except the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended), shall be construed to authorize the establishment by any officer or agency of the Government of maximum prices for any commodity or maximum rents for any housing accommodations."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I see no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RETURN OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES TO STATE OPERATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] desires to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4437, Calendar No. 1290.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4437, providing for the return to State operation of public employment offices.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4437) to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), and for other purposes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I was on the subcommittee which worked on the bill. I have been conferring about it with a number of Republican Senators who wish to confer again on Monday morning. I wonder whether it is the intention of the Senator from Montana to try to have the Senate proceed with consideration of the bill tonight, or to let the bill go over until Monday so as to enable the Senators I have mentioned to determine whether they wish to offer amendments.

Mr. MURRAY. I say to the Senator from Minnesota that I am agreeable to having the bill go over until Monday.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Vice Adm. James L. Kauffman, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 3d day of April 1945;

Several naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps; and

Sundry officers for appointment in the United States Marine Corps.

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

The following-named persons for appointment to positions indicated in the selective service:

Col. Claude C. Earp, State director, Missouri;

Harry F. Besosa, State director, Puerto Rico;

John L. McCormick, State director, Alaska;

Vivian B. Collins, State director, Florida;

Paul G. Armstrong, State director, Illinois;
John Van B. Metts, State director, North Carolina;
Holmes B. Springs, State director, South Carolina;
Carleton C. Pierce, State director, West Virginia;
Candler Cobb, director, New York City;
Homer A. Higgins, State medical adviser, Arkansas and Oklahoma;
Philip H. Bartholomew, State medical adviser, Nebraska;
Troy W. Lewis, Chief, Legal Division, Arkansas;
Frank D. Norton, administrative officer, District of Columbia headquarters.
Joseph A. Bell, administrative officer, Research and Statistics Division, Philadelphia branch;
Joseph Kormann, Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, Philadelphia branch;
Raymond V. Bowers, Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, national headquarters;
William Green de Rosset, records analyst, national headquarters;
Edmund A. Flagg, executive, Communications and Records Division, national headquarters;
Angus J. Gallagher, Chief, Headquarters Division, national headquarters;
Ronald M. Holmes, Chief, Appointments and Personnel Division, national headquarters;
Colgate Hoyt, Assistant Chief, Veterans' Personnel Division, national headquarters;
Austin S. Imirie, administrative officer, national headquarters;
Raymond M. Lancaster, fiscal accountant, national headquarters;
Kenneth H. McGill, Chief, Research and Statistics Division, national headquarters; and
James M. Smith, Assistant Chief, Research and Statistical Division, national headquarters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John R. Steelman, of Alabama, to be Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion for a term of 2 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stewart Berkshire, of Texas, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. Gibson, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip Hannah, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David A. Morse, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Joseph Reynolds, Jr., of New Jersey, to be a member for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey will be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until next Monday at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 24, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 21 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Maj. Clyde Massey, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1941.

Maj. Theodore Charles Wenzlaff, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1943.

Capt. David Henry Brown, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1946.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Roland Bennett Anderson, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 14, 1941.

First Lt. Charles Langworthy Beaudry, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1943.

First Lt. Charles Langley Patrick Medinnis, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Eugene Joseph Sweeney, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 14, 1941.

TO SIGNAL CORPS

First Lt. Dennis Ladislaus Barton, Cavalry (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

First Lt. John Jay Easton, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1944.

TO INFANTRY

Lt. Col. Harry Lee Bennett, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 1, 1939.

First Lt. Edward Fondren Shaifer, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 1, 1946.

First Lt. Alton Martin Shipstead, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 1, 1946.

TO AIR CORPS

Maj. Donald Philip Graul, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1946.

Maj. Harlan Clyde Parks, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.

Capt. Sidney Francis Giffin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.

First Lt. Josephus Alan Bowman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from July 1, 1946

Maj. Wayne Latta Barker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 2, 1946

Maj. Carl Brown McDaniel, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Carlisle Brown Irwin, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Lee Carl Vance, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Russell Vivian Perry, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Thomas Davison Drake, Infantry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Granville Victor Morse, Cavalry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 3, 1946

Maj. Herbert Spencer Jordan, Finance Department (temporary colonel).

Maj. Dresden James Cragun, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Edward Harvey Clouser, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Herbert Kenneth Baisley, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Thomas Robinson, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Maj. William Rush Blakely, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Carl Eugene Anderson, Finance Department (temporary colonel).

Maj. William Douglass Paschall, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Frederick Mott Thompson, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Voris Hamilton Connor, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. Arthur Bordeaux Nicholson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Staten Eugene Rall, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Don Emerson Carleton, Cavalry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Kenneth Lafayette Johnson, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. Eugene Haworth Vernon, Infantry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Paul Green Kendall, Cavalry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Ralph Waldo Russell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Archibald Yarborough Smith, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. DeWitt Ballard, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. James Lendsey McKinnon, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Maj. Willis Glenn Cronk, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Richard Tyler Willson, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. Leslie Lee Hittle, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. Eugene Desiré Regad, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
Maj. Donald Taylor Beeler, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Maj. Charles Creswell Blakeney, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Maj. William Mason Hoke, Infantry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.
Maj. Willard Fromm Millice, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Maj. Elvin Hamilton Burger, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.
Maj. James Freeland McGraw, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Maj. Richard Searl Marr, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Maj. Leonard James Greeley, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).
Maj. Kingsley Sherman Andersson, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Maj. William Frishe Dean, Infantry (temporary major general).
Maj. Ben Early Cordell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Dalies Joshua Oyster, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. George Phillips Privett, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Maj. William Lindsay McPherson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Daniel Peter Norman, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. John Mitchell England, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Floyd Cornelius Devenbeck, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
Maj. William Black Forse, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Maj. John Wallace Homewood, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Maj. James Vestie Collier, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Maj. Edwin Kennedy Wright, Infantry (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.
Maj. Philip Mapes Shockley, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
Maj. Charles Goodwin Pearcy, Air Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Clifford Andrew Gray, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 5, 1946.
Maj. Arthur John Redland, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 16, 1946.
Maj. William Lenoir Wilson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 16, 1946, subject to examination required by law.
Maj. Carlton Duncan Goodiel, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 16, 1946, subject to examination required by law.

To be majors

Capt. Angvald Vickoren, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1946.
Capt. William Earl Barry, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1946.
Capt. Emmert Carl Lentz, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1946.
Capt. James Leslie Snyder, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 2, 1946.
Capt. Thair Cozzens Rich, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 2, 1946.
Capt. Frank Hugh Lane, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 2, 1946.
Capt. Byron Glen McKibben, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 2, 1946.
Capt. John DeWitt Morley, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 2, 1946, subject to examination required by law.
Capt. Robert Tuthill Gants, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 2, 1946, subject to examination required by law.
Capt. George Foster Peer, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 2, 1946, subject to examination required by law.
Capt. Harold Everus Harrison, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 2, 1946.
Capt. Marshall Nelson Jensen, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 8, 1946.
Capt. Stephen Christopher Sitter, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 9, 1946.
Capt. Angel Antonio Cardona, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 16, 1946.
Capt. Edward Rudolf Wernitznig, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 18, 1946.
Capt. William Calaway, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 18, 1946.
Capt. Lewis Calvin Shellenberger, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 23, 1946.

To be captains

First Lt. Frank Wisner Lynn, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1946.
First Lt. Avery Parsons King, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1946.
First Lt. Raymond Joseph Getz, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1946, subject to examination required by law.
First Lt. James Archibald Bell, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1946, subject to examination required by law.
First Lt. Milton Boyd Brandon, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1946.
First Lt. Harry Aloysius Horstman, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1946.
First Lt. Robert Samuel Jordan, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1946.
First Lt. Charles John Hornisher, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1946.
First Lt. Arthur Bernard Tarrow, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1946.
First Lt. Philip Baker Watkins, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1946.
First Lt. Urban Linus Throm 2d, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1946.
First Lt. Frank Bradway Rogers, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1946.
First Lt. Raoul Constantine Psaki, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1946.
First Lt. John McReynolds Jackson, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1946.
First Lt. Christian Gronbeck, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1946.
First Lt. Frank Edward Harrigan, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1946.
First Lt. Robert Cantrell Feamster, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1946.
First Lt. Robert Edmund Lau, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 2, 1946, subject to examination required by law.
First Lt. John Joseph Graff, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 3, 1946.
First Lt. Graham Burton Milburn, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 15, 1946, subject to examination required by law.
First Lt. Robert William Thometz, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 29, 1946.
First Lt. Walter Frank Smejkal, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 29, 1946, subject to examination required by law.

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Dale Bowlby Ridgely, Dental Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 15, 1946.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be majors

Capt. William Edwin Jennings, Veterinary Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 2, 1946.
Capt. Curtis William Betzold, Veterinary Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 2, 1946.

PHARMACY CORPS

To be majors

Capt. Harland William Layer, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 2, 1946.
Capt. Eugene Gordon Cooper, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 2, 1946.
Capt. Arthur Melville Henderson, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 2, 1946.

CHAPLAINS

To be majors

Chaplain (Capt.) John Simeon Kelly, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from July 6, 1946.
Chaplain (Capt.) Joseph Calvin Sides, United States Army (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 12, 1946.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 21 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

John R. Steelman to be Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion for a term of 2 years.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Stuart Berkshire to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF LABOR

John W. Gibson
Philip Hannah
David A. Morse

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

James Joseph Reynolds, Jr., to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1946.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

APPOINTMENTS

To be hydrographic and geodetic engineers with rank of commander from the date indicated:
Casper M. Durgin, June 1, 1946.
William D. Patterson, July 1, 1946.
To be hydrographic and geodetic engineers with rank of lieutenant commander from the date indicated:
Clarence A. Burmister, April 1, 1946.
Percy L. Bernstein, June 1, 1946.
James D. Thurmond, July 1, 1946.

To be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineers with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the date indicated:
A. Gordon Anderson, December 24, 1945.
John O. Boyer, December 24, 1945.
Wilbert M. Hellman, December 24, 1945.
Gerald L. Short, January 18, 1946.
John O. Phillips, January 18, 1946.
Robert D. Singel, February 11, 1946.
John E. Schultz, April 7, 1946.
Edwin A. Dorner, April 7, 1946.
Robert C. Darling, June 10, 1946.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 21, 1946

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou in whose light we see light, we pray Thee to lift the shadows and rise with Thy morning upon our spirits. Grant that we may be newborn like the day, with new life and hope in Thy mercies. Do Thou scatter the darkness of our senses and fulfill in us the promise of a new world, unfolding our latent forces. Thus summon us to be strong, earnest, and brave, lest we forfeit our best selves. We are grateful that Thou hast made us a part of Thy plan to broaden and deepen manhood and to magnify intelligence and virtue. Thou eternal Spirit, under the shadow of the cross, the symbol of sin and sacrifice, we confess our failures and our needs, and pray for Thy mercy and forgiveness, as we pledge greater fidelity to Thee and trust the life immortal. Through Christ, the world's Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5606. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Wabash River near Mount Vernon, Ind.;

H. R. 5736. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Ind.; and

H. R. 5748. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the South Carolina State Highway Department to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River, at or near Leneudes Ferry, S. C."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6335. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, and Mr. CORDON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

STUDIES AND EXAMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 672) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and examinations authorized by House Resolution 69 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and continued by House Resolution 50 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Appropriations acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $30,000 in addition to funds heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommitte thereof conducting such study and examination or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE WALTZ OF THE CENTURY

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House now knows what a fraud and fiasco the Louis-Conn fight was on Wednesday night. It was a fraud that cost our sport-loving people over $2,000,000 in admissions alone. The fight was run by that lovable character, Mike Jacobs, who has been the impresario of numerous other queer ventures in fistic circles.

Knowing that a good portion of the population of the country was outraged at the fiasco, I addressed a telegram to Mr. Edward Eagan, chairman of the Boxing Commission of the State of New York, demanding that the fight be investigated. I further asked that the purses of the boxers be held up until such time as the people's representative, thus, the State boxing commission, could ascertain all of the details of the fight. I felt that the public was entitled to know what the contract contained, what private agreements might have been made between the boxers, what private agreements might have been made with Jacobs, what supervision was made of the training and all of the other details to which the public is entitled.

I have received no response from Commissioner Eagan, but when "Wily Mike" was accosted by the press, not being able to give an answer to my charges, with all the daintiness and delicacy that he and his mob possess, he charged me with having endeavored to "knock him off for two tickets." Coming from this guttersnipe, I would not utter a denial. It is not entitled to that much respect. I have instructed my attorneys in New York to sue Jacobs for $100,000, as he has accused me of extortion.

Boxing is one of the most deservedly popular of all sports in the United States and for many years did provide an outlet for a sport-loving people. But since Jacobs and his mob have acquired monopolistic control of the boxing profession, it has sunk, not into the gutter but into the sewer. It is controlled in New York by a group of pickpockets, parolees, ex-convicts, professional gamblers, and "heist" men. These are the habitués of Mr. Jacobs' office—these are his intimates. The natural result is the Conn-Louis fight, and many other aromatic—but not sweet-smelling—ventures which mulcted the sporting public of millions of dollars.

Jacobs was not alone responsible. The New York State Boxing Commission, who are the representatives of the people, had a deep obligation to prevent any such waltz contest as took place. The commission under Mr. Eagan should have insisted that both of these fighters engage in warm-up bouts with other opponents so that the public might have an opportunity to gage whether or not either or both men were fit for a championship contest. This was not done. It was the duty of the commission to carefully study the training preparations of the fighters and to decide whether or not they were using sparring partners of a caliber that would truly prepare them for the bout. But the worst feature of the actions of the commission was to sit themselves at the ringside and to allow this fight to continue after the first two rounds. Had these been two preliminary boys who were in the ring, Mr. Eagan or one of his colleagues would have ordered the fight stopped and would have held up the purses. Unfortunately for the public, the gentlemen of the commission did not have that type of moral courage and allowed the fraud to be perpetrated. Had they stopped the fight, they would have done boxing the greatest service possible.

Eddie Eagan is a nice boy, but nice boys are just snickered at by men like Uncle Mike and his mob. It is still not too late for Commissioner Eagan and his men to investigate not only the fight itself, but the entire industry in New York and to wipe out the vile, foul elements that are ruining a great competitive sport. Mr. Eagan, there is your duty. Have you the gumption to do it?

ADMISSION OF JEWS INTO PALESTINE

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to call the attention of the Members of the House, if they have not already noted it, to a recent statement by Foreign Secretary Bevin of

Great Britain with regard to the admission of a hundred thousand Jews into Palestine. I want to remind the membership that when the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee was formed and during its deliberations, its members were assured by Mr. Bevin and Prime Minister Attlee, and the Government of Great Britain, that if the report were unanimous the government would go along with it, and implement its recommendations.

The report was unanimous, and one of its recommendations was the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine. Now Mr. Bevin has the gall to state that they will not do so. His gratuitous insult to the city of New York will not be forgotten by the Members of the House who represent that city. I call this to your attention because before long we will have up for consideration the matter of a loan to Great Britain. I wonder, and I think we should all wonder, whether we can take the word of a government that they will repay this loan when they have broken their promise in this instance, and have done so before. The only way that the labor government now in power in Great Britain can convince the people of the United States of their good intentions, is to immediately demand the resignation of Bevin.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include certain statistics on the Anglo-American agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and to include an article on security for railroad workers and other items.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by the Rt. Rev. Bernard J. Sheil, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Chicago, to a veterans' organization a few days ago in Des Moines, Iowa.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include copy of a resolution.

INSULIN

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, there are about 1,000,000 people in the United States who today are suffering from a disease called diabetes. A great majority of these people must use insulin if they are to be about their business or, indeed, be able to live.

The production of insulin, which comes from the pancreas of the animal, has been greatly curtailed because the livestock that is being slaughtered goes into the black market. The black-market operator does not save the offals of the animal. The pancreas and other organs are not saved. The large packing houses of Chicago, Omaha, and Kansas City have been killing very few cattle. These packing plants always save the pancreas, the liver, the thyroid, the pituitary, and the adrenals. These glands go to the institutions making drugs which are so essential to individuals suffering from not only diabetes, but several other diseases which demand the use of these extracts. I have checked carefully with several large hospitals and drug houses, and they tell me that their supply of insulin, liver extract, and thyroid is being depleted.

In my humble opinion, the OPA, with its rules and regulations that prevent the legitimate slaughterers and packing houses from killing the livestock is directly responsible for the shortage of the drugs needed by the individual who is ill. Unless the regulations are changed these patients suffering from diabetes may well prepare to meet their Creator because many of them cannot go on without the use of insulin. It is the most serious condition and should demand immediate attention by the Government agencies concerned.

DEMOCRACY VERSUS IMPERIALISM

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, democracy versus imperialism; cents versus no cents. The United States with a population of 140,000,000 in an area of 3,750,000 square miles has a debt of $272,000,000,000. Compare that with the British Empire imperialists debt of $87,000,000,000, a population of 557,000,000 or more and an area of 14,000,000 square miles. Britain, and her colonies, has a monopoly on tin, nickel, asbestos, platinum, radium, uranium, diamonds, and so forth.

The question is this: Is little United States going to have to finance this great imperialistic nation? I say no. We have been Santa Claus to Great Britain long enough. You did it again, again, and again. Stop it now. Such propaganda as is going on now to get votes for this loan in my judgment is un-American. These people are working for the British and against the Americans. We are not allowed to give to a foreign country and then tax our people for the money without consent of our people. Let us be sensible, save America before we go into bankruptcy. It is high time we do it. Do it now. Save our country from going into bankruptcy and being wrecked. This may be the straw that will break the camel's back.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GROSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REES of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TOWE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a statement by Mr. Jack Hardy, national commander of the American Veterans of World War II; and in the other the text of H. R. 6746, a bill he introduced on June 11.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include in one an editorial about soil conservation and in the other a letter from a constituent about OPA.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and include resolutions adopted by the Rhode Island Child Service, by the Rhode Island Episcopal Convention, and by the Third Order of St. Francis.

Mr. MUNDT (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and include some printed matter in each instance.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a splendid editorial on tolerance and understanding appearing in the Pilot, which is the official publication of the archdiocese of Boston, entitled "Crosses and Stars."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CLASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF ALIEN FIANCÉES OR FIANCÉS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration the bill (S. 2122) to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. KLEIN. I believe the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] dissented. I cleared it with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. MASON. I understood it was unanimous in the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Is this a bill that has passed both the House and the Senate?

Mr. MASON. It has passed the Senate and been agreed to by the House committee.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the request? I could not understand the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asked unanimous consent to take the bill from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. I am going to reserve the right to object until I hear the amendments read. I am not exactly clear as to what they are trying to put over.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not trying to put anything over.

Mr. RANKIN. I realize that, but I would like to hear the amendments read.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognized the gentleman from New York to make a unanimous-consent request. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves the right to object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will just object for the time being, until I can have an opportunity to look into it.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I want the Members of this House to know that I am not a party and never will be a party to putting over anything on this House that is not open and aboveboard. I do not think it comes in proper spirit for any Member of this House to impugn another Member's motive, or to suggest an underhanded way of putting something over in the House. I resent the implication of such a suggestion.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have looked over the bill. I told the gentleman from New York I would withdraw my objection. But I want to answer the gentleman from Illinois. There has been too much of this opening up of the floodgates of immigration during this war and in these unsettled times. So far as I am concerned, from this day forward every bill that comes in here that tends to break down our immigration laws, or open the floodgates, is going to be carefully scrutinized, whether it suits the gentleman from Illinois or not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on or before July 1, 1947, the alien fiancée or fiancé of a citizen of the United States who is serving in, or who has been honorably discharged from, the armed forces of the United States during World War II may be admitted into the United States with a passport visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months (unless in exceptional circumstances such period is extended by the Attorney General) under the provisions of subdivision 2 of section 3 of the Immigration Act approved May 26, 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 154; 8 U. S. C. 203): *Provided*, That—

(a) the alien is not subject to exclusion from the United States under the immigration laws;

(b) the nonpreference portion of the quota to which the alien would be chargeable is exhausted at the time the alien applies for a visa;

(c) the administrative authorities find that the alien is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to a citizen of the United States who is serving in, or who has been honorably discharged from, the armed forces of the United States during World War II; and

(d) the administrative authorities find that the parties to the proposed marriage are able and intend to contract a valid marriage within the period for which the alien is submitted.

SEC. 3. In the event the marriage does not occur within the period for which the alien was admitted, the alien shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported at any time after entry in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act the period of World War II shall be considered as having started on September 1, 1939, and to have ended upon the formal conclusion thereof by a treaty of peace, or by the passage of a joint resolution of Congress, or by a proclamation by the President declaring an end to hostilities.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLEIN:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of State shall have authority to prescribe regulations for the administration of the provisions of this act which relate to the performance of functions by diplomatic or consular officers of the United States and he shall include in such regulations a requirement that the parties to a proposed marriage shall furnish satisfactory evidence to the American consular officer concerned, including sworn statements corroborated by other appropriate evidence showing that the parties have entered into a valid agreement to marry and are legally able and actually willing to conclude a valid marriage in the United States within a period of 3 months after the alien's arrival, or within such period as may be extended by the Attorney General.

"SEC. 4. The Attorney General shall have authority to prescribe regulations for the administration by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the provisions of this act in connection with the arrival of the aliens concerned at ports of entry in the United States, and he shall include in such regulations a requirement that the prospective American citizen spouse of an alien covered by the provisions of this act shall furnish to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization a suitable bond, which shall be in an amount sufficient to cover the cost of the deportation of the alien concerned, and which shall be forfeited to the United States if and when the alien becomes deportable, or shall be canceled by the Commissioner upon receipt of satisfactory evidence that a valid marriage has been concluded, or that the alien has left the United States without expense to the said United States.

"SEC. 5. For the purposes of this act the period of World War II shall be considered as having started on September 1, 1939, and to have ended upon the formal conclusion thereof by a treaty of peace, or by the passage of a joint resolution of Congress, or by a proclamation by the President declaring an end to hostilities."

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain the provisions of the bill. I do not believe there is any objection to it.

This is the bill which the newspapers have called the Sweethearts bill. The bill provides that, until July 1, 1947, the fiancé or fiancée of a member of the armed forces or of one who has been honorably discharged from the armed forces, can come into this country as a nonquota immigrant visitor for a period of 3 months. That is for the purpose of getting married. If the marriage does not take place within 3 months, then the alien is to be deported.

The Senate passed the bill in that form. However, our committee has recommended two amendments containing certain safeguards. First, that the consul in the country from which the alien comes has the duty of deciding whether a bona fide engagement or betrothal actually exists, and a visa must be issued. The consul must be satisfied by affidavit that an engagement actually exists between the member of the armed forces and the person in that particular country.

The second amendment requires that a bond is to be posted either by the member of the armed services or the discharged soldier, so that if the marriage does not take place within the required 3 months and the person has to be deported, the deportation will not be at the expense of this Government. The bond that is posted is to cover all costs of deportation. If the marriage takes place within 3 months, the person can become a citizen of this country, and then the bond is refunded.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. First of all, the Commissioner of Immigration must be satisfied the engagement existed?

Mr. KLEIN. It is the consul who must be satisfied. Naturally, the engagement cannot be by proxy. It must have been effectuated during the period when the soldier served in that particular country.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is that clear in the bill?

Mr. KLEIN. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I ask another question? Certainly the committee would not send out a bill without some very definite idea of how many people were involved in this immigration. How many people will come into the United States under this bill?

Mr. KLEIN. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. The nearest we could come to that is that there are about 14,000. Let me say to the gentleman that this is mainly for those boys who served in Australia. You will recall that at the beginning, when the boys first went over there, there was an order that those boys could not get married. Many of them did get married. Others obeyed the orders of their commanding officers and did not get married. Those who did get married are now bringing their brides to this country at the expense of the Government. If we do not pass this bill, we will penalize those boys who obeyed their orders and who were forbidden to get married. They are mainly in Australia, and our understanding is there are about 14,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from New York knows the tragedy of every postwar period in the number of divorces, the increase in divorces which take place as a result of war marriages. What will happen in a case like this, where these girls would come into this country and be married under the terms of this bill and then within a few months be divorced?

Mr. KLEIN. I could answer the gentleman this way: That that could happen under existing law. A person could come into this country on a visitor's visa by giving the legitimate excuse that he is only to stay here 3 months and will then return to his own country. What we are doing here is saying: "Stop kidding the Government. Are you coming over here to see somebody that you met on the other side and hope to get married? Come out and tell the consul the truth that that is the reason why you are coming here." Under existing law, they could come over as visitors and then get married to a boy in this country and thus be eligible for preexamination.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Would this girl lose her Australian citizenship by marrying this American boy?

Mr. KLEIN. When she becomes an American citizen she would.

Mr. STEFAN. She then takes out naturalization papers?

Mr. KLEIN. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. But she does not immediately lose her citizenship?

Mr. KLEIN. Oh, no. She has to go through the same procedure of becoming a citizen, but she does not have to go back to the country from which she came in order to apply for citizenship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. The Rules Committee by unanimous vote after the bill was explained granted a rule. I wish to congratulate the Immigration Committee and the gentleman from New York, as well as the gentleman from Illinois, upon strengthening this bill and adding provisions that were not embodied in the Senate bill. I think the House bill, as amended, will safeguard American interests. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Does this affect the fiancé of a Wac the same as it does the fiancée of a soldier?

Mr. KLEIN. It does.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does this bill permit the marriage of our soldiers with aliens of countries with which we were at war?

Mr. KLEIN. Let me correct the gentleman. This bill does not permit marriage at all; it has nothing to do with marriage. All we are doing is saying that if there has been an absolute and genuine engagement the other party may come to this country. They do not have to get married, but if they do not they have to go back.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In my State, for instance, white and Japanese cannot marry. Does this bill recognize such laws of the States?

Mr. KLEIN. This bill does not change existing law with reference to racial eligibility.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KLEIN. I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 24, after the date 1917, add the following: "as amended (39 Stat. 889–890; 54 Stat. 671–673; 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155; 39 Stat. 890–891; 57 Stat. 511; 8 U. S. C. 156)" and on page 2 strike out line 25 and on page 3 strike out lines 1 to 5 inclusive.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6279) and House Resolution 659 were laid on the table.

MILITARY COOPERATION OF THE AMERICAN STATES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 673, Rept. No. 2314) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6326) to contribute to the effective maintenance of international peace and security pursuant to the objectives and principles of the United Nations, to provide for military cooperation of the American states in the light of their international undertakings, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5876) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease to Henry A. Scandrett, Walter J. Cummings, and George I. Haight, trustees of Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1936.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is not the bill the gentleman spoke to me about the day before yesterday, is it?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. No.

Mr. SABATH. What does this propose to give to the railroad company?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It does not give them anything. It gives the Secretary of Agriculture the right to renew a lease covering a gravel pit.

Mr. SABATH. I know that any request the gentleman makes for the consideration of a bill is always proper, but I was desirous of knowing a little about the purpose of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It was introduced by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART]. It was reported from the House Committee on Agriculture with a favorable report and on recommendation by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for a term of 10 years that certain lease to Henry A. Scandrett, Walter J. Cummings, and George I. Haight, trustees of Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., bearing date June 27, 1936, of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, containing an approximate area of 241.67 acres, and also a strip of land for a right-of-way to said tract, executed by the Secretary of Agriculture under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1936, upon the terms and conditions contained in said lease, or such other terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem proper; said renewal and extension to inure to the benefit of Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. (succcssor to said Henry A. Scandrett, Walter J. Cummings, and George I. Haight, trustees of Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co.).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 12, following the date "1936," strike out the balance of line 12, all of line 13, and all of line 14 through the word "proper"; and insert in lieu thereof the following: "upon the general terms and conditions now contained in said lease but with specific provision that lessee shall pay annually a royalty of 1 cent per cubic yard on all material removed from said tract and shall in addition remove from the tract and deliver in a stock pile annually, free of charge, such quantity of sand and gravel suitable for use upon the walks and roads of the experiment station as would be required by the Government officials in charge of the station, not to exceed 100 car loads per annum."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines [Mr. ROMULO] is recognized for 1 hour.

FAREWELL ADDRESS OF GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, to say good-by is to die a little. For the last time I rise to address the Members of this House. I offer this valedictory in behalf of the long and honorable line of men who have served here as Resident Commissioners of the Philippines to the United States. This is our farewell spoken—our final ave. With the entry of our nation into its new status of independence, with the birth of the Republic of the Philippines, the voice of my people will no longer be heard in this historic Chamber.

For almost 2 years I have been one of you. I have learned to know many of you, not only as statesmen, but as close personal friends. It has been my privilege, on this floor, to watch the processes of democratic politics in the very bosom of American statecraft. As an insider who is nevertheless an outsider, I have seen something which it is possible that you yourselves have overlooked. It is this—in the heat of controversy, in the fervor of partisanship, in the bitterness of debate, you have inevitably demonstrated your faith in the ways of democracy. You have argued and debated, yes, and with spirit, but you have done so within the framework of democracy—within the fundamental recognition of human dignity—within the structure of human liberty.

What better example of this basic truth can I offer than your record on the problems of the Philippines? And what better moment can I choose than this my farewell?

I have reported to you from the foxholes of Bataan and from the grim, sodden battlefields of Leyte. I brought you word of the destruction that was Manila and the ordeal that was war in my homeland. I have told you, again and again, of how my people suffered—and still suffer—and of how, through their suffering, they remained faithful to America and to the principles for which Americans and Filipinos shall always stand.

Today I bring you another report, the only report that would be fitting to a valedictory. It is the report on what you yourselves have done.

You came to the Philippines by accident. After your ships of war had won their victory in the harbor of our greatest city you found that your Spanish foe had already been thrown into confusion by a Filipino revolt that had swept our land. We were a young and untried people in those early days, at the turn of the century. We were eager to strike out for ourselves, and certain that you would help us achieve our independence at once. But you did not. Instead, you stayed on in the Philippines. Your leaders uttered high-flown words to reassure us, although—let it be admitted between close friends looking back at the past—it seemed to us there was perhaps more than a little of imperialism, of colonialism, in your attitude.

And out of our bitterness, out of our disillusion, came the years of the insurrection. Your fathers and ours fought bitterly against one another. Both were engaged in a contest that should never have come to pass, and must never happen again. And the inevitable outcome of an unequal struggle was your final victory.

But with your victory came our resurrection. For, at this point, something happened which shall always be written in works of glory upon the record of American idealism. You launched a new, a dynamic, a revolutionary idea—an idea as bold and inspiring as the ideals of 1776 and 1789.

You told the world, by deed and not by word, that the imperialism of the past was dying. You marked the beginning of the twentieth century with an experiment in brotherhood that is still going on, and that has already paid rich dividends.

The idea was simple, as are all great truths. It was no more than this: That it is possible for a great and powerful nation to go into a weak and poor land, to help educate its people, to teach the ways of modern democracy, to nurture and encourage and assist, and in the end to set a date for independence. And then to keep that promise.

I put the idea into words, and it sounds, perhaps, more trite than inspiring. That is because you, being American, can afford to take it for granted. Ask the Filipino farmer why he took to the hills and harried the Japanese foe for three long years, and he will tell you of this idea, in his own simple way, and it will not sound trite. Ask the restless Indonesian what he thinks of the experiment in the Philippines and his answer will not be uninspired. Ask the man of Burma, or of Indochina, or the native of India, or visit the troubled lands of the Middle East, and you will learn more about the Philippines than most Americans will ever know.

To these people you have given hope. You have offered the knowledge that there is yet a way toward self-respect and liberty.

This hope, this promise, was largely the handiwork of the very body to whom I speak today.

It was the Congress of the United States that passed the Jones Act, which laid the foundation for our freedom. It was the Congress that provided for a voice from the Philippines on this very floor—for the line of distinguished delegates who have had the privilege of debate and of participation in all the activities of this legislative body, save only that of voting. This Chamber has echoed with the voice of the hidden aspirations of our people. Here, we have been privileged to battle for our cause, to bespeak your understanding, your cooperation, your help. Here, the fiery eloquence of our great patriot, Manuel L. Quezon, was given the right to enlist the sympathy and the support of the American people. Here, too, Ocampo and Legarda, Earnshaw and Guevara and Gabaldon, Osias and Paredes, Veyra and Yangco, Elizalde and Delgado, worked hard and labored faithfully for the best interests of the Filipino people. All honor to them and may their service to our country be enshrined in the hearts of two grateful nations—ours and your own. In serving America and the Philippines, they served and furthered the crusade of democracy.

In other parliaments, in other lands, there have been occasions when colonial spokesmen were offered the privilege of

the floor. There were even times when Spain permitted representatives from the Philippines onto the floor of the Cortes. But where, in all our human history, has a colonial representative been given so equal a standing, so sure a security, so humane an understanding, as in this House?

There is another legislative body, in another land, which has become known as the Mother of Parliaments. Your Congress has earned for itself a different name, for it is the Mother of Republics.

The Republic of the Philippines was born in this room. It was conceived 11,000 miles away, in the minds of our Nation's heroes, our Rizals and Bonifacios and Mabinis. It gestated in an atmosphere of cooperation between Filipinos and Americans over the past 45 years. And it was born here, with the Philippine Independence Act, and with the provisions for the Constitution of the Philippines. When a few days from now, the Republic of the Philippines is established, the Members of this House may say to themselves, "Behold, the fruition of a great experiment! It has been successful, and it was this Congress that helped make it so."

On July 4 the association of the United States and the Philippines comes to an end—but in its end is its beginning. For this is the final chapter of book I, and on July 5 we begin the first chapter of book II. This is the moment toward which we all have worked for so long, and it is come at last. But brotherhood does not die when the younger brother reaches his maturity. It changes, it broadens, it deepens. That is what will happen between us.

There will be no more Philippine Commissioners to speak on this floor. Is there need for a Commissioner to remind you that we in the Philippines have tasted the wine of democracy and found it sweet? Is there need for an orator to spell out the meaning of our loyalty to you throughout the bitter war, from Bataan to Leyte to Manila? Is there need for words to tell you how deeply we appreciated your answer when we sounded our call for help after the war left us devasted and helpless?

Mr. Speaker, ours is the third largest English-speaking country in the world. Our children attend schools created on the American model, and their schoolbooks make them as familiar with George Washington and Abraham Lincoln and Franklin Delano Roosevelt as they are with Jose Rizal and Manuel L. Quezon. The smallest Filipino child knows from living experience what words like democracy, free speech, free press, really mean. If in the Philippines we apply them a little differently at times, that is because we have also learned from you that the rules must be elastic enough to cope with new problems and new conditions.

I have recalled the fact that we were loyal to you in the war, and that is true. But there is a greater truth behind that truth. We were loyal, in reality, to the ideas which we hold in common, to the ideas which shall make your country greater and which shall make ours great, as well. These are the ideas of liberty, of opportunity, of an ever-increasing good for an ever-greater number. These are imbedded in our national mind, in our national soul. The ceremony of independence in Manila will not erase them from our national spirit. It will only intensify them. We shall be closer to you than we have ever been.

There will be changes, of course. No longer will there be a commissioner here, but an ambassador will represent the Filipino people in Washington. In the councils of the nations, our voice will be heard as the independent voice of a people who know their own mind. You in America may ask, in these unsettled times, where we in the Philippines shall stand? And we answer, by your side! Not in slavish imitation, not because of pressure, but by profound conviction that we belong beside America. We believe in the same things that hold you inviolate—and free. We, too, have learned the truths by which free men must live.

We are the messengers of democratic opportunity, and we have transmitted the word of that freedom around the world. We—who are of the Orient—speak to the restless millions of the Orient, and we say to them:

"The age of empire is no more. Long ago—in the Philippines—we saw the start of its death pangs. Out of that death—for us—came the dream of freedom. We represent the new spirit of our age—the only spirit that can help you and can help the world. It is the spirit of democratic cooperation, of civil liberties, of education and health and opportunity for all, of progress without bloodshed, of equality before the law. We stand before the world—on July 4, 1946—as the living proof that this spirit is realistic, practical, workable.

"Take heart, oppressed ones of the Orient. Take heart, all of you of failing faith. Freedom is a thing for which you have a right to hope. It can be won. We, your brothers, have achieved it, and we have learned not bitterness but friendship toward the western world."

That is the Filipino message. It is the only message, Mr. Speaker, that can prevent a generation of misery and bloodshed throughout the world. The oppressed peoples of the earth are rising, and they must make their choice. They can listen to the siren song of another ideology, and if they do, the road ahead will be blocked by conflict. Or they can listen to the wise counsel of democratic opportunity, planted in American hearts, grown and matured in this chamber within the past half century.

Mr. Speaker, I have given you, in the familiar American phrase, a piece of my mind. But I cannot say farewell without giving you, at the same time, a piece of my heart. It is easier to put one's thoughts into words than one's feelings. I leave with you, therefore, a part of my heart—just as, in achieving independence, the 18,000,000 people of the Philippines leave a part of their great heart in the sacred trust of the people of the United States. It is the greatest gift that we can offer. Cherish it. It is the bond that makes us comrades—past—future—forever.

And now—farewell.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to the last speech made in this body by the distinguished gentleman, Mr. ROMULO, the Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, who has so ably represented his people and his Commonwealth in the House of the Congress of the United States. It is more than that. It is the last time any representative of the Philippines will speak in this body, as the Philippine Government becomes sovereign on July 4, 1946.

His speech and his leaving of this body is an historic event.

Mr. Speaker, the Philippine people by their ceaseless resistance to the Japanese during the dark hours which followed the fall of Bataan and Corregidor proved beyond words that their trust in the United States never wavered. The sovereignty of this Nation over the Philippine Islands never implied a covetousness for territory nor a desire to dominate a people against their will. The principles of justice in harmony with our traditions committed our Government by law to ultimate independence for the Philippines whenever there would be established by them a suitable government capable of maintaining independence among the nations of the world. That day and hour have arrived. On July 4, 1946, the United States withdraws its sovereignty.

We have kept faith with the Philippine people. They are now free.

The independent Philippine Republic will rejoin the family of nations with all fear of tyranny and barbarism and concomitant evil plans for slavery and exploitation in the Far East forever banished. Equality, freedom, and justice will once more be enjoyed by the people of the Philippines. Commercial intercourse with other nations will grow and flourish. Industry on the islands will raise its bruised head and with international cooperation bring to the new nation increased opportunity for the wealth, happiness, and security of all its citizens. The future is bright with the natural hopes and aspirations of a country which, having suffered immeasurably, finally reaches the realization of nationality—at peace. The United States of America will never forget the sacrifice and heroism of the people of the Philippines in the cause of democracy, and will remain a steadfast friend, ever willing and anxious to aid in the regeneration of our new sister nation.

While we are sorry for personal reasons to see our friend General ROMULO leave us, we are glad because his leaving is the result of America keeping its word by the granting of independence to the people and the Government of the Philippine Islands. His leaving is also tempered by the knowledge that he will be able, if his Government utilizes his services and his great capacities, to render service to his people and to a future decent world in a broader field.

I know that all of my colleagues join with me in expressing to General ROMULO our expressions of real friendship, our best wishes for the future of his government and his people, and to himself that God in His infinite wisdom will always

guide and direct General ROMULO in his journey through life.

To have known General ROMULO and to have formed the friendship that exists between us is something I shall treasure through life.

FAREWELL TO GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I have listened to the farewell message of the last Resident Commissioner of the Philippine Commonwealth to the United States, Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO—my staunch personal friend during many critical years in the history of my country and an uncompromising defender of the Constitution of the United States.

It is with the greatest regret that the Members of the House of Representatives take leave of General ROMULO's wise counsel, his brilliant logic, his impassioned eloquence in behalf of the people whom he so ably served. It is with the utmost satisfaction that we know that General ROMULO goes from us after the attainment of the long-sought goal of independence for the Philippines; a goal which carries with its realization the duties, the responsibilities, the rights and the challenges of nationhood.

My own feeling of comradeship with General ROMULO stems from my experience in living among the Filipino people and in our association in projects designed to improve the social, economic, and political condition of those courageous advocates of human dignity. My interest in telegraphy, in wireless, and in radio was matched by his interest which manifested itself in his service as managing director of the Far Eastern Broadcasting Corp. and as vice president of Philippine Press Wireless. Nor did General ROMULO stop with the use of these space-spanning methods to tell the story of the Filipino people to the American people. His well-written, carefully documented books and articles on American-Filipino relationships and his public appearances as a lecturer did much to clarify the aims of the Philippine Commonwealth in this country.

There were times when the magnitude of his vital tasks must have discouraged even so determined a patriot as the last Resident Commissioner. In these times General ROMULO was strengthened by the charm and quiet confidence of his devoted wife and by the hope for the future given to him by his children. No small part of his eventual triumph is due directly to this unfailing support.

General ROMULO has written a chapter of accomplishment in the book of his people. His work in the field of education is widely known and equally widely appreciated. His services in the legislative branch and the executive branch of the Philippine government have marked him as a statesman of the highest order. His military activities have won for him unstinted approval from his own countrymen and from General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, under whom he served as aide-de-camp. His achievements as Resident Commissioner, as member of the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, as Philippine delegate to the 1945 Far Eastern Advisory Commission, and as chairman of the Philippine delegation to the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco have been masterpieces of diplomacy.

We know General ROMULO. We are aware of what he has done. It is indeed encouraging to find our opinion backed up by that of the American people. His books and magazine articles have deservedly gained him friends, and the popular reception of his literary works has stimulated country-wide interest in the problems of the Filipino people. He won the coveted Pulitzer Prize in 1941 for "distinguished interpretative correspondence." He was the recipient of a doctor of laws degree from the great American Notre Dame University. These are not honors which are lightly given; and, once awarded, they stamp the one who has received them as a scholar and an artist of true merit.

General ROMULO's yesterdays represent the conquest of patriotic determination over adversity. His busy present is filled with plans to better serve his gallant people. We can be sure that his tomorrows will be devoted to furthering the progress of the Philippine nation.

The Members of the House of Representatives regret the loss of a great man. But, since it is necessary for him to go, we can reconcile ourselves that no man who serves the freedom of thought and action anywhere can ever be lost to this House, dedicated as it is to the preservation of our freedom under the Constitution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks following the address of the Delegate from the Philippines, who just preceded me, because, having introduced the first resolution in this House for the independence and later the neutrality of the Philippine Islands, I would like to comment briefly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

OUR PLEDGE KEPT—AN INDEPENDENT PHILIPPINE REPUBLIC AN ACTUALITY

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the farewell address just delivered by Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, the Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, will go down in history as one of the most eloquent orations ever delivered on the floor of this House.

His plea for democracy, his pledge of loyalty to the United States at all times on behalf of the Filipino people, and his assurance of the maintenance in the Philippine Republic of a democratic form of government that will insure to the Filipinos freedom and liberty forever and without abridgment were stirring and satisfying. I am hopeful—nay, Mr. Speaker, I am certain—that the Filipino people will never break those pledges given by their great leader and able representative, General ROMULO, and will never swerve from the course of true democracy.

INTRODUCED RESOLUTION OF INDEPENDENCE

The attainment of full independence by the Philippine Republic on July 4 is especially gratifying to me because I introduced in the Sixty-second Congress the first resolution ever offered to grant full independence to the Philippine Islands, including a guaranty of their neutrality, and at this point I desire to insert the text of that resolution:

House Joint Resolution 78

(62d Cong., 1st sess., in the House of Representatives, April 27, 1911. Mr. SABATH introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.)

Joint resolution to secure the neutralization of the Philippine Islands

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he hereby is, instructed to take such steps as may be necessary to secure the adhesion of all maritime states interested therein in a declaration and international guaranty whereby the Philippine Islands and each of them shall be foreover neutralized and placed under the protection of the said powers. Whenever such neutralization shall have become effective the Government of the United States hereby pledges itself to cede its sovereignty in, to, and over said Philippine Islands to such body as the said maritime states shall have resolved on: *Provided*, That no such guaranty of neutralization shall become effective or binding on the United States until satisfactory arrangements have been made to reimburse the United States for the expenses and charges incurred or assumed by the United States since May 1898 in or on or about the Philippine Islands: *And provided further*, That no state guaranteeing said convention shall ever acquire, hold, grant, or exercise any exclusive or unilateral power, franchise or domination, authority or sway in or on or about said Philippine Islands. Said agreement shall provide for the policing of said Philippine Islands by an international force: *Provided further*, That any infraction of this resolution by any signatory power shall ipso facto rescind the adhesion hereto by the United States.

Even in those days, Mr. Speaker, I was fearful of Japanese aggression, and I thought that every effort should be made to insure the inviolable neutrality of the Philippine Islands by common agreement of the powers, guaranteed by them against force and treachery.

RANSOMED FROM GALLING SPANISH YOKE

At the time I introduced this resolution, our country was not as prosperous as it is now, nor was money as plentiful. Consequently, I deemed it to be no undue hardship on the Philippine Islands to agree to repay to the United States the ransom money we paid to Spain and other expenditures we had made directly benefiting the people of the Philippines.

However, as our Nation achieved a position of unassailable financial stability, naturally under Wilson, and its wealth increased; and as we recovered from the 1929 Hoover crash, so that we have become the richest and most prosperous and, in every way, the most liberal nation on earth, notwithstanding our tremendous public debt; I came to the inevitable conclusion that no condition of repayment of the Philippine purchase price should be involved, though I am sure, had not the Japanese ravished the islands and laid waste their wealth and resources, the Filipinos would have gladly assumed the payment of the price of ransom from 400 years under the galling Spanish yoke.

It was my privilege and my pleasure to know, to admire, and to cooperate with the late great patriot and leader, Manuel Quezon, first President of the

Commonwealth of the Philippines, whose whole life and every effort was devoted to securing for his people that freedom and independence which he so highly valued.

It has been equally my pleasure and privilege to cooperate, with all my heart, with the other Delegates and Resident Commissioners who have, from time to time, sat with us here in the House of Representatives. There is none, whether now living or dead, who does not deserve tribute for the part he played; and to the living, and to all the people of the Philippine Islands, our Nation offers congratulations upon having reached the freedom and dignity of an independent, democratic Republic, for which they have valorously contended for so long, and for which they have sacrificed so terribly.

I cannot omit from this brief tribute reference to one who aided greatly in bringing home to the American people the aims, the hopes, the aspirations, of the Philippine people; who wrote many articles, and for some years even published a Filipino magazine ably expounding the cause of the Filipino people; a former Member of this House, Mr. Speaker, the late Honorable Claude Tavenner, of Illinois, who has, I regret to say, now passed away, as has the first President of the Commonwealth with whom he worked so closely.

In just 2 weeks, Mr. Speaker, the new Republic of the Philippines, the youngest edition to the family of nations, will rise in the Pacific; and our colleague, General ROMULO, will step from his office in the New House Office Building to an embassy. We salute him and the infant Republic he represents.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all other Members of the House may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I listened with special interest to the eloquent remarks of the Commissioner from the Philippine Islands, the Honorable CARLOS P. ROMULO, who has spoken the farewell of his position, for our gallant associates of the Pacific who are about to take their place as one of the free and independent nations of the world.

Special interest, Mr. Speaker, because before he became Commissioner I had heard of the brilliant Manila newspaper publisher and editor who had sounded the notes of international cooperation in the forum of Rotary. And also before he became Commissioner, when he first visited this country during the war, I heard him make a great, stirring appeal to the Army and Navy Club of this city.

He told how the people of the Philippines were fighting and looking for the coming of the American troops. I recall how he told of going up and down the lines with words of encouragement and confidence. "When would the Americans come?" He did not know "but soon—maybe tomorrow." Many tomorrows came and went before General MacArthur was able to return, but return he did, at the head of forces who wrote one of the most brilliant campaigns in all the history of warfare. And it was written, I am confident, in large part because of the cooperation the loyal Filipinos gave as our troops approached and as they fought their way back, in one surprise maneuver after another.

I have seen Manila since the Japs were driven out. I saw it last September, when it still bore the terrible scars of destruction. Manila was a beautiful city, one of the most beautiful in the world. The Filipinos could be bitter—it is to the credit of leaders like ROMULO that they have not been bitter but have accepted their sufferings as part of the price of freedom.

As I think back over the historic months of the past 2 years, I think how fortunate it is that ROMULO has been the spokesman for his people in the Congress of the United States. He has had courage and patience and courtesy in a rare combination.

One with less courage would never have asked for what he has asked at various times. One with less patience would never have persevered until he won his requests. One with less courtesy and tact would never have been successful.

General ROMULO leaves the House of Representatives where he has served so honorably and well in these epochal years with the respect, best wishes, and affection of all who here have served with him.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity in bidding farewell to one of the distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, who has served with distinction as the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines during the latter part of the war. I am sure that I speak for all members of the Insular Affairs Committee when I say that our pleasant and helpful association and friendship with General ROMULO has been of worth-while and lasting benefit to both the Philippines and the United States. I feel sure that I speak for the Insular Affairs Committee and all the Members of this House when I extend to him my best wishes for happiness and success in his later endeavors.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to immediately follow the able and scholarly remarks by the delegate from the Philippines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to a wonderful message from the distinguished delegate from the Philippines. In the rather long service I have had in this body it has been my privilege to serve with many delegates from the Philippine Islands, but I know of none who has represented that brave people with greater fidelity and more effectively than has the distinguished delegate who just addressed us. Not only did General ROMULO render valuable service in the late war but I want to attest the very great contribution he has made the past few months in helping formulate and pass through both Houses of this Congress legislation that was necessary to the welfare of the Philippine Islands. That legislation will stand as an eternal monument to the distinguished delegate from the Philippines, General ROMULO.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay my respects to the distinguished delegate from the Philippine Islands, and similarly to pay my tribute and my compliments to the valiant, loyal, and great people of the Philippine Islands whose cause he so eloquently championed on so many occasions. I have known them. I have studied them and their problems for many years. I have tried in every respect to aid them. I want to say to the distinguished Delegate that his golden eloquence, wisdom, and presence in this Chamber will be missed very greatly. It will be my purpose at all times, whenever the question of the welfare of the Philippines is at stake, that be he here or in far-off Manila, my sentiments and my every energy will be brought into play in order to bring about justice. We must at all times strive to preserve and build the friendliest relations between both peoples.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have been inspired by the valediction of General ROMULO who has distinguished himself so brilliantly in the cause of freedom both on the field of battle in the late war and in his services on the floor of this House.

More than many others here, perhaps, I realize what the brave people of the Philippines had to go through during the war. I have seen wrecked Manila and I have seen Corregidor and Bataan where we provided so little in the way of strong modern defense. How MacArthur's and ROMULO's men held out so long against the Japs so superior in numbers and reinforced strength will never be so clear to me.

I think today of my old law classmate, Manuel Zamora, another hero of Bataan, who embraced me at the president's palace in Manila when we met last January. He was looking forward to July 4th and its meaning of independence for his native Commonwealth. May I say to him and his comrades through General ROMULO the Mother of Republics will stand by the new and friendly republic in the Pacific which did not fail her in its greatest trial.

I cannot help but feel that book II in the history of both our peoples will be an even greater contribution to the cause of human understanding and peace than the glorious chapters already written in book I to which General ROMULO has alluded.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I believe I reflect the sentiments of all of us here today when I say that I was deeply touched by the farewell remarks of our friend and colleague, Brig. Gen. CARLOS

P. ROMULO. Farewells are always sad occasions, but this one is brightened by the circumstances under which it occurs. It represents a historic milestone in Philippine-American relations because it marks the birth of a new republic. In saying good-by to our esteemed friend we, at the same time, extend a welcoming hand to a new member of the family of nations.

It is not necessary to put into words the admiration that we in this House feel for General ROMULO. We have shown it by the standing ovations we have repeatedly given him whenever he has used the privilege of the floor.

We demonstrated it here today during his inspiring farewell address.

We demonstrated it a few weeks ago when we overwhelmingly approved the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 and the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 after his forceful speeches advocating their passage.

We demonstrated it when we unanimously passed the Philippine naturalization bill; when we adopted without discussion the bill releasing $71,000,000 to the Philippine Commonwealth; when we approved the bill authorizing the Export-Import Bank to extend its operations to the Philippines; and when we passed the military assistance bill.

We have heard his pleas for the Filipino veterans, and I am sure action will be taken to do them justice.

These and other notable measures have been approved by the House at the behest of the Resident Commissioner.

It is only natural that General ROMULO should have our esteem and admiration. In his writings and utterances he has ably espoused the Filipino cause and has proven himself to be a worthy spokesman for the Filipino people. He has always expressed an unwavering faith in America. He has been an ambassador of good will and has done much to promote closer understanding and friendship between America and the Philippines.

General ROMULO, as much as any man alive today, represents the courage and heroism of our brave Filipino allies in the late war. He fought with us at Bataan, Corregidor, and Leyte, was wounded in action, and was several times decorated by General Wainwright and General MacArthur.

The words which describe another great general and founder of a Republic might well be used to salute this departing colleague:

First in peace, first in war, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman who will be the chairman of the House conferees if he is going to insist on a reduction in the amount of the bill as sent to the House by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that Members of this House can only judge the future by the past. At no time during the past several years have the House conferees accepted all or even a majority of the Senate amendments.

Mr. RICH. If the conferees are going to accept the amendments placed on the Interior bill in the other body, then I think they ought to bring the matter here for the House to vote on. Can we expect the amount of the bill to be cut?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman knows and the Members of the House conferees on the Interior bill know in the past we have never failed to do our utmost for the Nation's taxpayers. The House conferees always recognize that this is a conference where neither side can always have its way. I can assure my good friend from Pennsylvania that the House conferees will always be fair—and by that I mean not only fair to the taxpayers, but also fair to every agency of the Government.

Mr. RICH. The Members of the other body should do some worrying over cutting down these expenses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, KIRWAN, NORRELL, GORE, JONES, JENSEN, and DWORSHAK.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, a call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll Call No. 166]

Adams	Dworshak	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews, N. Y.	Eberharter	Patrick
Auchincloss	Elsaesser	Peterson, Ga.
Baldwin, Md.	Folger	Pfeifer
Baldwin, N. Y.	Forand	Powell
Barden	Gary	Reece, Tenn.
Barry	Gavin	Richards
Bates, Ky.	Gibson	Rivers
Bates, Mass.	Gifford	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bell	Gordon	Roe, N. Y.
Bennet, N. Y.	Gore	Ryter
Bennett, Mo.	Granger	Sadowski
Bland	Grant, Ala.	Schwabe, Mo.
Bloom	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Shafer
Boren	Hancock	Sheridan
Boykin	Harris	Slaughter
Bradley, Mich.	Heffernan	Somers, N. Y.
Buchanan	Izac	Sparkman
Buckley	Jackson	Starkey
Camp	Kee	Stewart
Cannon, Fla.	Kelley, Pa.	Stigler
Celler	Keogh	Sumner, Ill.
Clark	Kilburn	Sumners, Tex.
Cochran	Kinzer	Taylor
Coffee	Kirwan	Tolan
Colmer	Lemke	Torrens
Courtney	Ludlow	Vinson
Cox	Lynch	Welch
Curley	McGehee	West
Daughton, Va.	Mankin	White
Dawson	Mansfield, Tex.	Wickersham
De Lacy	Martin, Iowa	Winstead
Delaney John J.	Morrison	Winter
Douglas, Calif.	Murdock	Wolfenden, Pa.
Doyle	Murphy	
Durham	Norton	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 324 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes. Pending that motion I would like to see if we can come to some agreement with reference to the division of time.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Suppose we let the general debate run along for a time and see what requests there are for time. I am anxious to finish the bill as soon as possible.

Mr. KERR. That is agreeable to us. I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be allowed to run for the time being, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 6837, making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] is recognized.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee charged with the responsibility to hear and determine the justifications for appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, has discharged its responsibility, has reported its findings and recommendations to the full Committee on Appropriations, and having received approval there is now ready to submit its findings and conclusions to the House of Representatives for further determination.

Since the reporting of this annual bill in the last session of the Congress the committee has been saddened by the loss of one of its distinguished members, the Honorable J. Buell Snyder, who served as chairman of this particular subcommittee longer than any other Member since the creation of the committee. We have missed him in our deliberations, and shall continue to miss his guidance and counsel. To the other members of the committee I am personally grateful for their willingness and spirit of cooperativeness in our efforts to properly interpret and analyze the

justifications submitted, and I want to emphasize how well they have demonstrated their individual responsibilities and relieved the chairman to a very large extent in an effort to ascertain the facts relative to each item. It is a pleasure to pay tribute to the manner and efficiency of their individual efforts to secure a proper solution of each problem that arose.

There has been the fullest cooperation on the part of every member of our subcommittee and our endeavor to recommend a bill to the House which is adequate in every respect to care for and develop a peacetime defense, and which will protect our cherished traditions and demonstrate to all mankind our faith in freedom and the rights of all under our flag to personal liberty and those attainments in life which will glorify our God and best exemplify man's destiny.

In behalf of our committee I express our deep appreciation of the service rendered us by Maj. Gen. George J. Richards, Col. R. S. Moore, and Lt. Col. Donald N. Zirkle, representatives of our War Department. Their services and their advice have been the touchstone upon which we base many of our recommendations.

We are indeed fortunate in having assigned to us, as executive secretary, Robert E. Lambert, an intellectual, painstaking public official; he is accurate, patient, and thoroughly familiar with the work of our committee and the duties it undertakes to perform.

Forty-two appropriation items appear in this bill. Of that number, after full and careful consideration, 20 items remained unchanged, that is, the committee was of the opinion that the amount requested to conduct the activities under the 20 items had been justified and approved the amounts requested. Twenty-one of the remaining items were reduced, the amount of the reduction depending upon the evidence presented as analyzed by different members of the committee. In only one instance did the committee increase the amount presented in the Budget request, that being for the Atomic Service. As to the 21 items in which reductions were made, and as to the 20 items in which no reductions or changes were made, it is possible that not one of such items has the full endorsement of each member, but upon the record and the facts submitted to the committee, the action represents the cooperative and combined judgment of the entire membership of the committee.

As to the item for the Atomic Service, the program submitted to the committee represented that $200,000,000 was necessary for the continuation of the project through fiscal year 1947. General Eisenhower and General Groves testified that while such amount would cover the operating expenses for the coming fiscal year it would not provide sufficient funds to cover the negotiation of certain operating contracts which must be consummated during the last half of the fiscal year to insure next year's operations. They stated that an additional $197,000,000 would be required for this purpose and suggested contract authorizations in this additional amount as one means of meeting the situation. It is to be emphasized that while these operating contracts must be let during fiscal year 1947, actual expenditures under such contracts would not be made until fiscal year 1948. Considering the tremendous magnitude and scope of this project and its potentialities as an instrument of defense and welfare to mankind, the committee decided to rely upon the advice and counsel of the above-named witnesses and increase the item of appropriation to $375,000,000, which, it is believed, will enable continuation of all necessary contracts into fiscal year 1948. Due to accounting and administration technicalities a cash appropriation is considered preferable to contract authorizations.

I beg the Committee to indulge me for a few minutes to give you a summary of our Army achievements in World War II. It is history which can never be forgotten as long as nations revere valor, sacrifice, and unselfishness, and it is matchless in the record of all human history.

For the first time in 5 years presentation of the annual appropriation bill for the Military Establishment finds our armed forces completely victorious over every enemy of the United States. Accordingly, it appears appropriate to review at this time the great events leading to our victory over Italy, Germany, and Japan, and their satellites, and to touch briefly on the financial support which this House voted for the support of the war.

July 1, 1941, found America at peace, but it was an uneasy peace. The fall of France in six tragic weeks of the spring of 1940 had shaken our country from its lethargy; and passage of the Selective Service Act had afforded our armed services the first opportunity to initiate preparation for the storm which our leaders foresaw as inevitable. America, after her indifference of the 1920's and '30's, at last was mustering her strength for the struggle ahead. At the same time, an increase in the annual appropriation from $8,480,594,407 for fiscal year 1941 to $76,779,697,125 for fiscal year 1942 provided the matériel for the gathering armies.

The blow was not long in coming. We will never forget the shock of December 7, 1941; nor will we forget the spirit with which our people rose to meet the challenge which the Axis Nations had thrust upon us. The skill and wisdom with which the framework of a mighty Army had been built by Gen. George C. Marshall, our great wartime Chief of Staff, in the preceding 18 months became apparent as our vast military machine began to take form.

There were dark days to be endured, however, until our strength could make itself felt. The Nazi U-boats were not long in executing their carefully laid plans to ravage our shipping off the Atlantic coast. In the Pacific, the hordes of Japan, equally well prepared, were overrunning a vast empire, opposed only by the gallant but pitifully inadequate forces under Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Gen. Jonathan Wainwright.

But 1942 was not to be a year of unrelieved retreat. On April 18 of that year, B-25's flew from the decks of the gallant carrier *Hornet* under the command of General Doolittle, and demonstrated to the denizens of Tokyo that they would never again be immune from the arm of righteous vengeance. Our marines came to grips with the enemy on Guadalcanal, in an action which ended the threat against our long life line to Australia. General MacArthur, in the first of the masterful strokes which were to characterize his return to the Philippines, elected to challenge, with the handful of Australians and Americans under his command, the Japanese hold on New Guinea which was threatening the very existence of Australia. Finally, on November 7 of that year, a mighty armada under Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower landed in north Africa the vanguard of the forces which were to break forever Hitler's grip on two continents. At home, great camps were springing up all over America, where our citizens were being trained for the grim tasks ahead. And our industrial might had been diverted from its peacetime pursuits to the gigantic task of providing the matériel of war—not only for ourselves, but for our allies all over the world.

The year 1943 was a year of worldwide transition to the offensive, as our gathering strength was brought to bear and our forces began their relentless march. On May 11, the Africa Korps surrendered in Tunisia, and we were free to mount the operation which was to end the reign of the evil man who had first been Hitler's mentor and later his dupe—Mussolini, inventor of fascism, and whose lust for territory and power brought on World War II. Our shattering offensive against Sicily in July was the blow which ended his tottering regime, and our first lodgment on the Continent of Europe on September 3 was followed 5 days later by the unconditional surrender of Italy. The first of the aggressor nations had reached the inevitable end of its criminal adventure.

This year also saw the beginning of our great air offensive against Hitler's fortress Europe. On January 27, United States bombers of the Eighth Air Force made the first of the daylight precision attacks which were to bring utter devastation to the "1,000-year Reich." On August 1, in one of the most heroic air actions of the war, 175 United States Army Air Force Liberators bombed the great oil refineries of Ploesti, Rumania, from tree-top height, to deal a devastating blow to the vitals of the Nazi panzer divisions.

Meanwhile, in the Southwest Pacific, General MacArthur had started his long drive to Tokyo. In February 1943, the Sixth United States Army was activated under Gen. Walter Krueger, who had served for more than 40 years in every grade from private to general. With the Sixth Army as his spearhead, General MacArthur started his drive up the New Guinea coast, and soon great American bases and airdromes were rising in areas which had been overrun in the Japanese onrush of 1942. This year also saw the beginning of the final doom of the U-boat, as our Air Forces and Navy

combined with American inventive genius to reduce the toll of these underseas assassins by 60 percent. In Italy, General Clark's Fifth Army was continuing its relentless drive up the peninsula which Hitler had turned into a battlefield to complete the ruin of that hapless people which Mussolini had begun.

In the Central Pacific, forces under Admiral Nimitz, in bloody battles, captured Makin and Tarawa, in the Gilbert group, to initiate the second arm of a gigantic pincers movement against Japan.

Huge appropriations supported these efforts. For fiscal year 1943, the Congress appropriated $75,188,911,703 for the Military Establishment. For fiscal year 1944, $74,211,249,961 was provided.

Nineteen hundred and forty-four was the year of decision. Our Air Forces in Great Britain had now reached a peak of devastating power, which enabled them, in one daylight raid early in March, for example, to rain 360,000 bombs on Berlin. Our mighty air armadas were bringing utter devastation to the Nazi industrial machine with pinpoint bombing tactics for which General Arnold had held out against all opposition; and on these same islands General Eisenhower was gathering the mightiest army of liberation which the world has ever seen. Finally the appointed hour arrived. On June 6, a date that will live forever in history, our forces landed in Normandy and came to final grips with Hitler's hordes. The vaunted German West Wall fell before the irresistible rush of our sea, air, and land forces, welded together into a mighty team by the genius of General Eisenhower. The fighting was bitter for 2 months; but our field armies, under the inspired leadership of Gen. Omar Bradley, finally surged from the beachheads in a drive which liberated Paris on August 25 and moved forward onto the soil of Germany by fall. In support of this drive, the southern group of armies, under General Devers, invaded southern France and inflicted great losses of men and matériel on the Germans.

Meanwhile, across the world, General MacArthur was approaching the fulfillment of the vow which he had made on leaving Corregidor. In April, relying for the first time for initial air support on carrier-based aviation alone, he captured Hollandia, in Dutch New Guinea, in a brilliant operation, and broke the back of Japanese power on that island. Thereafter, nothing remained but the mopping up of miserable isolated Jap garrisons and preparation for the final thrust into the Philippines.

On October 19, General MacArthur, at the head of his forces, landed on Leyte, in a move which took the Jap General Yamashita, "the Tiger of Malaya," entirely by surprise. It was a fitting culmination to a campaign which will be studied as long as military history survives. The Jap elected to pour his resources into Leyte, but was annihilated. The year's end found General MacArthur firmly lodged on that island and poised for the knock-out blow against Japanese power in the Philippines.

In the Central Pacific, the year saw a continuation of a space-devouring amphibious offensive designed to place our B–29's in a position to strike the death blow at Japan. Eniwetok and Kwajalein fell to amphibious assaults in February; and after bitter fighting in June and July, Guam, Saipan, and Tinian, in the Marianas, came into our hands. The end was indeed drawing near for the planners of the attack against Pearl Harbor.

One final offensive blow remained within the Germans' capabilities before the year's end. On December 16 an attack through the Ardennes Forest, mounted under the cover of severe winter weather, initiated a bitter 10-day fight which has come to be known as the Battle of the Bulge. The blow was a severe one, but the tenacious stand of the Fourth and Twenty-eighth Divisions, and of the One Hundred and First Airborne Division at Bastogne, blunted the German spearhead, and with clearing weather our Air Forces turned the German venture into a slaughter. It was their last offensive of the war.

Nineteen hundred and forty-five, the year of victory, opened with General MacArthur's overwhelming blow against the Japanese forces on the main island of Luzon. Our forces drove rapidly to Manila, utterly crushing the enemy's forces and liberating our citizens who had spent more than 3 years in the concentration camps on that island. The way was now clear to mount the final offensive against the heart of the Empire itself.

In Europe, General Eisenhower again assumed the offensive, and, on March 7, the dramatic seizure of the great Ludendorf Bridge at Remagen on the Rhine River gave him his opportunity to pour our armies into the heart of the Reich. On April 25 came the link-up with the Russians at Torgau on the Elbe River, as pocket after pocket of hopelessly isolated Germans threw down their arms. Finally, on May 7, at General Eisenhower's headquarters in Rheims, our European war ended with Germany's unconditional surrender.

The appropriation for fiscal year 1945 reflected the partial ending of hostilities, with a reduction to $48,200,828,399.

Immediately a great flow of men and materials started for the Pacific, where two mighty amphibious operations against Kyushu and Honshu, the principal home islands of Japan, were in preparation. A combined Army and Marine force had landed on Okinawa on April 1. After the bitterest fighting of the Japanese war, the island was finally captured. The great airdromes hurriedly built there permitted our Air Forces to range over the Japanese Empire at will. Together with the Philippines, it would be used as a base for the forces redeployed from Europe. But while these preparations went forward without cessation, the B–29's were increasing the power of the blows which were relentlessly laying the cities of Japan in ashes. The sands were fast running out for the dreamers of the greater East Asia coprosperity sphere.

The earth-shaking impact of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki finished the work which the fire bombs had begun. On August 15 hostilities were officially suspended and on September 2 the most destructive war in history came to a victorious end on the deck of the U. S. S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay. It was the great privilege of General MacArthur to sign the surrender document as supreme commander for the Allied Powers, and of Admiral Nimitz as representative of the United States. Together these two magnificent leaders had encompassed the downfall of the oriental aggressor; together they were placing the final seal of doom on the mad dreams of the last of the unholy triumvirate which called themselves the Axis; and, as a last fitting touch, by their side stood General Wainwright, to witness the great victory for the cause for which he had fought so well and endured so much. In his person were symbolized the valor, the suffering, and the final triumph of his country.

For the period July 1, 1941, to June 30, 1946, a total of $214,249,156,450 was appropriated by the Congress to furnish our Army with every item it required to accomplish these great victories; $33-345,182,833 of this total appropriation has been or will be rescinded during this fiscal year since VJ-day.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to express my appreciation to the chairman as well as to the members of my subcommittee on both sides for the many courtesies they have extended to me as the ranking minority member of that committee. This is the tenth annual War Department appropriation bill which I have helped to draft and assist in steering through the House. There never has been a time, Mr. Chairman, during those 10 years when questions were decided on a political basis; and that is as it should be.

I want to express particularly my appreciation to my kind and splendid chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], for the many courtesies he has shown to me personally. He is an able chairman and is doing a splendid job.

I was not satisfied, Mr. Chairman, with the bill. I felt that the bill could have been cut a great deal more than it was. As we went along marking up the bill in executive session I went along with each item with the understanding that I would approve that item if the bill did not contain a transferability clause. I have opposed time and again on the floor of this House the insertion in these bills of clauses permitting the War Department or any other department to transfer funds from one bureau or one department to another, in that way creating lump-sum appropriations and using those appropriations in many cases for purposes for which neither the committee nor the Members of the House intended them to be used. There may have been some excuse for the transferability clause during the war. If there was, that excuse ceases to exist now.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is based upon the assumption that we will have an Army which starts out on July 1, 1946, with 1,550,000 men. On July 1, 1947, they

are to have 1,070,000 men. The average number of men in the Army during the year for whom rations, clothing, pay, and other expenditures will have to be furnished is 1,279,000. We know exactly the number of men we are going to have and where they are going.

The War Department told us exactly how many men were going to be in each theater of operations, how many in the European theater of operations, how many in the Pacific theater, and how many in the United States, so we know how many are going to have overseas pay.

There has never been a time during the 10 years I have been on this committee, and I dare say there never has been a time in the history of the War Department, when there was more complete information available as to how many men we were going to have and the amount of money required to provide for those men. We gave them the exact amount they asked for, for the number of men they told us they were going to have.

There is absolutely no need for a transferability clause. The transferability clause will give the War Department the right to transfer funds from one purpose to another. For instance, if the average number of men should happen to be reduced 10 percent, there would be 10 percent of the $7,000,000,000 that they could play with, and that is wrong. If, on the other hand the transferability clause is not in the bill—and it is on that condition that I went along because I feel personally that these amounts for rations, clothing, and other items are too high—if the transferability clause is not in the bill, if those items are too high, if there is too much money in here for rations, for clothing, and for pay or if they are not going to have the number of men they said they are going to have, then the amount the bill contains in excess of such requirements will revert to the United States Treasury, and that is as it should be. If they should happen to run short; if the cost of rations should increase or if the cost of clothing should increase; they can come before the Deficiency Committee of this House for a deficiency appropriation. All I am asking for now, and all I have asked for in the past, is that the War Department and every other department come before some congressional committee and justify every dollar they are spending. Without the ability to transfer funds from one branch of the service to another you will find money revert to the Treasury that would otherwise be transferred and spent.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be here when the conference report on this bill comes up, as I expect to go to the Pacific as a congressional observer in the Bikini atom bomb test. I am depending on this House to stand by me and by our committee in maintaining the position we have taken on this transfer clause.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss briefly a number of items. The chairman has discussed the bill completely. The report is complete. I want to discuss first the question of the money that has been turned over to UNRRA; and, second, the money spent for occupation requirements. Third, I want to discuss Tripler General Hospital, where the War Department without congressional authority is building a $33,000,000 hospital in Hawaii. Then I want to talk about the atomic bomb. I will have some recommendations to make.

Mr. Chairman, the War Department declared $327,000,000 worth of foodstuffs as surplus. Under the law, when the War Department declares this food surplus, while they have the responsibility of guarding it and warehousing it, the control and disposition of that food is under the Agriculture Department. The Department of Agriculture sold to UNRRA this $327,000,000 worth of food for $138,000,000. The budget of UNRRA was distributed to the several participating nations and each nation was told how much money that nation was to furnish. The United States share is about 80 percent of the total UNRRA money. In other words, they said to the United States, "Here is your share." They said, "Here is England's share and here is France's share and here is the share of each of the other nations." When we have met that financial responsibility in terms of dollars we have complied with our obligations. I am going to put the complete information in the RECORD. In my judgment, this foodstuff which cost us $327,000,000 is worth at least $300,000,000, and could have been sold in this country for $300,000,000 through the regular channels of trade, allowing for the handling charges. But when they turn over these foodstuffs worth $300,000,000 to UNRRA for $138,000,000, or for $162,000,000 less than it is actually worth, the Department of Agriculture in effect is increasing without congressional authority the amount of our contribution to UNRRA by $162,000,000.

UNRRA is supposed to furnish supplies only to Allied Nations or liberated nations. It does not include occupied nations. Austria was an occupied nation—it was occupied by the United States and Russia. I understand that Russia has not made any contribution to UNRRA. We are contributing around 80 percent. As an enemy country, which Austria was, Russia had to take care of the people in her occupied zone 100 percent, and we had to take care of the people in our zone 100 percent. By changing the word "occupied" to the word "liberated," they threw upon UNRRA the responsibility of furnishing all the help and all the food for all of occupied Austria and thus took the responsibility off Russia's shoulders. We therefore furnished 80 percent of the food for Austria; 80 percent for the Russian-occupier area and 80 percent for the area occupied by us. Now, that is absolutely unfair.

Let us see what was contained in this $327,000,000 worth of foodstuffs. The Army bought only the very best food. There was turned over to UNRRA, through the Department of Agriculture, $168,000,000 in rations. Of those, 35,000,000 were C rations; 24,000,000 K rations, which of course were special rations. The remainder were 10-in-1 rations, which contained food in gallon cans, the finest food in the world. We turned over to them 227,000,000 pounds of meat; 152,000,000 pounds of peanut butter, apple butter, marmalade, jams, stabilized butter. Nearly 200,000,000 pounds of fruit juices. All of this was turned over for the first $125,000,000. There was more. There was $14,000,000 worth of candy. The testimony shows that the Department of Agriculture turned over to UNRRA $244,000,000 worth of supplies for $100,000,000. I asked the War Department, "Is that all?" They said, "No. We turned over another $56,000,000 for $26,000,000." I asked again, "Is that all?" "Yes." Finally, when I called them on the phone, they had turned over still another $26,000,000 worth for $13,000,000.

I am willing to pay our share of the feeding of those countries, occupied and others, but I want the other nations to do their share. It is an absolute injustice to the American taxpayer to turn over food worth $300,000,000 to UNRRA for $138,000,000. It is unfair to put that additional burden of $162,000,000 on the United States. We should have received credit for the entire amount. I wonder what other nation would have turned over food at that price. Indeed, I am beginning to think Mr. Chairman, that the old gentleman with the beard called Uncle Sam should actually be called "Uncle Sap."

Now, I want to talk to you about the Tripler Hospital at Honolulu. Some of you may remember that I made several speeches on this floor opposing the building of the Pentagon Building. We started out with $35,000,000 and ended up with $86,000,000, including $16,000,000 for roads and bridges. While the average office building is supposed to contain 80 percent office space and 20 percent for corridors and halls, the Pentagon has only 56 percent floor space and 44 percent devoted to corridors, closets, driveways, and so forth. While I was talking about this Pentagon Building, the War Department started another Pentagon hospital without governmental authority, over on a big hill at Honolulu. I did not know anything about it until last August when my subcommittee made that trip around the world and we came to Hawaii. Here on a hill in Honolulu were standing the walls for a tremendous 1,500-bed hospital. I began to ask questions, where they got the authority, and I got nowhere. I got that information when the War Department appeared before our subcommittee. The War Department went to the chairman of my subcommittee, the ranking Republican and one other Democrat. Then they went to the chairman of the subcommittee in the other body and on the statement of these three men began very quietly to build this hospital.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Do I understand the gentleman is trying to leave the impression that on the approval of individual members of the subcommittee they started this hospital?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I understand that the gentleman from South

Dakota was contacted but did not approve the hospital.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. The proposition as informally mentioned to me was that the War Department had two hospital problems, one to meet a temporary condition of taking care of the wounded in the Pacific; the other to build a permanent general hospital for convalescents. The party who discussed the matter with me gave me the impression that he had already talked with other members of the subcommittee. But I told him that in my judgment provision should be made to meet the immediate situation to take care of the war wounded but that during the war was not the time to start the construction of a permanent general hospital in Hawaii. I felt that a hospital of that type should be built in peacetime when there was not such a heavy demand for materials, and moreover that probably it should be located in the United States; that is, in the mainland rather than in the Pacific.

During the time we were in the Pacific, to which the gentleman has referred, I made it a point to ask different members of the armed forces there, particularly boys who were at some hospital, whether they preferred to be hospitalized in Hawaii or in the States; and, without exception, officers and enlisted men said that when it came to convalescence they would prefer to be hospitalized in the States. This bears out the conclusion I had reached that a general hospital, a permanent hospital, should be located in the States. But to get back to the question of actual approval for Tripler Hospital, no contact was made with me beyond what I have stated. My impression was that only the temporary hospital would be started at that time. Of course I was only one member of the subcommittee and a majority could have felt otherwise. At least I did not approve what was done and was as astonished as the gentleman from Michigan when we saw what was under way at Honolulu.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I understood that; and as I referred to it I said that they contacted the ranking Republican member and two members on the other side of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am among those in the House who have commended—and I am glad to commend again—the gentleman for his very excellent work with respect to unauthorized as well as excessive expenditures, and I wish to ask the gentleman this question: Under the law, before property that has been declared surplus by a governmental agency can be acquired by another governmental agency that agency must obtain appropriations and pay for the surplus property. Prior to that law, which was recently passed, the War Department had transferred, and probably the Navy Department too, to one another, millions of dollars' worth of property without being reimbursed. My question is this: Are there any funds in this bill that directly or indirectly would be available to the War Department to purchase property that had been declared surplus by another agency of the Government, either the Navy Department or some other agency, including, for instance, the Chamberlain Hotel at Old Point Comfort?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The War Department does a great deal of purchasing with a revolving fund for the Navy for which the Army is reimbursed. The War Department can, of course, purchase surplus property from another agency, and we encourage them to do so if it is property which they require.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I have no desire to interrupt him, but is there now any fund in the pending bill that would enable the War Department to purchase the Chamberlain Hotel?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That has been declared surplus by the Navy Department.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I shall cover that in a minute.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Did the committee intend to include any funds for that purpose; that is, for the purchase of that hotel or any other hotel?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I certainly did not.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman referred to an agreement that the chairman of the subcommittee had.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That was not the present chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is referring to two Members who are not members of the subcommittee now?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Yes. The two members of the subcommittee on the Democratic side I referred to are not now Members of the House.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. I would like to inquire about this Chamberlain Hotel. The gentleman says the Army purchased this with a revolving fund?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No. I said that the Army had a revolving fund with which they could purchase quartermaster supplies for the Navy, to be reimbursed by the Navy. They have done a great deal of buying jointly with the Navy.

Mr. MANASCO. That does not mean the purchase of land or buildings?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman know that the Comptroller General has submitted to the Congress an interim report with reference to the accounting of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and that in this report he says among other things:

> The company has not controlled its surplus property disposal activities.

That appears on page 3. That is just one of the things that directly relate to the War Department bill because there is involved here, as I understand it, $48,000,000 of funds for the operation of the Surplus Property Act. We should know something about that.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I am going to talk about that before I get through.

COST OF TRIPLER HOSPITAL

This Tripler Hospital is located at Honolulu, T. H. As now planned it contains 140 buildings. It originated back as far as 1943. The first estimate of the cost of this project was given in a letter from General Richardson, commander of the Pacific area, to General Marshall at $11,500,000. On August 31, 1944, a field progress report gives the cost of the entire project at $16,000,000. Still later, in August 1945, when this subcommittee was in Hawaii, they gave us the cost at $24,000,000. The actual cost we are now informed will be approximately $33,000,000, although they still carry the $16,000,000 figure on their field progress reports. The engineers furnished the following summary of the cost as of today:

Total cost of project	$32,948,800
Less transportation	1,450,000
Less free issue items included in total cost	1,633,000
Less total free issue and transportation	3,083,000
Total cash outlay required	29,865,800
Obligated to date	16,000,000
Additional funds required	13,865,800

ITEMIZED DESCRIPTION AND COST OF PROJECT

The following is an itemized statement of the project given August 21, 1944, and present costs:

Building or project	Aug. 31, 1944, cost	Actual cost
Main hospital	$7,640,000	$14,350,000
Boilerhouse and incinerator	40,000	444,700
Laundry	125,000	356,000
Motor pool, fire station, warehouse, and shops	375,000	1,204,700
Enlisted men's barracks	730,000	1,265,400
Nurses' quarters	504,000	1,298,700
Laboratory	112,000	400,500
Officers' quarters (for 87 company and field officers at $22,500 each)	1,161,000	1,958,300
Noncommissioned officers' quarters (46 noncommissioned officers at $16,000 each)	353,000	739,900
Post exchange and Red Cross building	200,000	506,000
Bachelor officers' quarters and mess	120,000	488,300
Bachelor officers' swimming pool		55,600
Theater	75,000	216,900
Enlisted men's swimming pool	60,000	

Building or project	Aug. 31, 1944, cost	Actual cost
Gymnasium	$120,000	$344,900
Gymnasium swimming pool		100,100
Noncommissioned officers' club	50,000	80,000
Chapel	75,000	153,300
Officers' swimming pool	60,000	
Gatehouse and guardhouse	35,000	88,200
Roads, streets, parking areas, and drainage	370,000	870,500
Water supply	160,000	437,000
Sewers, not including disposal plant	105,000	383,000
Outside electricals	253,000	466,100
Steam distribution	21,000	241,900
Landscaping	90,000	349,800
Bridge	15,000	46,000
Outdoor recreation facilities	125,000	
Tennis courts		153,500
Baseball field		27,800
Rights-of-way	152,400	105,000
Architect-engineer management service	264,690	
Contingencies and engineering	2,278,910	
Engineering central procurement and temporary facilities		2,912,300
Overhead		1,342,200
Transportation		1,450,000

It will be noted that if we added to the present estimates the cost of engineering, overhead, and transportation, the individual cost of these projects will be still higher.

MAIN HOSPITAL

The main hospital was estimated on August 31, 1944, to cost $7,640,000. The actual cost or present estimate will be $14,350,000. The boilerhouse and incinerator was estimated at $40,000. It will actually cost $444,700. The laundry was increased from $125,000 to $356,000. The motor pool, fire station, warehouse, and shops cost increased from $375,000 to $1,204,000. Nurses' quarters were jumped from $504,000 to $1,298,700 while the post exchange was increased $200,000 to $506,900. The theater was increased from $75,000 to $216,000. The chapel was increased from $75,000 to $153,000. Roads, streets, parking areas, and drainage was increased from $370,000 to $870,000. The water supply was increased from $160,000 to $437,000; sewers not including disposal plant from $105,000 to $383,000; outside electrical equipment from $253,000 to $446,100. Steam distribution was increased from $21,000 to $241,900, with an item of $1,450,000 added on for transportation. Landscaping from $90,000 to $349,800. The project also contains $153,000 for tennis courts.

NURSES AND ENLISTED MEN'S QUARTERS

It is interesting to note that while the quarters for 153 officer nurses were increased from 78,000 square feet of space to 119,000, at the same time the space allotted for 1,017 enlisted men was decreased from 160,000 square feet to 117,000. In other words, while the Doolittle committee was studying and making a report on the Army caste system, the Army itself was changing construction plans at Tripler Hospital and gave 153 officer nurses 2,000 more square feet than they gave 1,017 enlisted men.

BACHELOR OFFICERS' QUARTERS AND OFFICERS' CLUB

A beautiful illustration of ultra-extravagance was the proposed construction of bachelor officers' quarters and officers' mess. They expect to provide quarters for 12 bachelor officers out of a total of 99 officers. The report of August 1944 gives this item as $120,000, the actual cost is going to be $488,300. The original proposal provided for a building containing 15,000 square feet. This was increased still under the name of bachelor officers' quarters and officers' mess from 15,000 square feet to 33,000 square feet.

I called General Bragdon's attention to the fact that out of 99 officers, 87 were to be furnished with married officers' quarters and only 12 for bachelor officers' quarters; that undoubtedly these married men would eat at home, and asked why it required 33,000 square feet for an officers' mess for 12 bachelor officers. I finally asked him for and received the break-down. He admitted finally that this was not a bachelor officers' quarters and officers' mess but was actually an officers' club for 153 nurses and 99 officers, and here is the break-down for this officers' club, which is going to cost $488,300:

Five thousand square feet are for basement, including lockers and storage.

Seven thousand six hundred and fifty square feet are for bachelor officers' quarters proper, including quarters for 12 resident and 5 transient officers.

Twelve thousand square feet is for a mess hall for officers, kitchen, and lounge.

Two thousand square feet is for lobbies and halls.

Six thousand five hundred feet for open porches on which they can sit and watch the beautiful Hawaiian sunset over the harbor.

We start out with a bachelor officers' quarters and mess for $120,000 and end up with an officers' club for nearly a half a million dollars at the expense of the taxpayers.

GYMNASIUM

We start with $120,000 for a gymnasium and end up with $344,900 for a gymnasium and $100,100 for a gymnasium swimming pool, or a total of $445,000. It is rather difficult to understand why a swimming pool should cost just $100 more than $100,000 and a gymnasium just $100 less than $345,000, unless it is to get a $1.98 bargain idea into the reader's mind.

OFFICERS' QUARTERS

The project provides for $1,958,300 for 87 company and field officers' quarters at $22,500 each, this sum being increased from $1,161,000. It provides for $739,900 for 46 noncommissioned officers' quarters at $16,000 each. The item for officers' quarters was increased from $1,161,000 to $1,958,300 and will, if built, provide quarters for 87 field and company officers at a cost of $22,500 for each officer. It also contains an item for quarters for 46 noncommissioned officers. This item was increased from $353,000 to $739,900, or a cost of $16,000 for each noncommissioned officer. Not so bad for corporals and sergeants.

This project is just another illustration of what happens when you have lump-sum appropriations either direct or through a transferability clause. Let me remind the House of just a few instances. In 1940 the House appropriated $466,000,000 to build cantonments for the first 1,200,000 men who were trained and cantoned in World War I. The actual cost was $800,000,000. The Pentagon Building was estimated at $35,000,000. The actual cost was over $86,000,000 including $16,000,000 for roads and bridges. The testimony before our committee shows that the veterans' hospitals to be built by the Veterans' Administration were estimated to cost $331,000,000 a few months ago. Now we are told they will cost $772,000,000. These are just a few of the many items and show this policy has become general.

After a careful study of the whole situation I make the following recommendations:

First. That no lump-sum appropriations should hereafter be made.

Second. That no transferability clause should be contained in any bill. This clause enables the creation of lump sums.

Third. That no project should be started until architect's plans are completed and the cost is determined.

Fourth. That before any project is advertised for bids, complete architect's plans together with all information as to the cost be double-checked by the architect's office of the Procurement Division of the Treasury, with instructions to eliminate all nonessential items and to reduce the cost wherever it is possible by changing plans and by eliminating unnecessary extravagant features. Adequate funds should be furnished that office to do this work.

This should be done regardless as to whether it is the War Department, the Navy Department, Post Office Department, or Veterans' Administration which is doing the construction. I am satisfied that if this were done, we could save hundreds of millions of dollars. While there is a legitimate increase in construction costs of approximately 40 percent over 1939, a look at the past construction record will convince any fair-minded person that millions can be saved by the adoption of this policy. The President could save in my judgment several hundred million dollars by ordering the Procurement Division of the Treasury to double-check the Veterans' Administration building program before construction begins. After all the millions of veterans will have to pay for their share of waste.

In conclusion I want to emphasize the fact that the officers now in charge in the Office of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army from Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler on down are not responsible for the planning and construction of Tripler Hospital. When this work was being planned and the project carried on as far as it has been, General Wheeler was making an outstanding record, as commanding officer of the Asiatic theater, as were many of the other officers now on duty here with him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Possibly somebody was made a little jealous by hearing of the admiral's swimming pool constructed over there. The gentleman will remember that we were told of an admiral's swimming pool that cost some

outlandish figure—$80,000 runs in my mind.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Before the gentleman leaves the subject of the Tripler General Hospital, I hope he will make clear to the Committee that the subcommittee reporting this bill has stopped the program as to many of the items the gentleman has discussed and is allowing only limited funds for the completion of buildings already started.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. We are permitting them to complete the nurses' quarters and hospitals, the walls of which have been partially built. We have to finish them. We allowed the enlisted men's quarters and the laboratory and, over my protest and objection, allowed $200,000 for landscaping. The rest was cut out.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. For the construction of this hospital not one dollar was appropriated by our committee.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No. They got this money just as they got the Pentagon money, by transferring it out of the Engineers' Service fund. They have the money. There was no money appropriated for this. They could not have obtained it in the House. We are making them turn back the money, with these exceptions, into the Treasury.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. What is going to happen to the Pentagon Building; does the gentleman know?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Ask me something easy.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have observed the gentleman for many years now in the great and effective efforts he has made to bring the facts to the Congress. It grieves me that these recommendations have not been followed. I wish to commend the gentleman for the suggestion he has now made. I wish also to inquire if there is a clear provision in the bill before us which will prevent a repetition of the conditions of which the gentleman complains.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. So far as this particular project is concerned, yes, we can control it. But as the bill now stands they cannot do anything unless we go back to the transferability clause and provide a lump-sum appropriation. If we go back to that, I just do not know what is going to happen. The subcommittee took the transfer clause out before.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thought there was a provision in this bill which took away this power of transfer.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. We took the transfer clause out of this bill. Last year, Mr. Chairman, I made a motion in my committee cutting it from 20 percent to 10 percent. I made a motion in the House cutting it from 10 percent to 5 percent. When it got over to the other body they put it back to 10 percent. That is the way it stands until July 1, 1946.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I ask the gentleman as a matter of procedure whether all this planning of the War Department has to go through the Committee on Military Affairs for an O. K.?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The Committee on Military Affairs authorizes the projects. The War Department had a blanket authority under Executive order. They had this blanket authority during wartime.

Mrs. BOLTON. That was during wartime?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Yes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Are we going to have a plan or program from the War Department giving us their plans and letting us know what they propose to do, and then will that have the O. K. of the committee?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. In the first place, they are not supposed to do any construction unless it is first authorized by the legislative Committee on Military Affairs. Before they can actually obtain the money after such authorization they have to come to us and justify the amount so that we would have the complete justification.

Mrs. BOLTON. Does not the Committee on Military Affairs bring any bill to the floor of the House for an O. K. from the floor?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I will let the Committee on Military Affairs answer that question.

Mrs. BOLTON. They do not do that. Of course, I am asking these questions of the gentleman in order to obtain information.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. They authorize the construction.

Mrs. BOLTON. But we do not authorize it. Does the Committee on Military Affairs authorize it?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Yes.

Mrs. BOLTON. But not the Congress?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The authorization bill goes through the Congress just like any other bill that the House passes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Have we had an authorization for this?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No; not for this. Not for this particular hospital.

I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Referring to the item of $3,275,000,000 of pay for the Army, does that take into consideration the increased pay that probably will be allowed under the Selective Service bill?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No; there is no authority for us to include the amount of increased pay. Until the act has actually been signed, that will have to come through the Deficiency Committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. In answer to the gentlewoman from Ohio, the fact of the matter is, as I understand it, that the War Department claims they do have authority to build these hospitals, and they claim they had the authority to build this particular hospital in Hawaii. Is that not so? But they got the funds by representing to the committee that it was going to cost so much money and then under the transfer clause they used more money.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. They had no authority to build that specific hospital in Hawaii. Nobody knew they were building it. I knew nothing about it and I am on the Appropriations Committee. They had blanket authority during wartime to build these temporary buildings and hospitals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

If you will go through the arsenals as I have you will find, for instance, a building which was built during the War of 1812. Then there had been no construction until the Mexican War. Then you will find a building built during the Mexican War. Then there will be one built during the Civil War. Then there is one built during the Spanish-American War, and then you will find buildings built during World War I. They are using the wars to build up these permanent facilities, Mr. Chairman, and to obtain money for projects that Congress would refuse in peacetime.

I want to answer now this question which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] asked. Approximately $48,000,000 is scattered through this for the handling of surplus property which has been turned over to the War Assets Administration. The Navy Department bill took that money out. We left that money in but earmarked it so that it could only be used for that purpose. If it is not used for that purpose, it is going to be turned back into the Treasury.

Here is the situation as far as the Army is concerned: Here is a warehouse, for instance, that may be two-thirds full. Gradually that material is declared surplus. One-third of it may be War Assets Administration property and the other two-thirds may be Army. The same warehouse, the same guards, the same help will handle both the war surplus property and the Army. We felt the Army could handle it cheaper than by trying to transfer funds around. We were afraid that if we denied these funds, then the War Department would get additional funds from the War Assets Administration which they could play with as they saw fit. This way we know exactly how much they are spending and the purpose for which it will be spent.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. It has been rumored that the Army is planning to

enlarge the Pentagon Building with a large tower in the center.

Mr. BENDER. I heard that also.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. About a year ago I wrote a letter to the Secretary of War. I told him I had been informed that the War Department was going to build a Tower of Babel in the center of the Pentagon Building and asked if it were true. The Secretary of War assured me that they were not going to build any Tower of Babel in the Pentagon Building.

Mr. REED of New York. Or any other kind of tower?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No.

Now, before I close I want to appeal to the House again. I will not be here when the conference report on this bill comes up. I want this House to stand by me for just once on this transferability clause. They will tell you that they can transfer funds and cut appropriations. The fact of the matter is that when you put the transferability clause in there they will inflate those funds so that they will always have something to transfer. They have appropriated $26,000,000,000 more in 5 years for the Air Forces than the Air Forces could even obligate, and that is where they got a great deal of their lump-sum money to transfer. They are going to see that they have a surplus in some fund if you leave that clause in there. You will find that you will save millions of dollars if you take it out.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, since before the beginning of the war the annual appropriation bill presented by our subcommittee on War Department appropriations has been the largest bill considered by the Congress during each year. Expenditures by the Army during the war were necessarily very, very heavy. Today we present to you a bill which calls for an expenditure in fiscal year 1947 of about $7,000,000,000. Seven billion dollars, when compared to the peak wartime military appropriation bills, is not so large a sum, but when considered in the light of our national debt it is a very large sum of money indeed. We cannot apologize, however, for presenting this request to you. If we were willing to appropriate to the War Department something over $200,000,000,000 in order to win the war—which we did—we cannot now at the end of the war throw overboard our military power and might, and sacrifice the very things we fought for. We want to get something out of the heavy expenditure of money and out of the precious expenditure of life which was necessary in order that the war might be won. It is with that in mind that we present this bill to you. We must be on a firm military basis in this uncertain postwar period.

Yes; $7,000,000,000 is a large sum of money, but the very largest sum involved is for pay of the Army, an Army which will average about 1,280,000 men during the coming year. About one-third of the money is for pay of the Army, and then large sums are for subsistence, clothing, and equipage of one kind and another. So the committee has been as conservative as it dared be in presenting this bill.

What did we get out of this war? We preserved our liberties, we prevented the annihilation of our country and the destruction of our Government. We got a great deal out of the war from that standpoint, and it is up to us by constant diligence to retain the victory which was won. Dollars are going to be part of the price of retaining the fruits of victory.

I should like to discuss with you briefly some other things which we got out of the war, some things that are more or less of a material nature. True, they are the lesser things but I think they are things of which we should be aware. In other words, in this great effort toward victory we developed many things which are today serving America in peacetime and which will continue to serve America in the years to come and make more happy, and prosperous, and delightful the civilization in this fair land.

American inventive genius, under the spur of wartime necessity, produced innumerable things which will better the daily lives of us all.

AERONAUTICS

In the field of aeronautics, of course, the advances have been so unbelievable that to some degree they lose significance through sheer inability of our minds to comprehend them.

Here are a few startling facts which have grown commonplace almost overnight. In 1927 Charles Lindbergh made his nonstop flight to Paris. For nearly 14 years thereafter the total number of persons who crossed the Atlantic by air could almost be carried in a single 15-hour trip of one of our present-day transoceanic air liners. Yet, under the impetus of military necessity we literally moved armies overseas by air. In fact, only a few days ago the Air Forces Air Transport Command was commended by the President for carrying its four millionth transoceanic passenger. And even now, on a peacetime basis, it is flying 483 crossings a month to implement and expedite necessary military business.

Before the war our fighter airplanes were capable of top speeds of 300 miles an hour and our bombers had a range of about 1,000 miles. During the war and since, we have reached speeds of 500 miles an hour with our fighters and have carried 10 tons of military load for 4,000 miles. It is this progress in aircraft design and construction which has resulted in the mighty air liners which are such a familiar sight in the air over our Capitol today. And this trend of development is headed steeply upward at this time. The peak is not in sight, and we are reaching out into the realms of supersonic speeds, rocket propulsion, and many other fantasies, that even Jules Verne's wildest imagination could not have envisoned a few years ago.

To reach these goals, we must have new means of propulsion. With jet engines we are entering a field which also includes gas turbines and rocket motors, or combinations of all of them, in order to propel aircraft in these amazing speed ranges.

QUARTERMASTER ITEMS

Less spectacular, perhaps, but no less important and far-reaching are the contributions of the Quartermaster Corps. In view of the class of supplies in which this corps is interested, the bulk of research and development performed during the war will have an effect on civilian economy, either directly or indirectly.

In the field of clothing and textiles, fabric construction techniques have been greatly improved. The development of shrinkproof, mildewproof, and coated fabrics will also be widely accepted. Industry will find broad application for the windproof and pile fabrics developed by the Quartermaster Corps. Garments and fabrics have been developed which will greatly benefit the sportswear and rainwear industries. Research in the field of high-strength synthetic fibers have greatly improved nylon fabrics and have led to the development of body armor which will be of benefit to law-enforcement agents.

In the field of footgear, improved soles, superior adhesives, waterproof leathers, and leather preservatives have been developed and have great commercial possibilities.

Practically all subsistence research will benefit the civilian economy. For example, the storage life of canned foods and dairy products has been greatly lengthened through Quartermaster research. New items of Army rations are now being packaged for civilian consumption and food acceptance studies will assuredly result in the more economical use of our national agricultural resources.

The work performed in climatic research laboratories will be of real value to industry in whatever climate or under whatever conditions man is required to work and to be exposed to environmental stresses.

A large number of scientific and industrial reports covering the above subjects have been and are continuing to be released to industry through the Department of Commerce.

One of the most interesting men in the Army is Brig. Gen. G. F. Doriot. Throughout the war he has been one of the keymen in research in the Quartermaster Corps. He has done an outstanding job in seeking better food processes, better textiles, and better quartermaster items of all kinds for the men and women of our armed forces. His testimony begins on page 180 of the hearings.

MEDICAL

The Surgeon General of the Army, Gen. Norman T. Kirk, appeared before the committee in behalf of the Medical Department of the Army. Some of the facts presented were rather technical, but I think they will be found of interest.

It has been said that the war served as a vast clinic for the medical profession. The impetus given thereby to research, new developments, and improved applications and techniques, while primarily to conserve the fighting strength

of the Army, will redound to the lasting benefit of the civilian population, not only of this Nation, but of countries around the globe.

The wonder drugs, penicillin and the sulfas, were of outstanding importance during the war and their success in the treatment of certain diseases and in allaying infections has been proven. Streptomycin, a new drug for the treatment of some infections resistant to penicillin and the sulfas, is still in the experimental stage but bids fair to be life-saving for certain conditions.

In the suppressive treatment of malaria, atabrine, a new synthetic drug, was substituted for quinine when the supply of the latter was cut off with the capture of the East Indies by Japan. A still later drug SN-7618, recently developed through research, gives evidence of being superior both to quinine and to atabrine.

Processes by which plasma was extracted from blood, dried to keep indefinitely, and shipped the world over for administration to the sick and injured were developed during the war. During the latter part of the war it was possible also to ship whole blood by airplanes, apparatus having been developed through research whereby the blood could be shipped and stored for as long as 30 days.

The public will benefit from the development during the war of special techniques in general surgery, improved methods and materials in plastic surgery, better artificial limbs resulting from improvement in mechanical design and in materials, and from the new acrylic artificial eye, fabricated from synthetic resin, which is superior to the glass eye and is practically unbreakable.

Among the important developments in the prevention of disease, the following may be mentioned: The development of a process of application of oil to floors and bedding to prevent the spread of airborne diseases; the virtual elimination, by vaccination and delousing processes, of typhus as a menace; vaccination whereby tetanus has been practically prevented in the Army; mass chest X-rays of inductees and of Army industrial workers whereby incipient tuberculosis may be discovered and early treatment initiated; the development of vaccines for dengue fever; the development of an influenza vaccine which has given very encouraging results; the development of a dysentery vaccine, now undergoing experimentation in tropical areas. An important adjunct in the preventive medicine program has been the use of DDT and its compounds, not only in the antimalaria campaign, but also in the elimination of other disease-carrying insects and pests.

Great advances were made during the war in the prevention and treatment of mental diseases. The results of the procedures followed and the special training of medical men by outstanding psychiatrists commissioned in the Army during the war offer great hope for improvement in the care of such patients in the future.

CHEMICAL WARFARE

The committee was provided with extensive information in regard to the effect of the wartime work of the Chemical Warfare Service on our civilian economy.

These discoveries will be helpful in the treatment of ptomaine poisoning, the treatment of an eye condition known as glaucoma, and in the treatment of cancer.

ORDNANCE

In addition to the development of weapons of war as such, the Ordnance Department during World War II was instrumental in the development of equipment, materials, and techniques which will essentially benefit the peacetime activities of the engineering and scientific professions and industry in general.

We were given information about a rocket that has been developed and successfully fired to an altitude of 230,000 feet. These rockets will be of great value to all agencies concerned with exploration of the areas at extreme altitudes and with more accurate weather forecasting. This information now being collected in the rocket program is providing scientific data on the phenomena in the ionosphere at heights never before attained by man. These data include information on temperatures, pressures, currents, bacteria, and gases above the stratosphere. The most far reaching of all may well be knowledge which will be secured on cosmic rays.

A number of wartime vehicles developed by the Ordnance Department and industry have been converted to full-time commercial usage.

On research sponsored by the Ordnance Department a very unique machine, the electronic numerical integrator and computer, has been developed. It is among the foremost scientific achievements of the war. It solves intricate problems a thousand times faster than any machine ever built. It opens up new fields of research, not only to the Ordnance Department but to all branches of science; and performs computations heretofore impossible by other methods and beyond the capacity of human beings.

Another installation of great importance is the Ordnance Department supersonic wind tunnel at Aberdeen Proving Ground. This tunnel is playing a major role in further development of our knowledge of ballistics at speeds many times that of sound. Through the use of scale models many valuable lessons have and will be learned on this subject which is of great importance to both the commercial and military future of this country.

Today we are procuring gun forgings more than double the strength of those of World War I. These improved steels are available for peacetime industry. Ordnance developed and placed into mass production during the war the centrifugal casting process for making cannon. The same process is now available for the production of commercial products.

Waterproofing of engines necessitated by amphibious operations has resulted in waterproof spark plugs and ignition systems which will have commercial application in automobiles, trucks, and busses.

Major contributions were made in the field of flexible cables, increasing the durability factor a hundredfold.

Constant research in the fields of materials, hydrodynamics, mechanical engineering, and chemistry helps assure the security of the Nation by providing the best weapons obtainable, and contributes much to the science and industry of the United States in days of peace.

If I had the time I could enumerate the various departments of the Army and discuss and recapitulate what appears in the hearings or information secured otherwise, with respect to these numerous discoveries and developments which are now available for peacetime America and for the world. But I will not have time to complete the remarks which I had intended to make.

ENGINEERS

The United States Army Engineers learned many lessons in the field of construction now being utilized in our peacetime programs which I will not take the time to discuss.

THE SIGNAL CORPS

The Signal Corps spent billions of dollars during the war and made a tremendous contribution in the saving of lives. If I have time before the conclusion of my remarks, I should like to make further reference to the great benefits which our civilian economy will derive from the wartime discoveries of the Signal Corps.

ATOMIC BOMB

As all of us know, the greatest and most spectacular scientific development that came out of the war was the atomic bomb. Possibly it is the most spectacular development of all time. This greatest military weapon was provided by this Congress, and more specifically by this committee, of which I am honored to be a member. It was not possible in 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945 for the members of this eight-man subcommittee to make known to the Congress the fact that funds were being appropriated for the atom bomb in the bills which we were then submitting to you. The scientists, the military people, labor, and industry cooperating together did the most marvelous job of all time under the leadership of that able commanding general of the project, Gen. Leslie Groves. He has done a great service for the Nation and the work which he has done is not only a monument to him but it is a monument to the inventive genius and the labor and the scientific skill of our country. We provided the money for this project by reason of the urgent necessity of the situation. When General Marshall came to us in our committee and said that our enemies were seeking to develop this weapon of death and destruction and were making some headway, we went forward with all possible speed.

I think some of us often wish that the atom bomb had never materialized. But the atom bomb was on its way and it was a question of whether America would have the weapon first or whether our enemies would have it first.

The people of our country should be very grateful for the fact that we outstripped other nations in achieving success in perfecting the atomic bomb. There is no doubt but that the bomb hastened victory and saved hundreds of thousands of American lives. In complimenting our committee for our work in

connection with the atomic bomb project, Secretary Patterson said in part:

I asked for your confidence, which you never broke. * * * I want to express my deep appreciation of the way in which this committee cooperated on that project, and I think you may have the satisfaction of realizing that by doing that, you saved hundreds of thousands of lives of American soldiers.

The activity in the atom bomb project continues. It is now going along at a rate of about two-thirds the wartime basis. We recommend the appropriation of $200,000,000 recommended by the Budget, and we add to that the sum of $175,000,000 in order that this money may be used prior to the beginning of the fiscal year 1948 for contract obligations. The secrecy of the lethal weapon which has come to the world must be preserved for our people and for our Nation, and America must be in the forefront of all scientific development, including the atomic energy field and all other fields.

As all of you know, it was because of the foresight of this Congress in making available some $2,000,000,000 for research of one kind or another that we were able to win the war at a lesser cost of human lives. It was a question in many instances of spending money upon a slender thread of hope, but this committee has been willing to pour out the treasure of the people in order to try to safeguard the lives of the men of this Nation who were called upon to fight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MAHON. In this bill you will find that we recommend the appropriation of $281,500,000 for research and development. It is a pretty large sum, by far the largest sum for research and development that has ever been suggested in peacetime, but it is most essential that we remember the lessons that we learned during the war and that we keep abreast and out in front in all of these matters involving research and development.

The largest sum out of the appropriation for research and development is $185,000,000 for the Army Air Forces. If this committee has its will and its way, you will find that our Nation, which is already out in front in the field of aviation, will go forward, ahead of the parade, in order that we may be more secure in the future, and that no nation will dare challenge us at some future time. While we talk of money, airplanes, weapons, and research and development, we realize that military might alone cannot insure the peace and security of this Nation and the world. We realize that much more is required. But we do feel that while going along with the United Nations program and with the program of better understanding, cooperation, and good will throughout the world, we must go forward with our program of military preparation, hoping for the time to come when nations will lay down their arms and live in peace.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman has spoken about the appropriation for atomic research. I take it that the committee was perfectly satisfied in recommending this large appropriation that the military authorities were prepared to go ahead with their experimental work on atomic bombs and other atomic weapons, even though it has not been decided whether or not eventually the program will be turned over to some civilian agency.

Mr. MAHON. I realize there has been a conflict over what shall be done about the atomic energy program for the future. Frankly, I think if the McMahon bill becomes law in its present form we will come to regret our action in passing that legislation. I do hope we will not take out of the hands of the military all authority and power in matters involving atomic energy and atomic weapons. I hope the gentleman's committee will be able to present to us legislation which will safeguard the military interest of the Nation.

Mr. ELSTON. I am glad to have the gentleman's views on that because our committee has adopted an amendment which will make it mandatory that the armed forces be represented on the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. MAHON. When you turn anything over to a full-time commission you often have difficulty, it seems to me. Gen. Leslie Groves during the war, as the top man, was the driving force behind the project. Some one person must be responsible on a big task like the atomic energy program. Let him have a board of directors or commissioners or advisers, but let us have somebody who is responsible and accountable for the carrying on of this program.

Mr. ELSTON. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, the gentleman is the ranking Democratic member on the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, I am.

Mr. WHITE. Can the gentleman tell me how much money is involved in the legislation now before the House? How much is being appropriated?

Mr. MAHON. The sum of money involved is shown in the report of the committee. It is substantially $7,000,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1946.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITE. We are told by the press that this amount is far in excess of any other appropriation for peacetime military purposes.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. WHITE. Now that so many of the enlisted personnel of the Army have been discharged, has any committee of the House or the gentleman's committee in particular, in making investigations as to these appropriations, made any investigation as to the excess number of officers still on the pay roll? We are told that the Army is top-heavy with officer personnel, that the men have been released but that the officers are still on the pay roll. Have you appropriated money for that, and have you made any investigation as to what the situation actually is?

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his question. May I say that during the war I believed in the man who was Chief of Staff, Gen. George Marshall. He had a bigger job than any human being could possibly discharge in every detail and particular. He did a marvelous job for his country. At this time we have as Chief of Staff, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower. He appeared before the committee. He has appeared before numerous congressional committees. He is a top-flight American citizen and a military man who has no superior in the world today. We conferred with him and his many aides and assistants in regard to all these appropriations and we made reductions wherever we could make them.

Yes, this is the largest peacetime appropriation ever recommended to the Congress. But this is a most unusual time in the history of our country. We must vary our program with varying conditions. We not only have General Eisenhower as our Chief of Staff and adviser in matters military, but we have Gen. George Richards who has worked with this committee for years and who is head of the Budget Division. A more conscientious and able man in uniform I have not had the privilege to meet. We have had his unfailing assistance in our efforts to make reductions wherever we could. But if we are going to maintain an Army of 1,280,000 it is necessary for them to be paid, fed, and clothed. If we did nothing but feed, pay, and clothe those men, we would still have to appropriate a vast sum of money.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. MAHON. I have already taken up too much time of the committee.

Mr. WHITE. If the gentleman does not want to meet the issue, that is his responsibility. But it is an issue before the American people and I propose to investigate it. If you do not want to answer questions, then say so.

Mr. MAHON. I will be glad to answer any questions that I am able to answer.

Mr. WHITE. I want to ask the gentleman if it would not be a simple matter to compare the officer personnel before the war and the officer personnel since the war and arrive at some conclusion as to what should be the structure and organization of the Army and eliminate this excess, expensive officer personnel who are using the money of the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman may be sure that the members of the committee do not want a top-heavy officer personnel and we have striven in every way possible to cut the deadwood out of the War Department, whether it be in personnel or otherwise. If the gentleman will read the hearings, he can get very

complete figures. I cannot give each figure at this time but they are available in the report and in the hearings.

Mr. WHITE. I asked the gentleman if any investigation was made in his committee of that situation. We are told by the press every day that there is a top-heavy personnel. The men are discharged and released, but the officers are still on the pay roll, and they are the highest priced part of the Army, using up the taxpayers' money.

Mr. MAHON. I do not have the figures before me, but our investigation revealed a drastic reduction of officer personnel.

Mr. WHITE. You have not made any investigation along these lines?

Mr. MAHON. Our investigation revealed a very drastic reduction in the officer personnel. I concur that there should not be a top-heavy officer personnel.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I like the comment that the gentleman has made in tribute to the Army Air Force. I think he is quite right to say that we have leading this Air Force today in the person of General Spaatz one who knows the score.

Mr. MAHON. Yes; the gentleman is correct in his estimate of General Spaatz, the commanding general of the Army Air Forces. We are trying to help streamline the Army and make reductions wherever we can. In peace, as in war, we want a Military Establishment of which the people of this Nation can be proud—a Military Establishment which future would-be aggressors of the world would not dare to challenge.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 167]

Adams	De Lacy	Kee
Andrews, N. Y.	Delaney,	Kelley, Pa.
Auchincloss	John J.	Keogh
Bailey	Doyle	Kilburn
Baldwin, Md.	Drewry	King
Baldwin, N. Y.	Durham	Kinzer
Barden	Eaton	Kirwan
Barry	Eberharter	LaFollette
Bell	Elsaesser	Lea
Bennet, N. Y.	Fallon	Lemke
Bennett, Mo.	Fogarty	Ludlow
Bland	Folger	Lynch
Bloom	Forand	McGehee
Bonner	Gavin	Madden
Boren	Gibson	Mankin
Boykin	Gifford	Mansfield, Tex.
Bradley, Mich.	Gore	Martin, Mass.
Buchanan	Gossett	Monroney
Buckley	Granger	Morrison
Camp	Grant, Ala.	Mundt
Cannon, Fla.	Hall,	Murdock
Case, N. J.	Edwin Arthur	Murphy
Celler	Harless, Ariz.	Murray, Wis.
Cochran	Harris	Norton
Coffee	Hart	Outland
Colmer	Hébert	Pace
Courtney	Heffernan	Patrick
Cox	Holifield	Peterson, Ga.
Curley	Izac	Pfeifer
Daughton, Va.	Jackson	Ploeser
Davis	Johnson,	Powell
Dawson	Luther A.	Reece, Tenn.
Rich	Slaughter	Tolan
Rivers	Somers, N. Y.	Torrens
Robertson,	Sparkman	Vinson
N. Dak.	Starkey	Welch
Roe, N. Y.	Stewart	West
Sadowski	Stigler	Wickersham
Savage	Sumner, Ill.	Winstead
Sheridan	Sumners, Tex.	Winter
Simpson, Pa.	Taylor	Wolfenden, Pa.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6837, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 308 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6837, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 20 minutes.

AUDIT OF RFC WAR ACTIVITIES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I think the calling of a quorum was not because I was about to make some remarks, but because someone thought there should be a larger attendance here during the consideration of a $7,000,000,000 bill.

The matter to which I shall address my first remarks, however, is a subject with which every Member of the House of Representatives will find himself concerned in the next few weeks. It is an interim report by the General Accounting Office on its attempt to audit the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, particularly as they dealt with production and procurement of war goods and the disposition of surplus war property.

These remarks are occasioned by a document which has appeared today, Document No. 674 of the House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session. I suggest that Members may want to take that number down because we are going to hear a great deal about it in the days to come. This document carries a report from the General Accounting Office and is transmitted by a letter from Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States. During the consideration of the Government corporations appropriation bill the other day a Member of the House thought it in order to criticize the minority members of the subcommittee for bringing in a minority report on the bill then under consideration. When the House is fully aware of what is in this report from the Comptroller General they will wonder no longer why the minority members of the committee made the recommendations that they did.

Now I am going to read from the letter from Mr. Warren to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The letter is dated June 19, 1946.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is forwarded herewith copy of a communication dated June 17, from the Corporation Audits Division of the General Accounting Office to the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This communication deals with matters being covered by an audit that the Corporation Audits Division is making of the affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries and affiliates for the year ending June 30, 1945, under section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945.

Now, then, catch the significance of the following sentence and bear in mind that this is not the minority members of the Committee on Appropriations speaking, but here is the Comptroller General of the United States saying, and I quote:

Upon consideration of the intelligence disclosed by this communication it was decided that it was of such seriousness and moment that it should be transmitted to you as an interim report as well as taken up administratively with the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The audit is proceeding with the utmost intelligence and dispatch, but the conditions stated in the aforementioned communication render us unable to say when it will be completed and our ultimate report submitted.

Respectfully submitted.

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General.

Following Mr. Warren's letter of transmittal, there are 17 pages of a report in the nature of a letter from T. Coleman Andrews, Director of the Corporation Audits Division of the General Accounting Office to the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The letter is dated June 17, 1946. I shall not attempt to read it all, of course, but shall read a few highlights and comment thereon.

Mr. Andrews states that the Corporation Audits Division has been engaged for approximately 8 months in an examination of the organization, the operating and accounting methods and the financial statements of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He states that under ordinary circumstances the work should be nearing completion but that circumstances encountered have made that impossible.

Indeed—

Mr. Andrews says—

it has been found that a satisfactory audit cannot be made and that no certification may be given of the financial statements of the companies at the close of June 1945. It is even doubtful that a satisfactory audit and certification of the statements of June 30, 1946, will be possible.

And then this General Accounting officer makes this astounding statement:

The RFC and its affiliated companies have not developed an adequate concept of the control of financial and operating responsibilities through accounting. * * * Some of the most important accounting records are so poorly devised * * * it is doubtful, from a management standpoint if any really useful purpose is served by their continued maintenance. * * *

Because of these conditions—

The report says—

the accounting records of the companies do not afford an adequate basis for turning out financial statements which would disclose fully the financial positions of the enterprises

at any date or the results of their operations for any period.

Is it any wonder, then that the minority members of the Appropriations Subcommittee the other day, then ventured to raise some questions about the operations of this Government agency, this huge Government agency which has handled many billions of dollars of our wartime expenditures?

The General Accounting Office sums up its interim report by making eight specific charges on the inadequacy of the accounting methods of the RFC. I quote now from the report at page 3, top of the page:

Specific examples of the failure of accounting functions of the RFC are presented in the paragraphs immediately following:

1. The Company does not control the $7,000,000,000 investment in properties.

2. The Company does not control its $800,000,000 investment in inventories of the Defense Supplies Corporation, the Metals Reserve Company, and the United States Commercial Company.

3. The Company—

Meaning the RFC—

does not control its cash receipts.

4. The Company does not control rentals earned on its properties.

5. The Company does not control certain important liabilities.

6. The Company does not control recoveries due it on plant extensions built for utility companies.

7. The Company has not controlled its surplus property disposal activities; and

8. The Company has had no control over the activities of its affiliate, U. S. Commercial Company.

Then follow paragraphs discussing each of these eight points. Bear in mind, as I read on, that this is not the report nor the words of a minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or a minority Member of the House. They are the words of the General Accounting Office in a report submitted by the Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren.

Under the first head:

The Company does not control its $7,000,000,000 investment in properties. The balance sheet of Defense Plants Corporation as of June 30, 1945, reports that this subsidiary had invested an aggregate of approximately $7,000,000,000 in plant properties.

I might say parenthetically that a great deal of the money which has been appropriated to the War Department during the war has been linked with the operations of the Defense Plants Corporation, either by allocation of funds for expediting production to allied plants or contribution of tools to companies operating those plants of Defense Plants Corporation, or by payments for equipment produced by the companies operating those properties. So that this $7,000,000,000 which the General Accounting Office is unable to find control for relates directly to the appropriations for the War Department and the Navy and other defense activities. And that is why this report is of special interest when we are considering new appropriations for the War Department.

The report goes on:

The records supporting this aggregate are not designed readily to disclose how much of it is invested in any one project; they are intended instead to show, without important regard for location, the total cost of all land owned, the total cost of each class of buildings owned, the total cost of each of many classes of equipment, and the total amount of expense disbursements capitalized as part of the investment. No complete determination of the amounts actually invested in the individual plant projects has ever been made by the company, and no accurate determination has been possible under the accounting methods applied. The nearest approach to such a determination has been the occasional totaling of disbursements made, whether they were investments or expense disbursements, in order that it might be known that the aggregate amount authorized for expenditure on any project had not been exceeded.

That is, no separation has been made between expenditures for what would be called capital investments and operating expense. I read further:

This test has not taken the capitalized expense disbursements into account, because these are not deemed to be covered by the authorizations.

We became apprehensive of the effectiveness of the control exercised by Defense Plant Corporation over its plant properties early in our examination when it appeared to us that the company had no reliable way of knowing if the properties turned over by its lessees in the settlement of their accountability, were actually all of the properties which they should have turned over.

In other words, the General Accounting Office is saying that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is unable to tell with respect to this $7,000,000,000 investment in properties turned over to operating lessees, whether when the property has come back, the lessees or operators are turning back all of the property which should have been returned.

My interest in this proposition of auditing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other Government corporations by the General Accounting Office stemmed from a little thing which came to the attention of this Appropriations Subcommittee for the War Department when we were working on the civil functions bill a couple of years ago. It came to my attention that the General Accounting Office had reported in connection with the audit of the Panama Railroad that it was unable to make a complete audit because it had no way of reconciling the cash, because the cash which came in in some of the minor activities of the Panama Company, the operation of concessions and the like, was mingled with the cash received in the operation of the railroad and the hotel. Although apparently there had been a private audit made for the directors of the Panama Railroad, it was not of even date with the GAO audit of the Government's activities and necessary information to reconcile cash was not available to the General Accounting Office. So the General Accounting Office, in its examination and report at that time said something should be done so that they should have greater authority to make a complete audit and check the cash, and thereby reconcile the complete operations in Panama. Growing out of that this subcommittee recommended that a change be made and that the General Accounting Office be given authority to make a complete audit of our operations in the Canal Zone.

I recall the incident quite clearly because some of the officials in the Canal Zone felt our action was reflection on them. A change in governors had recently been made, and the new governor thought the action indicated we did not trust him. I remember saying to him or to his representatives that there was no connection between the change in governors and the new policy; but that I had been stung by the remark in the report of the General Accounting Office that all it could do in matters of this kind was to report the situation to the Congress and leave it to Congress to do something about recommendations made.

Well, in that instance, we did something about it—the subcommittee handling this appropriation bill for War Department activities did—we proposed that the General Accounting Office should make a complete audit and we proposed that certain recommendations on the operation of the Tivoli Hotel be carried out. And out of the whole incident, I, for one, became convinced of the importance of establishing a uniform system of audit and budget controls for the various corporations and business enterprises of the Government.

This conviction was increased by matters brought to light by the hard-working gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] in his inquiries on the independent offices appropriations for various Government corporations. That, as I recall, was in December of 1943 and January 1944.

About that time a distinguished Senator from Nebraska and a distinguished Senator from Virginia introduced in the other body a bill which came to be known as the Byrd-Butler bill, and eventually became the Government Corporation Control Act. Before that bill was acted upon, however, a little crisis arose, one of these minor political crises, you might say, within the administration when Henry Wallace was nominated as Secretary of the Department of Commerce in order to provide him with a place in the Cabinet. At that time the Federal Loan Agency, headed by Mr. Jesse Jones, was within the Department of Commerce. Rumor said that Mr. Wallace could not be confirmed to succeed Mr. Jones in both positions.

A bill was introduced which eventually became Public Law 4 of the first session of this Seventy-ninth Congress, the act of February 24, 1945, which is cited in the letter by the Comptroller General as the act under which this particular report which I am discussing was made. This bill was a forerunner of the Government Corporation Control Act. But it did not start out that way. It started out as S. 375, a bill to divorce the Federal Loan Agency from the Department of Commerce before Mr. Wallace was confirmed as Secretary. But in the Senate some important amendments were added to it. The first part of the bill, as I have said, provided for a divorcement of the Federal Loan Agency from the Secretary of Commerce. But there was added to it section 5 through three amendments which became known as the Byrd

amendments, which established an audit for all governmental corporations by the General Accounting Office. These amendments were taken from the Byrd-Butler bill. While they were not the complete bill which we later adopted as the Government Corporations Act, they were the nub of it, and it was under this act of February 24, 1945, that this audit of the RFC was started, as cited in the Comptroller's letter, and has been going on for some 8 months.

If I seem somewhat familiar with this matter it is because during the discussion of that Wallace-RFC divorcement bill in the House on February 16, 1944, I called attention to the importance of these audits, and introduced a letter to me from the Comptroller General setting forth the list of Government corporations which the General Accounting Office would audit under the provisions in the bill, and further called attention to the fact that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and I had introduced companion bills to the Byrd-Butler bill in the House, H. R. 2177 and H. R. 2051, respectively. A revised form of that bill became law, as has been stated, but it was under the short form in the bill which was passed to make it possible for Mr. Wallace to be confirmed as Secretary of Commerce, that the audit was undertaken that is the subject for this extraordinary report made to the House in the document which I have been discussing.

This report is of further importance to the committee in its consideration of this appropriation bill for the War Department because of the determination by the audit of certain matters about surplus war plants and property. I read again from the report at the middle of page 4:

1. The company has not yet ascertained for any one of its approximately 2,500 DPC plant projects that it has a reliable record which reports in identifiable detail the items of property comprising its investment. This accomplishment for all 2,500 projects, in order that all of the lessees concerned might be held fully accountable, is the principal objective of the program undertaken on January 5, 1946.

The General Accounting Office further says:

It is not possible to ascertain from the accounting records of the company which DPC properties had been declared surplus at June 30, 1945, or at any other date before or since.

In other words, under the accounting procedure which has been going on it has not been possible for the General Accounting Office as of June 30, 1945, or any other date before or since to determine what DPC properties had been declared surplus.

The report goes on further to say:

It is not possible to ascertain from the accounting records which DPC properties have been disposed of through any date. This has been the case for sometime but the impairment in control on this account became even greater in 1946 when the disposal responsibility was transferred to War Assets Corporation and later, completely out of the RFC group, to War Assets Administration.

There are some funds in this bill that have to do with the disposal of surplus war property as the Members know, and yet here we find the General Accounting Office saying that it has not been possible to determine from accounting records which Defense Plant Corporations have been disposed of through any date and that that has become even worse following the transfer to the War Assets Administration.

In addition the report says:

The records show large amounts of unidentified sales proceeds at all times. In at least one instance of this coming to our attention a very substantial quantity of equipment was scrapped without proper identification, and as to the project in which this condition occurred the company has obviously rendered itself incapable of ever making a satisfactory accounting.

Now, the Members have had their attention called at different times to the alleged scrapping of property which was known as war property in one form or another.

It now appears that one reason why it has not been possible to find out what was scrapped and what should be accounted for apparently is because the accounting methods employed simply have not preserved records so that there could be an identification of the details as of any given date.

Another interesting item in the comment by the General Accounting Office says:

By April 1946, the net amount of approximately $77,000,000 had been recovered by RFC in renegotiation settlements with contractors. This recovery reflects substantial reductions in recognition of the effect of the renegotiation settlements on the contractors' liabilities for income tax, the gross recovery having been more than $300,000,000.

In that connection I may say that during the hearings on this bill a letter was received which was placed in the printed hearings at page 1101 by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], reviewing savings to the Government under the renegotiation statute. It will be recalled by many Members that the renegotiation statute stemmed from an amendment which I offered to the Sixth Supplemental Defense appropriation bill in the spring of 1942.

Activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were not covered in the 1942 law, but inquiry in our hearings on the next bill for the War Department revealed that contracts for identical items at similar prices were renegotiated if straight War Department contracts but not if they were contracts of an RFC subsidiary. So, we extended renegotiation to apply to RFC activities on war contracts by an amendment which I offered to the War Department bill in the spring of 1943, I believe it was. And under that extension, the recovery was made cited in the Comptroller's report.

Incidentally, it may be of interest to the Members to know that the total recoveries by the Government under renegotiation were $9,556,372,000 as of May 3, 1946. The letter from Secretary Patterson, dated May 17, 1946, says:

WASHINGTON, *May 17, 1946.*

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: This is in response to your request of May 9, 1946, for a recapitulation of the total estimated savings resulting from the renegotiation statutes.

The War Department Price Adjustment Board as of May 3, 1946, had completed renegotiation of cases in which excessive profits of $6,374,438,000 had been determined. As of that date the Navy and Treasury Departments, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Maritime Commission, and War Shipping Administration had completed cases involving excessive profits of $3,184,934,000. The total thus determined was therefore $9,556,372,000 as of May 3, 1946.

On the basis of the best available estimates, Federal income and excess-profits taxes would have recovered approximately 70 percent of excessive profits determined through statutory renegotiation, leaving an estimated net recovery from renegotiations conducted by the War Department of $1,911,431,000, and from all departments of $2,866,912,000.

In additions to the above, the Office of the Chief of Finance of the War Department reports contract-price reductions in War Department contracts in the amount of $3,255,508,000 as of March 31, 1946, and similar adjustments by other departments are known to be very large. Some of these reductions resulted directly from statutory renegotiation and others were brought about by the independent activities of contracting officers or through the coordinated action of contracting and renegotiation officers.

It should be noted that neither the refunds in renegotiation nor the price reductions on existing contracts include the amounts reflecting the lowering of prices on reorders and successive procurements. It is impossible to arrive at even an approximate estimate of the aggregate of such amounts, but it is known to be tremendous and in substantial measure has resulted from the influence exerted by the existence of the renegotiation statute and of the policies followed in its administration.

The renegotiation recoveries are after allowances of deduction for amortization of war facilities under certificate of necessity except to the extent that the refunds may be modified through the renegotiation rebate on recomputed amortization.

You early recognized the dangers inherent in unrestrained accumulations of profits on procurement for war, and you exercised farsighted leadership in fostering and maintaining the legislation to curb those accumulations. I am, therefore, certain that you must derive much satisfaction from the successful administration of the renegotiation laws which brought about not only the impressive monetary savings as noted, but also other results which in my opinion are even more consequential. Among these were stimulation of efficiency in industry, speeding up procurement and production of war matériel, combating inflationary tendencies inherent in a wartime economy, and protecting our American system of free enterprise against indictment that business has retained unconscionable and excessive profits out of its participation in the war effort. I believe the entire country will increasingly recognize the vital role renegotiation has had in the war period.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

One of the striking statements in the Comptroller's study of RFC accounting relates to plant extensions built for utility companies. At page 10, the letter from the General Accounting Office report states:

Defense Plant Corporation is the owner of certain of the utilities plant extension which it has constructed, and in these cases it has contracted to recover all or part of its investment through rate reductions based upon consumption at the DPC premises served, or upon other use of the facilities.

The practice has been for the utility companies to give effect to the rate reductions in the billing which they have rendered to the DPC lessees operating the plant. DPC has recovered its investment through remittances which the lessees have made along with the regular rental remittances.

Although the accounting methods employed by DPC have made a segregation of the investment recovery element from the rental income element of the lessees' remittances, the company has made no independent determination of what investment recoveries should have been accomplished.

In other words, the General Accounting Office is saying that the DPC has made no independent determination of what investment recoveries should be made on these plant extensions built for utility companies.

Then there is a very extensive comment on the general conclusion that the company has not controlled its surplus property disposal activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman ten additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the General Accounting comment says:

The RFC and certain of its subsidiaries were surplus property disposal agencies from the day on which the surplus property disposal activity began until the close of business January 15, 1946. On January 16, 1946, War Assets Corporation, an RFC subsidiary, became a disposal agent in their place.

War Assets Corporation never really existed as a separate entity except insofar as the legalities of the matter were concerned. It had no employees of its own, it maintained no complete separate corporate accounting records, and its operations were conducted in every respect as merely an activity of the RFC. No determination of the status of the disposal activity was made on January 16, 1946, and the condition of the records, including the memorandum records maintained for the purpose of furnishing information to the administrative and sales personnel, was such as to preclude the making of any reliable subsequent determinations.

In other words, at the time RFC turned the handling of surplus property over to War Assets Corporation, there was no cut-off date on their accounting and the records were so kept that no subsequent determination could be made reliably.

The communication goes on to say:

At no time during the period from inception of the disposal activity to March 25, 1946, when War Assets Corporation was relieved of its responsibilities, did the RFC possess a reliable record, either in quantities or in dollars, of the properties and commodities which had been declared to it for disposal; nor did it develop at any time during this period, a controlled orderly system of operation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Am I to infer from what the gentleman said that these various companies did not keep inventories or keep inventories current as to the things they had and what they sold and what they manufactured and the money they had, and things like that?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The only way in which I can interpret this report is that the RFC subsidiaries or the RFC itself did not keep a proper inventory to differentiate between investment and operating expenditures, nor did it keep an inventory from which it may be possible to determine the properties which were turned over from RFC to the War Assets Corporation, or from the War Assets Corporation to War Assets Administration.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. When subsidiaries like this were organized by the RFC, was there not a provision that they must report to RFC what they did and how they did it and what they had on hand, and so forth?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am sure that I cannot answer that question, but let me read further. This report just came out today and I have not had an opportunity to go into the matter that far, but apparently the answer would be in the negative. Here is something that bears on the gentleman's question. I read from General Accounting Office letter at page 13:

It is our opinion, in the case of the surplus property disposal activity, that no satisfactory accounting could be made without practically the complete reconstruction of the accounting records. It is our further opinion that such a reconstruction could not be made with any assurance of accuracy, because of the omission on the part of the company to make important determinations at the dates on which the responsibilities changed hands.

I assume that that is an answer to the gentleman's question.

Now then, I hope that every Member of the House will get this House document and study it, because unquestionably it is epoch making in our attempt to achieve a better control over Government expenditures and over the expenditure of funds which the taxpayers of the country have to pay.

In the few minutes remaining I want to direct attention to a few of the other features of this bill. In the first place, I want to say that there is language in this bill which I think should be removed from the bill, and I shall at the proper time offer an amendment to that effect. That language occurs on page 57, section 4, where it says:

Appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1947 shall be available for carrying out—

Then I am skipping line 13—

or carrying into effect the provisions of paragraph 8 of Executive Order 9630 of September 27, 1945.

That Executive order is the Executive order which transferred to the State Department the disposal of surplus war goods abroad. I am afraid that this language, if it remains in the bill, will in effect give to the State Department the right to tell the War Department what it must do with the funds appropriated for the War Department. I do not believe that language should remain in the bill. It is in there, I think, through a misunderstanding. I shall seek to remove that language at the appropriate time.

There is an item in the report on the bill to which I should like to direct attention, and that occurs on page 6. As has been remarked already, this bill carries $350,000,000 for government and relief in occupied territories. During the hearings on the bill, when General Echols was before us I asked him the current rate of expenditure for this purpose, and he gave the average monthly expenditures during the fiscal year 1946 as $30,000,000. That subsequently became the base on which the $350,000,000 was carried in this bill; in other words, 12 months at $30,000,000 a month would be $360,000,000. Because of savings which the committee believed could be made in administration and government of the occupied countries through greater use of the native people, the item was reduced to $350,000,000, which is a reduction of $150,000,000 from the request.

The report of the committee calls attention to the fact that favorable crop conditions in the occuplied areas during the current season should reduce the necessity for large and continued expenditures for the purchase of foodstuffs. That is true, but at the same time I think the record should be clear that it was not the intent of the committee that the reduction of $150,000,000 should be made at the expense of the food items proposed to be purchased for relief. We intended that the $150,000,000 reduction from the Budget estimate should be accomplished throughout the field of proposed expenditures, wherever they could be best made in the judgment of the War Department, and not confined to food.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The gentleman will recall that the committee had particular reference to the reduction in overhead costs, such as administration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. I am glad the gentleman brought that out because, unfortunately, that is not mentioned in our report on the bill, but it certainly was the understanding of the committee. I think the picture should be clear that we expect a substantial part of this reduction to be accomplished in the administration of government in the occupied areas, and not have the entire $150,000,000 saved at the expense of the stomachs of the people who are starving. We hope they can raise more of their food each year, more this year than last and also, that they may increasingly take on the responsibility and cost of their local government. If the funds we have proposed should not be sufficient, a deficiency estimate can be considered in January.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am sure the Committee appreciates the contribution of the gentleman from South Dakota with respect to the report of the Comptroller General. I call attention to his suggestion that he is going to offer an amendment to strike from the bill a proposal whereby the State Department is

to dispose of certain surplus property, rather than permit the War Department to sell it. In view of the criticism of the gentleman from Michigan a while ago as to the manner in which the War Department has handled the disposal of surplus property, does the gentleman think the War Department would do a much better job than the State Department in regard to it?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Opinions might differ on that but that is really not what is involved. There is now pending before the deficiency subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations an estimate for, I think, $150,000,000—I am not sure of the figure, but it is a large amount of money—for the State Department to handle this. I feel that they should get their money directly and not have the broad authority carried in the portion of the bill I have cited to tell the War Department how to expend its funds or to require that they be spent for a State Department activity.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. To explain the situation, the War Department did not handle the disposition of these foodstuffs. Under the law, where the War Department declares foodstuffs surplus, they go to the Department of Agriculture for disposition. It was the Department of Agriculture which turned over to UNRRA this $327,000,000 of foodstuffs for $138,000,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand, there was a sort of manipulation or understanding between the two agencies.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No, I would not say that. I want to be fair about the matter. The War Department was following the law. If there is any criticism, and I think there is, it should be directed to the Department of Agriculture for turning over this amount of food to UNRRA for $138,000,000, or less than half its actual value.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recall now that the figure that is pending before the deficiency subcommittee for the State Department for handling the disposal of surplus goods through the Foreign Liquidation Commission is $120,000,000 rather than $150,000,000. But in view of that fact certainly the State Department should not have the broad authority to dip into the War Department appropriations we have made on a nontransferrable basis this year and tell the War Department how much it should expend in the liquidation of surplus property abroad under the jurisdiction of the State Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, first of all, may I say that at the time of the passing of our beloved chairman, Hon. J. Buell Snyder, this subcommittee sustained a great loss. Chairman Snyder was admired and respected by all of the members of this committee. His work as chairman of this subcommittee during the war will never be forgotten. Always the fine work of this committee during the war should stand as a great monument to the memory of Mr. Snyder, one of the numerous heroes who gave his life for his country during the terrible war just ended.

Our present chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. JOHN H. KERR, is a very able and worthy successor. Judge KERR also has the respect and admiration of each member of this committee. He has conducted the hearings in a very able manner, and we believe that we are presenting today a proposed supply bill for the Military Establishment which will adequately and fairly cover the operation of our Army during the next fiscal year. I wish I had time to say something about the other members of the committee, especially the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman ENGEL, a very able and courageous member of the committee and ranking minority member thereof. I would like to say something about how we appreciate the fine, courteous, capable, and patriotic services of Maj. Gen. George J. Richards. I would also like to say in passing since this is the first peacetime bill to be presented to the Congress that the War Department is entitled, including all its officers and enlisted men, not only to the admiration of this committee, but to the admiration of the entire American people. They have brought us through—each one exerting his or her own effort—the greatest and most terrible struggle that civilization has ever witnessed. I am not defending the mistakes that have been made, but I want in passing to give my compliments to the GI who went into trenches and the front lines and who under the supervision of his officers caused the great victory to be achieved which we enjoyed. I would like, if I had the time, to say something about the great work among the civilians which was done during the war and which was necessary in order to back up our military forces. All have rendered a great service and all have done a great job from the least to the highest. Mistakes have been made everywhere, even by Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure and a privilege to have the opportunity of presenting for your consideration the Military Establishment appropriation bill for fiscal year 1947. The hearings on this bill have been of great interest to each member of the committee and we believe that we are presenting today a proposed authorization for the Military Establishment which will adequately and fairly cover the operations of our Army during the next fiscal year. In its consideration of this appropriation bill, the committee was privileged to discuss the many difficult problems which still face our military forces with the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War; Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Chief of Staff; Gen. Thomas T. Handy, the Deputy Chief of Staff; Gens. Carl Spaatz, Jacob Devers, and LeRoy Lutes, commanding generals of the Army Air, Ground, and Service Forces, respectively; Maj. Gen. George J. Richards, Budget Officer for the War Department; and the chiefs of each of the operating agencies and divisions of the War Department. Many of the men who appeared before our committee were the same men who led our Army to its glorious victories in Europe and in the Pacific. The printed record of these hearings covers some 1,183 pages and is filled with important facts covering the plans and programs of the Military Establishment for fiscal year 1947. The committee freely sought, and was given, the advice of our great military leaders and has given due consideration to their testimony in acting upon the proposed authorization.

Briefly stated, the tasks which confront the Army at the present time and which will continue through the oncoming fiscal year are: occupation, maintenance of lines of communication, operation of training and supply establishments in the United States, effective garrisoning of key points in our national security structure and the institution of research and development and other programs designed to keep our Nation ahead of all others in the field of national security.

SIZE OF THE INTERIM ARMY

From a peak wartime strength of approximately 8,300,000 individuals, it is contemplated that the Army will have been reduced to 1,550,000 by July 1, 1946, and will further decrease to 1,070,000 by July 1, 1947. The proposed authorization for fiscal year 1947 is based on an average strength of 1,279,000. The committee was informed that these terminal strengths were determined after manpower requirements as stated by the Army's field commanders had been carefully weighed and considered in the light of the policies and plans of the War Department. The committee has been assured that these figures indicate the minimum force necessary to accomplish the tasks ahead.

FUND REQUIREMENTS

The bill which we are presenting today proposes new authorizations to the Military Establishment totaling $7,091,034,700. The committee proposes several changes in the amounts as submitted to it. These changes are explained in our report. They do not affect the size of the Army upon which the estimates were based. The bill does not provide for the reappropriation of any amounts which may be in unobligated status on June 30, 1946. Any such funds will revert to the general fund of the Treasury. The proposed authorization for fiscal year 1947 is to be compared with estimated obligations during fiscal year 1946 of $19,963,055,064. A part of these funds relate to the atomic energy project and Government and relief in occupied areas. These two activities are not directly attributable to the Military Establishment although at the present time they are assigned to the War Department for accomplishment.

The details of the various programs which are planned for accomplishment by the use of the proposed authorization are fully covered by the printed record and the committee report. I will just briefly summarize these programs for your present information; but do recommend a study of the record for information on the various projects in which you may be individually interested.

ARMY AIR FORCES

The Air Forces' plan for fiscal year 1947 is designed to meet both the requirements of the moment and the long-term peacetime requirements of future security. It is designed around a force-in-being consisting principally of long-range bombers and fighters supported by all the other elements of a balanced force. Programs for research and development, for procurement of aircraft and special equipment needed to support our essential air industry, and for schools and training, have been incorporated to assure an air force qualified to meet any challenge.

The network of air transport routes is being reduced, and a reorganization of major command structures is being put into effect to increase efficiency and assure close cooperation and joint training with the other major services. The experiences of World War II showing the tremendous effectiveness of a closely knit air, land, and sea military team will be closely followed in achieving the maximum efficiency for the peacetime Air Force.

The Air Force fund requirements for fiscal year 1947 provide $368,701,400 for the procurement of 1,046 complete airplanes and $54,457,180 for all other procurement; that is, maintenance and operating supplies and equipment. Operating expenses, exclusive of pay of personnel, amount to $224,038,440. Education and training will cost $4,443,980. The research and development program, exclusive of pay of personnel, will total $160,513,000. The final item to make up the total proposed authorizatior of $1,199,500,000 is $387,346,000 for the pay of civilian personnel for all Air Force activities. These funds cover all Air Force requirements for which the Air Force has budgetary responsibility. The pay, subsistence, clothing, and medical care of Air Force military personnel and general supplies which are common to the whole Army are covered by other appropriations.

I might tell you that during the course of the hearings the committee was shown photographs and artists' sketches of some of the airplanes of the future and told of their peculiar characteristics. When these planes become an actuality, the aircraft of today will be somewhat in the same category as the plane of 1919 is as compared to the present-day long range bombers and fighters. The progress in this field is reaching fantastic proportions; but I am convinced the United States cannot afford to lag behind other nations in this highly important part of our national security structure.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

The Quartermaster's program calls for an authorization of $602,505,100 for Quartermaster Corps activities and $19,000,000 for welfare of enlisted men. This program is closely geared to the strength of the Army and is considered by the committee to be the expected normal requirements. The 1947 fund requirements are considerably less than the estimated obligations for 1946, mainly because of the reduction in troop strength to be supplied. There has also been an appreciable lowering of the authorized levels of supply with a resultant reduction in the quantities in Quartermaster pipe lines to all points where occupation troops are stationed. In computing requirements, it is now possible to eliminate combat and shipping loss factors and to lay greater stress upon food conservation and maintenance and reclamation activities.

In the subsistence program the committee was informed that every effort has been exterted to utilize to the fullest extent all foods which became excess to Army requirements upon the termination of hostilities. On the other hand, we were assured that the War Department is still following its policy of providing the best possible subsistence to the soldier. An increase in all overseas areas, in the supply of perishable items in the form of fruits, vegetables, meats, and dairy products has been made possible by the ending of the war. Accordingly, a solider's diet today, by weight, is composed of approximately 35 percent processed foods. In 1920 the basic garrison ration for the Army was computed at 70.8 ounces costing 43 cents; for 1946 the ration is 81.9 ounces costing 62.7 cents. There were fewer components in the 1920 authorized ration and they weighed less. This comparison does, however, reflect the generally higher food costs of today.

Under its subappropriation "Regular supplies," the Quartermaster Corps provides such items as forage for animals, stationery and office supplies, office machines, sanitary supplies, insecticides, tableware, kitchen equipment, reference books and technical publications, packing and crating supplies and equipment, warehouse equipment, fixed bakery equipment, special mobile equipment, printing supplies, and petroleum products. Even though this appropriation covers many miscellaneous items, the estimates are based on actual anticipated requirements, and there is no provision for any unforeseen contingency. The committee was assured that all stocks on hand, both in the United States and in overseas theaters, had been taken into consideration in computing the requirements under this program.

Requirements for clothing and personal equipage are, of course, greatly reduced from the current year's program. The various items of clothing which will be procured this next fiscal year are detailed on page 301 of the printed record. There are no new items, only the required standard items, to initially equip and maintain the enlisted personnel. One of the reasons for additional procurement is the fact that a certain amount of clothing is retained by an enlisted man upon his discharge from the Army. This fact has tended, of course, to deplete existing stocks which were on hand when the demobilization program got under way in a full-scale manner. As a matter of interest, the items which each enlisted man is allowed to take with him at the time of his discharge are listed on page 302 of the printed record. Our committee was informed that the War Department follows the policy of maintaining and reclaiming all items practicable rather than entering into new procurement. The total dollar value of items to be reclaimed during the fiscal year 1947 will be approximately $107,000,000. All classes of supplies, clothing, and general items will be reclaimed.

ORDNANCE

After having established and generated a great production machine during the war to turn out a flood of guns, tanks, ammunition, and other combat items to insure our victory, the Ordnance Department is now engaged in dismantling this great machine. Contracts have been terminated and claims are being settled. Plants are being converted to commercial work, and disposition is being made of property no longer needed. At the same time, the peacetime needs of the Army must be provided and research must be continued to assure the best weapons.

The budget program of the Ordnance Department covers training, procurement of a small number of newly developed weapons, and maintenance of the arsenals which performed such outstanding services in the early critical days of the war and maintained heavy production throughout the war. Certain plants will be maintained in standby status to meet any future emergency, and great quantities of left-over war equipment will be preserved as war reserve. Many of the items being returned from overseas theaters and from troops in the United States, are in need of repair before they are serviceable for reissue. At the present time, there are approximately 6,000,000 tons of ammunition stored in the United States. There is no requirement for about 20 percent of this amount. It is planned to break down this excess ammunition and sell the various components as scrap. The remainder of the ammunition consists of types which are standard for weapons being retained. About 40 percent of this ammunition will have to be renovated to make it suitable for firing. This is necessary because much of it has been stored in the open for several years and has deteriorated. On account of the large quantities involved, the renovation program will have to spread over a number of years.

One of the larger items in the ordnance program is the storage of ordnance matériel. Already many hundreds of millions of dollars worth of items have been declared surplus; and additional amounts are being declared daily. Only items for which there are foreseeable future needs are being stored. The long-term storage program consists of preparing selected items and placing them in hermetically sealed containers. It is anticipated that items sealed in containers free from all moisture, will remain in a condition ready for issue for a longer period than if they were merely greased and stored subject to humidity variations and condensations.

The Ordnance Department has a big job ahead of it, not only from the standpoint of cleaning up the left-overs of war, but in keeping abreast of the important developments in this very essential part of our national security.

Research must be emphasized and our troops must be trained in the use of the latest weapons.

ENGINEER SERVICE

The Chief of Engineers is charged by law and Army regulations with the supply of engineer materials and equipment, design and construction of facilities for the War Department, maintenance and repair of War Department facilities and the operation of utilities; acquisition, management, and disposal of War Department real estate; development and production of maps for the War Department; mobilization and training of specialized engineer units and personnel; development of improved engineer equipment and techniques; collection and dissemination of engineer intelligence, and the planning of the engineering phases of military operations; and the advising of the War Department general staff on engineer matters.

In addition to fund requirements for the actual construction of facilities in the United States and at overseas bases, funds are needed for procurement of certain engineer supplies and equipment. Engineer items range in variety and in size from small hand tools and hardware, such as hammers, nails, and screws, to large and complex machinery, such as tractors, cranes, crushing and screening plants, and hydraulic dredges.

One of the most important projects under the title "Engineer Service, Army" provides for construction of facilities at permanent overseas bases. To meet specific operational needs, wartime bases were established, war materials were assembled in dumps, ports were hurriedly reopened and put in operation, and troops were placed in temporary field shelter and in tent camps. In order to provide suitable facilities and adequate quarters for the permanent garrisons at certain overseas bases, a long-range program has been developed. There is housing, both permanent and temporary, construction of runways and operating facilities for airfields, construction of storage space and shops, utilities at posts, and miscellaneous facilities. Permanent type construction is contemplated only at permanent bases. The funds in the proposed authorization will cover but a relatively small percentage of the total requirement overseas.

Construction in the United States has been limited in this bill to those items which are required from the standpoint of health, safety, training, or research. The requirements are acknowledged to be far greater than can be taken care of under this bill; but it seems better to defer some of the projects until the materials situation in the United States has eased somewhat and probably more pressing needs have been taken care of. The greater part of the housing provided in this bill for construction in the United States will consist of conversions and temporary structures.

SIGNAL CORPS

The authorization proposed for the Signal Service of the Army will furnish communication services for the Army in the United States, in the occupied areas, and at other points where maintenance of communications is essential; and will provide for important research and development work. A small amount of procurement is proposed to augment existing stocks. Provision is also made for a limited amount of newly designed equipment for extended field tests. The principal items of standard procurement are those which are consumed at a uniform rate, such as electron tubes and dry batteries.

The major expenditures for research and development under this appropriation title will be in the general multipurpose radar field, in continued research in wave propagation in an effort to widen the usable portions of the already crowded radio spectrum, and in improvements in the field and fixed plant applications, including short-, medium-, and long-range ground radio communications equipment.

On the whole, this program represents a large reduction in the amount of communications facilities and services. It is believed to be the minimum amount essential for the conduct of the business of the War Department.

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE

Just like the Ordnance Department, the Chemical Warfare Service has a clean-up job to do in the dismantling of production machinery, redistillation of toxic agents, and the conversion of its wartime plant to a peacetime basis. Fund requirements for fiscal year 1947 are only a small percentage of wartime years.

It should be well understood that the Chemical Warfare Service is primarily a research and development service in addition to its being a procurement, supply, and fighting service. New developments in chemistry and related fields indicate potentialities of destructive power which will dwarf the violence of any destructive agents used in World War II. I believe the security of the Nation depends upon a continued program of military research and development.

I want to digress at this point to comment briefly upon one of the major contributions of Chemical Warfare Service to our victory in World War II. At the beginning of the war, the United States armed forces had no incendiary bombs of their own. Through the perseverance of CWS leaders, authority was obtained to explore this field. After that, providing fire bombs became their biggest single job and, I think, the greatest CWS accomplishment. The damage these bombs did to military targets in Japan and Germany has been well publicized. "Never in the history of aerial warfare," declares an Army Air Forces report, "has such destruction been achieved at such a moderate cost." CWS produced a total of 260,000,000 incendiary bombs. Victory was won after less than one-fifth of that number had been dropped.

MEDICAL

It has been said that never has an army received such splendid medical care and treatment as that accorded the Army of the United States during World War II. The Medical Department's program for fiscal year 1947 is to continue to render the same, and better if possible, fine medical care for which it is recognized. It must continue to procure certain medical supplies and equipment, operate station and general hospitals, dispensaries, depots, and other related Medical Department installations, and perform certain research and development. The fund requirements for the Medical Department are to a great degree influenced by the size of the Army. This program has been reduced to a minimum without sacrificing the high standards of medical care which have been established.

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation of War Department equipment and supplies by commercial carriers ashore and afloat, operation of Army transports in various parts of the world, and operation of Army ports of embarkation at New York, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Seattle, are the requirements of the Transportation Corps during the next fiscal year. The proposed authorization under this title will cover all freight movements of the War Department, other than by air, and other than from the vendor to the first point of use or storage; and will cover movement of personnel by water.

CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

Reactivation of the National Guard, Organized Reserves and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps will occur during fiscal year 1947. From the testimony which the committee heard, we were convinced that the plans were well determined and that the objectives of the leaders of these units could be accomplished. The proposed authorizations for these elements of our national defense system have been carefully considered; and I believe they are adequate.

ATOMIC SERVICE

While considerable of the testimony on the proposed authorization for the continuance of the atomic energy project was off the record, and I am sure you will agree that it should have been, the printed record does contain considerable of the pertinent facts concerning this activity. Inasmuch as the future of this project is more in the "unknown" class than any other, the committee relied to a large degree upon the advice and recommendations of our military leaders in taking action on this part of the bill.

The committee was informed that certain operating contracts must be let before the end of fiscal year 1947 to insure a continuation of the operation into fiscal year 1948. The estimates as submitted to the committee were insufficient to cover these contracts. For that reason, the committee has recommended that the estimates be increased to fully cover the stated requirements of this project. I might say that this increase will not have the effect of spending more money during fiscal year 1947 than had been recommended to the Congress by the President, because expenditures under the operating contracts will not be made until fiscal year 1948. I believe the committee was wise in taking this action. We certainly can leave nothing undone in this highly important development.

GOVERNMENT AND RELIEF IN OCCUPIED AREAS

The committee considered in substantial detail the requirements under this general head. It covers the fund requirements for carrying out the United States occupational responsibilities in Germany, Austria, Japan, Korea, and, to some extent, in the northeast corner of Italy. The War Department has been charged by the President with initial financing of the procurement for those supplies needed to bring feeding, medical care, and transportation up to certain minimum standards which will prevent disease and general unrest, thereby avoiding unnecessary friction between local populations and occupying forces. These supplies are imported into the occupied area wherever it is determined that the local economy is presently not self-sufficient to meet minimum basic dietary and health standards. It is through the medium of these activities that we hope the job of winning the war will be completed and the committee feels that the authorization is a reasonable one for these purposes.

The table on pages 109 and 110 of the hearings contains an itemized account under the heading "Care and handling surplus property," the total of which is $48,326,838. The committee in its deliberations proposed no change in the particular items making up this total amount, although some reductions were made in some of the over-all items in which these particular items are found. It was the purpose of the committee to provide the funds referred to above to enable the War Department to carry on in the same, or similar, manner as heretofore in its care and handling of surplus property, paying for such care and handling of such property from the funds herein provided. To strengthen and clarify the authority of the War Department to so carry on in the care and handling of surplus property there was included in the language found in section 4 of the bill, the section of the bill indicating certain purposes for which funds in the bill might be used, a reference to paragraph 8 of Executive Order 9630 of September 27, 1945, which has reference to the disposal of surplus property in accordance with the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

CONCLUSION

Gentlemen, I have covered the highlights of the programs having major fund requirements in this bill. The committee made a very searching investigation of the estimates as presented to it, and we believe that the bill as finally adopted fairly and reasonably covers the needs of the Military Establishment for fiscal year 1947.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. On page 5, I notice a nonflying officer is allowed up to $60 a month for making a flight of 5 minutes a month. Will the gentleman explain why that is necessary?

Mr. NORRELL. If I mistake not, this provision was placed in the bill several years ago and no change was made this year. It was generally understood that flight personnel must have more training and skill than the Ground Forces in the air services. This was possibly the reason this provision was originally placed in the bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JUNE 24

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wish to use this time to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Assuming that the pending bill is disposed of today there will be no further business this week.

Monday will be District day and completion of H. R. 5857, the Census bill; then S. 896, relating to the retirement annuity of those on retirement where the increase was not made retroactive. This to me is a most worthy bill.

On Monday also the conference report on the strategic stock-pile bill will come up. That conference report has already been filed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And is it to be understood that if a roll call is demanded on Monday it will go over to Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. There is an agreement that after today if on any Monday a roll call should be demanded the roll call will take place the following day, Tuesday.

Tuesday we may meet at 10 o'clock, although I have not submitted this request yet.

The selective-service conference report will be called up. I doubt if the War Department appropriation bill can be finished in time today to complete consideration of the railroad retirement bill. If we cannot take it up today, then the railroad retirement bill will come up on Tuesday; and if that bill is disposed of in time on Tuesday, we will also take up H. R. 6477 which extends the commissioner's loans in relation to agriculture. If that is not taken up on Tuesday it will be disposed of some day next week, and must be because the authority under which those loans are made expired the 20th of June.

Wednesday: Again comes our Calendar Wednesday.

Thursday: We will take up the deficiency bill. We must of course give appropriation bills the right-of-way.

The remainder of the week I am leaving rather flexible because at the end of the fiscal year I have to.

There are other conference reports that might come up on Monday or during the week, such as the OPA if agreed upon, or others.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has reported out three resolutions rejecting the three reorganization plans. I am hopeful that the committee members on both sides will get together and confer with the leadership on both sides as to a day when we can bring them up, a day which the leadership can arrange for them. Of course, it is a matter of high privilege if any Members wants to call them up, but I hope they will not exercise this privilege, and I am sure they will not do that without conferring with the leadership. If necessary, we will bring it up some day next week. We will have to make arrangements for it. In any event I hope that the membership of that committee, as I stated, will confer with the leadership on both sides to see if we cannot work out some time that is satisfactory taking into consideration the busy program we have. I know the House will not misunderstand when I say that we have an awfully busy program and accordingly there has got to be a lot of flexibility. The leadership on both sides will keep the House advised of any changes as far in advance as possible. We have in mind the question of final adjournment and all those matters have to be taken into consideration. The House has been very kind in cooperating with getting legislation through expeditiously and I know the House will continue to do so.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Perhaps the majority leader has not been informed, but the stock-pile minerals bill has been recommitted to conference. The conferees will meet the first part of the week. As I understand the situation it is simply to make some corrections which I do not think will be controversial. I do not believe, however, it can be called up on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and it was as a result of that that I put it down for Monday. I am glad to get the additional information. Under the circumstances, it cannot be brought up on Monday.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman mentions three bills adversely reported having to do with reorganization plans, and the gentleman spoke of the high privilege of these bills. It will be necessary to go before the Rules Committee. I understand, however, unless these plans are acted on before the 16th of July they will become effective. Under the circumstances it is highly important that they be brought up for consideration as speedily as possible. As a member of that committee, I propose to call up these bills in the event they are not presented for consideration by next Thursday or Friday.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. May I say that I talked to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], chairman of the committee, and I am sure there is no disposition on the part of the committee to delay the matter. I was advised that he was going to confer with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], majority leader, looking to the possibility of bringing those up some time next week and trying to get a definite date, the earlier the better.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] has talked

with me on two or three occasions. My note here is that he tried to get them up on Thursday. They have to come up on some day next week. The gentleman will note I stated that I hoped Members on both sides of the committee will confer with the leadership. What I would like to see is the members of the committee get together and agree on 1 or 2 hours to debate the three of them and bring them up all together.

Mr. PITTENGER. We all want to cooperate with the leadership of the House. I know you have difficulties. I hope you will give us a definite date and that it will be on Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday of next week or the week following.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is pleasing to me and the gentleman may rest content that there will be no delay on my part even if I could exercise it. It is simply a matter of tolerance on the part of any Member of the House, having regard for the rest of the program that I am seeking an agreement as far as possible. I hope you can get together and agree on time. Then when you do, let us confer with the leadership on both sides and we will agree on a day as soon as possible.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we are not going to have any trouble on time if you will just give us a date. But we do not want a date when the Members have all gone home.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Of course, the House ought to know that the Committee could take 30 hours on these resolutions. Each of these is privileged for 10 hours of debate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Correct.

Mr. JUDD. But we feel on both sides that we can handle the thing in 2 or 3 hours. I agree that we ought to get it out not later than Thursday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I suggest that you agree on a time, and I will bring it up just as soon as I possibly can. As a matter of fact, in my notes here I have it down for Thursday if we can get rid of the deficiency bill.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT].

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, it has been a pleasure to work with the distinguished members of the Subcommittee on Military Establishments. The committee has made a thorough and comprehensive examination of the program proposed for the fiscal year 1947. We are well aware of the heavy responsibilities which devolve upon our committee to recommend the appropriation for a program for the first year following the war.

In dealing with the Quartermaster Service of the Army, and the testimony of the Quartermaster General, it was estimated the requirements for his department for the fiscal year, 1947, to be $615,706,644, $19,000,000 of which is for enlisted men. We recommended in appropriations $597,750,100, which is a decrease of $17,956,544. The factors involved in the reduction are due to: First, a reduction in troop strength; second, lowering of levels of supply; third, elimination of combat loss factors from their requirements; fourth, increased emphasis of food conservation; fifth, elimination from their program of requirements for international aid and disease and unrest; and the stressing of economy wherever possible.

It is evident that the Quartermaster General is aware of the present urgency for economy and intends to follow in this direction. He assumes the responsibility of maintaining the high standards of his department and to be ready to meet all emergencies at the same time keeping in mind the demands for those things which the civilian population sacrificed while we were actively engaged in war.

Every effort is being made to prevent the waste of food. Qualified personnel, properly trained, are receiving the scope of training in the purchase of food. The estimated reduction in personnel for the fiscal year 1947 is estimated to be 64 percent.

There is a substantial decrease in the estimate for the disposition of remains. This is due to the decrease in the size of the Army, prisoners of war, and in the number of anticipated deaths.

Both General Gregory, the former Quartermaster General of the United States Army, and General Larkin, present Quartermaster General, I believe, have done a good job and are to be complimented for their hard work and fairness.

The Army program for 1947 includes the reestablishment of the National Guard and the ROTC. We understand that the plans for the reconstitution of the National Guard are now being worked out with the States. It was testified to by the Secretary of War that the plans call for 150,000 a year and over a period of 5 years, they hope to get 650,000 men.

It is estimated that $110,000,000 will be required for National Guard activities during the fiscal year 1947 for activation of men and officers; that reasonably complete table of organization equipment will be furnished without cost to the National Guard except when excess War Department stocks are not available. We are given to understand, too, that the Federal Government must provide an even larger portion of the cost of operating the National Guard in order to relieve the financial burden on the States and to create an even more efficient National Guard than existed in 1940, at the time of its induction into Federal service.

In the Air National Guard it is hoped that there will be a striking force to have at least one squadron in each State and two or three squadrons in the larger States.

We were assured a very close technical supervision by experienced personnel over the Air National Guard, arrangements for which would be through the National Guard Bureau. It seems that the War Department is getting their squadrons' officers for the National Guard Reserve and keeping them up to date. Quite likely a considerable number of the Reserve officers are going to take advantage of that. The testimony reveals, too, that eventually the requirements will call for a training rate of 5,400 pilots a year. It was made clear to us that the 22,500 pilots in the Air Reserve are not all that are required in the program, but they will be in need of some 30,000 additional men, who will be available for administrative duties and for combat crew duty other than pilots.

General Spaatz, in his testimony, informed us that in order to keep our Air Force effective they must have a constant influx of Reserve officers on extended active duty. This, in turn, would provide a constant flow to Reserve and National Guard units trained in the latest technique and on the latest equipment.

General Eisenhower, in his testimony before our committee, said:

> The National Guard must be stronger than ever before. This will require the Federal Government to bear a larger share of the operating cost of the National Guard than in the past. The framework of the Organized Reserve is rapidly being reestablished. The plan for this component calls for a portion to be completely organized into units and fully equipped. Legislation to authorize inactive-duty training, with compensation therefor similar to that presently authorized for the National Guard, will be sought. The Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the product of which paid such great dividends during the war, has already been reestablished. All courses have been revamped or are in the process of revamping to take advantage of our recent experience. The future graduate of this great corps will be even better equipped to take his place in the Organized Reserve Corps than his predecessors

Increases of pay, additional assistance in a civilian capacity, additional office equipment and supplies, and overhead facilities must be taken into consideration. The National Guard should be prepared at all times to carry out its assigned mission in peace and in war.

The National Guard's primary interest to the Federal Government is basically required to develop a balanced force in the Army of the United States, and is not essential for State security.

We must remember that when the National Guard was inducted into the Army of the United States their identification as National Guard men was lost.

As to the ROTC, the schools, colleges, and universities are now making their postwar plans, and we should be able to state definitely what our ROTC policies will be.

We are told that—

> Practically all the States feel that they cannot raise the complete number of troops in the troop bases unless they receive Federal aid in the construction of armories and other facilities necessary to house the troops.

With the present unsettled conditions of the world and our responsibilities as one of the leading nations of the world, the next step seems to be to determine the minimum strength of the Army which would enable us to meet those responsibilities.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIBBOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNEY. I was quite interested in listening to the gentleman's discussion of the National Guard. I wonder if the gentleman can give us any information as to just what assistance the Federal Government will give the States in rebuilding the armories to house the new Army, especially the new mechanized outfits.

Mr. TIBBOTT. I will say to the gentleman, that during the hearings the question came before the committee. It is my understanding the matter of assistance to armories was not included in the appropriations for the fiscal year 1947, but would be considered at some future time upon development of the postwar program.

Mr. KEARNEY. The armories as now constituted are wholly inadequate for the housing of these new outfits.

Mr. TIBBOTT. That was understood by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, the members of the committee will note that this bill is for the amount of something over $7,000,000,000. I do not know whether the chairman of the committee or the ranking minority member has brought out the point that not all of it is for military functions. I think I recall during the hearings we developed the fact that something like $1,200,000,000 was for civil functions as conducted by the War Department. The reason I bring that out is because sometime someone may ask us here in peacetime why we are appropriating $7,000,000,000 for the maintenance of an army. If you take the civil functions item of $1,200,000,000 out, you do not have a $7,000,000,000 army. It is my proposal, and has been my proposal to the committee, that next year those items for civil functions as conducted by the War Department be taken out of the military appropriations and put in a separate civil functions bill just as we have many items like the Canal Zone item in the civil functions bill. I think it is only fair because in that way we will then actually reflect the cost to the taxpayer of the maintenance of our Army and of our War Department. This committee went through this bill thoroughly and we did the very best we could. I think we combed every item. I think you can depend on that. We made every cut we possibly could. Sometimes we cut a little more than I wanted and sometimes we did not make quite as much of a cut as I wanted to make. But we struck a happy medium.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would be interested to know whether in the testimony you had during these lengthy hearings you delved into the matter of surplus property held by the Army.

Mr. HENDRICKS. We went into that rather thoroughly.

Mr. BAILEY. And what did you find with reference to surplus property held by the Army?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Does the gentleman mean in regard to the amount of surplus property that they have?

Mr. BAILEY. There is a feeling on the part of some of the officials dealing with surplus property that the Army has not been sufficiently liberal in turning loose some of the surplus compared with what the Navy has been doing.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I do not know whether I can answer that sufficiently or not, but I do not believe the subcommittee feels that the Army is holding on to anything that they should give up. They are getting rid of it just as fast as they can.

Mr. BAILEY. There is a feeling on the part of a great many people that they are not, when they want some surplus property.

Mr. HENDRICKS. That may be true. If you and I wanted a jeep and the Army still had it, we would probably think we should have it, but I think the committee feels the Army is doing a good job in handling surplus property.

Mr. Chairman, there are two items that I want to discuss particularly. Briefly, I want to mention the Tripler Hospital. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], talked about Tripler General Hospital. I want to concede to him that he did uncover a great many things there that we do not approve of and do not condone. I do not condone some of the errors made by the War Department. I do not want to approve of some of the things they want to do. But we have now put safeguards around the War Department in further construction. I believe the gentleman will agree with me on that, in connection with Tripler General Hospital. I wanted to give you some of the background. We are passing all of the blame, it seems to me, on to the War Department and I do not feel that we should do that. If I am incorrect in any of the statements I make in regard to dates and so forth I will be glad to be corrected, because I was not a member of this subcommittee at the time of the inception of Tripler General Hospital. However, as I recall from what I can find out, Tripler General Hospital was started on the orders of the then Chief of Staff, General Marshall. I believe it was in 1942 that General Marshall made a tour of the Pacific, and feeling that the war with Japan would not be ended as soon as it really did end, he felt it would be dragged out, and that we would need adequate hospital facilities. Therefore, he gave directions for the construction of the hospital. As a result of that they started plans for Tripler General Hospital in Honolulu. I had the pleasure of going out there to see that. Just as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] said, I did not know anything about the background of this until we actually visited the site of that hospital. It is unfortunate that during the war much of the discussion before the committees whenever we held discussions about construction abroad, was kept off the record. Therefore, we really do not have a record to go on, to see who was at fault for some of these things. General Marshall was interested in this hospital, I have no doubt, and if he had not felt the war would be dragged out much longer than it was, he would have held up plans until a later date when they could have really made better plans. But you will recall that during the war, especially when it came to installations such as hospitals or any other installation for the benefit of our servicemen, we acted promptly, and in doing so, we often wasted money. The truth of the matter is that war is a waste of money, and you have to continue to build and work and plan and you have to do it rapidly. We found out during the testimony on this bill, after having questioned the engineers and General Kirk, that one of the greatest troubles about Tripler General Hospital and its excessive cost, was the fact that they had to do their work and make their plans so quickly.

These plans were made hurriedly and they are not the kind of plans that we would like to have made. The Veterans' Administration has made better plans. But I want to point out this to you that in the hearings I questioned the Engineer Corps and General Kirk. This appears at page 1022 of the hearings. If you will read this you will get a little clearer picture of what happened.

They point out the excessive cost. I believe the gentleman from Michigan said it was to have cost $8,000,000.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Eleven million five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Eleven million five hundred thousand dollars. The costs went up from time to time They also pointed out that this was partially due to the increased cost of materials and also partially due to the increase in labor costs. I put in the record at the same time the fact that the Veterans' Administration had made proposals to us to build veteran hospitals. I forget the number at the moment, but they are in the hearings here. They gave us a certain amount as needed to build those hospitals throughout the country for the veterans, but a little later they asked for additional funds and to appear before the Deficiency Committee. I was invited to sit in on the hearings, and then I found that in many cases the cost was more than twice as much to build those Veterans' Administration hospitals in this country as they had originally estimated. Now, Tripler Hospital no doubt has increased in cost just the same as these other hospitals. At the same time I think some of the plans they have can certainly be modified and some of the things the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] mentioned can be eliminated.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] did bring out some things that were wrong, but that is not entirely the responsibility of the War Department. They did contact certain members of the subcommittee. At the time they did get tacit assent to beginning construction of Tripler. Those men are not here now. There were three of them, Joe Stearns, of Alabama, Mr. Snyder, and

Lane Powers, who was the ranking minority member. The gentleman from Michigan says he was not informed of this plan and, as he said, did not know anything about it until he saw the hospital out at Honolulu. The truth is that the War Department did come to the committee both of the House and of the Senate, and then on their statements were given tacit assent. Now the fault lies in the fact that Mr. Powers did not inform the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], and it also lies in the fact that there was not a committee meeting called and the thing threshed out and approved formally. I will admit that to the gentleman. On the other hand, it was at a time when we were doing things in a hurry, but they did come up and get tacit assent. They also went over to the Senate and got tacit assent from that body, too. At a later date it was brought out—and you will find the conversation here on page 1025 of the hearings between General Kirk and Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, chairman of the same committee in the Senate, in which the Senator said that there was money sufficient in here without being earmarked for the construction of this hospital.

So now we have it in this position, that the construction that they have started on already they may continue, and in addition to that we gave them the right to continue on with three or four other projects—I do not recall which they are at the present time, but they are in the report at page 7—they can continue with them because we felt it was necessary to complete the hospitals for use in January. Except for these four which have not been constructed which amount to two million and some hundred thousand, if they are going to do any more construction they must come to the Military Affairs Committee for authority and then come before this subcommittee for their funds. Therefore, they cannot continue without the consent of Congress.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that this is the only permanent hospital in the Pacific for our Army, and that in addition to that provisions are made for the veterans under the direction or at the request of the Veterans' Administration.

I am interested in that particularly because my committee has to handle veterans affairs. We do not want to lose track of the fact that if we are going to build a hospital, and it has been started, we want to build a good hospital because it is the only general and permanent hospital in the Pacific. We have bases out there which I am going to talk about later. Because something was done wrong here previously, we must not do something to delay the construction of facilities that are necessary, not only for the members of our armed forces but for the veterans who will use the hospital.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from California .

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Out near and bordering my district there are two large Army hospitals that were built there by the Army for treatment of their prisoners. I believe I can say from a visual examination of the buildings that they are permanent. We anticipated that when the Army was through with them, which they are now, the Veterans' Administration would take them over. When that was suggested to the Veterans' Administration or the Veterans' Committee, they said, "No; these hospitals are not adequate for our patients. They are not efficient, they are not the right kind of hospitals."

Does not the Army in building a hospital have in mind its possible use by other governmental agencies, and also is not the hospital problem an old problem? When they build one of those hospitals, there are certain principles and fundamentals that are well known which they should have put into those hospitals.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I would like to answer the gentleman briefly, because I have something here I want to discuss and my time is passing. I do not know the two hospitals the gentleman is talking about; however, up to now the hospitals that the Veterans' Administration felt were of a permanent nature were accepted. Some of these may look permanent on the outside but they still may not be fireproof and the Veterans' Administration is not going to use them. We do not want them unless they are fireproof and of permanent construction because it may be a danger to the patients. The policy of the Veterans' Administration is to take the permanently constructed hospitals, and then they want them to be near medical centers, and I think they should be near medical centers. I would like to talk with the gentleman about that later and I will be glad to do so about their policy. So far we have approved the hospitals that the Veterans' Administration has taken and the policy they have followed, in our committee. I will be glad to discuss this with the gentleman later.

I want to discuss with the members of the committee for a few minutes our bases in the Pacific. I had the pleasure of going out there with the late Buell Snyder and the members of our committee. We visited many of the bases which I shall discuss with you. May I say that we took these bases in the Pacific at a great cost in manpower, in lives of our boys, and in money. In fact, I may say that it cost billions of dollars to build the bases that we have out there now. I have some figures here in regard to what it cost us in lives. I will not give a break-down and these figures exclude the Navy. Including the lives we lost on Okinawa by the Navy and on the other islands by the Marine Corps and Army, we lost a total of 90,289 men. When we bring in the Navy's total on islands aside from Okinawa and include the lives which we lost out in the Pacific on battleships and in one way and another, I imagine they will run well above 100,000 men.

We have certain bases out there which were mandated to us. There are one or two of them. We took other bases or other islands on which we have established bases, which were mandated to Japan after the last war. In addition to that we have bases on islands which were under the sovereignty of the British Empire and of France and of the Netherlands.

I want to discuss with you what I think we ought to keep out there.

I brought a map in here which I have marked, which will give you some idea of the picture that I am trying to get across to you.

OUR PACIFIC OUTPOSTS

Our complete and final victory over Japan has placed the United States in possession of many of the strategic islands of the Pacific Ocean formerly controlled by the Japanese. Our Pacific adversary has been smashed, and the ring of strategic bases which were his outposts have been wrested from a desperate and fanatical enemy in battles which are glorious pages in American history. The names of Tarawa, Kwajalein, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa will resound like bugle calls as long as men respect valor; but they also will bring back the memory of bloody struggles which required incredible efforts by our land, sea, and air forces in the mightiest combined operations the world has ever known; efforts which cost us heavily in ships, in planes, in supplies, and, above all, in the lives of thousands of our finest young men. The price of victory was not a light one.

Millions of American dollars and uncounted hours of American toil were poured into these islands, once they had been taken from the enemy, in order that they might be made suitable stepping stones to bring us to grips with the enemy on his own shores. The skill and devotion to duty of our engineers, both Army and Navy, were a fitting complement to the valor of our assault troops. Roads were built, harbors developed, and airfields carved from mountain and jungle, in what can truly be described as modern miracles. Great bases sprang up where formerly a few miserable Jap huts had stood in fever-ridden swamps. From the easternmost tip of New Guinea, through the scattered islands of the Philippine Archipelago and on tiny coral atolls in the watery wastes of the Central Pacific, the blood, treasure, and talents of America were expended without stint to build a highway to the heart of Japan.

Every man and woman in the Nation hopes and prays that never again will there be war. Nevertheless, the advances of modern science, which make possible weapons of greater destructiveness, range, and stealth than any the world has heretofore known, make mandatory the securing of our shores against attack from any quarter. World War II gave the faintest preliminary indication of the destruction which can be wrought with guided missiles and atomic bombs. A war in the future could bring devastation from the sea, from the air, and from long-range guided missiles launched from distant shores. All these would make man's worst efforts to date seem like the work of children.

An adequate military posture demands that we possess bulwarks against aggression, sufficiently distant from our own shores to screen them against attack

from any quarter whatsoever. Our possession of such bases denies to any enemy their use as sites from which offensive operations could be launched against us.

To rely merely on defenses within or close to our own shores would be to invite disaster. Our minds reel when we consider what might have resulted if the Japanese had attacked Hawaii with forces large enough to wrest those strategic islands from us. From such a position, our west coast could easily have been assailed, and our people would have learned at first hand the horrors that the Jap brought to Nanking and Manila.

If we are to keep an enemy from our shores, we must have bases which are capable of being defended and supplied, and so located as to protect our air lanes, sea lanes, and continental shores. The system must have depth and flexibility, so that penetration of any one area by the enemy will not result in catastrophe. World War II has demonstrated for all time that, far from being a bulwark against invasion, an ocean is, instead, an open and inviting road to the heart of a nation which is weak.

The islands of the Pacific were bought with American blood and developed by American sweat and money. They must remain available as bases for the defense of the United States against any aggressor. Certainly, we have fully earned the right to insure that these vital shields of our western flank will never again be used against us.

Much remains to be done before we possess a well developed and adequate system of bases in the Pacific. Many of the bases which we now occupy were developed at top speed during the war. A breathless haste was the order of the day, in order that the bases might fill their operational missions. It was imperative that airfields be constructed in the shortest possible time, so that we could relentlessly press our attack on the enemy. Such airfields are not now adequate for the operation of the heavy-type aircraft now being produced. They must be strengthened, or in some cases reconstructed or even entirely relocated, to eliminate operational hazards which had to be accepted in wartime.

Further, our logistical arrangements on these installations must be adapted to peacetime use. Permanent storage facilities, depots, and repair shops must be provided, if installations are to be operated with reasonable economy. We can no longer operate supply dumps on an open beach as we did during the war. In tropical heat and rain or in Arctic snows, equipment and supplies deteriorate with appalling speed if adequate protection is not provided.

In peacetime, permanent housing is required for military personnel and their families. In the base areas which we propose to retain and develop, much of the construction is of such filmsy nature as to be entirely unsuitable. Substantial housing must be provided for the health, safety, and well-being of our troops and their familes. We cannot ask American soldiers to live in substandard facilities at a time when every effort is being made to encourage enlistments in the Army and to improve generally the lot of our fighting men.

If, then, we are to have the system of adequate bases so vital to our very existence, we must provide permanent construction to include airdromes which can accommodate the largest aircraft now projected by our great airplane industry; and adequate storage and repair facilities and troop housing of a standard which can be countenanced by the American people. The system of bases which I visualize must include many of those islands of the Pacific which were formerly Japanese mandates or possessions, such as Saipan, Tinian, Okinawa, and Iwo Jima, which were won by the valor of American arms. If you will look at the map you will note that these bases which I mention are Army bases and run in a circular curve southward to Guam and Okinawa and do not include an outer circle which we should have of naval bases. I think we should maintain our control of these bases without any question from anyone. In addition to the bases which I have named and which were either owned by Japan or under Japanese mandate, we plan for an Army base near Manila and for at least a refueling station at Kwajalein in the Marshalls. I should also like to say that the Navy, in my opinion, should have a base on New Caledonia and Manus which is in the Admiralty group. I realize, of course, that New Caledonia is under French sovereignty and that Manus is under British sovereignty or is a mandate of Australia. I do not know what steps the State Department is taking in regard to these bases but I know what steps they should be taking. They should be negotiating for bases in both New Caledonia and in the Admiralties. In the Admiralties the Army alone spent about $140,000,000. The Navy has a great base and a fine harbor and should by all means retain that base.

I wish you would observe this chain of bases which I propose that the United States maintain, first beginning with our Army and Navy bases on the island of Oahu in the Hawaiians and then in an outer circle the Navy base on New Caledonia, a Navy base on Manus in the Admiralties, a Navy base in the Philippines, at Leyte, a naval base on Okinawa, and, of course, our naval base at Dutch Harbor, in the Aleutians. This, as I said, is the outer circle of protective bases. The inner circle would begin with our Army and Navy bases at Honolulu with our refueling stop at Kwajalein in the Marshalls, and Army and Navy bases on Guam, Saipan, and Tinian, an Army base near Tokyo on the Tokyo Plain and an Army base on Attu, in the Aleutians, and end with our Navy base at Dutch Harbor, in the Aleutians.

There may be those who question the propriety of such proposals. I want it clearly understood that I am expressing only my own thoughts on the matter, but I have found that my thoughts are corroborated by those who have studied international affairs and the danger of an open gate in the Pacific. Whether you agree with me or not in this statement, I feel that the influence of the British Empire and their military power was much more potent in the days before the last war than they are now, and yet the Japanese were able to take the great bases of Hong Kong and Singapore and the Netherlands East Indies, and, of course, our own bases in the Philippines and control all of the mid-Pacific and southwest Pacific. The United States is the only power that was able to clear the Pacific of the Japanese. The United States will remain the only power in the Western Hemisphere who can maintain control of the Pacific. If you will observe these bases you will see that so long as we hold this outer circle of bases beginning at Hawaii, with a base in New Caledonia if it is possible to get such a base, a base at Manus in the Admiralties which we must have, and also bases on the Philippines, Okinawa, Tokyo, Attu, and Dutch Harbor, no power can break through. With the bases at Okinawa, Tokyo, Attu, and Dutch Harbor, we hold both hinges of the gate to the Pacific in this direction. With the bases at Oahu, Manila, Manus, the Marshalls, and the Hawaiians we hold both hinges to any gate to the Pacific in the mid- and southwest Pacific. As a deterrent to any aggressor these bases will contribute to the effectiveness of the United Nations Organization. We earnestly pray that the United Nations Organization will save the world from another terrible war; but if we are to do our share toward making that Organization adequate, the United States itself must be strong. Support of the United Nations and our own security, demand that the islands of the Pacific be adequately defended and properly organized. This bill contains $195,000,000 for the consolidation of our overseas bases. I urge your earnest support of this amount. Any other course would only lead to a heedless destruction of the fruits of victory, and is an invitation to a tragedy which might well mean an end to western civilization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I will be glad to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman recollects, of course, that several years before this war started some of us wanted to fortify the island of Guam.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I mentioned that.

Mr. MAY. If we had done that, we probably would not have lost it in the beginning, but, having lost it and paid for it in both blood and money, as we did in all of these bases, I think we ought to keep them.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I have heard that story so often, and I am simply surprised that the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, in the face of the knowledge that should be in his hands as chairman of that committee, would have the audacity to stand up here and make the statement he has just made with respect to Guam. I hope in a few days to give the gentleman some information on that subject. If he knows the war plan of

the Chiefs of Staff that was adopted—rainbow 5—as he should know it as chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, he will know that the Joint Chiefs of Staff from the very beginning have ruled, and have it in writing, that Guam was not defendable and could not be defended, and never was there a proposal to fortify the island of Guam. Do not bring that old red herring in here because you are going to be exposed in a few days when we make our Pearl Harbor report. The gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. MAY. I do know what I am talking about.

Mr. KEEFE. I know the gentleman does not when he makes that statement.

Mr. MAY. I hope the gentleman will withdraw that from the RECORD.

Mr. KEEFE. I am tired of hearing those statements made.

Mr. MAY. I offered the amendment here myself to fortify it, and the RECORD will show it.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I hope the argument between the two gentlemen is settled to their satisfaction and the satisfaction of everyone in the House, but I am afraid we will be arguing the fortification of Guam as long as the history of the United States exists.

I want to say this myself in regard to the fortification of Guam. Whether we were attempting to fortify it with $5,000,000 or not, and I do not know whether you would call that fortification or just improvement, does not make any difference. It simply reveals the policy that when we should have been fortifying Guam and our bases in the Pacific against aggression, when we should have seen what Japan was doing, and we tried to get only $5,000,000, this House voted it down. That is a clear indication of what would have happened if we tried to get something to fortify our bases in the Pacific.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The reason why it was not fortified is because we had been told for five long years before that by the United States Navy that Japan was just a breakfast spell and we did not need to pay any attention to her and could lick her in 3 months.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I will not comment on that.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I intended to speak on the question of bases. I knew that the gentleman from Florida was going to talk about them. I think he has presented the matter to the committee very ably. In my judgment the war with Japan was made possible and probable by the secret treaty between England and Japan made during World War I and before the United States entered that war whereby in the case of victory, Japan was to have the Mariannas, the Carolines, and the Marshall Islands, and England was to have the Gilberts. When World War I was over, big-hearted Uncle Sam said, "We do not want a thing in the world but just the privilege of paying for the war." The result was that Japan did get those islands and England did get the Gilberts. All we had left was Wake and Guam. I am not blaming England because England was in a tight spot when that agreement was made. The possession of the Mariannas, the Carolines, and the Marshalls by Japan, together with other islands like Okinawa and that string of islands, together with the inability of England to defend the Gilberts, enabled Japan, as they knew they would be able to, to block the United States completely from the Philippine Islands. No Guam or Wake fortifications could have saved us. The committee was unanimous that that must not occur again and that the United States should keep those islands if for no other reason than that no other nation could come in and fortify those islands against us. Is that not correct, may I ask the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is correct as I understand it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it the gentleman's view and the feeling of the committee members that we should not join with any group or anybody in a trusteeship of the bases indicated on the map by the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. It is my opinion we should retain those islands ourselves. Let us take Manus Island. Manus Island in the Southwest Pacific was owned by Germany. In World War I Germany lost it. It was mandated by the League of Nations to Australia. Australia was unable to hold it. Japan took it and we took it from Japan by a great sacrifice and spent $140,000,000, as I recall, on Army installations alone in addition to what the Navy did. It was an Australian mandate. If the Navy needs it, I say we should be just as realistic about it as Joe Stalin is and we should keep it. I think Australia would agree to that. That is how I feel about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, what I shall say pertains to defense, but I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the people of the United States have invested in the Tennessee Valley Authority dams, reservoirs, generators, transmission lines, and other power facilities, in round figures, $750,000,000. The Authority has just completed the Fontana Dam, in Fontana, N. C. The Congress, in December 1941, authorized the construction of the Watauga Dam and the Holston Dam, the Watauga Dam being on the Watauga River a few miles east of Elizabethton, in Carter County; the Holston Dam being above Kingsport, on the Holston River. Approximately $4,500,000 has been spent on the Watauga Dam and $6,500,000 has been spent on the Holston Dam. Work on the Watauga Dam was stopped by the War Production Board in 1942, and work on the Holston Dam was stopped in 1943, due to a shortage of critical materials. H. R. 6777 carried a provision of some $10,000,000 for resumption of work on these two projects. It was eliminated by the committee on the theory that strategic materials might be required that otherwise could go into veterans' housing. Investigation discloses, however, that these dams are, for the most part, to be constructed of earth and rock.

This further fact argues in favor of resumption of work on them at this time: The TVA has a trained force of men who are ready to go from the completion of the Fontana Dam, with salvaged materials and heavy construction machinery, directly to work on the Watauga Dam at this time. If they are not put to work on these dams they will be dispersed and it will cost a large sum of money to reassemble such a force.

In addition to that, this work that has been done up there, the construction work that has been done on these two dams, more than $10,850,000, by a delay of 1 or 2 years will deteriorate in value, and the Government will suffer heavy loss on this account. In addition to that, the Authority has equipment up there. It has installations there. It has housing there. It has contracted for office space in Elizabethton. There is a pool of available labor within 40 miles of the Watauga Dam of 20,886, according to the employment facilities in charge of that matter at Elizabethton. I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. Frank B. Poteat, area director of the United States Employment Service, stating this to be true. In addition to that, more than 75,000 men within a radius of 40 miles of the Watauga Dam on which it is proposed to resume work at this time, served in the armed forces of this country. Most of them are back home and thousands of them desire to work on this project. These men live in their own homes and reside within easy access of the dam sites. No appreciable quantity of critical materials will be required in the construction of these dams during the first 2 years of work on them.

These are multiple-purpose dams. They are for the purpose of flood control, and for the purpose of producing power. At Elizabethton, in 1940, which is an industrial city in a section of the country built upon and surrounded by river bottom lands—at Elizabethton and vicinity a flood from the waters of the Watauga caused approximately $6,000,000 damage.

There was destruction of residences, damage to railroads, damage to farm lands, and there was loss of life. There are installations there, rayon plants, that cost over $26,000,000, where 6,000 people are employed daily. Rayon, of course, was most vital to the defense of this country during the war.

At Kingsport, which is an industrial city of 75,000 people, is one of the greatest ordnance plants in the world. It was constructed during this war. It is a place

where we made our most devastating explosives. That is in the lowlands, and it would be threatened by floodwaters from the Watauga River because the Watauga runs into the Holston between Kingsport and Elizabethton. Kingsport is situated on the Holston River. So you have all those arguments from the standpoint of giving the people employment, from the standpoint of economy, and the saving of the work that has already been done and accomplished, and the necessity for flood control because floods may occur at any time. In addition to these facts, the Watauga Dam, when completed, will be capable of producing 50,000 kilowatts of prime power. This dam will produce 50,000 kilowatts of prime electrical energy, which means power that is produced day in and day out every day in the year. Holston Dam will have installed in it a 30,000-kilowatt generator which in turn will produce 30,000 kilowatts of prime power day in and day out the year around. These waters that are impounded by these two dams will go on downstream on the Holston, and passing out of Sullivan County through Hawkins and Hamblen into Grainger, these waters will flow into the Cherokee Dam, and from that dam they will flow down the Holston into the Tennessee at Knoxville, where the junction of the Holston and the French Broad form the Tennessee. With the aid and support of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who is sitting before me at this time, on the tenth day of my membership in this House, he and five other Republicans made possible the building of the dam at Lenoir City costing $40,000,000, which also will utilize this water as it comes down the stream. It will go from there to the Watt's Bar Dam, from there to Hale's Bar Dam, from there to Chickamauga Dam, and on down to Wheeler, Pickwick, and Kentucky Dams. Thus we can use this water impounded in these two dams at each of the downstream dams I have named, and thus increase the production of power at each and all of them.

I wish to impress upon you, Mr. Chairman, and upon the Members of this House the urgency of this matter. The resumption of work on these dams is a matter of economy and is in furtherance of the national defense and for the welfare of the whole country. We all realize that the Tennessee Valley Authority made a most notable contribution to the national defense during this war. That is why the Government built the atomic bomb down there in my district. The Tennessee Valley Authority furnished power in great quantities.

There were also available trustworthy and patriotic men and women to do the work. This current will be needed down there. It will save coal, because such vast quantities of electric current are used in that project at Oak Ridge that at some times it is necessary to use not only this hydroelectric power but to use as much as 40 railroad cars of coal per day in the most modern and efficient steam-generating power plant in the world there at Oak Ridge at this bomb plant.

Then there is a personal reason that I want to urge, and I think it will not have a bad effect on my colleagues over on this side of the Chamber. Both of these dams are in the district represented by our colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE]. This people and he himself are tremendously interested in the completion of these two dams. I have here a stack of telegrams and letters from hundreds of citizens of east Tennessee appealing to the Congress that work on these dams be resumed. Let me say that the Senate will likely restore this appropriation of approximately $10,000,000 for the resumption of work on these dams, and I am taking this opportunity to set these facts forth in order that when the conference report comes in you will know what it will mean to the people of this country and to the people of upper east Tennessee, western North Carolina, and western Virginia to complete these two projects. They have been authorized by the Congress. They can be built more cheaply now than later. The danger of destructive floods will be eliminated, power will be produced, employment furnished to veterans, and the Tennessee Valley Authority will be enabled to further serve the people of that region and the whole country. Let us build these dams now at less money than they otherwise hereafter could be completed for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I notice in this bill an appropriation for $375,000,000 for the further development of atomic energy. I have no particular quarrel with that, but I rather imagine that this item of $375,000,000 or an expenditure of better than $1,000,000 per day for a year comes rather as a surprise to the American people.

Some time ago, the Honorable JOSEPH MARTIN, minority leader of the House, introduced House Resolution 325, a resolution resolving that before the United States adopts compulsory military service, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the personal representatives of the President of the United States on the United Nations Organization be and hereby are urged to work unceasingly for an immediate international agreement whereby compulsory military service shall be wholly eliminated from the policies and practices of all nations.

This resolution, Mr. Chairman, has had my wholehearted support. The resolution was referred to the House Military Affairs Committee, which committee up to date has not seen fit to take action thereon. I am inclined to feel that now is a most propitious time for this legislation to be passed and I intend to do my utmost to obtain action by the Military Affairs Committee through calling for a vote on this resolution.

As we are all aware, great discussion is going on amongst the nations of the world as to what should be done on an international basis, regarding control of atomic energy. It has been suggested that atomic control vested in a world organization is the best answer as to how we can safely handle this new-found power. The Military Affairs Committee of the House is presently considering the McMahon bill, which sets up a United States commission of five men who would have absolute control of all atomic matters in this Nation.

The other day Bernie Baruch offered to make a deal on the part of the United States for international control of all atomic matters with other nations of the world toward complete abolition of all atom bombs and further atomic developments which might be used as instruments of war. A ready response came from Russia, one of our allies of World War II. As we so well know, Russia up to this time is not equipped nor do they have complete knowledge nor have they been able to keep abreast with the United States in atomic development, and therefore it is easily understandable why they so gladly expressed a willingness to cooperate to the end that military atomic force and development be done away with.

This brings me to my point; namely, that if the nations of the world because of their known lack of information, know-how, or ability to create atomic bombs and weapons are so overwhelmingly willing to support the suggestion by Mr. Baruch that all atomic bombs held by the United States be destroyed and that all atomic energy and development be placed under control of an international organization, then it likewise seems reasonable to me that Russia in particular and other of our allies might well agree through action by the United Nations to cooperate and formulate an agreement which will wholly eliminate compulsory military service as a practice and policy of every nation.

If, I repeat, nations of the world are willing to agree to do away with atomic energy and place development of this destructive power under the control of an international body, with the same reason, Mr. Speaker, and with the same logic, we can and have the right to ask that compulsory military training likewise be done away with on the part of all nations.

I do hope and trust that we can obtain quick favorable action on the Martin resolution to abolish conscription.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman has made a most interesting suggestion. I wonder if the gentleman would carry that a little further and suggest international control in the same way of the use of gas and other lethal weapons for conducting war.

Mr. ARENDS. I see no reason why that could not be done, for the simple reason that we are trying to do away with atomic energy and force because it is an instrument of war with which we do not want to deal, and by the same logic we should do away with the other weapons, because our only hope is that we may

somehow or other develop a lasting peace in this world.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That might even be carried further if we are going to suggest that Russia apply to her own weapons the same logic which she is proposing in asking us to destroy the atom bomb before we set up controls, and that might even be applied to asking them to abandon compulsory military training as a further solution of the whole problem of postwar military training.

There is one other thing in the gentleman's remarks on which I would like to comment briefly. He referred to $375,000,000 as being more than $1,000,000 per day. Of course, the gentleman is aware of the fact that the appropriation is not based on that rate of expenditure in fiscal 1947. The appropriation is based upon the Budget request for $200,000,000 for fiscal 1947 and a subsequent expenditure in 1948 of $197,000,000, most of which must be contracted in 1947. The committee thought that instead of making an appropriation of $200,000,000 now plus contractual authority for $175,000,000 and then a subsequent appropriation of $197,000,000 for expenditure in 1948 it would be better to make the $375,000,000 appropriation at this time in order to save confusion and double charges of expenditures for this project.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. All I wanted to do was to tell the gentleman that I very much agree with his remarks, and that to prove it I introduced a resolution very similar to the one he mentioned. I believe it is along that road that we have got to travel if we are going to save mankind.

Mr. ARENDS. In our dealing with the UNO, we should take advantage of all these opportunities.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There is quite a large sum in this bill for laboratories for the development of the atom bomb; am I correct in that?

Mr. ARENDS. The whole question of atomic energy; yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And they are looking at various Army bases with a view to establishing laboratories.

Mr. ARENDS. They are going on with this development every day, as the gentlewoman knows.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be brief. After listening to the debate this afternoon I am inclined to vote against this bill, not because I do not believe in an adequate army, and not because I do not believe in national defense, and not because I do not believe in the War Department, because I do believe in all those, and I believe we need them more now than ever before. I think the debate this afternoon challenges consideration on the part of the Members of this House. I refer particularly to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], in which he pointed out the facts—and I do not know whether he is correct about everything he said—and developed the idea that there was somebody in the higher brackets in the War Department and in the Army who did not know the value of a dollar in peacetime. I am afraid that that is correct.

It seems to me that Congress ought to have better control of the policies of the War Department, and it seems to me that the men in the higher brackets in the War Department ought to recognize and ought to measure up to the responsibilities that rest upon them to the American people. I do not believe they are doing that. Some of them are going to wonder why some day, as to the reason the Members of this House voted against the draft bill, and some will vote against it when it comes along again very shortly for a vote. It is going to be because we do not think they know what they are doing.

When I was listening here this afternoon to the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], I thought of that nonsensical report that is now reposing in the files of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of this House in connection with a bill I introduced providing that Congress take over the Inspector General of the Army so that we have somebody over in the War Department and in the Army who could tell Congress the truth, so that Congress could act intelligently. What do you suppose happened? The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] got a letter, of which I have a copy, saying that it would just be too bad if we let the Congress interfere with the policy-making people in charge of the things that really count in the War Department.

I want to say that until and unless we know that we have somebody who is making policies that are correct, Congress had better exercise that prerogative, which started back in the days of George Washington, when Baron Von Steuben was the first Inspector General of the Army, in the Revolutionary War.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not want to minimize at all the salutary effects of the gentleman's remarks, but I think that for the record we ought to differentiate between the appropriation situation on this bill and on the bills throughout the war. During the war we did appropriate large sums, and we had a transfer clause in those bills. It was under the transfer clause that the War Department was able to transfer funds from one purpose to another. It was necessary during the emergencies of the war, we felt, to have a transfer clause because of unexpected situations developing in the stress of battle. However, in this bill the transfer clause has been eliminated and the funds are appropriated under specific terms, so that at least we are trying to prevent the happening under this bill of what perhaps happened during the war.

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank my colleague for his contribution. What I said about having Congress appoint the Inspector General in the Army, who can go out for us and get facts without any fear that the Secretary of War or the high ranking brackets in the War Department will cut his head off if he does not bring us the right kind of a report, is still very much in point. I believe Congress ought to have a closer approach and a closer contact, especially in peacetime, with the expenditure of $7,000,000,000. I do not minimize the importance of the War Department in wartime. We all did support it and trust it.

I have over in my office, Mr. Chairman, newspaper clippings which just came to me, showing pictures of Army vehicles which have been deteriorating for months and months and the implication is that in due time they will become of no value. This is a direct charge of waste. It is a reflection upon the War Department. I wonder if those high-ranking men in the War Department who are asking for $7,000,000,000 in this peacetime world of ours are responsible for letting these Army vehicles rot and go to rack and ruin. These charges that have come to me may not be true. I have requested a report. I know in advance, however, that that report will be a "white-wash," and that nobody is going to admit that anybody made any mistakes. They do not do business that way in the Army. I do not like to criticize, but I want to repeat that the men in whom we placed so much confidence in wartime and the men who had the spending of billions upon billions of dollars in wartime have, in my opinion, failed in almost every way to measure up to their responsibilities to the American people since the close of the war.

I fear that money which they could and did spend, and justify during wartime, will now in peacetime be wasted by men in high command with extravagant ideas. That is exactly what our distinguished colleague from Michigan has told us has been and is being done. How can anyone justify a vote for a large peacetime army in the face of these serious charges which have gone unchallenged on the floor of this House?

If we had an Inspector General of the Army who was appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Representatives, we would then be able to find out the truth about these enormous expenditures. Such a person should be solely responsible to Congress. He should hold office for a definite period of time and he should not be removed except by a concurrent resolution of Congress. He should make reports to Congress. He should represent Congress so that Congress would know what was going on among the policy-making officials in our armed forces. I would not hesitate, so I would start in with the Secretary of War and then give attention to those under him and selected for important and far-reaching responsibilities. If we had such an official, he and his subordinates would have a very wholesome effect

upon the professionals in our armed forces, upon those who are indifferent to the fact that the American taxpayer is entitled to consideration and is entitled to have his dollars spent wisely and not wasted as has been charged on the floor of the House today.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge the enactment of H. R. 5122, Seventy-ninth Congress, a bill which I introduced to place the Inspector General of the Army under the jurisdiction of Congress. Those of you who are interested ought to examine the letter which Mr. Robert P. Patterson, Esq., alias the Secretary of War, wrote under the date of May 21, 1946, to the gentleman from Kentucky, the Honorable ANDREW J. MAY. It is a most rarefying expression of opinion, emanating in the brain of someone tinctured with the doctrine of infallibility, and, reading between the lines, it points rather plainly to the conclusion by the War Department that Congress should attend to its own business and let the brass hats do whatever they like. I do not subscribe to that philosophy, and I shall press for hearings and for a vote on H. R. 5122.

There is a lot more I could say about this bill and to its great advantage, and many things in its favor, but time does not now permit. I am serving notice, however, that you will hear from me again on this subject. Sometimes we have to protect America from its friends, as well as its foes outside the Territorial limits. This bill which I have introduced will serve that purpose.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the first duty we have in these terribly critical days is to try to prevent war, not to prepare for it. It may be that we have to pass a bill like the present one in order to achieve the end of preventing war. This has been called the American century. What is it going to portend? I was in conversation the other evening with a gentleman who represents here in Washington one of the British Commonwealth nations. He told me the United States is the only Nation in the world that any other nation completely trusts. I believe that is true. I believe in the disturbed times through which we are passing now the strength of the United States can be an extremely important factor making for peace. If this is not the case, then God help our children. It is our solemn duty to make it the case.

One reason a substantial military strength in the United States is necessary is because we are up against a world problem presented by a great dictatorship whose aims and purposes we know not and whose will to expansion seems to be very great indeed. Some limit evidently has to be placed against the expansion of any power if the world is to live at peace—particularly if the freedom of other and weaker peoples is involved. When Secretary Byrnes said as he did to the United Nations that it is impossible to have peace if any nation, however large, can achieve its ends by the use of force, what he said implied that the United Nations would have to be prepared to see that such things did not happen. I know the strength of this country has to be maintained, for some of the reasons I have already given.

But the question still remains whether in the eyes of the rest of the world American power is going to appear as an attempt at American domination or whether it is going to appear as a means of implementing American leadership toward peace. It all depends on whether the forces provided for in this and other bills are held in trust for all mankind or whether they are intended as a constant means to power for this Nation alone. Are we willing, for example, as soon as a balance is established and peace made, to give up the right to decide military policy unilaterally for ourselves and start on the road toward the internationalization not only of atomic weapons but of all weapons of mass destruction? The gentleman from Illinois spoke very ably a few moments ago in answering the question of the gentleman from South Dakota and said he believed that it was along that road that we had to travel. I believe that too, for I know that the alternative to it is an armament race in the development of weapons against which there can be no defense for people behind the lines.

I know that it will be an armament race in the development of weapons which can wipe out civilian populations and the civilization of nations and render utterly impossible the continuance of that kind of free democracy that America has believed in—regardless of the outcome of such a war.

So the question remains after we pass this bill: How hard are we going to work for peace? Peace cannot be won by any appeasement of Russia or by failing to stand up for what this Nation knows to be right under all circumstances; a strong policy is the only one that the Russians will understand. It is the way they operate themselves. But neither can peace possibly result from an armament race, or by permitting the growth of suspicions between nations. Peace can only be won by a policy of give and take, a policy of open, bold dealing, above all, a policy of challenging the world with measures that we know can lead to peace. Once already, indeed in the greatest field of all, America has done that thing and when our representative on the United Nations Atomic Energy Committee made that memorable address which I had the honor to insert in the RECORD, it was the voice of a great nation speaking because that voice said:

> We will throw into the scales for peace everything we have provided only * * * that every nation will accord to an international authority composed of the best scientists, engineers, and others the unlimited right to enter the borders of every nation, to go wherever they will, to control the production of atomic energy and to exercise police power to prevent possession or development of any atomic weapons. For then all peoples can know what is happening in all other countries and their representatives on this authority can go home and assure their people that indeed this agreement is being kept.

I remind the gentleman from Illinois in this respect the American proposal is altogether different from the Russian proposal, which provides for no such international controls.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much.

Indeed the whole genius of the American proposal is that all the peoples of the world should be able to know at all times that no other nation is violating the agreement. In other words, America offers, in the field of atomic weapons, a bold new plan for enforceable disarmament.

And now I want to call the attention of the membership to an article appearing in the Reader's Digest, written by William Hard and Andre Visson, entitled "Let Us Get Off the Road to War." I hope every Member of the House will read that article. It calls on us for movements toward peace and away from war. It proposes that instead of fortifying an area like the Aleutian Islands, that we propose that no one fortify any area in the North Pacific, that Russia agree to make no fortifications in that area if we do not, and that both be allowed to satisfy themselves at any time that the agreement is being kept. Instead of fortifying the islands off the coast of China, the article suggests that the United States propose that neither those islands nor Vladivostok nor Port Arthur nor Hong Kong nor any other place bordering China should be fortified, and that China should have a chance to live her own life instead of living under the guns of great powers. The article proposes international control of colonial areas, international control, not necessarily by the United States or Britain or Russia or a great power, but international control by the small free nations of the world in all so-called colonial areas including those which are important sources of raw material, in order that freedom of access to those raw materials may be assured. And in return for that, that we demand the freedom of every people, including Poland, for example, and every other people, to decide their own fate and their own forms of government.

Peace depends upon America's strength in times like these. But it also depends upon America's vision and upon America's demonstrating her will to peace so definitely and so clearly that she challenges every other nation in the world either to join with us or to stand in the position of obstructing peace.

I am going to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD tonight a proposal for a commercial treaty between the United States and Russia. I do it because I think it is necessary that the relationship between this country and all other countries, but above all between this country and Russia, be on an open and above-board basis. Today it is not. I do not know how many Members know it, but Russia is today obtaining most of the things that she wants to rebuild her strength and her economy by the process of paying three or four prices for it in gold. I can submit to you a list of the American corporations that are carrying

on that trade. They are some of the biggest ones in the country. Instead of that, what we ought to have is a commercial agreement whereby all American companies would have an equal chance to engage in it, whereby our people, our businessmen, scientists, engineers, yes, our artists and newspapermen, should have access to Russia to the same extent that Russian citizens have access to our country. These and other provisions could be included in such an agreement. They might help to roll up the iron curtain, and if they did it would be a most important move toward peace.

There are some things about the bill before us which I worry about very deeply. I worry because in the bill there is $150,000,000 cut off the appropriation for the feeding of people in areas for which we are responsible; in countries which our armies are occupying. Over against that, and I do not criticize that, but we have greatly increased the appropriation for the development of atomic energy. I know we must continue with the development of atomic energy until such time as some such world program as we ourselves have proposed is accepted by all nations and effective controls are in effect. But the contrast between those two things worries me a great deal. For peace can only be built in a rehabilitated world. America must spell hope. If she does, other nations will prefer our freedom to any other system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute in order to ask a question.

I want to make two things clear. In the first place, the increase in the appropriation for atomic energy is not an increase for the fiscal year.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand that. And may I say again I believe that item for atomic energy is, as matters stand today, quite necessary. I wish with all my soul it were not, but I believe it is.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The $150,000,000 reduction in the item to which the gentleman referred earlier is not a reduction of $150,000,000 in the program for feeding people, but it is a reduction in the combined item for government of occupied countries as well as the relief program. It should be made clear that we do not contemplate that the $150,000,000 is to be entirely cut off from the food item.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But the bulk of it will, because most of that expenditure has been and is for food. It is less than the amount the Army asked for and less than the Budget asked for.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The item that is in the bill maintains the same rate of expenditure that is currently being carried on. It was the feeling of the committee that if $30,000,000 a month is the amount we are spending now, the fact that improvement which we naturally expect in the rehabilitation of the economy of the captured countries should make that enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield the gentleman from California another minute.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have read the testimony of the Army officers on this question, notably the testimony of General Echols. As I understand it, this figure was asked for because last year the Army did not take the responsibility for this feeding until toward the end of the year. I understand further that the present ration is far below what they believe it ought to be if there is to be a chance for so-called democracy in those regions, and that it was the opinion of the Army that they needed that full amount for this purpose. I feel that if we are going to do the kind of constructive job that I have been appealing for, that America must not only be strong but she must see clearly that democracy and freedom and hope for peace grow in a soil where people have at least enough to nourish them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time during consideration of peacetime appropriations for the War Department to bring up the matter of automobiles for the amputees and paraplegics in order that they may be rehabilitated, in order that those who have lost their mobility may be gainfully employed and will be able to compete with other people—both veterans and civilians—who have retained their mobility.

At the time we sent these men to war we appropriated billions of dollars without hesitation for the building of tanks and all sorts of mechanical equipment for these men to use in their fighting, also equipment and vehicles they might be shot down in. These amputees are the very visible effects of the war; they are the battle-injured.

The bill provides an initial automobile for these men. That is all they ask. I wish it could be reported out of the Appropriations Committee for I am sure that the House would adopt it unanimously.

To tell the truth, we have not gone very far in improving prosthetic appliances or in giving these men artificial limbs with which they can get about. I believe a little progress is being made; that more will be accomplished in a year's time.

An automobile supplements the artificial leg, and it takes at least a year or two for the men to be able to use their prosthetic appliances. I am going to ask to insert in the RECORD a little later a letter which describes just what happened to one man before he had an automobile for transportation but had to depend on his artificial limb alone, which did not fit, and what happened to him after he received his automobile.

The following is the letter I have referred to, also an editorial from the Washington Post, also a suggested bill by the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

MRS. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Representative from Massachusetts,
Capitol Hill, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I would like to place before you the case history of my son, a 20-year-old amputee of World War II, in the belief that it will give factual aid in support of your bill advocating care for amputees.

Don was discharged from Walter Reed Hospital last December 8, 1945, after being hospitalized a year. He walked very well on his GI leg, but always carried a cane as it gave him a feeling of greater security in a crowd. He had ordered an Oldsmobile hydromatic last August when he became convinced that he could never drive a standard gear shift car, but had given up hope of its delivery because of the strikes. Being strong and active and having many friends in Washington, he managed very well until he went back to college in February. Then he was put to the real test. Could he take his place in civilian life equipped with a pair of crutches, an artificial limb and a pension? The answer was definitely "no."

Due to greater activity after his discharge his stump changed shape, so that his GI leg was too big. He immediately ordered his first civilian leg although it was sooner than he had expected to do so. His stump became bruised from the ill-fitting leg. His hip became so strained that he developed a deep limp. His gait was so clumsy that he appeared to be a victim of paralysis rather than a rehabilitated amputee. In this condition he started back to college at M. U. Although he had transportation from home to school, he had to make his way up three flights of stairs, between buildings and to the lunch room on his own. The strain was beyond endurance, but rather than give up, he took off his leg and went back to crutches. This left no free hands to carry books, etc., so he tied his satchel to his crutches, always looking forward to the completion of the new leg as the hour of his deliverance, but when the new leg was ready (after two months) his stump had swelled from using crutches, and he couldn't get it on—it was more hopeless than the GI leg.

Don is not a boy who accepts defeat readily. He goes down swinging. In a last desperate attempt to meet this new kind of life which was not of his choosing, he wrote a group of letters to General Motors Corp., Mrs. McLean, and Henry Ford, asking the first two to aid him in buying a showroom model of the car he had ordered even though OPA had not fixed the price and asking the latter if Ford cars (which were being delivered) would be equipped with automatic clutches. He received very kind letters from the first two, but Mr. Ford sent him a car equipped with an automatic clutch without further exchange of formalities. This he gladly paid for with money he had saved for the Olds.

I cannot express to you in words the difference the car made in this boy's life. For the first time in a year he could go where and as far and as fast as he wished to go, without depending on someone else. A whole new world opened up and, best of all, the strain on his hip and stump was removed because he rode every place, except up the steps. He shrunk his stump so that he could wear his new leg. He discarded canes entirely, and from teachers, neighbors, friends, everyone, came the same exclamation, "Doesn't he walk well since he has had his car." And it is true! The casual observer would never know he is an amputee, although his leg is off above the knee.

His story could end here with everyone happy, but there is an anticlimax. Two weeks ago he got the Oldsmobile he ordered so long ago, and was able to pass the Ford along to a fine boy at Forest Glen who had money saved with which to buy it. I know he will be saved much discouragement and suffering because he will start civilian life with four wheels to supplement his crutches and prosthesis—the two things given him with which to face a swiftly moving, not too sympathetic, highly mechanized world.

Now my son is completely satisfied, but what about the boys who, through no fault of their own, do not have $1,200 to $1,500 to buy a car? Some of my son's money was overseas pay, but some of these boys were wounded a week after getting overseas. Some have home responsibilities. Some are poor managers. If they cannot be given cars when discharged, a program of supervised saving should be put into effect, because I am absolutely convinced that no amputee can take his place in civilian life without a car which he can drive.

You have my sincere thanks, Mrs. ROGERS, for your interest in our disabled boys. You will be remembered always by them, because of your help and kindness.

Very sincerely,

GENEVIEVE ADDOR,
Mother of an Amputee.

[From the Washington Post of June 21, 1946]

CARS FOR AMPUTEES

A number of bills authorizing the furnishing of automobiles to seriously disabled veterans are now before committees of Congress. Hearings currently are in progress on H. R. 6304, introduced by Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, and various amputees have been called upon to present their case. It seems to us they have a good one. And if this assistance is to be of the most benefit to veterans, the measure ought to be passed in this session of Congress.

Cars for amputees and other similarly afflicted, in our opinion, should be considered not as a disguised bonus, but rather as additional prosthetics. The bills in Congress amount to recognition that existing prosthetics are inadequate to give amputees and paralytics the best chance possible for rehabilitation. Good transportation is a semi-necessity for such veterans to compete in ordinary jobs. The hazards for amputees involved in riding crowded streetcars and busses are obvious. Under the Rogers bill up to $1,500 is authorized for the purchase of an automobile in each case. The Government rightly would assume no responsibility for maintenance or replacement. Certain automobile manufacturers and dealers already are cooperating by giving disabled veterans priorities and by making available specially equipped vehicles.

Some important questions remain to be settled; for instance, just what constitutes a major disability. It is important to determine just how great a degree of paralysis or how much of an amputation qualifies a veteran—whether loss of, say, a hand warrants this special consideration. Likewise, there is the question of whether such assistance is to be made retroactive for veterans of previous wars. The Rogers bill provides that at the option of the veteran concerned or the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, a payment in lieu of an automobile may be made. This seems to us open to the charge that it constitutes a bonus. If automobiles are to be actually additional prosthetic devices, they should be considered as such and distributed only to persons who can use them. Part of the objection might be eliminated by following one suggestion already made, i. e., to issue vouchers for cars instead of making actual cash payments to veterans.

The following is a copy of a bill suggested by the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish funds for the purchase of an automobile by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be available to any veteran having a service incurred disability due to loss, or loss of use of, one or more limbs, a credit not to exceed $1,500 toward the purchase price of an automobile, which amount shall be payable to the seller by the Veterans' Administration upon the submission of evidence as to the value of the automobile involved, the terms of the sales agreement, and evidence that a good title will pass to the veteran upon complete settlement of the purchase price;

Provided, That the Administrator may issue such rules and regulations as may be appropriate to accomplish the purpose of this act which is to facilitate the rehabilitation of such veterans by enabling them to purchase an automobile for their own use;

And provided further, That only one such payment on the purchase price of an automobile shall be made for the benefit of any one veteran.

SEC. 2. The penal provisions under Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, shall be for application under this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise now merely to ask the chairman or some member of the subcommittee a question which I brought up before the full committee on yesterday relative to the use of funds in this or any other appropriation bill for a purpose not authorized by law. I have in mind the 30-cent bonus that has been promised to wheat growers in order to induce them to turn loose their wheat. I am not discussing the merits of the bonus pro or con, but it was not authorized by Congress and therefore not authorized by law. So far as I know Congress was not even consulted; consequently I believe it would be in order to have a provision in this bill (which calls for the expenditure of $350,000,000 for the procurement of food) against any possibility of Congress finding itself committed to a procedure that they have not authorized or even discussed. I am wondering whether this proviso on page 17 of the bill, line 3, will cover this situation. I will read it and I would like to get an answer.

Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the payment of any subsidy on agricultural or other products.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The language which the gentleman has read will clearly take care of the situation with which he is concerned. It is true this particular proviso appears under the subheading entitled "Subsistence of the Army" and under the main head "Quartermaster's Service, Army," but the language does say that none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the payment of any subsidy on agricultural or other products, consequently would be controlling over the appropriation for government and relief in occupied areas, which is the $350,000,000 item to which the gentleman had addressed his amendment in the full committee the other day.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why would any Government official, regardless of how high he might be in the Government, authorize an expenditure of 30 cents a bushel in order to get the farmers to sell their grain? Nothing like that should be undertaken by any official of government without proper authorization. The gentleman does not mean to tell me now that someone in the Government did that without authority, does he?

Mr. HORAN. I would prefer that that be answered by someone else. I am trying to ask that question myself.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me if anyone in the Government did such a thing as that he ought to be taken out of the office which he holds because no man should spend a dollar of funds that belongs to the Treasury of the United States unless he is authorized to do so.

Mr. HORAN. May I say that the Appropriations Committee is determined that the unauthorized use of funds shall not continue in the future, and I am glad to get this expression from the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of the Army: For pay and allowances of the Army of the United States, including pay of Reserve officers and officers of the National Guard of the United States ordered to active duty under the provisions of section 37a and the fourth paragraph of section 38 of the National Defense Act, as amended; pay of civilian employees at military headquarters; allowances for quarters for enlisted men on duty where public quarters are not available; interest on soldiers' deposits; payment of life-insurance premiums authorized by law; payment of exchange fees and exchange losses incurred by disbursing officers or their agents; repayment of amounts determined by the Secretary of War, or officers designated by him, to have been erroneously collected from military and civilian personnel in and under the Military Establishment; and losses in the accounts of Army disbursing officers in accordance with the acts of December 13, 1944 (31 U. S. C. 95a) and December 23, 1944 (50 U. S. C. 1705–1707); $2,375,000,000: *Provided*, That the appropriations contained in this act shall not be available for increased pay for making aerial flights by nonflying officers at a rate in excess of $720 per annum, which shall be the legal maximum rate as to such officers, and such nonflying officers shall be entitled to such rate of increase by performing three or more flights within each 90-day period, pursuant to orders of competent authority, without regard to the duration of such flight or flights: *Provided further*, That, during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination thereof, a flying officer as defined under existing law shall

include flight surgeons, and commissioned officers or warrant officers while undergoing flying training: *Provided further*, That section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), shall not apply to retired military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers' Home: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, no officer of the Army shall be entitled to receive an addition to his pay in consequence of the provisions of the act approved May 11, 1908 (10 U. S. C. 803): *Provided further*, That provisions of law prohibiting the payment of any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to military and civilian personnel in and under the Military Establishment: *Provided further*, That without deposit to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States and withdrawal on money requisitions, receipts of public moneys from sales or other sources by officers of the Army on disbursing duty and charged in their official accounts, except receipts to be credited to river and harbor and flood-control appropriations, may be used by them as required for current expenditures, all necessary bookkeeping adjustments of appropriations, funds, and accounts to be made in the settlement of their disbursing accounts: *Provided further*, That no collection or reclamation shall be made by the United States on account of any money paid to assignees, transferees, or allottees, or to others for them, under assignments, transfers, or allotments of pay and allowances made under authority of law where liability might exist with respect to such assignments, transfers, or allotments, or the use of such moneys, because of the death of the assignor, transferor, or allotter: *Provided further*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be used for any expense pertaining to (1) the instruction, education, or training of class IV-E conscientious objectors in colleges, (2) the service of such conscientious objectors outside the United States, its Territories and possessions, (3) the transportation of such conscientious objectors to or from any college or any such service, or (4) the compensation of military or civilian personnel performing any services with respect to the matters set forth in (1), (2), or (3) above after the enactment of this act, except any services which may be necessary promptly to terminate any such class IV-E conscientious-objector college or foreign-service projects existing on the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCK: On page 5 strike out lines 12 to 16, inclusive, and line 17 through the word "flights."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, deletion of the lines I propose to strike out would eliminate flight pay for nonflying officers. I believe this type of pay has become a racket and a scandal in the eyes of the public. That was emphasized very recently when a plane carrying officers on a joy ride for the purpose of maintaining flight pay status crashed into a bank in Manhattan and killed everybody on board.

Let us examine this provision in the bill in a little detail. It provides $720 a year or $60 a month for these non-flying officers. If you follow the wording of the bill, a man could get into a plane, have it take off the ground for a second or two, land, and collect $60 a month. It just does not make good sense and does not make for proper Government administration.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, the basic law provides flying pay to the extent of 50 percent of the pay of the military personnel involved. This provision in the bill limits the flying pay to $720 per annum—$60 per month.

In other words, this action on the part of the committee in inserting this provision into the bill conserves money rather than permitting a much larger sum, which would be far greater than $720 a year, for this flight pay. So, if the language should be stricken from the bill, it seems to me that then it would be permissible to expend flight pay to the extent of 50 percent of the man's salary. In other words, the gentleman is not accomplishing what he seeks to accomplish by his amendment.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. My language would leave in the bill the words:

Provided, That the appropriations contained in this act shall not be available for increased pay for making aerial flights by nonflying officers.

That stays in. My amendment would strike out beginning with line 12 down to the word "flights" on line 17.

Mr. MAHON. In other words, the gentleman leaves in, "*Provided*, That the appropriations contained in this act shall not be available for increased pay for making aerial flights by nonflying officers at a rate in excess of $720 per annum."

Mr. BUCK. No, ending with "nonflying officers."

Mr. MAHON. Well, then, I am probably in error in my conclusion as to the import of the gentleman's amendment. Of course, this is in compliance with the law that flight pay is required, and it seems to me that an appropriation bill is not the place in which we should undertake to change the basic law of the land with respect to flight pay.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Is this the provision which deals with the flying pay of doctors and flight surgeons?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that immediately follows this provision.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman's amendment should be voted down and that the Committee on Military Affairs should study the matter. If it sees fit to do so, now that flying is less hazardous than it once was, they can change the basic law. I think a change in the basic law might well be in order in view of the circumstances.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I think the gentleman was in error when he said that you could take off and land and get flight pay. They are required, I believe, to make three series of flights every 90 days. The purpose of this is not to give them something for nothing. These are men who have to deal with the Air Forces. They have to keep up with the latest developments in flying by directions of our Air Forces. I think we should keep them flying. They have to fly in order to know what to do with their new developments. We are not giving them something for nothing. As to a nonflying officer, it does not mean that he is not flying all the time. It does not mean that he has nothing to do with the Air Forces. He is an officer that has to keep up with all the latest developments of the Air Forces and has to fly so many hours each 90 days to collect that pay.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the wording of the bill is "without regard to the duration of such flight or flights."

Mr. HENDRICKS. It is my understanding that they have to fly so much. I do not know how that language got in there, but I know I talked to an official of the War Department about it, and they have to fly so many hours to collect that pay. They are the men who have to keep up with all the latest developments in the Air Forces.

Mr. MAHON. Let me read the basic law:

Officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act and members of the Reserve forces of such services, and the National Guard shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their pay when by orders of competent authority they are required to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights, and when in consequence of such orders they do participate in regular and frequent flights as defined by such Executive orders as have heretofore been, or may hereafter be, promulgated by the President.

So that is the law of the land. The committee reduced the basic law provision of 50 percent to $60 per month.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The effect of this amendment will be to knock out all extra pay for nonflying officers who are carried up in the air, that is all. It would not, however, affect at all the operations of the flyers who actually have to fly in connection with their work. This thing has been abused to such an extent that it really needs attention. I think it is a good amendment.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the distinguished gentleman from New York to section 18 of the Pay Readjustment Act as amended June 1, 1945. This act provides that these men may receive a maximum additional pay up to 50 percent of their base salary. With that in mind, what the committee has attempted to do here is to put a limitation upon the increased pay that may be received for

this kind of service so that under no circumstances can they pay a person more than $720 extra in 1 year's time. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is adopted, then there is no limitation on the money that can be paid by the War Department.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid the gentleman does not understand the amendment. The amendment is that all after line 11 shall be stricken out. It knocks out all increased pay for aerial flights by nonflying officers. That would be the effect of it.

Mr. NORRELL. The basic law provides an increase of 50 percent. If you knock out the words beginning in line 12, "at a rate in excess of $720 per annum," I think you leave the thing open for the basic law to operate, and in place of limiting them to $720 the War Department can pay them 50 percent of their base salary.

Mr. TABER. I think that the gentleman's construction of that part of it is correct.

Mr. NORRELL. That is exactly what you are doing. In place of decreasing the earnings of the man you are making it possible for him to get an increase up to 50 percent, whereas the committee puts a limitation there of $720 a year.

Mr. TABER. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the following language beginning on page 5 in line 17 is legislation on an appropriation bill:

Provided further, That, during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination thereof, a flying officer as defined under existing law shall include flight surgeons, and commissioned officers or warrant officers while undergoing flying training.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] offered an amendment to that paragraph and it was debated and voted down.

The Clerk read as follows:

During the fiscal year 1947 the dependents and household effects of such military and civilian personnel (without regard to rank or grade) in and under the Military Establishment on duty at stations outside the continental limits of the United States, or in Alaska, as may be determined upon by the Secretary of War, may, prior or subsequent to the issuance of orders for the relief of such personnel from their stations, or subsequent to the discharge or release of such military personnel from active military service, be moved (including packing and unpacking of household effects) from such stations outside the continental limits of the United States, or in Alaska, to such locations as may be designated by such personnel, by the use of either Government or commercial means of transportation, and later from such locations to the duty stations to which such personnel may be ordered, and current appropriations of the Military Establishment available for travel and transportation may be used for this purpose, the decision of the Secretary of War to be final as to the dependency of any individual sought to be affected by this provision except as to travel performed subsequent to arrival in the United States: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War, in prescribing per diem rates of allowance in accordance with law for officers and warrant officers of the Army of the United States traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, is hereby authorized to prescribe such per diem rates of allowance, whether or not orders are given to such officers for travel to be performed repeatedly between two or more places in the same vicinity, and without regard to the length of time away from their designated posts of duty under such orders, and also the actual and necessary expenses or per diem in lieu thereof as he may determine and approve for military and civilian personnel in and under the Military Establishment on special duty in foreign countries;

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make the observation that if this bill is disposed of today I intend to ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns we adjourn to meet on Monday next. If the bill is not disposed of, we will have to meet tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to suggest that if anyone contemplates offering any amendments or raising points of order that we might dispense with further reading of the bill at this time and have it open to points of order or amendment at any point in the bill. I do not like to do that on an appropriation bill but it is getting so late that perhaps we should do that if there is no objection. There is not any desire in that connection to wipe out the right of any Member to make a point of order or offer any amendments.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read and that, first of all, points of order may be in order according to the section numbers, and, secondly, that amendments likewise be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to section 1?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I understood that points of order as well as amendments would be in order according to the numbering of the sections in the bill. I assume the first request would be with reference to section 1. I have a point of order or an amendment.

Mr. NORRELL. The request was to commence where we are now in the bill and then proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order with reference to section 1?

Are there any amendments with reference to section 1?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on page 52.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: On page 52, line 15, strike out "$350,000,000" and insert "$500,000,000."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore the Budget estimate and the Army's request for the item entitled, "Government of Occupied Areas and Relief in Occupied Areas."

We have a bill of great size for the Army of the United States. We have a very large appropriation in the bill for the development of atomic energy. The reasons we are doing these things is because we believe that America has got to be a force for peace in the world and because we want her to remain strong, we even want her to remain active in the field of the development of atomic energy until such time as she, by her own motion and the acceptance of that motion by other nations, can make possible the building of a true structure of peace.

Mr. Chairman, from the same point of view I offer this amendment. I do not do so out of any discourtesy to the committee, I can assure you of that. But I have read those portions of the hearings which have a bearing upon this matter and I am convinced that the money is needed if we are to properly discharge our responsibility to the people in those occupied areas where we have complete responsibility for what happens to those people. I take it that our objective in those areas is the development among the people of a way of life and a structure of government which will prevent their ever seeking to go to war again. I take it that America wants to develop, if possible, the institutions of freedom and democracy in those nations to the greatest possible extent. I submit that the alternative may well be between the embracing of some form of dictatorship, such as Communism in those nations on the one hand, or a reasonably adequate provision for the needs of the people in this period of difficult transition, upon the other.

Assuming, therefore, that it is to America's interest to see to it that we discharge as well as possible our obligation to those people for whose whole destiny we are presently responsible, I offer this amendment.

I understand one reason the committee cut this was because they said there was a crop coming along. That of course is true, but in Secretary Patterson's own testimony on the bill, Secretary Patterson explained as follows. He said:

Our calculations take into account the indigenous production of the country itself.

A little later on he stated:

Our purpose is to maintain a steady ration, which in Germany today I believe is 1,250 calories.

As a matter of fact, it is not even 1,200 calories today; although the Army's aim is to have a ration of 1,500 calories. According to the testimony of General Echols, even that would be substantially below the rations of the countries surrounding Germany.

In Japan, according again to General Echols' testimony, General MacArthur is having a most difficult time with the

rations in that country at even 900 calories per day.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. The record will also disclose that it was costing $30,000,000 per month to administer this program and is costing $30,000,000 per month to administer it. In view of all the circumstances, the committee felt that economies should be made and that the amount provided would be adequate to meet the situation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate what the gentleman says. But in answer to his point, General Echols said in the hearings:

The principal increase in this appropriation for 1947 over 1946 is for food. We did not take over the problem of feeding Japan or Germany until relatively late in this year. In addition to that, we have not been able to get the food which was actually required to support those areas, and the 1947 estimate is based on the assumption that we will support a ration of 1,550 calories in the United States zone in Germany and 1,350 calories in Japan, which is distinctly higher than the ration levels in those areas now.

Again he said:

Our own particular area which was never able to feed itself and which has a large increase in population requires food imports.

He says again:

The countries surrounding Germany with the exception of Austria are on more than 1,500 calories today.

And then the gentleman from South Dakota asked him some questions as to whether the rations in some of the concentration camps were not almost as much as the people in the occupied areas are now getting. And the answer was that those rations were between 800 and 900 calories a day. It seemed to me in reading the discussion that the gentleman from South Dakota was as concerned about this problem as I am.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is not intended to feed people luxuriously; my amendment is intended to make it possible to maintain a high enough ration to prevent disease, suffering, and unrest in those countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee went into this item very thoroughly and very carefully. The Department said very conclusively that they were using $30,000,000 monthly to take care of the situation. Not only that but these people are now at work and they are to a large extent taking care of themselves. Some of us who have been over there and know something about it know they are not starving. They are getting to work and they are contributing largely to their own support. With the aid of this appropriation they will be taken care of handsomely.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I had the privilege of talking this week with a colonel who was in the military government of the American occupied zone of Germany. He has charge of the agricultural extension work. He pointed out to me that the floor space of my front office would cover every inch of ground that was not in cultivation in that area that ever had been cultivated. He said, furthermore, that they had established a fertilizer factory and whereas it had been calculated they would produce 25 percent of their needs for the current crop year they had actually worked so continuously day and night in that factory that it was producing 50 percent of their needs.

Mr. KERR. I want to say to the gentleman that as a matter of fact from my own observation most of the German farm land is rich enough to produce wonderful crops without any fertilizer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 21, line 22, after the word "station" strike out "$475,000,000" and insert "$375,000,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, let me read from the report of the committee:

Transportation service: The committee proposes a reduction of $49,664,256 in the appropriation item for transportation service leaving $475,000,000 for such purpose during the coming fiscal year. The amount requested is approximately one-third of the amount that has been appropriated for this purpose each year for the past 3 years although the emergency conditions have ceased to exist. The size of the Army is to be about one-fifth the size it was during the peak of the emergency.

Mr. Chairman, if the Army is to be one-fifth the size it was during the war, and if we appropriated $1,785,000,000 for transportation services during the war, one-fifth of that amount would be $357,000,000. I cannot understand why the committee put in $475,000,000 when $357,000,000 should be sufficient. I have therefore offered an amendment striking from this appropriation just $100,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of Congress knows that during the war there was more transportation of soldiers than was absolutely necessary. A soldier started in at Boston and we would send him out to San Francisco. They did not want him there except for a week or so and they would ship him back to Washington and from Washington they would ship him out to Michigan. We had a great many men traveling over the country during wartime, probably because of the fact there were so many of them it was difficult to keep from moving them back and forth all over the country.

We have come now to the time when we ought to know why these men are traveling for the Army and we ought to make every traveled mile count. We ought to save everything we can in transportation cost.

I am allowing $17,000,000 more than the average that we used during previous years and it seems to me that we can strike $100,000,000 from this item. If for any reason the Army finds it does not have money enough, they can come back and ask for a supplemental appropriation later on. This will say to the Army, "We are through permitting all this unnecessary travel."

Mr. Chairman, I think my amendment ought to be adopted and I hope the committee will agree to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that during the war, the last fiscal year, we appropriated approximately $2,000,000,000 for that item, at a time when the Navy was transporting a lot of Army goods and personnel. This year the Budget reduced the item down to $524,644,256, approximately four-fifths of what they had last year. The committee cut this item to the tune of $49,664,256.

We think we have made the most drastic cut anywhere in this entire bill on the item of transportation, and I care not to consume the time of the committee further.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. On page 390 of the hearings it will be shown that the subject of commercial ocean transportation was discussed. Last year for commercial ocean transportation the sum of $2,000,000, plus, was expended. This year the War Department is asking for $133,000,000 for commercial ocean transportation. That is where a large part of this money will go and that is brought about by this fact, that during the war and immediately after the end of the war these men and supplies were transported by the Navy and by the War Shipping Administration, and that expense was not charged to the War Department appropriation bill. But beginning July 1, 1946, the Army has got to pay its own way on commercial ships. That is the reason that this tremendous increase was brought about for this particular item. Of course, as the gentleman from Arkansas has so well pointed out, the over-all item for transportation was drastically cut, as it should have been for fiscal 1946.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If you take $1,785,000,000 annually for the last 3 years, and you cut the Army down so it receives only one-fifth as much as it received during any one of those 3 years, one-fifth of the amount would be $357,000,000, so why give them $474,000,000? If you give them $375,000,000 you are giving them more than $19,000,000 over and above the average necessary to transport the necessary personnel, and therefore you ought to cut down that appropriation. I have tried to be liberal now in cutting it down $100,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. There is no comparable item during this year for commercial ocean transportation, because we did not use extensively commercial ocean transportation. It is now that the war is

over, and beginning on July 1, that we will be employing these ships to do this transportation job.

Mr. RICH. Can we not teach the Army a lesson to not ship the boys back and forth over the country and make every mile count? Let us economize a little.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. As a matter of fact, if the bill remains as is and there should be more than required, it will revert back to the Treasury anyway. I do not like to cut the item down that is going to mean the transportation of our own boys back and forth here. But, if there is too much, the saving will be turned back to the Treasury anyway.

Mr. NORRELL. I think the item has been cut too much now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other amendments or points of order to section 1?

Are there any points of order to section 2?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against section 2 on page 5, which is plainly legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KERR. I do not care to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any member of the committee desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the language is clearly a limitation. It is not legislation.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, the whole point of the section is to discourage a supervisory employee from putting into effect efficient operation. Further, it is entirely contradictory to the provision in section 16, on pages 64 and 65, whereby efficiency is to be increased. The two just do not go together.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. THOMASON in the chair). On March 28, 1924, the Army appropriation bill was under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union when the Clerk read a paragraph similar to this, which was held to be a limitation rather than legislation. Therefore, the point of order is overruled.

Are there any amendments to section 2?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCK: On page 56, strike out section 2.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I cannot see any valid reason for having language in the bill such as that contained in section 2. Any manager, any superintendent, any foreman, or any other person having charge of work in a Government plant would be restrained and discouraged under this language from taking any measures which would increase the efficiency and the effectiveness of that plant. The language adds nothing to the bill. As I remarked a few minutes ago, it is entirely contradictory to the intent of section 16, which appears on pages 64 and 65. This is a day in our Government when we need greater effectiveness and greater efficiency rather than less efficiency and less effectiveness. I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to section 3?

Are there any amendments to section 3?

Are there any points of order to section 4?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve a point of order against section 4 as a whole in order that I may address myself to the chairman of the committee and ask him about the acceptance of an amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the portion of section 4 which I think does not quite carry out what the committee really had in mind is that carried in line 14 and 15, which would make appropriations for the military establishment carried in this bill available for carrying into effect the provisions of paragraph 8 of Executive Order 9630 of September 27, 1945.

It has been pointed out to some of us that that might make it possible for the Department of State to dictate to the War Department how much they should expend on handling surplus property through the Foreign Liquidation Commission. In view of that fact, I had thought that I might make a point of order against the entire paragraph because of legislative language contained therein, and reoffer it with this portion eliminated. However, after consultation with the chairman and other members of the committee, it has been suggested that it might be better simply to place a limitation on the amount of money that may be used. Consequently, I shall not make the point of order if the chairman assures me that he will accept an amendment to place a limitation in there in advance of line 14 which would read "and not exceeding $40,000,000", that being the approximate amount carried in the break-down submitted to us in the hearings at pages 109 and 110, under project classification of "Care and Handling Surplus Property."

There is some doubt, I may say, as to whether that table was intended to indicate foreign or domestic surplus property handling. In any event, I feel that there should be a limitation on the extent to which an office in the State Department can direct the expenditure of War Department funds. I have based the figure $40,000,000 on the break-down called to my attention by the clerk on pages 109 and 110 of the hearings.

Mr. KERR. The amount there is $48,000,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I realize that it is $48,000,000, but, in looking at the appropriation titles, I note there are several on which we reduced the total amount carried in the bill under those heads. If we were to make this limitation $48,000,000 we would be granting the full amount for the State Department's part and force the entire reduction on the War Department. I thought $40,000,000 would permit a proportionate reduction to be made.

Also, if we should find, as I suspect we may, that this table was not intended to apply to care and handling of surplus property abroad by the War Department for the Foreign Liquidation Commission of the State Department, the question will have been raised and can be considered in the other body. At least, we are better off with a limitation on the amount that can be used than without it. I understand the State Department is asking $120,000,000 for the Foreign Liquidation Commission from the deficiency subcommittee. Certainly we do not want the State Department to take that amount from this bill and the language is wide open as it stands.

Mr. KERR. We are willing to accept the gentleman's figures and his amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota withdraws the point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 57, after line 13, insert the following language: "And not exceeding $40,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other amendments to section 4?

Are there any points of order against section 5? Are there any amendments to section 5?

Are there any points of order against section 6? Are there any amendments to section 6?

Are there any points of order against section 7? Are there any amendments to section 7?

Are there any points of order against section 8? Are there any amendments to section 8?

Are there any points of order against section 9? Are there any amendments to section 9?

Are there any points of order against section 10? Are there any amendments to section 10?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, section 10 is the customary section which has been carried in the appropriation bills for a number of years to deny the availability of funds in the appropriation bills for a number of persons who are members of organizations who advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence. That particular language has been expanded recently in the amendments car-

ried in the other body to apply to those who engage in strikes against the Government or those who are members of an organization of Government employees which asserts the right to strike against the Government. Those amendments are being added to all of the appropriation bills which we have sent to the other body. Many of us have thought that a similar expansion of this language should be carried here. I have prepared the amendments to this section to accomplish that purpose. I wonder if the chairman would be disposed to accept them at this time?

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, it is agreeable to accept the gentleman's amendments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, my amendment at page 62, line 5, after the word "who" is to insert the appropriate language dealing with engaging in or supporting strikes against the Government, and in line 12, again after the word "who", to insert the same appropriate language, and in line 9, after the word "affidavit", to insert the appropriate language for inclusion in the affidavits required under this section. The language which is being submitted is the language taken from the official print of a bill that has been amended in the other body and will make this entire section conform with the language being used in other appropriation bills in the other body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 62, line 5, after "who" insert "engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 62, line 9, after "affidavit" insert "has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 62, line 12, after the word "who" insert "engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order or amendments to section 11?

Are there any points of order or amendments to section 12?

Are there any points of order or amendments to section 13?

Are there any points of order or amendments to section 14?

Are there any points of order or amendments to section 15?

Are there any points of order or amendments to section 16?

Are there any points of order or amendments to section 17?

Are there any points of order or amendments to section 18?

Are there any points of order or amendments to section 19?

Are there any points of order or amendments to section 20?

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committe of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTERING THE OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. FRED M. VINSON AS CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 21, 1946.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The President has much pleasure in inviting you and, through you, the Members of the House of Representatives to attend the exercises at the White House on Monday, June 24, next, at 11:00 a. m., when the oath of office will be administered to the Honorable Fred M. Vinson as Chief Justice of the United States.

Please ask the Members to enter the White House by the East entrance.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW J. CONNELLY,
Secretary to the President.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was granted permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in three instances: in two instances to include a newspaper article and in the third a letter.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection?

INCREASE OF PAY FOR PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, COAST GUARD, COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. MAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submittted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6084) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, for printing in the RECORD.

SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT, 1940

Mr. MAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6064) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an announcement to the members of the Military Affairs Committee who are present to the effect that I have called a meeting for further consideration of the atomic bomb bill at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

On account of the necessary absence of several members of the committee, that has been deferred until Monday at 10 o'clock.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk regarding disabled veterans.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. RYTER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain correspondence.

Mr. TRAYNOR (at the request of Mr. RYTER) was given permission to extend

his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a paper on the commercial treaty between the United States and Russia. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that this will cost $180. I make the request nonetheless.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include several editorials on the reorganization of Congress, and in the other to include a letter from former Senator Robert L. Owen.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and include editorials.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I submit two requests to extend my remarks: First, to include a statement from the Lowell Humane Society requesting help in the feeding of livestock in the Fifth Congressional District and, second, to include a telegram to the President of the United States from Jack W. Hardy, national commander of the American Veterans' of World War II, asking that a veteran be appointed in Mr. Klutznick's place because there are so many veterans who are in these houses.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ADAMS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

NEW HAMPSHIRE HAS ITS ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHTH BIRTHDAY

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, in the old North Meeting House at Concord, N. H., 158 years ago today, an event took place which stands as one of the important landmarks of the history of the United States of America and of the entire world. On that date, June 21, 1788, the State of New Hampshire ratified the Constitution of the United States; and, by being the ninth State to do so, made valid the greatest document ever drawn by the hand of man, providing for the principles under which a free people were to be voluntarily governed. It is well to take a periodic account of stock so that the people of this country, now a nation of 140,000,000 shareholders in the greatest business on earth—the Government of the United States—may have a regular and frequent appraisal of their assets, and of those things which imperil as well as those which foster and increase them.

The stake which every American citizen has in his own Government is greater than that which he has in any other enterprise on earth, for without political freedom dearly bought by the founders and protectors of this Republic the personal freedom and rights of the individual cannot exist. Our own John Langdon, who signed the Constitution, recognized this principle when, in the most critical hour of the Revolutionary War, he pledged a considerable portion of his wealth to equip Gen. John Stark and his men so that they might halt the British Army under General Burgoyne in its drive into the Champlain Valley from the north. Langdon at that time observed that if the American cause was won he would doubtless be reimbursed but that if it was lost his own estate would be quite worthless. Let me, therefore, call to mind on this occasion, in the position of a self-appointed auditor, a list of some of the more important assets of the State of New Hampshire and to call public attention to the services which she has rendered to the United States and the world, and particularly to the wealth of men and material which she has contributed to the preservation and welfare of this great Republic.

By comparison, New Hampshire is a small State; so small in area that 37 States of its size could be located within the boundaries of Texas; small in the number of its citizens, since it has only one twenty-seventh of the population of the State of New York. But it is, and has been, traditionally great in those things which do not depend upon the factors of size and number for their significance.

With the possible exceptions of ancient Greece and Switzerland, it is doubtful if any State of either ancient or modern times, located within so small an area and with a comparable population, has more decisively affected the course of history or contributed more to human civilization than has the State of New Hampshire.

From the time of its first settlement at Odiorne's Point in 1623 until the present, New Hampshire has marked its progress in the accomplishments of its sons and daughters, always keeping vigilant guard over the liberties and possessions of all our citizens as she has over her own heritage.

During the century and a half while this State was a colony under British rule, its hardy settlers ably defended themselves against Indian attacks and French encroachments that culminated in the Seven Years' War of 1754–61 between France and Great Britain, waged on American soil.

In 1745, 300 sons of the Granite State under William Vaughan joined in the successful storming of the French fortress of Louisburg on Cape Breton Island.

Nine years later, in 1754, four delegates of this State met with delegates from the other American colonies at Albany to draw up plans for their cooperative defense and union.

In 1759 the British under Wolfe defeated the French under Montcalm on the Plains of Abraham; and in October of that year Maj. Robert Rogers and his famous Rangers of New Hampshire fell upon the Indians of St. Francis on the south bank of the St. Lawrence River and utterly destroyed their village and their power to harass the colony. With the fall of Quebec the power of France in the New World was broken.

In 1760 this State furnished 800 men to complete the task of conquering the French, a task which, throughout its entire course, might well have proved impossible without the frontier skill and intrepid courage of the people of New Hampshire.

That the people here were well prepared to take the next step toward freedom from foreign rule, and to do so by force of arms, is well stated by the historian Edwin D. Sanborn, as follows:

> The people of New Hampshire were so inured to war that they never could be wholly unprepared for it. An old law required every male inhabitant from 16 to 60 years of age to own a musket, bayonet, knapsack, cartridge box, 1 pound of powder, 20 bullets, and 20 flints. Every town was required to keep in readiness for use 1 barrel of powder, 200 pounds of lead, and 300 flints, besides spare arms and ammunition for those who were too poor to own them.

The people of New Hampshire were ready for self-government as well as self-defense. In this sparsely settled colony there had been developing from its beginning a breed of men whose arduous toil with ax and plow, and hardly less arduous use of the rifle, had not blinded them to the high purpose for which these implements were to be used.

Three institutions, the church, the school, and the town meeting, had grown side by side into a seminary of liberty throughout the northern Colonies. In reference to the last of these three institutions James Bryce, former British Ambassador to the United States, declared that the New England town meeting and the Cantons of Switzerland represented the purest form of democracy in the world.

Schooled in both war and self-government, it was inevitable that the colonies should seek a redress of their grievances against the autocratic power of Great Britain, for British liberty had failed to satisfy the determination of the Colonists for freedom and independence from oppressive government.

New Hampshire played a major role in the Revolutionary War. Before he made his famous ride to Concord and Lexington, Paul Revere had ridden to Portsmouth, N. H., with news that the British Government had prohibited the exportation of arms and ammunition to the American Colonies. Acting on this information and turning the tables to their own advantage, a group of New Hampshire patriots under John Langdon and John Sullivan raided Fort William and Mary at New Castle on December 14 and 15, 1774, and carried off and secreted the powder and guns found there. Some of that powder was later used by the American Army at Bunker Hill. Due largely to the leadership of John Stark, New Hampshire furnished more than half the men who met the British attack

in that battle. Councils of state kept pace with action on the field of battle. On June 15, 1776, 3 weeks before the adoption of the Federal Declaration of Independence, the people of New Hampshire declared their own independence. In the field, and at a fateful hour, they stood like the immovable granite of their native hills against invasion from the north.

Whatever may be the final verdict of historians, it appears from our point of view at the close of the Second World War that the whole course of history would have taken an ominous turn toward oppression had the United States not become an independent republic. It is equally clear that this country could not have achieved its independence at the time of the Revolutionary War, if at all, had the battle of Bennington been lost by the Colonies, for if Burgoyne had won, the American forces would have been hopelessly divided and undoubtedly conquered.

To the eternal glory of New Hampshire, her valiant sons turned the tide of the battle at Bennington. John Stark and his men, financed by John Langdon, turned back the British and Indians under Colonel Baum and made the complete victory over Burgoyne at Saratoga possible.

In 1779 the American cause was again saved by the destruction of the Six Nations under the leadership of Gen. John Sullivan.

The people of New Hampshire had borne their full part in the attainment of independence. Those who took the field had endured their share of the privations of war on the march, in bivouac, and at Valley Forge; and fought in every battle from Canada to Yorktown.

As they distinguished themselves on the field of battle, so they distinguished themselves in the councils of peace and in the creation of a more perfect Union.

Four years before the Federal Constitution became the basic law of the Union, New Hampshire drew and adopted a State constitution of her own. When the Federal Constitution was completed in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 at Philadelphia, the accident of geography enabled the delegates of New Hampshire, John Langdon and Nicholas Gilman, to sign their names first after George Washington on that great document.

But it was no accident that New Hampshire ratified it. It was rather the statesmanship of John Sullivan, John Langdon, and especially of Samuel Livermore, and the forward-looking intelligence of the people of New Hampshire and their delegates in the State convention that insured ratification here in Concord on June 21, 1788, and brought this State the honor of giving effect to the Constitution and the establishment of our present National Government.

New Hampshire has vigorously defended the Constitution in whose adoption she played so conspicuous a part. Forty years after the Government of the United States had begun to function under its beneficent provisions, Daniel Webster, New Hampshire's greatest son, rose on the floor of the Senate to defend it against the attack of Robert Y. Hayne, of South Carolina. So able was his exposition of it and so eloquent his call for "liberty and union, now and forever; one and inseparable" that armed conflict between unionists and secessionists was postponed for a generation.

Nor did New Hampshire pause there in her contribution to the Union and the growth of America's greatness. She lays claim to having been the determining factor in bringing to the Presidency of the United States its greatest Chief Executive and the greatest man ever to preside over the destinies of the American people.

Abraham Lincoln had made a slight but important acquaintance with New England during a visit with his son who was attending Phillips Exeter Academy; and when he accepted an invitation to speak at Cooper Union, N. Y., and at several places in New England, it was in New Hampshire that he spent most of his time while in the East. The leaders of the Republican Party in the State were so impressed with Lincoln's apparent fitness for the Presidency that they gave their decisive support to his nomination for that office at the Chicago convention of 1860.

From its founding to the present day, New Hampshire has produced her full share of material benefits and contributed her full quota of distinguished men and women to the service of this country and the world, in both war and peace.

When war befalls, her sons she calls
From mill and forge and lea,
And bids them uphold her banner
Till the land from strife is free.

Her sons and daughters have never failed to respond to her call and to that of the Union of which she is a part. Her sons have fought in all of America's seven wars. In the Mexican War it was a son of New Hampshire who first scaled the fortress of Chapultepec; and in the Civil War, another who was the first to fall in action. It was the Fifth New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry that suffered the heaviest casualties of any regiment of the North during the bloody conflict that decided "whether this Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, could long endure."

In both the First and Second World Wars the Granite State fully maintained, in the number of men and women engaged and in the valor of their achievements, the proud record of its heroic past. In the war just concluded, New Hampshire sent 50,000 to serve in the armed forces of this Nation, and her contribution in all fields of service has been outstanding. The constructive achievements of peace have been equally notable.

The Mount Washington Railway is the first cogwheel railway built anywhere, and the aerial tramway on Cannon Mountain is the first of its kind on the American Continent. Earlier, the Concord coach was a standard conveyance in the West as well as in New England. The first free public library in America supported by voluntary contribution was established at Dublin, N. H., in 1822; and the first teachers' training school in the public taxation was the Peterborough Town Library, established in 1833; while the first teachers training school in the United States was established by Samuel R. Hall, born in Croydon.

It was Samuel Morey, of Orford, N. H., and not Robert Fulton, who first invented and operated a steamboat upon a river of America. Morey operated his boat upon the Connecticut River at least 14 years before Fulton made his cruise on the Hudson.

James Wilson, born in Londonderry, made the first terrestrial globes in America; and Ambrose Swasey, of Exeter, as though a comprehension of his own world only were not sufficient for a son of New Hampshire, made Lick & Yerkes telescopes to encompass the heavens.

James J. Walworth, born in Canaan, inventor and manufacturer of heating apparatus, equipped the White House with its first hot-water heating system in 1853.

There is time and space here to enumerate only a few of the eminent sons and daughters of New Hampshire. Besides those already mentioned are to be noted John S. Pillsbury of Pillsbury-Washburn flour mill fame; Carroll D. Wright, greatest statistician of his time; Benjamin F. Butler; John P. Hale; Henry Wells, of Wells, Fargo & Co. Express; Laura Bridgeman, Edna Dean Proctor, Mary Baker Eddy, founder of Christian Science; Celia Thaxter, and Sarah J. Hale.

There were also born here in New Hampshire: Horace Greeley of the New York Tribune; Charles A. Dana of the New York Sun; Stilson Hutchins of the Washington Post; John Wentworth of the Democrat, the first newspaper in Chicago; and Charles G. Green of the Boston Post.

Of the 12 Chief Justices who have sat upon the Supreme Bench of the United States to date, two were born in New Hampshire: Salmon P. Chase of Cornish, and Harlan F. Stone of Chesterfield, the latter lately deceased.

New Hampshire has furnished governors for 18 other States of the Union besides a Governor General, Leonard Wood, for the Philippines, and a President of the United States, Franklin Pierce.

When questioned by visitors who traverse our lakes and mountains in the enjoyment of this Switzerland of America as to the principal products turned out here, we can point with pride to the granite face of the Old Man of the Mountain looking down upon Franconia Notch and declare with Daniel Webster that "Here God makes men."

Our soil is not rich in mineral wealth, but the terrain of this region has encouraged a healthy balance between rural and urban life, and between agriculture, manufacturing, and recreational pursuits which result from the ever-increasing enjoyment of our countryside by summer residents, tourists, and sportsmen. Our economy, which fluctuates perhaps less than that of any other State in response to boom or depression, exerts a balance upon us resulting in progress rather than innovation, honesty based upon tried and tested principles rather than experimentation founded upon doctrinaire and theory.

People of New Hampshire may be called conservative in the sense that both their outlook and customs are founded upon sound and practical principles rooted in a New England heritage. It is this characteristic that has insured its steady development and which made the constitution of the State and Nation so expressive of the real wishes of the people that no other nation has ever matched its development.

The characteristics of New Hampshire's early history are a result of Puritan principles in which her people believed. That they are still fundamentally sound is proved by the record of the State in the difficult days through which it has just passed. In addition to a State government second to none and a State council of defense worthy of the committee of safety formed by our forefathers at the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, we led the Union in campaigns for the conservation of materials, and in the purchase of war bonds we led the Nation in the sixth and seventh drives. We established agencies for the conservation of critically short materials and supplies, notably the travel bureau, which was the first State agency of its kind in the country.

People of New Hampshire will never depart from the principles upon which the institutions of the State were so firmly founded. In extending cooperation to other peoples in world government she will not forget the lessons learned in the achievement of her own prosperity and happiness. She will oppose those within or without her borders who would undermine those institutions. People of New Hampshire believe in personal liberty, the freedom of enterprise, and the equality of opportunity. It is of men that such freedom has produced under the Constitution of this Republic that Dr. Lorin Webster wrote:

All hail, ye people of the Granite State,
In acres small, in manhood's power great!
Let others boast their shocks of golden corn
Which yield them wealth and all their fields adorn;
Our products last beyond earth's widest ken—
The Old Stone Face proclaims that we raise men.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

CIVILIAN CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the attempt of some groups to increase the role of the military in the control of atomic energy represents a retreat and a violation of well-established American tradition.

Never in the history of the United States—not even in wartime—has the military been given policy-making powers. The military in peacetime naturally has the assigned job of assuming that we will be involved in another major war and of making preparations to win that war. The business of the Commission in charge of atomic energy must be aimed primarily at developing atomic energy for the benefit of mankind, as a background for working out those cordial international relations which will avoid the necessity for war.

The most important reason for civilian control of nuclear research and development is simple. Men must cease to think of this as only a weapon. We do not want atomic war, we want atomic heat and power and knowledge for industry and medicine in a new and rich atomic age.

The military is still charged with defending the military security of the United States. It is not charged with developing medical research on cancer through the study of radioactivity, nor of any similar peacetime usage of man's new knowledge. They never will be, unless we allow them to gradually make America into the same kind of police state they developed on a small scale in the Manhattan district project. As a matter of fact it is not the War or Navy Departments themselves who are now pressing for increased control, but those who, under the guise of military security, wish to impose military control upon the American people.

It is true that the Atomic Energy Commission as proposed now in the new amendments would have on it only one or two military men out of five. But the presence of military men would constitute military intervention in policy making. As President Truman pointed out in his letter to Senator MCMAHON on February 2:

A commission established by the Congress for the control of atomic energy should be composed exclusively of civilians. This * * * is in accord with established American principles embodied in our statutes since 1870.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. ANDERSON of California, for 4 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. FALLON, for Monday, June 24, 1946, on account of official business.

To Mr. ALMOND, for 24th, 25th, and 26th of June, on account of official business.

To Mr. D'ALESANDRO, for Monday, June 24, 1946, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5606. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Wabash River near Mount Vernon, Ind.;

H. R. 5736. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Ind.; and

H. R. 5748. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the South Carolina State Highway Department to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River at or near Leneudes Ferry, S. C.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Adele Nahas;

H. R. 3185. An act for the relief of George Lassila, administrator of the estate of Senia Lassila;

H. R. 3454. An act for the relief of William Clyde McKinney;

H. R. 4160. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto;

H. R. 4419. An act for the relief of Mrs. James Plumb;

H. R. 4983. An act to provide for adjustment in connection with the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 4997. An act for the relief of Ernest I. Wade and Alma Wade;

H. R. 5071. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dora Foster;

H. R. 5444. An act to revive and reenact and amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near the city of Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., to a point opposite thereto in the county of Union, State of Kentucky," approved July 16, 1939;

H. R. 5605. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6195. An act to amend section 1 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 658);

H. R. 6265. An act to create a Department of Corrections in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6393. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the creation of an American Battle Monuments Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1923, as amended, in order to extend the Commission's authority to all areas in which our armed forces have operated during World War II, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the act approved July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army;

H. R. 6572. An act to provide military assistance to the Republic of the Philippines in establishing and maintaining national security and to form a basis for participation by that government in such defensive military operations as the future may require;

H. R. 6601. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6699. An act to decrease the amount of obligations, issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time; and

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of atomic weapons upon such vessels.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 24, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1412. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 121 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to authorize the appointment of three additional deputies for the register of wills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1413. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition, establishment, and development of the George Washington Memorial Parkway along the Potomac from Mount Vernon and Fort Washington to the Great Falls, and to provide for the acquisition of lands in the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia requisite to the comprehensive park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital," approved May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 672. Resolution providing additional expenses for conducting studies and examinations authorized by House Resolution 69 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and continued by House Resolution 50 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Appropriations; without amendment (Rept. No. 2313). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 673. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6326, a bill to contribute to the effective maintenance of international peace and security pursuant to the objectives and principles of the United Nations, to provide for military cooperation of the American states in the light of their international undertakings, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2314). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2218. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6506. A bill to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6023. A bill providing for the conveyance to the city of Atlantic City, in the State of New Jersey, of lighthouse property at Atlantic City, for public use; with amendments (Rept. No. 2317). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3420. A bill to provide for refunds to railroad employees in certain cases, so as to place the various States on an equal basis, under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, with respect to contributions of employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 2320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1545) for the relief of Charles F. Tusow, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 6852. A bill to authorize the continuance of the acceptance by the Treasury of deposits of public moneys from the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 674. A resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6853. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Boukakis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 6854. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Peter Kim; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEFEVRE:

H. R. 6855. A bill for the relief of the estate of Abram Banta Bogert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 6856. A bill for the relief of Col. S. V. Constant, General Staff Corps, to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6857. A bill for the relief of Edgar F. Russell, Lillian V. Russell, his wife, and Bessie R. Ward; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2026. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of residents of Knoxville, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill 5572; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2027. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Myrtle Parmele, 593 South Commercial Street, Salem, Oreg., and 17 others, approving House Joint Resolution 325, to prohibit the use of grain for nonessential purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2028. By The SPEAKER: Petition of the Townsend Club members of Elkhart, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of House bills 2229 and 2230; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2029. Also, petition of the Townsend Clubs of Grand Rapids, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of House bills 2229 and 2230; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 24, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, like the morning dew on parched ground, like the mystic quiet of summer twilight, steal upon us now with a sense of the eternal as we bring our fainting spirits to the holiness that shames our uncleanness, to the love that forgives our iniquities, to the truth that defies all our falseness, to the patience that outlasts our fickleness. In the brooding silence of this still moment, may open windows of faith flood our darkness with light, that in Thy sunshine's blaze our day may brighter, fairer be. Clothe our failing flesh with Thy renewing grace as we bring our incompleteness to Thy completeness. Give us inner greatness of spirit and clearness of vision to meet and match the large designs of this glorious yet demanding day, that we may keep step with the drumbeat of Thy truth which is marching on. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, June 21, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the Senate beginning on Wednesday next for several days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and leave is granted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, tomorrow morning the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and I are compelled to leave Washington to attend the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of the new independent Philippine Government. Therefore, on behalf of the Senators mentioned and myself, I ask that leave of absence be granted for such time as may be necessary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and leave is granted.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United State submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6837. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5876. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease to Henry A. Scandrett, Walter J. Cummings, and George I. Haight, trustees of Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1936.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2122) to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 5606. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Wabash River near Mount Vernon, Ind.;

H. R. 5736. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Ind.; and

H. R. 5748. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the South Carolina State Highway Department to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River at or near Leneudes Ferry, S. C.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bushfield	Ellender
Andrews	Butler	Fulbright
Austin	Byrd	George
Ball	Capehart	Gerry
Barkley	Capper	Gossett
Brewster	Carville	Green
Bridges	Chavez	Guffey
Brooks	Donnell	Gurney
Buck	Downey	Hart
Burch	Eastland	Hayden
Hill	Millikin	Stewart
Hoey	Moore	Swift
Huffman	Morse	Taft
Johnson, Colo.	Murdock	Taylor
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Kilgore	Myers	Tunnell
Knowland	O'Daniel	Wagner
La Follette	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Lucas	Overton	Wherry
McCarran	Reed	White
McClellan	Revercomb	Wiley
McKellar	Robertson	Willis
McMahon	Russell	Wilson
Magnuson	Smith	
Mead	Stanfill	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Committee in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Committee in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is unavoidably absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 22, 1946.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE:
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I wish to recommend to your earnest consideration amendment of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 in accordance with the proposal transmitted to the Congress under date of June 20, 1946, by the Securities and Exchange Commission. The amendment would extend important protective provisions of that act to investors in the many major corporations which do not have securities listed on the exchanges. As indicated by the Commmission, it was generally agreed at the time of enactment of the Securities Exchange Act that it was desirable to afford this class of investors similar protection to that afforded investors in listed securities. But there was then little public information as to just how the over-the-counter markets operate and for that reason the time was not ripe to deal adequately with the problem. Since then the Commission has had occasion to study and report upon these markets and I am impressed with what their study has revealed. I am convinced that the Commission report demonstrates the need for and the timeliness of the proposed amendment.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

PRESS AND RADIO REPORTING OF UNRRA DISTRIBUTION IN SOVIET RUSSIA—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 21, 1946.

TO the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

In accordance with the recommendation in paragraph B of Public Law 262, Seventy-ninth Congress, I have, through appropriate channels, taken steps to advise countries receiving UNRRA assistance of the desire of the United States Government that the admission to those countries of properly accredited members of the American press and radio be facilitated in order that they might be permitted to report without censorship on the utilization and distribution of UNRRA supplies and services.

I am advised that satisfactory arrangements are in effect to permit American press and radio representatives to report without censorship on the UNRRA programs in all UNRRA receiving countries except the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. There is attached a translation of a communication dated March 12, 1946, to the Secretary of State from the Chargé d'Affaires of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with reference to the situation in that country, which in effect states that the censorship rules in force for all correspondents in the Soviet Union will be applied to correspond-

ents desiring to report on the utilization and distribution of UNRRA supplies.

I am also advised that accredited representatives of UNRRA have been given necessary facilities for observing and reporting on the distribution of UNRRA supplies in all receiving countries including Ukrainian and Byelorussia Soviet Socialist Republics and have submitted extensive and detailed reports.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

[Translation]

The Chargé d'Affaires of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics presents his compliments to the Secretary of State and with reference to the note of the Acting Secretary of State of January 8, 1946, has the honor to communicate the following:

Inasmuch as special commissions of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration will be sent to the Ukrainian S. S. R. and the Byelorussian S. S. R., American official circles and the public will have the possibility of receiving information of interest to them concerning the utilization and distribution of the supplies and services of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration through these commissions.

With reference to the request of the State Department for granting representatives of the American press and radio the possibility for full and free execution of their functions in accordance with the desire expressed by the Congress of the United States, representatives of the American press and radio on the territories of the Ukrainian S. S. R. and the Byelorussian S. S. R. should be guided by the rules in effect on all the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and for that reason the establishment of any special rules regulating the activities of representatives of the American press and radio on the territories of the Ukrainian S. S. R. and the Byelorussian S. S. R. is not contemplated.

EMBASSY OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS.

WASHINGTON, *March 12, 1946.*

DEVELOPMENT OF GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition, establishment, and development of the George Washington Memorial Parkway along the Potomac from Mount Vernon and Fort Washington to the Great Falls, and to provide for the acquisition of lands in the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia requisite to the comprehensive park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital," approved May 29, 1930, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WALSH:

Memorials of sundry physicians and other citizens of Worcester County, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 1606) to provide for a national health program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing, Congress of the United States of America to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to requistion certain material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the prosecution of the war and for the national defense and to use such material, equipment, and supplies in soil- and water-conservation work and distribute such material, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies, and other purposes,

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota, the Senate concurring:

"Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives, first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, H. R. 538 by Mr. POAGE, which is in the following terms and language:

" 'SECTION 1. *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to requisition any materials, equipment, or supplies which constitute surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and are suitable for use in carrying out erosion control and soil- and water-conservation work and operations in furtherance of the act approved April 27, 1935, entitled "An act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes." Upon receipt of such requisition from the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to any such property, the head of the Government agency having control of such property shall transfer such property to the Secretary of Agriculture without reimbursement.

" 'SEC. 2. Material, equipment, and supplies requisitioned by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1 shall be distributed, through the Soil Conservation Service, by grant or loan, to soil conservation, drainage, irrigation, grazing, and other districts and public bodies organized under State laws with power to promote and carry out soil- and water-conservation operations and related public purposes. Such distribution shall be made in accordance with such standards, conditions, rules and regulations as to use and disposition as may be recommended by the Soil Conservation Service and may be established for such purpose by the Secretary of Agriculture.'

"Whereas South Dakota is extremely interested in such legislation and deems it wise and expedient that Congress enact such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring), That Congress be respectfully urged to enact H. R. 538, first session, Seventy-ninth Congress; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. CHAN GURNEY, Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, Hon. FRANCIS H. CASE, all in Washington, D. C."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America not to increase the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating oil tax and to discontinue the same as soon as possible and refuse to reenact such taxes

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the twenty-ninth legislative session of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

"Whereas the Congress of the United States did during the session of the Seventy-sixth Congress increase the Federal gasoline tax one-half cent per gallon making such tax now a total of 1½ cents per gallon despite the fact that every State in the Union now imposes a sales tax on gasoline averaging in excess of 4 cents per gallon; and

"Whereas such Federal gasoline tax during the past calendar year of 1944 has taken from the people of the State of South Dakota in excess of $1,875,000, which largely comes from the producers and from agriculture of South Dakota; and

"Whereas such tax at 1½ cents per gallon amounts to a 10-percent retail sales tax on such product which is a necessity of the residents of this State; and

"Whereas the Federal lubricating oil tax is 6 cents per gallon, and is likewise an enormous retail sales tax upon a product necessary to the production of food for the country, and is an unfair and unreasonable imposition upon such necessity; and

"Whereas it is the sense of this legislature that it is inequitable and unfair to impose such an enormous sales tax upon a single commodity of this type which is a necessity to persons engaged in agricultural and producing pursuits; and

"Whereas such gasoline tax is a revenue measure peculiarly adapted for the individual States for the purpose of construction and maintenance of adequate highway systems and means of transportation, and administrative machinery is well established in every State in the Union: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States should not increase such Federal gasoline tax or Federal lubricating oil tax or consider any increase in such taxes, and should discontinue the same at the earliest possible time, and should refuse to reenact the same upon their expiration, and should thus leave the field of revenue entirely to the individual States for use in construction and maintenance of the various States' highway systems; be it further

"Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of South Dakota be, and they are hereby, urged by the legislature of this State to use their best efforts in opposing any suggested increase in the Federal gasoline or Federal lubricating oil tax, or the reenactment or continuance of said taxes; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each Senator and Representative of the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States and to the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to be by them presented to the proper committee in Congress considering or determining such aforesaid legislation."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America on the postwar military policy and Military Establishment and of the National Guard

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

"Whereas the experience of the United States in the two World Wars, and more particularly World War II, demonstrates that it is desirable that our Nation should adopt a definite military policy so patterned that it will meet the postwar needs of the country; and

"Whereas it is of vital importance to the Federal Government, and to the several States and Territories of the United States, as to what that policy shall be, and as to the character, size, and the composition of the Military Establishment; and

"Whereas the decisions of the Congress which will be reached in this matter will directly affect the Military Establishment of the Nation and of the several States and Territories, and the relationship between those forces; and

"Whereas the Congress now has before it plans and suggestions as to what the postwar policy and the future Military Establishments shall be; and it is believed that the basic principles of the military policy proposed by Gen. George Washington to the Continental Congress, and more recently approved by our present military authorities, then were and still are basically sound and should be given serious consideration by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (and concurred in by the Senate) of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, That the Congress respectfully is urged to preserve in the postwar military policy the basic principles of the policy laid down by Gen. George Washington, the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, insofar as they relate to the civilian components of the Army of the United States, and more particularly the National Guard, the Officers Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves; and

"That we fully endorse and subscribe to the position taken by the Secretary of War relative to the place which the National Guard should have as announced by him on November 23, 1944, in which he stated:

" 'It would be the mission of this Reserve component (the National Guard), in the event of a national emergency, to furnish units fit for service anywhere in the world. * * *

" 'This conception of the mission of the National Guard of the United States would interfere in no way with the traditional mission of the National Guard of the States and Territories to provide sufficient organizations in each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia, so trained and equipped as to enable them to function efficiently at existing strength in the protection of life and property and the preservation of peace, order, and public safety, under competent orders of the State authorities.

" 'National Guard units have played a vital role in the mobilization of our present Army and they have made a brilliant record on every fighting front. We are counting on them as a bulwark of our future national security.'

"That we do endorse and fully approve the statement of Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, as set forth in War Department Circular No. 347, August 25, 1944, to the effect that the Postwar Military Establishment should consist of a professional army in peace, large enough to meet the normal requirements of the Nation, to be reinforced in time of emergency by units drawn from the civilian components of the Army of the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That in the event a system of universal military training is included in the postwar plan for a Military Establishment, we favor that such training should be integrated with the civilian components of the Military Establishment, and more particularly with the National Guard, the Officers Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves; and

"That the personnel of all components of the Army, both officers and enlisted personnel, be given full opportunity to express their views relative to the postwar military policy of the United States, and the form of the Military Establishment which should be provided, to the end that the Congress adopt a sound military policy consistent with the traditions and experiences of our Nation, and which will afford the greatest security of the United States of America; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. CHAN GURNEY, Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, and Hon. FRANCIS H. CASE, all in Washington, D. C."

GRAIN FOR LIQUOR MANUFACTURING AND EXEMPTION OF FARMERS FROM MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I received an interesting letter from Edith A. Fouse, of Manchester, Kans., registering her disapproval of the use of grain for liquor manufacturing, and urging the exemption and release of farmers from military service during the food famine. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter and that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

The being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANCHESTER, KANS., *June 17, 1946.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Because of my interest in the welfare of the American people and all peoples, I am writing you regarding things which I think should be done, and questions to which I would like to know the answer.

1. It is my belief that all drafted farm boys and men now in service should be released to aid in the present food situation.

2. By all means do away with these breweries and distilleries which are using grains and sugar for the destruction of people's health when they should be used for constructive and economic purposes. During the war and since those in service aren't receiving the best of food at all places. Even in our democratic country we have to use laws and a standard of morals so the liquor could be prohibited just as other things, I feel. Scientists have proved the ill results of drink so if we want our country to be a good country we can't let the younger generation, to whose hands the work will fall be down in the "rut."

3. Why can we and why do we have to tolerate strikes? If any service personnel had struck, no doubt, court martial would have been the answer and many would think they were against their country. Even during the war our people safe at home would strike for higher wages while those in the service received lower wages, than those at home, and many were at the front working. This is entirely wrong. Therefore, I say that the strike leaders and others who think of the almighty dollar and their political standing in place of public welfare should be removed from office and some method of punishment used. We can readily see that strikes are working against food production and preservation. The manufacture of farm equipment has been withheld; also farmers cannot get repairs for what machinery they do have.

Can we, as honest Americans, let those that were killed die in vain?

May God guide you in your work.

Sincerely,

EDITH A. FOUSE.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 6285. A bill authorizing the State of Delaware, by and through its State highway department, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Delaware River near Wilmington, Del.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1582).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1908. A bill to provide for the maximum and most effective utilization of surplus agricultural commodities through increased industrial and other uses and through the development of improved methods of storing and marketing such commodities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1583).

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. GREEN introduced a bill (S. 2366) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide annuities for employees with 25 years of service who are involuntarily separated from the service between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1947, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RETURN OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES TO STATE OPERATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DONNELL and Mr. MEAD each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 4437) to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. TYDINGS) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. TYDINGS to the bill (H. R. 6407) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. MCKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 291), which was referred to the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, authorized by Senate Resolution 9, agreed to January 6, 1945, and Senate Resolution 132, agreed to June 28, 1945, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, for the same purposes, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, $5,000 in addition to the amount of $15,000 heretofore authorized.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON ST. JOHNS RIVER, FLA., FROM PALATKA TO SANFORD AND LAKE HARNEY (S. DOC. NO. 208)

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated April 10, 1946, from the Chief of Engineers, United

States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on and a preliminary examination and survey of the St. Johns River, Fla., from Palatka to Sanford and to Lake Harney, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be referred to the Committee on Commerce and printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF ALIEN FIANCÉES OR FIANCES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2122) to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States, which were on page 2, line 24, after "1917", to insert a comma and "as amended (39 Stat. 889–890; 54 Stat. 671–673; 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155; 39 Stat. 890–891; 57 Stat. 511; 8 U. S. C. 156)"; on page 2, strike out all after line 24, over to and including line 5, on page 3; and on page 3, after line 5, insert:

SEC. 4. The Secretary of State shall have authority to prescribe regulations for the administration of the provisions of this act which relate to the performance of functions by diplomatic or consular officers of the United States and he shall include in such regulations a requirement that the parties to a proposed marriage shall furnish satisfactory evidence to the American consular officer concerned, including sworn statements corroborated by other appropriate evidence showing that the parties have entered into a valid agreement to marry and are legally able and actually willing to conclude a valid marriage in the United States within a period of 3 months after the alien's arrival, or within such period as may be extended by the Attorney General.

SEC. 5. The Attorney General shall have authority to prescribe regulations for the administration by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the provisions of this act in connection with the arrival of the aliens concerned at ports of entry in the United States, and he shall include in such regulations a requirement that the prospective American citizen spouse of an alien covered by the provisions of this act shall furnish to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization a suitable bond, which shall be in an amount sufficient to cover the cost of the deportation of the alien concerned, and which shall be forfeited to the United States if and when the alien becomes deportable, or shall be canceled by the Commissioner upon receipt of satisfactory evidence that a valid marriage has been concluded, or that the alien has left the United States without expense to the said United States.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this act the period of World War II shall be considered as having started on September 1, 1939, and to have ended upon the formal conclusion thereof by a treaty of peace, or by the passage of a joint resolution of Congress, or by a proclamation by the President declaring an end to hostilities.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the first House amendment merely provides that the consular office shall have evidence of the good faith of the parties in their engagements to contract marriage. The other amendment provides that the person in this country who is to marry the alien shall give a bond for the passage home of the alien in case the marriage is not consummated. I therefore move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

SILVER—STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address prepared by him regarding the silver rider attached to the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT SURPLUS PROPERTY—LETTER FROM SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding the disposal of Government surplus property, written by him to Representative Slaughter, chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate War Surplus Disposal, which appears in the Appendix.]

TECHNOLOGICAL FUTURE OF LATIN-AMERICAN COUNTRIES — EXCERPTS FROM PAPER BY PHILIP W. HENRY

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a paper on The Technological Future of the Latin-American Countries, by Philip W. Henry, at the conference, April 12–13, 1946, at Austin, Tex., Institute of Latin-American Studies, University of Texas, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE VETO POWER UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS' CHARTER—STATEMENT BY JAMES W. GERARD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address, delivered by James W. Gerard, former Ambassador to Germany, on June 20, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

EROSION OF CONSTITUTIONAL LANDMARKS—ADDRESS BY COL. O. R. McGUIRE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Erosion of Constitutional Landmarks, delivered by Col. O. R. McGuire at the annual dinner of the Kansas State Bar Association, Wichita, Kans., May 24, 1946, and published in the magazine Vital Speeches of the Day, of the issue of June 1, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HOBBS BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. ANDREWS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hobbs Bill," published in the Washington Post of June 24, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Providence (R. I.) Journal of June 17, 1946, entitled "Streamlining Congress"; an editorial from the Courant, of Hartford, Conn., of June 16, 1946, entitled "Ox-cart Government"; an editorial from the Washington (D. C.) News of June 17, 1946, entitled "Don't Cheer Yet"; an editorial from the News, of Buffalo, N. Y., of June 13, 1946, entitled "Senate Votes To Go Modern"; and an editorial from the News, of Lynchburg, Va., of June 15, 1946, entitled "Pay of Congressmen," all referring to the bill recently passed by the Senate, proposing a reorganization of Congress, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE NEED FOR UNITY

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by David Silberman, of New York, showing the need for unity in the United States, published in the Washington Post of June 21, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RAILROAD STRIKE—EDITORIAL FROM THE PROGRESSIVE

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Progressive of June 17, 1946, regarding remarks by Senator MORSE, concerning the recent railroad strike, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHORTAGE OF SILVER FOR MANUFACTURING PURPOSES—ARTICLE FROM TRADE UNION COURIER

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Silver Workers—Do You Really Need Silver?" published in the Trade Union Courier, which appears in the Appendix.]

A WAY TO CHECK DEPRESSIONS—ARTICLE BY SECRETARY WALLACE

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, the June issue of the American Magazine contains an article written by Secretary Wallace entitled "A Way to Check Depressions." This article gives an extended exposition of the ways in which the Federal Government, operating entirely within the scope of the free-enterprise system, can aid the businessmen of America, particularly the small businessmen, so that their chances of success will be increased and their danger of failure will be lessened.

The article makes it clear that it is not hand-outs in the form of money that the small businessman needs from his Government, any more than it is directives telling him how he must run his business. To use a war-time expression, the need is for technical know-how. A tremendous amount of this is actually available and much of it is being given to small businessmen through the Department of Commerce. The article in the American Magazine explains how this is being done, and describes the way in which Government can work for businessmen. I took the trouble to inquire about the response from businessmen to this article and found that the Department of Commerce had received a heavy flow of highly favorable mail from businessmen in all parts of the country.

I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WAY TO CHECK DEPRESSIONS

(By Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce)

If we profit from the lessons of history, we realize that it is dangerous for a nation to sit back complacently when times are good and not to prepare for the threat of hard times that heretofore have followed every war. We must mobilize, completely, all the elements of our economy, now.

One of the important steps is to strengthen the 2,750,000 small businesses of our Nation. This can be done in a great part through the furnishing of scientific information and the personal assistance of trained experts.

Small business is a vital part of our economy, employing about 9,000,000 persons. It operates, even in good times, under constant

threat of failure. Four out of five small businesses don't last 5 years.

The small businessman is in a far more precarious position than the big businessman or the farmer. He is more likely to collapse under the first wave of a slump. In an enormous number of cases, if the small businessman had technical aid comparable to that possessed by big business and agriculture, he would be able to pull through.

If we start right now to help the small businessman to anchor himself firmly to resist the coming storm, we can reduce the number of failures. Small business is a weak spot in our defense. We must strengthen it to resist any attack of economic adversity.

The Department of Agriculture, through research and personal service by farm agents, has raised tremendously the profits and standards of living of the small farmer. Expert agriculturists show him anything he wants to know, from how to keep his turkeys from dying to how to keep his topsoil from washing into the creek. He learns how to expand in good times and how to economize when things begin to go badly. The Department of Agriculture has saved hundreds of thousands of small farmers from poverty.

The Department of Commerce must give as adequate a service to small business. The crossroads grocer and the off-the-highway sawmill operator are just as entitled to competent advice as are the tobacco farmer and the poultryman. Now, we have 52 field offices, and I foresee the day when we shall have offices in every major community. Every business, no matter how small or isolated, should have the opportunity of getting scientific aid in solving its problems.

Few understanding persons, I believe, oppose the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture which have done so much to educate the small farmer. In the 10 years from 1932 to 1941 it spent an average of $9.20 a year to help the farmer make $100. And the farmer has been aided enormously, also, by agencies other than the Department of Agriculture.

No comparable figure is available for business, but obviously the cost of government aid to business is a great deal less. Because we have failed to give proper assistance, the average small businessman is much worse off than the small farmer.

The failure of a grocery store, restaurant, machine shop, or factory in your town not only is a set-back for its owner and his employees, the bank that lent him money, and the owner of the vacated property. It affects the prosperity of the entire community. If such failures multiply alarmingly it will be a catastrophe for all of us.

The Department of Commerce is under way now, giving subsidies to small businessmen—not subsidies in money, but subsidies in knowledge and services that will help them make more profit. We must give much more aid to these men and women, to all who are eager and able to work their way to success but who are handicapped by the lack of some of the know-how.

Often, when a small business fails, it is through no fault of its owner. Too often it is the fault of his government, which, for the good of all, should help him to become a more skillful manager.

Take two men, equally industrious, capable, ambitious, equally entitled to success. One owns a small business, the other is president of a large corporation. It is important that both weather any depression that may come. We don't have to worry so much about the big businessman. He has at hand scientists and technologists, marketing analysts, top-notch salesmen, advertising men, and accountants to help him make the proper decisions.

The small businessman has no army of experts to guide him to more profit now, to help him avoid bankruptcy in a slump. He reads trade papers, he may get advice from wholesalers who want to keep their customers in business, but usually he has no definite, personal assistance from first-rate advisers. Sometimes a few small changes in his sales methods, or accounting, or delivery system, or inventory, or advertising would turn loss into profit, but he doesn't know how to make such changes. So he makes guesses or, bewildered and hopeless, just drifts. His profits vanish; he is forced to give up.

Ahead of the people of the United States is a crucial test. What economic system will best weather a depression? Will a planned economy prove to be superior? Or will the United States, the leading exponent of free private enterprise, prove that its system is best?

In the boom that followed World War I we so bungled our economy that, although we were the richest nation in the world, we found ourselves in the depression of the 1930's That failure gave strength to the arguments of the enemies of free enterprise.

If we repeat our mistakes of the 1920's, if peoples under competing economies find that their system is superior for the common man in hard times, how can we defend the cause of democracy and free enterprise? The people of other countries all over the world, who are uncertain as to which kind of government to support, observing our failure, will swing too far to the left or too far to the right, and our own system will be attacked by our own hungry people. Democracy will be desperately in danger.

If its resources are properly mobilized, democracy and free enterprise can triumph over any threat of depression. We can prove to all the world that our system can continue high production and high employment in any emergency. But only through a sincere, wise, and unselfish effort of the entire Nation. Men and women who grab all they can get, who break laws and trample weaker citizens underfoot must change their ways and cooperate. Individuals and government must work together. The Department of Commerce is only one agency that will contribute, and only one of its contributions—but perhaps the most important one—will be information and services to help business help itself.

In our files in Washington we have an enormous amount of material that is being used mostly by representatives of big business. Small businessmen cannot afford to come to Washington, and whatever they need should be put into their hands. Facts filed away are not worth much.

Two years ago the Department of Commerce distributed a booklet outlining its services, and included a case history on a job that had been done in Washington for a small wholesale grocer who was losing money, who didn't know how to cut his expenses and increase his net income, and who came to Washington with all his data and asked for aid. Specialists revised his out-of-date systems, from bookkeeping to warehouse layout, and put him back on his feet.

As a result of this booklet, requests for assistance from thousands of small businessmen poured in. The main and field offices were swamped. There weren't enough men to handle all the requests promptly, and the Department did not have enough money to enlarge the staff. I regret to state that, for that reason, the Department stopped the distribution of the booklet which brought in so many worthy and proper requests.

Thousands of men and women are eager for expert counsel on starting or maintaining a small business. We are helping them now; we are extending our staffs to establish for business the best information and consulting services in the world.

Of enormous importance now is our distribution of German industrial and scientific secrets. In the past, in many important categories, German scientists advanced further than any others in the world. Their discoveries, in some instances, were the foundations of cartels, agreements on pricing, production, and distribution, between great corporations in various countries who shared and controlled the scientific and technological knowledge.

Today, through the activities of the United States Army and the Department of Commerce, practically all the secrets of the Germans are available to American business, big and little. Information from Germany that will be worth millions, perhaps billions, of dollars in profit to American management and labor is being distributed to all who can use it.

When our armies went into Germany, along with them—sometimes ahead of them—went American teams of scientists and industrialists to find and photograph documents and unique machinery. At first we wanted information that could be used against Japan, and we gathered data on V weapons, jet propulsion, submarines, and armored vehicles. After this was sent to the United States, the technical industrial intelligence committee's investigators, 380 in all, went into other fields. They gathered facts on ideas, on processes, and on details of success and failures. They interviewed leaders in German science and industry, gathering information not found in documents.

To date, more than 15,000 preliminary reports have been made, and 1,600 final technical reports are ready for American science and industry. These are sold as photostats or on microfilm at reproduction cost, from a few cents to a few dollars.

When an American manufacturer saw a complete report on the German synthetic-fiber industry, giving in detail all secrets of production of such textiles as rayon, he said, "This report would be worth $20,000,000 to my company—if we could have it exclusively." Anybody can buy it for a few dollars.

The most valuable haul was a complete record of the work of all the scientists in the great German I. G. Farbenindustrie. Thus far, 36,000 pages of documents, indexed, are ready. Never before, scientists say, has such a storehouse of secret information been assembled. It is secret no longer. Included are complete reports, up to the end of the war, on projects discussed, accepted, and rejected, on experiments authorized, with results analyzed and evaluated. Here is an exhaustive record of the work of German scientists on such things as liquid and solid fuels, metallurgy, textiles, synthetic rubber, plastics and drugs and chemicals of all kinds.

The I. G. Farben chemists had performed unique research in the manufacture of acetylene, which is used in plastics and many other chemical products. American chemists say similar research would cost us millions of dollars.

While many German secret patent records were destroyed, tons of them remained. The Krupp collection of patents on the making of munitions is substantially intact and is in the hands of Army and Navy scientists.

There is almost no end to the list of reports now available, and thousands more from hundreds of German companies are to come. In cases in which the Germans were ahead of us, we can use their new methods. When we find we were superior, we have the satisfaction of knowing that. Records of German experiments that failed are not worthless, because in many instances, they will save time and expense for our scientists, pointing out the wrong roads.

This information will help big and little business. Small chemical companies, for instance, may find much of value in the reports. Shops that do sheet-metal stamping will be interested in a new German

process for shaping cold steel. This process increases production tenfold and can be used to shape cold in a press thousands of parts now made as castings, drop forgings, or in malleable iron.

Dairy farmers and milk distributors may be able to use a German cold-ray process that fortifies milk with vitamin D and pasteurizes without the use of heat. The Germans made new discoveries—how valuable they are only tests will show—in rat killers and insecticides. They produced a synthetic blood plasma. The Robert Bosch Co. had a machine that made more than 50,000,000 condensers out of paper, coated with vaporized zinc. Condensers are used in enormous quantities in the electric, electronic, and communications industries, and this machine, which can be built for about $25,000, appears to make better and cheaper condensers. It is being brought to the United States for examination by American manufacturers.

The Germans had a new process for making colored motion pictures, one for dry development of photographic film, and new optical glass formulas. They made synthetic sapphires for watch and instrument bearings and had a unique evaporator for converting salt water into fresh. They had new methods for making steel and chlorine and commercial fertilizers. They had a unique Diesel engine, and propellers to be used on mine sweepers that could stop and turn a fast-moving boat in its own length. We have reports on plastic coatings to preserve bread and cheese, on a drug that is said to rival penicillin, on new ways of treating malaria, and on new ways of making dyes.

Available to us, in addition to all this, are the documents taken by the British—230 tons of technical information. We can now afford only a dozen specialists in Germany gathering material. The British have about 300. The Russians and French also are rounding up the same sort of information.

A casual examination of the German collection of documents brought suggestions that 23 types of businesses, with a capital of less than $100,000, could be started through the use of this information. They ran from the making of artificial leather to a new kind of machine that the Germans used for wrapping ration tablets in cellophane. It can be used by manufacturers for the rapid and economical wrapping of drugs, soap, cigarettes, and other small objects.

Included in the reports are German methods of manufacturing procedure, plant layout, transportation, prevention of waste, promotion of efficiency.

The Department of Commerce will make an exhaustive study of all the German material, to evaluate it for such special purposes as the establishment of new industries, reductions in costs of established businesses, use of new processes, reduction of production time, and the creation of new jobs.

At the end of World War I, Germany kept nearly all its secrets. This time, we are taking them—a form of reparations that will be more valuable to American management and labor than millions upon millions of dollars in cash.

Adding to new science and technology, the Army and the Navy are gradually releasing secrets of American discoveries during the war. Much that can be used by small business will be offered.

All of this contributes to the Department's plan to further the work of science in industry. The National Bureau of Standards, with its high-powered staff, for years has solved many general problems for business. It gave enormous service in war and should extend its activities in peace.

If a large manufacturer has a difficult scientific problem, usually he has a research laboratory that will solve it. He may be having trouble with a particular welding job, he may need a special kind of glue or chemical, assistance in making soup or catsup. He may want to make a new type of vacuum cleaner and must have a special metal and a special die, or he may want to test scientifically the wearing quality of a product. He has the money and the men to get the answers.

The small businessman, with problems that are just as vital to him, has no research laboratory. Perhaps his difficulty is one that can be cleared up if he gets a certain report on scientific and technological research, or it may be one that a scientist could clear up in a few hours. But he doesn't know where to go for help, he can't compete with the big fellow, he fails.

I believe the small businessman should be able to go to the Department of Commerce with his specific problems. The Department, in turn, should serve as a clearinghouse for the exchange of scientific and technical information and direct the small businessman to the commercial research laboratories and scientific experts in his field, to help him solve his problem. A bill is now before Congress which would provide for expansion of scientific facilities for the use of business.

The independent inventor sometimes fails to exploit his invention profitably because he lacks funds, advice, and encouragement. We hope to help this man. During the war the National Inventors Council performed useful services for the inventor with a device of potiential military value. Now under Congressional consideration is a bill to extend this same sort of service for inventions of peacetime value. In addition, we are seeking funds to clear up the backlog of patent applications and will help the inventor get his patent in a hurry.

Many small businessmen and women are now using our services. We have prepared comprehensive booklets that aid some categories. If our information on a particular business is sketchy we can tell an applicant exactly where he can get what he seeks. This service is for veterans who want to start a business of their own, for men and women now in business who want to increase their profits—for everybody.

Our aid, through booklets, has helped many a man take his shoe-repair shop out of a basement and convert it into an up-to-date profitable concern. We give complete information on such things as making concrete blocks, a sawmill business, real-estate and insurance brokerage, a metal-working shop, and various kinds of stores. We are preparing manuals for women who want to open beauty parlors, lending libraries, and notion stores.

For other small businesses, such as diaper services, florist shops, restaurants, and dry-cleaning services, at present we can give only basic information and suggestions as to where facts can be found.

We distribute ideas on handling employees in a small business, information on leaseholds and on credit sources. Our most recent and according to some businessmen, our most important contribution is a 15-cent booklet on distribution cost analysis, produced after 20 years of research in retailing, wholesaling, and manufacturing. In this booklet the businessman finds detailed methods for eliminating unprofitable items, checking his inventory, pricing, and selling costs. It will furnish many a businessman information that will stop losses and increase profits.

We assist communities that seek expert advice on development of their areas. Chambers of commerce want to know what kinds of business can be developed that will increase employment. Our statisticians and market analysts advise them.

Our foreign department aids the small businessman who wants to buy trinkets in Mexico or China, or sell hammers and saws in South America. We furnish names of firms with whom he can do business, we tell him about transportation, tariffs, taxes, packing requirements, and exchange rates.

Everyone of these services must be expanded. Today, the small businessman who lives near a Department of Commerce regional office, or who can afford to come to Washington, gets the service. We should have more field offices, more men who can give individual service. In many cases, a booklet isn't enough.

We must give the small businessman facts about the outlook for his particular business, how and where to develop markets. We must furnish him quick and complete scientific and technological service that will enable him to compete with the big fellow. We must give him answers to his particular questions about his products, about the most efficient specifications, materials, and processing techniques. We must furnish complete answers to all of his questions as to his relations with Government agencies, such as taxation, finance, unfair competition, foreign trade, and all the problems of regulation and control.

If a grocer wants to know whether he could convert to self-service, if a laundry wants to know what kind of new machinery it should buy and where to get it, if a small plant needs a unique metal for a special part and can't find it, if a florist seeks a plan for making over his shop, if a druggist has display problems, if a bakery seeks a new and more profitable location, if a clothing store needs financing, if a hardware man is bogged down with goods he can't sell—everyone of them should be able to get individual service quickly at a nearby office of the Department of Commerce.

In a year or so an era of intense competition will begin. Following that will come our critical war against the threat of depression—the battle for the survival of free business enterprise. It is as essential to train thoroughly an army of businessmen to fight a war against want as it is to train an army of warriors to fight an aggressor.

It won't do to put it off for a year or so. The time to act is now.

PARTY RESPONSIBILITY—ARTICLE BY SECRETARY WALLACE

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that another article by Secretary Wallace in the current issue of Collier's magazine on the subject of Party Responsibility be printed in the RECORD. I do this because there has been considerable misinterpretation of Secretary Wallace's position on this subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTY RESPONSIBILITY

(By Henry A. Wallace)

"Looking at government from a practical and businesslike, rather than from a theoretical and abstractly ethical point of view—treating the business of government as a business—it seems to be unquestionably and in a high degree desirable that all legislation should distinctly represent the action of parties as parties. * * * It should be desired that parties should act in distinct organizations, in accordance with avowed principles, under easily recognized leaders, in order that the voters might be able to declare by their ballots not only their condemnation of any past policy, by withdrawing all support from the party responsible for it; but also and particularly their will as to the future administration of the government, by bringing into power a party pledged to the adoption of an acceptable policy." (Woodrow Wilson, Congressional Government: A Study in American Politics (1885).)

We Americans are supposed to be an easy-going and patient people. At least, foreign

observers think so. They say, and with a great deal of undeniable truth, that every 4 years we enjoy the most dramatic political spectacle to be found anywhere on earth; that we become as excited about the verbal pugilistics of a Presidential campaign as we do about a world's heavyweight championship or the world series. And I can only hope that this is true.

But these foreign observers also say that just as soon as the votes are tallied, we relax politically for the next 4 years and forget all about the platform promises—even though we can hardly wait for the next championship bout or the opening of the next baseball season.

This view of American politics is entertaining—but only for outsiders. Unfortunately, the description contains too much truth for comfort. It is undoubtedly true that we have become somewhat cynical about party platforms and that, all too often, we have been complacent when our Representatives and Senators failed to support even the major policies of their party. Moreover, I have heard more than one man prominent in public life remark that only a politically naive person would expect a Congressman to support the promises in his party's platform.

I do not believe, however, that the American people are as completely cynical as this. I am certain that today the people are showing more concern over the actions of their elected representatives than at any time since the formative years of our Republic. I believe that most citizens agree that we must find a way to make the people's representatives responsible for their action—responsible to those who listen to their promises and elect them on the basis of those promises.

I have always been concerned with the problem of party responsibility, and in recent weeks I have felt it was time for some plain and blunt words on the subject. Why? Because this past fall and winter—and on into spring—I have seen bill after bill in President Truman's legislative program killed, shelved, or emasculated by Democratic Congressmen who were elected by a majority that believed in carrying on the progressive policies of Franklin Roosevelt, as reaffirmed in the Democratic platform of 1944.

Those back home who voted for Democratic Congressmen have been dismayed at finding too many of them voting against Democratic legislation. Republicans have been equally dismayed to find Republicans voting for Democratic legislation. Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, the Republican whip in the Senate, recently expressed deep concern over the confusion in voting among Republican Congressmen. He said that to elect New Dealers as Republican Congressmen would "only confound the present confusion and * * * betray those who entrust the future to Republican leadership."

Thus, it is not only the Democratic side that is concerned over party responsibility. Indeed, this is a problem that must concern everyone, since it involves our most cherished institution—representative government.

Believing as strongly as I do about all this, I first outlined my views informally and extemporaneously last March at a luncheon meeting of the Women's National Democratic Club in Washington. Long ago I came to the belief that when those in public life speak extemporaneously they must suffer the consequences, if any; also, I have no sympathy with those in public life who say, afterward, that they were misquoted in the newspapers—simply for the sake of covering up any "off the cuff" indiscretions they may have committed.

But still it was somewhat of a surprise to me to learn from a newspaper story the next day that I had called for a purge of Democratic recalcitrants in Congress—when what I did was to call for a system of discipline within the party organization. There is considerable difference.

Quite a bit of public furor was created on Capitol Hill and elsewhere in Washington by those brief luncheon remarks, yet, privately, I found much sympathy with my ideas.

MISQUOTED ON PURGE SPEECH

Since that luncheon in March I have tested out my ideas on a speaking trip across much of the country. I have found that the people do believe in thrashing out this question—here and now. And I had hoped that I had made it plain that I am not talking about a purge, but about party discipline. Yet a story on the front page of the New York Times about a speech I made in San Francisco in late April still led off by saying that I "called for a second time for a purge of Democrats"—even though the speech itself clearly made no mention of a purge in any sense of the word.

I am writing this article not only to expand my own views, but also in the hope that it will bring forth the ideas of others so that the Nation can have a beneficial debate on this vital subject. And I am dealing specifically with what should be done by the elected party. To this end, I want to present the following beliefs:

I believe that delegates should determine at a party's national convention certain major policies their candidates will go all out to support for the next 4 years. This platform should be drawn up—with all seriousness and after full democratic deliberation—in the knowledge that the citizens of the United States will hold the party accountable for its platform promises.

When the new Congress is organized, the leaders of the majority party in both Houses—in consultation with the President and his Cabinet—should immediately select from the platform several planks that, in their opinion, concern the most important problems facing the Nation. These planks would then become the test issues for determining party responsibility and party loyalty.

To amplify this point, let us select from the Democratic platform of 1944 some of the planks that could serve as test issues.

One of these test policies could be the party's pledge to promote international trade through reciprocal trade agreements. This was the policy of the Democratic Party during Franklin Roosevelt's first three terms, and the 1944 platform pledged the party to continue that policy.

Another Democratic policy that could be used as a test issue is the stated belief of the party that the Federal Government is responsible for using its powers to prevent economic catastrophes—such as serious inflation or deflation, and mass unemployment.

This has been the consistent policy of the party since 1933, and the coordination of our economy by the Federal Government has become firmly a fixed principle of the Democratic New Deal.

A third policy that could serve as a test of party responsibility is the party's belief in Federal development and conservation of the Nation's resources, through flood control, conservation of soil fertility, and the building of power projects. This policy also includes the party's belief that the Nation's human resources should be equally conserved and improved by the encouragement of adequate housing, health, and educational programs.

FAVORS MORE FREQUENT CAUCUSES

I suggest these issues as typical. In making the selections, the majority party leaders of the House and Senate should discuss party policy thoroughly with the party's Representatives and Senators before deciding on the test issues. For this purpose, I believe most strongly that party caucuses should be held more often.

In this connection, I believe that recommendations of the La Follette-Monroney Committee on the Organization of Congress should be put into effect promptly—particularly the recommendation that formal policy committees for both parties be established in the House and Senate, with funds appropriated to make the work of the committees available in usable form by our Congressmen. Such policy committees would augment the good accomplished by more frequent party caucuses. I heartily endorse the committee's recommendation that the majority policy committee in each House should hold frequent meetings to consider its role in expediting consideration and passage of matters pledged to the people by their party.

Once the basic test policies of the majority party have been selected, the Congressmen of that party would be required to vote with the party on bills designed to put these policies into action. But they would not have to vote with the party leadership on other party measures.

But who and what will require them to vote with the party? And what is to prevent the people from returning them to Congress in spite of their failure to live up to the party's platform promises? Here are some of the answers:

The party organization in Congress could deprive a dissident Congressman of his most valuable privileges. The first result of disloyalty to party principles could be the loss of membership in congressional committees. The dissenting Congressman would still have his democratic right to speak and vote, on the floor, but he could not participate in the highly important legislative decisions that are made in committee before bills reach the floor.

The constituents of a Congressman without committee privileges would not long return him to Congress.

Dissident Representatives or Senators could also be deprived of their privilege of influencing appointments to Federal offices. These appointments usually are subject to review by the national committee of the party in power, which could discipline a Congressman by completely ignoring his recommendations.

On first thought, this may seem like harsh discipline. But the demands of our time—the demands upon our democratic system—also are harsh. And we shall never have a healthy two-party system as long as a recalcitrant minority of the party in power fattens itself on party patronage and committee seniority and still flouts the party leadership that seeks to carry out a people's mandate.

Even if a Congressman had shown himself a party man in name but not in deed, he would still be free to seek renomination under the party label in his own State primary or convention. If such a dissident Congressman were reelected and then followed the party leadership on the test issues, party privileges would be restored to him.

I do not advocate, nor do I believe in, the direct use of the national party machinery against a dissident Congressman in his own State. I was opposed to the so-called purge of 1938—and I told President Roosevelt so on three different occasions. However, I do believe that the President and other party leaders have the obligation to make their views known about dissident Congressmen so that the voters can be fully informed. But the direct use of the national party machinery against dissidents in their own States would be an undemocratic act interfering with the people's right to choose their own representatives in free elections.

These, then, are the main points in my proposal for making parties responsbile for carrying out their promises to the people. But until some such plan is put into practice, anyone should feel free on occasion to support people who do not belong to their party, but who hold to the expressed national principles of that party. It was in this spirit, for example, that, with the sanction of President Roosevelt, I spoke for the reelection of young BOB LA FOLLETTE in 1940.

In outlining my proposal, I have not attempted to answer all possible objections as I went along. I well know, however, that all manner of sincere questions will arise and I shall try to anticipate some of them.

Someone is sure to ask: "With this kind of party discipline, wouldn't a Senator or Representative be merely a rubber stamp?" The answer is that no Congressman, as I have said, would be asked to follow the party leadership on every measure. He would be required to vote with the party only on those few basic issues that party leaders, after full consultation, decided were vital to the general welfare, from the party's own point of view.

Suppose a Congressman followed the party leadership on some measure against his own better judgment. He would be at perfect liberty to go back to the voters at home and tell them frankly that he voted against his own wishes; that he personally was opposed to the party policy on this particular measure, and that he would work unceasingly to change this party policy. Such activities should not be cause for imposing disciplinary action.

THE PROBLEM OF THE ISSUES

Others will ask, "If issues develop after the platforms have been voted on by the people, will the new issues be made a test of party loyalty?" The answer is "Yes; if they are basic to the party's position. For example, no one could have predicted, in the summer of 1944, that the control and utilization of atomic energy would become one of the most important issues before the present Congress. Certainly the peacetime development of atomic energy should be a basic issue for testing party loyalty and party responsibility. Then there is the British loan, which, in view of the Democratic position on the promotion of multilateral foreign trade, clearly should be included as a test issue.

Another question that may be asked is, "What can the people do about party platforms besides voting for or against the platforms presented to them at election time?" The people can have a great deal to say about the platforms of their parties if they become active in politics at the precinct level, and keep active.

All too often in the past we have become excited along about the end of October, only to become complacent again after the first week in November. The challenge to democracy today cannot be met by this kind of dabbling in politics.

The national interest demands that the people constantly exercise their privileges of citizenship right down to the precinct level.

If they do this, they will find that they have a powerful voice in the selection of delegates to party conventions and, through these delegates, in making party platforms.

If the present confusion should continue, all of the people will be the losers. Suppose, for instance, that the Republicans should run a plausible facsimile of a Progressive for President in 1948, on a plausible Progressive platform. And suppose the people, believing in the platform promises, should elect him and a Republican Congress.

Most of the Republican Congressmen elected on this platform, I am sure, would not support a progressive program. Legislation would be blocked. Nothing would be accomplished—unless the progressive Republicans could form a coalition with progressive Democrats to support a progressive Republican President. But this would be a practical impossibility, because the overwhelming majority of Republican Congressmen would be conservative or outright reactionary, and they could easily form a coalition with their kind on the Democratic side to defeat progressive legislation. We know from the bitter experience of recent months what harm this coalition can do to national progress.

DISILLUSIONED WITH G. O. P.

Up to now, I have tried to make this discussion as nonpartisan as possible. I was a Republican once—as my father and grandfather had been. I shared the same disillusionments they shared. I changed my party allegiance because I found that time and again the Republican Party failed to live up to its platform promises. I first actively campaigned for the Democratic ticket in 1928 because I believed in the sincerity of its "equality for agriculture" plank—and I had had enough opportunity to know that the Republican promises to the farmer, for years, had been only empty words. Ever since then, I have been fighting for the progressive principles proclaimed in the Democratic platform.

But having had a Republican background, I think I understand the Republican position. And I know, too, that many Republican leaders feel just as I do about party responsibility.

The following editorial I found quite pertinent:

"If Democrats and Republicans are to have legal standing as such, then Democrats should not make Republican decisions and Republicans should not make Democratic decisions. To permit this is to commit a fraud against the citizens who are trying to make their organization and their decisions according to the prevailing theory of political action and party responsibility."

This editorial is from the Chicago Tribune of April 23, 1938.

It was quite a surprise to find that Colonel McCormick and I were in agreement on even one thing. But this editorial does point to the heart of today's biggest political problem.

In the decisive days ahead, the American people have definite alternatives ahead of them.

They can make an effective and intelligent choice only if our political parties stand openly and honestly for clearly defined principles—and can be counted upon to put those principles into action when the people have made their decision.

WORLD GOVERNMENT—LETTER BY GRENVILLE CLARK

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a letter addressed by Mr. Grenville Clark, of Dublin, N. H., to the editor of the New York Times, which appeared in the Times of yesterday. Mr. Clark is a well-known lawyer of New York City, and he was one of the sponsors of the Dublin (N. H.) Conference, and was counsel for the Dublin Conference committee in preparing the petition to the General Assembly. The letter deals with the report made by Mr. Baruch, but particularly it deals with world government, and I wish to read a paragraph from the letter:

We should not be misled by the fact that the field of Federal jurisdiction is at the start to be restricted to atomic energy only. It remains true that within that field the plan calls for government in its true sense and with all its implications.

The announcement of this plan is heartening to those who have long perceived that unmodified sovereignty is incompatible with peace and that freedom from fear can be bought at no cheaper price than the acceptance of world government.

The letter is an illuminating one and is well worth the reading by all Members of the Senate.

I rose to say, Mr. President, that if Mr. Clark's evaluation of the proposal made by Mr. Baruch is accurate, and it seems to me to be an accurate and fair appraisal, then this proposal is one on which the American people are entitled to a referendum, and I may add that I have no doubt the American people will in time take a referendum upon the proposal if it should be accomplished without submission to the people in advance.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD GOVERNMENT—A BEGINNING IS SEEN IN BARUCH PROPOSALS ON ATOMIC CONTROL

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Will the effort to create a limited world government succeed in time to forestall World War III? Will the recent proposals of the United States for an International Atomic Development Authority, the first great official plan for limited world government, become a reality? These are the great questions of our time. They transcend all other questions, foreign or domestic.

Let there be no mistake as to the effect of the proposals presented by Mr. Baruch in his forceful and eloquent speech on June 14. That plan calls for nothing less than a considerable beginning in Federal world government.

The essence of government is law—law in the sense of rules binding upon individuals and enforceable by sanctions imposed by the law-making authority. The American plan contains these essentials. Thus, when Mr. Baruch calls for a world agreement for renunciation of the bomb with "condign punishments set up for violations of the rules of control which are to be stigmatized as international crimes," he is speaking of nothing less than binding and enforceable world law. In a word, he is speaking of limited world government.

Thus also when he says that "national authorities for the control and development of atomic energy should to the extent necessary" be "subordinate" to the new authority, and that there must be a "clear demarcation of the scope of duties and responsibilities of such national authorities," he is speaking of world government with a federal character. He is discussing the old problem, familiar to all Americans, of the proper division between the delegated powers of a federal government and the powers reserved to the constituent units of the federation.

START OF JURISDICTION

We should not be misled by the fact that the field of federal jurisdiction is at the start to be restricted to atomic energy only. It remains true that within that field the plan calls for government in its true sense and with all its implications.

The announcement of this plan is heartening to those who have long perceived that unmodified sovereignty is incompatible with peace and that freedom from fear can be bought at no cheaper price than the acceptance of world government. The encouragement is the greater in that the proposals mark a complete reversal of American policy.

As James B. Reston has often pointed out in the Times, our own Government originally proposed that the permanent members of the Security Council, now the Big Five, should have a veto in the Council on substantive issues. At San Francisco, our delegation upheld this veto. Yet, Mr. Baruch, speaking officially for our administration, says "There must be no veto to protect those who violate their solemn agreements not to develop or use atomic energy for destructive purposes."

The implications of this statement can hardly be overstressed, since the principle cannot and will not be limited to atomic energy. If the veto will not do and if government must prevail in respect of the atom bomb, must not the same conclusion follow as to blockbusters and incendiaries, as to bacteriological and chemical warfare, and as

to all heavy armament and means of mass destruction?

Is it not clear that once sovereignty is modified in one field, it will merely be a matter of time before modification occurs in other fields where the preservation of civilization plainly requires an extension of world law? As Mr. Baruch said, why should not the abolition of the veto apply to "the elimination of war" itself? Thus, this revolution in American policy implies much more than the control of atomic energy. It is no less than the entering wedge whereby world government will be gradually developed.

INCOMPLETENESS NOTED

Nevertheless, this recognition of the immense significance of the proposals should be accompanied by a realization of their incompleteness in at least two vital respects. Thus, on the question as to whether the new authority shall be independent of the United Nations or shall function under its direction, Mr. Baruch was indefinite. Here a dilemma is presented. On the one hand, it would be conceivable only as a last resort that the authority should function otherwise than under United Nations' control. If left independent, the authority, with its great mission and extensive powers exercisable without nullification by veto, would surely overshadow the United Nations, which would probably lapse into innocuous desuetude.

Moreover, it would be inefficient and confusing to have two world authorities functioning in closely related fields under different forms of organization and different voting procedures. On the other hand, to subject the authority to the control of the United Nations in its present form would be even more inadmissible, since the present defective structure of the United Nations would subject the authority to paralysis.

The other major omission is the absence of any definite proposal to solve the interrelated problems of balanced representation and voting procedure. Few will deny Mr. Baruch's proposition that a veto rule is wholly incompatible with the workable control of atomic energy. But unless this conclusion is supplemented by a well-devised new system of representation and voting, the mere condemnation of the veto will accomplish nothing.

To resolve these problems, the remedy is the early and necessarily radical amendment of the United Nations Charter, so as to make the United Nations itself a limited world government, with the authority as one of its agencies. The framing and adoption of such amendments would seem, indeed, to be absolutely indispensable, if the drastic alternative of entirely by-passing the United Nations is to be avoided. The next step, therefore, must be a discussion as to the kind of amendments required. And it would seem essential that all those having the responsibility, namely, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Security Council, and the General Assembly, should join in this discussion.

The most vital amendment must reconstitute the General Assembly on a fair basis of balanced representation that will take into account not only population but other relevant factors. This is the key problem because, until solved, it would be found impossible to deal with the companion issue of voting procedure or to determine the legislative authority to be conferred upon the Assembly.

In considering the amendments necessary to harmonize the new authority with the United Nations, Mr. Baruch and his associates are dealing with questions that have already had long consideration.

BALANCED REPRESENTATION

What factors besides population should be considered in the apportionment of representation in the Assembly, and what is the fairest and most acceptable plan of balanced representation? Should representatives vote in blocs for their countries or as individuals; and should all decisions be by majority or sometimes by a larger vote? What are the minimum legislative powers that the Assembly must have in order to prevent war?

It is possible that a recent detailed petition to the General Assembly for amendment of the Charter may be of use at this juncture. This petition resulted from the conference on world government at Dublin, N. H., in October 1945. The Dublin conference called for transforming the United Nations into a federal world government with "limited but adequate power to prevent war," this result to be achieved, if possible, by amendment of the Charter.

This petition called for discarding the obsolete conception of one vote for each country in the Assembly, whereby Liberia has an equal vote with the United States and Luxemburg with the United Kingdom. Instead, it proposed a concrete formula for weighting the representation of the member countries. Thus, to illustrate, the United States, the British Commonwealth and Empire, as a whole, and the Soviet Union, as a whole, would be allotted equal voting power, each with 65 representatives. China and France would each have 25 representatives, Belgium 9, Argentina 8, Norway 4, and so on, in view not merely of relative populations but of such factors as natural and industrial resources.

SPECIFIC POWERS

Assuming this basic change, the petition then proposed that all decisions be by majority vote with each representative voting as an individual. Finally, it set forth the specific legislative powers to be given to the reconstituted Assembly. These would permit the outlawing of war itself, the control of the atomic bomb and other major weapons, and the punishment of individuals for violation of the restricted class of laws that could be enacted.

It is of interest that, with the change of only a few phrases, these proposed amendments would include all the powers envisaged by Mr. Baruch for the Atomic Energy Authority. Perhaps these proposals, while far from perfect, can throw light upon the reconcilement of the authority with the United Nations and upon a plan of representation and voting which would make the elimination of the veto acceptable even to two-thirds of the American Senate and the Soviet Union.

Looking back even 1 year, immense progress has been made in the fight for world government. Where a few months ago those who insisted upon the inadequacy of the present Charter were called perfectionists, such disparagement is no longer heard. Instead of the veto being defended as essential, it is now admitted to be a fatal obstacle. By Mr. Baruch's great speech, the way has been opened for amendments of the Charter which, while confined at first to the control of atomic energy, can readily furnish a guaranty, in Mr. Baruch's phrase "against war itself."

OBSTACLES STILL

It would be folly to ignore, however, the formidable obstacles still to be overcome. Cynicism and defeatism still persist. Vestiges of isolationism survive. There remains a chasm of suspicion and misunderstanding between Russia and ourselves, for which we are equally at fault, and which must be bridged by mutual forbearance.

There may be some to say that the necessity for world government is so plain that its coming is inevitable. It is probably true that world government is on its way. But the question remains whether it will come soon or only after mankind has been still further chastened by another and yet more frightful war.

It is only a combination of clear political thought and of persistent work that can prevail in time. There was never a better moment to recall the famous saying of Mr. Justice Holmes: "The mode in which the inevitable comes to pass is through effort."

GRENVILLE CLARK.

DUBLIN, N. H., *June 20, 1946.*

RENEWAL OF LEASE TO CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE, ST. PAUL & PACIFIC R. R. CO.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the House of Representatives has just sent to the Senate the bill (H. R. 5876) authorizing the Department of Agriculture to renew a lease on some gravel beds in Montana. The office of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] asked me to watch for the bill and request that the Senate consider it on its arrival in the Senate. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has considered a similar bill, which provides word for word what is provided by the House bill, and the Senate bill is on the calendar at this time.

My request is that the Senate now take up the House bill and pass it. There is no objection to it from any source.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 5876) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease to Henry A. Scandrett, Walter J. Cummings, and George I. Haight, trustees of Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1936, was read twice by its title.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand this bill in its substance provides for a renewal of a previous lease given to the trustees of the Milwaukee road, permitting them to enter upon land of the Department of Agriculture and take gravel therefrom at a fixed figure agreed upon in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator is correct. The present lease will expire at the end of this month, which is only 5 or 6 days hence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5876) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 2014, now on the calendar, be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House

had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2218. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended; and

S. 2219. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3565) to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5716) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, Mr. HOBBS, and Mr. HANCOCK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EXTENSION OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT OF 1942

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5716) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

RETURN OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES TO STATE OPERATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4437) to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), and for other purposes.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, on Friday last House bill 4437, providing for the return to State operation of public employment offices, was made the unfinished business. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Albert D. Misler, attorney in the Solicitor's Office of the Department of Labor, be permitted to sit beside me during the discussion of this bill in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I believe at the very outset it should be made clear to the Members of the Senate that House bill 4437 provides for the return of the Employment Service to State operation. I might say also at the outset that it is throughout a compromise bill. It probably does not represent exactly what either majority or minority Members would have written. It does represent what was worked out as the best solution of the situation which we could agree upon and which I think practically all the members of the committee thought it desirable to pass. I personally, like some of the other members of the committee, favor the establishment of a permanent single system of public employment offices, rather than 48 separate State systems.

We believe that a national public employment service is necessary to meet the employment problems which will confront the Nation in the foreseeable future. We who advocate permanent federalization are firmly convinced—and we believe our convictions are borne out by the record—that a nationally directed system of public employment offices, not jurisdictionally limited by geographical and political boundaries, can more adequately and more effectively carry out a program designed to effectuate maximum employment and eliminate wasteful turn-over of workers in industry. However, there seems to be in the committee—and I think perhaps in Congress—a belief that these services should be returned to the States, and I shall support this bill on that theory.

In full recognition of the President's agreement that the employment service will be returned to State operation as soon as the unified service is no longer needed to meet the demobilization, reconversion, and other problems growing out of the war, and in view of the position recently taken by the Congress with respect to this subject, the committee undertook to formulate an agreed-upon bill which would return the United States Employment Service to the States under conditions which will best safeguard the public interests. To that end we have held hearings which extended intermittently over a period of 4½ months. I believe that it should be clearly pointed out that this bill is the first measure considered by the Congress on this subject, on which hearings have been held during which witnesses representing all sections of our economy were invited to present their views. All previous legislation on this subject considered by the Congress since VJ-day has been in the form of riders attached to other legislation.

From these hearings we have developed the practical and legal problems which must be solved in connection with the transfer. After careful study of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, we concluded that the House bill was grossly inadequate to the solution of those problems. We are therefore reporting to the Senate an amended bill. In this bill we have provided sound solutions to the problems of transferring our public employment offices to State operation and providing a sound basis for their efficient operation after the transfer. We have achieved a compromise bill; every provision of the bill has the acceptance of almost the entire committee. Through close analysis, we have met, to the maximum extent practicable, objections raised to provisions which were proposed for incorporation in this bill.

Perhaps the most difficult issue which arose in connection with this legislation was the determination of the date for the return of the employment service to State operation. The views presented to the committee varied between recommendations for permanent Federal operation of the employment service, the President's recommendation for return of the employment service to State operation on June 30, 1947, and the request of the State unemployment compensation administrators for the return of the employment service to the States on June 30, 1946. So there were three well-known suggestions.

The compromise date agreed upon and provided for in this bill requires the return of the employment service to State operation not later than December 31, 1946.

This date was agreed upon as the earliest date that the transfer could be effected without disastrous disruption to the employment service programs. Disruption at a time when an effective employment service is most imperative and most vital must be avoided at all costs. Those who for obvious reasons have agitated for the immediate return of the employment service to State operation, at whatever cost to the public interest, have urged that it is the moral obligation of the Federal Government to do so. We are told that the moral obligation to return the employment service to State operation immediately stems from the fact that the emergency for which the employment service was loaned to the Federal Government is now over. Current economic conditions, involving prices and wage stabilizations, might be argued as an answer to this suggestion. However, since the bill provides for a return at a specific time—and, as we believe, the earliest date at which it could be returned without a disruption of the service—the date is not only a compromise, but I think a reasonable compromise.

There are two basic reasons why it is imperative to defer the dismantling of the nationally directed, unified system of public employment offices we now have. First, present labor market conditions and manpower problems are peculiarly national in scope. Our problems are now more numerous than at any time in the history of the Nation because of the return of soldiers and sailors to this country. Our present system, which operates on a national basis without regard to State boundaries, can most effectively meet and solve these problems. Secondly, the transfer of the employment service to State operation, the dispersion of a single system into 48 separate systems, at a time when the work load of the local offices is at an all-time high, will entail serious disruption to their services, will inevitably result in their inability to render maximum assistance to the groups most urgently in need of assistance now, the veterans, displaced war workers, women, youths, and the handicapped.

I strongly urge, Mr. President, that any decision we make with respect to the date for the return of the public employment offices to State operation should be made in light of its effect upon both these problems.

The veterans' problem, for example, is in every sense a national problem requiring action on a national basis. Millions of discharged veterans and hundreds of thousands who are yet to be released must still be adjusted into the civilian economy. Many veterans who have returned to their former positions are still seeking better employment opportunities, in order to utilize the skills acquired in the armed services. Many veterans are entering the labor market for the first time; many acquired skills in the armed services for which there is no direct civilian counterpart. All these need and ask for employment counseling. All these are seeking jobs without regard to State lines. More difficult problems are presented by the disabled veterans who are now entering the labor market on an unprecedented scale. To these who were disabled in the service of their country we owe a special duty, a duty to assist them in their readjustment to civilian employment through rehabilitation and selective placement programs. The Congress itself foresaw and made provision for these problems. In June of 1944 it enacted title IV of the GI bill of rights, to require the expansion of veterans' placement facilities and to emphasize the responsibility of the Federal Government to maintain veterans' placement and counseling services.

Even apart from the veteran, we are now confronting the greatest movement in our peacetime history of workers and employers across State lines. The war worker who must convert his wartime skill to peacetime use is in no sense restricted by State lines. The displacement of wartime civilians, particularly women and older workers, by returning veterans, makes high labor turn-over the order of the day. In some areas acute labor shortages still exist, but the solution of the problem is impeded by the lack of adequate housing for immigrants. To these problems we must add those arising from the new manpower demands for the housing program, the food-production program, and plants whose reconversion has been impeded by industrial strife. The veterans and displaced workers who are swelling the stream of interstate migration, seeking employment opportunities wherever their skills can best be utilized, represent only a part of the national placement problem which demands unified, rather than divided, attention.

This Nation is now being called upon to assist in alleviating the famine which threatens the major portion of the globe. This task requires the maximum utilization of all our agricultural and food-processing resources. Our agricultural and food-processing industries are particularly dependent upon the recruitment of workers across State lines.

Probably one of the most serious, if not the most serious, of all the problems with which this country is confronted is the extreme housing shortage. It is estimated that the veterans' emergency housing program will require the recruitment of one and one-half million workers, many of whom must be recruited across State lines. In addition, we are dependent upon our Nation-wide system of public employment offices to supply the workers required to avoid bottlenecks in the production of building supplies.

This argument is advanced in order that the Senate may have before it the situation showing the necessity of considering well before requiring a hasty return of these facilities, and in support of the proposition that at least until December 31, 1946, the date set out in the bill, the employment services should not be disturbed.

To our committee, Mr. President, it was self-evident that a system of public employment offices in which every local office is a part of a unified Nation-wide system can most effectively meet these complex placement problems. To our committee, Mr. President, it was self-evident that our country is now facing, and will be facing, these placement problems for the balance of this year.

The natural result of these chaotic labor-market conditions is the tremendous work load which today is being carried by our local employment offices. More than 14,000,000 reception contacts a month are currently being handled by our local employment offices. This shows the tremendous demand for aid for employment purposes. This is a staggering work load. Not only does it surpass all wartime figures but it is the largest in the history of our public employment-office system. The most conservative predictions forecast no appreciable decline in this work load before the end of this year.

It has been urged by representatives of the State unemployment compensation agencies—and I may add that they have not been conversant with the details of the administration of the employment service during the past 4 years—that the transfer of our public employment offices from Federal to State operation can be effected within 30 days without disruption to the service. Such a contention is patently absurd. The transfer and division of a single, unified, Nation-wide system to 51 separate and independent jurisdictions, even under normal circumstances, will result in substantial disruption to the service. How, then, can virtually disastrous disruption be avoided if such a transfer is undertaken at a time when the local office staffs are already burdened with a staggering work load? At the very time when the time and energies of the employees would most be needed to meet this work load their time and energies would be diverted to reorganization and administrative problems. The drafting of policies and procedures to meet the needs of State-operated programs, the preparation and review of organizational and operating plans, and the multitude of negotiations and problems incident to the transfer of personnel, renegotiation of leases, and reorientation of personnel to revised programs, policies, and procedures are only some of the time-consuming problems which would divert the energies of the local office personnel.

The President in his memorandum disapproving the rescission bill cautioned against such action during the peak-load period of our public employment offices. General Bradley appeared before both the House Committee on Labor and our committee to voice his fear that the return of the Employment Service to State operation during this peak-load period will seriously disrupt the servicemen's readjustment allowance and veterans' placement programs. He was supported in his views by some of the major veterans' organizations, whose representatives appeared before our committee to urge that the transfer be deferred. Mr. President, because of these factors, I cannot urge too strongly that we defer the transfer of our public employment offices to State operation until at least the end of this calendar year which is the date set out in the bill now before us.

Apart from the date of the transfer, our committee found two groups of problems that require careful legislative action to assure a sound and orderly transition from Federal to State operation of our public employment office system. The first involves the transfer of the offices as going concerns. The second involves the financial and other provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act, which would apply to the States' operation of the offices after the transfer.

Our committee found that there was unanimity of opinion that our public employment office system should be transferred from Federal to State operation as a going concern. Obviously, the greatest danger to such a transfer is undue turn-over of personnel. To avoid such turn-over, the trained and experienced employees now employed in local public-employment offices must be transferred to State employment.

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. CARVILLE. Does what the Senator is now saying apply to the director of the unemployment compensation division?

Mr. TUNNELL. No. It does not apply to the national director who, it is provided in this bill, shall be appointed by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CARVILLE. Would it apply to the State director?

Mr. TUNNELL. I believe that there would have to be a qualification of the State director.

Mr. CARVILLE. In my State, according to the original act, the State director was not under civil service. He was selected by the governor to handle the employment section.

Mr. TUNNELL. Under this bill it is not provided that the State director shall be under national civil service, but that there shall be established a system of qualification under the State organization.

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield further to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. CARVILLE. What I am particularly interested in is whether the director, who would be appointed by the State authority, would be under the merit system so far as that system itself is concerned?

Mr. TUNNELL. There is no exception to be made so far as the director is concerned.

Mr. President, to assure continuity of service and at the same time, maintain sound personnel and merit-system practices, the employees must be entitled to permanent appointment in the State service if they become eligible, after qualifying or competitive examinations, for such appointments. Some disagreement was manifested before our committee as to whether the present employees of our local public employment office system should be given qualifying or competitive examinations under the State merit systems. The bill recommended by our committee leaves that choice to each State.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I am told that in many of the States, including Ohio and Massachusetts, laws have already been enacted providing expressly for the return of employees to State service, and that the provisions in the State laws and in the bill now before the Senate are in conflict with regard to the terms under which the employees should be returned. Has the Senator any information on that subject?

Mr. TUNNELL. I have not heard that statement made before. However, I do not believe there will be any difficulty if the merit system is operated on a good-faith basis in the particular State concerned. I think that was the intention of the committee.

Mr. President, since June 6, 1933, our public employment office system has been operated, except during the war emergency period, under a Federal-State cooperative arrangement as provided for in the Wagner-Peyser Act.

When the States resume the operation of our local public employment office system, the provisions of that act will again become applicable. Actual operating experience since June 1933 as well as other developments, have demonstrated the need for several amendments to the act. In order to provide a sound and up-to-date foundation for the resumption by the States of the operation of public employment offices, those amendments should be adopted now, as a part of the legislation providing for the transfer. The bill reported by our committee includes such amendments.

The need for amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act, the basic employment service act enacted 13 years ago, has manifested itself time and again. I may add that title II of this bill is, in substance, the present Wagner-Peyser Act with proposed amendments. When the Wagner-Peyser Act was passed, there were no Federal or State unemployment insurance laws on the statute books. Since that date, however, the Social Security Act has been passed, requiring the payment of unemployment insurance through public employment offices. At the State and local levels, unemployment insurance and public employment office programs have been closely coordinated. However, as of today, at the Federal level there exists no legislative foundation for the coordination of our employment service and unemployment insurance activities. Such a requirement has been included in this bill.

Similarly, some of the present provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act impose unnecessarily cumbersome procedures. Others have proved inadequate.

With your permission, Mr. President, I should like, briefly, to discuss the most significant amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act, recommended by our committee, and in connection with each, to review the objections interposed. But first let me say that representatives of the State employment security agencies voiced vigorous objections to any amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act. They urged the return of the employment service to the States on the same basis as it had been operated prior to the federalization. It is significant, however, that none of the bills which the State agencies supported and urged upon our committee would return the employment service to the States on the same basis as it had been operated before the federalization. The House bill, supported by the State agencies, eliminated the dollar-for-dollar matching provisions of the present act and substituted instead, 100-percent financing by the Federal Government. This constituted a major substantive change in the present act. Similar provisions are contained in the bill reported by our committee and were contained in the rescission bill previously passed by the Senate. Our committee found no difference of opinion on this point. So far as I remember, no objection was voiced by any member of the committee to the payment of the full amount of the cost by the Federal Government. There certainly was no objection registered on the part of representatives of the States.

Another amendment to the Wagner-Peyser Act, recommended by our committee, requires the States to establish and maintain personnel standards on a merit basis. This provision is virtually identical to a similar provision in title III of the Social Security Act. It was opposed by the State agencies on the ground that employment-service employees, after the return of the service to the States, should be covered by the Social Security Act standards which apply to State unemployment-insurance employees. It was contended by representatives of the State agencies that authority vested in two separate administrative agencies to promulgate merit standards covering the same employees could potentially result in conflicting standards. This contention is without merit. The Social Security Act merit standards apply only to State employees who are engaged in unemployment-insurance functions, and paid from funds granted under that act. The great majority of employment-service employees will have no unemployment-insurance functions and would therefore not be subject to the Social Security Act merit-system standards. Our committee recommends the incorporation of this provision in the Wagner-Peyser Act, in order to incorporate in that act well-established policies of the Congress under similar grant-in-aid statutes. To the extent that State employees are used interchangeably between the State unemployment insurance and employment service programs, it is reasonable to assume that the merit-system standards will be coordinated.

Another amendment to the Wagner-Peyser Act, recommended by our committee, would incorporate in the act, long-established and commonly accepted minimum principles governing the referral of workers by public employment agencies, that is, that workers should not be referred to jobs below their highest skill unless a reasonable effort has been made to place them in jobs which to utilize their highest skill, and that workers should not be referred to jobs in which the wages, hours, or other conditions are substantially less favorable to the individual than those prevailing for similar work in the locality. The first principle is so self-evident that it requires no explanation. The second principle has long been recognized by the Congress and is now incorporated in Federal legislation governing our unemployment-insurance program. It is likewise incorporated in every State unemployment-insurance law in the United States. Our basic enabling legislation for our Nation-wide system of public employment offices would be incomplete without these principles.

Our committee was urged to include in the Wagner-Peyser Act, a provision which would authorize the Secretary of Labor to maintain and operate a State-wide system of public employment offices in any State which became ineligible for grants under the act. It was contended by those who opposed this provision that this was a device to permit continued Federal operation of the public employment offices. On the other hand, representatives of the Department of Labor, as well as other affected public officials, strongly urged, and, as this body will recall, the President likewise urged in his memorandum disapproving the rescission bill, that the national interest in the continued operation of our local public employment offices in each State requires such a safeguard in the event any State, for a variety of possible reasons, ceases to operate such offices.

Under title IV of the GI bill of rights, the Congress recognized and provided for the primary responsibility of the national Government to assure adequate and effective placement and counseling service for some 15,000,000 veterans. Under the Wagner-Peyser Act Federal grants in aid are available on condition that the States provide the essential services through their public employment offices, and operate such offices with reasonable efficiency. Hence, under the present provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act, if a State fails to maintain essential services with reasonable efficiency, Federal funds must be withdrawn. In practical effect the withdrawal of Federal funds would mean the closing of the public employment offices in the State.

Obviously, in such a situation, those whom the Congress seeks to assist under

this legislation; that is, veterans, workers, and employers, are most seriously penalized. If the Federal Government is to carry out its obligations to veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, if the Federal Government is to carry out its obligation to maintain a system for clearing labor between the States, if the Federal Government is to avoid penalizing the beneficiaries of a program for the deficiencies of State officials, the Wagner-Peyser Act must include a provision authorizing the continued operation of public employment offices in States which cease to operate their own offices. Our committee weighed carefully the views expressed by those who advocated and those who opposed such a provision. We concluded that the contingencies feared by both opponents and proponents could and should be guarded against. We believe that has been accomplished in the bill as reported by our committee.

The compromise which this bill contains removes the threat of continued Federal operation and at the same time provides reasonable assurance that public employment offices will be maintained in all States. Under the provisions drafted by our committee, if a State ceases to be eligible for funds, the Federal Government will be authorized to operate public employment offices in the State for a limited period of 3 months and may expend in any fiscal year for such purposes not more than $1,000,000 unless the governor of the State specifically requests the Federal Government to continue its operation for more than 3 months, or unless funds are specifically appropriated by the Congress for that purpose. These time and monetary limitations will prevent the Federal agency from using this authorization as a cloak for continuing direct Federal operations, and at the same time will permit the continued maintenance of the service for those whom the Congress seeks to assist. It will also provide a reasonable time within which a State which has failed to qualify for Federal grants can take the measures necessary to correct its deficiencies.

Mr. President, I have discussed the significant amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act which our committee recommends after careful and extended study of the entire subject matter. I cannot close without one further comment. It has been repeatedly charged, in vague and general terms, that this bill contains broad grants of authority which would permit detailed domination of the States' administration by the Secretary of Labor. Several of the amendments I have described, are cited as a basis for such charges. In addition, the Secretary's authority to promulgate rules, regulations, and standards of efficiency is cited as a basis for such charges. I say flatly that such charges are absolutely without foundation in this bill. Authority to promulgate rules and regulations necessary to administer a program is so common a provision in Federal and State statutes as not to warrant taking the time of this body to discuss the provision. But apart from the common character of the provision that authorization was included in the Wagner-Peyser Act as enacted by the Congress in 1933. That authorization is not a new amendment, recommended by our committee. Incidentally, a similar authorization was included in the rescission bill—which was passed by both Houses of Congress, but was vetoed by the President—relating to the return of the Employment Service to the States.

It has also been claimed that the amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act, recommended by our committee, constitute such substantial changes that the States would not be able to resume the maintenance of State public employment offices without further State legislation. In truth and in fact, the changes which we have recommended are already implicit in the present act and in no sense represent a departure from its fundamental principles. However, out of an excess of caution, our committee has included in this bill a clause which in effect suspends, until after the next session of the State's legislature, the operation of any provision of the Wagner-Peyser Act which requires additional legislation in a particular State. That clause has been added in section 4 of the act, and occurs in lines 5 to 14, inclusive, on page 7 of the bill.

Mr. President, I know that representatives of the State unemployment compensation agencies are seeking to defeat this bill, regardless of its reasonableness, in order that they may, through a rider in the appropriation measure for the United States Employment Service, secure the return of the public employment offices without the safeguards which our committee recommends, and which are incorporated in the bill. I submit that the major portion of the subject matter covered in the bill will be permanently applicable. I submit that the importance of this subject matter renders it inappropriate for disposition through an appropriation measure. The importance of the subjects covered in the bill requires enactment at the earliest possible date of legislation making permanent provision for the problems I have discussed.

In conclusion, I again wish to stress the fact that the bill which is now before the Senate was agreed upon by almost the entire committee after long and arduous hearings and executive sessions, after all the witnesses were heard, and all the objections carefully weighed and considered. No one who had a legitimate interest in this legislation was denied an opportunity to present his views.

The bill is a reasonable compromise measure. It gives no one any wide and unrestricted authority. It brings up-to-date the basic legislation under which our Federal-State cooperative employment service program is to be administered. Its proposed changes reflect 13 years of development and operating experience. It provides adequate standards to guide both the Secretary and the States in carrying out their respective responsibilities in administering an effective Federal-State cooperative employment service program.

I recommend the bill to the Senate.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the able Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] has just presented the reasons why the measure now before the Senate should be acted upon immediately in the form in which it has been reported to the Senate.

I should like to say that, in my opinion, the pending bill, H. R. 4437, represents legislative action at its best. Members of the subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Delaware, who had major responsibility for preparing the bill, gave unsparingly of their time to a full consideration of all the angles of every problem, economic, legal, or practical, which it could be foreseen the proposed legislation might raise. The subcommittee secured assistance toward full and fair consideration through welcoming to its hearings all interested parties, whether individuals or representatives of organizations, whether private citizens or public officials. In addition, the subcommittee has participated with the full committee in executive sessions for exhaustive consideration of any alternative bills dealing with the subject of the return of the United States Employment Service to the States. No previously proposed legislation on this subject has received such adequate attention as this bill.

Only a singularly unreasonable person would maintain that the bill does not cover all its objectives. The report of the very able chairman of the subcommittee states these objectives as: First, to fix the date for the transfer from Federal to State operation of the local and State employment offices; second, to provide for the transfer to State agencies of properties and records used and personnel employed in State and local employment offices in order to assure that the transition from Federal to State operation is effected without confusion and disruption to the service; and third, to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act to provide, out of the knowledge gained by almost 13 years of operating experience, a sound and permanent basis for Federal-State cooperation in the maintenance of a national system of public employment offices which will meet the needs of veterans, employers, workers, and the public of the Nation.

With respect to the first objective, H. R. 4437 provides for retention of the United States Employment Service in that governmental department which should have primary concern with activities involing the labor force, namely, the Department of Labor. It requires the transfer of operating offices of the Employment Service to State administration not later than December 31, 1946. This date is sufficiently imminent to encourage immediate preparation for the transfer, but sufficiently in the future to allow such preparation to be made in an orderly fashion.

To meet the second objective, the bill requires that the States shall transfer the Federal personnel engaged in State and local employment office functions to State employment on the date of the transfer of the Employment Service to the States; and that they shall afford such employees a reasonable opportunity to acquire eligibility for continued employment in the State employment service. This provision will prevent any substantial loss of experienced Employment

Service personnel which might hinder full and efficient operation of employment offices in the period immediately following transfer. The bill further provides for the transfer of property and records of State and local employment offices to the States.

With respect to the third objective, H. R. 4437 amends the Wagner-Peyser Act to eliminate certain provisions of the original legislation which have proved to be impractical; to amplify other provisions in accordance with requirements for growth and development in the Employment Service; and to add new provisions which will assure continuous operation of a superior service by a high caliber of personnel.

It seems obvious to me that this bill represents the best possible compromise at this time between the views of those who, like myself, believe that we should have a federally operated employment service, and of those who as sincerely believe that the service can be most efficiently operated by the States. For this reason, I am more than willing personally to support the recommendation of the committee that the bill be passed.

FACTS OF LEGISLATION TO RETURN THE UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE TO THE STATES

In December 1945, as the Senator from Delaware has pointed out, the President pocket vetoed an appropriation rescission bill containing a rider which would have dismantled the USES and turned it over to State operation in 120 days. In his veto message the President indicated that this action was being taken at a time and under conditions which he could not approve.

In January the House passed a bill sponsored by Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, which is substantially similar to the one which the President vetoed. Meanwhile, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor was holding hearings on several bills relating to the USES, including S. 1510, a bill which embodied the President's recommendations. After extensive hearings, the committee reported a bill on April 30 which contains substantially the President's recommendations, modified to meet all reasonable objections which witnesses raised to specific provisions. In an effort to reach agreement within the committee on a bill, the date for the transfer was set at December 31, 1946.

The issue in this legislation focuses on the date of the transfer. President Truman's request for continued Federal operation of the USES until June 30, 1947, is based on a number of aspects of the heavy responsibilities of the administration for guiding the Nation successfully through the reconversion period.

To transfer the employment offices to new management at this time would inevitably disrupt the services provided to veterans and others seeking employment. The USES is confronted with the greatest work load in the Nation's history, with over 14,000,000 individuals per month calling at the employment offices for service. In no previous time in the country's history have labor market conditions been so chaotic and unstable. The rate of demobilization is not synchronized with the rate of reconversion to peacetime production. Thus the Nation is experiencing the contradictory trends of increased employment accompanied by increasing unemployment.

Widespread occupational and industrial shifts are occurring, and they are accompanied by extensive migration and job changing. Today we have in the labor market more maladjusted or totally unadjusted workers than ever before in our history. The veteran whose only work experience was as a heavy gunner; the paratroop captain who left off operating a mimeograph to go to war; the farm laborer who doubled his previous income as a riveter in an aircraft factory; the 17-year-old boy who dropped out of school to go to work; and the machinist who lost his right hand in the Battle of the Bulge. These workers, veterans in particular, are visiting local employment offices asking assistance and guidance in their readjustment to peacetime employment.

Even when the peak load of the reconversion period has passed, the transfer of the employment service from Federal to State administration will be a difficult and complex task. To undertake such a transfer at a time when the Employment Service is burdened with a staggering work load can result only in a substantial impairment of the services at a time when they are most urgently needed.

A transfer at this time would divert the energies of the Employment Service staff from the problems of servicing returning veterans and displaced war workers and would direct these energies instead to problems involved in dealing with reorganization, the drafting of policies and procedures to meet the needs of State-operated programs, discussions with State officials for the purpose of developing operating procedures, the transfer of personnel from Federal to State employment, the preparation of civil-service examinations, and morale problems of State and local office personnel created by job uncertainty and prospective salary reductions. This diversion of energies during the peak-loan period should be avoided at all costs.

There are additional reasons why Federal operation is important during the reconversion and demobilization period. Among these reasons is the necessity for breaking manpower bottlenecks that involve a coordination of activities on a national basis. The Nation is now called upon to assist in alleviating a world-wide food crisis. This task requires the maximum utilization of all of our agricultural and food-processing resources. The food-processing industry is particularly dependent upon the recruitment of workers across State lines, and their prewar experience does not dispose them favorably to State operation of the interstate clearance machinery.

The housing industry also requires assistance from the United States Employment Service in the form of intensive interstate recruitment of labor. It is estimated that the veterans' emergency housing program will require the recruitment of a million and a half workers. To prevent the development of bottlenecks in the production of building supplies will require a substantial effort on the part of the USES similar to that which was exerted to staff war production.

While exact figures are not available for the number of workers who must be recruited for the food-processing and other rural industries, such as timber and pulpwood, in the next year, it is estimated that it will total several hundred thousand.

The opponents of the administration's position—primarily the State unemployment compensation administrators and most of the State governors—argue that the Employment Service was borrowed from the States by the President for the emergency, that the emergency is now over, and the Federal Government has a moral obligation to return the Employment Service to the States, and that in any case the States can handle the problems of the reconversion period more efficiently than can the Federal Government because they are closer to the local communities and the people. They further argue that it is impossible to administer efficiently the unemployment-compensation programs for which they are responsible without having control over the Employment Service.

The administration believes that the emergency is not yet over, as has been recognized by Congress itself in the continuation of the War Powers Act and other legislation. As against the majority of the governors who are demanding the return of the USES to State operation, a substantial number of mayors and other municipal officials have requested continued Federal operation of the USES during the reconversion and demobilization period so as to avoid a disruption of services. The unemployment-compensation program is being administered in an efficient manner at the present time under Federal operation of the USES, and General Bradley—who is responsible for the payment of servicemen's readjustment allowances to veterans through the State unemployment-compensation agencies—has requested continued Federal operation of the USES and has expressed the fear that a return of the USES to State operation at this time might endanger the present efficient administration of the veterans' readjustment-allowance program.

SUMMARY OF EDITORIAL COMMENT ON RETURN OF USES TO STATES

In the discussions on this subject last winter, when we passed H. R. 4407, the measure that later was vetoed, it was asserted that there was a widespread demand in the so-called grass roots of the country for the immediate return of the USES to the States.

At that time I did not feel that those assertions were entirely true, but I did not know. So in the interim I caused to be made a review of the editorial comment of newspapers on the subject from every section of the country. Some of these editorials were published in our greatest metropolitan centers. Others appeared in newspapers published in communities so small they are barely able to support a daily newspaper. Still others were published in communities of varying size between those two extremes.

I would like to read excerpts from some of these editorials. The first of these editorials is as follows:

The logic of President Truman's demand that the United States Employment Service remain intact for a year from next July has always seemed to us unassailable.

The problem of finding employment for millions of returning veterans and other millions of displaced war workers surely requires for solution a centralized agency with national jurisdiction, to say nothing of the valuable experience acquired by the USES in guiding the vast migration of labor essential to war production. And it needs time. Yet, the House, by an overwhelming majority, has voted that the facilities and personnel of the Service be returned not later than June 30 of this year to the States from which they were borrowed.

One asks why and gets no coherent explanation.

That quotation is from the New York Herald Tribune.

From New York let us journey to the Midwest, and I take Senators to Cincinnati. I quote from the Enquirer, a distinguished journal of that city:

The United States Employment Service has handled the job all during the war and handled it well with an experienced civil-service staff. There certainly should be no rush about detaching it from duty, particularly in view of the fact that the USES is working so closely with the returning veterans and has facilities for handling their needs. * * * Ultimately, of course, the service should be a State or local function. But very definitely there should be no hurry about transferring it.

In the great State of California to which, during the war period, more than 1,000,000 war workers migrated from every section of the country there is another of the Nation's great newspapers. It is the San Francisco Chronicle. I quote now from Chester Rowell, one of the Chronicle's distinguished editors. He says:

President Truman favors (as does Governor Warren) this return (of the USES to the States) as rapidly as practical. But to hurry it like this would disrupt the whole operation, defer reconstruction, and increase unemployment.

Now let us return to the Midwest and I quote the sentiment of a leading newspaper of northern Ohio, the Cleveland Plain Dealer. It says, in part:

From time to time this newspaper has viewed with alarm the tendency of the Federal Government to encroach on prerogatives of the States. * * * This philosophy applies to the States' employment service which the Federal Government took over during the war. The Plain Dealer agrees with President Truman, however, that it is too early to return the employment offices to the States. As far as the services which these offices were set up to perform are concerned, the emergency has not yet ended. It will not be ended until the industrial reconversion program is much further advanced than it is at the present time.

The next quotation is from an editorial in the Elk City, Okla., News, a city with a total population of 5,021 persons:

President Truman, by pocket veto, has refused to permit the transfer of the employment service back to the States and thus has blocked the breaking up of the United States Employment Service into 48 separate units. We believe this action was wise. * * * We can see no reason for destroying this system as this time when hundreds are seeking work and employers are crying for particular skills. And above all else, veterans must be found jobs. Who can be so naive as to say this problem would be tackled by States on the same basis and with equal vigor as it will as a national service?

From Mississippi comes the next editorial, published in the Oxford Eagle. This small city has a population of 3,433. This editorial says:

President Truman's veto of a bill that would have returned control of employment offices to the States has at least temporarily halted a change that would be disastrous during a period where much shifting of workers is certain.

The Chicago Daily News makes this editorial comment:

It is true * * * that the United States Employment Service is at the peak of its activity and that a change in its administration would undoubtedly interrupt its work at an inconvenient time. It is also true labor is extremely mobile at this time. Hundreds of thousands of families are on the move from one State to another. This is inevitable during the period of reconversion. There never has been a time when the problems of employment and unemployment were more national in character. Even those who in general are eager to see the States and local communities regain a larger share of governmental responsibility must question the haste of Congress to put this particular function back into their hands.

I believe that, should a poll be taken, the sentiment of this body would unanimously affirm the declaration that South Carolina, of all the States, has given tangible support to the theory of States' rights. I quote now from the editorial page of the Spartanburg Journal:

President Truman's veto of the congressional bill to return the United States Employment Service to the jurisdiction of the States within the next 100 days was a courageous and intelligent action. * * * The USES was first taken over by the Federal Government because there was a very pressing need for coordinated effort on a national scale to find men for many new war jobs. Few denied the necessity at that time. Today the situation is equally urgent, though conditions are reversed. Today there is urgent need to find jobs for hundreds of thousands of people who previously had crossed State lines to get war jobs. There is still need for coordinated effort on a national scale. * * * The Journal believes in States' rights when States are right. This time we think they and Congress are wrong in urging an early return of the USES to State control.

The Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia, of which Robert McLean is president and publisher, and also president of that great news-gathering cooperative, the Associated Press, makes this comment:

The issue is one on which the public has not had much illumination, but, for the present, at least, a continuation of Federal administration has much to recommend it. The problem of reemploying displaced persons in industrial reconversion is obviously national in scope, and greater coordination could be achieved through unified control than through a multitude of State agencies operating independently.

Let us move to the Midwest again and see what the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has to say on the subject:

Soon after the war effort began job placement was centralized under Federal auspices. Workers were more effectively mobilized in this war for war production than if 48 agencies had been attempting the job. The necessity for effective placement of workers has not ended. The task of finding suitable employment for the millions of released veterans and displaced war workers is a formidable one.

The editorial opinion of the Louisville Courier-Journal likewise appeals for reasonable delay in this matter:

It would be the sheerest folly to restore the Employment Service offices to the States within 100 days, as Congress has decreed. * * * Employment ebbs and flows without any regard to State lines, and this is especially so in the reconversion period. * * * Mr. Truman was wise and courageous in repeating his advice that the transfer be postponed until June 1947 and that needed permanent changes in the whole employment system be effected meanwhile

Valley City, N. Dak., is a city of 5,917 population. It is deep in the grass-roots section. Its daily newspaper, the Times-Record, entitles its editorial on this subject "Well Done, Mr. Truman," and declares:

While President Truman probably would not win a popularity contest among Congressmen for his pocket veto of the return of the United States Employment Service to State control, he should receive the support of the country at large for his action.

Like price control and other controls over the economy during the period of reconversion, the Employment Service, as it has been operating since 1942, is an essential part of the program. He has asked Congress to leave USES under Federal supervision until the transition from war to peace has been completed. * * *

The USES certainly has operated with efficiency and a minimum of red tape under Federal regulations. It has been able to transcend State lines and to do an all-out job of placement of workers. It is not ridden with politics. Those of us who have had anything to do with USES know these things.

The Grand Rapids (Minn.) Herald-Review is published in a community of less than 5,000 people—4,875 to be exact. And here is its editorial comment on this subject, under the title "Too Broad for States." The editorial declares:

There are no State lines in the general problem of employment. That was recognized by the Federal Government when the Service was established. Men in Minnesota could find out that there was need for their work in Kansas, Detroit, or Washington. The great industries that needed men might learn of available help in Minnesota.

Return this function to the States and it will be seriously limited at a time when it may be sorely needed. Some States might do a good job, or try to. Others will do nothing. A well-coordinated effort will be impossible.

From the far Northwest—Prosser, in the Yakima Valley of the great State of Washington—population, 1,719—comes another voice, that of the editor of the Record-Bulletin. He says:

President Truman acted wisely and courageously when he vetoed the bill transferring the Federal employment offices to the States. If anything is needed in this group of 48 States, it is some organization that is Nation-wide. To cut this agency up into 48 parts would be to destroy its real effectiveness. Proponents of States' rights chose a poor place to start in their efforts to reduce the power of the Federal Government.

The Lewistown (Idaho) Morning Tribune, published in a city of 10,548, has something to say on the same subject, and it is this:

President Truman showed real spunk in vetoing a bill to rescind $51,800,000 of wartime appropriations because it contained a wholly unrelated rider providing for return of Government employment offices to the States. * * *

While we normally favor State and local control of anything that can be so controlled effectively, we are inclined to favor Federal control of the Employment Service, which we think is now doing a good job and which we think ought to function on a national basis as a coordinated agency.

Almost the breadth of the continent from the two papers from which I have just quoted is published the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times. Though this metropolis of up-State New York, at the gate to the Adirondack Mountains and New England, has a population of 33,885, the circulation of the Times, according to the Ayers Newspaper Directory, is 39,838. What does it have to say on this subject? Again I quote:

Our own judgment is that it is not the time now to do away with the United States Employment Service. We are in the middle of the reconversion period. Tens of thousands of workers are returning home after wartime employment in large centers of population, often to other States. The USES cuts across State lines. It can supply workers anywhere. Industry has become so big that State agencies are able to render only a limited service. Before the USES is abolished, State employment services should be better correlated.

In the city of Boston is the headquarters of a great religious organization which publishes a newspaper universally recognized for its integrity as well as its sound judgment. I refer to the Christian Science Monitor, and I quote from an editorial it published on this subject under the title "Too Soon to Change." In part the editorial reads:

Mr. Truman displayed sound judgment both in his veto and the accompanying message. The arguments in favor of State-operated employment services are many and valid, but the time for change is not now. The employment forecast is not clear. * * * For this very reason of uncertainty the USES should not be forced to undertake the difficult task of decentralization and reorganization while carrying a very heavy load of work and an even heavier load hanging over it.

Mr. President, the editorials from which I have quoted are from the grass roots of the Nation—North, East, South, Midwest, and far West. I believe the newspapers which published them represent the sentiment of the people on this subject. I think the attitude they express is the attitude of the vast majority of our citizens.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I have a communication which states that the House bill differs from the Senate bill in that the House bill contains a different standard in the matter of work allotments than the Senate bill. The safeguards in the House bill relate to the requirement for jobs; they require that jobs be allocated on the basis of qualification, and that jobs thus allocated shall call for no less wage than the prevailing wage for similar work in the locality.

The Senate bill refers to the criterion of suitability, that is, the suitability of the applicant to the particular job. The author of this letter indicates that this opens the door to discriminatory practices, and suggests that the Senate bill conform to section 10, as it appears in the House bill. I do not know whether the distinguished chairman of the committee would care to accept an amendment on that score, or whether it would be his desire, now that there is a difference between the House bill and the Senate bill, to take the matter to conference, or whether there is some other reason why the Senate bill contains the suitability provision as against the prevailing rate, and so forth, in the House bill.

Mr. MURRAY. It is my impression that the Senate subcommittee gave that question very careful study at the time the bill was before it for hearing. I am sure that if the subcommittee thought it should be made to conform to the provisions to which the Senator refers, it would have so reported to the full committee. I believe that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who served on the subcommittee, would be better able to answer that question than I.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The House bill contained no provisions at all for referral standards, and we wrote them into the Senate committee amendment in section 10.

Mr. MEAD. Then this statement in the letter is incorrect. Let me read the entire statement:

We note that H. R. 4437 (S. 1510), dealing with the return of USES to the States, has been amended by the Senate Education and Labor Committee to withdraw from section 10 the two safeguards against discriminatory job-referral practices which the House committee had placed in the bill. These two safeguards, in essence, are the requirement that jobs be allocated on the basis of qualifications and that jobs thus allocated would call for no less a prevailing wage than similar work in the locality.

Mr. BALL. That is not correct. There were no standards at all in the bill as it came over from the House. We wrote into it three standards, in section 10, which reads as follows:

SEC. 10. In carrying out the provisions of this act, no person shall be referred to a position (a) without due notice to the applicant, if the position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute; (b) if the wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are substantially less favorable to the individual than those prevailing for similar work in the locality, except upon request of the applicant; or (c) if as determined by the State agency the position is one which does not utilize the person's highest skill, until and unless a reasonable effort has been made to place him in a position that does utilize his highest skill.

There were no standards in the House bill.

Mr. MEAD. It is quite possible that the amendment which the Senator has read may have been adopted by the Senate committee after my informant received his original information. At any rate, the question can be considered in conference, and I shall refer this letter to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the provisions to which the Senator from New York has referred may have been discussed during the time the bill was before the committee in the House, but my recollection is that when the bill came to us it had no such provisions in it.

Mr. BALL. There was nothing of the kind in the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. MEAD. Apparently there is a misunderstanding on the part of the author of the letter. I shall refer the letter to the chairman of the committee, and he can refer it to the conferees.

There is one other matter which I feel should be considered before this bill is finally passed by the Senate. It is pointed out in this letter in the following language:

It will be of interest to you to know that the language in the appropriation bill affecting the USES which has been recommended by the House Appropriations Committee is regarded as most unfortunate. In addition to the fact that no provision is made for USES employees who will be returned to the States, there is language in the bill which indicates that H. R. 4437 would be ineffective, even though it may be enacted into law. I refer to the language in section "Grants to States" which reads, "For payment to the several States beginning October 1, 1946, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended to January 1, 1942." This langauge in effect nullifies for the fiscal year 1947 any other legislation which the Congress might enact because such other legislation must necessarily be an amendment to the Wagner-Peyser act enacted after January 1, 1942.

Why is that limitation included in the bill, limiting the authority to January 1, 1942?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I think the Senator from New York is a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which will consider that language in the bill. It was inserted because the date of January 1, 1942, which was the date on which the Federal Government took over these offices, was the date which was used. The theory was that the offices were to be returned in exactly the same status legislatively as that in which they were transferred to the Federal Government. I do not think it is a workable or practicable provision, but it is up to our Committee on Appropriations to do something about it.

Mr. MEAD. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion, and I have such an amendment ready for the Appropriations Committee. But why would it not be appropriate also to offer an amendment to the legislative bill, providing that funds appropriated to USES for the fiscal year 1947 shall be available to carry out the purposes of this act? That would reach

the problem just as well as would an amendment to the appropriation act which would run counter to an amendment already adopted by the House committee.

Mr. BALL. I doubt if that would change the date from January 1, 1942. I think the only place to amend that bill is in the bill itself.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me that that would be the appropriate place for such action to be taken.

Mr. MEAD. I am sure it will be taken; but it also occurs to me that we might make it doubly certain if we were to provide that the appropriations required under this act should apply to the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. MURRAY. I see no objection.

Mr. MEAD. I shall offer that amendment for consideration later, if it is agreeable to the chairman.

Mr. MURRAY. I can see no objection to taking it to conference. If, in the meantime, it is determined that it would be of benefit, it can be adopted. If not, it can be rejected in conference.

Mr. MEAD. It would offer additional opportunity to discuss the question.

Mr. MURRAY. We will accept it.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment if it is in order at this time. I send it to the desk and ask that it be read.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the pending bill open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the committee amendments have not yet been acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MEAD. I ask that my amendment be deferred until after the committee amendments shall have been disposed of.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

In section 3, line 18, after the semicolon, there is a clause reading "to maintain a farm placement service." Does the Department of Labor now have such a service?

Mr. MURRAY. I understand that that language is already in the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Mr. WHERRY. Then there is no change from existing law. I should like to know whether this bill represents an attempt to bring farm labor under the Department of Labor, rather than to leave it under the Department of Agriculture, where it is now.

Mr. MURRAY. My understanding is that the bill would not do that.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I understand that the Secretary of Agriculture has requested the Secretary of Labor to take over this function. That is the information which came to me.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from New York mean that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked the Department of Labor to take over the placement of farm labor?

Mr. MEAD. That is the information which I have received.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not that something new? Has the Secretary of Labor done this work before?

Mr. MEAD. I do not know. I think the matter is covered in the bill now.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have some little familiarity with the farm labor item. It is true, as has been stated by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], that the original Wagner-Peyser Act, which I believe was enacted in 1933, shortly after I came to the Congress, did contain this language. However, if the Department of Labor ever did function as a placement agency for farm labor, I never heard of it. I never heard of a single farmer or farm laborer who was helped in that way by the Department of Labor.

Mr. WHERRY. Neither did I.

Mr. RUSSELL. When the farm labor situation became acute in 1940 or 1941, the Congress passed the additional legislation which set up a farm labor bureau in the Department of Agriculture. Of course, that had the effect of repealing the provision of the original Wagner-Peyser Act.

Congress had subsequently taken action to keep the farm labor bureau in the Department of Agriculture. The Congress has extended the resolution on that subject from time to time. It is my understanding that the appropriation and the legislation for the handling of farm labor in the Department of Agriculture will expire on the first day of January 1947. I think I am correct in making that statement. I have had some apprehension, I may say to the Senator from Nebraska, that the effect of this language would be to annul the prior action of the Congress when it passed a specific act setting up a farm labor bureau in the Department of Agriculture. It could very readily have that result, and that might have the effect of calling for the transfer to the Department of Labor of the unexpended appropriation, which would be several million dollars, and the functions.

I think this provision of the pending bill should be clarified. I do not think the function should be left in this position, which might result in a situation in which neither department would know which one was to handle it. I have heard that the Secretary of Agriculture is anxious to get rid of this function. I should like very much to have someone place in the RECORD the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture which states that he is not desirous of handling the farm labor function. I know that many farmers are very apprehensive about having it put back into the Department of Labor, for the reason that they were not able to get much assistance from the Department of Labor prior to the time when the Congress passed the legislation placing the function under the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his observation. Let me inquire whether there was any testimony on that particular item in the hearings. I do not believe there was. I should like to have the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture, if it is a statement, or any other information on the matter placed in the RECORD, at least, as a basis on which to work. If the Secretary of Agriculture is not asking to have the Department of Labor take over this function, I would ask those in charge of the bill to modify it by deleting that phrase, so that there will be no doubt that this work is again to be handled by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. It is my understanding that there is no permanent legislation authorizing the Department of Agriculture to carry on a placement or employment service for farm labor.

Mr. MURRAY. The provision was a temporary one which was included in an appropriation bill. When the appropriation bill expires, the provision ceases to exist, unless it is renewed in another appropriation bill.

Mr. BALL. I think what has happened is that the Department of Agriculture, knowing that its authority under the resolution would expire on January 1, has been trying to get some agency to continue the work, and that would logically be the United States Employment Service. I understand that agreement has been reached whereby a joint resolution extending the appropriation until July 1, 1947, will be introduced.

The bill now pending in the Appropriations Committee does not contain any funds to enable the United States Employment Service to carry on this service. The funds are in the hands of the Department of Agriculture. If we continue its authority by means of a joint resolution, I do not think there will be any change in the present situation. At the same time, I do not like to have removed from this act the basic legislative authority for carrying on a farm-labor placement service, until we have permanent legislation placing the authority somewhere else.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, what I was apprehensive about—and I think my fears are well-founded—was that this language could be construed as annulling the resolution which now is the present law. Of course, we all know that the authority granted to the Department of Agriculture was temporary in character because of the gravity of the emergency. There had not been any shortage of farm labor until about 1940. Before that time it probably did not matter whether the Department of Labor functioned in this connection.

But I think we should be careful not to repeal the existing law, and I am afraid this language would have that effect. I think the President would be justified, under his powers under the re-

organization bill, to say that the Congress had demonstrated that it wanted this function placed under the Department of Labor, and thus he would transfer the service and all its functions from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Labor.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, does the Senator believe that would be the situation if we provided that the Service should remain where it is until June 30, 1947?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. But we would be dependent upon having the House of Representatives send us a resolution to cover the situation; and if the House did not send such a resolution to us we would be helpless.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, do I now have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana still has the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. For the moment I shall pass over the amendment, but I think before we finally act on the bill this matter should definitely be clarified, because I think the views expressed by the Senator from Georgia have a great deal of merit. If we leave the provision in this bill as substantive law, will it not nullify what already has been done? If that happens now, is it not true that we shall have no assurance that when the resolution comes up we shall be able to obtain the appropriation?

Mr. MURRAY. I understand that if this provision is left in the bill it will not nullify what already has been done.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator if that is not merely an opinion. If we pass the pending bill containing this provision it certainly would be the basic law under which the placement of farm labor would be carried on. If we are going to use the appropriations for the next year shall we not have to wait until they become available before we shall be able to carry on the work? Is not that the Senator's opinion?

Mr. MURRAY. My information is that, otherwise, funds for performing this function would not be available. I am informed that so long as the Congress continues to furnish funds to the Department of Agriculture to carry out this program it will be able to carry it out, and this language will have no effect whatever upon it.

Mr. WHERRY. I assume that the Senator feels reasonably certain that the provision in question will not in any way nullify or jeopardize the appropriations which will necessarily be made in order later to carry on the work.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. With that explanation, I shall not now ask that the language be modified by an amendment. I should still like to know whether the Secretary of Agriculture requested that a transfer be made from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Labor. There is no record of it.

Mr. MURRAY. There is no record of it. I assume that the Department of Agriculture was seeking to find out what would necessarily have to be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I now renew my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Myers
Andrews	Guffey	O'Daniel
Austin	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hart	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Hoey	Robertson
Brooks	Huffman	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Stanfill
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	Knowland	Swift
Byrd	La Follette	Taft
Capehart	Lucas	Taylor
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Wagner
Donnell	McMahon	Walsh
Downey	Magnuson	Wherry
Eastland	Mead	White
Ellender	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Willis
George	Morse	Wilson
Gerry	Murdock	
Gossett	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, before we start considering committee amendments, I should like to make a brief statement about the bill.

I was on the subcommittee which worked out the bill. It is not so much of a change from the bill passed by the House as might appear, because the House bill amended the Wagner-Peyser Act considerably, but did it by striking out here, there, and all through the bill. To eliminate the confusion, we merely struck out the House amendments, and amended the bill to read as it is now at the desk.

Most of the language in the present Wagner-Peyser Act we picked up, and made such changes as seemed to us necessary to bring it up to date. Actually, there has been quite a bit of confusion in operating employment offices under title III of the Social Security Act and under the Wagner-Peyser Act. We merely tried to make a coherent basic statute out of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

We had three purposes in the amendments recommended. One was to fix the date of transfer. The House had decided on fixing June 30 of this year, which I think obviously now is impossible, because it will take at least from 60 to 90 days to work out the mechanics of the measure. We decided on December 31, 1946. One idea we had in mind was that it might be a good plan to put this transfer off until after the elections next fall, that that would be better all around.

The second purpose was to provide for the transfer of personnel. Since the Federal Government took over the employment offices, in January 1942, more than half the personnel taken over with them have left the service, and now approximately 14,000 out of the 23,000 employees are individuals who have been added to the rolls since the Federal Government took over. As a result, most of them have no status under the various State civil-service systems.

We picked up most of the language of the bill which passed the House, which in turn was taken from the rescission bill which Congress passed last fall, and which was vetoed, simply in order to give the individuals who have no State civil-service status a reasonable opportunity to acquire such status before they are separated.

Then we had to make some provision to take care of transfer of property, leases, and all that sort of thing. Finally we had to make provision to take care of the civil-service retirement payments of the State employees who for nearly 5 years have been Federal employees, and have been paying into a Federal retirement system. When they go back to the State employment, in order that they may become eligible again for retirement, under most State retirement systems they must pay up contributions for all the back years when they have been out of the State service. If they are to do that, they will need a refund of the payments they made to the Federal system, and if they should happen to have been in Federal employment more than 5 years, they cannot draw out in a lump sum what they have paid into the civil-service retirement system. We provide that if an employee elects to do that, he may take that course, and get all his retirement benefits under the State law by making back payments.

The third purpose was to bring the Wagner-Peyser Act up to date, and make it a more workable statute for the operation of the Employment Service.

The first committee amendment, on page 1, deals with the date, and I do not think there is any need to expound that. We felt that December 31 was a fair compromise between the June 30 proposed by the House, which obviously now is impossible, and the June 30 of next year which the administration wanted.

Section 102 is a new section, and, in effect, is a substitute for title IV on the House bill, on page 20, which we struck out. As Senators know, the United States Employment Service was originally, under the Wagner-Peyser Act, in the Department of Labor and under the Secretary of Labor. In 1939, after the Social Security Act was passed, which provided in title III that there must be an employment service operated in connection with the unemployment-compensation payments, the President, under the authority of the Reorganization Act, transferred the United States Employment Service to the Social Security Board. It remained there, with the States getting a part of their funds under title III of the Social Security Act, in the way of grants, and a part under the old Wagner-Peyser Act.

After the war began, in 1941, the President, under the War Powers Act, transferred the employment service to the old War Manpower Commission, where it was one of the operating agencies in control of the distribution of manpower in

the war effort. After the War Manpower Commission was abolished, it was kept with the Secretary of Labor.

The subcommittee and the full committee felt that, rather than enact the House provision, which leaves the status of the agency up in the air, so long as it is in the Department of Labor these funds should go through the Secretary of Labor; but when the War Powers Act expires it will go back under the Social Security Board, and we felt that this particular service logically belongs in the Department of Labor, and we provided for a permanent transfer. As I have said, title II contains the amendments to the basic law, the Wagner-Peyser Act.

There is quite an argument made by the State directors, who, I know, have been contacting Senators, to the effect that the Federal Government took this service over rather suddenly and peremptorily on January 1, 1942, and that the services should be returned to the States in exactly the same status in which they were when they were taken over. In theory, that sounds all right, but in actual fact it cannot work out, because in the first place there must be provision for the transfer of about 14,000 employees who have been added to the rolls to replace former State employees who left the service; it is necessary to provide somehow for the transfer of property, and probably we should make some provision to avoid the necessity of the termination of leases which the Federal Government held and now holds, because if those leases are terminated and the States have to rent the property again, they are very likely to find their rents heightened considerably.

Furthermore, on January 1, 1942, the States were contributing about 5 percent of the cost of State services, under the Wagner-Peyser Act. The other 95 percent was a Federal grant, as I have said, partly under the Wagner-Peyser Act, and partly under title III of the Social Security Act. The provision in the rescission bill which Congress passed last fall amended that section of the Wagner-Peyser act to provide for a hundred percent Federal contribution, just as the unemployment compensation divisions of the States are operated on a hundred percent grant for administrative expenses. So that amendment was required.

The old Wagner-Peyser Act provided for grants to States solely on the basis of population. That today would be an extremely unrealistic basis for the grants, because of tremendous population shifts during the war, plus the fact that the farm placement service was transferred during the war to the Department of Agriculture, and the plan now is to keep it there, certainly until June 30, 1947, and probably there will be legislation in the next session of Congress placing it there permanently. So the basis for making grants had to be changed.

The other major changes which we made in the Wagner-Peyser Act concerned the requirement in that act, as it now stands, that the States submit each year a plan of operation to the Secretary before they are eligible for a grant. Under that act they still must conform to the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary. I talked to the director of this service in my own State, who said that he felt that the plan merely involved a lot of paper work which could and should be eliminated. We originally eliminated it, and then later in the committee we added a provision that, if the State agency desires to operate under a plan, it can submit a plan and operate under it.

We also in amending section 5 of the old law provided for a commingling of funds granted under this act, at the request of the State agency, by the Social Security Board for the administration of unemployment compensation, and granted by the Secretary of Labor for the operation of the employment offices. In most States the unemployment compensation and the employment offices are operated by the same agency, and the commingling of funds is provided for, so that there does not have to be an accounting for every single penny on the basis that the employee spent 50 percent of his time in the employment office and the other half in the unemployment compensation service. That kind of accounting does not have to be made. So the provision is that the Secretary shall certify to the Social Security Board the amounts to be granted for operating the employment offices, and then the Social Security Board makes the total grants to the States, and the States administer the combined fund for both unemployment benefits and for the employment offices as one fund.

One new provision is the so-called recapture clause, which is subsection (b) of section 9, on page 12. The bill as introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the chairman of the committee, provided for a flat recapture; that the Secretary at any time could take over and operate a State service. We provide in subsection (b) that the Secretary may use funds to operate a State service if the State is not eligible for funds under this act, or if no employment offices exist in that State, but it is limited to operation only if the Governor of the State requests it in writing, or with funds specifically appropriated by Congress for that purpose, except that the expenditure in any 1 year may not be more than $1,000,000, and the operation of the State system may continue for not more than 3 months.

What that means is that if the Secretary and the State agency get into a controversy over whether the State agency is specifically complying with the law or not, and they cannot work it out, as they will in 100 percent of the cases, I am convinced the Secretary could take over the service and operate it, expending not more than $1,000,000, and operating it for not more than 3 months. Both limitations apply. In order to continue operating it he would have to come to the Appropriations Committees of both Houses and justify a specific appropriation to continue such operation. In my estimation the Secretary would never make that attempt unless conditions in a State became so flagrant that he was confident he could win his argument with the State agency in the two committees and on the floor of both Houses.

I am not too convinced that it is necessary, but it was a compromise of the views of different Senators in the committee, and I think a compromise that is all in the direction of maintaining State authority, and not giving the Secretary any broad grant of power to withhold funds and operate his own service.

The other new provision which we put in the bill, which has aroused some controversy, I think largely due to misunderstanding, is section 10, on page 12, which reads as follows:

> In carrying out the provisions of this act, no person shall be referred to a position—

This is an applicant seeking employment—

> (a) without due notice to the applicant, if the position offered is vacant due to a strike, lockout, or other labor dispute;

That provision is contained in the Federal Social Security Act, as it applies to unemployment compensation, and we simply put it into this law. It is nothing new.

> (b) if the wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are substantially less favorable to the individual than those prevailing for similar work in the locality, except upon request of the applicant;

If the individual wants to take a lower-paying job he can do so, but he must be told that it is a lower-paying job, that it is not paying the prevailing rate of pay for that work.

> Or (c) if as determined by the State agency—

And this was the provision over which most of the controversy arose; so we left it up to the State agency—

> if as determined by the State agency the position is one which does not utilize the person's highest skill, until and unless a reasonable effort has been made to place him in a position that does utilize his highest skill.

The reason for that referral and standard in the bill was that there have been numerous charges that in a few States, during the reconversion period, the law was being administered so as to force applicants for work to accept jobs which did not utilize their highest skill. For instance, if a man was a skilled building mechanic, and no skilled mechanic jobs were open on that date, he either had to accept a job as an unskilled laborer or lose his rights to unemployment compensation. All this says is that if he is a carpenter, he shall be given a reasonable time—and it is again determined by the State agency—to find a job as a carpenter before he is obliged to take a job as a laborer, and if he does not take that job he loses his right to unemployment compensation benefits. That is about all the provision amounts to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator if he will be so kind as to give his answer to this question. Subdivision (c)

of section 10, which the Senator has read, is as follows:

If as determined by the State agency the position is one which does not utilize the person's highest skill, until and unless a reasonable effort has been made to place him in a position that does utilize his highest skill.

I observe that the determination as to whether or not the position does utilize the person's highest skill is left to the State agency. The question to which I ask the Senator's attention is, Who is it that makes the determination as to whether or not a reasonable effort has been made to place the person in a position that does utilize his highest skill? Is that determined by the State agency or by the Federal authority.

Mr. BALL. In my opinion "as determined by the State agency" modifies the whole clause, and I think that would also be determined by the State agency.

Mr. DONNELL. That is the Senator's intention at least?

Mr. BALL. Yes. That was our intention in writing in that language in committee as the Senator will recall.

Mr. DONNELL. I respectfully submit that the language as worded does not clearly carry out that intent. In fact, as I see it, it indicates that the determination of whether or not a position utilizes a person's highest skill is left to the State agency, but that the further determination of whether or not a reasonable effort has been made to place him in such position is not left to the State agency.

Mr. BALL. That is not the intention. I think, if the legislative intention has anything to do with the interpretation of the act, it certainly was the intention of the committee, and it is the intention of the sponsors of the bill, that the determination "by the State agency" modifies the whole standard in subsection (c).

Mr. President, these are the main amendments of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator from Minnesota have any objection to inserting in line 5, on page 13, after the word "unless" the words "the State agency determines that"?

Mr. BALL. No, I would have no objection. When the committee amendment is before the Senate, if the Senator offers that amendment I certainly would have no objection, because, as I said, that was the intent of the committee.

Mr. President, title III deals with the immediate transfer provision and the language is largely that which was in the rescission bill as passed by Congress. The changes we made were largely in the interest of clarity, with this exception, that as it came over from the House the requirement merely was that the Federal employees so transferred, who had no State civil-service status, should be retained, and given a reasonable opportunity to qualify to become eligible for appointment to other positions under the State civil-service law. After they had been given that opportunity, they could then be terminated.

We rewrote that to say that they may be separated——

(A) if they have failed to acquire eligibility for continued employment in the State-wide system of public employment offices under the State merit system in the positions occupied by them under the Federal service or in reasonably comparable positions, after having been given a reasonable opportunity to acquire such eligibility.

The House provision simply gave them no status. Once they had been given the opportunity to acquire eligibility, whether they acquired it or not, the State was then perfectly free, under the House language, to keep them on or dismiss them, as it saw fit. Under the language of the bill as it is reported to the Senate, if they acquire eligibility for appointment through a civil-service examination, it will not be simply a qualifying examination. It will be a competitive examination. If they pass it high enough so that they are among those certified for appointment—usually the top three or the top five—then under this language I think they would be entitled to retain their jobs. If a person then not working in the service were also among the first three, the appointing officer would have no discretion under this language, and would be required to appoint the present holder of the job. That is the substantive change.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. That, I understand, is the respect in which the State laws conflict. Because of the fact that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] was absent from the city, I was talking with the Massachusetts director. He raised a question in connection with the Massachusetts act, which provides various terms on which a person who has served may continue to the service, the kind of an examination he may take, and how he must conform to certain civil-service laws of the State of Massachusetts. The claim is made that if this bill is passed the service will be under two different directions. The Federal law assumes to prescribe who shall be employed in the State service, when possibly a person cannot qualify under the rules which the State has laid down, which it considers generous, but along somewhat different lines from those of the Federal bill.

Mr. BALL. I do not see how there could possibly be any conflict with the State law. To go back to the beginning clause——

SEC. 301. In order to assure the continuance of efficient public employment office services in all States during the transition from Federal to State operation of such services, the Secretary of Labor shall withhold or deny certifications of funds for payment to a State under the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, unless he finds that such State—

(1) (a) has made provision for the transfer to and retention in the State-wide system of public employment offices of employees of the Federal Government who (on the day preceding the effective date of the transfer of the employment offices to the State under this act) had been employed in State and local employment service functions in such State, in the positions occupied by them under the Federal service or in reasonably comparable positions, except that individuals so transferred may be separated or terminated for good cause as determined in individual cases under the applicable State merit system, or separated or terminated under the applicable State merit system by reason of reductions in force found necessary in the interests of efficient operations, and may be separated (A) if they have failed to acquire eligibility for continued employment in the State-wide system of public employment offices under the State merit system in the positions occupied by them under the Federal service or in reasonably comparable positions, after having been given a reasonable opportunity to acquire such eligibility.

I assume that in the case of Massachusetts, eligibility to continue, would mean that they must take a competitive examination and pass the examination high enough to be among those certified for appointment.

Mr. TAFT. But why should we say anything about Federal employees? If we are to turn these offices back to the States, why should not the States say whom they choose to employ, provided they have a proper merit system? Why should we say, "You must take X, who happens to have been employed temporarily by the Federal service"? Do we turn the offices back to the States, or do we retain them as Federal offices, in effect, telling the States whom they must employ and what they must do?

Mr. BALL. I do not think we are telling them whom they must employ. We say that if the present incumbents in the jobs can pass a civil-service examination with a high enough score so that they are among the top three or four certified for appointment, they should receive the appointment. I do not think it is a vital point. I do not believe that any State is going to clean house if the employees are qualified. If they are not qualified, they cannot pass a competitive examination high enough to be appointed.

Mr. TAFT. However, as I understand, if the State agencies do not conform, the Director so notifies them, and under the theory of this bill the moment he notifies them he can take away their funds if they do not comply, or he can even take over the services if he wishes to invoke such an extreme remedy.

Mr. BALL. He cannot take over the services in many States with a $1,000,000 limitation on his funds for that purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As a matter of fact, is not the present personnel largely the personnel which was employed by the States before the Federal Government borrowed the agencies?

Mr. BALL. That is true of less than half of the personnel.

Mr. AIKEN. There would have been a normal turn-over anyway.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. But so far as any employees who were employed by the State when the agency was taken over are concerned, those who wanted to continue have continued.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. At least that is true in my State. I do not know about other States.

Mr. BALL. Many of them have gone into the military service or left for war jobs. I think most of the employees now in the State offices have joined the Service since it was taken over by the Federal Government. So more than half of those employees have no State employment status whatever. That is the reason why this whole question is a little difficult.

Mr. President, in my opinion the Congress will have to meet this issue in one way or another. The labor-Federal security appropriation bill which is now before the committee provides for the transfer of these offices on October 30, I believe. The provision in the appropriation bill is very deficient. It does not do anything about the transfer of employees or the transfer of property, which is essential even if we do not do anything about the employees. It does not do anything about changing the basis on which the funds are allocated to the States under the Wagner-Peyser Act. We can either provide the basic legislation for the transfer and bring the Wagner-Peyser Act up to date in this bill, or we shall have to write some rather extensive legislation into the pending appropriation bill. It seems to me to be a much sounder procedure to legislate in this bill. Then all we shall have to do in the appropriation bill will be to appropriate the funds.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not overly familiar with this bill as it has been written by the Committee on Education and Labor, but under the first section it is provided that the Secretary of Labor shall return to State operation not later than December 31, 1946, or such earlier date as he may deem feasible, all public employment offices in an orderly and expeditious manner. What jurisdiction, if any does the Federal Government retain over any of the facilities which have been operating public employment offices, or over the employees, after December 31, 1946?

Mr. BALL. It would retain none under this bill, except general supervision, which it has under the Wagner-Peyser Act. The Federal Government has always promulgated over-all rules and regulations to govern the service, and has certified the States to receive grants of funds. That would be the only jurisdiction.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand from the answer of the able Senator that once a public employment office is turned back to a State, aside from the regulations laid down in the Wagner-Peyser Act the Federal Government would retain no jurisdiction over any employee, and would have no right to tell the State whether it might or might not employ a particular individual?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, if this bill were enacted into law, there would be no duplication of jurisdiction and no duplication of responsibility. In other words, after the enactment of the bill the States would assume full responsibility for the proper or improper administration of the act.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. That is exactly what I completely question, because while the States administer the act, they are subject in every detail to the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor. He defines every feature of the question of referral. By rule and regulation he can govern the administration of these bureaus, and if they fail to conform to his rules and regulations he can take over the service. So I question the answer which the Senator from Minnesota has given to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BALL. I specified that he could make the general rules and regulations. He has no control over who is appointed, once the transfer is made. Under title III the Secretary is to satisfy himself, before he transfers an office, that the plan for the transfer of employees will accomplish the results specified. Once he transfers it, I think he loses all jurisdiction so far as individual employees are concerned. He still must be satisfied that the merit system governs appointments in the service, but that is all.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As a result of this legislation, is the State Employment Service to be in any different position than it was when the Federal Government took it over 3 or 4 years ago?

Mr. BALL. I do not think so, measurably. It is in a different position because it has undertaken many different functions since then. For example, the entire veterans' service under the GI bill of rights has been added since it was taken over.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand; but what I am trying to ascertain is this: Will the States have the same authority and jurisdiction over employment offices they had previous to the time that the Federal Government took them over?

Mr. BALL. Yes; there will be no difference at all.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The copy of the bill which I hold in my hand consists of approximately 20 pages. I appreciate the fact that portions of the House bill have been stricken out. Title I provides that the Secretary of Labor shall, on or before December 31, 1946, return to the States the State employment agencies which the Federal Government borrowed in 1942. What further is in these 20 pages? Why do we not simply provide, in four or five lines, for the return of the services in the same condition in which they were when we took them away from the States? What is contained in the twenty-odd pages? If we are not adding something, then why have 20 pages to say nothing?

Mr. BALL. I tried to explain the situation, but the Senator from Indiana was not then on the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. I appreciate that the able Senator from Minnesota was not the author of the bill.

Mr. BALL. No; but I had considerable to do with writing it.

The House tried to handle the matter in the rescission bill which was passed last fall. When we considered the matter in the Appropriations Committee we decided that we had to add several pages of legislation to the bill, so as to take care of the employees. Title III of this bill is largely language taken from the rescission bill; that is all it is.

We had to do other things; for instance, we had to provide a basis for the allocation of funds. Under the Wagner-Peyser Act they are to be allocated on the basis of population, but that does not make sense any more. Moreover, the Wagner-Peyser Act contains a matching requirement, and the States and the Federal agency and all the Members who considered it seemed to agree that that should be doue away with. It amounted to only about 5 percent, anyway. So that had to be changed. Upon going over the Wagner-Peyser Act, we decided that it was rather out of date. It had not been squared with title III of the Social Security Act. So all we did was to try to amend it so as to bring it up to date. The bill is a little long, because we amended the whole act. Much of the language of the bill is in the law and does not represent a change.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then, is it the Senator's thought that the provisions for the changes and the descriptive matter contained in the twenty-odd pages should be added, and is it also his thought that those provisions will take no authority away from the States, but, rather, will clarify the bill and will add some new provisions, such as provisions with reference to veterans' affairs, which should be added?

Mr. BALL. I do not think the bill will take any authority from the States. I think in several cases the provisions of the bill clarify the intent of the Congress in setting up the employment offices.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am opposed to having the Congress pass any law which will permit the Federal Government to conduct the affairs of the States. I am opposed to having that done, and I think other Senators are opposed to it, and I know that the States are opposed to it.

Mr. BALL. I am in complete accord with the Senator in regard to that matter.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to see passed a law, and I trust that the pending measure will be such a law, by which the States will have complete freedom of action in employment matters. I believe I have the assurance of the able Senator from Minnesota that that is what the pending bill provides. If that be true, I shall support it.

But if the bill contains provisions giving the Federal Government more power over the States, then I am opposed to it.

No such provisions were contained in the old bill or the old act.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to develop further the point I raised a moment ago. I call attention to this language on page 6 of the bill, in section 3:

> The Secretary shall also assist in coordinating the public employment offices throughout the country, and in increasing their usefulness by developing and prescribing minimum standards of efficiency, assisting them in meeting problems peculiar to their localities, promoting uniformity in their administrative and statistical procedure, furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment and other information of value in the operation of the system, and maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States and facilitating the free movement of workers seeking employment and employers seeking workers.

My question is this: Under this bill will it be mandatory for the States to accept, for instance, the minimum standards of efficiency laid down by the Secretary? Will it be mandatory for the States to accept, for instance, the decisions made by the Secretary in regard to promoting uniformity in administrative and statistical procedure? Will it be mandatory for the States to cooperate in furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment, and so forth? Or is that to be merely a general position to be taken by the Federal Government, in the hope that the States will cooperate?

Mr. BALL. I think for the most part the Secretary has authority to develop and prescribe minimum standards of efficiency which the States shall meet in order to be eligible to receive the grants. Other than that, I think the whole purpose of the section is that the Secretary of Labor shall assist in developing and maintaining a system in the several States. That provision does not carry any authority for him to compel any State to do anything. Obviously there must be some cooperation between the States in order to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the interpretation which the able Senator from Minnesota puts on the bill, it is that if the States desire to accept the information and cooperation furnished by the Federal Government, they may do so; or they may go their own way.

Mr. BALL. That is correct for the most part, except, as I have said, in regard to prescribing minimum standards of efficiency. I think the Secretary can make such standards apply because of his power to make rules and regulations.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. But that authority already exists under the act or under other measures.

Mr. BALL. Yes. Most of that language is already in the act.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this bill has been before the Senate at least two or three times during the past year. On each occasion the Senate has simply voted to return the employment offices to the States. The Senate has not always provided adequately for transition periods, and that subject is the one now before the Senate.

The House has also passed a bill, which is in the form of the bill now before us, returning the employment offices to the States, but doing only that. The House has already done that in the appropriation bill which now is before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The only purpose of the pending bill is to give the Federal Government more power than it had when these offices were taken over. There cannot be any other purpose. There are some transitional matters which should be taken care of. But the purpose of this measure, as well as the basic purpose of the Wagner-Peyser Act, is to give the Federal Government more power over State employment offices than it had when the offices were taken over in 1942.

As Senators know, after Pearl Harbor the President took advantage of the situation then existing to issue a proclamation demanding that the States turn over to the Federal Government the State employment offices. All the Governors did so, although most of them were reluctant to do it and most of them specified that when the emergency was over the offices should be returned to the States. In many cases they expressed doubt as to their authority to turn the offices over to the Federal Government.

Now we say "Oh, yes; we shall return the employment offices to the States, but we shall do it upon certain conditions. We are going to change the basis on which the States formerly operated those offices."

I do not think we should do that. I think we should do just what we have done before, namely, leave the Wagner-Peyser Act as it is, except as we add any particular transitional provisions to take care of the retransfer and to look after the employees.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I think the Senator is a little mistaken in his interpretation that the acceptance of the amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act was conditioned upon the return of the services to the States. Title II can stand or fall by itself. It has nothing to do with the date of the transfer or whether the services are to be transferred. It is true that the provisions of title III do have.

Mr. TAFT. But we are asked by the committee to pass this bill. The provisions of the bill to which I am objecting were not contained in the House bill. They were inserted by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. Their only purpose, as I see it, is to increase the power of the Federal Government over the State employment services. When we are asked by the committee to pass the bill in its present form, we are asked to impose, as a condition of returning the services, additional powers under the Wagner-Peyser Act. I freely admit, Mr. President, that the Wagner-Peyser Act does contain carefully worked out powers over the State employment offices. But as a matter of fact, it was never carried out in that way, although it might have been. So the precedent which exists is somewhat less than the language actually contained in the Wagner-Peyser Act.

But under the pending bill the whole act would be changed, and the State offices would be placed more under the control and direction of the Secretary of Labor.

What is the purpose of doing that? It has nothing to do with the return of the employment offices to the States. It is an attempt to deal with the whole subject of Federal assistance to the State employment offices, and to impose requirements of that sort as a condition for the return of the offices to the States.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Will the Senator point out some instances in which the Wagner-Peyser Act was changed so as to afford greater authority?

Mr. TAFT. I shall come to that point.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator made a statement with reference to the matter. I should like to have him particularize.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, the original Wagner-Peyser Act lays much greater emphasis on a State plan being submitted and approved. Once that plan has been submitted and approved, it governs more or less the relations between the parties. In this case the bill originally took out the plan altogether and left remaining the power of the Secretary to issue rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act to prescribe standards of efficiency. The plan idea is entirely subordinated. Under the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the State may submit a plan if it wishes to do so, but, according to the provisions of the bill, rules and regulations may be issued which do not have to conform to the plan.

Mr. President, I have taken a very great deal of interest in all the State-aid plans, but it has always seemed to me that the Congress should prescribe the standards, and if there are to be rules and regulations they should be prescribed permanently and not subjected to being changed at the whim of the Federal official.

Section 9 of the bill states the situation somewhat more strongly than does the Wagner-Peyser Act. The language is, in part, as follows:

> It shall be the duty of the Secretary to ascertain whether the system of public employment offices maintained in each State is conducted in accordance with the rules and regulations and the standards of efficiency prescribed by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this act and to make such studies and investigations as may be necessary in connection therewith. The Secretary may revoke any existing certificate or withhold any further certificate provided for in section 5, whenever he shall determine, as to any State, that the cooperating State agency has not properly expended the moneys paid to it or there has been a substantial failure of compliance by such State agency with the provisions of this act or the rules, regulations, or standards of efficiency prescribed thereunder.

Those are rules which the Secretary may change on any day. He may completely change the rules and thereby

change the whole administration of the act by the State employment officers.

As I see it, Mr. President, under this bill the State officers are nominally under the State, but, as a practical matter, their policies are prescribed by the Secretary of Labor in every respect.

There has been inserted in the bill section 10, containing so-called referral provisions. I read it:

SEC. 10. In carrying out the provisions of this act, no person shall be referred to a position (a) without due notice to the applicant, if the position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute; (b) if the wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are substantially less favorable to the individual than those prevailing for similar work in the locality, except upon request of the applicant; or (c) if as determined by the State agency the position is one which does not utilize the person's highest skill, until and unless a reasonable effort has been made to place him in a position that does utilize his highest skill.

Those general principles are not so bad, but when we add to them the power of the Secretary to make rules and regulations defining what the language means, and changing the definitions of the act, we are going far afield. I believe that the Secretary may even write the general rules which determine what kind of positions utilize a person's highest skill, and affect the rules governing the question of whether a reasonable effort has been made to place a person in a position. How much time must be consumed in trying to find a position which will utilize the person's highest skill? Shall it be 3 months, 6 months, or a year?

I may say further, Mr. President, that the bill contains a provision to the effect that the Secretary may take over and operate any State employment office. Such a provision is contained in the Wagner-Peyser Act, but it is not nearly so expensive as is the provision which is contained in the pending bill. In the Wagner-Peyser Act it is provided that the Secretary may operate a State employment office only when there is no State system of public employment, or in any State where there is a system but the State has not complied with the provisions of section 4. All section 4 requires is that a State agency must be set up to cooperate with the State employment service. But under the pending bill the Secretary is authorized to take over those services whenever they do not comply with any of the rules and regulations which may be issued by the Secretary of Labor.

Paragraph (b) of section 9 reads, in part, as follows:

(b) The Secretary is authorized to expend in any State so much of the funds appropriated and made available under section 5 of this act as may be necessary to operate a State-wide system of public employment offices under the control of the Secretary if no State system of public employment offices exists in such State or if, and for as long as, the State is not eligible for funds in accordance with provisions of this act.

The State is not eligible for funds under section 9 unless its system is conducted in accordance with the rules and regulations, and standards of efficiency prescribed by the Secretary, and all the rules and regulations which may relate to any of the activities of the State office.

I continue reading from paragraph (b):

Except to the extent that a system of employment offices under the control of the Secretary is operated within a State either (1) pursuant to the specific request of the Governor of such State or (2) with funds specifically appropriated by the Congress for the operation of such system under the control of the Secretary, the Secretary shall not expend more than $1,000,000 in any fiscal year pursuant to this subsection or operate a system of employment offices in any State pursuant to this subsection for more than three months in any fiscal year.

If there happens to be a governor of a State who believes that the Federal Government should operate the entire State employment system, all he needs to do to nullify the action of Congress is to announce that he is satisfied with the Federal Government continuing to operate the State employment service. In that case, he may use all the funds which may be appropriated to his office for that purpose.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to propound a question to the Senater from Minnesota. How many States have approved the Senate version of the pending bill?

Mr. BALL. I have no idea. We did not send the bill to the various States and ask them for approval.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Were not the States consulted?

Mr. BALL. Oh, yes; the States were consulted and some of them sent representatives who testified before the subcommittee during one whole afternoon.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did they approve of the bill?

Mr. BALL. No. Mr. Stanley Rector opposed the bill. However, I went over the bill with my own State administrator, and he believes it to be a good workable bill, and one which is better than the old Wagner-Peyser Act.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the position of Mr. Rector in connection with this matter?

Mr. BALL. He wants the transfer to be made by a simple provision in an appropriation bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is his official position?

Mr. BALL. I believe he is chairman of an organization of State administrators of unemployment compensation.

Mr. TAFT. Is he not the director of the State employment system of Wisconsin?

Mr. BALL. He is counsel for the Wisconsin agency.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Aside from Mr. Rector's position, did any group of States send representatives, or a representative, to appear before the committee and either approve or disapprove of the bill?

Mr. BALL. The bill was rewritten by the subcommittee after it had held hearings. Mr. Rector testified at the hearings, and I believe two or three other State administrators also testified. The Council of State Governments was invited to send a representative to testify. It did not do so. Subsequently, however, the Council of State Governments and Mr. Rector testified before the full committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would it be fair to say that the States do not approve the committee's version of the bill?

Mr. BALL. I think it would be fair to say that most of the State administrators do not like it. They would prefer to have the provision incorporated in an appropriation bill.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. In connection with the inquiry which was made by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, I should like to read a very short resolution adopted by the Conference of Governors at its thirty-eighth annual meeting which was held in Oklahoma City on May 30 of this year. It reads as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States, both Houses of Congress and the Governors' Conference are all in agreement that the employment service should be returned to the States, the only question being the date of such return: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend the Congress for the favorable action that has been taken designed to return the employment service to the States at the earliest possible time, and we further urge the Senate to consider in the immediate future House bill 4437 without amendments, in order that this measure may be enacted prior to the adjournment of Congress; be it further

Resolved, That inasmuch as the employment compensation funds are accumulated through moneys derived from the citizens of the respective States, we urge the Congress to adopt legislation authorizing the use of such funds by the States to administer the service when it is returned.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will yield a moment longer, I may say that the title of Mr. Rector, in addition to his official position with the State of Wisconsin, is chairman of the legislative committee of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies. From a conference which I had this morning with Mr. Rector, it is my understanding that he is opposed very strongly to the committee amendments to the bill.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. I want to ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota. If this bill shall not be passed, and the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor shall be passed, will there not be a section in it turning the Employment Service back to the States?

Mr. BALL. Yes, there is a section in the bill to that effect. However, the subcommittee considering the bill, after hearing the testimony, has directed the drafting counsel to prepare a suitable provision. We will have to do substantially what we did in the rescission bill. There were several pages of legislation in the appropriation bill. We will have to take care of what is in titles I and III, and some of the provisions of title II.

Mr. BUCK. The Senator is preparing to amend this bill then, and have the amendment agreed to?

Mr. BALL. Yes.

Mr. BUCK. My State is opposed to the bill we are now considering, and has been urging that the matter be taken care of in the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield that I may ask a question of the able Senator from Missouri?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Did the Senator from Missouri say that the governors at their meeting unanimously approved H. R. 4437 as passed by the House of Representatives?

Mr. DONNELL. I am unable to state whether or not it was a unanimous vote, but that was the action of the Governors' Conference, as I understand, and as I read it a few minutes ago.

Mr. CAPEHART. They adopted a resolution approving H. R. 4437, did they not?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes; without amendments.

Mr. CAPEHART. That means as written by the House?

Mr. DONNELL. That is my interpretation of it.

Mr. CAPEHART. At that time they knew nothing about the amendments which have been added to the bill by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. DONNELL. I am not informed as to their knowledge, but evidently, by the expression "without amendments," I take it the bill as it passed the House is what is favored by the Governors' Conference.

Mr. TAFT. The amendments had not been decided on at that time, but were under consideration.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wanted the RECORD to show that the governors did not approve H. R. 4437 as reported by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and did not approve the bill we are considering at the moment, and the bill I have in my hand, but rather the bill as it was passed by the House.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I wish to state that when the Senator from Ohio shall have completed his remarks I should like then, if possible, to have the privilege of reading to the Senate a number of telegrams sent during the month of April by governors of various States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should not greatly object to the Senate passing the House bill, and I am in some doubt as to what to do, whether to move to reject the committee amendments, leaving the House bill as it is, or whether to move to postpone the consideration of the bill for 10 days until the matter is disposed of in the appropriation bill, and then, if there are any further matters to be cleaned up, come back to the pending bill at that time.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I may state to the Senator that I have drafted a proposed amendment, very short, which I should like to read at this time for the consideration of the Senator while he is addressing the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I propose to substitute in lieu of titles I and II of the committee amendment the following:

The Secretary of Labor shall provide for the return to State operation not later than December 31, 1946, or such earlier date as he may deem feasible of public employment offices in an orderly and expeditious manner which offices shall thereafter be operated under and in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended to January 1, 1942 (29 U. S. C. 49 to 491): *Provided*, That no State shall be required to make any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of said act of June 6, 1933, as amended to January 1, 1942, prior to July 1, 1948.

In due time I shall offer that as an amendment. I thought it proper to read it at this moment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think I should be glad to support the Senator's amendment, and it seems to me that perhaps it is the best method of reaching the question we are now considering.

Mr. DONNELL. Of course, this amendment would not dispose of title III. I think we might well consider whether to adopt it, or whether to adopt title III of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, in view of the transitional situation to which the Senator from Ohio referred. That is a matter which can be considered after the proposed amendment I shall offer shall have been acted upon.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know what date the Senator put in his amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. December 31, 1946. I may say, however, that as to that date I am not necessarily adamant. That is the date which is in the committee amendment, and I thought there was good reason for it, though from some information I have had it would seem that it is possible to make effective a retransfer to the States prior to that date.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the House bill made the date June 30. The House passed an appropriation bill that would make it October 31, and the pending bill proposes December 31. I myself cannot see why, if the offices are to be returned, they cannot be returned in 3 months. I realize it cannot be done today or tomorrow, but certainly 3 months will afford sufficient time to bring about that result.

I see nothing significant in the other dates. The House appropriation bill provides for the State offices from the 1st day of October. I thought it was September 30, and my previous reference was to September 30.

Merely to sum up what I have to say, there are many places in the bill in which more and more emphasis is laid on the power of the Secretary to issue rules and regulations to govern the operation of the State offices. That appears on page 6, line 13. It appears again on page 7, line 19, where it is provided that he shall "certify for payment to each State which is in compliance with the provisions of section 4 of this act, and such rules, regulations, and standards of efficiency as may be prescribed under this act"—consider the discretion of the Secretary as to the amount he may give—"such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State system of public employment offices."

He becomes in effect the appropriating authority for each State.

The Secretary's determination shall be based on (1) the population of the State and an estimate of the number of persons who will be served by the public employment office system in the State; (2) an estimate of the cost of proper and efficient administration of the State system of public employment offices; and (3) such other factors as the Secretary finds relevant.

So that besides prescribing detailed rules and regulations, he may prescribe the detailed amount each State is to receive for its employment office.

Certainly, with those conditions, and the history with which we are familiar of Federal interference with State bureaus, it means the Secretary would practically have the power of telling every State employment office exactly how it shall conduct the office, and almost what the employees shall be paid. There is one restriction, to the effect that he shall not interfere with the operation of the merit system, but he may determine how much an employee is to receive, because he is to determine how much money he will allocate to a particular State.

I refer to the power given him on page 11, line 12, and again in lines 21, 22, and 23, where it is provided it shall be his duty constantly to interfere to see that the States are operating the service in just the way he wants to have them conduct it. He may change the rules and regulations from day to day if he wishes to do so.

So far as I can see, there is no provision, and I do not know that the law would imply it, that the regulations must be uniform in all the States.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. I merely wish to remind the Senator that the language he is now criticizing is not only in the bill as it passed the House, but in the Social Security Act.

Mr. TAFT. The language in which place?

Mr. TUNNELL. On page 8, at the top of the page.

Mr. TAFT. I was not immediately referring to that. I think the Social Security Act was loosely drawn, and if we are to have a bona fide system of aid to the States, we should prescribe a system which will require the Government to lay down a definite plan, and if the States conform to the plan, interfere no more with their administration, but give them the funds to which they are entitled.

We wrote a provision into the bill that if that were done and the funds were disallowed, the States could appeal, first to the Federal Hospital Board, and then

finally to the courts, to determine whether in fact they had conformed to the plan, and get away from the arbitrary discretion of the bureaucrats in Washington, because I think that if we are to continue with the State-aid system, and constantly expand it, as we are doing, we must, unless we are to turn it into a Federal bureaucratic system, provide safeguards so that the States can operate their own plans.

When we add the power of the Secretary under section 10 to take over employment offices, as I have suggested if there happens to be a governor who believes in the Federal Government operating State employment offices under section 10 (b), it is perfectly possible for him to be somewhat delinquent and say, "Oh, well, take it over," and once it is taken over, there is no provision for returning it, so far as the governor personally is concerned, without authority from the State legislature.

Furthermore, when in section 10 rules are laid down respecting referral and as to who shall be entitled to the service, those rules in effect determine who obtains unemployment compensation. So that in that section we find an attempt to step into the unemployment compensation system and have a Federal authority determine who shall draw compensation when a job is offered to him and under what conditions he shall do so.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. In reply to a question which I propounded to the Senator from Minnesota earlier today I was advised that the States would be in practically the same condition, after this legislation is passed, as they were some 4 years ago when the Federal Government took the employment services over. Am I to understand that the same conditions obtained then with respect to mutuality between the States and the Federal Government, as found in section 10 which the Senator just read?

Mr. TAFT. No. There is one provision in section 10 which I think was in the original act, if I remember correctly. The provision in the original act reads:

> In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Director is authorized and directed to provide for the giving of notice of strikes and lock-outs to applicants before they are referred to employment.

That provision is carried in subparagraph (a) in this measure. I think section 10 (a) is about the same as the existing law. Paragraph (b) is new, as is also paragraph (c).

Mr. LUCAS. Paragraph (c) is one in which I was particularly interested, and I was wondering if the Senator would care to elaborate upon that.

Mr. TAFT. Paragraph (c) originally provided, showing what the authors of the act intended, that—

> If the position is one which does not utilize the person's highest skill until and unless a reasonable effort has been made to place him in a position that does utilize his highest skill.

That would be subject to the issuance of and definitions of regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor. In an effort to modify that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota had inserted in the subcommittee the words "as determined by the State agency", and the question has arisen as to whether that is confined to the determination of the question whether a position utilizes a person's highest skill, or whether it extends to the question whether a reasonable effort has been made to place him in a position.

My impression is that regardless of what is said about the words "as determined by the State agency" on the question of application, the whole character of the procedure can be determined by the rules and regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor. He will have to leave to the State agency the application to a particular case, in view of the words now inserted.

Mr. LUCAS. The only comment I desire to make respecting paragraph (c) is that there should not be any question about the determination to be made on the question of the person's highest skill. In other words, if there is going to be any conflict between rules and regulations laid down by the Federal Government and those laid down by a State agency, we should, by legislation in the Congress, make it clear and unequivocal what we mean. That is what I fear about many provisions of this bill. I am afraid, from what I have heard here, and from a cursory examination of this measure, that we are going to continue to have confusion and double responsibility between the Federal Government and the State agency, a condition about which the Senator from Illinois has complained from the time we started discussing turning the Employment Service back to the States.

While I am on my feet I desire to call attention also to subsection (b) of section 9. I think I understand that subsection. The Senator from Ohio is a member of the Committee on Education and Labor. I should like to have his reaction to a question or two I desire to ask. If I understand correctly, that subsection is new. If I am wrong about that I want to be corrected. It provides:

> The Secretary is authorized to expend in any State so much of the funds appropriated and made available under section 5 of this Act as may be necessary to operate a State-wide system of public employment offices under the control of the Secretary if no State system of public employment offices exists in such State.

If I understand that correctly, if there is no public employment office in the State of Illinois, then under this measure the Federal Government has the right to go into the State and establish an office of that kind.

Mr. TAFT. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that that right existed under the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Mr. LUCAS. That is not the point I am making. I do not object to that if there is no employment agency in the State, or if the governor and the State legislature desire to invite the Federal Government to set up an employment agency in the State. But in the same subsection it is provided:

> Or if, and for as long as, the State is not eligible for funds in accordance with the provisions of this act.

There is where trouble is likely to arise. In other words, upon the rules and regulations laid down by the Federal Government will depend whether or not the State gets any funds. So, if my State of Illinois fails to comply with the rules and regulations laid down and is denied the funds, then the Federal Government can come into the State of Illinois and take over, for at least a period of 3 months, if I understand the language correctly.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator's understanding is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. That to me, Mr. President, is an unreasonable proposal. I do not believe that the Federal Government should have the right to take such action merely because the agency in the State of Illinois does not comply with the rules and regulations laid down by the Federal Government. It seems to me that there should not be placed in the bill a provision which would permit the Government to come into a State and operate the service for a period of 3 months at least. Once the Federal Government is there, we may find some difficulty in dislodging its officials. So far as I am concerned that idea is wrong, and it certainly was not contained in the original act.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The Federal Government did not have that power under the original act.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Under the original act the right was to withhold the funds.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. TUNNELL. The original act did not prescribe any method for the Federal employment office to continue in operation until the State should comply. It simply left the unemployed without any assistance.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. But the Senator will now agree with me, will he not, that if the Federal Government wants to move in and take control it would not be very difficult for the Federal Government, through the Secretary, to lay down rules and regulations with which the people of the State of Illinois could not comply, and thereby, within a short space of time, move in and set up its own employment office and continue it in operation at least for 3 months?

Mr. TAFT. I wanted to point out that while the 3 months is a limitation, under some circumstances I take it it is not a limitation, if the Governor of the State, without legislative authority, says "I am willing to have you go on indefinitely so far as I am concerned." So, if there happens to be a Governor who believes in a public Federal employment system only, it can be kept in operation indefinitely, as I view it, under the terms of the measure.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is correct. I was referring primarily to paragraph (2).

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I agree with the Senator fully that once the Federal Government gets possession of the situation it is going to be difficult to shake it loose again. It will start a system which it

seems to me is likely to develop into another Federal system.

Mr. LUCAS. In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish merely to say that my position from the beginning, on the question of public employment service, has been that the dual responsibility between the Federal Government and the State governments should be eliminated. I appreciate that while we were operating under wartime conditions undoubtedly the system was all right, but I seriously doubt, now that we have gone back to peacetime, the wisdom of continuing the dual system. It seems to me we should turn the employment service back to the States, with just as few restrictions, from the standpoint of the Federal Government, as can possibly be imposed and still maintain the cooperation and the mutual understanding between the Federal Government and the States which we must have. I dislike to see a provision in the bill which permits the Federal Government to go into a State and remain in the State indefinitely, simply because the State refuses to comply with some regulation which has been laid down by the Federal Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me to ask a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Inasmuch as the Federal Government is assuming the financial responsibility in regard to this unemployment situation, or the major part of it, does the Senator think that the Congress should authorize the Government of the United States to turn over to the States, to be administered as they please, money collected by the Federal Government in the form of taxes without regulation and even without restriction, which would in some way or other keep the hand of the United States Government on the expenditure of the money? It seems to me unthinkable to ask the Congress to turn over to the States the administration of this law, and then furnish all the money, or practically all the money with which it is to be done, without any restraint or restriction as to how it shall be spent. That is what bothers me about the suggestion for turning the Service bodily back to the States, although the Government of the United States will put up most of the money, and in some cases practically all of it.

Mr. LUCAS. What proportion of the money did we put up previous to the time the Federal Government took over the activity?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot recall from memory.

Mr. LUCAS. Can any member of the committee tell me?

Mr. BARKLEY. In my judgment that would not make any difference. If we are to put up most of it now, we should have some supervision over it. If we put up most of it then, that would not cover the situation now.

In the matter of highways, when we started on the Federal system of highways most of the States had no highway departments. My own State had none. In order to encourage the building of highways we passed the Federal Road Act, under which we proposed to put up dollar for dollar. But even when we put up dollar for dollar, and when the Federal Government furnished only half of the money, the Federal Bureau of Roads retained control. It issued specifications and regulations. It cooperated with the State highway departments. The Federal Government insists upon certain standards which must be complied with in order that the States may get the amount of money which the Federal Government puts up as its share. In connection with that activity we put up only half of the money. In this case, when it is proposed practically to underwrite the whole program financially, it seems to me that the States have no right to complain if the Federal Government wishes to retain some supervision. The Federal Government must very largely finance this operation. Without the Federal Government many of the States would not even have a State employment service. The States have no right to complain if the Federal Government wishes to supervise the expenditure of the money. It would be a mistake, in my judgment, for the Federal Government to turn the money over to the States and permit the State administrations, without any oversight on the part of the Federal Government, to spend the money as they please. That is the thing that bothers me.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate what the Senator from Kentucky says. If the Senator from Ohio will pardon me for a further observation, in the beginning, when we started an unemployment fund in this country, as I recall, we turned it over to the States. What has troubled me from the beginning has been the divided responsibitly which existed, even during the war, between Federal officials and State officials, as the system was operating during wartime and as it is operating at the present time. I have received any number of letters asking me to do something about a particular individual who might be drawing unemployment compensation in the State of Illinois. I have received letters to the effect that in a particular town a number of persons who are absolutely not entitled to it are drawing unemployment compensation. The writers of these letters say that that is one of the New Deal measures that has been put over. They say, "The responsibility is yours, Senator LUCAS. See if you cannot take unemployment compensation away from those people, because they are not entitled to it." Obviously I have no time or opportunity to investigate such cases. But the truth of the matter is that under the present law responsibility for giving John Doe unemployment compensation in my home town of Urbana, or in any town in any other State, lies with the State at the present time, but the average individual does not understand that to be so.

My position is that I should like to see the responsibility of the Federal Government divorced, so far as possible, from the responsibility of the States. In taking that position I think I am on sound ground so far as the elimination of confusion and duplication of effort is concerned, and so far as concerns the further grant of Federal authority over a subject of this kind. That is my position.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am one of those who believe that unemployment in the United States is a Federal responsibility. It is a national problem. It cannot be divided into 48 airtight compartments when it is a national problem. I feel the same way about old-age pensions. If I had my way, I would provide old-age pensions for all the aged people in the United States, to be paid for and administered by the Government of the United States. The States have plenty of other uses for their money. I would handle the unemployment problem in the same way. I do not believe that one standard should be applied in Colorado and another in Kentucky, Illinois, or some other State. Frankly, I have no patience with the insistence of State governments that they be allowed to control this program. They make no objection when Uncle Sam puts up the money with which to administer the program, but they wish to retain authority to appoint all the officers. I agree that my theory with respect to old-age pensions and unemployment compensation is not the theory of the majority of the Senate, but it is my theory, and if I had my way, that is what I would do.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me so that I may answer the Senator from Kentucky? Then I shall subside.

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Kentucky will offer an amendment of the kind to which he refers, placing the administration of all unemployment compensation in the hands of the Federal Government, I will support such an amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator realizes that it is not easy offhand to offer such an amendment. It must be drafted in the proper technical form. I would not attempt to clutter up this bill by offering such an amendment. I am simply giving an expression of my views.

Mr. LUCAS. I feel the same way about it; but that is not the issue here. We started on an entirely different theory so far as unemployment compensation is concerned. So long as we are operating under the theory that the States shall control and spend this money, it seems to me that the States ought to have the right to lay down rules and regulations in regard to unemployment compensation in the respective States. When the time comes, if any Senator desires to offer an amendment to enable the Federal Government to take over the administration of unemployment compensation and administer it as should have been done in the beginning, in my opinion, in view of what the Senator from Kentucky has said, the Senator from Illinois will support such an amendment. But so long as we are operating under the present system, the program ought to be conducted with the least possible confusion and duplication.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I rose to stress the point that under this system, inasmuch as the Federal Government is largely financing this enterprise, it is not unreasonable to expect that the Government, which is furnishing most of the money, ought to have something to say about how it is expended.

Mr. LUCAS. We did not do so in connection with WPA.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that case the Government of the United States put up all the money. There was a sort of voluntary arrangement in counties and cities by which certain funds were put up to help the Federal Government, but the Federal Government controlled the expenditure of WPA money. In any event, I am not certain that that is a very happy illustration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this system proceeds on the theory that it is a State-aid system, on the theory that the unemployment compensation offices are a part of a State system. Certainly it would be a violent assumption to hold that the Congress intended any other system.

The theory is merely to provide Federal aid for State employment offices. If we are not to operate a Federal employment system, if it is agreed that the offices should go back to the States regardless of how much money we put up, the only purpose of such a system is to give greater local initiative and discretion as to how the system shall be operated. Of course, if we are to provide Federal money, we shall have to prescribe certain standards, either in the act or in certain permanent regulations. What I object to is that the power is proposed to be so extended that the Director can practically tell every State employment office what it shall pay, and how it shall conduct every detail of its business. We might just as well have a Federal office. The theory is that the system is a State-aid system, with independence and discretion lodged in the States, but that is not what is proposed. When we are returning the offices to the States, I see no reason why we should not return them under the same conditions under which we took them over. There was no complaint about the system. It is true that it did not work perfectly. Some wanted a Federal system. It was not a Federal system. It was a State system, coordinated by the Federal Government. The Federal Government operated the exchange of information among the various offices, so that a man could find out what was available in other States, and be sent to other States. But fundamentally it was a State system, and the States operated it. If we are going back to that system, why change all the rules? Why try to build up a greater Federal control than we had before?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask the Senator if it is not true that under the original act, the Wagner-Peyser Act, there was a dollar-for-dollar matching provision?

Mr. TAFT. I cannot tell the Senator. The best information I have been able to obtain is that during the first 4 years of operation under the Wagner-Peyser Act the total cost of operating all employment service offices was $44,660,000, of which $30,546,000 came from the Federal Treasury. Throughout the period from the enactment of the Social Security Act until 1942, when the employment service was federalized, approximately 95 percent of the operating funds came from the Federal Government. I take it that that was a provision of the Social Security Act rather than of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not read that act for some time, and I am speaking only from memory, which may be faulty. However, my recollection is that originally there was a dollar-for-dollar matching between the States and the Federal Government. However, what is now proposed is that the services be turned back to the States, and that the Federal Government shall put up all the money.

Mr. TAFT. I question that proposal. I think it is of doubtful validity.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Federal Government is to put up all the money, it ought to have at least as much control as it had when it put up only half of it.

Mr. TAFT. The proposed control is very much greater than it was under the original act.

Mr. BARKLEY. It ought to be at least 100 percent greater.

Mr. TAFT. If it is to be 100 percent, it ought to be a Federal system. The only purpose of a State system is to allow the States some discretion as to who shall be employed, and how the offices shall be conducted. Opportunity should be given for the development of new ideas in the various States. The States should not be bound by a uniform system of Federal regulation. If we are to have a State system, this is not the time to expand the authority of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. President, I believe that the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] should be adopted, and that we should return the offices to the States under substantially the same conditions as those which existed when the Federal Government arbitrarily took them over in 1942.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, in reply to what the Senator from Kentucky said, namely, that under the Wagner-Peyser Act there was an equal division between the States and the Federal Government, let me say that under the pending bill the control will be practically the same as it was when the employment offices were taken over. I have asked those who have stated to the contrary to say in what respects the pending bill provides greater power on the part of the Federal Government, but I have heard no explanation by them in that connection.

The fact of the matter is that the Secretary of Labor previously had authority to provide regulations. If a State did not comply, the Secretary of Labor could take away the money. Under the pending bill if a State refuses to comply, the Secretary of Labor will be authorized to operate the employment organization or service for 3 months, provided the total amount of money expended by the United States shall not exceed $1,000,000. That is practically the situation.

It is purely an exercise of the imagination to say that under the bill the power of the Secretary is expanded.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask the able Senator what will happen under the bill after the 3 months expire? Will the Federal Government then move out, assuming that it has reached no agreement with the States?

Mr. TUNNELL. In that event it cannot spend any more money.

Mr. LUCAS. In such a situation it will have to come back to the Congress for further appropriations, in order to continue operating, will it not?

Mr. TUNNELL. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TUNNELL. And the operation by the Federal Government during the 3 months' period will be entirely for the benefit of the unemployed in the State.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I understand.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Delaware about a telegram which we were told was sent from a governors' conference. I understand that the governors approved of the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives. I should like to have the Senator state briefly the changes between the bill with the amendments proposed by the Senator's subcommittee and the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have a copy of the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives, but it is rather long and I do not know that I can designate all the changes. The bill sets forth the amendments to the Wagner-Peyser Act and it brings the Wagner-Peyser Act, as amended, down to date. Under the pending bill the Federal Government will pay all the cost. Under the Wagner-Peyser Act the Government pays 50 percent of the cost.

One of the amendments, among others, is subdivision (c), on page 13. That was not contained in the bill as passed by the House.

There seems to be considerable fear that the Federal Government will obtain too much control. There is no disposition, and there was none on the part of the subcommittee which wrote the bill, to give the Federal Government too much control. In fact, it appeared to me, believing as I did in Federal control and a Federal system, that we were going clear over to the idea of lack of control. In almost every instance in which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] thought there would be too much Federal control, I think the majority of the committee accepted his idea. So under the bill the States will have absolute control, with

the exception of the regulations as provided for by the Wagner-Peyser Act and the Social Security Act. In fact, the language of the bill is almost identical with the corresponding language of the Social Security Act.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Could it possibly be contended that the Federal Congress should appropriate money and turn it over to a State and then have absolutely nothing to say about the way in which the money is expended? There must be some way by which there will be a uniform standard among the States. As I understand the bill, it sets up such a standard, and it provides that so long as the States comply with that standard they will receive the money; but if they do not comply with it, the money will be cut-off.

Mr. TUNNELL. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. Subsection (b) on page 12 is even more favorable to the States than the provision which previously was in the bill. The committee removed the other provision, and provided for a uniform handling of the problem.

Of course, when these agencies were taken over by the Federal Government, they had been State agencies. But at that time the Nation was at war and the President of the United States had authority under the War Powers Act to cover the agencies into the Federal service, and all of them came under our civil-service arrangement.

Now they are to be returned to the States. The governors of the States do not have such war powers. So there must be a uniform arrangement whereby some experienced personnel will be retained. The bill provides such an arrangement, but it is limited in its provisions. The bill provides that a State shall be judged to fail to act in this connection only if there is no specific request by the governor of the State that the Federal Government continue its control. Provision is made that the funds shall be specifically appropriated by the Congress, and that not more than $1,000,000 shall be appropriated, and that it shall be available for not more than 3 months. It seems to me that is a very reasonable arrangement by which to get the system back to the States as a going concern, because we cannot assume that in all 48 of the States everything will be exactly right at the moment of the transfer.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Does the Senator from Arizona know why the Federal Government should pay all the expenses?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the way it was done before, as the Senator no doubt remembers. I protested about that when the original transfer measure was before the Senate, but the States insisted upon it. They said they would manage it, but they insisted that the Federal Government pay the bill.

The Senator may remember that it was a new conception of States rights that the Federal Government should levy the taxes and that the States should have the right to come to the Federal Government and get the money.

Mr. BUCK. I was under the impression that prior to the war the States paid the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. They paid a part of it.

Mr. BUCK. When we take over a service, we should pay the bill. But now that we turn it back to the States, why should not the States pay for it?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because the States insist on that position, and the Congress took that view.

Mr. BUCK. What States insisted upon it?

Mr. HAYDEN. Was it not an organization of governors that asked us to handle the matter in this way?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think the Senator is mistaken about that. I do not think the States want to pay for any part of it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The question which is being asked is why should we make it possible for the Federal Government to pay a greater proportion of the cost of this service than the Federal Government paid before the war?

Mr. TUNNELL. As I understand, the Social Security System was paying a part of the cost, and under that arrangement the Federal Government paid 95 percent of the cost. Then, when the Federal Government took over the services, it paid all the cost.

Mr. BUCK. Is the Senator correct in his statement that 95 percent of the cost was paid by the Federal Government, prior to the war?

Mr. TUNNELL. That is correct, according to the information I have received from the clerk of the committee.

Mr. BUCK. I was under the impression that the arrangement was either on a 40–60 basis, or a 50–50 basis.

Mr. TUNNELL. Under the Wagner-Peyser Act it was a 50–50 basis. Then by some means 40 percent or 45 percent came from the Social Security System, under the Social Security Act.

Mr. BUCK. Regardless of whether the States paid any amount, I think they should be required to pay a part of the costs of administration.

Mr. TUNNELL. I agree with the Senator on that point.

Mr. BUCK. I do not see why they should expect the Federal Government to pay all the costs.

Mr. TUNNELL. But our committee went the whole way, with the idea of not antagonizing the States.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. What representatives of the governors or of the States appeared before the committee and so testified?

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not think any governors appeared. But there were those who represented themselves as representing the States.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I refer to action taken at a governors' conference about a year ago, wherein they strongly urged that this system be returned to the States.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; but I think the Senator will find that at all times they have had in the back of their minds the idea of having the Federal Government continue to pay the expenses.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As I recall, a representative of the Council of State Governors appeared before the full committee and asked to have the agency turned back as it was before, with the Federal Government simply putting up the money to carry it on. Then they said that if the law were to be amended in any way, as is proposed by the subcommittee of the Senate committee, they wished to offer several amendments which they would like to have incorporated in the measure. The committee agreed to do that.

As the bill now appears before us, it includes several amendments which were proposed by the representative of the States.

Mr. TUNNELL. I believe it was Mr. Rector who appeared for the States.

Mr. AIKEN. As I recall, we incorporated in the measure practically all the amendments which they proposed. As the bill is now written, I think it contains the amendments and the other provisions which the representatives of the State governments proposed.

Mr. TUNNELL. We thought we were giving the States what they proposed.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. TUNNELL. I wish to invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that, while the States have been desiring to take over this function, and the bill has been written with the idea of allowing the States to do so, there was in the original act, and there is also in the pending bill, a provision which gives power to the Secretary to make rules and regulations. I think the bill should contain such a provision.

Mr. BALL. The Federal contribution of 100 percent of the administrative cost in both cases is financed by the 10 percent of the unemployment compensation tax paid by employers which the Federal Government retains, and the remaining 90 percent which is received by the States and which goes into the reserve fund.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is it not true that because the money comes originally from the pay-roll tax collected within the State, it was not considered as being in the same class with the general revenues of the State?

Mr. BALL. The Senator is correct. I believe that if we are going to have Federal matching there is considerable merit to the contention that a detailed plan should be submitted, and that it be permanent once it has been adopted and agreed to. Where there is a 100-percent grant, I think the Federal Government must of necessity exercise supervision and have a great deal of authority.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is the Senator from Minnesota satisfied with the provision on page 12, in paragraph (b) concerning the interim activity in case the State cannot undertake the work immediately and the Federal Government continues to operate the system?

Mr. BALL. I think the provision to which the Senator has referred is satisfactory. The language there means that the Secretary may not operate a State system except at the written request of the governor of the State. The Secretary could not operate the New York system, for example, for 3 months on the amount of money which would be available.

Mr. HAYDEN. It seems to me that an adequate safeguard is provided in the bill.

Mr. BALL. Absolutely.

Mr. TUNNELL. I believe that the bill is many times more satisfactory than the original Wagner-Peyser Act. Some persons have expressed the belief that the State should advance a part of the funds. There was no disagreement in the committee, so far as I know, with respect to that point. There was no argument about it. We all agreed to it on the ground that the Government had taken over the offices, and an understanding had been reached that the offices would be returned. Now the Federal Government is paying 100 percent of the expense, and the offices are to be returned on the same basis as that on which they are now being operated.

Mr. BALL. I believe that the committee was guided by the fact that at least on two occasions both Houses of Congress had passed provisions in connection with 100 percent Federal funds.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. BALL. A similar provision was inserted in the rescission bill.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes. The matter can be approached from the point of view expressed by the majority leader, namely, that the States should pay if there is to be any return of the Service to the States, or that the Federal Government should take over the entire operation and pay all the expense. That point of view may be taken, or the point of view that the States should have all the control and the Federal Government should pay all the bills. That seems to be the argument which is being made on this floor. That is practically what we are agreeing to, except that the Secretary of Labor is authorized, as he was in the original Wagner-Peyser Act, to make the regulations. The only difference is in the power which he will have to enforce the regulations.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, according to my knowledge, the Governor of Idaho and the director of our employment service in that State are not greatly exercised about how soon the employment service shall be returned. They are not very anxious about having the responsibility which they will have in connection with the work, but they are very much worried about where the money will come from. I have received the following telegram from Governor Williams.

BOISE, IDAHO, *April 13, 1946.*

Hon. GLEN H. TAYLOR,
United States Senate:

House committee now considering appropriation for United States Employment Service. Necessary that Federal Government finance 100 percent operation of these offices in Idaho. War Manpower Commission funds being used to pay personnel in USES will not be available after June 30. Urge you to use your influence to have adequate fund appropriated to USES so that services will not be crippled in Idaho when turned over to State.

ARNOLD WILLIAMS,
Governor.

Governor Williams has also written me a letter endorsing the bill which was originally introduced by the Senator from Montana and which was much stronger than the pending bill in relation to protecting the rights of employees under the turn-back to the States. However, that bill is not now before us. Evidently the Governor is very much in favor of the present provisions in the bill to which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] referred a few moments ago as being extra verbiage.

Those provisions are merely for the protection of the rights of employees who have been employed by the Federal Government. When the service is turned back to the States those employees should be protected against being dismissed en masse and replaced by persons who might be members of a State political machine. Mr. President, I am convinced that something of that kind may happen to the employment service. If it is turned back to the States without the protection which has been suggested in connection with this bill, the various State services may be turned into political footballs.

I read from a paragraph of a letter addressed to me by Mr. S. D. Hayes, State director of the Department of Labor, United States Employment Service, at Boise, Idaho.

As Congress no doubt will return the Employment Service to the States during this next fiscal year, and as it is intended to return it with 100 percent Federal funding, then it is quite evident that the USES funds must be increased so that the Employment Service will not be returned with a handicap of shortage of funds.

He is very much worried about the matter.

I should now like to read into the RECORD one paragraph of the testimony of General Bradley given on January 17, 1946 before the House Committee in connection with the question of returning the Employment Service to the States. General Bradley said:

As head of the placement board I can state that we would like to see it go on as it is without change, at least until we are over this hump and where there are not so many veterans looking for employment. * * * That it is much easier to carry out the policies of the board and see that they are carried out by an employment service through a national organization rather than through so many seperate organizations of the States. * * * Whether it should be transferred beyond that, I should think would be for someone to determine whether or not it can be transferred when business is less and we still have an efficiently run program.

Mr. President, I should like to say, as a former worker, and one who has built up a social security account, that I cannot see the sense of having unemployment insurance and the proposed employment service operated by the States. A worker will go to one State and work there for a while, and during that time he will build up a social security account. Then he may go to another State and there build up another account. Finally, he may require the services of an expert bookkeeper in order to keep books on himself, or he will forget where his accounts are located, and he will lose all his benefits, or at least most of them, unless he remains in one particular place. If I should ever desire to draw from my social security account I would have to scratch my head and look for wage receipts, and one thing and another, whereas if the whole matter were administered federally I could write to the Government, give my social security number, and ask, "How much money do I have coming? I should like to get it because I am in bad financial shape."

Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished majority leader that the unemployment insurance, employment service and pension plans should be federally administered. Certainly, if we are going to return the employment service to the States, we should afford protection such as that which is embodied in the pending bill, and not return the service with no strings whatever attached.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a few minutes ago I referred to an amendment in the nature of a motion to substitute certain language for all of titles I and II of the committee amendment.

The gist of the proposed amendment is that the Secretary of Labor shall provide for the return to State operation, not later than December 31, 1946, or such earlier date as he may deem feasible, of public employment offices in an orderly and expeditious manner, which offices shall thereafter be operated under and in accordance with the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act as amended to January 1, 1942: *Provided*, That no State shall be required to make any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of the Wagner-Peyser Act, as amended to January 1, 1942, prior to July 1, 1948.

Mr. President, the basis of this amendment, which I shall offer shortly, is that the employment services should be turned back to the respective States in the condition in which they were taken over on January 1, 1942, subject only to such transitional requirements as obviously must be made in the course of the retransfer.

Before addressing myself to the fundamental principle underlying the amendment, Mr. President, let me refer to the point made by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] with reference to the absence of restraint on the States. I think his point is very well taken, that if the Federal Government shall finance the proposition, it should have some power of restriction and restraint with respect to the use of the funds appropriated.

Mr. President, let me call attention to the fact that the Wagner-Peyser Act, both as passed and as it went into effect on June 6, 1933, and as it had been amended to January 1, 1942, provided precisely the control and restraint which the Federal Government should have with respect to the operation of these services by the States.

It will be recalled that in the Wagner-Peyser Act it is provided that any State desiring to receive the benefits of the

act shall submit to the Director of the Bureau in the Department of Labor detailed plans for carrying out the provisions of the act within such States; that if such plans are in conformity with the provisions of the act, and reasonably appropriate and adequate to carry out its provisions, they shall be approved by the Director, and due notice of such approval shall be given to the State agency.

Then, Mr. President, the next succeeding section of the act, section 9, requires, first, that each State agency cooperating with the United States Employment Service under the act shall make such reports concerning its operations and expenditures as shall be prescribed by the Director. Thus, obviously the Director is given a power of observation and a power of requiring such reports as he shall prescribe. Certainly there is some restriction, certainly some restraint, when the Director of the Bureau in the Department of Labor has the power, as he does under the Wagner-Peyser Act, of requiring the submission of such reports concerning the making of expenditures as he himself shall prescribe.

But the section does not stop there. It then provides that—

> It shall be the duty of the Director to ascertain whether the system of public employment offices maintained in each State is conducted in accordance with the rules and regulations and the standards of efficiency prescribed by the Director in accordance with the provisions of this act.

Not only is there this express provision giving him the duty to ascertain whether the system of public employment offices maintained in each State is conducted in accordance with those rules and regulations and standards of efficiency, but in the act there is a further precaution expressly given to the Director, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, the authority to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act. I cite section 12 as having that general effect.

Reverting again to section 9 after making it the obligation of each State agency to submit the reports concerning its operations and expenditures, which shall be prescribed by the Director, and after making it the duty of the Director to ascertain whether the system of offices maintained in each State is conducted in accordance with the rules and regulations and the standards of efficiency prescribed by the Director, there is a further very significant provision.

Before mentioning that, however, let me refer to another matter. The distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] a few minutes ago referred to some such language as "a political football." I undertake to say that under the provision of section 9 not only does the Director have the power of supervision as to rules and regulations, but also with respect to standards of efficiency. I take it that the provision as to standards of efficiency which the Director has the right to see are carried out impliedly gives to him clearly the power to prescribe a merit system, and such other systems as may be necessary to guarantee that the employees of State offices shall not be mere political footballs, or stool pigeons for some political leader, but shall be men and women chosen because of their ability and efficiency. If I am not mistaken, those merit systems existed prior to January 1, 1942, and were carried into effect and operation certainly in various States of the Union.

The point I make, in answer to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, is that the amendment which I propose will not leave us in an uncharted sea of nonregulation or nonrestriction by the Federal Government, but will put us back under the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act to which I have adverted.

Then I come to the further provision to which I was about to refer, namely, that—

> The Director may revoke any existing certificates—

The certificate was the means by which money was to be transferred to the respective agencies under the Wagner-Peyser Act—

> The Director may revoke any existing certificates or withhold any further certificate provided for in section 7, whenever he shall determine, as to any State, that the cooperating State agency has not properly expended the money paid to it or the moneys herein required to be appropriated by such State, in accordance with plans approved under this act.

Then there is a provision for the giving of notice in writing to the State agency on the part of the Director before any such certificate shall be revoked or withheld, and a provision for an appeal by the State agency to the Secretary of Labor from the action of the Director in any such case. The power is expressly granted to the Secretary of Labor either to affirm or reverse the action of the Director on such appeals, as he shall consider proper.

So, I respectfully submit that no Senator need have the slighest fear that if the amendment which I propose shall be adopted, it will mean that the Federal Government, which will be putting up 100 percent of the expenditures, will be without effective power of supervision and control, for such power is clearly and conclusively existent under the terms of the Wagner-Peyser Act as they existed both at the time of its passage and on January 1, 1942.

Mr. President, I stated, in substance, that the fundamental proposition upon which this amendment is based is that the Federal Government should return the facilities, in the condition in which it received them, to the respective States, subject only to such necessary incidental provisions as may be required in order to bring about the transmission over to the States of the particular facilities in question.

Why should they be turned back to the States? Is there any obligation on the part of the Federal Government so to do? I take it that no one, certainly no one who occupied the position of Governor of a State, can read the record with respect to the acquisition of these facilities from the various States and fail to realize that these facilities were taken over under the express provisions of the telegraphic message sent by President Roosevelt on December 19, 1941, to the State governors. That message reads as follows:

> Now that this country is actually at war, it is more than ever necessary that we utilize to the fullest possible extent all of the manpower and womanpower of this country to increase our production of war materials. This can be accomplished by centralizing recruiting work into one agency.
>
> At present, as you know, the United States Employment Service consists of 50 separate State and territorial employment services whose operations are loosely coordinated by the Federal Government. In order that there may be a complete responsiveness to the demands of national defense, and speedy, uniform, effective action to meet rapidly changing needs, it is essential that all of these separate employment services become a uniformly and of necessity nationally operated employment service.
>
> I have, therefore, given instructions to the proper Federal officials that the necessary steps be taken to accomplish this purpose at once. I ask that you—

He was referring to the governors of the States in the telegraphic message—

> I ask that you likewise instruct the proper officials of your State to transfer to the United States Employment Service all of the present personnel, records, and facilities required for this operation.
>
> Inasmuch as the Federal Government is already paying practically 100 percent of the cost of operation and the State personnel has been recruited on a merit basis—

I pause in my reading to call attention to that important and significant observation—that a merit basis prevails—as I indicated a few moments ago. Returning then to the President's message—

> there will be no difficulty in transferring State employees into the Federal service. These employment offices will continue to serve the unemployment compensation agency so that there will be no need to set up duplicate offices. I shall appreciate your advising me at once of your full cooperation so that the conversion of the present Employment Service into a truly national service may be accomplished without delay.

Mr. President, obviously, the needs and conditions of stress and strain and war were those under which the President made this extraordinary request of the governors of the States, and to a man the governors of the States responded. Every one of them complied with the request made by the President in this forceful language.

Now, what do those governors consider to have been the nature of that transaction? They have expressed themselves on several occasions as to the nature of the transaction—whether it was a gift which would give to the Federal Government an irrevocable right or whether it was in the nature of a loan. I call attention to the fact that at the 1944 Conference of Governors of the United States, held at Hershey, Pa., among other recitals in the resolutions relative to the employment offices, is this short paragraph:

> Whereas it was the stated assumption of the governors that the transfer was made as a temporary loan to be terminated with the passing of the emergency which prompted the President's request;

Mr. President, at the subsequent meeting of the governors' conference held in Mackinac, Mich., on July 4, 1945, occurs

in the resolutions adopted on this same subject these various significant preambles:

Whereas the President of the United States more than 3 years ago requested the governors of the several States, as an emergency measure, to loan—

I call the Senate's attention to this significant expression of "loan"—

to loan their employment offices to the National Government in order to facilitate the fullest use of all of our manpower for war; and

Whereas the governors of all the States agreed to this emergency measure, with the understanding that at the proper time the employment offices would be returned to the States—

And so forth. Then, Mr. President, the language which I have already read today from the governors' conference at Oklahoma City refers to the agreement of the President of the United States, both Houses of Congress, and the governors' conference, in which all bound themselves that the Employment Service should be returned to the States.

Mr. President, the governors of this country considered the transaction as a loan. But it may be said, "What did the Federal Government itself consider it to be?" This very Senate of the United States has passed at least three times expressly upon this proposition. I refer to Public Law 124, page 24, a bill which was approved by the President July 3, 1945. It contains this provision:

That the employment service facilities, property and personnel loaned by the States to the United States Employment Service, shall be returned to the States not later than 3 months after the termination of hostilities in the war with Japan as determined by Presidential proclamation or by concurrent resolution of Congress.

Obviously, Mr. President, by the use of the term "loan" the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States each recognized the transaction to have been a loan. Likewise the President of the United States, by the very fact that he approved the bill to which I have referred.

Then, Mr. President, I call attention also to the bill S. 1274, an act to amend the General Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, and so forth, which was passed by the Senate on September 20, 1945. By that bill it is provided, among other things:

The employment service facilities, property, and personnel loaned by the States to the United States Employment Service, shall be returned to the States not later than 90 days after the enactment of this act. The Secretary of Labor is authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

So, again did this very body, the Senate of the United States, recognize the transaction as a loan.

Mr. President, I refer likewise to the rescission bill, which received what is known as a pocket veto by the President of the United States. I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that in the statement of the managers on the part of the House in the pamphlet entitled "Conference Report," with respect to that bill, namely H. R. 4407, occurs this significant language on the part of the managers:

No. 21, relating to the United States Employment Service: Accepts the Senate provision for returning to the States the employment services which were loaned to the Federal Government at the beginning of 1942, pursuant to the request of the President, but provides for an outside return date of 100 days after the enactment of the bill instead of 120 days, as the Senate amendment proposed.

So, Mr. President, it would seem to be clear that the transaction has been considered uniformly, both by the governors of the States and by the Congress of the United States, and, in the instance mentioned, by the President of the United States, as a loan.

A loan, as I understand it—and I have respectable authority for the statement—is anything loaned or given to another on condition of return or payment. I take it that it is not intended that when a service is loaned to the Government it shall be returned back to the States in a different condition or subject to different conditions than the condition or conditions, respectively, which existed at the time the loan was made.

The governors of the respective States are highly interested even yet with respect to this proposition. I have referred earlier, twice this afternoon, to the resolutions adopted by the conference of governors meeting in Oklahoma City on May 30 of this year. I also referred in passing to the fact that certain telegrams had been received with respect to the position taken by the various governors of the United States. I may say that these telegrams were received before the time the bill was placed in its present form, but they contain significant language, and indicate beyond peradventure of doubt that the governors of the various States who responded to inquiries made, or who volunteered their opinions, as the case may be, practically uniformly, so far as I know, took the view that there should be a return, and many of them stated that it should be under the conditions on which the services were turned over to the Government.

I hold in my hand the telegram received in Washington April 18, 1946, from the Honorable Earl Warren, Governor of the State of California, addressed to myself. In it he says:

This State favors return of employment service under terms of H. R. 4437, as it passed the House, with possible extension of return date to September 1, 1946.

I call attention to the fact that among these telegrams is likewise one which reached Washington on April 19 of this year from the Honorable John C. Vivian, Governor of the State of Colorado, which reads:

I regard Senate Education and Labor Committee version of H. R. 4437—

I may say that that was the earlier committee print; it is not the one now placed before us, but Senators will observe the view which the Governor takes nevertheless.

I regard Senate Education and Labor Committee version of H. R. 4437 detrimental and contrary to best interests of this State. It violates the present intent of Congress and obliterates States' rights. Would appreciate your help in retaining provision of Dirksen amendment as passed by the House.

Mr. President, the Dirksen amendment is H. R. 4437 as it passed the House and came to the Senate.

I hold in my hand two telegrams from Hon. Raymond E. Baldwin, Governor of Connecticut, the first one having been received in this city at 2:17 on the afternoon of April 18, the second one having been received on the same afternoon at 3:30. The first one reads:

Strongly favor House version of bill providing for return of employment services to the States over version now pending in the Senate. Hope that amendments can be made adopting form of House bill. Kindest regards.

Mr. President, again I say that the bill then before the Senate committee was the committee print and not the present bill, but the Governor indicates clearly his view with respect to the House version of the bill, and in this telegram advocates its passage.

This telegram was followed, as I have indicated, by the second telegram, which says:

Since sending telegram of this date have seen copy of letter written to you by Mr. Frank Bane—

I pause in reading, Mr. President, to say that Mr. Bane is the secretary of the governors' conference, and I think also is the secretary of the Council of State Governors.

Proceeding with the telegram:

I agree with the points suggested in that letter as possible improvements to the Senate bill.

I call attention to the fact that on April 20 there was received in Washington a further telegram from the Honorable Millard F. Caldwell, Governor of Florida, reading as follows:

Am advised your committee ready to release report approving bill returning unemployment service to States. Am advised the measure approved contains same objectionable features as original Ramspeck bill defeated in House and carries increased Federal controls and enforcement machinery. I disapprove such features and think it only fair and right that employment service be returned immediately to States in same form and substance as prevailed when service loaned to Federal Government at outbreak of war. This was the agreement on which transfer was made and a return of the service encumbered with controls and features not prevailing at time of transfer constitutes breach of same. Regards.

MILLARD F. CALDWELL,
Governor of Florida.

I hold in my hand a telegram received in Washington on April 20 from Hon. Ralph F. Gates, Governor of Indiana. The telegram reads as follows:

Am in receipt of copy of H. R. 4437 as Senate Education and Labor proposes reporting.

Again, at the risk of repetition, I invite attention to the fact that that was the earlier draft, and not the one now before us, but I think he indicates something of interest in his telegram nevertheless. He says:

This version contains same objectionable provisions stricken from Ramspeck bill by Dirksen amendment by House action. I urge

that Senate adopt without amendment this bill as passed by House to prevent federalization of employment service and to give States authority to improve and develop employment service without obnoxious Federal restrictions. I reaffirm stand taken by governor's conference.

RALPH F. GATES,
Governor of Indiana.

I have a few further telegrams. Here is one from Gov. Robert D. Blue, of Iowa, received in Washington on April 18:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *April 18, 1946.*
Hon. FORREST DONNELL,
Senator from Missouri,
Senate Education and Labor Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It is imperative that the employment service be returned to State control immediately. This return is needed for the proper administration of State unemployment compensation laws and for proper service under the GI bill to veterans. I urge the passage of H. R. 4437 as amended and passed by the House.

ROBERT D. BLUE,
Governor of Iowa.

I have a telegram received on April 18 from Governor O'Conor, of Maryland, which reads as follows:

BALTIMORE, MD., *April 18, 1946.*
Senator FORREST DONNELL,
Senate Education and Labor Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

I strongly oppose H. R. 4437 as now being considered by your committee. This is substantially the same as the Ramspeck bill which was defeated in House. I am strongly in favor of the immediate return of the employment service to the States.

HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Governor.

From the State of Montana, the State from which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor comes, I have a telegram received in Washington on April 20.

HELENA, MONT., *April 20, 1946.*
Hon. FORREST C. DONNELL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Advised Senate Education and Labor Committee withholding final report version of employment service return measure in order governors may have opportunity to express views. Once again we in Montana would like employment service loaned at request of President during stress of war returned at once. We are opposed to increased and continual Federal controls and therefore we do not favor Ramspeck bill though it may be labeled 4437 and presented as improvement over Dirksen amendment as passed by House. The governors have so many, many times expressed their opinions and the Congress has so many, many times expressed intention to make good on implied promise of President to return this service, and Federal departments have so many, many times by their acts demonstrated they have no intention to follow wishes of Congress it now seems crystal clear unless Senate will act decisively there is no hope that Federal departments will ever be willing to return this service to local management. We appreciate what you are doing and extend our thanks. The service could be returned within 24 hours in Montana without confusion. If this were done it would give to our people a minor sign justifying renewed faith in democratic processes of government.

SAM C. FORD,
Governor of Montana.

The following telegram was received in Washington on April 19 from Governor Vail Pittman, of Nevada:

CARSON CITY, NEV., *April 19, 1946.*
Hon. Senator FORREST DONNELL,
Senate Education and Labor Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand Senate Education and Labor Committee withholding final report of its version of employment service return measure until Monday at your request. I am not familiar with text Senate committee bill, but I am informed that it contains all the objectionable features of the Ramspeck bill that was defeated in the House. If this is the case, I am strongly opposed to new bill. Am heartily in favor of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. Wish to thank you for courtesy that has been extended through your efforts. Kind regards.

VAIL PITTMAN,
Governor of Nevada.

The following telegram from the Governor of South Carolina, Hon. Ransome J. Williams, was received in Washington on April 18:

COLUMBIA, S. C., *April 18, 1946.*
Hon. FORREST DONNELL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.,

Am strongly opposed to Education and Labor Committee version of employment service return measure. It is in substance the objectionable Ramspeck bill which was overwhelmingly defeated in House. Earnestly urge adoption of the Dirsken amendment heretofore passed by House in its stead.

RANSOME J. WILLIAMS,
Governor.

For the benefit of Senators who have entered the Chamber since I began speaking, let me say that this telegram was received before the present bill had been drafted.

Here is a telegram from Hon. Coke Stevenson, Governor of Texas, received in Washington on April 19:

AUSTIN, TEX., *April 19, 1946.*
Senator FORREST DONNELL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Texas Unemployment Compensation Commission is prepared to take over and operate vigorously and efficiently employment service at any time the Congress may designate. The commissioners do protest, however, and I join with them against legislation that would put them in a strait-jacket of Federal control.

COKE STEVENSON.

The next is a telegram from the Governor of West Virginia, Hon. Clarence W. Meadows. The telegram was received in Washington on April 18, and reads as follows:

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *April 18, 1946.*
Hon. FORREST DONNELL,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This is to advise that I am opposed to bill H. R. 4437 as amended by the Senate Education and Labor Committee as it gives the Secretary of Labor powers which rightfully belong to the States. In my opinion employment service should be returned to the States under the same condition as they were loaned to Federal Government.

CLARENCE W. MEADOWS,
Governor of West Virginia.

Finally—and perhaps appropriately—the following telegram comes from the oldest Governor in the United States, Hon. Walter S. Goodland, Governor of Wisconsin, who, notwithstanding his eighty-odd years, like our good friend Mr. Crockett in the Senate, is still vigorous and active, the telegram was received on April 19, and reads as follows:

MADISON, WIS., *April 19, 1946.*
Hon. FORREST C. DONNELL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Firmly believe that employment services should be returned to the States not later than June 30, 1946, and upon the same basis in which they were loaned.

WALTER S. GOODLAND,
Governor of Wisconsin.

So, Mr. President, in reply to the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I point out this expression which has been made by Governors over and over again, collectively and individually, with reference to this question.

The committee amendment does not return these facilities to the States in the condition in which they were received, and does not merely add to the bill such transitional requirements as would be obviously necessary to cover the situation of the increased personnel and different personnel, but it goes far beyond any such provisions. I shall not go into great detail in this respect. However, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to a very few of the changes which are made by the committee amendment.

Reference has been made particularly to section 9 (b) on page 12 of the bill. This subsection reads as follows:

(b) The Secretary is authorized to expend in any State so much of the funds appropriated and made available under section 5 of this act as may be necessary to operate a State-wide system of public employment offices under the control of the Secretary if no State system of public employment offices exists in such State or if, and for as long as, the State is not eligible for funds in accordance with the provisions of this act. Except to the extent that a system of employment offices under the control of the Secretary is operated within a State either (1) pursuant to the specific request of the Governor of such State or (2) with funds specifically appropriated by the Congress for the operation of such system under the control of the Secretary, the Secretary shall not expend more than $1,000,000 in any fiscal year pursuant to this subsection or operate a system of employment offices in any State pursuant to this subsection for more than 3 months in any fiscal year.

Mr. President, obviously, Congress itself could, if it desired, perpetuate the control of the National Government in the States under the provision that if it shall appropriate funds specifically for the operation of the system, it may retain control. As I read the section, the Secretary would then be privileged to continue the operation of the system within the State.

As has been so well pointed out by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], in any State in which the Governor himself should become of the opinion that he would like to have the Federal Government operate, that one official, regardless

of whether the millions of inhabitants of his State and the legislature of the State might prefer otherwise, would have the power vested in him by this bill to permit the Secretary of Labor to continue indefinitely the operation of the employment service within such State. There was nothing of this kind whatsoever in the Wagner-Peyser Act. Nothing even remotely to that effect was contained in the bill passed in 1933, or in the law as it was in existence on January 1, 1942.

The only provision in the Wagner-Peyser Act with respect to violations of the rules, regulations, and plans was that which I have already read, under which the Director might revoke any existing certificate or certificates. He might cut off the money and thus prevent the State from further breaking the regulations or upsetting the plan. But nowhere does the Wagner-Peyser Act permit the Federal Government, either by action of the Congress, by action of the governor, or by the action of anyone else, to operate in the State the employment service within its bounds.

The referral provisions of the bill have been mentioned. I shall not undertake to go into detail on that subject. It has been sufficiently covered. It is provided that—

> No person shall be referred to a position * * * (c) if, as determined by the State agency, the position is one which does not utilize the person's highest skill, until and unless a reasonable effort has been made to place him in a position that does utilize his highest skill.

It is true, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] has indicated this afternoon, that he would be agreeable to an amendment by which the determination of whether or not a reasonable effort had been made should be vested in the State agency. It has been well pointed out, however, by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that under the power of prescribing rules and regulations, the power of retaining money, and the power, if necessary, of going into a State and taking possession of the system, obviously the Secretary of Labor may, notwithstanding even such an amendment as the Senator from Minnesota is agreeable to accepting, have the power to determine whether or not a reasonable effort has been made to place the individual in a position which utilizes his highest skill.

Someone may ask, How is that provision of any importance? Let me give an illustration. Take the case of a young man working on a farm in the State of Wisconsin. He goes to Milwaukee and becomes employed there, not on a farm, but in shipbuilding, and develops that as his highest skill. At the conclusion of the war, there being no longer any shipbuilding in progress at Milwaukee, or certainly not enough to employ everyone who had been previously employed, suppose the State then determines that inasmuch as he has become skilled in some operation connected with shipbuilding, that is his highest skill. What, then, is a reasonable effort to place him in a position to utilize his particular skill? There is nothing in the bill to prevent the Secretary of Labor from saying that such a person shall draw unemployment compensation for the full period. Under the bill as it is now written, it would be within the power of the Secretary of Labor to expand the period beyond one which you, Mr. President, or I might deem to be reasonable, and to permit certain persons to remain without employment, drawing unemployment compensation, for a number of months, merely because they could not be placed at work building a ship, under conditions such as those to which I have referred.

So, Mr. President, in connection with the recapture clause to which I have alluded in section 9 (b), the referral standards are two instances in which the committee amendment does not give the services back to the States in the same way in which the services were transferred by the States to the Government.

There are other particulars which I might mention, but I shall mention only one, namely, that the commitee amendment, by legislative enactment, places back into the hands of the Secretary of Labor, the supervision of this system, in so far as the Federal Government shall supervise it. Mr. President, what was the condition on January 1, 1942? As has been pointed out this afternoon, at the outset of these services the Department of Labor was the branch of our government which had charge of this particular type of activity. Later, certain transfers were made, and under the Reorganization Act of 1939 this particular branch of the work of the Government was transferred to the Social Security Board. Thereafter, there was, first, a transfer to another organization; and, finally, under the War Powers Act, by the medium of a directive issued by the President, this particular type of work was transferred to the Department of Labor. Therefore, at the time when these services were transferred to the Federal Government on January 1, 1942, the condition which then existed was that the Social Security Board was in control of the services. Yet the amendment proposed by the Senate committee undertakes to return these particular facilities, not to the Social Security Board, but to the Department of Labor. I take it that a reasonable construction of the law would be that, in the absence of the amendment proposed by the committee, upon the expiration of the War Powers Act these services should be returned, not to the Department of Labor, but to the Social Security Board. So, here we have a number of instances of very material, direct, and substantial changes being made by the proposed amendment from the condition under which the services were transferred to the United States Government on January 1, 1942.

The question whether the statutory freezing of this particular work in the Department of Labor is wise or unwise is one upon which the late President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, spoke most eloquently and clearly in a statement which he made some years ago. We may remember that today the unemployment-compensation phase of these matters is vested in the Social Security Board. If, however, the employment services are placed under the Department of Labor, there will be two departments dealing with precisely the same person, in many cases.

One of the purposes which is served by the employment service is to make certain that no person shall be able to obtain unemployment compensation if work of an appropriate nature can be procured for him through the employment service. So these two branches of Government—on the one hand, the employment service; and on the other hand, the unemployment-compensation service—are directly linked or connected. In effect, they are the two sides of the same coin. The late President Roosevelt recognized the situation. I now read what he said in his message transferring the United States Employment Service to the Social Security Board:

> I find it necessary and desirable to group in a Federal Security Agency those agencies of the Government the major purposes of which are to promote social and economic security, educational opportunity, and the health of the citizens of the Nation.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The Social Security Board is placed under the Federal Security Agency, and at the same time the United States Employment Service is transferred from the Department of Labor and consolidated with the unemployment-compensation functions of the Social Security Board in order that their similar and related functions of social and economic security may be placed under a single head and their internal operations simplified and integrated.
>
> The unemployment-compensation functions of the Social Security Board and the employment service of the Department of Labor are concerned with the same problem, that of the employment, or the unemployment, of the individual worker.
>
> Therefore they deal necessarily with the same individual. These particular services to the particular individual also are bound up with the public-assistance activities of the Social Security Board. Not only will these similar functions be more efficiently and economically administered at the Federal level by such grouping and consolidation, but this transfer and merger also will be to the advantage of the administration of State social-security programs and result in considerable saving of money in the administrative costs of the governments of the 48 States as well as those of the United States. In addition to this saving of money there will be a considerable saving of time and energy not only on the part of administrative officials concerned with this program in both Federal and State Governments, but also on the part of employers and workers, permitting through the simplification of procedures a reduction in the number of reports required and the elimination of unnecessary duplication in contacts with workers and with employers.

So, Mr. President, I submit that in returning these facilities to the States under a condition by which the unemployment-compensation service now under the Social Security Board is to be matched by an employment service in the Department of Labor, we provide for a highly material difference between the condition which existed when these facilities were turned over to the Federal Government on January 1, 1942, and the condition under which they will be returned to the States at this time.

Therefore, I respectfully submit, first, that the transaction by which these facilities were turned over to the Federal Government on January 1, 1942, was a loan; second, the fact that it was a loan

implies that the facilities shall be returned in substantially the same condition as that in which they were when they were so loaned; third, that the bill which is before us, namely, the House bill with the amendments proposed by the Senate committee, does not return those facilities in the same condition or in substantially the same condition, but imposes various restrictions and conditions which the governors of the States, by action in their conferences and individually, have indicated not to be wise or proper or consistent with the understanding had at the time when the transfer to the Federal Government took place; and, finally, Mr. President, I submit that the amendment which I now offer will properly cover the situation and will see to it that the services shall be returned to the States in the condition in which the services were turned over to the Federal Government on January 1, 1942, and also will recognize that in view of the fact that up to now the States have not been advised as to when they will get the services back, and thus have made no appropriations, they should be relieved until January 1, 1948, from the obligation of making appropriations under the Wagner-Peyser Act.

So, Mr. President, with your permission, I submit the amendment which I now send to the desk, and at the appropriate time I shall move its consideration by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I think the amendment which has just been offered by the Senator from Missouri is an illustration of the fact that it is not possible to write a satisfactory bill by means of offering offhand an amendment such as the one the Senator from Missouri has just submitted. The amendment omits some of the most important points which must be included in connection with a bill of the kind now being considered.

If the bill is amended as suggested by the Senator from Missouri some very important points will be entirely omitted. Of course, I have not had an opportunity to read his amendment carefully, and I may have failed to understand all that it contains; but I do not think it contains any provision for the transfer of the property or the facilities or the records to the States. Of course, that is the most important part of the transfer. If the services were returned to the States without giving them a number of employees and without giving them the records and the facilities and the whole organization, the result would be, as I tried to state earlier today, that the system would be in a most unsatisfactory condition. It would not be in a working condition. The organization which the States would thus receive would not be a working or functioning one. It would not be a working organization which would be handed over.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I invite attention to the fact that the amendment which I have proposed is to strike out only titles I and II and substitute other language. As I understand, the provision for the restoration of properties transferred by the States to the Federal Government is set forth in title III, and that provision would not be affected by the amendment.

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not so understand, but perhaps the Senator is correct. Is there any provision in the amendment, or in the bill as the Senator would have it amended, to take care of the subject of personnel?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, again I may say that that matter is covered in title III.

Mr. TUNNELL. And that is to be left unamended.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes. It may be, Mr. President, that at the proper time I shall offer an amendment to title III, but at the present time the only amendment before the Senate is the amendment to strike out titles I and II.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator does not now know whether he is satisfied with title III?

Mr. DONNELL. No. I wish to give further consideration to it.

Mr. TUNNELL. Notwithstanding the present authority in the Wagner-Peyser Act, if a State refuses to operate an effective service the Secretary must cut off the funds to the State, close down the employment service, and thereby deprive the veteran of a means of being paid. Does the Senator's amendment have anything to do with the question of personnel?

Mr. DONNELL. My amendment has nothing to do with anything in the bill excepting titles I and II. It does not refer at all to personnel.

Mr. TUNNELL. Under the Wagner-Peyser Act, if the State services are not operated effectively and the funds are cut off, thereby depriving veterans of the means of receiving servicemen's readjustment allotments, and the payment of workers' unemployment insurance is affected, an inadequate service will be rendered. In other words, there are those who would attack the right of the Secretary to carry on the service for 3 months. They prefer that the Secretary should have his choice of either rendering service which would be a farce or rendering no service whatever. They object to the Secretary of Labor being given adequate power. Even though the Senator from Missouri has clearly shown what I contended a few minutes ago when the Senator from Ohio claimed that a great deal of additional power is proposed to be given to the Secretary, the Senator from Missouri has now shown that in the original act there was the power of regulation and that such power would continue to reside in the Secretary of Labor. However, the Senator from Missouri apparently objects to the Secretary having the authority to continue such service to men out of employment, even for only 3 months.

I cannot follow that sort of reasoning, Mr. President. If there is any necessity for this service, why should it not be continued? There is no doubt about the right of the Secretary to regulate. There is no doubt about his right to prescribe the conditions. If he now has the right to regulate and prescribe the conditions, why should he not have the right to correct the conditions for the benefit of those who are suffering and out of employment? That seems to be the particular object of attack, although the time is limited to 3 months, and the amount of money which could be spent throughout the whole United States, as stated by the Senator from Minnesota, would not be sufficient to support the service in the State of New York for 3 months.

I ask, Mr. President, What is the purpose in contending that no one should be authorized to continue the employment service? Do our friends object to such service? Do they not want unemployed veterans to receive employment? Why should it be said that the Secretary should not have the power to continue the service? The States are not furnishing the service. There is no question about the right of the Secretary to furnish it. If he cannot furnish it, who can furnish it? It is said by some, "Oh, no; the Secretary of Labor must not be allowed to perform this function for the benefit of the unemployed veterans. That would be a terrible thing. In that case the Federal Government would be taking over." Notwithstanding the fact that the Federal Government pays all the cost, it is contended by some that the Federal Government should not be given power to make sure that the service is properly regulated.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Under the theory advanced by the opposition, mismanagement would be encouraged because there would be no means of restricting or controlling the operation, and it could be turned into a political football without any opportunity being afforded to cure the situation. Am I not correct in my statement?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think the Senator is correct, and I wish to follow his line of reasoning with the statement that the Federal Government would be furnishing all the money. It is said that the Federal Government should not exercise any regulation. The State government cannot regulate. It has no power, and does not furnish any money. The Federal Government furnishes the money, but it has been argued that the Federal Government should not have the right to regulate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The statement has been made that the Federal Government furnishes all the money. Originally, under the Wagner-Peyser Act, there was a matching arrangement.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have gone over that matter.

Mr. TAFT. When the Social Security Act was enacted it provided that a tax of three-tenths of 1 percent would be levied against the employers in the States. That tax was paid by the employers in the State, and it was used for the purpose of defraying the costs of the

unemployment-compensation offices. It is now used for the purpose of paying employment officers, and $700,000,000 still remains as the unused portion of the tax of three-tenths of 1 percent which was paid by the employers of the various States. So it is hardly fair to say that the States do not put up any of the money. The reason that the matching arrangement was abandoned was that the new tax of three-tenths of 1 percent was levied on the employers of each State, and it was used for the purpose of defraying the costs of the unemployment offices. Is that not a correct statement?

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not believe so. The Federal Government levied a tax which was in the nature of an excise tax. The Senator proposes that the Federal Government shall spend that money in the States without any supervision or regulation being exercised either on the part of the State or Federal Government.

Mr. TAFT. The tax was levied on the employers of the State for a particular purpose; namely, to help provide employment. I am not dealing with the question of what kind of restrictions we should apply.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator did deal with that matter in his speech.

Mr. TAFT. I am perfectly willing to have the Federal Government prescribe some general rules, but I am opposed to granting total power to issue rules with the right to change them every day, and control the State officers just as though they were Federal officials. Whenever in the past we have granted Federal aid to States, it is true that we prescribed some general regulations. But unless we leave to the States some degree of discretion—none is left in this bill—there is no purpose in having a State system. We might as well have a Federal system. I believe that the Senator's argument in behalf of a Federal system is not a good argument for imposing all kinds of restrictions on a State-aid system.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I heard the Senator's argument when he made it on a previous occasion, and I have heard it just now. It is an argument that there should be no regulation. The Senator has now gone still further and has stated that inasmuch as the money has been collected from the citizens of the State, the Federal Government should not have any further control of it. That may be a good argument, but it is not the way I look at it. The Federal Government is expecting to pay 100 percent of the cost, and it has to take the money from some fund which it collects from citizens of the United States. Whether it is a tariff, an excise tax, or whatever it may be, it is something which comes from the people of the United States.

It is merely a quibble to say that it is taken for a particular purpose. It is not taken to be thrown away without supervision, and that is what would result from the method suggested, without regulation. In fact, so far as I can see, that is the whole ground of this great argument for the State-controlled organization.

I am willing to go along with that for the reason that I believe that a majority of Congress favor it. I do not believe it is better, and I do not think anyone can take the record of the testimony we heard and conclude that it is better. But since we are to do it, for heaven's sake let us have some regulation by somebody of these political employees. Let it be a regulation by the Federal Government, or give somebody in the State government the power. Do not turn it loose and lose all pretense and pretext of its being a legitimate transaction.

There are approximately 26,000 men affected. They are to be turned over to the States as employees. They have to qualify, under the bill, according to some fair regulation and prescription of methods. There must be something done by the State authorities to show that people are qualified to take the positions.

If we take the suggestion of some of those who have spoken in opposition to the bill this afternoon, and merely return the services to the States, we return them to the States without men, property, leases, or anything else. This has no political significance; those in a Democratic State are just as likely to want to take the employees as those in a Republican State, but it is argued that the State should have the power to say who are to work and who are not to work, regardless of qualifications. It should have the right to say what is to become of 26,000 employees. Are they to be thrown out of jobs without even a chance at their positions? Are they to be thrown on the mercy of the political organizations of the various States? If that is the purpose, let us say so.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator mean that when the employment services are turned back to the States the employees will not even be under the Hatch Act? Would not the Hatch Act apply to them?

Mr. TUNNELL. I should say not. It will apply to them so long as they are Federal employees.

Mr. McMAHON. So long as there are some Federal funds?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. That is what I wanted to make sure of.

Mr. TUNNELL. We do not know what amendments are to be offered or what they will provide. Thus far the funds would be those of the Federal Government. I think, though, that seems to be questioned. The Senator from Ohio seems to think they would be State funds. If these 26,000 persons are to be turned over to the tender mercy of those who have no interest in their continuation as employees at all, then this is a bigger proposition than some of us have been considering it.

The bill provides that they shall have an opportunity to qualify, and I am told that practically all these employees have come from the States and the civil-service registers. But that is not satisfactory; there must not be any regulation which would give these employees an opportunity for their jobs.

At a time when we are trying to prevent unemployment, we are saying to the Nation, "We have no interest in these 26,000 people any further. We are turning them over to the State political machines in the 48 States and 3 Territories. We are no longer going to consider them as an organization, Nation-wide, so as to furnish them insurance against unemployment in the way of jobs." We are saying, "We are going to change this into 51 different organizations, and we are going to turn those people loose so that those who employ may or may not employ them."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to get back to the Federal tax question again, because the argument made against the bill seems to me to be fallacious. As I understand, the money is to come from a payroll tax levied on employers throughout the United States to maintain the system. Everyone knows that any tax levied on an employer is passed on in the cost of the business, just as an excise tax on a pack of cigarettes is passsed on to the consumer. So it is like any other excise tax, and it then becomes Federal money. It is not separated in the Treasury, but goes into the Federal Treasury for redistribution. How could we say that the excise tax must be paid in the State of North Carolina, or that any money must be spent where it is collected?

Mr. TUNNELL. I wish again to refer to the contention of the opposition. They do not object that under the present law regulations must or can be prescribed by the Secretary of Labor. What they want in the new bill is that there shall be no regulation. What does that indicate?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator misapprehends the amendment I have suggested. It simply goes back to the law as it was, which, as I pointed out, gives to the Department of Labor the right to prescribe the rules and regulations.

Mr. TUNNELL. I know what the Senator said about that. I have not seen the amendment except at a distance, and I presume he is correct. But I was talking about the general argument which has been made this afternoon in opposition to the bill. The opponents even object to the proposition in section 10:

> In carrying out the provisions of this act, no person shall be referred to a position (a) without due notice to the applicant, if the position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute.

What is there unfair about telling a man before he takes a job whether he is getting into a fight, or what it is?

Then there is subdivision (b):

> If the wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are substantally less favorable to the individual than those prevailing for similar work in the locality, except upon request of the applicant.

Should a person be denied the benefits of employment under the bill because he refuses to take a job which is less favorable to him than other work prevailing in the neighborhood? Is there anything

wrong with that? I cannot see anything wrong. There is nothing in the argument, so far as I can see, that in this bill there is an attempt to put something over on employers, the general public, or the employees.

Subdivision (c) provides:

If as determined by the State agency the position is one which does not utilize the person's highest skill, until and unless a reasonable effort has been made to place him in a position that does utilize his highest skill.

Oh, it is said, who is to determine that? There are many laws in the country about which it might be said, who is to enforce them? Here is something with which the Secretary of Labor has something to do. The Federal Government has something to do with it yet. But the opponents of the bill want to compel a person to take a job as street cleaner when perhaps he is a chemist. They want to give him the most menial of positions and say, "You have been offered a job. You should have taken it. You did not take it, and you have not any argument. You have no rights under this bill."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, going back to the first point, it is provided in subdivision (a):

Without due notice to the applicant, if the position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute.

There are numerous cases in my State, until the State director got hold of the matter and stopped it, where, for instance, a veteran would apply for employment and would be referred to a plant in which a strike had been declared. When he would fail to go to work he was automatically cut off from the provisions of unemployment compensation granted to him as a veteran.

Mr. TUNNELL. In other words, the person unemployed, because of the action of the State organization, would be put in the position of being a strikebreaker.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. TUNNELL. Which, at least, is uncomfortable—maybe.

We find this language in paragraph (c):

As determined by the State agency, the position is one which does not utilize the person's highest skill.

The Nation is entitled to have the unemployed person placed where his skill is highest. Not only is the individual entitled to that but the State and the Nation are entitled to it. This language simply puts into written law the proposition of being fair to the unemployed. Why all this hubbub in opposition to it? Who is going to be injured by treating the unemployed fairly? I have not heard any argument which would show why that should not be done. All I have heard is that such language is not in the old law, or perhaps it is giving too much power to someone. Where is the power that it gives anyone if it gives only justice to the poor man who is trying to support his family, who perhaps has been in the service of and has done everything he could for his country, who perhaps has come home wounded and less capable than he was when he went away?

Now, when a bill comes before Congress in which an attempt is made to try to make it possible that such an individual shall get employment, we hear all sorts of technical objections and statements as to somebody being given too much power. Someone ought to have some power to help that man as a good citizen to be placed where he can use his talents and use them to the best advantage.

I have heard a number of objections made this afternoon. Perhaps some of them may be good, but I have not found many which I thought were good aside from what I have just stated. It was suggested by one Senator that it might be well simply to write one line, as follows:

The services are turned back to the States.

In that event, Mr. President, who is going to look after the unemployed? Who is going to look after the various rights to which they are entitled, and to see that the duty which the American people owe to the returned veterans is fulfilled?

I hope that the bill will not be defeated by reason of a spirit of indifference. I hope that no legal technicality will be permitted to interfere with the rights of these returning boys. I hope that no craving for patronage will be permitted to become the dominating factor in the determination of their rights. Let us be fair to the boys who are unemployed. Let us be fair to America. Let us get employment started. Let us not be carried away by imaginary objections which are raised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). The Clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 6, after the word "than", it is proposed to strike out "June 30, 1946", and insert "December 31, 1946."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is it the purpose of the Senator in charge of the bill to conclude discussion of it and to have a vote on it this evening?

Mr. TUNNELL. I have no desire to stay here until we are all exhausted. I am perfectly willing to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Perhaps I had better withhold a suggestion. I understand the majority leader is on his way to the Senate floor. I cannot think of any better way of utilizing the time than for the Senator from Delaware to continue his discussion of the bill.

Mr. TUNNELL. I always recognize a leader, and I do not always stop to inquire who he is.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. May I inquire whether the amendment I offered, which would strike out all of titles I and II and substitute certain language, will be voted upon first, before the committee amendments incorporated in titles I and II?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will take precedence over the Senator's amendment or any other amendments offered. The Chair will say to the Senator from Missouri that his amendment will be voted on after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. DONNELL. I understand that my amendment will be printed without formal request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has already been ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, unless some Senator desires to continue the discussion, I see no reason why the Senate should not recess.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, while we are waiting for the majority leader, in order to determine what is to be done after he returns, I may say that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads has favorably reported some nominations which are on the Executive Calendar. Why can we not consider the Executive Calendar while we are waiting?

(Mr. BARKLEY entered the Chamber.)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I see the majority leader has come to the floor now.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Delaware the present status of the bill that is pending? I have been necessarily engaged elsewhere.

Mr. TUNNELL. I will say to the majority leader that I think there is no probability of getting through tonight in any reasonable time, and I for one would be glad to have the Senate recess at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has any suggestion or proposal been made with reference to fixing any time for a vote or limitation of debate?

Mr. TUNNELL. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would the Senator prefer to have the consideration of the bill go over until tomorrow?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Department of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RABAUT, Mr. HARE, Mr. GARY, Mr. STEFAN, and Mr. JONES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. COFFEE, Mr. D'ALESANDRO, Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, and Mr. PLOESER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the selective service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the selective service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James L. Kauffman, to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from April 3, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the nominations on the executive calendar.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I notice on looking at the executive calendar that there are a great many nominations in the Selective Service. We do not know from what States they come. Would it not be possible to have the name of the State placed opposite the name of each nominee? On page 3 we find the name William Green de Rosset. He is a records analyst, Selective Service, national headquarters. From what State does he come?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not certain that in the nomination papers sent to the Senate the address or home State of the appointee is given, but they are not included in the executive calendar.

Mr. McMAHON. I assume that it is not simply a formality to send these nominations to the Senate. For all I know, it is not so. I would be very much surprised if it were so. De Rosset, Flagg, Gallagher, and Holmes might be from my State, and there is no way of my knowing it.

Mr. BARKLEY. That ought not to disqualify them.

Mr. McMAHON. No; it really would add to their qualifications. That is why I should like to see the State designation of the nominee. If it were the fact that they were from my State, I should like to see it emblazoned on the calendar for all the world to know.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would enhance their ability to serve their country with distinction.

Mr. McMAHON. That is why I want it written down.

Mr. BARKLEY. And on the assumption that they do come from Connecticut I hope the Senator will not interfere with their confirmations.

Mr. McMAHON. I am not suggesting that I wish to interfere. I suggest that in the future it would be a good idea that the States from which they come were placed opposite the names of the appointees.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it would be advisable hereafter for the nomination papers to give the addresses of the appointees. We are all interested to know where the nominees come from, especially if they come from our bailiwick.

Mr. McMAHON. That is correct. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed consideration of legislative business.

AMENDMENT TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is a very important bill on the calendar, Senate bill 2341, Calendar No. 1542, which ought to be acted upon, because the provision it deals with expires on June 30. I will read the report, which is very brief. It is as follows:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2341) relating to the insurance of existing construction under the National Housing Act, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill as reported provides for preserving the authority of the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages on existing construction which would otherwise expire and terminate on July 1, 1946, and removes the limitation which would otherwise prevent the insurance of such mortgages if the aggregate amount thereof should equal or exceed 35 percent of the total amount of insured mortgages.

The committee believes that the continued authority of the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages on old or existing houses as well as on new construction is important and necessary to the housing of those in need and to the success of the entire housing program.

The provisions of this bill are identical with those of section 308 of the General Housing Act of 1946 (S. 1592), which was passed by the Senate on April 15, 1946, but which may not be acted upon by the House of Representatives in time to prevent the expiration of the authority of the Federal Housing Administration on July 1, 1946.

For this reason, prompt action on the bill as reported is believed by the committee to be desirable.

In other words, we did this in the general housing bill which has not yet received consideration by the House. In order to preclude the possibility of the expiration of this provision, the Senate committee has reported this bill, which is identical with part of the original bill now pending in the House.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able majority leader if the report of the committee was unanimous.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it was. I do not recall any opposition to it. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is a member of the committee.

Mr. TAFT. The report was unanimous. It is important that the FHA should insure existing houses, just as much as new houses. A man may be able to build a new house if he can sell his old house to someone who can finance it. The power of the FHA originally extended only to new houses. Then it was extended to old houses, but the power expires on a given date, which is July 30. That is the necessity for this bill. So if we wish to have the FHA continue to insure old houses and remove the percentage limitation, which is wholly unnecessary, it is essential to pass this bill by the 30th of June.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the House had acted upon Senate bill 1592, which we passed a month or so ago, this legislation would not be necessary, because it is included in that bill. But in view of the doubt about final action in the House, this bill is necessary, and I hope it will not be objected to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I have made such inquiries as I could among the minority members as to their attitude toward the bill, and I can report that I find no opposition to its passage.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2341) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered, to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 203 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the second and third provisions and by striking out the colon at the end of the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 25, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 24 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

E. Tomlin Bailey, of New Jersey, now a foreign-service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Edmond M. Hanrahan, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1947.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

TO BE ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS, EFFECTIVE DATE OF OATH OF OFFICE

Ceril S. Scheppegrell
Raymon M. Bro
Earl C. Hewitt

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEON TO BE SURGEON

Frederick J. Brady

ASSISTANT SURGEON TO BE SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEON

Raymond F. Corpe

TO BE SENIOR ASSISTANT SCIENTISTS, EFFECTIVE DATE OF OATH OF OFFICE

Marion M. Brooke
Oliver R. Placak
Harry D. Pratt
Pope A. Lawrence

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Col. Henry Spiese Aurand, Ordnance Department (temporary major general), with rank from June 12, 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 24 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

SELECTIVE SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

Col. Claude C. Earp to be State director of selective service for Missouri, with compensation at the rate of $7,102.20 per annum.

Harry F. Besosa to be State director of selective service for Puerto Rico, with compensation at the rate of $6,650 per annum.

John L. McCormick to be State director of selective service for Alaska, with compensation at the rate of $5,905.20 per annum.

Vivian B. Collins to be State director of selective service for Florida, with compensation at the rate of $6,384 per annum.

Paul G. Armstrong to be State director of selective service for Illinois, with compensation at the rate of $9,376.50 per annum.

John Van B. Metts to be State director of selective service for North Carolina, with compensation at the rate of $8,179.50 per annum.

Holmes B. Springs to be State director of selective service for South Carolina, with compensation at the rate of $7,102.20 per annum.

Carleton C. Pierce to be State director of selective service for West Virginia, with compensation at the rate of $6,384 per annum.

Candler Cobb to be director of selective service for New York City, with compensation at the rate of $8,179.50 per annum.

Homer A. Higgins to be State medical adviser of selective service for Arkansas and Oklahoma, with compensation at the rate of $5,905.20 per annum.

Philip H. Bartholomew to be State medical adviser of selective service for Nebraska, with compensation at the rate of $5,905.20 per annum.

Troy W. Lewis to be chief, legal division, selective service, Arkansas, with compensation at the rate of $5,905.20 per annum.

Frank D. Norton to be administrative officer, selective service, District of Columbia headquarters, with compensation at the rate of $6,384 per annum.

Joseph A. Bell to be administrative officer, Research and Statistics Division, Selective Service, Philadelphia branch, with compensation at the rate of $5,905.20 per annum.

Joseph Kormann to be Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, Selective Service, Philadelphia branch, with compensation at the rate of $7,102.20 per annum.

Raymond V. Bowers to be Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, Selective Service, national headquarters, with compensation at the rate of $7,102.20 per annum.

William Green de Rosset to be records analyst, Selective Service, national headquarters, with compensation at the rate of $5,905.20 per annum.

Edmund A. Flagg to be executive, Communications and Records Division, Selective Service, national headquarters, with compensation at the rate of $5,905.20 per annum.

Angus J. Gallagher to be Chief, Headquarters Division, Selective Service, national headquarters, with compensation at the rate of $8,179.50 per annum.

Ronald M. Holmes to be Chief, Appointments and Personnel Division, Selective Service, national headquarters, with compensation at the rate of $7,175 per annum.

Colgate Hoyt to be Assistant Chief, Veterans' Personnel Division, Selective Service, national headquarters, with compensation at the rate of $7,102.20 per annum.

Austin S. Imirie to be administrative officer, Selective Service, national headquarters, with compensation at the rate of $7,179.50 per annum.

Raymond M. Lancaster to be fiscal accountant, Selective Service, national headquarters, with compensation at the rate of $5,905.20 per annum.

Kenneth H. McGill to be Chief, Research and Statistics Division, Selective Service, national headquarters, with compensation at the rate of $8,179.50 per annum.

James M. Smith to be Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, Selective Service, national headquarters, with compensation at the rate of $7,102.20 per annum.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

James L. Kauffman to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from April 3, 1945.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps to rank from the dates stated:

"K" "K" Bigelow, from the 1st day of October 1942.

Dellwyn L. Davis, from the 16th day of July 1943.

Wendell M. Waskom, from the 1st day of August 1943.

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Marine Corps in the ranks hereinafter stated:

TO BE CAPTAINS

John F. Elder
Edward R. Hagenah

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Charles L. Granger

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Charles W. Abrahams
Robert E. Adams
Clifford A. Allison
Robert H. Anderson
Thomas E. Archer
George C. Arnold
Roy S. Bachstein
William E. Baird
Frank E. Banks, Jr.
John M. Barclay
Frank W. Bell, Jr.
Carlton E. Betterton
Albert J. Bibee
William Biehl, Jr.
George F. Bloom
Richard D. Borgstadt
John A. Bowler
Cloyce K. Box
Emidio Briganti
Ralph A. Britson
Gordon S. Browne, Jr.
Harold E. Bryant
William W. Bryant
William A. Buell, Jr.
Leo D. Burden, Jr.
George R. Burke
Loren E. Burnett
Richard H. Bushnell
Raymond J. Butters
William O. Cain, Jr.
John H. Callan
Francis E. Campo
Frank A. Cassiano
Howard J. Connolly
Edward Cook
Charles E. Crew
William E. Culp
Daniel L. Cummings
Paul F. Curtis
Rex A. Deasy
Harold V. Deering
Earl E. Demers
Nicholas J. Dennis
Anthony R. Digiovanni
Jack W. Dindinger
Thomas S. Dlugos
Lloyd B. Dochterman, Jr.
James T. Doswell 2d
Roy M. Ducharm
Harry J. T. Ellzey
Don D. Ezell
George B. Farish
Robert B. Farrelly
Harvey A. Feehan
Gordon I. Feid
James A. Feliton
Francis J. Field
Richard B. Fielder
Don H. Fisher
Billie C. Forrester
John G. Freeman
Anton Froelich
Floyd K. Fulton, Jr.
Alfred F. Garrotto
Baylor P. Gibson, Jr.
George A. Gibson
Wayne R. Glase
Bruce A. Goewey
Albert Good
James E. Graaff
Robert J. Graham
Harold L. Green
Daniel Greene
Robert M. Greener
William N. Gustafson
Clyde P. Guy
Kenneth G. Hadcock
Peter H. Hahn
Sheldon O. Hall
Arnold J. Hammons
John V. Hanes
Robert M. Hanna
Edwin A. Harper
Esmond E. Harper
Charles W. Harris
Howard H. Harris
Lawrence P. Hart
Merlin L. Hasley
Roland B. Heilman
Jones L. Helms
Richard Hey, Jr.
Harvy C. Hinckel
Paul L. Hitchcock
Harding H. Holloway
John Hoogendam
Howard M. Humphrey
Robert E. Ingram
Manning T. Jannell
James C. Jewell
Winston E. Jewson
Harrel K. Jobe
Ray N. Joens
John W. Johnson
David M. Johnston
David G. Jones
Robert A. Jones
John H. Keith, Jr.
Gordon H. Keller, Jr.
Donald D. Kennedy
Walter J. Klimek
Charles E. Kollmann
Gordon A. Kroodsma
George Kuprash
Henry H. Kyle
Leo G. Lewis, Jr.
Robert D. Limberg
Roy O. Loftis

William J. Longfellow
James A. MacDonald, Jr.
James E. Machin
William G. MacLean, Jr.
Benjamin G. Martin
Reginald G. Martin
Vincent J. Marzelo
Gordon Matthew
William "S" McCaslin Jr.
George E. McClane
Wade C. McCoy
Edwin J. McCue
James McDaniel
Monroe E. McNiel
John W. McNulty, Jr.
Edward J. McQuillan
Bernard McShane
Ermine L. Meeker
William E. Melby
Ernest I. Melin
Herbert E. Mendenhall
Robert A. Meyer
John B. Michaud
Roland R. Miller
Joseph C. Missar
Frank N. Mitchell
Reynolds A. Moody
Kenneth L. Moos
Richard J. Morrisey
Herbert P. Mosca, Jr.
Edward D. Murray
George Nasif
Joseph A. Nelson
Harry E. Nevill
Arthur W. Nichols
Richard F. Noble
John T. Nugent
James B. Oliver, Jr.
Edward J. Orem
Eugene M. Oster
Donald B. Otterson
Eber V. Overby
Eraine M. Patrias
Nathan B. Peevey, Jr.
Edwin Pendrey
Virgil R. Penley
Philip G. Pickett
George W. Piland, Jr.
George R. Pillon
John B. Piper
Arthur A. Poindexter
Richard A. Polen
Elbert F. Price
Robert G. Price
Joseph Pultorak
John E. Quigley
Frederick A. Quint
Thomas A. Redden
Roy L. Reed
Richard G. Rees
Jack R. Rhoades
Clyde R. Roberts
John M. Rosebush
Jules M. Rouse
Ted J. Ryder
Wilfrid P. Rylander
Kenneth Samples
George W. Sarbacher, Jr.
Harold E. Savage
William H. Schomers
Nicholas L. Shields
Clyde B. Shropshire
Lawrence H. Simmon
Carl L. Sitter
James D. Skinner
Warren J. Skvaril
Franklin L. Smith
Lawrence W. Smith, Jr.
Loren R. Smith
Nathan A. Smith
Raymond Smith
Walter E. Sparling
James F. Stebbins
Walter C. Stewart, Jr.
David S. Stockbridge
Andrew J. Strohmenger
John N. Swartley
Samuel Taub, Jr.
Charles F. Temple
Galen M. Thomas
Roy H. Thompson
Gerald J. Tice
John J. Tooley
Lud R. Tucker
John E. VanHousen
Edward H. Voorhees
Andrew J. Voyles
Arthur Wagner
Donald E. Watterson
Robert J. Weaver
James H. Webb, Jr.
Holden C. West
Jack D. White
Elmer E. Wiedeman
Charles S. Wilder
Bruce F. Williams
James B. Williams 3d
Thomas E. Willingham
John B. Wilson, Jr.
Edward B. Winston
Robert L. Wood
Robert C. Woten
Theodore R. Yachik
William E. Zimmer
Harold A. Zimmerman

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Ella M. Cain, Bridgeport.

CONNECTICUT

Bernard O. Bailey, Glastonbury.

FLORIDA

Glenn J. Liles, Bonita Springs.
Margaret E. Livingston, Holt.

GEORGIA

George W. Adolphus, Sandy Springs.

ILLINOIS

Irene M. Parrent, Hurst.
Anna Mae Smith, Roselle.

LOUISIANA

Verlie Bollinger, Alco.

MASSACHUSETTS

James F. Desmond, Reading.
Vernon D. Morgan, South Yarmouth.

NEBRASKA

Eldon B. Pittam, Adams.
Herbert H. Ottens, Dunbar.
Rudolph F. Biere, Cook.
Henry F. Taddiken, Shelby.

NEW MEXICO

Ramonsita Gallegos, Chama.

NEW YORK

Susan H. Dye, Boston.
Stanley E. Zaremba, Herring.
Romeyn S. Dunn, Scottsville.

OREGON

Madge L. Herron, Shevlin.

PENNSYLVANIA

Florence E. Chamberlin, Hallstead.
Daniel S. Graeff, Hershey.
Nelle I. York, Mount Braddock.
Grant W. McElhatten, Oil City.
Martin E. Byers, Saegerstown.

TENNESSEE

James E. Meador, Dixon Springs.
Gilmer S. Brimm, Riddleton.

VIRGINIA

Ruby M. Nicholson, Ferrum.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 24, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite God, the creator of life, in exultation, we praise Thee for Thy benevolent purpose. In this spirit we rejoice in Thy overruling providence. Thou whose might holds the planets in their place, whose tenderness guides the sparrow in its flight and marks its fall, help us to discern Thy footsteps in the events of human life. Be Thou the refuge from whatever may threaten us, and deliver us from faint-heartedness. Where there is division, we ask for unity; where there is confusion, we ask for serenity; and for discord, we ask for harmony. O may divergent paths lead to a larger way of widening vision and distinctive service. Help us to be patient, faithful, and trustful, believing that all things work together for good to them that love Thee. In the name of Jesus the Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 21, 1946, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 32. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5716. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6056. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MEAD, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. WHITE, Mr. BALL, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6496. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. GREEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5452. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. WHITE, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. REED to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3517) entitled "An act to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BALL, and Mr. FERGUSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a letter from the President of the United States to the Speaker of the House, with an enclosure, which I think should be read for the information of the House. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the letter and the enclosure.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the letter from the

President and the enclosed memorandum.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 21, 1946.

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE:

In accordance with the recommendation in paragraph B of Public Law 262, Seventy-ninth Congress, I have, through appropriate channels, taken steps to advise countries receiving UNRRA assistance of the desire of the United States Government that the admission to those countries of properly accredited members of the American press and radio be facilitated in order that they might be permitted to report without censorship on the utilization and distribution of UNRRA supplies and services.

I am advised that satisfactory arrangements are in effect to permit American press and radio representatives to report without censorship on the UNRRA programs in all UNRRA receiving countries except the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. There is attached a translation of a communication dated March 12, 1946, to the Secretary of State from the chargé d'affaires of the U. S. S. R. with reference to the situation in that country, which, in effect, states that the censorship rules in force for all correspondents in the Soviet Union will be applied to correspondents desiring to report on the utilization and distribution of UNRRA supplies.

I am also advised that accredited representatives of UNRRA have been given necessary facilities for observing and reporting on the distribution of UNRRA supplies in all receiving countries including Ukrainian and Byelorussia Soviet Socialist Republics, and have submitted extensive and detailed reports.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

[Translation]

The chargé d'affaires of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics presents his compliments to the Secretary of State, and with reference to the note of the Acting Secretary of State of January 8, 1946, has the honor to communicate the following:

Inasmuch as special commissions of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration will be sent to the Ukrainian S. S. R. and the Byelorussian S. S. R., American official circles and the public will have the possibility of receiving information of interest to them concerning the utilization and distribution of the supplies and services of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration through these commissions.

With reference to the request of the State Department for granting representatives of the American press and radio the possibility for full and free execution of their functions in accordance with the desire expressed by the Congress of the United States, representatives of the American press and radio on the territories of the Ukrainian S. S. R. and the Byelorussian S. S. R. should be guided by the rules in effect on all the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and for that reason the establishment of any special rules regulating the activities of representatives of the American press and radio on the territories of the Ukrainian S. S. R. and the Byelorussian S. S. R. is not contemplated.

EMBASSY OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS.
WASHINGTON, *March 12, 1946.*

PROTECTION OF TRADE-MARKS

Mr. LANHAM submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1654) to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes.

REMODELING AND REDECORATING HOUSE CHAMBER

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the Members that the special committee appointed by the Speaker with reference to the remodeling and redecorating of the House Chamber is today filing its report. The plans are on display in the office of the Architect of the Capitol and will be there for 2 weeks. Any Member who wishes to see these plans may do so. It will be appreciated if any Member who so desires will offer any criticism or comment that may be helpful.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman contemplate that this repair work will be done within the course of the next 2 years or 4 years?

Mr. LANHAM. The work certainly cannot be done at present and will not be done until the situation is better with reference to labor and material. No contractor at present would enter into a contract to do the work. But there is a great deal of preliminary work to be done in the preparation of the plans.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

AMENDING EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 675, Rept. No. 2323), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (R. R. 6477) to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and section 3 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE HOUSING SITUATION

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to protest about the administration of the housing program in this country. The veterans are unable to get housing and yet I read in one of the Washington papers where a priority was granted for an $800,000 construction job here which would include enough material for 800 units for veterans. I also read in the paper here, Mr. Speaker, that liquor stores, cabarets, and night clubs, and bowling alleys, and many other unnecessary and nonessential projects are given priorities. Yet De Ridder, La., is unable to get a priority to build classrooms for the Sunday school of a Baptist church in my district.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in each instance a copy of an address by Mr. Frank A. Godchaux, chairman, Louisiana State Rice Milling Co.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the RECORD and to include an editorial in each.

Mr. WELCH (at the request of Mr. BLAND) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of international shipping policy.

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith a brief newspaper article.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the record in two instances and to include an editorial in each instance.

Mr. JACKSON (at the request of Mr. SAVAGE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from C. W. Brown, chief engineer of the Missouri State Highway Department, together with a resolution passed by the Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Officials at their annual meeting in Chicago on March 16, 1946.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

REFERENCE OF BILLS

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1564) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Shadrick Ponca, the bill (S. 1566) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Wilma Brandon Irving, and S. 1695, authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Louis Runs Above, and that the same be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

TOLLS ON SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND BAY BRIDGE

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3565, an act to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after "military", insert ", Coast Guard."

Page 2, line 6, after "military", insert ", Coast Guard."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the amendments?

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a provision affecting certain military and naval and some other Government personnel. It relates to the Oakland-San Francisco Bay Bridge. This adds the Coast Guard along with the military and naval personnel. It places them on a parity with the military and naval personnel.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a statement, and in the other a letter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a newspaper article and in the other some remarks made by the gentleman on the flour situation.

Mr. WILSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include copies of a radio broadcast made over two radio stations.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include editorial comment in tribute to a great philanthropist, Mr. Henry C. Lytton, of Chicago, who on July 13 will be 100 years old.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an address by General Devers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GROSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANDIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXPORT OF AUTOMOBILES

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the other week when I was home I visited with a friend of mine who has served with the marines for 2 years in the Pacific. This boy is now farming. He could not even secure a second-hand automobile, nor could his wife secure an ordinary ice box. When I see this picture of United States automobiles going to South America, which shows eight brand-new cars being loaded at one time to go down to Peru and also when I see the notation, "Freighter *Santa Olivia* makes ready to sail from New York to South America with a cargo of automobiles, trucks, tires, and refrigerators," I wonder if it is not about time to pay some attention to this marine and his wife sitting on that farm back there—an American citizen who has fought for his country—rather than to be too kindly disposed toward foreigners.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter from the mayor of Zanesville, Ohio, to Wilson Wyatt, Housing Administrator.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Mattoon (Ill.) Daily Journal Gazette of June 7, 1946.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters from constituents.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the significance of the Nebraska election and to include therein an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement recently issued by a former colleague.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the weekly bulletin of the Leather and Shoe News, captioned "Where do we go from here?"

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WIGGLESWORTH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ELLIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE BRITISH LOAN

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a week ago yesterday in the Sunday edition of the New York Times appeared an advertisement by a British manufacturer of a popular-make automobile. Various body styles were offered for immediate delivery f. o. b. New York. Four-door sedans were priced at $1,581.42. Another was designed to sell for $1,350, and so on.

Now we are glad to see our friendly competitor across the Atlantic prosper, and we are even glad to purchase some of their products, including automobiles, but it does surprise us to learn that while we are unable to get our own factories producing cars for domestic consumption, England is able to make them and ship them for sale abroad. All this they are doing without the benefit of a $4,000,000,000 loan.

What surprises are in store for us should this loan be consummated?

Authoritative word also comes that Czechoslovakia, another country whose application for a loan is pending, is now prepared to export cars to this country. By means of so-called loans which really amount to gifts, we are financing our competitors to put us out of business in the postwar era.

A MEMO FOR PEOPLE WITH SHORT MEMORIES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, if I were to give a title to these remarks, I would call them a memo for people with short memories. I refer especially to people in

Congress and in the White House who at the time of the railroad and coal strikes spoke courageously, acted dramatically, and voted patriotically, but who now appear to have entered into a pact by common consent to say nothing, do nothing, remember nothing, and anticipate nothing, insofar as strike legislation is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of whether it is a case of short memories or political expediency which has brought about this stalemate in labor legislation, I think the time is now abundantly here when this House should take action on the Truman emergency labor legislation, which the President personally requested at a joint session of Congress, which the House promptly passed, which the Senate subsequently amended and passed, and which the newspaper people now tell us is to be permitted to die on the Speaker's desk without even the courtesy or distinction of being officially killed or publicly buried.

I urge all Members of Congress who recognize with me that we are just precisely where we were before the railroad and coal strikes took place to join in an effort now to get action on the Truman labor proposal. Should the House fail to act on this legislation which is now appartly being shelved by high authority and should the Maritime Union then call its strike on September 30, the bitter words of "too little and too late" will have an ugly new significance for all of us.

Please keep this in mind: The President came to Congress on May 25 to ask for emergency strike legislation. The House acted favorably on May 25. The Senate acted favorably, with amendments on May 31. The Senate asked for a conference on June 3. Up to this minute the House has failed to join in a conference, no conferees have been appointed, and the legislation is still on the Speaker's desk. Mr. Speaker, it is time for somebody to take action. We must not permit this important matter to die from the disease of political expediency.

THE PROPHET OF SCARCITY

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, Saturday afternoon I had occasion to go into Brentano's book store, and I saw there, and bought a copy of a comparatively new book by Mr. Chester Bowles, called Tomorrow Without Fear.

I am glad to give the book this much advertising, and to say that it is published by Simon and Shuster, and that the price is $1. I have no doubt that this is the ceiling price.

I rise to call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the appropriateness of the title. No man in the United States has caused so many citizens to go without the things they might have had, than has Mr. Bowles, with his bright young men in the OPA. As Mr. Churchill would have put it, "Never have so many been confused by so few."

Instead of putting the power of the Government back of production, in the face of evidences of what this country can do, when given a chance, and as we saw it in the war, Mr. Bowles and the OPA have constantly emphasized scarcity, handicapped production, and caused the people to go without.

I can only add that if this estimable gentleman is actually going to resign, as the papers announce, so that production may be released, and inflation may be fought, instead of continuing his hysterical outbursts over the radio and in the papers, and trying to run for office, any office, then I think there may be some hope of the people looking forward to a tomorrow with less fear than now, if not entirely without fear.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include several newspaper editorials on atomic legislation and also a resolution passed by the American-Hungarian Congress last week.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one an editorial, and in the other to include letters from constituents.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include a prize-winning editorial on the Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry and a resolution adopted by the Daughters of the American Revolution favoring immediate statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on health.

Mr. McKENZIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject Sound Economics Like Charity Should Begin at Home.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO SECOND WAR POWERS ACT, 1942

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 5716, to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SUMNERS of Texas, HOBBS, and HANCOCK.

UNITY OF NATIONS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, when a nation proposes to the world that it is ready to lay in the scales for peace its supremacy in a great field of military weapons if only all the nations of the world will agree to international control within those nations to make sure nobody can possess such weapons, it becomes hard indeed to understand how another nation can criticize such proposal on the ground that the nation making it is trying to dominate the world. The only way I can understand the Russian comments against the American proposals for control of atomic weapons is that they got mixed up and read their own proposals instead of ours, and were talking about them when they were making their remarks. For the Russian proposal would leave each nation still completely independent of any sort of real control; it would leave the whole matter to the promises of nations; it would do nothing to allay the suspicion and distrust that now plagues the world and which could be dispelled under the proposal of the United States.

America would be foolish indeed to destroy her bombs or share her knowledge unless and until in so doing she can bring other nations into an effective international control strong enough, complete enough, so that our people can be assured that no nation, no agency in the world, except only the international authority can possess or produce atomic weapons at all.

America's offer is bona fide, it is statesmanlike, it is the one road to certain peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the OPA and an article.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the daily Chicago Sun.

Mr. PITTENGER (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts and newspaper articles in each.

CRITICS OF OPA PLEASE TAKE HEED

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, production is at a record high. Therefore, charges that ceilings cripple industry cannot be substantiated. The zero hour for OPA is approaching. Its fight for existence is recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There will be found listed: its champions, and its enemies. The determination of the friends of the agency is to continue OPA until the country's economy is on an even keel. No one has ever demanded that it should become a permanent organization, and that the free enterprise system should be abandoned. OPA is administered by human beings and human beings are subject to error, and the agency has made many errors.

NATIONAL PRODUCTION

The measurement, as to the effects of OPA, is national production and can best be ascertained from a study of statistics. In the first quarter of 1946, the gross national production was at the rate of $183,000,000,000 per annum. Please note that during that period there were some upsets between labor and capital. This did not equal the peak period of the second quarter in 1945, when the rate during the war was $206,000,000,000. But the production of the first quarter of 1946 was by far the largest in the peacetime history. It topped the banner year of 1941 by over 50 percent when the total was $120,000,000,000. It was twice as great as 1939, when the total was $89,000,000,000. And the often referred to prosperity of 1929 with its production figure of $99,000,000,000, it almost doubled. The answer is price control has had no crippling effects, and should be retained until supplies more fittingly meet the demand.

OPA

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, during the past 4 years, OPA and its food subsidies have cost the American people at least $6,207,168,000 in direct Government expenditures. This would be enough $20 bills to reach from coast to coast 10 times. It also means an average of $171 added to the bill of each income taxpayer.

This figure includes only direct expenditures from the United States Treasury. It does not include indirect expenditures such as interest or cost of administering subsidies.

Nor does it include the billions of dollars paid by consumers for inferior quality merchandise at ceiling prices, black-market overcharges, and cost of higher-priced alternatives after standard brands had been driven off the market.

The total includes:

Total losses and direct subsidies paid by Reconstruction Finance Corporation	$3,369,643,000
Losses on price-support programs and subsidies paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation	2,186,950,000
Administrative expenditures by the Office of Price Administration	650,575,884
Total	6,207,168,884

This total does not include expenditures for administration of subsidies by the following agencies: Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, Rubber Reserve Company, Foreign Economic Administration, United States Commercial Company, and War Production Board, nor the cost of operating the Office of Economic Stabilization.

To this total also should be added the interest that has been, and will be, paid by the Government in the future for this money, most of which figures into the national debt.

HOUR OF MEETING MONDAY, JULY FIRST

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House convenes next Monday it convene to meet at 11:30 a. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SHEPPARD, THOMAS of Texas, COFFEE, D'ALESANDRO, PLUMLEY, JOHNSON of Indiana, and PLOESER.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RABAUT, HARE, GARY, STEFAN, and JONES.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Dr. Marshall Wingfield.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the OPA has been hit and hit hard and has not been cooperated with one iota by the majority of this House. The same is true of the Senate. I heard the gentleman just now speak of the cost of subsidies. How much does the tariff cost the American taxpayers? And is not the tariff a subsidy?

COMMUNISIM AND THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with what the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] said a while ago, I desire to say that so far as I am concerned I am in favo. of leaving the secrets of the atomic bomb in the hands of the military leaders of this Government for at least 5 years.

We know that communisim throughout the world is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government. We know its object is world revolution.

While we have the power to control the atomic bomb, while we have the bombs already made and the planes prepared to handle them, while we are sitting on top of the world and in a position to command peace, let us stay where we are and not throw that chance away and encourage Communists to continue their program of revolution throughout the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE CEREMONIES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a commission:

JUNE 21, 1946.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Due to the illness of Mrs. Fernandez, which has confined her to the hospital as a result of an emergency operation this week, I am compelled to tender my resignation from the Commission selected to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies at Manila, July 4.

I sincerely appreciate the honor conferred on me by this appointment and regret that

these circumstances make it impossible for me to go, much as I would like to do so.

Sincerely yours,

A. M. FERNANDEZ.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 414, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Commission to represent the United States at the ceremonies to be held at Manila on July 4, 1946, in celebration of the independence of the Philippines, to fill the existing vacancy thereon, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ATOMIC BOMB TEST

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire the RECORD to show that 10 Members of the House are away at the present time on official business in connection with the atomic bomb test. They are the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. GILLESPIE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALLEY DWELLING ACT

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill, S. 2218, to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this bill do?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. It extends the law for 1 year, to July 1, 1947.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the reason for the extension?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. The purpose of the bill is to move up this date to July 1, 1947, so that it will not be unlawful for people to live in alleys in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is because of the congestion that exists in the District at the present time?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. That is right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the resolution provide for any increase in rent in the District?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. No. That is left to the discretion of the Administrator.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how many people in the District reside in alleys?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. I do not know the exact number.

Mr. RICH. How many people in the District want to live in alleys?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. I do not know of any who would like to live there.

Mr. RICH. I think the quicker we get the people out of the alleys in the District, the better off they will be.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. RICH. We hope that we do not have to extend this any further than this 1 year because that is just 1 year too long.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. May I say to the gentleman that we are trying to get the slum clearance bill through which I believe would relieve the situation as soon as they can get the material and labor.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate that that has held things up, but the quicker we get the people out of the alleys in the District the better it will be. We ought to make the District of Columbia a place where all the people have good homes and if there is any opportunity to do that, it ought to be done. It ought to be done right here in the District first.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 (b) of the act known as the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended, be further amended to read as follows:

"(b) On and after July 1, 1947, it shall be unlawful to use or occupy any alley building or structure as a dwelling in the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. That section 6 of such act, as amended, be further amended by striking "1946" and inserting in lieu thereof "1947."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2219) to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. The purpose of this bill is to extend the Rent Control Act for the District of Columbia and try to keep rents under control for another year.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is just for 1 more year?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is it a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Yes; the committee is unanimous in reporting the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1941, as amended, is further amended by striking out in section 1 (b) thereof the figure "1946" and inserting in lieu thereof "1947."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6506) was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the business from the District of Columbia Committee for today.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5857) to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 168]

Adams	Barrett, Pa.	Bradley, Mich.
Almond	Barry	Bradley, Pa.
Anderson, Calif.	Bates, Mass.	Brumbaugh
Andresen, August H.	Bell	Buck
	Bender	Buckley
Andrews, N. Y.	Bennet, N. Y.	Bulwinkle
Bailey	Biemiller	Byrne, N. Y.
Baldwin, Md.	Boren	Camp
Baldwin, N. Y.	Boykin	Campbell

Cannon, Fla.	Hall,	Philbin
Cannon, Mo.	Leonard W.	Powell
Carlson	Hancock	Quinn, N. Y.
Case, N. J.	Hand	Rabin
Case, S. Dak.	Harris	Ramey
Celler	Hart	Rayfiel
Chiperfield	Hartley	Reece, Tenn.
Clark	Heffernan	Reed, N. Y.
Cochran	Herter	Rivers
Coffee	Holifield	Robertson,
Cole, Kans.	Hull	N. Dak.
Colmer	Izac	Robertson, Va.
Cooley	Jackson	Robsion, Ky.
Corbett	Jensen	Roe, Md.
Cox	Jones	Roe, N. Y.
Crosser	Kean	Rooney
Curley	Kearney	Sadowski
D'Alesandro	Kee	Sasscer
Dawson	Keogh	Sheridan
De Lacy	Kerr	Sikes
Delaney,	Kilburn	Slaughter
James J.	King	Smith, Va.
Delaney,	Klein	Somers, N. Y.
John J.	Lane	Sparkman
Dingell	Latham	Starkey
Dirksen	Lemke	Stewart
Douglas, Calif.	Ludlow	Stigler
Douglas, Ill.	Lynch	Sumner, Ill.
Doyle	McConnell	Sundstrom
Drewry	McGehee	Taber
Eaton	McGlinchey	Taylor
Elsaesser	McGregor	Thom
Engel, Mich.	McKenzie	Tolan
Engle, Calif.	Madden	Torrens
Fallon	Mankin	Vinson
Fernandez	Mansfield,	Vorys, Ohio
Flood	Mont.	Weaver
Gardner	Mansfield, Tex.	Welchel
Gerlach	Marcantonio	Welch
Gibson	Morgan	West
Gillespie	Murphy	White
Gore	Murray, Tenn.	Wickersham
Gorski	Neely	Winstead
Granahan	Norrell	Wolfenden, Pa.
Granger	Norton	Woodhouse
Grant, Ala.	O'Konski	
Green	O'Toole	
Gwinn, N. Y.	Pace	
Hall,	Patman	
Edwin Arthur	Patrick	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 264 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF STATISTICAL INFORMATION

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5857), to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5857, with Mr. DAVIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on June 6, the first section of the bill had been read and is now open to amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 1, line 8, strike out the year "1947" and insert in lieu thereof "1946", and also on page 1, line 8, strike out the word "fifth" and insert in lieu thereof the word "second."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Members this is simply changing the bill back to the way the manufactures census was handled from the year 1920 through the year 1939. During that period of time the Government every 2 years took a census of manufactures for the benefit of business. Beginning after that year, this census was taken, but it was not made public because of security purposes. Now the war is over and we are in the reconversion period. We come up to the question of taking a census for business, to help business out. I say we should do just as we did from 1920 to 1939 and not follow the committee bill. My position is embodied in the minority report of the committee. If we follow the committee bill we will have a census of manufactures only every 5 years. As you know, the census is running behind, so that unless we come up with these figures every 2 years we will not have figures that are worth while.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. The gentleman's amendment saves quite a little money, does it not?

Mr. FULTON. It will be just the same cost as previously, because we are going to continue the practice they followed before the war and require them to come up with the figures every 2 years.

Mr. PITTENGER. What does the committee bill require?

Mr. FULTON. The committee bill would require them to come up with the figures every 5 years. We who have taken statistics and studied the subject a little bit know that you just do not make figures as you need them for a report, but you come up with a figure and have a cut-off point. You study the figure just the same but come up on a cut-off point every 2 years, to make the cut-off worth while to business.

I have had many comments made to me as a member of the Committee on the Census, that by the time the figures are received after the time the changes and the migrations have taken place and come and gone for years, the figures are of no use.

I yield to my good colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from Minnesota asked the question, whether your amendment would make it more economical. I would like to hear your answer on that because I am positive it is going to cost a whole lot more money to take these censuses every 2 years. I personally cannot see what good it is going to do. We have had so many censuses taken in the last 10 or 15 years on practically everything under the sun. It is about time to give the business people of this country a rest. They are sick and tired of making out all these reports.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. I am interested in having the question answered also, but, of course, the gentleman has not gotten around to it.

Mr. FULTON. That is correct. I was saying that the method of taking the census would not be materially altered but the time of coming up with the figures was going to be altered because we are going to have them give us the figures every 2 years as a cut-off point rather than every 5 years, as this bill proposes. May I say to my good colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], of the Republican delegation of Pennsylvania, that it is not increasing the cost of taking the census because we have done it right straight through from 1920 and we have all felt it has been necessary.

Mr. RICH. I would like you to explain how you are going to get any economy by taking the census every 2 years rather than taking it every 5 years. It is against my business judgment. That is the reason I am not in sympathy with your amendment.

Mr. FULTON. I will be glad to answer the gentleman further but I must first yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am curious to know just who wants these censuses.

Mr. FULTON. I shall be very glad to answer that. The Department of Commerce of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania wants these censuses and is very anxious to have them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is a Government agency. I wonder what private interests are concerned about these censuses.

Mr. FULTON. I might say to you that the Department of Commerce of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is in very close touch with the industries of Pennsylvania. They have advised me that our Pennsylvania industries want this in order that they may be more quickly advised as to what business developments are because if you come up with figures beginning in 1947 instead of 1946, the business figures for this reconversion period will not be available for business until about the year 1953. And what good are figures for the year 1946 going to be to a businessman in the year 1953?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I might be more or less in sympathy with your proposition there, but these censuses cost us so much more and more all the time just as the various other governmental agencies are spending more and more. I cannot see that this is really helping business a great deal.

Mr. FULTON. If you checked in your own home State and found through the Census Office there, as I did in my home town of Pittsburgh, that businessmen use these censuses quite a bit. Along that line, if you will give me the opportunity, I would like to read three statements by outstanding organizations and people as authority on why a 2-year census is necessary.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I was at one time a member of the Census Committee and had occasion to make something of

a study of this problem. I came to the conclusion then that these censuses were more of a political nature and more for political purposes, really, than for industrial purposes.

Mr. FULTON. Well, I am a new Member of Congress and I still think the Government is run for the purposes for which it is set up, and that the bureaus perform functions for which they are established. Might I ask the gentleman this question: During the time you were on the Census Committee, did you vote for these manufacturers' censuses every 2 years from 1920 to 1939?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I did not if there was any more cost attached to it.

Mr. FULTON. There was certainly a cost, so you therefore disagreed with the majority of your own committee.

Here is a letter to me dated January 15, 1946, from Mr. Floyd Chalfant, secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Commerce. He says:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Harrisburg, January 15, 1946.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FULTON: An expansion of employment in manufacturing and processing industries is of vital importance to this State.

A knowledge of current trends in this respect is essential for sound promotion of such development. We in the department of commerce depend upon the Bureau of the Census for information that reveals the condition and trend in different areas of the Nation.

In H. R 4781, introduced by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana on November 23, 1945, provision is made for such a census for 1947 and thereafter at 5-year intervals.

This is not adequate to our needs, and we urge that you secure amendment of this bill, to provide that a census of manufactures be taken in 1946, to cover 1945 operations, and that provision be made to repeat this census at 2-year intervals.

Your aggressive support of this revision will be much appreciated.

Sincerely yours.

That is the position of the department of commerce of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which has a Republican administration, and is a statement by the present administration on behalf of 10,000,000 people.

Let me tell you what Dr. Catherwood, of the department of commerce of New York, said in his statement:

Nothing but a comprehensive census of manufactures taken every 2 years can produce the results which we (in New York) deem essential.

Not only have these departments of commerce of the two major business States of the Union seen fit to back the position taken by this amendment, but the pamphlet Business Action for June 24, 1946, has a letter from the National Chamber of Commerce urging that the census of manufactures be continued, as it looks as if they might be discontinued at present.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, repeating, in the pamphlet Business Action to which I have just referred, there is a letter from the National Chamber urging restoration by the Senate of the appropriation for the census of manufactures and business:

These censuses are the only complete source of information on production and distribution. They contain detail obtainable from no other source for specific kinds of industry and for specific geographic areas.

The entire business community—manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers—depends on information derived from these censuses in planning production and marketing.

Changes which have taken place since the latest censuses of manufactures and business, which covered the year 1939, make it imperative that the information be brought up to date to serve business needs in this particularly crucial period.

Wartime postponement of the census was understandable, but it is difficult to understand present denial of informational tools on which business has long relied, particularly at a time when full utilization of business resources is so vital to the national economy.

We hope most sincerely that the funds requested for the census of manufactures and the census of business will be restored.

May I sum up my position as follows:

Great changes have been wrought in the geographical location of our manufacturing industries during the war. Still greater changes impend as a result of technological developments, new industries based thereon, and industry's plans to push our national income to levels higher than those ever attained before. Unusual importance, therefore, attaches to the statistical evidence of the number, location, character, employment, and production of our manufacturing industries. At no time in the past has it been so important to have comprehensive information promptly compiled and promptly published on a subject so vital to the future of this country.

It is therefore submitted:

First. That a complete census of manufactures comparable to those taken biennially from 1919 to 1939 should be taken immediately and published promptly.

Second. That for perhaps the next 10 years we shall continue to require comprehensive information of this sort collected and published at no less than biennial intervals.

Third. The greatest importance attaches to information concerning manufacture. Other economic activities—trade, construction, mining, and the service industries—are directly affected by the location of manufacturing establishments and the volume of manufacturing employment and pay rolls. Manufacturing is of primary interest. Censuses of other business activity are of a secondary order of importance in planning for the economic development and the expansion of employment opportunities. Other admittedly sound interests should not be allowed to prevent the taking of a comprehensive biennial census of manufactures as soon as possible.

Fourth. Nothing short of a complete, comprehensive census will satisfy our needs for statistics which will show the geographical migration of industry and the relative rates of growth of specific industries in different parts of the United States. This is of the greatest importance to the individual States in their preparation of plans for the economic development of their own resources. Sampling techniques applied to industry will produce valid results for only a limited number of statistical ratios and averages and these are of only minor importance in the programs for economic development. Nothing but a comprehensive census of manufactures taken every 2 years can produce the results deemed essential by the Department of Commerce of two of the major industrial States of the country, the State of New York and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I am, therefore, advocating this and stating that, if we go back as we have previously, to the way we took it between 1920 and 1939, we will vote for these amendments. These are amendments that put into effect what the committee had stated previously over a period of 20 years to be necessary for the development of our country for manufacturing.

I hope that my friends and all people in the manufacturing States will help us get this amendment through as the figures for business are not worth while taking unless they are current figures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania presented his amendment to the committee—rather it was presented to the committee. He was not present that day but in kindness to him I advised the committee of his position. The committee was not interested; as I recall there was not a single member of the committee who was in agreement with the gentleman's idea. My young friend from Pennsylvania likes this bill, he likes it so well that he wants the census taken every 2 years. I submit that would defeat the very thing we are trying to do. We are trying to get away from a 2-year census. The census of manufactures at present is taken every 2 years and the census of business presently is taken every 10 years. We want to combine these two censuses into one every 5 years beginning in the year 1947.

The Census Bureau told us very frankly that once in 5 years was as often as they could take this census and do a real job. We are trying to get away from a 2-year census. If you were to take it every

2 years you would hardly get through taking it one time until you would have to start right in again. It takes a good long time to take the census and then it takes a good long time to collate the information so the general public can use it. With due regard to my splendid young friend from Pennsylvania I think he is in great error in insisting that this be taken every 2 years.

May I say to the committee that we discussed this fully not only with the Census Bureau but we discussed it fully with businessmen; and, as I recall, outside of some people in Pennsylvania and maybe one or two businessmen elsewhere the great bulk of the businessmen wanted it every 5 years. We feel that it should be taken every 5 years beginning in 1947. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] asked something about the cost of this. The thing the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] is trying to do would increase the cost. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is entirely correct.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman give us the figures?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The present census of manufactures is estimated to cost $10,930,000, on the quinquennial basis. That appears on page 18 of the hearings. Business and distribution is estimated to cost $23,800,000, making a total of $34,730,000. Under the present plan those two taken separately will cost $36,125,000. The gentleman can readily see if you repeat that every 2 years, instead of lessening your cost you will make your cost about two and one-half or three times more than you have now and, in my opinion, you will not do as good a job doing it every 2 years as you will under the 5-year plan.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman know of any people in business clamoring for the information that would be given through a census every 2 years, and did those business people come before the gentleman's committee?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. May I say, answering the gentleman's question, that the business interests of the Nation want this information and they want it very badly, but most of the business people who testified felt that a 2-year census was entirely too often. Another thing, the Census Bureau would hardly get through one census until they would have to start back on another one. We felt, the Census Bureau felt and the business people felt that 5 years was often enough. Of course, there were some exceptions. Certain people in Pennsylvania, maybe one or two businessmen elsewhere, felt that we ought to have the information every 2 years, but it is not practical to take a complete census of business and manufactures every 2 years.

Mr. RICH. May I say as a Pennsylvania businessman, not as a Member of Congress, that when we get requests for these censuses every 2 years it is too much red tape and too much work to fill out all these reports. We are not anxious to have them, so far as our business is concerned, and I have never been able to fathom why it is necessary to have them every 2 years. In my opinion, 5 years is often enough.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. We are trying to make the reporting burden lighter on businessmen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. How long after these censuses are taken do the figures and the facts derived therefrom become available for use of business and industry?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I do not think I can answer that exactly. The gentleman knows from his own experience that it takes a right smart while. It will take several months at least to collate that information.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman say several months or several years?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I would say several months at least. I would not say several years.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman, as a member of the Census Committee, know of any time in which a business census taken in recent decades has been available for public distribution and used under 2 years after it was taken?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. In answer to the gentleman's question, let me say to him that that is due perhaps to the fact that the present business census is taken every 10 years along with population and everything else, and it does take a long time to get all of this information in form so that it can be given to the public. However, if we take only the censuses herein named every 5 years, a smaller census, not undertaking to take population and everything else, we will be able to give this information to the public in a much shorter time than is possible when we take the large decennial census.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I want to say to the gentleman, to the House of Representatives, and to the country, that I have on my desk at the present time a second request for a census report from the little printing business which I operate in Ohio, together with a blank containing some six or eight pages, asking questions which my auditors tell me will cost from $1,000 to $1,500 in order to obtain all the information. I expect to give the Census Bureau of the United States the information I have available and if they are not satisfied then I am asking publicly that they prosecute me if they have any law or authority under which to act, because this is all a lot of damnable nonsense, and the quicker we stop it and let business and manufacturing get back to business and manufacturing and to production the quicker we will get this country out of the situation which it now finds itself in.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I am sure that the gentleman would not take the position that business does not need this information. I think in his own business he wants this information.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, but by the time you receive this information from the Census Bureau it is absolutely obsolete and of no benefit or worth to any one for use.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. If you undertook to do it every 2 years you would be going around in a vicious circle.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not want to do it at all. I want to stop a lot of this monkey business.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. My position agrees with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. If it is taken at such long intervals and then takes 2 years to come up with the information, even though they do say it is a 5-year census, it, in effect, makes it a 7-year census, and on a 10-year census it would be over 12 years, and because it has been combined with the population census and taken so far back it is hard to come up with figures. Of course, it costs money. These business agencies are able to get it from companies because they get it currently, but when you go back and ask the auditors and accountants of companies to come up with things clear back in past history, of course, that costs money. These things should be kept currently, and if they are, it would be much less work and much less expensive.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlemen will yield further, I would like to say this: that if in taking the census they would ask questions that were really pertinent to the functions of the business and questions that are necessary for the Federal Government to know what is being produced, and questions that in my judgment are really sensible, they would not ask so many foolish things that would take them 2 or 3 years to compile. That is the trouble with it. The census is too comprehensive, and they ask about a whole lot of things that are useless.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], but if they would do it efficiently and on the right issues involved, we could do it every 2 years.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I submit, with all fairness and frankness, Mr. Chairman, toward my young friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], that his amendment would practically kill the bill. We do not want his amendment at all. Business does not want it, except a few people. The Census Bureau does not want it and the committee did not want it. Business wants this bill, if it becomes a law, to be effective. Business wants a bill which will get the job done. It is thought that this bill will call for fewer reports and will also make for efficiency. We want to provide business with real information at proper intervals, and we think a 5-year interval is

often enough. This bill was largely worked out by businessmen who have made a long and careful study of the problems and they say that this bill is necessary, will serve the Nation, and the committee presented it to you for your consideration.

Therefore I ask, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania be voted down.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if what I have to say is not pertinent to the bill under consideration, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, what we need now more than a census of business is a census of black markets to find out what is happening to the meat, flour, butter, and other farm products. The radio yesterday announced that the housewives up in Detroit last week broke the show counters of the merchants trying to get what little meat there was there.

What I am trying to say is this: I hope that the conferees who are considering the OPA bill will pay some attention to what the House membership and the Senate membership did in connection with the extension of OPA, and not get scared by the babblings of Bowles and other high-pressure groups. Just last week, you will remember, the press reported Bowles said he was in conference with labor leaders and with the President trying to make a trade with them; that if they would agree not to strike for a year, he would agree to see that prices on agricultural products remained frozen, regardless of the cost of production. Have not things come to a pretty pass in this country if one man can call in a favorite group and sit in the office of the President of the United States and fix the prices of the producers of this country without even consulting them about it?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That kind of an agreement will not work, because the members of the labor unions neither produce the food nor process it. The farmers do that. The gentleman might tell that to Murray and those fellows.

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes; and the farmers have been producing and they are going to continue to produce if they are let alone so they can produce; but they cannot produce without farm machinery, and they cannot produce without a lot of the other things that the OPA, by the restrictions now imposed, prohibits them from obtaining.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Those unions are on strike in the J. I. Case Co. and the other companies producing farm machinery so that the farmers cannot get that machinery. How are you going to produce a crop without a drill, a binder, or a combine?

Mr. RIZLEY. You are not going to get food without those things. Where is the meat? It is in the black market. Where is the bread? The executive branch of this Government has used the Second War Powers Act as a means of handling the wheat situation and said to the millers, the elevator people, and the farmers, "We will tell you how much you shall sell and when you can sell and to whom you must sell." Consequently, we have no bread.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The Government is acting under the Second War Powers Act? I thought the war was over a year ago.

Mr. RIZLEY. But the Second War Powers Act is still in full force and effect. If we adjourn this Congress for 6 months, which we are talking about, I think we ought to bring up some of the bills now pending to declare the war at an end. I have one of my own pending since last October but the committee thus far refuses to report it. There may be some things in the act that we need to continue. If so, the Congress may continue them without continuing the full War Powers Act.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not addressing himself to the subject before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was given permission to speak out of order.

The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. RIZLEY. I think it is very much in order. We are talking about taking a census here. We ought to take a census of the fool things this administration is doing and has done toward confusing confusion. I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota who apparently was not listening when I obtained permission to speak, that instead of being a "yes man" for everything some bureau wants to do, he should be trying to help the farmers and producers get rid of some of the red tape, OPA restrictions, and thus enable his consumers in Minnesota to be able to get some meat, bread, butter, and other food products on a legitimate market at less than present black-market prices.

Mr. RICH. We do not need a census for that, if we would just act.

Mr. RIZLEY. In all seriousness, what I really got up here to say is that I hope the conferees of the House and the Senate—I have no reason to suspect them—will stand up and not get the Bowles jitters or "Bowlesitis." As the elected representatives of the people this House passed on the question of OPA extension and the Senate passed on the question. These bills represent the views of the Congress and there is just no occasion for the conferees to get excited because Mr. Bowles and Mr. Porter and numerous others "blabbers" over the radio have been telling the American people that the whole world is going to cave in if we do not extend OPA strictly in conformity to Mr. Bowles' prescription.

It should be remembered in this connection that in the early days of the first consideration of price control, that a bill was offered in the House which a considerable number of us supported for a straight across-the-board control program to be effected during the war, which would have frozen prices on agricultural products and consumer goods and wages; but the administration opposed such a program and refused to permit wages to become a part of a price-control program.

The late President Roosevelt said, in substance, in respect to such a program, that the Congress could write a price-control program that would affect everyone except labor, and that he would handle the labor situation. Some of us believed then that such a program would never work, that unless you controlled wages, which is one of the principal costs of agricultural commodities, as well as consumer goods, that the whole program would break down and that any such so-called price-control bill would be nothing more than a "price fixing" bill. I think it is fair to say that our predictions have come true.

We used to hear a lot of talk about holding the line, but the line has been broken "again, and again, and again" by the Government's appeasement policy made with a few favored labor leaders.

Each succeeding day this whole policy of appeasement and the policy of those who are in charge of our Government points more definitely to the thing that agriculture fears and dreads, namely, that the planners and the regimentaters may not intend to ever get rid of controls; that they intend to make as a part of our permanent philosophy a subsidy program for agriculture, whereby the taxpayers pay into the Public Treasury and it in turn pays out the taxpayers' money to pay the grocery bills of a favored group, and that the farmer must rely upon political subsidies rather than a fair price for his products in the market place.

Each day this program more strongly indicates the very thing that some of their group have been honest enough to admit that they expect to make OPA a part of our permanent economy, and thus attempt to replace supply and demand with a policy of controls politically administered.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment that has been offered by my good friend from Pennsylvania, although I dislike to oppose anything that he proposes, but I do so because I feel that a census of business every 5 years and a census of the population every 10 years is sufficient.

When I think of the operation of this Government and what the gentleman said here a few moments ago about getting rid of a lot of bureaucrats in this Government, I say that this is one way to do it, that is, take the census every 5 years rather than every 2 years. The trouble is that we have had so many things for the Government to do that it has created so many jobs the Government is top-heavy.

When I came to Congress we had less than 500,000 Government employees.

Today we have 3,000,000, not withstanding the fact that we have had people promise, in order to be elected President of the United States, that they would consolidate departments and eliminate a lot of bureaus. We are just top-heavy. What we have to do in this country if we want to be a frugal nation is to eliminate a lot of the things that the Government is doing. They have the people of this country worried. They have business people just sick and tired of filling out the reports that the Federal Government has been requesting. From my knowledge of business and from my knowledge of what we have been requested to do in filling out Government reports in the last 10 or 15 years, I know it is not necessary. If we take this census once in 5 years it will give us all the information we need and save the business people of this country a lot of time and expense and trouble. If you will look at the hearings on page 142 you will find this testimony:

The CHAIRMAN. The decennial census of business and the biennial census of manufacture, and taking the both every 5 years, we would save over a million dollars.

Now, your second statement is that if, instead of taking those two every 5 years, we were to take them every 2 years, it would double the cost——

Mr. GRIEVES. More than double it.

The CHAIRMAN. More than double the cost of the present procedure?

Mr. GRIEVES. That is right.

Dr. HAUSER. Mr. Chairman, a concrete figure that I think would help is that it would cost about $18,000,000 to do the combined, complete census of manufacture and census of business quinquennially. If you did that biennially, you would be spending that $18,000,000 five times a decade instead of twice a decade, and that is considerably in excess of what the current program costs, which runs approximately $3,000,000 annually.

If that is the case, I think by all means we ought to vote down this amendment and let the census be taken every 5 years rather than every 2 years. That would save a lot of expense to the Government and would prevent a lot of people from being put on the pay rolls to run around the country antagonizing business rather than encouraging and helping them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as far as this census is concerned, I think there is only one problem that the businessmen of the country have now, and that is to get materials to manufacture goods. They want peace of mind and they want to know that when they have the materials, labor will work and work honestly and turn out the goods. The demand is unlimited. Aside from that, I want to say a word about this food situation. I was up in my district over the week end. I think if the President knew the farming situation and the food situation as I know it and as most of us know it, when Bowles and certain labor leaders met with him in the White House, to make a deal that if labor would not strike for a year, he, Bowles, would hold down the price of farm products. The President, out of respect for the farmers of the country, should have stuck with the farmer and kicked them both out. Now he cannot pass the buck. This administration is responsible for the food shortage. About 3 weeks ago—on one day the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, issued a statement saying the farmers should send 10 percent of their brood sows to the market or there were too many pigs for the feed that they were going to need. I have been a farmer all my life. I know the livestock game all around the clock. I never saw any livestock starve yet except once in a while in certain places in the country where feed is always scarce. At the same time Chester Bowles said we were going to have the greatest meat shortage in our history. On Saturday Anderson issued another statement saying that we are going to be short 2,500,000 fat hogs this fall. Now with all the confusion there is in the country and with all the bread lines and meat lines and every other kind of line and people going into the black market and paying $1 for butter and walking out feeling as if they were criminals when in a legitimate market they might pay 80 cents a pound for the butter and have peace of mind, if they could get the butter, and with black marketeers running all the markets in the East, the situation is very bad. I live near Lancaster, Pa., the biggest livestock market east of Chicago. That market is not handling any cattle with quality. What good cattle are coming to market are sold in the auctions where the fellows who used to be in the bootleg business years ago, studded with big diamonds and driving big cars, drive up to the auction, go through the pens with the auctioneer before the sale and decide who is going to get what and when. The cattle are driven into the auction ring, the fellows with the big bank rolls yell, "Ceiling." That stops the sale right there. The auctioneer says, "Sold to R. G." or whoever it is. He doesn't even tell what the price is or who the purchaser is He just says, "Sold to R. G." The result is, those cattle are killed in woodsheds, on trucks, in barns, and the meat goes to a favored few. All of the valuable byproducts that can only be utilized in a legitimate, licensed slaughterhouse are wasted.

In my home town they picked up 80 hides that were buried in the woods, about a week ago. In another place they dug 10 hides out of the river. Aside from all that, they lose all the blood and bone and all those things that make up our high protein feeds that go to make for poultry and for young livestock. Our insulin supply is about exhausted. The institutions of the country are begging for insulin, with a million diabetics in the country. Insulin is manufactured from the sweetbreads or the pancreatic glands of the cattle and sheep. That is exhausted because the cattle are killed in the black market. Seventy-five percent of our diabetics depend upon insulin. They must have it. Many of them will die in 10 days or a few months if the supply is exhausted. The big hospitals are telephoning to the packers for supplies. The packers do not have any. Omaha did not kill any cattle last week. Chicago killed about two dozen—the big packing houses of the world are closed.

The responsibility lies upon the administration, upon fellows like Chester Bowles, who set up these blockades and barriers and makes it impossible to do business; men like Clinton Anderson, who does not know what it is all about. He comes from the Southwest where he never saw a fat animal—talking about the meat supply of the country, issuing orders, telling us what to do. We have been feeding corn to cattle up in this country ever since we were a country. We know what it takes. First it takes a good animal, to start with. It takes good feed. It takes a lot of time. Yet, fellows like Bowles and Porter and Anderson think it can be done overnight. They think if they issue an order overnight that the cattle should revert back to the slaughterhouses, they think the meat is going to flow into the legitimate channels the next day. No matter what they think, it will take a good while. It will take good management. It will take a big house cleaning in Washington. If we must have orders let them come from men who know or at least who care.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

REORGANIZATION PLANS NOS. 1, 2, AND 3

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not imagine there is much left for me to say after listening to the remarks of the distinguished agricultural leader, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS]. I tried to ask him and also tried to ask his eloquent predecessor on the floor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], a question as to this amendment, but they were too filled with eloquence to answer me. I did not get a chance to get in the question. I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture needs anybody to defend him, but probably if he has any trouble locating a steer out west my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] will be able to help him out.

I wanted to ask if this proposed amendment took a census of the bureaucrats. If there is anything we need in this country right now it is a census of bureaucrats, because I do not believe the President has any accurate record. I think his predecessor lost count, and I do not believe he has been able to get any statistician that would improve the harmony of the horizon that overshadows us in bureaucratic Washington.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, the present occupant of the White House has not been able to catch up. Does not the gentleman know that all of these companies which went into the production of munitions of war have not been able to get back to producing adding machines?

Mr. PITTENGER. I saw something about that and I would be inclined to think the gentleman's information is accurate. The thing that is wrong in this country is that those Government officials who were floating around in prosperity, in unlimited, arbitrary power during the war days, do not know the war is over. I think the American people will probably give them a jolt this

fall so that they really will determine and decide that the powers which were to terminate 6 months after the ending of war are out of the window. I believe that the conditions that have been described here today as existing in agriculture are going to do a lot to bring that about. It is a terrific thing to consider the wrong policies that have been followed, the policies of burning up the pigs and plowing up the wheat when we need those products for our own people, to say nothing about needing them to carry out some of these blundering obligations that the State Department has taken on, where they assured the rest of the world that America would feed them without knowing whether they had the things to do it with, and without consulting these boys on burning up pigs and plowing up corn. The American people are fast becoming acquainted with this outfit and I think there is going to be a sad day of reckoning.

What I really wanted this time for was to tell you that the President's reorganization plans, Nos. 1, 2, and 3, came in here as House Documents Nos. 594, 595, and 596, as I recall, on May 16. Those plans are really something that are fearfully and wonderfully made. They are submitted with a straight poker face, pursuant to the act of December 20, 1945, known as the Reorganization Act. They were supposed to come in here and consolidate some of the departments and save the taxpayers some money. In my opinion they do not do either. Now there may be some good features in connection with those plans, but up to date I have found no one who can point out those features. Just so we can keep the record straight, the Members of the House are going to vote those plans up or down on Thursday, June 27. My resolutions, House Resolutions 151, 154, and 155, are highly privileged resolutions; they are so treated by the responsible leadership of this House, and we have been assured that next Thursday, June 27, this House will have an opportunity to register a vote for or against those resolutions. In my opinion, even though there may be some good things that can be said for those reorganization plans, they ought to be put over until next January when we can have more time to study them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment and wish to be heard on it.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Is that an amendment to the pending amendment?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My amendment is to section 1.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. My request applies to the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana that all debate on the pending amendment do now close?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 169]

Adams	Flood	Neely
Almond	Fogarty	Norrell
Anderson, Calif.	Gardner	Norton
Andrews, N. Y.	Geelan	O'Toole
Baldwin, Md.	Gerlach	Outland
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gibson	Pace
Barden	Gillespie	Patrick
Barrett, Pa.	Gore	Pfeifer
Barry	Gorski	Philbin
Bates, Mass.	Granahan	Powell
Bell	Granger	Quinn, N. Y.
Bender	Grant, Ala.	Rabin
Bennet, N. Y.	Green	Ramey
Biemiller	Gwinn, N. Y.	Rayfiel
Bland	Hagen	Reece, Tenn.
Bonner	Hall,	Reed, N. Y.
Boren	Edwin Arthur	Rivers
Boykin	Hall,	Robertson,
Bradley, Mich.	Leonard W.	N. Dak.
Bradley, Pa.	Hand	Robertson, Va.
Brumbaugh	Harris	Robinson, Utah
Buck	Hart	Rockwell
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Roe, Md.
Byrne, N. Y.	Heffernan	Roe, N. Y.
Camp	Herter	Rooney
Campbell	Holifield	Sabath
Cannon, Fla.	Hull	Sadowski
Case, N. J.	Izac	Sasscer
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Sheridan
Celler	Johnson,	Slaughter
Chiperfield	Lyndon B.	Smith, Va.
Clark	Kean	Somers, N. Y.
Cochran	Kearney	Sparkman
Coffee	Kee	Starkey
Cole, Kans.	Keogh	Stevenson
Colmer	Kerr	Stewart
Combs	Kilburn	Stigler
Cooley	Kirwan	Sumner, Ill.
Corbett	Klein	Sumners, Tex.
Cox	Lane	Sundstrom
Cunningham	Latham	Taber
Curley	Lemke	Taylor
D'Alesandro	Lynch	Thom
Dawson	McConnell	Tolan
De Lacy	McGehee	Torrens
Delaney,	McGlinchey	Vinson
James J.	McGregor	Vorys, Ohio
Delaney,	McMillan, S. C.	Wasielewski
John J.	Madden	Weaver
Dingell	Mankin	Weichel
Dirksen	Mansfield,	Welch
Doyle	Mont.	West
Drewry	Mansfield, Tex.	Wickersham
Eaton	Marcantonio	Winstead
Elsaesser	Martin, Mass.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Engel, Mich.	Monroney	Woodhouse
Fallon	Morgan	
Fellows	Murphy	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 5857, and finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called, when 263 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith a list of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to section 1?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Page 2, after line 6, insert the following new section:

"The Director is directed and authorized to take, compile, and publish the census of manufactures, of mineral industries, and of business or distribution, including the distributive trades and service establishments, for the purpose of determining whether such industries or businesses want such a census taken. This census shall be taken in 1947."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am not offering this amendment facetiously, but in good faith. This is perhaps the first time since I have been in Congress during my nearly 8 years of service that I have offered any legislation that involved any expenditure. This would involve some spending of money. I think it is a very worth-while project. If the census provided by the amendment passes I am sure it will show that business is overwhelmingly opposed to taking the census to which it applies. If that should develop this census should be discontinued. This might be a pattern to get rid of a large part of functions of the Census Bureau and save us a lot of money. The amendment ought to pass.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MASON. It is my firm opinion and conviction that the merchants of America, the small businessmen of America, want goods on their shelves to sell and not advice or facts or statistics coming from Federal departments.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. As the statistician thinks so the bill clinks.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this would completely kill the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is what I want.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I appreciate the gentleman's frankness, but under this amendment those who want to have the census taken would have it taken and would give the information, and, of course, the contrary would follow, that those who do not want it would not have it taken and would not give the information. The result would have no value. The result is you would not get any census at all. It would not be worth a dime to anybody.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 43, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "business", strike out the remainder of the line.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Director is authorized and directed to collect, collate, compile, and publish at appropriate intervals statistics and reports relating to marriages, annulments, and divorces based upon data from registration and other records of all States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, and their subdivisions, which records as determined by him provide such data in satisfactory detail.

SEC. 3. That the following sections of the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), shall apply to the censuses, surveys, and studies authorized by this act: 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, and 15, except that the Director may also authorize the expenditure of necessary sums for travel expenses for attendance at training courses held by the Bureau: *Provided*, That in connection with any survey or study conducted by the Director pursuant to section 1 (b) of this act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), with respect to the answering of questions and furnishing of information, shall apply only to such inquiries as are within the scope of the schedules and of the type and character heretofore used in connection with the taking of complete censuses under the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), or in connection with an censuses hereafter taken pursuant to section 1 (a) of this act and the act of June 18, 1929: *Provided further*, (a) That section 10 of the act of June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 21), shall apply to surveys and studies conducted pursuant to section 1 (b) of this act only after determination and certification by the Director with the approval of the Secretary that the information called for is needed to aid or permit the efficient performance of essential governmental functions or services, or has significant application to the needs of the public, business, or industry, and is not publicly available from governmental or nongovernmental sources; (b) that in the case of new surveys and studies said section 10 shall apply only after public notice given by the Director at least 30 days in advance that such survey or study is under consideration; and (c) that the provisions for imprisonment provided by said section 10 shall not apply in connection with any survey or study conducted pursuant to section 1 (b) of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 4, strike out "an" and insert "any."

Page 3, line 10, after "Secretary", insert "of Commerce."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That inquiries, and the number, form, and subdivisions thereof for the censuses and surveys provided for in this act shall be determined by the Director, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce. To the extent that the provisions of this act conflict with the provisions of any other act, pertaining to the Bureau of the Census, the provisions of this act shall control: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to revoke or impair the authority of any other Federal agency with respect to the collection or release of information.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the 8 years I have been here I have never listened to such a desultory debate as has been carried on in connection with this particular bill. It has been of a character that I think the circumstances of the time perhaps have caused, due to the confusion that exists in everybody's mind on almost everything throughout the country. There are a few things in connection with this bill on which I should like to get some information, before I am compelled to vote on it. Right at the outset I cannot see how I can vote for any more census bills of any kind or character at this time. As far as I can understand this bill, I shall vote against the whole bill and get rid of it if the situation is as I understand it to be.

May I have the attention of the chairman of the committee? In your report on this bill you say that the bill has three objectives—"to combine the 2-year census of manufactures and the 10-year census of business and distribution into a 5-year census." The first question I should like to ask is this: If this bill is defeated, is there existing law that will authorize the taking of the 2-year census of manufactures and the 10-year census of business and distribution?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. So that if this legislation is defeated, the existing legislation would continue in force the 2-year census and the 10-year census referred to in your report?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. It will continue, as far as the statute is concerned.

Mr. KEEFE. The present statute provides for a 2-year census of manufactures and it provides for a 10-year census of business and distribution. That is existing law, so that if this bill is defeated, the existing law will carry on?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. You grant specific authority for the monthly, quarterly, and annual surveys which have heretofore been made under the general authority of the organic act of February 14, 1903. As I understand, there is some question as to the legality of the authority under which these reports are demanded by the Secretary of Commerce now. For example, a manufacturer in my district wrote me the day before yesterday and sent me a sample of a paper that is sent out by the Secretary of Commerce. They are sent out every month, I understood him to say in his letter. In it they ask a long series of questions about his business. He said that he normally filed the request in the wastebasket, but he thought I might be interested from the standpoint of the expenditure of public funds involved. I want to ask the gentleman whether or not there is any question as to the legality of this survey that is being made from time to time by the Department of Commerce which is referred to in subparagraph 2 on page 2 of your report.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I will say to the gentleman there are differences of opinion as to the meaning of the statute. I quote a part of the statute in question from page 1 of the committee report where it says:

He—

Meaning the Secretary—

shall also from time to time make certain special investigations and reports as he may be required to do by the President or by either House of Congress or which he himself may deem necessary and urgent.

We have been making these interim reports monthly, quarterly, and annually under that authority. The gentleman knows that as well as I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The gentleman knows as well as I do that Members on his side of the aisle several times have made points of order against taking certain censuses predicated on that authority and those points of order at times have been sustained. Therefore, if we are to give to the business people and all the people of the Nation the information they want, we must have this statutory authority to do it. This bill seeks to give specific statutory authority to do it.

Mr. KEEFE. Then what you propose to do by this bill is to resolve the question of the statutory authority and to legislate that authority in the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. We are trying to remove that doubt.

Mr. KEEFE. If this bill passes, then there will be no question but that the Congress is granting specific statutory authority to the Secretary of Commerce to call for these quarterly, monthly, and annual surveys that my constituent was complaining about the other day?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is right. That is one of the purposes.

Mr. KEEFE. That will give to the Secretary of Commerce, if this bill passes, the power by law to fine and imprison that manufacturer if he fails or neglects to supply the information which has been demanded. Is that not true?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. No; the gentleman is half way right.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, in what way am I half way wrong? Let us put it that way.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. If you read the bill I think you will find that we struck out the imprisonment penalty, but we did retain the fine which has been on the statute books a very long time.

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, so they would only have the power to impose a fine? They could not put him in jail because he did not answer these questions? But the fact is, if a manufacturer fails or neglects to fill out one of these forms that is sent to him monthly or annually or quarterly or as the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Wallace, demands, that a manufacturer under this bill may be prosecuted and he can be penalized by a fine. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. A penalty has prevailed since we have been taking

censuses and it is true of the decennial census as well.

Mr. KEEFE. I will tell you right now I do not know whether it is true or not, but I know a lot of people who have received these things and thrown them in the waste-paper basket and they have relied upon the fact that they did not believe there was any statutory authority vested in the Secretary of Commerce to ask for this information. They have paid no attention to it and apparently the Secretary of Commerce has not seen fit to have the question of his authority settled in a court of justice. If we pass this law, and that is the point I want the Members of Congress to understand, if we pass this law, we are putting into the hands of Henry Wallace the power to ask questions of the manufacturers and the business people of this country monthly, quarterly, or annually, or as often as he sees fit, under regulations which he issues, compelling them to take their time to answer all the questions that he may see fit to ask; and if a manufacturer fails to respond, then, under the terms of this bill, Mr. Wallace has the right to take him into court and fine him as a criminal. I do not propose to support that kind of legislation.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. As a matter of law, if a man is haled into court and fined and is unable to pay the fine, he would at least be put in jail as a result of failure to pay the fine and he would be in jail after all.

Mr. KEEFE. I think that is true.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Did I understand the gentleman is advocating that papers which are sent out by the Federal Government should receive the respect of being tossed into the wastebasket?

Mr. KEEFE. I did not say any such thing, and if the gentleman had been listening he would have understood it.

Mr. RABAUT. I was listening.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman interpreted my remarks in line with the manner in which he interprets everything—to suit his own convenience.

What I did say was that I had received a letter from a constituent who stated it was his common practice to file these requests in the wastebasket. I made no comment upon it whether it was right or wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes to answer the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. I used that as an illustration to ask a question of the chairman of this committee, to find out whether my constituent, if this law passed, would be subject to a fine or imprisonment for throwing one of these questionnaires that came from the Secretary of Commerce, Henry Wallace, into the wastebasket. I am not saying whether it is good, bad, or indifferent, but, so far as I am concerned, I have had enough experience, and so has the gentleman from Michigan had enough experience, to know that we have taken censuses, we have gathered statistics, we have had thousands of economists and analysts passing upon this question, with the result that the country has become more and more confused until nobody knows what the situation may be that faces the country in any 24 hours.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. When you refer to statistics, if we had had something when Hoover was President, we would not have been so badly off. We have had something since, in the line of statistics, which has helped us a great deal.

Mr. KEEFE. I admit you certainly have had something in the line of statistics. Think of the statistics that the Secretary of Commerce gave to the strikers and the automobile manufacturers up in Detroit when they had that wage dispute.

Mr. RABAUT. We will defend Detroit. We do not need to have it defended from the West.

Mr. KEEFE. Statistics which the Department of Commerce itself had to admit were absolutely erroneous and were, in my opinion, intentionally erroneous, intended for one purpose only, and that was to affect the outcome of that wage negotiation.

Mr. RABAUT. Variety of opinion makes horse races.

Mr. KEEFE. Variety of opinion makes horse races, but those are facts and have been admitted by your Secretary of Commerce. These are statistics of the New Deal, statistics that you have gathered and had interpreted by your economists to suit the convenience and purposes of the New Deal. As a result, you have brought confusion and chaos to the country instead of bringing order and justice into our economy. I think we ought to vote down this whole bill and give some measure of relief to our distressed constituents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we may as well face the issue right now which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has presented. The committee went into this question very thoroughly as to whether or not these monthly, quarterly, and annual reports should be mandatory. Everybody knows, of course, that reports are now mandatory. Under the 10-year census and the 2-year census they are mandatory. The question was presented to the committee as to whether or not we should make all of these reports provided for in this bill mandatory. We heard considerable testimony on that subject and I believe if the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] had been present and had heard the businessmen themselves discuss that, he would have concluded, as did the committee, that if the census is to be effective you must obtain as full a report as possible.

You have to place something in there so you will know you will get results. If you leave it up to each person as to whether he will respond to the inquiry, the results would not be reliable. Some would report and some would not. Let me say parenthetically that there is nobody in the country who loves liberty more than I.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. In a moment I will yield.

Nobody loves liberty more than I. I hail from the deep South. We like liberty. We do not like compulsion. But we are faced with the proposition that if we are going to take this census and expect it to be effective we have to do it in such a way that businessmen and the public generally can rely on it being fairly accurate. If you make it optional with each person as to whether he will or will not give the information asked for you would have neither a full census nor even an accurate cross section. I think if business and the public in general need this, they need reliable information. If some give it and some evade it, who profits?

Now, if the gentleman from Wisconsin wants a part of the business world to escape giving the information while others give it, I submit that those who feel likewise should go along with him.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Just one further minute, please. But we are faced with the fact that if we expect this census to be any good, if we expect it to be of use to businessmen and the general public, if we expect it to be of a type they can rely upon, then we need the information from all. I do not see how else it could be effective and accurate. Of course, you could take a cross section, but his plan would not give a good cross section.

Let me give this illustration——

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to let me give him an illustration?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Let me proceed, then I will be glad to yield. If my time runs out I will try to get more time.

Let me give this illustration: Suppose we take a census of the automobile business and suppose that every manufacturer in the automobile business gave us information except General Motors. Then the census would not reflect at all the general trend in that business and the other automobile dealers could not rely upon the census because the General Motors is a big factor in the automobile business and the figures which you would get from the other dealers would not reflect facts encugh on which the public could rely. We are face to face with that. I do not like to require reports. But we are faced with the proposition that if the census is to be

of value it must reflect true conditions and that can be done only if the reports are received from a given business very generally. Any great number left out would throw the figures out of line and make them valueless.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. We have made the penalty as light as possible; we took out the imprisonment feature that has always applied. The law has always called for a fine and imprisonment. We did that in the census of 1929 and right on down the line. As the gentleman from Wisconsin knows no prosecutions have been brought under the penalty features of the census law. I asked the Director of the Census if he had prosecuted people. I think he reported that no one had ever been prosecuted. But if we do not do the thing right then it is not worth doing at all. That is what we are faced with. Any census costs a lot of money, and this one will cost a lot, and there is no use to spend all that good money for something on which no one could rely for accuracy.

I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman no doubt is familiar with the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, is he not?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I know something about it.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman, ever since I have been in Congress, has voted each year millions of dollars to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and he knows that that is the great fact-finding agency of government, to find facts upon which business, and commerce, and labor, and industry depend.

Does the gentleman know that in the procurement of facts and the information upon which the Bureau of Labor Statistics bases its cost-of-living index and all of the other things they send to the public, that that information is gotten entirely from voluntary sources? It is entirely voluntary. Every bit of information that the Bureau of Labor Statistics gets—and the information is what governs the conduct of labor unions, covers wage negotiations, covers wages, covers income, covers expenditures, covers cost of living—all of that information is obtained from voluntary sources. The gentleman asked me for an illustration. There is the biggest illustration in the United States. There is no compulsion in it at all, yet they have built up a system in America by which they get the information and they get sound and correct information that the gentleman relies upon and that I rely upon. The gentleman just wants to build up another great big outfit to go out and duplicate a great deal of the work that is now being done under appropriations of this Congress to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. When, in God's name, are you going to stop this spending of money?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Is the gentleman through?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I am through.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Fine. Let me say to the gentleman, in the first place, that the Bureau of Labor Statistics gets a lot of information from other departments in the Government. It gets information from the Bureau of the Census and other places. Let me say further that this act will not alter the Bureau of Labor Statistics at all. We had that question up. To be frank with you, that is exactly why the committee voted to strike out section 5 of this bill rather than to have any controversy with the Bureau of Labor Statistics and others. Let me say further to the gentleman that the Federal Reports Act of 1942 was passed by us, and I expect the gentleman voted for it.

Mr. KEEFE. I did vote for it and I am in favor of it if it is properly administered. I am very familiar with that act too.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. We wrote a provision in this bill leaving the Federal Reports Act intact. We do not propose to change that act at all. We have a provision in here doing that very thing. Now, under that act the Bureau of the Budget goes out and screens all of the requests presented by the various agencies of the Government, all of the Government agencies, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bureau of the Census, Education, and others. They present their requests to the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of the Budget screens them. We are not changing that situation one bit.

Mr. Chairman, the whole question resolves itself into the proposition of whether or not you want to do an effective job. It is not material to me. I have nothing at stake. Witnesses came from many parts of the country and said they wanted and needed this legislation. They also said they wanted it to be reliable and accurate, and they were pretty general in believing that from their experience and general knowledge the information should come from a given industry rather completely and not from just a few in an industry. I was asked to present this legislation. If you do not want it, all right, but it is a question of doing an effective job. If you do not want to do an effective job, then vote against the bill. Remember that your own friends and constituents asked for this legislation. Many veterans are wanting to go into business. They want information. The Census Bureau wants to be ready to give it to them.

If you want to do a job and give information to these veterans and all others, if you want that information to be reliable, then give the Census Bureau a law with which it can be reasonably expected to serve the public. They say this bill will do it. The committee offers it for your earnest consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That in carrying out the policy of Congress as expressed in section 2 of the Federal Reports Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 1078), the Bureau of the Census, departmental staff, and field organization shall be recognized as the central agency for the collection and compilation of general purpose statistics.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 7, strike out section 5.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5857), to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census, pursuant to House Resolution 643, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. FULTON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FULTON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Census.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 60, noes 48.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of this bill be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I withdraw my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 896) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend further the

Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942 (Public Law No. 411, 77th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. In the case of those who before the enactment of this act shall have been retired on annuity under the provisions of the act of May 22, 1920, as amended, or the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, the annuity shall be recomputed and paid in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this act."

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be construed so as to reduce the annuity of any annuitant, nor shall any increase in annuity accrue under this act to any annuitant for any period prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month following the month in which this act is enacted.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, Senate 893 is a measure that has unanimously passed the Senate. The House Committee on the Civil Service has reported the legislation unanimously and a rule has been granted. This afternoon the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the ranking minority member of the committee, and I, and perhaps other members of the House Committee on the Civil Service, will take the necessary time to inform our colleagues of the purposes of this legislation. We believe that it is meritorious and should pass.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the measure is to provide for the recomputation of a limited number of annuities that were granted under the Civil Service Retirement Act before certain amendments were added to the act in 1942. The bill is brought here to remedy an existing inequality. The bill would extend to certain annuitants retiring under the Civil Service Retirement Act prior to January 24, 1942, the privilege of having their annuities recomputed under the new method which was contained in the act of 1942, if such computation would result in an increased benefit to the annuitant. The recomputation would by the terms of the proposal be effective on the first day of the second calendar month following the date on which the measure becomes law.

I think I should say to the Members that the January 1942 amendment guarantees an annuity equal to one-seventieth of an employee's highest average salary for five consecutive years, multiplied by the years of service, not exceeding 35. The provision to which I call your attention was not retroactive to benefit those persons separated prior to the date indicated. In previous amendments to the retirement law, that is, in 1926 and 1930, we made specific provision to include annuitants then on the rolls. That is what we would do in this legislation. We would embrace a certain limited number of annuitants. The number, I believe, is something in excess of 5,500. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] if that is correct?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct; between 5,500 and 6,000.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The board of actuaries for the civil-service retirement and disability fund have advised the House Civil Service Committee that over a long period of years this would cost approximately $6,000,000. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas, who cooperated in this legislation, if that figure is approximately correct?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right. It is a little more than $6,000,000.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I may say properly to the House that as an example of the reason for this legislation let us take an employee retiring at the present time at a salary of $4,000 and with 35 years' service. His annuity on retirement would be $2,000. He would have contributed the additional deductions from salary over a period of slightly more than 4 years, amounting to about $850. An employee at the same salary and with the same term of service who retired just prior to 1942, when the amended law was passed, on an annuity of $1,200, has been denied the increased annuity of $800 per year for that period of 4½ years, totaling a sum of about $3,600.

That annuitant has contributed indirectly to the retirement fund through the denied annuity.

I think we should also direct the attention of our colleagues to the fact that the operation of the reemployment provision of the amendment of January 24, 1942, resulted in the fact that there are certain persons who have taken advantage of such provision, who retired before 1942, and who have obtained reemployment during the war. There is no requirement under the law as to how long a reappointed person must hold a position before he can retire under the 1942 amendment; hence, many have held such positions for very short periods, as little as 30 days, and then retired and been granted the increased annuity.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. May I ask the gentleman if this bill has provisions similar to those contained in the bill (H. R. 3054), which I introduced?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct. The legislation he presented for our consideration is embraced within the bill brought here today. We appreciate his interest and efforts in providing an equitable annuity for these persons.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Part of this group of Federal employees were not covered by other legislation which has been passed. Is that not correct?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct. We do know that they made their payments just as these who are working today have made them, yet we feel that they have not received the benefits of a law which Congress intended not only to apply to those retiring today but those who retired prior to 1942.

Mr. SPRINGER. In other words, those who will benefit by this legislation have made their payments the same as those who have benefited, but these folks have not received the same benefits?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is an assertion which is correct.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it not true also that this is to rectify the mistake that we made when the law was passed in not making it retroactive at that time?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is true. It was an error in a previous act of Congress. That is the reason we believe that the Senate, and now we trust the House, will make this an equitable annuity for all concerned.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to cover the same ground the gentleman from West Virginia has covered, but in substance this legislation is intended to take care of an inequity that occurred whereby in January 1942 Congress passed an act by which it increased the amount of annuities to those retired from Government service after January 24, 1942. Congress increased the percentage of the amount allowed these retired employees on the basis, as the gentleman from West Virginia has pointed out, of the salary they received during the last 5 years of service. This legislation is to bring that comparatively small group of people under the provisions of the legislation passed in January 1942. The group comprises between 5,500 and 6,000 individuals of an average age of about 69 years. If an individual left the service, as the gentleman has said, prior to 1942 and was able to get back on the pay roll after January 1942, and a great many did, then they get the benefit of the 1942 act. If they were not able to get back on the pay roll even for a short period of time, they do not get the benefit of it. This will take care of that inequity.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Why do you start with $4,000?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It does not start at $4,000. That is just an example set forth in the report to illustrate how it would work. Suppose an employee retired at a salary of $4,000 after 35 years of service. His annuity on retirement would be $2,000. If he had retired before January 24, 1942, it would have been $1,200. That is just an example set out in the report.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Suppose a man is getting a salary of $2,000 and he only has 20 or 25 years of service. Would it cover that sort of case?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, the other example was just given as a matter of illustration.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It would be covered?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It takes care of all of the case of those who retired prior to January 1942.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the ranking member of this committee, the gentleman from Kansas, the Honorable EDWARD REES, and also the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from West Virginia, the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, to a situation I do not want to be in the position of opposing this legislation, but every time this committee brings in a bill in connection with Federal retirement, then I wonder why in time it is that we have such rank discrimination against certain people who happen to get paid by the same Government.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In just a moment.

Once again I call attention to the fact that men out in the rural areas, working for the Government on the agricultural programs like the Production Credit Association, Farm Credit Administration, the AAA, the Farm Security, and other farm agencies, do not even come under civil service, nor do they get any benefits whatsoever. You will say to me, "Why don't you introduce a bill?" My answer to that is that there has been bill after bill introduced to correct that situation. Is there anyone in this body who can tell me why a person who is working in one of the county offices for the AAA, the Farm Security, Farm Credit, FCA, or any of the other agricultural agencies, should work year after year—some of them to my knowledge working for 10 or 12 years—should not receive any civil service status? Should not these people be entitled to have any retirement provided for them when they finish their work for this Government? They are working for the same Government that the rest of these people are working for. They do not happen to be living in Washington, but they are working for the same Government and yet they do not have any protective retirement. I did not want to make any issue of it, but right on this floor, a few months ago this Congress provided that the boys who press the pants and shine the shoes down at the Naval Academy will come under retirement. However, this great group of people working in the agricultural regions on agricultural programs do not come under the provisions of civil service nor are they provided the civil service retirement.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I remember, the gentleman from Wisconsin went along on that 1942 act that was passed when we increase the amount of annuities for these many thousands of Government employees. Now the gentleman talks about the inequities of the situation. If that was wrong legislation, it passed this House. All this bill does is to put those people who happened to retire before January 1942 on the same basis.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will answer my colleague by saying that how the gentleman from Wisconsin voted in 1942 or 1822 has nothing to do with the point I am trying to make. This committee year after year brings in legislation for Government employees, yet we have one large group of Government employees who do not receive any protection. That is the only point I want to make. I was careful in the beginning of my remarks not to make any reference to what you are doing in this particular bill. I do not know whether it is on the doorstep of the gentleman from Kansas or the gentleman from West Virginia or whose doorstep it is on, but the fact is that out in those rural areas year after year they do not come under the provisions of civil service or retirement. And I want someone to tell me why. Are not all Government employees entitled to the same legislative consideration?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will go along with the gentleman on that proposition if they are not getting what they are entitled to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I share the over-all objectives which are sought by my colleague from Wisconsin. I think the criticism that he directs at this committee should be realized not as a carping word but as a constructive word, and I take it in that manner.

The Civil Service Retirement Act does, by its terms, include all officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government not subject to another retirement system and not exempted therefrom by law or Executive order.

Recommendation has been recently made that employees of national farm-loan associations and production credit associations be brought within the purview of the Retirement Act, but it appeared from a report by the Civil Service Commission that such employees could not be legally considered as employees of the Government, belonging as they do either to a privately owned corporation or to an organization which will eventually become privately owned.

The words "in or under the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of the United States Government," appearing in section 3 (a) of the Retirement Act, has been construed by the Commission to include only persons who (a) are engaged in the performance of Federal functions under authority of an act of Congress or an Executive order, and (b) are appointed or employed by a Federal officer, and (c) are under the supervision and direction of a Federal officer and for these reasons are officers or employees of the United States Government.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman should know that.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I should say to him that I do believe the Civil Service Committee of the House has within the past few weeks, for the first time in the history of legislation in this body, be it the Civil Service Committee or any other committee, put a limitation, plus a reduction, in the number of employees who are to work for the Federal Government. For the first time, I will say to the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Wisconsin and to all my other colleagues, your committee has acted not only to further improve the efficiency of the department and the type of work undertaken in the name of good government, but we have actually started to reduce the number of employees, and that is a part of the Federal Pay Act.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will answer the gentleman from West Virginia by saying that is not the point as far as I am concerned. You can take off a million employees and it might be a desirable thing for the country. The point I am calling attention to is that many thousands of Government workers in rural areas who do not come under civil service obtain none of these benefits. It seems that we have no difficulty in coming here time after time and doing things for the benefit of a few of the civil-service employees, but I say it is time that these others were included.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 661 was laid on the table.

RETIRED STATUS OF RETIRED OFFICERS EMPLOYED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5626) to authorize the Veterans' Administration to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAY, THOMASON, BROOKS, SHORT, and ARENDS.

WILLIE HINES

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2544) for the relief of Willie Hines, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,514.48" and insert "$909.08."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN HAMLET

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2954) for the relief of John Hamlet, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,782.13" and insert "$1,250."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHAEL J. KEAVENEY AND MARY C. KEAVENEY

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5208) for the relief of Michael J. Keaveney and Mary C. Keaveney, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,500" and insert "$3,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIE EDENS NAST ET AL.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3010) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Edens Nast, Mrs. Bessie Amann, and George R. Townsend, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$7,400."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Gen. G. L. Collins on unification of the armed forces before the National Security Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of all the special orders heretofore entered for today I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

OUR FOOD SHORTAGE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make some observations regarding the food situation in our country. There are some matters of evidence in this very connection with which the people and the country are, perhaps, not entirely familiar, and it is my desire today to bring those matters to the attention of the people and the country. The people are entitled to know these things, and I intend to let them know insofar as I am able to do so.

Many years ago, Napoleon said, "An army travels on its stomach." More recently, Mr. Henry Wallace, the former Secretary of Agriculture, and now the Secretary of Commerce, who some years ago brought about the killing of some 7,000,000 little pigs and nearly a million head of cattle, and caused every third row of corn and cotton to be plowed under, said: "Food will win the war and write the peace." The latter statement is entirely correct and the same is literally true, but the question remains for every American to answer, "Has this administration adequately provided for the production of food?" The answer is "No." Otherwise we would have the available food which is so badly needed.

Mr. Speaker, our farmers produced the food which was so essential to the winning of the war. They accomplished this monumental task with but very little farm help because their sons were inducted into the Army, and their experienced farm help was either persuaded away to work in some war plant, at very high wages, or they were herded into some branch of the service. They faced the problem of attempting to secure farm machinery, or replacements, and this was a very serious obstruction. However, with all of these handicaps, and with the help of other members of their families—their wives and little children—they worked early and late, and they did a magnificent job. I cannot commend them too highly for this great accomplishment. They produced the food for war. Now, the war is over—the shooting has ended—and we face the question of food in time of peace. The statement to which I referred hereinbefore that "food will write the peace" is actually true.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to an article which appeared on last Saturday, June 22, in one of the local papers in which its bold headlines set forth: "Supply of meat falls 90 percent here to hit new low. Neither beef nor pork available as end of ceilings is awaited."

This is quite an interesting article. As I scan through the article I notice it has one particular feature which relates to the closing of packing plants and this is what the article relates with regard to that feature:

Many packing plants and butcher shops are closed. Armour who can slaughter 220 animals an hour has not slaughtered a beef animal this week. The company which had an average daily slaughter of 3,789 hogs last year and 7,607 through 1944 obtained but 16 hogs on yesterday's market.

Reports from large cities across the Nation read about the same, little or no meat. In Pittsburgh the coal miners told Navy officers of the area coal mines administration they would not work unless they get more bread, more flour, and more meat.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Those are very alarming conditions and the serious thing about it is they are true. Yet, we have the OPA and have had it about 3 years. We have been importuned by letters and telegrams from people urging us to continue OPA as is without amendment. We see the OPA as it has been operating for the last 3 or 4 years and the condition it has brought the country to.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct and I wish to thank him for that splendid observation.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. Last week I received a call from one of my local butchers in Fort Wayne who also runs a locker plant. He asked, "When are you going to give us some meat down there?" I said, "We will probably give it to you next week because we will have the OPA up for some sort of decision next week." He stated that the big local yards had closed down and he cannot get any meat.

The packing plants are closing because they cannot get any meat. I notice in the paper this morning that the big plant at Wilmington, Ind., has closed. The situation is really bad and we will have to do something mighty quick, I think.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct, and I wish to thank him for that observation. The same situation seems to apply all over the country.

I picked out this morning from one of the local newspapers a statement which to me is very alarming. It has a Chicago date line. The statement contained is, "Legal Packers Work at 10 Percentum Capacity." That means that the packers all over the country are now working at 10 percent capacity because in the legal operations they are unable to obtain the livestock. The OPA has certainly cut down those operators tremendously.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That does not apply to the large packers, may I say to my distinguished colleague from Indiana. The same condition prevails as far as the small operator is concerned.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. It applies to the large producers and packers as well as to the small producers and packers.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. However, there is this danger. I think the gentleman from Indiana will agree that there is a tendency to get people in the frame of mind that just because an animal goes to a federally inspected plant or a big packer, that that meat never goes into the black market, whereas the small operator is liable to be accused of being an illegitimate packer. I do not think the gentleman believes that the small packer is any more illegitimate than the big packer.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. This is a situation that is country-wide. It is not confined to any one market, and it is probably the result of the fact that the animals are not being marketed; is that not it?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is true.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is really the reason.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is the real reason.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The question is, Why are not the animals being marketed? Is that not it?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman has recalled in his very able speech the difficulties under which agriculture has attempted to operate for the last 4 or 5 years. I well recall the numerous occasions upon which the gentleman joined with many of us in trying to show WPB, for instance, where they were making a very grave error in permitting the exportation of approximately one-fifth of our tractor output, while our farmers needed them so very badly. I also recall the gentleman joining us when we were trying to convince the head of Selective Service that they were stripping too much of the farm labor off the farms, and in that way endangering the supply of food of the Nation. I want to compliment the gentleman upon the efforts which he has constantly shown in trying to put a little common sense into the people who today are administering this Government.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to thank the gentleman for that statement. We have had serious difficulty with respect to farm labor. At the moment farm machinery is almost impossible to obtain. We find that the farmers have had almost every obstruction imaginable thrown before them which has hindered and delayed the production of the necessities of life.

In my own district I wish to cite from a newspaper article, the Connersville News-Examiner of date of June 20, last week, in which this statement appears:

New Castle predicts OPA probe of black-market lumber sales. Sales of thousands of feet of black-market lumber there in the past few months may lead OPA investigators to New Castle, the Courier-Times reports.

OPA enforcement officers are probing activities of truckers hauling lumber from Kentucky and other southern States to dispose of at exorbitant prices in Indiana, and New Castle has been one of the most profitable sales points for the motorized dealers in such building material, according to the Courier-Times.

"Established lumber dealers here," the paper continues, "are offered the black-market lumber periodically, most of it rough finished and unplaned, and much of it odd-sized cuts. But the dealers regularly turn down such offers, and as a result have little or no supply of building material on hand."

This article appeared in the Connersville News-Examiner:

A Connersville dealer, who has little to offer even the customers who hold priority ratings, said his firm has had offers of black-market lumber at a price higher than we could sell it for, and added that it was of very poor quality. He said that although a number of trucks have stopped at his establishment, they don't come here as often as they do to some other cities in the State, according to the reports he has had. It is, however, a general condition throughout the State, he said.

This is just a little touch on the lumber situation and the situation which the people are facing at this particular time.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. This lumber and building material situation is a rather baffling thing. In my own State it is almost impossible to get a stick of lumber or building material of any kind. In a new town that was recently started in my county 100 farmers have moved out there and are trying to complete the building of a schoolhouse. It has been impossible to get material to complete that building so that the kids can go to school this fall. May I point out to the gentleman, however, that yesterday evening about 7 o'clock, in company with another Member of the House, a neighbor of mine, we drove just across the Maryland line to a place they call Pinehurst Village, and there I saw under construction 15 or 20 brick houses. They seemed to have all the material they needed. The man constructing them told me that he has six new permits that have just been issued. Those houses are selling, according to what he said, for $29,500 each. To me, the plain thing is that apparently all the materials are available for the construction of these high-priced houses here in the shadow of the Capitol, while in my section of the country there are no building materials available. Anybody here can go out and see this Pinehurst Village. My neighbor, a Member of this House, said that about 4 weeks ago he was out there and the house next to the one we looked at, an exact duplicate of it, was selling for $24,500, but yesterday evening it was $29,500. The OPA might well look into some of the material situation around here to see what is going on.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to my friend from Oklahoma that at that fabulous price for houses the common people and the veterans would have no opportunity to purchase a house.

Mr. RIZLEY. Certainly not. We were told here for days and days and we heard over the radio night after night for hours at a time when the housing bill was up for consideration that all of this material must be preserved so that the veterans could build houses.

The veterans cannot pay $29,500 or $25,000 for a house.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I assume the gentleman saw the article in the press yesterday in the Washington papers where they granted a permit here to build a saloon building within a block of the Nation's Capitol. That is unnecessary construction. I assume he also saw the Legionnaire, which is printed here, with great headlines saying that this administration and the Government does not intend and does not desire the veterans to have housing. That is a speech in a paper printed here by the American Legion.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, during the past 12 months possibly 400,000,000 bushels of American wheat and corn have been exported to fulfill foreign demands.

In that particular connection I recently read a letter from one of my constituents in the Tenth Congressional District of Indiana which relates to just that situation. I thought it was a very powerful writing and a very powerful accusation. I want to read it. This is what the lady says. She is a farm housewife:

I am not opposed to feeding starving Europe. But they surely are getting ham, bacon, and the best, while we have to live on lunch meat and sausage that an animal would scarcely eat. I do not think it is fair to our country which has always been a land of plenty. Last week all there was in Lebanon was lunch meat, fish, and a little sausage. Of all the bungling administrations, we sure have it now. Surely there is a better way than this.

May I say I agree with the lady wholeheartedly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We in Massachusetts have been more discriminated against in the matter of feed than any other section of the country. We have suffered so much, especially in Massachusetts as well as New England as a whole.

Mr. SPRINGER. I agree with the gentlewoman because just recently I saw a picture in one of the local newspapers of a farmer up in your area who had no feed for his chickens and there was a photograph of 200 chickens that had starved to death because the farmer had no feed with which to feed them.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That farmer was in my own district. The Humane Society was appealed to because they thought the farmer had not fed the chickens properly. The farmer had letters from all over the country. He did not feed the chickens properly because he did not have the proper feed and he gave them a combination of different things. I inserted a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Friday showing what he fed them.

Mr. SPRINGER. But the real cause of death of his chickens was the fact that he did not have the proper feed for them.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is right and that is why he tried to give them a substitute which contained no nourishment and, therefore, we have no poultry and no meat.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there are many things that can be said about this question but because of the scarcity of time I must hurry on. I am constrained to say that these scarcities to which I have referred have largely been brought about by reason of the exportation of foodstuffs to Europe and elsewhere all over the world and by reason of the price ceilings of the OPA.

May I ask, at the outset, "What has this administration done, or is now doing, to help promote the program to produce the necessary food that will win the peace and stop the world from being taken over by the Communists?" The answer is, "Very little," because we find that those in power, and the bureaucratic agencies which it has created, fail to recognize that it requires experienced manpower, adequate machinery, and a proper incentive for the farmers of our country to produce the food and feed which is so essential here and elsewhere. We find that the many labor disturbances which now exist in some of the leading farm-machinery manufacturing companies are preventing production of necessary farm machinery, and this same condition has obtained for many months. Recently it was discovered that a rule, or order, was in the making—and it is probably in effect at this time—whereby this administration is to seize and require the shipment of 7½ percent of all tractors, made in this country, to Russia. That proposed requirement has been kept secret, but the farm-machinery manufacturers have at least disclosed this plan, and that the Civilian Production Administration now contemplates such action, which, if put into effect, will make some very serious inroads against the ability of our farmers to procure these needed tractors for our use in this country.

There is no good reason for us to send anything to Russia, because she has failed and refused to cooperate with us and other nations in international affairs. If and when Russia cooperates with us and the world, then if there is need for help—and we can aid her—we will come to her rescue, as will other nations. Unless something is done to aid in providing our farmers with farm machinery so they may go forward and produce the essential foodstuff, we may have a famine in the United States within the next 9 months. In the eastern portion of our Nation there are now wheat fields and hay fields that remain uncut, because there is no available farm help which can be secured to help save those crops. Yet, there are 3,000,000 people now on the Federal pay roll, at least one-half of that number are not needed at all, but the administration keeps them. The taxpayers have to pay the bill. On many occasions, Congress has cut down the appropriations in many of the departments in a good-faith effort to force a reduction in the number of the employees—but, in those instances, the administration now in power merely transfers those employees, for whom no appropriation was made, into another and a different department of government. Practically all of them are kept on the pay roll. Many of those needless employees now drawing fat salaries from our Government could be used, to a very great advantage, in helping to save the crops and the food. This outrageous plan of Federal spending the taxpayers' money, for needless things, must be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, one thing this administration can do, which it has failed to do up to the present, is to discontinue taking essential farm boys and farm workers from the farms in America and inducting them into the military service during peacetime. That is one act this administration can do to help in this frightful food and feed shortage. Yet no action is taken even to this late date. They continue to take the farm help, yet the war is over, and it is almost impossible to buy a loaf of bread, a piece of meat, a pound of butter, or a box of washing powder.

There is always a reason for such an unexplainable situation. What is that reason? Those in power in our Government, in Washington, have utterly failed to make any plans, after last year's abundant crops, to cover food and feed requirements and commitments for domestic and foreign consumption. The only policy they have adopted is the policy of scarcity. That policy has been promoted by Economic Stabilizer Chester Bowles, and that policy is now bringing our country face to face with the most serious food crisis in history. Commitments were made without any regard to our production, our reserves, or our own requirements.

Since VJ-day the Export-Import Bank has made foreign loans, without any congressional knowledge or sanction, aggregating $3,467,500,000, a large portion of which was spent for food in this country. Records of that bank disclose the following loans were so made—and this was lending the taxpayers' money—upon such security as those in power might determine: France, $1,912,500,000; Great Britain, $650,000,000; Netherlands, $300,000,000; Russia, $280,000,000; Belgium, $100,000,000; Norway, $50,000,000; Finland, $50,000,000; Greece, $35,000,000; Italy, $25,000,000; and to many others in varying amounts. Yet in the fact of all of that aid, almost every flour mill in our country was besieged with orders for flour from Britain and other countries, and they paid us cash—that was the same money we had loaned to them. This food acquired by foreign interests was purchased at OPA ceiling prices, and we have received authentic information that the foreign buyers of our food resold it to their own people, and in other countries, at a tremendous profit. That is certainly a new and a novel policy in dealing with hungry people. I am uncertain as to whether our people are generally aware of the fact that a large percentage of the food which is now being sent out of our country is being resold at fancy black-market prices to people in other countries. It is quite a problem to determine how the hungry people who have no money can secure any amount of food for their sustenance. We have ever been a most charitable people, and we have ever stood ready—and we now stand ready—to make great sacrifices to help our destitute neighbors, but we falter in our effort when we learn of the unthinkable things that are now taking place. For instance, Russia took all of the grain out of Poland after last year's harvest and now we are called upon to provide food for Poland. Great Britain is now trying to take credit for our American food shipped to Greece, Italy, and other countries. That is bringing international power politics into the distribution of food and the feeding of the hungry. Such a policy should never be countenanced.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 12 months approximately 400,000,000 bushels of American wheat and corn have been exported to fill foreign demands. Failure to plan properly last fall to meet export requirements of grains brought about the initiation of many uneconomic and unusual policies by the administration, which will seriously reduce our food supply for many months to come. Bread lines now exist in many parts of our country and meat formations are to be observed in many places. Flour mills are unable to buy wheat because the Government bought all that was available and gave a 30-cent bonus per bushel above the legal ceiling price. This attitude placed our farmers in a very serious situation because they could not buy and pay 30 cents per bushel above the legal ceiling price without becoming liable to prosecution for noncompliance with the price ceilings. The result was the Government secured the available supply of those grains, and our farmers who had insufficient grain to carry them through were compelled to sell their livestock. Now a new plan is proposed by the Government: When our farmers take a load of wheat to the mill our Government, by and through a bureaucratic order issued, seizes and confiscates one-half of that load, and the farmer can only rely upon one-half of his delivery for the benefit of himself and family, and his neighbors, for food purposes. Many mills have closed down and their employees have been thrown out of their jobs.

On the other hand, the Canadian mills are operating, and they are producing white flour, while we in the United States are forced to change from 72-percent extraction white flour to 80-percent dark flour. It has been reported that Canada has on hand sufficient wheat to allocate 9 bushels to every citizen, while we have a supply sufficient only to allocate six-tenths of 1 bushel to each citizen. Also our Government cornered the market on corn by making purchases of available corn, and it bought some 35,000,000 bushels at a black-market price of 30 cents a bushel above the legal ceiling price established by OPA. By reason of that "cornering process" the legitimate buyers of feed—and that includes manufacturers,

dealers, and farmers, were unable to secure feed grains for dairy and beef cattle, hogs, and poultry. The fact is, we have lost about 700,000 tons of mill feed during the last 6 months because of the Government requirement that mills produce 80 percent extraction flour, and much more was lost when the Government refused, until quite recently, to sell or loan wheat to mills for grinding flour.

Mr. Speaker, when those in power seized the black-market purchases of wheat and corn, the OPA increased the ceiling price on corn 25 cents per bushel, and also made an increase in the ceiling on other feeds. This was done without making any compensatory increase in the ceiling price of beef, hogs, poultry, and dairy products. However, very recently dairy products were slightly increased. This policy throws feeding ratios out of balance, and under that plan our farmers will lose money when forced to pay higher prices for corn and other feeds.

I am constrained to say that the scarcities, to which I have referred, have largely been brought about by Mr. Chester Bowles, and his policy making group. I am convinced the people realize that fact, because they have followed this question very closely throughout the past. It is a man made or a group made scarcity. Under that plan of scarcity the needed food, and other essential commodities, have been withheld from the people. The fact is, Mr. Bowles and his crowd want to remain in power, even though this late war is now over, and they want to continue to control the lives, business, and destiny of every citizen in our land. Of course, this plan and policy is contrary to the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I propose a plan—which I firmly believe will be very helpful. This is my plan:

There should be an immediate readjustment in the price of hogs, cattle, poultry, and poultry products sufficient to compensate for the increase in prices of corn, and all other feeds. I am confident this would aid materially in encouraging production.

There should be an immediate cancellation of the 80-percent extraction order to save wheat and flour; this would also provide vast quantities of millfeed for domestic use.

Our flour mills, in this country, should be encouraged and permitted to operate full time and full capacity in producing flour for domestic use.

All Government black-market operations in grain, feed, lumber, and all other commodities, should be stopped. Government officials should be subjected to the same penalties for such offenses as our private citizens.

Our people should be encouraged to produce all the grain, food, feed, and civilian goods, including farm machinery, that can be produced, under which method the price controls can and should be removed. The age-old plan of supply and demand has never been found to be wanting in any particular.

It is evident to all of the people that the future solvency of our Nation depends, and will continue to depend, upon the reduction of all Government spending; this spending must be cut to the bone; this can and should be accomplished by a material reduction of all Government personnel, in every Department of our Government, to peacetime requirements. All bureaucracy which now exists in Washington, should be entirely eliminated, because that element seeks to destroy our liberty and freedom.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, we must keep our country strong. Strength cannot develop under a plan of scarcity—it can only develop under a plan of plenty.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PEOPLE WHO ARE NOT LOYAL TO OUR GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT BE EMPLOYED IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct your attention to some facts regarding the deplorable situation with respect to the policies and practices of the Civil Service Commission, during the past 5 years, with respect to loyalty investigations of Federal employees, and again renew my request for immediate House approval of House Resolution 667.

During the war, thousands of persons applied for Federal positions about whom some question arose with respect to their loyalty to the United States. These cases were investigated by the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Intelligence Unit of the Treasury Department, the Secret Service, and other similar investigative agencies. However, in all cases the investigation was transmitted to the Civil Service Commission and a rating was made with respect to whether such applicants were loyal. This first rating was made by a Rating Board in the Investigations Division of the Civil Service Commission. From there the cases were transmitted to a higher board, consisting of Mr. Alfred Klein, who is now chief legal officer for the Commission, Mr. Farrar Smith, and Mr. John Q. Cannon, who is no longer with the Government.

It was at this higher level that the recommendations of the investigator and of the Rating Board of the Investigations Division were reversed time and time again in cases involving Communist and subversive activity of Federal employees. The evidence I have shows that in 75 percent of the cases involving Communist activities of Federal employees, this board of advisors to the Civil Service Commissioners, reversed the findings of the investigator who actually conducted the investigation and the decisions of the Rating Board.

It was because of this situation regarding the presence of persons in the Federal employment of questionable loyalty to our Government that I addressed a letter to the Civil Service Commission on May 24, 1946, exactly a month ago, asking that the Commission furnish legal justification for its refusal to reexamine these loyalty cases where the subject of the investigation is still employed with the Government.

I did not receive a reply until just a few hours ago a letter came by special messenger from the Chairman of the Commission. He quotes from a five-page opinion by Mr. Klein and reaches the conclusion that the Commission has no power to require the removal of employees as a result of reopening loyalty cases in which there was a previous finding of eligibility. In other words, the books are closed and sealed. He says nothing in reply to my request for permission, as a Member of Congress, to examine the files of employees occupying key positions in our Government.

I maintain that if there are persons employed in Government who adhere to communistic views or who belong to groups who advocate the overthrow of our Government by force, this Congress has a right to know it. Surely, if the record of any of them is questioned, we should have a right to examine that record. The Commission should, and I hope will, cooperate in doing it.

On numerous occasions, I have requested the Civil Service Commission officials, including Mr. Mitchell, the President of the Commission, and Mr. Moyer, Chief Examiner, to allow me, as a Member of Congress, to examine the Commission's files with respect to these loyalty cases. I have since asked Mr. Mitchell why a Member of Congress cannot inspect the records of the Commission. His refusal was based on his belief that the Attorney General had ruled that a Member of Congress cannot inspect the Commission's files in this regard. I consider the Commission's refusal, whether supported by an Attorney General's opinion, completely contrary to the interest of the public and the taxpayers who pay the salaries of the Federal employees and whom we as Members represent in the legislative branch of Government. I think that every person who works for the Federal Government exercises a public trust, and his past, present, and future history in all details should be open to the public. Certainly, officials employing persons whose views are contrary to our form of government, should be held accountable for their actions.

The purpose of my resolution provides, notwithstanding the refusal of the Commission to permit a Member of Congress to examine these records, to have a subcommittee of the Committee on the Civil Service fully investigate the decisions and interoffice memoranda which were the bases for the decisions made by the Commission in rating as eligible hundreds of Federal employees, who are more concerned in promoting a Communist doctrine than maintaining a strong America as we know it.

I have in my possession, much evidence upon this subject. I think it is well at this time to point out what I regard as some of the illegal, arbitrary acts of officials in the Civil Service Commission, who rated Communists as eligible for Federal employment. I have in my files, for example, the case of a person who was an applicant for an extremely responsible position as an assistant to a policy-making official in one of the most important war agencies. I should like to

read part of the file which the Commission refuses to let the Members of Congress examine. In connection with this applicant's investigation, it was shown that he was a member of a half dozen Communist front organizations. In a statement concerning this investigation, Mr. Alfred Klein, whom you will remember I mentioned as the Civil Service Commission's chief legal officer, stated, "If I had to express an opinion as to whether the applicant is a Communist, my reply would be in the affirmative. However, I am constrained to recommend that the applicant be rated eligible." Mr. Klein stated in his confidential memorandum that the applicant had been a member of organizations which were noted for being characteristically aggressive as communistic.

I am advised that Mr. Klein is the official in the Civil Service Commission who wrote the Commission's legal opinion as to whether the Commission should review these loyalty cases in which he reversed the opinion of the Investigations Division time after time. In another portion of the memorandum regarding this case, other statements of Commission officials are as follows:

There was the loosest kind of control in this case.

And:

The Commission looks bad on this one.

And:

The reference is to the highly aggressive and rather militant type of person, who on occasion moves in and out of the Communist fringe.

In this particular case, Mr. Smith differed with Mr. Klein and stated:

On the record as a whole, I am inclined to believe that the conclusions of the Investigations Division are justified and should be approved, notwithstanding the fact that the CIO appears to be active and will contest any adverse action.

When the resolution, which I have introduced, is approved, I intend to place in the RECORD many other cases in which the Commission took similar action.

Before I leave this subject, I should like to call your attention to yet another case in which the applicant applied for an extremely responsible Government position. The investigation revealed that the applicant was a member of a dozen Communist-front organizations and actively participated in Nation-wide propaganda to keep this Nation out of war during the time Russia was allied with Germany. One of the responsible witnesses contacted who had outstanding knowledge of the foreign relations field in which the applicant was to work, stated that he would endorse the applicant with the qualification that the applicant would face conflict if the United States ever became involved with Russia.

The files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of Naval Intelligence, the Office of Military Intelligence, the New York City Police Department, all contained derogatory information. Yet, Mr. Klein, in his memorandum which was the Commission's ruling, decided that because there were a greater number of witnesses who testified for the applicant than in opposition, the majority rule would be observed and therefore the applicant was rated eligible.

I have always assumed that the Government in determining the eligibity for employment especially with respect to questions of loyalty, resolved all doubts in favor of the Government. I am convinced from evidence in my possession that the policy of the Commission is to resolve such doubts in favor of the applicant in loyalty cases.

I could develop this subject further and present to the Congress additional cases with respect to the policy of the Civil Service Commission. I mentioned these two examples just to give you an idea as to what is going on. Of course, if the Congress desires to approve and is in favor of such policy, the people should know it. I cannot subscribe to it.

My attention has been called to a recent statement by the Attorney General in which he expressed his opposition to the activities of Communists and Facists in this country. I suggest that the Federal Government is a place for him to begin in dealing with this problem.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is one which needs immediate attention, particularly in this hour in which true democracy is having its "trial by fire." I trust that we all will see the day when the administrative branch of the Federal Government will be frank, open and forthright and its relations with the legislative branch. I hope, too, that the day will come when the elected representatives of the American people will have a right to observe in detail the extent to which their policies as written in legislation are carried out by the administrative agencies. In this way only will a true cooperative sprit be developed between the executive and legislative branch.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, chairman of the Civil Service Committee and who I am glad to say is interested in this problem that has been discussed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, before the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, the ranking minority member of the House Committee on the Civil Service, made his remarks I had the privilege of talking with him informally. I am sure he knows the views I have taken, not recently but over a long period of years in reference to any individuals who are employed within the Federal Government but are not Americans. We do not desire to classify people in Government service or beliefs but we do insist that they be Americans. Whether a man be a naturalized or native-born citizen is not important. The vital consideration is that he be an American.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the message I have been trying to carry to the House this afternoon.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am constrained to believe that a Communist, or a person who advocates the overthrow of our Government, should not be on the Federal pay roll. It is that individual the gentleman from Kansas aims at, and I join him in the effort.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement because I believe and I know the gentleman from West Virginia is in accord with this view that the Government is the last employer that should give consideration to the employment of any individual who is not in accord with the American Government and the American way of life.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1

Mr. MANASCO, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported House Concurrent Resolution 155 against the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of May 16, 1946, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered printed.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2

Mr. MANASCO, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported House Concurrent Resolution 151 against the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of May 16, 1946, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered printed.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3

Mr. MANASCO, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported House Concurrent Resolution 154 against the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 16, 1946, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered printed.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on July 15, at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on the subject of the Iowa centennial and that I may also have permission to yield to other Members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

GEN. BREHON SOMERVELL

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the foremost officers that the American Army has ever produced, Gen. Brehon Somervell, commander of the Army Service Forces in World War II, has retired from active duty. As one who has had the opportunity to observe some of his unexcelled services to our country, I count it a privilege to give deserved recognition of his magnificent achievements in the most terrible conflict in all history.

On March 9, 1942, a Presidential directive reorganized the War Department of the United States Government. For four confused and unhappy months our Army had been trying to fight off our enemies at the same time it enlarged, trained, and equipped itself under a creaking peacetime structure. This structure was rapidly falling to pieces under the stress of war.

The new set-up divided the Army into Air and Ground Forces, Service Forces, defense commands, and overseas armies. The Air Forces were to train and fight in the air; the Ground Forces on the

ground; the defense commands were to defend our coasts from invasion; the overseas armies were to train for service on foreign soil. Their duties and responsibilities were clear.

On the other hand, the task of the Service Forces was to be so immense, so involved, so far-reaching that even today most Americans are not familiar with its accomplishments. Never in history had so vast and intricate an organization been called for or created.

The Service Forces had to experiment, design, test, produce or procure, deliver, maintain, and in the end salvage all arms and ammunition, all tanks and trucks, radios, clothing, medical supplies, tents, bulldozers, small landing craft, smoke and gas, lumber and canvas—everything every soldier needs to fight and win the war.

They had to build the ports, the roads, and railroads, the hospitals and camp theaters, the posts themselves, at home and overseas. They had to feed the soldier, wherever he might be, shelter him, entertain him, transport him around the world. They had to act as his paymaster and banker, his lawyer and judge, his policeman and librarian, his telephone and telegraph company, his photographer, his bookkeeper, his landlord, his tobacconist, his preacher and his priest.

For every administrative and supply service, for every technical advance, the Army depended on its service forces. Ordnance, Signal Corps, Quartermaster, Chemical Warfare, Medical Department, Engineers, Transportation Corps, the Adjutant General's Department, the Office of the Judge Advocate General, the Provost Marshal, the Chaplains, the Education and Information Division, the Finance Department—all these were included in the stupendous organization known as Army Service Forces.

Our military leaders, having set up this immense and far-reaching division of our armed forces, asked themselves at once: Is there anyone in America who has the skill and experience, the military genius, the executive capacity, the administrative ability, the drive and the stamina, the intelligence and the passion for work required of the man who would head up this organization?

It was the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, who answered.

"How about this man Somervell?" he wanted to know.

He had been watching this man Somervell for several years, was impressed by what he saw. The Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall, and the Under Secretary of War, Judge Robert Patterson, agreed on the choice.

Somervell was given the job—the job that could not fail.

His appointment was greeted in some quarters by restrained enthusiasm. There were some old officers in the Army who feared that he would do just what he did do—clear out dead wood, put producers in crucial spots, throw the comfortable old cult of seniority out of the window and get results.

Somervell's military career had been both exciting and unconventional. He always seemed to have a peculiar genius for being at the right place and the right time to display those extraordinary characteristics which fitted him so well for his new job.

Graduating from West Point in 1914, he was on leave in Europe when Germany struck across Belgium to France. It was Second Lt. Brehon Burke Somervell, 22 years old, who organized the American tourists thus stranded in Holland, arranged for special trains, and got them safely to Paris ahead of the advancing war front. It was Somervell in Paris that same month who safely transported a million dollars in gold, packed in kegs, from the port of Brest to the American Embassy and who once more, at the direction of our Ambassador, fed the thousands of our stranded tourists, ran special trains to the ports, hired whole steamships and transported every last American who would come back to the United States.

A year later, this same young officer was helping make a survey along the Mexican border when Pancho Villa lunged at Columbus, N. Mex., and a then obscure brigadier general named John J. Pershing took out after him with his cavalry. A few days before Villa struck, there had been delivered to the post to which Somervell was attached the first motortrucks ever assigned to the Army. Most old officers scoffed. Tractors could not be trusted. Give them the Army mule every time. But, after a few days, the mules were not keeping up, and new records were being rung up in building the road that was Pershing's life line. The road made it possible to get the rations, grain, and water to Pershing and the general marked him down as a young man with a future.

Later, while serving in the Pittsburgh engineer office, as we entered the war in 1918, Somervell helped Gen. Edgar Jadwin organize an engineer regiment among the railroaders of that railroad city and went to France as its adjutant. There he built our first American railroad yard on foreign soil, patched up a leaky old brass-bound French locomotive, and took out our first military train. Then he built a laundry and a bakery and a casual camp. And building them, he broke all records for speed. That done, he got himself assigned to the front, and won the Distinguished Service Cross for gallantry on a scouting trip that took him through and behind the enemy lines.

After the war, when most Regular officers were settling down to the monotony of life on military posts, Major Somervell made an engineering survey of traffic conditions on the Rhine for the League of Nations, did it so well that he was sent to make the same kind of survey on the Danube. At about this same time, the new Turkish leader, Mustapha Kemal, decided that his awakened nation needed to know more about its own highway, rail, and waterway system, and Somervell was the logical man to make the survey. He spent a year at it.

When he returned to America he was put to work on the Mississippi River flood-control system, with headquarters in Memphis. After that came other challenging assignments, preliminary surveys on the proposal for the controversial Florida ship-canal project. When this was dropped, he was on his way back to the Mississippi River and was driving through the town of Gainesville, Ga., when that city was struck by a tornado which practically destroyed it.

He took command of rescue work, brought order out of chaos. Citizens were impressed by his calm efficiency. They demanded of the Federal Government that he be allowed to remain there and help rebuild their town. He did that job up to the hilt; he got impossible-to-get materials, he slashed red tape, he fought and beat the slow-moving processes of bureaucracy.

As he finished there, the Works Progress Administration was having a painful experience in New York. Half a dozen directors had come and gone in a year. Everyone from Tammany Hall to the Communists, from the labor unions to the old-line Republicans, were trying to get a finger in the WPA pie. The President assigned Lieutenant Colonel Somervell to the job, told him to again get order out of the chaos.

Somervell did just that. Almost at once the WPA in New York became an efficient business-like organization.

Then came the war emergency. Our cantonment program was breaking down. There were hints of scandal; there was a lot of marking time. Somervell got that job next. He drove it through to a triumphant finish.

That done, he was placed in command of the newly formed ASF. Had he not been so superbly fitted for this gigantic task, Brehon Somervell would have been one of our greatest commanders in the field. He could have led the armies victoriously against all our enemies, but no other officer in the United States Army had so completely the requisities for the doing of the nearly superhuman assignment entrusted to him.

As commander of the Army Service Forces, General Somervell faced a task of such magnitude that there were no rules, no blueprints, no precedent to guide him. He had to take vast chances. A score of times each day he had to make decisions on which the lives of thousands of Americans depended, yes, upon which hung the difference between victory and defeat.

He urged on the officers who worked under him, but never as hard as he drove himself. Those closest to him knew that he demanded results, that anything less than accomplishment was not enough. Because of his immense responsibility he could not permit personal likes or dislikes to influence his appointments. He dared not allow to continue in any vital spot any man who was not producing 100 percent, and then some.

This led to the legend that he was a ruthless commander. This was not a true picture of the man. Many a night he sat late in his office, girding himself for the unhappy task of telling some old friend that his work was not satisfactory, that someone else would have to take his job. Perhaps this was the hardest task he faced in his 4 years as chief of Army Service Forces. But he developed an organization that could be counted on to do its job, fully and on the minute.

The men around him evolved a slogan: "The impossible we do at once, the miraculous may take a little longer." It

sounded like boasting. But it was the ringing truth.

The Germans and the Japanese had counted on the impossibility of our equipping, transporting, and supplying armies around the world. Their topmost military planners said positively that it could not be done. Somervell and the ASF did it.

Some of his critics have charged that he was reckless in the money he spent. But was he reckless—with the earth-shaking consequences at stake? Whenever there was a choice of saving a million dollars or saving the lives of young Americans, Somervell did not think twice. He spent the money. Yes, he spent a lot of money. At the height of the war, the ASF was spending $500,000,000 a week. And in spite of this astronomical sum, the instance of speculation, of graft, of favoritism in the expenditure of this money were astounding rare—less than one-thousandth of 1 percent.

The ASF at its height numbered a million soldiers and a million civilians—command of that large a force in itself is a task almost beyond comprehension. But it operated smoothly and efficiently, with little waste motion. Somervell put business into the business of war. He slashed red tape with a fine disdain that outraged many an old-time bureaucrat.

Under his leadership, American industry and American labor produced more goods than ever before in history; American transportation carried more freight; American farmers grew more food. With the arms, ammunition, and equipment furnished by the ASF, American soldiers fought and won the hardest war in history, farther from home than any war had ever been fought. So, as we look back on the results, World War II might not even have been won without him.

In numbering the heroes of this war, I hope that we will always remember with deep gratitude and appreciation the general who made victory possible by furnishing the sinews of war to the fighting men, who made a reality of the slogan: Enough, on time!

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. I have listened with considerable interest to the tribute paid by the gentleman from Tennessee to Gen. Brehon Somervell. He was a resident of my district when he was appointed to West Point, and the people of the city of Little Rock, in which he resided, have been very proud of his distinguished career. He is a remarkable administrator, a versatile officer, and his record in this war entitles him to the everlasting gratitude of the people of America. I thank the gentleman for having detailed some of the accomplishments of the Army Service Forces under the brilliant leadership of this distinguished former citizen of my State.

Mr. DAVIS. I thank the gentleman.

ITALIAN-AMERICAN WORLD WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, INC.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, with the end of the war and return to their communities of millions of veterans, veterans' organizations are becoming most active and my attention has been called to the fact that due to peculiarities in the law and regulations many of these groups are denied rifles from the Government which they wish to use for ceremonial purposes.

It appears that unless a veterans' organization's name is actually in the law, or on an approved list, that organization is not entitled to any consideration in regard to these rifles, no matter how patriotic the services of its members during the war.

Veterans take great pride in their arms, their guards of honor, and firing squads, and it is my belief that if one veterans' organization is entitled to these guns from the Government, all of them are.

One organization which has not been able to obtain these ceremonial guns is the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc. In order to correct this error, which I am sure is inadvertent, I have today introduced a bill which would add the name of this organization to the list of organizations which are entitled to receive these rifles. Those who can get these obsolete guns, by the way, pay $1 apiece for them, and there is a limit of 10 to each post.

There can be no question of the splendid patriotism of the members of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and the outstanding contribution that Italian-Americans have made in the winning of the war.

This organization at present has a membership of 32,000 in the States of New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Ohio, and is expanding all the time. The members are veterans of Italian extraction who have served under the American flag.

The fact that this organization, among many others, is not eligible for these rifles, was brought to my attention by Thomas F. Zaia, a veteran and attorney of Oswego, N. Y., who is a member of the Charles Crisafulli Post. This post, like many others, wishes to organize a rifle squad to function in military ceremonies, but is barred because of the law and regulations.

In my own district, the Thirty-fifth of New York, there are thousands of veterans of Italian extraction who served with honor and distinction in World War I and World War II. No group of Americans fought harder or more ably, and many gave their lives and their blood to preserve the Nation. On the home front members of their families were extremely active in all causes which advanced victory, and their purchases of war bonds and other patriotic endeavors were outstanding.

There is no question but that the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., are entitled to these rifles, and I urge upon the House the speedy passage of my bill, which will give them this very deserved recognition.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter he wrote to the Secretary of State, and the Secretary's reply.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BRADLEY of Pennslyvania, for an indefinite period, because of official business.

To Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana, until July 16, on account of official business.

To Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Mr. VOORHIS of California), for 3 days on account of important business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5606. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Wabash River near Mount Vernon, Ind.;

H. R. 5736. An act authorizing the Indiana Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or a free bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Ind.; and

H. R. 5748. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the South Carolina State Highway Department to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River at or near Leneudes Ferry, S. C.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the Interior appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 25, 1946, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1414. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $12,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 675); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1415. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct aviation facilities at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1416. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 3, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Stamford Harbor, Conn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 24, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 676); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1417. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 15, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Illinois Waterway, including the Calumet-Sag Channel, Grand Calumet River, and Indiana Harbor and Canal, Ill. and Ind., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 7, 1939, October 24, 1939, and October 15, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 677); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1418. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 1, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Savannah Harbor, Ga., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 19, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 678); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1419. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 8, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Delaware River between Philadelphia, Pa., and Trenton, N. J., with a view to improvement in the vicinity of Biles Creek, Pa., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 24, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 679); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1420. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 26, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Bridgeport Harbor, Conn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 30, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 680); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANHAM: Special Committee on Reconstruction of Senate and House Roofs and Skylights submits report pursuant to Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress, relating to the appropriation for the roofs and skylights over the Senate and House wings of the Capitol, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 675. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6477, a bill to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and section 3 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2323). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1367. An act to provide for the appointment of three additional Assistant Secretaries of Commerce, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5932. A bill providing for the conveyance to the town of Ipswich, in the State of Massachusetts, of lighthouse property at Castle Neck, for public use; with amendment (Rept. No. 2325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. House Concurrent Resolution 155. Concurrent resolution against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of May 16, 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 2326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MANASCO: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. House Concurrent Resolution 151. Concurrent resolution against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of May 16, 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 2327). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JUDD: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. House Concurrent Resolution 154. Concurrent resolution against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 16, 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 2328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULLER:

H. R. 6858. A bill to amend the act of May 22, 1896, so as to include posts of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 6859. A bill to amend section 121 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to authorize the appointment of three additional deputies for the register of wills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6860. A bill to provide that disabled veterans of World War II who elect to receive the educational benefits granted by part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) shall receive the entire subsistence allowance provided by such part; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 6861. A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6862. A bill to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act with respect to provisions concerning basic permits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6863. A bill to provide that automatic national service life insurance as to deceased veterans of World War II shall be payable, in turn, to their widows, children, and parents, if any, without any requirement, as at present, as to their dependency; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 6864. A bill to extend certain educational benefits granted to veterans of World War II by part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to veterans now ineligible for such benefits on account of age; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 6865. A bill to amend the Liquor Tax Administration Act, approved June 26, 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 6866. A bill to provide relief from tax on income to be paid or permanently set aside or used exclusively for religious, charitable, or educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 6867. A bill providing for the erection at the seat of the United Nations of a monument symbolizing peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 6868. A bill to provide for the payment of the expenses of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission wholly from Federal funds; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 6869. A bill to amend the immigration and naturalization laws to deny admission to the United States of certain aliens who have served in the armed forces of countries at war with the United States, also members of certain parties and organizations, and to deny naturalization to such persons, and to deny admission to the United States of persons who the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe seek to enter the United States for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 6870. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ambrosio; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 6871. A bill for the relief of Shiro George Nakamura; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2030. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the New England Council, adopted at its eighty-third quarterly meeting, concerning enactment of protective labor legislation; to the Committee on Labor.

2031. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Tavern League of Racine, Inc., at Racine, Wis., asking our elected Repre-

sentatives in the Congress, requesting the Federal agencies having the control of the allocation of grain for alcoholic beverages, to reexamine the entire program of these agencies to ascertain the true economic facts with a view to giving brewers and distillers increased allocations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2032. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Lawyers Committee of the Hundred, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to impeachment of Robert Houghwout Jackson, a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, high and holy above all our thought, the path of prayer but leads us to an appalling sense of our own need and to a sickening realization of how far we have fallen short of the glory of Thy plan for us and for mankind. Yet apart from Thee our outlook for the future is clouded by apprehensions that haunt us and murder sleep; our minds are plagued with questions that we cannot answer as to how humanity with the dread secret of nature in its fumbling hands can live on this planet in peace and security. Our hopes of a united world, for which costly blood has been poured upon the anguished ground, seem ever to move into thin air from our eager grasp, like mirages of the desert. O God, the answers for which we gropingly seek in the darkness of our own devices are hidden in Thy heart.

Make us such men that Thou mayest speak to us and that to this bewildered generation we may be the broadcasters of Thy voice. So shall the world that ever surely climbs to Thy desire grow swifter toward Thy purpose and intent. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, June 24, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 24, 1946, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 943. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Columbia River at Northport, Wash.;

S. 1043. An act to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma in trust for the Indians of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian Reservation;

S. 1336. An act to transfer certain real and personal property in Ward County, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota, acting by and through the Industrial Commission of North Dakota; and

S. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution extending for 7 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 896) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2544. An act for the relief of Willie Hines;

H. R. 2954. An act for the relief of John Hamlet;

H. R. 3010. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Edens Nast, Mrs. Bessie Amann, and George R. Townsend; and

H. R. 5208. An act for the relief of Michael J. Keaveney and Mary C. Keaveney.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4230) to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BYRNE of New York, Mr. CRAVENS, and Mr. REED of Illinois were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5452) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. D'ALESANDRO, Mr. KOPPLEMANN, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. TABER, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. CANFIELD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6084) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5626) to authorize the Veterans' Administration to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ARENDS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2218. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended;

S. 2219. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 32. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; and

H. R. 5876. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease to Henry A. Scandrett, Walter J. Cummings, and George I. Haight, trustees of Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1936.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2020. A bill granting a right-of-way at a revised location to the West Shore Railroad Co., the New York Central Railroad Co., lessee, across a portion of the military reservation at West Point; without amendment (Rept No. 1584).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Immigration:

S. 2351. A bill for the relief of Marian Antoinette McCloud; without amendment (Rept. No. 1585).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2349. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Navy to delegate the authority to compromise and settle claims for damages to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1586).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2367. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct aviation facilities at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 2368 A bill authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain and operate a toll bridge, or a free bridge, across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Dearborn County, Ind.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. O'DANIEL (by request):

S. 2369. A bill for the relief of Col. S. V. Constant, General Staff Corps; and

S. 2370. A bill for the relief of Edgar F. Russell, Lillian V. Russell, his wife, and Bessie R. Ward; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 2371. A bill to amend section 121 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to authorize the appointment of three additional deputies for the register of wills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

S. 2372. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Lewiston Orchards project, Idaho, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

TITLES TO LANDS BENEATH TIDEWATERS AND NAVIGABLE WATERS—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 225) to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent clouding of such titles, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

STATEMENTS OF CIRCULATION BY WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS—WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, on Friday, June 14, during my temporary absence from the Chamber, the Senate passed during the call of the calendar House bill 2543, requiring weekly newspapers to include a sworn statement of their circulation in their annual report of ownership to the Post Office Department. I had on a previous occasion interposed an objection to the consideration of the measure, and, that objection not having been waived by me prior to the time it was called up, I filed a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed by the Senate.

I desire now to state my reasons for that objection; and after I have stated these reasons I shall ask to have the motion to reconsider withdrawn, because I do not care to take the time of the Senate to fully debate the measure. However, I believe if the House and Senate had had full understanding of the principles involved neither body would have passed the bill.

The Post Office Department already has access to the actual number of papers which a newspaper circulates through the mail in the statements which are made to the local office for the computation of postage paid by the paper. This bill will provide no new information to the Post Office Department necessary for the proper conduct of its business.

The real intent of the bill is to police the circulation of newspapers, to give assurance to advertisers and advertising agencies of the truthfulness of circulation statements made by publishers. I have no toleration for the immorality practiced in a false circulation statement, and I am personally of the opinion that the weekly newspapers would profit in the end by a compulsory statement of sworn circulation. But it is not the function of the United States Government to police the circulation of a newspaper, any more than to require the newspaper publisher to pay his debts or to sweep the sidewalk clean in front of his office every morning. It is not possible to legislate morality into a man or a business. This bill, if it becomes a law, will be using the United States Government, through its Post Office Department, to perform a function for which there can be no just support. My objection to the bill has not been based on the objective rightly desired, but upon the perversion of the institution of the Government, and because of my growing objection to the Government sticking its nose into a lot of minor affairs of the people in which it has no legitimate business.

Mr. President, as I have stated, I have no objection to the purpose of the bill, and I have respect for the good intention of those who have been advocating it. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion to reconsider the vote by which H. R. 2543 was passed by the Senate on June 14, 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the motion to reconsider is withdrawn.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 206, ENTITLED "ECONOMIC CONCENTRATION AND WORLD WAR II"

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 292), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business 2,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 206, being a report entitled "Economic Concentration and World War II," made to the special committee by the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT (S. DOC. NO. 209)

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document what is really a reprint of a document which I requested to be printed on September 15, 1943. It bears the same title. The subject matter has been brought up to date. The title of the document is "Questions and Answers on the Equal Rights Amendment" prepared by the research department of the National Woman's Party, Helena Hill Weed, chairman.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed by the President of the United States under date of June 15, 1946, to the Senator from Utah as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs on the subject of the unification of our armed forces.

I also ask to have printed following the letter from the President the joint letter of the Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, and the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, to the President under date of the 31st day of May last, on the subject of the unification of our armed forces; and following that matter the letter of the President to the Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, and the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, under date of June 15 last. All these letters are on the subject of the unification of our armed forces.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 15, 1946.

The Honorable ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: One of the most important problems confronting our country today is the establishment of a definite military policy.

In the solution of this problem, I consider it vital that we have a unified armed force for our national defense.

At my request the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have made a sincere effort to settle the differences existing between the services on this question. They have made splendid progress.

They have reached an agreement on eight important elements of unification, and with reference to the four upon which there was not full agreement, their differences are not irreconcilable.

On May 31, 1946, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy delivered a report to me of the results of their efforts. I have replied to them today stating my position on those points submitted to me for decision.

I enclose herewith a copy of the report of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, together with a copy of my reply to them.

You will note that there are now presented 12 basic principles upon which the unification of the services can be based. They are as follows:

1. SINGLE MILITARY DEPARTMENT

There should be one Department of National Defense. It would be under the control of a civilian who would be a member of the Cabinet. Each of the services would be headed by a civilian with the title of "Secretary." These Secretaries would be charged with the internal administration within their own services. They would not be members of the Cabinet. Each service would retain its autonomy, subject, of course, to the authority and over-all control by the Secretary of National Defense. It is recognized that the services have different functions and different organizations and for these reasons the integrity of each service should be retained. The civilian secretaries of the services would be members of the Council of Common Defense and in this capacity they would have the further opportunity to represent their respective services to the fullest extent.

2. THREE COORDINATE SERVICES

There should be three coordinate services—the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The three services should be on a parity and should operate in a common purpose toward over-all efficiency of the national defense under the control and supervision of the Secretary of National Defense. The Secretaries of the three services should be known as Secretary for the Army, Secretary for the Navy, and Secretary for the Air Force.

3. AVIATION

The Air Force shall have the responsibility for the development, procurement, maintenance, and operation of the military air resources of the United States with the following exceptions, in which responsibility must be vested in the Navy:

(1) Ship, carrier and water-based aircraft essential to naval operations, and aircraft of the United States Marine Corps.

(2) Land-type aircraft necessary for essential internal administration and for air

transport over routes of sole interest to naval forces and where the requirements cannot be met by normal air transport facilities.

(3) Land-type aircraft necessary for the training of personnel for the afore-mentioned purposes.

Land based planes for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare and protection of shipping can and should be manned by Air Force personnel. If the three services are to work as a team there must be close cooperation, with interchange of personnel and special training for specific duties.

Within its proper sphere of operation, naval aviation must not be restricted but must be given every opportunity to develop its maximum usefulness.

4. UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

There shall be maintained as a constituent part of the naval service a balanced Fleet Marine Force, including its supporting air component, to perform the following functions:

(1) Service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases or for the conduct of such limited land operations as are essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign.

(2) To continue the development of those aspects of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by the landing forces.

(3) To provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy.

(4) To provide security detachments for protection of naval property at naval stations and bases.

5. COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

To integrate our foreign and military policies and to enable the military services and other agencies of Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving our national security. The membership of this council should consist of the Secretary of State, the civilian head of the Military Establishment, the civilian heads of the military services, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, referred to below.

6. NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

To establish, and keep up to date, policies and programs for the maximum use of the Nation's resources in support of our national security. It should operate under the Council and be composed of representatives of the military services and of other appropriate agencies.

7. THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

To formulate strategic plans, to assign logistic responsibilities to the services in support thereof, to integrate the military programs, to make recommendations for integration of the military budget, and to provide for the strategic direction of the United States military forces.

8. NO SINGLE MILITARY CHIEF OF STAFF

In the opinion of the War Department, the Military Establishment should contain a single military Chief of Staff, who would serve as principal military adviser, available to offer advice when differences of opinion arise among the military heads of the several services. The Navy feels that the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be the highest source of military advice. The War Department is willing to omit the feature of a single Chief of Staff.

9. CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

To compile, analyze, and evaluate information gathered by various Government agencies, including the military, and to furnish such information to the National Defense Council and to other Government agencies entitled thereto. It should operate under the Council. An organization along these lines, established by Executive order, already exists.

10. PROCUREMENT AND SUPPLY

There should be an agency to prevent wasteful competition in the field of military supply and procurement through joint planning and coordination of procurement, production, and distribution.

11. RESEARCH AGENCIES

There should be an agency to coordinate the scientific research and development of the military services.

12. MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

There should be an agency to review periodically the several systems of education and training of personnel of the military services and to adjust them into an integrated program.

A plan of unification containing these 12 elements has my unqualified endorsement. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, and the Chief of Naval Operations have assured me that they will support such a plan.

It is my hope that the Congress will pass legislation as soon as possible effecting a unification based upon these 12 principles.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

MAY 31, 1946.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to your instructions, we have reviewed the major elements involved in establishing a greater measure of unification among our national security organizations, with a view to defining those matters upon which we agree and those upon which we differ. While we regret our inability to bridge completely the gap between us, we are pleased to be able to report a considerable area of agreement. Sincere efforts to expand it were made by both of us.

For your convenience, we outline below those matters upon which agreement exists and those upon which we are unable to agree. The order of presentation is not intended to indicate the relative importance of the various items.

I. Agreement exists on the following matters:

1. COUNCIL OF COMMON DEFENSE

To integrate our foreign and military policies and to enable the military services and other agencies of Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving our national security. The membership of this council should consist of the Secretary of State, the civilian head of the Military Establishment (if there be a single military department), the civilian heads of the military services, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, referred to below.

2. NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

To establish, and keep up to date, policies and programs for the maximum use of the Nation's resources in support of our national security. It should operate under the council and be composed of representatives of the military services and of other appropriate agencies.

3. THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

To formulate strategic plans to assign logistic responsibilities to the services in support thereof, to integrate the military programs, to make recommendations for integration of the military budget, and to provide for the strategic direction of the United States military forces.

4. NO SINGLE MILITARY CHIEF OF STAFF

In the opinion of the War Department, the Military Establishment should contain a single military Chief of Staff, who would serve as principal military adviser, available to offer advice when differences of opinion arise among the military heads of the several services. The Navy feels that the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be the highest source of military advice. The War Department is willing to omit the feature of a single Chief of Staff.

5. CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

To compile, analyze, and evaluate information gathered by various Government agencies, including the military, and to furnish such information to the national security council and to other Government agencies entitled thereto. It should operate under the council. An organization along these lines, established by Executive order, already exists.

6. PROCUREMENT AND SUPPLY

There should be an agency to prevent wasteful competition in the field of military supply and procurement through joint planning and coordination of procurement, production, and distribution. If there should be a single military department, this agency should be within the department.

7. RESEARCH AGENCIES

There should be an agency to coordinate the scientific research and development of the military services. If there should be a single military department, this agency should be within the department. The existence of such an agency would not remove the need for an over-all Central Research Agency.

8. MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

There should be an agency to review periodically the several systems of education and training of personnel of the military services and to adjust them into an integrated program. If there should be a single military department, this agency should be within the department.

As to the agencies mentioned in 6, 7, and 8 above, the War Department believes that these agencies will not be fully effective except as agencies within a single department. The Navy, on the other hand, believes that they will be more fully effective under a coordinated organization than under a single military department.

II. We are unable to agree on the following matters:

1. SINGLE MILITARY DEPARTMENT

WAR DEPARTMENT VIEW	NAVY DEPARTMENT VIEW
The Military Establishment should be set up as a single entity, headed by a civilian of Cabinet rank with authority and responsibility for the several services. The administration and supervision of the services should, however, so far as possible, be delegated to their respective heads in order that each service may have as much freedom of development as possible and in order that the traditions and prestige of each be not impaired.	The Navy favors unification, but in a less drastic and extreme form. It believes that serious disadvantages will result from combining the military services into one department. It would involve sacrifices of sound administrative autonomy and essential service morale.
(Only if there is this unity of structure, headed by an individual with power of decision, can we achieve action where there is now inaction, concerted policy where there is now disjointed policy, and economy of manpower, resources, and money where there is now waste of	The Navy recognizes the need for a greater measure of integration than now exists not only between the military departments but among all agencies of Government responsible for our national security. A single military department falls short of meeting these objectives.
	While the Navy feels that the measures upon which agreement exists, as set forth above, would fully meet the needs of present conditions, it sees certain advantages in

WAR DEPARTMENT VIEW

them all. Any organization which does not facilitate prompt decision and prompt action thereon, totally ignores scientific development and the nature of modern war. The military security of the United States is a single objective. Accomplishment of this single objective with the greatest economy and efficiency demands unity of direction.)

NAVY DEPARTMENT VIEW

placing a Presidential Deputy with clearly defined powers of decision over specified matters at the head of the Council of Common Defense. From this as a starting point it should be possible to move forward such further measures of unification as become advisable, based on further experience.

The Secretary of the Navy recommends to the President, in view of the wide area of agreement which presently exists, that legislation be enacted at once giving statutory effect to those matters on which there is agreement. These steps will of themselves constitute a very substantial advance over our prewar, and even our present, organization for national security. If they are put into effect, it will be possible, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy, to meet the nine specific objectives set forth in the President's message to the Congress on December 19, 1945. Further consideration and study can then be given to the remaining questions on which there is wide and general divergence of view between, and outside of, the military departments.

2. THREE COORDINATE BRANCHES

WAR DEPARTMENT VIEW

The Military Establishment should contain three coordinate branches—naval, ground, and air. Each should have a civilian head and a military commander. These officials should have access to the President, but not Cabinet rank since this would be in derogation of the position of the civilian head of the Military Establishment. As was stated above, the three branches should be given as much autonomy as possible. (Our experience in the last war clearly indicates that parity for the Air Forces and the operation of all three services as a team are essential to our national security.

NAVY DEPARTMENT VIEW

The Navy feels that our national security requires maintenance of the integrity of the Navy Department, headed by a civilian Secretary of Cabinet rank. Naval aviation, together with surface and subsurface components, have been soundly integrated within the Navy. The Navy feels that similar integration by the Army of its air and ground forces would be in the best interest of our national security.

However, if the alternatives were three military departments or one, the Navy would prefer three departments.

WAR DEPARTMENT VIEW

Everything that we know of the future points to an increase rather than a decrease in the decisive role of air power.)

NAVY DEPARTMENT VIEW

3. AVIATION

WAR DEPARTMENT VIEW

Responsibility for the development, procurement, maintenance, and operations of the military air resources of the United States should be a function of the Air Forces with the following exceptions, in which cases these responsibilities should be vested in the United States Navy: (a) Ship, carrier, and water-based aircraft essential to naval operations including those of the United States Marine Corps. (b) Land-type aircraft necessary for essential internal administration and for air transport over routes of sole interest to naval forces and where the requirements cannot be met by normal air transport facilities. (c) Land-type aircraft necessary for the training of personnel for (a) and (b) above.

(The Nation cannot afford the luxury of several completely self-sufficient services. The war demonstrated that they must be complementary — mutually supporting. With respect to landplanes, there are no purely naval functions which justify uneconomical duplication of equipment and installations. For example, the Air Forces already performs long-range reconnaissance for the ground forces and itself. The Navy's recognized requirement for the products of long-range reconnaissance can be effectively filled by the Air Forces. As regards anti-submarine warfare, it is the view of the War Department that the experience of the Army Air Forces in the last war adequately justifies the belief that landbased planes operated by the Air Forces can meet this requirement.)

NAVY DEPARTMENT VIEW

The Navy has no desire either to compete with, or to dictate to, the Army Air Forces. On the other hand, the Navy feels that its experience qualifies it to judge its own aviation needs.

One reason for the Navy's strong conviction against a single department is the continued efforts of the Army Air Forces to restrict and limit naval aviation. The Navy knows that these efforts, if successful, would seriously impair our sea power and jeopardize our national security.

To accomplish its fundamental purpose, the Navy needs a certain number of landplanes for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare and protection of shipping. Experience indicates that such landplanes, to be effective, must be manned by naval personnel trained in naval warfare. Lack of such aircraft under complete naval control as to design, procurement, operations, personnel, training, and administration might be disastrous to our national security. Similarly, the Navy must have air transport essential to its needs.

4. UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The Navy and the Army differ on the functions of the United States Marine Corps, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT VIEW

There shall be maintained as a constituent part of the naval service a balanced Fleet Marine Force including its supporting air component for—

(1) Service with the fleet in the seizure of enemy positions not involving sustained land fighting, and

(2) To continue the development of tactics, techniques, and equipment relating to those phases of amphibious warfare which pertain to waterborne aspects of landing operations.

NAVY DEPARTMENT VIEW

There shall be maintained as a constituent part of the naval service a balanced Fleet Marine Force including its supporting air component for—

(1) Service with the fleet in the seizure of defense of advance naval bases or for the conduct of such limited land operations as are essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign, and

(2) To continue the development of those aspects of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, techniques, and equipment employed by landing forces.

There is agreement upon the other primary duties of the Marine Corps, viz:

(1) To provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy, and

(2) To provide security detachments for protection of naval property at naval stations and bases.

These matters have been explored by us with a sincere desire to comply with your wishes that the military services reach complete mutual agreement. Our failure to achieve complete unanimity is due to no reason other than that our respective views on the points of difference are as sincere as they are divergent.

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.
JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy.

JUNE 15, 1946.

The Honorable ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.
The Honorable JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy.

GENTLEMEN: I have read with care your joint report of May 31, 1946. It was also helpful to me to have the full oral presentation of the points involved, which you and the members of your departments made to me on June 4.

I am pleased and gratified at the progress you have made. I feel that we have come a long way in narrowing the zone of disagreement which had previously existed between the services. The full understanding reached on eight vital aspects of unification is a significant accomplishment. These eight elements are Council of Common Defense, National Security Resources Board, Joint Chiefs of Staff, omission of single Military Chief of Staff, Central Intelligence Agency, Procurement and Supply, Research Agencies, and Military Education and Training.

In addition to these eight points of agreement, I am advised also by representatives of both services that they are in accord in their attitude toward the provision in the Thomas bill, S. 2044, which provides for four assistant secretaries in charge of research, intelligence, procurement, and training, respectively. They believe that such assistant secretaries are unnecessary. I agree with

their position that the presence of these four assistant secretaries is undesirable because they would greatly complicate the internal administration of the services and that such a plan would deprive the secretaries of the respective services of functions which are properly theirs.

Your report of May 31 listed four items upon which you were unable to agree. An analysis of your comments contained in your report, and in the lengthy discussion which we had, discloses that the services are not nearly so far apart in their attitude toward these points as had been reported. It is my firm conviction that the determination of these questions in the manner which I present herein will result in a plan which incorporates the best features offered by the respective services.

With reference to the points upon which full agreement was not reached my position is as follows:

1. SINGLE MILITARY DEPARTMENT

There should be one Department of National Defense. It would be under the control of a civilian who would be a member of the Cabinet. Each of the services would be headed by a civilian with the title of Secretary. These secretaries would be charged with the internal administration within their own services. They would not be members of the Cabinet. Each service would retain its autonomy, subject of course to the authority and over-all control by the Secretary of National Defense. It is recognized that the services have different functions and different organizations and for these reasons the integrity of each service should be retained. The civilian secretaries of the services would be members of the Council of Common Defense and in this capacity they would have the further opportunity to represent their respective services to the fullest extent.

2. THREE COORDINATED SERVICES

There should be three coordinate services—the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The three services should be on a parity and should operate in a common purpose toward over-all efficiency of the National Defense under the control and supervision of the Secretary of National Defense. The secretaries of the three services should be known as Secretary for the Army, Secretary for the Navy, and Secretary for the Air Force.

3. AVIATION

The Air Force shall have the responsibility for the development, procurement, maintenance, and operation of the military air resources of the United States with the following exceptions, in which responsibility must be vested in the Navy:

(1) Ship, carrier, and water-based aircraft essential to naval operations, and aircraft of the United States Marine Corps.

(2) Land-type aircraft necessary for essential internal administration and for air transport over routes of sole interest to naval forces and where the requirements cannot be met by normal air transport facilities.

(3) Land-type aircraft necessary for the training of personnel for the aforementioned purposes.

Land-based planes for naval reconnaissance, antisubmarine warfare, and protection of shipping can and should be manned by air force personnel. If the three services are to work as a team there must be close cooperation, with interchange of personnel and special training for specific duties.

Within its proper sphere of operation, naval aviation must not be restricted but must be given every opportunity to develop its maximum usefulness.

4. UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

There shall be maintained as a constituent part of the naval service a balanced fleet marine force including its supporting air component to perform the following functions:

(1) Service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced naval bases or for the conduct of such limited land operations as are essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign.

(2) To continue the development of those aspects of amphibious operations which pertain to the tactics, technique, and equipment employed by the landing forces.

(3) To provide detachments and organizations for service on armed vessels of the Navy.

(4) To provide security detachments for protection of naval property at naval stations and bases.

It is important that the basic elements of the plan of unification be stated clearly. The 8 fundamental points agreed upon and the 4 points which are herewith decided, constitute a total of 12 basic principles that should form the framework of the program for integration.

There is no desire or intention to affect adversely the integrity of any of the services. They should perform their separate functions under the unifying direction, authority and control of the secretary of national defense. The internal administration of the three services should be preserved in order that the high morale and esprit de corps of each service can be retained.

It was gratifying to have both of you and General Eisenhower and Admiral Nimitz assure me that you would all give your wholehearted support to a plan of unification no matter what the decision would be on those points upon which you did not fully agree. I know that I can count upon all of you for full assistance in obtaining passage in the Congress of a bill containing the 12 basic elements set forth above.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

OPENING OF MAIL AND PARCEL POST SERVICE TO ALLIED ZONES IN GERMANY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, all the world is watching the proceedings of the Big Four Foreign Ministers Conference in Paris.

One of the questions which is, of course, at stake is the ultimate outlook for the German people. When will they be able through our guidance and control to resume a proud, respected place in the family of nations?

Some months ago I addressed a communication to the commanders in charge of our troops in the occupied area of Germany in relation to mailing into that area parcels of food sent by Americans of German descent living in this country to relatives in Germany. That correspondence is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have written an identical letter to the French, Russian, and British members of the Control Council of the Allied Control Authority in Berlin, respectfully asking that they open mail service between their zones in Germany and overseas, so that Americans of German descent in this country could forward parcels to the starving people of those areas. At the present time the American zone is open to mail service, but the foreign zones are not. I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of that letter printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 22, 1946.

FRENCH MEMBER, CONTROL COUNCIL, ALLIED CONTROL AUTHORITY, BERLIN, GERMANY.

DEAR SIR: I am respectfully addressing this inquiry to yourself and your Russian and British colleagues on the Allied Control Authority in order to urge the opening up of mail service between the United States and the British, French, and Russian occupied zones in Germany.

The purpose would, of course, be to enable American citizens to forward relief parcels through the mails to their friends and relatives in the afore-mentioned zones, just as relief packages may now be sent to the American occupied zone. I understand that at a meeting of your Council on June 14 of this month, final decision on this matter was delayed. May I humbly point out that each passing day is causing great anxiety in many American homes for the welfare of kinfolk abroad as well as much suffering, with which you are more familiar than I, in your zone.

I understand that the state of communications within your zone is still not entirely satisfactory, but I do not see this as sufficient reason for prohibiting mail service, particularly in view of the fact that the American occupied zone has, in spite of communication difficulties, allowed the resumption of mail. It seems to me, also, that each of the occupying authorities has an obligation to make provision for the necessary communications facilities in order to allow relief shipments to come in.

Back in January of this year, I addressed a letter to General McNarney urging the opening of the United States zone to mail service. Later I corresponded with General Clark in Austria along a similar line. Fortunately, our United States authorities saw fit to heed the appeal of many others and myself to allow the generous heart of America to forward supplies to the stricken people in the area under our control

Please be assured, sir, of my understanding of the difficulties of the problems faced by the Allied Control Authority. However, those difficulties will, in my personal opinion, be complicated and aggravated in the event that mail service is not resumed. The date at which the German people may resume a proud, respected place in the family of nations will be further delayed by failure to open mail service in all zones.

In the light of all the above, may I earnestly ask if you would advise me at the earliest possible date as to the facts in this matter regarding your official position on this subject, and may I fervently ask that you personally take the necessary actions to fill this humanitarian need.

The conscience of the American people has been deeply touched by the want and misery among our former foes, just as we have been even more concerned with the desperate circumstances experienced by our allies, including, of course, your own people.

We have not forgotten the injunction to "do unto others even as ye would have them do unto you" and to "love thy enemy as thyself." We are waiting with deep anxiety to be allowed to fulfill this creed through your action along the above lines and through other measures of famine relief.

In view particularly of the present strained state of Allied diplomatic negotiations over the peace settlement, it seems to me that Allied unity on this point of resuming mail service in Germany would be an encouraging and inspiring sign to both the Allied and former enemy people. Looking forward to hearing from you as soon as possible, and with my thanks for your consideration of the appeal, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

A UNITED NATIONS APPROACH TO THE CARTEL PROBLEM—ADDRESS BY GILBERT H. MONTAGUE

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject A United Nations Approach to the Cartel Problem, delivered by Gilbert H. Montague, before the symposium on trusts and cartels, Harvard Law School Forum, Cambridge, Mass., on May 10, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR AND MANAGEMENT—RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD resolutions on the subject of labor and management, adopted by the Convention of Kiwanis International, held at tlantic City, N. J., on June 11, 1946, which appear in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials on the subject of reorganizing the Congress, from the Dayton (Ohio) News of June 11, 1946, from the Canton (Ohio) Repository of June 12, 1946, and from the Cincinnati Times-Star of June 12, 1946, which appear in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several editorials commenting on the reorganization of Congress, which appear in the Appendix.]

JOINT STATEMENT OF SCIENTISTS AND EDUCATORS ON NEED FOR A NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a joint statement of scientists and educators on the need for a National Science Foundation, which appears in the Appendix.]

EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED OFFICERS BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5626) to authorize the Veterans' Administration to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

RETURN OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES TO STATE OPERATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4437) to provide for the return of public-employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the first amendment reported by the committee on page 1, line 6.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it seems there should be a quorum present, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Murray
Andrews	Hart	Myers
Austin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Bridges	Hoey	Reed
Brooks	Huffman	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Bushfield	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Stanfill
Capper	La Follette	Stewart
Carville	Lucas	Swift
Chavez	McCarran	Taft
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Eastland	McMahon	Wagner
Ferguson	Magnuson	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wherry
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Gossett	Moore	Willis
Green	Morse	Wilson
Guffey	Murdock	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent on official business, having been appointed to the committee on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 1, lines 6 and 7.

Mr. WHITE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. What is the amendment on which the vote is about to be taken?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 6, after the word "than", it is proposed to strike out "June 30, 1946" and insert "December 31, 1946."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 2, to insert the following:

SEC. 102. The functions of the United States Employment Service transferred to the Social Security Board by section 201 (a) of Reorganization Plan No. 1 (53 Stat. 1424), promulgated pursuant to the Reorganization Act of 1939, are returned to the Department of Labor. All functions of the Secretary of Labor relating to the administration of the United States Employment Service transferred to the Federal Security Administration pursuant to section 203 of said reorganization plan are returned to the Secretary of Labor. All provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1, promulgated pursuant to the Reorganization Act of 1939, inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. DONNELL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. I submitted yesterday an amendment which I intend to propose, under which all of titles I and II of the bill would be stricken out, and the paragraph which appears in the amendment upon Senators' desks would be substituted. My parliamentary inquiry is this: If we proceed in the course we are now pursuing, with the committee amendments being acted upon first, will I then have the opportunity, after the committee amendments shall have been acted upon, to present my amendment in the nature of a substitute?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will have that opportunity.

Mr. SMITH. Before the amendment is acted upon I should like to say a word in this connection, because I find myself in a somewhat embarrassing situation. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor I voted to report the bill to the Senate, but with the reservation that I might offer amendments on the floor. I desire to make it clear that in voting to report the bill I still reserved the right to present any matters which might come to my attention before final action was taken on the bill.

I immediately sent copies of the proposed measure to the Governor of my State. Gov. Walter E. Edge, and to Mr. Frank T. Judge, acting executive director of the Unemployment Compensation Commission of New Jersey, and asked the opinions of those gentlemen on the pending legislation as affecting the situation in my State of New Jersey. I received yesterday from Mr. Judge a telegram which I want to read to the Senate because it raises an important question so far as my State is concerned.

The telegram is as follows:

Understand H. R. 4437 order of business Senate this p. m.

This telegram was sent yesterday.

Proposed Senate version H. R. 4437 provides changes in Wagner-Peyser Act. Opinion of chief counsel, New Jersey Unemployment Compensation Commission, is: "Any changes in Wagner-Peyser Act affecting substantive rights or obligations of State of New Jersey under original arrangement would require new legislative action by New Jersey Legislature." Informed that 19 other unemployment compensation agencies take substantially the same position. Therefore, operation of employment service by State under proposed Senate revision H. R. 4437 would have to be postponed until State Legislature passed enabling legislation. This agency urges immediate enactment of appropriation bill H. R. 6739 followed by enactment of House version of H. R. 4437.

Mr. President, I read that telegram into the RECORD in connection with this discussion because it discloses an embarrassment in which I find myself respecting my own State, in supporting this legislation as it is now presented to the Senate.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BALL. On the point the Senator has raised, he will recall that it was raised by Mr. Bane, secretary of the Council of State Governments, in the full committee and afterward the committee added a proviso to section 4 which permits the States to accept the provisions of this act. The proviso, which appears on page 7 of the bill, is as follows:

Provided, That until the expiration of 1 week after the close of the first session of the legislature of any State which begins after the date of enactment of this proviso, such State shall, whether or not it has complied with the foregoing provisions of this section and all of the provisions of the other sections of this act, be entitled to obtain the benefits of such appropriations if the Secretary finds that such State is complying with the requirements of this act to the extent permitted under the law of such Sate.

The proviso was inserted to take care of the situation which might occur in a few States where the old statute accepting the Wagner-Peyser Act might not apply to all the provisions of this rewrite of that act. I think it would cover them until 1 week after the close of their next legislative session.

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that the matter was brought to the attention of the counsel for our commission in New Jersey, and it was still the counsel's opinion that the legislation which was passed in New Jersey simply provided for turning over the unemployment service under the Wagner-Peyser Act as it existed prior to the present amendment, and that therefore new legislation would be required before we would be eligible to take advantage permanently of this legislation. It raises the question of whether New Jersey must be compelled to take this new act in carrying on its unemployment program. It is one of those questions that gives me a good deal of difficulty.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for calling attenton to the proviso. Of course, I was familiar with it. But I still must reiterate that counsel for the commission in my State believes that it does not clear the question which was presented by the telegram I have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, beginning in line 3.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to point out that this amendment is the one which rewrites the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BALL. The pending amendment, I believe, is section 102 at the top of page 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the question is on the committee amendment on page 2, after line 2, to insert a new section 102.

Mr. TAFT. I thought the question was on the next amendment. My only comment on the pending amendment is that I have some doubt and reservation as to whether the USES ought to go back to the Labor Department. I have some doubt as to whether the unemployment compensation activity and the employment service at the Federal level should not be together somewhere. But I am not disposed to dispute the particular amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, after line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 15, to strike out:

The act of Congress approved on June 6, 1933, and entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes" (48 Stat. 113–117), as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

SEC. 201. Section 2 is amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the following clauses: ", without regard to the civil-service laws," and ", without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended,".

SEC. 202. Section 3 (b) is amended by inserting after the word "Hawaii" the following: ", Puerto Rico."

SEC. 203. Section 5 is amended by deleting subsections (a) and (b) thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"(a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums annually as the Congress may deem necessary.

"(b) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State which is in compliance with the provisions of section 4 of this act, and such rules, regulations, and standards of efficiency as may be prescribed under this act, such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State system of public employment offices during the fiscal year for which payment is to be made. The Secretary's determination shall be based on (1) the population of the State and an estimate of the number of persons who will be served by the public employment office system in the State; (2) an estimate of the cost of proper and efficient administration of the State system of public employment offices; and (3) such other factors as the Secretary finds relevant."

SEC. 204. Section 6 is amended by deleting the present provisions thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"The Secretary shall not certify for payment under this section in any fiscal year a total amount in excess of the amount appropriated for such fiscal year."

SEC. 205. Section 7 is amended by deleting the present provision and substituting therefor the following:

"Out of the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon receiving a certification under subsection (b), pay, through the fiscal service of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, to the State agency designated to cooperate with the Secretary under this act, the amount so certified."

And insert:

The act of Congress approved on June 6, 1933, and entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes" (48 Stat. 113–117), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That in order to promote the establishment and maintenance of a national system of public employment offices there is hereby created in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the United States Employment Service, at the head of which shall be a Director. The Director shall be appointed by the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary may delegate to the Director any authority vested in him under this act and may authorize the Director to further delegate any authority so delegated.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to appoint and to fix the compensation of one or more Assistant Directors and such other officers, employees, and assistants, and to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere and for lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. In case of appointments for service in the veterans' employment service provided for in section 3 of this act, the Secretary shall appoint only veterans of wars of the United States.

"SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the province and duty of the Secretary through the bureau to promote and develop a national system of employment offices for men, women, and juniors who are legally qualified to engage

in gainful occupations; to maintain a veterans' service to be devoted to securing employment for veterans; to maintain a farm placement service; to promote, develop, and assure the maintenance of such other special-service programs as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; to maintain a public employment service for the District of Columbia; to assist, in the manner hereinafter provided, in establishing and maintaining systems of public employment offices in the several States and the political subdivisions thereof in which there shall be located a veterans' employment service; and to assure that such employment service facilities and information as may be required for the proper and efficient administration of unemployment-compensation laws are provided to all agencies charged with the administration of unemployment-compensation laws. The Secretary of Labor and the Social Security Board shall facilitate proper cooperation and coordination between public employment service and unemployment-compensation programs. The Secretary shall also assist in coordinating the public employment offices throughout the country and in increasing their usefulness by developing and prescribing minimum standards of efficiency, assisting them in meeting problems peculiar to their localities, promoting uniformity in their administrative and statistical procedure, furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment and other information of value in the operation of the system, and maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States and facilitating the free movement of workers seeking employment and employers seeking workers.

"(b) Whenever in this act the word 'State' or 'States' is used it shall be understood to include Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska.

"SEC. 4. In order to obtain the benefits of appropriations available under section 5, a State shall, through its legislature, accept the provisions of this act and designate or authorize the creation of a single State agency vested with all powers necessary to cooperate with the United States Employment Service under this act: *Provided*, That until the expiration of 1 week after the close of the first session of the legislature of any State which begins after the date of enactment of this proviso, such State shall, whether or not it has complied with the foreign provisions of this section and all of the provisions of the other sections of this act, be entitled to obtain the benefits of such appropriations if the Secretary finds that such State is complying with the requirements of this act to the extent permitted under the law of such State.

"SEC. 5. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums annually as the Congress may deem necessary.

"(b) The Secretary shall from time to time certify for payment to each State which is in compliance with the provisions of section 4 of this act, and such rules, regulations, and standards of efficiency as may be prescribed under this act, such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State system of public employment offices during the fiscal year for which payment is to be made. The Secretary's determination shall be based on (1) the population of the State and an estimate of the number of persons who will be served by the public employment office system in the State; (2) an estimate of the cost of proper and efficient administration of the State system of public employment offices; and (3) such other factors as the Secretary finds relevant.

"(c) Whenever the State agency designated to cooperate with the United States Employment Service under this act is also the State agency charged with the administration of the State's unemployment compensation law for which grants are made under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, such State agency may, if it so elects, submit to the Secretary and the Social Security Board a joint budget covering both the functions for which grants are made under this act and the functions for which grants are made under such title III. In such a case the Secretary shall certify to the Social Security Board the amounts to be paid to the State under this act. Upon such certification, the Social Security Board shall certify such amounts to the Secretary of the Treasury, in addition to the amount, if any, payable by said Board under the provisions of section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended.

"(d) In cases to which subsection (c) does not apply, certifications made by the Secretary under subsection (b) shall be made to the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(e) Whenever funds are paid to the same State agency under this act and under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, the State agency may commingle such funds and account therefor by such accounting, statistical, sampling, or other methods as may be found by the Secretary and the Social Security Board, respectively, to afford reasonable assurance that the funds paid to the State agency under this act and the funds paid to the State agency under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, are expended for the respective purposes of this act and such title III.

"SEC. 6. The Secretary shall not certify for payment under section 5 in any fiscal year, a total amount in excess of the amount appropriated for such fiscal year.

"SEC. 7. Out of the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon receiving a certification under section 5, pay, through the fiscal service of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, to the State agency designated to cooperate with the United States Employment Service under this act, the amount so certified.

"SEC. 8. (a) The State agency designated to cooperate with the United States Employment Service under this act shall operate under such methods of administration relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, as are found by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods; and such State agency shall also replace, within a reasonable time, any moneys received under this act which, because of any action or contingency, have been lost or have been expended for purposes other than or in amounts in excess of those found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration of the State system of public employment offices. In those States where a State board, department, or agency exists which is charged with the administration of State laws for vocational rehabilitation of physically handicapped persons, the agency designated to cooperate with the United States Employment Service under this act shall make provision for cooperation with such Board, department, or agency.

"(b) The agency designated to cooperate with the United States Employment Service in any State under this act may, at the election of such agency, submit to the Secretary detailed plans for carrying out the provisions of this act within such State. If such plans are in conformity with the provisions of this act and reasonably appropriate and adequate to carry out its purposes, they shall be approved by the Secretary and due notice of such approval shall be given to the State agency.

"SEC. 9. (a) Each State agency cooperating with the United States Employment Service under this act shall make such reports concerning its operations and expenditures as shall be prescribed by the Secretary and shall comply with such provisions as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary to carry out his obligations under this act. It shall be the duty of the Secretary to ascertain whether the system of public employment offices maintained in each State is conducted in accordance with the rules and regulations and the standards of efficiency prescribed by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this act and to make such studies and investigations as may be necessary in connection therewith. The Secretary may revoke any existing certificates or withhold any further certificate provided for in section 5, whenever he shall determine, as to any State, that the cooperating State agency has not properly expended the moneys paid to it or there has been a substantial failure of compliance by such State agency with the provisions of this act or the rules, regulations, or standards of efficiency prescribed thereunder. Before any such certificate shall be revoked or withheld in the case of any State, the Secretary shall give notice in writing to the State agency stating specifically wherein the State agency has not properly expended such moneys or has failed so to comply, and shall afford such State agency a reasonable opportunity for hearing.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to expend in any State so much of the funds appropriated and made available under section 5 of this act as may be necessary to operate a State-wide system of public employment offices under the control of the Secretary if no State system of public employment offices exists in such State or if, and for as long as, the State is not eligible for funds in accordance with the provisions of this act. Except to the extent that a system of employment offices under the control of the Secretary is operated within a State either (1) pursuant to the specific request of the Governor of such State or (2) with funds specifically appropriated by the Congress for the operation of such system under the control of the Secretary, the Secretary shall not expend more than $1,000,000 in any fiscal year pursuant to this subsection or operate a system of employment offices in any State pursuant to this subsection for more than 3 months in any fiscal year.

SEC. 10. In carrying out the provisions of this act, no person shall be referred to a position (a) without due notice to the applicant, if the position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute; (b) if the wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are substantially less favorable to the individual than those prevailing for similar work in the locality, except upon request of the applicant; or (c) if as determined by the State agency the position is one which does not utilize the person's highest skill, until and unless a reasonable effort has been made to place him in a position that does utilize his highest skill.

"SEC. 11. The Secretary shall establish a Federal Advisory Council composed of men and women representing employers and employees in equal numbers and the public for the purpose of formulating policies and discussing problems relating to employment and insuring impartiality, neutrality, and freedom from political influence in the solution of such problems. Members of such council shall be selected from time to time in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe and shall serve at $25 per diem, and when attending meetings of the council they shall be allowed necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, or per diem allowance in lieu thereof, within the limitations prescribed by

law for civilian employees in the executive branch of the Government. The council shall have access to all files and records of the United States Employment Service. The Secretary shall also require the organization of similar State advisory councils, which shall also be composed of men and women representing employers and employees in equal numbers and the public.

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of Labor is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 13. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to extend to all State systems of public employment offices which receive funds appropriated under this act penalty mailing privileges for the transmission of official mail matter in connection with the administration of such State systems of public employment offices in the same manner as such privileges are extended to any agency, department, or independent establishment of the Federal Government. Reimbursement to the general fund of the Treasury for such privileges shall be made in such amounts from funds appropriated to the Department of Labor for that purpose, and in such manner, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Labor and the Postmaster General.

"SEC. 14. No provision of this act shall be construed to amend or in any way modify the provisions of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the committee amendment. I move to strike out section 11, on page 13, beginning with line 7, and extending through line 25 on page 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in connection with the amendment. As appears from the committee amendment, this section proposes the establishment of an Advisory Council. There are several vices in the committee amendment. In the first place, no limitation is placed on the number of persons who are to serve on the Advisory Council. It could be composed of 10, 100, 1,000, 10,000, or any other number the Secretary of Labor might see fit to appoint. The members would all receive $25 for each day of attendance at sessions, in addition to all their travel and subsistence expenses.

There is also a requirement in the committee amendment that the States shall all have similar advisory councils, with no limitation whatever on the number of persons to be appointed in the States, or on the amount to be paid members of the advisory councils within the States. If the compensation were fixed at $25 a day, which is the amount proposed to be paid to members of the Advisory Council in the Federal Government, the State advisory council could be quite a powerful political body in the hands of the governor of a State who wished to use it for political purposes.

The purposes of the Council and its powers are rather nebulous. I do not believe it is necessary to incur this additional expense throughout the Nation all the way down to the State levels. This section in the committee amendment is rather awkwardly worded. If the Secretary wishes to obtain advisers he can do so in the ordinary way. He can employ persons in the Department to advise him. There is nothing in the present law which would prevent him from appointing an advisory committee. But I do not believe that we should leave the door wide open to abuses all the way down to the State level in each of the 48 States in connection with a matter which might involve the expenditure of a large sum of money without accomplishing any useful purpose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Georgia know whether I am correctly informed, that the only part of section 11, on page 13, not now in the Wagner-Peyser Act is the provision with reference to the per diem fee? As I understand, all the other provisions of section 11 are already in the law. What is attempted by this amendment is to provide for payment of the fee which is uniformly paid to members of advisory councils in other branches of the Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that in the original Wagner-Peyser Act there is some language to provide for an advisory council; but to my mind there is considerable difference between the language in the present law and the language of the committee amendment.

It is my understanding that the present law provides that members of the Advisory Council shall serve without compensation. The provision in the committee amendment would allow members of the Advisory Council compensation of $25 a day. The committee amendment provides compensation of $25 a day for each person the Secretary of Labor might see fit to appoint, without limitation on the number, to advise with him on the formulation of policy. I think it is much better for the Secretary of Labor to formulate policies with the aid of experts in his Department, particularly when we are providing for a similar council in each of the States. It is a rather ridiculous situation to have a specific requirement that each of the 48 States shall have an advisory council, the expenses of which are to be paid 100 percent out of the Federal Treasury, in a bill which gives the Secretary of Labor the power to formulate policies which will bind the States. There is no machinery for bringing the advice of the various State councils to the Secretary of Labor; and anything they might do in an advisory way could be immediately overruled and annulled when the Secretary of Labor, under the terms of the bill, promulgated a regulation.

Mr. MORSE. Would not the objection of the Senator from Georgia—and I think it has great merit—be met if an amendment were inserted to fix the maximum amount which might be paid to a member of an advisory council during any period of time, such as 1 year? Possibly also we should fix the number of people that can be appointed to an advisory council in any State during a period of time such as a year. If we are to obtain the most competent experts to serve, I think it would be quite unfair to ask a man to serve on the advisory council and not pay him a reasonable amount for his time and expenses. As I understand, the figure used in the committee amendment is the amount uniformly paid for such services in other branches of the Government. I think it is only fair that members of the advisory council should receive compensation. However, in order to avoid the potential evil of which the Senator from Georgia speaks, could we not establish a maximum limit on the total amount that could be paid for any particular period of time, such as a year?

Mr. RUSSELL. That would considerably improve the provision in the committee amendment, but it would not relieve my fundamental objection.

In the first place, we are attempting to insert language in the bill which provides for 100-percent Federal financing of this activity. The original theory provided for matching on a fifty-fifty basis. The State advisory committees which would be required to be appointed under the provisions of the committee amendment would be fifth wheels. They would be absolutely useless when we rewrite the remainder of the law and give the Federal Government power—and I think properly so, when the operation is financed altogether out of Federal funds—to prescribe the methods of operation and lay down the rules and regulations for the conduct of the program within the States.

I am opposed to this provision for other reasons. The original Wagner-Peyser Act was enacted back in 1933. I happened to be a Member of this body at that time. We were enacting legislation which contained some rather new concepts. In 1933 we could not pass a bill without providing for a "brain trust." Every bill which was passed establishing a new activity or creating a new agency contained a provision for a little private brain trust within the department to advise the head of the department as to how he should administer the law. I think we have rather gotten away from the brain-trust days. If the Secretary of Labor wishes to have advisers on these questions, he should employ them in his Department. There is nothing in the present law which would prevent him from employing experts within his normal budget at $25 a day.

I do not like this nebulous language. It is coupled with the provision on page 14, which gives the Secretary of Labor authority to make any rules and regulations which may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of the act. That is probably necessary language in the bill. I have no objection to it as a general principle; but when it is proposed to establish an advisory council to advise with him, under the rather nebulous provisions set forth in the bill, I say that it is altogether unnecessary and would entail an expense which could well be dispensed with.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that the origin of that provision is the Wagner-Peyser Act, and so it is desirable that section 11 should remain in the bill.

The Senator from Oregon thinks section 11 should remain in the bill, and to that extent he disagrees with the Senator from Georgia.

But if we are to have it, we should fix a maximum number of days which can be served with pay during the year. I should like to suggest to those who have charge of the bill that as a minimum the words "not in excess of 15 days a year" be inserted in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that would not cure the difficulty in regard to the number who could be appointed. Ten thousand could be appointed in 15 days, and they could be kept coming in relays. Under the changed concept of this service to the American people, whereby it would become a purely federally financed function to be operated by the States, rather than to be operated on a 50–50 matching basis, as provided by the original Wagner-Peyser Act, I submit there is absolutely no necessity for section 11. It neither adds to nor detracts from anything in the other sections of the bill, and it can only bring about increased expense and confusion.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. While in the main this was a part of the original Wagner-Peyser Act, the whole plan will work without having any of section 11 in the bill, so far as we can see. While we do not have authority to say that the committee agrees, I do not think there will be any serious objection on the part of the committee if this portion is stricken out.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I agree with the Senator from Delaware. I think we picked up the section from the original Wagner-Peyser Act, and I am very much inclined to agree with the Senator from Georgia that we are overdoing the question of advisory committees in all the departments. I cannot see much use in the provision.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I think should be considered before the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No such amendment can be considered or acted upon while the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is pending.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, on yesterday I called attention to certain language on page 13 of the bill, namely, lines 3 to 6. It refers to the referral to positions, and in substance it prescribes that in carrying out the provisions of this measure no person shall be referred to a position without certain prerequisites; and then, in subsection (c), which is the particular portion on page 13 to which I refer, the following provision is found:

> (c) If as determined by the State agency the position is one which does not utilize the person's highest skill, until and unless a reasonable effort has been made to place him in a position that does utilize his highest skill.

The point I made yesterday was that there is, to say the least, an ambiguity as to whose function it will be under this language to determine whether a reasonable effort has been made to place an applicant in a position that does utilize his highest skill. In the course of the colloquy, as I recall, the Senator from Minnesota indicated that it had been his understanding that by the insertion in line 3 of the words "as determined by the State agency" it was meant not only to vest the State agency with the power of determination as to what position utilizes the person's highest skill but also to vest in the State agency the power of determination as to whether a reasonable effort had been made to place the individual in a position which does utilize his highest skill.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I was about to try to obtain recognition by the Chair in order to suggest an amendment in line 5, on page 13, after the word "unless", to insert "such agency determines that."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, that will meet with my entire approval. The words which I was going to suggest, and which I did suggest yesterday, were "the State agency determines that."

Upon reconsideration, Mr. President, I think I prefer the language I suggested yesterday, because the word "such" might possibly be subject to the interpretation of meaning the Department of Labor. Therefore, I suggest to the Senator from Minnesota and to the chairman of the subcommittee that following the word "unless," there be inserted the words "the State agency determines that."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I see no objection. I think the word "such" would clearly mean the State agency. But if the Senator from Missouri is worried about it, let us make it read "unless the State agency determines that."

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I offer that amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. It may well be that the Senator from Minnesota is correct in his interpretation, but I think the language I have suggested would certainly remove any ambiguity.

Mr. BALL. I adopt the language and offer it as an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 12, strike out subsection (b) of section 9.

I offer this amendment after conferring with my constituents in New Jersey with regard to the entire set-up. They call to my attention that if for any reason the Secretary of Labor should not approve of the program we in New Jersey have been working with very successfully, he could very well make New Jersey ineligible for funds, and then the Federal Government could take over our whole program. We recognize that that might not happen, but nevertheless the power to do so would exist under the bill, and therefore we urge that subsection (b) be eliminated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder whether the Senator will be willing to limit his amendment to such an extent that the first six lines of the subsection—in other words, down through the word "State", in line 9—would remain. If the amendment were limited to that extent, subsection (b) as thus amended would then read as follows:

> (b) The Secretary is authorized to expend in any State so much of the funds appropriated and made available under section 5 of this act as may be necessary to operate a State-wide system of public employment offices under the control of the Secretary if no State system of public employment offices exists in such State.

That is substantially the provision of the present Wagner-Peyser Act.

Mr. SMITH. I am very glad to accept that modification, because I had in mind, of course, a State like my own State of New Jersey, where there are provisions of this sort. We do not wish to have them removed.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator from New Jersey will modify his amendment accordingly, his amendment then will provide that in subsection (b) of section 9, on page 12, beginning with the words "or if", in line 9, to strike out from that point down through line 20.

Mr. SMITH. I am very glad to modify the amendment in line with that suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey will state the amendment as he wishes to have it modified.

Mr. SMITH. My modified amendment is as follows: On page 12, in subsection (b) of section 9, strike out, beginning with the words "or if", in line 9, and all the following words through the end of line 20, which ends with the words "in any fiscal year."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the portion of the committee amendment which it is proposed to strike out.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, in line 9, after the words "or if", it is proposed to strike out the following: "and for as long as, the State is not eligible for funds in accordance with the provisions of this act. Except to the extent that a system of employment offices under the control of the Secretary is operated within a State either (1) pursuant to the specific request of the Governor of such State or (2) with funds specifically appropriated by the Congress for the operation of such system under the control of the Secretary, the Secretary shall not expend

more than $1,000,000 in any fiscal year pursuant to this subsection or operate a system of employment offices in any State pursuant to this subsection for more than 3 months in any fiscal year."

Mr. TUNNELL, Mr. DONNELL, and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Murray
Andrews	Hart	Myers
Austin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Bridges	Hoey	Reed
Brooks	Huffman	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Bushfield	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Stanfill
Capper	La Follette	Stewart
Carville	Lucas	Swift
Chavez	McCarran	Taft
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Eastland	McMahon	Wagner
Ferguson	Magnuson	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wherry
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Gossett	Moore	Willis
Green	Morse	Wilson
Guffey	Murdock	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to the committee amendment on page 12.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have conferred further with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and together we have checked up on the language of the Wagner-Peyser Act. In view of the conversation which we have had, I modify my amendment to strike by including all of paragraph (b) of section 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment. The clerk will now state the language which it is proposed to strike out.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, in line 4, it is proposed to strike out the following:

(b) The Secretary is authorized to expend in any State so much of the funds appropriated and made available under section 5 of this act as may be necessary to operate a State-wide system of public employment offices under the control of the Secretary if no State system of public employment offices exists in such State or if, and for as long as, the State is not eligible for funds in accordance with the provisions of this act. Except to the extent that a system of employment offices under the control of the Secretary is operated within a State either (1) pursuant to the specific request of the Governor of such State or (2) with funds specifically appropriated by the Congress for the operation of such system under the control of the Secretary, the Secretary shall not expend more than $1,000,000 in any fiscal year pursuant to this subsection or operate a system of employment offices in any State pursuant to this subsection for more than 3 months in any fiscal year.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I certainly object to the amendment. The language which it is proposed to strike out is of such nature as to take care of two classes of persons during the interim period. The first class is employees in the particular State concerned. If the language is deleted there will remain no organization for the unemployed. Therefore, the members of the staff will not be employed during a period of time. That situtation is unquestionably the first which is aimed at by the motion. In other words, it is designed completely to demoralize the force in any particular State. Allow me to read a part of the language which it is proposed to strike out:

(b) The Secretary is authorized to expend in any State so much of the funds appropriated and made available under section 5 of this act as may be necessary to operate a State-wide system of public employment offices under the control of the Secretary if no State system of public employment offices exists in such State.

That is the first part of the language which it is proposed to strike out in order to take away from the Secretary the right to use funds in maintaining an employment system. I do not quite understand the purpose of striking out that provision; but I fear the result which would ensue.

But the proposal of the Senator from New Jersey goes further than that. It would mean that in some States there would be no protection for the unemployed at all, the purpose being to prevent any temporary arrangement by which employment facilities could be furnished, "if, and for as long as, the State is not eligible for funds in accordance with the provisions of this act." The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey would give the State authority the right to prevent the unemployed from having this assistance, even to the extent of preventing the Federal Government from helping the unemployed in the State, for the amendment would strike out the provision:

Except to the extent that a system of unemployment offices under the control of the Secretary is operated within a State either (1) pursuant to a specific request of the governor of such State or (2) with funds specifically appropriated by the Congress for the operation of such system under the control of the Secretary, the Secretary shall not expend more than $1,000,000 in any fiscal year pursuant to this subsectiton or operate a system of employment offices in any State pursuant to this section for more than 3 months in any fiscal year.

If that provision is stricken out the Secretary of Labor will not be permitted to bridge over the period of 3 months.

Under the bill as reported he is limited to 3 months, and the amount he may expend is limited to the entire United States to $1,000,000, according to my interpretation of the bill. I understand from statements made on the floor yesterday that $1,000,000, which is the maximum amount the Secretary could spend, would not carry on the office in the State of New York for 3 months. In other words, the whole Nation will have for the purpose of bridging over the temporary period only sufficient funds to carry on perhaps for a month, and I do not know whether it could be done even for a month, but, in any event, a very short time.

What could be the object of saying that the Secretary shall not have this power, unless there be a lingering fear of helping the unemployed in those States where the Governor and the State authorities refuse to comply with the Federal law. Not only is it proposed that such States shall have no assistance, but the organization in the States is to be demoralized until such time as the State shall put itself within the provisions of the law.

I hope that the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it is my opinion that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey is very important and that it strikes at the very heart and center of the pending legislation. It certainly will impair the standards, and, as the able Senator from Delaware has stated, in some States it will result in complete and widespread demoralization.

Under the present Wagner-Peyser Act the Secretary has authority, as has been stated many times on the floor, to issue rules and regulations and to prescribe standards of efficiency. The law imposes on the Secretary the duty of ascertaining whether the public employment offices maintained in each State are conducted in accordance with such rules, regulations, and standards of efficiency as are prescribed by the Director of the United States Employment Service. For the failure of any State to comply therewith the Secretary of Labor may withhold further grants to the State.

As the very able Senator from Delaware has pointed out, the effect of the pending proposal would be to close down public employment offices in the States. This would mean that there would be no method by which servicemen could be paid readjustment allowances or civilians their unemployment compensation, since the respective statutes under which these allowances are paid require that they be paid through public employment offices. So we must have public employment offices.

Mr. President, as a practical matter, the Secretary of Labor has no method by which he can require compliance with the rules and regulations which he is authorized to promulgate under the Wagner-Peyser Act. He could only close down the employment service in the State, an action which he probably would not resort to, in the face of the natural repercussions which would result therefrom. I think he would hesitate and probably refrain even in the most severe circumstances from closing down public employment agencies.

It is for this reason, because they know full well that there is no practical method of requiring compliance with such regulations or even assuring that in any State there will be maintained an effective employment service, that the State representatives have so vigorously opposed this bill, for this bill, for the first time, while precluding Federal domination and continued Federal operation,

nevertheless furnishes some method of assuring continued effective employment service programs in every State.

Mr. President, aside from the fact that the Federal Government is paying 100 percent of the cost, we have a very important stake in this problem. It seems that no one objects to the Secretary's authority to withhold funds, but when it comes to the proposition of assuring that the Federal Government's obligation under the GI bill of rights to maintain an effective employment and job counseling service for veterans is carried out there seems to be a feeling that no assurances are required. Section 9 (b) is the only real basis on which we can have reasonable assurance that there will be an effective and uninterrupted system of public employment offices in every State. The 3 months and $1,000,000 limitations in this bill preclude indefinite Federal operation but permit the continued operation of an employment service until appropriate State legislative action is taken where needed or until necessary congressional action can be taken.

Mr. President, on this particular amendment and on this particular point I have a letter from the assistant director of the national legislative service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It is one of a number of letters I have received bearing on this portion of the bill. This letter goes on to state:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 13, 1946.*

Senator JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MEAD: In the very near future, the Labor Department appropriation bill will be presented for consideration of your subcommittee. It is in regard to the House-inserted provisions relating to the return of public employment offices to the States on October 1, 1946, that I write this letter in behalf of the great veterans' organization I represent. In my testimony before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on March 19, 1946, in regard to the return of public employment offices to the States, I rightfully insisted that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States was not concerned with the ultimate control of these offices by either State or Federal Government, but that we are very much concerned with the continuation of a high standard of services to millions of unemployed veterans. We were heartened by the Senate committee's action in favorably reporting the bill, H. R. 4437, which contained a provision designed to insure certain standards of operation, which the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States recommended, and which we believe is essential in order that the veterans might continue to receive effective job placment and counseling.

Needless to say, it was somewhat disheartening to note that the House inserted provisions not only nullifying our efforts, but threatening to cause a premature return of the public employment offices without such minimum standards. An unfortunate disruption and diminution of services during the time when the United States Employment Service is carrying a peak load of veteran unemployment is inescapable.

In behalf of 1,700,000 veterans, members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and in the interests of millions of unemployed veterans, I respectfully commend to you the suggestion that the House-inserted proviso be stricken by your committee and that the question be left to separate legislation, such as H. R. 4437, reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and now on the Senate Calendar.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN C. WILLIAMSON,
Assistant Director, National Legislative Service.

As I said in the beginning, Mr. President, this is a very important matter. It strikes at the very heart and center of the bill, and the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish briefly to tell the Senate the origin of the compromise we are considering.

The administration bill introduced in both the House and the Senate provided for a wide open recapture power on the part of the Secretary of Labor. In other words, he would have been authorized under those bills, whenever he withheld funds from a State, to go into the State and operate the State system with Federal funds. The State administrators were very much afraid that such power would be used to federalize the employment service. Yet there is a case to be made for making sure that employment offices will continue to be available in any State, regardless of whether the Secretary may find it necessary to withhold certification of funds or not. The Federal Government especially has a duty in that respect now, because we have taken on a special obligation to try to help some 12,000,000 veterans to find jobs.

Therefore, in order to make sure that this particular subsection could not be used as a vehicle to federalize the system, we inserted the limitations which the Senator from Delaware recited. In other words, under this subsection the Secretary can operate a State system only for 3 months, or expend a total of $1,000,000 in a fiscal year in the whole United States, unless he meets one of two requirements. First, he must have the request of the governor of the State in writing to operate the system. It has happened in one State—I believe it was Arizona—that the State simply did not want to operate employment offices, and the Federal Government had to step in, and it did so under language inserted in an appropriation act, through an amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. It is possible such situation might arise again.

The second condition the Secretary must meet if he is to continue to operate a State system beyond 3 months is that he must get the approval, presumably, of both the Appropriations Committees and both Houses, and I do not think he can do that unless there is a flagrant failure on the part of the State to carry out the purposes of the act.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr HAYDEN. The situation in Arizona was that without action by the State legislature we could not have had a State employment service. So the Governor very properly asked the Federal Government to take care of the situation in the interim, which was done by amendment on an appropriation bill. There was no other way out of it.

As I look at this provision the Senator favors, it is a guarantee of operation in the interim between the time when the State decides that the transfer shall take place, and actual operation by the State. I think it is perfectly safe. I cannot see why there should be any objection to the provision at all. I heartily favor retaining in the bill the amendment as written.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator. I agree with him. Under the amendment I think there is absolutely no danger of what the States fear, namely, the federalization of the system. They are afraid it may give the Secretary a little too much bargaining power if he gets into a dispute with a State over a particular rule or regulation, but I think the Secretary has probably been before the Committees on Appropriations a sufficient number of times to make him know that he must have a very good case if he expects to make it stick in the committees.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does not the Senator believe that under the bill as it would be amended by the suggestion of the Senator from New Jersey the Secretary could, by raising objections to the situation in any particular State, perhaps put the State in such a position that it could not have any unemployment assistance?

Mr. BALL. The Senator from New Jersey modified his amendment, and is now moving to strike out the whole subsection. As it originally stood, with the suggestion that the first sentence be left in the bill, it would have been wide open to a recapture.

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not think the Senate understands my point. If the amendment as it would be after striking out all of subsection (b) were agreed to, suppose a difficulty arose, as the Senator suggests, between the Secretary of Labor and the authorities in any particular State. The Secretary could say, "Well, you have not complied"——

Mr. BALL. And he could withhold funds.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; he could shut off funds on any pretense whatever.

Mr. BALL. Oh, yes; he could do that.

Mr. TUNNELL. So that under the proposed amendment he would really have power to shut off assistance in any State.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to supplement the statement made by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. I think the Senator from Minnesota has stated the case very clearly as to what would happen if the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey should be agreed to.

I think we need to keep in mind the statement in the report of the Committee on Education and Labor on the bill, that in essence it is a reenactment of the Wagner-Peyser Act, with certain amendments. Although it looks as though we are presenting very long amendments, what we really have done is to present to the Senate again the

Wagner-Peyser Act almost in toto, with certain additions to it.

I think we need also to keep in mind that under the Wagner-Peyser Act, which has been in operation many years, the Employment Service has not been a State service alone, but it has been a combined Federal-State service. It was a combined Federal-State service when the matching was 50–50, 50 percent of Federal funds and 50 percent of State funds, in round numbers, at least.

Now we are considering a proposal under which the money appropriated is 100 percent Federal funds, and I think we have to keep in mind, as a Congress, that if we are appropriating on the basis of 100 percent the money of the Federal taxpayers, it is of great importance that we surround with reasonable safeguards the expenditure of the money by the States. I submit that the bill reported by the committee does exactly that, and that section 9 (b) is of great importance to an efficient administration of the bill. What will happen if a State does not meet the standards which I insist it is our obligation to see to it are set up in the bill? The people who will suffer under the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey are the unemployed individuals, many of whom are veterans, because, as the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, we now have taken unto ourselves—and rightly so—an additional employment service obligation in relation to about 12,000,000 veterans. Therefore, I think it very important that in carrying out our obligations to the veterans, when a State does not meet the standards set up in the bill, at least, there should be some period of time for a continuation of the employment service, under Federal auspices, if necessary, until the difficulty within the State can be adjusted. I think every Member of the Senate knows that when that particular problem arises in any State it will be ironed out within 90 days, because the agitation for its settlement will certainly become very strong within the 90-day period.

The proposal of the Senator from New Jersey would place a tremendous burden upon the Secretary of Labor. It would put him on the spot, so to speak. He would have to assume the responsibility either of discontinuing completely any employment service whatsoever, or going along with a State that refuses to set up such decent standards and criteria as ought to be maintained if it is to have the use of and the expenditure of the Federal funds provided for in the bill. I think it is not fair to the Secretary of Labor to put him in such a position. We have plenty of checks on him, as the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, through the Appropriations Committee. He is well aware that if he exercises any of the arbitrary tendencies which I understand the proponents of this amendment fear it might be possible for him to exercise, we have checks on him and they will be used.

But what we should not overlook, as we consider this amendment, Mr. President, are the individuals, the people who are going to benefit from an employment service. I say it is our clear duty, when a State does not meet the prescribed standards, at least to see to it that an employment service is continued, by the Federal Government, for at least 90 days, which is what the bill now provides for, or for such period as may be necessary, in accordance, however, with the specific provisions of this section itself.

I think the necessary checks and guaranties are there. I think it is a mistake to call this section, as it has been called in this debate, the so-called recapture section. What we ought to call it is "a guaranty-of-operations section." That is, a guaranty to individuals, including the veterans concerned, that until any difficulties that may arise over the criteria and the standards applied by the Secretary of Labor can be worked out, we guarantee to the individual that for a period of at least 90 days there will be an employment service. I say that we cannot justify doing less.

Therefore I submit that the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey goes to the very heart of this bill, and, if the amendment should be adopted, I take the position that in specific cases great injustice would be done to millions of individuals who ought to have the guaranty of the continuation of the service until the difficulties between the States and the Federal Government over standards in specific cases can be worked out.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in view of what the Senator from Oregon has just said I desire to say a word about what my amendment does. The Senator from Oregon is always persuasive with his fine presentations. There is no difference between us as to what we want to accomplish. I am just as eager as are those opposed to my amendment to have an effective employment service set up for our people and to make sure that there shall be no failure of such service. It is merely a question of whether we are going to accomplish that result as effectively if the Federal hand is in the State situation, rather than by allowing the States to handle their respective situations by putting in the right kind of employment systems.

My State of New Jersey has had its unemployment system for years, and it strikes me as unnecessary to have the system arbitrarily changed simply because Federal agencies think something else might be better.

Mr. President, we must put this service back in the States, because we have to decentralize this job. We cannot handle it effectively from Washington, and so far as possible I want the States to do the job. That is the reason I have offered my amendment. I do not want the possibility to exist that the work which the States should definitely do may be taken back by the Federal Government. I think it ought to be made as simple as possible for the States to share at least in putting this job over. I think it should be their job to take care of their people. I think we cannot better take care of our veterans and others who may be unemployed throughout the country than by having the States take care of them. In other words, I believe the States should assume this responsibility, that the Federal Government should help them but should not interfere with the administration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, most of those who are in favor of this section really believe in federalization of the unemployment compensation service and the employment offices throughout the country. For that purpose, this is a perfectly logical section. But I suppose we will face that issue. I imagine the Congress will face squarely, within another year probably, the question whether we wish to federalize the whole system. When that times comes the question can be determined in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the Congress. But what we are doing here is setting up a State-aid system. We have many systems of Federal aid to the States. I do not know that any of them provide as an ultimate sanction that the Federal Government shall take over and operate the particular activity which we are interested in financing. The reason for it is perfectly clear. If the ultimate sanction against the failure of the State to perform is that the Federal Government will step in and do the job itself, then there is very little incentive for the States to continue to operate. There is very little reason for a State system at all if the sanction for failure of the State to operate is Federal operation.

The whole point of the State system is that we want to encourage the States to engage in a certain activity, but if the States refuse to engage in the activity, that is the concern of the people of the State, and unless we admit that it is their concern and their choice whether they will take Federal money or not for this kind of an operation, we might as well abolish the State system. The purpose is to establish the initiative and the operation and the experimentation and the individuality of State operation in these fields. Now, if we want to federalize the job, that is another question.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator stated that this proposal is backed by those who believe in Federal control, and he referred to various systems of Federal aid to States. Can the Senator name one activity that was taken over from the States during the war in connection with which the Government is authorized to return and take over again in the event of the failure of the States to act?

Mr. TAFT. No; there are no other activities in which, so far as I know, the Federal Government is authorized to step in on the failure of the State to act, and operate it as a Federal agency. The provision of the Wagner-Peyser Act to take over if the State failed to operate a State unemployment office expired in 1938, and since that time there has been no power in the Federal Government to take over State offices.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator totally misinterprets my point of view in this

matter. I am not concerned about having this agency operated by the Federal Government at this time. That is not my concern at all. All I am concerned with is an orderly transfer from the Federal Government back to the States, and that, I presume, is also what the Senator wants to have accomplished.

Mr. TAFT. But this particular section has nothing to do with the orderly transfer back to the States. This is a provision that, after the function is transferred back to the States, the Federal Government may reclaim it.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The Senator totally misinterprets the section, as I read it. There is a provision now that this service shall go back to the States, but upon request of the governor, or some condition of that kind, the service can be carried on under Federal control pending that time. As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has very properly said, it is a guaranty of operations. It is a guaranty that the time will not come when the man out of a job in a State will have no place to go to get help.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, referring to the question of return, this is a permanent provision of law, a provision for the next 50 years. If the State does not conform to every detail and to every order of the administration, which may extend to the employment of Mr. X, how much he shall be paid, and every other detail of operation, the Federal Government is authorized to step in and operate the public employment offices. If things are not done in just the way Federal officials want them done, the Federal Government is authorized to operate the employment offices. A Secretary who is inclined to favor Federal operation will naturally use that power more freely than one who is not.

So far as the transition period is concerned, this has nothing whatever to do with the transition period. It is purely a permanent provision of law. My suggestion is this: So long as there exists a sanction with respect to the State-operated system, the system has no life of its own. It is in effect a Federal system, a system which may be made expressly a Federal system on the slightest excuse. While it is provided that the Federal Government shall not expend more than $1,000,000 or operate for more than 3 months in any fiscal year for this purpose, I take it that that provision would be inoperative if the governor said that he would like to have the Federal Government operate the system. So if we have Governors who believe in Federal operation, the Secretary can step in and use all his money to conduct a Federal system.

I admit that the only difference between this State-aid system and others is that the Federal Government supplies practically 100 percent of the funds. Why is that? It is obviously because when the social-security tax of three-tenths of 1 percent on every employer of eight or more persons throughout the United States was levied, specifically for the purpose of dealing with the problem of unemployment, it was provided that that money could be used to pay the expenses of State bureaus of unemployment compensation. It is true that technically it was a Federal tax, but it was a Federal tax raised for a particular function. That function was the operation of these offices. It was extended also to cover the cost of operation of the employment offices operated by the States, on the theory that while the money was technically Federal money, it was derived from a tax levied on the taxpayers in the States for the specific purpose of operating these offices.

In the course of administration of the Social Security Act we have collected $1,275,000,000 from the employers of the various States, as a pay-roll tax, for the purpose of dealing with unemployment. Incidentally, of that fund we have turned back to the States during that period, for the operation of the unemployment compensation offices and for the operation of the employment offices, until the Federal Government took them over during the war, only $477,000,000. So the Federal Government has made a profit from the tax, after paying all the expenses of this operation, of $798,000,000, which has gone into the General Treasury and has been used for Federal purposes. So, while I believe that a system of this sort is better on a matching basis, because I think the States ought to make some exertion of their own in raising money, to show their interest, nevertheless, the reason why it is a 100-percent grant is perfectly evident from the history of the tax of three-tenths of 1 percent.

It seems to me that in a State-aid system we must rely on the States to act. If the State should fall down and the Federal Government should cut off the funds, the State would be responsible for bringing that particular disaster on itself, and public opinion against the State would be so violent that no State would dare to fail. If it were ruled out temporarily, it would have to raise the money itself in some way, or settle the problem with the Federal Government.

What this provision does is to discourage the States from activity of their own. It removes all initiative and interest in the operation by the States of their own employment offices. It subjects them to the club of every order of the Secretary of Labor and of every traveling official representing the Secretary of Labor who comes into a State office and says, "You must do this. If you do not do it, we will take over your unemployment offices tomorrow and put you out of business, and establish a Federal operation in this State."

The States may be able to say, "You cannot do it for very long." That does not make any difference. The fact that it can be done for 3 months is a sufficient club to force every State to comply with the slightest wish of the Secretary of Labor, and utterly to deprive the States of any independence in the operation of employment offices. So it seems to me that we should rely for enforcement on the withholding of funds, and on public opinion, just as we do in connection with every other State-aid system which we have established. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to comment on some of the observations of the Senator from Ohio. As one of the supporters of the bill in its present form, I cannot be included in the category mentioned by the Senator from Ohio when he says that most of the proponents of the bill believe in federalization of the employment service. The record is perfectly clear. Time and time again the junior Senator from Oregon has voted against federalization of the employment service.

However, I cannot agree with what I think is implicit in the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], namely, that these problems are either exclusively Federal or exclusively State problems. We have never recognized this problem as a 100-percent Federal problem or a 100-percent State problem. Under the Wagner-Peyser Act we recognized it as a State and Federal problem. Many of our problems are mixed problems of Federal and State responsibility. I know of no clearer example of a mixed problem of Federal and State responsibility than the one now before the Senate involving employment services for the people of this country.

Of course, there is a responsibility on the part of the State to see to it that an employment service is maintained under this act, and that the money contributed by the Federal Government for the operation of that service, to the extent of 100 percent, is expended in accordance with reasonable standards and criteria set up in the act.

I think the Senator from Ohio will agree with me that on innumerable occasions he and I have been of one mind on the proposition that when we enact legislation of this type we ought to establish very definite standards to be followed by the States if they are to benefit from the expenditure of Federal funds. I could mention several examples. I mention one in passing. That was our joint opinion in regard to the hospital bill. I think we are pretty much of one mind on all bills which involve Federal money to be expended by the States. The States ought to meet reasonable and decent standards established by the Federal Government if they are to enjoy Federal grants in aid. I submit that that is what is sought to be accomplished by this bill. We cannot get away from the fact that 100 percent of this money is coming from the Federal Government, and that if a State does not meet certain standards the only check we have as a Federal Government is to withdraw or withhold the funds.

However, in such an event it is not the State which suffers. Unemployed men and women suffer. Unemployed individuals suffer. Unemployed human beings suffer unless there is a guaranty-of-operation clause in the bill; and that is what section 9 (b) is. It is that section which the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Ohio would strike from this bill. I say that there is provided in the bill a very definite check upon the

State to see to it that it meets decent standards. If a Secretary of Labor should abuse his rights under the bill, that would be a reflection upon us, as a Congress. If he starts to do so, then it is time for us, as a Congress, to go into action and see to it that any arbitrary action on his part is quickly stopped.

I take the position that we cannot justify handing out huge sums of money to the States and letting them spend it as they will, placing the Secretary of Labor in the position of having to make the decision either to let them spend it on the basis of subnormal standards, or to cut off the money entirely and cause individuals to suffer. This guaranty-of-operation clause would at least insure protection of individuals until the problem could be solved between the State and the Federal Government. I repeat that that clause goes to the very heart of the bill. If we strike it out, we do a great injustice to individuals.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TUNNELL. I wish to speak for a few minutes at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair). The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the amendment and I have wondered what argument could be made in support of it. The only argument in support of it which has been advanced thus far is that the Federal Government could thereby take over. That argument was suggested by the Senator from Ohio. He has said that the bill is built on the theory of those who favor a Federal employment system. I disagree with him entirely. I do not think there is the slightest ground for his position. I do not think there is anything in the bill which warrants such a statement. The bill is not built on the theory of a Federal system at all. I frankly say that I would favor such a system, but I have departed from that theory; and I think this bill meets the objections of those who favor the State systems, and I believe that a great majority of the Congress favors them.

Mr. President, those who oppose a continuous service by either the State governments or the Federal Government for the benefit of the unemployed should vote for the amendment. Those who favor a continuous service for the benefit of the unemployed should support the bill as it is now written and should oppose the amendment. Those who wish to put the States in a position to stop unemployment assistance whenever they may desire to do so and not permit the Federal Government to step in and conduct a Federal unemployment system for 3 months should favor the amendment. In other words, those who wish to strike out the unemployment system and who wish to take such a position at the expense of the unemployed should vote for the Senator's amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Can the Senator tell me the name of one State in the United States which wishes to do any harm whatever to the unemployed or which wishes to strike out or remove unemployment assistance?

Mr. TUNNELL. I am not suggesting the names of particular States. I am talking about the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, which would do just what I have said.

Mr. SMITH. I take issue with the Senator from Delaware. I know of no State which wishes to do harm to unemployed persons.

Mr. TUNNELL. I realize that the Senator from New Jersey takes issue, but I disagree with his argument.

The point is that the Senator from New Jersey proposes the amendment, and his amendment would take away from both the State and the Federal Government the right to conduct a system for the aid of the unemployed, whenever there is a difference between the State and the Federal Government as to the requirements. However, the amendment does not take away from the Secretary of Labor the right to stop the payment of funds. He has that right. He has the right to take away from a State the payment of funds for the support of the unemployment system.

The question now is, What will happen when he does that? Under the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, the Federal Government would be powerless to see that the unemployed received such assistance. Who would be benefited is more than I can understand. The unemployed would not be benefited. The employees of the State would not be benefited. Those who are employed for the purpose of trying to obtain employment for the unemployed would not be benefited. Not even those who are responsible for the appointment of the various State employees would be benefited. The State employees themselves would become unemployed, and would remain so until such time as the State might comply with the requirements. The Federal Government has that power. It retains that power through the Secretary of Labor. All this amendment attempts to do is to protect the unemployed in this service during the interim.

It has been said that there would be a great deal of State resentment and that the States would be compelled to comply. I think that is true. But in the meantime they would be without any unemployment service, under the provisions of the pending amendment. If any Senator wishes to put the unemployed in a position of having no service in a particular State, he should vote for the amendment, because that is just what it will do.

Exception is taken by the Senator from Ohio, in particular, because of the provision "Except to the extent that a system of employment offices under the control of the Secretary is operated within a State either (1) pursuant to specific request of the governor of such State," and so forth.

Now, our friends are afraid of the governors of the various States. I do not know, but I do not think they need be so fearful that the governors of the States will attempt to throw to the Federal Government the power of appointment of employees in the unemployment offices. It seems that they are afraid of the Secretary of Labor and now they are afraid of the governors of the States. They are afraid that, through some chicanery, the governors will take away from the States the right to make their own appointments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Delaware know of any governor of a State who would not welcome an opportunity to receive 100 percent Federal money for the maintenance of a State agency? Does the Senator know of any governor that would not be willing to comply with reasonable Federal standards if he could receive Federal support on such a basis and have full administrative control of the agency subject only to reasonable Federal standards? I know of none.

Mr. TUNNELL. I think the Senator is correct. The arguments in support of the amendment are simply a reduction to the absurd.

Mr. MORSE. Even the pay roll itself and the appointment of staff would be quite an inducement to any governor; would they not?

Mr. TUNNELL. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Especially so if the governor had something to say about the selection of the staff.

Mr. TUNNELL. That is correct. There is no one who would be benefited by the course advocated by the proponents of the amendment.

Mr. President, I think the States can be depended upon. As the Senator from Oregon has suggested, I do not think we need become so afraid about what the governors of the States will do in respect to those employees.

But I am pleading for the employment of the American people. I am pleading for the continuation of employment of the employees of this organization. I am pleading for the employment of the boys who come home from the armed forces. I am pleading for the employment of the unemployed throughout the Nation.

I do not think my State of Delaware or the State of New Jersey should be discriminated against because of a difficulty between the Secretary of Labor and the State authorities. I do not think our States should be deprived of that service, or that the citizens of any other States should be deprived of that service. I am not afraid of any disloyalty on the part of the governor of any State. I care not what his politics or his religion or his race may be, I think we can trust the governors of the States to be loyal to the interests of the States. I do not believe we need to strike out a protection for the unemployed of the Nation because of a fear that there may be some disloyalty on the part of a governor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Andrews	Hayden	O'Daniel
Austin	Hill	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hoey	Overton
Barkley	Huffman	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Burch	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	La Follette	Stanfill
Carville	McCarran	Stewart
Chavez	McClellan	Taft
Donnell	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McMahon	Tunnell
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
Ferguson	Mead	Walsh
Fulbright	Millikin	Wherry
Gerry	Mitchell	White
Green	Moore	Wiley
Guffey	Morse	Willis
Gurney	Murdock	Wilson
Hart	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to strike out section 9 (b) of the committee amendment on page 12.

Mr. TUNNELL and Mr. WHITE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. On this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent on official business, having been appointed to the Commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine Independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I also announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I announce that if present and voting the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the Commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—26

Austin	Hart	Smith
Brooks	Hawkes	Stanfill
Buck	Knowland	Taft
Capehart	Millikin	Wherry
Capper	Moore	White
Donnell	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ferguson	Reed	Willis
Gerry	Revercomb	Wilson
Gurney	Robertson	

NAYS—39

Aiken	Hill	Mitchell
Andrews	Hoey	Morse
Ball	Huffman	Murdock
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Carville	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Chavez	La Follette	Overton
Downey	McCarran	Russell
Eastland	McClellan	Stewart
Fulbright	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McMahon	Tunnell
Guffey	Magnuson	Wagner
Hayden	Mead	Walsh

NOT VOTING—31

Bailey	Byrd	Hickenlooper
Bilbo	Connally	Langer
Brewster	Cordon	Lucas
Bridges	Ellender	McFarland
Briggs	George	Maybank
Bushfield	Gossett	Pepper
Butler	Hatch	Radcliffe
Saltonstall	Thomas, Utah	Wheeler
Shipstead	Tobey	Young
Swift	Tydings	
Taylor	Vandenberg	

So, Mr. SMITH's amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment, was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6064) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2544. An act for the relief of Willie Hines;

H. R. 2954. An act for the relief of John Hamlet;

H. R. 3010. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Edens Nast, Mrs. Bessie Amann, and George R. Townsend;

H. R. 3565. An act to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage of transit of Government traffic over the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge; and

H. R. 5208. An act for the relief of Michael J. Keaveney and Mary C. Keaveney.

RETURN OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES TO STATE OPERATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4437) to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), and for other purposes.

Mr. MEAD. I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 7, in line 18, it is proposed to insert the following: "Funds appropriated to the United States Employment Service for the fiscal year 1947 shall be available to carry out the purposes of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR AUSTIN

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, Senator WARREN ROBINSON AUSTIN came to the Senate in 1931. At that time I had been in the Senate for quite a number of years. I remember the impression he made upon me at the time. He was a quiet, unobtrusive, dignified, and evidently a very highly educated man. He spoke very little in the Senate for a number of years.

He was, and is, a typical New Englander, a very able lawyer, and whenever he did speak, he had something to say. I was impressed with him at first, and Senator AUSTIN has grown every day he has

been in the Senate. He has been an ornament to this body ever since he has been in it. He is conservative in his views and yet at the same time liberal enough when the time comes to change. If a change is needed, he is as quick to see it as anybody and he does not hesitate to advocate it.

One of the finest characteristics about Senator AUSTIN is his lack of fear. He is not afraid to vote his convictions. I do not agree with him always but I have noticed that he votes his convictions, it makes no matter who agrees or disagrees with him.

He is a busy Senator; he is a hard working Senator; he is an effective working Senator; he is a good speaker and his views are always listened to by his brother Senators. I doubt if New England has had a more active Senator than he is, although New England Senators are ordinarily very active and quite effective, and one of them is the great leader of the Republican Party in this body.

I was greatly surprised, not that Senator AUSTIN was to be appointed as the representative of the United States of America on the Security Council of the United Nations, but that he would accept the appointment. He was so well fitted for the duties of a Senator; he fitted in so well with the senatorial system; he enjoyed the friendship and confidence of so many of his fellow Senators and was making such a success of his great office here, that I was surprised that he would be willing to go to a new field.

However, I am sure that he will carry the same vigorous determinations to succeed, the same energies, the same abilities, the same high qualifications to his new office that he has exhibited to such a high degree in his present office.

Mr. President, I wish Senator AUSTIN well. I wish him every success and happiness in his new field of labor. I think all his colleagues regreat his leaving the Senate. I doubt if there is any Senator who does not regret it. I know I regret very much that he is going to leave us. We shall miss him tremendously here, but at the same time I sincerely hope that he will enjoy his new work to the fullest.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I desire to take just a moment of the time of the Senate to express my very deep gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the President pro tempore of this great deliberative body, from which with a feeling of sorrow I am soon to depart.

I, too, remember the days 15 years ago, and I recall very well the impression which the distinguished Senator from Tennesee made upon me. I then recognized something that is more than an institution in the Senate of the United States, and that is the tremendous value of experience and even of seniority, for the distinguished Senator from Tennessee had been here taking a leading part in this body for 20 years when I came here 15 years ago. Many times he and I were found opposed to each other upon very important legislation. On the other hand, many times, I admired him in those early days for the pioneering, judgment, skill, and real power that he exercised.

He can well be called the father of the air-mail transportation system, for it was he who was the author of the first appropriation for it, and it happened that that was an appropriation for a line which led northward from Washington to my own home section. It was relatively a very small amount of money—$100,000—but rapidly, stimulated by his efforts in the United States Senate, this remarkable instrumentality of communication developed. I shall always think of him as being one of those great statesmen who had the vision early to promote this wonderful institution of progress—the systematic, regular, scheduled transportation of the mails of the United States by air.

I say we were found opposed to each other sometimes. So it was when he was pioneering another great project—TVA. I was opposed to his views upon that matter, but I must say that in debate he knew where an opponent's jugular vein was, yet the rapier which he carried never let any blood. If a rose was not on the tip of it, it was found somewhere, and today it seems very comforting, inspiring, and gives me confidence when I find it is not one rose but a whole bouquet of roses that comes to me from this very distinguished and very much loved friend.

RETURN OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES TO STATE OPERATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4437) to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), and for other purposes.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it in title II?

Mr. DONNELL. In title III.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will withhold the offer of the amendment for a moment until we finish with title II, then he will be recognized.

If there are no further perfecting amendments to title II, the question is: Shall the Senate agree to the committee amendment, title II, as amended?

Title II, the committee amendment as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention, if I may, of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], who have presented this bill. On page 15 of the bill——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Missouri permit the Chair to interrupt him again? The Chair finds there are committee amendments to title III, which take precedence over the Senator's amendment, and after they are disposed of the Senator will be recognized.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment in title III.

The first committee amendment in title III was, on page 15, line 3, after "(1)", to insert "(a)".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, in line 5, after the word "who", to insert "(on the day preceding the effective dates of the transfer of the employment offices to the State under this act)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, in line 14, after the word "terminated", to insert "under the applicable State merit system."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, in line 17, after the word "separated", to strike out "after they have been given a reasonable opportunity", and insert "(A) if they have failed."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the amendment that I had in mind offering has reference to the committee amendment which is now before us, and I am wondering——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment is in order.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall not present the amendment at this time. I understand the committee amendment has precedence, but I should like to address myself to the committee amendment, namely, the committee amendment just stated by the clerk. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Delaware with respect to this situation. The committee amendment in lines 17 and 18 strikes out the words "after they have been given a reasonable opportunity", and inserts "(A) if they have failed." Then subsequently, in lines 23 and 24, after striking out the word "positions" it is proposed to insert certain language italicized down to the word "or."

Mr. President, the effect of the particular portion of the bill set forth in subdivision (1) of section 301 is to make provision for the retention in the State-wide system of public employment offices of employees of the Federal Government who have been employed in State and local service functions in such State, and so forth; with certain distinct exceptions: First, that individuals so transferred from the Federal Government back to the State government "may be separated or terminated"—and by those terms I understand that they may no longer be allowed to work for the State government "for good cause as determined in individual cases under the applicable State merit system."

The second exception to the retention is that they may be "separated or terminated under the applicable State merit system by reason of reductions in force found necessary in the interests of efficient operations."

The third exception to the retention of Federal employees is that which is the subject of this particular committee amendment. In the committee amendment the exception is that the Federal employees may be separated or relieved from further employment "if they have failed to acquire eligibility for continued employment in the State-wide system of public employment offices after having been given a reasonable opportunity to acquire such eligibility."

The effect of this amendment is illustrated by the following example: If a Federal employee takes an examination

along with other persons who desire the same position and fails to pass the examination, he may be discharged or let out. But if he passes the examination along with others, he has an automatic preference by which he stays in, regardless of the fact that the other persons who pass the examination may have greater experience, may have higher grades, or may for any other reason be preferred to the Federal employee.

The language as it came over from the House of Representatives provided that such employees "may be separated after they have been given a reasonable opportunity to acquire eligibility for continued employment in the State-wide system of public-employment offices under the State merit system in the positions occupied by them under the Federal service or in reasonably comparable positions."

It seems to me that adequate preference is given to the Federal employee by the provision as it came from the House of Representatives, for under that provision he may be separated from employment in the event he has had reasonable opportunity to acquire eligibility and has failed to do so. But under the committee amendment, as I have indicated, if he takes the examination and passes the examination, he has an automatic retention of his position, regardless of whether the State desires him to be separated or not.

I am hoping that the Senator in charge of the bill may consent to substitute for the language of the committee amendment that which was contained in the House provision. That would mean striking out, on page 15, in line 18, "(A) if they have failed" and inserting in lieu thereof "after they have been given a reasonable opportunity"; also, in lines 23 and 24, the words to be striken out would be "positions, after having been given a reasonable opportunity to acquire such eligibility," and there would be inserted in lieu thereof the word "positions." I respectfully inquire whether the Senator in charge of the bill would be willing to accept the House language in lieu of the language of the committee amendment?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Missouri has not quite correctly interpreted the effect of the amendment. As the language came over from the House, it would give the employees transferred absolutely no protection whatever in their jobs, no matter what they did in a civil-service examination, even though they might pass at the head of the list. Once they had been given a reasonable opportunity to acquire eligibility, the State would be perfectly free to fire, dismiss, or to retain them, as it wished.

There was considerable pressure on the committee to require the States to agree to blanket all these Federal employees into the State service on the basis of merely a qualifying examination. The Senator from Missouri has interpreted this language as meaning that. However, it does not. In the merit system parlance there is a difference between qualifying and becoming eligible for appointment. What this language means is that if the individual now holding a job in the State system, after it is transferred, takes a competitive civil-service examination in competition with all the others who are trying for that job—and in most cases there will be from 10 to 100 positions in the same classification, and probably several hundred competing for them—and passes the competitive examination with a sufficiently high grade, considering veterans' preference, which applies to most of these positions, so that under the State merit system he is among the top three or four who are certified for appointment, the State must agree to appoint him. If the individual now in the position passes a competitive examination with a high enough grade so that he is among the top three certified, the State must agree to keep him in that position or a comparable position. This provision would not give him the right merely to pass a qualifying and noncompetitive examination and be blanketed into State employment. It seems to me that that is a reasonable protection in the interest of continuity of service to give those who have joined the service since it was transferred to the Federal Government.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Minnesota has correctly interpreted the language. That is the very ground on which I object to the committee amendment. As I see it, the language of the committee amendment means that if John Smith were employed in the Federal work, and the activity were transferred to the State, if he took an examination along with 300 others, and passed the examination among the first three who would be qualified for appointment under the State act, it would be obligatory upon the State to appoint him, regardless of the comparative grades of the other two who would be eligible for appointment. It seems to me that that is an undue preference.

In my opinion, the language in the House provision gives sufficient preference to Federal employees. The House language makes it possible for the Federal employee to take an examination in the grade which he has attained in Federal employment, whereas, as I understand, under the State merit system, otherwise an individual would have to take an examination at the foot of the ladder, for the lowest grade of employment open under the State merit system. So the system provided by the House language would give to the Federal employee a very considerable advantage, because it would entitle him to take the examination in the grade at which he was employed in the Federal service. The objection I have is the very fact which the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, namely, that after he takes the examination and is found to be among the first three, the other two of whom may have a very much higher grade than he has, may have had greater experience than he has had, and may for excellent reasons be preferable, the State would be obliged to blanket him into State employment. For that reason I do not believe that the committee amendment should be sustained.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that this amendment would afford protection to employees who have joined the State services since the Federal Government took them over. Of course, once they are appointed the State can discharge them at any time it wishes to do so. But it is provided that they shall be given an appointment if they pass an examination high enough to be among the top three certified for appointment. We are doing much less for the employees than the Federal Government did for the State employees when it took over the services, because the Government, by Executive order blanketed all the State employees of the State services into the Federal civil service, at their then grades, without any examination—not even a qualifying examination. It seems to me that the 14,000 persons involved are entitled to at least the consideration given them by the committee amendment. The House language gives them absolutely no protection. It simply provides that they shall have an opportunity to become eligible. Once they have had the opportunity, the State has no further obligation under the House language.

I hope the committee amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 15, beginning on line 17, after the word "separated" and ending with the word "eligibility" in line 24. [Putting the question.]

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. This vote is on the committee amendment, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. A division has been called for.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Is the effect of the action just taken to reinstate the content of the House bill at that point, in lieu of the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; that is the effect of the vote.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is it in order to move to reconsider the action just taken by the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is. Does the Senator make a motion to reconsider?

Mr. MORSE. I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator who has made the motion to reconsider was upon the losing side; was he not?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in the absence of a yea-and-nay vote, any Senator may move to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is eligible to make the motion to reconsider.

Mr. MORSE. So, Mr. President, I have moved that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was rejected.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Murray
Andrews	Hart	Myers
Austin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Bridges	Hoey	Reed
Brooks	Huffman	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Bushfield	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Stanfill
Capper	La Follette	Stewart
Carville	McCarran	Swift
Chavez	McClellan	Taft
Donnell	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McMahon	Tunnell
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
Ferguson	Mead	Walsh
Fulbright	Millikin	Wherry
George	Mitchell	White
Gerry	Moore	Wiley
Green	Morse	Willis
Guffey	Murdock	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 15 was disagreed to.

Mr. MORSE. On this question I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Do I understand that a vote "yea" will be to sustain the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And a vote "nay" would sustain the position of the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Is the motion of the Senator from Oregon debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is debatable.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the pending question on the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Missouri was agreed to?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; it is a motion to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 15, line 17, was rejected.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the language on which we are about to vote is on page 15, in line 17, after the word "separated", beginning with the word "after" and ending in line 24 with the word "eligibility." That is one of the transfer provisions relating to employees of State services who were hired since the Federal Government took over the services, and have no status in the State merit system. Under the House language of the bill those individuals might be separated from the service after having been given a reasonable opportunity to acquire eligibility. All the language of the committee amendment would afford to those persons—and there are some 14,000 of them—is the right to take a competitive examination under the State civil-service system in their respective States. If they pass highest on the list, very well. There would be no obligation, whatever, of the State to retain them once they had been given an opportunity to take the examination and did not pass with high grades. They are not to be blanketed in under a qualifying examination, but after they take a competitive examination, if they pass the examination high enough so that they are among the top three or four to be certified for appointment, the State then is under the obligation to appoint them and retain them in the positions which they have held, or in comparable position. That situation will obtain only so long as their services are satisfactory. Even though they have once been appointed, they still may be separated from their employment under the State system. What the committee amendment does is only to give them a right to continue in their original employment if they pass a competitive examination with a sufficiently high grade. The examination is a competitive one and not a qualifying one. Their ratings must be high enough to place them among the top three to be certified.

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. STANFILL. I should like to have the Senator explain to me how he arrives at the conclusion that if a person takes the examination and receives a rating which places him among the top three or four applicants, that person is eligible to appointment.

Mr. BALL. That is not provided for in the bill, because the State merit system must apply. There is a general provision in most civil service State laws that the civil service commission shall certify the top three applicants for appointment.

Mr. STANFILL. Suppose a person who has been a Federal employee should take the examination together with 10 or 12 other persons, and that he received a grade which placed him fifth or sixth man from the top of the list. Would the law give him the right to the job?

Mr. BALL. No; not unless he receives a grade which is high enough to be certified by the Civil Service Commission, or whatever the commission may be in the State which handles such matters. He must pass the examination with a grade sufficiently high to enable him to be certified for appointment.

Mr. STANFILL. According to the State law.

Mr. BALL. Yes. Usually that means that he must be among the three top candidates.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say only a word. Quite apart from the merits of the proposal which the Senator from Minnesota has been discussing, I believe it is apparent that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] took the first opportunity which was offered him to move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 15 had been rejected. It seems to me that that comity which does and should prevail between Senators should accord him a right to have a vote taken on his motion, so that the merits of the amendment may be passed upon in that manner.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if I understand correctly what we are trying to do, is to return the State employment offices to the States, as we promised to do.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

In view of the excellent suggestion which has been made by the minority leader, if it is within my power to do so I consent to the reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment on page 15 was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have already been ordered. It will require unanimous consent to vacate the order for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the subject which we are discussing is one which concerns the return of employment agencies to the respective States. If we are going to return them, and I am certain that we are, let us return them in as nearly the same condition as they were in when we took them over in 1942. Likewise, let us return them to the States on the basis of allowing the States to employ their own personnel under their own rules and regulations. Why tie the hands of the Governors of the respective States and establish rules and regulations by which they must employ this person or that person?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. In view of the fact that unanimous consent has been given to vacate the order for the yeas and nays, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider so that we can proceed with the discussion of the merits concerning which the Senator from Indiana is addressing the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states that the motion to reconsider has already been agreed to by unanimous consent.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will vote to eliminate the committee amendment and permit the 48 States to choose their own employees and operate their own business so far as employment offices are concerned.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to be heard briefly on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment is in section 301 (1) (a) under title III. Subdivision 1 of that section relates to a requirement that the State must, in order to secure moneys under the employment service appropriations, make provision for the transfer and retention in the State-wide system of public employment offices, of employees of the Federal Government, who, on the date preceding the effective date of the transfer of the public employment offices to the State under this bill, had been employed locally, and that they shall continue their employment in the State-wide system of public employment offices under the State merit systems in the positions occupied by them under the Federal service, or in reasonably comparable positions.

Subdivision 1 proceeds to make three exceptions to this mandatory requirement for transfer to and retention in the State-wide system of public employment offices. Those exceptions are, first, that individuals so transferred back to the States "may be separated or terminated for good cause as determined in individual cases under the applicable State merit system"; second, that they may be "separated or terminated under the applicable State merit system by reason of reductions in force found necessary in the interests of efficient operation"; and, third, may be separated, according to the committee amendment, "if they have failed to acquire eligibility for continued employment in the State-wide system of public employment offices under the State merit system in the positions occupied by them under the Federal service or in reasonably comparable positions, after having been given a reasonable opportunity to acquire such eligibility."

Mr. President, as I understand, the effect of subsection 1 is, first, that an obligation is cast upon the States to consent to the transfer back to them and to the retention by them in State public employment offices of employees of the Federal Government, except these three classes I have mentioned, and unless a person comes within one of those exemptions, the State must retain him.

The first exception relates to a case where a man may be terminated for good cause. There is no objection to that.

Second, he may be terminated by reason of reductions in force found necessary in the interest of efficient operations.

There is only one other contingency in which a Federal employee may be dismissed from his job by the State, and under the committee amendment that third exception is in a case where the individual has failed to acquire eligibility for continued employment.

Mr. President, the effect of that is best indicated by an illustration. Let us take the case of a Federal employee who goes back to the State of Illinois, we will say, and passes an examination, which is given by the State of Illinois merit system authorities, and let us suppose he is among the first three of the persons who pass the examination, that is to say, the first three in point of grades; but let us suppose he is the third as among the three. Under the statute as it would be written under the committee amendment it would be obligatory on the State authorities of Illinois to retain that man, even though there were two others of the three who had acquired eligibility, who had higher grades, who may have had long experience, who might be better qualified than he would be under the law and under the facts to occupy the position.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What effect, in the opinion of my able colleague from Missouri, would that have on a veteran's preference?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, that is covered on the next page. I do not think that is affected by the provision to which I am referring. Subdivision (b), on page 16, again under subsection (1), requires that the States shall have—

made provision for the extension to employees of the Federal Government who left employment-service positions in such State in order to perform training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States or service in the merchant marine.

I may point out that there is an "or" which appears between "(A)" and "(B)" on page 15. It is my understanding that the language on page 16 makes adequate provision for those who have been in the war. If I am mistaken in that, I have no doubt the Senator from Minnesota or the Senator from Delaware will correct me, and I pause for such correction, if either of them thinks I am in error.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That point covers a man in the Federal service who is a veteran; but does it not give him more or less of a superpriority against a veteran who has not been in the Federal service but otherwise might be considered by a State for employment?

Mr. DONNELL. That may be. I think perhaps the Senator from Minnesota could better answer that question than can I.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. BALL. No; it gives him no superpriority at all. It merely says that if he is an employee who was employed in the State service after the Federal Government took it over and left the service to go into the armed forces and returned after the employment services were transferred back to the States he shall have the same rights he would have had if he had returned one day before the services were turned back. It gives him no super rights at all.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the point I make, boiled down, is simply this: That under the language of the committee amendment, unless the Federal employee shall fail to acquire eligibility by continued employment—or, for illustration, in the case I have cited, failed to be one of the first three in point of grades—unless he fails, he cannot be separated from the employment, whereas, as I see it, under the House provision, he may be separated from the employment after he has been given a reasonable opportunity to acquire eligibility.

In my judgment, the recommendation of the committee to the Senate gives this man not only the right to take an examination in the higher grade in which he is employed in the Federal work, but, in addition to that, in the illustration which I have suggested, if he is one of the first three, he has an absolute preference as against the other two who are within the three, even though the other two may each have higher grades, and be better qualified, in the judgment of the State director, than is the Federal employee.

Mr. President, to my mind that is not advisable. To my mind, it is more preferable to adopt the House language, which likewise guarantees to the employee a reasonable opportunity to acquire eligibility, but does not require that he shall be continued in the service of the State if after he has acquired eligibility the appointing authorities may deem it advisable to appoint one of the other two I have mentioned in the illustration.

Mr. BALL obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The point I wish to cover is not the case of a man who has been in the Federal or State service and has left to go into the armed services and has returned. The point I wish to have cleared up is this: If there is a man in the Federal service who was not in the armed services, and there is a person outside of the employment service who was in the armed services and has come to take his civil-service examination, and normally would be entitled to a veteran's preference, having served in the armed forces, is he foreclosed from getting a job because a man who has been in the Federal service has a priority over him?

Mr. BALL. No; I do not think so, because the applicable State law would apply, and I think a great many State laws provide that a veteran who is certified for appointment cannot be passed over; he has an absolute preference.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is what I wish to make clear, and I want the record here to show that that is the intent, so that if this matter ever comes up in the courts we will be sure to have the legislative intent indicated, that the veteran is not being pushed aside and

deprived of the rights he normally would have under veterans' preference.

Mr. BALL. That is correct. If a State law gives him absolute preference, if he is in the top three certified, or four, or five, or whatever the number may be, and has absolutely a right to the appointment, then the State law applies, because we specifically provide that the whole proceeding is under the State merit system, and obviously in such a case the holder of the position has not acquired eligibility because someone else has prior eligibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 15, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 17, after the word "separated", it is proposed to strike out "after they have been given a reasonable opportunity," and insert "(A) if they have failed"; and on line 22, after the word "comparable", to strike out "postions" and insert "positions, after having been given a reasonable opportunity to acquire such eligibility."

Mr. BALL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withdraw his request if the yeas and nays are ordered?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DONNELL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. A vote "yea" is in favor of the committee amendment, and a vote "nay" is against the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The yeas and nays having been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent on official business, having been appointed to the Commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I also announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—43

Aiken	Hill	Murdock
Andrews	Hoey	Murray
Ball	Huffman	Myers
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Overton
Chavez	Kilgore	Russell
Downey	Knowland	Smith
Eastland	La Follette	Stewart
Ferguson	McClellan	Swift
Fulbright	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
George	McMahon	Tunnell
Gerry	Magnuson	Wagner
Gossett	Mead	Walsh
Guffey	Mitchell	
Hayden	Morse	

NAYS—24

Austin	Gurney	Robertson
Brooks	Hart	Stanfill
Buck	Hawkes	Taft
Bushfield	Millikin	Wherry
Capehart	Moore	White
Capper	O'Daniel	Wiley
Carville	Reed	Willis
Donnell	Revercomb	Wilson

NOT VOTING—29

Bailey	Green	Saltonstall
Bilbo	Hatch	Shipstead
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Taylor
Bridges	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Briggs	Lucas	Tobey
Butler	McCarran	Tydings
Byrd	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Wheeler
Cordon	Pepper	Young
Ellender	Radcliffe	

So the committee amendment on page 15, in lines 22, 23, and 24, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Without objection, the remainder of the committee amendment, beginning in line 24, on page 15, and ending in line 12, on page 16, is agreed to.

The committee amendment so agreed to was, on page 15, in line 24, after the previous amendment, to insert: "or (B) if the Secretary has determined that it is impracticable for them to be given an opportunity to acquire such eligibility; and (b) has made provision for the extension to employees of the Federal Government who left employment-service positions in such State in order to perform training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States or service in the merchant marine as defined in Public Law No. 87, Seventy-eighth Congress, of the same employment rights and privileges as those provided for Federal employees transferring to State employment in accordance with the provisions of this section."

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following conference report, which was ordered to lie on the table:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 1 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1946' and substituting 'June 30, 1947.'

"SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1946' and substituting 'June 30, 1947.'

"SEC. 3. Title I of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 1 thereof a new section as follows:

"'PURPOSES AND POLICIES IN THE TRANSITION PERIOD

"'SEC. 1A. (a) Objectives: The Congress hereby affirms—

"'(1) that because of abnormally excess spending power in relation to the presently

available supply of commodities, rapid attainment of production equal to the public demand is one of the necessary and urgent objectives for the prevention of inflation and for the achievement of a reasonable stability in the general level of prices and rents, cost of living and costs of production (including labor costs), for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act and for the further purposes of protecting the real value of benefits provided by law for veterans and their dependents, of keeping faith with purchasers of United States War Bonds, and of making possible a successful transition to a peacetime economy of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power under a system of free enterprise;

"'(2) that unnecessary or unduly prolonged controls over prices and rents and use of subsidies would be inconsistent with the return to such a peacetime economy and would tend to repress and prevent the attainment of this and the other goals herein declared; and

"'(3) that adequate prices are necessary stimulants to the production thus desired and the expeditious attainment of said goals.

"'(b) Declaration of decontrol policy: Therefore it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the Office of Price Administration, and other agencies of the Government, shall use their price, subsidy, and other powers to promote the earliest practicable balance between production and the demand therefor of commodities under their control, and that the general control of prices and the use of subsidy powers shall, subject to other specific provisions of this act, be terminated as rapidly as possible consistent with the policies and purposes set forth in this section and in no extent later than June 30, 1947, and on that date the Office of Price Administration shall be abolished.

"'(c) Recommendations by the President to the Congress: (1) As soon as practicable after the enactment of this section and in any event on or before January 15, 1947, the President shall recommend to the Congress such further legislation as in his judgment is needed to establish monetary, fiscal, and other policies which are adequate to supplement the control of prices and wages during the balance of the fiscal year 1947, and to insure that general control of prices and wages can be terminated by the end of that fiscal year without danger of inflation thereafter.

"'(2) On or before April 1, 1947, the President shall report to the Congress what, if any, commodities or classes of commodities, including housing accommodations, are in such critically short supply as to necessitate, in his judgment, the continuance of the powers granted by this act as to them after June 30, 1947, together with his recommendations as to established departments or agencies of the Government (other than the Office of Price Administration) which should be charged with the administration of such powers.

"'(d) Decontrol of nonagricultural commodities: (1) On or before December 31, 1946, the Administrator shall decontrol all nonagricultural commodities not important in relation to business costs or living costs, and prior to that date shall proceed with such decontrol as rapidly as, in his judgment, will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect. In no event shall maximum prices be maintained after December 31, 1946, for any nonagricultural commodity or class of commodities unless the same has been expressly found by the Administrator to be important in relation to business costs or living costs.

"'(2) The Administrator shall provide for the prompt removal of maximum prices in the case of any nonagricultural commodity whenever the supply thereof exceeds or is in approximate balance with the demand therefor (including appropriate inventory requirements).

"'(3) Whenever, after a reasonable test period, it appears that the supply of a nonagricultural commodity which has been decontrolled is no longer consistent with the applicable decontrol standard, the Administrator, with the advance consent in writing of the Price Decontrol Board established under subsection (h), shall reestablish such maximum prices for the commodity, consistent with applicable provisions of law, as in his judgment may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"'(e) Agricultural commodities: (1) On the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than thirty days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify to the Price Administrator each agricultural commodity which such Secretary determines to be in short supply. Thereafter, on the first day of each succeeding calendar month the Secretary shall certify modifications of such certification by adding other agricultural commodities which have become in short supply and by removing from such certification such commodities which he determines are no longer in short supply. No maximum price shall be applicable with respect to any agricultural commodity during any calendar month which begins more than thirty days after the date of enactment or this section, unless such commodity is certified to the Price Administrator under this paragraph as being in short supply.

"'(2) (A) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that maximum prices applicable to any agricultural commodity which is in short supply are impeding the necessary production of such commodity, he may recommend to the Price Administrator such adjustments in such maximum prices as the Secretary determines to be necessary to attain the necessary production of such commodity.

"'(B) The Secretary of Agriculture by December 31, 1946, shall recommend to the Price Administrator the removal of maximum prices on all agricultural commodities, whether or not in short supply, not important in relation to business costs or living costs, and prior to that date shall make such recommendations as rapidly as, in his judgment, will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect.

"'(C) Within ten days after the receipt of any recommendation under this subsection for the adjustment of maximum prices applicable to any agricultural commodity, or for the removal of maximum prices on agricultural commodities not important in relation to business costs or living costs, the Price Administrator shall adjust or remove such maximum prices in accordance with such recommendations.

"'(3) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that an agricultural commodity with respect to which maximum prices have been removed is in short supply and that the reestablishment of maximum prices with respect thereto is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act, the Secretary, with the written consent of the Price Decontrol Board, may recommend to the Administrator, and the Administrator shall establish, such maximum prices with respect to such commodity, consistent with applicable provisions of law, as in the judgment of the Secretary are necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"'(4) For the purposes of this section—

"'(A) an agricultural commodity shall be deemed to be in short supply unless the supply of such commodity equals or exceeds the requirements for such commodity for the current marketing season;

"'(B) the term "agricultural commodity" shall be deemed to mean any agricultural commodity and any food or feed product processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity.

"'(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law, except as provided in subsection (h), the Secretary of Agriculture, in exercising his functions under this Act, shall not be subject to the direction or control of any other appointive officer or agency in the executive branch of the Government, and no such officer or agency shall undertake to exercise any direction or control over the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the exercise of such functions. The Secretary of Agriculture may at any time withdraw his approval of any action with respect to which his approval is required under this Act, and upon the withdrawal of his approval such action shall be rescinded.

"'(6) No maximum price and no regulation or order under this Act or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, shall be applicable with respect to any agricultural commodity, or any service rendered with respect to any agricultural commodity, unless a regulation or order establishing a maximum price with respect to such commodity had been issued under this Act prior to April 1, 1946.

"'(f) Saving provision: Nothing in this section shall limit the Administrator's authority to remove maximum prices for any nonagricultural commodity, or any agricultural commodity with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, at an earlier time than would be required by this section, if in his judgment or in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be, such action would be consistent with the purposes of this section.

"'(g) Petitions for decontrol: (1) If in the judgment of the industry advisory committee appointed by the Administrator in accordance with section 2 (a) of this Act to advise and consult with respect to a commodity, the standards set forth in this section require the removal of maximum prices for such commodity, it may file a petition for the removal of such maximum prices. In the case of any nonagricultural commodity, such petition shall be filed with the Administrator in accordance with regulations prescribed by him. In the case of agricultural commodities, such petition shall be filed with the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with regulations prescribed by him and shall request that he make an appropriate certification or recommendation to the Price Administrator. The petition shall specifically state the grounds upon which the committee believes such action to be required and shall be accompanied by affidavits or other written evidence in support thereof:

"'(2) Within fifteen days after receiving a petition filed in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, the Administrator or the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be, shall either grant the petition or inform the committee in writing why in his judgment the standards for decontrol stated in subsections (d) and (e) have not been satisfied with respect to the commodity involved. If the petition is not granted in full, the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, shall, within ten days after the receipt of a request by the committee for further consideration of its petition, hold a hearing before himself or before a deputy administrator (or, in the case of the Secretary, before such officer as he may designate) at which the committee may present its argument in support of the petition. The Consumers Advisory Committee and the Labor Advisory Committee appointed by the Administrator shall be given notice of any such hearing and an opportunity to present their views with respect to the petition and may, not later than five days prior to such hearing, present in writing evidence relat-

ing thereto. Within fifteen days after such hearing, the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, shall either grant the petition in full or furnish the industry advisory committee with a statement in writing of his reasons for denying it in whole or in part, together with a statement of any economic data or other facts of which he has taken official notice in connection with such denial.

"'(3) At any time within thirty days after the denial in whole or in part, following a hearing, of a petition filed under this subsection, the petitioning industry advisory committee may petition the Price Decontrol Board established under subsection (h) for a review of the action of the Administrator or the Secretary of Agriculture. If the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, fails to act upon a petition within the time prescribed by paragraph (2), the industry advisory committee may, at any time within thirty days after the expiration of the time so prescribed, petition the Price Decontrol Board for the removal of maximum prices on the commodity involved.

"'(4) Nothing in this section shall be construed to take away or impair any right of any person to protest, in accordance with the provisions of sections 203 and 204 of this Act, the further maintenance of maximum prices for a commodity under the standards of subsection (d) or (e): *Provided*, That the filing of such a protest or of a petition under paragraph 3 of this subsection shall not be grounds for staying any proceeding brought pursuant to section 205 of this Act or section 37 of the Criminal Code, and no retroactive effect shall be given to any judgment setting aside a provision of a regulation, order, or price schedule under the standards set forth in this section.

"'(h) Price decontrol board: (1) There is hereby established as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government a Price Decontrol Board, to be composed of three members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two members of the Board shall be members of the same political party. Two members of the Board shall constitute a quorum, and a vacancy in the membership of the Board shall not impair the power of the remaining members to exercise its functions. Members of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 a year.

"'(2) The Board shall appoint and fix the compensation of a secretary for the Board and such other officers and employees as may be necessary to enable it to perform its functions. The Board may make such expenditures as may be necessary for performing its functions. The Board may, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, utilize the facilities, services, and personnel of other agencies or departments of the Government. The Board shall maintain an office in charge of its secretary in the District of Columbia, which shall be open on all business days for the receipt of petitions for review and the transaction of other business of the Board. The Board shall prescribe regulations and procedures for the conduct of its business which will provide for summary disposition, with the utmost expedition consistent with sound decision, of petitions filed with the Board.

"'(3) A petition made under subsection (g) (3) shall specifically state the grounds upon which the petitioning industry advisory committee believes that maximum prices on the commodity involved should be removed. A copy of such petition shall forthwith be served on the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, who shall within such time as may be fixed by the Board certify and file with the Board a transcript of such portions of the proceedings in connection with the petition under subsection (g) as are material. Such transcript shall include a statement in writing of the Administrator's or Secretary's reasons for believing that maximum prices on the commodity involved should not be removed, together with a statement of any economic data or other facts of which he has taken official notice. At the earliest practicable time the Board shall conduct a hearing upon the petition, at which the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, and the committee shall be given an opportunity to present their views and argument orally or in writing. If application is made to the Board by either party for leave to introduce additional evidence, the Board may permit such evidence to be introduced or filed with it if it deems it material and determines that such evidence could not reasonably have been offered or included in the proceedings under subsection (g). At the earliest practicable time after the hearing on any petition, the Board shall make and issue an order specifying the extent, if any, to which maximum prices on the commodity involved shall be removed. The Board shall order the removal of such maximum prices if and to the extent that in its judgment the standards of decontrol stated in subsection (d) or (e) have been satisfied with respect to the commodity involved. The Administrator shall remove maximum prices with respect to the commodity in question within such time and to such extent as shall be specified in the order of the Board. Orders of the Board shall not be subject to modification or review by any other department or agency or by any court.

"'(4) No petition may be filed with the Board with respect to any commodity within a period of three months after the issuance of an order of the Board with respect to the same commodity.

"'(5) The members of the Board may serve as such without regard to the provisions of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C., secs. 198 and 203) or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, except insofar as such sections may prohibit any such member from receiving compensation in respect of any particular matter which is within the jurisdiction of the Board.

"'(6) If the number of petitions filed with the Board should at any time become so great as to prevent the Board from promptly conducting hearings upon such petitions, the Board shall appoint such hearing commissioners as it deems necessary in order to expedite the transaction of its business. The Board may authorize one or more of the hearing commissioners so appointed to conduct the hearing upon any petition under this subsection and to exercise the authority of the Board with respect to such hearing. After a hearing conducted before a hearing commissioner, the commissioner shall make recommendations consistent with this subsection to the Board concerning its action with respect to the petition. If the Board approves such recommendations, it shall issue an order in conformity therewith. If the Board does not approve such recommendations, the Board may issue such order as it deems proper upon the record or may conduct a new hearing upon the petition before the Board.'

"SEC. 4. Section 2 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In administering the provisions of this subsection relating to the establishment of industry advisory committee, the Administrator, upon the request of a substantial portion of the industry in any region, shall promptly appoint a regional industry advisory committee for such region.'

"SEC. 5. Section 2 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"'After the date upon which this paragraph takes effect, the Administrator, when establishing rent ceilings on hotels or when passing upon applications for adjustments of rent ceilings on hotels, is authorized to take into consideration the distinction between transient hotels and residential or apartment hotels, including the difference in the investment, operation, expenses, and mechanical details of operation between the transient hotels and the residential and apartment hotels, and is directed to classify separately by regulation (1) transient hotels, (2) residential and apartment hotels, and (3) tourist courts, rooming houses, and boarding houses.'

"SEC. 6. (a) The last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply with respect to operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation: *Provided*, That with respect to such corporations and such operations, the making of subsidy payments and buying for resale at a loss shall be limited as follows:

"Payments and purchases may be made with respect to operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, which involve subsidies and anticipated losses as follows:

"(1) With respect to rubber produced in Latin America and Africa for which commitments were made before January 1, 1946, $31,000,000.

"(2) With respect to copper, lead, and zinc, in the form of premium price payments, $100,000,000: *Provided*, That (A) premiums shall be paid on ores mined or removed from mine dumps or tailing piles before July 1, 1947, though shipped and/or processed and marketed subsequently thereto; and that (B) the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc shall be extended until June 30, 1947, on terms not less favorable to the producer than heretofore and (i) adjustments shall be made to encourage exploration and development work, (ii) adequate allowances shall be made for depreciation and depletion, and (iii) all classes of premiums shall be noncancelable unless necessary in order to make individual adjustments of income to specific mines.

"(3) With respect to purchases by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, of such tin ores and concentrates as it deems necessary to insure continued operation of the Texas City tin smelter.

"(4) With respect to noncrop programs, 1946 crop program operations and the 1947 crop program operations relating to sugar, flour, petroleum, petroleum products, and other domestic and imported materials and commodities, $869,000,000: *Provided*, That the operations authorized under this subparagraph (4) shall be progressively reduced, shall be terminated not later than April 1, 1947, and shall not cost more than $629,000,000 during the last six months of the calendar year 1946. Operations shall not be carried out under authority of this subparagraph (4) with respect to any commodity for any period during which maximum prices on such commodity are not in effect under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended: *Provided*, That subsidies with respect to petroleum produced from stripper wells may be continued at not to exceed the existing rates. No new subsidy or purchase and sale operations shall be undertaken under the authority of this subparagraph (4), and no change shall be made in the basis of any existing operations for which funds are made available under this subparagraph which will increase the rate of any subsidy or the rate of loss incurred with respect to any commodity.

"(b) When any direct or indirect subsidy to an industry is reduced or terminated, any maximum price applicable to the product affected shall be correspondingly increased,

except in the case of transportation subsidies and differential subsidies to high-cost producers.

"(c) Where roll-back subsidies have previously been or presently are in effect, and have been discontinued, or shall hereafter be discontinued, the industries which have received such subsidies shall be permitted to increase their ceiling prices at least an amount equivalent to the amount of the discontinued roll-back subsidy. Such price increase shall become effective either upon discontinuance of the roll-back subsidy or upon passage of this Act, whichever date is the later. For the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'roll-back subsidies' means subsidy payments, or purchases and sales of a commodity at a loss by the Government of the United States (including any Government-owned or controlled corporation), or contracts therefor, which resulted directly or indirectly in the lowering of ceiling prices below the maximum price levels established by the Office of Price Administration prior to the institution of the subsidy payments or purchases and sales at a loss, or the execution of the contracts therefor, whichever date is the earlier.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the provisions of Public Laws 30, 88, 164, and 328 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, or to prevent the use of the sums authorized in such laws to fulfill obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1946, with respect to operations prior to such date.

"(e) Nothwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions of this section 6, 1946 and 1947 crop program operations with respect to sugar, may, while maximum prices are in effect with respect to sugar, be continued until such crops are processed and distributed, and the cost of 1946 crop program operations with respect to sugar may be charged to the funds authorized by Public Law 30, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended by Public Law 328, Seventy-ninth Congress. For the purpose of this section 6, no subsidy program operation on sugar shall be considered to be a new subsidy.

"(f) Nothing in this section shall be construed as a limitation upon operations authorized by the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946 (Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress).

"SEC. 7. Section 2 (i) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(i) For the purposes of this Act and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, fish and other sea foods shall be deemed to be agriculture commodities, and commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from fish or other sea foods shall be deemed to be manufactured in whole or substantial part from agricultural commodities: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 3 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, shall not be applicable with respect to fish and other sea foods and commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, but the maximum price established for any fish or sea food commodity or for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom shall not be below the average price therefor in the year 1942.'

"SEC. 8. Section 2 (j) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: 'or (5) as authorizing any regulation or order of the Administrator to fix a quantity or percentage of any product which any seller may sell to any buyer.'

"SEC. 9. Section 2 (k) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting the words 'or any operator of any service establishment' after the words 'seller of goods at retail.'

"SEC. 10. Section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(o) No maximum price shall be applicable to any item served in any restaurant or other eating establishment if such item consists in whole or major part of a commodity to which no maximum price is applicable with respect to sales to restaurants and other eating establishments, unless the maximum price of such item, when sold by such restaurant or other eating establishment, is determined, under the applicable maximum price regulation or order, by the addition of a customary margin to the acquisition cost of such item.

"'(p) After July 1, 1946, no maximum price regulation or order shall be issued or continued in effect requiring any seller to limit his sales by any weighted average price limitation based on his previous sales.

"'(q) In the case of any retail industry, the principal sales of which consisted during the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive, of sales of a commodity or commodities the production or retail distribution of which has been reduced, for a period of three years beginning on or after March 2, 1942, by 75 per centum or more below such production or retail distribution for the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive, as a result of the operation of any governmental regulation or restriction, the Administrator shall not, in establishing maximum prices under this section, reduce established peacetime retail trade discounts or mark-ups or dealer handling charges for any such commodity before the retail unit sales of such commodity for a period of six months shall have reached the average annual retail unit sales thereof for the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive.

"'(r) In the case of any wholesale industry, the principal sales of which consisted during the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive, of sales of a commodity or commodities, the production or wholesale distribution of which has been reduced for a period of three years beginning on or after March 2, 1942, by 75 per centum or more below such production or wholesale distribution for the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive, as the result of the operation of any governmental regulation or restriction, the Administrator shall not in establishing maximum prices under this section reduce established wholesale trade discounts or normal wholesale mark-ups for any such commodity prevailing on March 2, 1942, before the wholesale unit sales of such commodity for a period of six months shall have reached the average annual wholesale unit sales thereof for the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive.

"'(s) No maximum price regulation or order shall require the reduction of the established peacetime discounts or mark-ups for the sale of any manufactured or processed commodity (treating as a single commodity for the purposes of this paragraph all commodities in a line of related commodities which, for the purpose of establishing manufacturers' and processors' maximum prices, have been placed by the Office of Price Administration under a single regulation) if the retail, wholesale, or other distributive trade selling such commodity shows that the commodity constituted approximately one-half or more of the gross sales income of a majority of the persons engaged in such trade in 1945 and that, in the first quarter of 1946, the deliveries of such commodity to such distributive trade were less than 100 per centum of the deliveries thereof in the corresponding quarter of 1945.

"'(t) No maximum price applicable to any distributor, wholesaler, or retailer, shall be established or maintained for any commodity below a price which will return to such distributor, wholesaler, or retailer with respect to such commodity his January 1, 1946 discount or the sum of (1) total current cost of acquisition plus (2) his January 1, 1946 mark-up. The January 1, 1946 discount or mark-up shall be the percentage discount or percentage mark-up of such distributor, wholesaler, or retailer in effect on January 1, 1946.

"'(u) After the date upon which this subsection takes effect, no maximum price shall be established or maintained, under this Act or under any other provision of law, with respect to any new commodity when the Administrator upon application finds that its use, in the production, manufacturing, or processing of any commodity or commodities, without increasing the cost to the ultimate user, either increases the life or reduces the cost of production, manufacture, or processing of the commodity or commodities produced, manufactured or processed. As used in this subsection the term "new commodity" means a commodity which was not commercially or industrially available prior to January 30, 1942.'

"SEC. 11. The Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 5 thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 6. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of this Act or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, but only after the procedure prescribed in subsection (d) hereof, no maximum price applicable to any producer, manufacturer, or processor shall be established or maintained for any product below the price of such producer, manufacturer, or processor for such product during the base period, increased by an amount equal to (or by a percentage factor which on a weighted average basis is equal to) the increase in the weighted average of the per unit costs of a reasonable number of typical producers, manufacturers, or processors with respect to such product since the base period, but if such product as now produced, manufactured, or processed has a different size, quality, or other characteristic, then with appropriate adjustments for such differences. This section shall not apply with respect to any new product which was not produced, manufactured, or processed in the base period, nor with respect to any product if the weighted average per unit costs of a reasonable number of typical producers, manufacturers, or processors with respect to such product has decreased since the base period. In determining costs for the purposes of this section, all costs shall be included which are considered as such under the established accounting practices of the industry.

"'(b) For the purposes of this section—

"'(1) in the case of any product with respect to which a maximum price established by a price schedule issued pursuant to any Executive order was in effect between October 1 and October 15, 1941, the "base period" shall be the two-week period immediately preceding the date upon which a maximum price so established first became effective with respect to such product; and

"'(2) in the case of any other product, the "base period" shall be the period between October 1 and October 15, 1941,

except that, if in the case of any product there were no prevailing prices during the period prescribed in clause (1) or (2), as the case may be, or the prevailing prices during such period were not generally representative because of abnormal or seasonal market conditions or other cause, the base period shall be the nearest period not exceeding 60 days, in which, in the judgment of the Administrator, the prevailing prices were substantially normal.

"'(c) As used in this section, "product" shall mean any major item, or any article different in character from other products of the industry; but all the styles, models, or other varieties of any such item or article shall be considered as one product.

"'(d) Any industry advisory committee may apply to the Administrator for the application to any product of the standard set forth in subsection (a) hereof, and shall present with the application comprehensive

evidence with relation to the increase in cost of such product from the base period to the date of such application. The Administrator shall consider the evidence so presented and all evidence otherwise available to him and shall, within sixty days after the receipt of such application, determine the increase in the weighted average of the per unit costs of a reasonable number of typical producers, manufacturers, or processors with respect to such product since the base period and announce the amount of such increase. Such increase in weighted average of the per unit costs may be determined and announced in terms of a specified sum per unit or in terms of a percentage factor, as the Administrator may elect. In determining such weighted average of the per unit costs of producers, manufacturers, or processors, it shall not be necessary to obtain detailed cost accounting figures from any producer, manufacturer, or processor who does not already have such figures or to obtain the usual detailed accounting reports from more than a reasonable number of typical producers, manufacturers, and processors, but the Administrator shall promptly reach a conclusion from the best evidence available to him. He shall exclude from his calculations any producers, manufacturers, or processors whose costs by reason of special conditions are completely abnormal. If the Administrator fails to determine and announce the increase in the weighted average of the per unit costs for any product within the sixty-day period prescribed in this subsection, the industry advisory committee concerned may petition the Emergency Court of Appeals, created pursuant to section 204, for relief; and such court shall have jurisdiction by appropriate order to require the Administrator to determine and announce such increase within such time, not to exceed thirty days, as may be fixed by the court. If the Administrator fails to determine and announce such increase within the time so fixed, no maximum price shall thereafter be applicable with respect to any sale of such product by any seller.

"'(e) Whenever the Administrator has announced the increase in the weighted average of the per unit costs for any product under subsection (d), it shall be lawful for any producer, manufacturer, or processor to sell such product at the price per unit he charged in the base period, plus the increase per unit so announced by the Administrator, with appropriate adjustments for differences in size, quality, or other characteristics.

"'(f) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, in the case of any agricultural commodity, the base period shall be the calendar year 1941, and in lieu of computing the maximum prices required or permitted by this section by adding the increase in the weighted average of per unit costs to the base period prices of particular producers, such maximum prices shall be computed by adding such increase to the average 1941 price for such agricultural commodity (with appropriate adjustments for grade location, and seasonal differentials) as determined and announced by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"'(g) The provisions of this section shall not apply with respect to any maximum price applicable to manufacturers or processors in the case of products made in whole or major part from cotton or cotton yarn or wool or wool yarn.'

"SEC. 12. (a) The second sentence of section 205 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'In any action under this subsection, the seller shall be liable for reasonable attorney's fees and costs as determined by the court, plus whichever of the following sums is greater: (1) Such amount not more than three times the amount of the overcharge, or the overcharges, upon which the action is based as the court in its discretion may determine, or (2) an amount not less than $25 nor more than $50, as the court in its discretion may determine: *Provided, however,* That such amount shall be the amount of the overcharge or overcharges if the defendant proves that the violation of the regulation, order, or price schedule in question was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation.'

"(b) Section 205 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'The Administrator may not institute any action under this subsection on behalf of the United States, or, if such action has been instituted, the Administrator shall withdraw the same—

"'(1) if the violation arose because the person selling the commodity acted upon and in accordance with the written advice and instructions of the Administrator or any regional administrator or district director of the Office of Price Administration; or

"'(2) if the violation arose out of the sale of a commodity to any agency of the Government, or to any public housing authority whose operations are supervised or financed in whole or in part by any agency of the Government, and such sale was made pursuant to the lowest bid made in response to an invitation for competitive bids.

"'The Administrator shall not institute or maintain any enforcement action under this subsection against any manufacturer of apparel items where the Administrator shall determine (1) that the transactions on which such proceeding is based consisted of the manufacturer's selling such an item at his published March 1942 price list prices instead of his March 1942 delivered prices, and (2) that the seller's customary pricing patterns for related apparel items would be distorted by a requirement that his ceilings be the March 1942 delivered prices. The Administrator's determinations under this paragraph shall be subject to review by the Emergency Court of Appeals in accordance with sections 203 and 204.'

"SEC. 13. The third sentence of paragraph (2) of section 205 (f) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'If any such court finds that such person has violated any of the provisions of such license, regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement after the receipt of the warning notice, such court shall issue an order suspending the license to the extent that it authorizes such person to sell the commodity or commodities in connection with which the violation has occurred, or to the extent that it authorizes such person to sell any commodity or commodities with respect to which a regulation or order issued under section 2, or a price schedule effective in accordance with the provisions of section 206, is applicable; but no suspension shall be for a period of more than twelve months, and if the defendant proves that the violation in question was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation, then in that event no suspension shall be ordered or directed.'

"SEC. 14. Section 3 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'On and after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, it shall be unlawful to establish, or maintain, any maximum price applicable to manufacturers or processors, for any major item in the case of products made in whole or major part from cotton or cotton yarn or wool or wool yarn, unless the maximum price for such major item is fixed and maintained at not less than the sum of the following:

"'(1) The cotton or wool cost (which must be computed at not less than the parity price or the current cost, whichever is greater, of the grade and staple of cotton or wool used in such item, delivered at the mill);

"'(2) A weighted average of mill conversion costs; and

"'(3) A reasonable profit (which shall not be less than a weighted average profit for each unit of such item equal to the weighted average of the profit earned on an equivalent unit of such item during the period 1939 to 1941, both inclusive).'

"SEC. 15. The Secretary of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation or otherwise, is hereby authorized to allocate feed which he controls to feeders of livestock and poultry in domestic areas which he may determine to be in an emergency shortage condition with respect to animal and poultry feed.

"SEC. 16. (a) In the event producers of wheat are required by an order issued pursuant to the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, to sell all or any part of wheat delivered to an elevator prior to April 1, 1947, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall offer to purchase the wheat so required to be sold at a price determined as follows: The purchase price paid for the wheat shall be the market price at the point of delivery as of any date the producer may elect between the date of delivery and March 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided, however,* That only one election may be made for each lot of wheat: *And provided further,* That the producer may not elect a date prior to the date on which he mails a written notice to Commodity Credit Corporation of his election. In the event the producer does not notify Commodity Credit Corporation in writing by March 31, 1947, of his election of a date for determining the market price, such date shall be deemed to be March 31, 1947.

"(b) Any producer of wheat who, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, has sold any wheat pursuant to the requirements of paragraph (ee) (1) of War Food Order Numbered 144, may, at any time within thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act, pay to the Commodity Credit Corporation a sum equal to the amount for which he sold such wheat. Any producer paying any such sum to the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be deemed to have sold and delivered to the Commodity Credit Corporation as of the date he pays such sum a quantity of wheat equal in grade and quality to the quantity sold by him pursuant to such requirements and the purchase price to be paid to him for such wheat shall be determined in the same manner as in the case of a sale of wheat to the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

"SEC. 17. This Act may be cited as the 'Price Control Extension Act of 1946.'

"SEC. 18. The provisions of this Act shall take effect upon the date of its enactment; but insofar as such provisions require any change in any maximum price, such provisions shall not be deemed to require such change to be made before the thirtieth day following the date of enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ROBERT F. WAGNER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
CHAS. W. TOBEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
WM. B. BARRY,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RETURN OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES TO STATE OPERATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4437) to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of

Congress approved June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next committee amendment was, on page 16, in line 13, after the words "detail of", to strike out "such employees" and insert "the employees referred to in paragraph (1) (a) of this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BALL. Was the language of the committee amendment beginning in line 24, at the bottom of page 15, with the word "or", and ending in line 12 on page 16 with the word "section", adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment was agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 16, in line 15, after the word "following", to strike out "proviso: *Provided further,* That so" and insert "provisions. So."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, in line 18 after the word "necessary", to strike out "are authorized to be made" and insert "shall be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, in line 22, after the words "prior to the", to strike out "enactment of this act" and insert "effective date of the transfer of the employment offices to the State under this act)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, in line 3, after the words "opportunity to", to strike out "qualify" and insert "acquire eligibility."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, in line 5, after the word "this", to strike out "paragraph" and insert "section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, in line 11, after the word "amended", to insert "by this act."

Mr. DONNELL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it in order at this time to offer an amendment to subdivision (2) of section 301?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not until the committee amendments have been completed. It will be in order to offer an amendment at that time.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 17, line 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 24, to insert the following:

SEC. 303. The Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first paragraph of section 5 thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"Service rendered with a State employment security agency between June 6, 1933, and January 1, 1942, by any person who was appointed to a position in the Social Security Board under Executive Order 8990 of December 23, 1941, on or after January 1, 1942, shall for the purposes of this act, be considered service as an employee of the United States, subject to the following limitations: This paragraph shall not apply with respect to any period of such service rendered by any individual with the State employment security agency of any State (1) unless he shall have served continuously as an officer or employee of the United States for at least 1 year after December 31, 1941 (except that this limitation shall not apply in the case of any individual automatically separated from the service under section 2 of this act prior to the date of enactment of this paragraph); (2) if he shall have returned to employment with such State at any time prior to the end of 1 year after the return to State operation of the employment offices in such State; (3) if such period of such service is used in computing a retirement or similar benefit payable in whole or in part out of funds provided by a State or political subdivision under a retirement system. The annuity of any person to whom this paragraph applies and who shall have been retired under the provisions of this act, shall be recomputed whenever such recomputation is necessary to give effect to the provisions of this paragraph. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, any person who was appointed to a position in the Social Security Board under Executive Order 8990 of December 23, 1941, and who shall have returned to employment with the State at any time prior to the end of 1 year after the return to State operation of the employment offices in such State, shall, if he so elects, be paid a refund of the total amount of his deductions and deposits under this act, together with interest to the date of termination of his service with the Federal Government; and such person shall not receive any annuity benefits under this act based on the service covered by the refund unless he is subsequently reinstated, retransferred, or reappointed to a position coming within the purview of this act and redeposits all moneys, except voluntary contributions, so refunded to him, together with interest at 4 per centum compounded on December 31 of each year, except that interest shall not be required covering any period of separation from the service. As used in this paragraph, the term 'State employment security agency' means an agency to which the Federal Government has made grant for administrative expenses for the administration of State unemployment compensation laws or State employment services, under the act entitled 'An act to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes', approved June 6, 1933, as amended (or under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended), and the term 'State' includes Alaska and Hawaii."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is all one committee amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 7, to strike out title IV, as follows:

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. For the purpose of determining what officer or agency of the Government is to perform any of the functions of the Secretary of Labor under this act and the act of June 6, 1933, as amended and supplemented, after the termination of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, the vesting by this act and by the act of June 6, 1933, as amended and supplemented, of functions in the Secretary of Labor shall have the same effect as if constituting a transfer by the President under title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, of functions of the Social Security Board to the Secretary of Labor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, on page 17, line 7, at the end thereof, I move to strike out the period and insert the following: "; or (3) has arranged to comply with (1) or (2) above to the extent permitted under the law of such State."

Mr. President, the basis of this amendment is my understanding that at least in one State—and it may well be in others—there are presently existing provisions of law which are contrary to a portion of the committee amendment thus far adopted. The particular illustration I have before me is in the State of Massachusetts. There is a statute in Massachusetts, namely, chapter 535, approved June 12, 1943, which contains this language:

All employees, except as otherwise provided in this section, in the division of employment security who had been appointed on a permanent basis, including employees who had not completed their probationary period, and whose employment in the service of the Commonwealth was terminated on December 31, 1941, by reason of Executive Order No. 8990, issued by the President of the United States on December 23, 1941, and who, for the purpose of service during the existing state of war, were inducted into the United States Employment Service, shall be reinstated in the division of employment security or its successor, providing the offices or positions formerly held by them are reestablished in the division of employment security or its successor.

Mr. President, as I understand the effect of subdivision (1) in section 301, it is that a person now a Federal employee may not be separated from the service except for one of the three grounds referred to a while ago in the course of the debate.

In the State of Massachusetts it would seem from what I have thus far read from chapter 535 of the laws of Massachusetts that the returning veteran would under the law of Massachusetts have an absolute right to reinstatement. Therefore, the amendment which I propose is, in effect, that the State must, in its plan, either make provision for the retention in the Statewide system, as provided in subsection (1), or request the detail of such employee, as provided in subsection (2), or arrange to comply with subsection (1) or subsection (2) to the extent permitted under the law of such State. That is the reason for offering this amendment, and I respectfully move its adoption.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator to read his amendment again.

Mr. DONNELL. On page 17, at the end of line 7, it is proposed to strike out the period, and insert a semicolon and the following language:

or (3) has arranged to comply with (1) or (2) above to the extent permitted under the law of such State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, the committee has had no opportunity to examine the amendment; but I am advised that the effect would be to nullify subsection (1) and (2).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] a question. Earlier in the day I was called from the Chamber for a conference. Apparently while I was absent action was taken on section 3, on page 5, line 18, with regard to maintenance of a farm placement service. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if that means that the powers of the Secretary of Agriculture over farm labor, as they have existed under the Wagner-Peyser Act, are now to be transferred to the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. BALL. That language is now in the Wagner-Peyser Act, and has been ever since 1933. What happened was that during the war the Appropriations Committee recommended special legislation placing the farm placement service in the Department of Agriculture. As I understand, that legislation in the appropriation expires on January 1, 1947. However, I believe that a joint resolution extending it through the next fiscal year is to be introduced in both Houses before we adjourn.

Early in the next session we hope to arrive at some kind of a permanent solution to the farm placement problem. As the Senator perhaps knows, in a number of States the Secretary of Agriculture is now contracting with the United States Employment Service to handle some or all of the farm placement functions. The situation is pretty much confused. We wanted to preserve in this act the basic authority to maintain a farm placement service until we dispose of the question by permanent legislation. Otherwise there will be no legislative authority.

Mr. MORSE. In order that there may be no misunderstanding I should like to ask the Senator one further question. Am I correct in understanding that if this bill passes, containing the language in lines 18 and 19 on page 5 with reference to the maintenance of a farm placement service, the present administrative function of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to farm labor will be continued?

Mr. BALL. It will remain unchanged. That is my understanding and interpretation.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is important to have that understanding for legal interpretation of the bill. I am perfectly willing to accept that understanding for the present and not press for further changes in the law until, as the Senator from Minnesota has suggested, we can take up a permanent measure in regard to a placement service for farm workers. With that understanding, all I ask permission to do at the present time is to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from the Oregon State Farmers' Association on this point, in which is set out clear evidence that the farmers of the Nation would consider it very disruptive to have the present powers of the Secretary of Agriculture transferred, as of now, to the Secretary of Labor. But with the assurance of the Senator from Minnesota that that would not be the result of the bill in its present form, I will not press the question further. I offer the letter, with the statement that I wish to be associated with the arguments set forth in the letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON STATE FARMERS' ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg., June 25, 1946.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Pursuant to my conversation with you today, I would like to submit the following information.

A national conference which has been in session during the past week is composed of about 50 men representing agricultural interests in 36 States. They have come together for the purpose of attempting to acquaint executive officials of the Department of Agriculture, Senators, and Congressmen with the desires of agriculture with respect to agricultural labor, both for the present emergency and for the long-range program to follow. These two problems are closely tied together and it is difficult to consider them as separate problems.

As you will recall, last fall when representatives from various groups of agriculture obtained reenactment of Public Law No. 229 for the continuation of the imported labor program for the year 1946, commitment was made to Congress that those groups represented at that time would attempt to get a wider representation and make known to Congress during the fall of 1946 their desires for a long-range program.

The desire by the Members of Congress to adjourn this present session in July disrupted plans of agriculture with regard to the presentation of a farm-labor program this fall. It then became the best judgment of this group that since they wish very much to hold the nucleus of the present program for consideration in the long-range program, and in view of the fact that liquidation of the present program by December 31, 1946, would require the Labor Branch of the Department of Agriculture to commence repatriation of foreign workers early in the fall and at the same time start liquidation of all property, housing and camps held by the Labor Branch. This would remove workers and housing facilities from most areas during the peak of harvest and in some areas before the harvest actually began.

In view of these facts, it was felt it would be necessary to ask Congress to extend the authority of the present Labor Branch of the Department of Agriculture to June 30, 1947. We requested Congressman FLANNAGAN'S committee to consider the request, and, as a result, Mr. FLANNAGAN introduced a continuing resolution (H. R. 6828). This bill is now on the calendar of the House. At the same time, Congressman CANNON'S committee requested the Department of Agriculture to submit a budget for this 6-month period (January 1 through June 30, 1947).

The conference has appointed a committee with representatives from all sections of the United States to request consideration of all States interested to submit proposals for such permanent domestic labor program, and this committee will meet on September 9, 1946, to combine the proposals from the various sections of the United States into a proposal to be laid before Congress for its consideration.

With regard to this permanent program, agriculture is unanimous that they do not wish to have agricultural labor transferred out of the Department of Agriculture, but are very desirous of maintaining an agricultural labor program in the Department of Agriculture because of the following reasons:

1. Previous to the war, under the various State employment service organizations, agriculture was relegated to a back-seat position. Industry was consistently and constantly given the best workers and no referrals to agriculture were made until industries' needs were met or successful placement could not be made, which resulted in agriculture receiving a very low-grade type of worker, if at all.

2. We feel that a domestic labor program properly coordinating the needs of the agricultural-producing areas of the United States to meet planting, cultivation, and harvesting can and will result in a better wage and higher earnings, with the resultant raising of annual incomes of agricultural workers which will assist materially in raising the type of worker attracted to agriculture.

3. The type of direction and the thought given by the Labor Department is slanted entirely toward the organized industrial worker, which is a very different concept of management and direction than that required in agriculture and which we believe is not the type that can in any way be imposed upon agricultural labor to any degree of success, either to the worker or the employer.

4. Likewise, it is proposed to transfer the authority of our agricultural labor camps to the supervision of the Federal Housing Administration. As you know, Senator, their authority is wide and is to furnish housing for all types of people and workers, and since many of our agricultural farm labor camps are not used by agricultural laborers a small portion of each year, we believe that under the authority of Federal Housing Administration they would fill these camps during the slack periods with industrial workers with the result that in very few years these camps would all be used only by urban populations,

For these reasons we seek your assistance in preventing the passage of House Joint Resolution 4437 with the clause beginning on page 5, line 18, continuing for four lines thereafter, which transfers all this activity to the Department of Labor, giving additional broad powers never possessed by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of Labor. We are very fearful of the consequences of the Secretary of Labor having any authority over agricultural labor, much less the broadened and increased powers in this amendment.

We appreciate your indulgence in considering our problem and respectfully seek your continued support of our efforts in seeking a satisfactory solution to the problems of agriculture.

If any further information is desired do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. TOLBERT,
Executive Secretary, Oregon State Farmers' Association.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. Before offering it, I should like to perfect it by correcting a slight error. In line 7 of the amendment appears the figure "491." It should be "49", followed by a lower-case letter "l."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified accordingly. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, after line 3, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 19 on page 14, being titles I and II, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

The Secretary of Labor shall provide for the return to State operation not later than December 31, 1946, or such earlier date as he may deem feasible, of public employment offices in an orderly and expeditious manner, which offices shall thereafter be operated

under and in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to January 1, 1942 (29 U. S. C. 49–491): *Provided*, That no State shall be required to make any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of said act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to January 1, 1942, prior to July 1, 1948.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the committee amendment, as it is now before the Senate, consists of three titles, titles I, II, and III. The amendment which I have proposed undertakes to strike out title I and title II, and to substitute the language set forth in the amendment, which has been read by the clerk.

It will be observed that this amendment directs the Secretary of Labor to "provide for the return to State operation not later than December 31, 1946, or such earlier date as he may deem feasible, of public employment offices in an orderly and expeditious manner, which offices shall thereafter be operated under and in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to January 1, 1942 * * *: *Provided*, That no State shall be required to make any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of said act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to January 1, 1942, prior to July 1, 1948."

This amendment proceeds upon the fundamental proposition that the Federal Government should return to the States the employment-service facilities in the condition in which they were received, and subject to the law under which they were received, except only for such necessary incidental transitional provisions as may be required.

The act which is referred to in the amendment, the act of June 6, 1933, is the Wagner-Peyser Act. It will be observed that the amendment proposes that the services, after being returned to the States not later than December 31, 1946, shall be operated under and in accordance with the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act, as it was amended to January 1, 1942. January 1, 1942, was the date on which the various services were taken over by the Federal Government.

Yesterday I spoke at some length in regard to the theory upon which this amendment was predicated, and I shall endeavor to make my remarks as brief as possible.

The turning over of these facilities to the Federal Government occurred pursuant to a telegraphic message sent by the President of the United States on December 19, 1941, to the Governors of the respective States. That message was read yesterday to the Senate. As Senators may recall, it refers to the fact that the country was actually at war, "and it is more than ever necessary that we utilize to the fullest possible extent all the manpower and womanpower of this country to increase our production of war materials."

The message further referred to the fact that "this result can be accomplished by centralizing recruiting work into one agency." Pursuant to the request of the President, thus communicated to the Governors of the several States, each and every Governor complied with the request and turned over the State facilities to the United States Government through telegrams or such other messages as were deemed appropriate by the Governors.

I invite attention to the fact that the Governors of the several States have uniformly understood that the transaction by which these facilities were turned over to the Federal Government constituted not a gift, not an irrevocable transfer of title, but a loan. Yesterday I called attention to a number of telegrams from Governors of various States with respect to this transaction, and with respect to their views as to the conditions under which the facilities should be returned to the respective States.

I also called attention to the fact that the Federal Government itself considered the transaction to be a loan. It was pointed out yesterday that the Senate has passed upon this very proposition several times. On page 24 of Public Law No. 124, approved by the President on July 3, 1945, the following provision appears:

> That the Employment Service facilities, property, and personnel loaned by the States to the United States Employment Service, shall be returned to the States not later than 3 months after the termination of hostilities in the war with Japan as determined by Presidential proclamation or by concurrent resolution of Congress.

As pointed out yesterday, not only was that act passed by the Congress, but it was approved by the President. Thus, both the executive and the legislative departments of the Government recognized the fact that the transaction by which the facilities were turned over to the United States was a loan.

I also pointed out that in the general Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 the Senate used the following language:

> The Employment Service facilities, property, and personnel loaned by the States to the United States Employment Service, shall be returned to the States not later than 90 days after the enactment of this act.

Then, Mr. President, in this connection I pointed out finally, on yesterday, that by the conference report which relates to House bill 4407, the so-called rescission bill, the managers appointed on the part of the House of Representatives used the following language:

> No. 21, relating to the United States Employment Service: Accepts the Senate provision for returning to the States the employment services which were loaned to the Federal Government at the beginning of 1942, pursuant to the request of the President, but provides for an outside return date of 100 days after the enactment of the bill, instead of 120 days, as the Senate amendment proposed.

So Mr. President, I take it that there can be no question that the transaction was a loan; and by reason of that fact, there follows without question the legal conclusion that the property should be returned to the owners, the States, in substantially the same situation and certainly under the same laws as were applicable at the time when it was taken over by the Federal Government.

I shall not undertake this afternoon to read again the numerous telegrams which were presented here yesterday from the governors of the various States of the United States. Those telegrams reflect these views. However, I should like to mention briefly the fact that the committee amendment to House bill 4437 does not constitute a return of these facilities to the States in the condition in which they were received or under the law under which those facilities were received by the United States Government. There are a number of very important differences between the conditions imposed by House bill 4437 and the conditions under which the facilities were received by the Federal Government. For instance, subsection (b) of section 9, on page 12 of the bill, authorizes the Secretary of Labor, in the event of failure on the part of the States to be eligible for funds, thereupon to step in and operate the system for the State during the period prescribed; and by the request of the governor of the State, as has been pointed out on the floor of the Senate, that may be an indefinite period. That provision is a very marked and very material difference from the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act as amended up to January 1, 1942. It will be remembered that in the latter measure, namely, the one which was in existence at the time when these facilities were taken over by the Federal Government, there was no provision whatsoever—except a temporary provision set forth therein, which has been referred to today—by which the Federal Government could take posession of the facilities and could operate them. Section 9 of the Wagner-Peyser Act provided, not for a taking over and possession, but for a revocation of existing certificates under which moneys were to be paid to the States by the Federal Government in the event of a violation of the plans which had been approved under the act. So, Mr. President, House bill 4437, in this very important respect, which has been debated at such length this afternoon in the Senate, differs very materially from the law as it existed at the time when these facilities were taken over on January 1, 1942.

Mr. President, I have referred to plans, and I used the word "plans." That word is taken from the Wagner-Peyser Act. Here again we find a highly important difference between the provisions of House bill 4437 and the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act. The Wagner-Peyser Act in section 8 provides that any State desiring to receive the benefits of the act shall, by the agency designated to cooperate with the United States Employment Service, submit to the Director detailed plans for carrying out the provisions of the act within such State. It further provides that if such plans are in conformity with the provisions of the act and are reasonably appropriate and adequate to carry out its purposes, they shall be approved by the Director, and due notice of the approval shall be given to the State agency. Then the language with reference to the power of the Director of the bureau in the Department of Labor to revoke existing certificates or to withhold further certificates by which money shall be paid provides that the power of revocation shall apply whenever he shall determine, as to any State, that the cooperating State agency "has

not properly expended the money paid to it or the moneys herein required to be appropriated by said State, in accordance with plans approved under this act." I emphasize the latter provision.

Mr. President, it is true that House bill 4437, as a result of one of the committee amendments, does provide an option on the part of the agency in each State to submit to the Secretary detailed plans for carrying out the provisions of this act, and does provide that if such plans are in conformity with the provisions of this act and are reasonable appropriate and adequate to carry out its purposes they shall be approved by the Secretary and due notice of such approval shall be given to the State agency. But, Mr. President, when House bill 4437, as it is now before the Senate, and as reported by the committee, comes down to the subject of the sanctions to be imposed for violation by the State of some obligations on its part, all reference to the plans is eliminated.

In the Wagner-Peyser Act a variation from the plans which had been approved under the act was the decisive feature under which the director was authorized to revoke certificates or to refuse to give future certificates, but under House bill 4437, when we come to the sanctions provided under the bill, instead of a reference to plans, reference is made to the rules and regulations which shall have been prescribed by the Secretary of Labor. It is true that in the Wagner-Peyser Act there is a very clear reference, as I pointed out twice yesterday, to rules and regulations, and an obligation is vested in the director of the bureau to promulgate such rules and regulations. But when it comes to the important phase of the sanctions under the bill the Wagner-Peyser Act refers, as I have indicated, to the plans which have been submitted and approved by the State agency, whereas House bill 4437, as now before the Senate, does not refer to the plans, but refers to the rules and regulations which shall have been promulgated as provided in the bill.

So, Mr. President, not only in the case of subsection (b) of section 9, on page 12, but in regard to the matter of plans, as distinguished from rules and regulations which may be changed from day to day or from week to week, there is a very material difference between the law as it stood on January 1, 1942, and the law which would be created by House bill 4437 if the amendment which I have submitted is not adopted.

There are other provisions which constitute differences, but I shall not undertake to detail all of them. However, I should like to mention an important one. House bill 4437 undertakes to place in the Department of Labor—and would do so if the bill is enacted into law—the operation of the Federal facilities in connection with the employment office feature of the measure, whereas under the law as it existed on January 1, 1942, due to the fact that the Wagner-Peyser Act had been amended by the Reorganization Act of 1939, the power of administration of the facilities, insofar as the Federal Government was concerned, was vested in the Social Security Board. According to the very best advice I have been able to secure, in the event that House bill 4437 is enacted into law, it will place in the Department of Labor the management of these facilities and the control of the facilities, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, as distinguished from the Social Security Board, under the jurisdiction of which it existed on January 1, 1942.

Mr. President, I also call attention to the fact that while, today, the work of this particular branch of our governmental agency is in the Department of Labor, nevertheless, it is solely by reason of the fact that there exist directives issued by the President under the War Powers Act that that is true; and so soon as the War Powers Act terminates, as I understand the situation, the further administration by the Federal Government relative to the Employment Service will automatically revert, not to the Department of Labor, but to the Social Security Board, under the legislation existing on January 1, 1942.

Mr. President, I invite attention to these illustrative and very important instances of variation between the law as it existed on January 1, 1942, and as it would be created by House bill 4437 as reported by the committee and as now pending before the Senate.

I return to the statement which I made at the outset, namely, that my amendment is based on the theory that the Federal Government should return to the respective States the facilities in the condition in which it received them, subject only to such necessary incidental provisions as may be required in order to bring about the transfer to the States of the particular facilities in question.

Title III of this bill is not affected by my amendment. It is, of course, obvious that some provision should be made for transferring to the States the Federal employees who are today working in these services. Title III, with the various amendments which have today been agreed to, takes care of that situation. I have no quarrel with title III, although I disagree with certain of its contents. The ultimate general effect of it is to take care of the incidental matters to which I have referred. However, I do most strenuously object to titles I and II, because they violate the principle that these facilities should be returned to the States in the same condition as they were in when they were received by the Federal Government, at the request of the President of the United States, on January 1, 1942.

In the amendment which I have offered, Mr. President, there is a proviso that no State shall be required to make any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of the Wagner-Peyser Act of June 6, 1933, as amended to January 1, 1942, prior to July 1, 1948. The purpose of the proviso is this: The various States have been hoping, and governors in their meetings at Hershey, Pa., and at Mackinac Island have been putting themselves on record as being in favor of returning the facilities to the States. However, they have been notified of no date on which the facilities are to be returned. Thus it is that the States cannot be expected as of this date to have made provision by way of appropriations for their respective portions of the funds which would be necessary in order to take care of these facilities.

Moreover, Mr. President, it has been pointed out on numerous occasions during the debate on this bill that, in fact, the Federal Government has been providing almost 100 percent of the money. Prior to January 1, 1942, the Federal Government was paying approximately from 90 to 95 percent of the expense of the operation of the employment services in the various States. I need not reiterate the explanation of that situation which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has made so clearly upon the floor in the course of the debate. The fact is, as I have already indicated, that on January 1, 1942, the United States was paying approximately all the cost of administering the employment services.

Mr. President, the proposed exemption of the obligation of the States to make any appropriation as required in section 5 of the Wagner-Peyser Act is occasioned, therefore, first by reason of the fact that the States have had no notice of any kind with reference to when they are to receive back the facilities which the Government took over; and, in the second place, and as a matter of practical operation, the Federal Government had already been paying almost all the expenses until January 1, 1942.

So, Mr. President, under the transaction as it took place and induced, as it was, by the urgent request of the President of the United States, and accepted, as it was, by practically all the governors of the States of the Union, and accompanied, as it was, by a belief on the part of the governors that the transaction merely involved a loan recognized by the Federal Government as being a loan, I undertake to say that there is a moral obligation on the part of the Federal Government to turn back to the States these various services in accordance with the situation which existed on January 1, 1942, subject only to the exceptions set forth in title 3 of the bill.

Mr. President, I earnestly urge adoption of the amendment for the reasons which I have indicated. In my remarks yesterday I indicated much more fully than I have today an earnest advocacy of the principles, as I understand them, which have been asserted by the governors of our various States. They have been convinced that this country owes an obligation, based on moral integrity, to the States of the Union to return these services to the States at the earliest practicable date, and under the conditions under which they were surrendered on January 1, 1942. If we should pass House bill 4437 in the form in which it was reported to the Senate by the committee, and as it has been amended on the floor, we could not comply with the moral obligation, as I see it, which the States are entitled to have us comply with.

So, Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment, and on the question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, we have devoted a great deal of time to the many questions which are involved in the pending bill. The amendment of the Senator

from Missouri would wipe out all but four lines of the 14 pages comprising the bill. Many of the questions which have been raised have been determined. The amendment of the Senator from Missouri would entirely reverse the decision of the Senate on those matters.

I wish to invite attention to one thing in particular. The amendment would wipe out the present division of funds as between the various States. In Arizona it would reduce the amount of the funds by 43 percent. In California it would reduce the amount of the funds by 45 percent. In Colorado it would reduce the amount of the funds by 15 percent. In Connecticut it would reduce the amount of the funds by 4 percent. In Delaware it would reduce the amount of the funds by 12 percent. In the District of Columbia it would reduce the amount of the funds by 35 percent. In Florida it would reduce the amount of the funds by 11 percent. In Illinois it would reduce the amount of the funds by 6 percent. In Maryland it would reduce the amount of the funds by 13 percent. In Michigan it would reduce the amount of the funds by 30 percent. In Minnesota it would reduce the amount of the funds by 8 percent. In Nevada it would reduce the amount of the funds by 69 percent. In New Hampshire it would reduce the amount of the funds by 25 percent. In New York it would reduce the amount of the funds by 1 percent. In Ohio it would reduce the amount of the funds by 13 percent. In Oregon it would reduce the amount of the funds by 42 percent. In Rhode Island it would reduce the amount of the funds by 37 percent. In Utah it would reduce the amount of the funds by 35 percent. In Vermont it would reduce the amount of the funds by 19 percent. In the State of Washington it would reduce the amount of the funds by 36 percent. In Wyoming it would reduce the amount of the funds by 16 percent. I may say, incidentally, that in Missouri it would increase the amount of the funds. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, did the Senator read any figures with respect to Oregon?

Mr. TUNNELL. In Oregon the amount of the funds would be reduced by 42 percent.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator mean that, in view of the great increase which has taken place in our war population, Oregon would lose only 42 percent?

Mr. TUNNELL. According to one method or another, the increase in population should be greater.

I invite attention to the fact that this amendment has been offered without previous consideration of its effects on the various States, and it indicates the danger of agreeing to such haphazard amendments as those which are being offered without having been given previous consideration.

I invite further attention to the fact that the amendment would make no provision whatever for a continuation of the services of these various organizations at a time when the State refused or failed to comply with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor. Under those conditions the effect of the bill, in the form in which it was reported by the committee, would be destroyed. Practically all such provisions would be wiped out and we would embark on an uncharted sea where most of the damage would result to the unemployed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator speaks of an uncharted sea. If the language reported to the Senate should not be agreed to, we would return to the Wagner-Peyser Act under which we operated for 10 years.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; but yesterday I understood the Senator to say that under the terms of the Wagner-Peyser Act there was afforded a great deal less authority than would be afforded under the bill, even though we have not been able to discover, either from the Senator himself or from anyone else, what the difference is.

Mr. President, under these conditions I hope the Senate will not wipe out all the subcommittee has done, all the committee has done, and all the Senate has done, and impose upon the States a reduction of the funds they are now receiving, which they have found necessary.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the issue is a very simple one. We took the employment offices away from the States without any authority of law. We provided that the Federal Government should take them over and operate them because the President so requested. The Governors turned them over to the Federal Government reluctantly, with the stipulation that they should be returned. Now, instead of returning them under the conditions under which they were operated when we took them from the States, we are changing the whole basis of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

The Senator asks, "What changes?" Why change it at all? Every change made is toward increasing the power of the Federal Government over these employment offices. So, I say that if we pass the bill we are not in good faith returning these offices to the States. We are setting up conditions which inevitably will lead to the federalization of the entire Employment Service.

Every change made looks toward that end. There is the change putting the emphasis on rules and regulations, and less on State plans agreed upon by the States. There is the provision that the Federal Government may take over the offices again, or at least may step in and operate them, if the Federal officials do not like the details of the way a State is operating them. Every provision which is inserted is intended to strengthen the Federal Government.

Mr. President, why those changes? No one complained about the operation of the Wagner-Peyser Act. There was no criticism of it when the States were operating their employment offices under the act. The effect of the amendment is simply to provide that when the offices are returned they shall be operated under the Wagner-Peyser Act, and not under all the increased Federal power which is proposed by the Committee on Education and Labor.

There can be no reason for the amendments the committee urges except to give the Federal Government more power, and make the return mean less, make it a comparatively small change from the present conditions.

So, Mr. President, I think anyone who really desires that the offices be returned to the States in good faith should vote for the pending amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, very briefly, it seems to me that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri proposes one change, in the proviso in line 7, referring to State contributions to the expense of returning the services.

Mr. TAFT. Is not that only until 1948, so the State legislatures can meet to appropriate whatever money may be required?

Mr. BALL. That is the change.

With respect to the arguments made against the amendment by the Senator from Delaware, one of them was that requiring the grants to the States to be made on a straight population basis changes the amount going to every State in the Union, decreases it for about 21 or 22 of the States which have had a population shift during the war.

In addition to that, I think it is deficient in that since 1941 the administration of the United States Employment Service has been transferred by Executive order to the Social Security Board and the Department of Labor. That means that under the Donnell amendment there would be no provision for a commingling of funds for a single State budget for unemployment compensation and for the employment service. Each State would have to submit two different budgets, and would have to account for the funds in two different budgets.

Furthermore, under the Wagner-Peyser Act there is no provision for a merit system for State employees. That was taken care of by grants under title III of the Social Security Act, which would be eliminated by the amendment.

I think adoption of the amendment would not only undo the work we have done in the committee and here today, but it would be very greatly deficient as a practical proposition, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Delaware at the outset of his remarks took the view that if my amendment were to be adopted it would reverse the action of the Senate previously taken today. I respectfully disagree with the Senator upon that proposition. I think it was very clear that the Senate understood that the amendment which had been proposed by me could not be considered until after the committee amendments had been disposed of. I myself voted upon various provisions of the committee amendments. Yet that by no means waived my right nor made it inconsistent on my part to present at this time the amendment which is now before the Senate.

Every action taken by the Senate today with respect to the pending bill has been in the nature of perfecting the committee amendments, subject at all times to the fact that an amendment, namely, the one I filed, was on the desk and could not be called up until after the committee amendments had been disposed of.

Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware makes the point as to the change in amounts granted under the Wagner-Peyser Act to the various States. I have not checked the accuracy of his statement, I have no doubt that he sincerely thinks he has given us, and possibly he has given us, the exact facts in that regard; but I submit that the mere fact that there has been some change in the position of some States between 1942 and this time does not alter the moral proposition that the Federal Government should return to the States these facilities under the law as it took them over on January 1, 1942.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I have in my hand what I understand to be a copy of an opinion rendered on January 4, 1939, by the Attorney General, then the Hon. Frank Murphy, now a member of the Supreme Court, to the President of the United States. I shall present the entire opinion for the RECORD, but it reads in part as follows:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to refer to your memorandum of December 27, 1938, in which you request my opinion upon a question of law presented by the Chairman of the Social Security Board in his letter to you of December 22, 1938.

The Chairman's statement of the problem is somewhat indefinite, but as I construe his letter it is: When the Social Security Board has approved an unemployment-compensation law of a State, what part of the total cost of the State's public employment offices provided for under and operated as an integral part of such law is the Social Security Board authorized to finance by grants certified under section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act?

The final paragraph of the letter, after some intermediate discussion, reads:

Accordingly it is my opinion that the Social Security Board is authorized to finance by grants under section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act only that part of the total cost of a State's public employment offices which is over and above the expense the State otherwise would have to incur to enable them to perform required duties not necessary for the proper administration of the State's unemployment-compensation law.

Mr. President, if my understanding be correct, it is true that the States have been receiving from the Social Security Board, after the issuance of this opinion, or at some time, at any rate, funds payable to the States, not as appropriations for employment services, but moneys issued to them from the Social Security Board. But, be that as it may, the mere fact that Missouri or Oregon or Kentucky or Delaware may not be in exactly the same position as it was in on January 1, 1942, relative to the other States of the Union as to population—which would manifestly be an impossible situation to contemplate—the mere fact that there may have been some changes in the populations of the various States does not alter the moral proposition that these facilities, having been received under the request of the President of the United States under given conditions, should be returned under those conditions.

Mr. DONNELL subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago, during the course of my remarks, I referred to an opinion which had been issued by the Attorney General of the United States under date of January 4, 1939. I stated that I would offer the opinion in its entirety for printing in the RECORD. I omitted doing so and I now ask that the opinion be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1939.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to refer to your memorandum of December 27, 1938, in which you request my opinion upon a question of law presented by the Chairman of the Social Security Board in his letter to you of December 22, 1938.

The Chairman's statement of the problem is somewhat indefinite, but as I construe his letter it is: When the Social Security Board has approved an unemployment compensation law of a State, what part of the total cost of the State's public employment offices provided for under and operated as an integral part of such law is the Social Security Board authorized to finance by grants certified under section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act?

I agree with the statement of the general counsel of the Social Security Board in his memorandum submitted with the Chairman's letter that this question "does not permit of a categorical answer," and that "Each case must be * * * determined upon the basis of the statutory and factual situation existing in the State in which it occurs * * *." The Social Security Act of August 14, 1935 (49 Stat. 620 et seq.), provides in part:

"SEC. 302. (a) The Board shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State which has an unemployment compensation law approved by the Board under title IX, such amounts as the Board determines to be necessary for the proper administration of such law during the fiscal year in which such payment is to be made. * * *"

"SEC. 303. (a) The Board shall make no certification for payment to any State unless it finds that the law of such State, approved by the Board under title IX, includes provisions for—

* * * * *

"(2) Payment of unemployment compensation solely through public employment offices in the State or such other agencies as the Board may approve * * *."

"SEC. 903. (a) The Social Security Board shall approve any State law submitted to it, within 30 days of such submission, which it finds provides that—

"(1) All compensation is to be paid through public employment offices in the State or such other agencies as the Board may approve * * *."

As will be noted, when a State has enacted an unemployment-compensation law which complies with the provisions of the Social Security Act, the Social Security Board is required to approve such law and to certify, under section 302 (a), to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to that State the amounts determined by the Board to be necessary for its proper administration. A provision of State law prerequisite to approval by the Board is that payment of unemployment compensation shall be made through public employment offices in the State or such other agencies as the Board may approve. Thus, while the act does not so require, it contemplates that public employment offices may be utilized in the administration of a State's unemployment-compensation law.

A State's public employment offices, however, are set up by it under its own laws and for its own purposes; and they may be, and generally are, charged with duties other than those necessary for the administration of the State's unemployment-compensation law—duties in no way connected with such administration. This may be true even though they are organized under provisions of an unemployment-compensation law. It must be presumed that maintenance of them for such other purposes is a proper function of the State. To finance, to any extent, their cost for such ends, however, is no duty of the Social Security Board. The Social Security Act authorizes grants for their support only to the extent necessary for the proper administration of the State's unemployment-compensation law.

Also it is to be noted that the Social Security Act was enacted after the act of June 6, 1933, 48 Statute 113, generally known as the Wagner-Peyser Act. The declared purpose of the latter statute is "to promote the establishment and maintenance of a national system of public employment offices." In order to carry out this purpose the act establishes the United States Employment Service, a Bureau in the Department of Labor, and provides that when "a State shall, through its legislature, accept the provisions of this act and designate or authorize the creation of a State agency vested with all powers necessary to cooperate with the United States Employment Service under this act," the Director of the United States Employment Service shall, from funds appropriated under the act, make grants to such State to aid in "establishing and maintaining systems of public employment offices * * * in accordance with the provisions of this act." The functions and duties of such systems of public employment offices are set out in the act, and many of them are such that they bear no relation to the administration of an unemployment-compensation law. Reading the Social Security Act with the Wagner-Peyser Act it seems plain that the former should not be construed to encourage the establishment by States of systems of public employment offices other than such as may be set up under and in accordance with the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Accordingly, it is my opinion that the Social Security Board is authorized to finance by grants under section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act only that part of the total cost of a State's public employment offices which is over and above the expense the State otherwise would have to incur to enable them to perform required duties not necessary for the proper administration of the State's unemployment-compensation law.

Respectfully,

FRANK MURPHY,
Attorney General.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I not correct, however, in stating that under the bill, even if passed with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri, all the money will now be appropriated by the Federal Government, whereas prior to 1942 it was matched by the States?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the answer to the distinguished Senator from Oregon is that the law will still be exactly the same as it is in the Wagner-Peyser Act, namely, the provision there requiring matching, but there had never been appropriated, as I understand, prior to January 1, 1942, more than $4,000,000 a year by the Federal Government for the purposes contemplated by the

Wagner-Peyser Act. The result was, as the Senator from Ohio has indicated, that great sums of money have been used for the expenses of the employment office by the Federal Government outside the matching provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act, the aggregate amount being, as is indicated in a document which I have on my desk, as I recall, somewhere between 90 and 95 percent as being paid by the Federal Government before January 1, 1942, as compared with from 5 to 10 percent then being paid by the States.

Further answering the Senator from Oregon, I may say that the amendment which I have presented would restore the local condition precisely as it was, whatever it was, on January 1, 1942.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. In order to put the next question I want to make this statement of fact, and I am sure the Senator from Missouri is aware of the fact that in some of our States there has been a great increase in population since 1942 as the result of war plants which have been located in those States. One of the results of that shift in population has been to create a very serious potential unemployment problem in those States, and to meet that increased unemployment problem the States are vitally concerned about obtaining funds with which to meet it. Therefore any bill that would give to the States 100 percent of Federal money with which to administer their unemployment service is a matter of great concern to them. So my question is this: If the bill is passed as it came out of committee, does the Senator from Missouri agree with me that 100 percent of the funds for State employment services would be put up by the Federal Government?

Mr. DONNELL. I think that is correct. I think the Senator from Minnesota could give us an absolutely accurate answer on that, because he has undoubtedly studied the committee amendment very thoroughly.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that the question I have put to the Senator from Missouri is this. If the bill is passed as it came out of committee, 100 percent of the money that is to be used for the service will be Federal money, will it not?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Now may I ask the Senator from Missouri if it is true that if the bill were passed with the Senator's amendment in it, then we would revert to the match money basis as it existed under the Wagner-Peyser Act?

Mr. DONNELL. I think that is correct, and with this understanding that, as it applies under the Wagner-Peyser Act up until January 1, 1942, the Federal Government was in fact actually paying from 90 to 95 percent of the expense of each State.

Mr. MORSE. Then would the Senator from Missouri agree that his amendment does raise this question for the Senate to decide: Whether or not the Senate wishes to have the money put up by the Federal Government to the extent of 100 percent, or whether the Senate wants to go back to the match money basis under the Wagner-Peyser Act?

Mr. DONNELL. I think, Mr. President, that question is of course present. I take it, however, that the fact is that under the amendment which I have proposed the Federal Government would until July 1, 1948, finance the proposition 100 percent, because, as was pointed out by the Senator from Minnesota there is a provision in my amendment "That no State shall be required to make any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to January 1, 1942, prior to July 1, 1948."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Of course I want to say that those of us who are very much concerned about the data that have been introduced here this afternoon showing the loss of funds that would be suffered by the States such as my State and Washington and California and the other States that were listed in the report presented by the Senator from Delaware are not expecting the crest of our unemployment problem to hit us until the possibility of the potential economic bust occurs in 1948–49 or 1950 or if and when it occurs. Thus we have to think ahead as to what I say, expressing a personal opinion, is going to be an inevitable economic bust period in this country unless certain steps are taken to meet the potential unemployment problem that is going to confront us. Thus when we as representatives of those States think ahead 2, 3, 4, or 5 years and we see data as they have been presented here this afternoon pointing out that our States will suffer a severe loss of funds if the amendment of the Senator from Missouri is adopted we naturally question the desirability of joining with the Senator. I do not think the Senator from Missouri would charge me with being motivated entirely by provincial interests when I say that I have to give attention to the financial effects on my State of the amendment presented by the Senator from Missouri. If I understand the situation correctly a vote by me for the Senator's amendment—and I do not intend to vote for it—would really be a vote for a 42 percent cut in the funds that otherwise would come to my State under the bill as reported by the committee. My State is one of those States greatly concerned about the potential unemployment problem with which we will be confronted when the boom and bust cycle runs its course.

Mr. DONNELL. For his frankness in this matter, Mr. President, I thank the Senator, who is always characterized by that quality in his utterances here and elsewhere.

I may say, Mr. President, that I am not advised, other than the statement made upon the floor this afternoon, as to the effect upon the State of Oregon. I was informed yesterday of the fact, according to one of the representatives of the Department of Labor, as I recall, that there would be a considerable readjustment as between States because of the population feature. But as I see it, Mr. President, if these services had been held by the States, by the State of Oregon, by the State of Missouri, by the State of Delaware, right on through from January 1, 1942, until this time, there would then exist precisely the same problem as exists now upon their return. It would seem to me that if some States may be injured, there may be others that will be benefited. I did not understand the remarks of the Senator from Delaware respecting Missouri. I heard the name of Missouri mentioned. But regardless of the effect upon any given State, I take it that when these services were taken over by the Federal Government, when they were delivered by the governors of the States on January 1, 1942, to the Federal Government, there must have been in contemplation the fact that the populations of the various States would not remain static during the period in which the services were held by the Federal Government.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it should be pointed out that while the Wagner-Peyser Act had a definite system of distribution between the States, what is proposed to be substituted for it is absolutely discretionary power in the Secretary of Labor to give any State any amount he may want to give it, and certainly when we are distributing Federal funds we ought, on every basis that I know of, to prescribe a formula. If some other formula is better than the one in the Wagner-Peyser Act, very well, but under the provisions of this bill the Secretary may give such amounts as he determines may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State system.

His determination shall be based on, first, the population; second, an estimate of the cost of proper and efficient administration; third, such other factors as the Secretary finds relevant.

So if he does not like a State he can cut down its funds. If he wants to favor another State, he can give it funds. So, it seems to me that, regardless of the merits of the system which is in the Wagner-Peyser Act, to substitute a purely discretionary system by which money is handed out at the will of some Federal official is very much worse than the Wagner-Peyser Act provision.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for his very valuable contribution.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. BALL. What the Senator from Ohio was reading was identical with language contained in the so-called Dirksen substitute, which passed the House of Representatives, and if I am not mistaken a very similar provision was included in the rescission bill which passed both Houses last fall.

Mr. DONNELL. May I say to the Senator from Minnesota that regardless of whether it was in the Dirksen substitute or not, the Dirksen substitute is not the bill now before the Senate. The Senate now has before it my amendment which proposes to return these facilities back

to the States as they were on January 1, 1941.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to complete what I had to say, that under the Federal hospital bill we worked out very carefully a proper formula for division of funds. Under the provisions of the aid-to-education bill, which we have had before us, we worked out such a division. Now that perhaps ought to be done. But certainly it seems to me that we ought not to substitute for the provision of the present law a purely discretionary provision, whether it was in the House bill or was not in the House bill.

Mr. DONNELL. I think so.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding to me. He has been very kind to let me interrupt his remarks for comments of my own. I only wish to reply to him on two points. I think it is true that some States would benefit as the result of the Senator's amendment if the Senate should adopt the bill with the Senator's amendment in it. As I understand it, those States that would benefit would be those States that have not enjoyed a great increase in population since the 1940 census as compared with the States to which thousands of war workers migrated during the war. It seems to me quite unfair to set up a provision in this act which would accrue to the advantage of States that have not enjoyed a large increase in population since the 1940 census and to the disadvantage of those States that have had a big increase in population. It is my theory—and I want to make this position clear to the Senator from Missouri—it is my theory that those States that have had a large increase in war population are the ones that are going to need the funds when the unemployment wave hits us. Therefore I am back to the basic issue raised by the Senator's amendment. It is the question of whether or not we want to have the Federal Government put up the money 100 percent, or whether we want to come back to the match-money basis of the Wagner-Peyser Act. Now it seems to me that——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator is, I assume, fully in agreement with myself that in fact on January 1, 1942, the actual share as between States and the Federal Government was that the Federal Government was providing from 90 to 95 percent, and the State governments from 5 to 10 percent.

Mr. MORSE. I am in complete agreement, but that is not, of course, the formula of the Wagner-Peyser Act itself, if we go back to the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Mr. DONNELL. That was, however, true during the time that the Wagner-Peyser Act was in effect, as it was also during the time the social-security legislation has been in effect.

Mr. MORSE. That is true, but we have no guaranty that such a match-money arrangement would continue under the terms of the original act.

Mr. DONNELL. The combination of the two worked out this result by which the States were, in fact, notwithstanding the matching provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act, putting up only from 5 to 10 percent, and the Federal Government from 90 to 95 percent. Does the Senator concur in that statement?

Mr. MORSE. That certainly was the 1942 situation; but I am not of the opinion—and I am open to persuasion—that if the Senator's amendment were adopted the formula would be a 90–10 formula. If the Senator's amendment were adopted, as I understand it, we would go back to the original formula of the Wagner-Peyser Act itself and that was not a 90–10 formula.

Mr. DONNELL. We would go back to the Wagner-Peyser Act; and, as has just been pointed out, the other provisions of national legislation would be on the books just as they are at this moment.

Mr. MORSE. But mathematically the population statistics as of the 1940 census will have a great influence on the amount of money which would go to the individual States. It is because of that factor that I have endeavored to point out that approximately 20 or 21 States would suffer materially in funds as a result of the Senator's amendment if we adopt the principle which I think is inherent in his amendment, namely, the match-money principle rather than the principle of having the Federal Government put up all the money.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me say in response to the Senator from Oregon that in the first place the proviso which appears in my amendment relieves the States of the obligation to make any appropriation under section 5 (a), which is the matching provision of the Wagner-Peyser Act, until July 1, 1948.

In the second place, if an injustice creeps in by reason of changes in population between now and July 1, 1948, I take it that the Congress can be relied upon to make an equitable and proper redistribution.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that it is my understanding that many students of this question—and I know of one or two who are very eminent—advocate the entire abolition of the matching provision. They point out the fact that the Federal Government has been paying, as it was on January 1, 1942, from 90 to 95 percent, as compared with 5 or 10 percent by the States.

So, Mr. President, I submit, first, that under the situation as it arose on January 1, 1942, the States are entitled to have these facilities back under the conditions which prevailed at that time. Second, no one would have anticipated that there would be a static condition of population between then and now. Third, if there be any injury to any State such as has been suggested, under the provisions of the amendment the States are relieved until January 1, 1948, of any obligation or requirement to make an appropriation under the terms of the matching provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act. Finally, certainly the sense of equity and justice on the part of the Congress of the United States can be relied upon to make appropriate provision for the States thereafter.

The point made by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is exceedingly important, and I thank him very greatly for his contribution. As he has pointed out, the committee amendment provides as follows:

> (b) The Secretary shall from time to time certify for payment to each State which is in compliance with the provisions of section 4 of this act, and such rules, regulations, and standards of efficiency as may be prescribed under this act, such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State system of public employment offices during the fiscal year for which payment is to be made.

That provision gives tremendous power to the Secretary of Labor to prescribe rules, regulations, and standards of efficiency. As the Senator from Ohio pointed out, the Secretary's determination "shall be based on (1) the population of the State," which is a mathematical basis, "and an estimate of the number of persons who will be served by the public-employment office system in the State; (2) an estimate of the cost of proper and efficient administration of the State system of public employment offices," which is semimathematical in nature; and "(3) such other factors as the Secretary finds relevant."

So I submit, with the Senator from Ohio, that from the standpoint of the best interests of the States it is better to go back to the Wagner-Peyser Act, realizing the fact that under it and under the law existing on January 1, 1942, the States were paying only 5 or 10 percent; realizing that under this amendment there is no obligation on the States to pay anything until July 1, 1948; and realizing that the Congress, because its Members come from the States of the Union, can be relied upon to make equitable readjustment. I submit that this amendment should be adopted, not from any standpoint of finances, not from any standpoint of whether one State may benefit or not, but because of the fundamental fact that these facilities were turned over to the United States Government as a loan, and should be returned to the respective States in substantially the condition in which they were received.

One further word and I am through. I have recognized in this amendment the fact that it is necessary, of course, to have some transitional provision with respect to personnel. For that reason my amendment is not directed to title III of the bill. My amendment is directed solely to title I and title II, and leave the transitional provisions which relate to personnel and property intact as they have been passed upon by the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. President, I believe the yeas and nays have been ordered on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. On this question the yeas and

nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], are detained on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] is detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent on official business, having been appointed to the commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I also announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the Commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—32

Austin	George	Robertson
Brooks	Gerry	Smith
Buck	Gurney	Stanfill
Burch	Hart	Swift
Bushfield	Hawkes	Taft
Capehart	Knowland	Wherry
Capper	Millikin	White
Carville	Moore	Wiley
Donnell	O'Daniel	Willis
Eastland	Reed	Wilson
Ferguson	Revercomb	

NAYS—37

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Andrews	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Ball	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Barkley	La Follette	Overton
Chavez	Lucas	Radcliffe
Downey	McCarran	Russell
Fulbright	McClellan	Stewart
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Guffey	McMahon	Tunnell
Hayden	Magnuson	Wagner
Hill	Mead	Walsh
Hoey	Morse	
Huffman	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—27

Bailey	Ellender	Saltonstall
Bilbo	Gossett	Shipstead
Brewster	Hatch	Taylor
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Thomas, Utah
Briggs	Langer	Tobey
Butler	McFarland	Tydings
Bryd	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Mitchell	Wheeler
Cordon	Pepper	Young

So Mr. DONNELL's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in connection with the language on page 5, in line 18, I should like to ask the proponents of the bill if they will accept an amendment to the committee amendment, as follows:

Insert at the appropriate place the following:

"SEC. —. For the purpose of assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities within the several States, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to maintain in cooperation with the State agricultural extension services a farm labor recruitment, transportation, and placement service."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, we have discussed that matter both yesterday and today. I think that permanent legislation along that line should be considered early in the next session. But I do not like to enact permanent legislation establishing that kind of an employment service in the Department of Agriculture without having any committee consideration, hearings, or anything of the sort.

The language to which the Senator has referred on page 5 is now in the Wagner-Peyser Act. We did not change it. The Farm Placement Service which now is under the Department of Agriculture will remain there. It is my understanding that it is fixed there until January 1. In any event, it is my understanding that a joint resolution extending it through the next fiscal year will be passed, and then the Congress can do whatever it wishes to do at the next session.

But I do not think we should try to enact permanent legislation on such a matter at this time. I believe we should leave the basic authority for the Farm Placement Service in the law until we decide what we wish to do about it permanently.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I hold in my hand a letter from the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture which bears on this question. I really have not had time to study it, but I should like to read it to the Senate. It reads as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
June 25, 1946.

Hon. J. M. TUNNELL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR TUNNELL: The Secretary of Agriculture has asked that I communicate with you in regard to a question raised on the floor of the Senate on Monday, June 24, during the debate on H. R. 4437, a bill to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the Act of Congress approved June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), and for other purposes. The apprehension was expressed that the provision of section 3 (a) of the bill relating to the authority of the United States Employment Service to maintain a "farm placement service" would create doubt as to the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to continue with the farm labor supply program administered by the Department of Agriculture.

The language in question is identical with language in the act of June 6, 1933, commonly referred to as the Wagner-Peyser Act. Prior to the enactment of Public Law 45 (78th Cong.) which authorized this Department to operate a farm labor supply program, all authority of the War Manpower Commission with respect to the recruitment and placement of farm labor was delegated (Directive XVII, 8 F. R. 1426) to the Department of Agriculture. As a consequence, the United States Employment Service did not thereafter exercise its authority to maintain a farm placement service under the Wagner-Peyser Act. Following the enactment of Public Law 45, the Department of Agriculture relied upon the authority contained in that act as extended and modified from time to time for the operation of its farm labor supply program and not upon the delegation from the War Manpower Commission. The United States Employment Service has not, either during the existence of the delegation from the War Manpower Commission or since its rescission in June 1945 (10 F. R. 8801), obtained an appropriation for farm placement service and has not engaged in that activity except under contract with State extension services, using funds appropriated in the farm labor supply appropriation acts. There has been, therefore, no duplication of activity in the field of farm labor supply de-

spite the fact that both the United States Employment Service and the Department of Agriculture, acting through the State extension services, have authority to maintain a farm placement service.

In view of the foregoing, it is my opinion that the enactment of section 3 (a) of the bill in its present form would not prevent the Department of Agriculture from continuing to operate its farm labor supply program, nor would it change existing authorities with respect to the maintenance of farm placement services.

Sincerely yours,

W. CARROLL HUNTER,
Solicitor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Delaware answer this question for me, inasmuch as I could not hear all of the letter the Senator read because there was some confusion in the Chamber: Is it the Senator's interpretation of that letter that the passage of the bill as it now stands will not interfere in any way with the present program of the Department of Agriculture in respect to operating the farm placement service?

Mr. TUNNELL. Let me read again the concluding portion of the letter:

In view of the foregoing, it is my opinion that the enactment of section 3 (a) of the bill in its present form would not prevent the Department of Agriculture from continuing to operate its farm labor supply program, nor would it change existing authorities with respect to the maintenance of farm placement services.

Sincerely yours,

W. CARROLL HUNTER,
Solicitor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he has been informed by the Department of Agriculture that it will continue this program under the resolution by which it formerly has been authorized to handle it, so that the farm placement service will be continued by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have not been informed as to that.

Mr. WHERRY. What assurance do we have that it will be continued?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I talked to the Director of the United States Employment Service, and he tells me that they have reached an agreement with the Department of Agriculture whereby they will try to get through the Congress a resolution extending the present authority, which expires on January 1. They will try to have it continued through the full fiscal year. We have been handling it on a calendar-year basis. Twenty-five million dollars is available for this year. It is up to us to provide funds for the remainder of the fiscal year. I can tell the Senator that there are no funds for the farm placement service in the United States Employment Service bill which now is in the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask another question: Is there assurance that the farm placement work will be continued?

Mr. BALL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there assurance that it will be continued under the Department of Agriculture, regardless of the provisions of the pending measure, if it is passed?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the proponents of the bill feel that they do not wish to amend it in the way I have suggested, I shall not insist upon doing so at this time. But if the Department of Agriculture is to operate the service when the proper time comes I think we should amend the basic law so as to place the service in the control of the Department of Agriculture and let the Department of Agriculture handle it. I expect to take steps to that end at the appropriate time when the proper legislation comes before the Senate.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that I do not think his remarks are at all out of place. I think his thought is excellent, but I do not think there is any such danger at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4437) was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 7, 17, 53, 58, 78, 80, 90, 92, 98, 105, 114, 116, 159, 234, 238, 242, 256, 265, 274, 285, and 295 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate, Nos. 2, 5, 6, 18, 19, 20, 85, 87, 115, 141, 166, 239, 272, 276, and 277 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS IN THE CLASSIFIED GRADES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on H. R. 5244, to authorize the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5244) to authorize the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 to 20, inclusive, and 22, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 and agree to the same with amendments as follows: On page 3 of the House bill strike out lines 16 and 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. The second paragraph of section 32 of the Act entitled 'An Act for the reorganization and improvement of the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved May 24, 1924 (46 Stat. 1214), as amended, is amended to read as follows:" ; and in lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following: "or representatives duly authorized by such Committees."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire merely to say, before moving adoption of the report, that the House has agreed to all the amendments made by the Senate to the bill with one exception, and has concurred in that amendment with an amendment.

I therefore move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Without objection, the report is agreed to.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FOR CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS AND DISTRICT COURTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4230) to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MURDOCK, and Mr. WILEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1153, Senate bill 1850.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1850) to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, what was the motion of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1153, Senate bill 1850, a bill to establish a National Science Research Foundation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator intend that the Senate shall discuss the bill this evening?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF PERSONS OF RACES INDIGENOUS TO INDIA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I present the conference report on House bill 3517, a bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The report was read as follows:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.
>
> J. W. FULBRIGHT,
> HOMER FERGUSON,
> JOSEPH H. BALL,
> *Managers on the Part of the Senate.*
>
> JOHN LESINSKI,
> EDWARD H. REES,
> N. M. MASON,
> *Managers on the Part of the House.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report submitted by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement in regard to this conference report. House bill 3517, as originally presented, amends our immigration laws by permitting the immigration of the races of people living in India, which is a British possession. It allows India a quota of immigrants and permits the nationalization of all Indians who came into our country before the restrictive immigration laws were passed in the 1920's.

A similar bill allowing a quota to natives of the Philippines was also passed by the House. The conference report seeks to merge these two bills into one, so as to allow a quota to both countries and to nationalize those of the two countries who are already living in the United States. I do not oppose the measure with reference to the Filipinos, because of the peculiar relations which have existed for many years between the Philippines and this country. For many years the Filipinos have enjoyed the status of nationals of the United States and have not been aliens. We have been closely associated not only during the late war but ever since the Spanish-American War, and every American citizen prays for the progress and happiness of the people of the new Philippine Republic which will be launched on July 4.

I regret that the two bills have been merged, because I am opposed to the adoption of the bill allowing a quota to India. I greatly fear that the action of the Congress in adopting this measure will set in motion a course of events which will result in striking down all of the provisions of our immigration laws relating to the admission of immigrants from Asia.

We have already passed a bill allowing a quota to China. This bill was offered during the stress of war, and before it was enacted by the Congress the then President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, urged its adoption as an exception to our restrictive immigration laws which could properly be made as a gesture of good will to our allies in the fight against aggression. It was strongly implied that it would not be considered as a precedent for other legislation.

However, we now find that the Congress has enacted the Indian bill. Bills have already been introduced to allow quotas of immigrants to Koreans and other Asiatics. We may soon expect measures of the same kind allowing the immigration of natives of Siam, French Indochina, Burma, Java, Sumatra, and of each of the other many racial groups of the Orient. If all of these bills are enacted into law, each and every one of those races will be allowed a quota of immigrants into the United States. I am afraid that we have started a process which will gradually whittle away all of the restrictions of our immigration laws.

I have nothing against the Indians, and there is much to commend favorable action in allowing them to immigrate to the United States and become American citizens, but I am opposed to any weakening of our immigration laws at this time. This is particularly true in view of the precedent which this bill will set, and it will encourage all of those who wish to strike down all of our immigration laws to renew their efforts.

There are well organized groups in every State of the Union who are urging legislation relaxing our immigration laws to the extent of practically eliminating quotas and other restrictions upon immigration into the United States. As chairman of the Committee on Immigration I have received hundreds of communications from such groups. If they were to present their views in one measure to repeal all of our immigration laws and allow the unlimited movement of aliens into our country, the Congress would become alarmed. However, they are too smart for that, and they are seeking to undermine our restrictive laws by the whittling process of introducing a bill here and a bill there, each of which is plausible, but the sum total of which will destroy our present policy of restriction. It is difficult to see how the Congress, after committing itself to a measure such as the Indian bill, can oppose other bills of similar import for each of the numerous races in Asia when they follow in its wake.

Those who are seeking to strike down our immigration laws make the argument that it is a good things for all of us to increase the inflow of immigrants from abroad into this country. They say that each immigrant is a consumer, thereby increasing the domestic market and providing employment to our people to produce the products that they will consume. Under their philosophy we can only achieve the ultimate in prosperity in this country by striking down every present legal barrier to alien immigration. Under their theory, if we bring into this country the teeming millions of Europe, Asia, and Africa who are anxious to come here, and in effect pack most of the people of the world into the United States, we will have so many consumers and producers that we will then achieve the greatest measure of prosperity we have ever known. I do not subscribe to this philosophy, and I believe that we are very unwise to embark upon a policy of weakening our restrictive immigration laws at this time. The laws have already been badly abused during the war, and should be tightened rather than relaxed.

I was absent from the Senate by its leave when the calendar was called and the Indian bill was enacted, or I would have made this statement at that time. The forces back of the bill were so great that it would have been enacted despite anything that I might have said. I do, however, wish to have the RECORD show that I intend to resist any and all bills which are brought forward which tend in any degree to weaken our restrictive immigration laws. I believe that it would contribute to the well-being of our country and the American citizens generally if we were to tighten rather than to relax our existing laws. For myself I shall seek to strengthen and not weaken our immigration laws, and I believe that the majority of the American people are in favor of that course as opposed to the present trend to increase the number of immigrants into the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, did this bill come to the Senate from the Senate Committee on Immigration?

Mr. RUSSELL. It did, and over my opposition, I may say to the Senator from Maine. I regret that I was not present when it was called up on the calendar. I thought I had an understanding to the effect that the bill would not be called up during my absence. I would have opposed it if I had been present when it was called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report presented by the Senator from Arkansas.

The report was agreed to.

FEDERAL CITY CHARTER COMMISSION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1418, Senate bill 1942, a bill to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission.

I desire to state that this is a bill which addresses itself entirely to the District of Columbia. All that it would do would be to set up a commission which

would study and work out a suitable charter for the District of Columbia. When the bill was reached on a previous call of the calendar, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] objected to its consideration. He has told me since that he has no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is there anything in the bill which commits Congress in any way to the action it may take in the future?

Mr. McCARRAN. There is absolutely nothing in the bill which commits Congress in any way. Before any charter can be considered or submitted to the people of the District it must first be submitted to the Congress and approved by the Congress. It may be amended by the Congress, anything might be done to it, it might be set aside, or might be adopted.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, this is really the first step, one step, in the direction of granting to the city of Washington and the District of Columbia self-government, free from regulation by the Congress, is it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; it would not be free from regulation by the Congress. It would permit the District of Columbia, or the city of Washington in the District of Columbia, to work out, by a group, a charter which they believe would give a measure of self-government to the people of the District. But it would not divorce the Congress from control over the District. That is specifically provided for.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I feel this is a very important bill, one to which a great deal of care should be given. There should be discussion of the bill, in addition to great study, and under these circumstances I object to immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

INCREASE IN PAY FOR PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, ETC.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I call up the conference report on House bill 6084, to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended.

(See conference report printed in full in the RECORD of June 21, 1946, pp. 7267–7268.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Senators will recall that this matter was under consideration in the Senate 10 days ago, and there was a difference between the House and the Senate bill with respect to commissioned officers. The House provided for an increase in the compensation of commissioned officers of 10 percent, except in the two lower ranks. In the case of first lieutenants and second lieutenants the increase was 20 percent, in the case of captains 10 percent.

The net result of the conference report was to agree to the House provision, with the exception of captains, in which case the increase was from 10 percent to 15 percent.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Colorado to say that the net effect of the conference report was to agree to the House provision with the exception of the provision as to captains.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Was the amendment which I joined with the Senator from Colorado in offering, relating to the first four categories, rejected?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; that was agreed to. As a matter of fact, that provision was common to both bills, the House bill and the Senate bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not want the Senator's statement to stand without comment, and leave any Senator under a misapprehension as to the first four categories, that they had been changed in the respect in which the bill passed the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; the provision is the same as when the bill passed the Senate. The provisions were exactly the same in both bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the conference report was considered and agreed to.

PROVISION FOR HEARINGS, ETC., BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, an original resolution (S. Res. 293), and I also ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. It merely continues the standing and select committees and gives them authority to employ clerical assistance, to hold hearings, and to conduct investigations during the Seventy-ninth Congress and up until January 31, 1947. This is the usual resolution, and is presented each time a Congress is about to expire.

I might say for the benefit of the Senate that the resolution does not include resolutions which are now pending on the calendar, such as Resolution 161, offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]; Resolution 244, offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]; or Resolution 245, offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE.]

Some doubt has been raised as to whether or not this resolution includes the resolutions which are now pending upon the calendar and have not heretofore been disposed of by the Senate. My reply is in the negative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 293), as follows:

Resolved, That all resolutions heretofore agreed to, authorizing standing or select committees to employ clerical assistants, hold hearings, and conduct investigations during the Seventy-ninth Congress, hereby are continued in full force and effect until January 31, 1947.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois—so that there may be no mistake about what we are doing—if this resolution is the usual resolution which is passed before the close of a session to extend over to January 31 of the next year the standing committees and the committees which are set up under resolutions, with the exception of the subcommittee called the Pepper Committee on Health and Education, which the Senator has identified as Resolution No. 244, Calendar No. 1108; the Kilgore committee, called the Subcommittee on War Mobilization, under Resolution 245, Calendar No. 1109; and the so-called McFarland resolution, No. 101, Calendar No. 1107. We are extending all committees except those. Am I correct in that?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The others will come up when they are reached on the calendar for consideration?

Mr. LUCAS. This resolution applies only to standing committees and special committees which have heretofore been authorized by the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, these committees would be extended anyway up to the end of this Congress, that is, the 3d day of January, without this resolution, would they not?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. What this resolution does is to extend the life of the committees and their jurisdiction for 1 month beyond the date on which they would expire anyway?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. It would give the Senators opportunity, during the 30-day period, to reoffer resolutions for the purpose of asking for money to carry on the functions of the committees during the session which would then have convened.

Mr. BARKLEY. Are there any special committees which would expire prior to the 1st day of January which this resolution would operate to extend until the 31st of January?

Mr. LUCAS. That is probably true, but the committee thought that perhaps it was just as well to follow the usual custom, and provide that any special committee which would expire at the end of this Congress should not expire at that time, but opportunity would be given to reoffer resolutions if Senators so desired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand, this is the same resolution to the consideration of which I objected, but it is modified as the Senator from Nebraska has indicated?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Maine is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate a resolution (S. Res. 291), submitted by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] on June 24, 1946, asking for an additional $5,000 for the Committee on Appropriations. I ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, authorized by Senate Resolution 9, agreed to January 6, 1945, and Senate Resolution 132, agreed to June 28, 1945, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, for the same purposes, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, $5,000 in addition to the amount of $15,000 heretofore authorized.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably Senate Resolution 281, submitted on June 7 by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], which requests an additional $5,000 for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, one of the standing committees of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, authorized by Senate Resolution 9, agreed to January 6, 1945, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, for the same purposes, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, $5,000 in addition to the amount of $5,000 heretofore authorized.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I call up the conference report on House bill 6064, to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

(See conference report printed in full in the RECORD of June 21, 1946, pp. 7266–7267.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, does the Senator from Colorado intend to go on with the report today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I hope there will not be much debate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And finish it tonight?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I hope so.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I do not expect to take any great length of time in discussing the conference report. I only wish to reiterate the position I took when the question of the extension of the draft was before the Senate. My position then was taken on the basis of the figures and facts which were furnished to the Military Affairs Committee, largely from the Army and the staff of the Army and its representatives when they appeared before the committee.

I have taken the position, based upon those figures, that the army that is desired by this country can be obtained through voluntary enlistments. There are parts of this extension measure to which I heartily subscribe, and particularly the provision for not drafting fathers, and for releasing fathers, and for releasing men with 18 months of service. My colleagues on the Military Affairs Committee know my stand upon those subjects, and I have been in favor of such action.

However, there is now before the Senate the provision of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives that would induct men between 19 and 45 years of age. Since the beginning of the discussion of this whole subject, I have never differentiated in the ages, so that if any should be taken, then they should all be taken within the years covered. But it seems to me that in extending this inducting phase to men 45 years of age we are going quite high. A man in his forties, even a man in his thirties, is a little too old usually to make a good soldier. I make the statement to be consistent—and I feel it to be consistent with the position I held formerly—that further induction should not be provided for until the Congress itself sees a need for the calling up of more men. That is the reason that I myself, as a Member of the Senate, shall vote against the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1850) to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in light of the fact that Senate bill 1850 is the unfinished business before the Senate, I wish to offer and send to the desk and have printed an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 1850. In explanation of the amendment I wish to say that I did not join in with the views of the minority of the Military Affairs Committee, because I believe fully and completely in the objectives of Senate bill 1850. As is well known, for some years I have been connected with Princeton University. I have been in touch with a number of scientific people. I am deeply interested in this legislation. I am offering the amendment in behalf of myself and some of my colleagues, not to create difficulty in connection with this subject, but to try to present a slightly different approach to the matter, so that we may consider both the approach of the main bill and the approach of this amendment.

What I am interested in primarily is vesting in the proper kind of scientific groups the control of funds for scientific research. I shall not develop the subject further, but in advocacy of my amendment when the time comes to debate it I shall be glad to elaborate further on that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

BRITISH REGULATIONS RESPECTING TRAVEL BY AIR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to take much of the time of the Senate now, but at a later day I shall have something further to say on the matter of international air transport. I wish to say now, however, that it is one of the most important subjects facing this country at the present time. I was much concerned when an article which appeared in a number of newspapers was called to my attention. The article I have before me happens to be from the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon of Thursday, June 20, 1946. It is by John A. Thale, of the Chicago Daily News Foreign Service. The article comes out of San Juan, P. R. I shall ask that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

Briefly, I wish to say to the Senate that the sense of the article—and there is every indication that the correspondent is accurate in his reporting—is that the passengers on American air lines are confronted with obstacles which do not apply to the passengers on the British West Indies air lines. In other words, an American passenger traveling on a British air line is given different treatment from that accorded an American passenger traveling on an American air line. The particular point to which the correspondent refers is that an American traveling on the American air lines in order to disembark at certain islands of the British West Indies airports must have a letter from the governor of the particular British possession; and, from the indications given in the article, it is difficult for an American traveling on an American air line to obtain such a letter. If he travels on a British plane he is not required to secure a letter from the governor of the British possession.

I today have addressed a communication to the Department of State asking them as to what steps they have taken to look into this matter, and inquiring also, if the facts are as reported, just what they have done to protect American interests in this matter of international aviation.

Mr. President, I have not the least doubt that under the American system we can compete with any type of system in the world today, be it the communism of Russia or the new socialism of Britain. But we cannot do it, Mr. President, if the American system and those who believe in it are to have their hands tied by their own Government, or if their own Government is to permit obstacles to be put in their way in competing on equal terms in the international field.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. The point the Senator is raising before the Senate is the very point which was raised by me at the time I voted against the British loan. Regardless of how much friendship any one may have for another people or another nation—and I have just as great a respect and friendship for the British people as has anyone else in the United States—I cannot understand how the representatives of the American people in the United States Congress could vote to hand $3,750,000,000 to the British Government without correcting some of the very conditions the Senator from California is now talking about.

Mr. President, it is just plain common sense that when there exists a number of conditions which are wrong, or when there is misunderstanding between two parties and one of them wants the other to do a certain thing which he needs to have done very much, the parties should sit down together and say, "Let us correct the existing inequities before we do this other thing."

I am glad the Senator from California has raised this issue, but it does not do any good to lock the barn door after the horse is gone. The horse is pretty nearly gone now, I am told. I merely want to emphasize that, irrespective of the love one may have in his heart for other peoples of the world—and I have a very deep feeling for other nations—my practical experience in life tells me that the time to adjust conditions which are not right, which are not just, which are not equitable, is when one of the parties very greatly desires something the other party has. The thing to do is right then and there to say, "Let us adjust the misunderstandings we have respecting naval bases; let us adjust all our differences respecting air bases; let us adjust the questions relating to international communications so that everything is on an equal, fair basis, and there is equity between your country and our country."

Mr. President, if we are going to be friends, there is no use in talking about being friends unless we can find the essence and the principles of equity in our relationships.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that in December and January of this year, as a member of the subcommittee of the Mead committee, together with my colleague the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], I went on a 30,000-mile air trip around the world to investigate the disposal of Army and Navy surplus properties. On that trip we had called to our attention time after time, and we had the opportunity of seeing with our own eyes, airfields on which hundreds of millions of dollars of the money of the American taxpayers had been spent. This Government had not reserved rights to use commercial facilities on those fields which we had built. At that time it seemed to me that our Government had been very lax in not protecting what appeared to be a legitimate American interest.

Mr. HAWKES. Let me say one thing further to the Senator from California. I know what is going to happen in the United States 2 or 3 years after we have done all these things. It has been happening for years. People by the hundreds of thousands will say to us, as their representatives, "Why did you not protect the interests of America fairly at that time?"

That is all I am talking about. All I want is a square deal. During the past week I have talked with two or three distinguished British citizens. They agree with what I am saying in the Senate. They agree that it is in the interest of future friendship between the British people and the American people that we should adjust these things on a basis which is sound and fair at the present time.

I repeat what I said at the time of the British loan. God deliver me from an honest misunderstanding. An honest misunderstanding can be a thousand times more serious than a dishonest misunderstanding. I hope the American people will wake up not only with relation to Great Britain, but with relation to every other nation with which we deal. I hope we can see that the only way in which to build the magnificent peace about which we are talking today is by being sound in the deals we make, and sound in our relationships with the rest of the world. All the beautiful reaction which comes from the emotions of the heart will be dead when the pocketbook is empty.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Thale to which I referred in the beginning of my remarks may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN JUAN, P. R., June 20.—Some American officials in the Caribbean area complain that the British are giving them a fast shuffle.

The point of dispute is commercial use of military airfields built by the United States on leased bases in British territory. These bases were acquired in 1940 when Winston Churchill, needing 50 destroyers, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, wanting some more bases in the Caribbean, sat down and swapped.

Pan American Airways officials assert that the British now are adopting regulations which give their own British West Indies Airways an advantage in carrying passengers into the territory involved.

Under the Bermuda air agreement adopted this spring, planes of both nations were granted the right to use the United States military bases in Bermuda, Antigua, St. Lucia, and British Guiana.

UNITED STATES SPENT MILLIONS

During the war, the United States spent millions of dollars in establishing airfields there. Bulldozers pushed back jungles and leveled coral wastes. Broad runways and miles of taxi strips were laid down. Administrative buildings were constructed. The fields were used for maintaining antisubmarine patrols and as way-points in the long aerial supply line to Europe and the east.

Now that the bases have been opened to British and American commercial planes, Pan American Airways officials assert that British regulations are bringing on what amounts, to say the least, to considerable confusion.

Passengers who wait to fly via Pan American to Coolidge Field on Antigua, Beane Field on St. Lucia, and Atkinson Field in British Guiana, are told that they must have a personal letter of permission from the governor of the territory before they will be permitted to disembark.

LETTERS NOT AVAILABLE

Pan American has no way of knowing officially, but confused passengers have complained to their officials that those letters from the governor are not, in practice, forthcoming.

At the same time, passengers report that if they attempt to book a trip into one of those places via British West Indies Airways, nothing is said about the letter from the governor.

Pan American officials have been pressing, through diplomatic and private sources, to get the rule changed, but so far without too much success. In Antigua, for example, the requirement was waived for a time, but then reimposed.

They also maintain that the personal letter rule (besides being unfair to P. A. A.) if it is also imposed on B. W. I. A., also needlessly complicates the business of international travel in the Caribbean.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the House has adopted the conference report on the extension of the Price Control and Stabilization Acts. I do not know whether we shall receive a message from the House before we take a recess or not, but I wish to advise the Senate that as soon as practicable tomorrow after the convening of the Senate the conference report will be taken up for consideration.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—CONSTRUCTION OF WATAUGA AND SOUTH HOLSTON PROJECTS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, a few days ago Mr. Lilienthal and his associates on the TVA came before the Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate, of which the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is chairman, and asked for an appropriation of $10,666,000, requesting that the active construction of the Watauga project be started immediately and that the construction of the South Holston project be started late in the fiscal year 1948.

To this the senior Senator from Tennessee strongly objected and told these gentlemen that he would offer the following amendment:

And of which $17,666,000 shall be available for the immediate resumption of construction and continued prosecution of the work on the Watauga and South Holston Dams with a view to the completion of the work on both dams at the earliest possible date.

After some argument Mr. Lilienthal was asked by the chairman whether, if the Congress approved the larger amount, he would proceed with the work, and he said he would.

Early in the hearing the chairman addressed a number of questions to Mr. Lilienthal concerning charges which had been made against the chairman by newspapers and others. The following is taken from the record:

The CHAIRMAN. Did I ever recommend any human being to you or to your Authority so far as you know to hold any office in your organization or any position in your organization?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Senator, so far as I can recall, and I think I would recall, you have never urged the appointment of any individual.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you another question. Did I ever, in any way, try to interfere with your internal affairs at all except to have you pay your receipts into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Senator, if you mean by "personal interference," of course, no.

The CHAIRMAN. I saw in the newspapers a few days ago that you had paid $12,000,000 of your receipts into the Treasury. Was that correct or not?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. That is approximately the figure. To get it exactly, $12,597,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you intend, or expect, or have you made any arrangements to move your principal offices from Tennessee to Muscle Shoals?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. The answer to that is this, that we do expect and have, since the first recommendation made on that to the Bureau of the Budget in 1939, perhaps 1940, to move, and to build appropriate offices for the central administrative force, which is now in Knoxville, at Muscle Shoals. That would have to take place over a period of time. But that is and has been our intention.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I want to go back to a little ancient history. Do you remember yours and Dr. Morgan's "yardstick" theory, that you build three or four dams, not exceeding four, to teach the private power companies what they should charge for power, and that you did not intend to go into competition with private power companies? That is a long, long time ago, but that was your theory then.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. It is a long time ago, but my recollection on it is clear. I never had the notion that that was our function.

The CHAIRMAN. The "yardstick" theory, you did not subscribe to that?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Not in the way you describe it, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. You remember the occasion, I know, and I know you were not in favor of those dams at that time. (That is the number of dams like the Chickamauga, Guntersville, Watts Bar, Gilbertsville, Fort Loudoun, and other dams.)

Mr. LILIENTHAL. If that is your recollection, I am sure you must have examined the record. I do not have a clear recollection about it.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you this question, although I believe you have already answered it. I want to make it very specific: Do you recall that all of your dams were built by Senate amendments offered by me after the House had refused you appropriations except for the Douglas Dam?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No, sir; I would not think that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Which one was not offered by me?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. My recollection is that every one of these dams, none of these dams, have been built except such as have been recommended by the TVA and recommended by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. They were approved after my amendments had been agreed to by the Senate, and they went to conference. I call your attention to Guntersville, Chickamauga, Hiwassee, Gilbertsville, Watauga, Fort Loudoun, Cherokee, and all the other dams.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Senator, I remember any number of instances in which, as you say, dams recommended by the TVA were not approved initially in the House, and it was only when they got to the Senate that they were approved, and then in conference were retained.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you this question, and I am led to it because the newspapers have so much to say about it lately, about my opposition to the TVA: Have I ever opposed an appropriation for the TVA? Do you know of any appropriation that I ever in my legislative history opposed for the TVA?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I certainly do not.

The CHAIRMAN. There is this about it, Mr. Lilienthal, that the papers down there that publish these things are undertaking to distort the truth, and I want you to name any appropriation that I ever refused to give to the TVA for any dam. Now, just name a single solitary one. It takes appropriations to build dams. You know that. Now, can you name any appropriation, or any increase of an appropriation, that you have ever asked for to build a dam, that I refused?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Senator, I think the record is already clear on that. I answered a direct question on that and I will be glad to repeat it, that all the appropriations—well, answering your question, the opposition to appropriations relating to dams relate in particular only to this particular item (the Douglas Dam), and in the end the appropriation was granted.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to know of any others.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. There are not any others.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Now, on the question of the broader word "opposition," that is a matter of construction. We have differed on a question of policy.

The CHAIRMAN. Only a question of policy.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. In relation to section 26; that is all. (Sec. 26, paying his receipts into the Treasury.)

The CHAIRMAN. In relation to putting your receipts into the Treasury of the United States. That is the only one, is it not?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I have no recollection of any other one.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I want to ask you this, in view of statements that have been made in newspapers: Are you or the TVA or any of the subordinates taking part in the senatorial campaign in Tennessee?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you, as an individual, or as head of the TVA, contributed any money or other thing of value to anyone in the present senatorial or gubernatorial campaign?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No, sir.

Mr. President, in the interest of saving time I ask that all the testimony on this subject be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY OF RECOMMENDATION FOR DOUGLAS DAM

The CHAIRMAN. Do you recall that you first recommended these dams and then you thought that it would be better to build the Douglas Dam instead of these dams?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe the House put the Douglas Dam in and we agreed to it, or did we agree to it first?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I do not recall the details but I think the first way you stated it is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Incidentally, that is the only dam that was started in the House, of all these dams; is that correct?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I do not recall, but I think that is so.

The CHAIRMAN. That is my recollection.

COMPLETION FAVORED OF WATAUGA AND SOUTH HOLSTON DAMS

Now, whatever the past is, you now want to complete those dams.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Yes. These dams are partly completed, and they are good projects. They are necessary projects. We believe now is the time to complete them.

The CHAIRMAN. I am glad to hear it.

NO TVA APPOINTMENTS RECOMMENDED BY SENATOR M'KELLAR

In 1945 you were present before the committee and I asked you a question and I want to ask that question again, now.

Did I ever recommend any human being to you or to your Authority, so far as you know, to hold any office in your organization or any position in your organization?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Senator, so far as I can recall, and I think I would recall, you have never urged the appointment of any individual.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure that is correct, and I want to thank you for that statement.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. If there are any exceptions I believe they would be purely formal recommendations.

ITEMS ON WHICH VIEWPOINTS DIFFERED

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you another question. Did I ever, in any way, try to interfere with your internal affairs at all except to have you pay your receipts into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Senator, if you mean personnel interference, of course, no.

The CHAIRMAN. Any interference?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. If you mean a difference of viewpoint, of course, there have been some differences. They have been, however, related to the Douglas Dam, to section 26, or similar matters, so far as I know.

The CHAIRMAN. What is section 26?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. It concerns TVA's financial, fiscal policy.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, paying your receipts into the Treasury of the United States.

HISTORY OF SUBSTITUTION OF DOUGLAS DAM

As to the Douglas Dam, you recall that while I favored the building of the Holston River Dam and the Watauga first, that I agreed and the committee agreed, and that was done, and that the next year I put in, without recommendation from you, these two dams that we are now talking about. Is not that right?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. My recollection is somewhat different on those dams. My recollection is that your position was that these two dams be substituted for the Douglas Dam when it was recommended.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. And the Holston projects were approved by Congress ahead of Douglas Dam.

The CHAIRMAN. All of them were put in.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Yes, sir. The difference there was a matter of timing. We always agreed with you and you agreed with us that these upper Holston dams should be built. The question was when construction should be undertaken.

The CHAIRMAN. That is fine, and that is correct.

PAYMENT OF PROCEEDS INTO THE TREASURY

I saw in the newspapers a few days ago that you had paid $12,000,000 of your receipts into the Treasury. Was that correct or not?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. That is approximately the figure. To get it exactly, $12,597,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That is as I remember it. You say that is correct?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If you are opposed to the principle of your organization paying its moneys into the Treasury, why did you pay that $12,597,000?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. The payment of $12,597,000 was in accordance with the provisions of section 26 of the act in which we believe, and which we have urged, should not be changed. That section provides that 6 months after the end of the fiscal year such funds as the Board finds are not required for the purposes specified in section 26 shall be paid into the Treasury.

DIFFERING VIEWS AS TO PAYING WHOLE GROSS RECEIPTS INTO THE TREASURY

Our difference, Senator, was that we believe in the system of payment to the Treasury as set out in section 26 and as I understood your position you believed that section 26 which permits the use of receipts for certain operations described in that section, should be replaced with a general provision that currently, from day to day, all TVA receipts should go into the Treasury and that operating expenses should depend on appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. Just like the Post Office Department and just like every other of the many departments of the Government. That is correct. That is the difference.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. That is the difference.

The CHAIRMAN. So far as I know that is the only difference. I do not recall any others.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. It was a difference about management policy, and we did our best to persuade each other.

The CHAIRMAN. And under that section you paid in $12,597,000.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Under section 26; yes, sir.

TRANSFER OF OFFICES TO MUSCLE SHOALS

The CHAIRMAN. Do you intend, or expect, or have you made any arrangements to move your principal offices from Tennessee to Muscle Shoals?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. We do expect and have, since the first recommendation was made to the Bureau of the Budget in 1939 or 1940, to move, and to build appropriate offices for the central administrative force, which is now in Knoxville, at Muscle Shoals. The move would have to take place over a period of time. That is and has been our intention.

The CHAIRMAN. Then that is what you intended to do, and that was the substance of a statement that you gave out to the papers not a great while ago. I do not recall just when it was. They might have taken it from your report, but wherever they got it, I saw it in the papers.

RECOLLECTIONS OF ADVOCATING "YARDSTICK" THEORY

Now, I want to go back to a little ancient history. Do you remember your and Dr. Arthur Morgan's yardstick theory, that you build three or four dams, not exceeding four, to teach the private power companies what they should charge for power, and that you did not intend to go into competition with private power companies? That is a long time ago, but that was your theory then.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. It is a long time ago, but my recollection on it is clear. I never have had the notion that that was our function.

The CHAIRMAN. The yardstick theory, you did not subscribe to that?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Not in the way you describe it, Senator. So far as the number of dams to be constructed is concerned, that was set out in a report of our Board to the Congress in 1936. It was called the unified development of the Tennessee River system, and provided for the building of virtually all the dams that have now been built.

HISTORY OF SENATE AMENDMENTS FOR CONSTRUCTION DAMS

The CHAIRMAN. But before that you and Dr. Morgan had wanted to limit the dams. In order to refresh your memory I will ask you if you do not recall on one occasion prior to 1936 when the Guntersville and the Chickamauga Dams were up. You and Dr. Morgan came to me, at the time I had offered the amendments in the Senate, and urged me not to do it, that you advised not to go into competition with the private power companies, and that you did not want those dams built, and you urged me to withdraw my amendment. You remember that occasion, I am sure.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No, Senator, that is a long time ago, but I am sure this is true. My recollection checks with yours to this extent: We undoubtedly did have a difference of opinion about the Chickamauga Dam but only as to time construction should begin.

The CHAIRMAN. But you did not want it that year.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. My recollection is that we thought the Hiwassee Dam should be built ahead of the Chickamauga Dam. I would have to check that. But that is simply a question of when the dam should be built.

Whether the dam should be built or not, I think we were always in agreement that this whole system should be built.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you the same question, and I am sure you will remember the question asked previously. You and Dr. Morgan came to my office at the time when I offered an amendment to build the Guntersville Dam, the Chickamauga Dam, the Hiwassee Dam, and the Gilbertsville Dam, all four, for authorization to have them built and to furnish an appropriation for it. I remember your coming to me and asking me to withdraw my amendment, certainly for that year. I was surprised that you did not remember.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Senator, I do not want to get into a controversy over that.

The CHAIRMAN. No; but I do want to get the facts.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I do want to say this, that if there were such differences, and it is quite possible that there were differences, they would relate to engineering matters. It is very much like this Watauga and South Holston business.

The fact that for engineering reasons we would recommend that one dam be built ahead of another does not mean we are against the second one. It is our responsibility to make recommendations based on engineering data. It simply means, from an engineering point of view, that that is the most efficient way of scheduling such construction.

The CHAIRMAN. You remember the occasion, I know, and I know you were not in favor of those dams at that time.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. If that is your recollection, I am sure you must have examined the record. I do not have any recollection about it.

The CHAIRMAN. We will leave that alone.

I want to ask you this question, although I believe you have already answered it; I want to make it very specific: Do you recall that all of your dams were built by Senate amendments offered by me after the House had refused you appropriations except for the Douglas Dam?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No, sir; I do not think that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Which one was not offered by me?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. My recollection is that except for the projects under consideration now, construction on none of these dams has been started until they had been recommended by the TVA and approved by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. They were approved after my amendments had been agreed to by the Senate and they went to conference.

I call your attention to Guntersville, Chickamauga, Hiwassee, Gilbertsville, Watauga, Fort Loudoun, Cherokee, and all the other dams. They were just exactly like the situation here today. For some reason the House Members did not agree to these appropriations, and when they came to the Senate, just like I expect my committee to do today, I offered an amendment. I am going to offer an amendment to get them in and then do everything within my power to get the House conferees to agree, and I hope to heaven they will, because I regard this as the final steps taken in one of the greatest projects that I have ever had anything to do with. It is one of the crowning projects of my legislative life, and I am very anxious to get it through.

But I recall very distinctly, and the record here shows, with the exception of the Douglas Dam and the two first dams that were built—Cove Creek Dam and the Wheeler Dam, which were built by allotments that I got the President to make from the WPA and which were continued by allotments I got from the President from the successor of it, the PWA—we got an appropriation, you remember. And possibly the Pickwick.

The first dams that we ever appropriated the money for were the Wheeler and the Cove Creek, which was afterwards called the Norris Dam. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Senator, do I remember a number of instances in which, as you say, the construction of dams recommended by the TVA was not approved in the House initially, and it was only when they got to the Senate that they were approved, and then in conference were retained.

From 1940 on, I think, however, the dams TVA recommended were first approved in the House. However, the record will show that.

NO TVA APPROPRIATION OPPOSED BY SENATOR M'KELLAR

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you this question, and I am led to it because the newspapers have so much to say about it lately, about my opposition to the TVA: Have I ever opposed an appropriation for the TVA? Do you know of any appropriation that I ever in my legislative history opposed for the TVA?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Your people down there, your supporters and your newspapers, and you have some newspapers down there that seem to be under your control, have frequently said that I was opposed to the TVA. What possible phase of the TVA have I ever opposed? Can you think of one?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Senator, if you will permit me, I should like to ask you to take out of the question the reference to "controlling newspapers." I am sure you did not mean that.

The CHAIRMAN. I know there are certain newspapers down there that are talking about my opposition to the TVA all the time, and it is so untrue that I feel that it is my duty to myself, as well as to you, that the facts might be known.

You know I have never opposed any appropriation of the TVA. Is not that true?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. We have had differences, and some of them have related to appropriations, as, for example, the Douglas Dam.

The CHAIRMAN. That is where I gave in and approved it, and the record here shows it, and we passed a law approving it, and it was done with my vote as well as other votes. That is true, is it not?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. As far as I am concerned I do not see any advantage in emphasizing what the differences were with respect to Douglas Dam.

The CHAIRMAN. There is this about it, Mr. Lilienthal, that the papers down there that publish these things are undertaking to distort the truth, and I want you to name any appropriation that I ever refused to give to the TVA for any dam. Now, just name a single solitary one. It takes appropriations to build dams. You know that. Now, can you name any appropriation, or any increase of an appropriation, that you have ever asked for to build a dam, that I refused?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Senator, I think the record is already clear. I have answered a direct question on that already. I will be glad to repeat in answer to your question that so far as I know, opposition on your part to appropriations for dam construction is limited to Douglas Dam, and in the end that appropriation was granted.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to know of any others.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. There are no other cases.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I wanted to know.

DIFFERING VIEWS AS TO PAYING WHOLE GROSS RECEIPTS INTO THE TREASURY

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Now, on the question of the broader word "opposition," that is a matter of interpretation. We have differed on a question of policy relating to the management of TVA.

The CHAIRMAN. Only a question of policy.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. As expressed in section 26 of the TVA Act.

The CHAIRMAN. In relation to putting your receipts into the Treasury of the United States. That is the only one, is it not?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. At the moment I have no recollection of any other one.

POLICY AND PRACTICE OF TVA AS TO EMPLOYEES PARTICIPATING IN POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I want to ask you this, in view of statements that have been made in newspapers: Are you or the TVA or any of the subordinates taking part in the senatorial campaign in Tennessee?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you, as an individual, or as head of the TVA, contributed any money or other thing of value to anyone in the present senatorial or gubernatorial campaign?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No, sir; and I would like to expand on that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Are any of your officers taking part in that campaign?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Now I will be very happy to have you expand on your statement.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I would just like to restate what I stated last year about the policy of our Board and the management of the TVA with respect to the question you have raised of participation by our officials or employees in any kind of political campaigns.

At the very beginning of the TVA, before there was a Hatch Act, before there was a national policy on the question——

The CHAIRMAN. And you have a prohibition in your own act, too.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. In part because of certain provisions of the TVA Act we formulated a policy which goes beyond what later became the Hatch Act with respect to the participation of officers or employees in political matters, and political campaigns, even including local campaigns. Our policy went pretty far in the sense that it kept a lot of good citizens out of local affairs when for the community it perhaps might be better if they participated, but we thought it wise to make the rule very broad.

The penalties for violation were to be drastic, and fortunately I think there have only been two or three cases in all these years when discipline was required.

Now, bringing it down to the senatorial campaign, there is no reason to believe that that policy will not be observed in both the letter and the spirit in any future campaign.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1654) to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 26, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 25 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

John S. Hooker, of Maryland, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Granville Mellen, of Mississippi, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the unexpired term of 6 years from September 26, 1944.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

(Asterisk (*) indicates officers who will be designated as EDO officers upon receipt of their acceptance)

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

*Charles E. Briner	*Harold W. Keopka
Dale E. Collins	Harrison G. White

TO BE LIEUTENANTS

Harry A. Adams, Jr.	Eric C. Lambart
*Ralph V. Anderson	*John W. Malley
*Paul J. Burr	*Martin W. Mason
Wesley W. Carlson	Freeman D. Miller
Frank A. Dingfelder	George L. Phillips
Henry W. Dusinberre	Frank R. Putnam
George O. Gjoerloff	*James C. Radford
*James D. Hardy	*George B. Raser 3d
Charles B. Henriques	*Jack S. Stewart
Elgin B. Hurlbert	Peter K. Wells
Keith M. Krieger	Robert P. Winkel

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

George W. Albin, Jr.	Charles A. Lamborn
Richard A. Beveridge	Richard J. Lavery
Frank A. Bewley	Joseph T. Lawler
Daniel Bontecou	Charles L. Lipham
Carroll W. Brigham	William M. Lowry
*Parker E. Cherry	Perry R. Mansfield
*Paul T. Coil	Charles H. Mead
*Robert I. Cozzens	Thomas O. Murray
Carl R. Cunninghan, Jr.	Clarence W. Petrie
	*Harry D. Pickett
James W. Daniel, Jr.	Herbert F. Rommel, Jr.
George E. Dawson	Arthur M. Savage
Robert G. Dose	Albert P. Scott
Oscar W. Goepner	Edwin A. Shuman, Jr.
Donald M. Granstrom	Adolf L. Siegner
Orville E. Hardcastle	Franklin C. Snow
James E. Hartung	*Geoffrey Thompson
Reed K. Henderson	*William J. Van Meter,
Joseph M. Hermanson	Jr.
*Edward W. Hribar	Byron D. Voegelin
*William D. Hudgins	William E. Wallace
William A. Keefe	

TO BE ENSIGNS

James W. Abbott, Jr.	Carl S. Baker
Lawrence W. Abbott, Jr.	William B. Baker
	Merritt W. W. Baldwin, Jr.
Stanley F. Abele	
*Charles T. R. Adams	Robert N. Bale
David L. Adrian	George A. Bane
John F. Ahearn, Jr.	Fred "G" Barham
Robert J. Ahern	Paul R. Barker
James H. Airheart	Marion F. Barnett
Edgar L. Allen	James B. Barnette
Thomas E. Altgilbers	Harry R. Barnhorst
Joseph B. Ambler	Ralph L. Barnum
John B. Amos	Edmond A. Basquin
Harvey M. Andersen	Henry H. Bate, Jr.
Anthony L. Anderson	John F. Bauman
David G. Anderson	Wayne A. Baumgartner
*Frederic W. Anderson	Troy C. Beavers
George H. Anderson	*John C. Beckett
Scott K. Anderson	Albert J. Beede
Bernard A. Andrade	Herman C. Lehnke
*Richard Andrews	John R. Behr
Robert T. Andrews	Leo H. Benker
Theodore L. Appelquist	Ezra R. Bennett
	LeRoy E. Bennett
George A. Arbogust	David W. Benson
Robert G. Armstrong	Herbert V. W. Bergamini
Joseph F. Arrigoni	
Charles V. August	Robert B. Bergner
Joseph J. August	Samuel B. Berrey
Julian Aulich	William K. Bickenbach
Harvey H. Avants	John R. Bicknell
Edwin R. Ayres	George W. Bird
John C. Azab	Ralph F. Bishop
*Philip B. R. Baas, Jr.	John A. Black
Joseph J. Bacak	Donald M. Blake
Julius J. T. Bachman	Gordon Blake
Omer R Badger	Norman Blam
Herbert E. Bailey	James L. Bloom

Paul J. Bloom
Francis W. Bloomer
*Roger E. Boak
Charles H. Boldt, Jr.
David L. Bond, Jr.
Arden P. Bonner, Jr.
Robert F. Boord
Cecil W. Boswell
Jack F. Bouldin
David A. Bowdoin
Charles H. Bowen, Jr.
William D. Bowen
Fred Y. Boyer
William G. Boyer
Wilfred K. Bradbury
Oscar S. Braddock, Jr.
William S. Bradway, Jr.
Thomas J. Brady
Titus Branchi
Ferdinand L. Brand
Walter J. Brauer
Leo A. Braun
Charles E. Breen, Jr.
Cleon A. Brewer
Clarence P. Broadfoot, Jr.
James K. Brock
Charles P. Brooks
Clarence M. Brooks
Charles A. Brown, Jr.
Harry J. Brown, Jr.
Russell E. Brown
Robert E. Brownlee, Jr.
Joseph W. Brumbach
George D. Brundige
David Bryan, Jr.
George Buben
Clyde E. Buchanan, Jr.
Lawrence E. Budnick
Robert L. Buell
Lemuel P. Bumpers
John F. Burdoin
Emery L. Burgess
Wilbur J. Burgin
Noel A. Burkey, Jr.
Robert W. Burkhart
Robert M. Burnell
Harry A. Burns, Jr.
Robert E. Burrell
Lindsay L. Buswell
John L. Butler, Jr.
George J. Buyse
Ambros W. Byrd
Robert F. Byrnes
Jesse F. Cable
Ernest M. Cadenas
Adrian G. Cairns, Jr.
Robert J. Callahan
Richard J. Camp
William H. Camp
William A. Campbell, Jr.
Donald J. Canna
*Clifton E. Cantlon
Robert D. Carleton
George G. Carr
Winthrop W. Carr
Robert M. Carroll
Harry E. Carter
Gerald F. Case
Columbus F. Cauthen, Jr.
Lucian M. Cayce
Charles H. Chamberlain
Lewis C. Chamberlin
Terry M. Chambers
Laurin C. Champion
Ray E. Chance
Kenneth J. Chapman
Oscar I. Chenoweth, Jr.
Harry P. Chess
Wesley E. Chessman
William H. Christensen
Robert L. Clarke
Lane E. Clendenin
Duane M. Clough
Harry H. Cloutier
Paul A. Coari
Edward L. Colley
Henry D. M. Collins
Wilbur P. Collins
*Willard C. Collins
Paul C. Combs
Edwin S. Conant
Elton V. Conger
Seward B. Coningham
John M. Connolly, Jr.
Walter E. Constance
Elmer A. Conzett
George C. Cook
Emmett M. Cooke, Jr.
Walter Cooper
Steven T. Cornelius-sen
Leland B. Cornell
John E. Coste
John C. Costello, Jr.
John S. Cowart
*Harry C. Cox
*John H. Craft, Jr.
William D. Craig
*Kenneth W. Cramp
Grover W. Crawford
*William R. Crawford
Victor E. Crews
Eugene F. Criner
Gordon E. Crosby, Jr.
Armand C. Crossen
Carl M. Cruse
Herschel M. Cummins, Jr.
William E. Cummins
William D. Curry
Clifford B. Curtis, Jr.
Robert L. Cusick
Franklin J. Dailey
*Lowell P. Daniels
Marion Dargan, Jr.
Paul D. Davidson
William A. Davidson
Calvin R. Davis
John F. Davis
Leon F. Davis
Lewis E. Davis, Jr.
Maxey B. Davis
Robert J. Davis, Jr.
William D. Davis, Jr.
Richard R. Davison
William Deacon 3d
James S. Dearth
Harold J. DeBray
Paul J. Dee
Harold L. Defenbaugh
Philip L. Defliese
Kenneth A. De Ghetto
Raymond L. Dehler
Gregory L. Deliyanne
Walter J. Dempsey
Lewis E. Derry
Ralph "E" De Vore, Jr.
Lawrence A. Dewing
Melvin J. Dillon
Samuel H. Dinsmore
Harry C. Dittler
Eugene D. Dodson
Joseph F. Dorrington
Alan Dougall
Kenneth G. Dougherty
Daniel E. Douglas
Anderson M. Dowling
Robert C. Downing
James P. Doyle
Philip P. Doyle
William J. Doyle
*Francis X. Driscoll
*Lowell F. W. Duell
James H. Duncan
Donald L. Dunklee
James W. Durborow
Harold S. Durfee
Gordon A. Durna
Robert C. Dykins
Stuart T. Edgerton, Jr.
Francis E. Edmunds
Eldon L. Edwards
John Q. Edwards 3d
Robert W. Edwards
Donald D. Egly
David L. Ellis
Robert M. Ellis
Harry O. Enderson
Douglas K. English
*George S. Essenwine
George G. Estes, Jr.
*Willard A. Ethridge
Harry W. Evans
Martin L. Everhart, Jr.
Adelbert R. Evers
*Douglas G. Ewen
John W. Fair
George W. Fairbanks
Edward Falkowski
John E. Farrell
Richard S. Farrington
Thomas J. Fatkin
Richard E. Favreau
Joseph E. Feaster
Alfred J. Fecke
Clyde H. Fellows, Jr.
Jack Felsman
Benjamin Fern
*Edwin D. Ferretti
Herman C. Finkel, Jr.
Joseph C. Finnigan
Robert L. Finucane
Lowell E. Fisher
Mark E. Fitzgerald
Mayo M. Fitzhugh
*John P. Fitzpatrick
Max Flack
Bernard A. Fleck
John H. Flook
Joe H. Floyd
Albert H. Folensbee
John A. Foley
Thomas W. Foley
Walter A. Foley
Arlo Ford
William R. Ford
Harold M. Forrest
Edward D. Foye, Jr.
*Ralph E. Frank
Richard B. Franklin
Edward D. Franz
Dean M. French
Ferris L. French, Jr.
Paul V. French
Whitman H. Frick
Jack L. Fruin
William H. Funston
Joseph G. Galligan, Jr.
Bernard L. Garbow
John T. Garrow
Hugh M. Garvey
Richard S. Garvey
Donald E. Gately
James L. Gates
Leon W. Geer
Jerome D. Geisler
*Duane J. Gerry
Paul L. B. Gesner
James T. Gheen
Thomas E. Gibbs
Frank A. Gibe, Jr.
Ronald P. Gift
Robert C. Gilchriest
William L. Gill
Paul R. Goddard
Francis G. Gooding, Jr.
Harold J. Goodnow
Joseph H. Goodpasture
Winslow W. Goodwin
Donald W. Gordon
Erving L. Gordon
Robert G. Gorman
George A. Gowen
Homer C. Grasberger
Gerald C. Gravius
Robert J. Gray
Floyd J. Greene
*Carl F. Greer
Donald D. Griffey
Mitchell C. Griffin
Ralph I. Grigsby
John W. Gross
Robert H. Gulmon
Leonard A. Gundert
Joe M. Gunn
Donald M. L. Hager
Paul A. Haider
George D. Haines
Alfred J. Hall, Jr.
Stephen P. Hall
James E. Hammerstone
*Benjamin J. Haney, Jr.
Daniel H. Hanscom
Robert F. Harbison
Clarence C. Harbour
Terry Hardenberg
James H. Hardy
William W. Hargrave
James H. Harms
Charles B. Harrington
Raymond M. Harris
Thomas S. Harris
John R. Hart
*Frank R. Hartin
Gordon E. Hartley
Richard R. Hartwell
Edward S. Haugen
William S. Hawkes
Rupert D. Hawley
George A. Hayes
Eugene J. Healey, Jr.
Robert J. Healy
William J. J. Heffernan
Edward A. Heflin
Frederick J. Heiler
William A. Helsell
Bert L. Hendrickson
*Richard H. Henry
John R. Herb
Stanley E. Herbst
George L. Herider
Auburn W. Herron
John B. Herweg
Paul J. Hidding
Douglas Hill
Hollis H. Hills
Harlow Hines
Wilbur F. Hiser
Harold E. Hobson
Ronald W. Hoel
Paul J. Hoffman
Charles H. Hoke
David B. Holland
George E. Hollingsworth
John C. Holloway, Jr.
David C. Holly
Richard A. Holmes
Albert T. Holt
Leahman J. Holt
Hermann K. Hopper
Joseph W. Hopson
Thomas L. Horner
William R. Horton, Jr.
Alexander J. Houghton
Carl L. Howard
Macauley Howard
Robert S. Hoyle
Johan D. W. Hubbeling, Jr.
Woodrow Huddleston
Miller N. Hudson
Walter F. Huff
Albert "G" Hughes
Victor F. Hulstrand
John C. Humphreys
Robert S. Huston
Donald E. Ideker
Meryl A. Iiams
John W. Ingham
Charles W. Ireland
LeRoy E. Irvin
Charles W. Iverson
Sterling H. Ivison, Jr.
*Harry A. Jackson
Henry T. Jacobsen
Richard C. James
Ralph C. Janes
Michael Jarina
James D. Jenkins
Robert S. Jensen
David M. Jeter
Delmar K. Johannsen
Charles W. Johnson
Elmer O. Johnson
Harold J. Johnson
Henry J. Johnson
Keith V. Johnson
Jesse B. Jolly
Paul M. Jones
Thomas C. Jones, Jr.
John T. Jordan
"C" "Y" Justiss
Peter Karonis
Melvin C. Keebaugh
Arthur P. Keegan, Jr.
Frank M. Keele
Warren E. Keene
Richard E. Keister
LeRoy W. J. Keith
Harry M. Keller
Paul W. Kelley
Thomas J. Kelley
Stephen F. Kelley
Michael D. Kelly
Thomas D. Keller
Jefferson Kennedy, Jr.
*Raymond F. Kerr, Jr.
Charles J. Keener
Rufus B. Keys, Jr.
William N. Kidwell, Jr.
Robert W. Kieffer
Samuel B. Killingsworth
David A. King, Jr.
James P. King
Robert E. King, Jr.
Robert J. King
William D. King
James J. Kinsella
William A. Kistler
James R. Kittrell
Willard Kitts
William W. Kitts
Orville O. Klibbe
*Elwyn R. Knickel
Harry Knickelbine
James H. Knight
Robert J. Knoernschild
Eugene L. Knowles
George J. Koehler
Ernest J. Korte
Peter Kooyenga
Wendell S. Koozer
Clarence E. Kuldell
Kay L. Kyle
*Richard H. Lachman
Raymond W. Lamka
James S. Lampe
Ariel L. Lane
Richard H. Langdon
James R. Langford
William J. Langner
William J. La Plante
Gene R. LaRocque
Clyde Lasswell
Melvin W. Lee
Preston P. Lee
William L. LeForge
Russell C. Lemert
Robert "H" Lemmon
David D. Lewis
Harold S. Lewis
Elvin L. Lindsay
George A. Linville, Jr.
Robert L. Livingston
Richard M. Lockhart
David F. Loomis
Frank B. Lopez
Jacque W. Lorch
George W. Loveridge, Jr.
Philip H. Lowry
*Philip E. Lucas
William T. Luce
Kenneth J. Ludwig
Michael T. Lulu
Owen Lyons
Delbert W. Mac Faden
Laurence E. MacFawn
John R. Mackie
*Donald W. Mackiernan
Bobby S. Macklin
John A. Malcomson
Bruce T. Mallory
Robert E. Malmfeldt
Victor E. Marriott
Jack S. Morrow
Bela J. Martin
Charles F. Martin
Robert B. Martin, Jr.
Leonard P. Mathias
Gerard M. Mauer, Jr.
Elwin C. Maupin
Robert C. May
John R. Mayher
*Raymond A. Mazalewski
*Paul H. McAfee, Jr.
William E. McBride
Bernard E. McCabe
Charles McCandliss, Jr.
Arthur J. F. McCarthy
Elwood C. McCoy
Homer A. McCrerey
*Paul W. McEntire
George E. McGovern, Jr.
Clair A. McGuire
Richard P. McHugh
Robert W. McKee
Charles N. McKenna
*Milton L. McKenna
John B. McKinny
William E. McLaughlin
Hugh F. McLinden, Jr.
John J. McMonigle
Edwin F. McNeil
Joseph B. McNeill
Edgar L. McNett
Willard J. McNulty
John H. McSparran
Thomas S. S. Medford
Russell C. Medley
Orville M. Meek
Robert B. Meihaus
Charles M. Melhorn
James W. Mercer
Donald Michie
Emil Mikich
George V. Miller
John A. Miller
Myrl R. Miller
Raymond A. Miller
Jack O. Mills
Robert K. Minard, Jr.
Ray P. Minniear
George C. Moffatt
Gerald M. Monroe
Harold A. Moody, Jr.
Loren D. Moody
Horace B. Moranville
Harold J. Morehouse
Allen C. Morgan
Rutherford B. Morgan
Theodore P. Morgan
John N. O. Mork
George M. Morlier
Lloyd C. Morris
William J. Murray
Leonard N. Nearman
Robert S. Neasham
*William G. Neese
John D. Nevins
*Arthur F. Newell, Jr.
William E. Nicholson, Jr.
Walter F. Nickel
Arthur G. Noehren, Jr.
James H. Norman
Hugh G. Nott
Edward D. Nunnery
Clifford J. Oas
William B. O'Brien
John C. O'Connor
Allen D. Oder
Roderick I. O'Flaherty
*Elliott E. Okins
*Harry J. Older
Dorman S. O'Leary
Donald K. Olson
Willard W. Olson
Henry J. O'Neara, Jr.
Earl A. Orr

Edward F. Osborn
John G. Osborn
*Herbert E. Ost
Richard C. Pantall
Lawrence E. Parsneau
Joseph Pasterchik
Daniel R. Paul
Alvin E. Pawelczyk
Douglas C. Pearson
Forrest A. Pease
Everett H. Pelley
Tom A. Perkins
Herrick R. Peterson
Christopher C. Petroff
Harley J. Pierce
Alden M. Pierpoint
Wayne J. Pike
Robert E. Pine
William Pinkey
Paul Podbielski
Roby E. Poffenberger
James W. Porter
Philip W. Porter, Jr.
Richard M. Price
Francis H. Pritchard, Jr.
Erman O. Proctor
Charles S. Quinn, Jr.
Harry T. Quinn
Irving Radtke
Encil E. Rains
Jerome A. Rapp, Jr.
George S. Rawson
Richard G. Redmond
Charles W. Reed
Marvin Reed
Stephen H. Reed
John S. Reef
*Ira F. Reese
Robert W. Reese
Edwin H. Reeves
Donald A. Regan
John D. Reichel
Andrew H. Reid
Joseph L. Reilly, Jr.
Robert C. Rice
Gerald S. Richey
*Spencer Reitz
Richard R. Renaldi
Robert Ricks
Robert D. Rinesmith
Erhard V. Rinner
Roy Riser
James R. Risley
Floyd M. Ritchie
John W. Roberts
Marlin D. Roberts
Evans J. Robinson
*Russell I. Robinson
William H. Robison
James C. Rock
Charles E. Rodgers
*Harry C. Rodin
George F. Roe
Bernard L. Rogers
William E. Rohde, Jr.
George H. Rood
Jerome J. Rossillon
Leonard P. Ruch
William C. Ruddick
Guiseppe A. Rullo
John W. Ryan, Jr.
William J. Ryan 3d
Rowan H. Salyer
Francis R. Sanborn
Howard E. Sanders
Rodney D. Sanders
Edward A. Sandor
*Keith N. Sargent
John E. Schaefer, Jr.
Delmar A. Schatz
*Philip A. Scheuble, Jr.
Paul W. Schlegel
Stanley C. Schold
Russell C. Schubert
*Leo L. Schweers
Ralph J. Schweinefuss
Merlin J. Schwitters
Robert A. Scurlock
Henry V. Sebach
Gorden N. Selby
Clifford H. Selden, Jr.
Jimmie J. Sellars
Richard L. Shafer
Elbert B. Shane
George H. Sharp
William H. Shaw
George F. Silvani
Royce A. Singleton
John J. Skahill
Stanley E. Sloan
Alan C. Smith
Austin B. Smith
Benedict J. Smith
Eugene C. Smith
Gerald W. Smith
Harold T. Smith, Jr.
John W. Smith
Judson L. Smith
Michel F. Smith
Nicholas J. Smith 3d
Robert J. O. Smith
Virgil A. Smith, Jr.
Charles A. Soderlund
Arthur L. Scholt
Robert L. Sollenberger
William H. Sours
James H. Spalding
Ralph C. Spears
Curtiss Sprague
George W. Staeheli
Howard L. Stalnaker
Harry C. Stanley
Raymond R. Steltzner, Jr.
Walter B. Stephens
Robert S. Stockwell
Renold W. Stoppelmann
Stanford E. Storey
John R. Strane
Edmund J. Stronski
Allan H. Stubbs
John M. Suddreth
John P. Sullivan
*Philip H. Sullivan
William A. Sutherland
Thomas L. Sutton
*Dean H. Swain
Bradford G. Swonetz
Elza F. Tate, Jr.
Lamar S. Taylor
William D. Taylor
*Frederick W. Teepe
*William S. Tenhagen
Raymond J. Tennant
Samuel M. Tharp, Jr.
Ted R. Tharp
George E. Thelen
John L. Thom
Charles F. Thomas
Richard E. Thomas
Allen "B" Thompson
David H. Thompson
George E. Thompson
Herbert S. Thompson
Boyd Thomson
Richard H. Tibbets
Charles E. Tilden
Warwick M. Tinsley, Jr.
William J. Tipler
Buster E. Toon
Harris O. Torgerson
Albert R. Totino
Ygnacio T. Toulon 3d
Stanley B. Tracy, Jr.
Richard C. Tripp
William W. Tucker
Charles W. Turner 3d
Don B. Turner
Jack D. Turner
Freeman N. Tuttle
Theodore K. Ulrich
Donald E. Umphfres
Robert D. Unruh
James C. Ussery
Robert W. Vail
Lowell W. Van Tassel
John C. Vasse
James B. Vaughn
Wintford E. Verkin
Hubert L. Via
Alfred C. Viebranz
Francis E. Vincent
Harold E. Vita
John "P" Vivian, Jr
Stanton W. Waddell
Robert J. Waddick
Arthur R. Waggener
Douglas J. Wagner
Donald E. Walker
Charles U. Walkley
Charles B. Wall, Jr.
*David M. Walley
Fred M. Walters
Harold W. Walters
*Donald F. Walton
Frank K. Warnock
George R. Warren, Jr.
Doyle D. Watkins
Wayne W. Watkins
Omer L. Watson
Joe "W" Watts
Darrell E. Way
Curtis A. Weaver
Sydney R. Weed
Donald H. Weidig
Eugene P. Weinert
David F. Welch
Richard H. Weller
Thomas R. Weschler
William D. Wessinger
Jack West
James C. West
French R. White, Jr.
William B. Whitehurst
Richard W. Widdicombe
John A. Wiegard
Frederick C. Wienholz
Harmon F. Wietz
Charles L. Wilcox
William H. Wild
Malcolm A. Wilkinson
Martin T. Williams, Jr.
Thad "R" Williams
*William S. Willis
Lawrence E. Willson
Archer W. Wilson
Frederick C. Wilson, Jr.
James C. Wilson
James R. Wilson
*William Ralph Wilson
William Ross Wilson
Edward E. Wood
Thomas K. Wood
Robert F. Woody
David D. Work
Alton H. Worrall, Jr.
George L. Wrenn
John R. Wright
William W. Writt
*Frederick L. Yeo
Herbert M. Young
Neil W. Young
William H. Youngblood
James R. Zeitvogel
Richard T. Zettel
*Stanley Ziemba
David W. Zimmer
Donald Zimmerman, Jr.
Milton A. Zimmerman
Orville A. D. Zylstra

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

TO BE SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

George G. Burkley
Harry H. Haight
Clinton K. Higgins
Gerald A. Hopkins
Herman P. McCrimmon
John R. Phillips
Charles W. Reeder
William M. Russell
Christopher C. Shaw

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Herbert P. Benn
Thomas W. Bennett
Alexander S. Dowling
William F. Lyons
Thomas M. Manley
William C. Martin
Jacob L. Rudd
William J. Sheehan
Robert T. Spicer
Charles V. E. Waggoner
Maxwell F. White

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Gale G. Clark
Thomas C. Deas
Richard F. Dobbins
Edwin W. Edwards
Willard M. Fitch
Farrell F. Golden
James W. Gustin
Joseph H. Harris
Oliver S. Hayward
Judson H. Jenkins
James A. Kane
James R. Kingston
Harold H. Macumber
John P. Martin
William F. McKeever
Karl F. Menk
Frank J. Miselis
James A. Murphy
Edward G. Nedwicki
Vorris M. Reist
William R. Simonds
Harvey J. Thompson, Jr.
Paul V. W. Waldo
William E. Walsh
George R. Wiseman, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

TO BE PAYMASTER WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

William M. Landau

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Harry C. Graves
Harry Thornton

TO BE ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

William E. Byrne
Joseph J. Dantone
George M. Driscoll
Frederick F. Fallis
Eldon H. Gleaves
William H. Haeuser, Jr.
Dudley J. Kierulff
John V. Koch
John E. Madden
Gerald M. Malcolm
Stanley A. Mann
Louis Rudkin
William H. Shannon
John H. B. Smith
Earle K. Snyder
Otis W. Stafford
Harold A. Stockenberg
Herman Strock
Herbert R. Thielmeyer
Charles J. Van Donge
Clarence J. Walters
James K. Webster
Earl W. Wood

TO BE ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Henry T. Adams, Jr.
William M. Adamson
Elmer H. Anderson
Gerald C. Anderson
Robert R. Anderson
Norton J. Arst
George Arthur
Joseph H. Baker
James C. Bartlett
Joseph H. Batchelder
William C. Bauknight, Jr.
Paul N. Bentley
Edward R. Bower
William L. Brown
Ramsay Browne
Louis F. Brozo, Jr.
Paul B. Burdick
Grinnell Burt, Jr.
Harry Cagle
Thomas R. Campbell
Thomas A. Cassin
Andre L. Causse 3d
Robert B. Charles
Reginald B. Comeau
George A. Cookinham
Foster F. Comstock
Alexander H. Cornell
Joseph O. Cosgrove
Arthur B. Crooks
Norman M. Crowder
John M. Dester
Clark Dunn
Ronald Eicher
Dwight H. Ellis, Jr.
Thomas C. Farrell
Donald J. Fisher
Paul B. Fitch
Earl T. Fortenberry
Paul J. Fritch
Albert C. Garbak
Walter J. Gardner
Mallard J. Gibson
John B. Gilbert
James E. Grisham
Robert W. Hale
Ever L. Hanson
George O. Hays, Jr.
Robert A. Hendry
Mark R. Hickey
John W. Holmes
Jesse E. Howell
John W. Hull
John C. Jaxtheimer
Harold B. Jensen
Joseph B. Jones
William S. Jones
John C. Kamps
Jackson K. Kern
Andrew E. King
Joseph A. Kooker
Leo L. Kornfeld
Alfred G. Lachmann
William S. Langley
Kenneth M. Larsen
Ernst Lamei
William H. Link
Leslie E. Lobaugh
Carl E. Lucas
Robert C. Lyons
William C. Maas
Matthew Mackey, Jr.
Prescott L. Marsh
William M. Martin, Jr.
John H. May, Jr.
William P. McElligott, Jr.
Thomas J. McLernon
Glenn F. Meader
Hugh R. Mellon
Dewayne C. Miller
Michael Mittrick
Kenneth S. Moore
Alfred B. Mueller
Douglas S. Murray
Samuel Mushnick
Merlyn A. Nelson
Robert F. Newsome, Jr.
James F. Nichols
Merrill H. Nichols
Robert A. Nix
Everett L. Noble
Charles L. Nott, Jr.
Edmund G. Oelkers
Richard C. O'Loughlin
Devere E. Olson
John J. O'Malley
William R. Ormsbee
Richard M. Oster
Marvin Ostrowsky
Donald E. Parrish
George W. Pennebaker
Joseph Z. Powell, Jr.
Carl A. Prince
Raymond E. Purviance
Guy M. Putnam, Jr.
Charles P. Ramsey
Edward J. Rinetti
John J. Risser
Otto C. Rothlaender
Kenneth A. Schar
Alfred R. Schilling
Thomas H. Seaver
Joseph M. Shea
Ramon A. Sherer
Peter V. Sira
Henry J. Skipper
George C. Smith
Joe G. Smith, Jr.
Robert J. Stampfl
Robert A. Stevenson
Robert I. Stewart
William L. Strong
John J. Sullivan, Jr.
Vernon E. Sutton
Thomas Svob
Elwin O. Swint
Paul Tasker
George "S" Thoroughman
Charles J. Toma
John G. Travis
Philip Troth
Eugene L. Tucker
Ray M. Turner
William J. Vance
Robert R. Van Der Maaten
Samuel Y. Walker
Louis F. Washburne, Jr.
Thomas C. Watts
Leo Webb
John W. Weigand

John H. Whitener
John R. Wible
Stuart S. Wilmarth
Bentley L. Wilson
Clark F. Woodard
George H. Wood
Paul W. Woodhead

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy.

TO BE CHAPLAINS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Roland D. Driscoll
Chester L. Hults
Alvo O. Martin

TO BE ACTING CHAPLAINS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Florian W. Cassady
Donald R. Caughey
Edgar A. Day
Francis G. Doerschug
Milton P. Gans
Jack C. Greenawalt
Edward J. Hemphill, Jr.
Earle V. Lyons, Jr.
Kermit I. Meier
Walter R. Morten, Jr.
James W. Paul
Albert D. Prickett
William A. Rennie
Thomas J. Richter
Roderic L. Smith
Eugene S. Swanson
Joseph J. Tubbs
Robert S. Waldrop

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

TO BE ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Harry W. Baumer
Dole F. Thomson

TO BE ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

James C. Tily

TO BE ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Albert H. Boggs
James R. Bollinger
William R. Boyer
William J. Byrnes
Robert E. Daggett
Roscoe A. Davidson
Adrian E. Eckberg
John F. Elliott
Edward H. Feldmann
Melvin G. Franklin
William H. Griffiths
Warren R. Grove, Jr.
Arthur H. Hanson
Chester A. Lewis
George Ohl, Jr.
Jack P. Pollock
Charles O. Reinhardt
Jerome W. Roloff
Herbert E. Smith
Richard H. Stowe
Edward L. Waldin

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

TO BE DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Donald "M" Coughlin
Thaddeus V. Joseph
Arthur H. Swanson
Samuel S. Wald

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

William F. Maguire

TO BE ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Lloyd F. Abel
Adolph "A" Anfinson
Vincent H. Arhart
Richard L. Bardsley
George L. Cermak
Joseph G. Chudzinski
Robert F. Deetz
Joseph E. Faltermayer
Edmund H. Frizzell
Claud E. Galloway
Samuel Goldhaber
William H. Hartnett
Edward J. Jerdon
Nolan L. Johnson
Eugene L. Kerewich
Charles E. Loveman
Harvey W. Lyon
Glen H. McGee
Robert A. Middleton
Byrnes E. Missman
Roe C. Percy
Thomas W. Pope, Jr.
Harry E. Pump
Harry C. Pund, Jr.
Alfred L. Raphael
George M. Smith
Ben S. Steinert
Harold R. Superko
Wilbur A. Trick
Clarence G. Veno

The following-named officers to the rank of commissioned warrant officer in the Navy in the grades indicated:

TO BE CHIEF BOATSWAINS

William F. Adams
Robert C. Allen
Thurman J. Austin
Francis T. Bean
Wladyslaw S. Biernat
Arford C. Boyett
Cecil E. Bradford
Raymond E. Calhoun
Evan M. Chanik
William H. Chapman
Raymond G. Cook
James H. Danenhower
Clarence L. Davis, Jr.
Harvard F. Deen
Paul W. Dodson
Eugene L. Edgerton
Oscar L. English
Lamar W. Foley
Joe W. Grant
Arthur F. Hamby
Rex Harbert
Paul E. Henderson
Robert G. Hoffman
Rhodell L. Holderby
Trumond E. Houston
Raymond O. Hyland
"C" "B" Kossert
Peter Kowalchyk
John P. Kreckel
Leamond F. Lacy
George "W" Lewis
Charles H. Little
William C. Logan, Jr.
Henry H. Malan
James E. Manson
Chester A. Martin
Sidney J. Martin
Anthony A. Mazur
Albert P. McCloskey
Marvin P. McCormick
Malcolm W. McGaughey
Richard "K" Meyer
Thomas A. Miechurski
Hugh M. Miller
Charles E. Napier
Arthur W. Nordquist
Raymond Oddone
George E. Paris
Luther C. Parrott
Richard M. Peacock
John J. Pratt
Robert F. Reed
Lester L. Reynolds
Paul R. Rogers
Robert J. Siegelman
Leighton Spadone
Clyde H. Steele
Thomas M. Stell, Jr.
Milfred W. Thomas
Roswell Van Over
Elwood Vaughan
Dick Weidemeyer
Raymond M. Weimer
Clarence W. Westergaard
William F. Westfall
Thomas S. Williamson, Jr.
John L. Wimberly
Roy A. Woodliff
James R. Woolyhand
John A. Zehner

TO BE CHIEF GUNNERS

Terry B. Barr
Charles R. Brown, Jr.
Leonard A. Caslow
Joseph Catanzarito
Haskell Clark
Warren "L" Clary
Leonard H. Crain
Joseph H. Cupp
Silas W. DeLoach, Jr.
Claude L. Dickerson
Jack E. Dickson
Charles H. Eaton
Edwin H. Edgerton
Robert W. Eigell
Anthony Gannarelli
John J. Garrity
Charles W. Gibbo
James R. Guglietti
Harold L. Harriman
Staley P. Hawthorne
Henri L. Hayes
Carl Holmes
William G. Holmes
Forest M. Jones
Robert F. Jones
Howard W. Mabus
Berley L. Maddox
James D. March
Robert P. Mudd
Ernest J. Ogilvie
Edmond H. Oliver
Charles F. Pape
Orville W. Rockwell
Walter A. Sheltren
Kenneth L. Shurtleff
Norman L. Sorenson
Robert B. Stickles
Frank Sulewski
Kermit A. Thompson
John E. Tracy
Francis J. Tuggle
Edwin W. Williams

TO BE CHIEF SHIP'S CLERKS

Lowell B. Archer
Willis J. Boo
Ira N. Bowman
Wallace G. Brownell
Raymond S. Broyles
James E. Callan
Lyle E. Carter
Wilbur W. Carter
Thomas A. Conant
Thomas E. Craig
William M. Crowe
Pierre H. Dalton
William Q. Damon
Thomas H. Debri
Charles M. Dorris
William T. Duke, Jr.
Oliver E. Emmons
Loren P. Fitzgerald
Elton E. Flowers
Harold M. Frediani
Clayton P. Hall
Jack C. Hamilton
Harry R. Hathaway
Max W. Henry
Harold C. Hill
Dale C. Hillman
Joe W. Holland
Paul W. Hopkins
Metro Horoschak
Augustus C. Iles
Harry L. Jackson
Robert G. Jacobson
Philip W. F. Jones
George D. Kaley
Wayne W. Litchfield
Howard E. Mann
Kenneth L. Mell
James E. Morgan
Murrill C. Morris
Basil T. Morrison
Thomas D. Murdock
Gerald W. Murphy
Clifford R. Nevins
William C. Norcott
Edward D. Platz
Stuart G. Poole
Charles A. Potts
Gilbert W. Rappelt
Joseph C. Rhodes
Jack Rountree
John R. Shannon
George G. Sherry
George O. Sims
Horace W. Specht
Henry J. Statchen
John T. Sullivan, Jr.
Carl O. F. Swanstrom
George L. Tait
Robert C. Turner
Robert F. Turney
Anthony L. Vincelette
Joseph W. Wallace, Jr.
Edmund L. Wells
George D. Wendell
Gordon C. White
Wilmot L. Williams
Morris W. Woods

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 25 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

James M. Rice, Fry.

ARKANSAS

Allie Marie Lanier, Joiner.
Otho Norris, Poughkeepsie.

COLORADO

Earl A. Riggs, Gilcrest.

IDAHO

Evelyn R. David, Bovill.

KANSAS

Fred M. Allen, Burden.

LOUISIANA

Lillie M. Scarborough, Angie.
Laura P. Grantham, Bush.

MARYLAND

Joseph E. Nolan, Kingsville.

NEBRASKA

Louis L. Lewandowski, Ashton.

NEW YORK

Edward T. Mulhern, Brockport.
Alton B. Moses, Parishville.
Norman L. Howell, Sunmount.

NORTH CAROLINA

Joe R. Johnson, Toecane.

OREGON

Eleanor R. Stewart, Monroe.
Ross H. Linville, Yachats.

PENNSYLVANIA

William H. Lambie, Liverpool.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Wilbur E. Williams, Wagener

TENNESSEE

William J. Collins, Elora.
Thomas Earl Hudson, Flintville.
Bennett L. Guthrie, Forbus.
Floyd E. Joyner, Huntingdon.
Cordia T Miller, Indian Springs.
Lex Taylor, Whitleyville.

WISCONSIN

Oscar W. Lindall, Cushing.
Edna Aschinger, Tigerton.

WYOMING

Lee Waddell, Moorcroft.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 1946

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of love and mercy, how unsearchable are Thy riches! O let the heart unveil the vision splendid, for the human soul is big with the sense of the future. As intellect seems so often sightless and wandering, we pray that the soul may lead us along the upward path. Over the broad earth Thy children are crying for help and bread. Needy millions, blinded by ignorance, are before us as a great opportunity for all loving hearts. O God, let us taste the comfort that comes to the soul when clothed with sacrificial action. Reenforce our minds with sympathy and justice for others; let

us do our utmost, loyally and cheerfully, without anxiety or regret, for our times are in Thy hands. Be with us in our assigned place, direct us in our paths, and let our deeds sing the song of hope and praise. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5876 An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease to Henry A. Scandrett, Walter J. Cummings, and George I. Haight, trustees of Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1936.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2341. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2122. An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5716) entitled "An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. FERGUSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frank Waldrop.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES.

Mr. MAY and Mr. BUFFETT asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Tragedy of Britain."

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, to include an editorial from the Chicago Sun, an editorial from the Chicago Times, and also an article.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF STATISTICAL INFORMATION

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the motion to recommit the bill H. R. 5857.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 167, nays 161, not voting 104, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

YEAS—167

Adams	Gillette	Mason
Allen, Ill.	Gillie	Merrow
Andersen, H. Carl	Goodwin	Michener
	Graham	Miller, Nebr.
Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ind.	Mundt
	Gross	Murray, Wis.
Angell	Gwynne, Iowa	Norblad
Arends	Hagen	O'Hara
Arnold	Hale	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Neal
Baldwin, N. Y.		Phillips
Barrett, Wyo.	Hall, Leonard W.	Pittenger
Beall		Ploeser
Bender	Halleck	Plumley
Bennett, Mo.	Hancock	Ramey
Bishop	Hand	Randolph
Blackney	Harness, Ind.	Reed, Ill.
Boiton	Hartley	Reed, N. Y.
Brehm	Henry	Rees, Kans.
Brown, Ohio	Herter	Rich
Brumbaugh	Heselton	Rizley
Buck	Hess	Robsion, Ky.
Buffett	Hill	Rockwell
Butler	Hinshaw	Rodgers, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Rogers, Mass.
Campbell	Hoffman, Mich.	Schwabe, Mo.
Canfield	Hoffman, Pa.	Schwabe, Okla.
Carlson	Holmes, Mass.	Scrivner
Case, N. J.	Holmes, Wash.	Shafer
Chenoweth	Hope	Sharp
Church	Horan	Short
Clason	Howell	Simpson, Ill.
Clevenger	Hull	Simpson, Pa.
Clippinger	Jenkins	Smith, Maine
Cole, Mo.	Jennings	Smith, Ohio
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Smith, Wis.
Corbett	Johnson, Calif.	Springer
Cunningham	Johnson, Ill.	Stefan
Curtis	Johnson, Ind.	Stockman
D'Ewart	Jones	Sundstrom
Dirksen	Judd	Taber
Dolliver	Keefe	Talbot
Dondero	Kilburn	Talle
Dworshak	Knutson	Taylor
Eaton	Kunkel	Thomas, N. J.
Ellis	Landis	Tibbott
Ellsworth	Larcade	Towe
Elsaesser	Latham	Vorys, Ohio
Elston	LeFevre	Vursell
Fellows	Lemke	Wadsworth
Fenton	Luce	Weichel
Fuller	McConnell	Wigglesworth
Fulton	McCowen	Wilson
Gavin	McGregor	Winter
Gearhart	McMillen, Ill.	Wolcott
Gerlach	Martin, Iowa	Wolverton, N. J.
Gifford	Martin, Mass.	Woodruff

NAYS—161

Abernethy	Bland	Byrne, N. Y.
Allen, La.	Bloom	Carnahan
Andrews, Ala.	Brooks	Celler
Bailey	Brown, Ga.	Chapman
Barden	Bryson	Chelf
Barrett, Pa.	Buchanan	Clements
Bates, Ky.	Buckley	Cole, Kans.
Beckworth	Bulwinkle	Combs
Biemiller	Bunker	Cooley
Cooper	Hébert	O'Toole
Courtney	Hedrick	Outland
Cravens	Heffernan	Peterson, Fla.
Crosser	Hendricks	Pfeifer
D'Alesandro	Hobbs	Philbin
Daughton, Va.	Hoch	Pickett
Davis	Hook	Poage
Delaney, John J.	Huber	Pratt
	Jarman	Price, Fla.
Dingell	Johnson, Luther A.	Price, Ill.
Domengeaux		Priest
Doughton, N. C.	Johnson, Okla.	Rabaut
Douglas, Calif.	Kefauver	Rabin
Douglas, Ill.	Kelley, Pa.	Rains
Durham	Kelly, Ill.	Rankin
Earthman	Keogh	Resa
Eberharter	Kilday	Richards
Elliott	King	Riley
Engle, Calif.	Kinzer	Robertson, Va.
Ervin	Kirwan	Roe, N. Y.
Fallon	Klein	Rogers, Fla.
Feighan	Kopplemann	Rogers, N. Y.
Fernandez	LaFollette	Rowan
Fisher	Lane	Russell
Flannagan	Lanham	Ryter
Flood	Lesinski	Sabath
Fogarty	Link	Savage
Folger	Lyle	Sheppard
Forand	Lynch	Sikes
Gallagher	McCormack	Spence
Gary	McGlinchey	Starkey
Gathings	McKenzie	Sullivan
Geelan	McMillan, S. C.	Tarver
Gordon	Madden	Thom
Gore	Mahon	Thomas, Tex.
Gorski	Maloney	Thomason
Gossett	Manasco	Traynor
Granahan	Mathews	Trimble
Green	May	Voorhis, Calif.
Gregory	Mills	Walter
Griffiths	Morgan	Weaver
Hare	Morrison	White
Harless, Ariz.	Murray, Tenn.	Whittington
Havenner	Neely	Worley
Hays	O'Brien, Ill.	
Healy	O'Brien, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—104

Almond	Granger	Peterson, Ga.
Anderson, Calif.	Grant, Ala.	Powell
Andrews, N. Y.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Quinn, N. Y.
Baldwin, Md.	Harris	Rayfiel
Barry	Hart	Reece, Tenn.
Bates, Mass.	Holifield	Rivers
Bell	Izac	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bennet, N. Y.	Jackson	
Bonner	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Robinson, Utah
Boren		Roe, Md.
Boykin	Jonkman	Rooney
Bradley, Mich.	Kean	Sadowski
Bradley, Pa.	Kearney	Sasscer
Camp	Kee	Sheridan
Cannon, Fla.	Kerr	Slaughter
Cannon, Mo.	Lea	Smith, Va.
Case, S. Dak.	LeCompte	Somers, N. Y.
Chiperfield	Lewis	Sparkman
Clark	Ludlow	Stevenson
Cochran	McDonough	Stewart
Coffee	McGehee	Stigler
Colmer	Mankin	Sumner, Ill.
Cox	Mansfield, Mont.	Sumners, Tex.
Crawford		Tolan
Curley	Mansfield, Tex.	Torrens
Dawson	Marcantonio	Vinson
De Lacy	Miller, Calif.	Wasielewski
Delaney, James J.	Monroney	Welch
	Murdock	West
Doyle	Murphy	Whitten
Drewry	Norrell	Wickersham
Engel, Mich.	Norton	Winstead
Gamble	Pace	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gardner	Patman	Wood
Gibson	Patrick	Woodhouse
Gillespie	Patterson	Zimmerman

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Bradley of Michigan for, with Mr. Camp against.

Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Case of South Dakota for, with Mr. Coffee against.

Mr. Jonkman for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. LeCompte for, with Mr. De Lacy against.

Mr. Robertson of North Dakota for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Stevenson for, with Mr. Rayfiel against.
Mr. Lewis for, with Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania against.
Miss Sumner of Illinois for, with Mr. James J. Delaney against.
Mr. Gillespie for, with Mr. Sparkman against.
Mr. Engel of Michigan for, with Mr. Barry against.
Mr. Bates of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Quinn of New York against.
Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Izac against.
Mr. Chiperfield for, with Mr. Doyle against.
Mr. Crawford for, with Mr. Jackson against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Gwinn of New York.
Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Bennet of New York.
Mr. Hart with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Monroney with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York and Mr. LEMKE changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5452) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LUDLOW, O'NEAL, D'ALESANDRO, KOPPLEMANN, CANNON of Missouri, TABER, KEEFE, and CANFIELD.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FOR CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEAL AND DISTRICT COURTS

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4230) to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. BYRNE of New York, Mr. CRAVENS, and Mr. REED of Illinois.

PAY INCREASES FOR PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, COAST GUARD, COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6084) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6084) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That (a) the first paragraph of section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows: Enlisted men of the first grade, $165; enlisted men of the second grade, $135; enlisted men of the third grade, $115; enlisted men of the fourth grade, $100; enlisted men of the fifth grade, $90; enlisted men of the sixth grade, $80; and enlisted men of the seventh grade, $75. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of $150."

"(b) The third paragraph of section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Every enlisted man paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his grade for each three years of service up to thirty years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act or reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve: *Provided*, That retired enlisted men heretofore or hereafter retired with credit for thirty years' service in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps and who served beyond the continental limits of the United States between 1898 and 1912, such service having been computed under previous laws as double time toward retirement, shall be entitled to receive the maximum retired pay now provided for the grade in which retired.

"(c) Section 11 of the act of March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1274; 34 U. S. C. 701), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 11. That the band of the United States Marine Corps shall consist of one leader whose pay and allowances shall be those of a captain in the Marine Corps; one second leader whose pay shall be $230 per month and who shall have the allowances of a sergeant major; ten principal musicians whose pay shall be $180 per month; twenty-five first-class musicians whose pay shall be $150 per month; twenty second-class musicians whose pay shall be $120 per month; and ten third-class musicians whose pay shall be $102 per month; such musicians of the band to have the allowances of a sergeant: *Provided*, That the second leader and musicians of the band shall receive the same increases for length of service and the same enlistment allowance or gratuity for reenlisting as is now or may hereafter be provided for other enlisted men of the Marine Corps: *Provided further*, That in the event of promotion of the second leader, or a musician of the band, to leader of the band, all service as such second leader, or as such musician of the band, or both, shall be counted in computing longevity increase in pay: *And provided further*, That hereafter during concert tours approved by the President, members of the Marine Band shall suffer no loss of allowances."

"(d) Retired members of the band of the United States Marine Corps and former members of the band of the United States Marine Corps heretofore transferred to the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve shall have their retired pay and retainer pay computed as now authorized by law on the basis of the pay provided in section 11 of the Act of March 4, 1925, as amended by subsection (c) of this Act, which pay shall include increases for all active duty performed since retirement or transfer to the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve in the computation of their longevity pay: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this Act shall operate to reduce the present pay of any former member of the band of the United States Marine Corps now on the retired list or drawing retainer pay.

"SEC. 2. (a) The second and third paragraphs of section 8 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"'First mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service shall receive base pay at the rate of $2,340 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officer receiving the pay of the first period.

"'Chief warrant officers of the Army except masters and chief engineers in the Army Mine Planter Service, and commissioned warrant officers with less than ten years of commissioned service, of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive base pay at the rate of $2,520 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay for the second period: *Provided*, That a commissioned warrant officer or chief warrant officer promoted from the grade of warrant officer or warrant officer (junior grade) shall suffer no reduction of pay by reason of such promotion: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be held to affect the authority of the Secretary of War to designate permanent or temporary chief warrant officers of the Army to receive the base pay and allowances of the third and fourth pay periods as provided in section 3 of the Act approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 230, Seventy-seventh Congress).'

"(b) The seventh paragraph of section 8 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'When the total pay and allowances authorized by this section for any person shall exceed the rate of $550 per month, the amount of the allowances to which such person is entitled shall be reduced by the amount above $550.'

"SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 7 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'The annual base pay of a brigadier general of the Army or the Marine Corps, rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the

Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard, commodore of the Navy, an Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, shall be $6,600; and the annual base pay of a major general of the Army or the Marine Corps and of a rear admiral (upper half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall be $8,800. Every such officer shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters authorized in sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the sixth period.'

"SEC. 4. The second paragraph of section 1 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'The first period, $2,160; the second period, $2,400; the third period, $2,760; the fourth period, $3,300; the fifth period, $3,850; and the sixth period, $4,400.'

"SEC. 5. The increases in pay resulting from the amendments made by this Act to the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, shall be applicable to the active duty, retired, retirement, or retainer pay of all persons whose pay is governed by, or by reference to, those sections of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, which are amended by this Act.

"SEC. 6. Hereafter the retired or retirement pay of any person whose name is borne on the emergency officers' retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States and who is entitled to receive retired or retirement pay shall, in lieu of being computed upon the basis of the pay to which he was entitled at the time of his discharge from his commissioned service, be computed upon the basis of the rate provided in the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended by this Act, for an officer of corresponding grade who is credited with the same number of years of service for longevity purposes as the number with which such person is credited.

"SEC. 7. The increases in pay provided by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following its enactment, and no increase in pay for any period prior thereto shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
LISTER HILL,
SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6084) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the bill strikes out all after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment, and that the Senate agree to the same.

Except for the differences noted in the following statement, the conference substitute is the same as the House bill.

INCREASE IN PAY RATES FOR MEMBERS OF MARINE BAND

The House bill contained no provisions affecting the pay rates of members of the Marine Band. Their rates of pay are not regulated by the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, but are fixed by section 11 of the act of March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1274). The Senate amendment contained a provision amending section 11 of the act of March 4, 1925, in such a manner as to give to the members of the band of the Marine Corps increases corresponding to those given to personnel of comparable grades paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended. The conference agreement adopts those provisions of the Senate amendment relating to the pay of the Marine Band with two minor technical changes relating to the pay of the second leader of the band and to the pay of retired members of the band.

PAY INCREASES FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ENTITLED TO PAY OF THE THIRD PERIOD

The House bill provided for increasing the pay of officers entitled to the pay of the third period from $2,400 to $2,640 a year. Generally speaking, officers entitled to the pay of the third period are captains in the Army and lieutenants in the Navy. The monetary increase provided by the House bill for these officers was less than that provided for any other class of officers. The conference agreement provides for increasing the pay of officers entitled to the pay of the third period from $2,400 to $2,760, which is a 15-percent increase as contrasted with the 10-percent increase provided in the House bill.

RETIRED OR RETIREMENT PAY OF EMERGENCY OFFICERS

The House bill contained no provisions affecting the retired or retirement pay of officers whose names are borne on the emergency officers' retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States. The persons whose names are borne on this list are emergency officers of World War I who were disabled and were granted retired or retirement pay under special legislation. That legislation fixed their retired or retirement pay at 75 percent of the rate of pay which they were receiving at the time their commissions were terminated. The Senate amendment contained a provision providing, in effect, that hereafter the retired or retirement pay of this group of former officers should be based upon the higher rates provided in the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, for officers of corresponding grades. The conference agreement adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF PAY INCREASES

The House bill provided that the increases in pay should take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following the enactment of the bill. The Senate amendment contained a provision providing that the increases in pay should become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment. The conference agreement adopt that provision of the Senate bill.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a very brief statement with respect to this matter.

This conference report returns to the House of Representatives the pay readjustment bill almost identically as it passed the House. The only change in the substance of the bill in any particular provision as it passed the House is one which increases the pay of the grade of captain 5 percent. The House bill had provided for a 10-percent raise, and by agreement of the conferees that was fixed at 15 percent.

The only other change was to include the Marine Corps Band, with increases in the same proportion as the other grades and ranks in the bill for other personnel of the armed forces.

The bill having been passed practically unanimously and having heretofore been debated, I have no requests for time at this time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I simply wish to inform the Members of the House that this conference report was unanimously adopted, and once more I want to take advantage of this opportunity to compliment the subcommittee of our Committee on Military Affairs who worked so long and so hard to bring about the best pay bill, I think, since 1922. Particular credit goes to the chairman of that subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of this committee exactly what happened to the amendment with reference to the scientists.

Mr. SHORT. That is not in this bill. That is in the draft bill.

Mr. MAY. That is in the draft bill.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I want every Member of this House, when we bring up this conference report on the draft, to bear in mind that we are passing this increased pay bill, which is a separate measure, and do not mess it up with the other issue.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I did not understand the change that was made in the pay bill which the gentleman stated.

Mr. MAY. The only change is to increase the captain's pay 5 percent and to include the Marine Corps Band on the same schedule as other personnel.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This, then, retains the 50-percent increase for the lower grades in the personnel of the Army and Navy and auxiliary services.

Mr. MAY. It retains the 50-percent increase for the seven grades of enlisted personnel. I voted for the bill as it passed the House and trust this confer-

ence report will be adopted without a dissenting vote.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on this provision of this conference report.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6064) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the conference report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6064) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That all of the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, are hereby expressly reenacted, except those provisions which are hereinafter amended or repealed.

"SEC. 2. (a) So much of the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the first proviso is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of nineteen and forty-five, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of nineteen after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this Act, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States:'.

"(b) The fourth proviso of the second sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows: *'Provided further*, That on July 1, 1946, the number of men in active training or service in the Army shall not exceed one million five hundred and fifty thousand, and that this number shall be reduced consistently month by month so that the Army's strength shall not exceed one million and seventy thousand on July 1, 1947: *And provided further*, That on July 1, 1947, the number of men in active training or service in the Navy shall not exceed five hundred and fifty-eight thousand and in the Marine Corps one hundred and eight thousand: *And provided further*, That the monthly requisitions on the President under this Act by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall not exceed the number of men required after consideration of the actual number of voluntary enlistments during the three months preceding that month in which the requisition is made. For the purposes of the fourth and fifth proviso of the preceding sentence, no man shall be deemed to be in active training or service or to be part of the strength of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, if—

"'(1) he is on terminal leave;

"'(2) he is a member of the detachment of patients who are to be discharged or relieved from active duty without being returned to an active duty status; or

"'(3) he is being processed, following completion of his period of service, for discharge or relief from active duty.'

"SEC. 3. Section 3 (b) of such Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Each man inducted on and after October 1, 1946, under the provisions of subsection (a) shall serve for a period of training and service of eighteen consecutive months (excluding time served while pursuing a course of instruction in a university, college, or other similar institution of learning), unless sooner discharged. Each man inducted prior to October 1, 1946, under the provisions of subsection (a) who shall have completed a period of training and service under this Act of eighteen months or more (excluding time served while pursuing a course of instruction in a university, college, or other similar institution of learning) shall, upon his request, on and after such date, be relieved from his period of training and service under this Act. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, whenever, after January 1, 1946, the Congress declares that the national interest is imperiled, such periods of training and service may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interest of national defense.'

"SEC. 4. Section 3 (e) of such Act, as amended, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 5. (a) Section 5 (e) (1) of such Act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'No person shall be deferred for employment in industry except upon the basis of his then status in an industry essential to the national health, safety, or interest.'

"(b) Section 5 (e) (3) of such Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(3) After May 14, 1946, no individual who has a child or children dependent upon him for support, or with whom he maintains a bona fide family relationship in their home, shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this Act. As used in this paragraph, the term "child" includes a child legally adopted, a stepchild, a foster child, and a person who is supported in good faith by the individual in a relationship similar to that of a parent and child but such term does not include any person eighteen years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped.'

"(c) Section 5 (e) of such Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'(4) Any man inducted under the provisions of section 3 (a) of this Act who has a child or children, as hereinabove defined, dependent upon him for support, or with whom he maintains a bona fide family relationship in their home, shall, upon his request after August 1, 1946, be relieved from his period of training and service under this Act.'

"'(5) No individual shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this Act, if he has served on active duty in the land or naval forces of the United States outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska; or if he has served on active duty in the land or naval forces of the United States for a period of at least six months after September 16, 1940 (excluding the time that any such individual so served while pursuing a course of instruction in a university, college, or other similar institution of learning). The provisions of this paragraph shall cease to be effective during any period after January 1, 1946, when the Congress or the President shall declare that the national interest is imperiled.'

"SEC. 6. Section 5 (m) of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(m) No individuals shall be called for induction, ordered to report to induction stations, or be inducted because of their occupations, or by occupational groups, or by groups in any plant or institutions, except pursuant to a requisition by the land or naval forces for persons in needed medical professional and specialists categories.'

"SEC. 7. Section 16 (b) of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The provisions of the third sentence of section 3 (a) of this Act shall become inoperative and cease to apply at twelve o'clock post meridian on July 1, 1947. All of the other provisions of this Act, except the provisions of sections 3 (b), 3 (c), 3 (d), 8, and 16 (b), and the fourth and fifth provisos of the second sentence of section 3 (a), shall become inoperative and cease to apply at twelve o'clock post meridian on March 31, 1947, or on such earlier date as may be specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose, except as to offenses committed prior to such date. One day prior to the date of the termination of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as herein or hereafter specified, all remaining functions and responsibilities of the Personnel Division established under the authority of section 8 (g) of such Act, and all records and balances of appropriations which have been utilized or are available for use in the administration of such functions of the Personnel Division of the Selective Service System, shall be transferred to such agency of the Federal Government as the Congress may designate, or, if none is so designated, to such agency of the Federal Government as the President may designate.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
LISTER HILL,
SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6064) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill made persons between the ages of 20 and 30 liable for training and service under the Selective Training and

Service Act of 1940, as amended. The bill prohibited the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy from making requisitions for men on selective service during the period May 15, to October 15, 1946, and provided that requisitions might be made thereafter only with the approval of the President. The Senate amendment made men between the ages of 18 and 45 liable for training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and would have reestablished the age limits as they existed prior to the enactment of the joint resolution of May 14, 1946 (Public Law 379, 79th Cong.). The conference agreement makes men between the ages of 19 and 45 liable for such training and service and contains no provisions comparable to the House moratorium provisions.

The House bill provided that on July 1, 1947, the number of men in active training or service should not exceed 1,070,000 in the Army, 558,000 in the Navy, and 108,000 in the Marine Corps. The bill provided that monthly requisitions on selective service by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy should not exceed, after consideration of the actual number of volunteer enlistments during the previous month, the number of men required in view of the limitations established. The Senate bill contained similar provisions with respect to the strength of the services on July 1, 1947, and also established 1,550,000 as the limit of the strength of the Army on July 1, 1946. The Senate bill provided that the monthly requisitions for men made on the President by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy should not exceed the number of men required after considering the actual number of volunteer enlistments during the 3-month period preceding the month of making the requisition. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate bill in this respect, together with an amendment eliminating the necessity for the services to count, for the purposes of the strength limitations, certain classes of men who, although technically still military or naval personnel, are not in fact part of the effective strength of the services. The first of these classes is composed of officers on terminal leave. The second is composed of members of the detachment of patients who are to be discharged from the service or relieved from active duty as soon as their physical condition will permit them to be separated or as they can be transferred to Veterans' Administration facilities for further medical care and treatment. The third class is composed of men who are in, or en route to, separation centers.

The House bill provided that men heretofore or hereafter inducted should serve for a training and service period of 18 months unless sooner discharged. The Senate bill provided that men inducted after October 1, 1946, should serve for a period of 18 consecutive months, unless sooner discharged. The Senate bill also provided that men inducted prior to October 1, 1946, should, upon completion of a period of training and service of 18 months or more, on or after such date, be relieved from active service upon their own request. The Senate bill provided that whenever after January 1, 1946, the Congress should declare that the national interest is imperiled, the periods of training and service might be extended by the President to such time as would be necessary in the interest of national defense. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate bill in this respect, together with amendments which provide that service performed while pursuing a course of instruction in a university, college, or other similar institution of learning shall not be counted in computing the required period of 18 months' service.

The Senate amendment contained a provision repealing section 3 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. This section is the one which provides that persons inducted into the land forces of the United States shall not be employed beyond the Western Hemisphere except in the Territories and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands. The section was suspended for the period of the war and 6 months by the joint resolution of December 13, 1941 (55 Stat. 799). The House bill contained no provision affecting section 3 (e). The conference agreement adopts the provision of the Senate bill repealing section 3 (e).

The House bill provided that after May 15, 1946, no individual having a child should be inducted without his consent for training and service. The Senate bill also provided for exemption from training and service of individuals having a child or children, but limited the application of the provision to those individuals having a child or children dependent upon them for support or with whom they maintained bona fide family relationships in their homes. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment with respect to this matter.

The Senate bill added a provision to the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, requiring that inducted men who have one or more children dependent upon them for support or with whom they maintain bona fide family relationships within their homes be relieved from training and service upon their request made after August 1, 1946. The House bill did not contain any similar provision relating to men who had actually been inducted. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision with respect to this matter.

The Senate amendment contained a provision prohibiting the induction of persons who have served for any period of time on active duty in the land or naval forces of the United States outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, and prohibiting the induction of men who have served on active duty in the land or naval forces of the United States in any place for a period of at least 6 months after September 16, 1940 (excluding time served while pursuing a course of instruction in a university, college, or a similar institution of learning). These prohibitions on inductions were not to be effective at any time after January 1, 1946, if the Congress or the President should declare the national interest to be imperiled. The conference agreement adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment.

The House bill added to section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (relating to agricultural deferments), a new sentence to the effect that in administering such section local selective service boards in classifying registrants should base their findings solely and exclusively on whether the registrants were necessary to and regularly engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors. The conference agreement contains no provisions modifying existing law with respect to deferments of persons engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors. The conference agreement does, however, insert in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, a provision to the effect that no person shall be deferred for employment in industry except upon the basis of his then status in an industry essential to the national health, safety, or interest.

The Senate amendment contained a provision rewriting section 5 (m) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to eliminate so much of that section as provided for the induction of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers after the induction of other registrants. The elimination of such provisions was based upon the fact that other provisions of the Senate amendment had prohibited the induction of any fathers having children dependent upon them or with whom they maintained bona fide family relationships and had further provided for the discharge of fathers previously inducted. The House bill contained no provisions amending section 5 (m). The conference agreement adopts the amendment to section 5 (m) proposed by the Senate amendment.

The House bill extended the period of effectiveness of all provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to February 15, 1947, or such earlier date as might be specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress. The House bill also provided that the entire section 8 of such act (relating to reemployment rights of veterans) should be permanent law. Under existing law only so much of such section as provides for the establishment of a Personnel Division in the Selective Service System is permanent law. The House bill provided that on February 15, 1947, or on such earlier date as might be specified in a concurrent resolution terminating the provisions of the act which are not specifically continued, all of the functions, responsibilities, records, and property of the Personnel Division of the Selective Service System should be transferred to such agency of the Federal Government as the Congress might designate, or, if none should be so designated, to such agency as the President might describe. The Senate amendment provided for an extension of the period of effectiveness of the act generally to May 15, 1947, or such earlier date as might be specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress. The Senate amendment also made the entire section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, permanent law. The Senate amendment further provided that the provisions of the bill relating to the limitations on the strength of the armed forces should not become inoperative on the date when the act generally would expire. The Senate amendment provided that 1 day prior to the general expiration of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, the functions, responsibilities, records, and balances of appropriations of the Personnel Division of the Selective Service System should be transferred to the Veterans Employment Service of the United States Employment Service. The conference agreement adopts the date of March 31, 1947, as the date on which the Selective Training and Service Act generally will expire. The conference agreement makes the entire section 8 of such act permanent law and also makes section 3 (b) of the act (establishing the 18 months period of service) permanent law. The conference agreement also provides that those provisions imposing strength limitations on the armed forces on certain dates in the future and establishing a rule with respect to the computation of strength shall not cease to be effective on the date on which the act generally expires. The conference agreement provides for the transfer, 1 day prior to the termination of the Selective Training and Service Act, of the remaining functions and responsibilities of the Personnel Division of the Selective Service System to such agency of the Federal Government as the Congress may designate, or, if none is so designated, to such agency of the Federal Government as the President may designate.

The Senate amendment included a provision providing for the deferment from training and service of certain students in scientific and engineering schools and of certain other persons engaged in scientific and engineering activities. As the conferees were of the opinion that existing law contains adequate authority for whatever deferments of scientific and engineering students and other scientific and engineering personnel that may be necessary, the conference agreement does not include any of the provisions of the Senate amendment relating to this matter.

The Senate amendment contained several provisions affecting the pay of military and naval personnel and persons on the emer-

gency officers' retired lists. The House bill contained no provisions relating to the pay of such personnel. As the entire matter of pay or personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and Coast and Geodetic Survey is dealt with in H. R. 6084, upon which the conferees have currently reached a complete agreement, this conference agreement contains no provisions relating to pay.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of this report and the fact that so many requests for time have been made, I wonder if we might have an additional hour to discuss this matter.

Mr. MAY. No.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we have an additional 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MAY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleague will not insist upon that request, because there are two or three other conference reports coming up today.

Mr. SHORT. I know that there are many important conference reports to be acted on today, but we met at 10 o'clock and it is now only 11. We can sit here until midnight or 2 o'clock in the morning. We have done it before.

Mr. MAY. Let me say to my genial friend and colleague that it is only 6 days now until this act expires. The same applies to the OPA. I am leary of the fact that we may run into some difficulty in connection with some of these matters and have to reenact the old legislation.

Mr. SHORT. Could we not have an additional 30 minutes?

Mr. MAY. I am going to yield to the gentleman what time I can.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my request that the time be extended 30 minutes.

Mr. WALTER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am going to take just a very few minutes for the purpose of calling attention to some of the high spots in this report.

Everyone remembers that the House bill as passed and sent to the Senate contained a provision fixing the minimum age for the drafting of men for military service at 20 years and the maximum age at 30 years. The Senate in the consideration of the measure sent to it from the House, struck out everything after the enacting clause and wrote a new bill, which constituted one amendment to the House bill. At the conference, which was attended for several days and on numerous occasions, there was detailed discussion of every provision of both bills.

May I add here in answer to a lot of newspaper columnists' criticism of the conferees and the proceedings in the conference that it was a gentlemanly procedure, well behaved, with everybody in a good humor, the reports to the contrary notwithstanding. It was, however, a matter of strong contention on both sides. I think everybody in this Chamber knows that every conference report is the result of give and take. You cannot always have your own way. If any one side of a conference could just write its own bill there would be no necessity for a conference. It is because there are contentions and disputes on differences in judgment that these measures go to conference.

Everyone knows I have fought courageously and bravely here to keep the teen-agers out of the military service in peacetime, but when the conferees came to that question I had to yield a part of the way, not all of the way. We compromised that by fixing the minimum age at 19 and the maximum age at 44. All men who are physically qualified between those ages are subject to induction, with certain exceptions.

There is one other thing I think you ought to know, and I think it is helpful in this matter, that during the actual conduct of the war there were about 4,500,000 men deferred from military duty on the ground of essentiality in war industries, some of them in the class known as IV-F. Many thousands of others were classified for deferment during the actual combat period of the war and for numerous reasons were also deferred from military service. We have removed these from the group who may be deferred, for reason that they are no longer engaged in war-production industries.

We provide in the conference report that these men cannot be any longer deferred for military reasons because of the fact they are no longer engaged in the production of munitions for war or war equipment. We also fixed the size of the armed forces as of two dates. As of July 1, 1946, the size of the Army is fixed at 1,550,000. On July 1, 1947, that is required to be brought down to 1,070,000. In the consideration of that matter we arrived at the conclusion that in determining the size of the Army at those particular times there ought not to be included three groups of men:

First. Those on terminal leave.

Second. Those who are in a detachment of patients who are to be discharged or relieved from active duty without being returned to their active-duty status.

Third. Those being processed and now in or going to reception or discharge centers.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman mentioned that the draft age had been raised to 19 years. I notice in section 3 the language reads "between the ages of 18 and 45." Is that the customary limitation being provided by putting it that way? Is it the intention of the conferees that the boy does not become subject to the draft until he is 19 years old?

Mr. MAY. The act in another section, the number of which I do not recall at the moment, specifically provides that when they reach their nineteenth birthday they are eligible for induction and not until then. Therefore, that exempts the 18-year-olds from induction under the draft. That was and is the purpose and intent of the bill to be sure no one who has not reached 19 years of age will be drafted.

Mr. KUNKEL. With reference to the figures that you quoted as to the size of the Army on July 1, 1946 and 1947, respectively, are those figures acceptable to the Army?

Mr. MAY. That is the recommendation of the Army, as I recall it, in the hearings before our committee.

There were a lot of questions propounded to me during the time of the conference meetings on the subject of whether or not scientists and other experts were to be deferred for that reason. We eliminated that provision and they are not to be deferred except under the provisions of the law as it originally existed subject to the requirements of the Secretary of War and regulations of the Selective Service System.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot urge too strongly the very real necessity for prompt adoption of the pending conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of the world's greatest characters once said:

> To act contrary to conscience is neither safe nor upright.

Again he said:

> Here I stand, I can do no other, God help me.

One of our wisest American philosophers once stated:

> To be great is to be alone.

History is replete with men and incidents which corroborate this immortal truth.

One of our greatest Presidents once said:

> Let us have faith that right makes might.

And again he said:

> Never let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction to the Government, nor of dungeons to ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, these quotations were not uttered by Judas Iscariot, Aaron Burr, or Benedict Arnold; they were uttered by honest, intelligent, and patriotic men, who loved God, their country, and all mankind.

These criteria they uttered, we should follow in voting on this conference report.

No person in or out of this Chamber has higher admiration or deeper gratitude for the leaders of our armed forces who did such a marvelous job in winning the two wars from which we have triumphantly emerged than I. This goes for the Secretaries of War and Navy and their assistants.

It is needless for me to remind you that on different occasions I have defended and praised the generals and admirals, but I know they are human,

not at all infallible, and do not hesitate to differ with them. I want to maintain their respect as they have mine. They fight wars; we determine policy.

Sir, because of unsettled conditions and conflicting interests in this uncertain and troubled war-torn world, we all agree that America must remain strong.

As George Washington once said:

If we wish to avoid insult we must be prepared to repel it.

And Theodore Roosevelt was realistic when he said:

Speak softly but carry a big stick.

I might also quote an old adage, "Trust God, but keep your powder dry."

There are brigands still loose in this world who can understand only the language of force. Last autumn I declared that we were demobilizing too many too fast. It was not popular then.

At all times we must be able to defend ourselves and contribute our part to the establishment of a just and lasting peace. Who wants it otherwise?

Mr. Speaker, all of us believe in adequate national defense and want to live peaceably with all men. But we differ only as to the method whereby these worthy objectives can be achieved.

No wonder the public is confused because Members of Congress are bewildered by the many conflicting reports and sets of figures given out by the leaders of our armed forces and selective service.

Well do we remember the dire predictions made during the war. We were told by those in high command that unless nurses were drafted we would lose the war. A determined effort was also made to pass a work-or-fight bill which would have enslaved our free workers. But history has proved and experience has shown that free men and women can always out-work, out-produce, and outfight slaves. We do not want to maintain military controls in this country or perpetuate wartime methods and procedures during peace. Let us keep America a republic where democratic processes still rule.

Following VJ-day last fall we were told by the military that we could possibly raise 300,000 volunteers by May of this year. The fact is we have now raised more than 800,000.

At long last the Senate has agreed with a minor amendment to accept the House bill we passed some time ago appreciably increasing the pay of all men and women in our armed services. Now that we have passed the conference report on the increased pay bill we will have no difficulty in getting a sufficient number of volunteers. Everyone admits his belief in this, but still some half-heartedly entertain doubt.

Even the military admits that a volunteer Army is the best Army and the Senate conferees, as well as those of the House, expressed the belief that the volunteer system would get all the men necessary to reach our goal. They likewise admitted that increased pay would stimulate and encourage men to volunteer but for some strange reason stubbornly refused to vote the increase in pay until we had passed the draft bill. It is also queer that the War Department—if it wants volunteers—raises the standards for volunteers and lowers the standards for draftees.

The House, I believe, won a victory in prohibiting the draft of 18-year-old boys. Personally I would like to see the draft automatically end and the volunteer system be given a fair trial. A southern gentleman of the other body hit the nail on the head when he pointed out that as long as we have a mixture of the volunteer and compulsory systems we can never have a fair trial of the volunteer system.

Mr. Speaker, a prominent magazine refers to me as "Missouri's mulish DEWEY SHORT" but I want to assure all of you that I do not want to be obstinate because of sheer obstinacy. I am glad, however, that I can be stubborn at times, particularly on basic principles and on a fundamental issue.

It is claimed that the drafting of 18- and 19-year-old youths is necessary to carry out our foreign commitments. Pray tell me—what are our foreign commitments? No peace treaty has yet been signed and too many secret conferences have been held behind closed doors. The American people and even Members of Congress have been kept in the dark. No definite decisions have been reached upon the handling of the atomic bomb, and no one yet knows what our contribution is to be to the international police force under the United Nations.

To be sure teen-age boys are bold and daring in combat but even in battle their casualties are terrific and certainly they are not well fitted for occupational purposes. I am glad in conference we eliminated 18-year-old boys—but even 19-year-old boys do not make good policemen and are not capable of self-control under the conditions they must cope with in foreign countries. They are susceptible to every temptation in a foreign land when removed from the influences of home, church, and school in their native land. It is bad enough when older men with mature judgment are segregated and removed from the refining influences in a normal society.

The amount of venereal diseases among our troops abroad is appalling and one naturally wonders what the future generation in our country will be.

Any one of us who has visited foreign countries and who has talked to our friends, recently returned, read the letters from our men abroad, and the articles of editors recently returned, knows that today our army of occupation, especially in Europe, is a near joke.

It is composed of three classes:

First. Eighteen- and nineteen-year-old boys—young, untrained, undisciplined, and inexperienced.

Second. Rascals and riffraff, who have reenlisted to rape, plunder, and loot.

Third. Brass hats who want to retain their rank and pay and who are living the life of Riley on the misery of conquered peoples.

This is rather plain and unpleasant speech, but is too true. I will qualify the statement by the fact that there are some fine, clean, patriotic boys and officers abroad—and it is through them that I receive much of my information. May I suggest you read the article in the Saturday Evening Post of June 22, 1946. Remember that each one of our soldiers abroad is not only a representative of our Army but also an ambassador of our country. Naturally, the people in Europe have only contempt for these young, and too many irresponsible lads, who do not possess the mature judgment to take care of themselves or represent us abroad. We need older and more professionally trained men at decent salaries to do a good job.

Mr. Speaker, a boy not old enough to exercise the full rights of citizenship ought not to be compelled to carry the full responsibility of citizenship. Conscription in peacetime of anyone is repugnant to reason and distasteful to free men. It is dishonorable to draft legal minors unless the very life of our Nation is at stake.

Do not forget, sir, that our enemies had conscription and today are thoroughly beaten. We do not want to adopt the system they had which utterly failed, or to worship their false gods and put our trust wholly in military might.

"Not by might nor by power but by my spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

It is generally agreed that the next war will be as different from the one just ended as this war was from the one fought a quarter of a century ago. The next war will largely be fought in laboratories and test tubes—perhaps by pushing buttons, touching off pilotless planes and jet-propelled rockets carrying atomic energy, which would render obsolete any large standing army within a few years or even months after its training. While trained men are still necessary, future wars will not be won by mass armies.

In this atomic age our country will be much safer if the youths of today are highly trained and well educated in our technical and scientific schools in the newest and most effective methods and weapons of warfare. We need doctors, dentists, engineers, technicians, technologists—scientists in every field.

It will be remembered that the War Department told the Members of Congress in our Congressional Library that a force of 400,000 men was needed to occupy Japan, but the next day General MacArthur informed us that he could do the job with 200,000. It is also interesting to note that General McNarney last Friday said that a plan was in existence to reduce American occupation forces in Germany to 150,000 men. This is less than one-half the number we have there now. He is right.

Mr. Speaker, it is generally admitted by both military and civilian officials who are competent to speak that a volunteer army is the best army. It is more efficient, it is possible, and certainly it is preferable. We can secure it, as proved, by the figures of the War Department itself—by increasing pay, improving living and working conditions, providing for promotion within the ranks, by eliminating unnecessary caste distinctions, and by putting an end to a mixture of the compulsory system with the volunteer system.

As American cannot remain half slave and half free, so the morale of an army cannot be maintained when half volunteer and half conscripted. The conference report should be voted down.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to use the eloquent speech such as my good friend and associate, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has presented to this House. I merely want to talk to you today as I talked at that conference committee and give you the ideas which came to my mind as they came to the conference committee and the reasons which actuated me finally in signing the conference report.

I entered the conference as everybody else entered it knowing that we do have world responsibilities, knowing that we do have commitments of some kind or character. Anybody who has read the newspapers, listened to the radios, and talked to anyone else in this age knows that we have responsibilities, commitments, and obligations that require the use of armed forces in many parts of the world. I sat there in that conference committee and thought of the some 350,000 men who gave their lives in this war that has just come to a conclusion, and I felt an abiding sense of obligation resulting from the sacrifices of those men who made the supreme sacrifice for their country, those men who gave up their time, their service, and their bodies, if necessary, to bring peace back to the world. This is a troublesome peace, though, and it does require force and it does require commitments and activity all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, we were told by the Army that we need an Army of 1,070,000 men as of July 1947. I do not think there was any dispute about that among any of the conferees. The question is how to gain and maintain that size Army and meet the needs which we are told exist.

I went into the conference representing this side of the Capitol which had already voted to set the minimum age at 20. We met over there another group at the other end of the Capitol that had voted just as strongly as we had voted for the age of 18. When our first vote was taken there in conference, it was agreed that we would raise the age limit set in the House bill from 30 to 45 and, as far as I know, there was no objection to that. The objection and the fight came, as you will know from reading the press and listening to the radio, over the question of teen-agers.

When this bill first came before the House I voted with the majority in the House to eliminate teen-age draftees, so anxious was I not to draft our young men. I served in the First World War, if you will pardon a personal reference, as a teen-age man. I volunteered at the age of 18 and served overseas in the army of occupation in Germany below the age of 20. I know something about the duties of occupation troops in a foreign land in a time of peace after the fighting is over. But I also knew that the Nation and its sons had made a tremendous sacrifice, and I sat there in conference and tried to work out some arrangement which would give the Army and the Navy what they needed in manpower, and at the same time not hurt the country.

I first suggested, reluctantly, Mr. Speaker, that we go down using the age of 19 as a base, and then in certain emergencies, as foreseen by the Secretaries of War and the Navy, it was my thought that we might permit the President, upon the showing of an unusual emergency, to dip down, if necessary, into the 18-age group to a limited extent and take the men necessary to fill the ranks of the Army if they were depleted by lack of volunteers. You and I know that the conferees did not agree upon that. They came to use the age of 19 as a base, and I personally now believe that it will do the job.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that we find there are 100,000 men deferred for school purposes, and 60,000 who have attained the age of 19 since the suspension of the draft of teen-agers. By working into that group of deferred men upon reaching the age of 19, by utilizing the 9,000 men who may be obtained from the group of 20 and above, together with the volunteers that we feel assuredly must come, I think that this bill will meet the needs of the armed forces and will give the Army a force that it can rely upon. I am most anxious, Mr. Speaker, that this Nation return to a volunteer system as soon as possible. I want to stop this draft. But this Nation must not lose the fruits of victory for which it has paid a fabulous sacrifice in men and blood by lassitude and inaction on our part.

In addition to this, this bill provides for the return after 18 months of service of all enlisted men presently inducted in service. It provides for the immediate release of all fathers and prohibits the further induction of men with children. Overseas today are hundreds of thousands of men who have served many months, some far in excess of 18 months, who are entitled to come home. Overseas are thousands of fathers who have never seen their babies; and who have done their full part. We must not forget the men who have served.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, as the membership so well recalls, the House has on two different occasions expressed itself in favor of exempting teen-agers from any further draft. Since the Senate had gone on record favoring the drafting of 18- and 19-year-old boys, this problem was the most troublesome item in dispute between the Senate and the House.

As is so often the case, this conference report is a matter of compromise in order to bring about an agreement. I have publicly gone on record opposed to drafting teen-aged boys. In this report, I agreed to the drafting of 19-year-old boys but stood firm in my opposition to drafting any 18-year-old boy.

First. The report now before us extends the Draft Act to March 31, 1947.

Second. Under the provisions of this act, every male citizen in the United States between the ages of 19 and 45 stands liable for training and service in the land and naval forces of the United States.

Third. Anyone heretofore or hereafter inducted must serve for a period of 18 months.

Fourth. All fathers are to be released upon their own request by August 1, 1946.

Fifth. There are no occupational deferments in the bill, such matter being a problem of Selective Service.

Sixth. No individual who has served overseas or for a period of longer than 6 months in this country, is to be reinducted.

Seventh. No credit is given the individual who served while pursuing a course of instruction in a university or college.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great question as to whether or not it becomes necessary during peacetime for this Nation to draft teen-aged boys as well as any other individuals of any age, in order to meet the manpower requirements of our armed forces. I think the vast majority of the Congress agree that a volunteer Army and Navy would be of greater service to this country if sufficient volunteers could be had. In an effort to make the service more attractive and draw such volunteers the Congress has today passed a new Pay Act which increases the pay of the buck private or apprentice seaman by 50 percent or otherwise brings his base pay to $75 a month. Increased pay on a percentage basis follows all along the line, up to and including the highest ranking general. It is my honest opinion that with the approximately 9,000 men who are each month available within the age bracket of 20 to 30 there will be sufficient volunteers under the new Pay Act which will no longer make it necessary for the Army and Navy to any longer draft teen-aged boys. In fact, the Navy by September of this year will have released all drafted men and be on a strictly volunteer basis. That same program, I hope, can be found to exist shortly within the Army.

It is interesting to note the rate of volunteering during the last 10 months. One item of particular interest is the fact that the Army during the last half of May got more volunteers than they did during the first half, at which time the drafting of teen-agers was inoperative. In addition, it is interesting to learn that for the first week in June there were more volunteers than for any single week during May.

The Army monthly requirements between now and next April 1 will be approximately 30,000 men. Taking out the 9,000 mentioned above this leaves 21,000 per month to be enlisted. At the rate of enlistments to date it seems to me that such volunteers will be forthcoming. There were 48,000 volunteers in May. Already we have approximately 800,000 volunteers in the Army, and, let me repeat, I am convinced that if the War Department will apply itself to the best of its ability volunteer enlistments may well fill our Army requirements.

The War Department at one stage testified that they felt 300,000 would be the greatest number of volunteers they might

expect to be able to obtain over the year. Already they have missed their guess by 500,000.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that we are in any way handicapping or crippling the Army by a limitation in age for those liable to service. I feel certain and convinced that we can, and will, get a volunteer Army sufficient in force to carry out the world assignments and commitments to which we are obligated. Nothing will please me more when such time arrives that we have an Army and Navy made up completely of volunteers.

I feel this conference report should be adopted.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May I ask the gentleman if it is his understanding that we require in this legislation that the Army first consider all volunteers before they draft anybody?

Mr. ARENDS. That is right; they must first take all volunteers into consideration before drafting any individual.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman stated that fathers would not be released until August 1947. Did not the gentleman mean 1946?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes; upon their own request by August 1, 1946.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman also stated that the draft was extended only until March of 1947?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes; March 31, 1947.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it a fact that the Army has raised the physical requirements as to the men now enlisting?

Mr. ARENDS. That is the report.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As this act is written, does it not provide for compulsory military training in peacetime and for the retaining of 19-year-olds for foreign service just as long as the President wants them?

Mr. ARENDS. That is not quite correct. There is an 18-month limitation on length of service for the inductee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHERIDAN].

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, we heard the report of the conferees that we have to meet our war responsibilities. We can meet them in every way. Only today as I came down from Philadelphia I read that the voluntary enlistments are 122 percent of the necessary quota, and I understand that the voluntary enlistments on last Friday were 132 percent of the daily quota. I suppose the reason for the exceptional voluntary enlistments is the anticipation of the increased pay. None of those boys were subject to the provisions of the draft as it is now constituted.

Let me call attention to this further report, which I do not believe has as yet been filed but which will be filed with our committee. A survey was ordered of the Bremen area by the commanding general of that area. This is what I want you to pay particular attention to. This report shows that the moral looseness was especially injurious to the 18- and 19-year-olds in the occupation forces, and he was speaking specifically of the Bremen area. The report was that not only is this condition physically dangerous to the soldier but it is found to result in poor soldiering. That comes from the Army itself.

We might also recall that just a few days ago we passed the Navy appropriation bill. The conferees report here that the Navy has 558,000 men provided for. This statement is not correct. The Navy appropriation provides for 435,000 men, and the Navy is receiving its entire complement by voluntary enlistments.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the extension of selective service on four grounds. In the first place, it is not needed. In the second place, it interferes seriously with the educational program of the country. In the third place, it does not make any provision for exempting farm workers who are so badly needed in this present emergency to raise food. In the fourth place, the extension of the draft will defeat the best brand of preparedness for our Nation.

Why is the draft not needed? Mr. Patterson told us last March when he came before the committee, and you will find his remarks on page 18 of the hearings, that we could raise 800,000 men by volunteer enlistments. I have made a computation of the present make-up of the Army. I find we are going to reach 800,000 enlisted men, that is, by volunteers, by July 1. Mr. Patterson also said on that occasion that the estimated enlistment of 30,000 a month for the last half of this year and 20,000 per month all through 1947 would maintain an army of 800,000 enlisted volunteers. I find in my computation of the average attrition in the Army and the expiration of enlistment periods of those who have already enlisted that that will be the case. Let us examine what the needs are. The needs are estimated at 1,070,000 a year from this July 1. Take from that 100,000 officers and 50,000 Filipino scouts, 20,000 Wacs, and some 50,000 drafted men who will still be in service even though the draft is not extended beyond July 1, and you will find you have with that make-up of the Army 1,020,000—only 50,000 short of the goal. Remember further that that estimate of enlistments is made without any consideration for a pay increase which just passed the House.

Now, we cannot go off the deep end and sacrifice American principles in order to raise only 50,000 soldiers by the draft method. What group are they looking to? There are two principle groups you will find from the hearings. One group is the educational group that has been deferred because of school. On May 13 I gave you the data on that. You can look it up in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We have a pool of boys deferred to go to school. That is the first group that is going to be taken in under this draft. Those who are over 19 years of age in this group will be the first to be taken. What are other countries doing? While we have discharged and returned home a number of veterans equivalent to 5 years of potential students, the total enrollment in science and engineering on May 1 was equal to only one-half of 1 year's normal enrollment. At the same time foreign students in our schools of science and engineering have run 200 percent above prewar enrollment and there are 50,000 more applicants from foreign countries to enter our schools of science and engineering. If all these foreign applicants were admitted to our schools the number would be eight times the number of normal enrollments of foreign students in our schools of science and engineering in 1941. We will be taking our own boys from that pool of students and bringing in foreign students.

The other point is the matter of farm deferments. We have the Flannagan and the Tydings amendment which is in the law, but during our discussion Mr. ARENDS, of Illinois, and I worked very hard to include a further exemption of farm workers, a little more liberal than is provided in the Flannagan bill. We got it in there but if you read the conference report you will find they struck that out. So there is your other pool. They are reaching for the farm workers while we are trying to feed the world. Is that logical to reach for your two prime sources—the students whom we can ill afford to spare for the development of science and engineering and the farm workers when we are trying to feed the world.

The other point of my opposition to extension of the draft is that the adoption of compulsory military service in peacetime weakens our national defense. We will have an Army of 1,070,000 men; a Navy of 558,000 men; Marine Corps, 108,000; National Guard 550,000; and 600,000 Reserve Army and Navy officers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. We will have an armed force of 2,500,000 to 3,000,000 men. Then, we should add to that the recent dischargees who have training recently enough to be worth something, from 500,000 to 1,000,000 men. That gives a total of 3,500,000 men trained for combat. In World War II we had need for 12,000,000 in active military and naval service. In event another world war should come, where are we going to get the other 9,000,000 men with any training at all unless we adopt a universal training program? The Army and Navy officials say they cannot run conscription for service and the universal military training contemporaneously. They are asking us for an easy way to raise 50,000 soldiers. If the War Depart-

ment and the Army officials succeed in extending the draft, 9,000,000 children of today will be sentenced to go into combat without any training at all if a world war strikes us during their young manhood. This is far too high a price for them and for our Nation to pay for a peacetime draft that not only is in complete violation of our American principles but is not even needed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to make inquiry of the chairman of the committee concerning the language on page 3 of the conference report, under paragraph 5, which has to do with the deferment of those already having served on active duty. At the conclusion of the war it was acknowledged that those who had served in the merchant marine for 30 months would be exempted from further service. Likewise, there is another classification — technicians — who have served with the armed forces abroad during this war, both in the European theater and the Asiatic theater, for as many months, right along with our troops. I wonder if the gentleman expects to induct into the armed forces of the United States those who have already served a period in the merchant marine and those who have served a period as technicians with the armed forces in the theaters of war. These men were not inducted purposely, because the War Department wanted their services to be as employees of aircraft companies and other suppliers of war materials.

Mr. MAY. The bill as passed does not exempt them from induction, but they have the same rights to deferment that they would have had otherwise under the original act.

Mr. HINSHAW. Which is nothing at all, except at the pleasure of the Director of Selective Service and his military advisers.

Mr. MAY. They can make claim for deferment and then it is up to the local boards to determine. The reason why we did that was there are two other groups, one in the Navy and one in the Army, that is in that particular situation and we thought it was right to treat them all equally.

Mr. HINSHAW. In other words, it is entirely up to the regulations that may be issued by the selective service as to whether or not acknowledgment will be given for the service of those men in the theaters of operation and the theaters of war. Is that correct?

Mr. MAY. That is my understanding of the legislation.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I shall favor the adoption of this conference report as I am convinced that we need to remain strong militarily for some time to come. No one can foretell the future course of international relations. They may take a strong turn for the worse. In that event we can only rely upon our own strength for survival.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. First I desire to ask my distinguished colleague from Kentucky a brief question. Under this conference bill can the President keep these men in more than 18 months without a declaration of emergency by the Congress?

Mr. MAY. He cannot.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The Selective Service Act of 1940 gave the impression that persons drafted or who volunteered under that act would be discharged after the end of 1 year. Some of us at the time raised the point that they could be held as long as the President might desire to keep them. This, at the time, was denied, but it turned out that we were right.

At the present time, the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps can keep the boys who entered the service under the Selective Service Act or who volunteered for an indefinite period of time.

We passed a bill in the House early in April by an overwhelming majority, the main provisions were—First, eliminating the 18- and 19-year-olds; second, it fixed the term of service of those who had or should enter the service under the Draft Act or volunteered at 18 months; third, fathers without their consent could not be drafted, and fourth, it gave preference to persons actually engaged in agriculture. This measure went to the Senate but no action was taken on it in the Senate until recently.

The Senate passed a bill that included in the draft the 18- and 19-year-olds. It did make provision for the elimination of the fathers from the draft, together with other provisions. The two bills then were referred to the conference committee, made up of members of the Military Affairs Committees of the House and Senate. These two committees, after long consideration, agreed on a bill, and submitted this agreed bill in a conference report to the House and Senate and, of course, that is the bill before us now for consideration, and it is up to the House to accept or reject it.

During all the period of our history and until September 1940, the American people had rejected military conscription in peacetime and perhaps a substantial majority of the Members of Congress are now opposed to military conscription in peacetime. Some Members favor the training of young men as has been advocated by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars and some other veterans' organizations. However, we do have a situation at this time that provides some argument for the extension of the Selective Service. One is, while the fighting has ceased, yet no peace treaty has been concluded between the Allied Nations and countries with which we were at war.

We have about 300,000 men in the service in foreign countries, and nearly all of them have had 2 years or more of service, and among these are many fathers. Those in charge of our armed services insist that they cannot bring these men home unless they are assured of ample replacements, and they also insist that we must keep up the strength of the Army by reason of the unsettled conditions in the world, and the fact that no treaties of peace have yet been concluded. These are very cogent reasons. It is not clear, however, that we could not get all the men we need by the volunteer method, the policy that this country has followed throughout its history.

The Navy and Marine Corps insist that they do not want the draft, and that they can and will secure all the men they need by the volunteer system, and, therefore, the Army is the only branch of our service that is insisting on the draft. The Army states they will need on July 1, 1946, 1,550,000 men. We still have more than 2,000,000 men in the Army, and since October 1945 we have averaged approximately 100,000 volunteers a month, and we secured these volunteers without increase in pay.

Some months ago the House passed a bill which provided for an increase of pay of enlisted personnel of approximately 50 percent, and also some increase of pay for the officer personnel. The administration, through its leaders, permitted that bill to lie in the Senate until very recently, when it substantially approved the House bill, and those two bills were referred to a conference of the House and Senate, and recently the conferees made a unanimous report to their respective Houses, and on today the House unanimously accepted this conference report, and no doubt it will be accepted in the Senate today or tomorrow, and when approved by the President this bill, with its increase in pay and other attractive features, will, in my opinion, bring more volunteers than the Army can use. If the Senate had acted 2 months ago, we would have secured many thousand more volunteers.

During the past 8 months, when the Army was securing 800,000 volunteers, at very little expense to the Government, they secured less than 260,000 by the draft. The draft procedure costs the Government many millions more than the volunteer plan. If the Army would discharge all the men they think ought to be discharged of the more than 2,000,000 men they now have, they would still have more than 1,550,000 men, and with assurances will get volunteers of more than 100,000 a month. The Army states they will need not more than 1,070,000 on July 1, 1947. I have never doubted, with the increased pay, we could secure many more men than the Army says they need, through the volunteer plan, by July 1, 1947.

Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson sent a letter today to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], ranking Democrat of the Military Affairs Committee, and which was read to the House today by him. Secretary Patterson most definitely and positively states that the Army prefers an army made up of volunteers, and he also said that no man will be drafted if the Army can secure volunteers to meet the quota of 1,070,000 by July 1, 1947. As we now have more than 2,000,000 men in the Army, and with the increased pay that will certainly insure at least 100,000 volunteers per month, how can anyone insist that the Army requirement of 1,070,000 cannot be met by

July 1, 1947, and allowing for the discharges as provided in the bill before us.

General Eisenhower, the Chief of Staff, states that he favors a volunteer army. The Navy and Marine Corps insist that they do not desire and it will not be necessary to draft men for those branches of the service. Secretary of War Patterson also states that they will not call for any men under the draft for the months of July and August 1946. With these facts and these assurances it appears as if there is very little reason to vote against this bill.

BRING THE 300,000 HOME

When we had up for consideration in the House the draft bill in April 1946, the 18- and 19-year-olds were excluded. I spoke and voted for that bill as I was opposed to drafting the teen-agers. The compromise bill before us provides for the drafting of those between the ages of 19 and 45. It expressly excludes the 18-year-olds, and, in effect, it really excludes the 19-year-olds because the boys who are now 19 years of age have already been drafted as most of them were drafted when they were 18; therefore, this bill has very little to do with the teen agers.

This act, by its provisions, will expire in 9 months, March 31, 1947, and before the present 18-year-olds will become 19. While the bill states they may draft those between the ages of 19 and 45, the fact is the Army does not want men who are over 30 years of age and they are not now and have not been for some time drafting men over 30 years of age, and do not intend to do so except in a very limited way.

This bill appeals to me because:

First. It excludes the 18-year-olds.

Second. It fixes a definite period of service at 18 months for those who are already in the service and for those who may later enter the service. Of course, volunteers can enlist for a longer period and when they do they will be required to remain in the Army until their enlistments expire, and those already in the service who volunteered to enlist for a longer period in the Regular Army do not come under the 18-month provision of this bill, but those are cases where they volunteered for service for a longer period than 18 months. This bill does very definitely fix the limit of service at 18 months for those who were drafted or who volunteered for the emergency. The longer period only applies to those who volunteered for a longer and certain number of years.

Third. If this bill is passed it will take away from the War Department and the Army the excuse for keeping the nearly 300,000 men in the service who have had as much as 18 months of service or who are fathers. Many of these men saw combat duty and helped to win this great war. They certainly are entitled to come home to their families and to set about to rebuild their lives, and to take advantage of the educational provisions of the GI bill of rights and other privileges and rights under the GI bill of rights.

Fourth. Under this bill fathers cannot be drafted, and fathers now in the service may be released if they wish.

Fifth. Those who have served in our armed forces for as much as 6 months and now have been discharged or are undergoing the process of being discharged, or those who are in hospitals, when they recover, they cannot be drafted, under this act.

Sixth. I should like to see us return to the American plan of raising an army—the volunteer system. In view of the fact that on an average more than 100,000 have volunteered per month, and that by July 1 more than 800,000 will have volunteered since last October under the lesser pay. Now with the increase of pay and inducements, and the assurance of the War Department and General Eisenhower that no effort would be spared to get a volunteer army, I firmly believe that we shall have many more volunteers offering their services than the Army can use, and at the most very few persons will be drafted of any age during the existence of this act, which expires March 31, 1947.

This bill will completely meet the requirements of the Army and at the same time will expedite the speedy return to their homes and families the 300,000 men who have served overseas for 18 months or more. The Navy that requires approximately 600,000 men and officers and the Marine Corps that requires approximately 100,000 men and officers, strongly insist on securing their requirements from volunteers. They do not want the draft, and it is most gratifying to know that the Secretary of War, Patterson, and General Eisenhower now entertain the same view as to the Army. It is pointed out that the Army should not be made up of part conscript and part volunteers. Congress has provided the pay and inducements. They can get the Army if they build up the morale for the Army that we now have in the Navy and Marine Corps. They will have a hard time getting Congress to extend further the draft law in peacetime.

It is for these reasons and under these circumstances that I am voting to extend the draft for a period of 9 months.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a very practical situation. We must view it from that angle. There are Members of the House who believe that young men under 20 should not be inducted. They acted in good faith. There were those who acted in good faith who believed that the situation confronting our country and the national interest of our country called for a continuance of the Selective Service Act. One branch acted one way on that question and the other branch acted another way. Then the bill went to conference and the conferees have agreed. I believe practically every one of us agrees that some kind of extension of the present Selective Training and Service Act is necessary for the national interests of our country. Personally, as I voted, I felt that we should continue the present law. I thought of the young men who are still in the service wearing the uniform. I am thinking of those young men who were drafted at 18 and sent all over the world. Much is being said about the young man today who is coming 18 years of age and who is inducted into the service, who would serve when our country was not at war, and I saw very little consideration given to those who are still in uniform and who are all over the world. Apparently they have not voting power. I am thinking of them and their claim for equitable consideration.

We are faced with a very practical situation. The law has got to be extended. As far as I am concerned, reluctantly, very reluctantly, I shall vote for the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report is a compromise, one of those things that has to occur many times in the process of legislation. The continuance of the act is absolutely necessary. The continuance is before us. In its present form we cannot offer any amendments. If I were to offer an amendment I would want to exempt those over 30 years of age. I do not think men over 30 should be drafted. I do not think he plays a very important part in modern armed forces. However dissatisfied as I am with that, dissatisfied as I am with the fact that we are starting at 19, but respecting the viewpoint of those who feel we should start at 20 that they are honest and sincere, and this being before us without opportunity to amend, the necessity existing that the law be extended, I am going to vote for the conference report; and I am going to urge for practical reasons only that the House adopt the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to preface my remarks by reading a letter that I received only a few minutes ago from the Secretary of War, Hon. Robert P. Patterson. It comes in response to a request of mine asking for an official statement as to how he proposed to administer this act in the event the conference report is adopted. It reads as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1946.

Hon. R. EWING THOMASON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMASON: This is in reply to your recent inquiry concerning the requisitions of men which the Army anticipates making on the Selective Service System during the next few months when the Selective Training and Service Act is extended beyond July 1, 1946.

As you know, it is the earnest hope of General Eisenhower and myself that the manpower requirements of the Army will, in the not-too-distant future, be filled solely through voluntary enlistments. Both of us want an all-volunteer army. The War Department, I assure you, is not endeavoring to get conscription established as a part of the permanent military policy of the Nation. As I have previously stated, the War Department does not desire to have a single man drafted into the military force unless he is actually needed to fill an existing or anticipated shortage. In fact, the bill to continue the Selective Training and Service Act, as recommended by the conference committee,

specifically precludes the Army from requisitioning men from selective service unless they are required to meet such a shortage. That prohibition is in accord with the War Department's views on this matter. General Eisenhower and I have urged the continuance of the Selective Service System only for the purpose of insuring that the Army will be able from month to month to carry out its occupational commitments in enemy lands and to maintain the strength necessary for our national security. There should not be any doubt or uncertainty as to our ability to perform these duties.

The War Department is conducting an intensified recruiting drive this summer. If aided by substantial increases in pay, such as those contained in H. R. 6084, this drive may produce sufficient volunteers to meet the Army's requirements for replacements for the next few months. I have, therefore, directed that no requisitions be made on the Selective Service System for the months of July and August.

Inasmuch as 1-year enlistments begin to expire at a substantial rate in October, and under the terms of H. R. 6064 we must discharge men with 18 months' service beginning at that time, there is serious risk that a shortage will then develop. As it is necessary to give men a minimum of 8 weeks' military training before they are effective replacements, it is not possible to project at this time whether or not we will be able to meet our requirements without requisitions on selective service after September 1. However, I can assure you again that the War Department will limit these requisitions to the numbers actually needed to meet the manpower requirements as set forth in H. R. 6064.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. Speaker, the situation as I see it is to be realistic and not resort to any hysteria or personalities. It is a time to be constructive and place the welfare of our country above every other consideration. We are living in a sick and chaotic world. Communism is on the march all over Europe and in most of Asia. Our delegates, from Secretary Byrnes on down, are this minute sitting around the peace table in Paris, and we might just as well be frank about it, they are not making much progress. We all long and pray for lasting peace, but we must at all times be prepared for any eventuality.

The absolute truth is, and the record will show it, that Russia today has an army of 6,000,000 men. During the past year she has drafted 1,500,000 men, including teen-agers. She has compulsory universal military service, not just training. Great Britain has likewise extended her selective service act, depending almost entirely on 18-year-olds to replace the veterans. France, as well as Yugoslavia and a number of other European countries, continue to raise and maintain armies by conscription. Only a few minutes ago we passed unanimously a pay raise bill that I feel sure will attract enough volunteers to do the job. We cannot gamble. We can take no chances. Not one peace treaty has yet been agreed upon.

It is my conviction that not a single man after September 1 will be drafted under selective service. Of course, I could be mistaken about that, but nevertheless it must not be forgotten that although there has been a serious dropping off in enlistments from 68,867 in April to 48,136 in May, yet in the very first week of this month of June 11,745 men have volunteered. If this rate continues I hope and believe, because I have given much study to this problem, that not a single man will be drafter after that time. I do not guarantee it but I think that is a reasonable hope. But there is something bigger than that in all this. I have the same solicitude for and interest in the teen-age youngsters and their fathers and mothers as the balance of you have. However, I want to tell you, too, that I have a very keen solicitude for the 290,000 men, and I speak from the record, who will have been in the service 18 months or longer on the 1st day of October. Thousands of these men are fathers, thousands of them have never seen their babies that have been born since they went overseas, and many thousands of them have been in combat. If you defeat this bill there is no predicting when these men will get home. Then you tell me they are not entitled to some consideration when these same 19-year-old boys have not served their country a single day.

Mr. Speaker, bona fide and essential farm workers are deferred.

No 18-year-old boy is drafted under any conditions if this report is adopted. All fathers will be out on request on August 1. All men with 18 months' service will be out on October 1. No man who has served a single day overseas will be recalled. No man now out of service and who has served 6 months in this country will be recalled. No father or man over 29 years of age will be drafted. Volunteers will be called first under the machinery of this bill before any men between 19 and 20 are to be drafted. What could be fairer than that?

If we should fail to get them by the volunteer method, I would like to know what you are going to do to meet our obligations. My good friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] always talks about commitments. To say that there have been any secret commitments on these matters is pure bunk. But it is true that our representatives, including the representatives of the other Allied Nations, all agreed at Potsdam that we would do our part in providing the necessary occupation forces both in Germany and the Pacific.

So it was up to General Eisenhower, and later General McNarney and General MacArthur to set those figures, and those figures for this immediate time are 397,000 for the Pacific, 338,000 for the European theater, and 815,000 for the Western Hemisphere.

Now, then, I just want to raise this question: If we are going to meet our obligations to our allies in countries that are running rampant with communism, where famine literally stalks the land, and where you can have revolution any day, I refuse to believe that the Members of this House will be parties to throwing away the victory that we won at such great cost in blood and treasure.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] referred with considerable ridicule and sarcasm to the so-called brass hats, which seems to be a very popular pastime in these preelection days, but 2 years ago, when those of us sitting in this Chamber did not know for sure whether this Capitol would be standing at this time or not, and when General Eisenhower had landed in Normandy, and he with Generals Patton, Bradley, Simpson, and Patch, and others of our great military leaders took that old flag back of the Speaker's stand and started on their march to Berlin, we all said then that they were the greatest men of all time. General MacArthur kept his pledge and returned to Manila. He was then the greatest military genius since Napoleon. Today, in the eyes of some, he is a brass hat. I am sometimes accused of using a trite expression that you have to trust somebody. If you are not going to trust a man like General Eisenhower when he comes here and says we have got to have so many men in the armed services if we are to have security as well as the hope of lasting peace, then I do not know where we will look for leadership.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Would the defeat of this conference report not be a staggering blow to our foreign policy and the maintenance of peace?

Mr. THOMASON. We might just as well be frank about it. There are some nations in the world today that the only thing they respect is strength. They are not agreeing to anything at the Paris Conference. I am for the United Nations organization. It must succeed or civilization is doomed. To succeed it must be implemented by military strength until a permanent peace treaty is agreed upon. There will be no time for lengthy preparedness if war ever comes again. Our men must already be trained. To fail to pass this conference report would be heralded all over the world as a sign of weakness. Our foreign policy would be a joke. We are a strong and patriotic people. It is a question of country and duty. We must assume our place in world affairs.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that I agree with much that the gentleman has said, but I want to correct the gentleman from Texas in a statement he made. In the beginning of his remarks he said that the Secretary of War administers this act. The Secretary of War has nothing to do with the administration of this act.

Mr. THOMASON. Well, that might be technically true, but the Secretary of War, together with General Eisenhower, makes the requisition on selective service for the necessary men. I have the greatest confidence in both of them. I invite the gentleman to carefully read the Secretary of War's letter which I presented a few minutes ago. Let me say

this, that if this volunteer enlistment campaign keeps up as successfully as it has in the last few days, it is likely, I repeat, that not a single man will be drafted.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. That is very true; but the gentleman did not say that.

Mr. THOMASON. Let us assume that there is a call for 50,000 men and 45,000 of them are obtained by volunteer enlistment. Then the only thing that selective service does is to call for the remaining 5,000, and you go back to your own draft boards who know these people and these boys better than anybody else.

Let me say that since shortly after VJ-day there has not been a single man over 29 years of age drafted, and there has not been a single father drafted. Under this conference report no man who on October 1 will have had 18 months' service and no man who on August 1 is a father will be subject to the terms of this extension.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman says that farmers, who are so badly needed now, are exempted in this report.

Mr. THOMASON. Sure. The old act is still in effect, that if a man is engaged in essential agriculture he is deferred. We are not going to have any storm cellar about this thing, I hope, but if a man is actively engaged in essential agriculture he is deferred.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman speaks of the brass hats. Is it not true that they pay with their lives and their bodies for our mistakes, that if we are not prepared they die for our mistakes?

Mr. THOMASON. I thank the lady for that wise observation. I hold no brief for the brass hats, but I am proud of every one of those who led us to the great victory they won on battlefields all over the world.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May I ask the gentleman if he does not feel that inasmuch as the local draft boards were liberal during the war with deferments for agricultural workers, now, since the actual fighting is over and we are in a famine and production of food is most vital, they likely will be more liberal than they were before?

Mr. THOMASON. Local draft boards have done a grand job. They are fine citizens who know the boys in their communities. They can be depended upon to administer this act fairly. They usually do justice, in spite of what some of them might think at the time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman said that this bill provides that a person who has served 18 months will be eligible for discharge.

Mr. THOMASON. Let us get this straight now, because I beg of you not to vote against this conference report under a misapprehension. I got the figures on this just this morning. As to these 290,000 men who will have been in service 18 months on October 1 next, if you want them back home do not vote this conference report down, because the man who has served 18 months by October 1, I do not care where, he is to be released immediately. I speak with authority on this matter because I sat there in this committee of conference for many days. I did not get all I wanted but I do undertake to say that this is a fair report. It leaves the 18-year-olds completely out of it. It will let out every father on August 1. It will let out every man with 18 months' service on October 1. I do not believe you want to go back home to some boys who are running around town and say, "No; you won't render 1 day's service," and then defeat this conference report and let those men now in service remain in uniform indefinitely. This bill is fair. It is just. It is necessary for our national security and to maintain our high position in world affairs. If you vote down this report, you ought to go out and cable Jimmy Byrnes to come on home.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H. R. 6064, which provides for extension of selective training and service, and the bill itself, show that under it there will be established compulsory military training in peacetime.

It provides for the drafting of 19-year-old men for service abroad in peacetime. Under its provisions, men so drafted, can, if the Congress once declares that the national interest is imperiled, be retained in training and service so long as the President of the United States deems such training or service to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

Under the leadership of the internationalists, becoming a member of the United Nations, this administration has agreed to furnish an Army, a Navy, and Air Corps, and whatever other agencies of war may, in the judgment of an International Security Council and an International Military Staff, controlled by individuals and officers who owe allegiance to other countries, who owe no allegiance to the United States, be deemed necessary for the preservation of world peace, as that term may be defined by them; for participation in any aggressive action which the Security Council and the International Military Staff may deem to be necessary or expedient.

It is contrary to the American policy to force compulsory military training under Army and Navy rule upon the youth of our land in peacetime.

It is contrary to American policy and I deem it to be contrary to the best interest of our national welfare, to conscript the youth of our land to fight abroad in wars in which we have no vital interest, under the command of officers of other lands.

It is contrary to American policy, contrary to our traditions, to, after the Congress has once declared "the national interest is imperiled," permit a President to retain drafted men in the armed service indefinitely and long after the peril to the national interest has ended.

All of the forgoing power this bill as enacted would incorporate into the law of the land. I cannot, I will not, support the conference report.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Missouri opposed to the bill?

Mr. SHORT. Most assuredly, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHORT moves to recommit the conference report with instructions that the House insist on eliminating the drafting of 19-year-old men.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHORT) there were—ayes 74, noes 182.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 259, nays 110, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—259

Abernethy	Cole, N. Y.	Gardner
Adams	Combs	Gary
Allen, La.	Cooley	Gathings
Andrews, Ala.	Cooper	Gavin
Arends	Corbett	Gearhart
Auchincloss	Courtney	Geelan
Bailey	Cox	Gerlach
Baldwin, N. Y.	Cunningham	Gifford
Barrett, Wyo.	Curtis	Goodwin
Barry	D'Alesandro	Gore
Bates, Ky.	Davis	Gorski
Beckworth	Dawson	Gossett
Bender	Delaney, James J.	Graham
Biemiller		Green
Blackney	Delaney, John J.	Gregory
Bland		Gwinn, N. Y.
Bloom	D'Ewart	Hale
Bolton	Dingell	Hall,
Bonner	Dirksen	Edwin Arthur
Brooks	Domengeaux	Hall,
Brown, Ga.	Dondero	Leonard W.
Brumbaugh	Douglas, Calif.	Halleck
Bryson	Douglas, Ill.	Hancock
Buchanan	Durham	Hand
Buck	Earthman	Hare
Buckley	Eaton	Harless, Ariz.
Bulwinkle	Eberharter	Hartley
Bunker	Elliott	Hays
Byrne, N. Y.	Ellsworth	Hébert
Byrnes, Wis.	Elsaesser	Heffernan
Campbell	Elston	Hendricks
Canfield	Engle, Calif.	Herter
Cannon, Mo.	Ervin	Heselton
Carlson	Fallon	Hess
Carnahan	Fellows	Hinshaw
Case, N. J.	Fenton	Hoeven
Case, S. Dak.	Fisher	Holmes, Mass.
Celler	Flannagan	Holmes, Wash.
Chapman	Fogarty	Hook
Chelf	Forand	Hope
Clark	Fuller	Horan
Clason	Fulton	Howell
Clements	Gallagher	Huber
Cole, Kans.	Gamble	Jarman

Jennings	Mills	Rowan
Johnson, Calif.	Monroney	Ryter
Johnson, Luther A.	Morrison	Sasscer
	Mundt	Scrivner
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Murdock	Shafer
	Murphy	Sheppard
Jonkman	Murray, Tenn.	Sikes
Judd	Neely	Simpson, Ill.
Kean	Norblad	Simpson, Pa.
Kearney	O'Brien, Ill.	Slaughter
Keefe	O'Brien, Mich.	Smith, Maine
Kefauver	O'Konski	Smith, Va.
Keogh	O'Neil	Somers, N. Y.
Kilburn	O'Toole	Spence
Kilday	Outland	Stefan
King	Pace	Sullivan
Kirwan	Patman	Sumners, Tex.
Klein	Peterson, Fla.	Sundstrom
Kopplemann	Pfeifer	Taber
Kunkel	Phillips	Talbot
LaFollette	Pickett	Taylor
Lanham	Plumley	Thom
Larcade	Poage	Thomas, N. J.
Latham	Pratt	Thomason
Lea	Price, Fla.	Tibbott
LeFevre	Price, Ill.	Towe
Lesinski	Priest	Traynor
Lewis	Quinn, N. Y.	Trimble
Link	Rabin	Voorhis, Calif.
Luce	Rains	Vorys, Ohio
Lyle	Ramey	Wadsworth
Lynch	Randolph	Walter
McConnell	Rayfiel	Wasielewski
McCormack	Reed, Ill.	Weaver
McKenzie	Rees, Kans.	Whitten
McMillan, S. C.	Resa	Whittington
McMillen, Ill.	Richards	Wigglesworth
Mahon	Riley	Wolcott
Maloney	Rivers	Wolverton, N. J.
Manasco	Robertson, Va.	Woodhouse
Martin, Mass.	Robsion, Ky.	Woodruff
Mathews	Rodgers, Pa.	Worley
May	Roe, N. Y.	Zimmerman
Merrow	Rogers, Fla.	
Michener	Rogers, Mass.	

NAYS—110

Allen, Ill.	Griffiths	Patterson
Andersen, H. Carl	Gross	Philbin
	Gwynne, Iowa	Pittenger
Andresen, August H.	Harness, Ind.	Ploeser
	Havenner	Powell
Angell	Healy	Rabaut
Arnold	Hedrick	Rankin
Barden	Henry	Reed, N. Y.
Barrett, Pa.	Hill	Rich
Beall	Hoch	Rizley
Bennett, Mo.	Hoffman, Mich.	Rockwell
Bishop	Hoffman, Pa.	Rogers, N. Y.
Brehm	Hull	Russell
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins	Sabath
Buffett	Jensen	Sadowski
Butler	Johnson, Ill.	Savage
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ind.	Schwabe, Mo.
Chiperfield	Johnson, Okla.	Schwabe, Okla.
Church	Jones	Sharp
Clevenger	Kelley, Pa.	Sheridan
Clippinger	Kelly, Ill.	Short
Cole, Mo.	Kinzer	Smith, Ohio
Cravens	Knutson	Smith, Wis.
Crosser	Landis	Springer
Daughton, Va.	Lane	Starkey
Dolliver	Lemke	Stockman
Doughton, N. C.	McCowen	Sumner, Ill.
Dworshak	McDonough	Talle
Ellis	McGlinchey	Tarver
Feighan	McGregor	Thomas, Tex.
Fernandez	Madden	Vursell
Flood	Marcantonio	Weichel
Folger	Martin, Iowa	White
Gillette	Mason	Wilson
Gillie	Miller, Nebr.	Winter
Gordon	Morgan	Wood
Granahan	Murray, Wis.	
Grant, Ind.	O'Hara	

NOT VOTING—63

Almond	De Lacy	Ludlow
Anderson, Calif.	Doyle	McGehee
Andrews, N. Y.	Drewry	Mankin
Baldwin, Md.	Engel, Mich.	Mansfield, Mont.
Bates, Mass.	Gibson	
Bell	Gillespie	Mansfield, Tex.
Bennet, N. Y.	Granger	Miller, Calif.
Boren	Grant, Ala.	Norrel
Boykin	Hagen	Norton
Bradley, Mich.	Harris	Patrick
Bradley, Pa.	Hart	Peterson, Ga.
Camp	Hobbs	Reece, Tenn.
Cannon, Fla.	Holifield	Robertson, N. Dak.
Cochran	Izac	
Coffee	Jackson	Robinson, Utah
Colmer	Kee	Roe, Md.
Crawford	Kerr	Rooney
Curley	LeCompte	Sparkman
Stevenson	Torrens	Wickersham
Stewart	Vinson	Winstead
Stigler	Welch	Wolfenden, Pa.
Tolan	West	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bates of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Mansfield of Montana against.

Mr. Andrews of New York for, with Mr. De Lacy against.

Mr. Sparkman for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Camp for, with Mr. Coffee against.

Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Doyle against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Hart with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mrs. Mankin with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. Norrell with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Almond with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Roe of Maryland with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BYRNE of New York, Mr. D'ALESANDRO, Mr. FALLON, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. TIBBOTT, and Mr. HOWELL changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement in connection with the vote on the conference report on the so-called Draft Act. At the time that vote was taken, through the courtesy of the Speaker, I was in his private office engaged on official business and did not know, because of my unfamiliarity with those sacred precincts, that the bells did not ring there. I was there waiting for the vote.

Had I been present I would have voted in favor of adoption of the conference report, and I would have arranged a live pair for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] who requested me to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that these remarks may appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of the proceedings on the conference report on the so-called Draft Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE CEREMONIES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a commission:

JUNE 21, 1946.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am very grateful to you for having appointed me last Monday as a member of the committee to attend the Philippine celebration to be held in Manila on July 4, 1946. Unfortunately, because of certain pressing matters, I am unable to accept this appointment and must respectfully decline it.

Again thanking you for your consideration in appointing me and with every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES DOMENGEAUX.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 414, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the commission to represent the United States at the ceremonies to be held at Manila on July 4, 1946, in celebration of the independence of the Philippines, to fill the existing vacancy thereon, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1947

Mr. GARY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT—INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BILL, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6335) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 30, 41, 49, 54, 100, 101, 102, 118, 119, 123, 125, 126, 127, 133, 145, 146, 148, 149, 155, 162, 173, 174, 175, 184, 231, 240, 254, 255 and 261.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 12, 14, 21, 22, 25, 42, 43, 48, 50, 51, 77, 79, 81, 82, 86, 88, 89, 91, 94, 95, 96, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 122, 124, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 150, 151, 156, 164, 191, 212, 213,

216, 217, 222, 230, 233, 266, 270, 273, 279, 280, 281, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293 and 294, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,298,-337"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$263,885"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$156,526"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$250,760"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "thirty-four"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$12,-470,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,-000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,-000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "eighteen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$392,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$287,126"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$365,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$454,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,054,-337"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,137,-300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,429,-008"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$815,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,000,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,130,-570"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$488,-910"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$902,-168"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$925,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: in lieu of the sum proposed insert "$962,-500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada and Oregon either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,624,-000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$294,-815"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,267,-078"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$47,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$28,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,938"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$42,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,725"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: in lieu of the sum proposed insert "$23,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$26,125"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$47,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$237,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$924,038"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Shiprock dormitories and utilities, $318,600; Toadlena School expansion, $500,000;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$118,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ", except that $1,000 additional may be expended for the purchase of one passenger automobile for the use of the chief of the Choctaw Nation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada and Oregon either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "five hundred and eighty-four"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 142: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,827,468"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 144: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 144, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,435,097"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 152: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 152, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ", Shasta to Oroville, two hundred and thirty kilovolt, $10,000, Oroville to Sacramento, two hundred and thirty kilovolt, $1,000,000, Contra Costa Canal extension, sixty-nine kilovolt, $50,000; in all, $12,685,622"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 153: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,504,075"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 157: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$18,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 158: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 158, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$48,725,307"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 160: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 160, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$932,893"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 161: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 161, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 165: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 165, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 167: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "one hundred and sixteen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 168: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 168, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 169: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 170: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 170, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 171: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 171, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 172: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 172, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 176: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 176, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,498,672"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$235,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 179: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 179, and agree to the same with an amendment, as

follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$69,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 180: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$110,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$442,030"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 185: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,708,772"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 186: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$90,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$184,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 188: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "four"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 189: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$80,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 190: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 190, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 192: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 192, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "four"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 194: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 194, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$112,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 195: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 195, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 196: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 196, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 197: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 197, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 198: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198; and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 199: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 199, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$34,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 200: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 200, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$559,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 201: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 201, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "five"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 202: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 202, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$45,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 203: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 203, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 204: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 204, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "two"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 205: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 205, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$21,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 206: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 206, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 207: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 207, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 208: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 208, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$826,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 209: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 209, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$52,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 210: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 210, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,430,615"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 211: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 211, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$47,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 214: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 214, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$30,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 215: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 215, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 218: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 218, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 219: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 219, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$727,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 220: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 220, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 221: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 221, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$8,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 223: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 223, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$62,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 224: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 224, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$711,248"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 225: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 225, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$659,407"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 226: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 226, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,290,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 227: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 227, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 228: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 228, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$71,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 229: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 229, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 232: That the House recede from its disagreement to the

amendment of the Senate numbered 232, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$675,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 235: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 235, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 236: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 236, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$11,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 237: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 237, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 241: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 241, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "thirty-seven"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 243: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 243, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$265,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 244: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 244, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 245: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 245, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,413,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 246: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 246, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$724,440"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 247: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 247, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$360,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 248: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 248, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 249: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 249, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$819,307"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 250: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 250, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$62,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 251: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 251, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 252: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 252, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 253: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 253, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 257: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 257, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$853,000, and in addition thereto the unexpended balance for special improvements on the Wichita Mountain Wildlife Refuge for the fiscal year 1944 is continued available for the fiscal year 1947"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 258: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 258, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 259: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 259, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,723,502"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 260: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 260, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 262: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 262, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,223,502"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 263: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 263, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$962,790"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 264: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 264, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "one hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 267: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 267, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 268: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 268, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$79,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 269: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 269, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,360,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 271: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 271, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 275: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 275, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,215"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 278: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 278, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and acquisition (not to exceed $1,352,415 for purchase of the Ark-La line from Markham Ferry, Oklahoma, to Nimrod, Arkansas)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 282: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 282, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 283: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 283, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 284: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 284, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 53, 58, 78, 80, 85, 87, 90, 92, 98, 105, 114, 115, 116, 141, 159, 166, 234, 238, 239, 242, 256, 265, 272, 274, 276, 277, 285 and 295.

JED JOHNSON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL (except as to amendments 29, 80, 112, 129, 130, 132, 135, 136, 137, 138, and 139),
ROBERT F. JONES (except as to construction items, Bureau of Reclamation),
BEN F. JENSEN (except as to construction items, Bureau of Reclamation),
HENRY C. DWORSHAK (except as to construction items, Bureau of Reclamation),
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
GUY CORDON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1: Appropriates $1,298,337 for salaries, Office of the Secretary, instead of $1,243,063, as proposed by the House, and $1,368,000, as proposed by the Senate. The reduction of $69,663 in the Senate figure is due to the denial of $18,000 for an additional Assistant Secretary and staff, $5,120 for the suggestions award system, $37,703 for the Division of

Power, and $8,840 for the Division of Information.

No. 3: Appropriates $263,885 for personal services, Office of the Solicitor, instead of $251,278, as proposed by the House, and $267,000, as proposed by the Senate, the reduction of $3,115 in the Senate figure being due to the denial of that amount for the Legislative Division.

No. 4: Appropriates $156,526 for personal services, Division of Territories and Island Possessions, instead of $141,711, as proposed by the House, and $167,200, as proposed by the Senate, the increase in the House figure being due to the allowance of one chief of branch, CAF-14 at $7,175, a secretary and clerk, CAF-5, $4,640, and $3,000 for the restoration of positions to a full-time basis.

Nos. 8 and 9: Appropriates $250,760 for contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, instead of $224,460, as proposed by the House, and $263,500, as proposed by the Senate, the reduction of $12,740 in the Senate figure being due to the denial of $1,800 for the Division of Power, $940 for the suggestions award system, and $10,000 for travel expenses; and authorizes the transfer of $4,000 for stationery supplies for the Grazing Service, instead of $6,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 10: Appropriates $10,000 for expenses of the Commission of Fine Arts, instead of $7,926, as proposed by the House, and $11,900, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16, relating to the Bonneville Power Administration: Inserts language, as proposed by the Senate, which removes any doubt as to the authority of the Administration to acquire transmission lines, and limits, as proposed by the Senate, the application of this authorization to the following items: (1) 230,000-volt river crossing and substation, Troutdale, Oregon, owned by RFC, (2) Albany-Camp Adair line and facilities owned by the War Department, (3) Brewster-Okanogan-Washington line and related facilities, and (4) Eugene-Drain-Oregon line and related facilities, all of the foregoing projects being publicly owned; authorizes the purchase of 34 automobiles, instead of 29, as proposed by the House, and 39, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the purchase of two aircraft, as proposed by the Senate, instead of one, as proposed by the House; appropriates a total of $12,470,000 for construction, operation, and maintenance, instead of $9,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $19,086,250, as proposed by the Senate; and provides $4,000,000 for operation and maintenance, instead of $3,695,400, as proposed by the House, and $4,290,000, as proposed by the Senate, $154,600 of the reduction in the Senate figure for operation and maintenance being specifically applied to the following items:

Administrative offices	$39,167
Office of general counsel	5,196
Branch fiscal and administrative management	78,947
Branch of Power Management	31,290
Total reduction	154,600

Of the total increase allowed for the Bonneville Power Administration, the following increases were allowed over the bill as passed by the House:

(1) Operation and maintenance, $304,600.
(2) Feeder lines, $1,500,000.
(3) Olympia-Cosmopolis Line, $790,000.
(4) Advance surveys, $50,000.
(5) Tools and equipment, $100,000.
(6) Ellensburg Columbia Line, $590,000.

Nos. 21 and 22: Authorizes the use of funds appropriated to the Grazing Service for "fire fighting," as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE

Nos. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, and 32: Appropriates $1,000,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of $950,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,075,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $950,000 for surveying public lands, instead of $494,602, as proposed by the House, and $750,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $392,600 for salaries and expenses, branch of field examination, instead of $387,000, as proposed by the House, and $397,500, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $287,126 for salaries and expenses of district land offices, instead of $277,126, as proposed by the House, and $293,200, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $365,000 for timber operations on the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, Oregon, instead of $310,191, as proposed by the House, and $429,240, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $454,000, for protection and management of timber resources of the public domain, instead of $433,455, as proposed by the House, and $474,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $15,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, instead of $23,500, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $75,000 for surveys and investigations in Alaska, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House, and $100,000, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

No. 33: Appropriates $1,064,337 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Indian Affairs, instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,128,675, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 34: Appropriates $950,000 for salaries and expenses, district offices, instead of $900,000, as proposed by the House, and $985,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 35: Appropriates $3,137,300 for salaries and expenses, reservation administration, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $3,274,600, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 36: Appropriates $3,429,008 for the Alaska native service, instead of $3,084,008, as proposed by the House, and $3,609,400, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of $345,000 in the House bill being provided for operation of the former Sitka Naval Base as an Alaska native service institution.

No. 37: Appropriates $815,000 for maintenance of buildings, instead of $800,000, as proposed by the House, and $838,100, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 38: Appropriates $10,000,000 for education of Indians, instead of $9,600,000, as proposed by the House, and $10,317,450, as proposed by the Senate; and provides $2,980 for a curator for Knishba Museum, Apache Indian Reservation.

No. 39: Appropriates $5,130,570 for conservation for health, instead of $5,930,570, as proposed by the House, and $6,769,570, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 40: Appropriates $488,910 for welfare of Indians, instead of $150,000, as proposed by the House, and $750,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 41 and 42: Appropriates $704,728 for management, Indian forest and range resources, as proposed by the House, instead of $960,000, as proposed by the Senate; and inserts a statute reference, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 43 and 44: Appropriates $902,168 for agriculture and stock raising, instead of $808,336, as proposed by the House, and $968,000, as proposed by the Senate, $10,000 being specifically provided for the eradication of fever ticks among livestock on the Seminole Agency in Florida.

Nos. 45 and 46: Appropriates $925,000 to the revolving fund for loans to Indians, instead of $350,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate; and provides an increase in the authorization for loans to Indians otherwise ineligible to $962,500, instead of $925,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 47, 48, 49, 50, 51 and 52, relating to the acquisition of land for Indian tribes: Appropriates $350,000, instead of $250,000, as proposed by the House, and $950,000, as proposed by the Senate, excepts certain states in which land may be purchased outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations, as proposed by the Senate, with the exception of the State of South Dakota, which has been eliminated; and provides that no part of the appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights in the States of Nevada and Oregon.

No. 54: Appropriates $30,000 for development of Indian arts and crafts, as proposed by the House, instead of $35,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 55, 56, and 57, relating to operation and maintenance of irrigation and drainage systems: Appropriates $1,624,000, instead of $1,600,000 as proposed by the House, and $1,648,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides that $294,815 shall be reimbursable, instead of $290,000, as proposed by the House, and $299,631, as proposed by the Senate; and provides further that $1,267,078 shall be nonreimbursable, instead of $1,250,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,284,157, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, and 77, relating to construction, irrigation systems: Appropriates $924,038 for such projects, instead of $743,825, as proposed by the House, and $1,104,250, as proposed by the Senate; and authorizes the interchangeability of amounts in the discretion of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, as proposed by the Senate, instead of the Secretary, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 79, 81, 82, 83, 84 and 86, relating to construction of buildings and utilities: Appropriates $1,359,700 for schools, hospitals and quarters in Alaska, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $113,300, as proposed by the House; appropriates $118,000 for schools, dormitories and utilities at Kiowa, Oklahoma, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $88,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $8,500 for quarters, Mescalero, New Mexico, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $318,600 for Shiprock dormitories and utilities, as proposed by the Senate, and $500,000 for the Toadlena School expansion, instead of $700,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $100,000 for surveys and plans and administrative expenses, instead of $80,000, as proposed by the House, and $263,000, as proposed by the Senate; and authorizes the interchangeability of amounts in the discretion of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, as proposed by the Senate, instead of the Secretary, as proposed by the House.

No. 88: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House setting up a new formula for the distribution of funds appropriated for roads, Indian reservations.

No. 89: Inserts a statute reference, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, and 113, relating to appropriations for the benefit or relief of Indians from tribal funds: Appropriates $278,170 for administration of tribal affairs, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $118,000 for support of the Klamath Agency, Oregon, instead of $106,000, as proposed by the House, and $224,000, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of $12,000 in the House Bill being provided for purchase of certain well-drilling machinery and farm machinery requested by the tribe; appropriates $129,500 for support of the Menominee Agency, including not to exceed $1,000 for scholarships, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $200,000 for the support of the Osage Agency, Oklahoma, instead of $186,027, as proposed by the House, and $213,500, as proposed by the Senate; provides funds for the purchase of an automobile for the use of the chief of the Choctaw Nation; strikes out the proposal of the Senate to increase per diem allowances for travel of members of tribal councils or committees thereof; appropriates $75,000 for relief of

needy Indians, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $22,980, for compensation and expenses of attorneys, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $304,000 for the purchase and lease of lands, with certain limitations, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $220,000, as proposed by the House; and appropriates $326,375 for industrial assistance, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $151,375, as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Nos. 117 and 118, relating to administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of 584 automobiles, instead of 380, as proposed by the House, and 1,168, as proposed by the Senate, and restores the provision of the House relating to the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft.

Nos. 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, and 142, relating to appropriations from the reclamation fund: Appropriates $4,000,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $5,550,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and expenses (other than project offices), and provides that not exceeding $150,000 of funds available for expenditure under such appropriation shall be used for salaries and expenses in connection with informational work, instead of $125,000, as proposed by the House, and $200,000, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $5,000,000 for general investigations, instead of $3,250,000, as proposed by the House, and $11,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. Appropriates the following amounts for continuation of construction of projects as compared with the House and Senate bills:

Project	Recommended in House bill	Recommended in Senate bill	Agreed to by conferees
Boise project, Idaho, Payette division	$1,115,660	$2,782,659	$2,782,659
Anderson Ranch Dam	1,234,475	2,847,000	1,234,475
Minidoka project, Idaho	433,605	1,000,000	1,000,000
Palisades project, Idaho	650,410	1,500,000	650,410
Sun River project, Montana	41,625	96,000	41,625
Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas	360,675	831,800	360,675
Tucumcari project, New Mexico	753,605	1,738,000	1,738,000
Lugert-Altus, Oklahoma	901,900	2,664,610	2,664,610
Deschutes project, Oregon	563,685	1,716,837	1,716,837
Owyhee project, Oregon	----------	125,000	125,000
Klamath project, Oregon-California	216,800	1,281,605	1,281,605
Provo River project, Utah	1,345,040	4,602,000	1,345,040
Ogden River project, Utah	26,885	62,000	62,000
Yakima project, Washington, Roza division	624,650	2,597,100	2,597,100
Kendrick project, Wyoming	216,800	1,895,000	1,895,000
Riverton project, Wyoming	650,410	3,520,550	3,520,550
Shoshone project, Wyoming, Hart Mountain division	346,885	1,917,672	1,917,672
Shoshone project, Wyoming, Willwood division	58,970	196,895	196,895

Provides for the payment of operation and maintenance expenses, Columbia Basin project, Washington, from power revenues, as proposed by the Senate, instead of from a special account, as proposed by the House; and corrects the total of appropriations from the reclamation fund.

Nos. 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, and 158, relating to appropriations for construction of reclamation projects from the general fund: Appropriates $2,000,000 for the Gila project, Arizona, instead of $867,210, as proposed by the House, and $3,500,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $7,500,000 for the Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada, instead of $6,504,070, as proposed by the House, and $15,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides funds for the construction of transmission lines and substations for the projects and not exceeding the amounts set forth as follows: Tucson-Deming interconnection, $100,000; Wickenburg extension, $100,000; second Parker-Gila line, $600,000; and other miscellaneous extensions, $70,000. Appropriates $12,685,622 for the Central Valley project, California, instead of $10,840,120, as proposed by the House, and $25,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides for the construction of transmission lines and substations, including $1,000,000 for completion of the Oroville-Sacramento line, which will ultimately be extended to Tracy to provide power for pumping water in the Delta area, instead of the proposals of the Senate; appropriates $100,000 for the Kings River project, California, instead of $200,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $7,504,075 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, instead of $6,504,075, as proposed by the House, and $13,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $867,210 for the Hungry Horse project, Montana, instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $68,400 for the Colorado River project, Texas, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $18,000,000 for the Columbia Basin project, Washington, instead of $13,008,145, as proposed by the House, and $27,400,000, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total of such items.

No. 160: Appropriates $932,893 for the Fort Peck project, Montana, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $433,605, as proposed by the House, the amount provided in excess of the House figure being allowed to restore funds specifically disallowed by the House for the construction of transmission lines, substations, and the purchase of facilities.

No. 161: Appropriates $17,500,000 for the Missouri River Basin, instead of $10,312,685, as proposed by the House, and $25,582,202, as proposed by the Senate, a portion of the increase being provided for transmission lines specifically disallowed in the House bill, as set forth on page 19 of the House report.

No. 162: Appropriates $433,605 for continuation of construction, Boulder Canyon project, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 163: Appropriates $5,000,000 for construction, All-American Canal, instead of $2,384,825, as proposed by the House, and $7,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 164: Appropriates $500,000 for investigations of projects for utilization of waters of the Colorado River in the four States of the upper division, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 165: Appropriates $100,000 for Colorado River Front work and levee system, instead of $75,000, as proposed by the House, and $250,000, as proposed by the Senate.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Nos. 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, and 185, relating to the Geological Survey: Authorizes the purchase of 116 automobiles, instead of 30, as proposed by the House, and 202, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the use of $20,000, for the purchase of office furniture and equipment, instead of $15,000, as proposed by the House, and $55,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $3,000,000 for topographic surveys, instead of $2,626,120, as proposed by the House, and $5,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides that $400,000 shall be available for cooperation with States or municipalities, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the House, and $500,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $2,000,000 for geologic surveys, instead of $1,200,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,463,500, as proposed by the Senate, and provides that $500,000 shall be available for salaries in the District of Columbia, instead of $725,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $200,000 for mineral resources of Alaska, as proposed by the House, instead of $312,500, as proposed by the Senate, of which $65,000 shall be available for salaries in the District of Columbia; appropriates $2,498,672 for gaging streams, instead of $2,109,345, as proposed by the House, and $2,888,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides that $235,000 shall be available for salaries in the District of Columbia; appropriates $275,000 for classification of lands, instead of $216,800, as proposed by the House, and $350,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides that $69,000 shall be available for salaries in the District of Columbia; appropriates $442,030 for printing and binding, and so forth, instead of $397,610, as proposed by the House, and $657,030, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $625,000, for mineral leasing, instead of $575,500, as proposed by the House and $690,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides that $75,000 shall be available for salaries in the District of Columbia; and corrects the total of the items for the Geological Survey.

BUREAU OF MINES

Nos. 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, and 222, relating to various items for the Bureau of Mines: Appropriates $184,800 for salaries and expenses, including printing and binding, instead of $176,243, as proposed by the House and $195,800, as proposed by the Senate, of which $90,000 shall be available for personal services, instead of $81,443, as proposed by the House and $101,000, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the use of $80,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia in connection with operating mine-rescue cars and stations, instead of $76,000, as proposed by the House, and $111,000, as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the purchase of four automobiles; authorizes the use of $100,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $91,000, as proposed by the House, and $107,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorizes the purchase of not to exceed five automobiles, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $500,000 for testing fuel, instead of $397,100, as proposed by the House and $596,000, as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the use of $112,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; appropriates $5,250,000 for synthetic liquid fuels, instead of $3,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $7,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the use of $115,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; appropriates $559,350 for mineral mining investigations, instead of $381,100, as proposed by the House, and $737,600, as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the use of $34,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; appropriates $1,700,000 for investigation and development of domestic mineral deposits, except fuels, instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,400,000, as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the use of $45,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; appropriates $350,000 for coal investigations, instead of $250,000, as proposed by the House and $500,000, as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the use of $21,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; appropriates $826,750 for oil and gas investigations, instead of $772,000, as proposed by the House and $881,500, as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the use of $52,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia; appropriates $1,430,615 for mining experiment stations, instead of $985,820, as proposed by the House and $1,875,410, as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the use of $47,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia; appropriates $1,000,000 for metallurgical research and pilot plants, instead of $500,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate,

authorizes the use of such funds for the construction of permanent buildings, if necessary, as proposed by the Senate, instead of temporary buildings, as proposed by the House, and provides that of the funds appropriated a portion shall be available for the continued operation of a pilot plant in connection with bauxite in the State of Arkansas; appropriates $198,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $183,000, as proposed by the House, for care, maintenance and improvement of buildings and grounds at the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, station; appropriates $850,000 for economics of mineral industries, instead of $500,000, as proposed by the House and $1,190,000, as proposed by the Senate, $350,000 in excess of the House bill being provided for the coal economics division for use in the collection of bituminous coal statistics, and authorizes the use of $727,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia; appropriates $100,000 for helium utilization and research, instead of $87,400, as proposed by the House, and $107,000, as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the use of $8,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia; and corrects a typographical error in connection with the authorization for the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Nos. 223 and 224: Appropriates $711,248 for salaries and expenses, instead of $643,177, as proposed by the House and $779,320, as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the use of $62,500 for printing and binding, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House, and $75,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 225: Appropriates $659,407 for regional offices, instead of $568,814, as proposed by the House and $750,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 226: Appropriates $3,290,000 for administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement of national parks, instead of $2,384,584, as proposed by the House, and $3,314,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 227: Appropriates $1,375,000 for administration, protection, maintenance, improvement, and preservation of national monuments, historical parks, and military areas, instead of $1,164,905, as proposed by the House and $1,396,615, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 228: Appropriates $71,500 for the Boulder Dam Recreational Area, Arizona and Nevada, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House, and $93,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 229: Appropriates $50,000 for the Lake Texoma Recreational Area, Texas and Oklahoma, instead of $44,816, as proposed by the House, and $54,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 230: Appropriates $68,300, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $79,700, as proposed by the House, for recreational demonstration areas.

No. 231: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $38,500 for a travel bureau.

No. 232: Appropriates $675,000 for salaries and expenses, National Capital Parks, instead of $651,967, as proposed by the House and $716,097, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 233: Appropriates $25,000 for acquisition of the Montezuma Well Property, Arizona, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 235: Appropriates $6,000,000 for roads and trails, National Park Service, instead of $4,250,000, as proposed by the House and $7,400,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which $115,500, is provided for the construction of roads and parking facilities in the Lake Texoma Recreational area.

Nos. 236 and 237: Appropriates $11,000,000 for Parkways, National Park Service, instead of $7,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $15,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which $4,400,000 is for the Natchez Trace Parkway.

No. 240: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $1,250,000 for the Glacier Bay National Monument, Alaska.

No. 241: Authorizes the purchase of thirty-seven automobiles for the use of the National Park Service instead of twenty, as proposed by the House, and fifty-four, as proposed by the Senate.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Nos. 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, and 266: Appropriates $265,000 for general administrative expenses, instead of $252,364, as proposed by the House and $283,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides that $35,000 shall be available for printing and binding; appropriates $1,413,350 for propagation of food fishes, instead of $1,315,100, as proposed by the House and $1,511,600, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $724,440 for investigations respecting food fishes, instead of $659,440, as proposed by the House and $780,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which $10,000 is for an additional amount for salaries and expenses, fishery biological laboratory, Milford, Connecticut and $5,000 for pollution survey in the Narragansett Bay area, to be made by the fishery biological laboratory at Milford, Connecticut, $25,000 is provided for the conversion and outfitting of a vessel for fishery research, and $25,000 for surveys and improvement of salmon spawning streams in Alaska; appropriates $360,000 for commercial fisheries, instead of $331,400, as proposed by the House and $393,400, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $125,000 for fishery market news service, instead of $119,600, as proposed by the House and $133,700, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $819,307 for Alaska fisheries, instead of $780,615, as proposed by the House and $858,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $62,500 for Alaska fur seal investigations, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House and $75,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $150,000 for fur-resources investigations, instead of $136,200, as proposed by the House and $198,700, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $300,000 for biological investigations, instead of $237,975, as proposed by the House, and $380,600, as proposed by the Senate, of which $25,000 is provided for cooperation with the State of Utah in the investigation of joint use of forage by big game and livestock, including competition for various types of plants by different kinds of animals, seasonal range use, and related problems; appropriates $1,000,000 for control of predatory animals and injurious rodents, instead of $985,650, as proposed by the House and $1,100,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $335,900, as proposed by the House, instead of $417,600, as proposed by the Senate, for protection of migratory periods; appropriates $162,630 for enforcement of Alaska game law, instead of $186,900, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $853,000 for maintenance of mammal and bird reservations, instead of $766,000, as proposed by the House and $940,000, as proposed by the Senate, and continues available during the fiscal year 1947 an unexpended balance for improvements on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; appropriates $100,000 for River basin studies, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House and $150,000, as proposed by the Senate; corrects the total for salaries and expenses; appropriates $2,500,000 for Federal aid in wildlife restoration, instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the House and $3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $750,000 for wildlife management areas in the State of California; corrects the total for the fish and wildlife service; authorizes the use of $962,790 for departmental personal services, instead of $937,790, as proposed by the House, and $992,790, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the purchase of one hundred automobiles, instead of seventy-two, as proposed by the House and one hundred and forty-two, as proposed by the Senate; and removes the limitation in the House bill restricting the use of certain airplanes and vessels to the territory of Alaska, as proposed by the Senate.

GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES

Nos. 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 273, and 275: Appropriates $2,600,000 for the construction, repair and maintenance of roads, and so forth, in Alaska, of which $79,100 is made available for surveys and plans for new construction, instead of $72,000, as proposed by the House, and $250,000 as proposed by the Senate, such funds for surveys being provided for the Kenai Lake-Homer Road, and the Eagle-Forty Mile-Tanacross road. In allowing $1,360,000 for new construction, which will provide $800,000 for the Kenai-Homer Road, and $560,000 for the Eagle-Tanacross highway, the conferees have eliminated the requirement that 25 per cent of the cost of such construction must be provided by the Territory, owing to the fact that the Territorial legislature will not be in session to provide funds for cooperative work. However, funds are provided in the bill with the understanding that in the future funds must be made available for road construction by the Territory on the basis set forth in the bill as passed by the House. Appropriates $750,000 for continuation of construction of the Richardson Highway, instead of $500,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. Authorizes the transfer of twenty surplus Diesel locomotives to the Alaska Railroad, as proposed by the Senate, instead of ten, as proposed by the House. Appropriates $200,215 for salaries of the Governor and employees, Virgin Islands, instead of $184,640, as proposed by the House, and $208,000, as proposed by the Senate, funds for a Legal Counsel to the Governor being specifically disallowed.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

No. 278: Provides that in the acquisition of transmission lines not to exceed $1,352,415 may be used for the purchase of the Ark-La Line from Markham Ferry, Oklahoma, to Nimrod, Arkansas.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Nos. 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, and 294; Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision in the House Bill requiring the purchase of automobiles and trucks from used or Federal surplus motor vehicles; adjusts the limitations on the use of appropriations for attendance at meetings or conventions, strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House placing a limitation on the use of funds for long distance telephone tolls and for telegrams and cablegrams; adjusts the limitations on the use of appropriations for the purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals; and corrects section numbers.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

No. 2, relating to War Agency Liquidation: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 5, relating to the Oil and Gas Division: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 6, relating to the Division of Geography: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 7, relating to the hire of aircraft under the appropriation, contingent expenses: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 17, relating to fighting fires, Grazing Service: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 18, relating to appropriations for salaries and expenses for the Grazing Service: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 19, relating to the amount available for the payment of accrued leave, Grazing Service: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 20, relating to fire fighting, Grazing Service: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 53, relating to the acquisition of Indian lands by the city of Lawton, Oklahoma: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 58, relating to settlement of claims to water rights in the Gila River, Arizona: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 78, relating to the hire of private architectural services, Indian Service construction: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 80, relating to school facilities at Fort Apache, Arizona: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 85: Corrects a total.

No. 87, relating to the appropriation for roads, Indian reservations: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 90, relating to settlement of claims of Indians, Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, North Dakota: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 92, relating to administration of tribal affairs, Blackfeet Indians, Montana: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 98, relating to Hot Springs enterprise, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Montana: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 105, appropriating funds for the payment of attorneys for Indians of California: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 114, authorizing the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to transfer installations and equipment to the Secretary of the Interior for the use of the Bureau of Indian Affairs: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 115, relating to the purchase of automobiles by the Bureau of Indian Affairs: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 116, authorizing the Bureau of Indian Affairs to acquire surplus equipment and stores from other Government agencies: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 141, relating to the utilization of power revenues, Bureau of Reclamation: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 159, appropriating funds for water conservation and utilization projects: The House manager will move to recede and concur.

No. 166, authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to acquire by transfer lands, improvements, etc., acquired by the War Relocation Authority and declared surplus: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 234, relating to recreational resources, Lake Texoma area, Texas and Oklahoma: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 238, relating to acquisition of rights-of-way, Mesa Verde National Park: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 239, relating to the appropriation for physical improvements, National Park Service: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment. In connection with the amendment the conferees have agreed to an increase of $7,000 in the House bill for Atlanta Campaign markers, making a total of $32,000 available for this purpose, $30,000 is provided for construction of facilities needed in connection with the Lake Texoma recreational area, and $75,000 is allowed for a new concert barge, Watergate, District of Columbia.

No. 242, relating to the transfer of surplus equipment, materials and supplies to the National Park Service: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 256, relating to repair of damage to public roads within wildlife reservation areas: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 265, relating to contracts for plans and specifications, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, Fish and Wildlife Service: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 272, relating to construction, The Alaska Railroad: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 274, relating to the transfer of surplus property and equipment to the Alaska Railroad: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 276, relating to defraying the deficit in the treasury of the municipal government of Saint Croix, Virgin Islands: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 277, relating to a study of the fiscal affairs of the municipality of Saint Croix, Virgin Islands: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 285, relating to the prohibition against the payment of salary to employees who are members of an organization that asserts the right to strike against the government or advocates the overthrow of the government by force or violence. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 295, relating to the retention of employees in the Department during a reduction in force: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

JED JOHNSON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL (except as to amendments 29, 80, 112, 129, 130, 132, 135, 136, 137, 138, and 139),
ROBERT F. JONES (except as to construction items, Bureau of Reclamation),
BEN F. JENSEN (except as to construction items, Bureau of Reclamation),
HENRY C. DWORSHAK (except as to construction items, Bureau of Reclamation),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 11 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the House, after extended meetings and deliberations with the conferees of the Senate, have finally reached an agreement. This conference report is by no means what all Members of the House want. Several of the items as finally agreed upon are more than some of us thought they should be. Some of the cuts are deeper than the Senate conferees thought could be justified. I am glad to tell the House, however, we have reached what we believe is a fair and reasonable agreement. Our conferees recognized the fact that we could not have our way in every instance, but the following figures speak for themselves.

The Interior bill as passed by the Senate provided for $341,890,768. The conferees agreed on a total of $247,167,036 so the Senate receded on a total of $94,723,732.

This conference report as it is presented now provides appropriations totaling $247,167,036. The House bill provided $179,426,847. The House receded on $67,740,189. The total budget estimates were for $350,357,230, so the bill is under the budget estimates by $103,190,194.

The fact is this is the best record for economy of any annual supply bill that I have had anything to do with during my years as a member of this committee. The reduction of $103,190,194 below budget estimates on the annual supply bill is still a record breaker for economy.

I might point out the fact that there were some budget estimates that went to the other body after the bill passed the House. For example, at Sitka Island in Alaska there are some Navy installations in which the taxpayers have invested more than $50,000,000. It was found that those installations could be taken over for a fine Indian hospital and school, but it will require more than $2,000,000 to do the job properly. Budget estimates were also sent to the Senate for two additional schools in the Navaho country, where there are more than 14,000 Navaho children who are not now in school. So that called for considerable additional funds for construction items.

Between the time the bill passed the House and the time it passed the Senate, the House committee held hearings on the Navaho situation and also on the Sitka Island Indian school and hospital project.

We were convinced that it would be good business and would be good economy to provide money for these purposes in the bill, and therefore the House conferees agreed to those construction items which run the Indian item up considerably but which, of course, will not recur in next year's bill.

As I say, this is a compromise bill. For instance, some Members have asked me about the Grazing Service, over which there was considerable controversy. The Grazing Service has been increased over the House figure by nearly $400,000, but it has been reduced from a Budget estimate of $1,784,000 and from a current-year appropriation of $1,293,000 to $802,500 for the next fiscal year.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma direct our attention for a moment to the appropriations for the Bureau of Mines, especially relating to the amount which has been covered in the conference report for the further development of the synthetic liquid fuels program?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I shall be glad to. If the gentleman will turn to page 68 of the bill, he will find,

as I am sure he recalls, that the bill as it passed the House carried a total of $3,500,000 for synthetic liquid fuels. As passed by the Senate it was increased to $7,000,000. The conferees, after considerable deliberation and with additional evidence, some of which I am glad to say was furnished by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, who is the coauthor of the synthetic-fuels legislation and has been tremendously interested in this great program, agreed on the sum of $5,250,000. The conferees feel that this is a very fair and reasonable compromise.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman for his statement. It is gratifying to know of the action taken. This money is being well spent, and the results will more than justify the funds to be used. I express our thanks to the House conferees for agreeing to this increased sum. Its use carries forward the purposes of the original authorization bill and also the actual expenditures vitally necessary for the synthetic liquid-fuels program. The work being conducted in several States, including West Virginia, is progressing most satisfactorily.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia even though he may ask me about funds under the Pitman-Robertson bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The gentleman is suffering from a guilty conscience, because that is what I am going to ask him about.

We have over $14,000,000 to the credit of that fund. The Budget recommended that we be given $3,000,000, and the distinguished subcommittee in reporting a $2,000,000 item to the House did not give us any explanation of why they cut it $1,000,000 below the Budget estimate—a trust fund amounting to over $14,000,000.

I should like to know what is in the conference report, and if it is not $3,000,000, why is it less?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia, who has been very diligent and interested in this particular item, that if he waits for the gentleman from Oklahoma to become conscience-stricken for having lopped off a million dollars in appropriation, that he will be a lot older than Methuselah, who lived a thousand years. Seriously, I will say that because of the shortage of materials, particularly lumber, the House committee did reduce that item as it did nearly every other item in the bill. As it passed the House it carried $2,000,000 and as it passed the Senate $3,000,000. So after much deliberation and on the part of the conferees, keeping in mind the deep interest of the gentleman from Virginia and several of his interested friends in his State and mine, the House conferees finally agreed to raise that item by $500,000 providing a total of $2,500,000, which we thought was a very fair compromise.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, will the able gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia who I suspect is going to ask something about mine inspectors or some related item that he is tremendously interested in with reference to his people in West Virginia whom he represents so well.

Mr. NEELY. I thank the eminent gentleman for his gracious observation. He will recall that the House adopted two important amendments to the bill as it was reported from the Committee on Appropriations. One of these was offered by the statesman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. Its purpose was to increase the number of mine inspectors. The other was proposed by me. Its object was to assure the operation of an adequate number of mine rescue cars, thorough investigation of explosives such as are used in mining, and widespread diffusion among miners of information designed to promote their safety. Will the gentleman please inform us whether these items, as approved by the House are still in the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct, and if the gentleman will turn to page 65 of the bill he will find that both items are included in the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. NEELY. I am very much obliged to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. For which the gentleman is largely responsible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished minority member of the conference committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], who has rendered a very valuable and patriotic service to this committee in helping reduce the expenditures of government.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the overall result of this conference report is very good. As a matter of fact, I think it is still the best conference report, and the best appropriation bill if it becomes law, that has ever passed the House in many years as compared with the Budget estimates.

As the bill passed the House it contained appropriations of $179,426,847. The bill as it passed the Senate contained appropriations of $341,891,768. You can readily see there was a considerable difference between the House and Senate bill, and I make the statement in complete honesty that the chairman of our subcommittee, the chairman of the conference committee on behalf of the House, worked as hard and as diligently as any Member I have seen any place to keep down expenditures. There was no division along party lines and there was no disagreement as far as objectives were concerned to try to save the taxpayers' money. If a Republican had sat as chairman of the House conferees I do not know that any better result would have been attained, because the chairman of our committee did earnestly and conscientiously try to resist the pressure constantly exerted by the conferees from the other body to spend more and more money.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work of the conferees. The conferees have reported a bill which contains appropriations totaling $247,000,000 instead of $341,000,000 as passed by the Senate and instead of $179,000,000 as passed by the House. The Budget estimates, you will remember, with which we were dealing, were $350,357,230. This conference report is a reduction of $103,190,194 below the Budget estimates.

The conferees have reported a bill that is 30 percent above the House figures, yet we are still 29.4 percent below the Budget figures. We cut 60 percent of the Senate increases.

The only point of disagreement is in the reclamation construction amendments. You will remember that when we had the bill before the House we had taken great pride as a committee—we were all of one accord—cutting horizontally every item and treating every Member alike. The Senate adopted a different theory and a different plan. The Senate conferees conceived the idea, in the name of the veteran, that some projects were more worthy and deserved more funds for the fiscal year 1947 because they were subject to earlier completion. I do not take much stock in voting huge increases to some project on the theory that it will assist the veteran and leave other projects go unaccelerated with the House's lower, economical figure. For that matter, I do not subscribe to the theory of letting every agency of the Government set up a program for veterans. I think all veterans' legislation should be championed by the Veterans' Administration, and what we choose to do for the veteran should be done by the Veterans' Administration. We make a big mistake when we let other agencies of the Government chisel in on a veterans' program. Every agency of Government wants to use or exploit the veteran to increase public expenditures for its agency. They always use the popular individual or organization at the moment to increase their appropriations. I think that has been unsatisfactory Governmental wise. It is not an honest way to help and serve the veterans of World War I and World War II. Whatever I am going to do for the veteran, I want to do through the Veterans' Administration and let someone in that agency of the Government be responsible.

The projects proposed by the Senate conferees which could be completed, you will find on page 47 and continuing to page 55 of the bill. These projects did not stay within the limitation of the Budget estimate. They went over the Budget estimate, while some projects that I considered just as worthy remained at the economical House figure, which is part of the $179,000,000.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I was listening very intently to the fine presen-

tation that the gentleman from Ohio was making. Could the gentleman give me the reasons in the minds of the conferees for the amount of the cut that was made in the Columbia River Basin from $27,400,000, as stated by the Senate, down to an agreement of $18,000,000. The House permitted $13,007,140. While this raises the appropriation $5,000,000, I feel it is not enough.

Mr. JONES. That is one of the projects that I had in mind criticizing, because it is a long-range project and cannot possibly be completed in the near future. In other words, it is inconsistent with the theory used by the Senate conferees; this is: projects possible of completion with funds in this bill should be given millions ahead of schedule in 1947. Columbia Basin project cannot be put into operation in the next fiscal year, and should have remained at the $13,000,000 House figure.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Is it not necessary that the schedule for the project be maintained? Its magnitude demands that the schedule be maintained in order to reach the objective of completion of the project.

Mr. JONES. I recognize the point made by the gentleman. In other words, the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, has stepped up the schedule of reclamation construction projects, but by the rule that was supposed to have been adopted by the conferees, only those projects that could be completed within the year should have received increases by the conferees. My complaint is: In addition to those projects possible of completion in 1947, we added the Columbia River Basin project. It was increased $5,000,000, and it should not have been. Had we stuck to the Interior Department schedule and made percentagewise increases, the Columbia River Basin project would have been no worse or better off than all the others. This conference report dropped the schedule plan and accelerated some projects and deferred others that were to be completed in 1952. Under this conference plan the Columbia River Basin should have received no more than $13,000,000.

Another item of two projects that should have gotten nothing, in my opinion, is the water conservation and utilization project described in amendment No. 159, appropriating $3,340,000. There is evidence to show that of two projects involved one is 16 percent complete and the other is 28 percent complete. I do not believe these should have remained in the bill under the rule that was adopted by the conferees. My point is that the conference report is not consistent with our avowed purpose.

I do not want you to have the wrong impression. I think the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], on the conference committee did a splendid and a wonderful job. The Congress should be very much indebted to the chairman especially for his sterling endeavor, and the constant, persistent urge on the part of the House conferees headed by him to try to cut down the amount of appropriations.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] have been most diligent in trying to arrive at a proper solution of this supply bill. Their help and their patriotism, and their insistence for the good of the Treasury and on cutting down Federal expenditures have been of the highest and greatest value. You see the result in the fact that the bill is now $103,000,000 below the Budget estimate. This is the best, figurewise, that could be accomplished. In trying to arrive at a satisfactory end result, however, I think some of these particular items were treated more favorably than others.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I realize that the gentleman and the other members of the subcommittee have worked very diligently on this matter. I know of no other subcommittee in the House that works harder than the gentleman from Ohio and his colleagues on Interior appropriations. I am wondering if, in the study of the schedules under which projects—such as the Columbia Basin project—will be built it is the gentlemans' feeling that sufficient amounts have been allowed to avoid a deficiency during the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. JONES. Yes; I think that the representatives of the Department of the Interior who came up and testified, perhaps in response to pressure, are the ones who broke up the routine, broke up their own schedules. Now they should abide by their amended point of view. They should stop the insidious practice of asking deficiencies in appropriation bills after the regular annual supply bills have been presented and voted upon. Congress should train the departments not to do that sort of thing.

Incidentally, in connection with the Bonneville Power Administration, the House yielded so that the amount is now $3,470,000 above the House figure. Again I say I think we have been most liberal and we should not have any deficiency because they have 500,000 kilowatts going down the river with no sale for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has had printed and distributed to the Members of the House copies of three proposed contempt resolutions. For the information of the Members of the House, may I say that I expect to ask for the consideration of those resolutions tomorrow morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Can the chairman of the committee inform the House what the recommendation on the Central Valley project in California includes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I will be glad to do so. If the gentleman will turn to page 28 of the conference report in the statement of the managers on the part of the House, he will find the following:

Appropriates $12,685,622 for the Central Valley project, California, instead of $19,840,120, as proposed by the House, and $25,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; and provides for the construction of transmission lines and substations, including $1,000,000 for completion of the Oroville-Sacramento line, which will ultimately be extended to Tracy to provide power for pumping water in the Delta area, instead of the proposals of the Senate.

Mr. HAVENNER. I want to congratulate the committee on behalf of the members of the California delegation for recommending this additional appropriation for the Oroville-Sacramento line. I hope the committee in the future will see fit to make provision for the west side line.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman. It is a pleasure to receive a compliment from a member of the great California delegation. We realize we have not been able to give them all that they want, for California wants and gets a lot, but I think you will find the committee has been very fair and reasonable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished and able gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] who has given noble service to the people of Iowa and to the Nation in fighting for rigid economy in government. We are proud of the fine work he has done and I am glad to commend him for his fine service.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the nice things our very able chairman has said about this humble Member. I assure him the feeling is entirely mutual. The conferees, as you will note, were substantially in agreement on this bill. We had quite a tussle to bring it down to something near the amount the House Members felt was the right figure. You will observe from the report, the minority members of the committee signed the report with certain reservations. That was simply because of discrimination in the treatment of these projects. If you will remember when the bill was before the House originally, there was considerable argument about some reductions that had been made by the House committee on a number of reclamation projects. You will also recall we stated at that time the true facts of the case, which were that the revised figures had been brought to the committee by the Reclamation Bureau on many of these reclamation items. The bill passed the House and went to the Senate and was considered by the Senate committee. The Senate committee raised our figures approximately $200,000,000. They not only put back in the bill virtually everything the House Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations had taken out but added an additional $25,000,000 in round figures.

The thing which disturbed the minority members of the committee was that after the bill had left the House and gone to the Senate committee, the Reclamation Bureau appeared before that com-

mittee and said in effect that there were a number of these reclamation projects that could be finished in the fiscal year 1947.

As a consequence of that statement by the Reclamation Bureau the committee of the Senate not only put back the amount the House had reduced the items at the Reclamation Bureau's request but also added to the original budget request for a number of reclamation projects, as you will note by the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. It was difficult for me and some of the other members of the committee to understand the feasibility of such procedure. We had always leaned over backward, as have the rest of the members of the House committee, to treat every project fairly and properly. The committee of the Senate, however, took the position that these specific projects should be rushed to completion primarily in order to make irrigated farms available for returning veterans. There is not, of course, a Member of Congress who is not doing everything possible for the veterans, but we must remember there is hardly a single reclamation project in this bill that does not, and that will not, eventually benefit our returning veteran. So to set a number of projects off to one side and treat them so much better than the rest of the reclamation projects was difficult for us to approve.

Without a doubt this conference report will go through as is, but I think, as did the rest of the members of the minority, that it is always well for a member or members who take a different attitude than the majority on any issue to express openly and freely their opposition on the floor of the House or in a minority report. Because of the fact that we were substantially in agreement, we felt it best in this case to simply voice our objections and hence give the American people and the Members of Congress the benefit of our expressed objections.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to say that it is always a pleasure to work with the members of this committee. It is always a pleasure to work with our good chairman who fights fair and hard to keep every appropriation bill down to where it belongs. I would be the last one to criticize him, but the first to praise him for the fine job the gentleman always does; and that goes for every member of the committee. I am sorry, however, that the committee did not treat all of these projects more equitably. I trust it will not happen again.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the very fine statement that has just been made by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa. I share his view in expressing regret that all of the reclamation projects could not be treated alike. It was our suggestion that all those projects be treated exactly alike right across the board, but this is what we were up against: The committee at the other end of the Capitol called in the Reclamation Service and asked them to submit a list of projects that could be finished this year, and at the same time put several thousand veterans on such irrigated lands. They submitted such a list. Whether that list was accurate, I do not know—some say it was not. But the fact remains that such a list of projects was submitted, and consequently those projects have received larger appropriations, proportionately, than many other worthy projects which cannot be completed to provide land for veterans for 2 years or longer.

We are assured that all those projects for which additional funds have been provided can be finished and that they will actually put many thousands of veterans on the land. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, the committee did permit appropriations for about 10 or 11 reclamation projects to be given more than some members thought could be justified at this time. With the additional appropriations they will be able to complete the projects and we were assured they will not be back requesting additional appropriations next year.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. How much did the other body increase this appropriation over what it was when it left the House?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As the bill passed the Senate it contained appropriations totaling $341,819,768 and as it passed the House it provided $179,426,827. A total of $16,463,921 was added by the Senate as it passed that body.

Mr. RICH. Then the Senate is running true to form on these appropriation bills. After the bill leaves the House it has almost doubled the appropriations in this bill for the next fiscal year over what it was when it left the House? Is not it a real shame? I will say it is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, the gentleman has answered his own question. And I might add that the gentleman's point is well taken, but call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the bill is now nearly $104,000,000 below the Budget estimates and that the Senate receded on $94,723,732 of the funds it had added to the bill.

Mr. RICH. They have increased the bill, according to what the gentleman said, $162,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No. They only attempted to do so. Although the distinguished gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol did increase the bill to the tune of $162,000,000, it is also true the same gentlemen marched back down the Hill by receding on $94,000,000, which is an unprecedented record for the gentlemen of the other body to recede on.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman did a good job as well as the other conferees, and I congratulate him. If we can hold the other body down, some day there is a possibility we might balance the Budget, but you are never going to do that as long as the United States Senate continues to appropriate money like they do. We are coming to the day in our national life when we are going to be compelled to repudiate our debt or else we are going into bankruptcy. That is not the fault of the House of Representatives nearly as much as it is the fault of the other body and maybe the Budget Bureau. For 15 years we have not had a balanced budget. Where are you going to get the money?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman agree that, if every subcommittee on appropriations battled like the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations, we would have considerable savings?

Mr. RICH. I congratulate the gentleman on the work he did. I think you are trying to do the best you can even when you realize that there is somebody else trying to lift up the appropriations and spend and spend and spend. I want to hear somebody say some day, "I promise you again and again and again that we will cut down these expenses until we can balance the Budget and keep this country from going bankrupt." You must remember also that we are going to get the British loan in here next week. You do not want to vote for that. That may be the straw that breaks the camel's back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have longed to live to see the time when the gentleman from Pennsylvania would compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma. I appreciate it more than he knows. Both of us have at least one thing in common. We are both interested in economy and in balancing the Federal Budget. I might add that both of us understand full well that there is one sure way of doing that job, and that is by really slashing appropriations.

Mr. RICH. I want to say that the gentleman from Oklahoma is doing a pretty good job nowadays and so are all of these other conferees, like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] and other members of the subcommittee. I know they are working to cut it down. I am not condemning you gentlemen. I am condemning the other body. They are always spending and spending and spending and they are responsible more than anybody else for the unbalanced Budget. Of course, the New Deal program started us on our way down, and it is still at it. We must get rid of it or bust.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, the Speaker the other day said something to the effect that he was not going to permit the other body to be criticized. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is criticizing the other body.

Mr. RICH. I am going to criticize anybody who spends needlessly. It is imperative and absolutely essential and necessary. It is life or death to our Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the conclusion of the debate on the preceding conference report, prior to the vote, and also to extend my remarks on the conference report that will be brought up on OPA.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder where the gentleman from Pennsylvania was when we passed the $7,000,000,000 peacetime bill for the Army. Where was he when the House was voting to spend money in that case? Surely such extravagance should have been given his attention.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman can answer for himself.

Mr. WHITE. Where was he then?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished, capable, and fighting member of this committee from the great State of Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I did sign the report with the reservation as to the construction items under the Bureau of Reclamation. I am reluctant to criticise the action that was taken in the conference report on these construction items. Although I believe there was rank discrimination and a lack of fairness so far as all of the construction items currently in progress under the Bureau are concerned. Frequently use is made of the term "veteran," and in the conference there were certain members of the committee not representing this body, who contended that the Bureau of Reclamation had made recommendations that, on those particular projects wherein public domain was involved and where the acceleration of the work might result in the early filing by veterans on the farm units available, far in excess of the Budget estimates should be provided.

I want to point out that practically every reclamation construction project involves public domain or supplemental water for existing farm units. The House figures were far below the Budget recommendations, and it is unfortunate that in some specific cases these reductions were restored and other amounts which were in excess of the Budget figures, while in other cases the reduced House figures were retained in the bill.

I have several projects in my own State which can qualify as making available public domain for filing by veterans, but the Bureau of Reclamation did not include those in its recommendations for that particular category. For instance, Anderson Ranch project currently is employing about 800 men, where construction work will probably be suspended late in August or early in September. The project is more than 75 percent completed, and work will be suspended because of the lack of funds in this bill. I do not know what will necessarily have to be done, or whether supplemental budget estimates will be necessary to continue the work. I am not referring to those projects where construction has not actually started; but I want to state very definitely my disapproval of the discriminatory tactics which were used in arriving at the specific figures for the construction items under the Bureau of Reclamation.

You will recall that when this bill was originally before the House I made an effort to restore the funds for the Grazing Service to an estimated $850,000, which were the receipts expected in the fiscal year 1947. That motion was defeated by a small margin—26, I believe. The Grazing Service now has 275 persons employed. The Senate figure recommended funds for approximately 100 personnel, and the conference report includes amounts which will cut the current force of 275 to about 80.

Mr. Speaker, when the Bureau of the Budget submitted its Interior Department report for 1947, it was shown that, if all of these requested funds had been approved by the House and Senate, it would have involved an increase of approximately 11,000 personnel during the year 1947. I do not know how much increased personnel is provided for by the funds in this conference report, but I personally believe that Secretary Krug, with his reputation as an executive and administrator, will be able to streamline the various agencies in the Department of the Interior and make the best possible use of the funds which are provided in this appropriation bill.

If he does that, I am confident there will be no serious interruption of those projects which are of vital importance to the West, particularly, because there has been a westward trend in population and there are many thousands of World War II veterans who are seeking to establish homes in the western part of our country.

I am not in complete accord with the conference report, but I do believe that a sincere effort was made on an over-all basis to demand efficiency and economy in the operation of the Interior Department. I am sure that Secretary Krug and his associates will do everything possible in cooperating with the Congress to see that these funds are used to the best possible advantage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished and able gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to compliment the committee in several respects, too many respects to enumerate them in the short time allotted me, but particularly with respect to the added school facilities on the Navajo Indian Reservation. As the distinguished chairman of the conferees has said, there are at least 14,000 children on the Navajo Indian Reservation formerly without schooling. This added appropriation will go a long way toward relieving that situation.

With regard to the discrimination which several gentlemen have mentioned in respect to the irrigation projects, it is said here that some projects were favored over others, all in the name of veterans. That may be. I cannot deny it or confirm it, or comment on it except to say that there are certain projects in this country on which we have recently passed legislation giving veterans preference on land that is to be irrigated.

I, as chairman, have brought in here legislation that would give veterans preference on all irrigated land watered by the Bureau of Reclamation in the 17 Western States. Unfortunately, that legislation has not been completely enacted, it is not on the statute books. Being apparently unable to get that measure on the statute books, I recently attempted to get certain specific reclamation projects thus favored. On the 6th of March the President signed a bill which gives veterans preference on an irrigation project in my own State. That is good, but I do wish we could get overall legislation that would give the same preference in all the 17 Western States. In that case, I think there would be no proper charge of discrimination.

The gentleman preceding me did not specify what irrigation projects they thought were favored in behalf of veterans and which they thought to be discriminated against by receiving relatively less appropriation. It is barely possible that among others they may have had in mind projects in my part of the Southwest receiving water from the lower Colorado River in southern California or in Arizona. Now, it was the Gila project in Arizona and the lands in southern California watered through the All-American Canal which were covered by the legislation signed by the President on March 6 last, giving preference to veterans on such newly irrigated lands.

I think that in the name of helping veterans such projects ought now to receive favorable consideration and appropriation. If that is discrimination, it is discrimination in favor of veterans. I certainly feel a lot better about appropriating money to irrigate new lands which the law specifies is going to veterans than I do to appropriate money to irrigate lands which may go to nonveterans, being open to first comers.

As chairman of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation I worked hard to get that legislation favorable to veterans which the President signed on the 6th of last March. However, that legislation applies only to a limited area in Arizona and California, lying on both sides of and near the lower portion of the Colorado River. Believe me, I also worked very hard, as chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to get enacted my bill, H. R. 520, which was designed to give veterans preference to newly irrigated lands reclaimed by the Bureau of Reclamation in any of the 17 Western States. This bill is through the House only, and much impaired.

Let no one claim to be a friend of veterans who has been indifferent, or obstructive, or hostile to this wholesome legislative move to furnish qualified veterans their desire for homes on the land. There is much lip service given veterans these days, but here is the possibility of real service which many Members of Congress seem to have been slow to take advantage of. Well, they may know a better way to help. I, myself, have been scoffed at because of an effort to get good farm homes for some of the qualified veterans. Let him who has done more in a better way to

satisfy the land hunger of veterans scoff at these efforts, but I know that such a one will not be inclined to scoff.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California with the unusually good name of Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the committee for permitting the raising of the appropriation for the Central Valley project about $2,000,000. I also want to express my gratitude for the very generous way in which they have always treated us when we have appeared before them in the committee hearings, and also for the generosity they always show when they give us time to speak on this bill.

I notice in the report that all the money to provide for transmission lines on the west side of the Sacramento Valley has been cut out. May I ask the chairman if that is correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does this mean that the committee in the future will not allow any money for transmission lines to run down the west side of the Sacramento Valley, and will all of that juice be carried over the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. wires?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The committee of conference, of course, could not and would not attempt to commit any future conferees, but the committee was of the opinion that the lines are not absolutely essential at this time. We will cross the bridge with reference to those lines in the future when we come to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the chairman for that statement, especially the words "at this time."

In my humble opinion, to get the maximum value out of the Shasta Dam in the development of the electricity there, we must develop an integrated system. If we are going to funnel our electricity over the wires of the private utilities we will not get the maximum financial benefits out of the development of this great water project. A good example of that is the Turlock irrigation district, 40 miles south where I live. They generated power at the dam where they store their irrigation water and instead of selling it as they had a good chance to do, to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., they distributed that juice themselves to their own consumers. The Central Valley, in my opinion, will get the greatest financial benefit out of this great project and it will bring the greatest benefits to the irrigation users by generating the power and carrying it over their own wires, then selling it to utility districts, reclamation districts, and irrigation districts. I want to leave that thought in the minds of the members of the committee especially, that in order to carry out the original State plan we must develop an integrated system where we control our transmission lines and our generating plants and all other parts of the system. If we do not do that, then the irrigators will not get the financial benefit that was anticipated when the State plan was adopted.

All of you know that the present Federal plan is nothing more than the State plan, approved by the people of the State of California in 1933. Therefore, I want to recommend as strongly as I can that this Subcommittee on Appropriations have in mind in the future that adequate money should be given for the development of transmission lines and all of the necessary paraphernalia to make an integrated system out of the Central Valley water project.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute in order that the gentleman from Washington, who is standing, may ask me a question.

Mr. SAVAGE. Is the amount for the Olympia-Cosmopolis line under the Bonneville Administration included in the conference report?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; it is included as is shown on page 24 of the report.

Mr. SAVAGE. What is the amount?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The amount is $790,000, the full amount which was requested.

Mr. SAVAGE. I thank the gentleman. I know they gave much consideration to this project. I am sure it will return to the Government several times the cost of its construction.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sure that is true, and may I say also that the gentleman from Washington appeared before our committee and made a very convincing statement relative to the project in question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 2, line 6, insert:

"WAR AGENCY LIQUIDATION

"War Agency Liquidation: For all expenses necessary for liquidating the War Relocation Authority program provided for in Executive Order 9102 and in the President's message of June 12, 1944 to Congress (House Doc. 656, 78th Congress), including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel expenses; printing and binding, $173,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 8 of said amendment strike out "$173,000" and insert "$150,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: On page 2, line 20, strike out lines 20 through 25 inclusive and on page 3 strike out lines 1 to 5 inclusive and insert the following:

"OIL AND GAS DIVISION

"Oil and Gas Division: For all expenses necessary for coordinating and unifying policies and administration of Federal activities relative to oil, gas, and synthetic fuels, including cooperation with the petroleum industry and State auhorities in the production, processing, and utilization of petroleum and petroleum products, natural gas, and synthetic fuels and the compilation of technical reports thereon, for administering and enforcing the provisions of the act of February 22, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., ch. 15A); and for the liquidation of the Petroleum Administration for War; including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $10,000 for employment of a director without regard to the civil service and classification laws; travel expenses; contract stenographic reporting services, printing and binding; and the purchase (not to exceed five), maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger automobiles; $449,516."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 18 of said amendment strike out "$449,516" and insert "$400,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 3, line 24, insert the following:

"DIVISION OF GEOGRAPHY

"Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Division of Geography, in performing the duties imposed under the Secretary by Executive Order 6680, dated April 17, 1934, relating to uniform usage in regard to geographic nomenclature and orthography throughout the Federal Government, including personal services in the District of Columbia, stationery and office supplies, and printing and binding, $50,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 9 of said amendment strike out "$50,000" and insert "$12,956."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: On page 5, line 16, insert after the semicolon where it appears first "hire of aircraft."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: On page 8, line 14, strike out "fighting fires, fire prevention."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: On page 8, line 21, after the comma, strike out "$212,500" and insert "$689,000; for payment of a salary of $6 per diem while actually employed and for the payment of necessary travel expenses, exclusive of subsistence, of members of advisory committees of local stockmen, $40,000; in all, $729,000: *Provided.*"

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$514,500, for payment of a salary of $5 per diem while actually employed and for the payment of necessary travel expenses, exclusive of subsistence, of members of advisory committees of local stockmen, $35,500; in all, $550,000."

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield the gentleman from Colorado 2 minutes.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very unfortunate to cut this Grazing Service personnel any further than the Senate did. I thoroughly approve of the division of the money, such as the $40,000 for advisory boards, but I want to say there are 56 grazing districts in the 10 Western States, and the amount of money that is available allots 100 permanent employees for the Grazing Service, which is one and one-half men for each grazing district, to make out reports, supervision of 140,000,000 acres of land, fire fighting, and everything else. It seems to me this is too low even as the Senate reported it. I understand this amendment would make it still lower. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman from Colorado that under the provisions of the Senate amendment there would have been little or no reduction of the personnel of the Grazing Service. The Senate added to the personnel of the Grazing Service.

Last year the Grazing Service had $1,293,000. The appropriations have been skyrocketing for the past few years, and the more Congress gave them the more they demanded. Imagine the surprise of the committee this year when, instead of getting back to prewar appropriations, the Grazing Service asked for $1,784,000, although the committee had made it plain a year ago that they must take a reduction this year.

The amount agreed upon, although less than one-half of the huge sum requested, is nearly twice as much as was allowed by the House. It will not hinder or hamstring that agency, but I do not hesitate to predict that it will function more efficiently. At least I hope so. The fact is that unless the Grazing Service gets its house in order, and by that I mean that unless it increases the grazing fees on sheep and cattle and actually makes an effort to function within its revenues, there is more trouble ahead of it. For example, the charge of 1 penny a month as a grazing fee for sheep, and 5 pennies a month for cattle, a small fraction of the amount charged by the Department of Agriculture, is absurd. It does not make sense, and for fear your friends in the Grazing Service do not read the RECORD I would thank the gentleman from Colorado to so advise them of the situation.

Mr. ROCKWELL. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the amount paid in by stockmen in fees for grazing is considerably more than the total amount allowed for administration. The fact that 50 percent of the amount they pay in is returned to the States is not to be blamed upon the men who pay the fees; that is a law passed by Congress. In my opinion, Congress is to blame, if there is any blame, for the fact that all of it does not go into the Federal Treasury; but to me to blame the men who pay these fees for the fact that the Treasury does not receive them all is not fair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman wants to defend the policy of the Grazing Service in charging fees of 1 cent a month for sheep and 5 cents for cattle, that is his responsibility, but the gentleman no doubt is familiar with the history of this legislation. I am sure the gentleman knows that this committee and the Congress were assured by the author of the act creating the Grazing Service—the late Edward T. Taylor, respected and admired by all who knew him—assured the Congress that this act would be self-supporting. It will also be recalled that his main witness in support of his bill, a former "extinguished" Secretary of the Interior, not only assured the Congress that the grazing setup would pay all of its way but he also assured us that the entire cost of the administration of the Grazing Service would not be more than $150,000 per year. Go read the RECORD. I placed the testimony in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Congress accepted it as an ironclad agreement. I repeat that a definite assurance given this Congress and the committee again and again and again that the Grazing Service would operate within its revenues, with the understanding that only one-half of the revenues went for the administration of the agency.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself another minute.

Mr. Speaker, they have not kept faith with the Congress. Their slogan seems to be to spend and spend and spend. We have been extremely liberal with this agency under the circumstances, and unless and until they get their house in order, they are strictly on "probation" so far as our committee is concerned.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I still say that the stockmen of the West are paying approximately $775,000 in fees to the Grazing Service. It is not their fault if the Congress does pass a law returning 50 percent of that money to the State. In other words, they are allotted under this amendment a little over $500,000 where they are paying in fees $775,000. The fact that the Congress passes a law or bill returning 50 percent of the fees to the States or giving it to Britain for a loan or something else is not the fault of the men who are paying. I think they are carrying out their agreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am not blaming, and the committee is not blaming, the gentleman's constituents, the fine stockmen of the West. They are good substantial citizens, some of whom, however, do not relish an increase in grazing fees. I hope they are all friends of the gentleman from Colorado and I am sure they should be. He is a very splendid gentleman aside from being their friend. We are blaming the Grazing Service for its mismanagement and inefficiency. The Grazing Service, in the beginning, was given a yardstick, but they have stretched that yardstick to the limit. They evidently saw other Government agencies, like the Division of Geography, mushroom from a modest beginning of 3 or 4 employees to one with 69. So, they evidently thought that they could do the same. And I regret to say they have done so. And now because your conferees insist on this mushroomed agency coming down to earth and operating in a businesslike way, we are told that this slight reduction under what it had last year is very unfortunate. In my book it is fortunate to get anything.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 9, line 12, insert ": *Provided further*, That $100,000 of this appropriation shall be available only for the payment to employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1, of said amendment, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$125,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 9, line 16, insert "Fire fighting: For fighting fires on or threatening lands under Grazing Service administration, $50,000, which amount shall also be available for meeting obligations of the preceding fiscal year."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of said amendment strike out "$50,000" and insert "$40,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: On page 21, line 5, insert ": *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior, with the consent in writing of the tribal council representing the Indians of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation, is hereby authorized and directed to sell to the city of Lawton, Oklahoma, for public uses, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, such portions of the school and agency lands as are no longer needed for administrative purposes, located in section 30, of township 2 north, range 11 west, of the Indian meridian, and which formed a part of the original Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation: *And provided further*, That out of the proceeds of any such sale, the sum of $1.25 per acre shall be credited to the general fund of the United States Treasury and the balance shall be deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of the tribal fund of the Indians of the said Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 23, line 14, insert:

"The unexpended balance of the appropriation contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1946, for settlement of claims to water rights in the Gila River, Ariz., is hereby continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1947."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 78: On page 25, line 10, insert "private architectural and engineering services."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 80: on page 25, line 22, insert:

"Fort Apache, Ariz.: For the purpose of cooperating with McNary school district, Apache County, Ariz., for the construction, and improvement of public-school buildings, for which the Indian Service may furnish plans, $25,000: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any money so appropriated shall be subject to the condition that the schools maintained by said district shall be available to all Indian children of the school district on the same terms as other children of said school district: *Provided further*, That the amount expended on this project shall be recouped by the United States within a period of 30 years, commencing with the date of occupancy of the project, by the acceptance of Indian pupils in this school without cost to the United States; and, in computing the amount of recoupment of the project, interest at 3 percent per annum shall be included on unrecouped balances: *Provided further*, That with the consent of the tribal council of the White Mountain Apache Tribe of the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz., the Secretary may set aside tribal land at McNary, Ariz., as a school reserve so long as such land is needed for school purposes."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 85: Page 28, line 3, strike out "$875,300" and insert "$3,386,800."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 85 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$3,023,800."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 87: Page 28, line 14, strike out "$1,700,000" and insert "$5,700,000 to remain available until expended."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 87 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$3,700,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand, the gentleman is moving that the House recede and concur with an amendment making the amount $3,700,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the conference report was Amendment 87, the one which related to the Division of Roads?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The formula was eliminated, but I will say that the conferees agreed unanimously to advise the Indian Bureau that it must work out a formula that will be fair and equitable to the States having the bulk of the Indian population with reference to the distribution of Indian road money. In the past, for instance, the State of Oklahoma has received only about 6 percent of Indian road money, yet it has more than one-third of the Indian population of the United States. On the other hand, it was found that the new proposed formula might be unfair to other States, so the formula has been eliminated for the time being, and, as I stated, the Indian Service has been asked to work out a formula that will be fair to all States having a substantial Indian population.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, the formula applied made some of the road money go to States which really have no active reservations today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; the committee was advised that is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This money, as I understand, is for the use of the true reservation roads and not for main highways.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, I am not sure I know what the gentleman means by "true reservations," but it is for roads and highways adjacent to lands a major portion of which is owned by Indians.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The main highways coming out of the regular Federal-aid fund.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 90: Page 30, line 16, insert "For full and final settlement of all claims and demands of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota in accordance with the provisions of H. R. 1095, Seventy-ninth Congress, $400,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed 5 per centum of the amount herein appropriated may be used for payment of fees and expenses of attorneys employed under contract approved in accordance with existing law."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 92: Page 31, line 6, insert "Administration of tribal affairs, Blackfeet Indians, Montana (tribal funds): For general support of Indians and administration of Indian property of the Blackfeet Indians, Montana, including the purchase of land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Blackfeet Indians, $100,000, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the Blackfeet Tribe of Indians."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 98: Page 34, line 1, insert "Development of Hot Springs enterprise, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Montana (tribal funds): For all expenses necessary for the development of a health resort on the Flathead Indian Reservation at Hot Springs, Mont., including the construction of buildings, and the payment of private architectural and engineering fees, $350,000, to remain available until expended, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 105: Page 36, line 19, insert "That there is hereby appropriated out of funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California the sum of $10,000, to remain available until expended, to be used to pay attorneys for the said Indians for services or expenses incurred under and in accordance with any contract of employment which may be approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 114: Page 40, line 10, insert "The Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War are hereby authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for the use of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, without compensation therefor, the entire Sitka Naval Base on Japonski Island, and the entire Army installations on the adjacent Charcoal and Alice Islands, located in Alaska, including the land, buildings, and utilities, with the drawings pertaining thereto, and all materials and equipment on both installations, and, in addition, the said Secretaries and the War Assets Administrator are authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior for the use of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, without compensation therefor, any other surplus materials, supplies, and equipment needed to equip and operate these facilities for school and hospital purposes."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 115: Page 41, line 6, strike out "one hundred" and insert "two hundred."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 115 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: Before the words "motor-propelled", strike out the words "and fifty."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 116: Page 42, line 6, insert the following:

"The Bureau of Indian Affairs is hereby authorized to acquire by transfer without exchange of funds (for three years beginning July 1, 1946), from the War Department, the Navy Department, the Department of Agriculture, or the War Assets Administration, equipment, materials, and supplies of all kinds, with an appraised value of not to exceed $6,300,000 from the surplus stores of these agencies, for use in the schools, hospitals, and agencies, or by any operating division of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the United States and Alaska: *Provided*, That the authorization in this paragraph for transfer of surplus property to the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall not be construed to deny to veterans the priority accorded to them in obtaining surplus property under Public Law 375, approved May 3, 1946."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 141: Page 52, line 3, insert the following:

"Utilization of power revenues: No power revenues on any project shall be distributed as profits to any individual, before or after retirement of the project debt, and nothing contained in any previous appropriation Act shall be deemed to have authorized such distribution: *Provided*, That the application of such revenues to the cost of operation, maintenance, and debt service of the irrigation system of the project, or to other purposes in aid of such irrigation system, shall not be construed to be such a distribution."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of said amendment, strike out the words "to any individual."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is in accord with a recommendation of the National Reclamation Association, as follows:

Resolution No. 11

Whereas the intent of the reclamation laws is to accord equal treatment to every type of water users' organization, and there should be no discrimination, under any Federal statute, between irrigation districts, water users' associations, mutual ditch companies, and other types of water users' organizations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in view of that intent the reclamation laws and other Federal statutes should be clarified where necessary to insure that the application of water revenues and power revenues to repaying the cost of construction, to pay operation and maintenance expenses, and otherwise to reduce the cost of water to the farmer on a reclamation project by whatever type of organization it is operated, does not constitute a dividend or distribution of such revenues, but a proper disposition of the resources of a multiple-purpose project, as intended by Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers and appropriate committees of the National Reclamation Association are instructed to present and endeavor to secure the adoption of clarifying legislation to the foregoing effect.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 159: Page 55, line 1, insert the following:

"WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

"For the construction of water conservation and utilization projects and small reservoirs, as authorized by the act of August 11, 1939, as amended (16 U. S. C., 590y, 590z–1, 590z–2), $3,340,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am most gratified to have this conference committee and the House approve the appropriation of $3,340,000 for the construction of water conservation and utilization projects and small reservoirs, as authorized by the act of August 11, 1939. The amount is immediately available and will remain available until expended.

The purpose of the appropriation is to provide funds for the completion of the Mancos project, in southwestern Colorado, to the amount of $1,300,000 and the balance of the Eden project in Wyoming.

Your committee, and the House, have also approved in this bill an appropriation of $362,000 for the acquisition of rights-of-way and construction of a water supply line into the Mesa Verde National Park, the money also to remain available until expended. This water supply will probably come from the Mancos Dam when it is completed.

The Mancos project was begun 6 years ago under the Wheeler-Case Act, with WPA labor. It was continued during the war, the labor being furnished by conscientious objectors. This appropriation for $1,300,000 will complete the project, according to the estimates of the Reclamation Service. The project is about 28 percent completed at this time and it is hoped that it will be completed within the year. The completion of the Mancos project will provide supplemental water in the Mancos Valley to about 7,000 acres, and will also furnish water for 3,000 acres of new land.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 166: Page 58, line 20, insert the following:

"For purposes of effecting settlement of war veterans on public land reclamation projects and to provide facilities for veteran employment in construction and operation of reclamation projects, the Bureau of Reclamation is hereby authorized to acquire by transfer without exchange of funds from the War Assets Administration or other Federal agency in responsible charge, the lands, improvements, and equipment acquired by the War Relocation Authority on the war relocation centers on the Heart Mountain Division of the Shoshone project, Wyoming; the Minidoka (Hunt) project, Idaho; and the Tulelake division of the Klamath project, California; and the former prisoner-of-war camp at Indianola, Nebr.: *Provided*, That said lands, improvements, and equipment shall be made available under regulations of the Secretary of the Interior to veteran settlers and nonprofit organizations, in accordance with the provisions of Senate Report No.

1412, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session: *Provided further*, That the War Assets Administration is authorized to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation funds required for maintenance and protection of the transferred property pending its final disposition."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"For purposes of effecting settlement of war veterans on public-land reclamation projects and to provide facilities for veteran employment in construction and operation of reclamation projects, the Bureau of Reclamation is hereby authorized to acquire by transfer without exchange of funds from the War Assets Administration or other Federal agency in responsible charge and such agencies are directed to transfer the lands, improvements, buildings, furnishings, and equipment acquired by the War Relocation Authority and declared surplus on the war relocation centers on the Heart Mountain division of the Shoshone project, Wyoming, the Minidoka (Hunt) project, Idaho, and the Tulelake division of the Klamath project, California; and on the former prisoner-of-war camp at Indianola, Nebr.: *Provided*, That said lands, improvements, buildings, furnishings, and equipment shall be made available under regulations of the Secretary of the Interior to veteran settlers and nonprofit organizations and otherwise in accordance with the provision of Senate Report No. 1412, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session: *Provided further*, That the War Assets Administration is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation funds required for maintenance and protection of the transferred property pending its final disposition."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 234: Page 81, line 20, after "including", insert "necessary access roads for development and use of the recreational resources of Lake Texoma recreational area, Texas and Oklahoma, and."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, assuming that this amendment is not particularly objectionable to the great Speaker of the House, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 238: Page 83, line 23, after the comma insert "including not to exceed $362,000 for the acquisition of rights-of-way and construction of a water supply line partly outside of the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 239: Page 84, line 1, strike out "$725,000" and insert "$2,330,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 239 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$1,330,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 242: Page 85, line 14, insert the following:

"The National Park Service is hereby authorized to acquire by transfer without exchange of funds, for 3 years beginning July 1, 1946, from the War Department, the Navy Department, or the War Assets Administration, equipment, materials, and supplies of all kinds, with an appraised value of not to exceed $2,500,000 from the surplus stores of these agencies, for use in the areas administered by the National Park Service or by any office of that Service in the United States, Alaska, and Hawaii: *Provided*, That the authorization in this paragraph for transfer of surplus property to the National Park Service shall not be construed to deny to veterans the priority accorded to them in obtaining surplus property under Public Law 375, approved May 3, 1946."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 256: Page 91, line 20, after the comma where it appears the second time, insert "repair of damage to public roads within reservation areas occasioned by authorized operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 265: Page 94, line 23, after the word "thereof", insert "without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5.)."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 272: Page 98, line 23, after the semicolon, insert "construction (not to exceed $400,000)."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 272 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$200,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 274: Page 100, line 8, after "Alaska", insert ": *Provided further*, That in the operation of the facilities of the Alaska Railroad, the War Department or any other agency of the United States Government having title thereto is authorized to transfer, regardless of present location and without charge to the Alaska Railroad, materials, roadway and bridge maintenance, and other necessary equipment, locomotives and spare parts, shop facilities and machinery, supplies, rolling stock, buildings, and docks, surplus to its needs and which may be certified by the Department of the Interior as necessary for the improvement, maintenance, or operation of the Alaska Railroad: *Provided further*, That the authorization in this paragraph for transfer of surplus property to the Alaska Railroad shall not be construed to deny to veterans the priority accorded to them in obtaining surplus property under Public Law 375, approved May 3, 1946."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 276: Page 102, line 15, insert the following:

"Municipal government of St. Croix: For defraying the deficit in the treasury of the municipal government of St. Croix, V. I., because of the excess of current expenses over current revenues for the fiscal year 1947, $142,400, to be paid in monthly installments."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 276 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of said amendment strike out the sum "$142,400" and insert "$71,200."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 277: On page 102 line 20, insert the following:

"For salaries and expenses of three municipal experts, to be appointed by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, to make a study of, and report to said committee on, the fiscal affairs of the municipality of St. Croix, V. I., $6,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 277, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"For salaries and expenses of three municipal experts, to be appointed by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, to make a study of, and report to said committees on, the fiscal affairs of the municipality of St. Croix, V. I., $6,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 285: Page 105, line 3, strike out all of line 2 and the balance of page 105, and lines 1 and 2 on page 106, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 7. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That in cases of emergency, caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage, persons may be employed for periods of not more than 30 days and be paid salaries and wages without the necessity of inquiring into their membership in any organization."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in this very splendid amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 295: Page 109, line 9, insert the following:

"SEC. 11. No funds appropriated by this act shall be available for the payment of the compensation of any employee retained after a reduction in force, unless such employee is retained as a result of application of retention preference regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, a motion to reconsider the various votes by which the motions were agreed to was laid upon the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 172]

Almond	Gillespie	Patrick
Anderson, Calif.	Gore	Peterson, Ga.
Andrews, N. Y.	Granger	Reece, Tenn.
Baldwin, Md.	Grant, Ala.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Robinson, Utah
Bell	Harris	Roe, Md.
Bennet, N. Y.	Hébert	Rooney
Boren	Holifield	Sabath
Boykin	Izac	Slaughter
Bradley, Mich.	Jackson	Sparkman
Bradley, Pa.	Kee	Stevenson
Buckley	Kerr	Stewart
Camp	Kinzer	Stigler
Cannon, Fla.	LeCompte	Sumners, Tex.
Celler	Ludlow	Tolan
Clark	McGehee	Torrens
Cochran	Mankin	Vinson
Coffee	Mansfield, Mont.	Welch
Colmer	Mansfield, Tex.	West
Crawford	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Curley	Murphy	Wilson
De Lacy	Norrell	Winstead
Doyle	Norton	Wolfenden, Pa.
Engel, Mich.	O'Neal	
Gibson		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 358 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT AND STABILIZATION ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 1 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1946' and substituting 'June 30, 1947'.

"SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1946' and substituting 'June 30, 1947'.

"SEC. 3. Title I of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 1 thereof a new section as follows:

"'PURPOSES AND POLICIES IN THE TRANSITION PERIOD

"'SEC. 1A. (a) OBJECTIVES.—The Congress hereby affirms—

"'(1) that because of abnormally excess spending power in relation to the presently available supply of commodities, rapid attainment of production equal to the public demand is one of the necessary and urgent objectives for the prevention of inflation and for the achievement of a reasonable stability in the general level of prices and rents, cost of living and costs of production (including labor costs), for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act and for the further purposes of protecting the real value of benefits provided by law for veterans and their dependents, of keeping faith with purchasers of United States War Bonds, and of making possible a successful transition to a peacetime economy of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power under a system of free enterprise;

"'(2) that unnecessary or unduly prolonged controls over prices and rents and use of subsidies would be inconsistent with the return to such a peacetime economy and would tend to repress and prevent the attainment of this and the other goals herein declared; and

"'(3) that adequate prices are necessary stimulants to the production thus desired and the expeditious attainment of said goals.

"'(b) DECLARATION OF DECONTROL POLICY.—Therefore, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the Office of Price Administration, and other agencies of the Government, shall use their price, subsidy, and other powers to promote the earliest practicable balance between production and the demand therefor of commodities under their control, and that the general control of prices and the use of subsidy powers shall, subject to other specific provisions of this Act, be terminated as rapidly as possible consistent with the policies and purposes set forth in this section and in no event later than June 30, 1947, and on that date the Office of Price Administration shall be abolished.

"'(c) RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE CONGRESS.—(1) As soon as practicable after the enactment of this section and in any event on or before January 15, 1947, the President shall recommend to the Congress such further legislation as in his judgment is needed to establish monetary, fiscal, and other policies which are adequate to supplement the control of prices and wages during the balance of the fiscal year 1947, and to insure that general control of prices and wages can be terminated by the end of that fiscal year without danger of inflation thereafter.

"'On or before April 1, 1947, the President shall report to the Congress what, if any, commodities or classes of commodities, including housing accommodations, are in such critically short supply as to necessitate, in his judgment, the continuance of the Powers granted by this Act as to them after June 30, 1947, together with his recommendations as to established departments or agencies of the Government (other than the Office of Price Administration) which should be charged with the administration of such powers.

"'(d) DECONTROL OF NONAGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES.—(1) On or before December 31, 1946, the Administrator shall decontrol all nonagricultural commodities not important in relation to business costs or living costs, and prior to that date shall proceed with such decontrol as rapidly as, in his judgment, will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect. In no event shall maximum prices be maintained after December 31, 1946, for any

nonagricultural commodity or class of commodities unless the same has been expressly found by the Administrator to be important in relation to business costs or living costs.

"'(2) The Administrator shall provide for the prompt removal of maximum prices in the case of any nonagricultural commodity whenever the supply thereof exceeds or is in approximate balance with the demand therefor (including appropriate inventory requirements).

"'(3) Whenever, after a reasonable test period, it appears that the supply of a nonagricultural commodity which has been decontrolled is no longer consistent with the applicable decontrol standard, the Administrator, with the advance consent in writing of the Price Decontrol Board established under subsection (h), shall reestablish such maximum prices for the commodity, consistent with applicable provisions of law, as in his judgment may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"'(e) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES.—(1) On the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than thirty days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify to the Price Administrator each agricultural commodity which such Secretary determines to be in short supply. Thereafter, on the first day of each succeeding calendar month the Secretary shall certify modifications of such certification by adding other agricultural commodities which have become in short supply and by removing from such certification such commodities which he determines are no longer in short supply. No maximum price shall be applicable with respect to any agricultural commodity during any calendar month which begins more than thirty days after the date of enactment of this section, unless such commodity is certified to the Price Administrator under this paragraph as being in short supply.

"'(2) (A) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that maximum prices applicable to any agricultural commodity which is in short supply are impeding the necessary production of such commodity, he may recommend to the Price Administrator such adjustments in such maximum prices as the Secretary determines to be necessary to attain the necessary production of such commodity.

"'(B) The Secretary of Agriculture by December 31, 1946, shall recommend to the Price Administrator the removal of maximum prices on all agricultural commodities, whether or not in short supply, not important in relation to business costs or living costs, and prior to that date shall make such recommendations as rapidly as, in his judgment, will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect.

"'(C) Within ten days after the receipt of any recommendation under this subsection for the adjustment of maximum prices applicable to any agricultural commodity, or for the removal of maximum prices on agricultural commodities not important in relation to business costs or living costs, the Price Administrator shall adjust or remove such maximum prices in accordance with such recommendations.

"'(3) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that an agricultural commodity with respect to which maximum prices have been removed is in short supply and that the reestablishment of maximum prices with respect thereto is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act, the Secretary, with the written consent of the Price Decontrol Board, may recommend to the Administrator, and the Administrator shall establish, such maximum prices with respect to such commodity, consistent with applicable provisions of law, as in the judgment of the Secretary are necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"'(4) For the purposes of this section—

"'(A) an agricultural commodity shall be deemed to be in short supply unless the supply of such commodity equals or exceeds the requirements for such commodity for the current marketing season;

"'(B) the term "agricultural commodity" shall be deemed to mean any agricultural commodity and any food or feed product processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity.

"'(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law, except as provided in subsection (h), the Secretary of Agriculture, in exercising his functions under this Act, shall not be subject to the direction or control of any other appointive officer or agency in the executive branch of the Government, and no such officer or agency shall undertake to exercise any direction or control over the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the exercise of such functions. The Secretary of Agriculture may at any time withdraw his approval of any action with respect to which his approval is required under this Act, and upon the withdrawal of his approval such action shall be rescinded.

"'(6) No maximum price and no regulation or order under this Act or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, shall be applicable with respect to any agricultural commodity, or any service rendered with respect to any agricultural commodity, unless a regulation or order establishing a maximum price with respect to such commodity had been issued under this Act prior to April 1, 1946.

"'(f) SAVING PROVISION.—Nothing in this section shall limit the Administrator's authority to remove maximum prices for any nonagricultural commodity, or any agricultural commodity with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, at an earlier time than would be required by this section, if in his judgment or in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be, such action would be consistent with the purposes of this section

"'(g) PETITIONS FOR DECONTROL.—(1) If in the judgment of the industry advisory committee appointed by the Administrator in accordance with section 2 (a) of this Act to advise and consult with him with respect to a commodity, the standards set forth in this section require the removal of maximum prices for such commodity, it may file a petition for the removal of such maximum prices. In the case of any nonagricultural commodity, such petition shall be filed with the Administrator in accordance with regulations prescribed by him. In the case of agricultural commodities, such petition shall be filed with the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with regulations prescribed by him and shall request that he make an appropriate certification or recommendation to the Price Administrator. The petition shall specifically state the grounds upon which the committee believes such action to be required and shall be accompanied by affidavits or other written evidence in support thereof.

"'(2) Within fifteen days after receiving a petition filed in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, the Administrator or the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be, shall either grant the petition or inform the committee in writing why in his judgment the standards for decontrol stated in subsections (d) and (e) have not been satisfied with respect to the commodity involved. If the petition is not granted in full, the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, shall, within ten days after the receipt of a request by the committee for further consideration of its petition, hold a hearing before himself or before a deputy administrator (or, in the case of the Secretary, before such officer as he may designate) at which the committee may present its argument in support of the petition. The Consumers Advisory Committee and the Labor Advisory Committee appointed by the Administrator shall be given notice of any such hearing and an opportunity to present their views with respect to the petition and may, not later than five days prior to such hearing, present in writing evidence relating thereto. Within fifteen days after such hearing, the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, shall either grant the petition in full or furnish the industry advisory committee with a statement in writing of his reasons for denying it in whole or in part, together with a statement of any economic data or other facts of which he has taken official notice in connection with such denial

"'(3) At any time within thirty days after the denial in whole or in part, following a hearing, of a petition filed under this subsection, the petitioning industry advisory committee may petition the Price Decontrol Board established under subsection (h) for a review of the action of the Administrator or the Secretary of Agriculture. If the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, fails to act upon a petition within the time prescribed by paragraph (2), the industry advisory committee may, at any time within thirty days after the expiration of the time so prescribed, petition the Price Decontrol Board for the removal of maximum prices on the commodity involved.

"'(4) Nothing in this section shall be construed to take away or impair any right of any person to protest, in accordance with the provisions of sections 203 and 204 of this Act, the further maintenance of maximum prices for a commodity under the standards of subsection (d) or (e): *Provided*, That the filing of such a protest or of a petition under paragraph 3 of this subsection shall not be grounds for staying any proceeding brought pursuant to section 205 of this Act or section 37 of the Criminal Code, and no retroactive effect shall be given to any judgment setting aside a provision of a regulation, order, or price schedule under the standards set forth in this section.

"'(h) PRICE DECONTROL BOARD.—(1) There is hereby established as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government a Price Decontrol Board, to be composed of three members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two members of the Board shall be members of the same political party. Two members of the Board shall constitute a quorum, and a vacancy in the membership of the Board shall not impair the power of the remaining members to exercise its functions. Members of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 a year.

"'(2) The Board shall appoint and fix the compensation of a secretary for the Board and such other officers and employees as may be necessary to enable it to perform its functions. The Board may make such expenditures as may be necessary for performing its functions. The Board may, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, utilize the facilities, services, and personnel of other agencies or departments of the Government. The Board shall maintain an office in charge of its secretary in the District of Columbia, which shall be open on all business days for the receipt of petitions for review and the transaction of other business of the Board. The Board shall prescribe regulations and procedures for the conduct of its business which will provide for summary disposition, with the utmost expedition consistent with sound decision, of petitions filed with the Board.

"'(3) A petition made under subsection (g) (3) shall specifically state the grounds

upon which the petitioning industry advisory committee believes that maximum prices on the commodity involved should be removed. A copy of such petition shall forthwith be served on the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, who shall within such time as may be fixed by the Board certify and file with the Board a transcript of such portions of the proceedings in connection with the petition under subsection (g) as are material. Such transcript shall include a statement in writing of the Administrator's or Secretary's reasons for believing that maximum prices on the commodity involved should not be removed, together with a statement of any economic data or other facts of which he has taken official notice. At the earliest practicable time the Board shall conduct a hearing upon the petition, at which the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, and the committee shall be given an opportunity to present their views and argument orally or in writing. If application is made to the Board by either party for leave to introduce additional evidence, the Board may permit such evidence to be introduced or filed with it if it deems it material and determines that such evidence could not reasonably have been offered or included in the proceedings under subsection (g). At the earliest practicable time after the hearing on any petition, the Board shall make and issue an order specifying the extent, if any, to which maximum prices on the commodity involved shall be removed. The Board shall order the removal of such maximum prices if and to the extent that in its judgment the standards of decontrol stated in subsection (d) or (e) have been satisfied with respect to the commodity involved. The Administrator shall remove maximum prices with respect to the commodity in question within such time and to such extent as shall be specified in the order of the Board. Orders of the Board shall not be subject to modification or review by any other department or agency or by any court.

"'(4) No petition may be filed with the Board with respect to any commodity within a period of three months after the issuance of an order of the Board with respect to the same commodity.

"'(5) The members of the Board may serve as such without regard to the provisions of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C., secs. 198 and 203) or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, except insofar as such sections may prohibit any such member from receiving compensation in respect of any particular matter which is within the jurisdiction of the Board.

"'(6) If the number of petitions filed with the Board should at any time become so great as to prevent the Board from promptly conducting hearings upon such petitions, the Board shall appoint such hearing commissioners as it deems necessary in order to expedite the transaction of its business. The Board may authorize one or more of the hearing commissioners so appointed to conduct the hearing upon any petition under this subsection and to exercise the authority of the Board with respect to such hearing. After a hearing conducted before a hearing commissioner, the commissioner shall make recommendations consistent with this subsection to the Board concerning its action with respect to the petition. If the Board approves such recommendations, it shall issue an order in conformity therewith. If the Board does not approve such recommendations, the Board may issue such order as it deems proper upon the record or may conduct a new hearing upon the petition before the Board.'

"SEC. 4. Section 2 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In administering the provisions of this subsection relating to the establishment of industry advisory committees, the Administrator, upon the request of a substantial portion of the industry in any region, shall promptly appoint a regional industry advisory committee for such region.'

"SEC. 5. Section 2 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"'After the date upon which this paragraph takes effect, the Administrator, when establishing rent ceilings on hotels or when passing upon applications for adjustments of rent ceilings on hotels, is authorized to take into consideration the distinction between transient hotels and residential or apartment hotels, including the difference in the investment, operation, expenses, and mechanical details of operation between the transient hotels and the residential and apartment hotels, and is directed to classify separately by regulation (1) transient hotels, (2) residential and apartment hotels, and (3) tourist courts, rooming houses, and boarding houses.'

"SEC. 6. (a) The last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply with respect to operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation: *Provided*, That with respect to such corporations and such operations, the making of subsidy payments and buying for resale at a loss shall be limited as follows:

"Payments and purchases may be made with respect to operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, which involve subsidies and anticipated losses as follows:

"(1) With respect to rubber produced in Latin America and Africa for which commitments were made before January 1, 1946, $31,000,000.

"(2) With respect to copper, lead, and zinc, in the form of premium price payments, $100,000,000: *Provided*, That (A) premiums shall be paid on ores mined or removed from mine dumps or tailing piles before July 1, 1947, though shipped and/or processed and marketed subsequently thereto; and that (B) the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc shall be extended until June 30, 1947, on terms not less favorable to the producer than heretofore and (i) adjustments shall be made to encourage exploration and development work, (ii) adequate allowances shall be made for depreciation and depletion, and (iii) all classes of premiums shall be noncancelable unless necessary in order to make individual adjustments of income to specific mines.

"(3) With respect to purchases by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, of such tin ores and concentrates as it deems necessary to insure continued operation of the Texas City tin smelter.

"(4) With respect to noncrop programs, 1946 crop program operations and the 1947 crop program operations relating to sugar, flour, petroleum, petroleum products, and other domestic and imported materials and commodities, $869,000,000: *Provided*, That the operations authorized under this subparagraph (4) shall be progressively reduced, shall be terminated not later than April 1, 1947, and shall not cost more than $629,000,000 during the last six months of the calendar year 1946. Operations shall not be carried out under authority of this subparagraph (4) with respect to any commodity for any period during which maximum prices on such commodity are not in effect under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended: *Provided*, That subsidies with respect to petroleum produced from stripper wells may be continued at not to exceed the existing rates. No new subsidy or purchase and sale operations shall be undertaken under the authority of this subparagraph (4), and no change shall be made in the basis of any existing operations for which funds are made available under this subparagraph which will increase the rate of any subsidy or the rate of loss incurred with respect to any commodity.

"(b) When any direct or indirect subsidy to an industry is reduced or terminated, any maximum price applicable to the product affected shall be correspondingly increased, except in the case of transportation subsidies and differential subsidies to high-cost producers.

"(c) Where roll-back subsidies have previously been or presently are in effect, and have been discontinued, or shall hereafter be discontinued, the industries which have received such subsidies shall be permitted to increase their ceiling prices at least an amount equivalent to the amount of the discontinued roll-back subsidy. Such price increase shall become effective either upon discontinuance of the roll-back subsidy or upon passage of this Act, whichever date is the later. For the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'roll-back subsidies' means subsidy payments, or purchases and sales of a commodity at a loss by the Government of the United States (including any Government-owned or controlled corporation), or contracts therefor, which resulted directly or indirectly in the lowering of ceiling prices below the maximum price levels established by the Office of Price Administration prior to the institution of the subsidy payments or purchases and sales at a loss, or the execution of the contracts therefor, whichever date is the earlier.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the provisions of Public Laws 30, 88, 164, and 328 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, or to prevent the use of the sums authorized in such laws to fulfill obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1946, with respect to operations prior to such date.

"(e) Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions of this section 6, 1946 and 1947 crop program operations with respect to sugar, may, while maximum prices are in effect with respect to sugar, be continued until such crops are processed and distributed, and the cost of 1946 crop program operations with respect to sugar may be charged to the funds authorized by Public Law 30, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended by Public Law 328, Seventy-ninth Congress. For the purpose of this section 6, no subsidy program operation on sugar shall be considered to be a new subsidy.

"(f) Nothing in this section shall be construed as a limitation upon operations authorized by the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946 (Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress).

"SEC. 7. Section 2 (i) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(i) For the purposes of this Act and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, fish and other sea foods shall be deemed to be agricultural commodities, and commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from fish or other sea foods shall be deemed to be manufactured in whole or substantial part from agricultural commodities: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 3 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, shall not be applicable with respect to fish and other sea foods and commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, but the maximum price established for any fish or sea food commodity or for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom shall not be below the average price therefor in the year 1942.'

"SEC. 8. Section 2 (j) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: 'or (5) as authorizing any regulation or order

of the Administrator to fix a quantity or percentage of any product which any seller may sell to any buyer'.

"SEC. 9. Section 2 (k) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting the words 'or any operator of any service establishment' after the words 'seller of goods at retail'.

"SEC. 10. Section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(o) No maximum price shall be applicable to any item served in any restaurant or other eating establishment if such item consists in whole or major part of a commodity to which no maximum price is applicable with respect to sales to restaurants and other eating establishments, unless the maximum price of such item, when sold by such restaurant or other eating establishment, is determined, under the applicable maximum price regulation or order, by the addition of a customary margin to the acquisition cost of such item.

"'(p) After July 1, 1946, no maximum price regulation or order shall be issued or continued in effect requiring any seller to limit his sales by any weighted average price limitation based on his previous sales.

"'(q) In the case of any retail industry, the principal sales of which consisted during the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive, of sales of a commodity or commodities the production or retail distribution of which has been reduced, for a period of three years beginning on or after March 2, 1942, by 75 per centum or more below such production or retail distribution for the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive, as a result of the operation of any governmental regulation or restriction, the Administrator shall not, in establishing maximum prices under this section, reduce established peacetime retail trade discounts or mark-up or dealer handling charges for any such commodity before the retail unit sales of such commodity for a period of six months shall have reached the average annual retail unit sales thereof for the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive.

"'(r) In the case of any wholesale industry, the principal sales of which consisted during the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive, of sales of a commodity or commodities, the production or wholesale distribution of which has been reduced for a period of 3 years beginning on or after March 2, 1942, by 75 per centum or more below such production or wholesale distribution for the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive, as the result of the operation of any governmental regulation or restriction, the Administrator shall not in establishing maximum prices under this section reduce established wholesale trade discounts or normal wholesale mark-ups for any such commodity prevailing on March 2, 1942, before the wholesale unit sales of such commodity for a period of six months shall have reached the average annual wholesale unit sales thereof for the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive.

"'(s) No maximum price regulation or order shall require the reduction of the established peacetime discounts or mark-ups for the sale of any manufactured or processed commodity (treating as a single commodity for the purposes of this paragraph all commodities in a line of related commodities which, for the purpose of establishing manufacturers' and processors' maximum prices, have been placed by the Office of Price Administration under a single regulation) if the retail, wholesale, or other distributive trade selling such commodity shows that the commodity constituted approximately one-half or more of the gross sales income of a majority of the persons engaged in such trade in 1945 and that, in the first quarter of 1946, the deliveries of such commodity to such distributive trade were less than 100 per centum of the deliveries thereof in the corresponding quarter of 1945.

"'(t) No maximum price applicable to any distributor, wholesaler, or retailer, shall be established or maintained for any commodity below a price which will return to such distributor, wholesaler, or retailer with respect to such commodity his January 1, 1946 discount or the sum of (1) total current cost of acquisition plus (2) his January 1, 1946 mark-up. The January 1, 1946 discount or mark-up shall be the percentage discount or percentage mark-up of such distributor, wholesaler, or retailer in effect on January 1, 1946.

"'(u) After the date upon which this subsection takes effect, no maximum price shall be established or maintained, under this act or under any other provision of law, with respect to any new commodity when the Administrator upon application finds that its use, in the production, manufacturing, or processing of any commodity or commodities, without increasing the cost to the ultimate user, either increases the life or reduces the cost of production, manufacture, or processing of the commodity or commodities produced, manufactured or processed. As used in this subsection the term "new commodity" means a commodity which was not commercially or industrially available prior to January 30, 1942.'

"SEC. 11. The Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 5 thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 6. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of this Act or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, but only after the procedure prescribed in subsection (d) hereof, no maximum price applicable to any producer, manufacturer, or processor shall be established or maintained for any product below the price of such producer, manufacturer, or processor for such product during the base period, increased by an amount equal to (or by a percentage factor which on a weighted average basis is equal to) the increase in the weighted average of the per unit costs of a reasonable number of typical producers, manufacturers, or processors with respect to such product since the base period, but if such product as now produced, manufactured, or processed has a different size, quality, or other characteristic, then with appropriate adjustments for such differences. This section shall not apply with respect to any new product which was not produced, manufactured, or processed in the base period, nor with respect to any product if the weighted average per unit costs of a reasonable number of typical producers, manufacturers, or processors with respect to such product has decreased since the base period. In determining costs for the purposes of this section, all costs shall be included which are considered as such under the established accounting practices of the industry.

"'(b) For the purposes of this section—

"'(1) in the case of any product with respect to which a maximum price established by a price schedule issued pursuant to any Executive order was in effect between October 1 and October 15, 1941, the "base period" shall be the two-week period immediately preceding the date upon which a maximum price so established first became effective with respect to such product; and

"'(2) in the case of any other product, the "base period" shall be the period between October 1 and October 15, 1941,

except that, if in the case of any product there were no prevailing prices during the period prescribed in clause (1) or (2), as the case may be, or the prevailing prices during such period were not generally representative because of abnormal or seasonal market conditions or other cause, the base period shall be the nearest period not exceeding 60 days in which, in the judgment of the Administrator, the prevailing prices were substantially normal.

"'(c) As used in this section, "product" shall mean any major item, or any article different in character from other products of the industry; but all the styles, models, or other varieties of any such item or article shall be considered as one product.

"'(d) Any industry advisory committee may apply to the Administrator for the application to any product of the standard set forth in subsection (a) hereof, and shall present with the application comprehensive evidence with relation to the increase in cost of such product from the base period to the date of such application. The Administrator shall consider the evidence so presented and all evidence otherwise available to him and shall, within sixty days after the receipt of such application, determine the increase in the weighted average of the per unit costs of a reasonable number of typical producers, manufacturers, or processors with respect to such product since the base period and announce the amount of such increase. Such increase in weighted average of the per unit costs may be determined and announced in terms of a specified sum per unit or in terms of a percentage factor, as the Administrator may elect. In determining such weighted average of the per unit costs of producers, manufacturers, or processors, it shall not be necessary to obtain detailed cost accounting figures from any producer, manufacturer, or processor who does not already have such figures or to obtain the usual detailed accounting reports from more than a reasonable number of typical producers, manufacturers, and processors, but the Administrator shall promptly reach a conclusion from the best evidence available to him. He shall exclude from his calculations any producers, manufacturers, or processors whose costs by reason of special conditions are completely abnormal. If the Administrator fails to determine and announce the increase in the weighted average of the per unit costs for any product within the sixty-day period prescribed in this subsection, the industry advisory committee concerned may petition the Emergency Court of Appeals, created pursuant to section 204, for relief; and such court shall have jurisdiction by appropriate order to require the Administrator to determine and announce such increase within such time, not to exceed thirty days, as may be fixed by the court. If the Administrator fails to determine and announce such increase within the time so fixed, no maximum price shall thereafter be applicable with respect to any sale of such product by any seller.

"'(e) Whenever the Administrator has announced the increase in the weighted average of the per unit costs for any product under subsection (d), it shall be lawful for any producer, manufacturer, or processor to sell such product at the price per unit he charged in the base period, plus the increase per unit so announced by the Administrator, with appropriate adjustments for differences in size, quality, or other characteristics.

"'(f) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, in the case of any agricultural commodity, the base period shall be the calendar year 1941, and in lieu of computing the maximum prices required or permitted by this section by adding the increase in the weighted average of per unit costs to the base period prices of particular producers, such maximum prices shall be computed by adding such increase to the average 1941 price for such agricultural commodity (with appropriate adjustments for grade, location, and seasonal differentials) as determined and announced by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"'(g) The provisions of this section shall not apply with respect to any maximum price applicable to manufacturers or processors in the case of products made in whole or major part from cotton or cotton yarn or wool or wool yarn.'

"SEC. 12. (a) The second sentence of section 205 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'In any action under this subsection, the seller shall be liable for reasonable attorney's fees and costs as determined by the court, plus whichever of the following sums is greater: (1) Such amount not more than three times the amount of the overcharge, or the overcharges, upon which the action is based as the court in its discretion may determine, or (2) an amount not less than $25 nor more than $50, as the court in its discretion may determine: *Provided, however*, That such amount shall be the amount of the overcharge or overcharges if the defendant proves that the violation of the regulation, order, or price schedule in question was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation.'

"(b) Section 205 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'The Administrator may not institute any action under this subsection on behalf of the United States, or, if such action has been instituted, the Administrator shall withdraw the same—

"'(1) if the violation arose because the person selling the commodity acted upon and in accordance with the written advice and instructions of the Administrator or any regional administrator or district director of the Office of Price Administration; or

"'(2) if the violation arose out of the sale of a commodity to any agency of the Government, or to any public housing authority whose operations are supervised or financed in whole or in part by any agency of the Government, and such sale was made pursuant to the lowest bid made in response to an invitation for competitive bids.

"'The Administrator shall not institute or maintain any enforcement action under this subsection against any manufacturer of apparel items where the Administrator shall determine (1) that the transactions on which such proceeding is based consisted of the manufacturer's selling such an item at his published March 1942 price list prices instead of his March 1942 delivered prices, and (2) that the seller's customary pricing patterns for related apparel items would be distorted by a requirement that his ceilings be the March 1942 delivered prices. The Administrator's determinations under this paragraph shall be subject to review by the Emergency Court of Appeals in accordance with sections 203 and 204.'

"SEC. 13. The third sentence of paragraph (2) of section 205 (f) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'If any such court finds that such person has violated any of the provisions of such license, regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement after the receipt of the warning notice, such court shall issue an order suspending the license to the extent that it authorizes such person to sell the commodity or commodities in connection with which the violation has occurred, or to the extent that it authorizes such person to sell any commodity or commodities with respect to which a regulation or order issued under section 2, or a price schedule effective in accordance with the provisions of section 206, is applicable; but no suspension shall be for a period of more than twelve months, and if the defendant proves that the violation in question was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation, then in that event no suspension shall be ordered or directed.'

"SEC. 14. Section 3 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'On and after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, it shall be unlawful to establish, or maintain, any maximum price applicable to manufacturers or processors, for any major item in the case of products made in whole or major part from cotton or cotton yarn or wool or wool yarn, unless the maximum price for such major item is fixed and maintained at not less than the sum of the following:

"'(1) The cotton or wool cost (which must be computed at not less than the parity price or the current cost, whichever is greater, of the grade and staple of cotton or wool used in such item, delivered at the mill);

"'(2) A weighted average of mill conversion costs; and

"'(3) A reasonable profit (which shall not be less than a weighted average profit for each unit of such item equal to the weighted average of the profit earned on an equivalent unit of such item during the period 1939 to 1941, both inclusive).'

"SEC. 15. The Secretary of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation or otherwise, is hereby authorized to allocate feed which he controls to feeders of livestock and poultry in domestic areas which he may determine to be in an emergency shortage condition with respect to animal and poultry feed.

"SEC. 16. (a) In the event producers of wheat are required by an order issued pursuant to the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, to sell all or any part of wheat delivered to an elevator prior to April 1, 1947, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall offer to purchase the wheat so required to be sold at a price determined as follows: The purchase price paid for the wheat shall be the market price at the point of delivery as of any date the producer may elect between the date of delivery and March 31, 1947, inclusive: *Provided, however*, That only one election may be made for each lot of wheat: *And provided further*, That the producer may not elect a date prior to the date on which he mails a written notice to Commodity Credit Corporation of his election. In the event the producer does not notify Commodity Credit Corporation in writing by March 31, 1947, of his election of a date for determining the market price, such date shall be deemed to be March 31, 1947.

"(b) Any producer of wheat who, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, has sold any wheat pursuant to the requirements of paragraph (ee) (1) of War Food Order Numbered 144, may, at any time within thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act, pay to the Commodity Credit Corporation a sum equal to the amount for which he sold such wheat. Any producer paying any such sum to the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be deemed to have sold and delivered to the Commodity Credit Corporation as of the date he pays such sum a quantity of wheat equal in grade and quality to the quantity sold by him pursuant to such requirements and the purchase price to be paid to him for such wheat shall be determined in the same manner as in the case of a sale of wheat to the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

"SEC. 17. This Act may be cited as the 'Price Control Extension Act of 1946.'

"SEC. 18. The provisions of this Act shall take effect upon the date of its enactment; but insofar as such provisions require any change in any maximum price, such provisions shall not be deemed to require such change to be made before the thirtieth day following the date of enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
WILLIAM B. BARRY,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT F. WAGNER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL ACT AND STABILIZATION ACT

The House bill (secs. 1 and 3) provides for continuing in effect until March 31, 1947, the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and the Stabilization Act of 1942. The corresponding provisions of the Senate amendment provide for extension of these laws until June 30, 1947. The date fixed in the conference substitute (in secs. 1 and 2) is June 30, 1947.

GENERAL PRICING STANDARDS APPLYING TO PRODUCERS, MANUFACTURERS, AND DISTRIBUTORS

Section 2 of the House bill prohibits the establishment or maintenance of any maximum price which will not reflect to producers, processors, and distributors (including retailers) of the commodity the sum of (1) the current cost of producing and processing and distributing such commodity as determined by the established commercial accounting practices of the industry, and (2) a reasonable profit thereon.

Section 11 of the conference substitute, and a new subsection (t) of section 2 of the Price Control Act added by section 10 of the conference substitute, have been included in lieu of the above House provision and in lieu of two provisions of the Senate amendment which are referred to below.

The provision of the House bill above referred to is not included in the Senate amendment but the Senate amendment does include a provision, section 13, relating to the determination of maximum prices applicable to manufacturers and processors. Subsection (a) of this Senate section provides that no maximum price applicable to any manufacturer or processor shall be established or maintained for any product (defined as hereinafter explained) below the price of such manufacturer or processor for such product during the base period (defined in general, in subsection (b), as the period between October 1 and 15, 1941), increased by an amount equal to the increase in the weighted average of the per-unit costs of a reasonable number of typical manufacturers or processors with respect to such product during the base period; but, if the product as now manufactured has a different size, quality, or other characteristic, with appropriate adjustments for such differences. The provision is to apply only after the procedure of application to, and determination by, the Administrator, as provided in subsection (d), has been followed. The provision is not to apply with respect to any new product which

was not manufactured or processed in the base period. In determining costs, all costs were to be included which are considered as such under the established practices of the industry. It is further provided that where per unit advertising expenditures are below those of the calendar year of the base period, unit costs, for the purposes of the section, shall include per unit advertising expenditures at the rate prevailing in the year of the base period.

Subsection (b) of this Senate section, defining the "base period" contains an exception that if in the case of any product there were no prevailing prices in the period between October 1 and 15, 1941, or the prevailing prices were not generally representative because of abnormal or seasonal market conditions or other causes, the base period shall be the nearest 2-week period in which, in the judgment of the Administrator, the prevailing prices were substantially normal.

Subsection (c) of this Senate section defines the term "product" as any major item, product, or article different in character from other products of the industry and which is separately considered, listed, priced, or dealt with by the industry in the normal course of business.

Subsection (d) of this Senate section authorizes any industry advisory committee to apply to the Administrator for the application to any product of the standard set forth in subsection (a) relating to the allowance of an increase in price equivalent to the increase in the weighted average of per-unit costs. The Administrator is directed within 60 days to determine and announce the increase with respect to which the application is filed. It is provided that in making the determination it shall not be necessary to obtain detailed cost accounting figures for any manufacturer who does not already have such figures or to obtain detailed accounting reports from more than a reasonable number of typical manufacturers and processors, but the Administrator is directed to reach a conclusion promptly from the best evidence available to him. He is directed to exclude from his calculations any manufacturers or processors whose costs by reason of special conditions are completely abnormal.

Subsection (e) of this Senate section provides that when the Administrator has so announced the increase in the weighted average of the per-unit costs for any product, it shall be lawful for any manufacturer or processor to sell such product at the price per unit he charged in the base period, plus the increase per unit so announced, with appropriate adjustments for differences in size, quality, or other characteristics.

Section 11 of the conference substitute is based upon and is similar to the Senate section above described, but the following changes have been made:

(1) The section has been made applicable to maximum prices applicable to producers, in addition to those applicable to manufacturers and processors.

(2) Authority is granted to the Administrator to determine and announce the amount of the increase in per-unit costs in terms of a percentage factor which on a weighted average basis is equal to the increase in per-unit costs.

(3) The provision relating to per-unit advertising expenditures at the rate prevailing in the year of the base period has been eliminated. The conference committee feels that this provision is unnecessary by reason of the fact that reasonable advertising costs would be properly allowable as a cost element without the necessity of specifically so providing.

(4) In the provision relating to the use of a different period when there are no prevailing prices or prices are not generally representative the 2-week period has been changed to a period not exceeding 60 days.

(5) A modification is made with respect to the base period in the case of any product with respect to which a maximum price established by a price schedule was in effect between October 1 and 15, 1941. In that case the base period is to be the 2-week period immediately preceding the date upon which a maximum price so established first became effective with respect to the product; except that the provision relating to the use of a different period, in cases where there were no prevailing prices or where the prevailing prices were not generally representative, will apply.

(6) Modifications have been made in the definition of "product" for the purposes of clarifying such definition and to provide that all styles, models, or other varities of an item or article shall be considered as one product.

(7) A new subsection has been included with respect to the operation of the section in the case of agricultural commodities.

(8) A provision is included providing that if the Administrator fails to make a determination and announcement within the time required the industry advisory committee concerned may petition the Emergency Court of Appeals, and such court is given jurisdiction by appropriate order to require the Administrator to make the determination and announcement within such time, not to exceed 30 days as may be fixed by the court. It is provided that if the Administrator fails to make the determination and announcement within the time fixed no maximum price shall thereafter be applicable with respect to any sale of such product by any seller.

(9) Because of the provisions of section 14 of the conference substitute, specifically applying to maximum prices in the case of products made from cotton or wool, a provision has been included to provide that this section will not apply with respect to any maximum price applicable to manufacturers or producers in the case of products made in whole or major part from cotton or cotton yarn or wool or wool yarn.

(10) In order to insure that regional advisory committees appropriate for the making of applications under the foregoing provisions may be readily established, there has been included in the conference substitute (sec. 4) an amendment to section 2 (a) of the Price Control Act providing that in administering the provisions of that subsection relating to the establishment of industry advisory committees the Administrator, upon request of a substantial portion of the industry in any region, shall promptly appoint a regional industry advisory committee for such region. It is felt that this will be particularly helpful in the case of agricultural producers.

The Senate amendment (in sec. 9) also contains a provision (not contained in the House bill), adding to section 2 of the Price Control Act a new subsection (t) providing that no maximum price shall be established or maintained for any commodity below a price which will return to distributors, wholesalers, or retailers of such commodity their prewar trade discount or the sum of total current cost of acquisition plus the prewar mark-up, the term "prewar mark-up" being defined as the average mark-up for the period between October 1 and 15, 1941. A modified form of this provision is included in section 10 of the conference substitute, as follows:

(t) No maximum price applicable to any distributor, wholesaler, or retailer, shall be established or maintained for any commodity below a price which will return to such distributor, wholesaler, or retailer with respect to such commodity his January 1, 1946, discount or the sum of (1) total current cost of acquisition plus (2) his January 1, 1946, mark-up. The January 1, 1946, discount or mark-up shall be the percentage discount or percentage mark-up of such distributor, wholesaler, or retailer in effect on January 1, 1946.

In cases where the discount or mark-up prevailing on January 1, 1946, was expressed in a dollars-and-cents amount, such amount would be converted for the purposes of the above provision into a percentage of the prices prevailing on such date.

DECONTROL OF COMMODITIES; PRICE ADJUSTMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION IN CASE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Both the House bill (by sec. 4) and the Senate amendment (by sec. 3) propose to add after section 1 of the Price Control Act a new section 1A containing declarations of congressional policy regarding termination of price controls and related controls, and prescribing particular standards or requirements with respect to termination of price controls.

Section 3 of the conference substitute adds a new section 1A to the Price Control Act which is similar in some respects to the House section, but is patterned generally on the Senate section. In addition to its decontrol provisions, it relates to price adjustments and price administration in the case of agricultural commodities. The new section 1A added by the conference substitute is explained below.

Objectives.—Subsection (a) of this new section, taken from the Senate amendment, states that the rapid attainment of production equal to the public demand is one of the necessary and urgent objectives for the prevention of inflation and for the achievement of a reasonable stability in the general level of prices and rents, cost of living, and costs of production; that unnecessary or unduly prolonged controls over prices and rents and use of subsidies would be inconsistent with the return to a healthy peacetime economy and would tend to repress and prevent the attainment of the goals stated in the act; and that adequate prices are necessary stimulants to the desired production and the expeditious attainment of said goals. The House bill contained no such provision.

Declaration of decontrol policy.—Subsection (b) of the new section declares the policy of Congress that the Office of Price Administration, and other agencies of the Government, shall use their price, subsidy, and other powers to promote the earliest practicable balance between production and demand in the case of commodities under their control, and that the general control of prices and the use of subsidy powers shall be terminated as rapidly as possible consistent with the policies and purposes set forth in this section and in no event later than June 30, 1947, and that on that date the Office of Price Administration shall be abolished. While the text of this subsection is taken from the Senate amendment, it is similar in substance to the first part of subsection (a) of the new section 1A proposed by the House bill.

Recommendations by the President.—Subsection (c) of the new section, taken from the Senate amendment, provides, in paragraph (1) thereof, that the President shall recommend to the Congress as soon as practicable and in any event on or before January 15, 1947, such further legislation as in his judgment is needed to establish monetary, fiscal, and other policies which are adequate to supplement the control of prices and wages during the balance of the fiscal year 1947, and to insure that general control of prices and wages can be terminated by June 30, 1947, without danger of inflation thereafter. Paragraph (2) of this subsection provides that on or before April 1, 1947, the President shall report to the Congress what, if any, commodities or classes of commodities, including housing accommodations,

are in such critically short supply as to necessitate, in his judgment, the continuance of price control or rent control as to them after June 30, 1947, together with his recommendations as to established departments or agencies of the Government which should be charged with the administration of such control. This paragraph is almost identical with the last part of subsection (a) of the section 1A contained in the House bill.

Decontrol in case of nonagricultural commodities.—Subsection (b) of the new section 1A added by the House bill contains two paragraphs, designated (2) and (3), relating to removal of price control in the case of nonagricultural commodities. Paragraph (2) provides that in the case of any such commodity or class of commodities the producers of which are not represented by an industry advisory committee the President shall at least once each month determine whether the production of such commodity or commodities (either singly or in combination) equals or exceeds for the past 12 months, by volume, the production of such commodity or commodities in the period from July 1, 1940 to June 30, 1941. The President is directed, when he makes such a finding, to certify the finding to the Price Administrator, the Price Administrator must, within 10 days, remove price controls. Paragraph (3) relates to the case of a nonagricultural commodity or class thereof in the case of which producers are represented by an industry advisory committee. In such a case the industry advisory committee is directed to make a certification to the Administrator at least once each month as to whether the production of the commodity (either singly or in combination) equals or exceeds for the past 12 months, by volume, the production of such commodity or class of commodities for the period from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941. Whenever the committee so certifies, the Price Administrator, within 10 days, shall remove price controls.

The above provisions of the House bill have not been included in the conference substitute.

Subsection (d) of the new section 1A, added by the conference substitute, relates to the decontrol of nonagricultural commodities. These provisions have been taken from the Senate amendment. First, paragraph (1) of this subsection provides for the removal of maximum prices on nonagricultural commodities not important in relation to business costs or living costs. The Price Administrator is directed to proceed with the decontrol of these commodities as rapidly as, in his judgment, will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect. Maximum prices on all such commodities are to be removed on or before December 31, 1946, and after that date no maximum price may be maintained for any nonagricultural commodity or class of commodities unless the same has been expressly found by the Administrator to be important in relation to business costs or living costs. Paragraph (2) of subsection (d) states a general rule for the removal of maximum prices in the case of nonagricultural commodities, whether or not such commodities are important in relation to business costs or living costs. This rule is that maximum prices shall be promptly removed whenever the supply of a commodity exceeds or is in approximate balance with the demand therefor (including appropriate inventory requirements). Under this subsection, it is the duty of the Administrator to remove maximum prices upon his own initiative when the applicable decontrol standards are satisfied; however, provision is made in the later parts of this section for industry advisory committees to petition the Administrator for decontrol when such committees believe that the applicable decontrol standards have been satisfied and, in case of adverse action by the Administrator upon such a petition, further provision is made for an appeal to an independent Price Decontrol Board which may order the Administrator to remove maximum prices. Paragraph (3) of subsection (d) provides that the Price Administrator, with the advance consent in writing of the Price Decontrol Board, may reestablish maximum prices for a nonagricultural commodiy which has been decontrolled, if the supply of such mommodity is no longer consistent with the applicable decontrol standard. Under the provision of the House bill relating to reestablishment of control, which has not been included in the conference substitute, recontrol was permitted on a finding by the President with respect to unsatisfied domestic demand.

Paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of the Senate section, specifically directing the removal of price controls not later than June 30, 1946, in the case of petroleum, and petroleum products processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from petroleum, has not been included in the conference substitute.

Decontrol and other requirements in case of agricultural commodities.—The proposed new section 1A in the House bill, in subsection (b) (4), contains provisions with respect to decontrol in the case of agricultural commodities. The first subparagraph of this paragraph provides that in the case of agricultural commodities the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to make a determination as to whether supply of the commodity is equal to the domestic consumption thereof. When supply is equal to domestic consumption the Secretary is directed to certify that determination to the Price Administrator, and within 10 days the Price Administrator must remove all price ceilings with respect to the commodity. The second subparagraph provides that when the production of any agricultural commodity for the past 12 months equals or exceeds the production of the commodity during the 12 months' period from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941, then such fact shall be certified to the Price Administrator by the Secretary of Agriculture, and within 10 days the Price Administrator must remove all price ceilings with respect to the commodity and with respect to all commodities for human consumption derived principally therefrom. These provisions of the House bill have not been included in the conference substitute, but there have been inserted in lieu thereof provisions from the Senate bill explained below.

Subsection (e) of the section in the Senate amendment contains provisions relating to the removal of maximum prices on agricultural commodities, the adjustment of such maximum prices, and other provisions relating to the administration of maximum prices on agricultural commodities. Paragraph (1) of this subsection provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify to the Price Administrator each agricultural commodity which the Secretary determines to be in short supply. An agricultural commodity will be in short supply for the purposes of this section, unless the supply of such commodity equals or exceeds the requirements for such commodity for the current marketing season. No maximum price may be applicable to any agricultural commodity during any calendar month which begins more than 30 days after the enactment of this section, unless such commodity is certified by the Secretary of Agriculture as being in short supply. Paragraph (2) of subsection (e) provides that whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that maximum prices on any agricultural commodity which is in short supply are impeding the necessary production of such commodity, he may recommend to the Price Administrator such adjustments in such maximum prices as the Secretary determines to be necessary to attain the necessary production of such commodity; and the Price Administrator is required to adjust such maximum prices in accordance with such recommendations. This paragraph (2) also contains a provision relating to the decontrol of agricultural commodities not important in relation to business costs or living costs. The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to recommend to the Price Administrator the removal of maximum prices on such commodities as rapidly as, in the judgment of the Secretary, will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect, and he is to recommend the removal of maximum prices on all such unimportant commodities by December 31, 1946. The Administrator is required to remove maximum prices in accordance with such recommendations. This provision is comparable to that contained in paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of this section for the removal on or before December 31, 1946, of maximum prices on all unimportant nonagricultural commodities.

Paragraph (3) of this subsection (e) providing that price controls with respect to livestock, poultry, eggs, and milk, and food and feed products processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from livestock, poultry, eggs, or milk, and with respect to leaf tobacco and tobacco products manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, shall be removed not later than June 30, 1946, has not been included in the conference substitute.

Paragraph (4) of this subsection provides that whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that an agricultural commodity with respect to which maximum prices have been removed is in short supply and that the reestablishment of maximum prices with respect thereto is necessary to effectuate the purposes of the Price Control Act, the Secretary, with the written consent of the Price Decontrol Board, may recommend to the Administrator, the reestablishment of price controls with respect to such commodity, and that the Administrator shall reestablish such controls upon such recommendation. This provision for restoring price controls in the case of an agricultural commodity is applicable in the case of agricultural commodities specifically decontrolled by the provisions of this section as well as in the case af agricultural commodities decontrolled under the general formula in this section or otherwise. As has been hereinbefore explained the provision of the House bill for reestablishment of price control has been omitted from the conference substitute.

Paragraph (5) of this subsection defines the term "agricultural commodity" to mean any agricultural commodity and any food or feed product processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity.

Paragraph (6) of this subsection (e) provides that the Secretary of Agriculture, in exercising his functions under the Emergency Price Control Act, shall not be subject to the direction or control of any other appointive officer or agency in the executive branch of the Government, except to the extent that a review of his decisions by the Price Decontrol Board is provided for in this section. and that no such officer or agency shall undertake to exercise any direction or control over the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the exercise of such functions. This paragraph also provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may at any time withdraw his approval of any action with respect to which his approval is required under the Emergency Price Control Act, and that upon the withdrawal of his approval such action shall be rescinded. This provision is related to section 3 (e) of the present law, which requires that written approval of the Secretary of Agriculture be

obtained for actions taken under the Price Control Act with respect to agricultural commodities and with respect to regulations, orders, price schedules, and other requirements applicable to processors with respect to food or feed products processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from agricultural commodities.

Paragraph (7) of this subsection (e) provides that no maximum price and no regulation or order under the Price Control Act or the Stabilization Act shall be applicable with respect to any agricultural commodity, or any service rendered with respect to any agricultural commodity, unless a regulation or order establishing a maximum price with respect to such commodity had been issued under the Price Control Act prior to April 1, 1946. This provision will not prevent the restoring of maximum prices in the case of a commodity upon which maximum prices had been in effect prior to April 1, 1946, even though maximum prices upon such commodity had been removed and were not in effect on April 1, 1946, nor will it prevent the maintenance of maximum prices upon a commodity if a regulation or order establishing maximum prices upon such commodity had been issued prior to April 1, 1946, even though such regulation or order did not take effect until after that date. On the other hand, the provision will prohibit other types of regulations and orders as well as maximum prices in the case of any agricultural commodity unless a regulation or order had been issued prior to April 1, 1946, establishing a maximum price on such commodity. Thus, in the case of cotton, the recent order relating to margin requirements for futures trading, although not a maximum price regulation or order, will be made inapplicable because maximum prices with respect to cotton were not established prior to April 1, 1946.

Except as stated above, the provisions of subsection (e) of the Senate amendment have been included in the conference substitute, with changes in some paragraph numbers.

Saving provision.—Subsection (f) of the new section 1A, taken from the Senate amendment, provides that nothing in this section shall limit the authority to remove maximum prices at an earlier time than would be required by the section. This provision is similar to subsection (c) in the new section 1A in the House bill, except for its reference to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Petitions for decontrol.—Subsection (g) of this new section, taken from the Senate amendment, provides that the industry advisory committee appointed under the Price Control Act with respect to a commodity may file a petition for the removal of maximum prices on such commodity, if in the judgment of the committee the standards set forth in this section require the removal of maximum prices for such commodity. Such petitions are to be filed with the Price Administrator in the case of nonagricultural commodities and with the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of agricultural commodities. The petition is to state the grounds upon which the committee believes the removal of maximum prices to be required and is to be accompanied by written evidence in support of the petition. The Administrator or the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be, must act upon the petition within 15 days after it is filed. If the petition is not granted in full, the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, must, upon the request of the industry advisory committee, hold a hearing for the further consideration of the petition, and must within 15 days after the hearing make a decision upon the petition. If the petition is denied in whole or in part, such decision must be accompanied by a written statement of the reasons for denying the petition in whole or in part. If the Administrator or the Secretary has not granted the petition after the hearing, the petitioning industry advisory committee may petition the Price Decontrol Board, established under this section, for a review of the action of the Administrator or the Secretary. The special method which is provided in this section for the consideration of petitions for decontrol made by industry advisory committees does not take away or impair any right of any person subject to a maximum price regulation to protest the continued maintenance of maximum prices in accordance with the regular protest provisions of the Price Control Act.

Price Decontrol Board.—Subsection (h) of the new section, taken from the Senate amendment, establishes a Price Decontrol Board as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government. The Board is to be composed of three members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. This Board is to have jurisdiction to review decisions of the Price Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture in cases where those officers have failed or refused to remove price controls upon the petition of industry advisory committees. Upon such review the Board is to order the removal of maximum prices if and to the extent that in its judgment the standards of decontrol stated in subsections (d) and (e) have been satisfied with respect to the commodity involved. Also, as indicated above, price controls may be reestablished with respect to a commodity from which price controls have been removed only if the Price Decontrol Board gives its written consent to reestablishing such controls. This subsection contains provisions giving the Board such authority as is necessary to enable it to perform its functions and prescribing procedure to be followed with respect to petitions made to the Board.

SUBSIDY OPERATIONS

Authorized subsidy operations.—Section 6 of the House bill and section 5 of the Senate amendment contain certain provisions relating to subsidy operations, having for their purpose permitting the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, notwithstanding the prohibition contained in the last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act to carry on subsidy operations (subsidy payments and buying commodities for resale at a loss) within specified limits as to time, commodities, and amounts.

The House provision provides that such subsidy operations for the year ending December 31, 1946 shall be limited as follows (these provisions being subject to other provisions later referred to):

"(2) * * *

"(A) With respect to funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation—

"(i) for the dairy production payment program, $180,000,000: *Provided*, That in carrying out the dairy production payment program the rate of payment per pound of butterfat delivered shall not be less than 25 per centum of the national weighted average rate of payment per hundred pounds of whole milk delivered;

"(ii) for other noncrop programs, $17,500,000; and

"(iii) for the 1946 crop program operations, $56,000,000:

* * * * *

"(B) With respect to funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—

"(i) for rubber produced in Latin America and Africa for which commitments were made before January 1, 1946, $31,000,000;

"(ii) for materials or commodities produced in the United States as follows:

"Flour, $91,000,000;

"Petroleum and petroleum products, $50,000,000;

"Copper, lead and zinc in the form of premium price payments, $100,000,000;

"(iii) for other materials or commodities, produced in or outside the United States, $59,500,000:"

The comparable provisions of the Senate amendment are as follows:

"Payments and purchases may be made with respect to operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, which involve subsidies and anticipated losses as follows:

"(1) With respect to rubber produced in Latin America and Africa for which commitments were made before January 1, 1946, $31,000,000.

"(2) With respect to copper, lead, and zinc, in the form of premium price payments, $100,000,000: *Provided*, That (A) premiums shall be paid on ores mined or removed from mine dumps or tailing piles before July 1, 1947, though shipped and/or processed and marketed subsequently thereto; and that (B) the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc shall be extended until June 30, 1947, on terms not less favorable to the producer than heretofore and (i) adjustments shall be made to encourage exploration and development work, (ii) adequate allowances shall be made for depreciation and depletion, and (iii) all classes of premiums shall be noncancelable unless necessary in order to make individual adjustments of income to specific mines.

"(3) With respect to purchases by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, of such tin ores and concentrates as it deems necessary to insure continued operation of the Texas City tin smelter.

"(4) With respect to noncrop programs, 1946 crop program operations and the 1947 crop program operations relating to sugar, flour, petroleum, petroleum products, and other domestic and imported materials and commodities, $969,000,000: *Provided*, That the operations authorized under this subparagraph (4) shall be progressively reduced, shall be terminated not later than May 1, 1947, and shall not cost more than $629,000,000 during the last six months of the calendar year 1946. Operations shall not be carried out under authority of this subparagraph (4) with respect to any commodity for any period during which maximum prices on such commodity are not in effect under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended. No new subsidy or purchase and sale operations shall be undertaken under the authority of this subparagraph (4), and no change shall be made in the basis of any existing operations for which funds are made available under this subparagraph which will increase the rate of any subsidy or the rate of loss incurred with respect to any commodity."

The provisions included in the conference substitute are the same as those in the Senate amendment except that—

(1) in subsection (a) (4) the sum of $969,000,000 has been changed to $869,000,000;

(2) the provision in subsection (a) (4) providing that operations shall be progressively reduced and shall be terminated not later than May 1, 1947 has been changed by striking out "May 1, 1947" and inserting "April 1, 1947"; and

(3) a proviso has been included that subsidies with respect to petroleum produced from stripper wells may be continued at not to exceed the existing rates, even though maximum prices are not in effect.

The House bill, in the case of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, respectively, permits amounts not needed for any particular purpose to be used for other items, subject to the limitation that not to exceed 10 per centum of any such amount may be so used. No such provisions are contained in the Senate amendment.

Discontinuance of subsidies and related price adjustments.—Section 6 of the House bill also contains the following proviso relating to discontinuance of livestock and meat subsidies, and price adjustments in lieu thereof:

"*Provided further*, That no funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to, borrowed under Congressional authorization by, or in custody or control of any governmental agency, including Government-owned or controlled corporations, shall be used after June 30, 1946, to continue any existing program, or to institute any new program for the payment of subsidies on livestock or meat derived from livestock, or for the purchase of such commodities for resale at a loss thereby subsidizing directly or indirectly the production, sale, or distribution of such commodities, except that nothing contained herein shall prevent the payment of obligations created under existing programs which accrued prior to June 30, 1946: *And provided further*, That in order to prevent a reduction in livestock prices upon the elimination of such livestock and meat subsidy payments, the Administrator shall make corresponding increases in maximum prices of livestock, meat, and meat products to the extent necessary to compensate for the removal of such subsidies."

Section 7 of the House bill, relating to liquidation of subsidy operations in the case of agricultural commodities, and price adjustments in lieu thereof, reads as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) The Administrator shall make adjustments in maximum prices of agricultural commodities including milk and livestock and products manufactured in whole or substantial part from such commodities in lieu of any payment by the Federal Government of sums of money or losses incurred by any agency of the Government through the purchase and resale at a loss of such commodities or products, and equivalent reductions in subsidy or similar payments shall be made by any such agency authorized to make such purchases and sales at a loss or to make such payments: *Provided*, That the first such adjustment or adjustments of not less than 25 per centum of the rate of subsidy or similar payments made in the corresponding period of 1945 shall be made not more than 45 days from the effective date hereof and similar adjustments shall be made at intervals of not more than 45 days thereafter: *Provided further*, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any operations conducted for the purpose of maintaining support prices for agricultural products or payments or losses incurred with respect to domestic sugar beets or sugarcane: *And provided further*, That nothing contained herein shall be construed to prevent the making of parity payments or soil-conservation payments authorized under existing law or benefits to sugar growers authorized under title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended.

"(b) Modifications shall be made in the maximum prices established for any agricultural commodities and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part from agricultural commodities where it appears that the maximum prices established do not reflect all increases in costs to the producers of such agricultural commodities incurred since January 1, 1941, and such modifications or adjustments in the case of milk and its products shall be made on a regional or area basis.

"(c) In no event shall maximum prices of agricultural commodities be established below support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section III of Public Law No. 729 approved October 2, 1942: *Provided*, That, where minimum prices to producers are regulated under any agreements or orders pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to adjust such minimum prices to reflect not less than the adjustments in maximum prices ordered pursuant to the provisions of this section. Except as expressly provided herein, nothing contained in this section shall be construed to repeal, amend, or supersede the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended."

The House provisions above set forth are not included in the conference substitute.

The provisions of the Senate amendment relating to liquidation of subsidies, and to the making of price adjustments by reason of reduction or discontinuance of subsidies are contained in section 5 of the Senate amendment, and are as follows:

"(a) * * *

"(4) With respect to noncrop programs, 1946 crop program operations and the 1947 crop program operations relating to sugar, flour, petroleum, petroleum products, and other domestic and imported materials and commodities, $969,000,000: *Provided*, That the operations authorized under this subparagraph (4) shall be progressively reduced, shall be terminated not later than May 1, 1947, and shall not cost more than $629,000,000 during the last six months of the calendar year 1946. Operations shall not be carried out under authority of this subparagraph (4) with respect to any commodity for any period during which maximum prices on such commodity are not in effect under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended. No new subsidy or purchase and sale operations shall be undertaken under the authority of this subparagraph (4), and no change shall be made in the basis of any existing operations for which funds are made available under this subparagraph which will increase the rate of any subsidy or the rate of loss incurred with respect to any commodity.

"(b) When any direct or indirect subsidy to an industry is reduced or terminated, any maximum price applicable to the product affected shall be correspondingly increased.

"(c) Where roll-back subsidies have previously been or presently are in effect, and have been discontinued, or shall hereafter be discontinued, the industries which have received such subsidies shall be permitted to increase their ceiling prices at least an amount equivalent to the amount of the discontinued roll-back subsidy. Such price increase shall become effective either upon discontinuance of the roll-back subsidy or upon passage of this Act, whichever date is the later. For the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'roll-back subsidies' means subsidy payments, or purchases and sales of a commodity at a loss by the Government of the United States (including any Government-owned or controlled corporation), or contracts therefor, which resulted directly or indirectly in the lowering of ceiling prices below the maximum price levels established by the Office of Price Administration prior to the institution of the subsidy payments or purchases and sales at a loss, or the execution of the contracts therefor, whichever date is the earlier."

The Senate provisions above referred to have been included in the conference substitute except that—

(1) as hereinbefore explained, the amount of "$869,000,000" has been substituted for "$969,000,000", the date of "May 1, 1947" has been changed to "April 1, 1947," and a proviso relating to petroleum produced from stripper wells has been included; and

(2) subsection (b) has been modified so that it will not be applicable in the case of transportation subsidies and differential subsidies to high-cost producers.

Saving provisions.—In section 7, set forth above, the House bill contains saving provisions with respect to certain types of operations. In the conference substitute these provisions have not been included because they are considered unnecessary: It is intended, and it is believed to be clear, that the provisions relating to subsidy payments and buying for resale at a loss will not limit or affect payments or losses incident to such of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation as sales of commodities for export at competitive world prices pursuant to section 21 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, sales of farm commodities for new or byproduct uses pursuant to section 2 of the act of April 12, 1945 (59 Stat. 50), sales of commodities pursuant to section 2 of the act of April 12, 1945 (59 Stat. 50), which have substantially deteriorated in quality, or of nonbasic perishable commodities where there is danger of loss through waste or spoilage, and loans, purchases, or other price support operations which do not involve supporting prices to producers of agricultural commodities at levels above those reflected by price ceilings, or prevent parity payments or soil conservation payments under existing law or benefits under title III of the Sugar Act of 1937.

Section 8 of the House bill contains a provision to make it clear that the limitations imposed with respect to subsidy operations are not to affect the operation of Public Laws 30, 88, and 164 of the 79th Congress, or to apply to purchases by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of such tin ores and concentrates as it deems necessary to insure continued operation of the Texas City tin smelter. The Senate amendment contains provisions having similar legal effect, but adding Public Law 328 to the provisions of law referred to. The conference substitute contains the Senate provisions, with a clarifying change of the word "Act" to "section" in subsection (d).

The Senate amendment, in section 5, includes the following provision:

"(e) Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions of this section 6, 1946 and 1947 crop program operations with respect to sugar, may, while maximum prices are in effect with respect to sugar, be continued until such crops are processed and distributed, and the cost of 1946 crop program operations with respect to sugar may be charged to the funds authorized by Public Law 30, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended by Public Law 328, Seventy-ninth Congress. For the purpose of this section 6, no subsidy program operation on sugar shall be considered to be a new subsidy."

This provision is included in the conference substitute.

The Senate amendment contains a provision to the effect that the limitations imposed with respect to subsidy operations are not to affect the operation of the premium payment provisions of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946 (Public Law 388, 79th Cong.). This provision, which was not in the House bill, is included in the conference substitute; with a clarifying change striking out the word "Act" and inserting the word "section."

RENT CEILINGS IN CASE OF HOTELS

Section 5 of the House bill adds a new paragraph to section 2 (b) of the Price Control Act authorizing the Administrator, when establishing rent ceilings on hotels or when passing upon applications for adjustment of rent ceilings thereon, to take into consideration the distinction between transient hotels and residential or apartment hotels, including the difference in investment, operation, expenses, and mechanical details of operation. The Senate amendment (sec. 4) contains this same provision, but there is added a requirement that the Administrator classify separately by regulation (1) transient hotels, (2) residential and apartment hotels, and (3) tourist courts, rooming

houses, and boarding houses. This provision, with the Senate modification has been included in the conference substitute, as section 5.

FISH AND SEA-FOOD COMMODITIES

Section 6 of the Senate amendment amends section 2 (i) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, which now provides that no maximum price shall be established for any fishery commodity below the average price of such commodity in the year 1942. Under the proposed amendment, this subsection will provide that for the purposes of the Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act, fish and other sea foods shall be deemed to be agricultural commodities, and commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from fish or other sea foods shall be deemed to be manufactured in whole or substantial part from agricultural commodities. However, instead of making applicable to fish and other sea foods the provisions of section 3 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, which establishes for agricultural commodities pricing standards based on parity or the highest price prevailing between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942, the amendment provides that the maximum price for any fish or sea food commodity or for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom shall not be below the average price therefor in the year 1942. The amendment will have the effect of making applicable to fish and other sea foods the provisions of section 3 (e) of the Price Control Act relating to securing the written approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, and will also have the effect of making applicable to fish and other sea foods the decontrol standards which are provided for agricultural commodities. There is no corresponding provision in the House bill. This provision is retained in the conference substitute.

LIMITING QUANTITY OF PRODUCTS SOLD TO ANY BUYER

Section 7 of the Senate amendment adds to section 2 (j) of the Price Control Act a provision to the effect that nothing in such Act shall be construed as authorizing any regulation or order of the Administrator to fix a quantity or percentage of any product which any seller may sell to any buyer. This provision would have the effect of discontinuing and prohibiting such limitations as that contained in Maximum Price Regulation 602, which provides that a manufacturer of nylon hosiery may not distribute a larger percentage of his product to wholesale outlets than he did in the base year, 1941. There is no corresponding provision in the House bill. This provision is retained in the conference substitute.

HIGHEST PRICE LINE IN SERVICE ESTABLISHMENTS

Section 8 of the Senate amendment amends section 2 (k) of the Price Control Act so as to make applicable with respect to service establishments the provisions of that subsection which provide that no seller of goods at retail shall be required to limit his sales with reference to any highest price line offered for sale by him at any prior time. There is no corresponding provision in the House bill. This provision is retained in the conference substitute with clerical changes.

SUBSECTIONS ADDED TO SECTION 2 OF THE PRICE CONTROL ACT

Section 9 of the House bill, section 9 of the Senate amendment, and section 10 of the conference substitute, respectively, add several new subsections at the end of section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.

Certain new commodities.—Section 9 of the House bill adds a new subsection (o) which provides that no maximum price shall be established or maintained with respect to any new commodity the use of which, in the production, manufacturing, or processing of any commodity or commodities, without increasing the cost to the ultimate user, either increases the life or reduces the cost of production, manufacture, or processing of the commodity or commodities produced, manufactured, or processed. The term "new commodity" is defined to mean a commodity which was not commercially or industrially available prior to January 30, 1942. No corresponding provision is included in the Senate amendment. This provision is retained in the conference substitute as subsection (u), with an amendment which provides that the exemption provided for in this subsection is to apply only when the Price Administrator upon application finds that the standards prescribed in the subsection are met.

Control of certain items in restaurants.—The new subsection (o) which is added by the Senate amendment provides that no maximum price shall be applicable to any item served in any restaurant or other eating establishment if such item consists in whole or major part of a commodity which is not under price control with respect to sales to such restaurant or other eating establishment, unless the maximum price of such item, when sold by such restaurant or other eating establishment, is determined by the addition of a customary margin to the acquisition cost of such item. There is no corresponding provision in the House bill. This subsection is included in the conference substitute.

Maximum average price plan.—The new subsection (p) which is added by this section of the bill is the same in the House bill, in the Senate amendment, and in the conference substitute. This subsection provides that no maximum price regulation or order shall be issued or continued in effect requiring any seller to limit his sales by any weighted average price limitation based on his previous sales. This provision will have the effect of eliminating the maximum average price plan under which manufacturers subject to it are restrained from delivering for sale in any quarter goods averaging in price more than the weighted average price of the goods which he delivered for sale in a corresponding previous quarter.

Discounts in certain retail industries.—The House bill adds a new subsection (q) which provides that the Administrator shall not reduce established retail trade discounts or dealer handling charges in the case of certain commodities whose production was discontinued or restricted during the war. This restriction would apply in the case of any retail industry whose principal sales during the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive, consisted of sales of a commodity or commodities whose production or retail distribution was reduced for a period of 3 years beginning on or after March 2, 1942, by 75 percent or more below such production or retail distribution for the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive, as a result of the operation of any governmental regulation or restriction. The restriction contained in this subsection would no longer apply after the retail unit sales of an affected commodity for a period of 6 months have reached the average annual retail unit sales thereof for the calendar years 1939 to 1941, inclusive. The Senate amendment makes a clarifying change to indicate that the established discounts which must be preserved are the normal peacetime discounts and not those which are in effect upon the enactment of the act, and also makes the provision applicable with respect to goods priced on a mark-up basis as well as goods priced on a discount basis. This provision is included in the conference substitute with the changes made by the Senate amendment.

Discounts for certain wholesale industries.—The new subsection (r) which is added by this section of the House bill makes the same kind of provision, except as to dealer handling charges, for wholesalers dealing in the commodities described above in subsection (q) as that subsection makes for retailers dealing in such commodities. This subsection in the conference substitute is the same as the corresponding provision of the House bill except for some clerical changes which are made in the Senate amendment.

Discounts for certain commodities.—The Senate amendment adds a new subsection (s) which provides that no maximum price regulation or order shall require the reduction of the established peacetime discounts or mark-ups for the sale of any manufactured or processed commodity if the retail, wholesale, or other distributive trade selling such commodity shows that the commodity constituted approximately one-half or more of the gross sales income of a majority of the persons engaged in such trade in 1945 and that, in the first quarter of 1946, the deliveries of such commodity to such distributive trade were less than the deliveries thereof in the corresponding quarter of 1945. For the purposes of this subsection, all commodities in a line of related commodities which, for the purpose of establishing manufacturers' and processors' maximum prices, have been placed under a single regulation are to be treated as a single commodity. The effect of this provision is to require that dealers in farm implements and farm machinery, or in any other commodities to which the subsection may be applicable, be given maximum prices which will allow them the same discounts or mark-ups which they enjoyed during peacetime. There is no corresponding provision in the House bill. This provision is included in the conference substitute.

Distributor discounts and mark-ups.—The new subsection (t), based upon a provision in the Senate amendment and included in the conference substitute, is discussed earlier in this statement in connection with pricing standards applying to producers, manufacturers, and processors.

ENFORCEMENT AMENDMENTS

Section 10 of the Senate amendment relates to the enforcement provisions of section 205 (e) of the act. Subsection (a) prevents the cumulation of the Administrator's claims, except for three times the actual overcharges, where he brings a treble damage action based on overcharges to a number of buyers. Under the present law, the Administrator might sue a grocer for $5,000 because of 100 overcharges of 10 cents each to 100 different buyers. Under the amendment the maximum recovery in that lawsuit would be $50. Had the overcharges been 20 cents each, the maximum recovery would be three times the overcharges or $60.

This subsection also provides that if the defendant in a treble damage action proves that his violation was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against its occurrence, the damages assessed shall be the amount of the overcharge. The effect of the amendment is to eliminate in such cases the $25 minimum prescribed by the present law.

Subsection (b) forbids the Administrator from instituting or maintaining an action if (1) the violation arose because the seller acted upon and in accordance with the written advice and instructions of the Administrator or any regional administrator or district director of the Office of Price Administration or (2) if the violation arose out of a sale to an agency of the Federal Government or to any public housing authority supervised or financed by such an agency if the sale was made pursuant to the lowest bid made in response to an invitation for competitive bids.

The last paragraph of this subsection is designed to forbid the institution or maintenance of an action by the Administrator in a situation like that which has arisen in the work-glove industry. The amendment forbids enforcement action where the Administrator determines (1) that the violation consisted of an apparel manufacturer's selling an item at his published March 1942 price list prices instead of his March 1942 delivered prices, and (2) that his customary pricing patterns for related apparel items would be distorted by a requirement that his ceilings be the March 1942 delivered prices.

Section 11 of the Senate amendment amends section 205 (f) of the Emergency Price Control Act, relating to suspensions for violations of the Act. The amendment made by this section provides that no suspension of a license shall be ordered or directed if the person charged with the violation proves that the violation in question was neither willful nor the result of failure to take proper precautions against the occurrence of the violation.

The House bill does not include any provisions corresponding to sections 10 and 11 of the Senate amendment. These provisions are included in the conference substitute as sections 12 and 13.

PRODUCTS MADE FROM COTTON AND WOOL

Section 10 of the House bill adds a new paragraph to section 3 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended. This paragraph relates to maximum prices applicable to manufacturers or processors of products made in whole or major part from cotton or cotton yarn or wool or wool yarn. Under existing law the price standards established in the law must be applied separately to each major item in the case of products made in whole or major part from cotton or cotton yarn. This amendment makes it clear that when the current cost of cotton is higher than parity, the current cost must be used in applying such price standards separately to each major item. The amendment also specifies that as to each such major item there shall be added to the cotton cost the weighted average of mill conversion costs and a reasonable profit. This amendment also provides that the pricing standards applicable to major items made in whole or major part from cotton or cotton yarn under this paragraph shall also be applicable to major items made in whole or major part from wool or wool yarn. The Senate amendment includes this provision of the House bill and adds to it a provision defining the reasonable profit as not less than a weighted average profit for each unit of the item in question equal to the weighted average of the profit earned on an equivalent unit of such item during the period 1939 to 1941, both inclusive. This provision is included in the conference substitute with this change made by the Senate amendment.

RELIEF OF FEED SHORTAGES

Section 14 of the Senate amendment provides that the Secretary of Agriculture or other governmental agency having control of supplies of grain or feedstuffs for shipment overseas is authorized and directed to make such diversions of such supplies as he shall deem necessary to relieve feed shortages in domestic areas where an emergency condition exists with respect to animal and poultry feed. The Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized under the Senate amendment to replace such diverted supplies by further purchases for foreign shipment. No corresponding provision is included in the House bill. The conference substitute includes this provision in a modified form as section 15, which provides that the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation or otherwise, is authorized to allocate feed which he controls to feeders of livestock and poultry in domestic areas which he determines to be in an emergency shortage condition with respect to animal and poultry feed.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASES OF WHEAT

Section 16 of the Senate amendment provides that when producers of wheat are required by the Government, pursuant to the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended, to sell all or any part of the wheat delivered to an elevator prior to April 1, 1947, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall offer to purchase the wheat which the producers are required to sell. The purchase price to be paid by such corporation in these cases is to be the market price at the point of delivery as of any date the producer may elect between the date of delivery and March 31, 1947. The producer may not elect a date which has occurred prior to the time he makes his election. In this manner the producer is given an opportunity to decide whether or not he wishes to retain the right to profit from any increases which may occur in the market price of wheat before April 1, 1947; but, if he does so, he must assume the risk of loss which will result from any decrease in the market price of wheat prior to such date. Subsection (b) of this section of the Senate amendment in effect makes the provision described above retroactive until May 24, 1946, when the Government's present wheat purchase program was put into effect. Producers who have sold their wheat under that program prior to the date the provisions above described takes effect may, by returning or paying to the Commodity Credit Corporation the sum which they received for their wheat when it was sold, place themselves in the same position as if the provisions of subsection (a) of this section had been in effect at the time when the wheat was sold. There is no provision in the House bill corresponding to this section of the Senate amendment. The section is included in the conference substitute.

MISCELLANEOUS

Section 17 of the conference substitute contains a short title for the act.

Section 18 of the conference substitute provides that in cases where the provisions of the act require the Administrator to make or permit changes in maximum prices, the Administrator shall have a period of 30 days from the date of enactment of the act to comply with such requirements.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
WM. B. BARRY,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SPENCE (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I object.

(The Clerk continued reading the statement.)

Mr. SPENCE (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that time for debate be extended 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have had no chance to read either the conference report or the statement. I object to the request. I think the statement should be read.

(The Clerk continued reading the statement.)

Miss SUMNER of Illinois (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I am willing to withdraw my objection on the understanding that there be 30 minutes additional time for debate. I ask unanimous consent that the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] be permitted to go through.

The SPEAKER. There is no particular request pending before the House at the present time.

Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to submit a request?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that further reading of the statement be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that time for debate be extended 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

(The Clerk continued reading the statement.)

Mr. WOLCOTT rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate be continued one-half hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am a believer in effective price control. I introduced the bill to continue the Price Control and Stabilization Acts without amendment. I believe in spite of all the criticisms that have been leveled against the Office of Price Administration, and regardless of the many inequities that have existed, it has saved the economy of the Nation. I believe if we take off price controls—and one does not have to be an economist to be convinced of this—there will be an indescribable disaster befall the people of America. We went into conference endeavoring to obtain a bill that would carry out the purposes of the Price Control and Stabilization Acts. This is the best act we could obtain. This act will in a general way continue to control all prices until supply and demand get in equilibrium. I think the longer we continue price control and the more the opportunity exists for supply and demand to equalize, the greater opportunity we have to avoid disaster. We know what has occurred. The great productive activity of America was converted to manufacture instruments of war. Men have had large wages. They have accumulated purchasing power, and there has been no consumers' goods on which to expend it. Now, turn this power loose and I think you are experimenting with an economic atomic bomb. I would think twice and consider prayerfully before I

would vote down this conference report, because if we have no price control, in my honest opinion, we have nothing. If we have nothing, what a train of evils is going to follow. Labor is wise. Labor knows what its purchasing power is. Labor is not asking for dollars. Labor is asking for purchasing power. Labor will know what happens if the lid is off, and labor will make demands for a purchasing power to which they will be entitled.

We have done the very best we could in bringing a bill here that I think will meet the exigencies of the occasion as far as they can be met. It may not meet with the entire approval of any of the conferees, but it certainly was a happy culmination of the whole matter when many times it looked as though we could not come to any conclusion. I am confident there will be no great injustices done if this bill is enacted into law. You have talked about decontrol, and I think we all want decontrol when decontrol can safely be administered. Certainly decontrol is not a legislative matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONRONEY). The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Decontrol is essentially administrative. The Senate took out of control livestock and livestock products; it took out of control poultry and eggs, milk, dairy products, petroleum and petroleum products, and tobacco. Some of those things, petroleum and petroleum products, and tobacco will automatically be decontrolled because the supply and demand are now in balance, and in the case of tobacco the Secretary of Agriculture would be compelled to find it was in short supply before he could issue an order placing it under control, and it is obviously not in short supply and he would not issue such an order for its control. The essential food, feed, and fiber of the American people will remain under control until the supply comes in balance with the demand. When this takes place we need have no apprehension of disastrous inflation. I sincerely hope and I confidently trust that the conference report will be agreed to.

I am not going into detail in regard to the conference report, but I want my colleagues to take the broad view as to what might happen if they vote this down. I firmly believe that if you vote this conference report down you are going to have no price control.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think we can all agree that the Congress has had rather a difficult time with this price control extension bill. Our objective when we started out was to compel adjustments in maximum prices sufficient to get full production, but under control. That objective has been maintained in the bill so that the policies and principles and objectives which we sought originally will have been effectuated when this bill becomes law and operative. For that reason anyone who voted for the price-control bill in the House on final passage can vote for this conference report with full assurance that the principles for which he fought at that time, the policies with which he was in accord at that time, have been in principle preserved in the conference report.

I am inclined to think that in many particulars the conferees agreed upon language which was more effective than that in either the House or the Senate bills. We met for three full days and late into last night, breaking up about 12 o'clock after we had finally agreed on this conference report.

I think, to be realistic about it, that it is this conference report or nothing. I do not believe this House is in any temper, I do not think this Congress is in any temper, to continue price control as it exists today by a simple continuing resolution. We have preserved the principle of price control, we have put the responsibility for price control where it belongs and yet we have established certain standards, established certain formulas, which should assure full production by all producers.

I know that there is in the minds of many the question: Why did not the conferees agree to specific controls on meat, poultry, dairy products, petroleum, and tobacco?

It can be said that one of the principal reasons why we insisted there be no specific decontrols was that the machinery had been set up under this bill for decontrols under certain standards applicable to all commodities, including those which I have mentioned and which are listed specifically in the Senate bill.

We have provided that prices will reflect the increase in production costs from the October 1 to 15, 1941, base. That is carried through not only on the price to the producer but also on the price which the distributor and retailer may charge, in principle the House language. Within the last 2 weeks the Office of Price Administration has put into effect that formula. So there is not any question at all but that they can work that out. They have put it into effect on 61 different items in the last 2 weeks. In other words, the OPA has increased the price of 61 commodities during the last 2 weeks to absorb increases in production costs. That is what this formula provides.

The only controversy between OPA and the Congress in that particular is whether OPA shall be forced to do the things which it says it is going to do anyway.

In respect to agricultural commodities, we have decontrolled the OPA in that respect. The OPA will have only token control over agricultural commodities from now on. The Secretary of Agriculture, who will operate under the terms of the bill independently of any other officer or agency of the Government, is given control over the prices to be maintained on all food commodities, all agricultural commodities, and is given broad powers in respect to decontrol of all agricultural commodities. So that, in effect, Clinton Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, can within 10 days after this bill becomes law effectively decontrol meat or livestock or dairy products or poultry or all other food commodities.

He may make recommendations to the Office of Price Administration when agricultural commodities are in short supply as to price adjustments which must be made to get full production, and if the Office of Price Administration does not act in accordance with those recommendations within 10 days the adjustments suggested, the recommended modifications, automatically become operative. Each month he must make up a list of the agricultural commodities that are in short supply and price controls on all other articles which are not included on the list of short-supply articles are automatically decontrolled. Even though they are in short supply he can make recommendations for price adjustments, as I have said, and the Office of Price Administration must within 10 days follow that recommendation or the adjusted prices automatically prevail.

Let me say further that we have set up in this bill a decontrol board to make sure that the standards under which the Administration of OPA and the Secretary of Agriculture must operate in respect to decontrols are followed and any aggrieved person claiming that the Administrator or the Secretary of Agriculture has not complied with the standards set up can petition this decontrol board, which must act expeditiously. The board is given quasi-judicial and quasi-administrative powers. So that if it finds that the standards have not been complied with and that the Administrator or the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be, has not decontrolled, then the board has the administrative authority to decontrol the article, notwithstanding any other action which the Administrator or the Secretary of Agriculture may take.

Taking those three things into consideration, the fact that we almost automatically increase the price of all goods sufficiently to absorb the increase in production costs, coupled with the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture can, on his own initiative, in effect decontrol any agricultural commodity in 10 days' time or adjust the price of any agricultural commodity to get full production, and that we have set up this board to make sure that these standards have been complied with, make unnecessary any provision in the law specifically decontrolling any particular commodity. We put the responsibility for decontrols and price controls squarely on the Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture, who must function in compliance with very specific and understandable standards.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I take the opportunity at this time to read a telegram which Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, has just sent to several

Members of Congress, and which has been read to me over the telephone:

On behalf of the CIO I urge you and all friends of price control to vote down the conference report for the OPA bill which will not control prices but in effect legalize inflation. Instead, I urge passage of concurrent resolution extending price control for 1 year. We do not want the American people fooled by an amendment called price control which will not do the job. Only by extending price control and vigorous enforcement can the living standards of all Americans be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, the bill as it comes out of conference is not a price-control bill but a bill to legalize inflation. Examination of the amendments to the present act agreed to by the conference committee leaves no doubt of this.

1. COST ABSORPTION

By the adoption of the amendment requiring prices to be fixed to include increased costs all along the line in the manufacture and distribution of any commodity, this bill will produce a continuous spiral of higher prices to which no end can be seen.

2. MAXIMUM AVERAGE PRICE

By the abolition of the maximum average price regulation and with the present demand for textiles, all low-cost clothing will disappear and manufacturers will divert all material to the high-price lines.

3. AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Although there is no specific decontrol on June 30 of meat, poultry, and dairy products, through transfer of authority to the Department of Agriculture, for price increases and decontrol of agricultural products, the conference report opens the way for every big packer and processor to exert pressure on the Secretary of Agriculture for higher prices by withholding farm commodities from the market.

4. DECONTROL BOARD

By setting up a separate decontrol board, a new avenue is established for future relaxation of controls and higher prices. There is serious question whether such a decontrol board will be able to cope with the administrative task required of it.

The major industries in the country have just closed labor contracts based on the assumption that the present level of the cost of living would be maintained. The passage of this bill will result in either great hardship on the people or in the revision of all wage agreements arrived at after great disturbance of the national economy.

This bill flouts the will of the American people. The polls have run 10–1 for effective price control. Passage of this bill in the name of continued price control would deceive the people for only a short time. I refuse to share responsibility for the inflation that will be ushered in by this bill.

It will now be argued as an excuse for surrender that this bill is better than nothing. This is worse than nothing; it is unconditional surrender to inflation and to powerful, selfish interests. There is a way out of this dilemma. This Congress can pass a simple resolution extending OPA for another year. We have ample precedent for such action. Once before we were up against a similar predicament when President Roosevelt vetoed another OPA bill which, like this one, legalized inflation. Then, too, we were told to either agree to surrender or have no legislation. However, Roosevelt fought back in defense of the consumers. He vetoed the surrender. Immediately Congress passed a continuing resolution extending the life of price controls. Why cannot this be done now? Vote down this betrayal of the American people and pass a resolution extending the life of price controls. We will be told that Congress will not do it. That remains to be seen. I venture that after the American people talk to Congress following the rejection of this bill, that such a resolution will pass. If you vote for this bill now, you preclude this opportunity for real price control. If Congress refuses, then those who refuse to vote for such a resolution will have to assume the responsibility. I shall discharge mine by voting in favor of such a resolution. I refuse to accept the alternative to such a course, abject and unconditional surrender, by voting for the adoption of this conference report. Within 4 months, America will be thrown into the most violent inflation as a result of this legislation. Therefore, I refuse to vote for it. I shall not cast my vote to ruin the economy of the Nation, to permit the robbery of the hard-earned dollars of Americans simply because you tell me that Congress will not do its duty and extend price controls for another year.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is there any provision in there for any chance to end OPA? It seems to me there is no termination date. It looks like a permanent OPA. They can come back any time they want to and slap it on again.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I will answer that later.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think this report pleases anyone in every particular. I am satisfied that if you want any control you must vote for this conference report. I am satisfied there are many who do not want any kind of control. I am satisfied there are many who want much stronger control, but we were limited to the provisions of the House and Senate bills. I hope I can show you before I take my seat that the conference report speaks only the present law, but the present law has not been carried out. I am satisfied if you vote down this conference report you will not be able to get anything. The other body practically destroyed the bill by decontrolling nearly all food products. When you take off food you might just as well take everything off. If we are going to have any control it must be on food, rents, and clothing, but food comes first.

Now what? The amendment known as the Taft-Wolcott amendment has been the law all the time, because every man in all kinds of business is entitled to the profit he made in peacetime. That is all there is to it. He will only be given the increased cost, not increased profit, under this amendment. Who within the sound of my voice will challenge the fairness of this statement? You should not oppose this amendment, because it was the intent of the law all the time, but this is the first time we have spelled it out in the bill. That is all some of you oppose. Some are opposed to the committee report because we did not agree with the other body in taking control off of practically all foods. We have created an independent decontrol board to do this, based on certain standards as a yardstick for all those commodities and everything else.

As I understand, the situation in the other body was as follows: Many wanted to take price control off beef. Other Members said if you take price control off beef we must take it off pork. Some said if you take it off pork we must take it off lamb. Others said if you take it off lamb we will take it off poultry, and if you take it off poultry we must take it off everything, including milk, butter, and everything else. So you can well see the fallacy of not having standards but singling out one commodity to be decontrolled, and how far reaching it would be without an independent decontrol board, which, in the final analysis, meant no price control on practically all foods, regardless of merit. The decontrol board, I am satisfied, will take control off of some food commodities, as well as other commodities, when a proper case is made to the board, and I take it as nonsense to decontrol any commodity unless it complies with the fair standards of decontrol we have set up in the bill.

I take the position that the conference report has not changed the fundamental law. We have written into the bill language to show the OPA that they must carry out what was the original intention of Congress.

This bill is workable. Yes; some commodities may be higher, but what everybody wants is that full production will not be hampered and will be secured as soon as possible. You know that without controls in the days following World War I your dollar went down to less than 40 cents in value. Today it is around 70 percent. The OPA officials sometime ago said, "We hope to hold the purchasing power of the dollar to 60 cents." I think this can be done under the bill agreed to by the conferees; but, if you take all controls off, the people are going to bid against each other so much on scarce commodities that the public will have to pay two or three times more than such commodities are worth. I say it is a workable bill. It is the only bill we are going to be able to get. All the conferees know this. Now, are we going to be so foolish as to vote this down because we are not getting what we want. May I say to the extremists who do not want any control under any circumstances, and to the extremists who want no change in the

present law, that the position of both groups means no control on any commodities the production of which is greatly below the demand. The position of both groups is untenable.

The conferees of both the House and Senate were limited to the provisions of the bill as passed by both bodies, and we have done the very best we could. Let me state to both groups—those who believe in no control and those wanting everything in the present law—that it is impossible to carry out your wishes, and I am satisfied unless the conference report is adopted both groups will regret it, and we will have no way to prevent people bidding against each other on all the necessary commodities which are so short of demand in the present emergency. When production is not short of demand, all controls will be taken off. I beg you to vote for the conference report under all these circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, this particular compromise now placed before us in my opinion is far better than either the House or Senate bill. Anyone who voted for the OPA extension bill as it passed the House originally should certainly vote for this, assuming he or she seeks to keep a check rein on prices. Naturally, it will not satisfy a great many people. However, if you do not support it, in my humble judgment you are just taking a great big gamble with the future of the Nation, because you cannot tell what will result. You will most probably, as was indicated by both the gentleman from Michigan and the distinguished chairman of our committee, end up with no price control at all—not even over rents and food—or you might end up with a simple continuing resolution which will give you the same kind of badly administered, slow, and inefficient price control that we have had for many months past.

The votes against the conference report will come from those who have extremely stern or extreme views on one side of the question or the other. If it is defeated, it will be defeated by votes representing two minorities at the opposite poles. The people who hold those two views, for their own safety, had better get together with the conferees and try to adopt this solution which does give great promise of working with at least some degree of success and not take the risk of subjecting themselves to the will of the minority seeking to impose the opposite extreme. That would not be good for the Nation nor would it be an easy thing to explain to their constituents.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Anybody who votes for the British loan cannot pretend he is against inflation.

Mr. KUNKEL. I am discussing the conference report on the OPA. I want to see an effective and intelligent OPA. This proposal goes too far in many respects, in my judgment. But it does keep a check rein. It offers good possibilities.

In voting for the conference report, whether you like it or not, it is at least a known quantity. If you vote it down, you are voting for an absolutely unknown quantity. You cannot foresee what will occur. I urge its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Do you think anybody who cannot see any connection between the British loan and the OPA ought to be listened to for his advice on how to stop inflation?

Mr. BUFFETT. I think, if the Members of the House will look up the testimony of Mr. Bernard Baruch and Mr. John Small on the extension of the OPA, they will get the answer as to how the British loan will prolong OPA controls. Mr. Speaker, this bill as it stands is another attempt to continue hoodwinking the people of this country on the issuance of deficit dollars that cause inflation.

However, I think this House is missing another great fact that is confronting us—that is, the fact that the farmers of America have lost confidence in the integrity of their Government.

That is the great fact confronting us. Until that confidence is reestablished we are going to see this problem of food get worse and worse.

A wise man once said, "You cannot go to work tomorrow morning on yesterday morning's breakfast." The answer to the food problem in this country is in the hands of the farmers who produce the food.

But they have lost all confidence in the management of the affairs of this Government as they relate to agriculture. Unless the farmers produce and bring in the food, you will not get it, and the Members from the big cities should recognize that fact.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. How do you think supply is ever going to equal demand with forty billion of foreign money coming into this country to wipe the shelves clean?

Mr. BUFFETT. Obviously, supply is not going to meet demand when they expect the American farmer to supply the demands of the world in exchange for a deteriorating currency of limited use value.

Out through all the producing regions, corn is being bartered, wheat is being bartered. The normal sale of those products has almost stopped.

In the Omaha grain exchange in the last month there has not been a single car of wheat or corn come up for sale in the normal fashion. New Deal "planned corruption" is rampant. If wheat does not roll into the elevators during harvest time, you can look for a shortage this fall or winter that will be devastating. But do not blame the farmers. The blame belongs here in Washington. This House should face the fact now that nonperishable farm products are not coming to market normally until constructive action is taken to restore the confidence of the farmers in the Government.

I believe that confidence can be regained by making a genuine start on decontrol—by taking controls off of meat.

Then the corruption and thievery and underground operations going on now in the meat industry will end. Unless something like that is done to restore the confidence of the farm population the food situation is going to deteriorate to the point of disaster and crisis. That disaster is almost guaranteed by the conference report. When it comes, it should be considered a prearranged crisis, and the responsibility for the tragedy belongs to the Truman administration. Let that fact be understood now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the American people believe this measure will give them relief from the tyrannical impositions of the OPA, they will soon be disillusioned. God help us save America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this conference report will mean a continuation of a controlled economy in peacetime, just one more step for America down the road toward state socialism. This bill will not hold down prices, stop the inflationary trend, or give our people the bread, meat, and clothing for which they cry.

I predict the President will sign this bill, and it will become law, although I shall vote against it. I further predict that Chester Bowles will soon resign, regardless of the fate of OPA or price control. Both have served their purpose well to give him the publicity springboard he desired to become a candidate for high political office. I join Mr. Bowles in his prediction of "boom and bust." His "boom" as a candidate for political office is now on. The "bust" for both Chester's candidacy and the administration's attempt to control our national economy will come next November—on the first Tuesday after the first Monday.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN].

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, I have always advocated a strong OPA. Until supply meets the demand there is no other way to prevent inflation. When the original OPA extension bill came before this session I opposed all amendments that would limit OPA controls. I voted for the bill, however, in the hope that the Senate would send back a better bill. That the Senate failed to do. I am sorry that it did not.

The provisions of the conference report on which we are now voting will not prevent inflation. It will insure it. I am constrained to vote against it. I cannot accept the statement that it is the better of the two evils or that it is the best that we can get. Congress can do better if it wishes to do it. This bill does nothing. We should vote it down and extend OPA in an effective manner.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on April 16 last I imposed myself upon the House with an address describing the corruption then existing in the livestock industry. No statement made by me upon that occasion has been contradicted. It was a statement of the truth. I regret at this time to have to state to the House that the situation is infinitely worse today than it was on April 16.

We speak about decontrolling meats. Mr. Speaker, they are already decontrolled. At least 80 percent of the beef, the mutton, the pork, the veal, the lamb purchased by our housewives is purchased in an open, competitive black market.

I communicated with the stockyards at Chicago yesterday morning, and found that, despite the statement of Mr. Bowles, the farmers were holding back the shipment of their stock; that there were 10,000 cattle in the yards Monday morning at Chicago, and yet the 3 largest buyers could only buy 18 head. One week before that, a week ago Monday, there were 7,500 head of cattle in those yards, and 6,500 of them were shipped out alive over the horizon. Nobody knows. Armour did not get one, neither did Wilson, for the simple reason that they could not compete with the bids of the black marketeers on live animals. Everybody in the industry knows that plants are closing down all over the country. I am assured by the gentleman from Michigan and by the gentleman from Georgia that this bill as reported by the conferees gives power to the Secretary of Agriculture to decontrol livestock and meats and that if he does not do it the decontrol board may do it. From the bottom of my heart I hope one or the other has the courage to do it; otherwise we shall live in a welter of corruption and hypocrisy which rivals the days of prohibition.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, referring to the remarks of the gentleman from New York who preceded me as to the scarcity of cattle in the livestock markets, today's Washington News carries a picture on the front page of a lone steer in the stockyards. Being a stockman all my life and living among cattle, and having won a judging contest before I was 20 years old, when I look at this steer I see "he" is a heifer, and a sad, long-faced heifer at that. About this picture, this heifer had some time or other had a calf, maybe two, which makes her in the market grade as a heiferette, actually a scrub cow.

That is the kind of stock in the stockyards; that is the kind of stock the packer gets. Her scrubby horns, her long face, hard lines, and large muzzle indicate that she is over 4 years old and has had a hard life.

As far as the farmers' withholding their livestock is concerned, it is just not true. Ten thousand head were in the Chicago yards yesterday morning. That was a fair sum, an average day for late June. You have no right to expect more cattle. That was normal; but they did not get into the legitimate market.

More cattle in trucks are traveling over the highways than ever, mostly black market.

Swift & Co. daily purchases around 700 head. Yesterday they got eight head of cattle.

It just gets down to this, that you are not going to have a supply of legitimate food until you get rid of these controls. Production and more production is the only safeguard against inflation and the answer to nearly all of the world's problems. This is impossible under OPA.

The very same fellows who are handling this thing some time ago—referring to the Secretary of Agriculture from New Mexico—one of those fellows down there trying to sell me on an irrigation project some time ago showed me a picture of a plain with sagebrush and with a large beautiful mountain in the background. Then he picked up another picture and said, "This is the same scene 15 years later," and the fruit trees had grown so high on the plain that you could not see the mighty mountain. Those are the kind of fellows that are handling this, and the farmers get the blame. I am reminded of the following by Edwin Markham:

Bowed by the weight of centuries he leans
Upon his hoe and gazes on the ground,
The emptiness of ages in his face,
And on his back the burden of the world.
Who made him dead to rapture and despair,
A thing that grieves not and that never hopes,
Stolid and stunned, a brother to the ox?
Who loosened and let down this brutal jaw?
Whose was the hand that slanted back this brow?
Whose breath blew out the light within this brain?
O masters, lords and rulers in all lands,
How will the Future reckon with this Man?
How answer his brute question in that hour
When whirlwinds of rebellion shake the world?
How will it be with kingdoms and with kings—
With those who shaped him to the thing he is—
When this dumb Terror shall reply to God,
After the silence of the centuries.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, this conference report has some merit. For instance, it provides that all agricultural products are turned over to the Secretary of Agriculture. This is in line with a bill introduced by me 3 years ago. My bill was approved by the Republicans and by many Democrats. The chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the House, Mr. FULMER, who was a distinguished Democrat, approved it and the Agriculture Committee of the House recommended the passage of a bill introduced by Mr. FULMER after I had introduced my bill. The Fulmer bill was very similar to my bill. My bill and the Fulmer bill were positive and provided positively for the transfer of all food products over to the Secretary of Agriculture. We have repeatedly, on this floor and in speeches all over the country, demanded that instead of permitting a half dozen different agencies to handle food prices that all foods be put under one agency. While they say that this conference report will put all food under one agency in the Department of Agriculture, still it is not done in a positive way. The Secretary will be compelled to report to Mr. Bowles or his successor. Why should not all food be put under the Department of Agriculture? Why restrict him with some other control? When we amended the OPA legislation 2 years ago we gave Mr. Anderson enough authority that would have enabled him to control the food prices, but he was fearful and he was afraid to assert himself. He probably will do the same thing again.

If Bowles is retained and if Anderson must refer matters to Bowles, I am afraid that Bowles and his wrecking crew will continue to ride over the American food producers and food distributors, as he has been so shamefully doing for years.

Mr. Speaker, this proposed legislation is wrong in another respect. What else is wrong with this piece of legislation? My good friend the distinguished Member from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] painted a very vivid picture to you a few minutes ago. He told you of the critical conditions that obtain today. Mr. Speaker, this bill does nothing today. This bill will not bring meat today; it will not bring bread today; it will not bring butter today. It is all in the future. Whatever it proposes to do is to be done upon the passing of several other contingencies. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] said, the law already provides that these things can be done. But they have not been done because of the weakness of the administration. Mr. Speaker, how in the name of common sense can Bowles and Porter and their gang defend their efforts as top men in controlling our food supplies when this very day, right here in Washington and in all parts of the country, long lines of people are trying to get a loaf of bread, and when the papers, in flaming headlines, tell us that there is not a pound of meat in the city? And how can we defend ourselves by voting for a lot of promises?. Mr. Speaker, we want bread now; we want meat now.

Under this legislation they say we are going to appoint a control board of three members. Who will they be? And how are they going to do any decontrolling? Are they going to be under the control of Chester Bowles? If we judge the future by the past, we will have to conclude they will be. This board, as I understand it, cannot do anything initially.

Any powers that it may have must be invoked by the action of someone who has been aggrieved. Why do we not set up a decontrol board and give it power to decontrol upon its own initiative?

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if the Secretary of Agriculture cannot make a final decision he will be just another official rattling around over the country. And if the decontrol board can do no decontrolling except when someone initiates a proceeding, all Bowles has to do is to continue to scare the people into submission. This is not right. Let us do something that will bring results.

We have a rather strange situation presented here this afternoon. From the remarks already made it is evident that some of the Members will vote against the approval of the conference report for some reasons and other Members will vote for entirely different reasons. Some would like to see Chester Bowles and his gang continue in power without let or hindrance in any respect. Others would repeal OPA completely, root and branch. Personally, I think that control should be continued over rents in large cities and congested areas. I think it would not be wise to raise all control on sugar and products which might be bound up in treaty agreements made by the State Department. I think, however, these could all be handled by transferring them to appropriate agencies of the Government which have for a long time been in existence and which agencies are permanent in their nature.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of a strong OPA and while this bill is not as strong as I would like to see it, nevertheless I shall vote for the conference report. I do it with this thought in mind, that I and everyone else here knows that unless we accept the conference report we will not have any OPA after June 30. There are two schools of thought—so-called—who intend to vote against this conference report. Both of them are seeking to defeat OPA. One of those schools of thought is composed of Members who are actually opposed to OPA's further continuance and who openly state so. The other school of thought is composed of those who claim to be for a strong OPA and, because they are not able to obtain every last provision, are willing to scuttle the whole ship. I, for one, shall not vote to scuttle the OPA today in the vain and visionary hope that by some ledgerdemain an OPA bill will again come forth in the remaining few days before June 30 and price controls will be continued. I do not believe that there is a possibility of extending an unamended OPA bill by resolution. If we cannot get a better bill than the present one through the House and Senate, we certainly cannot get through a resolution that would extend the OPA in its present strength.

The Members of the House, especially those of us who come from the large cities, have been under pressure from certain groups, who are neither Democrats nor Republicans, to vote against this conference report and to vote for a continuance to June 30, 1947, only in the event that OPA is extended in its present form—in other words, without amendments and on a take it or leave it basis. The people who are urging that course upon us are not in their hearts for OPA. They are for confusion worse confounded; they are for discord and chaos; as a result of which they hope to spread their foreign ideologies. They pretend to be for price control—actually they want to see inflation; they want to see privation; they want to see the value of the dollar grow less; in short, they want to confuse and distress the people of our community. I know whereof I speak. I hope that my colleagues who come from consumer districts as I do will not fall into the trap.

I call attention to my colleagues on the Democratic side and especially from New York that we belong to the majority party, that it is our responsibility to pass legislation for the interests of the people, and that we cannot take the position, which some have in mind to take, of letting OPA die because the legislation is not altogether to our liking. As the dominant political party we cannot permit OPA to die. We should not follow the plan that you and I know does not come from Democratic sources and which advocates voting against OPA and letting it die and giving it a fraudulent death certificate. If we do that we might just as well abandon the idea of Democratic leadership and accept the leadership of those who want to cause chaos and confusion, of those who want to spread disorder and discontent, of those who to advance the interests of their own political and economic ideologies would permit the removal of rent ceilings and would permit the spiraling of prices—all under the guise of being advocates of price control.

There are things in this conference report, as I have said, which I do not approve, but I certainly am not going to take the position that I am 100 percent right in everything that I advocate insofar as OPA is concerned, and that I shall not take one thing less than the 100 percent that I demand. That does not go or tend for good legislation. If I cannot get all that I think should be had in the bill, then I certainly would be most foolish to reject the bill entirely if it gave me any considerable part of what I want and it certainly gives us, under the conference report, ceilings on foodstuffs and ceilings on rents, and that is what the people of my district need; that is what they want and that is what I am going to vote for.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I shall support this conference report. In doing so I wish to make it clear that I do not believe it will meet adequately the challenge of terrific inflationary pressures.

Under the circumstances, however, it is rather obvious that we must choose between this report and the very likely possibility of no control at all.

Many of those who want to abandon completely the battle against inflation and many others who wish tighter controls will no doubt oppose this report.

But if it should be voted down, then the chances are about 100 to 1 that we shall have no control after midnight Sunday.

In the fight against inflation I stand today where I stood in 1942 when I supported the original Gore bill for over-all price controls.

Those of us who have battled consistently for effective price control, properly administered, cannot help but fear there will be some rather sharp increases under the provisions of the pending conference report.

But without the bill before us, the situation would be worse. I shall, therefore, support the report brought back to the House by the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express what I believe is a widely shared appreciation for the work of the House conferees on this bill. By their diligent and conscientious labors they have brought to the House a better bill than either of the bills passed earlier.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not meet the desires of consumer organizations and Mr. Murray, president of the CIO. I am voting against this conference report. This is not OPA. This is a hoax being perpetrated upon the little man. Under this there will be no controls. This is pure inflation masquerading under the hypocrisy of OPA. There is not one bit of OPA left in this. Even the so-called ceilings to be maintained on food are taken out of OPA's hands and given to the Secretary of Agriculture. Anyone who votes for this bill is voting against the people and voting in favor of big interests, big corporations, big money, and big people.

This bill is an attempt to hoodwink the consumer. No one in his right mind who can read or write can differ from that conclusion.

It is now up to the President of the United States to veto this bill just as he vetoed the Case bill. The Case bill was supposed to be a labor bill but the public knew it was antilabor; this bill is supposed to be an OPA bill but it is anti-OPA, anti-consumer, anti-hold the line, anti-low prices—it is pure inflation.

From now on, unless the President vetoes it, there will be a runaway. By the time election rolls around the value of the dollar will be cut in half. The only way to stop inflation now is for the President to veto this bill and force the House and the Senate to pass a resolution continuing OPA in its present form with present controls.

I voted against every crippling amendment when this bill first came up weeks ago and I am voting against this now because this is the cripple.

Because Congress has not the courage to do the right thing, I refuse to do the wrong.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the conference report should be rejected. The bill is unworkable. It adds

confusion to confusion and chaos. In reading the bill, it does seem that someone in the OPA had a fine opportunity to write the conference report.

The Decontrol Board, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, is set up to handle industrial commodities. The Decontrol Board may act when a petition is presented to the Board under rules and regulations prescribed by the Board. The industry advisory committees are appointed under the law by the OPA. Many of these committees are no longer in existence. Members have resigned. The OPA seldom calls upon these committees for advice. It then follows that many segments of industry would have no access or means of presenting a petition to the Decontrol Board. If all advisory committees were functioning, the Decontrol Board would need thousands of individuals to hear their complaints. The Board would be so swamped with requests for price adjustments that it would be impossible for the Board to function within the time prescribed in the bill.

I oppose the bill also because meat and agricultural products are not decontrolled. The conference report sets up a greatly complicated method of decontrolling agricultural commodities. I do approve of the section of the bill which transfers to the Secretary of Agriculture the complete control of agricultural products. The Secretary of Agriculture must determine when the supply is equal to the demand. In my judgment the Secretary of Agriculture is no longer free to make his own honest opinion, he is merely a pawn in the hands of the CIO and other radicals in this administration. He is without a spine. In the question of meat, how would the Secretary of Agriculture determine how much meat was available to the consumer during any month or year since the black market has been in operation? The black market started in 1942.

The bill sets up a yardstick placing the years of June 30, 1940, to July 1, 1941, as a standard representing agricultural products. In the matter of milk, there is more milk produced now than in 1941. There is less butter produced now and the supply is diminishing because of OPA regulations. I am wondering if the bill would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to decontrol milk because more is produced now than in the years 1940–41. He can still say agricultural products are in short supply.

The question of meat is highly complicated. Would the Secretary of Agriculture decontrol meat on the basis of the number of cattle in the country or the amount of meat in the wholesale or retail trade?

The bill as written is entirely unworkable and would cause a revolt among the farmers and food processors handling agricultural products. The bill should be recommitted with instructions to strike from the bill all meat, dairy, and agricultural products.

The past history of the OPA is such that regardless of the type of law that Congress might pass, they proceed to interpret the law to suit their convenience. The OPA should be entirely abolished along with subsidies on consumer foods, and the American farmer and industry should be given a free hand to produce. Just as long as we keep the heavy heel of the OPA upon the neck of industry and the farmer, there will be continued difficulties in adjusting our economic problems.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, that in section 15 of the bill, it states:

> That the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, or otherwise, is hereby authorized to allocate feed, which he controls, to feeders of livestock and poultry in domestic areas, which he may determine to be an emergency shortage condition with respect to animal and poultry feed.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first step of seizing not only all agricultural products but all meat and everything produced by the farmer. He will be told what and when to plant, and where and when to sell. He will have nothing to say about how he shall conduct his business. This is a form of economic slavery unmatched except in Russia. This bill must be sent back to conference.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that there is no termination date on this, and that if they do not choose to be controlled this bill will go on and on and will not come back to Congress? In fact, it is a permanent OPA.

Mr. SPENCE. The act itself will expire on June 30, 1947. It is a 1-year extension.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have worked and fought for the continuance of the OPA. I believe in price control. I believe that to abandon price control at this time will be as disastrous to our economy as the atomic bomb was to Hiroshima.

I have spoken and pled for price control in meetings all over the country. As late as yesterday on a national hook-up, I urged the continuance of price control, but I cannot vote for a measure which according to the testimony given before the Senate committee and the Banking and Currency Committee of the House by Chester Bowles and Paul Porter, has amendments which leave nothing but the title OPA to protect the American people.

I do not consider that voting for this bill will give the American people a half loaf instead of a whole loaf, which is the argument of those in favor of the conference report. What the American people are being handed in this bill is a half loaf of illusion. Now you see it. Now you do not.

This bill is a control of the price controllers so that they cannot control prices.

This bill is an invitation to the mad marathon of inflation.

By the adoption of the cost absorption amendment alone requiring prices to be fixed to include increased costs all along the line in the manufacture and distribution of any commodity, this bill will produce a continuous spiral of higher prices so that no businessman will know from day to day what his costs are going to be.

I cannot insult the intelligence of the American people by voting for this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, we are today faced with a dilemma created when the House acted on the OPA extension bill several weeks ago. When we adopted several crippling amendments at that time we all but destroyed effective price control.

Today the sad results of that victory of special-interest groups is before us again. From the conference committee we have received a measure all too similar to the one which passed this House. The so-called Taft amendment is particularly dangerous.

But I do not particularly blame the conferees for the inadequate and dangerous bill which is in front of us. They had to deal with the various amendments which had passed the House and Senate. I believe they have given us the best bill they could construct from the mass of inflationary amendments which were in front of them.

I shall very reluctantly vote for this bill. Any other action today would simply mean that there was no bill on which the President could take action.

Should the President see fit to veto the bill and challenge the House to pass a sound price-control measure, I think he would be doing the people a real service.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, were it not for the fact that defeat of the conference report would end rent control on existing buildings, I would vote against it because all other OPA controls have brought the country nothing but high prices, black markets, and scarcities. I vote for the report with much reluctance.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this country is facing a deplorable situation in handling and marketing of livestock and meat products. In the early stages of the war the OPA seemed to exercise complete control of the meat products of this country—the Government control of the country's meat supply at the present time is an absolute failure—and must be changed and corrected.

Mr. Speaker, a telegram has just been placed in my hand from the management of one of the finest packing plants in Idaho—a business concern in which the people of Idaho take especial pride—this telegram indicates that there is a complete break-down in Government control of the livestock marketing and meat-packing industry which is submitted for the information of the Members of the House:

NAMPA, IDAHO, *June 26, 1946.*

COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building.

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Closed our plant Friday due to fact cannot buy cattle at legal

ceilings prescribed by OPA. Present control program has been abolished and ceilings on live cattle a failure. Certainly must urge you to consider voting for taking meats out from price control.

MARSHALL ANDERSON,
Kings Packing Co., Inc.
NAMPA, IDAHO.

Mr. Speaker, I know that with over twenty-nine billions of currency in circulation and millions of new money being placed in circulation every day—I know that if we are to maintain a stable national economy and protect the consumer, price controls are necessary, but, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote, if given an opportunity, to remove the control on marketing of livestock and meat and packing-house products. This bill should be recommitted and price controls on livestock and meat products removed.

Mr. Speaker, realizing the inflated condition of the currency—and the disastrous effect on business if all price controls are removed—I shall vote for the conference report.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, my choice here is a very difficult one. I am a believer in strong price controls—really effective controls. This conference report does not offer such controls. It is price control legislation in name only. To vote against it, I know I aline myself with those who do not want any controls whatsoever. Yet I cannot bring myself to vote for a bill which would have no effect at all. It would continue the OPA it is true, but it would be so hamstrung that it could not operate effectively. I believe that if we vote this conference report down, the Republicans and those who have been so vigorously opposing price controls will not wish to assume the onus and responsibility of killing price controls altogether. They will agree to a simple resolution extending the Price Control Act, at least until a new and better act can be worked out. Those opponents of price control do not want the American people to know of their opposition to controls, but would seek to delude them by passing the compromise bill under discussion, retaining only the name "price control." I will not be a party to such tactics.

I repel the company I now find myself in, but I must vote against this bill and trust that a better bill will result if the conference report is voted down.

Mr. RAYFIEL. Mr. Speaker, the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Price Control Act has submitted recommendations which make virtually impossible of enforcement its few remaining controls. By them the law will be stripped of the effective weapons which have prevented inflation and saved our national economy.

While I am mindful of the most urgent necessity of price controls, particularly with regard to articles and services which are in short supply, I feel that the conference report will give to the people of the Nation an act which will be so barren of all practical value that I cannot conscientiously support it.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have always supported price control, with the firm conviction that if properly administered it would prevent, or at least restrain, the forces of inflation. This bill, as it comes from conference, will not do that, and I cannot support it. The bill is a sham and a pretense, to deceive the American people who are looking to the Congress to safeguard them from rising living costs and excessive prices in this transition period. The Congress can do that by enacting sound, workable price-control legislation.

The conferees' bill would encourage inflation and delay full production at a time when just the opposite is needed. There is not a person in this country who will not feel the effects of unchecked inflation; and if the Congress enacts this legislation, it is going to have to answer to everyone for the disastrous conditions which will inevitably result.

Price control is ruined.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H. R. 6042 falls far short of the requirement for satisfactory price-control legislation. I opposed the crippling amendments which were adopted in the House several weeks ago. The enemies of price control have succeeded in weakening this legislation to such an extent that prices are certain to rise on some commodities.

Speaker RAYBURN, Majority Leader MCCORMACK, and the chairman of the committee, Congressman SPENCE, have each declared on the floor of the House this afternoon that if this conference report is not adopted our country will be without any price-control legislation. The Speaker was very emphatic in stating that a continuing resolution of the present price-control law would not be adopted by the Senate.

In order to retain some protection for the consumers of this country, especially as to rents and other essentials still embodied in this bill, I am going to cast my vote for the conference report.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, when the extension of price control was before the House originally I voted against the amendments which I thought were crippling. I then voted to send the bill to the Senate notwithstanding the fact that those amendments were still in the bill as it passed the House.

I stated then that I would vote against the bill on final passage unless the Senate produced a better bill than that which passed the House. I do not think the Senate bill, nor the result of the conference report, is, to any appreciable extent, superior to the bill as it passed the House.

Therefore, I have voted against the conference report. It will not control prices—only provide jobs for people in the OPA. As for rent control, you cannot let everything the landlord buys for his personal use or for the maintenance of his property rise 50 percent without increasing rents. So that is a poor excuse to support the conference report.

The administration owed a duty to put through effective price control. It has failed in that duty. I will not, by my vote, condone that failure or assist in the perpetration of a fraud—price control in name only.

Mrs. MANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is pretty much of a farce. We have inflation already but it has been controlled to some extent. This measure takes off practically all restraint and I believe will precipitate a disastrous rise in prices.

While it offers little hope for controlling inflation, I voted for it as it was this or nothing, but in my opinion we are now headed inevitably for a postwar period that will be a case of boom and bust.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when Congress must deal with the realities of life. We are either to provide legislation which will furnish the people with vital foods through legal channels, or we are forcing them to go into the black market and buy meat, poultry, and dairy products at inflationary prices. I urge that this conference report be returned to the conference committee for the purpose of decontrolling meat, poultry, and dairy products. This is the only manner in which these vital foods can be taken away from the black market and restored to legitimate production, marketing, and distribution channels at reasonable prices to the people.

As matters now stand, 90 percent of all meat has passed into black-market channels, and shortly, if present policies are continued, poultry, eggs, and dairy products will follow suit.

I am interested in the consumers of America who demand meat, dairy, and poultry products at reasonable prices from legitimate dealers. As I see it, the continuation of the policies of Chester Bowles, who has paid lip service to abundant production, but who has in fact put into operation policies to drastically curtail production, will cause the black market to flourish under legal OPA maladministration. The people do not want to eat statistical meat or dairy products. They want red meat, butter, and milk. We have the opportunity to legislate for the consumers today, and I therefore again urge that the conference report be returned to the conference committee for further consideration.

I definitely know that the conference committee can write provisions into the law which will continue price control but at the same time direct the initiation of policies by the Administration which will encourage production and stop inflation. Abundant production is the only remedy to stop inflation, and Congress must speak for the people to reach such an objective before it is too late.

I voted for the price-control bill when it came up in the House, and it was my hope that the Senate would have concurred in the House amendments, but this was not done. I feel that there is a need for the right kind of a price-control law to curb inflation. Had the original price-control law been properly administered by Chester Bowles the tragic situation confronting the country in its food crisis would not have taken place. Mr. Bowles did not administer the law in accordance with the intent of Congress. He disregarded the law and, as I see it, purposely created scarcities of vital products as an excuse to remain in power for the purpose of controlling the lives and business of every American

citizen. No one man, whether it be Chester Bowles or any other individual, is big enough to direct or control the destiny of our economic system. Therefore, it is up to Congress to write a law that will restore production, which is the only remedy to stop inflation.

I do not know what the final vote will be on the conference report, but I do want to say this: My single purpose in voting to send the conference report back to the committee is to give that committee an opportunity to rewrite its report and to make clear that Congress means what it says when it insists on the initiation of policies to bring about full production of all foods and civilian goods. Of course, should Mr. Bowles resign, the President may give the Secretary of Agriculture sufficient power under the report to realistically deal with the food crisis, and if this is done I am satisfied that we can secure a return to full production without the need for many amendments to the present price-control law. We are legislating today against maladministration, and not against the original Price Control Act as written by Congress.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, in Washington, at the Mayflower Hotel, the Director of Economic Stabilization, Chester Bowles, speaking before 1,000 women of the District of Columbia, stated and declared:

If Congress compromises the OPA out of authority and power, no matter how hard we try—

Meaning the agency of Price Control—

we can't keep down disastrous inflation.

Do we not know we have it now, in the black market?

Pointing out that Washington is packed with lobbyists determined to get what they can and destroy OPA, "come what may." Seems that the voice of the American people can be heard only dimly here, since it is drowned out by special interest groups.

Has it come to the point in life where it is a sin for a citizen to fight for his right—and probably un-American to try and stay in business, according to Mr. Bowles' statement?

The only lobbyists I have seen around here are people whose promotion of activities comes from and is augmented by the OPA.

Honest business people, who have to come to Washington seeking redress of right, in order that they may remain in business, have no right to protest against the methods that are being used by this and other agencies that are constantly stifling business, according to Mr. Bowles.

In a speech of the 21st day of June 1945, I said that the maladministration of the OPA was causing the black-market operations in the meat industry.

And I cited a specific case of slaughters on that day, whereby the nonprocessing slaughterer was actually losing $10.95 on every head of cattle he slaughtered that was graded A–1 beef. That condition has been the cause of many reputable packing plants having to almost suspend their operations. Many of them now are holding on in hopes that some level-headed action may be taken before all the legitimate packers are forced to close completely.

What little operation is in process today is for the purpose of keeping their forces together. For the matter of profits is not the principal concern with these people today. The difficulties are the loss of long-established business, due to pitifully light livestock slaughter, volume lost to thousands of black-market operators and some new, unscrupulous slaughterers who are nothing more than opportunists, many of whom do not even apply for subsidies.

This practice of operations has caused the loss of important byproducts, such as hearts, livers, tongues, bones, fats, grease, and animal glands that are so badly needed for pharmaceutical purposes.

Yes, even the hides are buried in the ground, for a black-market operator cannot market the hide, because he knows the marketing of these byproducts will disclose his illegitimate business. These byproducts, which are so essential to the people—for we shall wake up some one of these days with a terrific shortage of leather—and no shoes or leather goods.

Unemployment is constantly on the increase in the packing districts all over this Nation. Because of the slow-down in operations, the average worker does not get a full week's time, which, naturally, reduces his take-home money. And the stockyard worker cannot get employment with the black-market slaughterer, because he operates outside of cities.

I have heard many employees claim that the packers are purposely curtailing operations to break unions. That is a false impression, because legitimate slaughterers have to comply with OPA and War Food Administration regulations and cannot compete with the black-market operator, because they are paying up to fifty or seventy-five cents per hundredweight alive more for cattle and livestock than the legitimate slaughterer can pay, thus putting them over OPA live compliance regulations.

This practice is well known by these governmental agencies, for they have been told about it many times, yet nothing ever happens.

We now have a black market in meat. Notwithstanding near-record livestock numbers on ranches and farms, we have an acute shortage of meat in most large consumer centers, brought about by the black-market maldistribution. These unscrupulous operators are now charging for inferior meat all the consumer will pay to get it.

It is as certain as you and I are here assembled that consumers will not pay legitimate operators as much per pound, with meat in abundance.

Most of us are familiar with the methods used by the distributors in the purchase of this meat. The consumer goes to the market to make a purchase and unless she is well known to the butcher, as an old customer, she is told, "Sorry, we have no meat today." Or, if it is on display, she is told that it has all been sold, or has been ordered by customers early in the morning, or she may be told to go around to the back door, and there she will get her meat from an out-of-the-pocket transaction.

The butcher, while not a criminal, has also taken advantage of a serious situation, and he is out to get his share of the profits. The consumer, anxious to acquire meat for the family, pays more than she should.

We doubt whether any group of men can devise a system of price control for this complex industry and its multitudinous products which would not create a black market. However, we do not need to argue this point.

The Office of Price Administration, by its price policy, has created a black market which cannot now be corrected by a mere revision of livestock or meat prices. It, together with the War Food Administration, has been apparent that profit control, rather than price control, has been the principal objective of both these agencies of government.

In the face of indisputable evidence that its policy was and is forcing legitimate meat packers out of business and otherwise dislocating the supply of livestock and meat, these two agencies have stubbornly and persistently refused to abandon its theory that as long as the over-all profits of the industry, before taxes, were as large as such profits in the year of 1939, then individual meat prices were "generally fair and equitable."

The Office of Price Administration was fully aware that there were included in these over-all earnings large income wholly unrelated to the domestic meat business, such as foreign earnings, earnings from fertilizers, mineral cleansing powders, sports and athletic equipment, vegetable oils, soaps, acids, pharmaceutical products, butter, cheese, ice cream, poultry, eggs, and other products, none of which accrue to hundreds of meat packing companies who, therefore, must choose between bankruptcy, closing down, curtailing operations, or entering the black market.

I have a case now before the War Food Administration that clearly explains black-market operations and shows that this agency is helping the black-market operators, not any individual in particular, but because of a new order to curtail the slaughter of livestock, known as War Food Order 75.7 Livestock Slaughter Restriction.

And here again a Government agency is now curtailing production of food, while other agencies of the Government are preaching from the mountain tops for more production—that we must have food—food to feed a starving world—but what they are actually doing is destroying legitimate business.

Yet, in issuing War Food Order 75.7, the OPA not only curtails legitimate slaughterers of swine, but helps promote a most serious situation which is developing in the hog market and pork business, and unless the causes thereof are removed promptly an increasingly large percentage of the hog and pork business also will be black market. Many pork packers already are forced to operate at only a small percent of the normal production and in some areas have ceased all pork operations.

We who went through the bootlegging era know the disrespect for law and order, and how cheaply life was held by unscrupulous individuals. Well, a new field of get-rich-quick has sprung up overnight, only this new adventure is dealing with the most needed product of today—food.

Bootlegging and black marketing are twin brothers. The consumers of our Nation no longer feel that they are under a patriotic obligation to observe unnecessary wartime restrictions.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I have voted for extension of the Price Control Act each time it has been before us Two months ago I voted against most of the amendments adopted by this House because I believed they went too far and would serve to destroy price control rather than to improve its effectiveness, which is what I want and what I believe the country wants and needs.

There is plenty to support the position that it would be better to abolish the OPA entirely than to have it continue in the same impractical and unrealistic fashion as so often in the past. However, I believe it would be still better for our whole economy if we can get the OPA to operate more flexibly in order to get maximum production and thus be able to discontinue price control gradually as supply approaches demand.

This bill agreed on in conference has a good chance of achieving that end. It is better than last year's law or than either the bill passed by the Senate or the one passed by us. It does not change the basic philosophy or purposes of the original Price Control Act which prescribed that prices be fair and equitable. It sets up a mechanism to require that OPA operate according to that act wherever it has not done so hitherto.

When the administration bought off the steel strike by raising the price of steel $5 a ton, one of the top OPA price executives said to a friend of mine, "There goes the last chance of effective price control." He was right in the sense that there was no longer any chance of holding the old line which had been kept remarkably stable for almost 3 years. Our problem and OPA's immediately became one of trying to establish and hold the new price line made necessary by the wage break-through engineered by the administration.

Our objective always has been and is to get those price adjustments necessary to effect maximum production, but no more. That is where legitimate costs have gone up 10 percent, we know prices must go up accordingly or the manufacturer will stop producing the commodity—but we do not want the prices to go up 15 percent or 30 percent or 50 percent as might very well happen for a time if this conference report is voted down and we have no price control at all.

I believe that extension of the OPA operating along these lines is necessary if we are to win the fight against runaway inflation. This bill, if faithfully administered, should enable us to reconvert to a genuinely free economy with a minimum of shock and hardship to all concerned. Therefore, I hope the report will be adopted.

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, preventing further increases in the cost of living for the American people is one of the most important problems before the Congress. Since becoming a Member of Congress I have fought for a strong OPA. When the original bill came before the House of Representatives I voted against every amendment designed to permit price increases. I know that the people of the Thirteenth District in Los Angeles want me to continue my fight against inflation.

Mr. Speaker, this emasculated OPA bill which is before us today is going to make it impossible for prices to be kept at their present level. This bill is an invitation to economic disaster. I cannot vote for such a bill. By a simple joint resolution Congress can extend an effective OPA.

This is supposed to be a measure to control prices, to prevent further inflation. Last April this House effectively took most of that purpose out of the bill; this measure will complete the job. Under it, prices will increase rather than stand still—and when that happens no act of Congress can, or should, prevent the workingman from demanding a comparable increase in his income. By passage of this bill we will have encouraged a new wave of labor unrest and strikes.

Should this bill pass, I predict that by September or October of this year the American people will already be feeling the full pinch of inflation.

Certainly OPA is crippled—it has been badly crippled by the forces who have put profits ahead of their country. But the passage of this bill will not help that cripple—it will take away its last crutch. I urge the defeat of this bill. We should then pass a bill giving the OPA authority to hold the line on prices.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I intend no reflection upon the conferees in saying that I shall vote for the conference report with great reluctance. While an improvement over the Senate bill, the bill reported by the conference will not enable the OPA to deal effectively with the pressures bearing down upon the price structure. A general price increase is now inevitable. In spite of this, I shall support the conference report because it is the only alernative offering even a semblance of control. It is the conference bill or no legislation at all, and I am unwilling to share responsibility for complete abandonment of controls.

I have consistently supported the price-control program and in spite of its irritations I have insisted that OPA should be retained until inflation threats disappear.

In my opinion the Banking Committee reported an acceptable bill and I regretted that the House adopted a series of weakening amendments. I supported the amended bill, however, in the hope that further investigations would result in an improved measure in the Senate and in conference.

Today we must choose between the conference bill and death for OPA, for obviously a simple extension of the law will not be possible.

How great the increase in living costs will be under this bill is not ascertainable. It will be substantial but if all interests will think less of the price factor and work together for full production we can come through with no grave consequences. It will require more than half-hearted cooperation, however, and we can keep ahead of the inflation evil only by an all-out production program.

The outcome will be determined not so much by administrative efficiency in the executive agencies as by the spirit in which everyone accepts the new policies and works without interruption for the kind of production that will destroy inflation dangers.

PRICE CONTROL A MYTH AND A TRAP

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, just as surely as one and one make two, an unusual volume of money in circulation and a below-normal production of merchandise brings inflation; an increase in prices and higher living costs.

During the war, the production of goods used by civilians, the construction of homes and other buildings, was to a large degree of necessity suspended. Thus was created a Nation-wide scarcity of those items.

The necessity of the speedy construction of buildings for the use of the armed forces; the urgent demand for the immediate production of munitions of war, including vehicles of all kinds, planes and ships, forced the employment at unusually high wages of millions of workers in war industries; thus withdrawing them from the production of goods ordinarily needed and purchased by a civilian population and, at the same time, placing in the hands of the workers an unprecedented volume of purchasing power, created largely either directly or indirectly out of Federal appropriations obtained through the selling of war bonds.

The shipping of millions of tons of food, clothing, supplies of all kinds, to our own men abroad and to our allies but increased the scarcity of things ordinarily supplied to and used by a people and which is inevitable in every war.

Germany surrendered on May 6, 1945; Japan, the following August. Our country should then immediately have turned its attention, directed its energy, toward the solution of its domestic problems; the restoration of its domestic economy, a speedy reconversion of its productive machinery from the war effort to the supplying of our own people with the merchandise for which they had so long waited and which they had ample funds to buy.

Unfortunately, the administration, to obtain the political support of labor politicians and, it thought, of the members of some unions, issued the absurd statement that wages could be increased 24 percent without increasing the price of the manufactured product.

Due to the appropriation by the Federal Government of billions of dollars, not only for the war but, since the fighting ended, for this, that, and the other purpose, which funds it had obtained through the selling of bonds—borrowed money—there is now in the hands of would-be purchasers cash spending power of more than two hundred and

twenty-five billions—more than three times as much as there was in 1939 and, in addition, more than $100,000,000,000 of Government security available for cash borrowing.

The volume of money now in circulation is almost five times what it ever was at any previous period in our history.

That fact, coupled with the loss of production due to strikes and the senseless regulations of OPA which have prevented production, are sufficient to give us runaway inflation.

To make the situation worse, the administration and the internationalists insist upon increasing the scarcity, upon diminishing the supply of available merchandise of all kinds, by shipping abroad millions of feet of building material; millions of tons of food and clothing; millions of tons and billions of dollars' worth of machinery—thus giving us an ever greater scarcity of the essentials of life, of those things which we must have if the cost of living is to go down.

The administration and its political allies, the labor politicians, are not content to permit our productive machinery to function normally. They insist upon increasing wages. They demand that the price of the articles upon which they work be held down, even though every item going into the cost is increased.

They demand that the life of OPA continue. They ignore the fact—wilfully ignore the fact—that, although the fighting ended in Germany on May 6, 1945, and Japan surrendered on August 14, 1945, and, although, since that time, OPA has exercised arbitrary power over the production, transportation, and distribution of food, of more than a million items in everyday use, prices have continued to advance until today they are at an all-time high.

That the administration is determined to create a scarcity here in America is evidenced by release No. 46A issued by Chester Bowles this morning.

In that release he made it clear that he would prevent, if possible, the payment of subsidies to the slaughterers of cattle who did not set aside for foreign shipment the tonnage of meat designated by an administrative agency.

That release is proof positive of a fact which many of us have long known; that is, that this administration is determined that, come weal or woe to our own people, they are to be compelled to feed and clothe all those of other nations who, regardless of their need or their ability to sustain themselves, ask us for charity.

The policy Bowles is following today is the same as that followed by administrative agencies during the war. The OPA would issue a regulation or a directive which it had no legal authority to enforce. Then it would call upon and receive the aid of either the War Labor Board or the War Production Board, which would blackjack the American citizen or corporation into complying with the nonenforceable order of Mr. Bowles and his OPA.

That is government by intimidation, by coercion. That is the kind of government Hitler imposed. That is the kind of government we are now getting from the present administration. Unwittingly Bowles is playing into the hands of the Communists.

Not only has price-fixing proven itself to be a myth, but it is a snare and a delusion—a trap into which our people have fallen.

Why? Because today, regardless of the price, necessities which we must have if we are to live and maintain ourselves, to say nothing of helping other nations, are disappearing from the market.

Long years ago, Wallace brought about the killing of the little pigs and the old sows; the plowing under of the cotton; the restriction of the acreage devoted to the production of wheat, corn, and other farm crops, and yesterday in Washington a morning newspaper carried a streamer across the front page, "Not one meatball in sight in District."

The news story in all the papers yesterday and today is to the effect that the District is without beef; that there is a negligible supply of lamb and pork, a decreasing volume of poultry; almost no butter; but little bread, and the prices of fresh fruit and vegetables are going up.

It is no longer a question of price, but a question of ability to buy. OPA and Chester Bowles, its operator, are responsible in part for the fact that the cost of living has gone up. They are directly and almost wholly responsible for the fact that needed supplies cannot today be purchased at any price.

It is no longer a question of "What is the price?" The question which today confronts every housewife is, "Where can I buy it?"

OPA should be kicked out the window—this in spite of the fact that we know that, because of the administration's restrictive policies, its give-away policy, its determination to ship abroad so much of the many things we need here at home, prices will continue to rise and, unless it mends its ways, our economy will be completely wrecked.

The only real remedy for the high cost of living—the only cure for inflation—is a return to a free economy; the noninterference of Government agencies with the operation of the law of supply and demand.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to continue OPA for at least 1 year without crippling amendments. For that reason on April 17 last, I voted against every amendment which I thought would weaken OPA in its efforts to hold the line against the rising cost of living. Although on April 17 when the OPA extension bill was before the House for amendment I was very careful to vote against such crippling amendments, most of them carried in spite of my vote and thus helped to shape what was to my mind a very unsatisfactory House version of the bill.

The bill as the House passed it last April was unsatisfactory, but even so, I voted for it on final passage. Some of my constituents wondered why I did so and criticized me for voting to pass such an unsatisfactory bill. I had to explain to them that my vote even for that unsatisfactory bill was a vote friendly to OPA, because the parliamentary situation required the House to pass some measure on which the Senate and the later conference committee could work or there would be no extension of OPA legislation, and thus there would be no OPA at all after June 30, 1946. Now, that was the impelling reason then that I voted for an unsatisfactory OPA extension bill last April when it came to a final passage in the House.

In April, when I saw one crippling amendment after another being added to the OPA bill, in spite of my vote against them all, I consoled myself that the other body would probably exercise better judgment than the House had exercised in drafting its version of the OPA extension. I cannot say that the Senate version of the bill was any more satisfactory to my mind than the House version. I know that the conferees have worked hard and earnestly trying to make something satisfactory and a worthy piece of legislation out of what seemed to me two unsatisfactory versions.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not satisfied with the measure now presented to us by the conferees. However, there is no chance to amend it under our rules and I must either vote it up or vote it down. Wanting as I do to continue price control on the necessities of life, for at least a limited period until supply and demand can be more nearly equalized, I find myself today in about the same predicament which I was in last April in regard to this vote.

I feel inclined to vote "no" on accepting the conference report as I feel that it is a fake OPA extension measure; however, it may be better than I think. The Administration leaders have taken the floor to urge us to vote for this bill even though we do not feel satisfied with it. We are told by our House leaders on the Democratic side that this is the best we can hope to get, and it is either this or nothing. I believe that to be the case. I believe that if this bill is voted down, or if it is passed and the President should veto it, in either case, I am sure there would be no extension of OPA in any form after June 30. So I am about where I was last April. I must vote for this bill, or OPA will expire by limitation in less than a week's time and certainly now there is no other chance to extend it in a safer form.

I listened earnestly to what my colleague from California, [Mr. OUTLAND] said in fixing the blame for the unsafe and unsatisfactory features of this legislation. He spoke exactly what was on my mind. I feel sure that under this legislation the country will experience a dangerous and cruel rise in the cost of living, surpassing anything that we have known during the war. Who will be blamed by the millions of American citizens for passing legislation that will bring about such a calamity? And who will really be to blame?

Of course, the administration party which has the majority vote in both Houses of Congress will get the credit and the blame. Who should get the blame for the ill effects of this legislation upon the American economy and standards of life certain to occur during

the coming 12 months? The gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] thinks, and I agree with him, that the blame should fall in large part upon the Members of the House who voted on roll-call vote for those crippling amendments last April 17. Of course, some crippling amendments were added in the Senate. However, I am specifically referring my constituents who wanted a strong OPA continued, to the roll-call vote taken in this Chamber on amendments to the OPA extension bill on last April 17. The study of those votes will make interesting and profitable reading during the next 12 months.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that a matter which so materially affects the future of the United States should come to the floor under a conference report with so little time for discussion. The report still brings to us unsettled problems of administration, for example, the demands upon the Secretary of Agriculture requiring him to furnish statistics upon which his decisions shall be based are, in my opinion, difficult to carry out, because under present conditions, particularly in the meat industry, those statistics are not available to him. The meat is not going through the channels which provide the figures.

More important, this bill, so far as the control board is concerned, resembles an election in Russia. In Russia you can vote for any candidate you want, but the only person on the ticket is the one candidate of Mr. Stalin. Here we have a decontrol board apparently given broad powers, but as I read the bill—and I shall be glad to be corrected if this is not so—the only way an appeal can come to the decontrol board is to go through the advisory committees, already set up and under the influence of Mr. Bowles.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield willingly to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I say to the gentleman that that is not the case.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Can an appeal go direct to the Decontrol Board from industry or agriculture?

Mr. WOLCOTT. A petition is made to the Decontrol Board that the standards have not been complied with, and the matter is heard de novo before the Decontrol Board. In other words, where there is no industry advisory committee, any individual can raise the issue whether or not the standards have been complied with in a protest, and that protest may go to the Emergency Court of Appeals, and by certiorari to the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am glad to have the gentleman's explanation, but I suggest that the confusion still exists. Apparently, if an advisory committee does exist, the appeal must pass through it to the Decontrol Board.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the remarks that have been made here on the conference report this afternoon and I have been waiting for someone to say something about the consumers of America. It seems to me that we in this Congress have been giving a great deal of consideration to one portion of our economy but that there has been very little consideration given to those who are going to have to foot the bill. Those on fixed incomes are especially going to be affected. People have asked me how I was going to vote on this measure, and I had to give them the same answer that a great many other Members of the House have also given, that is, I did not know. It is a choice between two evils; that is obvious. The choice is bad, but the badness, the evil in it, came long before the conference report. The badness, Mr. Speaker, came out at the time when we added eight amendments to the bill here in this House when the price-control bill was up. Those who really favored a strong price-control bill opposed every one of these crippling amendments.

I am going to vote for this conference report, but I am going to do it in the hope that by so doing I shall be able to contribute toward saving a little bit for the consumers of this country—not a great deal, I admit. It might be a good thing if this thing were voted down and the American people knew just who was responsible for killing price control in America. It might be that that would be a good thing. I do not know. But as long as there is a chance to save anything at all, my vote and my work are going to be for saving that little that we can save. Already Congress has taken a long step forward, breaking the price-control line, already we are on our way toward boom and burst. However, by defeating this conference report, we would be doing more harm than good.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Speaking for myself as one who believes that effective price control is still necessary, I think the gentleman has taken the only sound position that can be taken at this time.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

There is a temptation, I admit, for a great many of us to vote against this report and place the blame for raising prices squarely where that blame belongs, but as long as there is some chance to save something, Mr. Speaker, I expect to vote for the conference report. My vote will be made reluctantly; but I would feel that I was tossing away even that small chance that still remains, should I join with the opponents of all price control and vote against this report. I repeat, I shall vote for what I sincerely believe to be the lesser of two evils.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from North Carolina. I found in my congressional district and in the district adjoining that they had just completed plowing under approximately one-quarter of a million dollars worth of very fine lettuce, based on the cost of production. Just this last week they have plowed up thousands of tons of the finest cabbage you ever saw I visited the fields and saw it myself. They had no market for them. Yesterday it was estimated that there were 3,200 carloads of potatoes for which there is absolutely no market except the Government's buying them and either dumping them or carrying such of them as they can use to the alcohol plants. In California they are dumping them in the woods, and the California Members know it. Let some of these folks who say that the justification for continuing the OPA is scarcity of food, justify these facts. There is probably a need for some sensible regulation with a few items, but apparently the OPA folks do not know how to be reasonable, fair, or sensible. It seems that their desire for power and an opportunity to exercise it exceeds their desire to be helpful, reasonable, and fair public servants. A most regrettable situation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this comparatively brief period to call the attention of the House to a communication I received this morning. It reads as follows:

> Mr. CONGRESSMAN: The proposed OPA bill would make a mockery of price control.
>
> I strongly urge you to support a new bill to extend OPA for a full year without any amendments.
>
> Name: Joseph W. Kelley, Jr.
>
> Address: 59 Putnam Street, Somerville 43, Mass.
>
> Sponsored by: Communist Party of Massachusetts, 80 Boyiston Street, Boston 16.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to our distinguished and able Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], to close the debate.

Mr. COOPER assumed the chair.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I shall take only a moment. We have in this Chamber this afternoon a most peculiar situation. Two elements are warring against this conference report. One of those want no price control at all. If this conference report is voted down, they will have their way. Others say that they want more control than is contained in this bill. If this conference report is voted down, they will get nothing because there will not, in my opinion, be any price-control legislation at all. If this House will not vote up this conference report, it certainly will not vote for a continuing resolution and continue the law as it now stands. Even though the House were to pass a continuing resolution, the leader of the Senate is doubtful if it has a chance on earth to pass there. So if we want to control any kind of food prices and if we want to control rents and not have people turned out into the streets—as they will be turned out—the only alternative is to vote up this conference report. The responsibility is here. I will not, as far as I am concerned, by my vote here this afternoon shoulder the responsibility of killing all price control.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet seeking recognition in order to offer a motion to recommit and I also addressed the Speaker, saying that I had a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman says he was on his feet seeking recognition, of course, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. What is the parliamentary situation with reference to the decision of the House in having ordered the yeas and nays?

The SPEAKER. That will come later.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The SPEAKER. Yes; if the matter reaches that point.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RIZLEY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RIZLEY moves to recommit the bill to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to remove all controls from livestock, dairy, meat, and meat products.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RIZLEY) there were—ayes 108, noes 181.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 151, nays 220, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

YEAS—151

Abernethy	Carlson	Fellows
Adams	Case, S. Dak.	Fernandez
Allen, Ill.	Chenoweth	Fisher
Andersen, H. Carl	Chiperfield	Fuller
Andresen, August H.	Church	Gearhart
Arends	Clevenger	Gillette
Arnold	Clippinger	Gillie
Bailey	Cole, Kans.	Goodwin
Barden	Cole, Mo.	Gossett
Barrett, Wyo.	Cole, N. Y.	Grant, Ind.
Bennett, Mo.	Cooley	Griffiths
Bishop	Cunningham	Gross
Brehm	Curtis	Gwinn, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	D'Ewart	Gwynne, Iowa
Brumbaugh	Dirksen	Hagen
Buck	Dolliver	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Buffett	Dworshak	Harness, Ind.
Byrnes, Wis.	Elliott	Hendricks
Campbell	Ellis	Henry
Cannon, Mo.	Elsworth	Hess
	Elston	Hill
	Ervin	
	Fellows	
	Fernandez	
	Fisher	
	Fuller	
	Gearhart	
	Gillette	
	Gillie	
	Goodwin	
	Gossett	
	Grant, Ind.	
	Griffiths	
	Gross	
	Gwinn, N. Y.	
	Gwynne, Iowa	
	Hagen	
	Hall, Edwin Arthur	
	Harness, Ind.	
	Hendricks	
	Henry	
	Hess	
	Hill	
Hoeven	McMillen, Ill.	Schwabe, Mo.
Hoffman, Mich.	Mahon	Schwabe, Okla.
Hoffman, Pa.	Martin, Iowa	Scrivner
Holmes, Mass.	Mason	Shafer
Hope	Merrow	Sharp
Horan	Miller, Nebr.	Short
Howell	Mundt	Sikes
Hull	Murray, Tenn.	Simpson, Ill.
Jenkins	Murray, Wis.	Simpson, Pa.
Jennings	Norblad	Smith, Ohio
Jensen	O'Hara	Smith, Wis.
Johnson, Ill.	O'Konski	Springer
Johnson, Ind.	Peterson, Fla.	Stefan
Jones	Phillips	Stockman
Jonkman	Pittenger	Sumner, Ill.
Keefe	Ploeser	Sumners, Tex.
Kelly, Ill.	Plumley	Taber
Kilburn	Price, Fla.	Talle
Kilday	Randolph	Thomas, N. J.
Kinzer	Rankin	Vursell
Knutson	Reed, Ill.	Wadsworth
Landis	Reed, N. Y.	Weichel
Lanham	Rees, Kans.	White
Larcade	Rich	Whitten
Lea	Rivers	Wilson
LeFevre	Rizley	Winter
Lemke	Robsion, Ky.	Wood
McCowen	Rockwell	Woodruff
McGregor	Rogers, Fla.	
McMillan, S. C.	Russell	

NAYS—220

Allen, La.	Gallagher	Manasco
Andrews, Ala.	Gamble	Mankin
Angell	Gardner	Marcantonio
Auchincloss	Gary	Martin, Mass.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gathings	Mathews
Barrett, Pa.	Gavin	May
Barry	Geelan	Michener
Bates, Ky.	Gerlach	Mills
Beall	Gifford	Monroney
Beckworth	Gordon	Morgan
Bender	Gore	Morrison
Biemiller	Gorski	Murdock
Blackney	Graham	Murphy
Bland	Granahan	Neely
Bloom	Green	O'Brien, Ill.
Bolton	Gregory	O'Brien, Mich.
Bonner	Hale	O'Neal
Brooks	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Toole
Brown, Ga.	Hancock	Outland
Bryson	Hand	Pace
Buchanan	Hare	Patman
Buckley	Harless, Ariz.	Patterson
Bulwinkle	Hart	Pfeifer
Bunker	Hartley	Philbin
Butler	Havenner	Pickett
Byrne, N. Y.	Hays	Poage
Canfield	Healy	Powell
Carnahan	Hébert	Pratt
Case, N. J.	Hedrick	Price, Ill.
Celler	Heffernan	Priest
Chapman	Herter	Quinn, N. Y.
Chelf	Heselton	Rabaut
Clark	Hinshaw	Rabin
Clason	Hobbs	Rains
Clements	Hoch	Ramey
Combs	Hook	Rayfiel
Cooper	Huber	Resa
Corbett	Jarman	Richards
Courtney	Johnson, Calif.	Riley
Cox	Johnson, Luther A.	Robertson, Va.
Cravens	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rodgers, Pa.
Crosser	Johnson, Okla.	Roe, N. Y.
D'Alesandro	Judd	Rogers, Mass.
Daughton, Va.	Kean	Rogers, N. Y.
Davis	Kearney	Rowan
Dawson	Kefauver	Ryter
Delaney, James J.	Kelley, Pa.	Sabath
Delaney, John J.	Keogh	Sadowski
Dingell	King	Sasscer
Domengeaux	Kirwan	Savage
Dondero	Klein	Sheppard
Doughton, N. C.	Kopplemann	Sheridan
Douglas, Calif.	Kunkel	Slaughter
Douglas, Ill.	LaFollette	Smith, Maine
Drewry	Lane	Smith, Va.
Durham	Latham	Somers, N. Y.
Earthman	Lesinski	Spence
Eaton	Lewis	Starkey
Eberharter	Link	Sullivan
Elsaesser	Luce	Sundstrom
Engle, Calif.	Lyle	Talbot
Fallon	Lynch	Tarver
Feighan	McConnell	Taylor
Fenton	McCormack	Thom
Flannagan	McDonough	Thomas, Tex.
Flood	McGlinchey	Thomason
Fogarty	McKenzie	Tibbott
Folger	Madden	Towe
Forand	Maloney	Traynor
Fulton		Trimble
		Voorhis, Calif.
		Vorys, Ohio
Walter	Whittington	Wolverton, N. J.
Wasielewski	Wigglesworth	Woodhouse
Weaver	Wolcott	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—61

Almond	Gibson	Patrick
Anderson, Calif.	Gillespie	Peterson, Ga.
Andrews, N. Y.	Granger	Reece, Tenn.
Baldwin, Md.	Grant, Ala.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Robinson, Utah
Bell	Harris	Roe, Md.
Bennet, N. Y.	Holifield	Rooney
Boren	Holmes, Wash.	Sparkman
Boykin	Izac	Stevenson
Bradley, Mich.	Jackson	Stewart
Bradley, Pa.	Kee	Stigler
Camp	Kerr	Tolan
Cannon, Fla.	LeCompte	Torrens
Cochran	Ludlow	Vinson
Coffee	McGehee	Welch
Colmer	Mansfield, Mont.	West
Crawford	Mansfield, Tex.	Wickersham
Curley	Miller, Calif.	Winstead
De Lacy	Norrell	Wolfenden, Pa.
Doyle	Norton	Worley
Engel, Mich.		

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Andrews of New York.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Bennet of New York

Mr. Norrell with Mr. Holmes of Washington.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Coffee with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Jackson with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Welch.

Mr. De Lacy with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. JONES and Mr. KILBURN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thought the vote was on the conference report. I change my vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have already been ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 265, nays 105, answered "present" 1, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

YEAS—265

Abernethy	Bryson	Corbett
Allen, La.	Buchanan	Courtney
Andersen, H. Carl	Buck	Cox
Andrews, Ala.	Buckley	Cravens
Angell	Bulwinkle	Crosser
Auchincloss	Bunker	Cunningham
Bailey	Butler	D'Alesandro
Barrett, Pa.	Byrne, N. Y.	Daughton, Va.
Barry	Campbell	Davis
Bates, Ky.	Canfield	Dawson
Beall	Cannon, Mo.	Delaney, James J.
Beckworth	Carnahan	Delaney, John J.
Bender	Case, N. J.	D'Ewart
Bennett, Mo.	Chapman	Dingell
Biemiller	Chelf	Dirksen
Blackney	Church	Domengeaux
Bland	Clark	Dondero
Bolton	Clements	Doughton, N. C.
Bonner	Cole, Kans.	Douglas, Ill.
Brooks	Cole, Mo.	Drewry
Brown, Ga.	Cole, N. Y.	Durham
Brumbaugh	Combs	
	Cooper	
	Corbett	
	Courtney	
	Cox	
	Cravens	
	Crosser	
	Cunningham	
	D'Alesandro	
	Daughton, Va.	
	Davis	
	Dawson	
	Delaney, James J.	
	Delaney, John J.	
	D'Ewart	
	Dingell	
	Dirksen	
	Domengeaux	
	Dondero	
	Doughton, N. C.	
	Douglas, Ill.	
	Drewry	
	Durham	

Earthman	Hook	Price, Fla.
Eaton	Horan	Price, Ill.
Eberharter	Huber	Priest
Elliott	Jarman	Quinn, N. Y.
Ellsworth	Johnson, Calif.	Rabaut
Elsaesser	Johnson, Ill.	Rains
Elston	Johnson, Ind.	Ramey
Engle, Calif.	Johnson,	Randolph
Ervin	Luther A.	Reed, Ill.
Fallon	Johnson,	Resa
Feighan	Lyndon B.	Richards
Fenton	Johnson, Okla.	Riley
Fernandez	Judd	Robertson, Va.
Fisher	Kean	Robsion, Ky.
Flannagan	Kearney	Rodgers, Pa.
Flood	Kelly, Ill.	Roe, N. Y.
Fogarty	Keogh	Rogers, Fla.
Folger	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Forand	Kilday	Rowan
Fuiton	King	Russell
Gallagher	Kirwan	Ryter
Gamble	Kunkel	Sabath
Gardner	Landis	Sadowski
Gary	Lane	Sasscer
Gathings	Latham	Savage
Gavin	Lea	Scrivner
Gearhart	LeFevre	Sharp
Geelan	Lesinski	Sheppard
Gerlach	Lewis	Sheridan
Gifford	Link	Simpson, Ill.
Gillie	Luce	Slaughter
Goodwin	Lyle	Smith, Maine
Gordon	Lynch	Smith, Va.
Gore	McConnell	Spence
Gorski	McCormack	Springer
Gossett	McDonough	Starkey
Graham	McGlinchey	Sullivan
Granahan	McKenzie	Sumners, Tex.
Green	McMillen, Ill.	Sundstrom
Gregory	Madden	Taber
Hale	Mahon	Talbot
Hall,	Maloney	Talle
Edwin Arthur	Manasco	Tarver
Hall,	Mankin	Taylor
Leonard W.	Martin, Iowa	Thom
Hancock	Martin, Mass.	Thomas, N. J.
Hand	Mathews	Thomas, Tex.
Hare	May	Thomason
Harless, Ariz.	Michener	Tibbott
Harness, Ind.	Mills	Towe
Hart	Monroney	Traynor
Hartley	Morgan	Trimble
Havenner	Morrison	Voorhis, Calif.
Hays	Mundt	Vorys, Ohio
Hérbert	Murdock	Wadsworth
Hedrick	Murphy	Walter
Heffernan	Murray, Tenn.	Wasielewski
Hendricks	Neely	Weaver
Herter	Norblad	White
Heselton	O'Brien, Ill.	Whitten
Hess	O'Neal	Whittington
Hill	Outland	Wigglesworth
Hinshaw	Patman	Wolcott
Hobbs	Philbin	Wolverton, N. J.
Hoch	Pickett	Woodhouse
Hoeven	Ploeser	Woodruff
Holmes, Mass.	Poage	Zimmerman
Holmes, Wash.	Pratt	

NAYS—105

Adams	Griffiths	Merrow
Allen, Ill.	Gross	Miller, Nebr.
Andresen,	Gwinn, N. Y.	Murray, Wis.
August H.	Gwynne, Iowa	O'Brien, Mich.
Arends	Hagen	O'Hara
Arnold	Healy	O'Konski
Baldwin, N. Y.	Henry	O'Toole
Barden	Hoffman, Mich.	Pace
Barrett, Wyo.	Hoffman, Pa.	Patterson
Bishop	Hope	Peterson, Fla.
Bloom	Howell	Pfeifer
Brehm	Hull	Phillips
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins	Pittenger
Buffett	Jennings	Plumley
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Powell
Carlson	Jones	Rabin
Case, S. Dak.	Jonkman	Rankin
Celler	Keefe	Rayfiel
Chenoweth	Kefauver	Reed, N. Y.
Chiperfield	Kinzer	Rees, Kans.
Clevenger	Klein	Rich
Clippinger	Knutson	Rivers
Cooley	Kopplemann	Rizley
Curtis	LaFollette	Rockwell
Dolliver	Lanham	Rogers, N. Y.
Douglas, Calif.	Larcade	Schwabe, Mo.
Dworshak	Lemke	Schwabe, Okla.
Ellis	McCowen	Shafer
Fellows	McGregor	Short
Fuller	McMillan, S. C.	Sikes
Gillette	Marcantonio	Simpson, Pa.
Grant, Ind.	Mason	Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.	Sumner, Ill.	Winter
Somers, N. Y.	Vursell	Wood
Stefan	Weichel	
Stockman	Wilson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Kelley, Pa.

NOT VOTING—61

Almond	Engel, Mich.	Patrick
Anderson, Calif.	Gibson	Peterson, Ga.
Andrews, N. Y.	Gillespie	Reece, Tenn.
Baldwin, Md.	Granger	Robertson,
Bates, Mass.	Grant, Ala.	N. Dak.
Bell	Halleck	Robinson, Utah
Bennet, N. Y.	Harris	Roe, Md.
Boren	Holifield	Rooney
Boykin	Izac	Sparkman
Bradley, Mich.	Jackson	Stevenson
Bradley, Pa.	Kee	Stewart
Camp	Kerr	Stigler
Cannon, Fla.	LeCompte	Tolan
Clason	Ludlow	Torrens
Cochran	McGehee	Vinson
Coffee	Mansfield,	Welch
Colmer	Mont.	West
Crawford	Mansfield, Tex.	Wickersham
Curley	Miller, Calif.	Winstead
De Lacy	Norrell	Wolfenden, Pa.
Doyle	Norton	Worley

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. De Lacy against.

Mr. Worley for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Andrews of New York.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. Norrell with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Coffee with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Jackson with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Clason.

Mr. GEELAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. ARENDS, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. SOMERS of New York, and Mr. PFEIFER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WORLEY, who left this afternoon on official business. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTION OF TRADE-MARKS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1654) to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1654) to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 35, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Becomes the common descriptive name of an article or substance on which the patent has expired, or"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with the following amendments: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Act; or

"(d) at any time in the case of a certification mark on the ground that the registrant (1) does not control, or is not able legitimately to exercise control over, the use of such mark, or (2) engages in the production or marketing of any goods or services to which the mark is applied, or (3) permits the use of such mark for other purposes than as a certification mark, or (4) discriminately refuses to certify or to continue to certify the goods or services of any person who maintains the standards or conditions which such mark certifies."

On page 44 of the House bill strike out beginning with line 18 down to and including line 2 on page 45 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The term 'certification mark' means a mark used upon or in connection with the products or services of one or more persons other than the owner of the mark to certify regional or other origin, material, mode of manufacture, quality, accuracy or other characteristics of such goods or services or that the work or labor on the goods or services was performed by members of a union or other organization.

"The term 'collective mark' means a trademark or service mark used by the members of a cooperative, an association, or other collective group or organization and includes marks used to indicate membership in a union, an association or other organization."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numerbed 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted

by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"*Provided*, That the Federal Trade commission may apply to cancel on the grounds specified in subsections (c) and (d) of this section any mark registered on the principal register established by this Act, and the prescribed fee shall not be required."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment and on page 18, line 23, of the House bill strike out "hereof." and insert the following:

"hereof; and

"(4) no incontestable right shall be acquired in a mark or trade name which is the common descriptive name of any article or substance, patented or otherwise."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(7) That the mark has been or is being used to violate the antitrust laws of the United States."

And the Senate agree to the same.

FRANK W. BOYKIN,
FRITZ G. LANHAM,
FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLAUDE E. PEPPER,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
A. W. HAWKES,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1654) to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment changes the House provision by refusing registration to a mark which, when applied to the goods of the applicant, is descriptive. Under the House bill, a mark is refused registration only if it is "merely" descriptive. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment makes clear that, under section 5 of the House bill, the use by related companies of a registered mark or a mark sought to be registered must be legitimate. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment provides that marks which become descriptive of a patented article are subject to cancellation at any time. The House recedes with an amendment making subject to cancellation at any time any mark which becomes the common descriptive name of an article or substance on which the patent has expired. While this change in section 14 (c) adds as a ground for cancellation the fact that the registered mark has become the common descriptive name of an article or substance on which the patent has expired, this specific provision is not intended to affect the applicability of the subsection to registered marks used on or in connection with nonpatented articles or substances where the mark is the common descriptive name of the goods and has become "abandoned" as that term is used in this section and defined in section 45.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment provides that registration of collective and certification marks obtained contrary to section 4 are subject to cancellation at any time. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: This amendment adds a new subsection (d) to section 14 to provide that a certification mark is subject to cancellation if the registrant (1) does not or is not constituted so as legitimately to exercise control over the use of such mark, (2) produces or markets any goods or services to which the mark is applied, (3) permits the use of such mark for other purposes than as a certification mark, or (4) refuses the use of such mark on nondiscriminatory and reasonable terms by all persons producing or marketing goods or services to which the mark is applied who maintain the standards or conditions which such mark certifies. The House recedes with amendments clarifying clauses (1) and (4), and with amendments to the definition of collective and certification marks in section 45 which are rendered necessary by the inclusion in section 14 of subsection (d).

Amendment No. 6: This amendment permits the head of any Government department or agency to apply for cancellation of collective and certification marks without the payment of the prescribed fee. The House recedes with an amendment permitting the Federal Trade Commission to apply for cancellation, on the grounds specified in section 14 (c) and (d), of any mark registered on the principal register without the payment of the prescribed fee.

Amendment No. 7: This amendment is technical, conforming to the inclusion in the bill by amendment No. 5 of the new section 14 (d). The House recedes.

Amendment No. 8: This amendment adds a new paragraph (1) to section 15 providing that if a mark or trade name becomes descriptive of a patented article, the right of a registrant to use such mark may be contested at any time. The House recedes with an amendment omitting such paragraph (1) and inserting a new paragraph (4) which provides that no incontestable right shall be acquired in a mark or trade name which is the common descriptive name of any article or substance, patented or otherwise.

Amendments Nos. 9, 10, 11, and 12: These amendments are clerical and technical and are rendered unnecessary in view of the action taken on amendment No. 8. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 13: This amendment increases the fee for filing each original application for registration of a mark in each class on either the principal or the supplemental register proposed by the House from $15 to $25. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 14: This amendment increases the fee for filing each application for renewal of registration in each class proposed by the House from $15 to $25. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 15: This amendment increases the fee for filing notice of claim of benefits of the bill for a mark to be published under section 12 (c) proposed by the House from $5 to $10. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 16: This amendment increases the fee for filing notice of opposition or application for cancellation proposed by the House from $10 to $25. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 17: This amendment increases the fee for filing an appeal from an examiner in charge of the registration of marks to the Commissioner of Patents proposed by the House from $20 to $25. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 18: This amendment increases the fee for filing an appeal from an examiner in charge of interference to the Commissioner of Patents proposed by the House from $20 to $25. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 19: Since the United States is no longer an adherent to the protocol establishing the International Bureau, Habana, this amendment eliminates (1) the fee of $15 proposed by the House for filing in each class each application communicated to the United States from the International Bureau, and (2) the fee of $10 proposed by the House for filing and transmitting application in each class, including certificate, to the International Bureau. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 20: This amendment increases the fee for certifying manuscript copies proposed by the House from 75 cents to $1. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 21: This amendment increases the fee for each additional registration or application which may be included under a single certificate proposed by the House from 25 cents to 50 cents. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 22: The House bill proposed a fee of 50 cents for each brief from the digest of assignments of two hundred words or less, with an additional fee of ten cents for each additional one hundred words or fraction thereof. This amendment changes this provision by prescribing a fee of $1 for each brief from the digest of assignments of two hundred words or less. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 23: This amendment increases the additional fee proposed by the House for a single printed copy of statement and drawing, if certified, for the grant, from 50 cents to $1. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 24: This amendment increases the fee for the certificate proposed by the House from 50 cents to $1. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 25: This amendment increases the fee for copy of certificate of renewal proposed by the House from 50 cents to $1. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 26: The House bill proposed for photographic copies of records, a fee of 20 cents per page; if certified, for the certificate, an additional fee of 50 cents. This amendment changes this provision by providing that the fee for photographic copies of records and drawings shall be the reasonable cost of making them. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 27: In conformity with amendment No. 26, this amendment eliminates the fee of 20 cents per sheet for photographic copies of drawings proposed by the House. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 28: This amendment provides that the use of a registered mark in violation of the antitrust laws shall constitute a defense to a suit by the registrant. The House recedes with an amendment substituting the words "to violate" for the words "in violation of." This amendment provides an additional defense to the conclusive evidence rule of a certificate of registration of a mark which has become incontestable under section 15. It does not and is not intended to enlarge, restrict, amend, or modify the substantive law of trade-marks either as set out in other sections of this Act or as heretofore applied by the Courts. The amendment does not and is not intended to affect the validity of the mark nor affect the right of the registrant to continue use or enforce his rights in the mark. If it is established that a registrant has used or is using his registered mark, which has become incontestable, as the legal, causal, and efficient instrumentality to violate the antitrust laws of the United States, such registrant is denied the benefit of the rule that the certificate of registration is conclusive evidence of his exclusive right to use the mark. Under such circumstances, the certificate is only prima facie evidence of his exclusive right to use and he must be prepared to carry the additional burden of proof as though his mark had not become incontestable.

Amendment No. 29: Inasmuch as court fees are prescribed by the Act of September 27, 1944, this amendment eliminates the provision in section 34 that for each notice with respect to any action, suit, or proceeding arising under the bill required and furnished to the Commissioner of Patents by the clerk of the court, a fee of 50 cents shall be taxed by the clerk as costs of suit. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 30: This amendment amends the definition of the term "related company" to exclude any person who does not legitimately control or is not legitimately controlled by the registrant or applicant for registration in respect to the nature and quality of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 31 and 32: These amendments are clerical; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 33: The House bill provides that nothing contained in the bill shall be construed as "limiting or restricting" any statute in force on the effective date of the bill which does not relate to trade-marks. This amendment amplifies the stipulation by adding that nothing contained in the bill shall be construed as "modifying or repealing" any such statute. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 34: This amendment provides that nothing contained in the bill shall be construed as limiting, etc., any statute which does not relate to trade names (as well as any statute which does not relate to trademarks as provided in the House bill). The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 35: The House bill provides that nothing contained in the bill shall be construed as restricting or increasing the authority of any Federal regulatory agency except as may be specifically provided in the bill. This amendment includes any Federal department in this provision. The House recedes.

FRANK W. BOYKIN,
FRITZ G. LANHAM,
FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is the trade-mark bill that has passed the House on three or four different occasions. The purpose of it is to protect legitimate business and the consumers of the country. The Senate placed certain amendments upon the bill which were objectionable to the House conferees in some of their features, but they were so modified and amended in the conference that we are presenting a full conference report and all the conferees are in agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished friend and colleague and fellow conferee the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY].

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I concur in everything that the gentleman from Texas has said. We feel that the position of the House was sustained in the conference.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the legislative history of this act is long and extensive. Many hearings have been held over a period of almost 8 years. Those hearings may, and probably will, be referred to by the courts in construing and interpreting the provisions of the act. However, there is one provision in the act which has no recorded legislative history, and in order that the purpose and intent of the House may be made perfectly clear, I wish this statement to appear in the RECORD as an explanation of our intent and as a part of the legislative history of the act.

This Trade-Mark Act places in one statute all the Federal law relating to the subject and repeals the prior laws specifically referred to in its provisions. It reenacts much prior legislation and creates new rights, some of which are substantive and others procedural. It implements our international commitments and brings the trade-mark law of the United States down to date, recognizing the changes in business and commercial practices since the act of 1905 became the law.

The Senate amended the act and the conference committee has reconciled its differences. I believe it necessary, however, that specific reference be made to one amendment in order that its interpretation may be made clear.

Paragraph (b) of section 33 of the act has been amended by adding subparagraph (7) in the following words:

(7) That the mark has been or is being used to violate the antitrust laws of the United States.

The prior statutes enacted by Congress on this subject provide that the certificate of registration shall be prima facie evidence of ownership and the right to use the mark. H. R. 1654 changes this rule and provides that "the right of the registrant to use such registered mark in commerce for the goods or services on or in connection with which such registered mark has been in continuous use for five consecutive years subsequent to the date of such registration and is still in use in commerce shall be incontestable" if the conditions of section 15 of the act are met. Section 33 (a) of this act reenacts the prima facie evidence rule which is applicable from and after the date of registration of a mark under the act of March 3, 1881, the act of February 20, 1905, and under this bill. Section 33 (b) provides that where the registered mark has become incontestable under section 15, the certificate of registration shall be conclusive evidence of the registrant's "exclusive right to use the registered mark in commerce on or in connection with the goods or services specified in the certificate."

However, section 33 (b) contains seven exceptions to the rule that the certificate of registration shall be conclusive evidence of the rights of the registrant even where the provisions of section 15 have been met. Some doubt has been expressed on the following points:

First. Do these seven exceptions, including the amending paragraph (7) with reference to the violation of the antitrust laws of the United States, lay down substantive rules of law or substantive defenses which go to the validity and enforceability of the mark, or do they relate only to the weight of evidence to be given to the certificate of registration?

Second. What is the meaning of the words "used to violate the antitrust laws," as found in paragraph (7) of paragraph (b) of section 33?

It is clear from the language of the act and from the congressional history of the act as it is found in the hearings and reports that the seven "defenses or defects" listed under paragraph (b) of section 33 are intended to relate to and to affect the weight of the evidence to be given to the certificate of registration where the owner claims the benefit of the incontestable rule and where the opposite party can, by the weight of the evidence, establish any one of the things listed in the seven paragraphs in paragraph (b); but these seven paragraphs are not intended to enlarge, restrict, amend, or modify the substantive law of trademarks either as set out in other sections of the act or as heretofore applied by the courts under prior laws. A trade-mark registrant who is shown to have used his mark to violate the antitrust laws is denied the benefit of the rule that his certificate of registration is conclusive evidence of his right of ownership and his right to the exclusive use of the mark. Under these circumstances, his certificate of registration is only prima facie evidence of his right and he must be prepared to carry the additional burden of proof as is necessary under the laws and statutes as they existed prior to the passage of this act. One of the valuable new rights created by the act is the incontestable right after 5 years' use of the mark and the corollary thereto that the certificate of registration is conclusive evidence of ownership and the right to the exclusive use of the mark. This new and valuable right is denied to any trademark registrant who is shown to have used his mark to violate the antitrust laws, but this provision does not and is not intended to deprive the registrant of any rights he would possess or enjoy if this act were not enacted into law. Stated in other terms, proof of violation of the antitrust laws of the United States by a registrant in the use of his mark does not under this act destroy the validity of or the right of the registrant to continue to use the mark, but it places on him a burden of proof in the event of litigation which others do not have to carry, by diluting the weight the court is to give to his certificate of registration as evidence of ownership and the right to use the mark. This is the intent and effect and the only intent and effect of the seven subparagraphs of paragraph (b) of section 33.

Although the words "used to violate the antitrust laws of the United States" are general in their nature, their meaning is clear. A registrant of a trade-mark might violate the antitrust laws by entering into an agreement to restrict output or to suppress competition and yet the use made by the registrant of his trade-mark in his business might have no legal, causal, or efficient relation to the violation of these laws. The relation of the trade-mark to these illegal acts might be purely physical or coincidental. If a trade-mark should be used the legal, causal, and efficient instrumentality to effect a contract, agreement, or arrangement which violates the antitrust laws, then the actual use of the mark to carry out such a scheme would constitute a use in violation of the antitrust laws; but if the mark is in no true sense an essential legal element of the unlawful conduct, then the fact that the registrant may have violated the antitrust laws would

not bring paragraph (7) of paragraph (b) of section 33 into operation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. BATES of Kentucky, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 677, Report No. 2338), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3420) to provide for refunds to railroad employees in certain cases, so as to place the various States on an equal basis, under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, with respect to contributions to employees. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 6429, the legislative appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY, JUNE 27

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock a. m. on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RECOMMITTING BILL TO THE COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE LAWS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2200) to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure" be recommitted to the Committee on Revision of the Laws with authority to rereport with committee amendments and that such rereporting shall not affect the calendar position of the bill nor the special rule which has been reported thereon.

I further ask unanimous consent that such committee amendments may be printed in roman type when the bill is rereported.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON H. R. 6702

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 6702) to clarify the rights of former owners of real property to reacquire such property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. DREWRY, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5356) to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a naval establishment, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD.

ADMISSION OF PERSONS OF RACES INDIGENOUS TO INDIA

Mr. LESINSKI, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter with regard to the British loan.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Congress of Civilian Rights.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post of today.

Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a clipping from the North Canton Sun, and a letter from the Department of Agriculture on the sugar situation.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and also to have printed three columns of Mr. Stokes' as written concerning the American Veterans Committee in Des Moines, Iowa.

Mr. MUNDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of today and any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I was present and voted against the motion to recommit the conference report on the extension of the Office of Price Administration. I then returned to my office to transact some business but was unable to return until after my name had been called the second time. Had I been present at the time my name was called I would have voted "yea" for the passage of the conference report to extend the Office of Price Administration.

GRAIN FOR NEW ENGLAND

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I had a telegram from Mr. Louis Webster, former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and I have introduced a resolution to inquire as to why Massachusetts is being discriminated against, and I believe gets a poorer quality and a lesser amount of feed than other sections or States in the country.

He states:

BOSTON, MASS., *June 24, 1946.*

Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Canvassed two-thirds Massachusetts grain trade today. They are receiving 40 percent of 1945 shipments, some of which is unsatisfactory substitute for regular grain. No help in sight. Above figures do not include Government allocation. Government allocation 793 cars for New England, 198 cars for Massachusetts, of that 91 cars ordered and little if any shipped, practically no corn, just substitute. Middlesex County Farm Bureau Cooperative with high priorities reports only four cars from allocation and all on paper, no deliveries, even if whole 198 come through in 1 month. That is less than 8 cars a day, and normal Massachusetts consumption is 60 cars a day, and we are now short 36 cars a day. Allocation not even a decent trickle; dealers still blame unrealistic price pattern.

LOUIS WEBSTER.

House Resolution 676

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is requested to submit to the House of Representatives such facts as may be in his

possession with respect to the shortage of food and feed in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, particularly with respect to the alleged discriminatory shortage of meat, milk, butter, and bread, and of grain suitable for the feeding of poultry and livestock.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CARRY-BACK OF UNUSED EXCESS-PROFITS CREDITS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the 2-year carry-back of unused excess-profits credit was adopted by the Senate Finance Committee as an amendment to the revenue bill of 1942, as a substitute for the allowance of setting up of reserves for deferred maintenance, inventory losses, and other deductible expenses held down during the war years to a bare minimum by priorities, rationing, labor and material shortages, and other factors beyond the control of the taxpayer.

The report of the Finance Committee on the revenue bill of 1942, states as follows:

> The present law permits corporations to carry forward for 2 years their net operating losses. It also allows the unused excess-profits credit to be carried forward for 2 years. These provisions obviously are of benefit only in periods of increasing business activities. Many corporations will suffer substantially in periods of declining profits, especially at the close of a war economy in which their deductible expenses have been held down to a bare minimum by priorities, rationing, labor shortages, and other factors beyond the control of the taxpayer. For example, a corporation during the war years makes substantial profits which would be considerably reduced if it could make the expenditures possible in a free economy for maintenance, repair, and other deductible expenses. Upon the termination of the war, the materials and labor will once more be available, but the costs and expenses which would otherwise be taken against the wartime profits will fall into years of lesser profits or no profits, thereby resulting in small or no tax benefit for the taxpayer.
>
> If the taxpayer would in any case be subject to excess-profits tax for every year of the cycle, no harm results from deductions being taken in years other than those to which they should properly be attributable. This would be generally true if the taxpayer would in any case be subject only to the normal and surtax for each of the years in the cycle. If, however, the taxpayer is subject to excess-profits tax in the year to which the deduction should properly be attributable and not subject to excess-profits tax in the year in which the deduction is allowable under the present law, hardship results. The same is true if he is subject to normal tax and surtax in the former year and has a deficit in net income in the latter year..
>
> To afford relief to these hardship cases, where maintenance and upkeep expenses must, because of wartime restrictions, be deferred to peacetime years, your committee has provided a 2-year carry-back of operating losses and of unused excess-profits credit. This provision affords, in effect, the same type of relief in periods of declining profits which the present 2-year carry-forward of operating losses and unused excess-profits credits affords in periods of increasing profits.

CONTINUATION OF CARRY-BACK FOR 1946

Secretary Vinson in his statement to the Committee on Ways and Means on October 1, 1945, recommended the repeal of the excess-profits tax as of December 31, 1945. He also recommended the continuation of the carry-back of the unused excess-profits credit for 1 year following the repeal of the excess-profits tax. In this connection he said:

> The chief purpose of the carry-backs was to correct inflated wartime profit figures by allowing a deduction of war-induced costs not incurred until the end of the war. It appears that a considerable volume of such costs will remain to be incurred after December 31, 1945. Accordingly, despite repeal of the excess-profits tax the carry-backs should continue for one more year.

The revenue bill of 1945 as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means did not repeal the excess-profits tax, but merely reduced the rate of tax. The committee's action, in effect, continued the carry-back of the unused excess-profits credit for 1946 the same as under the affirmative action by the Senate in continuing the same for 1 year after the repeal of the excess-profits tax.

When the bill reached the Senate the Finance Committee provided for the repeal of the excess-profits tax and the continuance of the carry-back of unused excess-profits credit for 1946. At that time I questioned the wisdom of continuing this provision beyond the expiration of the excess-profits tax.

The purpose and reason for continuing the carry back of the unused credit for 1946 was set forth in the Finance Committee report, as follows:

> The 2-year carry-back of unused excess-profits credit is retained for 1 year beyond the repeal of the excess-profits tax. Thus it will be possible to carry back unused excess-profits credits arising in 1946 to 1944 and 1945 and reduce the excess-profits tax paid in these years. It is believed necessary to continue the carry-back for one more year to be sure that business has the opportunity to apply reconversion expenditures to reduce wartime taxes. However, it is recognized that the carry back is subject to abuse and inequity. Therefore your committee is studying ways of removing the abuses of this provision and expects to propose retroactive legislation on this subject in the near future.

Later in the report, on page 30, the following statement is made:

> There is danger that the operation of the unused excess-profits credit carry-back provision, particularly in 1946, may make possible certain abuses. These potential abuses might arise through various devices or transactions entered into wholly or in large part for the purpose of obtaining refunds of wartime excess-profits taxes through unused credit carry-back, or through transactions having the apparent effect of creating carry-back refunds in situations unrelated to the purpose and intent of the provisions allowing carry-backs. While various tax avoidance schemes are already dealt with either by express provisions in the internal-revenue laws or through court decisions, your committee will give further consideration to the necessity or desirability of retroactive legislation in this connection.

IS THE UNUSED CREDIT A PROPER YARDSTICK FOR MEASURING WAR-INDUCED COSTS?

Before discussing the potential abuses which might arise through various devices or transactions entered into in order to increase the benefits thereunder, it might be well to examine the unused credit from the standpoint of equity and soundness as a yardstick for measuring the amount of war-induced expenditures incurred in 1946, and whether or not the same carries out the purpose and the intent of the provisions as set forth in the Finance Committee report and in Secretary Vinson's recommendation.

What relationship, if any, does the unused excess-profits credit have to war-induced expenditures? While such expenditures, if actually incurred, will in some measure determine whether or not the corporation has an unused credit, the principal factor determining the amount of its unused credit in 1946, or lack of an unused credit, is the amount of corporate earnings in 1946 as compared with the normal peacetime earnings. In the absence of abnormal conditions such as fires, floods, and prolonged idleness growing out of labor disputes, earnings of many corporations in 1946 would naturally tend to return to their peacetime level, especially in view of the continued material shortages.

In the case of those corporations whose credit is based on their average earnings in the base period years 1936–39, no unused credit would likely occur in 1946 unless their 1946 earnings are less than 95 percent of their base period earnings.

However, in the case of corporations whose credit is based on invested capital, which in many cases is greatly in excess of their base period earnings, such corporations by the very nature of things will have an unused credit in 1946 even though their earnings may be greatly in excess of their base period earnings.

For example, a corporation whose normal earnings might show an excess-profits net income of $50,000,000, whereas its excess-profits credit based on invested capital may be $100,000,000. Such a corporation, even though its 1946 excess-profits net income equals its normal earnings of $50,000,000, will have an unused excess-profits credit of $50,000,000 and would be entitled to a refund or tax adjustment of its 1944 or 1945 excess-profits taxes amounting to $22,750,000 regardless of whether it had any war-induced expenditures in 1946. If such a corporation had no earning at all in 1946 it would be entitled to a refund or tax adjustments of $45,500,000.

On the other hand many corporations having legitimate war-induced expenditures in 1946 will be denied any relief by offsetting such expenditures against wartime income because they do not have an unused excess-profits credit in 1946. If the intent and purpose of the carry-back of the unused excess-profits credit is to allow for war-induced expenditures not incurred until after the war because of the taxpayers' inability to make such expenditures during the war because of priorities, rationing, scarcity of labor and materials, and other factors beyond the control of the taxpayer, why should corporations having such expenditures be denied relief while other corporations receive refunds and tax adjustments regardless of whether or not

they have any war-induced expenditures?

In this connection, I quote from a statement by Mr. Roy Blough, of the Treasury Tax Research Division, as follows:

To the extent that earnings simply fall off in amount while remaining above their peacetime level there is room to question whether the corporation should receive a tax refund out of its wartime profits. Yet the development of a high credit far above the prewar experience of a company results in a carry-back against excess profits and a refund in such a case.

The objection is most valid in the case of the invested capital credit. Many concerns using this credit not only receive free from excess-profits tax much larger profits than they earned before the war, and perhaps ever received, but in effect will have their profits level artificially maintained by the carry-back in the postwar years.

In addition, it might be pointed out that the corporations most likely to benefit through the carry-back of an unused 1946 excess-profits credit, are those corporations which benefited most through the 2-year carry-forward of unused excess-profits credit. This is especially true in the case of those corporations using the invested capital method for determining their excess-profits credit. Under the 2-year carry-forward of unused excess-profits credits it was possible for a corporation to escape paying any excess-profits tax during the war even though they had excess-profits net income in excess of their current year's credit. Others were allowed to earn 15, 20 or more percent on their invested capital before being subject to the excess-profits tax.

In my opinion, the use of the unused credit as a yardstick to measure the amount of war-induced expenditures incurred in 1946 fails to carry out the purpose and the intent as set forth in the committee reports and as stated by Secretary Vinson. The unused credit in many cases has little relation to war-induced expenditures in 1946, and the benefits derived in such cases under the carry-back is therefore not measured by deferred war-induced expenditures.

Many corporations continued their normal operations during the war producing for the Government and after the end of the war continued their normal operations producing for civilian consumption. Many such corporations had little reconversion costs, and during the war enjoyed top priorities for maintenance and upkeep as the Government was anxious to speed up war production. Why should such companies having no reconversion cost and little, if any, deferred maintenance receive a refund of excess-profits taxes paid during the war? Many corporations during the period following VE-day or VJ-day incurred war-induced expenditures and applied the same against their 1945 profits, thereby reducing their excess-profits net income. Such corporations have already offset war-induced expenditures against wartime income. Why should they be allowed an additional offset merely because they have an unused excess-profits credit in 1946?

USE OF 1946 CREDIT

Many corporations following the end of the war have and are increasing their capital to take care of peacetime expansion. Such increase in capital in 1946 will increase their excess-profits credit, resulting in a carry-back in many cases, or an increased amount of carry-back, having no relation whatever to wartime profits. For example, if a corporation invests an additional $100,000 of new capital in 1946, it could increase its credit as much as $10,000. To the extent that this new capital produces less than $10,000 in 1946, any unused credit it has will be increased accordingly. Many corporations are increasing their invested capital structure by many millions of dollars of additional capital for expansion purposes, and where the same results in additional refunds out of the Treasury the taxpayers are contributing to the expansion of private industry for the benefit of private stockholders.

The following are some of the abuses and transactions that will no doubt be resorted to in order to create carry-back refunds or tax credits:

(a) The bunching of expenditures, which by normal business policy would be spread over a number of years, in such a way that increased carry-back advantages may be obtained.

(b) The embarking on broad experimental undertakings or "prestige advertising" the expenditures for which are not only largely borne by the Treasury, but will result in increasing also the amount of the unused credit carry-back.

(c) Deferment of profits normally attributable to the immediate postwar period (1946) to later years.

(d) Manipulations in general so that losses or reduced income are made to appear in 1946 to increase unused credit carry-back.

(e) Keeping so-called war babies which have no peacetime use, alive for the purpose of carrying back excess-profits credits against wartime income in order to secure refund of war profits.

For every $1,000,000 increase in the unused credit by reason of such manipulations and transactions the taxpayer will be entitled to a refund or tax credit of $455,000, and if the same causes a loss in 1946 he will be allowed in addition 85½ percent of such loss.

POTENTIAL REVENUE EFFECT

The following earnings reports of corporations, and estimated effect of the carry-back provisions, as shown by published reports in the Wall Street Journal, gives some idea as to the probable magnitude of the impact on the Treasury.

There were over 54,000 corporations paying excess-profits tax in 1944 and while many of these corporations will have no unused credit in 1945, and others through the carry-back of unused credits in 1945, or through the elimination of excess-profits tax liability for 1944 and 1945 by reason of recomputation of amortization of emergency facilities, it is possible that several thousand corporations may benefit under the carry-back of 1946 unused excess-profits credits.

Carry-backs

AMERICAN BRAKE SHOE CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Federal income and excess-profits tax	(1)	$1,060,000	$1,000,000
Net income	$329,236	693,855	588,520

[1] No provision has been made, the report states, for income taxes since earnings for the year at the rate reflected in this quarter would entitle the company to a refund for the year of approximately $148,000 under the carry-back provision of the tax law.

AMERICAN MACHINE & METALS, INC.

Tentative report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Federal tax provision	[1] $31,000	$154,103	$401,000
Net profit	79,088	90,064	137,357

[1] After deducting $17,000 estimated excess-profits-tax carry-back credit.

AMERICAN RADIATOR & STANDARD SANITARY CORP.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net income	[1] $712,225	$1,223,543	$1,113,854

[1] Includes estimated tax refunds based on carry-back credits from 1946 to prior years of $796,000.

AMERICAN SEATING CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Federal income tax	----------	$440,000	$148,000
Net loss	[1] $265,452	[2] 123,562	[2] 72,191

[1] No provision for possible tax refunds which may result from excess-profits-tax credit carry-backs or operating-loss carry-backs has been included in income since their effect cannot be accurately measured until the results for the full year are determined. In the event that losses should continue, the amount of refund applicable to the quarter is estimated at $290,000.

[2] Profit.

AMERICAN STEEL FOUNDRIES [1]

Report for 6 months ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Federal taxes on income	$280,000	$2,472,100	$3,059,200
Net loss	915,607	[2] 1,442,997	[2] 975,406

[1] This statement does not include the effect of substantial claims for prior years' taxes that may result from (*a*) carrying back the current fiscal year's unused excess-profits credit, and (*b*) carrying back any current year's operating losses if the losses for the 6 months reported above are not offset by profits which may be earned during the 6 months ending Sept. 30, 1946.

[2] Profit.

AMERICAN STOVE CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net profit	$3,591	$322,294	[2] $287,508

[1] No provision made for Federal income taxes; if earnings do not amount to approximately $1,400,000 for the year, the company will have a claim for excess-profits taxes paid in prior year.

[2] After Federal income taxes.

ATLAS POWDER CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net income	[1] $38,127	$437,857	$328,222

[1] Does not reflect an estimated refund of Federal taxes amounting to $185,000 which would arise from carry-back of unused excess-profits credit for the quarter.

Carry-backs—Continued

BIRDSBORO STEEL FOUNDRY & MACHINE CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net loss	[1] $322,088	$57,434	[2] $82,761

[1] The company states that on the basis of this loss it is entitled to adjustments as a result of the carry-back provisions of the tax law.
[2] Profit.

BLAW-KNOX CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net profit	[1] $28,936		

[1] The net profit was after a tax credit of $235,000 computed at the rate of 38%, and also after a transfer of $450,000 from reserves provided from income of prior years for war and postwar adjustments.

BLISS (E. W.) CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net loss	[1] $135,909		

[1] After charges and including $91,000 refundable credit under the carry-back provisions of the Federal tax law.

BORG-WARNER CORP.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Federal income taxes	[1] $230,947	$13,545,602	$17,198,545
Net profit	310,772	1,822,653	2,152,119

[1] Does not reflect possible effect of carry-back provision of taxes.

BRIGGS MANUFACTURING CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Loss after charges	$3,700,343		
Federal tax refund	[1] 3,293,303		
Net loss	407,037	[2] $1,131,234	

[1] Potential refundable Federal income and excess-profits taxes.
[2] Profit.

BUDD (EDW. G.) MANUFACTURING CO., BUDD WHEEL CO.

First 4 months 1946

	1946	1945	1944
Combined operating loss [1]	[2] $5,815,887		

[1] The 4-month operating loss was before giving effect to carry-back refunds on income taxes. * * * An SEC registration statement filed by Budd Co., which would be the successor company under the merger estimated a tax carry-back recovery of $4,504,300 for the first 4 months of 1946.
[2] Estimated.

CATERPILLAR TRACTOR CO.

	1946	1945	1944
Report for month of March			
Net profit	[1] $503,680	$703,529	$650,695
Report for month of April			
Net profit	[2] 423,393	701,263	658,715

[1] The 1946 profit includes a recovery of a portion of the excess-profits tax provided in the year 1944, but the amount is not stated.
[2] Profit for April 1946 includes recovery of a portion of the excess-profits taxes provided in 1944 as computed under the carry-back provisions.

Carry-backs—Continued

CHRYSLER CORP.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Operating loss	$8,382,072	[1] $8,094,236	[1] $5,552,937
Federal tax recovery	[2] 7,150,000		
Reserve for reconversion [3]	402,143		
Net loss	829,929	[1] 8,094,236	[1] 5,552,937

[1] Profit.
[2] Estimated recovery of prior year's income and excess-profits taxes resulting from carry-back of operating loss and unused excess-profits credit.
[3] Portion of reserve for reconversion expenses restored to income account equal to reconversion costs ($2,272,134) included in costs for the March quarter, less applicable reduction in Federal taxes ($1,869,990).

CLARK EQUIPMENT CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net loss	[1] $417,699	[2] $517,022	[2] $739,039
Federal income and excess profits and estimated renegotiation		1,880,000	3,982,000

[1] Company states that income account does not take into account adjustment of net loss carry-back of excess-profits taxes paid in prior years. If losses were to continue for the balance of the year, refund applicable to first quarter of 1946 is estimated at $300,000.
[2] Profit.

CLEVELAND GRAPHITE BRONZE CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net profit	[1] $218,214	$399,354	

[1] Includes $95,000 carry-back tax credit.

CORN PRODUCTS REFINING CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Federal income and excess-profit taxes		$3,370,800	$1,555,000
Net loss	$1,068,470	[1] 2,212,377	[1] 1,701,516

[1] Profit.

NOTE.—The report states that the above earnings are subject to adjustment at the end of the year when accounts are finally audited. At that time any claim the company may have for tax refund, under the carry-back provisions, will be determinable.

CHAIN BELT CO.

	1946	1945	1944
Report for quarter ended Apr. 30			
Loss from operations	$756,652		
Estimated income-tax credit [1]	[2] 795,000		
Net income	38,348		
Report for 6 months ended Apr. 30			
Loss from operations	802,569		
Estimated income-tax-credit adjustment [3]	[2] 1,045,000		
Net income	242,431		

[1] The estimated income-tax-credit adjustment turned a loss of $756,652 into a profit of $38,348.
[2] Report points out that the income-tax adjustments representing tax refunds have been estimated on the basis of book losses to date though the amount of such adjustments is dependent upon the profit or loss for the entire year.
[3] The estimated income-tax-credit adjustment turned a loss of $802,569 into a profit of $242,431.

Carry-backs—Continued

DOUGLAS AIRCRAFT CO., INC.

Report for quarter ended Feb. 28

	1946	1945	1944
Net income	[1] $1,111,710		

[1] This net income includes $560,000 recovery of prior years' Federal excess-profits taxes resulting from unused excess-profits credit carry-back.

FLORENCE STOVE CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net loss	[1] $254,910	[2] $318,690	

[1] Before credit for possible tax refunds resulting from carry-back provisions.
[2] Profit.

GENERAL CABLE CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Federal tax on income	(1)	$3,875,000	$2,300,000
Net loss	$2,231,404	[2] 675,415	[2] 517,063

[1] The amount of refund which may accrue under the carry-back provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, the report states, is dependent upon the results for the full calendar year and thus cannot be predicted at this time. The minimum refund that will accrue if the loss for the year equals or exceeds the loss for the current quarter is estimated at $2,025,000.
[2] Profit.

GENERAL ELECTRIC CORP.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Orders received		$395,466,000	$391,901,000
Net sales billed	$60,426,744	309,766,472	354,624,206
Costs, expenses, etc	88,044,511	266,629,395	286,480,104
Loss from sales	27,618,167	[1] 43,137,077	[1] 68,144,102
Other income, net	1,666,587	1,825,585	3,240,303
Loss, including other income	25,951,580	[1] 44,962,662	[1] 71,384,405
Federal income and excess-profit tax	[2] 10,000,000	32,000,000	55,450,000
Postwar adjustments and contingencies	[3] 2,250,000	1,200,000	5,550,000
Net loss	13,701,580	[1] 11,762,662	[1] 10,384,405

[1] Profit.
[2] Represents the estimated minimum amount by which such taxes will be reduced when final results for the year have been determined as a result of the operating loss sustained in the first 3 months.
[3] Transfer from the reserve for postwar adjustments and contingencies.

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945 [1]
Net sales	$74,950,618	$1,022,693,175
Equity in subs (debit)	1,759,046	61,351
Other income (net)	2,562,538	1,362,854
Total income	75,754,110	1,023,994,678
Cost of sales	129,870,805	861,288,029
Expenses	24,298,805	24,149,082
Postwar reconversion costs [2]	5,414,450	
Depreciation and amortization	10,493,163	16,858,838
Employees bonus		3,946,000

[1] Adjusted by company.
[2] Represents amount charged to reserve for postwar contingencies and rehabilitation created by charges to income in prior years. This amount was offset by a special income credit utilized during the period to absorb costs or postwar reconversion.

Carry-backs—Continued

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.—continued

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31—Continued

	1945	1945[1]
Income-tax credit [3]	$52,784,000	
United States and foreign income and excess-profit taxes		$68,423,000
Loss before special credit	41,539,113	[4] 50,229,729
Special income credit	5,414,450	
Net loss	36,124,663	[4] 50,229,729

[1] Adjusted by company.
[3] Reflects estimate of the tax credit and carry-back refund allocable to the first quarter of 1946 as provided in the current law.
[4] Profit.

The two tax adjustments, Mr. Sloan said, were made as follows:

"(1) By a tax credit computed at the combined normal tax and surtax rate of 40 percent, representing the amount by which the normal tax and surtax for the year may be reduced because of the loss in the first quarter, and

"(2) By an additional credit to income for the quarter equal to one-fourth of the maximum amount of taxes which may be recovered through the carry-back to 1944 of the unused excess-profits credit for 1946."

NOTE.—For the year ending Dec. 31, 1945, General Motors reported as follows:

"The 1945 provision for United States income taxes has been reduced by $34,415,207 representing the net reduction in income and excess profits taxes for the year 1943 arising from the carry-back of unused excess-profits credit for the year 1945." (This would indicate an unused credit of approximately $84,000,000.)

GENERAL TIME INSTRUMENTS CORP.

Report for 12 weeks ending Mar. 23

	1946	1945	1944
Federal and Canadian taxes	[1] $106,334	$1,171,462	$1,077,148
Net profit	171,538	352,449	425,829

[1] No account has been given in the 1946 figures with respect to the carry-back of any excess profits tax credit as provided under the revenue act, as the effect, if any, of such carry-back is undeterminable at this time, the report states.

HAYES INDUSTRIES, INC.

Report for 9 months ended Apr. 30

	1946	1945	1944
Sales	$3,455,429	$29,310,638	$27,934,535
Loss after charges	411,543	[1] 4,191,478	[1] 5,488,617
Federal tax provision		1,776,720	2,383,972
Tax carry-back credit	405,803		
Net loss	5,740	[1] 673,758	[1] 814,841

[1] Profit.

HERCULES MOTORS CORP.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net loss	[1] $815,307	[2] $320,619	[2] $261,164

[1] Before application of appropriate tax credit and without using any part of the postwar reserve for contingencies previously provided. Report states that minimum tax credit would amount to approximately $300,000
[2] Profit.

HOUDAILLE-HERSHEY CORP.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net loss	[1] $269,002	[2] $379,501	[2] $424,853

[1] Net loss after Federal taxes refundable on basis of current operations, amounting to $2,057,375.
[2] Profit.

HUDSON MOTOR CAR CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net after charges	$94,670	$688,544	$686,871
Tax credit	[1] 52,202		
Net profit	146,872	428,016	271,871

[1] Represents adjustment for Federal income taxes to cover estimated recoveries under the carry-back features of the tax law for losses and charges to reconversion reserve during the period.

Carry-backs—Continued

KELSEY-HAYES WHEEL CO.

Report for 6 months ended Feb. 28

	194[illegible]	1945	1944
Loss after charges	$2,486,925	[1] $4,226,450	
Federal tax provision, net		3,069,276	
Federal tax credit	[2] 1,894,000		
Net loss	592,925	[1] 1,157,174	

[1] Profit.
[2] Estimated refund of Federal taxes on income of prior years.

LINK-BELT CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net sales	$9,947,117	$17,638,668	$18,585,772
Loss after charges	219,065	[1] 3,068,357	[1] 3,860,037
Federal income taxes, etc	194,500	2,592,400	2,366,514
Loss before tax credit	413,565	[1] 476,957	[1] 493,523
Tax credit	[2] 786,000		
Net income	372,435	476,957	493,523

[1] Profit.
[2] Represents the estimated recovery of prior years' income and excess-profits taxes resulting from carry-back of operating loss and unused excess-profits credits.

NOTE.—By reason of the tax credit this company was able to turn a loss of $413,565 into a profit of $372,435.

LIQUID CARBONIC CORP.

	1946	1945	1944
Report for 6 months ended Mar. 31			
Net sales	$9,135,426	$9,685,304	$10,291,116
Loss after charges	580,082	[1] 804,232	[1] 1,220,569
Income and excess-profits tax	79,338	385,976	698,554
Net loss	[2] 659,420	[1] 418,256	[1] 522,015
Report for quarter ended Mar. 31			
Net sales	4,797,412	4,807,012	5,249,329
Net loss	[2] 467,869	[1] 138,663	[1] 186,010

[1] Profit.
[2] No account has been taken of any credit that may accrue under the carry-back provisions of the Federal tax laws. It is estimated that for the current fiscal year this credit may approach $500,000.

MENASCO MANUFACTURING CO.

Report for 8 months ended Feb. 28

	1946	1945	1944
Operating loss	[1] $1,695,607		
Net loss	423,607		

[1] Includes $1,272,000 recovery of prior years' income and excess-profits taxes resulting from carry-back of net operating loss and unused excess-profits credit.

MOTOR WHEEL CORP.

For quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Operating loss	$232,541		
Federal tax credit	[1] 432,000		
Net profit	199,459	$615,070	

[1] Refund of prior year's Federal income and excess profits taxes arising from carry-back of net operating loss and unused excess profits credit.

NOTE.—The Federal tax credit of $432,000 turned a loss of $232,541 into a net profit of $199,459.

MULLINS MANUFACTURING CORP.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Federal income and excess-profits tax		$884,710	$750,909
Net loss	[1] $687,997	[2] 353,579	[2] 287,269

[1] Does not reflect unused excess-profits credit or net operating loss carry-back, according to the company.
[2] Profit.

Carry-backs—Continued

MURRAY CORP. OF AMERICA

Report for 6 months ended Feb. 28

	1946	1945	1944
Loss after charges	$3,259,084	[1] $1,726,082	[1] $2,435,225
Income and excess-profits tax, net		1,112,500	1,712,500
Federal tax credit	[2] 2,345,000		
Net loss	914,084	[1] 613,582	[1] 722,725

[1] Profit.
[2] Tax credit is the recoverable portion of prior years Federal taxes on income arising from carry-back of net operating loss and unused excess-profits credit.

NASH-KELVINATOR CORP.

	1946	1945	1944
Report for 6 months ended Mar. 31			
Operating loss	$5,639,633		
Tax credit adjustment	3,848,000		
Net loss	1,791,633	[1] $1,829,425	[1] $1,551,325
Quarter ended Mar. 31			
Operating loss	2,684,775		
Tax credit adjustment	1,532,000		
Net loss	1,152,775	[1] 510,258	[1] 491,064

[1] Profit.

NATIONAL MALLEABLE & STEEL CASTINGS CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net loss	$191,000	[1] $199,614	[1] $230,502

[1] Profit.

NOTE.—Company states that the March 1946 quarterly reports reflect no provision for possible tax benefits which may result from excess profits tax credit carry-backs or operating loss carry-backs, as such benefits are contingent upon results of future periods and are not definitely determinable at this time.

NATIONAL SUPPLY CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net sales	$21,064,733	$39,429,950	
Loss after charges	69,243	[1] 3,904,275	
Federal, State, and foreign taxes		2,830,000	
Tax credit	[2] 680,000		
Net income	610,757	1,074,275	

[1] Profit.
[2] Represents estimated credit resulting from carry-back provision of Federal tax laws, less estimated income taxes on certain consolidated subsidiaries.

NOTE.—The tax credit of $680,000 turned a loss of $69,243 into a profit of $610,757.

NOBLITT-SPARKS INDUSTRIES, INC.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Sales	$2,978,142	$7,971,394	
Net loss	447,192	[1] 452,337	

[1] Profit.

NOTE.—That company states that it has not taken into consideration the carry-back provisions of the income-tax law in reporting the result of operations for the first quarter of this year. If this provision were taken into consideration, the operating loss would be substantially reduced, according to Glenn W. Thompson, company president.

Carry-backs—Continued

NEW YORK CENTRAL R. R.

Estimated report first 4 months 1946

	1946	1945	1944
Net loss	[1] $8,385,800	[2] $8,752,862	

[1] After allowance for income-tax carry-back, Jacob Aronson, vice president, said at the annual meeting of stockholders "* * * Based upon actual operations and without the benefit of income-tax carry-backs, the deficit in net income in the Jan. 1-Apr. 30 period is estimated $18,931,500." (This would reflect a tax credit of $10,545,700.

[2] Profit.

EXCERPTS FROM ARTICLE BY ARUNDEL COTTER IN WALL STREET JOURNAL, APRIL 29, 1946

The New York Central Railroad, after a relatively brief 4 years of war prosperity following 10 lean years, faces the possibility of substantial postwar losses. * * *

Central's earning record in the decade before the war—1931-40—was far from satisfactory. In 4 of the 10 years the road reported deficits, and for the period as a whole these exceeded aggregate profits by $18,000,000.

The road, however, is in a far better position today than it was at any time during the 10 prewar years. Fixed charges against income—interest, rentals, etc.—which were $62,700,000 in 1932 and averaged $55,700,000 over the decade, are estimated at only about $41,000,000 in 1946. Central, other things being equal, would not have done so badly in the prewar decade if its fixed charges had been at present levels.

Outstanding debt has been cut from $1,108,000,000 in 1932 to $855,400,000 at the end of 1945. And there is reason to expect further reduction in debt. The road has no important maturities for many years. The largest total for any of the next 10 years is $25,000,000, less than the annual depreciation charge, while average maturities for the 10 years is $10,200,000.

Finally, New York Central is in the best working-capital position in its history. Net current assets December 31, last, were $149,800,000, compared with $37,500,000 at the end of 1940. * * *

Tax refunds may play an important part in Central's final results for 1946, as they did in 1945. Due to a special charge on earnings of $45,600,000 for accelerated amortization of war facilities that year, the road had a deficit, before taxes, of around $17,000,000. Recomputation of its reports for previous years, combined with carry-baek of the loss, resulted in tax recoveries of $32,800,000, while tax credits of $9,400,000 resulted from over accruals of previous years. These recoveries offset the loss by $24,400,000.

In the event that the road's earnings this year fall short of its excess-profits tax credit, it will be able to recompute 1944 taxes and secure a refund.

NOTE.—The deficit for the first 4 months of 1946, exclusive of tax credit, is $18,931,500 as compared with a net income of $8,752,862 for the corresponding period 1945.

Carry-backs

OUTBOARD MARINE & MANUFACTURING CO.

Report for 6 months ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net sales	$7,700,889	$15,343,643	
Net after charges	547	3,350,650	$4,113,640
Federal, State, and Canadian taxes	[1] 175,800	2,622,000	3,128,800
Net profit	176,347	553,650	684,840

[1] Credit due to carry-back provisions of Federal tax.

Carry-backs—Continued

PACKARD MOTOR CAR CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Sales	$5,737,226	$97,977,931	$113,934,499
Loss after charges	3,465,449	[1] 4,085,420	[1] 6,376,989
Federal tax provision		3,430,000	5,291,000
Income tax credit	[2] 3,218,000		
Net loss	247,449	[1] 655,420	[1] 1,085,989

[1] Profit.

[2] Estimated tax carry-back refund.

PHILCO CORP

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Sales	$14,218,351	$38,046,306	
Net loss	[1] 69,471	[2] 846,109	[2] $946,326

[1] After including in the account tax credits under the carry-back provisions of the tax law estimated at $2,500,000.

[2] Profit.

PRESSED STEEL CAR CO., INC.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Loss after charges	$590,798	[1]$1,506,292	[1]$2,805,260
Tax carry-back credit	425,000		
Federal tax and contingencies		1,188,500	2,288,300
Net loss	165,798	[1] 317,792	[1] 517,960

[1] Profit.

RHEEM MANUFACTURING CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net sales	$3,987,000	$27,848,000	$16,215,000
Net profit	[1] 93,991	561,200	396,381

[1] Gives effect to income and excess-profits tax carry-back credit. * * * the loss before such tax credit adjustment for the March quarter was $555,000. (This would indicate a tax credit of $648,991.)

REYNOLDS METALS CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net loss	[1] $227,580	[2] $1,419,406	[2] $919,296

[1] After estimated tax credit of $799,126.

[2] Profit.

REYNOLDS SPRING CO.

Report for 6 months ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Loss after interest, etc.	$1,019,844	[1] $341,893	[1] $596,261
Federal tax provision		156,899	409,967
Loss after taxes	1,019,844	[1] 184,994	[1] 186,294
Estimated tax refunds	537,637		
Net loss	483,355	[1] 184,994	[1] 186,294

[1] Profit.

STUDEBAKER CORP.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Sales	$25,135,700	$90,885,037	$108,502,292
Operating loss	4,485,760	[1] 3,977,323	[1] 4,163,548
Federal income and excess profits tax, net		2,953,000	2,945,000
Tax credit	[2] 4,356,000		
Net loss	129,760	[1] 1,024,323	[1] 818,548

[1] Profit.

[2] Tax credit resulting from carry-back provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

Carry-backs—Continued

SYLVANIA ELECTRIC PRODUCTS, INC.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net sales	$12,834,131	$34,453,343	$18,829,198
Profit after charges		3,292,361	2,205,914
Federal tax provision, net		2,563,330	1,764,730
Net loss	[2] 422,264	[1] 729,031	[1] 441,184

[1] The 1946 first quarter net loss is without credit for any excess-profits-tax refund which might be available to the companies through the carry-back provision of the Internal Revenue Code.

[2] Profit.

YALE & TOWNE MANUFACTURING CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Federal tax on income		$1,149,123	$1,144,706
Net loss	[1] $742,771	[2] 287,280	[2] 286,177

[1] Report states that the loss does not take into account any tax refund to which the company may be entitled to under the carry-back provisions of the Internal Revenue Code or any tax credit to which the company will be entitled in the event the loss shown is absorbed by future profits earned during the balance of 1946.

[2] Profit.

UNITED AIRCRAFT CORP.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Sales and other income	$26,850,898	$165,941,052	$216,067,157
Loss after expenses	2,334,029	[1] 15,103,940	[1] 19,212,275
Postwar provision		1,011,371	1,354,468
Tax credit	[2] 1,828,108		
Federal income and excess-profits tax		10,544,788	13,797,179
Net loss	505,921	[1] 3,547,781	[1] 4,060,628

[1] Profit.

[2] Represents credit due to reduction of Federal taxes of prior years as provided for by the carry-back provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

WM. WRIGLEY JR. CO.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Net after expenses	$562,450	$2,618,431	$2,518,095
Total income	1,009,759	2,928,723	2,674,352
Federal income and excess-profits tax	281,962	1,327,330	1,110,800
Special credit	[1] 820,625		
Net profit	1,548,422	1,557,723	1,543,952

[1] Includes $500,000 estimated credit for refund of prior year excess-profits tax arising from carry back provision of Internal Revenue Code considered applicable to 3 months ended Mar. 31, 1946 * * *

WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP.

Report for quarter ended Mar. 31

	1946	1945	1944
Orders booked	$106,063,528	$312,116,465	226,110,472
Orders unfilled	373,561,735	608,376,164	791,340,584
Sales billed	31,452,123	194,371,393	188,981,992
Loss after charges	18,724,601	[1] 22,635,790	[1] 24,566,179
Income and excess-profits tax, net		17,263,655	18,362,126
Net loss	[2] 18,724,601	[1] 4,007,815	[1] 4,516,092

[1] Income.

[2] Westinghouse Electric's operating loss for the first quarter of 1946 gives no effect to the carry-back features of the Federal Revenue Act, G. A. Price, president, stated. He emphasized that losses incident to the 118-day strike have been absorbed in operations currently and not charged to reserves created during past years. "The reason for not making such adjustments," Mr. Price explained, "is that the Westinghouse strike still was in progress at the end of the quarter. Such adjustments may be made at the end of the second quarter."

Effect of carry-backs not indicated—1946 earnings reports compared with like period, 1945

RAILROADS

Reports for quarter ended Mar. 31

Company	1946	1945	(+) or (−) 1945	Percent (+) or (−) 1945	Company	1946	1945	(+) or (−) 1945	Percent (+) or (−) 1945
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	$11,898,247	$12,799,394	−$901,147	−7.04	Missouri, Kansas & Texas	$632,000	$1,363,249	−$731,249	−53.64
Central of Georgia	[1] 1,135,967	260,382	−1,396,349	−536.27	Pennsylvania [2]	[1] 7,747,349	16,803,144	−24,550,493	−146.11
Chicago, Indianapolis & St. Louis	[1] 449,798	366,778	−816,576	−222.63	Reading	579,395	1,876,965	−1,297,570	−69.13
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha	[1] 1,398,655	250,804	−1,649,459	−657.67	Seaboard Air Line	[1] 1,386,693	1,466,411	−2,853,104	−194.56
Delaware, Lackawanna & Western	[1] 116,057	288,196	−404,253	−140.27	Tennessee Central	[1] 83,964	62,289	−146,253	−234.80
Fort Worth & Denver	[1] 190,698	65,826	−256,524	−389.70	Western Pacific	856,028	1,718,597	−862,569	−50.19
Kansas City Southern	671,964	1,086,208	−414,244	−38.14	Wisconsin Central	22,575	412,009	−389,434	−94.52
Louisville & Nashville	3,817,310	5,301,952	−1,484,642	−28.00	Wabash	980,383	1,575,545	−595,162	−37.77

Reports for 4 months ended Apr. 30

Alabama Great Southern	$91,342	$592,226	−$500,884	−84.58	International Great Northern	[1] $724,336	$402,567	−$1,126,903	−279.93
Alton R. R.	[1] 1,447,859	1,219,477	−2,667,336	−218.73	Maine Central R. R.	121,120	267,016	−145,896	−54.64
Atlantic Coast Line	1,256,759	4,476,109	−3,219,350	−71.92	Minneapolis & St. Louis	[1] 207,970	607,085	−815,055	−134.26
Baltimore & Ohio	[1] 12,950,674	7,243,236	−20,193,910	−278.80	Missouri Pacific	127,704	5,463,493	−5,335,789	−97.66
Boston & Maine	[2] 302,637	1,509,892	−1,812,529	−120.04	Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis	[1] 609,128	1,573,421	−2,182,549	−138.71
Central R. R. of New Jersey	[1] 2,046,885	864,647	−2,911,532	−336.73	New York, Chicago & St. Louis	332,632	3,866,922	−3,534,290	−91.40
Chesapeake & Ohio	6,603,505	8,684,277	−2,080,772	−23.96	New York, New Haven & Hartford	[1] 2,685,020	3,947,136	−6,632,156	−168.02
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	9,244,678	9,185,665	+59,013	+0.64	Norfolk & Western	6,426,930	7,478,818	−1,051,888	−14.06
Chicago & Eastern Illinois	[1] 1,172,350	446,979	−1,619,329	−362.28	Northern Pacific	[1] 954,250	1,941,481	−2,895,731	−149.15
Chicago Great Western	[1] 1,098,901	342,307	−1,441,208	−421.03	Pere Marquette	[1] 501,442	1,893,816	−2,395,258	−126.48
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific	1,204,025	5,461,763	−4,257,738	−77.96	Pittsburgh & West Virginia	[1] 154,861	637,238	−792,099	−124.30
Chicago & North Western	[1] 2,351,866	5,080,690	−7,432,556	−146.29	Pullman, Inc	320,990	2,571,818	−2,250,828	−87.52
Colorado & Southern	[1] 214,114	773,038	−987,152	−127.70	Southern Pacific	3,873,736	11,731,811	−7,858,075	−66.98
Denver & Rio Grande	[1] 849,864	2,197,727	−3,047,591	−138.67	Southern Ry	2,844,558	7,322,694	−4,478,136	−61.15
Erie Railroad	[1] 2,315,752	2,123,206	−4,438,958	−209.07	St. Louis Southwestern Lines	1,097,330	2,945,351	−1,848,021	−62.73
Great Northern	[1] 2,484,062	2,524,722	−5,008,784	−198.39	Union Pacific	6,135,251	11,440,666	−5,305,415	−46.37
Gulf, Mobile & Ohio	[1] 170,395	1,044,843	−1,215,238	−116.31	Western Maryland	482,944	1,368,255	−885,311	−64.70
Illinois Central	2,155,439	6,973,079	−4,817,640	−69.09	Wheeling & Lake Erie	608,908	1,153,262	−544,354	−47.20

CORPORATIONS

Reports for quarter ended Mar. 31

Corporation	1946	1945	(+) or (−) 1945	Percent (+) or (−) 1945	Corporation	1946	1945	(+) or (−) 1945	Percent (+) or (−) 1945
Allegheny Ludlum Steel	$252,043	$936,690	−$684,647	−73.09	Jones & Laughlin	$813,246	$2,013,489	−$1,200,243	−59.61
American Metal Co	146,866	468,526	−321,660	−68.65	Kalamazoo Stove & Furnace	[1] 28,373	210,704	−239,077	−113.47
Air Reduction Co	786,725	1,422,947	−636,222	−44.71	Koppers Co	104,934	630,970	−526,036	−83.37
American Bosch Corp	[1] 357,696	178,024	−535,720	−300.93	Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass	[1] 450,445	1,902,464	−2,353,909	−123.66
Allis Chalmers	[1] 2,250,956	1,979,582	−4,230,538	−213.71	Midland Steel Products	[1] 316,262	377,596	−693,858	−183.76
Atlantic Refining Co	1,902,237	2,706,306	−804,069	−29.71	National Steel Corp	2,083,356	3,429,988	−1,346,632	−39.26
American Smelting & Refining	996,154	2,867,169	−1,871,015	−65.26	National Automotive Fibers	[1] 113,098	135,538	−248,636	−183.44
American Zinc & Lead	[1] 213,709	150,730	−364,439	−241.78	National Cash Register	[1] 343,206	580,034	−923,240	−159.17
American Airlines	[1] 447,648	1,252,377	−1,700,025	−135.74	Paraffines Co	[1] 614,311	479,473	−1,093,784	−228.12
Anaconda Copper	534,626	7,357,449	−6,822,823	−92.73	Pittsburgh Forging Co	[1] 31,248	179,165	−210,413	−117.44
Bausch & Lomb Optical	[1] 380,580	311,037	−691,617	−222.36	Pittsburgh Steel	[1] 1,173,697	192,718	−1,370,415	−711.10
Bethlehem Steel	4,804,438	7,695,909	−2,891,471	−37.57	Pittsburgh Screw & Bolt	[1] 75,843	255,607	−331,450	−129.67
Bridgeport Brass	[1] 385,834	517,284	−903,118	−174.59	Republic Steel	[1] 347,413	3,084,548	−3,431,961	−111.26
Bigelow-Sanford Carpet	[1] 159,405	202,892	−362,297	−178.57	Reo Motors	263,626	716,756	−453,130	−63.22
Central Foundry	[1] 48,147	82,191	−130,338	−158.58	Revere Copper	[1] 340,180	709,359	−1,049,539	−147.96
Copperweld Steel	[1] 188,521	253,631	−442,152	−174.33	Richfield Oil	993,859	1,121,910	−128,051	−1.14
Crucible Steel	[1] 1,742,750	803,558	−2,546,308	−316.88	Stewart-Warner Co	[1] 142,110	467,642	−609,752	−130.39
Climax Molybdenum	504,282	3,085,946	−2,581,664	−83.66	Superior Steel Co	[1] 36,678	67,324	−104,002	−154.48
Curtis Publishing Co	647,809	1,036,389	−388,580	−37.49	Southern Bell Telephone Co	2,274,190	3,121,640	−847,450	−27.15
Checker Cab Manufacturing Co	[1] 103,464	20,056	−123,520	−615.88	Savage Arms Corp	[1] 105,837	170,278	−276,115	−162.16
Continental Diamond Fiber	[1] 192,021	106,593	−298,614	−280.14	Symington Gould Corp	[1] 497,490	280,228	−777,718	−277.53
Cutler-Hammer Co	112,703	345,268	−232,565	−67.36	Sharon Steel Co	[1] 343,339	301,760	−645,099	−213.78
Continental Steel Corp	10,962	151,892	−140,930	−92.78	Standard Oil Co. of Ohio	2,025,909	11,407,315	−9,381,406	−82.24
Coca-Cola	3,770,722	3,893,760	−123,038	−3.16	Shell Union Oil	7,727,503	8,461,601	−734,098	−8.68
Continental Oil	2,606,354	3,448,359	−842,005	−24.42	Standard Steel Spring	[1] 537,202	481,854	−1,019,056	−211.49
Diamond T Motor Car	195,289	599,489	−404,200	−67.42	Tidewater Associated Oil	3,744,555	4,322,929	−578,374	−13.38
Elliott Co	[1] 423,673	186,857	−610,530	−326.74	Timken Roller Bearing	[1] 3,030,950	1,247,452	−4,278,402	−342.97
Electric Auto Lite Co	[1] 1,433,228	1,476,178	−2,909,403	−197.09	Twin Coach Co	[1] 328,603	168,000	−496,603	−295.60
Follansbee Steel	[1] 213,151	70,114	−283,265	−400.63	Thompson Products	[1] 758,889	722,427	−1,481,316	−205.05
General Railway Signal	[1] 64,557	282,602	−347,159	−122.84	United Car Fastener	92,698	118,801	−96,103	−50.90
General Steel Casting	[1] 536,603	372,276	−908,879	−244.14	United Airlines	[1] 512,541	1,179,046	−1,691,587	−143.47
Granite City Steel Co	[1] 459,103	81,647	−540,750	−662.30	Walworth Co	[1] 421,509	278,272	−699,781	−251.47
Hayes Manufacturing Co	[1] 74,712	90,823	−165,535	−182.26	Wheeling Steel Corp	22,655	1,201,881	−1,179,226	−98.11
Heywood-Wakefield Co	528,597	146,686	−675,283	−460.36	White Sewing Machine	138,137	192,802	−54,665	−28.35
Hupp Motor Car Corp	[1] 56,000	330,356	−386,356	−116.95	Western Union	[1] 5,660,576	317,383	−5,977,959	−1,883.52
Illinois Bell Telephone Co	1,766,947	2,719,722	−952,775	−35.03	Wilcox Oil	[1] 10,199	94,380	−104,579	−110.81
Inland Steel	1,046,958	2,370,948	−1,323,990	−55.84	Youngstown Sheet & Tube	1,205,444	1,888,549	−683,105	−36.17
Johns-Manville	[1] 796,863	1,395,598	−2,193,461	−157.17	York Corp	16,172	337,537	−321,365	−95.21

[1] Deficit.

[2] Net operating income for 4 months 1946 was $543,210 as compared to $39,150,491 in 1945 and $26,197,070 in 1944.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] on January 21, 1946, introduced legislation to repeal the provision of law providing for the carry-back of unused excess-profits credits. The Ways and Means Committee requested a report from the Treasury Department on the bill on January 23, 1946. The Treasury Department has not filed this report with the committee to date. The Treasury is studying the matter, we are advised, in an effort to make recommendations of methods of eliminating abuses and inequities.

In view of the fact that the Congress will soon adjourn for an indefinite period and before the Treasury can make its report and legislation can be passed carrying out the report if the Congress desires, I recommend that the Congress immediately repeal this provision of law as suggested by the so-called Bailey bill. The Congress can at a later date pass legislation on the subject to carry out the original intent and purpose and to safeguard against abuses and inequities. Certainly we cannot afford to permit the present situation to continue unaltered.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables and charts which I have prepared and others which I have taken from magazines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MINIMUM-WAGE LEGISLATION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the greatest enemy of democracy is poverty; the most persistent challenge to American democracy is human want. Poverty is the "black hole"; it is the breeding ground of the social diseases, and the physical and mental diseases, too, which weaken the spirit and the strength of our Nation. Local infections and ailments threaten the health of men; and if they are chronic, if they persist, even though localized, they draw on the strength of the whole man to fight them and can be the cause of his death. Not a few of our young men who looked as healthy as a man can look and strong were rejected by the armed forces because of some persistent, though not apparent, defect. Many an athlete of national prominence and great ability failed to pass the careful scrutiny of medical boards. I am sure, too, that many of my colleagues here can recall the sudden passing of a friend who when last seen looked sound and vigorous. The whole body succumbs to the devastating effect of a single, even a local, defect, a brain tumor, a heart disease, a cancerous growth. And we know, too, that the spirit is of prime importance in maintaining life and health; the will to live can fight off the malady. But if the spirit falters and fails, the bodily break-down follows fast.

It would be to neglect an obvious and true parallel if we were to fail to apply this knowledge to our national being. It is in recognition of this that we assert our purpose and strive to achieve "freedom from fear" for our people. Fear is a harrowing and destructive social disease which can be campaigned against with success by practical remedy, or which can rage as an epidemic. Closely allied is the struggle to achieve "freedom from want," which is a struggle against a companion disease, best identified as poverty. Not only can we witness the ravage of the social disease of poverty in the great corporate land of wealth and plenty as we see a single and local malady afflict the healthy body, but we can witness in poverty the source of many of the physical and mental illnesses of our people.

I make this comparison because I see it to be true, yet would like to impress it more forcibly because there is a danger that we do not realize in full the fatal consequences of the presence of poverty in our land of plenty. A man whose grip is strong, his step firm, his sight good, yes, and his clothing new, will ignore that occasional pain in his side until he is suddenly stricken. This Nation, victorious in war, rich in resources, and greatest in production, a power in the world and a source of aid to suffering nations can easily ignore the pain in its side, the poverty that is manifest in the very middle of almost every large city. We are rich, we are strong, we are vigorous. How can we be poor?

We, the collective, the national "we," may not be poor, but some of us are. We identify the disease by its symptoms. What are the symptoms of poverty? Undernourishment, overcrowding, deterioration of household equipment and clothing, liability to acute distress with any minor disturbance in the family equilibrium. There is not a man among us who can deny that he has witnessed these symptoms. We do not have to travel far to see them, but we can travel far across the country and everywhere see them. And if we fail to see them because the train of progress and plenty we are traveling on is going too fast, let us remember for a minute when that train slowed down and almost stalled.

Do we remember the depression? We were traveling on the same line then that we are now. We have come some distance since then; we have new power, greater steam in our engines of production; we have streamlined our cars, added men to operate and control, and perhaps strengthened the ties and the rails with social advances and some guaranties of security. But this is the same system we were on; it is the road of our own choosing, which does not stop us from seeking improvements. The memory of the snail-pace and creaking condition of the "depression local" is too sharp for us to forget.

Yet who can assert that our way of life has forever eliminated the danger of the business cycle, as we call it, which finds its nadir in depression? Our hopes are strong; we refuse to accept as inevitable the cycles of prosperity and depression; we will not regard the cycle complacently as characteristic. But we have no assurance that we have straightened out the cycle and made it a level, if not of prosperity, yet a minimum guaranty of freedom from want for our people. We refuse to accept the alternative of peace and depression, war and seeming prosperity. But already festering in us is the fear that in days to come we may be stricken again, the germ of fear is in us. As the body marshals its forces against the germ, as the vital principle in man fights off disease, we too are already marshaling our forces, and the vital principle in our Nation which asserts the essential dignity of the human being, and his right to be free from want and fear continues to stir us.

We have asserted our determination that mass unemployment will not afflict us again. We strive for full employment, a goal which the late Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaimed with characteristic vision, faith, and assurance. President Truman reasserted this objective in his message to Congress on the state of the Union last January when he said:

> All Americans able to work and desiring to work have the right and opportunity to useful, remunerative, and full-time employment.

He asserted our basic objective—

> To improve the welfare of the American people which, in addition to economic prosperity, means social security in the fullest sense.

Mr. President, this House is now considering legislation which is directed to that objective. I refer to the proposed amendment to minimum-wage legislation reported to the floor in H. R. 4130 which would set a minimum wage of 65 cents an hour. I endorse that proposal. I am convinced that the present minimum of 40 cents per hour, set by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in pre-inflation days was, as the President has said: "Inadequate when it was established. It has now become obsolete. Increases in the cost of living since 1938 and changes in our national wage structure require an immediate and substantial upward revision of this minimum." However, while I endorse legislation which would raise the minimum wage to 65 cents an hour, I believe that if this alone were now provided by law, the same appraisal might now or very shortly be made, namely of present inadequacy and imminent obsolescence. As a cosponsor of minimim-wage legislation with a group of my colleagues in the House who also oppose the impoverishment of people in this land, I insist that we must not stop with the proposed 65-cent minimum. We must step up to security, to the level of freedom from want and one step does not get us there, particularly when the rising waters of prices tend to float the level higher day by day. This legislation was first reported by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in S. 1349, which proposed a gradual step-up from the dirt-floor 40-cent minimum, which might better be described as quicksand, for the level seems to sink constantly for the great mass of workers whose feet are gripped in it. The original Senate bill proposed a minimum of 65 cents an hour in the first year of operation, 70 cents per hour in the second, and 75 cents per hour thereafter. With these minimum rates our workers might have kept pace with the escalator of prices, though butter has gone up 11 cents a pound, a cue to the soaring prices we can expect now that the OPA, almost the only safety valve in our economy, has been blown up by pressure. These graduated minimum rates I thoroughly endorse; every lesser scale is inadequate and promises to bind the worker to his first meager step up, a step up, a step which he will find flooded as soon as he steps on it.

But there are those who deny the necessity for such upward revisions. The Senate bill as amended and passed by that House, in addition to numerous confining provisions, provides a minimum of 65 cents per hour for the first 2 years of operation, 70 cents per hour in the third and fourth years, and 75 cents thereafter. Meanwhile, the cost of living, the mean of subsistence, continues to advance as much per month as the proposed percent increase provides in years. And are we now to be content with the barest minimum proposed and to be forced to devote our energies to securing only that end?

The Fair Labor Standards Act, inadequate at the time and now obsolete, provided for graded increases with a minimum of 25 cents per hour the first year, 30 cents per hour the next 6 years, and 40 cents per hour thereafter, the present rate. The inadequacy of this legislation was manifest at the time of enactment, and witness to this is the fact that in many cases provisions for increases above the minimum were made in anticipation of the legal increase. But it is 8 years since the act became law, 8 years in which it has been more and more inadequate, 8 years in which tremendously expanded production and increas-

ing prices were the rule, and it is 8 years before we get around to proposing an additional increase. Are we to persist in inadequacy; are we to continue to hold security or, more accurately, freedom from want beyond the reach of our low-paid workers? This is the opportunity; let us be aware of the danger of letting it slip.

It is apparent to observers of the political and economic scene that the western world, of which America is a most important part, is passing through a period of high social tension produced by the tardiness of social and economic adjustment to change. In the great depression years of the last decade millions of our people suffered from want, the entire Nation suffered from an economy of scarcity. Yet we had not lost our capacity to produce. We had great national resources and our tremendous productivity during the war years proclaimed mightily our ability to produce goods. That production potential existed in the depression years, but we still went without. We did not consume; we did not produce. There is emerging from our experience of the last two decades a conviction that we must deliberately set out to achieve new minimum goals of consumption.

The first fact pertinent to that conviction is that to close the gap of tardiness in social and economic adjustment, we must raise the minimum wage rate immediately and adequately and not permit a less than adequate rate to forever prevent our workers from buying and consuming what they need.

There is a second fact pertinent to our conviction that we must deliberately set out to achieve new minimum goals of consumption, namely that this can be achieved in part by setting new minimum goals for wages. We are acutely conscious of the capacity for production of American industry, so acutely conscious that some of our economists speak of overproduction and many observers speak of the flooded market. But we have no proof that industry can produce more than we can consume. What we do know is that production can exceed what we can consume expressed in terms of our ability to pay. The needs and wants of our people have never been satisfied. Even in June 1945, the percent of workers receiving below the minimum wage in the tobacco, lumber and textile industries was 58, 54, and 47 percent respectively. That means that more than one-half of the families of such workers were living below an emergency sustenance level of living. Prof. Alvin Hansen, the noted economist, says this: "We may take it as axiomatic that within the visible range human wants are insatiable." Arthur A. Hood, director of dealer relations of Johns-Manville, in an address to the American Business Policy Conference of the Economic and Business Foundation recently stated in this way: "There is no down cycle in human wants." The total market is unlimited. There is no known height to which the American standard of living cannot rise." The economist is recognizing, the merchant and manufacturer are now declaring what the great majority of American workers and their families have known too intimately for years, that there are a great many things they need. Economists currently refer to different levels of human living, calling poverty a distinct state of submergence, and identifying other stages as "minimum of subsistence," "minimum of maintenance" and so forth. What these terms mean is that there are a great many families in this Nation today who are going without the necessities of life. Living at a minimum of subsistence means just that. They are not completely impoverished, they are not completely without food or housing or medical care, but they live at the very lowest level of subsistence.

Now look at the relationship between low income and high infant mortality, between low income and poor physical condition of children or between low income and the mortality of mothers at childbirth. Study the report and supplement of the Senate Committee of Education and Labor on this proposal and see the corrolation between low income and inadequate education. Then note that in June 1945, about a year ago, there were more than 4,000,000 workers receiving below 65 cents per hour. Here is the unlimited market. Here is the capacity to consume which flaunts the fear of overproduction. Four million workers who must consume more food, live in better houses, obtain adequate medical care, educate their children, and better clothe themselves and their families.

I do not insist that a complete answer to our economic problems can be obtained by increasing the minimum wage as proposed. In fact my primary concern in advocating such legislation is in the fundamental necessity of assuring a living wage, even a minimum living wage, to the great numbers of our people who are now at best merely subsisting. I am primarily determined to try to eliminate privation and want and to enable all our people to live in decency and health. I believe that still further increases in wages, and particularly in the wages of our lowest paid workers, are necessary before the great majority of those dependent on them can live in a manner consistent with decency and self-respect. Few grievances man may suffer are more acutely painful than those of insufficient earnings. In addition to the effects, great and depressing, on the physical well-being of the worker and his family of inadequate earnings, is the pernicious effect of fear and the dangerous effect of resentment. What other feelings can a man have who works at hard labor all day only to find that he has less than enough to feed, clothe, house, and safeguard the health of his family?

To those who cannot see that such fears and resentment can exist in this Nation today, I recommend a reading of the statistical record of the supplemental report of the Senate committee. To those who cannot give the time to such a study, I recommend a reading of the thorough, detailed, and clear speech on minimum wage legislation by our distinguished colleague from California, Representative OUTLAND. Let them consider the fact that the Senate now deems it necessary to raise the salary of Members of Congress from ten thousand to fifteen thousand dollars a year while recognizing that more than 4,000,000 workers are now receiving less than 65 cents an hour for their labor with no guarantee that they will be employed for 52 or 50 weeks in the year. Or recall that only 42,500 workers in industry today receive any kind of guaranteed annual wage. Remember that in the mid-thirties over one-half of our regularly employed labor force suffered from seasonal lay-offs and had no other employment. If you regard that as abnormal, and who can positively assure the worker that it is, take account of the fact that in 1943, in the very midst of our years of greatest productivity, nearly one-fourth of the regularly employed labor force had less than 52 weeks of work. And when a man is earning subsistence wages, the loss of a week's pay can seriously affect the family equilibrium. It has been well and wittily asserted that there are only two occupations which are largely proof against cyclical and seasonal fluctuations, the baking of bread and the building of coffins. Irregularity of employment is the greatest industrial wastes and one of the main causes of social demoralization. Yet in voting a minimum wage we are not guaranteeing the worker a minimum assured income for the year; we are merely assuring him that while he works he will receive not less than a definite hourly rate, one presumably sufficient to sustain him and his family. Can we do less?

We are in a period of expanding production. Our experience must warn us that sufficient purchasing power must be returned to the worker, the consumer, to enable him to purchase what is being produced. This era has been called by management the imperative consumption stage, in which management will operate under the compunction that production is not complete and goods are not sold until they are in consumption or use. We must raise the wages of our lowest paid workers to enable them to buy, to place necessary purchasing power in their hands, and what is more important, to enable them to live in decency and in health. I repeat my insistence that the minimum wage must be raised to 75 cents an hour either immediately or within a few years, and if the latter, it must be guaranteed by our action now.

Mr. President, the issue is presented squarely to us by our veterans who are returning to the labor field after 3 and 4 years' absence. Great numbers of them are being offered jobs which pay less than the proposed minimum. They know that they cannot live as they have the right to live, as all our citizens have the right to live, on the wages they are offered. Many of them are refusing to work at such rates, and are justified in so refusing. Even with a 65-cent minimum the veterans' recompense will be but $26 a week while he works. Many veterans have told me of the discouragement they are experiencing in looking for work which will pay adequately. These men are ready and anxious to work; they are not looking for bonanzas or hand-outs, but they know what it costs

to live, and they declare insistently that they are entitled, as every man is, to a living wage.

The opportunity is present for us to dignify the life and extend the possibility of decent living to millions of our people, to do credit to our Nation in its steadfast belief in the dignity of the individual. We have the opportunity to extend to many more American families the ability to buy the necessities of life and to consume what the Nation can produce. We can simultaneously give a boost to our productive capacities and assure that what is produced will be consumed. We can at the same time stimulate our prosperity and safeguard ourselves against a depression. We can give our veterans the minimum assurance that in their work they will receive recompense enough to adequately support themselves and their families. Our workers will benefit and our industry and total economy will benefit. I earnestly hope that this House is anxious to achieve these ends. We are now being tested on our ability to adjust ourselves to the age in which we live, though tardily, but to fail to move forward now is to fail today and to deny hope for tomorrow.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on next Thursday after the legislative business of the day and other special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BENNET of New York (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2341. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 32. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934;

H. R. 2544. An act for the relief of Willie Hines;

H. R. 2954. An act for the relief of John Hamlet;

H. R. 3010. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Edens Nast, Mrs. Bessie Amann, and George R. Townsend;

H. R. 3565. An act to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge;

H. R. 5208. An act for the relief of Michael J. Keaveney and Mary C. Keaveney; and

H. R. 5876. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease to Henry A. Scandrett, Walter J. Cummings, and George I. Haight, trustees of Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1936.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2218. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended; and

S. 2219. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 32. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934;

H. R. 2544. An act for the relief of Willie Hines;

H. R. 2954. An act for the relief of John Hamlet;

H. R. 3010. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Edens Nast, Mrs. Bessie Amann, and George R. Townsend;

H. R. 3565. An act to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge;

H. R. 5208. An act for the relief of Michael J. Keaveney and Mary C. Keaveney; and

H. R. 5876. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease to Henry A. Scandrett, Walter J. Cummings, and George I. Haight, trustees of Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1936.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 26, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Friday, June 28, 1946, at 10 a. m., in executive session to consider H. R. 6058, relating to the payment by the Government of premiums on bonds for postal employees; House Joint Resolution 356 to provide for making available to the Veterans' Administration, for distribution to veterans' hospitals, undeliverable magazines and other periodicals held by the postal service; and H. R. 2000, relating to the star-route service.

At 10:30 a. m. the committee will hold a hearing on H. R. 5993, a bill to provide for the extension of the air-mail postal service, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1421. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2332. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1988. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the heirs of Jesus Gonzales all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain described tract of land within the Carson National Forest, N. Mex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1860. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a duplicate of Porterfield scrip certificate No. 53 to the Muskegon Trust Co., Muskegon, Mich., as trustee of the Joint Torrent trust; without amendment (Rept. No. 2336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MANASCO: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 6702. A bill to clarify the rights of former owners of real property to reacquire such property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944; with amendments (Rept. No. 2337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 677. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3420, a bill to provide for refunds to railroad employees in certain cases, so as to place the various States on an equal basis, under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, with respect to contributions of employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 2338). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2339. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHITE: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 680. An act to encourage and protect oil refineries not having their own source of supply for crude oil by extending preference to such refineries in disposing of royalty oil under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 2340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BUNKER: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1979. An act to eliminate the restriction on the number of lots which may be acquired by settlers in the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE of California: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 6816. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the State of California for State highway purposes a tract of land situated in San Bernardino County, Calif; with amendment (Rept. No. 2342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Committee on the Public Lands. Senate Joint Resolution 160. Joint resolution to amend the act of March 22, 1946, for the purpose of correcting the description of the small parcel of land authorized to be conveyed to the State of Wyoming by such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 6872. A bill to relieve from the additional estate tax members of the armed forces dying in active service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 6873. A bill to provide additional compensation for widows and orphans of World War II; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 6874. A bill to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6875. A bill to amend section 5 of the Judicial Code, as amended by the act entitled "An act further defining the number and duties of criers and bailiffs in United States courts and regulating their compensation"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 6876. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Lewiston Orchards project, Idaho, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 369. A joint resolution declaring VJ-day, August 14, to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 676. Resolution requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to submit information on shortage of food and feed in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 6877. A bill for the relief of Mid-South Airways Corp.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EARTHMAN:

H. R. 6878. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maggie Wood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 6879. A bill for the relief of J. C. Dollar; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 6880. A bill for the relief of John Arethas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 6881. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Mastrogeorgakes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 6882. A bill for the relief of Eleonore M. Hannon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 6883. A bill for the appointment of Walter Conner, formerly a major in the United States Army and thereafter a captain in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grade of major in the Regular Army and his immediate retirement in that grade; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6884. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Felice; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2033. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the Presbytery of New York, urging the Congress to safeguard the American standard of living of the workers in the merchant marine and their families; to the Committee on Labor.

2034 Also, petition of Bronx Zionist Region, Zionist Organization of America, urging the speedy realization of the American policy on Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2035. By the SPEAKER: Petition of director, national legislative committee, the American Legion, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to House bill 2346; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 26, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in whose peace our restless spirits are quieted, from the flickering torches of our own understanding, we would lift the difficult decisions of the public service unto Thy holy light. In these anxious days when the destinies of nations hang in the balance, the tensions of human relationships are like waters tossed and troubled. Through estranging seas, be Thou our chart and compass:

"Great God of all the earth,
Lead us to know the worth
Of sympathy.
May fellowship increase,
May all contentions cease,
And nations dwell in peace
And unity."

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 25, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 25, 1946:

S. 1857. An act to authorize the availability for certain necessary administrative expenses of appropriations for the Department of the Interior.

On June 26, 1946:

S. 1523. An act to modify the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has been appointed a member of the commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies. I ask unanimous consent that he may be granted leave of absence from the Senate for such time as may be necessary to consummate that mission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask leave to be absent from the Senate for the remainder of the week because of a death in my family.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 25, 1946, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2218. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended; and

S. 2219. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

GRANT OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation granting certain property to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and relinquishing jurisdiction therein (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

PENALTY MAIL MATTER

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (b) of Public Law 364, approved June 28, 1944, a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1945; the number of pieces procured; the estimated mailings, and the estimated cost, by departments and agencies, for the period July 1 to March 31, 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

INCLUSION OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AS MEMBER OF ADVISORY BOARD OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, ETC.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the Secretary of

Agriculture be included as a member of the Advisory Board of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and as a member of the National Advisory Council of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Eric Haase, assistant to the president, Association of National Advertisers, New York, N. Y., praying an appropriation of $15,000,000 for censuses of manufactures and business; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from P. W. Singer, vice president of Fligelman's, Helena, Mont., relating to the manufacture and price ceilings on long stockings and winter underwear for children; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the fifty-first annual convention of the Colorado State Federation of Labor, at Pueblo, Colo., favoring extension of the Office of Price Administration without crippling amendments; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOEY, from the Committee on Immigration:

S. 1607. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Peter Kim; without amendment (Rept. No. 1587).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 619. A bill to provide vocational education and retraining, including part-time training and work-experience programs for the occupational adjustment and readjustment of youth and adults, including persons demobilized from essential war work or from the armed services, in order that individuals and the Nation may attain economic stability and security; with amendments (Rept. No. 1588).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GUFFEY (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 2373. A bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2374. A bill authorizing the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, prescribing the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court and the municipal court of appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. 2375. A bill to change the name of the Chemical Warfare Service to the Chemical Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 2376. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Sadie Janis Shorthorn; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate bill (S. 2377) to amend title III of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the naturalization of persons who have served with the armed forces of the United States in overseas theaters, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and appears under a separate heading.)

NATURALIZATION OF PERSONS WHO SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce at this time, although I realize it is late in the session, a bill pertaining to the naturalization of persons who have served in the armed forces, and I ask that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee. I wish to read only one section of the bill:

Persons who have served with the military or naval forces of the United States in overseas theaters and who, having been lawfully admitted to the United States, including its Territories and possessions, shall have been at the time they were accepted for such service residents thereof, may be naturalized under the provisions of this title in the same manner and subject to the same terms and conditions as if such service had been performed in the military or naval forces of the United States.

Mr. President, I should like to say that the bill bears upon a matter of great injustice to a considerable number of people who really have performed very valuable services for the United States during the war, while attached to the naval or military forces, and who in the absence of the enactment of this bill will not be eligible for naturalization.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2377) to amend title III of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the naturalization of persons who have served with the armed forces of the United States in overseas theaters, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

ON THE JOB TRAINING FOR VETERANS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning I attended a conference, together with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in regard to a bill which I introduced, Senate bill 2144, to authorize the Veterans' Administration to reimburse State and local agencies for expenses incurred in rendering services in connection with the administration of certain training programs for veterans. The bill seeks to authorize the Veterans' Administration to use Veterans' Administration funds for payments to the States for the supervision of so-called on-the-job training for veterans.

In our conference this morning, we agreed upon certain additions and revisions of the bill. I now offer as a substitute a measure sponsored not only by myself and my senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], but also by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. It is my understanding that, as a substitute, the measure will bear the same number as my previous bill, Senate bill 2144.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The substitute submitted by the Senator from Oregon will be printed as an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that it is sincerely to be hoped that immediate consideration will be given to this measure, so that it can be passed before the Congress takes the summer recess, because the need is one of immediate emergency insofar as the veterans are concerned.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR HAWKES AT UNION COLLEGE, SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a commencement address to the graduating class at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., delivered by Senator HAWKES on June 24, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPORTANCE OF AMERICA'S INVESTORS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Dr. B. C. Forbes, president of the Investors League, together with an enclosure, which appear in the Appendix.]

ANGLO-AMERICAN COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY—LETTER FROM MAJ. NATHAN RUBY

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the Secretary of State by Maj. Nathan Ruby, vice president of the Political Action Committee for Palestine, submitting its views and suggestions with regard to the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Charles G. Bolte, national chairman of the American Veterans' Committee, delivered at the first convention of that organization at Des Moines, Iowa, June 14–16, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

CITIZENS' JUVENILE COUNCIL PLAN—ADDRESS BY CECIL L. WHITEHEAD

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Citizens' Juvenile Council Plan" delivered by Cecil L. Whitehead to the Up-Town Washington Lions Club on June 21, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIST OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES WHOSE SONS, DAUGHTERS, GRANDSONS, OR SONS-IN-LAW SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES DURING WORLD WAR II

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as secretary of the Congressional War Parents' Association, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a list of Senators and Representatives who have had sons, daughters, grandsons, or sons-in-law in the armed forces during World War II.

The following list includes the names and information on all the persons who have been reported to date. I ask that if there are any mistakes in the names, the ranks, the service, or in any of the facts as reported in the following list, the Senator or Representative concerned report the correction to Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, president of the association, or to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, secretary of the association, at the earliest possible date.

It is the general plan of the Congressional War Parents' Association to have a formal document prepared that will give a historical picture. In order that the information given in such a formal document be correct, the burden of reporting changes in the following list rests with each Senator or Representative.

I should also like to have any Senator or Representative who has personally served in World War II report his rank, branch of service, and any other pertinent information.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Congressional War Parents Association list

Senator	State	Name of son (otherwise relationship noted)	Service	Rank
Aiken, George D	Vermont	Harry L. Cleverly (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant.
		Howard Aiken	Army	Private first class.
		Malcolm Jones (son-in-law)	do	Sergeant.
Andrews, Charles O	Florida	T. Oakley Andrews	do	Lieutenant.
Austin, Warren R	Vermont	Edward L. Austin	do	Lieutenant colonel.
		Warren R. Austin, Jr	Coast Guard	Chief boatswain's mate.
Bankhead, John H	Alabama	Charles B. Crow, Jr. (grandson)	Army	
Barkley, Alben W	Kentucky	David M. Barkley	Army Air Forces	Major.
Bilbo, Theodore G	Mississippi	Theodore G. Bilbo, Jr	Army	Lieutenant colonel.
Bone, Homer T	Washington	Homer T. Bone, Jr	do	Private.
Brewster, Ralph O	Maine	Charles F. Brewster	do	Captain.
Bridges, Styles	New Hampshire	Styles Bridges, Jr	Navy	Lieutenant.
Briggs, Frank P	Missouri	Eugene A. Briggs	do	Do.
Brooks, C. Wayland	Illinois	Russell A. Brooks	Marine Corps	Private first class.
Buck, C. Douglass	Delaware	C. Douglass Buck, Jr	Navy	Ensign.
		Paul E. Wilson (stepson)	Army Air Forces	Flight officer.
Burton, Harold H	Ohio	William S. Burton	Navy	Lieutenant.
		Robert S. Burton	Marine Corps	Do.
		R. Wallace Adler (son-in-law)	Army	Do.
Bushfield, Harlan J	South Dakota	Harlan J. Bushfield, Jr	Army Air Forces	Do.
Byrd, Harry F	Virginia	Harry F. Byrd, Jr	Navy	Lieutenant commander.
		Richard E. Byrd	Army	Sergeant.
		Bradshaw Byrd	do	Private first class.
Capehart, Homer E	Indiana	Thomas Charles Capehart	do	Corporal.
Caraway, Hattie W	Arkansas	Paul W. Caraway	do	Lieutenant colonel.
		Forest Caraway	do	Do.
Chandler, Albert B	Kentucky	John P. Gregg (son-in-law)	Army Air Forces	Major.
Chavez, Dennis	New Mexico	Dennis Chavez, Jr	Marine Corps	Lieutenant.
		Stanley Miller (son-in-law)	Army Air Forces	Do.
Connally, Tom	Texas	Ben Connally	do	Lieutenant colonel.
Danaher, John A	Connecticut	John A. Danaher, Jr	Army	Lieutenant.
		Robert Danaher	Navy	Seaman.
Davis, James J	Pennsylvania	James J. Davis, Jr	do	Lieutenant.
Ellender, Allen J	Louisiana	Allen J. Ellender, Jr	Army	Do.
George, Walter F	Georgia	Heard F. George	Army Air Forces	Captain.
		J. Marcus George [2]	Navy	Lieutenant.
Glass, Carter	Virginia	Carter Glass, Jr	Army	Major.
Gurney, Chan	South Dakota	John B. Gurney	Army Air Forces	Technical sergeant.
		Deloss B. Gurney	do	Captain.
		Morgan T. Smith (son-in-law)	Army	Lieutenant.
Hart, Thomas C	Connecticut	Thomas C. Hart, Jr. [1]	Navy	Lieutenant commander.
		Roswell R. Hart	do	Lieutenant.
		Caroline B. Hart (daughter)	do	Ensign.
Hatch, Carl A	New Mexico	Stewart A. Hatch	Army Air Forces	Lieutenant.
Hawkes, Albert W	New Jersey	Whitfield Hawkes [1]	Army	Major.
Jackson, Samuel D	Indiana	James W. Jackson	do	Private.
		Robert I. Jackson	do	Private first class.
Johnson, Edwin C	Colorado	Robert L. Howsam (son-in-law)	Navy	Ensign.
Johnson, Hiram W	California	Hiram W. Johnson, Jr	Army Air Forces	Major.
Kilgore, Harley M	West Virginia	Robert Kilgore	Army	Lieutenant.
McCarran, Patrick A	Nevada	Samuel P. McCarran	do	Private.
McClellan, John L	Arkansas	Max E. McClellan [1]	do	Corporal.
		John L. McClellan, Jr	Navy	Ensign.
Maloney, Francis	Connecticut	Robert Francis Maloney	Coast Guard	Lieutenant.
Maybank, Burnet R	South Carolina	Burnet R. Maybank, Jr	Army Air Force	Do.
Mead, James M	New York	James M. Mead, Jr	Army	Captain.
Millikin, Eugene D	Colorado	Karl C. Schuyler (stepson)	do	Do.
Murdock, Abe	Utah	Daniel Beck Murdock	Navy	Lieutenant.
		Peter Jaremko (son-in-law)	do	Do.
Murray, James E	Montana	Edward Murray	Army	Do.
		Howard A. Murray	do	Private.
		W. D. Murray	Navy	Lieutenant.
Nye, Gerald	North Dakota	James P. Nye	do	Apprentice seaman.
O'Daniel, W. Lee	Texas	Pat O'Daniel	Army	Lieutenant.
		Mike O'Daniel	do	Do.
		Jack D. Wrather (son-in-law)	Marine Corps	Do.
Overton, John H	Louisiana	John H. Overton, Jr	Navy	Ensign.
Radcliffe, George L	Maryland	George Radcliffe	Army	Lieutenant.
Reed, Clyde M	Kansas	Howard H. Reed	do	Colonel.
		James E. Smith (son-in-law)	Army Air Forces	Major.
		Donald I. Mitchell (son-in-law)	Army	Do.
		James E. Smith, Jr. (grandson)	do	Private.
		Reed Bundy (grandson)	Army Air Forces	Do.
Saltonstall, Leverett	Massachusetts	Leverett Saltonstall, Jr	Army	Lieutenant.
		Emily B. Saltonstall (daughter)	Navy	Radio operator first class.
		William L. Saltonstall	do	
		Peter B. Saltonstall [1]	Marine Corps	Sergeant.
Stewart, Tom	Tennessee	Tom M. Stewart	Army	Captain.
		Laurence F. Stewart	do	Lieutenant.
		Paul T. Stewart	Navy	Seaman second class.
		Charles S. Coffey (son-in-law)	do	Lieutenant.
Taft, Robert A	Ohio	Lloyd Bowers Taft	do	Ensign.
		Horace Dwight Taft	Army	Technical sergeant.
		Robert A. Taft, Jr	Navy	Lieutenant.
Thomas, Elbert D	Utah	Wayne C. Grover (son-in-law)	Army	Lieutenant colonel.
Thomas, Elmer	Oklahoma	Wilford S. Thomas	do	Lieutenant.
Tunnell, James M	Delaware	Robert W. Tunnell	do	Do.
Vandenberg, Arthur H	Michigan	Arthur H. Vandenberg, Jr	do	Major.

[1] Killed in service.
[2] Reported missing in action Aug. 7, 1943.

Congressional War Parents Association list—Continued

Senator	State	Name of son (otherwise relationship noted)	Service	Rank
Van Nuys, Frederick	Indiana	William L. Van Nuys	Navy	
Wagner, Robert F	New York	Robert F. Wagner, Jr	Army	Captain.
Weeks, Sinclair	Massachusetts	John W. Weeks II	do	Do.
		Sinclair Weeks, Jr	Army Air Forces	Lieutenant.
		William D. Weeks	do	Do.
Wheeler, Burton K	Montana	Richard Wheeler	Navy	Do.
Wilson, George A	Iowa	James H. Wilson	Army	Captain.
		George A. Wilson, Jr	do	Lieutenant.
		John D. Wilson	do	
Young, Milton R	North Dakota	Wendell M. Young	do	Private.

Representative	State	Name of son (otherwise relationship noted)	Service	Rank
Allen, A. Leonard	Louisiana	Harwell L. Allen	Army	Colonel.
		Lyndon B. Allen	do	Captain.
Allen, Leo E	Illinois	Richard Young (son-in-law)	Army Air Forces	Lieutenant.
Anderson, Clinton P	New Mexico	Sherburne P. Anderson	Army	Private.
Arnold, Wat	Missouri	Sam M. Arnold	Navy	Lieutenant.
Bailey, Cleveland M	West Virginia	J. R. Bailey	Marine Corps	Colonel.
Baldwin, H. Streett	Maryland	John Streett Baldwin [1]	Army Air Forces	Captain.
		Harry Wallace Baldwin [1]	do	Lieutenant.
Barrett, Frank A	Wyoming	Francis A. Barrett, Jr	Army	Do.
		James E. Barrett	do	Corporal.
Barrett, William A	Pennsylvania	John F. Barrett	Navy	Seaman.
Bates, George J	Massachusetts	William H. Bates	do	Lieutenant.
		George J. Bates, Jr	do	Seaman third class.
		Raymond H. Bates	do	Ensign.
		Mary E. Bates (daughter)	do	Lieutenant
		James B. Ginty (son-in-law) [1]	do	Do.
Bates, Joe B	Kentucky	Joseph Rice Bates	Army	Do.
		William S. Vinson (son-in-law)	Navy	Do.
Bender, George H	Ohio	Ernest B. Stevenson (son-in-law)	do	Ensign.
Bishop, C. W. (Runt)	Illinois	Jack H. Bishop	Coast Guard	Yeoman first class.
Blackney, William W	Michigan	William W. Blackney, Jr	Army	Sergeant.
Bland, S. O	Virginia	James Bland Martin (nephew)	Navy	Lieutenant commander.
Bolton, Frances P	Ohio	Kenyon C. Bolton	Army	Major.
		Oliver P. Bolton	do	Captain.
Bonner, Herbert C	North Carolina	Charles H. Hargrave (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant.
Boykin, Frank W	Alabama	James Robert Boykin	Army Air Forces	Cadet.
		Richard Ainsworth Boykin	Coast Guard	Seaman second class.
		Riley Smith (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant.
Bradley, Michael J	Pennsylvania	Raymond J. Bradley	do	Do.
Brehm, Walter E	Ohio	Thomas Walter Brehm	Army	Private first class.
Brown, Clarence J	do	Robert A. Haines (son-in-law)	Navy	Petty officer second class.
Brown, Paul	Georgia	Robert T. Brown [2]	do	Lieutenant.
Brumbaugh, D. Emmert	Pennsylvania	D. Robert Brumbaugh	do	Seaman.
Bryson, Joseph R	South Carolina	Joseph Bob Bryson	do	Apprentice seaman.
		William J. Bryson	Marine Corps	Private first class.
Buck, Ellsworth	New York	Orlando J. Buck [1]	Army	Lieutenant.
Burchill, Thomas E	do	John J. Burchill	do	Private.
Cannon, Clarence	Missouri	Harry B. Hackethorn (son-in-law)	do	Lieutenant.
Carnahan, A. S. J	do	Robert E. Carnahan	Navy	Apprentice seaman.
Carson, Henderson H	Ohio	Leonard W. Snyder (son-in-law)	Army	
Celler, Emanuel	New York	Sidney B. Wertheimer (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant.
Chenoweth, J. Edgar	Colorado	Jack Chenoweth	do	Seaman first class.
Church, Ralph E	Illinois	Ralph E. Church, Jr	do	Lieutenant.
		William Stitt Church	do	Ensign.
Clark, J. Bayard	Tennessee	Herman R. Clark	do	Lieutenant.
		Jerome B. Clark, Jr	do	Do.
		George D. Jackson (son-in-law)	do	Lieutenant (chaplain.)
Clevenger, Cliff	Ohio	John G. Clevenger	Army	Technical sergeant.
Cole, William P., Jr	Maryland	William P. Cole III [1]	do	Captain.
Colmer, William M	Mississippi	William M. Colmer, Jr	Navy	Lieutenant.
		James H. Colmer	do	Ensign.
		Thomas W. Colmer	do	Apprentice seaman.
Compton, Ranulf	Connecticut	William Ranulf Compton	do	Lieutenant.
Cooley, Harold D	North Carolina	Roger A. P. Cooley	Army	Private.
Courtney, Wirt	Tennessee	Wirt Courtney, Jr	Army Air Forces	Sergeant.
		Richard Courtney	do	Private first class.
Cox, E. E	Georgia	Lemar P. Cox	Navy	Lieutenant.
Creal, Edward W	Kentucky	James Grady Creal	Army	Do.
Crosser, Robert	Ohio	Robert Crosser, Jr	Army Air Forces	Corporal.
		Charles A. Sweeny (son-in-law)	Coast Guard	Lieutenant.
Culkin, Francis D	New York	Francis H. Culkin	Army	Do.
Cunningham, Paul	Iowa	Edward P. Cunningham [1]	Marine Corps	Corporal.
Curley, James M	Massachusetts	George James Curley	Navy	Lieutenant.
		Leo Francis Curley	do	Do.
		Richard James Dennis (stepson)	Army	Private.
		George Edmund Dennis (stepson)	Navy	Seaman second class.
Davis, Clifford	Tennessee	Clifford Davis, Jr	do	Apprentice seaman.
Dewey, Charles S	Illinois	Albert Peter Dewey [1]	Army Air Forces	Lieutenant colonel.
		Frederick M. Alger (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant commander.
		Edward Byron Smith (son-in-law)	do	Lieutenant.
Dies, Martin	Texas	Martin Dies, Jr	do	Apprentice seaman.
Dimond, Anthony J	Alaska	John Henry Dimond	Army	Lieutenant.
Disney, Wesley E	Oklahoma	Wesley V. Disney	Army Air Forces	Do.
Ditter, J. William	Pennsylvania	J. William Ditter, Jr	Navy	Seaman.
Dolliver, James I	Iowa	James M. Dolliver	do	Ensign.
Dondero, George A	Michigan	Robert L. Dondero	do	Lieutenant.
		Stanton G. Dondero	do	Do.
Doyle, Clyde	California	Clyde Doyle, Jr. [1]	Army Air Forces	Do.
Drewry, P. H	Virginia	Patrick H. Drewry, Jr	Army	Major.
Durham, Carl T	North Carolina	Carl T. Durham, Jr	Navy	Seaman second class.
Dworshak, Henry C	Idaho	Henry I. Dworshak	Army	Captain.
		Ward W. Dworshak	do	Lieutenant.
		Charles L. Dworshak	Marine Corps	
Earthman, Harold H	Tennessee	Harold H. Earthman, Jr	Navy	Seaman first class.
Eaton, Charles A	New Jersey	Robert Burwell (grandson)	Army	
		Douglas Denler, Jr. (grandson)	Marine Corps	
Elliott, A. J	California	I. J. Elliott	Army Air Forces	Sergeant.
		R. R. Vancil (son-in-law)	Navy	Ensign.

[1] Killed in service.
[2] Missing in action.

Congressional War Parents Association list—Continued

Representative	State	Name of son (otherwise relationship noted)	Service	Rank
Ellis, Hubert S.	West Virginia	T. A. Edgell (stepson)	Army	Lieutenant.
Elston, Charles H.	Ohio	Robert P. Dietz (son-in-law)	do	Do.
Engel, Albert J.	Michigan	Albert J. Engel, Jr.	do	Do.
Englebright, Harry L.	California	Harry J. Englebright	Navy	Ensign.
Fellows, Frank	Maine	Oscar Fellows	do	Apprentice seaman.
		Stanley B. Nichols (son-in-law)	Army	Corporal.
Fenton, Ivor D.	Pennsylvania	James J. Kernan, Jr. (son-in-law)	do	Sergeant.
Fish, Hamilton	New York	Alfred Chapin Rogers (stepson)	do	Captain.
		Insley Blair Pyne (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant.
		Edward S. MacDonald (stepson-in-law)	do	Ensign.
Flannagan, John W., Jr.	Virginia	Francis W. Flannagan	Army Air Forces	Staff sergeant.
Folger, J. H.	North Carolina	Henry Folger	Army	
		Frank Folger	Navy	
Fuller, Hadwen C.	New York	Robert C. Fuller	Army	Lieutenant
Fulmer, H. P.	South Carolina	Arthur Ahrens (son-in-law)	U. S. Maritime Service	Commander.
		William T. Reed (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant.
Furlong, Robert G.	Pennsylvania	Keene A. Furlong	do	Seaman first class.
Gale, Richard P.	Minnesota	Richard P. Gale, Jr.	Army	Private.
Gallagher, James	Pennsylvania	William W. Fogarty, Jr. (grandson)	do	Do.
Gallagher, William J.	Minnesota	Russell Thomson (son-in-law)	Navy	Seaman second class.
Gehrmann, B. J.	Wisconsin	Barney E. Gehrmann	Marine Corps	Lieutenant.
Gibson, John S.	Georgia	Marvin M. Gibson	Army	Do.
		Blanche L. Gibson (daughter)	Marine Corps	Private first class.
Gillie, George W.	Ohio	John Tapp Strawbridge (son-in-law)	Army	Major.
Gordon, Thomas S.	Illinois	William L. Hentschell (son-in-law)	do	Lieutenant.
Gross, Chester H.	Pennsylvania	Nellie Gross (daughter)	do	Nurse.
		Stanley Gross	U. S. Merchant Marine	
		Earl R. Doll (son-in-law)	Army	Sergeant.
Gwinn, Ralph W.	New York	Robert L. Gwinn	Navy	Lieutenant.
		Davis W. Morton (son-in-law)	Army	Do.
Haines, Harry L.	Pennsylvania	George Haines	Navy	Do.
		Stewart Stabley, Jr. (grandson)	Army Air Forces	
		Harry Stabley (grandson) [1]		
Hall, Leonard W.	New York	H. Wyndol Carroll (stepson)	Navy	
Hancock, Clarence E.	do	John Shenk Hancock	Army Air Forces	Major.
Hare, Butler B.	South Carolina	Robert Hayne Hare	Navy	Lieutenant.
		James Butler Hare	do	Do.
Harris, Winder R.	Virginia	Davis S. Bill, Jr. (son-in-law)	do	Do.
Hartley, Fred A., Jr.	New Jersey	Henry Allan Hartley	Army Air Forces	
Hays, Brooks	Arkansas	Marion Steele Hays	Coast Guard	
Herring, Clyde L.	Iowa	Clyde Edsel Herring, Jr.	Army	Captain.
Herter, Christian A.	Massachusetts	C. A. Herter, Jr.	do	Major.
		Frederic P. Herter	do	Lieutenant.
Hobbs, Sam	Alabama	Truman Hobbs	Navy	Do.
		Rosa Miller Hobbs (daughter)	do	Do.
		Sam Earle Hobbs	do	Ensign.
Hoch, Daniel K.	Pennsylvania	Bruce Hoch (grandson)	do	Do.
Hoffman, Clare E.	Michigan	Leo W. Hoffman	do	Lieutenant.
Holmes, Pehr G.	Massachusetts	George E. Holmes	Army	Staff sergeant.
Hope, Clifford R.	Kansas	Clifford R. Hope, Jr.	do	Corporal
Hull, Merlin	Wisconsin	Perry Hull	Navy	Lieutenant.
Izac, Edouard V.	California	Edouard V. Izac, Jr.	do	Do.
		Charles Izac	Army	Private first class.
		Robert M. Waller (son-in-law)	do	Lieutenant.
Jacobsen, W. S.	Iowa	Bernard M. Jacobsen	Navy	Do.
Jensen, Ben F.	do	Donald G. Fitzpatrick (son-in-law)	Army	Do.
Johnson, Calvin D.	Illinois	John Bernerd Johnson [1]	Army Air Forces	Do.
		Calvin P. Johnson	Army	Corporal.
		Dean F. Johnson	Army Air Forces	Staff sergeant.
Johnson, Leroy	California	William A. Johnson	do	Corporal.
Johnson, Luther A.	Texas	Luther A. Johnson, Jr.	Navy	Lieutenant.
Johnson, Ward	California	Walter F. Johnson	do	Midshipman.
Jonkman, Bartel J.	Michigan	Bartel Zanstra (son-in-law)	Army	Private.
Kean, Robert W.	New Jersey	Robert W. Kean, Jr.	do	Lieutenant.
		Hamilton F. Kean	do	Do.
		Edward L. Hicks (son-in-law)	Navy	Do.
Kearney, Bernard W.	New York	Joan Kearney (daughter)	Army	WAC corporal.
Kee, John	West Virginia	James Kee	Army Air Forces	Private.
Keefe, Frank B.	Wisconsin	B. F. Keefe	Troop carrier	Flight officer.
Kelley, Augustine B.	Pennsylvania	Regis Kelley	Army	Lieutenant.
		Robert V. Kelley	Marine Corps	Private first class.
		Richard B. Kelley	Army	Sergeant.
		Paul A. Kelley	U. S. Military Academy	Cadet.
		J. Hilary Kelley	Army	Lieutenant.
Kilburn, Clarence E.	New York	William B. Kilburn	Army Air Forces	Cadet.
		Katharine Kilburn	Army	Nurse.
King, Samuel Wilder	Hawaii	2 sons		
Kirwan, Michael J.	Ohio	John Joseph Kirwan	Army	Sergeant.
		Michael J. Kirwan	do	Corporal.
Kleberg, Richard M.	Texas	G. W. Sugden (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant.
		W. B. Yarborough (son-in-law)	do	Do.
Lambertson, W. P.	Kansas	Milan Lambertson	do	Hospital apprentice first class.
		Farrell B. Copeland (son-in-law)	Army	Captain.
Lanham, Fritz G.	Texas	John D. Head (stepson)	Navy	Lieutenant.
LeFevre, Jay	New York	Jay A. LeFevre	Army	Private.
Lemke, William	North Dakota	Robert Lemke	do	Lieutenant.
Lewis, Earl R.	Ohio	Robert N. Lewis	do	Do.
		Paul M. Spurrier (son-in-law)	do	Do.
		Richard E. Lewis	Navy	Apprentice seaman.
Lesinski, John	Michigan	John Lesinski	Do.	Petty officer third class.
Link, William W.	Illinois	Oren R. Link	Army	Major.
		Chester V. Link	Navy	Ensign.
Luce, Clare Booth	Connecticut	Henry Luce III (stepson)	do	Lieutenant.
Lynch, Walter	New York	Walter A. Lynch, Jr.	Army	Do.
McCowen, Edward O.	Ohio	Edward R. McCowen	Navy	Do.
		J. Lawrence Kelley (son-in-law)	Army	Captain.
McDonough, Gordon L.	California	William L. Carter, Jr. (son-in-law)	do	Corporal.
		Gordon L. McDonough, Jr.	Navy	Lieutenant.
		Vincent S. McDonough	Army	Private.
		James Q. McDonough	Navy	Seaman second class.
		Paul M. McDonough	Army	Private.
		Thomas C. McDonough	Navy	Seaman first class.
McGehee, Dan R.	Mississippi	Alfred E. Bruch (son-in-law)	Army	Sergeant.
McGregor, J. Harry	Ohio	Monroe Horst (son-in-law)	Navy	Ensign.
		Warde Q. Butler (son-in-law)	Marine Corps	Lieutenant.
McKeough, Raymond S.	Illinois	James J. Flanigan (son-in-law)	do	Do.

[1] Killed in service.

Congressional War Parents Association list—Continued

Representative	State	Name of son (otherwise relationship noted)	Service	Rank
McLean, Donald H	New Jersey	Donald H. McLean, Jr	Army	Lieutenant colonel.
		Edw. R. McLean	do	Captain.
McMillen, Rolla C	Illinois	Thomas R. McMillen	do	Do.
Maas, Melvin J	do	Elmer J. Wood (son-in-law) [1]	Marine Corps	Cadet.
Martin, Thomas E	Iowa	Richard C. Martin	U. S. Military Academy	Lieutenant.
		Raymond H. Reiser (son-in-law)	Army	Do.
May, Andrew J	Kentucky	Robert Vernon May	Navy	Lieutenant colonel.
Michener, Earl C	California	Charles E. Quick (son-in-law)	Army	Private.
Miller, A. L	Nebraska	Richard K. Miller	do	WAC private.
Monkiewicz, B. J	Connecticut	Dorothy Monkiewicz (daughter)	do	Lieutenant commander.
Morrison, Cameron	North Carolina	James J. Harris (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant.
Mott, James W	Oregon	John L. Sullivan (son-in-law)	Army	Ensign.
		Benjamin Murray Whisenand (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant.
Murdock, John R	Arizona	David N. Murdock [1]	Army	Captain.
		John B. Murdock	do	Pharmacist first class.
Murray, Reid F	Wisconsin	Reid F. Murray, Jr	Navy	Apprentice seaman.
Norman, Fred	California	Harry Carlson (son-in-law)	do	Corporal.
O'Hara, Joseph P	Minnesota	J. P. O'Hara, Jr	Army	Do.
		Edward M. O'Hara	Army Air Forces	Ensign.
O'Leary, James A	New York	James A. O'Leary, Jr	Coast Guard	Do.
		John D. Lucey (son-in-law)	do	Lieutenant.
		John K. Lucey (son-in-law)	Army	Do.
Pace, Stephen	Georgia	Stephen Pace, Jr	do	Do.
		William D. Swift (son-in-law)	Navy	Major.
Patman, Wright	Texas	Connor Wright Patman	Army	Sergeant.
		James Harold Patman	Marine Corps	Private.
		William N. Patman	do	Do.
Patton, Nat	do	Weldon T. Patton	Army	Do.
		Nat Patton, Jr	do	Seaman first class.
Peterson, J. Hardin	Florida	J. Hardin Peterson, Jr	Navy	Lieutenant.
		C. B. Myers, Jr. (son-in-law)	do	Do.
Pfeifer, Joseph L	New York	Joseph L. Pfeifer, Jr	do	Cadet.
		Thomas Edward Pfeifer	U. S. Military Academy	Lieutenant.
Phillips, John	California	Carl Phillips	Army Air Forces	Sergeant.
		Robert W. Phillips	do	Private.
		Margaret Phillips	Marine Corps	Lieutenant.
Pittenger, William A	Minnesota	Richard W. Pittenger	Army	Do.
Rabaut, Louis C	Michigan	Vincent Charles Rabaut	Navy	Private first class.
Rayfiel, Leo	New York	Robert D. Rayfiel	Army	Lieutenant.
		David Rayfiel	do	Do.
Ramey, Homer A	Ohio	Bernard C. Ramey	do	Lieutenant commander.
Ramspeck, Robert	Georgia	J. R. Dunson (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant.
		John Leedy (son-in-law)	Army Air Forces	Do.
Reed, Daniel A	New York	William T. Reed	Navy	Do.
Rich, Robert F	Pennsylvania	Sheridan W. Bell, Jr. (son-in-law)	do	Do.
		Charles H. Kurtz (son-in-law)	Army	Sergeant.
Rizley, Ross	Oklahoma	Roscoe Q. Rizley	do	Lieutenant.
		Robert S. Rizley	Marine Corps	Captain.
		Melvin S. Camp (son-in-law)	Army	Sergeant.
		Paul Barrere (son-in-law)	do	Flight officer.
		John Cox (son-in-law)	Army Air Forces	Midshipman.
Robertson, A. Willis	Virginia	A. Willis Robertson, Jr	U. S. Naval Academy	Lieutenant.
Robinson, J. W	Utah	George B. Robinson	Army	Captain.
Robsion, John M	Kentucky	John M. Robsion, Jr	Coast Artillery	Lieutenant colonel.
Rockefeller, Lewis K	New York	John Bain Rockefeller	Army	Lieutenant.
Rockwell, Robert F	Colorado	Robert F. Rockwell, Jr	Navy	Corporal.
		Wilson M. Rockwell	Army Air Forces	Lieutenant.
Roe, Dudley G	Maryland	William M. D. Roe	Navy	Do.
Roe, James A	New York	James A. Roe, Jr	Army	Captain.
Rogers, Dwight L	Florida	Paul G. Rogers	do	Lieutenant.
		Dwight L. Rogers	Navy	Technical sergeant.
Rogers, George F	New York	George J. Rogers	Army	Lieutenant.
		Ralph J. Rogers	do	Major.
Rohrbough, E. G	West Virginia	Edward G. Rohrbough, Jr	Canadian Army	Private.
Rolph, Tom	California	Henry Renton Rolph	Marine Corps	Ensign.
		John Robert Metcalf (son-in-law)	Army	Lieutenant colonel.
Rowe, Ed	Ohio	Ed Rowe, Jr	Navy	Major.
Sasscer, Lansdale G	Maryland	H. C. E. Claggett, Jr. (son-in-law)	Army Air Forces	Seaman first class.
		W. Murray Sanders (son-in-law)	do	Staff sergeant.
		Lansdale Sasscer, Jr	Coast Guard	Captain.
Scanlon, Thomas E	Pennsylvania	Edward A. Scanlon	Army Air Forces	Corporal.
Schiffler, A. C	West Virginia	Robert A. Schiffler	do	Lieutenant.
Schwabe, George B	Oklahoma	George B. Schwabe, Jr	do	Captain.
		Robert V. Schwabe	Army	Lieutenant.
		John L. Schwabe	Marine Corps	Private.
		William H. Schwabe	Army	Staff sergeant.
Simpson, Sid	Illinois	Arthur Stoffel, Jr. (son-in-law)	Army Air Forces	Major.
Smith, Howard W	Virginia	Howard Worth Smith, Jr	Army	Lieutenant.
		Joe H. Tonnahill (son-in-law)	Navy	Major.
Smith, Joe L	West Virginia	Joe L. Smith, Jr	Army	Lieutenant.
		Hulett C. Smith	Navy	Corporal.
Smith, Lawrence H	Wisconsin	John L. Smith	Army	Captain.
Somers, Andrew L	New York	Arthur S. Somers	Marine Corps	Lieutenant.
		Thomas J. Ross, Jr. (son-in-law)	Army	Do.
Sparkman, John J	Alabama	T. T. Shepard, Jr. (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant.
Starnes, Joe	do	Joe Starnes, Jr	Army	Do.
Stefan, Karl	Nebraska	Karl F. Stefan	Navy	Corporal.
Sullivan, Maurice J	Nevada	M. J. Sullivan, Jr	Army	Do.
Sweeney, Martin L	Ohio	Martin L. Sweeney, Jr	do	Seaman first class.
		Robert Emmett Sweeney	do	Staff sergeant.
Starkey, Frank T	Minnesota	Frank G. Starkey	Coast Guard	Radio technician.
Taber, John	New York	Charles Taber	Navy	Lieutenant.
Talle, Henry O	Iowa	Keith A. Crown, Jr. (son-in-law)	Army	Sergeant.
		J. C. Merriman (son-in-law)	Navy	Staff sergeant.
		W. P. Tilton, Jr. (son-in-law)	Army Air Forces	Lieutenant colonel.
Thomas, J. Parnell	New Jersey	J. Parnell Thomas, Jr	do	Lieutenant.
		Stiles Thomas	Army	Do.
Thomason, R. E	Texas	William E. Thomason	do	Staff sergeant.
Tolan, John H	California	J. H. Tolan, Jr	Navy	Staff sergeant.
		William Gale	Army Air Forces	Apprentice seaman.
Torrens, James H	New York	Raymond E. Torrens	Army	Lieutenant.
Towe, Harry L	New Jersey	Harry B. Towe	Navy	Cadet.
Treadway, Allen T	Massachusetts	Royal W. Treadway (grandson)	Army	
Trimble, J. W	Arkansas	James K. Trimble	U. S. Military Academy	

[1] Killed in service.

Congressional War Parents Association list—Continued

Representative	State	Name of son (otherwise relationship noted)	Service	Rank
Vursell, Charles W	Illinois	H. D. Vursell	Army	Private.
		Charles E. Vursell	Navy	Lieutenant.
Wadsworth, James W	New York	Reverdy Wadsworth	Army	Captain.
		Stuart Symington (grandson)	do	Private.
Ward, David J	Maryland	Howard P. Ward	Army Air Forces	Captain.
		Albert W. Ward	Coast Guard	Lieutenant.
		David J. Ward	Navy	Do.
Weaver, Zebulon	North Carolina	C. H. Hites, Jr. (grandson)	Army Air Forces	Technical sergeant.
		Zebulon Weaver Hite (grandson)	do	Lieutenant.
Welch, Richard J	California	Garrett J. Welch	Navy	Do.
West, Milton H	Texas	Milton H. West, Jr	do	Do.
Whelchel, B. Frank	Georgia	Hillyer C. Godfrey (son-in-law) [1]	Army	Do.
White, Compton I	Idaho	Benjamin R. McConnell (son-in-law)	Army	Major.
Whittington, William M	Mississippi	W. M. Whittington, Jr	Navy	Lieutenant.
		Charles A. Whittington	Army Air Forces	
Winter, Thomas D	Kansas	Robert G. Winter	Army	Do.
Wolfenden, James	Pennsylvania	John J. Tomalino (son-in-law)	Navy	Do.
Wolverton, Charles A	New Jersey	Donnell Knox Wolverton	Army	Major.
Woodhouse, Chase Going	Connecticut	Noel R. S. Woodhouse	Army Air Forces	Lieutenant.
Woodruff, Roy O	Michigan	Devere H. Woodruff	Army	Major.
Woodrum, C. A	Virginia	C. A. Woodrum, Jr	Marine Corps	Do.
Zimmerman, Orville	Missouri	Joe Zimmerman	Army	Private first class.

[1] Killed in service.

EXCLUSION OF NEGROES FROM VOTING

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to call the Senate's attention to an incident which reflects seriously on the integrity of this body, and which therefore should be thoroughly and quickly investigated. A United Press report which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, June 23, accuses—and I trust that it is a false accusation—a Member of this body who is now a candidate for reelection, of inciting people in his State to use "any means" to prevent qualified voters of his State from exercising their right to vote for candidates for the United States Senate. This is a serious charge. In the absence of the gentleman whose actions are discussed in this news report, I do not wish to discuss the matter at length at this time. But time is of the essence, since elections are to be held in about 2 weeks. The matter should be quickly and fully investigated by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, so that the Member in question will be given an opportunity to clear his name if the charges are false, and so that no citizens will be deprived of their rights under the Constitution and laws of the United States, if the charges are true. Ours is the duty as well as the privilege of passing on the credentials of our Members, and we cannot disregard charges such as these without a serious loss of prestige. Americans are proud of their country as the world's greatest assemblage of freely elected representatives of the people; indeed, we are inclined to look askance upon other governments of the world whose systems are different from our own. It therefore behooves us jealously to protect our democratic institutions, and to see that full observance is given everywhere to our precious constitutional guaranties, many of which were enacted for the specific purpose of preventing racial discrimination at elections.

For the information of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the article which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, June 23.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILBO URGES MISSISSIPPI MEN TO EMPLOY ANY MEANS TO BAR NEGROES FROM VOTING

JACKSON, MISS., June 22.—Senator THEODORE BILBO of Mississippi demanded tonight that the "red-blooded Anglo-Saxon" men of Mississippi bar Negroes from voting. His demand came a few hours after a Negro Army veteran charged that he had been beaten and flogged by four white men when he sought to register.

In one of his strongest "white supremacy" statements of his current campaign for renomination, Senator BILBO said that if a few Negroes vote in the Democratic primary this year, more would vote in 1947, "and from then on it will grow into a mighty surge."

He called on every "red-blooded Anglo-Saxon man in Mississippi to resort to any means to keep hundreds of Negroes from the polls in the July 2 primary."

"And if you don't know what that means, you are just not up on your persuasive measures," Mr. BILBO added.

Mr. BILBO's speech came after Etoy Fletcher, Army veteran attending Jackson College, a school for Negroes, under the GI bill of rights, charged in an affidavit that he had been seized, flogged, and beaten at Brandon on June 2 when he attempted unsuccessfully to register. His charge was made in an affidavit made public by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in New York.

In his speech, which was broadcast, Mr. BILBO said that the white people of Mississippi were sleeping on a volcano "and it is up to the red-blooded men to do something about it. The white men of this State have a right to resort to any means at their command to stop it."

It is said that the Negro veteran, who served 23 months in the South Pacific, went to the circuit clerk at Brandon on June 2 and asked to be allowed to register. He allegedly was directed to "the gentleman in charge of veterans affairs," on the second floor of the courthouse, where he was told to "get out."

After he left, he said, four men seized him, carried him to some woods, stripped him, and flogged him with a heavy wire cable, and threatened him with death if he made another attempt to register.

The sheriff's office at Brandon and the circuit clerk denied today any knowledge of the affair.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 30, 41, 49, 54, 100, 101, 102, 118, 119, 123, 125, 126, 127, 133, 145, 146, 148, 149, 155, 162, 173, 174, 175, 184, 231, 240, 254, 255 and 261.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 12, 14, 21, 22, 25, 42, 43, 48, 50, 51, 77, 79, 81, 82, 86, 88, 89, 91, 94, 95, 96, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 122, 124, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 150, 151, 156, 164, 191, 212, 213, 216, 217, 222, 230, 233, 266, 270, 273, 279, 280, 281, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293 and 294, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,298,337"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$263,885"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$156,526"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$250,760"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "thirty-four"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$12,470,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "eighteen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$392,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$287,126"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$365,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$454,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,064,337"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,137,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,429,008"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$815,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,130,570"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$488,910"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$902,168"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$925,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$962,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada and Oregon either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,624,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$294,815"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,267,078"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$47,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$28,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,938"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$42,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,725"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$23,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$26,125"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$14,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$47,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$237,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$924,038"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Shiprock dormitories and utilities, $318,600;

"Toadlena School expansion, $500,000;"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$118,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ". except that $1,000 additional may be expended for the purchase of one passenger automobile for the use of the chief of the Choctaw Nation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada and Oregon either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "five hundred and eighty-four"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 142: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,827,468"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 144: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 144, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,435,097"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 152: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 152, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: ". Shasta to Oroville, two hundred and thirty kilovolt, $10,000, Oroville to Sacramento, two hundred and thirty kilovolt, $1,000,000, Contra Costa Canal extension, sixty-nine kilovolt, $50,000; in all, $12,685,622"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 153: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,504,075"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 157: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$18,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 158: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 158, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$48,725,307"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 160: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 160, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$932,893"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 161: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 161, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 165: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 165, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 167: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "one hundred and sixteen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 168: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 168, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 169: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 170: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 170, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 171: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 171, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 172: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 172, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 176: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 176, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,498,672"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$235,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 179: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 179, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$69,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 180: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$110,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$442,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 185: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,708,772"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 186: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$90,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$184,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 188: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "four"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 189: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$80,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 190: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 190, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 192: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 192, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "four"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 194: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 194, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$112,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 195: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 195, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 196: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 196, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 197: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 197, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 198: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 199: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 199, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$34,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 200: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 200, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$559,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 201: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 201, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 202: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 202, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$45,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 203: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 203, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 204: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 204, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "two"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 205: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 205, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$21,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 206: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 206, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 207: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 207, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 208: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 208, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$826,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 209: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 209, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$52,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 210: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 210, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,430,615"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 211: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 211, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$47,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 214: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 214, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$30,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 215: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 215, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 218: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 218, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 219: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 219, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$727,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 220: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 220, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 221: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 221, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$8,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 223: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 223, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$62,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 224: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 224, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$711,248"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 225: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 225, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$659,407"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 226: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 226, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,290,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 227: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 227, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 228: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 228, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$71,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 229: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 229, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 232: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 232, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$675,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 235: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 235, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 236: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 236, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$11,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 237: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 237, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 241: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 241, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "thirty-seven"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 243: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 243, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$265,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 244: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 244, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 245: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 245, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,413,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 246: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 246, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$724,440"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 247: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 247, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$360,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 248: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 248, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 249: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 249 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$819,307"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 250: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 250, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$62,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 251: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 251, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 252: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 252, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 253: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 253, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 257: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 257, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$853,000, and in addition thereto the unexpended balance for special improvements on the Wichita Mountain Wildlife Refuge for the fiscal year 1944 is continued available for the fiscal year 1947"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 258: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 258, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 259: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 259, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,723,502"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 260: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 260, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 262: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 262, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,223,502"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 263: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 263, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$962,790"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 264: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 264, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "one hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 267: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 267, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 268: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 268, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$79,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 269: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 269, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,360,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 271: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 271, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 275: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 275, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,215"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 278: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 278, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and acquisition (not to exceed $1,352,415 for purchase of the Ark-La line from Markham Ferry, Oklahoma, in Nimrod, Arkansas)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 282: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 282, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 283: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 283, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 284: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 284, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 53, 58, 78, 80, 85, 87, 90, 92, 98, 105, 114, 115, 116, 141, 159, 166, 234, 238, 239, 242, 256, 265, 272, 274, 276, 277, 285, and 295.

CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
GUY CORDON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JED JOHNSON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL (except as to amendments 29, 80, 112, 129, 130, 132, 135, 136, 137, 138, and 139),
ROBERT F. JONES (except as to construction items, Bureau of Reclamation),
BEN F. JENSEN (except as to construction items, Bureau of Reclamation),
HENRY C. DWORSHAK (except as to construction items, Bureau of Reclamation),
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think I should make a brief statement with regard to the conference report. There were 295 Senate amendments. The Senate receded from 29, the House from 73, and the House agreed to the amendments of the Senate with further changes in the case of 157. There were 36 amendments in disagreement. Those disagreements have all been adjusted by the House and that is the way the matter now stands.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Has the conference report been signed by all the Senate members of the conference committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it has been signed by all of them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator tell us how many of the additions to the appropriations made by the Senate were cut down in conference?

Mr. HAYDEN. The original Budget estimate was $350,357,230. The House passed the bill carrying $179,426,847. The Senate bill carried a total of $341,890,763, or about $8,000,000 under the Budget. The bill comes back from conference under the Budget estimate by $103,190,194.

Mr. TAFT. What is the total amount of the bill as agreed upon in conference?

Mr. HAYDEN. The total is $247,161,000.

Mr. TAFT. Two hundred and forty-seven million, as contrasted with $341,000,000 as passed by the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. I think the House must have done a very good job in conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. It should make those gentlemen who feel that expenditures for the development of the natural resources of our country, particularly in the western part of the United States, are unwise and unnecessary, very happy that these reductions have been made.

I should like to point out one other thing with respect to this conference report. As will be remembered, there was considerable controversy in the Senate with respect to transmission lines. We made a very satisfactory adjustment with the House in that regard. First, as to the Bonneville project, the acquisition of certain lines which was prohibited by the House was allowed in conference.

Second, as to the Davis Dam on the Colorado River, the House denied any money for transmission lines. They were allowed in conference.

With respect to the Central Valley project in California concerning which we had a good deal of discussion here, as may be remembered, the way the bill now stands there is appropriated an additional sum of money for transmission lines. The power will not be disposed of to only one possible purchaser at the Shasta substation, as was originally proposed by the Senate, but will be carried down to Sacramento from Oroville and on to Tracy. There will be a Government transmission line to carry the power down to pump the water for the farmers of the Central Valley project in California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is that the line on the east side of the Sacramento River?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The House would not agree to a transmission line on the west side of the Sacramento Valley and insisted it was not necessary at this time, but, under the conference report, the farmers in the valley are assured of transmission lines that will bring the power from the dam to pump the water.

The House also denied any transmission lines in the Fort Peck project in Montana. That item, however, was agreed to in conference.

The same is true with respect to the Missouri River transmission lines. That proposal was specifically denied by the House but was agreed to in conference. Those lines were insisted upon, it will be remembered, by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and his colleague [Mr. BUTLER].

I can report that so far as transmission lines are concerned, they have all been restored as requested by the Bureau of the Budget. In addition there is specific mention of the acquisition of a transmission line by the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does that also include the Bonneville project transmission lines?

Mr. HAYDEN. It includes the Bonneville transmission lines. If the Senator will examine the report, he will see that while they were originally denied by the House, they were agreed to in conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message showing the action of the House on certain amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6335, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 25, 1946.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 17, 53, 58, 78, 80, 90, 92, 98, 105, 114, 116, 159, 234, 238 242 256 265, 274, 285, and 295 to the bill (H. R. 6335) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 8 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$173,000" and insert "$150,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 18 of the matter insert by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$449,516" and insert "$400,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 9 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$50,000" and insert "$12,956";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment insert "$514,500; for payment of a salary of $5 per diem while actually employed and for the payment of necessary travel expenses, exclusive of subsistence, of members of advisory committees of local stockmen, $35,500; in all, $550,00";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$100,000" and insert "$125,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$50,000" and insert "$40,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$3,023,800";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$3,700,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: On page 34 of the House engrossed bill, in line 4, strike out "and fifty";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "to any individual";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"For purposes of effecting settlement of war veterans on public land reclamation projects and to provide facilities for veteran employment in construction and operation of reclamation projects, the Bureau of Reclamation is hereby authorized to acquire by transfer without exchange of funds from the War Assets Administration or other Federal agency in responsible charge and such agencies are directed to transfer the lands, improvements, buildings, furnishings, and equipment acquired by the War Relocation Authority and declared surplus on the War Relocation Centers on the Heart Mountain Division of the Shoshone project, Wyoming, the Minidoka (hunt) project, Idaho, and the Tulelake Division of the Klamath project, California; and on the former prisoner of war camp at Indianola, Nebr.: *Provided,* That said lands, improvements, buildings, furnishings, and equipment shall be made available under regulations of the Secretary of the Interior to veteran settlers and nonprofit organizations and otherwise in accordance with the provisions of Senate Report No. 1412, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session: *Provided further,* That the War Assets Administration is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation funds required for maintenance and protection of the transferred property pending its final disposition."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 239 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$1,330,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 272 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$200,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 276 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, strike out "$142,400" and insert "$71,200";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 277 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"For salaries and expenses of three municipal experts, to be appointed by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, to make a study of, and report to said committees on, the fiscal affairs of the municipality of St. Croix, V. I., $6,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate agree en bloc to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 6, 18, 19, 20, 85, 87, 115, 141, 166, 239, 272, 276, and 277.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered as stated by the Senator from Arizona are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. HAYDEN. As to one of these amendments, No. 141, which was legislative in character, as a number of them were, I desire to place in the RECORD an excerpt from the hearings on the bill and to make a statement of my own, including citations to certain statutes.

For more than 30 years I have been intimately acquainted as a Member of the House and Senate with all legislation relating to the irrigation of arid lands and the incidental development of hydroelectric power and I do not hesitate to assert that Congress has never intended to make any practical distinction between water users' associations and irrigation districts, nowithstanding the fact that the latter are municipal corporations and therefore tax exempt.

In proof of this assertion I submit a list of numerous acts of Congress passed during my service which couple associations and districts on terms of equality. It was just common sense on the part of Congress to show no preference because each form of organization serves the same purpose insofar as both the Government and the water users are concerned. I ask that the list of statutes be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

References to water users' associations and certain aspects of power revenues in reclamation laws annotated

Page	Statute	United States Code
59	Sec. 6, act of June 17, 1902	32 Stat. 389.
[1] 96	Sec. 5, act of Apr. 16, 1906	34 Stat. 117.
137	Sec. 1, act of Feb. 13, 1911	36 Stat. 902.
140	Sec. 1, act of Feb. 21, 1911	36 Stat. 925.
142	Sec. 2, act of Feb. 21, 1911	36 Stat. 926.
145	Sec. 1, act of Feb. 24, 1911	36 Stat. 930.
166	Sec. 5, act of Aug. 13, 1914	38 Stat. 687.
170	Sec. 7, act of Aug. 13, 1914	38 Stat. 688.
177	Sec. 3, act of Oct. 5, 1914	38 Stat. 728.
188	Note to act of May 18, 1916	
201	Sec. 4, act of Jan. 25, 1917	39 Stat. 869.
221	Act of Feb. 25, 1920	41 Stat. 451.
229	Act of June 5, 1920	41 Stat. 1054.
239	Sec. 1, act of Mar. 31, 1922	42 Stat. 489.
[1] 248	Act of Sept. 18, 1922	42 Stat. 847.
260	Sec. 5, act of Feb. 28, 1923	42 Stat. 1325.
264	Sec. 2, act of May 9, 1924	43 Stat. 116.
276	Subsec. G, act of Dec. 5, 1924	43 Stat. 702.
[1] 277	Subsec. I, act of Dec. 5, 1924	43 Stat. 703.
291	Act of Mar. 3, 1925	43 Stat. 1170.
295	Act of May 10, 1926	44 Stat. 479
317	Sec. 45, act of May 25, 1926	44 Stat. 648.
401	Sec. 1, act of Jan. 31, 1931	46 Stat. 1074.
[1] 410	Act of Feb. 21, 1931	46 Stat. 1202.
414	Sec. 1, act of Apr. 1, 1932	47 Stat. 75.
415	Sec. 2, act of Apr. 1, 1932	Do.
416	Sec. 4, act of Apr. 1, 1932	Do.
418	Sec. 7, act of Apr. 1, 1932	Do.
[1] 418	Sec. 8, act of Apr. 1, 1932	Do.
418	Note to sec. 8, act of Apr. 1, 1932.	
450	Sec. 1, act of Mar. 27, 1934	48 Stat. 400.
486	Sec. 1, act of Apr. 14, 1936	49 Stat. 1206.
494	Sec. 1, act of June 22, 1936	49 Stat. 1818.
498	Sec. 6, act of June 24, 1936	49 Stat. 1907.
524	Act of Aug. 9, 1937	50 Stat. 592.
535	Sec. 1, act of Aug. 21, 1937	50 Stat. 737.
[1] 547	Act of May 9, 1938	52 Stat. 318.
564	Act of June 22, 1938	52 Stat. 941.
572	Sec. 1, act of May 31, 1938	53 Stat. 792.
589	Sec. 2 (g), act of Aug. 4, 1939	53 Stat. 1187.
590	Sec. 4 (a), act of Aug. 4, 1939	Do.
[1] 598	Sec. 9 (c), act of Aug. 4, 1939	Do.
639	Sec. 1, act of Aug. 27, 1940	54 Stat. 862.
655	Sec. 4 (a), act of Oct. 14, 1940	54 Stat. 1119.
691	Sec. 1 (b), act of July 2, 1942	56 Stat. 634.

[1] Reference is to statutes re power revenues, not necessarily to water users' associations.

Mr. HAYDEN. The text of the amendment as amended by the House and agreed to in conference together with extracts from the record made before the Senate Committee on Appropriations are as follows:

Utilization of power revenues: No power revenues on any project shall be distributed as profits before or after retirement of the project debt, and nothing contained in any previous appropriation act shall be deemed to have authorized such distribution: *Provided*, That the application of such revenues to the cost of operation, maintenance, and debt service of the irrigation system of the project, or to other purposes in aid of such irrigation system, shall not be construed to be such a distribution.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

This amendment is declaratory of existing law, but removes any doubt as to the intended effect of section 4 (I) of the Second Deficiency Act of 1924 (act of Dec. 5, 1924, ch. 4, 43 Stat. 703; 43 U. S. C. 501), as to the status of power revenues on projects turned over by the United States to the water users' organizations for operation and maintenance. This statute reads:

"SUBSEC. I. Profits from projects taken over by water users: That whenever the water users take over the care, operation, and maintenance of a project, or a division of a project, the total accumulated net profits, as determined by the Secretary, derived from the operation of project power plants, leasing or project grazing and farm lands, and the sale or use of town sites shall be credited to the construction charge of the project, or a division thereof, and thereafter the net profits from such sources may be used by the water users to be credited annually, first, on account of project construction charge; second, on account of project operation and maintenance charge; and third, as the water users may direct. No distribution to individual water users shall be made out of any such profits before all obligations to the Government shall have been fully paid."

It is the intent of the reclamation laws that the power revenues shall be applied for project purposes and not distributed as profits to any individual before or after the United States has been repaid its investment. The application of the power revenues to reduce the cost of water service is one of the uses intended by the Congress of the power produced as an incident to the operation of a reclamation project. No discrimination is intended by the statutes in this respect between projects operated by the United States, those operated by irrigation districts, and those operated by water users' associations or other types of water users' organizations. The reclamation laws speak throughout of all three types of projects, collectively and indiscriminately. The proposed amendment removes any doubt as to this intent, arising from the language of the cited Appropriation Act.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY NATIONAL RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION, DENVER, COLO., NOVEMBER 16, 1945

RESOLUTION NO. 11

Whereas the intent of the reclamation laws is to accord equal treatment to every type of water users' organization, and there should be no discrimination, under any Federal statute, between irrigation districts, water users' associations, mutual ditch companies, and other types of water users' organizations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in view of that intent, the reclamation laws and other Federal statutes should be clarified where necessary to insure that the application of water revenues and power revenues to repaying the cost of construction, to pay operation and maintenance expenses, and otherwise to reduce the cost of water to the farmer on a reclamation project by whatever type of organization it is operated, does not constitute a dividend or distribution of such revenues, but a proper disposition of the resources of a multiple-purpose project, as intended by Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers and appropriate committees of the National Reclamation Association are instructed to present and endeavor to secure the adoption of clarifying legislation to the foregoing effect.

Mr. GOSSETT subsequently said: Mr. President, I was detained in a meeting of the Committee on Commerce when the vote was taken on the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill, and I wish to state that I favor the conference report bill. However, I wish to call attention to one item in the bill which will be contrary to the principles of sound administration.

I refer to the Anderson Ranch Dam project in my own State. The Bureau of the Budget recommended $2,847,000 for this project, but this was cut to $1,234,475 by the House. The full amount was restored in the Senate, but the conferees have settled upon the House figure.

This particular project is 75 percent complete, and a force of 800 men is now at work. If the figure as passed by the Senate had been agreed upon by the conferees, the dam could have been completed during the fall of this year.

The project on June 30 will have exhausted its 1946 fiscal year funds. It will require about half of the $1,234,475 now contained in this bill to continue payments on previous commitments to complete turbine and generator construction. That will leave only about $600,000 to continue work, and that will mean the project will shut down in August.

I am informed that this is the only project nearing completion which will have to shut down completely. A shutdown will mean that the Government will keep a great deal of money tied up in expensive machinery which must remain idle until more funds are appropriated. If the money were appropriated to finish the dam proper, this machinery could be sold and used on other construction work where it is badly needed.

Had I been present, I would have voted for the conference report, but I should like to serve notice that an effort will be made to obtain additional funds up to the amount of the Budget Bureau's approval in a deficieny appropriation bill, which will probably come before the Senate next week.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 896. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes; and

S. 2122. An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATON ACTS OF 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report on House bill 6042, to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(See conference report printed in full in the RECORD of June 25, 1946, pp. 7443–7447.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, mechanically the procedure will be that we will have an opportunity to vote for or against the conference report?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, if the report shall be agreed to, that will conclude its consideration, and if it shall not be agreed to, other motions can be made, for instructions to the conferees, and the like?

Mr. BARKLEY. Other motions can be made, including a motion to send the report back with instructions.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I mean.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Hayden	Overton
Ball	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Huffman	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Burch	Kilgore	Smith
Bushfield	Knowland	Stanfill
Bryd	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	Lucas	Swift
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Carville	McClellan	Taylor
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McMahon	Tobey
Downey	Magnuson	Tunnell
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
George	Mitchell	Wherry
Gerry	Moore	White
Gossett	Morse	Wiley
Green	Murdock	Willis
Guffey	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	
Hart	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO and Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business, having been appointed to the Commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the Commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair will ask the Senator from Kentucky to yield for a moment, in order that the Chair may make a statement. A parliamentary inquiry was made a moment ago, and the Chair now wishes to state the parliamentary situation.

The question is on agreeing to the report, which question is debatable.

Inasmuch as the House has already agreed to the report, and its conferees thereby discharged, a motion to recommit the conference report is not in order. It cannot be amended, and must be accepted or rejected in its entirety.

If the report is agreed to, no further legislative step is required.

If it is rejected, a motion that the Senate further insist upon its amendments and ask a further conference with the House is in order.

A motion to instruct the conferees would be in order after the foregoing motion is agreed to, and before the conferees are actually named by the Presiding Officer.

The Chair feels that that statement of the parliamentary situation should be made to the Senate at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief factual statement concerning the conference report which is now before the Senate. Before discussing the report itself I wish to state that this legislation has received as studious and careful consideration by the two Houses of Congress and by the Banking and Currency Committees of the two Houses as any legislation which has been before Congress in a long time. Everyone recognized the complications, the difficulties and the annoyances growing out of controls and regulations affecting the lives and the business and the habits of 140,000,000 people. Everyone recognized that, with the war having terminated, impatience with these restrictions naturally increased, as well as the natural desire of our people, whether in business, or professions, or on farms, whether producers or consumers, to resume as soon as possible the natural methods by which business is normally transacted. Yet, I think the country as a whole recognized that we could not, without incurring great dangers, lift these regulations and restrictions all at once, and that there must, if possible, be worked out a tapering-off process by which we could finally reach the period when all controls might be eliminated without too great risk of danger to our economic system, without too great encouragement of inflationary increases in the price of products and without repeating, or insofar as possible without incurring the danger of repeating, the disastrous consequences that followed World War I.

Hearings began in the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I believe, back in February. They were very exhaustive hearings in which everyone was allowed to tell his story, not only for or against the continuation of these controls, but to tell his story with respect to how they had affected his own business or his own affairs.

The bill came over to the Senate, and hearings were begun in the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on the second day of May. They were continued for more than 3 weeks, during which time no one was denied the right to be heard, no matter what his position was or what he advocated.

I stated a moment ago that I thought the hearings in the House began in February. The record of the hearings shows that the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House began on the 18th of February and continued until the 19th of March. Hearings before the Senate committee began on April 15 and continued until the 10th of May. The Senate committee hearings comprise two volumes. I mention these facts to show the meticulous care and industry which were devoted to this legislation, regardless of what anyone may think of the result of the deliberations.

After the hearings were concluded some complaint was raised that Congress had delayed too long in bringing this legislation to a culmination. Perhaps so; but, inasmuch as the hearings in the House began in February and continued for a month so as to allow everyone his day in court, and the hearings before the Senate committee began as soon as the bill came to us and extended over a period of 3 weeks or more, so as to allow everyone his day in court before the Senate committee, it certainly shows that the Senate and the House, as well as

the two responsible committees, were anxious to get at the facts as fairly and as accurately as it was humanly possible in a controversial situation which has aroused passions, emotions, hatred, and denunciation. The committees and the conferees have come through a maze of antagonism and controversy to the point where we now are. We present to the Senate a bill which does not altogether satisfy anyone, but which, in the democratic process of give and take, is the result of consideration of every viewpoint presented to the committees charged with responsibility to the Congress. I am prepared to say—and I say it with as much earnestness as I can command—that notwithstanding its imperfections, notwithstanding that no one would have written the bill just as it is if he had been commissioned to do it, in my judgment we have produced the best bill possible under the circumstances which existed, in the atmosphere in which we were compelled to legislate upon the subject.

With that preliminary statement, I wish briefly to describe what we have done. When the Senate passed the bill it struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted in lieu thereof an amendment which constituted an entirely new bill. There were many major differences, both as to form and substance, between the House bill and the Senate amendment. The conference report, of course, is based upon both the House bill and the Senate amendment. In a few cases substantially identical provisions were contained in the House bill and in the Senate amendment, and those provisions are now contained in the conference report. In those respects in which the Senate amendment differed from the House, the conference report for the most part follows the Senate amendment, both as to form and substance.

There are only about five differences of major importance between the bill as it passed the Senate and the conference report. Probably only one of those differences can be said to be of primary importance.

The Senate provisions relating to the removal of maximum prices were modified so as to eliminate the specific provision for the immediate removal of price control from meat, poultry, dairy products, tobacco, and petroleum. That is the major difference, I should say, between the Senate bill and the conference report, and it was the major difference between the House bill and the Senate amendment before the conference report was agreed to.

Secondly, the amount made available for subsidies was reduced from $1,100,000,000, provided under the Senate amendment, to an even $1,000,000,000; and the general termination date for subsidies was changed in the conference report from May 1, as in the Senate bill, to April 1, 1947.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Is not the subsidy provided for stripper wells continued?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I shall come to that a little later.

Third, the provision of the Senate bill, usually referred to as the Wherry amendment, which required that maximum prices must be fixed so as to return to the distributors, wholesalers, and retailers their prewar discounts or mark-ups, was modified so as to provide that the discount or mark-up which must be allowed shall be that which prevailed on January 1, 1946, rather than that which prevailed before the war.

I may say in that connection that I believe it was demonstrated to the conference that many merchants and distributors, whether retailers or wholesalers, would find it difficult at this time to ascertain just what their mark-ups and discounts may have been prior to the war. Inasmuch as most of the increases in wages which have taken place have occurred since the 1st of January, the conferees felt that January 1 was the more equitable date, and one more easily administered, than to go back before the war and try to provide that the same conditions which prevailed then—in many cases unascertainable—should govern in fixing the formula for prices with respect to the subjects treated in the Wherry amendment.

Fourth, the provision of the Senate amendment, usually referred to as the Taft amendment, which established for manufacturers and processors a pricing formula based upon their October 1941 prices increased by the weighted average per unit increase in cost of production since October 1941, was extended so as to include producers along with manufacturers and processors. Senators will recall that under that amendment, which was adopted on the floor of the Senate, the words "manufacturers" and "processors" were used, but the word "producers" was not included. The conferees extended the provision to include producers, so as to make it certain that it would include farmers as well as manufacturers and processors, a farmer being technically neither a manufacturer nor a processor. It would include also producers of petroleum who may be neither manufacturers nor processors, and it would also cover coal as well as petroleum and agricultural products.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the farmer would not be included, either as a manufacturer or processor?

Mr. BARKLEY. There was doubt whether the word "processor" would apply to a farmer. But when we added the word "producer" we made it certain that the provision would include a farmer.

Mr. WHERRY. So the farmer is now included.

Mr. BARKLEY. The farmer is included in the provisions of the amendment. That is practically the only extent to which the amendment was changed in the conference.

Fifth, the portion of the bill as passed by the Senate which provided that the Price Administrator could not institute any enforcement proceedings unless the institution of such proceedings was approved by the appropriate United States district attorney was eliminated in the conference. That amendment was offered on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], as will be recalled. The conferees felt that in view of the fact that the district attorney has his office at a central point in the district which he is serving, and in view of the fact that the amendment would apply as well to the institution of any civil process, as well as the institution of a criminal prosecution, it would handicap the enforcement of the price-control program to require every time, before any legal proceeding could be had, that the district attorney be consulted. The House conferees were very much against such a requirement, and the Senate conferees yielded on it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to express regret that that provision was removed, because I think one of the greatest abuses in the administration of the OPA, I say to the Senator from Kentucky, has been the prosecution end or the clause of the OPA Act which imposes a minimum fine of $25 upon any violator, regardless of whether the violation is willful, regardless of whether it is committed because of a mistake, and even though it occurs as the result of an absolute intent to comply with the law. The OPA still fines such persons that minimum amount. In my State recently, in Hardy County, three merchants who had acted in the utmost good faith were fined $25 minimum each, although it was admitted that they had not willfully broken the law.

If those cases could have gone into the hands of the district attorney he could have passed on them in an adequate and proper way, and would not have fined people who were not willful violators.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I appreciate that situation, and I voted for the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. Of course, the Senator from West Virginia realizes that when there is a complicated piece of legislation, such as that which is before us and when there are differences between the positions taken on it by the two Houses, neither House can always have its own way, and concessions must be made. This was one of the concessions we had to make. I say to the Senator that, on the whole, the theory of the Senate bill, with the exception of the specific decontrols with which all of us are familiar, and the philosophy and almost the text of the Senate bill are preserved in the conference report to as great an extent as in the case of any conference report with which I have been familiar in recent years.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course the amendment with regard to the $25 fine which the Senate added to the bill is retained on

page 12, in section 12, where we find the following:

Provided, however, That such amount—

That is to say, the penalty—

shall be the amount of the overcharge or overcharges if the defendant proves that the violation of the regulation, order, or price schedule in question was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation."

If he proves that, he is liable only for the amount of the overcharge.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was about to say that the House accepted the Senate language with respect to the matter discussed by the Senator from West Virginia, but would not accept the Senate provision that before anything could be done the district attorney would have to be consulted. I think, however, the language of the Senate provision amply protects the individual against abuse, because we have written a new standard by which these proceedings shall be instituted and conducted.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am indeed glad to know that the Senate amendment was kept in the measure in respect to protecting those who do not willfully violate the law. I am glad to have that provision included. But at the same time I think it is regrettable that the district attorney, a fixed Federal Government official, cannot pass upon the question whether the offense is such and is so willful that the person committing it should be prosecuted. I think the greatest abuses which have occurred in connection with the administration of the act have been particularly in respect to punishing innocent people and harassing them with fines. I hope that the language which was accepted by the conferees will relieve that situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Ohio has called attention to the proviso in section 12. I now read it for the first time. It seems to me that it constitutes a complete reversal of the accepted procedure in proceedings against any defendant. The proviso requires the defendant to prove his innocence rather than to require the prosecutor to prove the defendant's guilt. It reads as follows:

Provided, however, That such amount shall be the amount of the overcharge or overcharges if the defendant proves that the violation of the regulation, order, or price schedule in question was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation.

It seems to me that the prosecutor should be required to prove the willful character of the overcharge.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the procedure has been that the Government must prove that there was a violation. Under the law as originally written when a violation, whether willful or otherwise, was proved, there could be assessed triple damages, and so forth, and a minimum fine of $50. We have modified that from time to time because of complaints which the committee and the Congress thought were justified. After the Government has proved the violation, then it is a defense, so far as this language is concerned, to show that the violation was not willful and that the person who is charged with the violation resorted to all practicable means to avoid a violation of the law. In my judgment, the provision does not really reverse the course of procedure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to make this comment: I find from my experience and from statements which have been made to me and from letters which I have received that one of the primary sources of criticism of the OPA has been the result of what might often be termed the unintelligent attempt of OPA to punish for violations which obviously were not willful. In case after case merchants who made mistakes in the marking of price tags upon commodities have been prosecuted and punished as a result. That sort of thing has been one of the principal sources of the accumulating criticism of OPA. I certainly hope that if this conference report is adopted, those who are in charge of the OPA in Washington and throughout the country will recognize the fact that wholesale prosecutions should not be undertaken, that no case should be taken into court, no assessment should be made, unless the OPA has definite evidence that the defendant charged was in fact a chiseler, not an innocent violator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's comment. All of us have received such complaints, and we have tried to deal with them. Naturally, in the institution of a new agency, such as the Office of Price Administration, which was a new venture, it is inevitable that inexperienced and overenthusiastic people be drawn together in connection with the enforcement. The truth is that we have never given the OPA a sufficient amount of money for enforcement to enable it adequately to cover the entire country with respect to such matters. It may be that on that account the OPA has been led into the error of seeking to make examples of individual cases, so as to have a deterrent effect upon others. But I hope that with this language in the bill for the remaining year of the operation of OPA, there will be no cause for any justified complaint upon that score.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I do not wish to dwell on the point; but because of the possible judicial interpretation which may flow from the measure which we are about to enact, I wish to say that I think the Senator from Wyoming has raised a very sound point. We should not overlook the fact that in this bill we are dealing with a proposed law that has criminal penalties within it. As I understand it, the conference report now proposes that a burden of proof in establishing the innocence of the defendant shall be placed upon the defendant. No longer shall he be entitled to the presumption of innocence until proved guilty by the Government. I admit that relieving the Government from proving the guilt of the defendant beyond a question of a doubt and the taking away from the defendant of the protection of the presumption of innocence is contrary to basic guaranties of American criminal jurisprudence. I assert that the language of the conference bill in respect to this problem cannot be reconciled with constitutional rights of American citizens when accused of crime.

I submit, as a matter of law, that once we take away the purely mala prohibita features of this act and say by statute that the punishment shall be based only on a willful violation of the act, under our law we cannot put the burden of proof on the defendant to establish his innocence. I believe that, unless the OPA follows the suggestion which the Senator from Wyoming has made, namely, that it will not proceed with prosecution or, rather, that it will itself assume the burden of proof of establishing guilt the courts of this land will be bound to declare at least this part of the enforcement section of the bill unconstitutional. I do not believe that under American law we can now include in the statute the requirement that there shall be placed upon the defendant the burden of proving that he was not guilty of a willful violation. I make these statements at this time because I think the courts are entitled to notice in this debate as to the intent of the Senate when it passes this bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the suggestions, and I am sure the Administrator will take note of them in administering the new act.

Mr. President, one of the principal differences between the two Houses related to the length of time for which the Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act were to be extended. The House provided for an extension until March 31, 1947, and the Senate provided for an extension until June 30, 1947. The Senate date was approved by the conference.

In both bills there was a declaration of policy. Both the House bill and the Senate amendment added a new section 1A to the Price Control Act. This section, particularly in the Senate bill, was of considerable length and related to a number of matters concerning the purposes and policies with respect to stabilization and price control to be followed during the interim period. The first part of this section contained a declaration of policy. The declaration of policy agreed upon in conference is that which was contained in the Senate bill, practically without change. Decontrol provisions were provided in both bills.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe that it might be well to emphasize that the declaration of policy puts the emphasis upon production as the answer to inflation

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator speak a little louder?

Mr. MLLIKIN. I believe that most of us will agree that production is the an-

swer to inflation, and that we double riveted it with what I believe is a very strong declaration of policy to that effect. We include in the declaration of policy the statement that adequate prices are essential to the securing of adequate production.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for his statement. As I have already said, the declaration of policy contained in the Senate bill was accepted by the conferees on behalf of the House; and, if I may say so, with some admiration, they felt that we had written a better declaration of policy than was contained in the House bill. We did emphasize the essentiality of production, and in that declaration of policy we linked pricing with production so that they might go along together with whatever effect they might have on production, so that even before the year has expired, during which the law will operate, production may be so increased as to reach a point where decontrol will take place as rapidly as possible.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained provisions relating to the removal of price controls. The House bill provided, in the case of nonagricultural commodities, that price control should be removed when the production of the commodity for the past 12 months equals or exceeds the production of the same commodity for the period from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941.

In the case of agricultural commodities, the House bill contained a sort of double-barreled provision, to the effect that controls should be removed when the production of a commodity for the past 12 months equals or exceeds the production during the period from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941, and also provided that controls should be removed from an agricultural commodity whenever the supply of the commodity was equal to the domestic consumption.

Of course, that situation would always be true. It is true now. We can consume only as much as we supply. Therefore, if the decontrol of an agricultural product depended on consumption and producing balancing from day to day, that condition would exist. Obviously, we cannot consume any more than is supplied. In the Senate bill we provided, both as to agriculture and nonagricultural commodities, a general standard for removing controls so that controls will be eliminated when the supply of a commodity is in balance with the demand for the commodity.

Mr. President, there is a great deal of difference between demand and consumption, because demand may go far beyond consumption. It is true at the present time that demand is going far beyond consumption, because commodities are in short supply and, therefore, cannot be obtained. Notwithstanding the excess of demand over the ability to obtain and consume, the Senate amendment also provided that the controls should be removed before December 31, 1946, in case of all commodities which are not important in relation to the cost of living or business costs. The Senate amendment also contained requirements for the removal of price controls on or before June 30, 1946, in the case of specific commodities which were referred to earlier, such as meats, livestock, poultry, dairy, tobacco, and petroleum.

The Senate amendment also provided for the establishment of an independent Price Decontrol Board to review actions of the Price Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the removal of maximum prices in the case of particular commodities. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The agreement reached in conference follows the provisions of the Senate bill relating to decontrol in all respects, except as to the mandatory provisions for the immediate decontrol of certain specific commodities.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I observe that in connection with petitions for the decontrol of commodities, it is provided that they shall be filed under regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator himself. So the Director would have to abide by his regulations in determining the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have provided that industry committees may make application not only to the Secretary of Agriculture, in regard to agricultural products, but to the Administrator in regard to nonagricultural products, and that the Administrator shall be required to act promptly upon the matter. If he does not act within a certain length of time—60 days, as I recall—the decontrol board may move in and, in cases where the Administrator does act, the committee will have the right to appeal to the decontrol board from the decision of the Administrator, or the decision of the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be. Of course, regulations would have to be established by the Administrator with respect to procedure after the matter had been brought to his attention. It would be utterly impossible to write those regulations into the law.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We had a great deal of discussion about that subject in the committee. In fact, I myself was somewhat dubious as to whether that power to make regulations should exist. But it became apparent that there had to be certain forms to be followed which would not substantively affect the rights of the petitioner. I believe that we all agreed in the committee that the Price Administrator should not have the power by regulations to affect the substantive rights of the petitioner. Am I correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is absolutely correct, and inasmuch as the Senator from Colorado has made that contribution to the discussion of the decontrol board, I wish to say that no member of the Committee on Banking and Currency worked harder or more effectively in perfecting the process by which we set up this new board, in an effort to secure prompt action on the part of the Administrator and the Secretary, than the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I appreciate the compliment. I do not know whether it is quite in order, but I wish the distinguished majority leader would exercise his great abilities and influence in seeing that we have a real board. I think that if he would busy himself on that subject we would have a board which would be constructive. On the other hand, it is conceivable that we might have a board which would add nothing whatever to what we are trying to do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I have no idea whether I will be influential in any respect, either proximately or remotely, in regard to the setting up of the Board, but I certainly share the hope that it will be completely independent. We have provided that it shall be completely divorced from the Price Administration and the Secretary of Agriculture. The members of the Board are to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and that is as far as we can go in divorcing the Board from either agency and making it independent.

I should certainly think it most unfortunate if a Board were appointed to perform this important function which was not truly representative of the people but was subservient to any agency or department of the Government. I might add that I think the Congress would have been well advised if it had had the foresight in the beginning to create such a Board. We did not do it; we are doing it now, as the activity is tapering off, but I think it is worth while even in the closing days of the OPA to set up this Board.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that while I was out of the Chamber the Senator discussed briefly the amendment I offered, which was deleted by the conferees.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I called attention to it as one of the provisions of the Senate bill on which the conferees of the Senate were compelled to yield. The House conferees felt that, in view of the fact that the district attorney has his office generally in a central location within the district he serves, and that most of the proceedings are required to be initiated in the various sections of such district, it would handicap the enforcement of the remaining powers of the Office of Price Administration to require in every case that the district attorney should give his consent before any sort of proceeding, either criminal or civil, should be instituted. Therefore, the House conferees would not recede from their opposition.

I also stated that the language of the Senate bill with respect to the modification of the penalties assessed in cases where there was a violation which was not willful, or where the person involved had exercised ordinary diligence in undertaking to adhere to the law, was retained in the bill, and would no doubt be helpful in minimizing any injustices that might occur during the remaining life of the act.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Senate conferees struggle very hard for my amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. We "rassled" with Jacob considerably. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. I rather gathered from the explanation of my good friend, the majority leader, that when the House conferees said they would not take the amendment, the Senate conferees just gave up.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has no right to assume, from my discussion of the matter, that the House conferees just said, "We won't agree," and that we caved in at once. It did not occur in that way at all.

Mr. LUCAS. I know how sincere and how convincing my able friend always is in anything about which he is vitally concerned, and of course I know he did the best he could with my amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], during the colloquy, expressed his regret that that provision was eliminated, and in reply I stated that I had supported the amendment on the floor of the Senate and that it was a good amendment, and therefore the Senate conferees insisted as much as they could reasonably be expected to insist, recognizing the fact that we could not get everything in the bill that we were advocating on the part of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that fact, and I understand that in reaching conference agreements there always must be a considerable amount of compromise.

I merely wish to repeat what I said when the amendment was adopted by the Senate, when there did not appear to be very much opposition to it, and everyone to whom I talked about it seemed to believe it was a very good amendment. In my judgment, one of the real reasons why we are discussing OPA as we are today has been the faulty administration of the enforcement division of OPA. Had the Congress placed the enforcement policy in the hands of the United States district attorneys throughout the country in the beginning, I am satisfied in my own mind, from what I personally know of what has happened in my own State, that we would not have been having the trouble with the OPA we are having at this very moment. I regret very much that the amendment was deleted. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for doing what he could to keep it in.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's feeling about it.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I feel very much as the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from West Virginia have exressed themselves in regard to the loss of the amendment just discussed. I wish to ask the majority leader whether in conference the question was considered of putting the burden of proof on the prosecutor to prove that a violation was a willful violation, or resulted from the failure to take practical precautions, rather than leaving on the defendant the burden of proving himself innocent. I think it is quite important to know what the conference did in regard to that subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. That matter was discussed. Of course, there was no comparable provision on the subject in the bill as it passed the House. The matter was discussed thoroughly. Of course, we did not spend a full day on it.

Mr. HAWKES. The conferees could not do that, of course.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; but it was discussed, and the opinion was expressed not only on the part of the House conferees, but on the part of others who were in consultation with respect to it, that to require the Government to prove willful conduct, to prove positively and affirmatively that a merchant did not exercise ordinary diligence, would make enforcement impossible. Such things are matters of intent, and sometimes intent must be drawn from conduct. That is true in criminal prosecutions, as a rule. Some things are presumed to be willful. It depends on the circumstances.

We did not change the Senate provision in conference. Wherever a violation is shown, even under circumstances where willfulness might be assumed, where the defendant might prove that it it was not willful, or that he exercised ordinary diligence in trying to comply with the law, this provision would apply. It is not true that this language reverses the process of prosecutions or procedure against anyone.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may make an observation to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It was the theory of Congress, during the earlier years of OPA, that the penalty for violations should be automatic, in the same sense that if a man drives on the left-hand side of the street, no matter why he is doing it, he has committed an offense.

Mr. HAWKES. If I may interject there—even if he be an Englishman? [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLIKIN. Even if he be an Englishman. So it was thought that although the Radcliffe amendment to the bill, which gives the defendant a chance to show that his act was not willful, was not complete relief from the viewpoint of many of us, it did nevertheless represent a distinct improvement over the prior more or less automatic punishment theory.

Mr. BARKLEY. And, also, this language was the language of the Senate bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And it was retained as the Senate passed it.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, may I make just one remark?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. If what the conference has done and if what is being said on the floor of the Senate at the present time results in the OPA and the prosecutors understanding that we are not trying to ascertain how many people we can convict in the United States, but are trying to get results out of the law for the benefit of all the people, then I say the conference has done a good job—if that is the result.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not undertake to be the spokesman for the OPA, but I think the intent of Congress is very clear.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I merely wanted to comment on that unusual provision, that when a charge is made against a man with respect to violation of law, it is not necessary to charge a willful violation of the law. If so it would be incumbent on the prosecution to establish willfulness. A defendant has the chance to come in and show his action was not willful, but that it was the result of a mistake.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whatever may be its defects, it was the language of the Senate committee bill, and was not changed on the floor of the Senate, and the House accepted it.

Mr. MOORE. I should say the Senate was pretty careless when it accepted it.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be. Now I wish to continue and conclude my remarks.

FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

This new section 1A as it was contained in the Senate bill included a number of provisions relating to the functions to be performed by the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with the administration of price control as to agricultural commodities. These provisions, in effect, gave the Secretary of Agriculture full responsibility as to price control in this field. These provisions are included in the conference report just as they were in the Senate bill.

In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture, under the Senate bill, has full control over whether there shall be decontrol of agricultural products—and agricultural products include livestock, poultry and dairy products—as well as tobacco, which, of course, by the Senate bill was also decontrolled specifically. It does not include, of course, petroleum. But personally I have no doubt in my mind that that matter will be promptly attended to so that there will be no injustice resulting by reason of its elimination from this bill.

I might at this point say that in regard to the subsidy on petroleum the conferees recognized that if the subsidy is completely removed at once from what are called stripper wells they would be required to rely upon the willingness of the purchasers of oil to increase their price sufficiently to absorb the subsidy, and therefore we provided that the subsidy on stripper wells may continue, even though price ceilings are removed, during the life of the subsidies, which is to the 1st of next April.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. That would mean, then, that if by chance the Administrator should decontrol oil, these subsidies could continue for a year?

Mr. BARKLEY. They might continue. Of course, the difficulty is, as the Senator, I am sure, knows——

Mr. MOORE. They would continue?

Mr. BARKLEY. They might continue as long as subsidies were paid generally—that is, to the first of next April. The reason for that, I will say to the Senator—and I am aware that he knows much more about the oil business

than I do—that stripper wells, once they are closed, are rarely reopened. There are thousands of wells in the country which produce from 1 to 3 or 4 barrels of oil. If they cannot produce that oil at a price which would justify their operation, they close down, and when they are closed down they rarely reopen. In order that they might have this period within which to readjust their prices with the purchasers, which are usually the large oil companies, we felt that we were justified in saying that, notwithstanding price control might be withdrawn from the oil produced, there might be continued on stripper wells a subsidy which would give them a breathing spell in which the price of their oil could be adjusted.

Mr. MOORE. Was not quite an emphatic gesture made toward declaring a policy there for subsidy payments on wells—if we want to use the word "wells"—when they can no longer be economically operated?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not think so at all. The purpose was simply to give the smaller wells, which have no control over their prices—for the price they receive for their oil is the price that is fixed by the large oil-purchasing companies—a breathng spell during which the price might be adjusted between them and the purchasers, so that they would not have the subsidies taken off at once and have to fall back on the price paid by the purchasers, less the subsidy. That is all we had in mind in doing this.

Mr. MOORE. As I read this language, then, assuming, as the Senator says, that oil might be decontrolled by the Administration, the price would be advanced or not as the buyer might determine, but the subsidy on so-called stripper wells, as defined now in the provision with respect to subsidy payment, continues. It continues right on for a full year. I cannot understand why that should be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is this difference, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma: We provide in the legislation that where the Price Administrator or the Government itself lifts a subsidy but continues the price ceiling on the product, the price shall be raised to absorb the subsidy that is denied. In the matter of small stripper wells there is no power left in the Government to say that the purchaser shall increase the price so as to absorb the subsidy. Therefore, we felt that, in fairness to the small stripper wells, they should have this breathing spell, as I call it, in which the price structure as between them and the purchasers of oil might be worked out without injury to them.

Mr. MOORE. Does the Senator mean even beyond the time when the price of oil might be controlled?

Mr. BARKLEY. Even beyond the time when the ceiling was taken off; yes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to correct one statement?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. This provision does not authorize the continuation of stripper-well subsidies beyond April 1, 1947.

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. TAFT. There is a general termination of subsidies under section 4 on April 1, 1947. What this provision does is to say in effect, "Contrary to other subsidies, if you decontrol oil you may continue the subsidy on stripper wells until April 1, 1947." That is the reason for putting the language in the report. Otherwise, if petroleum were decontrolled tomorrow the subsidy on stripper wells would have to stop. It was felt by some at least that decontrol might become more possible if there were not the opposition from stripper-well operators against decontrol if the subsidy has to be cut off at the end of control.

Mr. MOORE. Do I understand the Senator to construe that language to mean that if petroleum were decontrolled the subsidy for stripper wells would expire on April 1, 1947?

Mr. TAFT. On April 1, 1947; yes. That is definite.

Mr. MOORE. I did not understand that.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. I thought I had made that point clear to the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. In the conference report are any commodities decontrolled?

Mr. BARKLEY. There are none.

Mr. WILEY. None?

Mr. BARKLEY. There are none.

Mr. WILEY. So the jurisdiction of OPA is the same as it was before?

Mr. BARKLEY. The jurisdiction is modified, first, by putting control of all agricultural products in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture. It is modified, also, by setting up the decontrol board which has the final say as to whether there should be decontrol under the terms of the bill.

I might say in that connection that the House conferees felt, with some degree of logic, that to set up a decontrol board with one hand and with the other take away a large portion of its functions by Congress itself saying that on next Saturday or Sunday there should be decontrol on certain specific products was an illogical thing, and that in view of the fact that we were setting up the decontrol board for nonagricultural products, as well as agricultural products if the Secretary of Agriculture did not act, and also putting in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture the power to control prices and decontrols with respect to agricultural products, that board might be well depended upon to function promptly and effectively in the field of decontrol.

Mr. WILEY. Am I to understand that under this arrangement the Secretary of Agriculture not only has the power to decontrol but he has control over the prices?

Mr. BARKLEY. No. He makes his recommendation. He is required to report to the Price Administrator agricultural products which are in short supply. He is required to make recommendations not only as to absolute decontrol but as to adjustment in prices, and he is authorized and directed from month to month to make a report and recommendations to the Price Administrator, and the Price Administrator is by the measure which we are now considering required to carry out the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture. If he does not do it promptly, then the complainant may go to the decontrol board and there get prompt consideration.

Mr. WILEY. The jurisdiction of the board that is set up then simply goes to the one issue, and that is if the OPA Administrator, or if the Secretary of Agriculture, on petition, does not decontrol, the board has the final review?

Mr. BARKLEY. They have the final power to order the decontrol on any commodity or any product which is brought to their attention.

Mr. WILEY. But they have nothing to say in relation to adjustment of prices?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the decontrol board is not a price-fixing agency.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to say that my experience with OPA, and my constituents' experience with OPA, has not been very, let us say, healthy, because of what has been said heretofore to be, perhaps, a lack of administrative ability. First, as suggested by the Senator from Illinois, OPA agents have taken the attitude that when mistakes were made by citizens that immediately made them a species of criminal, and the OPA agents in a way take the sleuth attitude or persecution attitude. That was the one thing. There are numerous instances of that, as the Senator knows.

The other thing which to me is the big factor, is the absolute inability to get action from OPA in relation to adjustment of prices. Applications have been made, and month after month there was no action taken upon the applications. I could give the Senator innumerable instances of failure on the part of OPA to take action. I wonder if the machinery in that respect has been in any wise improved?

Mr. BARKLEY. Decidedly so. We have put in the measure limitations as to time in which the Administrator is required to act. If he refuses, or fails for any reason to act, the matter can be taken before the Decontrol Board, in some cases automatically, and in others by the industry committee that has made the application for decontrol, or for decontrol with respect to the commodity which the particular industry committee represents.

Mr. WILEY. That is only with relation to decontrol, the Senator says?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. I am talking about prices, about price adjustments.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have not, of course, given the Decontrol Board price adjustment functions. We have given that power practically to the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to all agricultural products. Naturaly we had to leave with the Administrator the function of price adjustments in nonagricultural products, and that still remains with him. But I think the Senator can depend upon it that the complaints

which have been brought before the Congress in connection with the consideration of this legislation will have effect. I have made a very vigorous complaint myself at the delays which have occurred. I would not assume that they have been deliberate. I think the administration has been short-handed with respect to employees. This is a temporary agency. It is going out; and qualified and competent men naturally are looking around for places to land permanently. Many of them are naturally not enthusiastic about remaining until the whole thing ends and then taking a chance on obtaining permanent employment. Therefore there has been a constant sloughing off of some of the most efficient men in OPA.

During the hearings and during the consideration of the bill we have brought these questions to the attention of the Price Administrator, and we have the assurance of Mr. Paul Porter, the new Price Administrator, that he intends to do everything in his power to facilitate prompt consideration of all applications for price adjustments which may come before him. I have faith to believe that he is sincere, and that he will carry out that purpose.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Is there anything in the conference report which gives direction or guidance to OPA in relation to the rule which should be applied in fixing prices? Let me cite an example.

Some months ago I showed on the floor of the Senate what took place in relation to aluminum skillets. Two weeks ago I had in my office two representatives of the OPA. We had before us five chairs, which were apparently substantially the same. Some of them were made by old manufacturers. The old manufacturer was having a very difficult time getting an increase in his prices. He was given a price of $4.50, which was the prewar price. But there was another chair, which anyone could see was inferior in workmanship and material. The manufacturer of that chair was allowed a price of more than $9. The rule that I contend for is, that with respect to the same commodity, each manufacturer should be able to charge as any other manufacturer.

I ran up against the type of mind—and I speak advisedly with respect to these OPA representatives—which had figured out some mathematical formula. Those men, by their own particular rule—not of law, but of some mathematical calculus—had figured out that the old manufacturer should not get as much as the new manufacturer, though his costs were the same. I wondered if there was anything in the bill in the way of guidance or direction in price fixing that will do equity to old manufacturers.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is nothing in the bill which changes the intellectual processes of anyone in charge of enforcing the law. In the bill we have set a standard for pricing, based upon the prices which prevailed in October 1941, plus costs. But if someone is now making something which was not being made during the base period, of course the base period would not apply. The price for the new product must be computed under a process which takes into consideration a situation as nearly comparable as possible with that of manufacturers of similar products. But there is no way that we can actually write into the law what shall be done with respect to certain differentials.

Mr. WILEY. I appreciate that fact; but let me get back to the chairs again. One manufacturer made chairs in 1941. He then entered into the production of war materials. In the meantime his wages and material costs had gone up. Another manufacturer did not make chairs until after the war. He paid the same wages as did the first manufacturer. But because the first manufacturer had his capital invested in the chair business before the war, he had to be penalized, although when he returned to the manufacture of chairs his wages and material costs had increased. But the favorite son who began the business afterwards was allowed a price of $9.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not attempt to pass on the equity of such a situation. I do not know enough about the particular instance. No doubt there are many others like it, in which there has been inequity as a result of the beginning of new manufacture, or because someone has gone into business who was not in business in 1941.

Mr. WILEY. They are the favored sons.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know about the favored sons. I do not believe that anyone has deliberately favored someone because he started in business after the war, or before the war, so far as that is concerned. We have done the best we could to write a formula by which the OPA can be guided. There is much objection to that formula, but I am supporting it because I believe that it is workable, notwithstanding assertions to the contrary. I believe that any ordinarily intelligent person with business experience can apply the formula which we have provided, and that it will be done. I know that it is not a perfect formula. No formula which Congress could write would be perfect. Administrators must take into consideration innumerable circumstances, phases, and approaches which perhaps we have not considered. But I believe that on the whole this formula will be administered fairly and with equity, and without intentional discrimination as among producers.

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. STANFILL. A little while ago I understood the Senator to say that the Secretary of Agriculture would recommend to the Price Administrator certain prices on agricultural products. What provision does the bill make with respect to whether or not the Price Administrator shall carry into effect such recommendations?

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill provides that he is required to do so.

Mr. STANFILL. I further understood the Senator to say that there would be an appeal to the Decontrol Board. Later the Senator said that the Decontrol Board would have no jurisdiction as to price fixing. I wish to have that point clear in my mind.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Secretary of Agriculture is charged with the duty of making recommendations to the Administrator with respect not only to decontrol but with respect to price adjustments. The Administrator is required to carry out the Secretary's recommendations. If he does not do so, the injured party may go into the Emergency Court of Appeals and obtain a mandamus to compel him to do so. If he does not decontrol on the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture that question may go promptly to the Decontrol Board, and it may take action. But I will say to the Senator that it is inconceivable that the Administrator, whoever he might be, would deliberately refuse to carry out the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture when Congress had deliberately and intentionally, and with its eyes open, given such power to the Secretary of Agriculture, and required that it should be mandatory on the Administrator to carry it into effect.

Mr. STANFILL. I am not so sure that it is inconceivable, because so many inconceivable things have been done.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to enter into a discussion of that question.

Mr. STANFILL. I should like to ask one further question. Is it the Senator's understanding that meats, dairy products, and poultry come within the definition of agricultural products?

Mr. BARKLEY. Absolutely.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Section 14 of the bill as it passed the Senate was an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by my colleague [Mr. BREWSTER]. That section, as the Senate approved it, authorized and directed the Secretary of Agriculture, or any other governmental agency having control of grain and feedstuffs for shipment overseas, to transfer such grain, under certain circumstances, to what we call deficit areas.

The conference report has dealt with the same subject matter in section 15 of the conference agreement. What I am interested to know is whether in the conference draft any greater assurance has been given that grain and feedstuffs will be moved to the deficit areas, or whether the chances of the deficit areas receiving such grain and feedstuffs are lessened. The Senator will note that section 14 of the bill as it passed the Senate refers to grain or feedstuffs for shipment overseas. Under that section, apparently that is the only grain which might be diverted to the so-called deficit areas. Under section 15 of the conference report there is a very substantial rewriting of the language, but I am looking to the effect. Section 15 in the conference report reads as follows:

> The Secretary of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation or otherwise, is hereby authorized to allocate feed which he controls to feeders of livestock and poultry in domestic areas which he may deter-

mine to be in an emergency shortage condition with respect to animal and poultry feed.

I am interested to know whether under this section there is a larger bulk of grain and feedstuffs with which the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to deal than under section 14 of the Senate amendment, which relates only to grain marked for export.

Mr. BARKLEY. That section was discussed very thoroughly by the conferees, and it was recognized that some effort ought to be made to provide relief for section in which feed was scarce. The language was rather carefully drawn. It gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to allocate any feed which he controls, no matter in what manner he obtains control of it, whereas the provision in the Senate amendment required him to do so only with respect to feed grains which were destined for shipment overseas.

Mr. WHITE. So the Senator's answer to my question as to whether there would be a larger volume of grain to which the Secretary of Agriculture might resort for transfer or diversion to the deficit areas, under the conference report than under the provisions of the Senate amendment, is that a larger amount of grain would be made available under the terms of the conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. But there is no absolute direction in the conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it is not a direction. But we also provide that the Secretary shall act through the Commodity Corporation, which for years has been dealing with matters of this kind. I think that is an improvement.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand the Senator, the general and over-all answer to my question is that section 15 in the conference report gives greater assurance than did section 14 of the bill as it passed the Senate, that the deficit areas will receive grain and feedstuffs.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think so.

Mr. President, let me say just a word in regard to subsidies, and then I shall be through. The House bill provided a total of $585,000,000 for subsidies, and provided for their termination on December 31, 1946. It also provided for the immediate elimination of meat subsidies.

The bill, as passed by the Senate, provided for a total of $1,100,000,000 for subsidies and further provided that subsidies generally should terminate not later than next May 1. Provision was made for continuing beyond that date subsidies relating to copper, lead, zinc, and sugar. Such a provision was contained in the bill as passed by the Senate because the situation in regard to copper, lead, and zinc is peculiar, and the sugar situation is one in which we have to extend subsidies beyond May 1, because the crop of sugar raised in 1946 is not marketed until 1947. So we had to make a special provision with respect to sugar.

The provisions in the conference report relating to subsidies follow very closely the Senate provisions on that subject. The amount provided for subsidies in the bill as passed by the Senate has been reduced by $100,000,000. The Senate voted to continue subsidies for 11 months, and voted a total amount for subsidies of $1,100,000,000, which was $100,000,000 a month. The conferees voted to shorten the period to April 1, to reduce the amount by $100,000,000, and also to require that all subsidies be terminated by the first day of next April. The authority to pay subsidies is modified with respect to subsidies for petroleum. I have already explained that with respect to stripper wells.

In all other respects the subsidy provisions of the conference report are practically the same as those of the bill as passed by the Senate.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS WHICH ARE THE SAME IN THE CONFERENCE REPORT AS THEY WERE IN THE SENATE BILL

There are a number of provisions which were in the Senate bill and are now included in the conference report in the same form as they appeared in the Senate bill. Since no change was made in these provisions it is hardly necessary to explain them. However, it might be indicated briefly what these provisions are.

First. The provision relating to the classification of hotels as between transient hotels, residentials and apartment hotels, and tourist courts, rooming houses, and boarding houses.

Second. The provision for treating fish and other sea foods as agricultural commodities.

Third. The provision prohibiting the Price Administrator from fixing a quantity or percentage of any product which any seller may sell to any buyer.

Fourth. The provision which extends the prohibition now contained in existing law against maintaining a "highest price line" requirement for sellers of goods at retail, so that such prohibition will now also be applicable with respect to service establishments. A clerical change is made in the conference report in connection with this provision. But there is no change in substance.

Fifth. The provision relating to maximum prices in restaurants for commodities which are not under control when purchased by the restaurants.

Sixth. The provision eliminating the maximum-average-price plan. This provision was also the same in the House bill.

Seventh. The provisions requiring that established discounts, mark-ups, and dealer-handling charges be allowed in the case of certain commodities, such as automobiles. These provisions were substantially the same in the House and Senate bills.

Eighth. The provision in the Senate bill which was designed to require that established peacetime discounts and mark-ups be allowed for dealers in farm implements.

Ninth. The amendments to the enforcement provisions contained in section 205 (e) and 205 (f) of the Emergency Price Control Act.

Tenth. The provisions relating to the purchase of wheat in cases where the Government requires producers to sell their wheat. Under this provision producers will not be required to accept the market price prevailing when they deliver their wheat, but may elect a date between the date of delivery and March 31, 1947, and receive the price prevailing on the date so elected.

NEW COMMODITIES

The conference agreement includes one provision from the House bill which was not included in the Senate bill. This provision provides that maximum prices shall not be applicable to certain new commodities which are used in the production of other commodities and increase the life or reduce the cost of such other commodities.

THE GENERAL PROVISION RELATING TO DEALERS' MARGINS

As has been stated before, the provision—known as the Wherry amendment—requiring that distributors, wholesalers, and retailers, must be allowed their prewar discounts or mark-ups, has been modified so that it now requires that they be allowed the percentage discount or percentage mark-up in effect on January 1, 1946.

PRICE FORMULA FOR PRODUCERS, MANUFACTURERS, AND PROCESSORS

The provision of the Senate bill which established a pricing formula for manufacturers and processors, based upon their October 1941 prices increased by an amount equal to the increase in the weighted average of the per unit cost since October 1941, is included in the conference report and has been extended so as to apply to producers. A number of other changes of a technical nature were made in this provision in conference, but the other changes do not represent any important difference in the policy of the provision.

PRICING OF COTTON AND WOOLEN TEXTILES

Both the House bill and the Senate bill included a provision relating to the pricing of products made in whole or major part from cotton or cotton yarn or wool or wool yarn. The House bill required that the maximum prices for such products must be not less than the sum of the cotton or wool cost, plus the weighted average of mill conversion costs, plus a reasonable profit. The Senate bill retained these provisions and added a definition of reasonable profit as not less than the average profit per unit prevailing during the period 1939 through 1941. The conference agreement includes the change made by the Senate bill.

Another provision relating to the pricing of cotton textiles, which was included in the Senate bill, is omitted from the conference agreement. This is the provision which provided for a 5-percent increase in maximum prices as an incentive for increased production in certain cases.

FEED SHORTAGE AREAS

The provisions of the Senate bill which related to the diversion of grain and feedstuffs to areas where feed shortages prevail has been modified to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to dispose of feed which he controls to feeders of livestock and poultry in domestic areas which he determines to be in an emergency shortage condition with

respect to animal and poultry feed. As it is included in the conference report, this provision is permissive rather than being mandatory as it was in the Senate bill.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The conference agreement also includes a provision which will allow the Price Administrator 30 days within which he may make the changes in maximum prices which are required by the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, I earnestly urge that the conference report be agreed to. In my judgment, if it is rejected, the chances of having any price control beyond next Sunday are extremely dim. If this conference report is rejected, it will throw the whole matter back to where it was before the conferees met, assuming that there would be any further conference at all.

I realize that there is dissatisfaction regarding the elimination of the specific decontrols on the part of livestock, meat, poultry, and dairy products. I think the elimination of those specific decontrols is largely minimized and nullified by the fact that we have set up a decontrol board, in the first place, and by reason of the fact that we have given to the Secretary of Agriculture the initiation and the responsibility with respect to these matters, all of which include the things which we ourselves, by specific action of the Senate, voted to decontrol. So when that point was reached in the conference, the House conferees were practically unanimous in standing out against the specific decontrols—all of them, without regard to their type.

When the bill was before the House originally, a motion was made for the decontrol specifically of meat. That motion was overwhelmingly defeated in the House of Representatives. After the conferees wrote the conference report, it went back to the House yesterday. A motion was made in the House to recommit the conference report to the conferees with instructions to agree to the decontrol of livestock, meat, poultry, and dairy products.

There was a yea-and-nay vote on that proposal in the House of Representatives, and it was defeated by a vote of 221 to 150—a majority of 71. So the House has twice gone on record in opposition to the specific singling out of any product for decontrol by action of Congress. So, yesterday, when the House voted on the conference report, after defeating that motion, the conference report was adopted by the House by a vote of 265 to 105.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. It is my understanding that the Department of Agriculture or the Secretary of Agriculture now is responsible for the decontrol of meat, poultry, and dairy products. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. Those commodities are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture to the same extent that any other agricultural product is under his jurisdiction with respect to making recommendations, because we have placed in the law a definition which includes livestock and meats and dairy products. Whether that definition would apply to the ultimate manufacturer of cheese or other article of that kind, I am not prepared to say. But milk and butter and meats and poultry are agricultural products by definition, and therefore they are included.

Mr. BUCK. Does the Secretary of Agriculture have the final word in regard to decontrols? If he wishes to decontrol, is not his word final?

Mr. BARKLEY. His word is final if he decides to decontrol. If he does not decontrol, then application can be made to the Decontrol Board, and action may be obtained from it. But the Secretary of Agriculture has the power to decontrol.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. The Senator from Kentucky will remember that in the measure continuing the Price Control Act, last year, there was a provision known as the Bankhead amendment which required, probably as applied to cotton, and perhaps as applied to other agricultural products, that before such a change could be made, the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture would have to be procured.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Oklahoma is speaking of a previous amendment of the law; is he not?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; and I refer to the conduct of the OPA in connection with it. According to my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Secretary of Agriculture repeatedly refused to give consent to reducing the price of cotton. Finally, he was directed by the Stabilization Director to give consent, and he did so. Of course that is a matter of administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have provided in this measure that no appointive officer under the Government of the United States shall have power to control the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to any of the functions we have legislated upon his shoulders. So no one below the President of the United States could do so, and I doubt very much whether the President could direct the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to these matters, although he could advise him. But certainly no one else could.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask a question regarding section 8 of the conference report, which reads as follows:

SEC. 8. Section 2 (j) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as emended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "or (5) as authorizing any regulation or order of the Administrator to fix a quantity or percentage of any product which any seller may sell to any buyer."

Does that mean that the authority to ration is rescinded by that provision?

Mr. BARKLEY. That amendment grew out of the following situation: The OPA issued a certain order providing that the manufacturers of nylon hose should channel that product into certain retail hands, and thereby bypass wholesalers and jobbers and other distributors. If that could be done with respect to nylon hose, it could be done with respect to sheets and any other kind of drygoods, or even clothing or anything else.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. In my mind there was grave doubt whether the OPA had any authority to do so, and that doubt was also expressed in the conference and in the committee by the general counsel of the OPA. It might be entirely possible for the Civilian Production Administration to do that by allotments and allocations, but there was always a doubt whether the OPA could do it. So we included the provision, so that the OPA could not, by issuing an order, say to a manufacturer, "You have to bypass the wholesaler, and the jobber, and everyone else," and thus require him to send his product directly to a retailer in some community in the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. This provision is not intended is it, to deprive the Administrator of the authority to ration butter or coffee or any other commodity in case there is not enough to go around?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it has no relationship to that.

Really its primary purpose is to make sure that the distribution of goods shall go through the ordinary channels, and that someone who has been in business for a long time shall not be set out on the side of the road by an order which would prevent him from buying and selling goods.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Kentucky will recall that at an early day the OPA channeled fresh fruits and vegetables in such a manner as to set up certain middle men who did not operate before.

Mr. BARKLEY. However, that may be, Mr. President, I hope the conference report will be agreed to. Although it is not a perfect measure, it is the best we have been able to obtain. In my humble and honest judgment, the rejection of this conference report will mean that when the present law expires next Sunday, there will be no effective price control in the United States. What would happen with regard to that, I do not know. All sorts of predictions are made as to runaway inflation and wild prices.

They may be the consequence of taking off all controls. I do not want the Senate of the United States to accept the responsibility of making such a situation possible. Therefore I urge that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I should like very much, and as briefly as possible, to compliment the majority leader for his clear explanation of the conference report. I am one of those who voted sincerely for the Senate version of the bill. I believed that the line which we took was a sound one in an endeavor to take care of the price situation. I have always maintained that production was the key to the inflation problem. I know that the question of how to prevent inflation is a debatable one, and none of us can be sure that he is right. I think we should approach the subject, after all the various studies and conferences which have been

made and held with regard to the matter, from the point of view of what is best for the country. If we vote down the conference report we are in danger of having no price controls whatever. I am not willing to take that responsibility.

Mr. President, while I do not agree entirely with the conference report and would have preferred more rapid decontrols, I may say to the majority leader that I believe it is my duty to support the report, and give to him my vote of confidence for the work which he has so earnestly performed with regard to the matter, and the work which was performed by the committees of both Houses. I believe that we should say to the country that we have done what, in our consciences, we believe to be right in connection with the adjustment of this difficult matter. I am glad to support the majority leader in his able presentation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement which has been made by the able Senator from New Jersey.

I wish to make one additional statement. Within 3 days we shall be confronted with the question of terminating this law. We need not go into tirades as to why consideration of the matter has been delayed. The entire subject has received the most careful and industrious consideration, both day and night, of those who have been dealing with it. However, we are now confronted with the choice of voting for the conference report or voting it down. I, myself, am not willing to say to the American people that this bill, with all its imperfections, is not better than nothing, and therefore I support it. I hope that it will become law, and that the process of gradually working out from under controls will be sufficiently orderly so as to prevent any serious dislocation in the American economy or in the welfare of the American people.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but briefly. I wish to state at the beginning that, in accordance with the desire of our majority leader, I personally shall cast my vote for the conference report, although I do so most unhappily and with a deep sense of reluctance. In the first place, I feel that agreement to the conference report may result in a rapid and marked inflation, and secondly may result in establishing a system for OPA to operate which will be entirely unworkable and impracticable.

I desire first to invite attention to this fact: Under the proposed law, if passed, we will establish a base period from October 1 to October 14, 1941, by which we will measure the right of American business to prices and profit. We will give them the same profits and costs which they had in October 1941, and to that, we will add all the accumulating costs.

I ask any Senator, why do we take the base period of October 1941? Is it because, as of that time corporate profits were the greatest they had been in the history of the United States?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. We took that date which I wrote into the bill because that was the date which had been fixed in the Price Control Act. The Price Control Administrator has been supposed, from the beginning, to base his prices on October 1, 1941, prices, plus increases in cost. The Administrator has never done that. He has never paid attention to it, I agree, but that is where the date came from.

Mr. DOWNEY. Very well, Mr. President. I am glad to accept the statement of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, for whom I have the highest respect. But nevertheless the results which were indicated in my remarks are as I have stated them. We passed into the war period with rapidly rising prices and shortages of commodities. During 1940 and 1941 there was an everascending spiral of costs and profits. So, while October 1941 may have been selected for the reason indicated by the Senator from Ohio, we have selected a date which would give to the great corporate businesses of America, under the proposed formula, profits and incomes far beyond anything ever before accruing.

Mr. President, in order to show you how extremely generous is the base which we have selected, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD in its entirety, without reading, a table which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Ohio into the committee hearings. The table may be found on page 42 of the committee hearings. It is marked "Exhibit C," and is entitled, "Table Showing Net Corporation Profits After Taxes, and the Percentage of National Income Represented Thereby From 1929 to 1945."

Mr. President, I ask that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT C.—*Table showing net corporation profits after taxes, and the percentage of national income represented thereby from 1929 to 1945*

[Department of Commerce Statistical Abstract]

	National income	Corporation profits	Percentage
1929	$83, 326, 000, 000	$7, 194, 000, 000	8.6
1930	68, 858, 000, 000	1, 723, 000, 000	2.6
1931	54, 479, 000, 000	−1, 614, 000, 000	−3.0
1932	39, 963, 000, 000	−3, 646, 000, 000	−9.1
1933	42, 322, 000, 000	−625, 000, 000	−1.5
1934	49, 455, 000, 000	549, 000, 000	1.1
1935	55, 719, 000, 000	1, 668, 000, 000	2.9
1936	64, 924, 000, 000	3, 767, 000, 000	5.8
1937	71, 513, 000, 000	3, 943, 000, 000	5.5
1938	64, 200, 000, 000	1, 658, 000, 000	2.5
1939	70, 829, 000, 000	4, 228, 000, 000	6.0
1940	77, 809, 000, 000	5, 844, 000, 000	7.5
1941	95, 618, 000, 000	7, 668, 000, 000	8.0
1942	119, 791, 000, 000	7, 600, 000, 000	6.3
1943	149, 400, 000, 000	9, 800, 000, 000	6.5
1944	160, 700, 000, 000	9, 900, 000, 000	6.2
1945	157, 000, 000, 000	9, 300, 000, 000	5.9

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, that table reveals that the percentage of corporation profits compared with the national income in 1941 was greater than in any other year from 1929 to 1945, with the exception of the year 1929. But it should be noted that the figures show corporate profits after the payment of taxes. In 1941 we had the heaviest excess-profits tax of all time. In 1929 we had comparatively small taxes on corporations. Nevertheless, taking corporate profits after payment of the taxes in both years, even then in 1941 and 1929 the percentage of profits of corporations compared with the national income was practically the same. And let me repeat, as I have already said, in 1941 the profits of corporations, when measured by that standard, exceeded those in any other year save and except 1929 only.

Mr. President, what is even more noteworthy is this fact: In 1941 there was a constant increase of prices and profits, so that the base period of October 1941 was substantially abcve the average for the whole year.

The table to which I have referred shows that there was a marked drop in the profits per dollar sales of American corporations in 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946.

So we are here establishing a rule under which the great businesses of America will be enabled to go back to a much higher standard than they are now operating under, a standard so improvidently generous that I do not think it can be justified.

Mr. President, consider this situation: Assume a corporation was manufacturing a hundred thousand articles in 1941 and making, as I have said, almost unparalleled profits per unit. We are now going to give him the same price for those articles plus all the accumulating costs, even though the number of units being produced will rapidly increase over the number produced in 1941. Therefore, the profits of corporations will undoubtedly swell tremendously under two factors, namely, the high profits measure of 1941 and the great increase in the volume of business.

And here, Mr. President, I want to emphasize that the huge corporate profits of 1941 were materially reduced by the excess-profits tax. But the excess-profits tax has now been repealed.

Mr. President, I would not undertake to prophesy, because I have no idea how much will be the exact increase in profits and prices as a result of the pending measure. Whether it will be 10 percent or 20 percent or 30 percent, I think no one has very much of an idea. The whole field is so vast, the segments are so many, the factors are so complicated, that what will occur can only be determined by the passage of time. But I am sure at least that prices and profits will most materially increase.

Mr. President, I desire now to give a brief analysis of the factors which lead me to believe that the bill does not present a workable plan which can be administered by the OPA.

Under the amendment, the Office of Price Administration is required to determine the costs of producing different products during the period between October 1 and 15, 1941. No companies keep their books on the basis of this period, or have any costs relating to this base period. Where costs are available, they usually are computed on an annual basis. It is highly doubtful if OPA would have the legal authority to accept 1941 costs as those obtaining in October 1 to 15, 1941.

Even if this were permitted, however, many industries are so seriously lacking in adequate cost data that it is impossible to determine the costs of producing many individual products. Let us look at three examples.

BRICK AND TILE

There are between 400 and 500 producers of brick and tile in the country. Less than 5 percent have any cost systems. No company, so far as is known, allocates costs between different kinds of brick or different kinds of tile, or between brick generally and tile generally. Getting any adequate cost figures for this industry within the time limits imposed, or a period of many months, would be impossible.

LUMBER

There are 40,000 producers of lumber in the United States operating on all kinds of species and under widely varying production conditions. Only 10 percent of the total number have any costs systems at all. All known cost systems are based on the cost of carrying on different processes and are not applied to the production of different types of lumber. It would be possible from available figures, through many months of study, to determine the cost of individual species and types of lumber; but it would be impossible to get such figures within the time limitations set up in the bill.

MEAT

There are approximately 12,000 firms, other than farmers, producing meat. The great majority of them are very small firms. Although 12 large companies pretty much dominate the industry, their costs are in no sense representative of those of the whole industry. Existing cost systems are built up on a process basis, and no company, so far as is known, is able to determine the individual costs of rib roasts, pork chops, hamburger, or sausage. It would take a large force of highly skilled accountants many months to apply available figures to a calculation of the costs of individual cuts of various types of meats. It could not, under any conditions, be done within a 60-day period.

It is true that the bill authorizes the Price Administrator, in the absence of satisfactory data, to reach his conclusions on the best data available. Under normal working conditions it might be possible out of existing figures to develop reasonably satisfactory data. However, it seems certain that as soon as this amendment is enacted into law, if that happens, OPA will be deluged with applications from hundreds of industries and will find it utterly impossible to reduce inadequate existing information to a reasonably sound foundation for action. The only recourse under those circumstances would be to accept the often wholly inadequate data supplied by the industries, the use of which would have highly inflationary effects.

MULTIPLE READJUSTMENTS

Not only does the absence of adequate cost data make the administration of this amendment highly impracticable; it will be difficult of administration because of the pyramiding of price increases granted under the amendment. Within 60 days from the time an adjusted price is asked, for example, the Office of Price Administration will be required to adjust washing machine prices on the basis of prices obtaining from October 1 to 15, 1941, plus increased costs since that date. In determining those prices, within the 60-day period, OPA, obviously, cannot wait for adjustment in the prices of parts and materials out of which washing machines are made. It will have to make its determination on the basis of present costs in the industry. The same policy will have to be applied in the case of the manufacturers of washing machine parts. It will also have to be applied in the manufacture of steel, copper, brass, and other basic fabricated materials out of which the parts are manufactured. Finally, there would have to be an application of the policy to the production of basic metals and other raw materials. After washing machine prices were readjusted on the basis of present costs, a second adjustment would have to be made to take care of the initial adjustment in the prices of washing machine parts. Later on, two additional adjustments would have to be made to take care of the additional adjustments that would have to be made in washing machine parts to take care of cost increases further down the production line.

In fact, increases in the prices of steel, copper, zinc, brass, and other basic materials might often be reflected in two adjustments in the prices of washing machine manufacturers; once because of the increases in the price of such materials when sold direct to the washing machine manufacturers; a second time due to adjustments in the prices of parts manufacturers, growing out of increases in the prices of such materials. Thus, one price increase would be pyramided upon another. It would take several months before the increases in raw materials, basic fabricated materials, and parts all were reflected in increases in the prices of washing machines. However, when these increases generally were made, the chances are that labor would have made wage demands and industry generally would be subjected to new cost increases that would call for a whole series of new price increases. Under this amendment prices can never settle down to a stable basis, but will constantly be on the march until ultimately they collapse. Certainly that is not in the interests either of business, farmers, or the consumers of the Nation.

A second feature of this bill which should not escape attention, is the fact that at a time when inflationary pressures are intense, and we need to use every effort to keep our economy steady, it is proposed to revise prices upward, by assuring producers the profits they earned in the most profitable part of the most profitable year in the history of American business. Industry's profits in 1944, for example, were twice 1940 profits; three times 1939 profits. They were substantially higher even than profits in the boom year 1929. Certainly there is no element of stability in legislating prices upward to yield business the highest profits it ever earned per unit of production, and to base those profits on a volume of output that already exceeds 1941 output and is certain to go far above it before the end of the present year. With the excess-profits tax eliminated, this bill will yield profits so fantastically great that the inevitable result will be widespread criticism of business and demands for the end of profiteering.

If there is any idea in the minds of any Members of this body that this amendment is designed to aid production, it should be dispelled at once. Our recent experiences have clearly shown us that goods will be hoarded and not delivered for use when a price increase is anticipated. This creates serious shortages when the goods remaining undelivered are for consumer use. The difficulties are intensified many times when those goods are basic fabricated materials or parts needed for the manufacture of finished products. When such goods are withheld from the market, assembly lines break down, inefficiencies of manufacture develop, and costs of production still further increase. By subjecting the industries of the Nation to a continuous series of increases in prices, this amendment cannot fail to have most serious consequences in curtailing industrial output. It will result in withholding of goods from the market and a serious interference with production.

In another way too, constantly rising prices hamper production. They invite producers with an inside track on supplies to fill their warehouses to the doors with raw materials and parts. This inevitably leads to a dislocation of available supplies. The sufferers seldom are the large producers of the country. It is the little boys who find their production handicapped by a shortage of materials.

Instead of being an aid to production, the Taft-Wolcott amendment will be a serious impediment to large-scale output and removal of shortages at the earliest possible moment.

I repeat what I said at the beginning. This amendment is a monstrosity from the standpoint of administration. It will be explosive in its effect upon the economic stability of the country. If it becomes law, the value of the dollar will steadily decline; disabled veterans and other veterans living on fixed allowances; dependents of men still in the armed services; pensioners, and all other persons on fixed incomes, will be put in a terrific squeeze. The American people who were persuaded to invest millions of dollars in war bonds on the assumption that they would, at maturity, get back a dollar for every 75 cents invested, will be swindled by the action of the United States Government that sold them the bonds.

Mr. President, I say again, I shall vote for the conference report, but I do so with a sense of insecurity. I am not sure that the American economy would not be better without any bill whatsoever, but I do believe that under the legislative condition existing it is either this bill or nothing, and I for one am not willing to take the responsibility and vote for nothing.

Mr. President, it is sometimes said that the lot of a would-be statesman is not a happy one because a public of-

ficial is seldom called upon to select the good from the evil. The choice is almost always between the lesser of two evils. Anyone can easily say that war is the greatest evil we can have, but there is one greater evil, and that is to have an enemy conquer and occupy one's country. So we take the lesser evil in choosing war than the greater evil in allowing conquest.

I think that is almost always true. We seldom have the happy condition of choosing between a positive good and a positive bad. I feel very much in that state of mind in voting upon the conference report. So far as I am concerned, I think we are confronted with a possibility of having this bill, which I consider most unfortunate, or no bill at all, and I am guessing that the lesser evil would be to have some bill, however defective.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am going to vote for the conference report, but, as I have said, I do so reluctantly, in spite of the fact that I fear it will tend to inflation; to hoarding and delayed production; and to a complete break-down of OPA administration. It is my own belief that the OPA has done a notable and most valuable service for our people. I wish I could vote for a measure to support its vital duties rather than for one that may completely destroy it. But such is not the case. And I can only vote for the report weak and defective though I consider it.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I ask unanimous consent to make a statement, and I request the Senator from Wyoming to ask for a quorum.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Hayden	Overton
Ball	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Huffman	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Burch	Kilgore	Smith
Bushfield	Knowland	Stanfill
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	Lucas	Swift
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Carville	McClellan	Taylor
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McMahon	Tobey
Downey	Magnuson	Tunnell
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
George	Mitchell	Wherry
Gerry	Moore	White
Gossett	Morse	Wiley
Green	Murdock	Willis
Guffey	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	
Hart	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on May 23, I asked the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to yield to me, which he courteously did, and I then spoke briefly in behalf of New Hampshire and New England poultrymen, who were facing a direful situation because of the famine in grain and the disaster threatening their flocks and herds unless immediate relief was given. I had received hundreds of telephone calls, telegrams, and letters, urging my assistance, and with other New England representatives I had approached different sources in Washington without much success, and it seemed to me the only recourse was to petition the President to use the power of his great office to afford a measure of relief. I concluded my remarks by reading a telegram to the President which I had sent him on that day.

On May 29, 6 days later, the President replied to this message of mine. The letter amazed me and troubled me, because it was not the type of letter which a Senator would expect to receive from one holding the high office of President of the United States, and who had communicated with him as part of his duties as a Senator, seeking relief for constituents. I showed this letter to three or four friends in the Senate, in whose judgment I had confidence, and decided not to make the matter public. Apparently, the contents of this letter came to the attention of some members of the press, and since yesterday several articles have been written thereon. Some of these articles have not given an accurate picture of the matter, and therefore, in the interest of the record, and since I feel sure that no President of the United States would be unwilling, or embarrassed, to have anything he wrote a Senator of the United States made public, I have reluctantly decided to give out the contents of this letter.

Mr. President, I now read my remarks and the telegram sent to the President on May 23. I first asked the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to yield, which he did most courteously, and my remarks follow:

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I have a duty to perform, and I rise to do the best I can toward that great objective. I speak in behalf of hundreds of poultrymen of the State of New Hampshire, whom I have the honor to represent here tonight and who find themselves in a tragic situation. What I am about to say is by the evidence which has come to me in the form of letters, telegrams, and telephone calls, which set forth the dire situation now existing in my State. The emergency is extreme and immediate relief must be had. Growing stock is dying on range and flocks have been reduced to a sad extent because grain cannot be obtained for their food. I have in my hand a copy of a telegram which I have sent the President, which I read to the Senate:

This is the telegram:

MAY 23, 1946.

The PRESIDENT,
White House, Washington, D. C.:

This is a Macedonian cry.

I appeal to you in behalf of our New Hampshire poultrymen, who are sick at heart and discouraged at the tragedy which confronts them. Their entire and exclusive business is the production of poultry and eggs for food and breeding stock. They are without grain for their flocks. Growing stock on range are dying of starvation. Laying and breeding fowl have been thrown on the market in great numbers, because grain cannot be obtained to feed them. A certain result of this will be scarcity of poultry and eggs this fall and winter.

The tragic situation has been accentuated by the Government's raising the price it is paying for grain for foreign shipment. Let the Government purchase grain to save our farmers, the while it does this for the needy abroad. The situation demands heroic action.

Will you not issue a proclamation citing the dire situation confronting poultrymen and call upon those withholding grain from market for anticipated speculative profits to meet this need, and create a reservoir of grain supply to be prorated according to needs? Our people have the right to expect of and to plea to their President to exercise the great powers of his office under the War Powers Acts and to instruct the proper officials in the Government to take this immediate and unusual step to alleviate the most serious situation which ever confronted our poultry raisers.

I suggest the raising of the ceiling on grain at once to help care for the needs of the emergency.

Sincerely yours,

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY.

I now read the letter I received from the President. It was not marked "Personal" or "Confidential," and it came to my office in the ordinary course of business and was opened by my secretary:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 29, 1946.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Replying to your telegram of May 23, in which you say you are making a Macedonian cry, it seems to me that you have been making Macedonian cries or yells ever since I have been in the White House. For what reason I never could understand.

Your unwarranted attacks on Mr. Pauley almost ruined a good public servant. Between you and Mr. Ickes, you have made it exceedingly difficult for me to get good men to fill the necessary places in the Government. You are still continuing your Macedonian cries and I hope you will get a lot of pleasure out of them.

As far as your food situation is concerned, the Secretary of Agriculture has been instructed to meet the situation as well as he possibly can both in New England and the far Northwest, where the situation is exactly the same. It is a matter of chickens or people, and if it comes to the decision as to which should be kept from starving, naturally, if I make the decision, it will be the people. I don't know whether that will please you or not, but I hope it will.

Sometime when you have reached a cooling-off period, I'd be glad to talk with you about the whole situation.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY.

And written in handwriting on the side are the words: "Come and see me." [Laughter.]

I might point out and interpolate that that was not a "Mae West" invitation, either. [Laughter.]

The comments of the President on my use of the phrase, "This is a Macedonian cry," I will only touch upon, pointing out that the Biblical explanation of that is explained in the words, "Come over and help us." It is a scriptural phrase that has often been used to depict a serious situation.

But it is the second paragraph of the letter which I think was unfortunate on the part of the President. Therein, he

refers to the investigation into the qualifications of Edwin W. Pauley to be Under Secretary of the Navy, to which post he was nominated by the President last February. The Constitution gives the Senate the power of confirmation. It is the duty of the Senate to exercise this power, and the only place in which the nominees can be screened, and their fitness or lack of fitness for the posts to which they are nominated can be determined, is in the appropriate committee to which the nomination is referred. In this case it was the Naval Affairs Committee, of which I am a member. Certainly the President cannot expect Senators to become rubber stamps for any appointment he makes. I had heard many things about Mr. Pauley and his past activities which made me feel that his appointment should not be confirmed at once without being looked into, so I asked the chairman, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], to hold hearings, which he consented to do. The hearings lasted for 5 or 6 weeks and the record speaks for itself. Mr. Pauley repudiated his testimony at least five times, while under oath, on different occasions, and his testimony on that record constituted, in my judgment, an indictment of Mr. Pauley as being unfit for the post of Under Secretary of the Navy; and again the record speaks for itself. As a matter of fact, there was never a time, after the appointment was challenged, that Mr. Pauley could have been confirmed, either in committee or on the floor, and those close to the administration so advised me, not once but twice during the course of the hearings. Realizing that he could not be confirmed, Mr. Pauley asked that his nomination be withdrawn, to which the President acquiesced.

I assumed the matter had been closed, but the President, replying to a Senator who was seeking help for his constituents, saw fit to make that the motivation of his reply. That is regrettable; and for him to charge in his letter that because Mr. Pauley could not be confirmed and was turned down, he has been unable to get men who were competent and worthy to fill other high positions, seems to me to be a statement that will not stand inspection. In my judgment as a Senator, the effect of the Pauley episode should be to cause the President to realize that in sending appointments to the Senate they must be on a plane so high that confirmation would be assured before the appointment is sent down. I look upon the Pauley episode as a healthy sign in our American political life. But that is merely my own personal opinion.

But the President, rather unkindly I think, says that if it is a question of feeding chickens or people, if he makes the decision, it will be people who will be fed. I point out that that is not a fair remark, because in my telegram I had specifically asked him to purchase grain for our famine-stricken areas the while he was doing this for the starving people abroad—in other words, coincidentally and at the same time, and in addition thereto.

The President suggested in his letter that some time when I have reached a cooling-off period, he would be glad to talk with me about the whole situation. I submit to fair men that they can examine as carefully as they will the telegram I sent to the President and they will fail to find anything therein which indicates that the telegram was sent in a feeling of heat or rancor, but only because of an honest and appropriate solicitude for my constituents' needs.

I shall let the readers of my telegram and the President's reply decide for themselves who needs a cooling-off period.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, coming back from scriptural philosophy to the hard, cold facts of price control, I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the fact that just before the speech of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] made the statement that he was for the bill, but he was for it because he was making a choice between two evils—the evil of having no price control whatever or having this bill, which he described as far from perfection in carrying out the Price Stabilization Act. He stated that he was for the bill because he thought it would be better to have some price control than no price control.

Mr. President, I submit—and I say it from the bottom of my heart—that we do not have price control today. In its place we have chaos; and we have chaos because we do not control all the factors which enter into prices. Unless all the factors which enter into prices are controlled, there can be no real price control. That is why the so-called price control—I call it fiction control—has got completely out of hand.

Not only do we not control all the factors, but in addition we do not control black-market prices. In the meat industry 80 percent of the meat which is being sold is being sold at black-market prices. We do not control 80 percent of the prices in the case of meats for we do not control black-market prices. So I say to the distinguished Senator from California, and to every other Member of the Senate, that today we do not have price control. The reason we do not have price control is that the administration has lost control of the factors which enter into price control. Moreover, it has permitted to grow up in all industries a black market which today is sapping the buying power of our low-bracket income citizens who need a system which will permit them to buy in keeping with what they earn.

There are other factors entering into price control; but let me say in passing that if the present administration wishes to control inflation it is overlooking one element to which it should be giving its attention. I refer to the termination of deficit spending. We have more than $27,000,000,000 in Federal bank notes in circulation. We have more than $150,000,000,000 of time and demand deposits which represent pent-up spending power with which to buy things. Furthermore, the people have their own borrowing credit, which they can use to buy. What are we doing about it? As was so forcibly pointed out by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] the other day, this Congress is grinding out appropriation bills which will run us further into debt. My prediction is that the deficit this year will be in excess of $10,000,000,000. That is to be added to the present debt. That money will go into the avenues of purchasing power.

Yet what are we doing about it? We are continuing to enlarge bureaus. The Senate is putting back into practically every appropriation bill the estimates of the agencies themselves, and we are losing control of the one great factor, namely, deficit spending, which is preventing us from getting back to a balanced budget and to a point where we can start to stabilize the dollar. Unless that is done the laboring people will not get price control. Their checks will buy less and less of the materials they need. There will be a continued fight with respect to prices. There will be a fight with respect to strikes, as was stated by Mr. Bowles, resulting in a vicious cycle.

We are losing control of the element of deficit spending, which is plunging the country deeper and deeper into debt. Yet we continue to bring out demagogic and social legislation which is extending the deficit by many billions of dollars, and we are doing nothing to stem the trend. The time has come, when we are giving attention to price control, to give, as well, a great deal of thought and attention to the deficit-spending program, which is being continued on a wholesale basis by this administration.

Getting back to prices alone, it is said that price control will do the job. The first speech I made on the floor of the Senate was in behalf of production. That was in 1943. I have said the same things ever since. At that time I said, "We are in a war. Let us take off the shackles. Let us get production. We need it in the war, and we shall need it in the postwar period."

Production is the only answer, in the catalog of prices, to inflation. It is one of the factors which goes along with deficit spending. Unless we can get production we cannot hope to control prices. I have made the statement before, and I make it again, that production is paramount to prices. Chester Bowles does not believe in that philosophy. He never has believed in it, and that is the reason why we do not have production today.

What good does it do to have a ceiling price on beefsteak if we cannot get any meat? What good does it do to have a legal price on nylon hosiery if we cannot get the hosiery? We must get production. If we do not get production, it does not make any difference what the legal price is. In the case of a scarce

commodity the price is the black-market price. The people of the country are buying in the black market, and not at legal prices, with respect to most things produced by industry today. Why cannot the people who today because of their limited incomes are pleading that we control prices see the philosophy that what is needed is production and more production if we are ever to control prices? They string along with Chester Bowles and his propaganda artists. Today there is only 20-percent control of meat prices. The black market is expanding day by day, until we no longer have price control. Prices are in a chaotic condition, and are leading the people of the country down the road to bankruptcy.

Production brings higher wages. Why do those who wish to obtain relief from high prices object to production regardless of prices? If we can get production, production will result in higher wages and lower prices. I can prove it.

Let us consider the Ford Motor Co. In 1917 the Ford Motor Co. paid its employees higher wages than were paid by any other automobile company then in existence. It produced more automobiles and it sold an automobile for $390. It was not a bad automobile, either; and we need good low-priced automobiles today. That is a concrete example. That example can be followed by all our industries, if they are able to operate on a production basis. Production is what is needed.

Mr. Bowles and those who favor the conference report feel as I do, I believe, in regard to that premise. But the proponents of the conference report take the position that under Mr. Bowles' administration we shall be able to obtain production, and that we cannot take off controls without disrupting our economy. My answer to that is—and I shall refer to meat, because Mr. Bowles always preaches about meat—that after 4 years we certainly do not have production of meat. Anyone who thinks there is production of meat should try to buy a pound of it. It does not take any fancy figures or Mr. Bowles' charts to demonstrate the actual situation. Try to buy a pound of meat. We have been under the Bowles plan for 4 years now. The conferees say, "Let us extend the Bowles plan for another year." That, Mr. President, is what the conference report amounts to.

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. STANFILL. In connection with what the Senator from Nebraska has been saying, I should like to read at this point a headline from one of the Kentucky newspapers:

Famine threatened in eastern Kentucky mine fields.

The miners are faced with famine because of a shortage of meat and a shortage of bread. The miners are threatening to quit work. They say they cannot work unless they have meat and bread. That is proof of the point, certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator very much for his contribution, which is of inestimable value at this point in connection with my remarks. It definitely proves what I have said, namely, that there is a meat famine and a bread famine in this country.

The other day, when I was on my way to the Capitol, I drove through the little settlement in Virginia where I live. Automobiles were lined up for nearly a mile. I asked, "Has there been an accident?" The reply was, "No. We are just standing in line, trying to get some bread!"

Mr. President, we have bread famines and meat famines and famines in regard to practically everything else. I do not know any industry which is up to full production. It is claimed that some industries are, but we are unable to learn of any that really are. The conference report would extend the present Price Control Act for another year on the same basis as the present act, except for one or two amendments.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I think what the Senator from Nebraska has been saying is tremendously important. I think that the misunderstanding existing in the minds of the people of the United States regarding the effect of the OPA is most unfortunate. For instance, millions of people think it is only necessary to have a ceiling placed on the price of various commodities. The Senator from Nebraska is saying that the imposition of a price ceiling does not bring the goods into existence.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator remembers that the other day, during the debate, I produced evidence from the history of the great nation of France showing that during the French Revolution there was a "law of the maximum," but it did not produce the goods.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. What the Senator from Nebraska is saying is most important. I wish the people of the country would understand the situation, so that they would not criticize him or me or others who are deeply interested in seeing that the people get what they need, at the best price at which the needed goods can be produced in the United States. I wish the people of the country would not think, when they hear the Senator from Nebraska talk as he has been, that he is trying to keep them from getting what they really need, namely, production.

Mr. President, what made possible the $390 automobile? It was production.

Mr. WHERRY. That is precisely the point.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to reinforce what the Senator from Nebraska has been saying, and I wish to stress the point that in our great society and industrial and business organization in the United States we never can reach the point which we are seeking to reach unless we have voluntary cooperation between all groups, as unselfishly as possible. In such voluntary cooperation we must find a fair balance in equity between all groups.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. We cannot set one group in front of the others and pay to the members of that group everything they want, and say to a member of another group, a man who has his hand on a lever which makes a machine work, "We are not going to give you any increase," for, in that event, then his arm will get very tired pulling the lever, and the needed production will not be obtained.

The people of the United States must remember that there is only one way to solve our problems, and that is to get back to full production. The only way in the world to get back to full production is to be fair in stimulating by means of giving fair rewards to every man who is a party to or a part of the great system which brings about production.

I compliment the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for what he has been saying and for what he is trying to do. Again I express the hope that everyone who hears him or who reads his remarks will understand that there is no Member of the Senate who is more interested in the welfare of the people of the Nation, all the way along the line, than is the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for his contribution. He bespeaks my position with more force than I can. Not only does he speak because he believes what he says, but he speaks from practical experience. I deeply appreciate having at this point in the RECORD the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, and I am glad they will be printed at this point, because I know that he believes, as I do, that what we wish to do is to help 140,000,000 American citizens to get decent prices. I am pleading for that as I have never pleaded before. I submit to the Senate that, after 4 years, what we must do is obtain production. As to anything that hinders production, we should have the courage and the leadership to remove such impediments, and see to it that we obtain the production we need, and obtain it in what I call the American way.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL] for his references to the article in the Ashland, Ky., newspaper, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMINE THREATENED IN E-K MINE FIELDS—APPEAL MADE TO WASHINGTON FOR HELP

(By C. E. Forgey)

Hunger stalked eastern Kentucky mine fields today as Big Sandy coal operators frantically sought help from Government officials.

H. S. Homan, secretary of the Big Sandy Elkhorn Operators Association, said he would leave today to seek a conference with Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson in the hope of averting a serious situation.

Homan said a careful survey revealed that hundreds of families would go without Sunday dinner. There is no beef, lard, bread, beans, corn meal, and flour to be purchased in the mining fields' company stores.

"The bakeries which normally serve us notified us at noon today that no deliveries of bread would be made to Big Sandy points next week," Homan declared.

"Unless something is done at once, either the mines will be forced to close—because men cannot work without food—or we will see some serious food riots," the secretary declared.

L. D. Feuchtenberger, head of the Feuchtenberger Bakeries, and J. R. Haislip, of the Norton, Va., bakery, sent the following messages to Homan Saturday:

"H. S. HOMAN,

"Executive Secretary, Big Sandy Elkhorn Coal Operators Association:

"Regret to advise you that our coal-field bakeries at Williamson, W. Va., and at Pikeville and Paintsville, Ky., and Grundy, Va., furnishing the Big Sandy coal-field area almost exclusively with bread, will be closed after today and remain closed until flour is received with which to resume baking. Our largest bakery at Bluefield, W. Va., has been closed this entire week and will also remain closed this coming week. We have commitments on shipments which, if fulfilled, will enable us to start baking July 1. However, these promises do not indicate continued operation. We voluntarily curtailed usage of flour 25 percent as requested by the Government and I have naturally exhausted all possible sources, including the purchase of family flour from retail stores. Any assistance or relief will be appreciated. This situation has been brought to the attention of American Bakers' Association representatives at Washington and others by wire June 5.

"L. D. FEUCHTENBERGER."

"BIG SANDY COAL OPERATORS ASSOCIATION,

"Norton, Va.:

"Unable to operate our bakery after July 2; mill cannot furnish flour due to wheat shortage. We serve the miners in five counties of southwest Virginia and eastern Kentucky.

"J. M. BARKER,

"Manager, Haislip Baking Co., Inc."

Homan said that he had appealed to Commander Gordon King, naval administrator of the coal fields since the Government seizure. King when questioned by the Independent Saturday said he was worried but beyond this would make no comment.

"I am up to my neck in this stuff," King declared.

A survey of 22 stores associated with the Big Sandy organization revea'ed the following situation:

In the last 2 weeks 2,174 pounds of beef had been received in these stores—today there was no beef on hand; 18,026 pounds of pork was shipped into the Big Sandy region in the last 2 weeks; today there was only 50 pounds of pork available and this was at the Koppers Coal Co. store. There was 6,162 pounds of lard shipped into the region from June 3 to June 15—today no lard was available at any of the company stores; the Elkhorn Coal Co. was the only place where lard could be purchased. There was 400 pounds available. No lard could be purchased elsewhere. The Elkhorn Co. was the only store to report corn meal on hand. They had 60 pounds on hand. Three stores reported beans for sale, but the supply was such a small amount that it was hardly noticeable; the Southeast Coal Co. store was the only place where bread was for sale and this store offered 50 loaves for sale. This was to take care of 350 families.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have received thousands and thousands of telegrams similar to one which I received just as I rose to speak in this Chamber. The one which has just come to me is from the little town of Arapahoe, Nebr., which is in the South Platte district of the State, where the farmers are trying to produce enough grain so that supplies will be sufficient both at home and across the seas.

The telegram reads as follows:

ARAPAHOE, NEBR.

Congratulations on your OPA stand today. Texas trucks boldly offering $2.60 per bushel today according to reliable farmers. Local ceiling is $1.33. Complaints filed with Omaha OPA office totally ignored for past 2 months. Situation is terrible.

BILL RANKIN ELEVATORS.

Mr. President, that telegram comes from an elevator operator at Arapahoe, Nebr. I would read thousands of similar telegrams except for the fact that they would clutter up the RECORD.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator explain the reference to "per bushel" in the telegram?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in reply to the question of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, let me say that the reference is to a bushel of corn. The telegram shows that the farmers there are offered higher than legal prices for their corn, by truckers who try to buy the corn and haul it away to the black market.

The telegram again proves conclusively that we do not have price control, that price control has gotten out of hand, that there is chaos in this country. I do not seek to scare anyone or to make an extravagant statement; but I predict that, unless this situation is cured, unless we get back to a respect for law, if we continue price control, so-called, for another year, acts of violence will be committed in this country.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MOORE. I wish to call the Senator's attention to something of which I know he is already aware. In the debate it has been said that we do not have price control. We simply do not have price control, of course; and it is well known in the Senator's State and in my State that not a truckload of corn or of cottonseed meal or of any other feed which is used for cattle or hogs can be had, except in the black market.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MOORE. As the Senator has said, today corn is being sold in the black market. Truckers are buying corn from the farms and are taking it to the black market, and it is being sold in the black market. So there is no regular market for corn.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his contribution. The point he has made is the one I am trying to prove. I take the position that the American people do not now have price control. There is no price control. The black markets are setting the prices. I have said that to the American people time and time again. What is true in regard to meat is true in regard to wheat, and what is true in regard to wheat is true in regard to corn.

Mr. President, how are we going to get the commodities we need? The only way a livestock feeder can continue in operation today is by buying corn at the black-market price. He cannot get it in any other way. That is what the livestock feeder is confronted with. The legal price is $1.33. But to feed steers he has to pay up to $1.75 or even $2.60 a bushel, and the only market is the black market.

So the present situation is causing wholesale disrespect for law, and it has broken down any semblance of price control which we did have. The people of the United States know that today there is no price control.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree in general with everything the Senator from Nebraska has said. One thing which he has mentioned is of particular significance, it seems to me, and that is the general break-down of respect for law which has occurred as a result of the wholesale operation of black markets in the United States. It is leaving on the young people of the Nation a definite imprint which will last for the next generation.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I wish to say that the other evening I was invited to take part in a little family dinner. My wife is in Nebraska at this time, and I am getting along alone as best I can. Because of the present shortages, I am having a terrible time. At the dinner we were talking about the food situation. One wife said, "I got some meat today." Another wife said, "I got some meat, too." And they would whisper to each other and say, "I will tell you where I got mine if you will tell me where you got yours." [Laughter.] Thus, winking at the law has been brought right into the household. In the days of bootlegging liquor we looked with disrespect upon one who was a black-market operator or bought in the black market. Today every housewife in the country, if she obtains meat or bread, must be on her toes, because most of it is being sold through the black-market operators.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. We have reached a pretty low level in America if we must violate the law in order to get a loaf of bread.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. His statement is absolutely correct, and what he has stated is what is happening today.

The distinguished majority leader said that when the conferees went into this matter they studied it thoroughly and with a great deal of industry. He stated further that there were emotional feelings and hatreds of minority groups because of the issues involved in the OPA. I agree with the distinguished majority leader, and I may say that no one is more capable than is he of pouring oil on troubled waters and ironing out a difficult situation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber? Some Members of the Senate wish to listen to the Senator from Nebraska. I think we should have order in the Chamber and in the galleries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I had referred to the statement of the distinguished majority leader that there had been hatreds. I should like to say to the membership of the Senate, and to the people of America, that there is certainly no hatred in my heart. What I believe to be true I am willing to say, and do say from the bottom of my heart. I have no ulterior motives of any kind. Any Senator who believes that it is possible to obtain production under the Bowles program has the right to believe so; and I would say that if that is the way he feels about it he would be a coward if he did not vote to support the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a point of order. The Chamber is out of order, and I suggest that the Presiding Officer take appropriate action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The Senator is correct. There must be order in the Chamber.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, are we to have an extra session of the Senate over on the other side of the Chamber, or shall we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We will try to maintain order.

Mr. WHERRY. I know that the Senator is for the bill and that he is not interested in anything I may say relative to production and prices. That is all right. But I want to tell the Senator from Pennsylvania that the Senators who vote to agree to the conference report will be doing so after 4 years of faith that production would be obtained. Some of the telegrams which I have received today, and some of the letters which I have received in the Small Business Committee, have come from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. How does the Senator know that I am going to vote for the conference report? From where did he get that information? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the present indication of the Senator is that he is in favor of the bill and that he is not interested in what I wish to do about it. Moreover, if the past is an indication of future events, the Senator will vote for the conference report, because he votes for every administration measure that comes to the Senate. In that connection, in my opinion, he is a rubber stamp. [Laughter.]

Mr. GUFFEY. I have walked out several times before when the Senator was talking. He is opposed to every bill offered by the administration, and has been ever since he has been a Member of the Senate. I am for the administration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor. I voted for the extension of the Price Stabilization Act the last time it came before the Senate. I voted for every appropriation asked for by the Office of Price Administration in order to enforce the OPA law. Of course, the Senator from Pennsylvania is just as wrong now in his accusation as he is always wrong on the floor of the Senate.

The statement was made by the distinguished majority leader—and I think he has the right to his opinion—that if the conference report is not agreed to we will not have price control. I believe that the distinguished Senator meant that it would be useless to send the conference report back to the conferees for them to try to iron out more than has already been ironed out. In that respect I agree perfectly with the distinguished majority leader. However, my opinion is that the mechanics of the situation make it imperative that those of us who do not agree with any provision of the conference report must vote against the whole report. We cannot amend it as we do with other forms of legislation. That should be clearly understood, although apparently some Senators do not understand it. We do not have a rule for recommitting the conference report. Our rule, as it was explained earlier in the day by the distinguished President pro tempore when he said that all we can do, if we do not agree with any provisions of the report, is to vote to agree to or vote to disagree to it. That is all that can be done. If the conference report is agreed to, there is nothing else to be done about it. If the report is disagreed to, we can move to return it to the conferees on the part of the Senate with instructions.

Mr. President, what I should like to have the Senate do is to disagree to the conference report. I do not wish that to be done in order to kill the bill. But I have in mind the overwhelming vote of 2 to 1—to take a figure out of the air—on the question of decontrolling livestock, milk, butter, poultry, poultry products, petroleum, and tobacco. As I recall, that vote was 2 to 1. I do not have the figures before me, but I am satisfied that what I have stated is substantially accurate. I should like to have our conferees go back and say, "Here are the votes on each of the commodity amendments. We think you should accept those amendments." That has not yet been done, but it would be customary to do so. Members of the Senate who have been Senators longer than I know that such procedure has been followed time and again.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe any man, woman, or child in America can stand on his feet and honestly say that the price control of meat has been successful?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall try to answer for the American people. I believe that no one can say that the price of meat has been successfully controlled. It has been admitted in all the testimony before the committee—and I believe the distinguished majority leader will so admit—that price control on meat has gotten completely out of hand. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has probably spent more time on that subject than has any other Member of the Senate. The Thomas report shows that the price of meat has gone completely out of control. If that statement is not correct, I ask the Senator to give his own version as to whether the price of meat has gone out of control.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the OPA control of meat has been unsuccessful—and I think that the meat situation throughout the country has become a national scandal and that there have been widespread black-market operations in meat—what could be more logical than to remove meat from OPA control?

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. I believe that we will all remember that the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], just before he went to Paris to attend a peace conference—I hope it will be a peace conference—made the statement that he thought that we should try decontrols on meat and see what would result.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I thought there was an implication in something which the Senator said a while ago to the effect that the conferees did not support the Senate version of the bill. I merely wish to say to the Senator that we made a hard fight for the Senate version of the bill, and two of the Senators, including myself, were so disappointed with the results that we refused to sign the conference report. I would not want the RECORD to be silent, at least so far as I am concerned, and indicate that there was any softness in the approach of the Senate conferees in maintaining the Senate version of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly did not want the RECORD to contain any implication at all to the effect that the Senate conferees did not fight for the Senate amendments. Especially is that true of the distinguished Senator from Colorado, who I know has been one of the outstanding Senators going along, during these 3 years, with those of us who are interested in decontrol. I would call the Senator the spearhead of those who believe in it, and I certainly would not want to leave any other implication in the RECORD.

I did say—and I hope the distinguished Senator will agree with me in my statement—that in view of the vote taken on the Senate amendments, especially on that having to do with the decontrol of meat, I thought we should resist the conference report, send the conferees back to another conference, and that they should not recede, if possible, from the Senate amendments.

Mr. HAWKES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am still yielding to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What the Senator has said was also my own view, which was a minority view. As a result of what happened the matter had to go back to the House. The House vote was so overwhelmingly against the very thing we are discussing here now that it has seemed to me—and I have complete respect for any contrary opinion—that it

would be a futile thing, resulting in nothing but an impasse, to go over the same road again.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I wish at this time to ask a question of the Senator from Colorado who has worked faithfully and long and arduously on this subject. Is he of the opinion now that if the conference report is sent back, as I understood the majority leader to state, there would be no chance to get price control? My question is, so what? Have we had any price control anyway? I ask the Senator from Colorado or any other Senator who has informed himself in this subject, what good would it do to have a price-control law, when the only thing it could possibly do would be to oppress the people in every shape, form, and manner, and give those in charge more money and give them more opportunity to act for political purposes, and build up a bureaucracy and regimentation that can have no other effect than be conducive to the people of the country violating the law, for which they have no respect, a law which cannot be enforced. I am not, like the Senator from Nebraska, for any price control, because I think it is all wrong. None of it can be enforced, and it should be completely lifted from the backs of the American people.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Taking the first part first, I am thoroughly convinced that if we rejected the conference report in the Senate and sent it back for further conference, we would come to nothing but an impasse, and the responsibility would then be on us for the death of price control. That brings me to the second part.

I think there is an honest field of opinion that it would be a blessing to this country if price controls were completely stopped, and the sooner the better. There is also an opinion—and I share the opinion—that if we can continue price controls, and if we can end them progressively and as soon as possible, we can cushion the shocks of complete and sudden decontrol, which in my opinion, respectfully asserted, with all due respect to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, might have a cataclysmic result.

With all the inefficiencies of OPA—and no one has been more energetic in denouncing them than I have been—I believe that the bill as we have it has much good in it, is constructive in many respects, and if those in authority will follow it, or follow it approximately, the result will be better than a complete and absolute termination overnight.

There can be an honest difference of opinion on that, but so far as I am concerned, I do not intend to get myself hooked on any part of the responsibility for complete and immediate decontrol.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to make one more observation, if I may. The Senator from Oklahoma has suggested that there is no control.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator let me ask him a question before he makes another observation?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator for decontrolling meat, milk, butter, and other dairy products, as proposed by the Senate?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am completely for it.

Mr. WHERRY. Then does the Senator think those of us who still believe in that, and who believe that no controls are better than these fixed controls we are discussing, should ask the conferees to go back once again and see if they can get the amendment through as the Senate voted it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think the Senator's position is a perfectly legitimate one, which can be held in perfect good faith. I share with him every feeling he has that meat and allied products should be decontrolled. But we fought that out, and we now find ourselves in the situation where we might bring price control to a precipitous end if we sent this report back for further conference.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not mean that if the Senate conferees have to go into further discussion of this one amendment, we are voting down price control?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think that would be the precise result. I certainly cannot complain of anyone who wants that result, because, as I have said, a pretty good argument can be made for it, but I do not agree.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator brought the question up, and I wish to ask him a further question. Is there any way, except by voting down the conference report, by which those of us who believe we should have decontrol, under the Senate amendment, of livestock, milk, poultry, and poultry products, can attain that objective?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not know of any other way.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator suggest any other way?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator permit me to make an observation?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly, but before the distinguished Senator makes the observation, I should like to say to him that I am not one who is going to condone black-market price operations in meat. I should like very much to help to make the bill as good as I can, and the only way in the world that can be done is to vote down the conference report, and vote for another conference, with instructions.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If I thought we could vote the conference report down and get the result which the Senator wants, I would give it my heartiest approval and my utmost energy. I have already made that fight.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator can make it again.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We have failed, and we cannot repeat it because of what happened in the House yesterday. I am in complete agreement with the Senator that there is no control of meat and allied products at the present time.

Mr. WHERRY. It seems strange to me that after getting 2 to 1 votes on four or five Senate amendments, the Senate conferees come back with the Senate amendments deleted from the bill. That is the point I am making. I think we have a right to ask that the conference report not be accepted, and that it be sent back, and that the Senators who represent us, in whom I have implicit faith, try once again to see if they can not get the House to recede from its position. That is the way we can do it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Of course, the Senator has the right to take the position he has taken. He and I are in complete agreement so far as the specific decontrols are concerned; but that fight has been made. It was made with such intensity on my part that I refused to accept an adverse result, and had there been a vote in the House which would have given the slightest encouragement to a final, ultimate, successful result in achieving specific decontrols, I would have been in the forefront of those making the fight.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me to ask the Senator from Colorado a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. With all due respect to the Senator from Colorado, in whose political judgment and fairness I have the highest confidence, is the Senator from Colorado unwilling to take the responsibility of sending this report back to another conference, when he now admits that the decontrol provision contained in the Senate amendment was in the interest of a proper administration of price control? Then, if it should fail, if it should turn out that it would defeat price control, entirely, how much worse off would the country be than it is today with price control as is?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is my judgment that if this matter went back to conference we could not agree, we could not bring back any result other than the one we have now; that ultimately we would come to the same pass where we are now, and therefore I think there is no point to it. We might also bring the two Houses to a complete impasse, which would find us on the 1st of the month with no control, not even the semblance of control, and, as I have said, I am unwilling to take a part of that responsibility.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I should like to make one suggeston while the matter is on my mind. There has been a total failure of the administration of price control in the past, when the price control administration had full sway, when they were free of all legal restraints, though there were some con-

gressional restraints, to which they paid not the slightest attention. We have imposed some restraints on them today, but the Senator from Colorado and every other well-informed man knows that under the philosophy of control of prices they will pay no attention to any legal restraints placed upon them, and that the only opportunity we have is for Congress to decontrol those things which are in full supply, which the OPA officials refuse to do.

I will say to the Senator at the same time that just as certainly as that I am now standing here price control as it exists at the present time is perfectly satisfactory to the OPA, is perfectly satisfactory to the President of the United States, is perfectly satisfactory to those who want an opportunity to go ahead with the character of control we have had in the past.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to say that I share somewhat the sentiments of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] regarding the legislative situation, but I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question with regard to meat particularly, and some other agricultural products. Would we not be in a better position, or would not those who feel that there should be some decontrol of these particular products be in a better position with the passage of this bill in view of the provision contained in it, as follows:

That in case of agricultural commodities the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to make a determination as to whether the supply of the commodity is equal to the domestic consumption thereof, and when the supply is equal to the domestic consumption, the Secretary is directed to certify that determination to the Price Administrator, and within 10 days the Price Administrator must remove all price ceilings.

As I recall the testimony given in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the meat situation, it was practically unanimous, on the part of the meat packers and on down through to those who raise cattle, that the supply was equal to the domestic consumption, and under the provisions of this bill it seems to me, if those facts are correct, it would only be a short time when what the Senator from Nebraska wishes would be accomplished.

I ask the Senator from Nebraska if he does not think that is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to answer the distinguished Senator from Washington. I was going to discuss that very provision a little later on in my remarks, but I might as well take it up now. It is true, as shown in the explanation afforded by the distinguished majority leader, that a decontrol body has been set up, and that the products in question are placed under the control of the Department of Agriculture. Now we come back to the question, Will they take any action looking to decontrol? I simply do not know, Mr. President. I will say that I have a great deal of faith in the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MAGNUSON. He is a cattle man and he ought to know the problems of the cattle growers.

Mr. WHERRY. I think possibly if the Secretary were not overriden in his opinion, if he could always do what he thought best and be free from any pressure, as I hope he will be if this measure is passed—at least we can all hope for it—the bill sets up machinery by which he could decontrol.

I now want to ask the Senator a question. Did the Office of Price Administration, under Chester Bowles, interpret the Barkley-Bates amendment as the Congress intended it should be interpreted?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think in some cases it probably did.

Mr. WHERRY. In some cases? Let me say to my dear friend from Washington, the reason why nearly 26,000 little black-market operators are in the meat business today is because the OPA did not interpret the amendment as the distinguished majority leader wrote it and as it was put into the law. That is why we have a great many black-market operators, as I am satisfied the distinguished Senator from Washington knows.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me ask the Senator from Nebraska a further question.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me first ask the Senator from Washington a question. We tried to help the late Senator Bankhead in what he sought to accomplish. He was a man for whom I had the highest respect. He has now gone to his reward. Because of his fight to help cotton he will always be the "cotton man" to my mind. He pleaded with tears in his eyes that the Senate write an amendment into the act giving the Secretary of Agriculture authority in reality over anybody else relative to orders issued. That is, others would have to come to him first. We tried to help the late Senator from Alabama in what he sought to accomplish. But did the administration keep faith with him in connection with the provision which he was instrumental in having placed in the act?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not familiar with that situation.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is, surely. The Senator knows that Senator Bankhead time after time on the floor of the Senate complained that the administration did not keep faith with him. He made two or three speeches on that subject. And, out of respect for the late Senator from Alabama, the Senator from Washington will recall now that he heard him make such speeches in which he said that the Secretary did not keep faith with that provision.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me ask the Senator a further question.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly, the Senator is going to admit it. He is a good sport.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did hear the speech, but that was the claim made by the late Senator from Alabama and the claim made by many other Senators on that point. As I understood, however, there were some disputed facts in regard to making the decisions which some Senators claimed violated the law.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But as I recall the testimony, there was no dispute regarding the supply of meat in this country as compared with domestic consumption.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes; Mr. President, we claim we have more meat animals on hand than needed for domestic consumption.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what I say. There is no dispute about it.

Mr. WHERRY. We think the supply is greater than the domestic consumption, and that there should be decontrol. That is what we are talking about. The Senator from Washington is in favor of that, is he not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Every witness who appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, from the meat packer clear on down to the producer of the cattle, the cattle raiser, testified to that effect.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, that is correct. Then why not decontrol?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It seems to me that the Secretary would have no other alternative.

Mr. WHERRY. Why not have Congress decontrol, and not take any chance on any Government agency doing it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have faith in the Secretary of Agriculture. He knows the facts.

Mr. WHERRY. So have I faith in him. In the bill I see that the machinery is set up. I agree with the distinguished Senator that it is set up, as is shown by the explanation given by the majority leader. It comes down to a question of whether the machinery is adequate to bring about decontrol. I am hopeful that it is. I am told that the Secretary will decontrol without any strings attached. I hope he can accomplish it, because I certainly think that the meat and poultry and milk and butter should be decontrolled. I hope the majority leader, in whom we have so much faith, will use his influence in line with the interpretation that he has made so that there will be decontrol of livestock and milk and butter and poultry in the immediate future, and by "immediate" I mean right away.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose the Senator knows, as we on the committee know, that the Secretary of Agriculture did not want this authority.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. He not only did not want it, but he does not relish it. But I have every confidence in the Secretary and in his good faith, in his knowledge of the situation. I recall very vividly his description of it when he appeared 2 months ago before the Committee on Banking and Currency. Although the Secretary did not seek this authority, and did not want it conferred upon him, I have no doubt whatever that he will exercise it and administer it to the best of his ability, in good faith, as Congress intended for him to do.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to thank the distinguished Senator for once again stating what he has already told us earlier today. But I want as forcefully and yet as kindly as I can to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the

fact that in times gone by—and I think I can have this statement verified by the chairman of the complaints subcommittee of the Small Business Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], with whom I have worked side by side in hearing after hearing—that there have been violations of the Barkley-Bates amendment; there have been violations by Chester Bowles of what Congress intended. I will say to the majority leader I think that is one of the chief reasons why we find ourselves in the condition we are in today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator permit me to make a statement about that, inasmuch as it was the so-called Barkley-Bates amendment which I offered here, and it was adopted on the floor a year ago when we had under consideration the extension of OPA?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. There was a dispute or disagreement between the OPA and the meat industry, the packers, as to really what that amendment meant. They sought a conference with me early this year to obtain my interpretation of the language which I had written myself, and a representative of OPA and a representative of the meat industry came to my office, and we had a long conference about it. I reiterated the interpretation of the amendment that I had given when it was offered, and I told the OPA and the packing representatives that that was my interpretation, that was my intention, and that was the intention of Congress. Following that they did improve the administration of that amendment compared to what it had been up to that time, because the amendment had not been interpreted as I felt it should have been. I gave my very frank opinion to the representatives of both sides, and from that time on there was an improvement. I would not say it was a perfect administration, but it was a better administration of the subject than it had been.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for that contribution, and I hope that his opinion that the provision has been better administered is correct. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that certainly the records of the kills at the principal packing plants last week was the worst it has been at any time since price stabilization went into effect.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think that is altogether attributable to any misinterpretation of the amendment I offered. It grows in part out of other conditions which are independent of that.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to ask a question and then make an observation. Since the Barkley-Bates amendment has been brought in question, as I recall that amendment which was offered in the Senate by the majority leader a year ago and discussed here at considerable length, it was offered as a substitute for what many of us thought was a much stronger provision along the same lines. I do not recall at the moment who offered the language for which the Senator's amendment was substituted.

Mr. BARKLEY. There was quite a lively controversy in the Senate over a pending amendment with respect to the division of livestock meats into categories.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. And in an effort to compose the differences, I offered the amendment, which required that a basis be fixed with respect to different categories of meat, so as not to put sheep and mutton and lamb all into one pot and put a price on it all, but to separate the meats into categories. That was the object of the amendment.

Mr. STEWART. The amendment was to prevent stew then, as I get it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, it has not prevented a stew. We are still in it so far as that is concerned. But it was to prevent a general over-all ceiling on all kinds of meats regardless of the kind of meat.

Mr. STEWART. I recall the debate. I thought at the time the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky, our majority leader, had the sanction and approval of OPA as a substitute for the more drastic amendment which it replaced.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not recall from memory whether it had OPA approval. I do not think OPA approved it as much as OPA approved the one for which it was a substitute.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky one other question. It has been said here—I have heard it said two or three times, and other Senators I am sure have heard it said—that Mr. Bowles stated, as I recall before the Banking and Currency Committee, that he would not enforce the Barkley-Bates amendment; that it was not enforceable, and that therefore he would not allow OPA to enforce it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If he ever made such a statement as that, I did not hear it, and I have never heard of it.

Mr. STEWART. I have heard it stated several times.

Mr. WHERRY. I am quite satisfied that it is in the evidence.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not believe that Mr. Bowles made such a statement before the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. He might not have made it before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not attend every hour of the hearings, which continued over a period of 3 or 4 weeks.

Mr. STEWART. The statement may have been made elsewhere.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have never heard Mr. Bowles make such a statement, and I doubt very much that he did.

Mr. STEWART. I hope he did not; but to be frank, I am rather suspicious.

I should like to ask the Senator a question. Referring to the language read by the Senator from Washington, with particular emphasis on the part which provides that when the supply is equal to the domestic consumption the Secretary—meaning the Secretary of Agriculture—is directed to certify that determination to the Price Administrator, and within 10 days the Price Administrator must remove all price ceilings with respect to the commodity, suppose that the Secretary of Agriculture makes a certification that there is an ample supply, that it has caught up with consumption, and so forth. Is that determination by the Secretary of Agriculture reviewable by Mr. Bowles in his position as czar?

Mr. WHERRY. Not as I understand.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The word used is "must."

Mr. BARKLEY. That certification is not reviewable by Mr. Bowles. He is required to carry it out. If he should refuse to do so, he could be compelled to do so by a mandatory injunction.

Mr. WHERRY. So long as the Senator from Tennessee has brought up this question, I refer to page 3, subparagraph (C) under subsection (2). First, let me read subparagraph (B):

> The Secretary of Agriculture by December 31, 1946, shall recommend to the Price Administrator the removal of maximum prices on all agricultural commodities, whether or not in short supply, not important in relation to business costs or living costs, and prior to that date shall make such recommendations as rapidly as, in his judgment, will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect.

Subparagraph (C) read as follows:

> Within 10 days after the receipt of any recommendation under this subsection for the adjustment of maximum prices applicable to any agricultural commodity, or for the removal of maximum prices on agricultural commodities not important in relation to business costs or living costs, the Price Administrator shall adjust or remove such maximum prices in accordance with such recommendations.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to learn if the majority leader can throw a little light on this subject. Who is to determine whether these commodities are important or unimportant in relation to business costs or living costs? That is the essence of the whole thing. If one man has the right to say that a particular commodity is important or is not important, we shall still be in the hands of a bureaucrat, no matter how highly he may be regarded. We shall still be in the hands of one man. Can the majority leader throw any light on that question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there are two categories with respect to agricultural commodities. One is those which are in short supply. Not later than the first of the calendar month following the adoption of this act the Secretary of Agriculture is required to report to the Price Administrator agricultural commodities which are in short supply. That is one category.

Subsection (2) (A) reads as follows:

> Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that maximum prices applicable to any agricultural commodity which is in short supply are impeding the necessaray production of such commodity, he may recommend to the Price Administrator such adjustments in such maximum prices as the Secretary determines to be necessary to obtain the necessary production of such commodity.

The Secretary decides when commodities are in short supply. No one else decides it. No one else has any authority over him.

Mr. WHERRY. But he operates under certain limitations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Subparagraph (B) reads as follows:

The Secretary of Agriculture by December 31, 1946, shall recommend to the Price Administrator the removal of maximum prices on all agricultural commodities, whether or not in short supply, not important in relation to business costs or living costs, and prior to that date shall make such recommendations as rapidly as, in his judgment, will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect.

In other words, under the first paragraph which I have read the Secretary of Agriculture decides what products are in short supply.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not subparagraph (C) nullify subparagraphs (A) and (B)?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; it does.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me to finish my answer—

Mr. WHERRY. I have the floor, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Secretary decides what agricultural product is in short supply. He reports to the Price Administrator. Under the next paragraph, the Secretary of Agriculture decides also what agricultural products are not important with respect to the cost of living or the cost of business, whether or not they are in short supply. He makes that determination, and reports it to the Price Administrator; and the controls are to be removed as rapidly as possible during the period between now and December 31, and entirely removed by that date, under his recommendation.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the majority leader for his explanation; but it brings me back to the only conclusion I can reach, and that is that the whole thing is in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY. Absolutely.

Mr. HAWKES. In other words, if he fails to do the right thing the Nation suffers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course. That is true of any officer who has jurisdiction over anything.

Mr. HAWKES. That is one reason why I do not believe that any one man should have jurisdiction over this subject. That is one reason why I felt that the decontrol of meats was important. I may say to the majority leader that a moment ago I was called to the telephone. I talked with one of the most distinguished men in the Government service. I wanted to make an engagement to meet him a little after 5 o'clock, and he told me that he was very sorry, but he had to leave at half past 4 because his butcher had 2 pounds of round steak for him, and unless he got there at 4:30 he would not get it. That shows that meat ought to be decontrolled, from my point of view. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator give me the name of his friend?

Mr. HAWKES. No; I am going to keep it quiet. [Laughter.]

Let me say that the very fact that I will not give the Senator the name of my friend or the name of the butcher is the reason why the black market is thriving so successfully.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want the name of the Senator's friend or the name of the butcher in order to prosecute. I wish to go with the Senator from New Jersey and help him to eat the steak.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like very much to have the majority leader join me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish again to invite the attention of the majority leader to subparagraph (C) on page 3. I should like to see if his interpretation is the same as mine. The language is as follows:

Within 10 days after the receipt of any recommendation under this subsection for the adjustment of maximum prices applicable to any agricultural commodity—

That recommendation would be the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture to the Price Administrator—

or for the removal of maximum prices on agricultural commodities not important in relation to business costs or living costs, the Price Administrator shall adjust or remove such maximum prices in accordance with such recommendations.

How does the majority leader answer that?

Mr. BARKLEY. How do I answer what?

Mr. WHERRY. The Price Administrator has the final determination.

Mr. BARKLEY. The language is mandatory. It provides that the Price Administrator shall adjust prices in accordance with the Secretary's recommendation.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or he shall remove such commodities from price control, according to the recommendation of the Secretary.

Mr. WHERRY. On what basis?

Mr. BARKLEY. On the basis of the Secretary's recommendation.

Mr. WHERRY. The language is:

or for the removal of maximum prices on agricultural commodities not important in relation to business costs or living costs.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a matter to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and not by the Price Administrator. When the Secretary of Agriculture makes his recommendation to the Price Administrator, stating that any agricultural product is not important, either in relation to the cost of living or the cost of business, and recommends removal of maximum prices, it is mandatory upon the Administrator to remove them. Or if the Secretary in his certificate says that additional prices are needed in the interest of greater production, the Administrator is required to establish such prices. He is not authorized to exercise any independent judgment as to how much the prices shall be increased.

Mr. WHERRY. As I read the bill, subparagraph (B) has to do with the recommendation made by the Secretary of Agriculture after he makes his determination. It goes to the Price Administrator, and it becomes mandatory that he do what the recommendation calls for, provided the commodities which he decontrols are not important in relation to business costs or living costs. That language is in the bill, and I think the Price Administrator would be justified in not carrying out the recommendations if in his opinion such commodities should not be decontrolled.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not agree with the Senator, but I should like to read this sentence, which probably has been overlooked. I refer to subparagraph (e) of subsection (3):

No maximum price shall be applicable with respect to any agricultural commodity during any calendar month which begins more than 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, unless such commodity is certified to the Price Administrator under this paragraph as being in short supply.

In other words, under that language agricultural ceilings will come off all agricultural products within 30 days after the effective date of this act unless the certification has come from the Secretary of Agriculture that a product is in short supply.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that the purpose which was very clearly in the minds of those who considered the subject in the committee was to compel a monthly review of every agricultural product. By the mechanics which have been described by the distinguished majority leader, there would be compelled a monthly certification of that which is in short supply and that which is not in short supply.

I believe it would be helpful to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska if he understood the reason for bringing that direction to decontrol back to the Office of Price Administration. First, we thought it advisable that there be one place where the citizen could find out what the price was, and that it would be confusing if the Price Administrator had a list of prices and the Secretary of Agriculture had another list of prices. By the mechanics provided in the conference report, there is one place where the citizen can find out what the maximum price is.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator refer me to one place in the bill which provides that a citizen can find out what the maximum price is?

Mr. MILLIKIN. All that a citizen needs to do——

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Colorado refer to the black-market price or the legal price?

Mr. MILLIKIN. A citizen can ascertain the black-market price by paying it.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And he can find out the imaginary price by asking the Price Administrator.

One of the reasons why we have the Price Administrator perform the mechanical service of declaring the agricultural commodity to be decontrolled is that the agricultural advisory committees are now serving under the Price Administrator. We thought that to move those over and to set up a whole new system of agricultural advisory committees and put them under the Secretary of Agriculture would be too complicated. That is the main reason why it is provided that the Secretary of Agriculture is to bring the decontrol determination back to the Office of the Price Administrator, who then must, as the report provides, decontrol.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his explanation. I suppose if we were to go through each one of the paragraphs and each sentence of the conference report and if we were to obtain the interpretations of those who worked so faithfully in the conference committee, it would be very enlightening. But when we start to read and interpret the conference report as it comes to us now on such short notice, it seems that the Price Administrator must have a definite part to play in interpreting that section. Certainly there should be no doubt about the matter. One of the great troubles we have today is that the statutes have not been interpreted as the Congress wishes them to be interpreted. I say that with all due respect to differences of opinion. We are having differences of opinion here in connection with the pending measure. Certainly no Senator will stand on the floor of the Senate and say that we have not had differences of interpretation in regard to the numerous orders which have been issued by the OPA.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I may draw an analogy in relation to the Price Administrator's function of carrying out the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to agricultural products, I think it would be a clear analogy to say that his function would be the same as or similar to that of the clerk of a court whose duty it is to record the judgment of the court which is handed down from the bench. I think that is a fair analogy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the remarks I have made thus far are preliminary to what I would like to tell the Senate in regard to the meat situation. I told the distinguished majority leader that I would take only 30 or 40 minutes; but numerous colloquies have intervened, and I have not been able to present all the arguments which I should like to present in regard to the decontrol of meat, livestock, milk, dairy products, and butter.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think the Senator from Nebraska is making an excellent record in regard to the meat situation, but I think it would help the RECORD to have inserted in it the statement that for the last 3 years there have been approximately 7,000,000 more cattle in the United States than ever before in the history of our country.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. I had intended to include that statement as a part of my remarks, but I am glad to have it come from the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, because it comes from one who is a practical cattleman. If he had written the orders which the OPA has issued in regard to the cattle industry, we would not be involved in the confusion in which we find ourselves today, because the Senator from Wyoming understands the cattle situation both as a cattle producer and a cattle feeder. One criticism of OPA which I know is justified is that too many orders have been written by men in the OPA who did not know the difference between a male critter and a female critter. I have in my files an order in which they asked for the discontinuance for 60 days of the slaughtering of female steers. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to read for the information of the Senator from Nebraska and of the Senate an extract from a statement I made to the Senate a few days ago, before the vote was taken on the OPA bill. At that time I read a statement which comes from the records of history. I should like to read one paragraph of it now, because it bears upon what the Senator from Nebraska has been mentioning:

Many were crushed in the scramble at the bakers' shops.

Earlier today the Senator from Nebraska referred to the great lines of people who were waiting to buy bread.

Many, especially the children, were literally starved. After the fall of Robespierre (July 1794) the law was openly broken. Fortunately, it had neglected to take into cognizance live cattle and sheep—

In other words, they had neglected to control meat—

and, consequently, though bread was scarce, meat became tolerably plentiful when it could be sold at a fair price.

So we learn that it was meat, which was not controlled and which became available, that saved the lives of the people.

Agriculture and manufacturing began to revive, especially after the maximum law—

Which was the same as our OPA—

had been formally repealed (December 1794).

Mr. President, when that law was repealed and when the people were allowed to resume their normal pursuits, when fair rewards were offered for the production of goods, then France began to produce the things which her people needed, the people began to come back to life, and the nation began to get back upon its feet.

If the distinguished Senator from Nebraska will permit me to do so, I should like to say that I know some of the ablest men in the United States will agree with what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] said a few minutes ago, when he suggested that this whole thing should be wiped off the slate. As I said the other day, I have not been able to bring myself to vote to do it abruptly. I may be wrong; but I have not been able to bring myself to vote for the total elimination of all price controls instantly. I have not been able to bring myself to believe that I should vote to cut off all price controls at once.

I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that the conference committee should have had a little more regard for the things as to which the Senate has put itself on record as favoring.

I say to the Senator, in connection with a somewhat different matter, that if there had been on the conference committee enough men of the courage and understanding of our distinguished friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the conferees might have brought back to us a report which would have been totally acceptable.

But I say to the Senator from Nebraska that I am one of those who believe that there are certain controls which must be let down easily and gradually. However, I should like to know that they are going to be let down easily, and I should like to know that the question of when they are to be removed and how they are to be removed will not be left to the whim or idea of one particular man, no matter who he may be, because in the United States 140,000,000 people are waiting to see this matter adjusted to the point, not where they can get all they want, but where they can get all they need, and can get it on time.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for yielding to me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for his contribution at this point. I hope he will have the entire speech to which he has referred printed at this point in the RECORD, if he has it before him.

Mr. HAWKES. It is already in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey brought up a point which I think should be thoroughly understood. Reference has been made to the fact that the House overwhelmingly defeated the decontrol amendment during its consideration of the conference report. Once again I have to speak from memory, because I do not have the record before me. Am I not correct when I state that once prior to this time the question of the decontrol of meat, livestock, poultry, milk, cream, and butter was brought to a vote in the House of Representatives? As I recall—and I think I am not mistaken—there was a difference of only 5 or 6 votes on the question whether they should be decontrolled. I am not positive about that, but I should like to have the record regarding it introduced at this point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, what happened about that was that when the bill was originally in the House of Representatives, Mr. WADSWORTH, of New York, offered an amendment for the decontrol of meats. I do not think the

amendment included the decontrol of dairy products, poultry, and so forth.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps not.

Mr. BARKLEY. But he offered an amendment for the decontrol of meats, and it was defeated in the House.

Mr. WHERRY. Was it defeated by a majority of more than 5 or 6 votes?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think so.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the RECORD introduced here. I am quite satisfied that the vote was very close.

Mr. BARKLEY. Regardless of that, the amendment was defeated. Yesterday the House by a majority of 71 defeated a motion which was broader in its aspects than the Wadsworth amendment, and would have included dairy and poultry products, in addition to meat.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to get to that matter. I thank the majority leader for bringing up the point, but first I should like to refer to the first vote the Senate took. I wish to have these matters placed in the RECORD. I may be mistaken; but the vote was taken on the amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH in the House of Representatives, and I am quite satisfied that the vote was very close.

The second time when this matter came up was in the Senate of the United States. Unfortunately we did not have a straight out-and-out vote on the question of the decontrol of meat, livestock, poultry, and dairy products. If the conference report is rejected at this time, I shall move that the Senate instruct its conferees to stand by that Senate amendment. I shall do so in order to have a record vote on the question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator might strengthen the line of the argument which he is now making by recalling that the House voted for the Gossett amendment, which would have decontrolled practically everything.

Mr. WHERRY. That was next; was it not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That was in the bill which came to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; it was. So we have a record of the vote on the Gossett amendment, which carried in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the Gossett amendment did not particularize anything. It simply provided a formula which would have resulted in the decontrol of many things. But it did not mention anything by name.

Mr. WHERRY. But was it not argued on the floor of the House that it would accomplish the very purpose we have in mind in regard to the decontrol of meat?

Mr. BARKLEY. Those who opposed the Gossett amendment argued that it would have decontrolled practically everything.

Mr. WHERRY. Particularly meat.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it would have decontrolled a thousand things in addition to meat.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky, but the emphasis there was placed on meat. When the Senate voted on the question of the final passage of the bill those who voted for the Senate version of price control had in mind primarily, I think, the decontrol of meat and of milk and of butter and of poultry products. I believe that I am correct in making that statement. I believe that every Senator will agree that the vote on the passage of the bill was in support, primarily, of decontrolling meat and dairy products.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. As I have followed the argument, I gathered the inference that the other House has not yet voted on the decontrol of meat alone.

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. BUCK. Why cannot they be prevailed upon to decontrol meat? Slaughter houses in my State are all closed down. No meat is being purchased and no cattle are being slaughtered.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. He has made a timely suggestion.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to say that that question also came up in the conference. I do not wish to emphasize any partisan matters, but two of the Republican Senators who were members of the conference committee made certain surveys of Republican sentiment on this side of the Chamber, and I understand that similar surveys were made on the other side of the Chamber, the end point of which was that we could not have carried within the Senate the decontrol of meat separated from its allied commodities.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, once again I appreciate the judgment and the opinions of the distinguished Senator from Colorado. This record is piling up, point by point, and I believe that it proves the conclusion which we could all reach, namely, that we should vote down the conference report, and again try to have presented a more satisfactory measure. Why cannot we vote down the conference report? What is wrong about it? Is not that the American way, if we choose it? Is it not good sportsmanship? We have not had an opportunity to accomplish all that may possibly be accomplished. It has been said that if we vote against the conference report and disagree to it, we will kill price control. That might be the opinion of some, but it is not a fact. The fact is that the only way we can cure the situation is to vote down the conference report and then move to instruct the conferees. I believe that every Member of the Senate has the obligation to try. If we cannot get all commodities decontrolled, let us see what commodities we can get decontrolled.

Mr. President, I reiterate what was said by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. He gave a figure of 7,000,000. I cannot now quote the exact figure, but it seems to me, from statistics which I have seen, that the population of cattle in this country as of the last census ran more than 81,000,000 head. We now have nearly 10,000,000 more head of cattle than we had as an annual average during the 10-year period prior to World War II. Think of that, Mr. President! We have grain. We have the largest agricultural crops ever produced. Yet, because of these price impediments, because of the interpretations of the OPA, because of the idea on the part of some that in czaristic fashion Mr. Bowles can write the economy for 140,000,000 people, we do not have meat today. The only way to obtain it is through the black market where 80 percent of it is being handled. Some say that the question of price is not involved. I say that we have the cattle, and we can get the meat if we do not have impediments thrown in our way. Mr. President, what is the answer to that statement? We cannot write legislation which will cure our difficulties so long as Congress is willing that Mr. Bowles shall interpret in his own way everything that is written into price-control laws.

Last week I was in Nebraska for 4 days. We may talk about charts and statistics, but on the farm south of Pawnee City, Nebr., which was operated by my father for 50 years before I undertook to operate it, we have always fed cattle, and there are 27 cattle feeders between our farm and the Kansas State line. Ordinarily, at this time of the year, we are getting white faces on that farm ready for the market in August, which is one of the best markets of the year. Yet there is not a cattle feeder who has one hoof in those feed lots today. Why? Because the price directive of Mr. Vinson does not permit feeding cattle at a profit. Why? Because the feeders cannot buy corn, the ceiling for which has been fixed at $1.33, while the Vinson price directive legalizes corn at $1.03 a bushel. If we obtain corn at all, we must pay at least $1.75 a bushel for it. We must pay almost double what the price was formerly. When the Vinson directive was issued we had a top price of $17.50 a hundred for cattle. How many feeders will feed cattle when the top price is such a figure as that? Mr. President, the price extension of the Price Control Act as provided in the conference report will not help the feeder in any way whatever. It will not enable consumers to obtain meat. What I have said has come from a man who has fed cattle and knows what he is talking about. We cannot eat statistics or charts. We must eat beefsteak. The only way to obtain beefsteak is to obtain production.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator if, when comparing the House bill and the Senate version, he does not believe the conference report results in weakening both versions.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. But I shall not go into that question. I do not want to be placed in a position of unnecessarily consuming time which I should use in presenting my arguments. What I am saying today is being said from the bottom of my heart. I am telling the Members of the Senate what I believe to be true.

Mr. President, something has been said about the question of politics. My goodness! politics should be thrown

to the wind, because this country, in many localities, is faced with chaos as a result of a wholesale disrespect for law because of black-market operations not only in meat, but, as some Senators know, in other commodities such as lumber. Can any Senator who comes from a lumber-producing region say there are no black-market operations in lumber? No. What about textiles and automobiles? We talk about production. We cannot get meat, we cannot get milk, and we cannot get textiles without going to the black market and paying exorbitant prices, or standing in line for hours and hours in an attempt to obtain a very meager amount.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the figures which the Senator from Nebraska gave are correct with reference to the number of cattle on the hoof, would it not be his opinion that, under the section of the bill pertaining to decontrol, the Secretary of Agriculture would have to release the controls?

Mr. WHERRY. No, I do not believe so. I will tell the Senator why. The Senator has asked several such questions this afternoon, and I think they are very proper questions. Allow me to state what I believe with reference to the subject of supply and demand. I had provided for the subject in my speech, but I have not yet had an opportunity to reach my speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sorry.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not mean at all to be discourteous. I have the highest regard for the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator know where his speech ended before I interrupted him?

Mr. WHERRY. I will call it a set speech, if it will make any difference to the Senator.

The bill calls for the decontrol of agricultural products which are not in short supply. Thus, it is seen that, as a practical matter, the conference report contains no decontrol formula. What is or is not in short supply would be within the control and discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture and the decontrol board. No complainant could ever prove there was not a short supply of an agricultural commodity. That is the position which I take. Meat is a good illustration. Notwithstanding the great surpluses of livestock on the ranges and farms, all that would be necessary in order to bring about an apparent short supply would be for a Government agency to claim the need for a large quantity of meat for relief, or some similar purpose. That is exactly what is being done now. Such a demand would be reflected in our domestic supply.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator referred to our domestic supply.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. We are scraping the bottom of the barrel today because we are sending abroad a great quantity of our fats and oils. Fats and oils are going to Russia. During the last quarter we exported 317,000,000 pounds of fats and oils, some of which went into the Ukraine and into White Russia. We sent eight boatloads of corn to Europe. The people there did not know what it looked like or what to do with it when it got there.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator has brought up the matter, we might make clear the legislative picture of Russia's position so far as food is concerned. Russia has refused to contribute her quota to UNRRA. Certainly, she has requested relief from UNRRA, and UNRRA relief has gone to two Russian states, namely, the Ukraine and White Russia, as the Senator has said. Russia has requested and accepted from UNRRA relief in foodstuffs for two of the principal Russian states. Then she proceeded to sell to France 500,000 tons of grain, and announced her action through the head of the Communist Party there prior to the elections, all of which was done for political purposes. That is the record.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. A few minutes ago I was called to the telephone. I had received a long distance call from the junior Senator of North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. Today he feels that he has received a fresh mandate from the people in that he has polled 29 percent more votes than did his two opponents together. He feels that such vote is a mandate directed at the meat situation as affected by the conference report. He has asked me, in view of that fact, and in view of the confidence expressed in him, to arrange a pair for him to see that he is recorded as voting for the decontrol of meat and foods.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I just came into the Chamber, but I thought I understood that there was some comment about our having sent foods and oils to the Ukraine and White Russia.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure the able Senator from Nebraska recalls the testimony of Mayor LaGuardia, the head of UNRRA, recently before the Committee on Small Business, in which statement he made it clear that fats and oils were being sent to the Ukraine and White Russia because the UNRRA authorities found that the people there did not have them. We were not sending wheat, but were sending fats and oils, because they did not have them. Mayor LaGuardia also told us that his organizaiton were following up with their own personnel the distribution of everything that was sent by UNRRA to those countries.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me point out also that if the people in two of the Russian states fail to have fats and oils, so do the people of most of the United States fail to have them. I think that is a very important point.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know how——

Mr. WHERRY. I have the floor. Does the Senator want me to yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I was going to ask the Senator to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know how the Senator can make a comparison between the shortage or apparent shortage in White Russia and the Ukraine and the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have made a comparison. I know that Russia has refused to contribute to UNRRA, and I know that UNRRA, in turn, has furnished substantial quantities of food to two of the Russian states. I also know that Russia has sold 500,000 tons of grain to France, a fact which was announced by the head of the Communist Party of France. That is the record.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. This will be the last question.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know where the Senator from New Hampshire obtains his information, but I got an entirely different picture of Russia's part in UNRRA from Mayor LaGuardia's testimony before our committee—and the able Senator from Nebraska was present and heard the testimony—than I got from the statement made by the able Senator from New Hampshire, and I think that Mayor LaGuardia is in a position to be exceedingly well informed about the matter.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me point out, too, that the countries which are in discussion here are also the countries which have refused the press access to their territory, even at the request of the President of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire and also the distinguished Senator from Florida for their colloquy. I should be glad to furnish the testimony of Mayor LaGuardia, if the Senator would like to have it. It was in the same hearing when I propounded the question about the transportation of wheat to France, and LaGuardia stated they were furnishing bottoms for the transportation of wheat.

I had just come to the point in my remarks where I was answering the distinguished Senator from Washington to the effect that it would be difficult ever to prove when the supply would catch up with the demand. I am satisfied that those of us who have been close to the food situation realize that UNRRA, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the military, and other Government organizations, go right out into the market. They have priorities, and they buy what they need, and we take what is left. That is the way it is operated. When commitments are made by the Allied Food Control Board through our Department of State they are definite, and it is those definite commitments today which are causing us our domestic trouble. It is having an impact upon our domestic economy.

I should like to have the RECORD show that I believe in all our citizens under the American flag having all the food they need, no matter where they may live. The time has come when we have to go into these commitments and find out where the food has gone, because if things continue the way they are going, we are not only going to have to scrape the bottom of the barrel but we will have trouble in this country before a year passes.

So I say to the distinguished Senator from Washington, it is going to be very difficult to know when the supply equals the demand. I do not know how the Secretary of Agriculture, with conditions as they are today, could say that he could decontrol meat because of the commitments made even though there are 10,000,000 head of cattle more than in prewar years. I do not see how he could say that. He does not know. His testimony was to the effect that he does not know what the commitments are, even though he sits on the board.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Nebraska and I apparently have a different version. As I understand the report of the conferees, it says when the supply of a commodity is equal to the domestic consumption. It would not have anything to do with foreign commitments.

Mr. WHERRY. Domestic consumption is concerned with foreign consumption, and we can never tell when we will decontrol meats, so long as such commitments exist.

I appreciate the Senator bringing that to my attention, and I think it proves conclusively that we should send the conference report back and see if we cannot decontrol meat. The people are looking for Congress to take the leadership. The controls have fallen down, and they are looking to Congress to take the leadership and write meaning into the statute and not leave it to an administrative official in OPA.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me point out to the Senator, along the line of what he was discussing as to the international food situation, that I know the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators are anxious and willing and extremely desirous of sharing America's food with the starving in other lands. But what we object to is, first, having the food we send and the money we contribute utilized to promote the selfish ends of dictators; or, secondly, to promote political intrigue in some foreign nation, and in a way stultify the principles for which we fought the war, and result in oppression of people we sought to bring freedom to in other lands. That is exactly what a part of the food is going for today, and I predict here on the floor of the Senate now that the time will come when we will see developed some of the greatest scandals we have ever seen, international in character, concerning the use or misuse of American food.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his observation. After being present at the food hearing for many months, I know there is certainly much justification for the statement just made by him.

Therefore, Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated, I think no one has the right to believe that, with OPA functioning as it does now, supply will ever come into balance with demand.

Almost the last thing Mr. Paul Porter, of the Office of Price Administration, said before the Committee on Banking and Currency was:

> I would say that we are in the business of keeping the law of supply and demand from working. There is no question about that.

Those were the words of the Administrator. He does not intend to bring them into balance, he intends to write orders to keep them out of balance. That is what he meant.

Now let me tell the Senate what Mr. A. L. Erickson, in charge of the Meat Division, said before the Banking and Currency Committee on May 10 in response to questions by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. First I quote the question of the Senator from Colorado:

> So that in this field—

He was talking about livestock and meat—

> So that in this field you gig back from the proposition that when supply and demand are in balance you still will not decontrol.

I want the Members of the Senate to get that. He said that was what they were doing. They first said they were for supply and demand, and this is the question from the Senator from Colorado:

> In other words, you say that in this instance supply and demand can be in balance, but you will not permit it to be in balance, because if you do permit it to be in balance the price would rise?

That is the question of the Senator from Colorado. This is Mr. Erickson's answer:

> I think that is true of any commodity, sir.
>
> Senator MILLIKIN. I just want to understand if that is your theory?
>
> Mr. ERICKSON. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. PORTER. It is the same situation as if a manufacturer were withholding goods.
>
> Senator MILLIKIN. And it is perfectly apparent to you that you will never decontrol if you do not allow enough supply to balance demand.

What do Senators think of that? In the face of that statement, we are not going to get decontrol of livestock or milk, or butter, or poultry products, so long as Mr. Porter and Mr. Bowles operate the Office of Price Administration. I do not care what we write into the statute to the contrary, we are just never going to get it. That is what they mean. We are giving one man authority to run our domestic economy.

Let me say something else. Mr. Bowles is an advertising man, and now he has in the State Department a partner by the name of Benton who is going to have considerable to say about our foreign policy. So we have a partnership of two men running the domestic policy and much of the foreign policy of the United States of America. I think this is deliberate, premeditated notice to the Senate and to other legislative representatives of the people, that OPA is cognizant of its ability to sabotage the decontrol provisions of the conference bill, and it is its announced policy that it will do so. I say it intends to do so, and that it is serving notice on the Senate that that is what it will do, regardless of what we do here. It should be clear to all Members of this body that unless Congress decontrols meats and all other agricultural products which are now in the black market, they will not be decontrolled.

Mr. President, I have prepared a 30-page document which gives the history of the black market from 1943. I do not want to take any more of the time of the Senate, so I shall place it in the RECORD. It presents the livestock and meat situation from month to month; it presents the situation as it exists with respect to the feeders, the producers, the processors, and the distributors.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

LIVESTOCK AND MEAT AND THE OPA

Four years of OPA failure in livestock and meat controls are responsible for the most critical meat situation we have ever known in this country. There is no close parallel. It would be unbelievable if the record were not so convincing. It is a national scandal and disgrace.

Few industries in our country are as large or as important to us as livestock and meat. It provides the meat we want and need, the raw materials for much of our raiment, fats to give us energy, soap to keep us clean, medicines to aid our health, and a livelihood to millions of our people. We cannot let this great industry be further sacrificed, if not wholly ruined, by the self-perpetuating policies and demonstrated failures of the OPA.

Strange as it may seem, the OPA itself was responsible for the beginning of the black market in meat. It commenced when the OPA instituted profit control as an integral part of price control in 1942.

OPA was not satisfied to establish meat price ceilings at existing levels. It rolled them back to levels of the low-demand lenten period of 1942. It froze meat prices at levels out of line with existing livestock prices and thereby immediately placed the legitimate operator in a price squeeze and at the mercy of the unscrupulous buyer who knew very well that there was no plan or program for effective meat price ceiling enforcement. No serious meat enforcement campaign was even commenced until December 1942.[1]

Packers whose sole income depended upon a reasonable operating margin on meat were promptly faced with the alternatives of going broke or going black. Other meat processors, with large sidelines of business, had the choice of curtailing their meat operations to minimize their losses, or also going black.

From the beginning of price control there has been a price squeeze on some species of livestock and a consequent inviting opportunity for the black marketeer in meat.

---

[1] Ninth Quarterly Report of OPA, March 31, 1944.

As early as March 1943 the OPA acknowledged the meat black market. Administrator Brown told the Special Committee on Small Business (Doc. No. 84369):

"I believe the black market (in meat) is at the bottom of this situation where demand and supply are in bad condition."

Again in March 1943 the OPA, the Department of Agriculture, and Office of War Information, in Book VII, Campaign Against the Black Market in Meats, said:

"Anyone who has gone to a butcher shop within the last 3 months knows all is not well in the meat business * * *."

"The conditions are the result of a huge black market in meats—a black market so extensive it has disrupted the normal meat supply and meat distribution machinery of the United States."

This was the situation after less than a year of OPA.

After 4 years of OPA, we might summarize the current black-market meat situation by saying, "It is at least four times as bad as after 1 year of OPA."

The "price squeeze" that OPA placed and has maintained on meat packers was only one of the ways in which OPA contributed to the conditions that made meat black marketeering profitable and uncontrollable. The roll-back subsidy program in June 1943, obviously added pressure to the meat price line. Ceilings were reduced 10 percent on meat in the face of rapid increases in purchasing power. Meat consumption was thereby encouraged by a 10-percent price reduction in the face of a serious black market already out of control.

In June 1943, almost half of the Chicago cattle receipts were being shipped away from the market for slaughter elsewhere—or nearly twice the pre-OPA proportion—because black-market slaughterers were paying more for these cattle than legitimate packers at Chicago could afford to pay and sell beef at ceiling prices.

What did the OPA decide to do? Enforce its meat price ceilings, which clearly was the problem? No, no, as usual, it issued another regulation; one to supposedly control live-cattle prices. Three features of the cattle stabilization program are worth noting because they illustrate OPA policies and operations.

1. Live cattle maximum and minimum prices were set at levels so that even if cattle could be purchased at the minimum of the range, the legitimate slaughterer would incur heavy losses. The industry protested vigorously but OPA made the regulation effective, and "froze" the "squeeze" on the legitimate beef business.

2. OPA embarked at the same time on a course of using subsidies as instruments of price-control enforcement, price juggling, and discrimination rather than merely as a price roll-back compensation.

3. Finally, in the Cattle Stabilization Order, OPA definitely and admittedly commenced its policy of meat production control, which has never ended. Cattle feeding and efficient finishing were clearly discouraged by the live cattle prices which were established and, in the face of a large supply of feeder cattle and a shortage of beef, production was curtailed.

In many ways the OPA has discouraged maximum meat production and thereby contributed to the shortage of meat and the opportunity and growth of the black market. The OPA propaganda that our meat troubles are all due to increased demand is far from the facts. We have not had maximum meat production, large as it has been, and the black market in meat has resulted in untold waste of good, edible meats and meat food products.

OPA regulations, directives, orders, and propaganda—have caused no end of confusion and uncertainty in the minds and plans of our livestock producers. It takes time—a long time—to produce meat on the hoof. Livestock producers have always been willing to make long-time plans on their judgment of market prospects. But they will not, and cannot, be expected to plan and push full production when it depends upon the changing notions and ill-conceived ideas of a Government agency like the OPA as to what production and prices should be—and worse yet—what the black market demand might be, months ahead.

Nobody knows what meat production might have been except for the confusion and uncertainty arising from price and subsidy controls and changes, and the black market. Certain facts, however, provide good reason to be sure it could have been much higher and very much better distributed seasonally.

The slaughter of nearly 14,000,000 veal calves in 1944, compared with only 9,000,000 in 1940, shows how beef calves were liquidated due to uncertainty in the cattle outlook. They were slaughtered to produce but little meat instead of being grown on grass and roughage for a year, and fed out last winter and this spring with a little grain to augment our beef supply right when it has been most needed. You cannot blame producers for not growing and feeding those calves over a period of 18 months with the uncertainty there was in the situation of price control, subsidies, and the black market.

Nor can you blame cattle feeders for not putting light-weight cattle into their feed lots for the past three falls and planning to keep them 3 to 9 months to make a large tonnage of beef with the efficient use of some grain and lots of roughage. No—they have done the only safe thing. They let the light-weight cattle go to the cattle kill and bought heavy weight feeders which could be fed heavily on grain for a 30- to 60-day period for a fast gain and quick sale before the OPA had a chance to change the rules.

Our beef supply in the spring depends on fed cattle. With the whole cattle feeding picture hazardous and discouraging to feeders, and with short feeding the rule insofar as feeding was done, there is little wonder that supplies of beef have been curtailed each spring and especially limited more than necessary in the late spring—April, May, June—after the short-fed cattle were already mostly marketed.

Public spirited, experienced men in the livestock and meat industry always wondered whether any system of price control could work in such a complex industry. In wartime they felt a serious and sane attempt should be made, and notwithstanding the attitude and policies of the OPA, these cattle feeders, and industry leaders cooperated wholeheartedly. They encouraged and aided enforcement as the keystone of price control success. The most serious enforcement they got out of OPA was constant surveillance of themselves—the very ones who were trying to be helpful. Show me a racketeer that has been punished.

Meat rationing was supported by the industry. Its observance beyond that depended on voluntary cooperation—never on serious enforcement efforts by OPA.

Whether OPA regulations could have been enforced is a moot question. There never was more than a token effort a enforcement, and now the black market in meat has thoroughly whipped the OPA. Any possibility of enforcement has long since vanished.

More and more regulations have always been OPA's answer to lack of control. Certainly no one can accuse OPA of being lax in their "regulation manufacturing departments" or in so-called "informational" activities. Just imagine—since May 11, 1942, 112 regulations and directives and more than 1,100 amendments had been issued affecting the beef and veal division of the industry alone, at the last count. No single operator could possibly understand all of these regulations, much less comply with all of them if understood.

These regulations constitute the evidence of OPA efforts to control livestock and meat. There are more words in these regulations than there are dollars in fines assessed against meat black marketeers—more pages of regulations than suits filed—and more regulations and amendments, many times over, than persons put in jail for all meat control violations together. I am confident that the man-hours spent by the OPA on regulations and publicity would exceed by great odds all the hours of thought, as well as work, done on meat-price enforcement.

And the program of OPA in the most serious situation yet, is the same old story—another regulation, the slaughter control order, and another impotent threat of enforcement. OPA pleads for another chance for another regulation—this time for one that was tried and failed miserably a year ago.

Over 50 percent of the cattle receipts in Chicago in July 1945 were shipped out as slaughter cattle at prices which only the black-market slaughterer could recover. That is how slaughter control didn't work last year.

Furthermore, the OPA has not explained why 10 legitimate national packers who slaughtered 70 to 75 percent of all federally inspected cattle, prewar, were down to less than 30 percent in the last week of April 1946 and still were less than 30 percent of the total in the last 3 weeks of May 1946.

While discussing federally inspected cattle slaughter, I wish to call attention to how the OPA has time and again misled us to believe that Federal inspection is synonymous with OPA compliance. The OPA has inferred this both in its publications and in testimony before committees of the House and Senate. The facts simply do not bear this out. Noninspected black-market slaughter is undoubtedly most rampant and dangerous to the public health, but it is clear that a substantial amount of federally inspected meat also is being sold at over-ceiling wholesale prices.

But the OPA has not yet explained why 10 representative national packers, who are doing all the beef business they can on a legitimate basis, slaughtered 44 percent less cattle in March 1946 than in March 1945, 58 percent less in April 1946 than in the year before and, again, 58 percent less in May 1946 under the control order than in May 1945. In the same periods, compared with a year earlier, total federally inspected cattle slaughter was down only 25 percent in March, only 27 percent in April, and only 24 percent in May.

The only explanation yet offered by the OPA to these facts has been the accusation that these national packers were on a buying strike to wreck the OPA, when the OPA must well know that cattle are selling well above compliance prices except only for a few animals and a few lots that can be purchased here and there in compliance.

Secretary Anderson made it clear that there is no cattle buyers' strike in these companies, in his testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, May 1, 1946:

"Mr. ANDERSON. I think that it is absolutely true that the large, well integrated packers have not been able to go into the market and buy cattle. I realize that there has been a belief that they are on a buyers' strike, but we have tried to check, in the times that we were running the plants, and we found it impossible for those firms to go into the market and buy cattle within the compliance range. The difficulty is that they are large.

"Mr. BARKLEY. They are what?

"Mr. ANDERSON. They are large; that they are well recognized; that they are reliable,

and they are not willing to gamble with buying cattle at improper prices; and therefore, if the ceiling is $17, they must stay within the compliance range and they do try to stay within that range. They try to buy within it. But they are up against the competition of people who are not in the slightest interested in staying in the compliance range, and who take it away from them as fast as they can."

Certainly nobody questions the existence of a widespread black market in meat today. OPA admits it—but of course is loathe to admit how serious it really is. It is not new for the OPA to admit the meat black market. As a matter of fact, the OPA record shows the admission of the problem throughout the period.

Price Administrator Brown bemoaned the meat black market in 1943. OPA quarterly reports in March and September 1944, recognized the problem and threatened again to do something about it. On March 6, 1945, Administrator Bowles said:

"We estimate above ceilings on food cost American families above $1,000,000,000 a year."

Congressional committees have likewise recognized and deplored the meat black market. The report on May 1, 1945, of the Special Committee to Investigate Food Shortages for the House of Representatives, of which Secretary Anderson was then chairman, discussed "Black market expansion" at length on page 10 and then said under the heading, Inflation in black market prices:

"This surely indicates the inflationary spiral that quickly moves into the black market operation, and indicates as well the cost to the American public of not being able to control the price of meat and hold the line on that important part of the American diet.

"The best evidence of the dislocation that has taken place in our meat distribution system is the fact that legitimate processors of meat and legitimate wholesale and retail distributors of meat find it increasingly difficult to secure supplies to meet the civilian requirements while those engaged in black market operations seem to have an abundance of supplies both at wholesale and retail levels.

"Many legitimate dealers both in processing, wholesaling, and retailing, are being forced out of business because they are trying to hold the line and comply with Government regulations."

Shortly thereafter the Special Subcommittee on Agriculture and Forestry submitted its Interim Report pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 92, finding that one of the important causes contributir - to the shortage of meat for civilian consumption was:

"The diversion of livestock from normal channels of slaughter and distribution into the black market and the failure of the Office of Price Administration to take effective enforcement measures."

Everybody talked about the black market in meat and deplored it month after month, but not until this spring were actual facts developed on a broad basis to really show how widespread and serious it was.

In testimony during the past several weeks, before the three committees of this Congress—the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate—the black market in meat has been finally measured and labeled for what it is—or was, early this year. I am positive the situation is much worse than it was then.

Mr. President, we do not have price control on meat—we only have an OPA fiction of price control. Worse than this, we have a national scandal and disgrace with ramifications too great to imagine and too dire to be tolerated any longer.

Even under the black market of 3 months ago, the American public was paying more than $2,000,000,000 a year over ceiling prices for meat, including subsidies. Perhaps they can stand this bill, but this is only the out-of-pocket cost. It does not measure the many indirect losses nor some of the more sinister and dangerous effects of the black market on our people and our country.

Disregard for meat price control is breeding contempt for our laws and, I am afraid, already doing harm to the moral fiber of many of our once self-respecting citizens.

The meat black market is very definitely imperiling the public health through the unbelievable insanitary conditions of slaughter and distribution. As we now come into the warm summer season, slaughterhouses and trucks and consumer outlets without adequate refrigeration, or any at all, are shocking to contemplate as a health hazard.

In the face of the need to conserve every possible pound of meat and animal products, millions of head of livestock have been diverted from established packinghouses with a wide reputation for saving "everything but the squeal" and shipped over long distances to a rampant black market which is neither equipped for nor interested in saving the byproducts.

In testimony before committees of this Senate, representatives of the legitimate beef slaughtering industry estimated conservatively an actual loss of 95,000,000 pounds of beef in 1945 due alone to tissue shrink in excessive shipping of cattle compared with normal. I would estimate it is running at twice that amount now.

It was estimated that byproduct losses as a result of black-market cattle slaughter in 1945 amounted to 118,000,000 pounds, with a value of $33,000,000. This covered only the losses of edible fat, inedible fat, grease, hoof meal, dried blood, tankage and meat scrap, tripe, casings, diaphragm meat, cheek and head meat, beef brains, melts, oxtail, and the 15 percent of the hides which is lost for leather on the average country hide.

Nobody, to my knowledge, has even tried to estimate the amount of these products that are being lost at the present, giving consideration to the grealy increased level of black-market slaughtering compared with 1945.

The black market waste of glands and other byproducts essential to the preparation of vital pharmaceuticals is perhaps the most sinister result of this black market situation. During the hearings before the Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, and Banking and Currency, reports were received from the various national pharmaceutical laboratories stating that the situation was critical with them, even at that time, because they could not obtain necessary raw materials due to the black market diversion of livestock from legitimate slaughterers.

Mr. President, human lives are endangered as a result of the declining production of essential pharmaceuticals. Several vital medicines are derived solely from livestock, for example:

Insulin for the treatment of diabetes can only be made from pancreas glands.

Pituitary glands from cattle produce two important medicines one of which is used in childbirth and the other in most surgical cases and for shock.

Adrenalin for the treatment of asthmatic conditions as well as a heart stimulant is produced from beef suprarenal glands.

Adrenal cortex extract for the treatment of Addison's disease is also produced from the suprarenal glands and is the only known treatment for this disease and must be administered daily much like insulin for diabetes.

Dehydrocholic acid, made from ox bile, is a very effective treatment for certain liver, gall bladder, and intestinal disturbances.

Liver extract made from calves' and other livers is used for treatment of pernicious anemia.

The black market in meat is rapidly destroying the source of these vital pharmaceutical materials and unless the black market is eliminated forthwith millions of people are going to suffer extremely. For example, over 1,000,000 diabetic people depend upon insulin solely to alleviate their suffering.

To be more specific, let me call your attention to the following telegram dated at Chicago, Ill., Thursday, June 5, 1946, from one of the leading pharmaceutical companies in the country, the Wilson Laboratories:

"Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
"Senate Office Building,
"Washington, D. C.:

"Present inability of legitimate packers to get livestock causing serious medicinal situation through lack of raw glands to make insulin for diabetics, adrenals for adrenal cortext extract for Addison's disease, pituitaries for posterior pituitary solution for childbirth and surgery, ox gall for bile products for liver and gall-bladder ailments.

"To illustrate, Addison's disease patients must take daily injections of adrenal cortex extract to keep alive. In crisis large quantities must be given to revive the patients. Our present supplies of extract are insufficient to take care of needs of these unfortunate individuals with Addison's disease. Unless something is done immediately to make it possible to get necessary raw glands, there is grave danger of death in many cases of Addison's disease, some of which have been maintained on our extract for more than 9 years. Other firms making similar products are in same situation."

The black-market diversion of livestock has further made it necessary for legal slaughterers to lay off thousands of employees with many years of experience and valuable skills. Thousands more have suffered serious reductions in their weekly hours of work because of the reduced volume of slaughter.

For example, a survey of 10 legitimate national packers showed that from January 12, 1946, to March 30, 1946, they had to lay off 11,765 employees and that there was a loss of 1,747,814 man-hours of work by their packing-plant employees. They actually had a 54-percent decrease in man-hours in the cattle-killing departments from the week ending January 12 to the week ending March 30, 1946. Of course the situation has become much more serious and acute since the end of March.

This employment situation affecting alike large, medium, and small legitimate processors of meat explains why the president and secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL, the long-time established union in the meat industry, very realistically sent a telegram to President Truman, Secretary Anderson, and Messrs. Bowles and Porter on April 5, 1946, demanding that meat be decontrolled. It said, in part:

"We are firmly convinced that present Government regulations in the meat-packing industry are unenforceable. These inoperable prohibitions have already resulted in thousands of men and women in packing plants being unemployed. They have resulted in scores of meat-packing plants closing their doors. Unless something is done quickly hundreds more will do likewise. * * *

"These regulations only result in a terrific increase in the cost of meat to the consumer, and the Government and the OPA is responsible for the situation. It is responsible for the loss of the thousands of jobs of our membership and responsible for the present inability of hundreds of legitimate slaughterers to continue their business.

"We feel sincerely that if these restrictions were eliminated the prices of meat to the consumer would within a very short time level off, which would result in cheaper purchases of the product.

"Why not give these men who have been in the meat business all of their lives an opportunity to prove what they can do and release the controls. * * * At least the men who know the industry ought to have a chance to operate it so the consumer may have lower prices and so that the thousands of men and women who earn their livelihood in the industry might have the opportunity to do so."

These are some of the more tangible reasons for calling the meat black market a national scandal, to which must be added whatever may be the financial loss and, in many cases irreparable harm, that has been done to scores of long-established, efficient meat processors who have elected not to go "black."

A meat packer must have a reasonable volume in order to operate economically or efficiently. The figures on the number of cattle slaughtered this year, and especially in recent weeks, by 10 representative, legitimate national packers show without question that they are practically out of cattle killing—are just on a stand-by, waiting basis.

Mr. President, this is the record of the number of cattle killed by these ten packers who did 70 to 75 percent of all federally inspected cattle slaughter in pre-OPA times, but who are now down to less than 30 percent. I have their number from the beginning of 1946 through the week ending June 8, and the corresponding number in 1945, or last year, and in the more normal year of 1941. There was also a serious black market in meat a year ago which adversely affected their operations; nevertheless their slaughter for the week ending June 8 was only 25 percent of a year ago:

Cattle slaughter of 10 representative national packers

Period	Number of head		
	1946	1945	1941
January	371,000	705,000	614,000
February	525,000	739,000	556,000
March	352,000	631,000	559,000
April:			
First 3 weeks	162,054	371,527	390,512
Week of 27th	42,693	116,759	142,013
After control order:			
Week ending—			
May 4	58,169	123,152	149,908
May 11	59,062	112,035	161,313
May 18	51,723	115,247	157,335
May 25	44,518	119,860	149,282
June 1	29,274	103,021	139,448
June 8	31,632	124,235	155,292
Week ending June 15:			
Number of head	21,714	125,925	163,527
Percent of total federally inspected slaughter	18.9	50.4	75.7
Week ending June 22:			
Number of head	14,065	124,721	159,201
Percent of total federally inspected slaughter	14.1	50.1	73.7

Mr. President, there were 7,243,000 steers on farms and ranches in this country on January 1, 1946, compared with only 5,939,000 on January 1, 1941, an increase of 22 percent. From January 1, 1941, to January 1, 1946, official Government data shows, furthermore, that the total number of all beef cattle increased by 20 percent and the total number of all kinds of cattle, including milk cows, increased by 9 percent.

Yet, Mr. President, the cattle slaughter of these 10 companies, who bought every head they could find at compliance prices—and they have the best cattle buyers in the country—decreased in the first 5 months of 1946 by 44 percent compared with the same period in 1941.

Let me emphasize this—they had a 44 percent decrease in their slaughter compared with a 22 percent larger supply of steers and 20 percent more total beef cattle on farms in 1946 than in 1941.

Now, obviously, our total beef supply in these 5 months, with all these cattle on our farms, must have been substantially larger than in 1941. But clearly it has not been slaughtered by those efficient, established operators who would protect the public health, be satisfied with a small profit, and distribute the product equitably wherever it was most needed, as they always did before OPA.

The situation has become so upset that nobody knows how very large our total meat supply really is. Marketing channels are so changed that even the receipts of livestock at our great public markets no longer provide a reliable indication of the marketing of meat animals.

Hogs, cattle, sheep, lamb, and calves are bought in great and increasing volume by the vicious black marketeer or his agent right at the producers' feed lot, pig pen, or pasture gate.

All the evidence points to a large potential and actual supply of meat in the United States. The problem is not: How much? The question is: Where?

We need to keep up a reasonably high level of meat production. It cannot be done under the policies of OPA. If OPA cannot control meat prices, then full production consistent with feed supplies is the only answer to reasonable meat prices.

We have, according to all reports, a record supply of cattle on our farms and ranches. We have untold amounts of grass and roughage to grow these cattle into beef on the hoof. With excellent prospects for another bumper feed-grain crop this year, we should be letting cattle feeders have encouragement to buy these feeders, when they come from the range, and give them an efficient finishing on the small amount of grain it will take, along with large amounts of hay and pasture, so that a year from now we may eat away as finished beef some of our surplus beef-cattle numbers.

There is no prospect for this being accomplished under OPA confusion and uncertainty. All experience is sadly to the contrary.

Producers have reason to be frightened by the subsidy program of OPA. They well know it will be the producers who will stand to lose the inventory value of the subsidy if it is not removed until supply and demand are in balance or overbalanced at ceiling prices. They say, take off the subsidy while the price will absorb it, or very nearly so, as indicated by black-market meat prices, and while we know the consumers have the purchasing power to pay what the large supply of meat we now have is worth in terms of what it cost to produce.

Our livestock producers are unwilling to wait for a depression to see OPA finally agree to take off subsidies on livestock and meat.

Mr. President, I can well understand how livestock producers feel about this crazy scheme where the Government is borrowing money to pay part of the meat bill of consumers, and at the same time crying, "Keep OPA; there is too much consumer-purchasing power." This kind of "business" is more than confusing; it is most disturbing to livestock men who must do business on a sound, long-time basis or sink.

Mr. President, I have eight points to give in conclusion. I am convinced that:

1. We do not have price control on livestock and meat. I think it is a pure fiction and a travesty on the American people.

2. There is no possible chance now, if ever, of having effective price controls on livestock and meat.

3. The morality and health of our Nation are endangered by the black market in meat.

4. There is a tremendous waste of vital foods and raw materials going on in the meat industry as it is today being conducted.

5. There is an ample supply of meat, present and potential, in our country if only its production can be stabilized, its processing done efficiently and economically, and its distribution be handled equitably.

6. People are already paying as much as they are willing to pay for meat which includes the extortion and waste of the black-market profiteer, that might as well be saved for our people.

There is only one remedy to this scandalous situation, and it is up to Congress to take that action.

Mr. President, this remedy is the immediate and final removal of all price controls and subsidies from livestock and meats and all products which are produced in whole or substantial part from livestock or meat.

The black market in livestock and meat has whipped the OPA—the war is over—this Congress as elected representatives of the people must protect these people and we must not permit this great livestock and meat industry to be ruined because of an unrealistic and self-perpetuating bureaucracy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, one more statement and I am through. I am sure the Senators all know that a black market in meat has existed, and has gotten completely out of control. Therefore I urge on Members of the Senate that the report be sent back for further consideration, because at this time I think we should do our level best to do away with black marketing so that the people of our country may again have respect for law, rather than disrespect for law.

I am sure all Senators will agree with me that there is an enormous black market in meat. I am sure the majority leader will agree that the meat situation has gotten completely out of control. Secretary Anderson stated that he was willing to have meat quotas established for a period of 6 weeks, beginning the latter part of April, and if after 6 weeks the situation did not improve, then something else would have to be done, and he stated that that something else was to remove controls from meat.

I say again that we should send the report back if for no other reason than to decontrol meat. That should be done because meat has gotten completely out of control. There is no control over meat. Eighty percent of it is in the black market. The receipts on the legitimate markets are so small that soon we are going to have meat famines throughout the country.

Mr. President, I feel that we should send the report back to conference because I believe that one way to obtain respect for law is to decontrol meat. That is the first thing we ought to do in our campaign to bring about respect for law. If we succeed in obtaining maximum production, by making it possible for the feeders to feed their cattle and for the cattle to flow into the market through the legitimate channels, we shall take a great step forward in obtaining a plentiful supply of meat, and also in obtaining the byproducts which are so necessary in the production of pharmaceuticals needed in hospitals and by individuals and which are not obtainable now because the greater number of cattle are slaughtered in illegitimate operations. Millions of dollars' worth of products are wasted because so large a proportion of the cattle are going into the illegitimate markets.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Has the Senator dealt with the situation which now exists with respect to the shortage of pharmaceuticals resulting from the black-market operations in meat? The shortage of pharmaceuticals is becoming alarming. It is going to be a very critical problem. Hundreds of thousands of individuals are facing death from diabetes and other diseases because they cannot get the insulin and other products which are made from certain byproducts of meat. We have reached an intolerable condition in the United States in that respect. Not only are our citizens hungry for meat which they cannot obtain, but the morale of our people is dangerously affected by the illegal operations that everyone knows are taking place in connection with the meat supply. Moreover hundreds of thousands of our people are actually facing death because of the growing shortage in needed pharmaceuticals, due to black-market operations in meat.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his contribution. The statement which I have had inserted in the RECORD deals also with that situation. Not only do we have a shortage of needed pharmaceuticals, but tremendous waste results from the illegal operations in meat. Animals are being killed in nonfederally inspected plants by black market operators who do not depend upon a subsidy, and are therefore foreclosed from making use of the byproducts of meat which should go into the manufacture of pharmaceutical products. Therefore there is this growing shortage of insulin, adrenalin, and other pharmaceutical products.

Mr. President, I should like to say in conclusion that if we adopt the conference report we give sanction to and condone everything that Chester Bowles has done with respect to meat during the past 4 years. Adoption by the Senate of the conference report would mean that we condone a program which has resulted in 80 percent of the meat going into the black market.

I shall not support the conference report. I shall vote against it. I beseech, I plead with other Senators not to adopt the conference report. If Senators want to reestablish law and order in this country, if they want to establish once again our own American way and our own American traditions, let us send the report back for further study by the conferees. Let us instruct our conferees to insist upon the decontrol of meats, and thus give us a start in the decontrol program. The people of the United States expect us to do that. The administration has failed in its leadership in this respect, and the people are now looking to the Congress of the United States to furnish the leadership. I beseech the Senate not to accept the report.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to a telegram I have received from my own town of Chippewa Falls, Wis., which reads as follows:

> The Peter Fox Sons Co., Chippewa Falls, Wis., contemplate closing packing plant account black market operators paying prices on livestock which prevents sale of dressed carcasses at dressed ceiling prices except at a tremendous loss. We urge the OPA decontrol meat.

That is signed "The Employees of the Peter Fox Sons Co."

I should like to ask the Senator if the way this whole matter is operated does not put out of employment thousands of men in the meat industry who want to make an honest living at honest wages, and, on the other hand, if it is not creating a group of racketeers who are making millions of dollars out of black market operations at the expense of the public?

Mr. WHERRY. That is true.

Mr. WILEY. The result is somewhat analogous to what occurred in prohibition times, when bootleggers campaigned against repealing prohibition. Is it not true that there are now those who are making illegitimate profits who are vitally interested in seeing that OPA is not decontrolled?

Mr. WHERRY. That is true. I want to thank the Senator for bringing that matter to our attention. I dealt with that situation in the statement which I presented for printing in the RECORD.

In 1945 the 10 principal markets killed more than 150,000 head of cattle in the week corresponding to the week just ending. In 1941 the number of cattle killed in the corresponding week was much greater. In the 10 principal markets less than 14,000 head of cattle were slaughtered last week. Last week less than 14,000 head of cattle went through the legitimate channels. That means that thousands and thousands of employees in those markets lost their jobs. Back in 1941 there were 1,425 legitimate packers. How many slaughterers, Mr. President, do you think are operating now? More than 26,000. Their plants are not federally inspected. The serious-minded people of this country know that the meat situation is out of all control, and that the only thing for us to do is to try to get it back in control. So I again plead earnestly with the Senate not to accept the conference report. Let us send it back for further deliberation. The conferees have 3 days in which to deliberate on it. They can bring back a new report and we can vote on it. We in the Senate owe that much to the people of the United States.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. In confirmation of the last statement made by the Senator, I have a telegram from William J. Mason, general manager, Central West Food Stores, Madison, Wis., the capital of my State, in which he says:

> Unless OPA regulations on meats and dairy products are suspended June 30, we will have to resort to black markets for these products.

The manager of that chain of stores now indicates that if they want to supply the consumers, they have to become law violators and have to resort to the black marketeers.

I have another telegram from the Wisconsin Retail Food Dealers Association, Arthur E. Gesch, secretary, which reads as follows:

> Unless all price control on meats and dairy products is removed immediately every dealer will be forced to buy on black market to provide consumers with meat.

It appears that if the meat dealers are to continue operations, they have to become violators of the law; they have to join up with the racketeers who violate the law.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. That means that the legitimate merchant then must join the hordes of the law violators.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; that is true. If they are to supply their customers, under conditions now existing, they must become violators of the law. On that point let me call attention to the fact that the black marketeers do business in cash. They do not pay any taxes to the United States Government. They are free from that necessity. Everything is done sub rosa. Therefore, we are not only losing the tax money which the racketeers should pay but we also lose what we would get from legitimate business if it could operate profitably.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I want to add to the testimony already submitted the fact that the Morrell Packing Co., the largest packing company in South Dakota, closed its doors today because it was not able to obtain meat.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to bring out a point to reinforce what the Senator from Nebraska is saying. Last Saturday I made it my business to talk with 10 workingmen. I asked them this question: "Which would you rather have, a price ceiling of 50 cents a pound on meat when you could not get the meat and had to go into the black market and pay a dollar and a quarter a pound for a very poor grade of meat, or the removal of price control so that you could get meat by paying 25 or 30 cents a pound more for it, knowing that you could get it honestly, that you could go through the front door as an honest man and come out as an honest man, and that the merchant was maintaining his self-respect? Which would you rather have?"

These were not rich men. They were men who worked in overalls. Every one of them said the same thing, "We would rather know where we can get meat honestly and pay the necessary price than do what we are doing."

Let me say one further thing. There was not one of those 10 fine, honest American workingmen who did not admit to me that he was buying in the black market in order to obtain the food which was needed for his table. They are buying butter, meat, and other things in the black market.

To me it is pathetic when fine American citizens must admit that they are violating the law. Life is dearer than the law. Senators may not think it is, but when it comes to the choice between getting the things which one's family must have to eat in order to live, or obeying a law in which he does not believe, I think that the choice of 95 percent of the people of the United States would be to take care of living.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator.

THE STATE OF WORLD AFFAIRS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I beg leave to make some frank observations on the state of world affairs today and the challenge it presents to American idealism, American national self-interest, and American common sense.

I speak in full awareness that our spokesmen, along with those of Great Britain, Soviet Russia, and France, are now meeting in Paris. They are engaged in another of a series of desperate efforts to solve complex and tragic problems affecting directly the destiny of 400,000,000 Europeans and indirectly the fate of all humankind.

No one with a conscience and a sense of responsibility would wish in any way to prejudice the negotiations. So long as there is a marginal chance of ending the stalemate and opening the road to a just and wholesome settlement, it must be encouraged and supported. If it all ends in failure, let there be no doubt that it was not for lack of trying on our part.

I submit, however, that neither silence nor diplomatic double-talk constitutes support of the effort now under way in Paris. On the contrary, it will be misunderstood in some quarters as indifference—or worse, as a willingness to countenance unprincipled compromises. Our silence can only fortify the position of those who, for reasons of their own, prefer to prolong the uncertainties and confusions of this period.

We need more candid and more vigorous statement of American viewpoints and feelings and resentments at this juncture, in the press, on the radio, and on the floor of this Congress. Of that I am thoroughly convinced. There should be no room for doubt abroad about our opinions and our preferences. The American negotiators, being human, are under constant pressure and temptation to make new appeasements, to yield to new tactics of postponement or evasion. Their hand should be strengthened by unmistakable expressions of public sentiment at home.

We must help the statesmen in Paris, and especially their superiors in the home capitals, to grasp the fact that the long cycle of face-saving expedients and one-sided concessions is over. They must be helped to understand that all Americans, whatever their politics or their differences on domestic issues, are united in the determination to achieve an enduring peace firmly grounded on law, order, justice, to small as well as large nations.

The hour is much too late for tact and circumlocution. To the ordinary people of all countries the fine sentiments and clear promises embodied in documents like the Atlantic Charter and the first Moscow declaration, reaffirmed in meeting after meeting of the top Allied leaders, are not scraps of paper. The men and women who did the fighting and made the sacrifices for victory accepted them in good faith at face value, and looked to the victors to redeem them. The sophisticated cynicism of political supermen is below their comprehension. Those documents were sacred covenants with millions who gave their lives or risked their lives in the fervor of those sentiments, to make good those promises. None of the secret agreements made or anything said in Teheran or Yalta or Potsdam could alter this fact.

It is my belief that had the American people and the democratic peoples elsewhere been taken more generously into confidence by their wartime leaders, some of the toughest problems now confronting the Paris negotiators would not have arisen at all. It calls for no exceptional political insight to recognize that the four foreign ministers are wrestling with the unhappy consequences of shabby bargains entered into in secrecy—bargains that could not have been consummated in the light of day. In my own view, it was at bottom the fear of popular disapproval, a troubled conscience about the unholy bargains, that was the real reason for excessive secrecy on a long array of decisions.

Today an alert and enlightened American public opinion is the best guarantee that there shall be no more such cynical compromises—no more face-saving formulas to camouflage surrenders to pressure. Idealism aside, the experience of these years has amply demonstrated that a bad settlement is worse than no settlement; that compromise on principle, far from solving problems, creates new problems. Unless I am seriously mistaken, the American people want an end to underwriting injustice, even where we cannot prevent injustice.

We all pray that the contradictions among the great victorious nations will be resolved and that a modus vivendi can be found. But we could not face the God to whom the prayers are directed if the solutions were based on the enslavement of weaker nations, the bankruptcy of democratic aspirations, the perpetuation of chaos and suffering in large segments of this globe.

The alternative to a settlement subscribed to by all the Great Powers is a world permanently cut into two self-contained and hostile compartments. Admittedly it is a terrifying prospect. No one wants it. No one in his senses would deliberately plan it. I count myself among those who seek a basis for sensible understanding between the Western democracies and Russia.

But there is a price in self-respect and human freedom too big to be paid even for such an understanding. Unpleasant as the prospect of a dual world may be, we must not permit it to terrify us into abandoning our democratic heritage and betraying the obligations of our material strength and our moral leadership. We must not accept the counsels of despair.

The time has come—indeed, it is long overdue—to insist on peace. Not any peace, but a peace with honor, a peace that is not an uneasy prelude to another war. The time has come to insist on the development and implementation of machinery for heading off aggression and defending the hard-won victory. The reluctance of any one nation to cooperate, whatever its size or its motives, cannot indefinitely be allowed to block the process.

Agreement among all nations is desirable. We have spared no efforts to attain it. The next best hope is agreement among the great majority of nations, provided the doors are left wide open for all others to join when they see fit.

I believe that I echo the basic American sentiment in urging that peace settlements be made with all enemy and satellite nations by all those willing to do so, once it becomes clear that a unanimous settlement is impossible. A genuine peace conference of all countries which fought and won the war against the Axis can no longer be delayed.

I am no less certain that I speak for the vast majority of Americans in urging that Europe, and therefore the world, be given the opportunity to restore its economy and rebuild its ancient civilization. Policies of sheer vengeance or greed must make way, wherever possible, for the dictates of humanity and of economic sense. Exploitation by armies of occupation must be branded as vandalism and outlawed.

A writer in the current issue of the magazine Nation's Business complains that in the general reconversion from war to peace one vital item has been overlooked. He recommends that in dealing with foreign affairs we reconvert to truth. Whatever justification there may have been for distorting the facts and evading unpleasant realities during the war, it can no longer hold good. The fear that we might give aid and comfort to the enemy by telling some embarrassing truths no longer applies.

I second the recommendation. Let us muster the boldness to admit that one of the great powers—Soviet Russia—seems to have a vested interest in prolonging the disorder, the confusion, the economic catastrophe, the demoralization of Europe. Apparently it seeks time to consolidate its unilateral seizures of territory and its political impositions on neighboring countries before submitting its actions and claims to the arbitrage of a genuine peace conference.

Yet, let us reconvert to truth. Then we shall no longer be squeamish about acknowledging that one political party and doctrine—communism—prospers on chaos and mass suffering, and consequently has a vested interest in delaying firm peace settlements.

The western democracies have no alternative but to repudiate such purposes and such methods. Unless the whole world is to relapse into a grab-as-grab-can barbarism, there must be a return to principle and decency and humaneness. We must revive confidence in the pledged word of governments. We must find the moral stamina to recognize and admit our own share of responsibility for the

fact that half of Europe, in the hour of its liberation, lives under regimes imposed by foreign bayonets and kept in power by millions of occupation troops quartered on the countries involved.

Unless Europe, from the Soviet frontiers to the English Channel, is given the opportunity to restore its basic economy, to determine its own forms of government, to normalize life in general, it will remain an ugly open sore. The rest of the world will be in mortal danger of infection. The wounds of that tortured continent must be healed, and the establishment of a durable pattern of peace is the first and indispensable step.

Except for stringent limitations on war industries in the former Axis areas, industry and agriculture must be restored. There must be jobs and goods. There must be exports and imports. The channels of trade and commerce must be opened wide. Arbitrary barriers to navigation of international rivers must be removed. Hindrances to rail and air transport must be eliminated. The terrible economic burden represented by millions of foreign troops living off famished nations must be sharply reduced immediately, and a date must be set for their total evacuation.

Until these things are done, there can be no chance for true European recovery. Until these things are done, the continent will remain a drain on the resources of other nations, and of the United States in particular. Until these things are done, the gifts and the loans we provide will continue to be poured into a bottomless pit.

I am under no illusions that such a restoration of normal or near-normal life can be achieved in full without the consent and collaboration of Russia. It seems to me, however, that the ambitions or obsessions or stubbornness of one nation cannot be made the pretext for indefinite delay. We dare not turn a populous and potentially self-sustaining continent into a demoralized slum for the exploitation of political adventurers. After our experience with Hitlerism we know too intimately the risks to our civilization involved in social break-down in Europe. Another failure of the great powers to agree will leave the majority of them no alternative but to take any and all steps possible to stabilize life on that continent, to extend the area of peace, and to improve the machinery for the prevention of new wars.

Whatever we do, we shall of course be accused by the Moscow Pravda and Communists all over the world—including the Communist fifth column in our own country—of "imperialism." A noisy campaign of vituperation on this score has, in fact, been under way for months. The magnitude of the calumny and its bitterness could hardly be stepped up any further, no matter what we do or fail to do.

American imperialism! What a bizarre charge, coming from the partisans of the nation that since September 1939 has annexed territories with a population of 24,000,000 and has imposed its political domination, in varying degrees, on at least 12 nations with a total population of 165,000,000; coming from the partisans of a nation which has about completed the political conquest of Iran, is conducting a war of nerves in the Near and Middle East, and is enforcing its will on large areas of China.

We Americans know the absurdity of the Communist charge. We know that our national instinct, product of generations of isolation from world affairs, is to withdraw, rather than to extend our external lines of power and influence. Unfortunately, a large part of our population is still far from the realization that the epoch of natural isolation is ended, that whether we like it or not we must shoulder the responsibilities and the risks of leadership in a shrunken world. The Communist outcries against American imperialism, I must say, sound to me suspiciously like the "Stop thief!" shouts in the familiar story.

Only political illiterates ignore the extent and the effectiveness of the world-wide network of Communist fifth columns. If we are serious about reconverting to truth, we cannot overlook the obvious fact that the network is controlled from one center. The unanimity and alacrity with which anti-American and anti-British slogans of abuse launched in Moscow are grabbed up and barked forth by Communists and their fellow travelers on all continents and in all countries can hardly be accidental. Whether the Communist International has or has not been dissolved is an academic question. In practical fact, it is functioning in more strikingly disciplined fashion than ever before.

Mr. Herbert Hoover, whose stature as a great moral force in the world grows with every day of his distinguished career, found the Communist pressures everywhere he went in Latin America. There is ample evidence from other sources that the network is being extended and fortified in the Western Hemisphere. South of the Rio Grande the Communist propaganda has resumed the violently anti-Yanqui line which it peddled there until the day when Hitler attacked the Soviet Union.

Now that Latin-American Communists are no longer obliged to devote themselves to lambasting fascism in Argentina, the energy thus released is being diverted to intensified attacks on "Yanqui imperialism." Our supposed collaboration with Argentina, it will be recalled, was one of the important counts in the indictment of our alleged imperialism. Have we forgotten the magnificent grandstand play made by Mr. Molotov in San Francisco in opposing the admission of Argentina into the United Nations?

The rapprochement of Soviet Russia and the country it had so long and so vigorously attacked came with a demonstrative show of friendship. One is tempted to remark that this is not the first time the Kremlin has found it easier to make agreements with totalitarian countries than with the democracies. Who knows how soon the current Communist shouting about Spain will seem, in retrospect, as cynical and as meaningless as the recent shouting about Argentina?

The significance of the new and strange Russo-Argentine friendship, I trust, will not be lost on American policy makers. It should convince them, if they still need convincing, that in the pursuit of its own objectives Moscow is never hampered by principles or prior commitments or even ideological consistency. It follows the law of the main chance. This is a fact so important in the international equation today that our own policies and our understanding of the world picture must take account of it.

We dare not permit ourselves to be diverted from a firm democratic peace policy by the shenanigans of those who, knowingly or otherwise, take their intellectual marching orders from the Kremlin. Their doctrine of unrelieved expediency, to which they refer proudly as "realism," justifies any turn and twist and back-tracking that seems opportune.

We have learned to recognize this brand of realism, and we do not wish to be further contaminated by it. The contamination unfortunately went too deep for our national taste during the war years. Many of us held our criticism of it down to a minimum in deference to the life-and-death struggle in which we were engaged. Even when we were impelled to speak out in protest, we rarely gave full vent to our feelings. Today, there is no reason for concealing our knowledge that this realism worked havoc with American prestige, American influence, and American interests.

It was in the name of realism—the fashionable label for old-style expediency and opportunism—that we sold Poland down the river. It was under the shabby banner of this realism that we gave away Chinese territory and Chinese rights without so much as consulting China, that we turned Yugoslavia over to a totalitarian dictator, and denied nearly half of Europe the chance for self-government we had explicitly promised.

That realism has boomeranged. The one excuse for unabridged power politics—the excuse that "it works"—has been disproved more quickly than those of us who opposed it had thought possible. The master-mind realism of those who sneer at principle, who insist that the end justified any means, who believe that might makes right, has failed even in terms of expediency. The fact is that scandalous concessions of other people's freedom and sovereignty have not brought the peace for which they were presumably the pay-off. On the contrary, every compromise of principle, every betrayal of friendly countries and democratic leaders, every exercise in appeasement, has merely produced new dangers, greater than those it was supposed to eliminate.

No American interested in the well-being of his own country and conscious that we live in a narrow and integrated world can view the current international scene with complacency. Nothing in human life stands still. If the disastrous situation is not improved it must deteriorate, and the last chance to head off an over-all catastrophe may be lost. To do nothing, to postpone and procrastinate, is to play into the hands of those who have a stake in chaos.

Let us make it perfectly clear to ourselves and to the world that we do not propose to lose the peace by default. There is no reason in common sense why we should continue to play from weakness in the hour of our greatest strength. Patience is a virtue that turns mischievous if it is overdone.

The outside world should not be fooled by the tensions in the United States. The strikes and political passions do not mean, as some Moscow commentators seem to think, that our country is in the throes of civil collapse. Neither should the outside world be misled by the noisy doings of our fifth columns. It was thus that Hitler's Germany and the Mikado's Japan misjudged us. They learned to their sorrow that American squabbling is a surface phenomenon, for we are unified and profoundly patriotic at heart. In any future crisis, as in every past crisis, the one certainty is that these United States would instantly be galvanized into magnificent unity of purpose. Should the test ever come, the Communist borers from within will prove that they are about as futile as the German-American Bund.

The civilized world must get on with the job of making peace, restoring order and safeguarding the peace after it is made. America, as the great repository of faith in democracy and freedom, cannot and will not shirk its responsibility of leadership in this urgent task.

We have paid heavily in American blood and substance to prevent a few dynamic nations from imposing their will on the whole world. We have no more love for that sort of domination now than we had before. We are determined to avoid a Third World War, and we have learned the hard way that the time to prevent it is before it has started.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, as the end of the fiscal year draws near I should like to consume a few minutes of the time of the Senate in discussing a matter which is closely concerned with the welfare of the country. It should be of some concern to the administration and to the Congress.

There is no more important problem before the country today than that of putting the Federal fiscal house in order. We have been preoccupied with price ceilings and the activities of OPA as the means of preventing inflationary price rises. Too little emphasis has been given to the fact that the fundamental source of this pressure is found in the unbalanced Budget. For 16 years the country has lived beyond its income. During that time, recourse to borrowing from commercial banks to meet the annual deficits has resulted in an increase in bank deposits from $27,000,000,000 in 1939 to more than $69,000,000,000 at this time.

Over the same period, money in circulation has increased almost $20,000,000,000. Unless a real effort is soon made to prevent further accumulation of inflationary bank credit, the price control program will prove abortive, and a larger and larger proportion of available supplies will be diverted from normal market channels. If we are determined to control postwar inflation, the attack must begin with the Federal Budget.

On January 21, 1946, the President of the United States sent to the Congress a combined message on the State of the Union and on the budgetary requirements of the Nation for the coming fiscal year. The opening paragraph of that message greatly impressed me. It sent my hopes soaring for an organized financial policy in government. It reads:

> A quarter century ago the Congress decided that it could no longer consider the financial programs of the various departments on a piecemeal basis. Instead it has called on the President to present a comprehensive Executive Budget. The Congress has shown its satisfaction with that method by extending the Budget system and tightening its controls. The bigger and more complex the Federal program, the more necessary it is for the Chief Executive to submit a single budget for action by the Congress.

Further, in the third paragraph, the President said:

> All the programs I have recommended for action are included in the Budget figures.

This was indeed stimulating. For 3 years I have been privileged to sit in this body, for 3 years I have seen Budget messages come to Congress, and for 3 years I have come to learn that those messages contained only a part of the planned expenditures of the administrative branch of our Government. Consistently the Chief Executive would, after sending the Budget message, send program after program to Congress which had never been mentioned specifically in the Budget. Of course, the past 3 years were war years and money was no object in gaining our war ends. There had to be consideration for emergency situations—true emergencies which could not be foreseen. But programs beyond that classification are the ones about which I am talking. Under such a system as we followed it would seem impossible to put or keep the budget in balance.

However, the war is now over.

The President stated that he had submitted a "comprehensive Executive Budget," including all the programs he had recommended for action. For all intents and purposes a balanced budget was in sight. At least, we would know what our financial program was going to be this year. Let us examine that statement in relation to the budget itself.

I have taken care to look over the nearly 1,000-page book called "The Budget of the United States Government for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1947." In this volume I found, quite detailed, the operations and costs of the various established Government agencies, departments, and bureaus. Then I turned to the President's message of January 21—a part of this great book. I found listed some 21 new recommendations for legislative action. Most of those recommendations, if enacted into law, would require money. For example, the full-employment bill, or "employment bill," as it is now termed, would require funds for establishing work projects should private industry be unable to absorb all labor that was able and willing to work. To supplement unemployment insurance benefits increased funds would be required. Others of the 21 recommendations in the same category are the adoption of a health and medical care program, universal training, increased Government pay, increased unemployment allowances for veterans, extension of crop insurance, Federal airport legislation, Federal aid for housing, and development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin. All those recommendations, if enacted into law, would admittedly require money to make them effective.

Returning to the President's opening statement in his recent speech, I quote:

> For these reasons, I have chosen to combine the customary message of the State of the Union with the annual Budget message, and to include in the Budget not only estimates for functions authorized by the Congress, but also for those which I recommend for its action.

Mr. President, what estimates are submitted for each of those programs? In the Budget Résumé I find listed under the heading "Budget expenditures" the item "Expenditures based on proposed legislation (excluding international finance), $1,500,000,000."

I searched the pages of the Budget in an attempt to ascertain just how this $1,500,000,000 was divided among the programs proposed by the President. My search proved futile. Nowhere could I find a break-down of this sum. Nowhere in the Budget could any other taxpayer find the President's estimate of what extended unemployment benefits, or any of the other proposed programs, would cost the people.

Obviously, the President did not contemplate the expenditure of all that amount on one of the new programs. Yet, on the other hand, it seems hardly likely that such a sum would cover the expense of them all, should they be adopted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUCK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. The figures submitted in the President's January Budget estimate totaled approximately $36,000,000,000, including the $3,000,000,000 of indefinite expense which he said might be recommended.

Mr. BUCK. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. According to the figures which I have before me today, if we consider all the bills which have been passed by one House or the other, and exclude social welfare measures, the health bill, or bills of that kind, the total expenditures will be approximately $46,000,000,000 instead of $36,000,000,000. Those figures are somewhat uncertain, but, during the course of a few days, I hope to present a more accurate estimate. It is apparent that the total expenditures of the Government during the next fiscal year will increase to nearly $10,000,000,000 more than was estimated by the President. That may be a somewhat high figure, and is subject to check. But certainly the Senator's point is very strongly made that we have

no estimate today of what the expenditures of the next fiscal year will aggregate.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the Senator for his observation. Following what the distinguished Senator from Ohio has said, how is a Member of the Senate, or any congressional committee, to determine how that money was to be appropriated and for what purposes? How is anyone going to evaluate potential benefit from such a program as against the cost?

With apologies for a personal reference, I wish to say that as Governor of my State for 8 years I never sent a budget message to the legislature without including a specific estimate for every new expenditure I proposed, and it is my belief that the governors of nearly all the other States follow the same practice. In that way the people know what their State administration has in mind for them and what such a program will cost. They then can weigh the cost against the benefits and accordingly advise their representatives of their feelings toward such legislation.

Going back to the President's message, after covering estimates for regular Government departments and agencies, the President sums up with a statement, heartening on its face and good reading in newspaper headlines, that expenditures will only exceed income by $4,300,000,000. Not only that, but that the public debt will be reduced from $278,000,000,000 to $271,000,000,000.

But it is not emphasized that that debt reduction is occasioned by merely using cash funds already in the Treasury. By that method no real accomplishment can be claimed. As the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has ably put it, "It is like drawing on one's savings account to meet an overdraft on the checking account."

In spite of the administration's efforts to sell the people and Congress on a synthetic budget, the Budget must soon be brought into balance. The economic structure of this country will be wrecked if this is not accomplished.

The simple rules governing family budgets should be applied to the Federal Budget. No family can borrow itself prosperous, spend itself rich, buy and build things not needed, and become thrifty and wealthy, nor can any government.

To achieve a balanced budget, Congress must take the lead, and I would like to suggest some steps which I believe will, if followed, reach toward that ultimate goal.

First. Every wartime agency should be placed in the process of liquidation and terminated at a definite date. There can be no justification for a creature of war in the household of peace. This does not mean a transfer of a wartime agency into a regular, established Government agency for liquidation. I have seen that subterfuge adopted before. When it has happened, not only does the function of the agency continue under a new guise, but many, if not all, employees are retained, and in some instances others are added. Merely cutting appropriations for such agencies will not suffice, while the President has his war powers, enabling him to transfer them at will to another fount of money. Congress must specifically legislate them out of existence, along with their duties and functions.

Second. Congress should require a complete and specific Budget from the Executive each year. If the President wishes to institute a new social or economic program, there should be included in his sales talk a dollars-and-cents estimated cost. I would go further and say that he ought to indicate sources of revenue to cover this increased expense. This would eliminate the type of budget Congress recently received and give something to work with.

Third. The practice of piecemeal appropriations should be abolished. Congress never has a complete picture of appropriations under the present system. We pass appropriation after appropriation without knowing, or apparently caring, if revenues will support them or if the money will have to be borrowed to pay the bill. Duplication of appropriations and excessive spending result. In this connection, I was interested to note a statement of the Honorable Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General. He said:

> There are 29 Government agencies lending United States funds, 3 insuring deposits, 34 buying land, 16 in wildlife preservation, 10 in Federal construction, 12 in home and community planning, 10 in materials and construction, 28 in welfare matters, 14 in forestry matters, 9 in credit and finance, 4 in bank examination, and 65 gathering statistics.

I am satisfied that in large part such duplication results from lack of over-all consideration of the appropriation picture. It must be impossible even for the able members of the appropriations committee to remember details of departmental appropriations in going from one to the other, as they do now. Only after all appropriation bills are passed does Congress have an opportunity to compare the appropriations of one department with all the others. Then it is too late to correct duplications and errors.

Fourth. The appropriations of regular Government agencies must be scrutinized with microscopic care. It is interesting to note that since 1941 practically every regular department of Government has been increased year by year, and the President's Budget for 1947 asks for increases in many over 1946. Can it be that Government agencies need more money and personnel each year to do the same job they did the year before? Or is Congress being unwittingly sold a bill of goods for departmental expansion of activities, by the appropriation method? With the war over, and everyone expecting a cut in Government personnel, the last report of the Byrd committee is startling. It shows a personnel increase in peacetime agencies in January 1946 over December 1945, of 34,569.

Fifth. The Comptroller General should be given a staff of a size and competence to present an audit to Congress each year of each department. This should be in the hands of Congress before the appropriations for those departments are passed. In this connection, Congress should insist that the Government departments account for the authorized expenditure of their funds before additional funds for the continued activity of the angencies are voted.

The Comptroller General is the agent of the Congress, whose duty it is to check the expenditures of Government funds and tell the Congress of any discrepancies. Because of a meager staff, his reports come late, and when they do come, Congress has been loath to do anything about them.

Mr. President, as an outstanding example of unaccountability in the bookkeeping of Government agencies, I call attention to an audit report of the War Shipping Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943. It appears in toto on page 282, and following, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 23, 1946. In this report, one item entitled "Supplies and equipment, Training Division" for $10,071,152.51 is totally unaccounted for by the Administration. The Comptroller General could find no records to substantiate it. This is what he says:

> The item of "Supplies and equipment, Training Division," $10,071,152.51, included in the Administration's balance sheet under the general caption of "Stores, equipment, and automobiles," was not reflected in the books of the Administration at June 30, 1943, but was brought into the balance sheet by year-end adjusting entry. Of the total valuation in the balance sheet, an amount of $2,000,000 was reflected in the accounts as having been received from the United States Coast Guard without transfer of funds, and the remainder, $8,071,152.51, was estimated as having been expended by the Administration in the first year 1943 (first recorded in the accounts as expense). No inventory records were made available for examination during the course of the audit, nor was information furnished as to the whereabouts of the records, if any. The available information indicates that the inventories were classified as follows:

Equipment, nonexpendable	$4,722,887.39
Supplies, expendable	684,767.46
Clothing	4,229,278.00
Provisions	434,219.66
Total	10,071,152.51

Generalizations, such as "Equipment," "Supplies," "Clothing," and "Provisions," without any itemized statements, serve only an attempt to balance the books. How does the Comptroller General, or Congress, know if these funds were spent properly? The Comptroller General repeatedly asked for an explanation, but it is not known that he ever obtained an answer.

And what did Congress do about it? It did nothing. The Maritime Commission got its appropriations since 1943, and probably wil get them this year, with no questions asked about this item. Such practices can never balance the Budget.

Sixth. The system of deficiency appropriations should be abolished. When a Government agency is given a sum of money with which to do a job, the job should be budgeted to not exceed money available. Under our present system, it

seems that an annual appropriation to most departments is an installment or part payment of their yearly allowance, and if they want it, they can later get almost any other amount they ask for. Heretofore Congress has willingly obliged. How can we hope for a balanced budget with such a system?

Department heads have said that Congress often authorizes a program and then does not provide adequate funds to carry it out. Thus there are requests for deficiency appropriations. That is the fault of Congress. It must closely analyze the work it expects a Government agency to do, and appropriate funds accordingly. But once a program is adopted and an appropriation is made, the program should be carried out within the limits of that appropriation.

Every State operates on that principle. I know many say the Federal Government cannot operate as a State, but I have yet to hear a valid reason excusing a Federal agency from staying within its appropriations under normal conditions.

Seventh. I heartily commend the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] for his introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 8. This resolution proposes a constitutional amendment to limit appropriations in each fiscal year to not more than the estimated income. It is my sincere hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee will act on this measure at an early date. In the long run it may be far more important than any appropriation bill now pending.

Eighth. As of June 30, Congress should "freeze" some part of the cash balance then in the National Treasury and make it an unexpendable balance until such time as the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House have had an opportunity to consider and report what disposition should be made of it. The present balance is said to be in the neighborhood of $14,000,000,000.

I have read with great interest article IV, "Strengthening Fiscal Control," contained in the report of the able Committee on the Reorganization of Congress, and commend it as a praiseworthy contribution to those in the Congress who are interested in securing a balanced budget.

The balancing of the Budget of the United States is one of the most important and fundamental steps Congress needs to take if we are to have economic security in this country. Rich as we are in natural resources, scientific brains, and manpower, we cannot continue as a prosperous Nation if deficit financing continues. With every artificial dollar of Government credit we inject into our economic system, we lower the relative value of every dollar already there. Hard-earned dollars invested in insurance policies and savings accounts will become lower in value and purchasing power as this program continues, until they become worthless. All of the OPA's ever conceived will not prevent such a situation if the financial structure of the Government is not soon put in balance.

Already we have indications of such a reaction to our inflated credit base. Servicemen returning to reenter civilian jobs find that the old salary before the war does not provide a living. We are paying excessive prices for shoddy goods—higher prices than we paid for better quality a few years ago. For this condition certain Government administrators blame the profit motive and stubbornness on the part of producers; but the primary difficulty is too much money and credit, resulting in those basic factors becoming cheap and valueless.

There are some who consider balancing the budget uneconomic and even reactionary since we theoretically are not in debt to anyone but ourselves. They point with horror to the so-called Hoover days of depression when we had surpluses of goods, because people did not have the money to buy them. On this basis, they advocate increased extension of Government credit through subsidies, higher and higher wages, less and less work, increased Federal aid, and worry little about paying for it.

To them, I issue this warning or prophecy, be it what it may. A continuation of present financial and resulting economic unbalance, will make the days of the depression of the early thirties look like a golden spring day. Yes; people will have money which they did not have in those former dark days. Their pockets may be overflowing with it. But, it will buy them but a pittance of what it is buying now. Bad as the depression of deflation was, I see a much darker picture in a depression of inflation.

Without currency, but with money backed by the Government, a people may suffer severely, and still retain faith in their democratic principles. But, with an over abundance of such Government money and currency, which will buy little or nothing, not only the individual's bodily needs and desires suffer, but so does his faith in his Nation's Government.

As the only strong bulwark of democracy in the world today, we cannot sacrifice it on the altar of unsound Government fiscal policy, for the generations of the future.

With the utmost sincerity I urge Congress to grasp firmly the purse strings of the Treasury, and make certain this year that no more money is taken from that till than is put into it. We, in the Senate, have been more prone to spend, than those of the other House of Congress. In recent years we have increased almost every appropriation that has been sent over from that body. Let us mend our record, get back to economical, common-sense policies when handling public funds, and so limit congressional appropriations as to live within the Federal income. There is no more valuable service Congress can render the people of America.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, today the economy of the country is at the point of collapse. Bread lines are forming, meat and butter have disappeared. Low-priced clothing is a thing of the past. The people are in a jittery state of mind and no one can foresee what may happen in 30 days if relief is not secured.

This at a time when the bank deposits and savings are at an all-time high, when normal wages for those who are employed are at a new high level.

Sixteen years ago we were in the throes of a depression when there was a surplus of goods, but no money with which to buy them. Now we are in an even more serious predicament with a shortage of goods, but an abundance of money.

What is the reason for this anomalous and ridiculous situation?

It is the result which the founders of this Government predicted if certain things came to pass. And what they warned us against, was that we should never let the Government attempt to plan and manage for the people the things the people should do for themselves.

In three letters, the cause of our predicament is OPA. Here we have an institution staffed on many levels with people who have sought Government employment because they had failed to make a living in private effort. At best it is staffed by people without business experience who attempt to tell men of long experience how to run their business.

These people are obsessed with the idea that they can circumvent the natural and basic laws of economics by Government fiat. They are shooting at the moon, but are successful only in hurting the people on the ground.

Our present-day economic system is, at least it was until the planners took over, an intricate machine developed out centuries of human needs, human passions, human desires. It had through the centuries developed into a fairly smooth-running machine, with occasional jolts until these planners took over and began tampering with the gears. They changed the gear ratios and the strains here and there and everywhere, until the economic machine began to vibrate, to shimmy, to run hot in the bearings, and is now on the point of stalling completely. It will not function properly again until we get the heavy hand of the manipulators out of this economic system, and let the normal pressures of production and distribution apply themselves.

Mr. President, the OPA is poison in our American system. Twelve or 15 years ago we tried a similar control in the NRA. The Supreme Court said that venture was not within the Constitution. Neither would the present system be tolerated except under the operation of wartime powers. That pretext is now a falsehood. The war is over so far as peacetime economy is concerned. Recovery of business will not be accomplished until this wartime restriction against production of peacetime goods is removed.

I have here more than a hundred telegrams received today urging that we reject the extension of controls over the production of meat and other essentials of daily living. If we permit the extension of these controls then there will be scarcities for weeks to come.

I shall read only three or four of these telegrams so Senators may be given the views expressed by those who sent them to me. The first is from Wheatland, Ind., as follows:

Price-control bill must not go through as written. Kill some way. Filibuster. View of 98 percent customers.

WHEATLAND MERCHANTS COMMITTEE.

Here is a telegram from Evansville, Ind.:

Do not approve OPA bill without Wherry amendment.

ALBERT C. GRIMM PLANING MILL.

I read one from Gary, Ind., as follows:

Refuse conference report and vote Wherry amendment back into OPA bill.

GARY LUMBER CO.

Another from Butler, Ind.:

OPA should die June 30. Present compromise is as unworkable as present law. No consideration has been given small business by compromise and none has ever been given by present set-up. Please vote against this.

FUR PRODUCTS CO.

I read a telegram from South Bend, Ind.:

Vote to remove price control from beef at least, which will kill the black market on all meat and possibly both.

A. J. BAUMBACH.

I read another telegram from Anderson, Ind., as follows:

We earnestly request that you do not approve OPA without inclusion of Wherry amendment.

F. C. CLINE LUMBER CO.

Another telegram from Fort Wayne, Ind.:

Fort Wayne food merchants ask that meat and dairy products be removed from price control. If not done they will be compelled to enter black market to supply their trade. Being honest dealers they do not want to do this.

JOHN E. WILSON,
Secretary, Fort Wayne Food Council.

And one from Hammond, Ind.:

Unless OPA controls on all meat and dairy products are removed all legitimate retail grocery stores will be forced into the black market or go out of business if the instituted controls exist. Please do everything in your power to let us operate legitimately.

W. A. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. President, the telegrams I have read cover quite well the sentiment of the senders of the nearly 150 telegrams which have come to me from the State of Indiana, and manifest the uneasiness and concern which is in the minds of the people, consumers, retailers and producers alike.

Mr. President, we will have to go through the same struggle again when we are convinced control must be removed, whether it be 6 months from now or a year from now. Now let us forget about the political effect of this action and do what is best for American economy, American business, and the American people, and that will be to get this un-American influence out of our free economy. America will remain sick until this is done—the patient may die.

The principal objection which is raised to removal of these controls is that such action will promote inflation. The factors which cause inflation have already been enacted. They are the issuance of huge amounts of currency, bonds, and banking credits; the enormous expenditures of Government far beyond our income, which will bankrupt any individual or business; the increase in Government pay rolls; the encouragement by the Government of heavy wage increases. And all the time the OPA is telling us that they are going to hold down inflation. If they believe they can do it in that way, they are too childish in their thinking successfully to operate any business, and should be fired.

We have within the past few weeks recklessly appropriated for everything from school lunches to millions for carrying on a fantastic fourth of July demonstration of the atomic bomb at Bikini; we have made appropriations for about everything the spending boys want to put out, without any knowledge of what the total amount will be, or when or where we will get the money. We have not shown any real constructive desire to stop inflation. Now it is proposed to extend the life of an agency to which we will commit the duty of holding back the irresistible pressures of human selfishness and human desires. We should, to be consistent, amend the bill to control the tides or the washing of the waves. How futilely vain are a pleasure-seeking people!

The best way to reduce inflation is to promote production and distribution. OPA has not done that, there is no hope that it will do it, there is no argument reason can bring to us that will convince us it can do that. Therefore, let us vote for the welfare of the American people today, return this bill to conference with instruction to remove controls from needed goods now found only in black markets at exorbitant prices. Let us get going on the way to recovery.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to take only a few moments to make one or two statements about the pending OPA bill. First, however, with regard to the criticism of the personnel of OPA, let me say that during the war I found a great many competent persons who had accepted employment in that agency. I have always considered that it required a great deal of patriotism to work for OPA, because it is a most unhappy place to work. I have always felt that it would be one of the last places I would work, and it would require a great degree of concern for the public welfare to accept employment in that agency. I must say that I think the personnel of that agency has been unduly criticized.

Furthermore, I believe that they did a good job during the war. But the principal point I wish to make in my remarks is that it has seemed to me quite doubtful that a price-control law by itself can control prices under present, or perhaps any, circumstances. Whether or not this particular bill is all that it should be—which I doubt—is somewhat beside the question. I believe that during the war the control of prices was effective only partially because of the OPA itself. I believe—as I stated last fall—that the wage controls under the War Labor Board and the excess-profits tax were equally important in the problem of trying to maintain a reasonable price level until such time as production could meet the demand.

Simply for the purposes of the record, I wish to read a very few statements from the speech which I made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD volume 91, part 8, page 10093, regarding the repeal of the excess-profits tax. I desire to quote from that speech because I do not wish to be accused of using hindsight rather than foresight. At that time, long before the strikes got under way, and long before the really serious dislocation between prices and costs arose, I had this to say:

Mr. President, the main reasons for high wartime taxes, including the excess-profits tax, were, first, to hold down the deficit and the need for borrowing particularly from the banking system; second, to reduce inflationary pressures at a time of greatly excessive demands for goods and services relative to supply; and, third, to curb profiteering out of the war.

These underlying reasons for maintaining high taxes apply with equal or even greater force during the critical period of reconversion, because, first, we still face a heavily unbalanced budget; every dollar of Government expenditures not raised by taxes will have to be borrowed, and to the extent that banks furnish these funds new supplies of money will be added to the already enormous accumulations of liquid funds in the hands of the public as a result of war financing; second, demands, both demestic and foreign, upon our economy are and will continue for an indefinite period to be greatly in excess of supply; and, third, the profits to be made in the next year, at least, will be a direct result of war expenditures and thus just as much war profits as if they were derived while hostilities were still in progress.

Taxation is the last real bulwark against inflationary forces because of the weakening of other controls, such as the War Labor Board exercised over wages and hence prices, of such as the WPB exercised in the construction field. The most prudent course at this juncture would be to defer tax reductions until such time as supply is more nearly in balance with demand and we have begun to approach a balanced Budget. At this stage we would be wise to err on the side of too much rather than too little revenue—taxes can always be reduced.

I wish to remind the Senate that the real period of inflation in connection with the last war was not so much during the war as it was soon after the war. In fact it began about 6 months after the war with the removal of what controls there were during that war, and we are facing exactly the same situation.

A little later in the same speech I said:

It is significant that expectations of outright repeal of the excess-profits tax are having four adverse effects: First, it is doing much to boom the stock market, drawing into this vortex of speculation funds that the Government ought to be getting. Second, whetting the appetite of labor for bigger demands, reinforced by strikes.

I think that statement certainly was borne out by the experience during the following 6 months.

Third, inducing corporations in the excess-profits group to avoid any further sales in the last quarter of this year, because, obviously, profits after January 1 would go untaxed so far as the excess-profits tax is concerned if Congress repeals it as of that date. Fourth, inviting inventory speculation in anticipation of profits resulting from rising prises together with lower taxes.

In summing up I said:

To sum up, if any reductions are to be made at this stage, they should benefit primarily those at the bottom of the income scale, not those individuals and corporations best able to pay taxes. Repeal of the excess-profits tax, in particular, not only favors the few and the financially strongest corporations, but it would grant them these benefits, including refunds, at the Government's expense when revenue is of critical importance; it sets an example in pocketing what are, in fact, war profits that makes it difficult to argue that labor should be denied correspondingly large wage increases; and the effect is to invite the familiar wage-price upward spiral.

Mr. President, I read that only in order to emphasize the point that I am very doubtful about the efficacy of this OPA bill or for that matter any other OPA measure standing alone. I think it is very doubtful, even if we should extend the present OPA without any change, that such an act could effectively control prices after we have removed the deterrent of the excess-profits tax, the benefits of which we had all during the war, and after we have already created a dislocation between costs arising from increased wages and the prices which have been established and the OPA is attempting to maintain.

During the war there had been worked out, by the combination of these three methods of control, a fairly satisfactory relationship between costs and profits; and while we all had complaints from the business people within our districts or States on the whole. I believe that the system worked quite well. I believe that if we could have maintained that relationship and those three controls, the system might well have worked for one more year, during which we could have attained production sufficient to have relieved much of the pressure which now exists against the prices which we are attempting to maintain.

At the present moment I am inclined to vote for the conference report, simply because it is a symbol. I am told that there may be some beneficial effects in the field of rents, and in a few other isolated instances. However, the greatest danger is that in adopting the conference report we shall lead the people to believe that we have done something effective.

Under the present circumstances I believe it is misleading to encourage the people to feel that we have discharged our duty in the control of prices. I doubt that it can be done by any single legislative act dealing with price control. It will require a tremendous upsurge of understanding and cooperation on the part of the people themselves—the consumers as well as the producers—to exercise self-restraint during the next few months or the next year, if there is to be any effective control of prices. I think it is perhaps beyond the ability of any single legislative act such as this, or the one under which we are now operating, to control prices. The only thing I could suggest, in a legislative way, would be the reinstitution of something similar to the excess-profits tax, and some agreement with labor, or the reinstitution of some agency such as the War Labor Board, which could to some extent control wages. But there has been no serious move to do either of those things. As I have just stated, the exces-profits tax was repealed, against my vote and against my best opinion at that time. And without the excess-profits tax, I doubt the effectiveness of the proposed new OPA Act. If I recall correctly only three or four Senators opposed its repeal at that time. Many of those who now complain of the ineffectiveness of OPA supported the repeal of excess-profits tax then.

I am making this statement only because I wish the RECORD to show that I am under no illusions that the adoption of the conference report will solve all difficulties or will maintain a reasonable level of prices. I believe we are in for some very serious inflation, regardless of what we do with this report, except with respect to the suggestions which I have made, but which I have no hope of having adopted, because apparently there is no support for the reinstitution of the excess-profits tax or anything like the War Labor Board. The destruction of price control began with the repeal of excess-profits tax, the abolition of WLB and the theory that wages could be raised without raising prices.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had hoped, as I think we all had, that today we would dispose of the conference report now pending before the Senate. However, it is obvious that we cannot vote on it now, for the reason that two or three other Senators wish to discuss it. In a short time I shall move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow. I hope that we may vote on the conference report tomorrow, after 2 or 3 hours of debate at the longest.

In that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune. It deals with the conference report, and it is entitled "A 'Workable' Measure."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A "WORKABLE" MEASURE

Before the House voted yesterday on the conference committee's compromise price-control measure, there were unofficial reports that Price Administrator Paul Porter would urge the President to veto the measure if it reached him in the form in which it went to the House floor.

Against this report should be placed two less partisan opinions. Chairman SPENCE, of the House Banking Committee, which conducted hearings on the Office of Price Administration legislation in that chamber, said he regarded the bill as "workable" and that he believed the President would sign it. And Senate Majority Leader BARKLEY, while refusing to speculate on what action the President would take, left no doubt as to what he thought the latter should do. In his opinion, said Senator BARKLEY, it is the best bill obtainable under the circumstances, and he declared that he would support it on the Senate floor.

If the stabilization authorities, in the face of the judgment of such experienced party leaders as Messrs. BARKLEY and SPENCE, press further their all-or-nothing policy with respect to price-control legislation, they will, in our opinion, be revealing a complete lack of understanding of the temper not only of Congress but the public. From the outset these authorities have taken an uncompromising stand against liberalization of the law, branding every amendment offered as "crippling" or "weakening," while at the same time offering no constructive counter-proposals of their own for meeting the criticisms of existing legislation or for adjusting the latter to the changed conditions resulting from premature abandonment of ceilings on wage costs. Their only answer to Members of Congress, who in many cases have given weeks of their time in an earnest and sincere effort to improve the mechanism of reconversion in the lagging area of price control, has been to organize so-called consumer meetings and public demonstrations calculated to intimidate the Nation's legislators by creating the impression that public opinion was overwhelmingly behind the OPA.

Accounts of Mr. Porter's purported plans yesterday said that in seeking a veto he would make the pricing formula of Senator TAFT the "villain of the peace." Price Administration economists, said reports, made a rough guess that this formula, which would make October 1941 the base for price ceilings, with adjustments to take care of added costs since that time, would increase earnings of manufacturing corporations generally from 15 to 20 percent this year. This is characteristic of the approach by the OPA to reconversion, with its emphasis centering on holding business income to a minimum rather than seeking, as Senator WOLCOTT said yesterday of the conference measure, a formula which would bring about full production at the soonest possible time.

It is to be hoped, on the other hand, that the Senate today refrains from pressing further its proposal for the immediate removal of ceilings on meat and certain other farm products. As it stands now the revised law places responsibility for control in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, and he has stated that with respect to meat ceiling the facts should be the determining influence. If he finds that meat control has broken down, as many critics insist, Mr. Anderson has made it clear that he is prepared to adopt the only alternative, which is removal of all ceilings. If the Senate is wise it will be satisfied with this very substantial gain in this area. And if it takes that course we can see no reasonable justification for a Presidential veto of the conference measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "The New OPA," published in today's New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW OPA

The new price-control extension bill as agreed to in conference and already passed by the House is a victory for the administration in the sense that it keeps price control more intact and leaves OPA with more powers than did either the House or Senate bill in its original form. Nonetheless, the powers of OPA have been greatly cut down, and price control, beginning next week, if the conference bill becomes law, will be radically different from what it has been in the past.

In several ways the new bill will compel OPA to deal more liberally with producers and distributors. The amendments should have the effect of encouraging more production of desired commodities than have some of the policies hitherto pursued. For example, OPA would be required to discontinue its present "maximum average price" (MAP) plan, which was designed to force manufacturers to produce cheaper rather than more expensive clothing. The plan has been a notorious failure. It has tended to reduce production and sale of clothing of all grades. Its abolition should mean better clothing supplies.

Another amendment would oblige OPA to set prices at not less than those existing in October 1941, plus subsequent average unit cost increases. Still another amendment would prevent OPA from forcing distributors to resell at a lower dollar margin of profit per unit than that existing on January 1 of this year. All of these amendments, because of the policies hitherto pursued by OPA, were clearly necessary. Price control was originally designed to prevent profiteering, but it was not designed to prevent producers and distributors from selling at their normal margin of profit.

Many of the other changes made by Congress are more dubious. There is too much effort to prescribe details, or to grant special treatment to special interests. There are questionable sections on restaurant prices, hotel prices, special pricing provisions for cotton and wool textiles, continuation of metal subsidies that have lost their original excuse, and so on. There are dubious provisions on the administrative side. The bill transfers to the Secretary of Agriculture authority to decide which farm commodities may be kept under price control. Moreover, the bill sets up a Decontrol Board, independent of the OPA, with power to overrule either the Price Administrator or the Secretary of Agriculture in removing price controls when in its judgment supply and demand of a commodity have come into approximate balance. This still further divides authority. These provisions can only be explained as the outcome of congressional distrust of the judgment of the particular administrators who have hitherto been in charge of OPA policies.

The most significant amendments may turn out to be those concerned with decontrol. Among these the most specific are those which would taper off subsidies. Subsidies are a method by which price rises are concealed by being shifted from the consumer's grocery bill or butcher bill to his tax bill. Once this device is stopped much of the magic will go out of price control.

The other decontrol provisions in the new bill are more vague. Their effect depends mainly upon the way they are interpreted by the administrators. Thus the provision which directs that price ceilings should be removed when supply and demand of a commodity come into approximate balance is largely meaningless, because supply and demand balance only at a price. Another decontrol provision which may be important or unimportant, depending upon its interpretation is that directing the Administrator, on or before December 31 of this year, to decontrol "all nonagricultural commodities not important in relation to business costs or living costs."

The most significant decontrol provisions in the new extension, if the administrators take it seriously, is the following:

"Unnecessary or unduly prolonged control over prices and rents and use of subsidies would be inconsistent with the return to * * * a peacetime economy. * * * Therefore, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress * * * that the general control of prices and the use of subsidy powers shall * * * be terminated as rapidly as possible * * * and in no event later than June 30, 1947, and on that date the Office of Price Administration shall be abolished."

This is accompanied by significant provisions that as soon as practicable, and in any event not later than January 15, 1947, "the President shall recommend to the Congress such further legislation as is in his judgment is needed to establish monetary, fiscal and other policies and wages during the balance of the fiscal year 1947, and to insure that general control of prices and wages can be terminated by the end of that fiscal year without danger of inflation thereafter."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to urge upon all Senators that there is much legislation which must be completed before Saturday. There are still some appropriation bills which are yet to be disposed of. Some of them have not even been passed by the Senate. Among them are the War Department appropriation bill and the appropriation bill for the Government corporations. There is also one, I think, which has not yet even been reported from the Committee on Appropriations. There are only 3 more days left in this week. It is extremely important that during the week, we dispose of all the appropriation bills, in addition to the conference report on the OPA, which now is under consideration. So I hope that all Senators will cooperate, as I am sure they will, in trying to clean up the program during the remainder of the week.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Kentucky would like to displace the unfinished business, the National Science Foundation bill, with the appropriation bills?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am not asking to have that done. But if the appropriation bills are ready, following disposition of the conference report on the OPA bill, it will be necessary to lay aside, temporarily, the unfinished business until the appropriation bills are disposed of, because they are subject to a time limit, whereas the National Science Foundation bill is not subject to such a limitation.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall make only a few remarks at this time on the OPA conference report. I simply wish to say that on the basis of my study of the conference report today and on the basis of the debate which I have heard on the floor of the Senate today, my present opinion is that for several major reasons it will be impossible for me to vote for the conference report.

First, I am satisfied that the report in its present form would be more inflationary than no OPA at all, because I think it will result in such confusion and disruption of production as to be a serious impairment to production. Thus it will be causative, rather than preventive, of inflation.

In the second place, I cannot vote for the conference report in its present form because I think the Taft amendment results in undue benefits to American industry, to which it is not entitled, and amounts to grossly unfair discrimination against the agricultural interests of the United States. I do not propose to vote for discriminatory legislation.

In the third place, my present intention is to vote against the conference report because, if I correctly understand the ruling which was made earlier today by the Chair, the only hope we have of getting this problem back to conference is by rejecting the conference report. Then, from a parliamentary point of view, we shall be in a position to direct our conferees to go back into conference. Therefore, from a parliamentary standpoint, I do not think I could justify a vote for the conference report, because I think in toto, in every section thereof, it is an exceedingly unsound and unwise piece of legislation. As a liberal Member of this body, I cannot sentence the American people to the great inflationary cruelties which I think will flow from the adoption of this report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the charge was made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that the Taft amendment was discriminatory against agriculture. As amended by the conference committee, it covers producers of all kinds and applies to the prices which they are entitled to charge exactly the same formula as that which is applied to the prices of manufacturers and processors.

I wish to read into the RECORD a brief statement on the subject of production from this morning's issue of the New York Journal of Commerce. It reads as follows:

Production in most industrial fields will be stimulated so effectively if price control is modified along the lines of the House-Senate conference bill that competition soon will act as an effective brake on prices.

This is consensus among industrialists surveyed by the Journal of Commerce.

Even initial price advances under the new bill will be far more moderate than widely predicted in administrative quarters, spokesmen of most industries declared yesterday. Estimates of price boosts ranging from 7½ to 10 percent were given for a number of industries, such as automobile parts, radios, and textiles.

In some instances competitive conditions, now existing, or favorable results of recent ceiling increases will rule out over-all price increases of more than very moderate extent, it was emphasized.

Cases in point are machine tools and metal stamping manufacturers.

FEAR OPA ATTITUDE

While numerous industrialists still believe that complete removal of ceilings on manufactured products would have been preferable at this time, the prevailing opinion is that realistic application of the Taft amendment would go a long way toward eliminating most of the present price impediments to production.

A growing apprehension is noticeable, however, lest failure of OPA officials to live up to the spirit of the Taft amendment

might jeopardize the new style price control. OPA officials already seem to be taking the view that the Taft amendment will not work.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to confirm what the Senator from Ohio has said about the inclusion of the word "producers" in the language as amended by the conference committee. The provision adopted by the Senate included only manufacturers and processors. The conference committee wrote into the provision the word "producers," which was intended specifically to cover farmers as well as other producers who might not be either manufacturers or processors. So at the present time there is no discrimination in the conference report with respect to any farmers.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe that my good friend from Ohio and my good friend from Kentucky are quite mistaken with reference to the effects of this bill on the farmers. However, they are welcome to try to convince the country of their position. When we compare the benefits which the American farmer will receive with the benefits which the American manufacturer will receive, I believe that the American farmer will be able to see through the effects of the section to which the Senator refers.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO PSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4512) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 4 and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: ", but only to the extent necessary for the purposes of such training and instruction"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CLAUDE PEPPER,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
LISTER HILL,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
ALFRED L. BULWINKLE,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
CLARENCE J. BROWN,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Florida whether the report represents the unanimous action on the part of the Senate conferees.

Mr. PEPPER. It is unanimous. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was one of the conferees, and he is on the floor at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield to me, let me say that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I took part in the conference, and I think the report is entirely satisfactory. The House conferees yielded in regard to the amount involved for the construction of the buildings, and the conferees on the part of the Senate yielded on one or two minor amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may show the nature of the conference report, let me say it pertains to what is called the mental hygiene or mental health bill. It provides for the construction in the District of Columbia of a mental health institute for research, at a cost of $7,500,000, and for Federal and State cooperation in research in meeting the challenge to mental health with which the country has been faced, especially during the war.

SALE OF GENEVA STEEL PLANT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, during the war we needed a steel plant to be constructed in Utah for the purpose of supplying steel to the west coast. A steel plant was constructed which was one of the largest and most modern plants built during the war, and I believe that today it is one of the most modern steel plants in the world. A great deal of skepticism was felt with reference to what would happen to the Geneva steel plant after the war. Many predictions were made that it probably would become junk and would not be operated at all. A few weeks ago bids were received by the Government after the plant had been offered for sale, and the bid of the United States Steel Corporation was accepted by the War Assets Administration. That bid was submitted to the Attorney General for his opinion as to whether or not the disposal of the plant under the bid of the United States Steel Corp. would be at all violative of the antitrust laws. About a week ago the Attorney General handed down a decision on the question to the effect that the sale of the Geneva steel plant to the United States Steel Corp. would not be violative of the antitrust laws.

All that remains, as I understand, to a consummation of the transaction between the War Assets Administration and the United States Steel Corp., or one of its subsidiaries, is the formal signing of an agreement in conformity with the bid.

This news, Mr. President, was very happily received throughout the entire State of Utah. I believe that at least 90 percent of the people of Utah were very pleased and happy over the fact that the Geneva steel plant had been disposed of to a competent company which would operate it in the future. An editorial appearing on June 19, 1946, in the Salt Lake Telegram, one of the outstanding newspapers of the West, reflects, I believe, the entire opinion of the State of Utah, and I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR THE GREATER PROSPERITY OF UTAH AND THE ENTIRE WEST

This is a great day for Utah and the entire West. Geneva is over the last of a long series of hurdles, and peacetime operation of this, the first integrated steel plant west of the Rocky Mountains, is now assured.

The decision of Attorney General Tom Clark that the sale of Geneva to the United States Steel Corp., is not a violation of the antitrust laws, puts the final seal of approval on the transaction. The War Assets Administration has already accepted the $47,500,000 offer of United States Steel, and the approval of the Justice Department was the last action required to close the sale.

Geneva's future has been a touch-and-go proposition for many months. Pessimists in Utah insisted all along that the plant would never operate in peacetime—and truly at several points along the way it seemed they might be right. It was only because many farsighted, progressive men in this State, the West, and the Nation refused to be discouraged that we today can look forward to a new era of industrial development.

Utah owes a vote of thanks to Attorney General Clark for courageously resisting terrific pressure brought to bear on him by various interests in and out of his own Department against approval of the United States Steel sale. He handed down the only opinion which was legally sound, and he handed it down flatly, without equivocation. He cited the statistics on steel capacity and United States Steel's share of that capacity and the steel market, which emphatically disprove any charge of monopoly. He cited Supreme Court decisions which clearly indicate that such percentages do not constitute monopoly. And then he said frankly: "In the light of the foregoing considerations and all the other pertinent circumstances of the case, I do not view the sale, as such, of this property by the War Assets Administration to the United States Steel Corp. as a violation of the antitrust laws." There were no qualifications or reservations on that approval. Mr. Clark did properly make clear that the opinion referred only to this particular case and did not tie the Justice Department's hands on any other matters affecting the United States Steel Corp. That was to be expected and it did not becloud the issue in any way.

Sale of Geneva to United States Steel is the best possible assurance Utah and the West can have of a permanent, profitable western steel industry based on western production costs. United States Steel will integrate Geneva into its western steel operations. It has the organization, the know-how, and the markets to make Geneva go. No other bidder could have given us the same assurance, no matter how good their intentions or how sanguine their hopes. As several key Washington officials who were long familiar with Geneva said, the alternative to a sale to United States Steel probably was that the plant would rot away in idleness.

Utah owes sincere thanks to many men whose untiring efforts on Geneva's behalf helped to win this long hard battle. Under the leadership of Senator Abe Murdock, many Utahans played key roles in the fight—Gov. Herbert B. Maw; Congressman J. Will Robinson; Senator Elbert D. Thomas; Congressman Walter Granger; Gus P. Blackman, executive secretary of the Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce; Dr. J. R. Mahoney,

director of the bureau of business and economic research, University of Utah. They were ably assisted by many Washington officials, notably Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board; Senator Pat McCarran, of Nevada; John W. Snyder, Director of Reconversion; W. Stuart Symington, former Surplus Property Administrator; and General Gregory, War Assets Administrator. These men worked hard in Geneva's interest. We are deeply grateful to them all.

To the United States Steel Corp., Utah says: Thanks for making a well-considered, fair bid on Geneva and planning a steel expansion in the West which will mean much to western development. Utah welcomes you as the owner and operator of a great new industry. You have been in the past, with your iron plant at Ironton, a good neighbor and good citizen. We know that in your new expanded role you will be only a better neighbor and better citizen. We, on our part, will cooperate with you in every possible way to make your operations in this State successful and profitable for the greater prosperity of Utah and for the industrial progress of the entire State.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the Clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the executive calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 27, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

John W. Snyder, of Missouri, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund, and United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Commodore Ellis Reed-Hill, United States Coast Guard, for appointment as Engineer in Chief of the United States Coast Guard, with the rank of rear admiral, effective from August 1, 1946, for a term of 4 years.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be assistant dental surgeons, effective date of oath of office

Ceril S. Scheppegrell
Raymond M. Bro
Earl C. Hewitt

To be surgeon

Frederick J. Brady

To be senior assistant surgeon

Raymond F. Corpe

To be senior assistant scientists, effective date of oath of office

Marion M. Brooke
Oliver R. Placak
Harry D. Pratt
Pope A. Lawrence

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To Field Artillery

Col. Henry Spiese Aurand

To Quartermaster Corps

Maj. Clyde Massey
Maj. Theodore Charles Wenzlaff
Capt. David Henry Brown

To Ordnance Department

First Lt. Roland Bennett Anderson
First Lt. Charles Langworthy Beaudry
First Lt. Charles Langley Patrick Medinnis
First Lt. Eugene Joseph Sweeney

To Signal Corps

First Lt. Dennis Ladislaus Barton

To Field Artillery

First Lt. John Jay Easton

To Infantry

Lt. Col. Harry Lee Bennett
First Lt. Edward Fondren Shaifer, Jr.
First Lt. Alton Martin Shipstead

To Air Corps

Maj. Donald Philip Graul
Maj. Harlan Clyde Parks
Capt. Sidney Francis Giffin
First Lt. Josephus Alan Bowman

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from July 1, 1946

Wayne Latta Barker, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 2, 1946

Carl Brown McDaniel, Air Corps.

Carlisle Brown Irwin, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.

Lee Carl Vance, Cavalry.

Russell Vivian Perry, Quartermaster Corps, subject to examination required by law.

Thomas Davison Drake, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.

Granville Victor Morse, Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 3, 1946

Herbert Spencer Jordan, Finance Department.

Dresden James Cragun, Finance Department.

Edward Harvey Clouser, Quartermaster Corps, subject to examination required by law.

Herbert Kenneth Baisley, Air Corps.

Thomas Robinson, Cavalry.

William Rush Blakely, Infantry.

Carl Eugene Anderson, Finance Department.

William Douglass Paschall, Field Artillery, subject to examination required by law.

Frederick Mott Thompson, Infantry.

Voris Hamilton Connor, Field Artillery.

Arthur Bordeaux Nicholson, Coast Artillery Corps, subject to examination required by law.

Staten Eugene Rall, Infantry.

Don Emerson Carleton, Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.

Kenneth Lafayette Johnson, Field Artillery.

Eugene Haworth Vernon, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.

Paul Green Kendall, Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.

Ralph Waldo Russell, Coast Artillery Corps.

Archibald Yarborough Smith, Air Corps.

DeWitt Ballard, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.

James Lendsey McKinnon, Field Artillery.

Willis Glenn Cronk, Infantry.

Richard Tyler Willson, Cavalry.

Leslie Lee Hittle, Field Artillery.

Eugene Desiré Regad, Ordnance Department.

Donald Taylor Beeler, Infantry.

Charles Creswell Blakeney, Field Artillery.

William Mason Hoke, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.

Willard Fromm Millice, Field Artillery.

Elvin Hamilton Burger, Adjutant General's Department, subject to examination required by law.

James Freeland McGraw, Infantry.

Richard Searl Marr, Field Artillery.

Leonard James Greeley, Chemical Warfare Service.

Kingsley Sherman Andersson, Corps of Engineers.

William Frihe Dean, Infantry.

Ben Early Cordell, Coast Artillery Corps.

Dalies Joshua Oyster, Field Artillery.

George Phillips Privett, Field Artillery.

William Lindsay McPherson, Coast Artillery Corps.

Daniel Peter Norman, Infantry.

John Mitchell England, Coast Artillery Corps.

Floyd Cornelius Devenbeck, Ordnance Department.

William Black Forse, Infantry.

John Wallace Homewood, Infantry.

James Vestie Collier, Field Artillery.

Edwin Kennedy Wright, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.

Philip Mapes Shockley, Quartermaster Corps.

Charles Goodwin Pearcy, Air Corps, subject to examination required by law.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Clifford Andrew Gray, Medical Corps.

Arthur John Redland, Medical Corps.

William Lenoir Wilson, Medical Corps, subject to examination required by law.

Carlton Duncan Goodiel, Medical Corps, subject to examination required by law.

To be majors

Angvald Vickoren, Medical Corps.
Willam Earl Barry, Medical Corps.
Emmert Carl Lentz, Medical Corps.

James Leslie Snyder, Medical Corps.
Thair Cozzens Rich, Medical Corps.
Frank Hugh Lane, Medical Corps.
Byron Glen McKibben, Medical Corps.
John DeWitt Morley, Medical Corps, subject to examination required by law.
Robert Tuthill Gants, Medical Corps, subject to examination required by law.
George Foster Peer, Medical Corps, subject to examination required by law.
Harold Everus Harrison, Medical Corps.
Marshall Nelson Jensen, Medical Corps.
Stephen Chirstopher Sitter, Medical Corps.
Angel Antonio Cardona, Medical Corps.
Edward Rudolf Wernitznig, Medical Corps.
William Calaway, Medical Corps.
Lewis Calvin Shellenberger, Medical Corps.

To be captains

Frank Wisner Lynn, Medical Corps.
Avery Parsons King, Medical Corps.
Raymond Joseph Getz, Medical Corps, subject to examination required by law.
James Archibald Bell, Medical Corps, subject to examination required by law.
Milton Boyd Brandon, Medical Corps.
Harry Aloysius Hortsman, Jr., Medical Corps.
Robert Samuel Jordan, Jr., Medical Corps.
Charles John Hornisher, Medical Corps.
Arthur Bernard Tarrow, Medical Corps.
Philip Baker Watkins, Medical Corps.
Urban Linus Throm 2d, Medical Corps.
Frank Bradway Rogers, Medical Corps.
Raoul Constantine Psaki, Jr., Medical Corps.
John McReynolds Jackson, Medical Corps.
Christian Gronbeck, Jr., Medical Corps.
Frank Edward Harrigan, Jr., Medical Corps.
Robert Cantrell Feamster, Medical Corps.
Robert Edmund Lau, Medical Corps, subject to examination required by law.
John Joseph Graff, Medical Corps.
Graham Burton Milburn, Medical Corps, subject to examination required by law.
Robert William Thometz, Medical Corps.
Walter Frank Smejkal, Medical Corps, subject to examination required by law.

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Dale Bowlby Ridgely, Dental Corps.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be majors

William Edwin Jennings, Veterinary Corps.
Curtis William Betzold, Veterinary Corps.

PHARMACY CORPS

To be majors

Harland William Layer, Pharmacy Corps.
Eugene Gordon Cooper, Pharmacy Corps.
Arthur Melville Henderson, Pharmacy Corps.

CHAPLAINS

To be majors

John Simeon Kelly, United States Army.
Joseph Calvin Sides, United States Army.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 26, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most patient and loving Father, in the birth of this day, Thou hast spoken to us, and Thy mercy fills the earth. For all Thy impartial benevolences, receive Thou the praise and gratitude of our humble hearts. Overwhelmed at times by the mysteries and vicissitudes of this suffering world, teach us that we cannot dispense with the heart and soul of things and survive.

Lord God, with Thy spirit warn our people everywhere against the fallacy that material possessions determine the greatness of permanence of a nation. O direct our citizens and fortify them against all the threatening inroads of destructive selfishness. In sternness rebuke us, and lead us to hold fast the great truths of our most holy faith. Be Thou the unseen guest of each and the Saviour of all. In the name of Christ our Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2543. An act to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4437. An act to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5626) entitled "An act to authorize the Veterans' Administration to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4230) entitled "An act to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MURDOCK, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3517. An act to authorize the admission into the United States of persons indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5244. An act to authorize the appoint of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades;

H. R. 6064. An act to extent the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6084. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday and Saturday next, at the conclusion of the legislative programs of the days and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fifty Years of RFD" which appeared in the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal on June 5, 1946, eulogizing the late Senator Thomas E. Watson as the father of rural free delivery of mails.

I also wish to include a list of reforms advocated first by Senator Watson, this list having been prepared and issued by the First National Bank, of Cornelia, Ga.

Senator Watson was an outstanding statesman of the Nation, and certainly his untiring efforts for the establishment of rural free delivery service should be recognized.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the Committee to Protect the Consumers.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a resolution adopted by the Military Order of the Purple Heart, department of Massachusetts, and in the other to extend his remarks on the subject of New England Air Mail Week.

PRESIDENT'S REORGANIZATION PLANS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow, or at least within the next few days, we will have before us for consideration the reorganization plans of the President of the United States. Action has been taken in your Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments disapproving those three proposals. I have filed a minority report and I respectfully ask the Members to study that report, No. 2326. I feel this is a most important subject regardless of whether you agree with my minority views or the views taken by the majority of the committee. It is vital that we intelligently act and I trust that the Members will inform themselves on the matters in issue, insofar as practical, prior to the time the legislation is brought to the floor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California asked and was given permission to extend her

remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. CHELF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials in one.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2345), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

CONSENT CALENDAR AND SUSPENSIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday next be dispensed with and that it be in order on Tuesday next for the Consent Calendar to be called and for the Speaker to recognize Members for suspensions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the third deficiency appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REVENGE AT POLLS

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the other day the letter I am about to read appeared in the New York Daily News. It is entitled "Revenge at Polls."

During the past 13 years, union leaders, with the blessings of the Roosevelt administration and now the Truman administration, have been able to take away my constitutional right to work and compel me to pay them in order to work. They have been able to dictate where I shall work, or whether I shall work at all. To increase their lust for power, politically and otherwise, they have been able, against my wishes, to call me out on strike even against my own Government. They have the power to assess me for political purposes and for something I am not in sympathy with. If I signed my name to this letter, they would have power to bring me up on charges and take away my union card, thereby keeping me from earning a living for my family. They can fine me if I refuse to attend demonstrations or parades, even though they be dominated by Communist elements. But I'll be damned if they can control my vote on election day. After I get into the voting booth, that is one constitutional right no one can take away from me. Hillman and others of his ilk, please note.

CIO UNION WORKER.

BRITISH LOAN PROPOSAL

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, how shall Congress celebrate the Fourth of July?

We all know how our forefathers celebrated it. Fireworks and a big time. The occasion was caused by taxation without representation. You remember how history records the dumping of tea in Boston Harbor. Again those words echo: "Taxation without representation is tyranny."

Mr. Speaker, bring up the British loan proposal and agreement for free trade and cancellation of the British debt on July 4. We will celebrate the day by not imposing on the American people the agreement by the New Deal bureaucrats to tax our people $4,400,000,000 without the consent of the American people.

Let one lesson in our early history be reechoed to the Members of Congress: "Taxation without representation is tyranny." Let us be American. Let the people vote on the gift to Great Britain.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my friend from Pennsylvania, may I say that I think he has jumped to a hasty conclusion.

GALLINGER HOSPITAL

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, under a unanimous-consent request, I propose to address the House on the subject of Gallinger Hospital. The appropriations for this hospital, although very definitely increased over last year's, do not meet the dramatic needs of this great municipal institution which, when all is said and done, is our responsibility. I am not asking any of you to be present—that would be a little too much to hope for—but I am asking you to look through the material tomorrow morning when you read your CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Conditions at Gallinger Hospital are shocking. The appropriation agreed to in conference will not make possible adequate patient care, nor will it expedite the building of new units to replace the unbelievably outmoded buildings still in use.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and to include excerpts.

THE WHEAT SITUATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I stated on this floor that our wheat producers were bitterly opposed to the War Food order which forced the sale of 50 percent of their wheat when stored in a public elevator or warehouse. These wheat growers resent requisitioning and interference in the marketing of their own grain.

Recent marketing experience demonstrates that farmers are refusing to sell new grain in any quantities. They do not object to the shipment of wheat to starving people in other countries but they do believe they should receive a guaranty from the Government that they will be given the benefit of any increase in wheat prices which may come during the marketing year. This is not surprising in view of the fact that most of them lost a total advance of 48 cents per bushel through bonuses and increased prices in the last crop.

I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that the present forced sale and set-aside order be repealed. If this is not done black-market operations in the handling of grain will continue to increase and it will become practically impossible for the Department to secure the wheat needed to take care of its announced export program. I would repectfully submit the following simple program which would get wheat and flour moving for the export program and for such domestic uses as flour and feed.

First. The set-aside order under War Food Administration Order No. 140, amendment 9, should be repealed as it affects the forced sale of farm marketing of wheat. In its stead the War Food Administrator should require a set-aside for export of 25 percent of the free wheat sold by the farmers to the elevators.

Second. Wheat growers should be urged to market their wheat immediately through mills and country elevators.

Third. Market or ceiling prices should be paid for all wheat at time of delivery.

Fourth. Growers to receive a delivery receipt from the country elevator, which in turn would be certified by the Production and Marketing Administration, local Field Service Branch, that delivery wheat had been affected. This certificate would be cashable for the equivalent of any price advance, because of any factors, from date of delivery of wheat forward.

Fifth. Certificates would be good until, but canceled on June 30, 1947.

It is my opinion that this program would secure the wheat needed for export and eliminate the dissension that is prevalent in the wheat sections of the Nation.

I commend this program to the departments for serious consideration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a paper from a high-school student, and in the other to include a letter.

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

THE EMBATTLED FARMER

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a statement regarding the embattled farmer. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on that subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MEMO NO. 3 TO PEOPLE WITH SHORT MEMORIES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished Member of this House has called for an investigation of the Louis-Conn fight in New York. He says it was a greatly overpublicized spectacle and that it was much ado about nothing.

I respectfully suggest to the gentleman from New York that he is trying to investigate the wrong spectacle. For a really colossal spectacle of much ado about nothing, I refer him to the President's march up the Hill on May 25, calling for emergency strike legislation, on which the House acted favorably, with 13 dissenting votes, and which the Senate has approved, but which legislation reposes some place where no one seems to be able to locate it, and nothing is being done. Mr. Speaker, the silence can be heard around the world as to what has happened to the emergency strike legislation.

Does this House propose to recess for the summer without approving legislation which was thought to be important enough by the President to leave his office and come up the Hill to address a joint session of Congress to ask us to undertake our responsibility? Who is now responsible for this do-nothing conspiracy about strike legislation? Some Democrat somewhere must know the answer. Who will dare to give it to the public?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DWORSHAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Deseret News.

THE WHEAT SITUATION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the War Food Order, No. 144, which requires that the farmer must sell half of his wheat within 15 days after he delivers it to the elevator, is causing a great deal of unrest and dissatisfaction among the farmers in the wheat producing sections of this country. The order is unworkable and will have a bad effect. Already in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas the farmer is holding his wheat off the market because of this order. The order is un-American and unjust. The farmer must have the right to deliver his wheat where and when he desires. The order should be modified in order that the farmer may be protected when he sells his wheat. This administration and the Department of Agriculture have not been honest with the farmer. They placed in effect an order which gave a bonus for the delivery of wheat and corn to the market after they promised there would be no further regulation regarding the selling of grain.

The bill we passed yesterday, if approved will make it possible for the farmer to deliver the wheat under this order and the farmer may elect the time of sale up to March 31, 1947. This will partly nullify the present vicious order which is now in effect.

The farmers of this country are losing confidence in their Government because of the regimentation which is being forced upon them. It is causing them to lose respect and confidence in their Government. The only way that the Government can keep their respect and confidence of the farmer is by treating him in a just manner.

There are some in the Department of Agriculture who are now contemplating placing a severe penalty upon the farmer when he does not deliver all of his agricultural products to the market. This not only includes corn, wheat, and all grains, but it includes livestock. If this order ever goes into effect, we will have adopted the Russian system, lock, stock, and barrel.

This order must be rescinded or greatly modified and further regimentation and kicking around of the farmer must be stopped.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from Time magazine.

EMERGENCY ANTISTRIKE LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the Members who supported President Truman when he came before the Congress at one of the most critical hours I have known since I have been in the House and asked for emergency legislation to prevent a tie-up in this country and a breakdown of our transportation system, I agree that the measure he recommended should be brought to the floor of the House immediately.

I think it should be passed by both Houses in the same form in which it passed the House, because if we are going to whittle away the time—and I am speaking for both Houses now—and permit a recurrence of the very crisis that the President was trying to head off, then the responsibility next time will not rest upon President Truman, but it will rest upon the Congress of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Richard L. Strout, appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I submit a privileged report and ask that it be read.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 175]

Adams	De Lacy	Mahon
Almond	Dingell	Mansfield, Mont.
Anderson, Calif.	Doyle	Mansfield, Tex.
Andresen, August H.	Engel, Mich.	Miller, Calif.
Andrews, N. Y.	Fernandez	Murdock
Baldwin, Md.	Flannagan	Murphy
Barry	Gallagher	Norrell
Bates, Mass.	Gardner	Norton
Bell	Geelan	O'Brien, Mich.
Bennet, N. Y.	Gibson	Patrick
Boren	Gillespie	Peterson, Ga.
Boykin	Granger	Ploeser
Bradley, Mich.	Grant, Ala.	Plumley
Bradley, Pa.	Harris	Reece, Tenn.
Bunker	Hoffman, Mich.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Byrne, N. Y.	Holifield	Robinson, Utah
Camp	Izac	Roe, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Jackson	Rooney
Chiperfield	Kee	Sabath
Clark	Keefe	Slaughter
Cochran	Kefauver	Smith, Va.
Coffee	Kerr	Sparkman
Colmer	Kirwan	Starkey
Cox	Lea	Stevenson
Crawford	LeCompte	Stewart
Curley	Lewis	Stigler
Davis	Luce	Tolan
Dawson	Ludlow	
	McGehee	

Torrens	Welch	Winstead
Vinson	West	Wolfenden, Pa.
Voorhis, Calif.	Wickersham	Worley

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 341 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RIVERS) there were—ayes 91, noes 0.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, are there not provisions in the rules regulating the conduct of this House against obviously dilatory tactics?

The SPEAKER. There are if that time comes.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 334, nays 3, answered "present" 3, not voting 92, as follows:

[Roll No. 176]

YEAS—334

Abernethy	Clippinger	Gary
Allen, Ill.	Cole, Kans.	Gathings
Allen, La.	Cole, Mo.	Gavin
Andersen, H. Carl	Cole, N. Y.	Gearhart
Andrews, Ala.	Combs	Geelan
Angell	Cooley	Gerlach
Arends	Cooper	Gifford
Arnold	Corbett	Gillette
Auchincloss	Courtney	Gillie
Bailey	Cox	Goodwin
Baldwin, N. Y.	Cravens	Gordon
Barden	Crosser	Gorski
Barrett, Pa.	Cunningham	Graham
Barrett, Wyo.	Curtis	Granahan
Bates, Ky.	D'Alesandro	Grant, Ind.
Beall	Delaney, James J.	Green
Beckworth	Delaney, John J.	Gregory
Bender	D'Ewart	Griffiths
Bennett, Mo.	Dirksen	Gross
Biemiller	Dolliver	Gwinn, N. Y.
Bishop	Domengeaux	Gwynne, Iowa
Blackney	Dondero	Hagen
Bland	Doughton, N. C.	Hale
Bloom	Douglas, Calif.	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bolton	Douglas, Ill.	Hall, Leonard W.
Bonner	Drewry	Halleck
Brehm	Dworshak	Hancock
Brooks	Earthman	Hare
Brown, Ga.	Eaton	Harness, Ind.
Brown, Ohio	Eberharter	Hart
Brumbaugh	Elliott	Havenner
Bryson	Ellis	Healy
Buchanan	Ellsworth	Hébert
Buck	Elsaesser	Hedrick
Buckley	Elston	Heffernan
Buffett	Engle, Calif.	Hendricks
Butler	Ervin	Henry
Byrnes, Wis.	Fallon	Herter
Campbell	Feighan	Heselton
Canfield	Fellows	Hess
Cannon, Mo.	Fenton	Hill
Carlson	Fernandez	Hinshaw
Carnahan	Fisher	Hobbs
Case, N. J.	Flood	Hoch
Case, S. Dak.	Fogarty	Hoeven
Celler	Folger	Hoffman, Pa.
Chapman	Forand	Holmes, Mass.
Chelf	Fuller	Holmes, Wash.
Chenoweth	Fulton	Hook
Church	Gallagher	Hope
Clason	Gamble	Horan
Clements	Gardner	Howell
Clevenger		
Huber	May	Sadowski
Hull	Merrow	Sasscer
Jarman	Michener	Savage
Jenkins	Miller, Nebr.	Schwabe, Mo.
Jennings	Mills	Schwabe, Okla.
Jensen	Monroney	Scrivner
Johnson, Calif.	Morgan	Shafer
Johnson, Ill.	Morrison	Sharp
Johnson, Ind.	Mundt	Sheppard
Johnson, Luther A.	Murray, Tenn.	Sheridan
	Murray, Wis.	Short
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Neely	Sikes
	Norblad	Simpson, Ill.
Johnson, Okla.	O'Brien, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Jones	O'Hara	Slaughter
Jonkman	O'Konski	Smith, Maine
Judd	O'Neal	Smith, Ohio
Kean	O'Toole	Smith, Va.
Kearney	Outland	Smith, Wis.
Keefe	Pace	Somers, N. Y.
Kelley, Pa.	Patterson	Spence
Kelly, Ill.	Peterson, Fla.	Springer
Keogh	Pfeifer	Stefan
Kilburn	Philbin	Stockman
Kilday	Phillips	Sullivan
King	Pickett	Sumner, Ill.
Kinzer	Pittenger	Sumners, Tex.
Kirwan	Ploeser	Sundstrom
Klein	Plumley	Taber
Knutson	Powell	Talbot
Kunkel	Price, Fla.	Talle
LaFollette	Price, Ill.	Tarver
Landis	Priest	Taylor
Lane	Quinn, N. Y.	Thom
Lanham	Rabaut	Thomas, N. J.
Larcade	Rains	Thomas, Tex.
Latham	Ramey	Thomason
LeFevre	Randolph	Tibbott
Lemke	Rankin	Towe
Lesinski	Rayfiel	Traynor
Lewis	Reed, Ill.	Trimble
Link	Reed, N. Y.	Voorhis, Calif.
Lyle	Rees, Kans.	Vursell
Lynch	Resa	Wadsworth
McConnell	Rich	Walter
McCowen	Richards	Wasielewski
McDonough	Riley	Weaver
McGlinchey	Rizley	Welchel
McGregor	Robertson, Va.	White
McKenzie	Robsion, Ky.	Whitten
McMillan, S. C.	Rockwell	Whittington
McMillen, Ill.	Rodgers, Pa.	Wigglesworth
Madden	Roe, Md.	Wilson
Maloney	Rogers, Fla.	Winter
Mankin	Rogers, N. Y.	Wolcott
Marcantonio	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton, N. J.
Martin, Iowa	Rowan	Wood
Martin, Mass.	Russell	Woodhouse
Mason	Ryter	Zimmerman
Mathews	Sabath	

NAYS—3

Manasco	Poage	Rivers

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Hand	Kopplemann	Rabin

NOT VOTING—92

Adams	Doyle	Murdock
Almond	Durham	Murphy
Anderson, Calif.	Engel, Mich.	Norrell
Andresen, August H.	Flannagan	Norton
	Gibson	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews, N. Y.	Gillespie	Patman
Baldwin, Md.	Gore	Patrick
Barry	Gossett	Peterson, Ga.
Bates, Mass.	Granger	Pratt
Bell	Grant, Ala.	Reece, Tenn.
Bennet, N. Y.	Harless, Ariz.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Boren	Harris	
Boykin	Hartley	Robinson, Utah
Bradley, Mich.	Hays	Roe, N. Y.
Bradley, Pa.	Hoffman, Mich.	Rooney
Bulwinkle	Holifield	Sparkman
Bunker	Izac	Starkey
Byrne, N. Y.	Jackson	Stevenson
Camp	Kee	Stewart
Cannon, Fla.	Kefauver	Stigler
Chiperfield	Kerr	Tolan
Clark	Lea	Torrens
Cochran	LeCompte	Vinson
Coffee	Luce	Vorys, Ohio
Colmer	Ludlow	Welch
Crawford	McCormack	West
Curley	McGehee	Wickersham
Daughton, Va.	Mahon	Winstead
Davis	Mansfield, Mont.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Dawson		Woodruff
De Lacy	Mansfield, Tex.	Worley
Dingell	Miller, Calif.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Adams.

Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Andrews of New York.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. De Lacy with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Jackson with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

Mr. BLOOM submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5244) to authorize the appointment of additional Foreign Service officers in the classified grade.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST CORLISS G. LAMONT

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I present a privileged report and ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives by House Resolution 5 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, caused to be issued a subpena to Corliss G. Lamont, chairman of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., with offices at 114 East Thirty-second Street, New York City, N. Y. The said subpena required the said person to produce books, papers, and records of the organization for the inspection of your committee. The subpena is set forth as follows:

"To the SERGEANT AT ARMS OR HIS SPECIAL MESSENGER:

"You are hereby commanded to summon Corliss G. Lamont, chairman of National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., located at 114 East Thirty-second Street, New York City, N. Y., to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which Hon. JOHN S. WOOD is chairman, and to produce at said hearing all books, records, papers, and documents showing all receipts and disbursements of money by the said National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., and its affiliated organizations, and all letters, memoranda, or communications from, or with, any person or persons outside and within the United States of America, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on January 23, 1946, at the hour of 10 a. m. then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

"Witness my hand and seal of the House of Representatives of the United States at the city of Washington this 27th day of December 1945.

"JOHN S. WOOD, *Chairman.*

"Attest:

"JOHN W. CARRINGTON, *Clerk.*"

The said subpena was duly served, as appears by the return made thereon by George V. McDavitt, ar investigator for your committee:

"Served Hilda Zachariah at 11:45 a. m. on December 28, 1945, at 114 East Thirty-second Street, Manhattan Borough, New York, N. Y., at the offices of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., eighth floor, as per instructions of Corliss Lamont, via telephone communication.

"GEORGE V. MCDAVITT, *investigator.*"

In response to the said subpena the said Corliss Lamont appeared before your committee on February 6, 1946, and your committee then and there demanded the production of the said books, papers, and records, and the said Lamont refused to produce as required by the said subpena. The said Lamont was duly sworn by the chairman and gave his testimony under oath. The material parts of his testimony follow:

"Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Lamont, does your organization refuse to either produce the records or permit our investigators to inspect them at your office?

"Mr. LAMONT. My organization has taken no stand on that since your subpena was issued.

"Mr. ADAMSON. Well, have you produced them?

"Mr. LAMONT. No; I have not, as I said, because I do not have the power.

"Mr. LANDIS. Does the organization know that they have been asked for?

"Mr. LAMONT. We are not set up that way, Mr. Adamson.

"Mr. RANKIN. Who does have the power?

"Mr. LAMONT. I am only the chairman. I am not a dictator, and our organization is democratic.

"Mr. ADAMSON. When you were subpenaed you informed your organization that you had received such a subpena? Isn't that true? As a matter of fact, the organization gave out a statement to the newspapers in regard to it.

"Mr. LAMONT. That is right; yes.

"Mr. ADAMSON. So that your organization knew that you were subpenaed, and you did discuss it with your associates, and they did make a statement to the newspapers on the subject? There was a newspaper release on it?

"Mr. LAMONT. I don't remember which one, but there was something on it. There has been a lot of misquotation in the newspapers.

"Mr. ROBINSON. Let me ask one question there. Do you object to having the investigators of this committee go into your office and investigate your records?

"Mr. LAMONT. I really cannot decide that question on behalf of the organization.

"Mr. ROBINSON. I didn't ask you whether you could decide it. I asked you whether you had any objection.

"Mr. LAMONT. I should consider it a very doubtful procedure, yes; but that, you see, is not—the fact is that I don't have the power to make this decision, because it has to be a vote.

"Mr. ROBINSON. I am not asking that. I want to know whether you have any objection?

"Mr. LAMONT. I prefer to not become involved in my personal feelings about the matter.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lamont, you are the head of this organization, confessedly so. Your personal attitude about it is very material to this committee.

"Mr. ROBINSON. It seems to me that if the facts are as you represent them here, why should you have any objection whatever to one of our members going up there and making an investigation? The very fact that you indicate that you don't want them to do that would be pretty strong evidence that the facts are not as you are representing them, wouldn't it?

"Mr. LAMONT. Here is the point as I see it: that having submitted all published material and shown you what the organization does, there is no relevance or point in having somebody come and go through all the council files and financial records; and frankly, the council had not, a while ago, taken a final stand on the business. It is very suspicious, afraid of submitting or making semipublic lists of contributors, because we know that they often appear in the newspapers.

"Mr. ADAMSON. Didn't you just tell Mr. RANKIN a few minutes ago that your contributors were not secret? They are taking tax deductions under Federal statutes.

"Mr. LAMONT. Mr. Adamson, as I told you a couple of weeks ago, if there is anything wrong with our set-up in relation to tax exemption, we would show our financial records to the proper Government authority, which is the Treasury Department.

"The CHAIRMAN. What authority do you think is a higher authority in the Government than the Congress of the United States?

"Mr. LAMONT. I am not saying there is a higher authority, but there is a division of powers, as you know, Mr. Chairman, in our Constitution and in our Government, and I would doubt—I don't think it is part of the functions of this committee to get into a lot of financial records unless you can prove on the face of it that there is something un-American about our organization.

"Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we don't need any lecture from him as to what the functions of this committee are or what the functions of Congress are; and his statement, in my opinion, is contempt of this committee. This committee has the power, the constitutional power and the authority of Congress, to bring you here and demand that you deliver those books.

"Mr. LAMONT. If I can deliver them, Mr. RANKIN.

"Mr. RANKIN. Who can?

"Mr. LAMONT. As I said, I am only chairman of the organization, and I don't have custody of the files and that sort of thing.

"Mr. RANKIN. As chairman of the organization you have custody of those files and everybody knows it.

"Mr. LAMONT. That just is not true in our organization. The director has the custody.

"The CHAIRMAN. Who is the director?

"Mr. LAMONT. He is down here—Richard Morford.

"Mr. RANKIN. What is he?

"Mr. LAMONT. Director.

"The CHAIRMAN. Of what?

"Mr. LAMONT. Of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

"The CHAIRMAN. Where is his office?

"Mr. LAMONT. He is our only salaried official, you see.

"The CHAIRMAN. Where are his offices?

"Mr. LAMONT. His offices are at the headquarters of the organization, 114 East Thirty-second Street, New York City.

"The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand that Mr. Morford is the exclusive custodian of the records, books, the financial affairs of the organization that you are the head of?

"Mr. LAMONT. That is right.

"Mr. ADAMSON. Is he the official upon whom the responsibility would fall in the case of his refusal to produce the books, papers, and records of the organization?

"Mr. LAMONT. I think so; yes.

"Mr. ADAMSON. Do you agree with me that, in default of the production of the papers, Mr. Morford is the gentleman who should be punished for contempt? Is that right?

"Mr. LAMONT. I would have to consult my counsel on that.

"The CHAIRMAN. Let us not go into the question of contempt now. If you were to give an order in your capacity as chairman of this organization to Mr. Morford, would he be bound to comply with that order?

"Mr. LAMONT. No. The chairman gives no orders in our organization.

"Mr. RANKIN. Who does?

"The CHAIRMAN. Who directs the policy?

"Mr. LAMONT. The board of directors.

"Mr. RANKIN. Who is chairman of that board?

"Mr. LAMONT. We have no such office as chairman of the board of directors.

"Mr. RANKIN. Who presides over it?

"Mr. LAMONT. Well, I do part of the time; if not, some one of the vice chairmen.

"Mr. LANDIS. Whom did you serve?

"Mr. ADAMSON. It is a corporation, Mr. Chairman, and we got service on the chairman.

"Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Lamont, I think you are getting yourself into a ridiculous position, the most ridiculous position I have ever seen a man get himself into.

"Mr. LAMONT. I don't see why, because I tell you—it is a technical matter, if you like, but it is the same on our local councils—you ask for financial records of those councils, and, honestly, we can't do it. We just don't have the power, and I don't have the power to bring you the financial records. I can't go into our office and cart off all the documents.

"Mr. BONNER. He didn't ask you that. He asked you if you were willing to let our investigators go in and make an investigation. This is the only thing that makes me suspicious about these witnesses that come in here and they make a nice witness and I go along with them, and then when they get to the place where they have got something that we want, they want to hide it. I am willing to go along with pretty nearly everything you say myself, but when you have got something you want to hide, I get suspicious. You are the second witness that has come up here and put up the same kind of argument, that nobody seems to have the responsibility. That is the way I view it.

"Mr. LAMONT. I am telling you the director does have the responsibility. He does have the responsibility for our files and records. There is no doubt about that. That is the way our organization is built up, and we can't change our whole constitution because of what this committee may want or not want."

Because of the foregoing, the Committee on Un-American Activities has been deprived of the opportunity to inspect the books, papers, and records mentioned in the foregoing subpena and of the evidence contained therein which your committee considers relevant to the subject matter of subversive and un-American activities as set forth in House Resolution 5 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, which instructed and required your committee to investigate such matters. The willful and deliberate refusal of Corliss G. Lamont, as set forth herein, to produce the books, papers, and records as called for in the subpena deprives your committee of the evidence necessary to conduct its investigation of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., which evidence is pertinent to the said investigation, and places the said Corliss G. Lamont in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"HOUSE RESOLUTION

"Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the foregoing report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as to the willful and deliberate refusal of the following person to produce before the said committee for its inspection certain books, papers, and records which had

been duly subpenaed; under seal of the House of Representatives to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that the said person named below may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law: Corliss G. Lamont, 114 East Thirty-second Street, New York, N. Y."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the report on the ground that it does not contain all of the transcript of what transpired before the committee with respect to this witness. On page 2 of the report, at the end of the first paragraph, the committee concedes that this is not a full transcript. It states: "The material parts of his testimony follow." In other words, the House has before it only that portion of the testimony which the committee conceives to be material. This deprives the House of having the full proceedings before it; consequently, the House will be asked to vote on whether or not this witness is to be cited for contempt and whether or not the House is to recommend prosecution of this witness, without having the full story before it, without having all of the testimony before it. All that is given is part of the testimony which the committee describes as material.

I respectfully submit in support of my point of order, Mr. Speaker, that what is material and what is not material should be determined by the House, because the House has to pass on this question and the majority of the Members of this House must vote in the affirmative in order to recommend these contempt proceedings. To do so it must have the entire transcript before it. Consequently I submit that the report is defective and that the report should be referred back to the committee by the Speaker, directing it to produce the full transcript of what transpired so that the House may have the entire proceedings before it before the House Members cast their votes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has stated the point exactly, and that is that this is not a matter for the Chair to pass upon but is a matter for the House to pass upon. The Chair overrules the point of order.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement. Many Members are irked with roll calls. Many Members want the Chair to hold that those motions are dilatory. The Chair would not refrain from doing that under certain circumstances. However, it is a major operation when it does come. On the first roll call today 341 Members answered to their names. If 216 Members would stay on the floor, time would not be consumed by roll calls.

The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 177]

Adams	Douglas, Ill.	Miller, Calif.
Almond	Doyle	Miller, Nebr.
Anderson, Calif.	Elliott	Neely
	Gallagher	Norrell
Andresen, August H.	Gibson	Norton
	Gillespie	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews, N. Y.	Gossett	Patrick
Barry	Granger	Peterson, Ga.
Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ala.	Rains
Bates, Mass.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Reece, Tenn.
Bell	Harness, Ind.	Rees, Kans.
Bennet, N. Y.	Harris	Resa
Boren	Hoffman, Mich.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Boykin	Holifield	
Bradley, Mich.	Holmes, Wash.	Robinson, Utah
Bradley, Pa.	Hook	Roe, N. Y.
Brooks	Izac	Rooney
Buffett	Jackson	Sabath
Byrne, N. Y.	Jennings	Sadowski
Camp	Jones	Sparkman
Cannon, Fla.	Kee	Starkey
Chiperfield	Keefe	Stevenson
Cochran	Kefauver	Stewart
Coffee	Kerr	Stigler
Colmer	Larcade	Tolan
Combs	Lea	Torrens
Cox	LeCompte	Vinson
Crawford	Lemke	Welch
Curley	Lesinski	West
Daughton, Va.	Luce	Wickersham
Davis	Ludlow	Winstead
Dawson	Mahon	Wolfenden, Pa.
De Lacy	Mansfield, Mont.	Woodruff
Dingell		Worley
Dirksen	Mansfield, Tex.	Zimmerman
Doughton, N. C.	May	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RETURN OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES TO STATE OPERATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4437) to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the request of several Members on this side who want to be here when this is brought up, I must object.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. PRIEST submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4512) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 678), which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the foregoing report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as to the willful and deliberate refusal of the following person to produce before the said committee for its inspection certain books, papers, and records which had been duly subpenaed; under seal of the House of Representatives to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that said person named below may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law: Corliss G. Lamont, 114 East Thirty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, Corliss G. Lamont is the chairman of an organization incorporated and known as the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship. Some time ago your Committee on Un-American Activities obtained certain publications that were being issued and distributed by this organization and had an analysis made of the same, from which it appeared that this organization is engaged in political propaganda of a highly international character.

One of the declared objectives of this organization is "to take specific action against any anti-Soviet propaganda."

This organization has been given by the Treasury of the United States an exemption certificate in the collection of its funds, so that it does not have to file itself any income-tax report and contributors to the organization are permitted to deduct such contributions from their income-tax return for the year in which they are given.

After having gone into the activities of the organization at some length it was determined by your committee that we in the discharge of our duty should seek to learn something of the internal workings of this organization, the sources from which it was obtaining its funds and the purpose for which its funds were expended, likewise something of the correspondence that was being carried on by this organization with certain foreign countries.

We requested permission for one of our investigators to go through their books and records in their office in New York, which request was curtly refused.

Thereupon we caused a subpena to be served upon them to produce these books and records before our committee, with the result shown in the testimony read here, and which was also furnished to each of you in your offices some days ago. If your committee is to continue its operations in an effort to ferret out and expose subversive activities in this land we must, of necessity, have the privilege of inspecting the books and records of the organizations that are thought to be engaged in that character of activity. We have no recourse except to come to this Congress, and the matter is now before you.

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a list of Communist-front organizations with which Mr. Corliss Lamont has had affiliation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to preface my remarks by making this observation: 6 years ago the Dies committee recommended to this House certain contempt proceedings. This House had cited certain persons for contempt. Those persons were not tried by the courts until some few weeks ago. Now, there is no sense in our citing people for contempt today if they are not going to be tried by the courts for the next 6 years. I recommend immediate trial.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman should state to the House that there were two actions taken: One against a man by the name of Blumberg, who was tried and found guilty, but only received a suspended sentence by the court, and, in another proceeding, the Dolson case, that this House voted contempt proceedings against, the district attorney, on his own motion, dismissed the case.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I am very glad that the gentleman from New York brought that out because one of the things the gentleman from New York and other Members of this House always complained about was the way in which the Dies committee went ahead with these proceedings. The procedure of the permanent Committee on Un-American Activities has been just the opposite. We have been very careful, so you cannot compare the two at all.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I disagree with the gentlemen on that.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further. The gentleman will have plenty of time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes; I hope so.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing to keep in mind about Corliss Lamont, and particularly Corliss Lamont, though we have one or two other persons we will cite for contempt today. Corliss Lamont will tell you that he has nothing to do with the books and records of this organization; that a man by the name of Morford has everything to do with them, and Morford will then tell you that he has nothing to do with the books and records, that Corliss Lamont has everything to do with them. Well, I want to make this statement, and that is that there is not one person in this organization called the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship that knows hardly anything about what is going on except Corliss Lamont. Corliss Lamont is the key to the whole organization. I do not care whether a person in this body even might be a member of the organization; I dare say that even a Member of Congress, if he were a member of that organization, would know much about what is going on other than Corliss Lamont. So what I have to say here this afternoon is going to be chiefly in connection with Corliss Lamont, although I do not want to give the impression that this man Morford, whom we are going to cite a little later on, is not guilty also.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. At the time we were making this investigation there were spies in this country trying to get the secrets of the atomic bomb, and Canada was doing what the Government of the United States should have done—that is, it was catching these people and prosecuting them, and if you go into this thing thoroughly you will find them working hand in glove with this outfit.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. In connection with Corliss Lamont, I doubt if there was ever a person who came before the Dies committee or the Committee on Un-American Activities that has a longer Communist-front record than has Corliss Lamont.

Here is his entire record, which I am going to put in the RECORD today, for which permission has been received. It contains some six pages. I have tried to find a person connected with the Communist-front organizations that has a longer record than this fellow has.

Now, about this Corliss Lamont, one of the published hearings of the Dies committee says that he "is probably the most persistent propagandist for the Soviet Union to be found anywhere in the United States. No matter what the fluctuations of Soviet foreign policy and no matter what the corresponding shifts in the line of the Communist Party in the United States, Lamont has for many years been found a subservient fellow traveler of the Communists."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is he an American citizen?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. He is supposed to be an American citizen, but the House will have to judge whether he is or not. I have my own personal feelings about that. Lamont's ardor for the Soviet Union was not one whit diminished by the Stalin-Hitler pact. He has tagged along faithfully through all the sharply divided periods which have characterized Communist policy and tactics. His financial contributions to the Communist-front movement have made him a darling of the Communist Party.

There are American friends of the Soviet Union whose friendship is based exclusively on military considerations—friends who are deeply grateful for the fight which the Soviet Union has made against the armies of Hitler. There are other American friends of the Soviet Union whose friendship stems first and last from their own devotion to or sympathy with communism. Corliss Lamont belongs to the latter.

Lamont has written numerous pamphlets and books on the Soviet Union, most of which have been published under the auspices of the Communist Party in the United States. Among his pamphlets published by the Communist Party is one entitled "Soviet Russia and Religion." In this pamphlet Lamont quotes approvingly Marx's statement that—

> The social principles of Christianity are lickspittle, whereas the proletariat is revolutionary.

A recent report of an investigator of the Committee on Un-American Activities says that—

> Corliss Lamont * * * despite any denials to the contrary, believes in communistic socialism and the best witness against him is a magazine practically published by him called Soviet Russia Today.

In the August 1937 issue of this magazine Mr. Lamont said:

> This is the time of all times for friends of progress and socialism to stand by the Soviet Union——

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman says he is supposed to be an American citizen, and then he makes statements of that kind, I question whether he ought to be considered an American citizen.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. No, I did not say he was supposed to be an American citizen. If I did say it, I did not mean it just that way. I have my own personal views as to what kind of an American he is, but I am not going to express those personal views today. The gentleman can judge right from this what kind of an American he is.

Lamont further in this issue of the publication states:

> As for world socialism, I think it realistic rather than pessimistic to suggest that it will take at least another 100 years for the new order to triumph on the entire international scene. * * * The USSR has been and is a bulwark against world war—

And he envisions a peaceful Socialist internationalism as the final goal.

He concludes his article by stating that—

> In countries such as the United States and Great Britain which have a long democratic tradition and highly developed parliamentary institutions, I see a real chance that socialism may be achieved without violent revolution or any form of dictatorship.

In addition to being national chairman of the Friends of the Soviet Union, Lamont was a member of the executive committee of the Medical Bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, a member of the national committee of the Student Congress Against War, and a member of the national executive committee of the American League Against War and Fascism. All of these are well-known Communist-front organizations. He has been a signer of various statements among which was a statement to the President defending the Communist Party which appeared in the Daily Worker of March 5, 1941.

His articles have appeared frequently in New Masses and in Soviet Russia Today, and he is on the editorial board of the latter magazine. Both the International Publishers Catalogue and the

Workers Book Shops' Guide to Reading on Communism list Corliss Lamont as an approved author.

In closing, may I say that we probably have never had a person come before us that has had a longer Communist-front record than has Corliss Lamont. I have heard Corliss Lamont testify before the Un-American Activities Committee and there never was an inclination on his part to answer any question pertaining to his record or pertaining to communism, his financial record, or otherwise, or his connections with any foreign country. Corliss Lamont, like this fellow Morford and this other man we are proceeding against today, has an absolute distrust of Congress.

Corliss Lamont

Organization	Connection	Source
American Committee for Friendship with the Soviet Union	Speaker at seminar on Soviet Union, held Sept. 27-29, at Hopewell Junction, N. Y.	New Masses, Sept. 17, 1940, p. 2.
American Committee for Struggle Against War	Member	The Struggle Against War, June 1933, p. 2.
American Friends of the Soviet Union	Chairman of meeting	Daily Worker, Jan. 29, 1938, p. 8.
Do	Chairman	Daily Worker, Feb. 2, 1938, p. 2.
Do	Chairman (picture) (assails Dewey for attack on Moscow trials).	Daily Worker, Mar. 7, 1938, p. 1.
Do	Chairman (on tour in Russia; speaks over Moscow short-wave radio station).	Daily Worker, May 11, 1938, p. 1.
Do	Chairman (on tour in Russia; broadcasts to the United States).	Daily Worker, May 14, 1938, p. 2.
Do	National secretary (in Russia; makes statement praising U. S. S. R.).	Daily Worker, May 31, 1938, p. 2.
American Friends of Spanish Democracy	Member, executive committee	Letterhead, Feb. 21, 1938.
Do	Signer of letter to President	Daily Worker, Feb. 16, 1938, p. 2.
Medical Bureau of American Friends of Spanish Democracy.	General committee, member	New Masses, Jan. 5, 1937, p. 31.
American League Against War and Fascism	Member, national executive committee	Letterhead, Aug. 22, 1935.
Book Union Bulletin	Member, editorial board	Book Union Bulletin, August 1938, p. 1.
China Relief Rally	Speaker	Daily Worker, Feb. 7, 1938, p. 8.
Communist International	Book reviewed	Communist International, August 1936, p. 1093.
Communist Party	Signer of the statement to the President defending the Communist Party.	Daily Worker, Mar. 5, 1941, p. 2.
Defense Rally of the New Masses	Attended rally	Daily Worker, Feb. 26, 1940, p. 4.
Fight	Contributor	Fight, December 1933, p. 5.
Friends of the Soviet Union	Chairman	New Masses, Dec. 21, 1937, p. 8.
Do	Contributor, Soviet Russia Today	Soviet Russia Today, November 1933, p. 17.
Do	do	Soviet Russia Today, May 1940, p. 11.
Do	Member, editorial board, Soviet Russia Today	Soviet Russia Today, October 1936, p. 4.
Do	Member, editorial council, Soviet Russia Today	Soviet Russia Today, August 1937, p. 1.
Do	National chairman	Soviet Russia Today, June 1935, p. 30.
Do	Signer, defend the Soviet Union	Soviet Russia Today, June 1936, p. 25.
Do	Signer of manifesto	International Press Correspondence, vol. 15, No. 58, Nov. 2, 1935, p. 1443.
Do	Speaker	International Press Correspondence, vol. 14, No. 11, Feb. 23, 1934, p. 305.
Do	Speaker, protest meeting	Soviet Russia Today, June 1935, p. 30.
Guide to Readings on Communism	Author listed	Workers Book Shops, pp. 14, 15.
International Publishers	Author	Catalog, p. 61.
John Reed Memorial meeting	Speaker	Daily Worker, Oct. 14, 1940, p. 7.
League of American Writers	Signer of call to the fourth congress, June 6-8, 1941, New York City.	New Masses, Apr. 22, 1941, p. 25.
Medical Bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy.	Member, executive committee	Letterhead, Nov. 18, 1936.
Memorial meeting to commemorate John Reed's death in Moscow.	Chairman of the meeting held in New York City, Oct. 20, 1940.	New Masses, Oct 8, 1940, p. 2.
Mother Bloor banquet	Sponsor	Program, Jan. 24, 1936, p. 9.
National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance.	do	A leaflet, Call to a National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance, p. 3, Jan. 5-7, 1935.
National Peoples Committee Against Hearst	Member	Letterhead, Mar. 16, 1937.
New Masses	Contributor	New Masses, February 1932, p. 26.
Do	do	New Masses, April 1932, p. 18.
Do	do	New Masses, Aug. 20, 1935 p. 15.
Do	do	New Masses, Nov. 2, 1937, p. 23.
Do	do	New Masses, Nov. 30, 1937, p. 19.
Do	do	New Masses, July 26, 1938, p. 21.
Do	do	New Masses, Sept. 20, 1938, p. 19.
Do	do	New Masses, Nov. 14, 1939, p. 6.
Do	do	New Masses May 7, 1940, p. 4.
Do	do	New Masses, May 11, 1937, p. 25.
Do	do	New Masses May 28, 1940, p. 12.
Do	do	New Masses, July 9, 1940, p. 10.
Do	do	New Masses, July 16, 1940, p. 10.
Do	do	New Masses, July 23, 1940, p. 13.
Do	do	New Masses, Oct. 8, 1940, p. 17.
Do	do	New Masses, Apr. 1, 1941, p. 26.
New Masses, John Reed memorial tribute	Speaker, chairman	Daily Worker, Oct. 3, 1940, p. 7.
New Masses	Sent letter to New Masses	New Masses, Jan. 28, 1941, p. 23.
New Masses letter to President	Member, initiating committee	New Masses, Apr. 2, 1940, p. 21.
Do	Signer	Do.
Open letter to American liberals	do	Soviet Russia Today, March 1937, pp. 14-15.
Open letter for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union	do	Soviet Russia Today, September 1939, p. 25.
Open letter to New Masses concerning American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky.	do	New Masses, Feb. 16, 1937, p. 2.
"People's Platform," Station WABC	Speaker	Daily Worker, Sept. 28, 1940, p. 7.
Soviet Russia Today	Chairman of dinner-dance, Roger Smith Grill, New York City, Mar. 2, 1934.	New Masses, Feb. 27, 1937, p. 31.
Do	Contributor	Daily Worker, June 7, 1938, p. 3.
Do	do	Soviet Russia Today, June 1935, p. 26.
Do	do	Soviet Russia Today, November 1936, p. 18.
Do	do	Soviet Russia Today, October 1940, p. 30.
Do	do	Soviet Russia Today, November 1940, p. 8.
Do	do	Soviet Russia Today, December 1940, p. 12.
Do	do	Soviet Russia Today, April 1941, p. 7.
Do	Editorial board	Soviet Russia Today, August 1940, p. 8.
Do	Editorial council	Soviet Russia Today, August 1940, p. 3.
Soviet Russia Today, Lecture Bureau	Lecturer	Soviet Russia Today, September 1936, p. 3.
Soviet Russia Today	Member, editorial council	Soviet Russia Today, June 1940, p. 3.
"The Soviet Union and Present World Affairs" (meeting at Mecca Temple Auditorium).	Chairman of committee on arrangements	Daily Worker, Mar. 17, 1938, p. 2.
Statement by American Progressives on the Moscow Trials.	Signer	Daily Worker, Apr. 28, 1938, p. 4.
Student Congress Against War	Member, national committee	Fight War (a pamphlet), p. 4.
Sunday Worker	Contributor	Daily Worker, Dec. 21, 1935, p. 3.

Public hearings, pp. 345, 375f, 382, 421, 450, 516, 518, 528, 530, 536, 541, 562, 568, 622, 885f, 914, 1594, 2168, 2514, 4928, 5156, 6233, 6249f, 6467, 8416, 8703, appendix, vol. 10, p. XVIII, XXVI; 1939 H. Rept. No. 78; appendix I, p. 809; appendix V, pp. 1680, 1684.

Public hearings, appendix IX, pp. 257, 262f, 264-268, 370, 380f, 382f, 409, 417, 467, 469, 589, 591, 649, 758, 930, 968, 971, 974, 1101, 1163, 1170, 1187, 1190, 1192, 1194, 1201ff, 1250, 1300, 1313, 1351, 1355ff, 1377, 1379, 1384, 1446, 1454, 1456ff, 1471f, 1603f, 1617, 1620, 1649, 1651, 1677, 1772f.

Executive hearings, pp. 2359, 3134, 3179, 3375.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I voted against making this committee a permanent standing committee of the House because I did not believe we should have a permanent investigatory committee. However, when a majority of the Members of this House voted for this as a standing committee, and its subpena was not obeyed, I carefully examined the record of proceedings and voted to punish for contempt those who refused to obey its subpena. Today I come before you and say that upon this record we have here no one could ever be indicted for contempt. We have here a record that is barren of facts. We have only a demonstration such as has been put on here by the preceding speaker who is condemning this man because he has in the past written some tracts or pamphlets and because he is allegedly a Communist. Let me say I have nothing in common with this man. I certainly do not favor this organization of which he is a member. But when you come into this House and try to punish a man for contempt because of his political beliefs, then I say it is time to inquire into what we are doing. What does the record show? He was asked to produce before the committee certain books and pamphlets. This is what he said, and I quote:

I am only chairman of the organization and I do not have custody of the files and that sort of thing.

However, he tells the committee the name of the man who has the custody of the files desired by the committee. He gives the man's name and he gives the man's address and the place where the man can be found. Then later on he says in his testimony:

I am willing. I am telling you the director [and that is this Mr. Morford] does have that responsibility. He does have the responsibility for our files and records. There is no doubt about that. That is the way our organization is built up. We cannot change our whole constitution because of what this committee may want or not want.

Here is a man who is subpenaed to produce certain records and comes before the committee and tells the committee, "I have not got those records. I do not have the power to produce those records. The man who has those records and the man who has the power to produce those records is one Mr. Morford. If you want the records there is the man to go and get the records from."

Somebody may say, "Well, Mr. Morford was subpenaed and he did not produce the records." Is that any reason why this man Lamont should be haled before a grand jury and perhaps be cited for contempt—because somebody else has not produced the records? Is it any reason that this man Lamont should be brought before a grand jury and cited, perhaps, or an attempt made to cite him for contempt because in the past he has written certain pamphlets with which I disagree and with which you probably disagree? No; but from the remarks of the preceding speaker it is evident that he is to be cited for contempt not for what he did or did not do before the committee, but rather because at some time in the past he has engaged in allegedly communistic activities. We have here a man who has told the committee who has the books; who has come forward and at least has given some evidence of truthfulness before the committee. It may be that he is not as cooperative as the committee might desire. It may be perhaps that he might be evasive. It may be that he did not tell the committee how to go about obtaining a certification for contempt because certainly this record is absolutely devoid of any testimony to warrant a certification for contempt. Every lawyer in this House knows there is not a scintilla of evidence before this House that could in any wise justify a grand jury in indicting this man for contempt of Congress.

Although I voted against making this committee a permanent standing committee of the House, as I have previously stated, nevertheless, I felt that when it had been established as a standing committee it would conduct its proceedings differently from the old Dies committee. I regret to say that as time goes on it seems to be adopting the procedure of the Dies committee. In the 18 months in which it has been in existence it has not in any way contributed to the legislative efforts of the Members of this House—neither had the Dies committee in the 5 or 6 years of its existence. Both have been barren of any legislation or recommendations for legislation. They have had one thing in common and that is a penchant to hold witnesses in contempt.

We are sitting here today more or less as judges hearing only one side of the case and yet, even with that great advantage on the part of the committee, we have seen an effort made to sway this House by passion and prejudice rather than by the cold facts of the case. For what purpose did the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey refer to the allegedly communistic connections of this man Lamont? They are not part of this record which is to be certified. He did not even read the so-called long list of communistic connections but simply referred to a sheaf of papers in his hand and upon that you are to pass judgment and are asked to have this man Lamont cited for contempt. You will not know what was in that sheaf of papers until tomorrow when you read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and by that time you will have voted to cite for contempt.

I do not care what Lamont's record is; I do not care whether he be the worst criminal in the world; I do not care whether he is a Communist or not. I am concerned with the more important question, and that is whether a man can be held in contempt when he has answered the questions of the committee and when he has told the committee where they can get the information that the committee desires.

This Congress, on the recommendation of this committee, has previously certified the record to cite others for contempt. No action has been taken by the district attorney of this district, although weeks and months have elapsed since the record in these cases was certified to the grand jury. What can be the only explanation? Certainly, it cannot be said that the district attorney of the District of Columbia is derelict in his duty. The only inference that can be drawn is that as matter of law the district attorney does not feel that he can secure an indictment from any American grand jury. We gain nothing by this continual procedure of holding witnesses in contempt, with no action being taken thereon.

Furthermore, let me say that there is grave doubt in my mind whether this committee has not far exceeded its authorized purpose. It seems to me that it was not the intention of Congress that this most unusual committee should have the most unusual power to go and investigate any organization it sees fit. I take it that the Congress intended that there should be some evidence that the organization which is to be examined is engaged in subversive activities. It need not be that a prima facie case of subversion must be established before the committee could exercise its subpena power, but at least there must be some evidence of such subversive activity. We cannot and should not on mere suspicion subpena the records of any individual or of any organization just for the sake of a fishing expedition. It is not the American way. It is not either the judicial or legislative way. We cannot expect respect for this great legislative body except if we in turn respect the rights of others. This committee apparently goes on the assumption that it has carte blanche to investigate whomsoever and whatsoever it pleases. That was the reason why I opposed making this committee a permanent standing committee of the House. Someday in the future, if this committee is continued, I have no doubt that as the cycle of time goes on and perhaps when there are new members on the committee, we will be haunted by the precedents established by this committee and that minority groups, perhaps religious organizations, will be the target of its subpena. But whatever the future may hold, let me say that upon this cold record before me I can see no justification to certify this record for contempt proceedings.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to Representative POWELL, of New York.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to say a word concerning this matter that is before us right now and the two matters which will probably follow. The organization we are dealing with now is an organization which has been exempted from taxation by the Treasury; contributions to the organization are tax exempt. It is an incorporated body and, therefore, all of its records are open to the public. Whether we agree with its principles or not does not seem to me to be cause for citing it as a subversive organization. Whether we agree with Mr. Lamont's principles or not does not seem to me to be cause for citing him for being subversive.

We differ in this body politically, oftimes. Perhaps if we carried this to the extreme we would all be cited eventually for contempt of something or other.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Does the gentleman think the Communist Party is a political party of the United States?

Mr. POWELL. Yes. Until we abolish the Communist Party or the Republican Party the people of the United States who are citizens are privileged to belong to any political party.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. Certainly.

Mr. RICH. If you abolish the Communist Party and the Republican Party, what would you do with the New Dealers?

Mr. POWELL. We would stay right where we are.

I would like to say a word concerning Mr. Lamont personally, because I know him. I am not a lawyer, but as the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] said, there is nothing in the record to show where Mr. Lamont is guilty. Mr. Lamont is a very fine individual. I have known him for years. He happens to be the son of J. Pierpont Morgan's partner, Thomas Lamont. That will probably be held against him.

Coming after him for contempt citation is Richard Morford, who happens to be a fellow clergyman of mine, a member of the Presbyterian ministry. The third person for citation is a fine gentleman, George Marshall, son of the eminent Louis Marshall.

These people are people who may have views different from ours, but under our democracy they are entitled to them. You cannot hold an individual responsible for the action of his organization. That is not democracy. That is not justice.

I suggest also, in conclusion, that the Committee on Un-American Activities investigate this week's issue of the Saturday Evening Post. I am sure it will find the feature article subversive.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 178]

Adams	Buffett	Daughton, Va.
Anderson, Calif.	Bunker	Davis
	Byrne, N. Y.	Dawson
Andrews, N. Y.	Camp	De Lacy
Bailey	Cannon, Fla.	Dingell
Baldwin, Md.	Chiperfield	Dirksen
Barry	Clark	Doyle
Bates, Mass.	Cochran	Durham
Bell	Coffee	Ellsworth
Bennet, N. Y.	Colmer	Engel, Mich.
Boren	Combs	Engle, Calif.
Boykin	Crawford	Gallagher
Bradley, Mich.	Curley	Gathings
Bradley, Pa.	D'Alesandro	Gearhart
Gibson	Ludlow	Roe, N. Y.
Gillie	McCormack	Rooney
Gossett	McGehee	Sabath
Granger	Mahon	Sheppard
Grant, Ala.	Mansfield, Mont.	Slaughter
Gwinn, N. Y.		Sparkman
Harness, Ind.	Mansfield, Tex.	Starkey
Harris	Miller, Calif.	Stevenson
Hartley	Murdock	Stewart
Hébert	Murphy	Stigler
Hedrick	Norrell	Sumners, Tex.
Hoffman, Mich.	Norton	Thomas, Tex.
Holifield	O'Brien, Mich.	Tolan
Izac	O'Neal	Torrens
Jackson	Outland	Vinson
Jennings	Patrick	Voorhis, Calif.
Johnson, Ind.	Peterson, Ga.	Wadsworth
Kee	Ploeser	Weaver
Kefauver	Plumley	Welch
Kerr	Powell	West
Kirwan	Reece, Tenn.	Wickersham
Lea	Robertson, N. Dak.	Winstead
LeCompte		Wolfenden, Pa.
Lemke	Robinson, Utah	Worley
Luce	Rockwell	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 322 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REACQUISITION OF PROPERTY UNDER SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 679, Rept. No. 2349) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6702) to clarify the rights of former owners of real property to reacquire such property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROCEEDING AGAINST CORLISS G. LAMONT

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the speaker who preceded me, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], stated that he did not like to have this case brought up here because Mr. Lamont is a dear old friend of his and he felt that he should protect him. I recognize Mr. Lamont is a member of a distinguished family in the city of New York and has many friends up there, of course. But the problem with which we are now confronted is about the same problem we had before us on the previous citation cases for contempt where the House ruled very definitely that a committee of its creation should be empowered to examine witnesses and insist that they answer questions directly and factually.

We have found that this case differs not one bit from the previous cases in that the same routine has been followed. Whoever cuts the pattern of evasion for these subversive organizations apparently has got a central office directing all of them to follow the same technique. All you need do is read the complete hearings of the Corliss Lamont-Richard Morford testimony, short excerpts of which you have had placed before you, to realize how they endeavor to evade questions and to deceive the Congress.

We have Mr. Lamont stating that he is only chairman of the board of directors; he presides at the meetings, but that the books of the organization are in the hands of a salaried employee, Mr. Morford. Then we have Mr. Morford testifying that he was employed by Mr. Lamont to serve as a salaried employee, and to maintain custody of the records pursuant to the orders of the board of directors, of which Mr. Lamont is chairman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr RANKIN And he testified also that this was a corporation and he was president of it?

Mr MUNDT. That is correct. The point I am trying to make is simply this. We are asking you to cite for contempt both Mr. Lamont and Mr. Morford so that proper court procedure can follow, where these men can both be summoned and put under oath and the complete facts made available. Obviously, somebody in this organization must have control of the books. Obviously, it is a matter to be settled in the courts, because we find one witness contradicting the other throughout this testimony. If Mr. Lamont employs Mr. Morford and directs him as secretary to have custody of the books and not to allow the investigators of this committee to see them and examine them, it would appear to me that Mr. Lamont must certainly be in contempt of the committee when he blandly advises us that he washes his hands of the entire affair and suggests that we talk to Mr. Morford. Mr. Lamont is at best an adept artist in concealment. Mr. Morford says, "Unfortunately I am bound by the policy established by the board of directors of which Mr. Lamont is chairman." Apparently Mr. Lamont is also many times the sole member who determines the policy to be followed by the board.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It would appear to me that as long as the committee has been investigating un-American activities you certainly ought to be in a position to know who the ringleaders of this gang are. I think the House should support you.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the House will support us. I hope it will. It has done so consistently in the past.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SAVAGE. I see in the report which the committee submitted to the House that Mr. Morford did not deny

having the records. On page 2 of the report I find this:

The CHAIRMAN. Have you such records?
Mr. MORFORD. The records are in my custody in the office of the council.

He does not deny having the records. Therefore, Mr. Lamont must be telling the truth. He says he does not have them. The other man does, and the other man admitted it.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it the gentleman's position that there is no question about Mr. Morford being in contempt of our committee, then?

Mr. SAVAGE. No. I am talking about the proceedings with reference to Mr. Corliss Lamont now.

Mr. MUNDT. I suppose you will support the resolution with reference to Mr. Morford when we bring that up next?

Mr. SAVAGE. The resolution that is before us now concerns Mr. Lamont. He says he does not have the records. I maintain he was telling the truth, because the other man says he has them.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to know that you will be with us on the next resolution.

Mr. SAVAGE. We will vote on that when we come to it.

Mr. MUNDT. It will be interesting to study the gentleman's vote at that time in view of the statements he has just made. Mr. Speaker, all that we ask today is that the House once more back up its standing Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities in our effort to bring an end to the vicious circle of concealment, evasion, deception, buck-passing, and studied secrecy by which Mr. Lamont's organization and others like it are endeavoring to keep from public inspection the actual purposes and policies of their various groups. If they have nothing in their records of which they are ashamed, it is indeed difficult to understand why they go to such great lengths to deny the public an opportunity to examine their records.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that an organization of this type which seeks and secures tax-exempt privileges for its contributors, which utilizes our mails freely, which stands meticulously on every conceivable constitutional point to protect its freedom and liberty is certainly sailing a strange course when it defies the United States Congress, conceals its records from public inspection, and never at any time has anything good to say about the United States or its form of government. Its literature is packed with plaudits to the Soviet system but whenever there is a difference of opinion to be discussed between the U. S. S. R. and the United States of America this outfit is invariably found in the Russian corner seconding the position of its commissars and leaders. If this is done from purely American motives and under purely American leadership, there is no harm in such activity, because we all desire to increase by every legitimate means the ties of friendship between the United States of America and Russia.

On the other hand, if this policy is motivated, directed, and/or financed from the Kremlin, it is at least not too much to ask that the American public be so advised. Not until the public can know the true identity of the master minds of this organization and can learn the true nature of its financial transactions and its international contacts will the real character of this organization be known which so disarmingly calls itself the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship. We ask you today by your vote to help the public learn the facts of life about this council, which for reasons best known to themselves, the officers of the outfit persistently and consistently refuse to disclose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has expired.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. * * *

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York will take his seat. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk reported the words objected to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair thinks it very clear that these remarks are offending remarks; that the words "I cannot respect the actions or even the sincerity of some of the committee members" are improper.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike those words from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi moves to strike the offending words from the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MARCANTÓNIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] be permitted to proceed in order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, then I move that the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] be permitted to proceed in order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for me to cast an affirmative vote in this proceeding. To me it is a flea hunt while the lion escapes.

The Committee on Un-American Activities was created by this House to investiagte subversive activities that would undermine the fundamental character of the Nation and that might threaten the rights and constitutional guarantees of the people who make up the Nation.

The Klu Klux Klan has come forth from its hiding place and is once again riding the highways and byways uttering its hideous shout in an effort to be a threat to the Government of these United States. To me the Klu Klux Klan is just as repulsive as communism and fascism. It terms itself the "invisible empire" and it is just that. The aim of the Klan is to create a government within the Government which would be run by lawless scamps who deny the existence of both the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

This committee has been made aware of this momentous danger and has chosen not to take cognizance of it. The governors of both Alabama and Georgia—men who are evidently sincere, patriotic Americans—have demanded investigation and suppression of the charter of the Klan. They are conscious of the danger and are taking steps to see that the conditions that existed 20 or 25 years ago do not repeat themselves.

The Klan is opposed to the guaranty of constitutional rights to the 25,000,000 Catholics of this country, the 13,000,000 Negroes, and the 3,500,000 Jews. It would deny the protection of our Government to over 40,000,000 people. It reserves the right to itself to establish its own secret courts and mete out its ironic and tyrannical judgments. The boast of the Klan is that it will build up a membership of 3,000,000 people, a force more powerful than all of the Communists and Fascists in this country. A force that could create havoc and anarchy in many sections. At the recent initiation held by this organization in Atlanta 35 policemen of that city laid their guns at the feet of the imperial wizard and pledged allegiance to him when they already owed allegiance to the State.

When the Committee on Un-American Activities takes cognizance of the existence of these hooded scalawags and makes a sincere effort to drive them from American life, then and not until then will I listen to any plea that that committee makes upon this floor.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear that the two organizations that George Marshall is chairman of, the National Federation of Constitutional Liberty, and that Corliss Lamont is chairman of, the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship, and that Richard Morford is director of, the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship, are Communist-front organizations.

Our committee has carried on its work during the past year despite many efforts at dissolution, led by Communists and their fellow travelers. The committee has formulated the policy of investigating complaints received from American citizens who have the interest of the United States foremost in their hearts and minds.

The committee has not endeavored to curb the civil rights of persons whom it has investigated nor has it any intention of doing so. However, the committee has endeavored to determine whether the persons under investigation have the interest of the United States Government at heart or whether they are sympathetic toward the establishment of a form of government which would forever abolish the civil liberties of all of the people for the benefit of a few.

Our committee will undertake the investigation of any organization which advocates the overthrow of the American system. Communists would like to see the committee abolished because it has exposed their activities in many fields. Communists hate and dread exposure because when the committee uncovers the extent of their infiltration into certain groups it results in the loss of years of work to the Communist followers in the United States.

The Communists have many organizations in the United States, and in New York City alone there are more than 150 organizations which follow the Communist Party line. They have approximately 50,000 Communist members—holding cards—500,000 fellow travelers, and 150,000 underground workers. Our committee has noted with alarm that many innocent citizens have loaned themselves to the furtherance of some phase of communistic doctrines by joining Communist-front groups. When these groups are exposed, the loyal American citizens should disavow their association with these groups. It is conceivable that a person may make a mistake once by joining an organization set up by the Communists. However, when a citizen belongs to many such organizations he is either intentionally or carelessly helping to sell the United States short.

Certain groups and individuals in the United States have tried to frighten the American public into believing that unless we become a communistic nation along with the rest of the world that the United States will be destroyed by atomic bombs. These persons would have one believe that communism is the only way to peace for the world.

The United States must fear communism because it is a foreign-controlled totalitarian movement whose leaders in the past have openly proclaimed that it advocates revolution and the overthrow of the present Government of the United States.

Control of labor unions in the United States is very important to the communistic movement because they hope that through the labor unions they can combine strength with the working class and cause the overthrow of the Government. The Communists fully realize that the workers in mass industries are militant bodies and can be incited to take violent physical action in the form of riots. Some of our labor unions have let these Communists enter their organizations. Some of these unions have been cleaning house. It is time for the rest of these unions to clean out the communistic element that has been throttling the labor unions. No Communist should be allowed to hold an office in a labor union.

The Communists do not hope to obtain control of the Government through the ballot. However, they will work in the 1946 campaign with the PAC, and they expect to have the Communist Party back in action in the 1948 campaign.

OUR RELIGION IN JEOPARDY

If the Communists would succeed, science would replace religion. The Protestants, Catholic, and Jews in America are disturbed at the danger of losing their religious freedom. We do not want our churches sacked or burned.

IT CAN HAPPEN HERE

It can happen here. Anything can happen anywhere at any time if our citizens will not organize, fight, and take the trouble to vote. It happened in Russia when about 200,000 Communists took over Russia in 1918.

Now it makes no difference to us what kind of a system they have in Russia. That is their business. But it does make a difference what kind of a system we have in the United States. That is our business. If these subversive individuals persist in the overthrow of our Government we should put them on a boat and send them back where they belong.

America has reached the crossroads. Today it does seem to me important to make a record of what is a very critical hour in the history of the Republic, so that future generations can turn back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and find that some Members of Congress warned the American people the danger of losing their liberty.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has investigated the German-American Bund, Fascists, Nazis, Communists, and the Black Dragon Society of Japan. These subversive groups would like to take over our churches, schools, labor unions, movie industry, radio industry, transportation, and business institutions. They would like to regiment our farmers and workers.

As a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I want to speak to you frankly on communism, because I have made direct contact with American and Russian Communists who have recently denounced communism with its iron dictatorship over the liberties and souls of men. Communism is a political idea that the government owns everything and tells everyone what to do. Communism holds that there is not room enough for it on earth and any rival ideas in politics, religion, or economics. No Communist anywhere can be considered a trustworthy citizen. He is a Russian agent and takes orders from Moscow. In America we still allow a Communist Party to run at large. From the first day to the present they have publicly stated that they aim at and work for the violent overthrow of our Government.

We have our choice between American and Christian principles or communism. The danger of communism to America is real; it is imminent. It threatens everything for which our boys have been fighting.

Among Commuists in this country there are many who have become such out of an original sense of social justice, but who are now most unhappy that they belong. Communism is being subsidized by many of our best people and laughed off by many others—who persist that it cannot happen here.

The Political Action Committee, which was organized by Sidney Hillman, who came to the United States from Russia, is one of the most dangerous organizations in America at the present time. The Communists are working with this organization in the coming elections, but they claim they will have a Communist Party organization ready for action in 1948. This CIO Political Action Committee boasts of having $6,000,000 to spend in the 1946 election. Some of this New York Communist money will be spent in Indiana to try to defeat the Republican Members of Congress. I believe the Indiana people will resent these funds coming into our State and they will give them another set-back like they got in the 1944 election.

The voters of Indiana and America will decide at the polls in November whether or not the Communist—CIO—Political Action Committee is going to run the country. I am certain all Americans will take one day off to vote this fall, when they know it means so much toward preserving their liberty.

MINUTEMEN ORGANIZATIONS

Minutemen organizations are springing up all over the United States to combat these Communists. Minutemen groups are made up from liberals, progressives, and conservatives of the Republican and Democratic parties who feel that a united effort irrespective of party must be made to reestablish, foster, and protect the American form of government which has given us the highest standard of living of any nation in the world.

These minutemen believe that America's greatness rests upon a foundation that has its cornerstone, religious freedom, freedom of the press, personal liberty, full economic opportunity, and the right of private enterprise.

They are opposed to the New Deal program of scarcity, control, and regimentation.

They believe that the people's savings, whether life insurance policies, war bonds or other forms of savings, should be protected from inflation that will follow continued reckless public spending.

They believe the time has come for the Government to look after our own people before we make any foreign loans or gifts.

They believe the Government must remove the needless Federal bureaus and unnecessary Government workers. The Reds should be removed immediately from United States pay rolls.

They want to stop the exportation of lumber and logs in order for America to catch up with its housing program.

They want to stop the exportation of farm machinery until our farmers are adequately supplied.

They are not ready to turn their country and control of their Government over to subversive groups.

We have coddled subversive activities too long in America. Too many Americans are disturbed about Great Britain going communistic, instead of being disturbed about the communistic activities in America. It is time for all Americans to wake up. If necessary, we should double the forces of the FBI. Today we need the help of every American and every patriotic organization to protect our temples of liberty.

We should rededicate ourselves to our God, to our country, and to our homes with the inspiration of Lincoln's words when he said:

Many free countries have lost their liberty and ours may lose hers; but if she shall, be it my proudest plume not that I was the last to desert but that I never deserted her.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I think a careful reading of the RECORD of today's proceedings will demonstrate conclusively that a great deal that has been said by the proponents of this resolution is not only extraneous and foreign to the issue involved here but has been injected for the sole purpose of evading the issue itselt and of creating atmosphere.

The raising of the Red bogey is an old technique. It has been used time and time again, particularly in support of every endeavor to violate the fundamental liberties of the American people. Red baiting has been used against labor. It will be used again. It is being used now. It is being used against anybody who at some time or another takes a position which is diametrically opposed to both domestic and foreign fascism. It is a technique used particularly in furtherance of domestic fascism. It was used by Hitler, it was used by Mussolini. Raise the Red bogey and by means of raising the Red bogey you ride roughshod over the democratic rights of all the people. Mussolini did it, and it worked out there. Hitler did it. The attack on the Communists was followed by an attack on labor. Then it was followed by an attack on the Catholics, and so on and so forth, so that no one was left with any democratic rights in Germany. Remember, recent history has taught us that when you destroy the democratic rights of any group, you endanger the liberties of all.

So the Red bogey technique is being used here again. But I submit we should concern ourselves with the direct issue of whether or not the person mentioned in this resolution has refused to respect a subpena of the House of Representatives. Incidentally, at this time I want to refer to a colloquy that I had with the gentleman from South Dakota during the previous contempt proceedings. I pointed out at that time that despite the fact he felt that the majority of the House was on his side I recalled to him that when we had the Dodd, Watson & Lovett cases before the House, those of us who oppose those resolutions were also in the minority, and I pointed out to him that the court had sustained our contention. He stated at that time, "Well, let us see what the Supreme Court will do about it." The Supreme Court, may I say to him, since that colloquy, has acted, and the Supreme Court sustained the position of the minority of this House, who at that time said that the House was violating the fundamental constitutional liberties of those men. The Supreme Court takes the same position today and Congress stands today in a very ridiculous position.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I do not think that holding the opposite of what the Supreme Court holds means that Congress is in a ridiculous position. I think Congress was right, and I think history will prove that Congress is right.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. History has already proven that Congress is wrong. May I say to the lady, speaking about subversive activities, certainly the lady does not want to overthrow the authority of the Supreme Court? When we were kids in school we were taught that the Supreme Court makes decisions on constitutional questions and that those decisions should be respected. I do hope the lady will give the Supreme Court the respect to which it is entitled under the Constitution of the United States unless the lady wants to advocate open and violent overthrow of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I give them enough respect to think that in time they will overrule their decision.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If the lady does that, perhaps she may be subpenaed by this committee and she is placing herself in very serious danger. You had better be careful, Jessie.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The question here is whether or not Mr. Lamont has custody of these records. The only testimony is to the effect that he does not have custody. He testified that somebody else, Mr. Morford, had custody. Mr. Morford admits in his testimony that he does have custody. Therefore, you have no case against Mr. Lamont, and despite the speech of the gentleman from New Jersey as to Mr. Lamont's record and as to Mr. Lamont's activities, how are you going to get around the proposition when you go before the Department of Justice and the district attorney asks you, "Show me, where does Mr. Lamont have custody?". It is elementary law that you cannot hold a person for violation of a subpena and for failure to produce books when that man does not have custody of those books. The record distinctly shows that Lamont does not have custody and that Morford has custody.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now you are going to ask me what my position is on Morford?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Yes; that is right.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There is a fundamental constitutional question involved here which I hope to discuss in the Morford case when it comes up. That fundamental constitutional question involved is, whether your proceedings violate the first amendment of the Constitution. They do, and I am ready to debate that question with the gentleman. But since the gentleman wanted to know my position on the Morford case on the basis of the fact that Morford has custody, then let me know how the gentleman feels with reference to the reverse situation; in other words, that Mr. Lamont does not have custody. Do you still insist on trying to punish Mr. Lamont for contempt?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. The gentleman knows even better than I do that Corliss Lamont is the one man in this organization who has more to say about the records than anyone else. Do you know him personally?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That does not mean we should cite him for contempt. You ask me if I know Mr. Lamont personally. Yes; I do. I do not hide the identity of anybody I know, nor for that matter, my own identity. That is my reputation, and everybody knows it.

But let us go back to the record here. Your record discloses completely that Mr. Lamont does not have custody of these records. I ask every Member of this House to read this two-page report before you vote. Lamont does not have custody of these records. The testimony shows that the director has custody of the records. The director testifies and admits that he has custody of the records. You can use the Red bogey all you want, but I shall not cast my vote to make this Congress once again ridiculous in the courts of this country.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a rather interesting spectacle when you think of the parade that has taken place before this House in the past few years, of the names of many men who were seeking to destroy and overthrow the very Government under which they lived. And, mark you, they are the first ones to cry out for the protection of the Constitution.

I was interested in that plea being presented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] just a minute ago. Every time one of these un-American fellows are brought in here, every time one is taken before this body for attempting to destroy and undermine this Government, I do not remember a single instance that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] did not rise to defend him.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Please excuse me. There is a disturbing factor in addition to that. I fear there are some people in this country who call themselves "liberals" that would give away everything we have, including our liberty, while screaming for protection under the Constitution. Then tear up the Constitution and join the gang that has the loot, where they would undoubtedly be received with open arms. I know that New York probably has the largest percentage of foreign population of any city in the United States. Naturally, those people have foreign ties. Many of them do not even believe in our form of government, and many of them are the loudest critics of this Government. To those I would say in firm and unmistakable terms, You must return to the land from whence you came.

Now, we established a committee of this House to be on the alert, to keep their eyes open for people who would seek to destroy and undermine this Government, and I am one who proposes to support that committee. They may make a

mistake occasionally. Who is it that does not? But we had better make a mistake once in a while and get the wrong man than to leave too many of the wrong kind operating in this country. There is no question about the fact that we have been too lax in that respect.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The thing that strikes me so oddly, we cited these other men on the same state of facts precisely, and when we get the people that the Dies committee says are the ringleaders, then all the opposition rises from those who did not oppose it before.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that this opposition did not just arise today. They will holler any time the occasion arises when they can support a fellow of this kind. When any strong suspicion arises, backed up by facts that would indicate that a man was operating against the best interests of this Government, that should be enough for this committee to say to him, "Here. We want to know your story." That should be enough for any good American, and I do not care who he is, to rush forward and want to clear his record and show that he was a good American, and that that suspicion was without foundation. Instead of doing as this man did—defy a summons from the United States Congress.

Now, here is a man who is president of an organization. I have practiced law a right good while. I always regarded—and so did the courts and the laws of my State—a subpena served on the president of a corporation that was properly served that the corporation was bound by that action. Here is the president served by a subpena of a duly organized legislative committee organized by this House. Yet he refuses to comply with it. Now mind you he sought cover under a law passed by this body and secured a certificate from the Treasury Department from paying Federal taxes, and also allowing those who made contributions to his organization to deduct them as credits on their tax reports—and still there are some in this House who say Uncle Sam has no right to question him—even if there is evidence tending to show that he and his organization are using this very tax-exempt money to undermine and do injury to this Government. I must confess I cannot understand their attitude.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such of the time remaining as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER. Six minutes remain for debate.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to answer in just a few words the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE], and to say to him that I am a Protestant. I never was in a Catholic Church in my life. There are Catholics all around me. None of them have ever heard me criticize their religion; but I want to tell the gentleman from New York that neither a Protestant Church nor a Catholic Church can exist in a Communist country. If they had their way they would close every church in America whether it was Catholic, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, or what not.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. No; not now.

I will read what Foster said about that:

In my opinion—

I am quoting William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party—

In my opinion, a member of the party of the Soviet Union who would be married in the church would not be of any value to the Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker, they rise here and cry "Red baiters" and "fascism." You know there is a little group of Reds and semi-Reds in this country who are always referring to the white people from the South as "southern Fascists," and to the people of the North they cannot browbeat as "native Fascists."

They talk about the Supreme Court. As far as I individually am concerned the Congress of the United States stands at least as high in my opinion and the opinion of the American people, as the Supreme Court of the United States as now constituted.

Now, let us see about this man Lamont.

But first, for the information of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] I read further what Mr. Foster said:

Many workers join the Communist Party who still have some religious scruples, but a worker who understands the elementary principles of the Communist Party must necessarily be in the process of liquidating his religion, and when he joins the party he will soon get rid of them.

So you will see, Mr. O'TOOLE, that Communism is out to destroy all religion.

Now, let us get back to this man Lamont. It has been shown that he is head of a Communist front organization, and has been mixed up with Communist fronts for years.

He came before the committee on Un-American activities at a time when traitors in this country, and in Canada, were trying to steal the secrets of the atomic bomb. Canada seized some of them and is today incarcerating them in the penitentiary. We found evidence that this group here headed by Mr. Lamont was in alliance with them. We brought Mr. Lamont before the committee, and of all the squirming I have ever seen, he did it. He is president of the corporation, has all the power on earth to bring those books and lay them before the committee. But he showed absolute contempt for the Congress of the United States by refusing to do so.

Now, are you going to underwrite that kind of conduct by your votes? Are you going to permit a man who goes around, a rich parlor pink, if you please, who goes around and mixes with other Communist front organizations that are dedicated to the overthrow of your Government, that are dedicated to wiping out every Christian church of any and all denominations, that are dedicated to the destruction of the American way of life, —are you going to permit him to become president of a corporation engaged in those subversive activities and then come before a committee of Congress and treat it with contempt, and treat Congress with contempt?

I was the author of the resolution which created the Committee on Un-American activities. I never felt a greater responsibility in my life than I did at that moment. It is punishment to a man to serve on that committee. I want to say to you now that no committee of this Congress has rendered a greater service than those men who serve on the Committee on Un-American Activities. In helping to protect our country, in helping to protect the American people, in helping to protect this Government, from being undermined and destroyed by those insidious enemies who are boring from within.

The gentleman from New York talks about the Jews and the Catholics. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman sitting before me [Mr. KLEIN] when he had a Communist running against him the Committee on Un-American Activities investigated and found that his opponent was engaged in subversive activities. Yes; you have Communists among the Jews, and they are doing the Jews more harm than everybody else put together. You have some Communists going down South stirring up trouble among the Negroes. They are doing the Negro more harm than anything else that has ever come along. Look at what they did at Columbia, Tenn. It was nothing in the world but a little Communist movement sent there to stir up trouble. Look what they did. They almost brought on a riot. I want to pay my respects to our distinguished former colleague, Governor McCord, of Tennessee, for calling out the highway patrol, for calling out the State guard, and to them for surrounding and taking care of those poor Negroes who were being agitated and stirred up by these Communists sent there for that purpose.

This is a question for you to decide. You can decide by your votes whether you want the individuals carrying on this kind of subversive work to treat your committee with contempt, to treat the Congress with contempt, or whether you are going to stand up for the United States of America.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

All time has expired. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240, nays 85, not voting 107, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—240

Abernethy	Angell	Beall
Allen, Ill.	Arends	Beckworth
Allen, La.	Arnold	Bender
Almond	Auchincloss	Bennett, Mo.
Andersen, H. Carl	Barden	Bishop
Andrews, Ala.	Barrett, Wyo.	Blackney
	Bates, Ky.	Bland

Bolton	Hall,	Pace
Bonner	Edwin Arthur	Patman
Brehm	Hall,	Peterson, Fla.
Brooks	Leonard W.	Philbin
Brown, Ga.	Halleck	Phillips
Brown, Ohio	Hancock	Pickett
Brumbaugh	Hare	Pittenger
Bryson	Harless, Ariz.	Plumley
Buck	Hartley	Poage
Bulwinkle	Hays	Pratt
Butler	Hendricks	Price, Fla.
Byrnes, Wis.	Henry	Priest
Campbell	Hess	Rains
Cannon, Mo.	Hill	Ramey
Carlson	Hinshaw	Randolph
Case, S. Dak.	Hobbs	Rankin
Chapman	Hoeven	Reed, Ill.
Chelf	Hoffman, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.
Chenoweth	Holmes, Mass.	Rees, Kans.
Chiperfield	Hope	Rich
Church	Horan	Richards
Clevenger	Howell	Riley
Clippinger	Hull	Rivers
Cole, Kans.	Jarman	Rizley
Cole, Mo.	Jenkins	Robertson, Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Jennings	Robsion, Ky.
Cooley	Jensen	Rockwell
Cooper	Johnson, Calif.	Rodgers, Pa.
Corbett	Johnson, Ill.	Roe, Md.
Courtney	Johnson, Ind.	Rogers, Fla.
Cravens	Johnson,	Rogers, Mass.
Cunningham	Luther A.	Russell
Curtis	Johnson,	Sasscer
D'Alesandro	Lyndon B.	Schwabe, Mo.
Daughton, Va.	Jones	Schwabe, Okla.
D'Ewart	Jonkman	Scrivner
Dirksen	Kilburn	Shafer
Dolliver	Kilday	Sharp
Dondero	Kinzer	Short
Doughton, N. C.	Knutson	Sikes
Drewry	Kunkel	Simpson, Ill.
Dworshak	Landis	Simpson, Pa.
Earthman	Lane	Slaughter
Eaton	Lanham	Smith, Ohio
Elliott	Larcade	Smith, Wis.
Ellis	Latham	Springer
Ellsworth	LeFevre	Stefan
Elsaesser	Lemke	Stockman
Elston	Lesinski	Sumner, Ill.
Engle, Calif.	Lewis	Sumners, Tex.
Ervin	Lyle	Sundstrom
Fallon	McConnell	Taber
Fenton	McCowen	Talbot
Fisher	McDonough	Talle
Flannagan	McGregor	Tarver
Fuller	McKenzie	Thomas, N. J.
Fulton	McMillan, S. C.	Thomason
Gamble	McMillen, Ill.	Tibbott
Gary	Maloney	Trimble
Gathings	Manasco	Vorys, Ohio
Gavin	Martin, Iowa	Vursell
Gearhart	Martin, Mass.	Wadsworth
Gerlach	Mason	Walter
Gifford	Merrow	Wasielewski
Gillette	Michener	Weichel
Gillie	Miller, Nebr.	White
Goodwin	Mills	Whitten
Gore	Monroney	Whittington
Gossett	Morrison	Wigglesworth
Graham	Mundt	Wilson
Grant, Ind.	Murray, Tenn.	Winter
Gregory	Murray, Wis.	Wood
Griffiths	O'Hara	Woodruff
Gross	O'Konski	Zimmerman
Gwynne, Iowa	O'Neal	

NAYS—85

Baldwin, N. Y.	Green	Neely
Barrett, Pa.	Hagen	Norblad
Biemiller	Hale	O'Brien, Ill.
Bloom	Hand	O'Toole
Buchanan	Hart	Outland
Buckley	Havenner	Patterson
Canfield	Healy	Pfeifer
Carnahan	Heffernan	Powell
Case, N. J.	Herter	Price, Ill.
Celler	Heselton	Quinn, N. Y.
Clason	Hoch	Rabaut
Crosser	Hook	Rabin
Dawson	Huber	Rayfiel
Delaney,	Judd	Resa
James J.	Kean	Rogers, N. Y.
Delaney,	Kearney	Rowan
John J.	Kelley, Pa.	Ryter
Douglas, Calif.	Keogh	Sabath
Douglas, Ill.	King	Sadowski
Eberharter	Kirwan	Savage
Feighan	Klein	Sheridan
Flood	Kopplemann	Smith, Maine
Fogarty	LaFollette	Somers, N. Y.
Forand	Link	Sullivan
Gardner	Lynch	Taylor
Geelan	Madden	Thom
Gordon	Marcantonio	Towe
Gorski	Mathews	Wolverton, N. J.
Granahan	Morgan	Woodhouse

NOT VOTING—107

Adams	Fernandez	Murdock
Anderson, Calif.	Folger	Murphy
Andresen,	Gallagher	Norrell
August H.	Gibson	Norton
Andrews, N. Y.	Gillespie	O'Brien, Mich.
Bailey	Granger	Patrick
Baldwin, Md.	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Ga.
Barry	Gwinn, N. Y.	Ploeser
Bates, Mass.	Harness, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.
Bell	Harris	Robertson,
Bennet, N. Y.	Hébert	N. Dak.
Boren	Hedrick	Robinson, Utah
Boykin	Hoffman, Mich.	Roe, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Holifield	Rooney
Bradley, Pa.	Holmes, Wash.	Sheppard
Buffett	Izac	Smith, Va.
Bunker	Jackson	Sparkman
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Spence
Camp	Kee	Starkey
Cannon, Fla.	Keefe	Stevenson
Clark	Kefauver	Stewart
Clements	Kelly, Ill.	Stigler
Cochran	Kerr	Thomas, Tex.
Coffee	Lea	Tolan
Colmer	LeCompte	Torrens
Combs	Luce	Traynor
Cox	Ludlow	Vinson
Crawford	McCormack	Voorhis, Calif.
Curley	McGehee	Weaver
Davis	McGlinchey	Welch
De Lacy	Mahon	West
Dingell	Mankin	Wickersham
Domengeaux	Mansfield,	Winstead
Doyle	Mont.	Wolcott
Durham	Mansfield, Tex.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Engel, Mich.	May	Worley
Fellows	Miller, Calif.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Coffee against.

Mr. Crawford for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. Robertson of North Dakota for, with Mr. Izac against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. De Lacy against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Bradley of Michigan for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Fellows.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Holmes of Washington.

Mr. Voorhis of California with Mr. Keefe.

Mr Camp with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Buffett.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr Davis with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Gwinn of New York.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Andrews of New York.

Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Mahon with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 645, Rept. No. 2353) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 3, 1947, with respect to the following matters:

1. The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaign for nomination and election to such office.

2. The amounts subscribed, contributed or expended, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobile and other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1946 to which a candidate for the House of Representatives is to be nominated or elected.

3. The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates.

4. The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, and expended, by any individual, individuals, or groups of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, including any political committee thereof, in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee from any corporation, labor union, individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership.

5. The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:

(a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

(b) Title 18, sections 61 to 61t, inclusive, United States Code, 1940 edition, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.

(c) The provisions of section 9, Public Law 89, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 144, first session, referred to as the "War Labor Disputes Act."

(d) Any statute or legislative act of the United States, or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

6. Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1946, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding any contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

7. The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee shall be public.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times

and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, as it deems advisable.

8. The committee is authorized and directed to report promptly any and all violations of any Federal or State statutes in connection with the matters and things mentioned herein to the Attorney General of the United States in order that he may take such official action as may be proper.

9. Every person, who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties prescribed by law.

That said committee is authorized and directed to file interim reports whenever in the judgment of the majority of the committee, or of a subcommittee conducting portions of said investigation, the public interest will be best served by the filing of said interim reports, and in no event shall the final report of said committee be filed later than January 3, 1947, as hereinabove provided.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 896. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes; and

S. 2122. An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 27, 1946, at 10 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Friday, June 28, 1946, at 10 a. m., in executive session to consider H. R. 6058, relating to the payment by the Government of premiums on bonds for postal employees; House Joint Resolution 356 to provide for making available to the Veterans' Administration, for distribution to veterans' hospitals, undeliverable magazines and other periodicals held by the postal service; and H. R. 2000, relating to the star-route service.

At 10:30 a. m. the committee will hold a hearing on H. R. 5993, a bill to provide for the extension of the air-mail postal service, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1422. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting an annual report covering operations during the calendar year 1945, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6885. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years; to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946; to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 541. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6223. A bill to authorize the Department of Highways of the States of Kentucky and West Virginia to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Williamson, W. Va.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2347). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 679. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6702, a bill to clarify the rights of former owners of real property to reacquire such property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (Rept. No. 2349). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6869. A bill to amend the immigration and naturalization laws to deny admission to the United States of certain aliens who have served in the armed forces of countries at war with the United States, also members of certain parties and organizations, and to deny naturalization to such persons, and to deny admission to the United States of persons who the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe seek to enter the United States for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6644. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; with amendments (Rept. No. 2352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 645. Resolution creating a special committee to investigate the election of Members of the House of Representatives (Rept. No. 2353). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 680. Resolution waiving points of order against H. R. 6885, a bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2355). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOOD: Committee on Un-American Activities submits a report pursuant to House Resolution 5, Seventy-ninth Congress (Rept. No. 2354). Referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 6886. A bill to authorize increases in the salary rates of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose pay is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 6887. A bill to authorize the transfer of the Fort Clark Military Reservation in Kinney County, Tex., to the Fort Clark Military Institute; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 6888. A bill to authorize the transfer of the Fort Clark Military Reservation in Kinney County, Tex., to the Fort Clark Military Institute; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 6889. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 6890. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 6891. A bill for the relief of George Demetrios Kariotis (James Pappas); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 6892. A bill for the relief of Werner P. Friederich; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 6893. A bill to authorize cancellation of deportation in the case of Anthony Consola; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2036. By Mr. JENSEN: Petition of William Bruzenhemke of 1326 Pleasant Street, Council Bluffs, Iowa, and 63 other signers, regarding removal of restrictions on beer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, whom to find is like exchanging a windowless cell for the blue depths of the sky, for the stretch of the infinite sea, for a serene garden with its sacrament of fragrance and color, escaping from the narrow prejudices and inflamed passions of this embittered day,

enable us to think with justice, truth, and reverence concerning the common interests of this troubled world. Teach us the saving secret of being anxious for nothing; and when we have honestly given our best to the solution of problems that now vex the earth plowed with the tragic furrows of war, may we leave the result to Thy wisdom with no fear in our hearts save only that of failing Thee and, at the last, of being found unworthy of Thy "Well done." In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, June 26, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 26, 1946, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1288. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States;

S. 1460. An act to fix the salary of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior;

S. 1963. An act to authorize additional permanent professors of the United States Military Academy; and

S. 2218. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 26, 1946, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 896. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended", approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes; and

S. 2122. An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON PATENTS, PROCESSES, TECHNIQUES, AND INVENTIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to section 19 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, the first supplementary report of that Administration on patents, processes, techniques, and inventions, which, with an accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Philippine Scouts Veterans' Legion, Manila, P. I., favoring the enactment of legislation providing the same basic pay for the Philippine Scouts as that received by the American soldier according to their respective ranks, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A radiogram in the nature of a petition signed by Senator Ver, president of the National Party, Judge Barrera, president, Democratic Alliance, and Dr. Javier, president of the Popular Front Party, Manila, P. I., favoring the enactment of the Knutson bill disassociating the rehabilitation act from the Bell trade law; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

H. R. 5654. A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1589).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6837. A bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1590).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6428. A bill making appropriations for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1616); and

H. R. 6777. A bill making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1617).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 4458. A bill for the relief of Rosella J. Masters; without amendment (Rept. No. 1591).

By Mr. HUFFMAN, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1754. A bill for the relief of Edwin Doyle Parrish; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1592).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3988. A bill for the relief of Decatur County in the State of Indiana; without amendment (Rept. No. 1593).

By Mr. HOEY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 6516. A bill to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1618).

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1322. A bill for the relief of the Marine Engine Works & Shipbuilding Corp., of Tarpon Springs, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1594);

H. R. 1480. A bill for the relief of the S. G. Leoffler Operating Co., of Washington, D. C., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1595);

H. R. 4577. A bill for the relief of Dolores Joyce; without amendment (Rept. No. 1596);

H. R. 4917. A bill for the relief of the Western Union Telegraph Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1597); and

H. R. 5352. A bill for the relief of Joseph Ippolito; without amendment (Rept. No. 1598).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1850. A bill for the relief of Louise Zerweck; without amendment (Rept. No. 1599); and

H. R. 6442. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth J. Patterson, Joy Patterson, and Roberta Patterson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1600).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 3484. A bill for the relief of the Poultry Producers of Central California; without amendment (Rept. No. 1601); and

H. R. 4466. A bill for the relief of Francis T. Lillie and Lois E. Lillie; without amendment (Rept. No. 1602).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2243. A bill for the relief of Arthur A. Guarino; without amendment (Rept. No. 1603);

H. R. 3341. A bill for the relief of J. E. and Minerva Mitchell, and Rosie Monroe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1604);

H. R. 3360. A bill for the relief of Mrs. W. H. (Agnes) Holmes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1605);

H. R. 3400. A bill for the relief of Herbert W. Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1606); and

H. R. 4090. A bill for the relief of Roy Hesselmeyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1607).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1549. A bill for the relief of Duane N. Thompson, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 1608);

S. 1573. A bill for the relief of James H. Wilkinson; with amendments (Rept. No. 1609);

S. 1910. A bill for the relief of George D. King; with amendments (Rept. No. 1610);

H. R. 247. A bill for the relief of E. D. Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 1611);

H. R. 2287. A bill for the relief of Susan S. Wiseman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1612); and

H. R. 4673. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Jenkins Ward; without amendment (Rept. No. 1613).

By Mr. O'DANIEL (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1151. A bill for the relief of James Lemuel Muzzall and James M. Muzzall; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1614); and

H. R. 2962. A bill for the relief of Justin P. Hopkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1615).

By Mr. HOEY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 5933. A bill to authorize and direct the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes; with amendments.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the months of April, May, and June, 1946, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION.

Mr. LESLIE BIFFLE,
Secretary of the Senate, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIFFLE: It has been suggested to me that despite the passage of Senate Resolution 201 of the Seventy-ninth Congress requiring reimbursement for all personnel borrowed from the executive agencies, Senate Resolution 319 of the Seventy-eighth Congress is also still operative. Accordingly, I am transmitting a report covering the months of April, May, and June.

Sincerely yours,

H. M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the months of April, May, June, 1946, in compliance with the terms of S. Res. 319, agreed to Aug. 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Schimmel, Herbert	3604 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Washington, D. C.	$9,012.50
Oleksy, Elizabeth H	1620 Fuller St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	3,090.00

H. M. KILGORE, *Chairman.*

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2378. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2379. A bill for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURCH:

S. 2380. A bill to clarify the rights of former owners of real property to reacquire such property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. KNOWLAND introduced Senate bill (S. 2381) to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Social Security Act so as to authorize any State to use amounts contributed by employees to the unemployment fund of such State to pay cash benefits to individuals with respect to their unemployment by reason of their disability, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 2382. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 2383. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 2384. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the States of North Dakota and South Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

WATER RESOURCES OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 294), which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the terms and conditions of contracts offered by the Department of the Interior for the disposition of the water resources of the Central Valley project of California, including, but not limited to, (a) the basis of the water rights claimed by said Department; (b) the character of the water rights offered by the Department to water users' organizations; (c) the control asserted or possessed by the Department with respect to both surface and underground waters; (d) the collection and application of taxes, assessments, and other revenues; (e) the provisions for limitation of acreage in single ownerships which may be served under said contracts; (f) the specific legal authority for said contracts and the several provisions thereof; (g) any other factors relating to the proper utilization and disposition of the water resources of the Central Valley project, and the policies of the Department of the Interior with reference thereto.

The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable concerning additional legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

FLOOD CONTROL ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6597) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

FOURTH DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. GOSSETT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place, insert the following:

"Bureau of Reclamation, Boise Project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch: For an additional amount for construction, $1,612,525, from the reclamation fund, special fund, to remain available until expended."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR STANFILL AT ROTARY INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION, NEWPORT, KY.

[Mr. STANFILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a convention of Rotary International held at Newport, Ky., which appears in the Appendix.]

DEDICATION OF OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF INTERIOR KRUG

[Mr. MITCHELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Secretary of the Interior Krug at the dedication of the Olympic National Park, at Lake Crescent, Wash., and his introduction of the Secretary, which appear in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	Myers
Andrews	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Bridges	Hoey	Pepper
Brooks	Huffman	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Bushfield	Kilgore	Smith
Byrd	Knowland	Stanfill
Capehart	La Follette	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Swift
Carville	McCarran	Taft
Chavez	McClellan	Taylor
Donnell	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McMahon	Tobey
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tunnell
Fulbright	Mead	Wagner
George	Millikin	Walsh
Gerry	Mitchell	Wherry
Gossett	Moore	White
Green	Morse	Wiley
Guffey	Murdock	Willis
Gurney	Murray	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO and Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business, having been appointed to the commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing of Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6777) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 28, after line 2, insert the following:

"SEC. 306. In order to meet emergencies or contingencies arising subsequent to approval of the Budget and not provided for in the Budget program, a corporation or agency covered by the provisions of this act may, with the approval of the President, adjust its budget program to provide, within the limits of available funds and borrowing authority, for the immediate initiation of programs authorized by law and not specifically set forth in the Budget: *Provided*, That the new program shall be promptly transmitted to the Congress as an amendment to the Budget: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as authority for increasing the amount available for administrative expenses under any limitation on such expenses."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6777, making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For the text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

NAVAL ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WALSH submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5356) to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a Naval Establishment, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4 and 5.

Amendments numbered 1 and 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President is authorized, whenever in his discretion the public interests render such a course advisable, or will assist in relieving United States forces of duty in China or putting the Government of the Republic of China in better position to protect or improve the safety of navigation in its waters, to provide to the Republic of China such naval services, training, plans, and technical advice as he may deem proper; and to dispose of naval vessels and craft, not to exceed two hundred and seventy-one vessels and craft under authority of this Act, which are in excess of the naval needs of the United States, floating drydocks of capacity sufficient to accommodate any vessel or craft disposed of under authority of this Act, and material necessary for the operation and maintenance of the vessels and craft disposed of under authority of this Act and for the training of the crews of such vessels and craft, to the Republic of China by sale, exchange, lease, gift, or transfer for cash, credit, or other property, with or without warranty, or upon such other terms and conditions as he may deem proper: *Provided*, That prior to the disposition under the authority of this Act of any battleship, aircraft carrier of any type, cruiser, destroyer (but not destroyer escort), or submarine the President shall first obtain the authority of the Congress in each instance: *Provided further*, That no information, plans, advice, material, documents, blueprints, or other papers, bearing a secret or top-secret classification shall be disposed of or transferred under authority of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The President is authorized, upon application from the Republic of China, and whenever in his discretion the public interests render such a course advisable, to detail not to exceed one hundred officers and two hundred enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps to assist the Republic of China in naval matters: *Provided*, That United States naval or Marine Corps personnel shall not accompany Chinese troops, aircraft, or ships on other than training maneuvers or cruises: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Navy is authorized to pay to such persons such additional compensation as may be necessary to make appropriate adjustment for increased cost of living occasioned by reason of detail to such duty: *And provided further*, That while so detailed such officers and enlisted men shall receive the pay and allowances thereunto entitled in the United States Navy or Marine Corps and shall be allowed the same credit for longevity, retirement, and for all other purposes that they would receive if they were serving with the forces of the United States."

And the Senate agree to the same.

DAVID I. WALSH,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

PATRICK H. DREWRY,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
W. STERLING COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the conference report was considered and agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS—SUBSTITUTION OF A CONFEREE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, because of the fact that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent from the city, I ask unanimous consent that he be excused from further service as a conferee on the part of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 5452) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] be appointed in his stead.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to read two telegrams I have received from two of my constituents, both of whom I know very well, in which they express their opinion regarding the OPA. One telegram is from El Dorado, Kans., dated April 25, 1946, addressed to me, and is as follows:

I want to protest about the terrible curse the OPA is inflicting on the American people. I have been in the jewelry business for 40 years. It has become impossible to get merchandise. I am president of Allen Memorial Hospital. We have been without meat for over 3 weeks, forcing us to buy steers and do our own butchering, all on account of OPA.

Am president of the Mid-Continent Building & Loan and have started to build some GI houses but have shut down because we are out of lumber, hardware, and plumbing, all on account of OPA. The prices of real estate and rents have inflated to the extent that we will have to stop making loans because of the unsafe valuation. My belief is this: Throw the OPA out of the window. Remove all subsidies and make a law holding real estate and rents to a 1944 level. On the above, I feel that I know whereof I speak and feel justified in making this complaint to you.

Sincerely,

J. W. KIRKPATRICK.

The other telegram is from Topeka, Kans., dated May 2, 1946, addressed to me, and is as follows:

Our country is in one helluva fix. The OPA with their propaganda has the unthinking people scared to death. The OPA has stymied reconversion and progress. They have stopped production of building materials until there is little compared with the demand. If they were out of the picture this situation would be corrected in a very short time. Roosevelt with all his rules and regulations dragged out the depression until World War II took us out. OPA will drag out the reconversion the same way if it is not stopped by Congress. The House did a good job. I hope the Senate does not nullify it.

FRED P. MARTIN.

Mr. President, I have received approximately 10,000 letters, telegrams, and petitions dealing with OPA. The ratio is about 6 to 1 in favor either of abolishing OPA or severely curtailing OPA. An examination of these telegrams, letters, and petitions shows that about 50 percent of those favoring restriction of the OPA came from housewives, which is contrary to much of the propaganda which is spread throughout the country, principally through the OPA.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I am opposed to the conference report. I am opposed to the extension of OPA. I have been opposed to it from the beginning. I said a year ago, when the matter was up for discussion, that the OPA is wrong in principle and contrary to our Constitution, and repugnant to Americans. I am of the same opinion still. If we permit prolonged regimentation, as exemplified by OPA, we will be playing with the same fire that consumed both Germany and Italy. Americans and freedom-loving people everywhere should now take heed.

If there is any merit in consistency, Mr. President, I have been consistent in this matter all the way through. I ask unanimous consent that the speech which I delivered a year ago, on June 6, 1945, with reference to extension of OPA, be now reprinted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, in discussing the pending legislation I wish to say at the outset that I am aware of the pressure that is being exerted to secure its passage. Apropos of some aspects of that pressure I desire to call attention to a press release which was issued yesterday by the OPA itself in its effort to have itself perpetuated for future time. I am aware that the officials of the OPA, seeking an extension of time, were protected against the Members of the Senate except those who happen to be on the committee, and while their testimony may have been reduced to writing I have not as yet seen it. The hearings were held behind closed doors. The release to which I have referred is, in substance, that penalties were imposed upon more than 28,900 violators of price, rent, and rationing regulations during the first 4 months of this year, which is a short period. Of this number, 480 were sent to jail; 12,087 paid fines totaling more than $8,000,000; 4,349 violators were suspended from business for varying periods of time; many for the duration of rationing, which, in the opinion of the OPA, may be indefinitely; 7,296 were placed under court injunctions ordering them to obey regulations; 4,081 consumers' rationings were revoked or suspended; 456 violators were placed on probation; 151 violators are not classified.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD a telegram from a group of chambers of commerce in one of the western counties of Oklahoma, of which Buffalo is the county seat. It is one of the wheat-producing counties of the State. It is populated by men who work for a living, who produce food crops, and who have always been self-reliant. They are begging somebody to allow them the means of harvesting one of the big wheat crops in their neighborhood. The means that they ask of someone is permission to use their own resources, their own money, and their own food, raised by themselves, and not knowing where to turn for assistance, they have appealed to me, with an almost futile hope that I might be able to procure for them action on the reasonable request they make, the request to be granted by somebody who lives in Washington.

I regret to say, Mr. President, that I scarcely knew what to do or what course to take to advise them how to proceed legally to achieve their objective for which they so humbly petition. The one thing that I knew to do was to appeal to a man by the name of Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, Washington, D. C. I pleaded with him by letter. I telegraphed the distressed citizens of Harper County that I was making an appeal, not only to Mr. Chester Bowles but also to Judge Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, and promised them that I would do all I could to get some sort of relaxation of orders from Washington so that they might, within the law, do such a reasonable thing as to employ their own resources to harvest the crops which they have raised, and then be permitted to deliver those crops wherever the markets of the country afforded an outlet.

To my knowledge, I have never seen this man, Chester Bowles. He testified, so I am told, a few days ago at a closed hearing. As an American Senator, I sought permission of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee to be present so that I might listen to the reasons Mr. Bowles would present for the continuation of such orders as I have referred to, and so that I might also see what manner of man Mr. Bowles is and "upon what meat he doth feed that he should so bestride the pigmy world."

The telegram from the Harper County Chamber of Commerce is as follows:

BUFFALO, OKLA., *May 29, 1945.*

E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate:

Harper County is facing an emergency which will restrict procurement of outside labor to harvest one of its largest wheat crops. To relieve the situation the undersigned chambers of commerce were called together by the county organization to meet with the local meat slaughterers and restaurant operators which are this week threatened with closing for want of meat. On a basis of last year's statistics harvest laborers will increase the county population at least 20 percent. Slaughtering has been reduced 25 percent on beef and 50 percent on pork. With this unreasonable predicament it will be impossible for the harvest crews to be fed. Harper County has a surplus of medium to good grade beef cattle. Grant us permission to process our local meat and we will need no packinghouse products. We face no harvester shortage but these men must be fed, if we save our wheat. We beg your assistance in this crisis.

Harper County Chamber of Commerce, by O. A. Maddox; Laverne Chamber of Commerce, by J. C. Holmes; Rosston Chamber of Commerce, by C. C. German; May Chamber of Commerce, by R. O. Allen; Selman Chamber of Commerce, by Ernest Branch; Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, by Ross Murray.

Mr. President, I also desire to read into the RECORD another telegram which I have received from the chairman of the Agriculture Department of the Tulsa, Okla., Chamber of Commerce. This telegram says that they are confronted with one of the most serious livestock marketing and food situations in the history of the livestock industry; that there exists in this important farming area the largest number of food livestock on the hoof in history; that Government orders prevent the slaughtering of more than a very limited number of the large crop of meat animals from the ranges of that locality; that the stockyards, built by the citizens of Tulsa, are daily refusing many hundreds of cattle; that these poor farmers, not knowing of this condition, haul their cattle to the stockyards and then have to haul them back to their farms, and that this same condition exists in many other localities in this southwestern cattle area. They have pleaded with me to do something or have something done to remedy this ridiculous situation, and they appealed to me after a large meeting of business and professional men in the chamber of commerce at Tulsa.

Now, Mr. President, what can be done so long as we are fearful of some mysterious thing we hardly know how to define and, through that fear, are deterred from exercising our authority for relief in such cases, but yield, instead, to the course recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency, at the vehement demands of Chester Bowles and his kind of thinking?

The telegram from the chairman of the agriculture department of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, Mr. C. W. Cotton, is as follows:

TULSA, OKLA., *May 30, 1945.*

Hon. E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate:

We are confronted here with one of most serious livestock marketing and food situations in the history of our livestock industry. There exists in this important farming area largest number of food livestock on the hoof in history. As you are aware, the normal marketing period for grass-fat cattle is just beginning and will continue until middle of October. Present Government restrictions prevent local packers from slaughtering more than very limited number of these cattle. Therefore, they are entirely helpless to care for normal offerings. Our local stockyards are daily refusing acceptance many hundred of head cattle and large percentage are being returned to ranches and farms because these cattle are brought into stockyards in small numbers by hundreds of farmers who have no other available market. Many other localities in Southwest also are confronted with this very serious problem. When cattle are fat and there is no market it naturally causes economic loss to producer as well as food loss to public. At large meeting business and professional men at Tulsa Chamber of Commerce today resolution was passed respectfully asking agriculture committee to request you to provide means of immediate relief and to suggest increased killing quotas for local packers.

C. W. COTTON,
Chairman, Agriculture Department,
Tulsa Chamber of Commerce.

These telegrams I have read are only sample complaints of literally hundreds that are coming from the people. There is, however, another class of complaints that is growing more and more numerous, to which I should like to refer. These are from men of long experience in business, men who head substantial business organizations. In many cases they have acted or are now acting in an advisory capacity to OPA or some other war-control agency—men who from patriotic zeal have tried desperately to believe in the soundness of production and price control, at least as a wartime measure; men who are

able to diagnose the situation, and who are now condemning the theory and the philosophy of price- and production-control experiment. They have witnessed the debacle first hand. They have felt the sting of the regimenter's whip. As law-abiding citizens, they conscientiously attempted to comply with the complicated and irresponsible regulations, but in so doing have seen their business disintegrate and taken over by the black-market gangster.

Many letters from this type of businessman telling the sordid story are being received, but always end with the amazing and chilling statement: "This letter is for your personal information. Please do not use it in any manner or give publicity to my name."

Why? We all know the reason. It has been answered on the floor of the Senate many times, but it cannot be repeated too often. The dictatorial power which we in Congress have delegated to the regimenters is so great, so all-inclusive, and is actually being used to such devastating extent that businessmen who accept seriously the responsibilities of their investors, who feel they must protect their families and their own future, dare not speak up in public. This, indeed, is tyranny personified.

It is said that there is a growing number of people—businessmen—who despair of a restoration of private enterprise. And there are some who do not want controls removed. Government control of supply and demand, the creation of artificial channels, and the regimentation of business have caused some to see advantages. Their initiative has been removed and they find they like it. They always have an excuse to give to their importunate customers for goods. Their markets are ready-made for them and their methods of distribution charted. After many months of this kind of artificial life, they have come to enjoy the shelter afforded. Their business enterprise is gone, but so are their competitive worries. They are like a bird which has been placed in a cage and which, after release, flutters around and then returns to the cage for protection.

I cannot believe that this is true of the great mass of businessmen. I cannot help hoping that when businessmen see their enterprise being absorbed by Government controls, they will rise up and place the blame definitely where it belongs, and that is on the Congress of the United States, which has delegated its power and constituted these authorities which now tyrannize over the lives and activities of the people as a whole.

Mr. President, the Congress is about to be called upon to extend OPA. The manner in which we meet the challenge inherent in this request will be the measure of our faith in American democracy under the Constitution.

There are a few fundamentals on which our decisions should be based:

First. Artificial control of prices and arbitrary distribution of commodities are repugnant to the conception of free trade and enterprise as encompassed by the Constitution. Both are the essence of a socialistic state.

Second. The Constitution is the supreme law of the land, in war or in peace. The guaranties of the Bill of Rights and other provisions of the Constitution protecting essential liberties are not suspended by the existence of a state of war. The war powers of the several branches of Government are both created and delimited by the Constitution. There are constitutional boundaries which the Congress, the executive, or the judiciary may not transgress.

Third. It is axiomatic that the law of supply and demand may not be diverted from its economic orbit without a corresponding punishment to those subject to the law.

Fourth. Our experiment in the field of governmental rationing and price control has failed to accomplish even a small degree of the benefits hoped for by those who were persuaded to depart from the Constitution, because of their fear of the devastating effects of inflation and shortages of the necessities of life for our people. On the contrary, it has become a monster of oppression, a vehicle for crime, the instrumentality of destruction, the breeder of greed, and the perpetrator of shortages and hardships.

Who is there that can successfully deny these plain facts?

OPA has failed under the management of un-American-minded men who have no confidence in the principles of the Constitution or the integrity of the American way of life. It has failed under the management of men who live in a world of theories, and most of whom are totally minus the practical experiences that make for sound judgment.

The effects of its failure have been doubly severe because of these facts, but I want to emphasize that OPA was doomed to failure under the most capable and conservative personnel that could have been selected for it, because it was wrong in principle, contrary to our Constitution, and repugnant to Americanism. No system that usurps the liberties of the people, as guaranteed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, can ever succeed in America, so long as those instruments stand as the charter of our Government.

There are those who plead that this retreat from the Constitution is justified on the ground that without OPA we would have had run-away prices. Two answers to this argument are apparent. First, we do have illegal run-away prices; and second, we frankly say, certainly we would have been burdened with legally high war prices. No realistic person will deny that high prices and shortages are the burdens of a nation at war. But I do undertake to say that had those burdens been laid upon us in a constitutional and legal manner, they would have been borne with grace and a high feeling of patriotic pride. We would not have had the disgrace, shame, crime, and loss of morale engendered by this un-American experiment.

OPA officials and those who have been tricked into supporting the theory of OPA on the fallacious philosophy that it is justified by war are making dire predictions of what will happen if the heavy hand of Government control is withdrawn.

I saw a propaganda press release only a few days ago in which Mr. Bowles said that without OPA, steel used by the Government for war purposes would have cost the American people $26,000,000,000 in excess of what had been expended. On its face this sounds good, but it is a snare to the unsuspecting. Steel purchased by the United States for war purposes should have and could have been bought on contract under terms that would have protected the Government, and at the same time given due regard to the cost of production and a reasonable profit to the manufacturer. The same is true of every item of our war material, including military food supplies. If the $26,000,000,000 saving on steel, claimed by Mr. Bowles, is reflected by a loss to private enterprise, then he has performed a very great disservice to his country.

No one objects to the Army and the Navy declaring a priority upon all the resources of this country as may be necessary for conducting war. But, there is a rising tide of revulsion against the bureaucratic destruction of our ability to produce not only for war but for the peace that is to come. The record of OPA is replete with instances of destruction and planned shortages. The meat shortage is directly in point.

The recent reports of both the Senate and the House committees is an exposé that should embarrass every American citizen. The bungling of OPA personnel is, of course, inexcusable, but, let us not forget that OPA was set up for the express purpose of holding prices in a fixed groove, regardless of result. OPA is not concerned with production. It has no concern with who goes broke. It has no anxiety as to the future of our economy. OPA is charged only with the responsibility of "holding the line"—the country be damned. The application of this philosophy in the hands of any group would have necessarily caused the same result, however wisely it may have been administered.

The bitter experiences of the Russians with controlled economy are beginning to show their effect. A few days ago the Associated Press carried a dispatch from Moscow stating that "the Red Army command in Russian-occupied Germany has reestablished free trade and the 'profits system' to encourage the selling and bargaining of surplus produce in the open market, in a move to combat the serious threat of famine in the cities."

Sugar is another example of the application of the same philosophy. The refusal of OPA to increase the price of Cuban sugar sufficiently to cover the increased cost of production has resulted in a 600,000- to a 1,000,000-ton shortage for this year.

Not long ago OPA decided to make a survey to determine the consumptive demand for sugar. At considerable expense and effort it took groups of figures from the census and set up estimates of demand. I am now told these were never even checked against actual registrations with ration boards. In the first quarter of 1945 civilians consumed 140,000 tons more than OPA's allocations. In the second quarter consumption in excess of current supply rose to 193,000 tons.

Last fall the War Food Administration encouraged western growers to plant a heavy crop of sugar beets, which will now come on the market before Cuban cane sugar. Obviously, this will cause an expensive derangement of distribution, not only costly in terms of food production but in use of transportation facilities and manpower. Against all economic practices western beet sugar will now cross the continent to meet eastern markets. Then the Cuban sugar production, from the acreage that is now being planted, will recross the continent to fill the deficit created by the situation in the West. In a word, beet sugar will be shipped to fill an artificial shortage in the East and cane sugar will be shipped back over the same route to fill an artificial shortage in the West, the whole fantastic operation being directly traceable to OPA.

While OPA is busy planning and executing a sugar shortage, other agencies and departments of government are urging the housewife to can a greater proportion of the fruit and berry crop than ever before.

This is only another example of the natural result of artificial restraints upon supply and demand, when the guesser who applies the restraints misses his guess, as he usually does.

The milk shortage, which was only remedied temporarily by resorting to the iniquity of a subsidy, was caused by the same forces, namely, a failure to permit the milk producer to meet the cost of production.

The dried-bean shortage is still another example of OPA bungling. The farm bureau for the State of New York has adopted a resolution calling attention to the deplorable situation with respect to the production of beans. Beans are a vegetable protein that can be used when meat is not available. The more complete meat proteins on a dry basis cost from $1.50 to $2 a pound. For one of the best vegetable substitute proteins, which can be had in beans, OPA has established a price range of from 8 to 9 cents a pound. Beans cannot be produced for the market under war conditions at this price. Had the public been permitted to pay 15

cents a pound, beans would have been available in abundance, the public would have had one of the best, although incomplete, protein substitutes for meat at one-tenth the cost of meat, and the public would have been enormously benefited.

I am advised that we may be faced with a severe shortage of poultry and eggs unless the abnormal demand for these products is relieved by an increased meat supply. On January 1, 1945, our poultry and egg production stood near an all-time peak. According to the Department of Agriculture, supplies of poultry and eggs had dropped 19½ percent by April 1. In the South Atlantic States, according to the Department's figures, the decline was over 23 percent; in New England, it was over 27 percent. Poultry growers flatly deny the accuracy of these Government figures. They declare that the over-all decrease has been far greater than the 19½ percent claimed by the Department.

We have 80,000,000 cattle on the range today, approximately 30 percent more than ever before in history. Outside the demands of our armed forces, why should we not slaughter a sufficient amount to satisfy the civilian demand? The answer is that a group of individuals have decided how many cattle may be slaughtered, where they shall be marketed, and at what price. Economic dislocations follow, with resultant loss of production, black-market prices, and a reduction of quantity available to the consumer. The guessers in this case are obviously wrong. The result is a shortage in a land of plenty.

To further complicate the situation, OPA is making a drive—and may I add that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has charged that it is a premeditated design for subversive purposes—to eliminate the nonfederally inspected packer by the issuance of Control Order No. 1. My office has been deluged with letters from local packers throughout the country who are being forced to abandon their businesses under the oppressive terms of this order. A few days ago 12 independent slaughterers supplying 70 percent of the meat consumed by the war workers of the Gary, Ind., area were forced to suspend business by reason of the quota limitations placed on them by Control Order No. 1.

I am advised that OPA, wholly outside the scope of its authority and outside the purposes for which it was created, brought meat from other sources into this area. Where did OPA get the meat? What other area was discriminated against in order to quiet the protest of these war workers, who had been denied a necessary part of their diet? The Gary situation is only one example. Multiply this by the several hundred thousand communities of America, and you have a slight indication of the chaos into which OPA has led us.

Controlled prices and arbitrary distribution lead to inequality, both as to price and as to distribution. Inequality and discrimination are the very theory of rationing. Under rationing, all share and share alike, from the cradle to the grave, whether infant, munitions worker, farmer, or octogenarian. Under this system, some have more than they need. Others go without or patronize the black market. Yet rationing is sold to the public on the basis of equality. Everyone, regardless of need, gets an equal number of meat coupons. This test of equity cannot stand the test of time.

The packers, meat wholesalers, and local butchers have long known that it was a farce. The public who was supposed to be protected, is getting a real lesson in the inequality of rationing. Some are eating much more meat than normally and some much less. There has been no time in history when distribution was so inequitable as at the present time.

Under the present system a family of 2 can have meat for dinner, 15 to 18 days out of the month, while a family with 4 or 5 children can have meat three times a day for 30 days, if they can find it on the market.

Equality may be the battle cry of the regimenter, but both man and nature bear testimony to its nonexistence.

The theorists that sold the "share and share alike from the cradle to the grave" plan should talk to the housewives of the Nation. They will quickly learn that equal numbers of red ration tokens do not result in equal treatment or equal sacrifice. Rationing is the essence of inefficiency. Free prices are the final judgment of the people. Under a free economy everyone is on the committee and serves without pay.

People have always followed the dictates of relative prices. When prices are low, consumption goes up, and prices rise until consumption goes down. Within this cycle, the law of supply and demand furnishes a variation of price that insures distribution to all. When this age-old guide is taken away, we are thrown into confusion.

No one knows enough to set prices. To set prices on food, for instance, the price fixer must know the acreage that will be planted with a given schedule of prices. He must know what the weather is going to be like, what the supply and demand for the various classifications of food and their various food forms will be, in the various markets throughout this country and abroad. He must know what the general level of all prices is going to be and what the situation among competing foods will be. In addition, he must have information on such factors as labor supply, machinery available for producing and processing, transportation, and numerous other pertinent factors. All these must be known well in advance. Such a task is beyond the ability of any man or agency. Price fixers must necessarily be erroneous forecasters.

Shortages, created by the same method used to develop a meat shortage, are by no means confined to foods. The shelves of the hardware merchant, the clothing store, the drug store, the department store, and many other types of merchants and shopkeepers, are bare or filled with substitutes at tremendously inflated prices for greatly inferior quality.

The report of the Senate committee investigating OPA has recommended a complete removal of price control from all commodities "as fast as they become sufficiently plentiful to permit the law of supply and demand to operate." But may I suggest to the learned gentlemen of the committee that until incentive prices are developed under the free play of the law of supply and demand, commodities will never become sufficiently plentiful to permit removal of price controls. Under this formula, we are doomed to a perpetual OPA.

Incentive prices are necessary to stimulate increased production. Increased production, in turn, depresses high prices. Thus production and prices complement each other as checks and balances. During the past several years there has been an effort to indoctrinate people with the idea that a free-price system is associated with inflation, excessive profits, exploitation, planned scarcity, greed, and inequality, and is harmful to the war effort.

But let us examine the comparative situation of America at the close of the last war, operating under a free economy, with our position today under controlled prices. Our food agencies are discussing with fear and trembling the fact that we expect to ship 12,000,000 tons of food to the people of Europe in the coming year. During the first 12 months following the close of World War I, America delivered in Europe more than 23,000,000 tons of food. How were we able to accomplish this immense task? It was because the producers were fired by the incentive of profitable prices.

Today, however, faced as we are with the great humanitarian obligation to alleviate the sufferings of the peaple of Europe, instead of releasing the restraints upon the great productive capacity of this country, we continue to engage in the very practices that destroy our productivity.

Our bureaucratic czars of today, and those who have been persuaded to follow them, earnestly insist that food rationing was an absolute necessity, in order that our armies abroad might be well fed during this war. I deny this, and again point to the comparison of our food consumption today, as compared with the years of World War I—a comparison between compulsion and patriotism.

During the 3-year period from 1942 to 1944, inclusive, average civilian consumption of meat was 6 percent greater than during the World War years of 1917 and 1918. During the same period civilians ate 28 percent more chicken than during World War I, 10 percent more lard and cooking fats, and 12 percent more sugar. To the average city dweller, with the average income, who cannot find meat, chickens, or sugar on the market, it is hard to understand how it is possible that consumption today is greater than it was during the years of World War I.

The answer, of course, is the operation of the black market, which has fed a small proportion of the population much better than usual and a very large proportion much poorer. The answer also lies in the fact that the black market has filled the pantries and meat lockers of the hoarders who patronize the black markets. These are the direct evils of OPA.

There is a deep significance in these figures. During World War I, the conservation of food was organized on a voluntary, patriotic basis through cooperative measures with consumers and producers. There were no ration boards, ration cards, harassments, black markets, gangsters. The expense was trivial.

Today, we have submitted ourselves to compulsion. We have saddled ourselves with ration boards and ration cards, elaborate and unintelligible regulations over every trade, business, and enterprise; black markets, gangsterism, and untold inconvenience to the public by expensive, complicated, and irresponsible administration.

It is indeed of interest to compare the results of the two methods in these four most critical commodities. The figures demonstrate that the American people, by voluntary effort, motivated by patriotic desires, will make greater sacrifices than under any plan of dictatorship and coercion.

Now let us examine the argument that abolishing OPA would bring about uncontrolled and ruinous inflation. The fact is that we are confronted by a severe inflationary condition today. If anyone doubts my word, let him talk to any housewife who has the responsibility of making the pay check stretch from one pay day to the next. Talk to anyone who is frank enough to tell of the black market on scarce commodities. The A. F. of L. and the CIO say that available figures indicate a 40- to 50-percent increase in the cost of living over the last prewar year. Our inflationary condition, however, is not reflected in the high prices that are paid and received across the counters of our merchants, although in many cases they have increased substantially. The severe and most devastating inflation is that which has accrued by reason of a deliberate avoidance of OPA regulations.

The man's suit of clothes that sold for $50 prewar comes on the market slightly changed and, consequently, as a new style, with a ceiling price of $75, $80, or $90. Prices of

women's and children's clothing have been raised by the same process of avoidance and evasion. A prewar pair of shoes sold for $10. Today the same brand of shoes may sell for $11. OPA contends that that is only a 10 percent increase, but studiously avoids the fact that the $11 shoes of today are only $4 prewar quality.

Inferior qualities of foodstuffs have joined the inflation parade in the same manner.

Hotel managers have closed out their apartments as fast as possible and have converted their rooms to day rentals. I know one case where an apartment rented for $250 in 1941. Today it must be rented by the day at a rate of $15 a day. Not only this, but the prewar $5 room, by the addition of a new piece of furniture, is now a $10 room. Hotel dining rooms now serve an inferior quality of $1.50 prewar dinners, but they appear on the waiter's check as pheasant dinners at $5.

These practices, and hundreds of others with which we are all familiar are only a small part of the inflation that is consuming the country and, at the same time, is depressing our production.

The black markets are the real source of our inflation. The black market takes its toll all along the line, from producer to consumer. Press reports from New York say that the farmers of that State are refusing to surrender their live poultry to buyers at the OPA ceiling price of approximately 30 cents a pound, and are continuing to market directly with the consumer, without benefit of the middle man, at from 65 to 70 cents a pound. Here in Washington the press reports chickens selling at farmers' markets for as much as $9 apiece.

These instances are not peculiar to New York and Washington, nor are they confined to the poultry market. As a matter of fact, they include practically every type of farm produce. Throughout the length and breadth of this country the farmers and consumers are doing business at substantially above-ceiling prices. I may add that red points are not a consideration in these dealings.

The man with the C card, new tires, and the money is going out after his food, and he is getting it, notwithstanding inflation or OPA. The result is that a few are eating well, at tremendously inflated prices, but the great majority who are not in a position to compete with food on this basis are being poorly fed. The produce that normally supplies the industrial areas, over-the-market-counters of the large cities, is going to supply roadside sales. The markets are bare, and they will continue to be bare until OPA is abandoned.

Then, there is, of course, the black-market wholesaler, who does business with the black-market retailer, who, in turn, must pass along the black-market prices to his customers. This calls for evading OPA regulations and resorting to counterfeit rationing stamps. I notice that OPA claims that since July 1 it has confiscated over 330,000,000 counterfeit red points, representing over 55,000,000 pounds of meat.

The extent of inflation involved in these black-market transactions, measured by prewar prices, cannot be estimated. The inflation represented by this type of transaction has gone underground. It has filled the strongboxes of the country with currency. It has made tax dodgers and petty criminals out of a substantial portion of our people and, if continued, it will lead to a gangsterism that will put to shame the prohibition days of Capone. It is this type of transaction that has led the Secretary of the Treasury to call upon Congress for an army of 10,000 additional tax agents.

Inflation, as the economist knows it, comes from two sources: First, when the Government debt grows to such proportions that the people lose confidence in the Government's ability to repay, with a dollar having purchasing power equal to the dollar borrowed. Such loss of confidence results in a discontinuance of bond buying, and the Government is forced to take up the slack with printing-press money. This is the kind of inflation that destroyed the economy of France, Germany, and Italy. When this condition has been reached, it means that the Government must adopt a new medium of exchange, at the expense of wiping out savings, credits, and a complete collapse of the existing economic order.

The second cause of inflation, and the one under which the American people are suffering today, arises from a surplus of income and a shortage of consumer goods. When the demand is in excess of available consumer goods, those with surplus spending power begin to bid up the price. If it cannot be done legally, then there are those who will do it illegally, and the economy of this country is so far-flung and so intricate that no administrator can amass a force great enough to prevent it. The only remedy known to man for this kind of inflation is an increase in production. So far, healthy prices have been the best stimulant for increased production.

As some indication of the inflation spiral in which we find ourselves, I call attention to the fact that consumer expenditures during 1944 rose to $97,000,000,000, as compared with ninety-one billions in 1943, although there was a slight decrease in civilian consumption. Thus, we spent $6,000,000,000 for less and, consequently, we had an over-all inflationary jump of equal proportions.

In 1944 individual incomes increased to $156,000,000,000, as compared with one hundred and forty-two billions in 1943. Personal taxes rose from $18,000,000,000 in 1943 to $23,000,000,000 in 1944. With 1944 consumer expenditures at ninety-seven billions, surplus income amounted to $36,000,000,000, as compared with thirty-three billion surplus in the previous year, and with less consumer goods available for purchase.

The job that confronts America today is an increase of production. America is starving, not alone for food but for new, durable goods of better quality. These can be had only through price incentive.

The bureaucratic mind answers the problem by subsidies. But subsidies merely emphasize the trouble. Subsidies are merely another form of inflation. The money represented by subsidies must first be borrowed from the public, and thus the public debt is increased, and at the same time the public income is further enlarged to the extent of the interest paid.

Subsidies, like price control and rationing, are alien to the American concepts of a free economy. The subsidy is of European origin. It is part of a controlled economy. No businessman or industry is free of the dictates of the Government officials who administer the subsidy. As a practical matter, subsidies usually fail to reach the producer, and are largely consumed by the middleman. Even in cases where they reach the producer, there is little incentive for the producer to respond with increased production, since Government subsidies may be withdrawn at will, and the producer always labors under the psychological handicap that the bonanza is only temporary.

In an address delivered before the annual meeting of the National Grange, on November 10, 1943, Mr. Albert S. Goss, master of the Grange, had the following to say:

"Subsidies will lead to economic chaos. If we maintain price ceilings with subsidies to meet the rising costs, we will develop an increasingly unbalanced price structure. When war ends, if we are to escape that swift road to printing-press inflation, we will have to think about balancing the budget. Subsidies will be one of the first items cut off. Then either farmers will have to raise prices to get production costs or go out of business. If during these days, when our surplus spending power is one of our greatest problems, we are not willing to pay the cost of producing our food, what would the chances be of raising prices when the boys come home looking for jobs? The answer is none, whatever. The result would be complete collapse."

It is my honest belief that if price control were relaxed through abolishing OPA, in order that our surplus incomes might be matched with consumer goods, the productive power of this country is such that we would bring supply and demand in balance in short order. Thus, shortages would be averted and high prices would be curbed by the operation of the natural laws of economics.

As a matter of fact, it has never been established that a moderate degree of inflation is harmful. In times of war it is necessary to increase the price of practically all commodities. Price incentive has been and always will prove to be the greatest encouragement to production.

Historically, the free-price system has always involved a certain degree of inflation during wartime, which resulted in advantageous production. This, in turn, retarded excess consumption. Prices are made by economic laws rather than political laws. We have seen this truth demonstrated many times. During the 7 years from 1933 to 1939, when billions were spent in an effort to restore parity prices for agricultural products, the average of all farm products brought only 77 percent of parity. The efforts to hold farm prices down during the past 4 years have been no more efficient than our previous effort to push them up.

Eventually, the economic forces of supply and demand must triumph. The artificial efforts of the bureaucrat to soften the blow merely prolong the agony. A free economy emanating from the operations of the law of supply and demand will always render the final judgment.

During the period of reconversion, shifts must be made in farm and industrial production. These can only be satisfactorily accomplished under a system of free prices. The program for reconversion is being discussed by the bureaucrats in terms of substituting one control for another. This leads to interminable conflict. What particular control should be adopted and how should it be enforced? The simple, desirable, constitutional plan would be to relax price controls and rationing, and to permit the free flow of the economic forces that have made this the greatest and strongest country in the world.

To prolong regimentation, as exemplified by OPA, is to play with the same fire that consumed both Germany and Italy.

The men who wrote the Constitution of the United States were fresh from the experience of political tyranny and economic oppression. They were fresh from the experiences of war. They had witnessed an economic collapse in Europe. With true vision they foresaw that some day America again must meet war, tyranny, and economic oppression. With that experience and foresight they wrote into the Constitution a prohibition against the very things which we seek to adopt today. The Constitution has withstood the strain of many emergencies. It has cured many national ills, both political and economic.

For more than 12 years, in both peace and in war, the administration in power has sought to abdicate the principles of the Constitution. We have embraced almost complete regimentation. I want to take this occasion to say to the majority party in Congress that it must take full responsibility for the economic collapse which will necessarily

follow a further continuation of the present regimentation.

Even more, it must take the responsibility for the destruction of the morale of a great Nation. It must assume the responsibility of creating and maintaining a bureaucratic tyrant that now boasts of imposing millions of dollars in fines upon thousands of businessmen, without any authority of law—a bureaucratic tyrant that has driven thousands out of business, even in the past year, and is preventing others from entering business, as well as depriving returning soldiers of an opportunity to gain a livelihood by starting their own business enterprise. It is a bureaucratic tyrant which says that it has turned the names of 3,000 individuals over to the Treasury Department for investigation of their income-tax returns, a bureaucratic tyrant that is driving a Nation to illegal dealings in the black market, a bureaucratic tyrant whose word cannot be trusted, and in whom the public has lost confidence.

These are the responsibilities of the administration, and if it fails now to meet the issue courageously by abandoning this un-American experiment, the party it represents will be doomed to oblivion. I have faith that the American people will not desert the constitutional principles on which this country was founded and which have so long protected and encouraged our people and our commerce at home and abroad, in peace and in war.

In closing, Mr. President, permit me to say that I am not optimistic enough to believe that we will abandon this un-American experiment until it is too late to avoid at least some of the punishment that must follow our transgressions. There are two reasons why we will be deterred. First, the propaganda mills of the bureaucrats have had their effect upon the people. The bogeyman of inflation has been sold to the public. The public mind is confused. There is popular acceptance of the propaganda that OPA has held prices down and effected a fair distribution of available supplies. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

Second, the administration will exert its influence to preserve OPA, because of its reluctance to admit the horrible mistake it made when it created this bureaucratic tyrant.

Churchill has said:

"Controls under the pretext of war or its aftermath which are, in fact, designed to favor the accomplishment of totalitarian systems, however innocently designed or whatever guise they take, whatever liveries they wear, whatever slogans they mouth, are fraud which should be mercilessly exposed to the British public."

Americans, and freedom-loving people everywhere, should take heed.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I am somewhat disturbed by the reasons which are given by various Members of the Senate for extension of OPA. The fact that the House in its recent action on the conference report voted to extend the OPA under the present program as contained in the conference report, is now given as a reason why we should extend it. I am told by many, both inside and outside the Senate, that it is good politics on the part of either the Republicans or Democrats, or both, not entirely to abolish OPA. Of course, I do not pretend to know what is good politics and what is not good politics. I am not motivated by what is "good politics," because I am sure that no law which has ever been enacted under the American Government has been so burdensome and so oppressive as the OPA law and its administration by the Office of Price Administration. It is conceded by all that it has not been a price restraining influence.

There is not a Senator, so far as I know, who will now contend that, so far as food products are concerned, in fact, so far as concerns practically all commodities which today are handled in commerce, there is not a black market in them. The black market today is probably the most shameful thing which has ever been prevalent in America. It has resulted in the complete break-down in the morals of the country. There has been no way to obtain necessary food without resort to the black market. That in itself, I think, is sufficient to warrant us now in believing OPA is a complete mistake. A Member of the House the other day in his brief comment made in his effort to abolish OPA, said that he prayed to God that OPA would be abolished; but the Congress will not do it.

I wish to begin my remarks, Mr. President, by reading an editorial published in the Chicago Tribune, as follows:

CONGRESS ABDICATES

The conference committe which was supposed to bring out a bill compromising the already feeble Senate and House versions of the OPA bill brought forth a measure that is worse than either.

That is very true. I voted for all the amendments in the Senate version of this bill, and then I voted against the whole bill because I think the country would be better off and the people would be relieved, and we would come nearer to getting the production which is needed if we had a free hand today.

Quoting further from the editorial:

We hope that this abomination can yet be defeated.

Congress knows what OPA has done to the Nation's economy. The Senators and Representatives know that there isn't any meat to be had in the butcher shops and they know why. They know that the OPA's prices for meat are meaningless because when meat is available it isn't sold in accordance with the OPA schedule, and, of late, meat isn't available at any price. All this and much more to the same effect is as familiar to the Representatives and Senators as it is to every housewife and every businessman in the land.

Nevertheless, Congress is apparently lacking in the courage to do what the vast majority of Congressmen know is the right thing to do: namely, abolish OPA, root and branch. The bill that the conference committee has produced will satisfy the bureaucrats and tyrants of the administrative machine whose jobs will be continued for another year. It will please, also, the black-market gangsters who are getting rich by evading the regulations. To everybody else in the country, the conference committee offers nothing but needless hardship. For all practical purposes, Congress is abdicating.

OPA, as the conferees know, has not prevented prices from rising sharply. What it has done is to prevent the rising prices from resulting in increases in production. The secret payments under the table don't get back to the factories to stimulate output. The private deals by which vacant apartments are rented to the applicant who offers the appropriate bribe don't encourage building. The economic machine is stalled because of OPA's tampering with the mechanism.

Congress could have done the country an enormous service by tossing the bureaucrats out of their offices and restoring the law price system which, as much as anything else, is responsible for the growth of this country's productivity over the years. The representatives of the people, instead of serving them, are serving the bureaucrats. Congress has never appeared in a worse light than it did when the conference committee made its disgraceful report on the OPA bill.

Mr. President, the key to the left-wing movement in America is OPA. This wartime agency's postwar operations have been such as to seriously impair our economy, weaken the morale of our people, destroy respect for government, and to create unnecessary shortages. To further continue this disruptive program in peacetime will, in my opinion, stand as a regrettable mistake in the history of our country.

Two forces are urging upon the Congress that OPA must be continued. The first and most active force is represented by CIO and its subsidiary organization, the PAC, both of which represent the Communist thought and action in America. The second force is composed of sincere men and women of America who have fallen victims to well-organized scare propaganda of the OPA that inflationary prices will destroy the economy of the country and bring untold hardships upon the people if Government abandons price controls and returns our economy to the competitive forces of private enterprise under the free play of the law of supply and demand. The CIO and the PAC are likewise conducting a scare campaign by threatening to liquidate at the coming congressional elections at least a hundred Members of the Congress who dare question the correctness of a controlled economy.

The deep underlying purpose of the CIO leadership, although conducted in the name of protection, is in reality a campaign to destroy our capitalistic system and with it the free enterprise of this country. With deadly deliberation the plan is designed to cause economic collapse, overthrow of constitutional government, and the establishment of a centralized government in complete harmony with the ideals of Soviet Russia under which complete regimentation may be effectuated.

I fully appreciate the seriousness of the charges I make in this connection, but the evidence and the extenuating circumstances are so clear and so convincing that I feel compelled to speak entirely frankly.

It is common knowledge that men such as Sidney Hillman, Harry Bridges, Mike Quill, R. J. Thomas, Joseph Curran, C. B. Baldwin, and other leaders of the CIO and the PAC, are not in tune with our American ideals and traditions. It is not to be denied that key positions in the administrative agencies of our Government are in many cases filled by men and women who are in sympathy with the socialization of our economy, which is the first step to communistic government, and thus continued wartime control of our economy is being urged by these ambitious regimenters.

There are some who will ridicule the possibilities that I suggest, but to treat lightly the communistic influence that has been growing in America for more than 10 years is to play with a devastating influence which thrives and, in fact, has already grown strong on the placid gullibility of our American citizens.

There is a strong suspicion that Mr. Bowles, following a precedent established by the New Deal administration more than 10 years ago of using public funds to further personal political ambitions, is, in fact, conducting a campaign for bigger and better things. It would appear that Henry Wallace, who for so long has been the darling of the CIO, is being displaced by Mr. Bowles, and I shall not be surprised if Mr. Bowles is offered to the Democratic Party by that organization in 1948 for a place on the Democratic national ticket; and, like Wallace in '40 and Truman in '44, he will probably be accepted, unless those members of the once great Democratic Party who still believe in constitutional government take a stand now for democracy.

The movement toward socialism, which is the broad highway to communism, has become so rapid in our Government that many seem to have lost sight of the fundamentals on which our constitutional form of government was created. Recently I heard a member of the Banking and Currency Committee of this Senate ask a witness just "where democracy ceased and socialism began." I would like to answer the question by suggesting that representative government ceases when bureaucratic government takes over. Socialism begins at the moment government control is substituted for free and competitive enterprise. Surely, it is well understood that we today labor under a centralized bureaucracy that has almost usurped representative government, both National and State.

It is not too much to say that we have, at least temporarily, accepted a governmentally controlled economy that is rapidly destroying the last vestige of private enterprise and the free operation of competitive forces. The only competition now left in business is the scramble for bureaucratic favoritism.

The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House, Mr. HATTON W. SUMNERS, recently had this to say:

> By ignoring principles and the lessons of history, and accepting the theories of men and political expedience for our guidance, we have made vassals of our States and dependents of our people. By concentration of governmental power and drafts upon the Federal Treasury, we have now a financially "busted," great piled-up mass of governmental confusion beyond human comprehension; impossible of democratic control, extravagant, wasteful, inefficient, and by its nature, the instrumentality of favoritism, tyranny, oppression and corruption, and the destroyer of the self-reliance and self-respect and governmental capacity of the people, qualities without which no people can remain free.

The sincere rank-and-file individual who urges the continuation of OPA has been made to believe, by a systematic, planned, scare, propaganda program, that if controls are eliminated he will be destroyed by inflation. This fallacious scare propaganda has been carried on in the main by OPA itself by the use of funds appropriated for the use of that agency by the Congress. Its activities in this regard are in open and flagrant violation of the plain language of the law. Section 201, title 18, of the Federal Code provides:

> No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress.

Prior to the time OPA started its extensive campaign for self-perpetuation, the Bureau of the Budget reported that this agency would spend $2,572,000 during the current year for propaganda and so-called educational services. The so-called news letters of OPA and its regional offices being sent to Members of the Congress, cartooning the devastating effects of inflation, the circulars and pamphlets that are being mailed out of these offices by use of the frank to the public, making appeals to support a further extension of price controls, the use of thousands of man-hours of time by OPA employees and officials in either direct or indirect lobbying, furnish sufficient evidence to indict and convict the officials of both OPA and the Office of Economic Stabilization. OPA seems to be comfortable in the reliance that the Department of Justice, under an administration that is itself a captive of the CIO influences to which I have referred, will fail to prosecute this open violation of the law. Whether this reliance is well founded is yet to be determined.

The facts are, Mr. President, that OPA has actually caused shortages, inflation, deterioration of quality, and continued high prices.

In the hearings just completed by both the House and Senate on the proposed extension of this control of our economy, representatives of practically every segment of industry and business, from the smallest retailer to the producers of our basic raw materials, including every branch of our food-producing industries, appeared to condemn the policies and operation of OPA. The testimony of these witnesses is a shocking and disgraceful story of the assassination of our business and industrial enterprise.

The retail merchants, the wholesalers, commission merchants, the manufacturers, the canners, the farmers, the cattlemen, the meat packers, the oil industry, the vegetable growers, and many others, have all come forward to condemn the pernicious practice of this organization, and in a great many cases to frankly state that complete and final termination of this governmental control of our economy must be effectuated at once to save our private enterprise and to insure the necessities of life at prices we can afford to pay. Not a single important industrial organization appeared to defend the administration of this agency. Not only was the administration of this agency almost unanimously attacked by business and industry, but the honesty, integrity, and good faith of its personnel were questioned by dozens of witnesses. Hundreds of specific examples were cited. The evidence is so clear that the truth of their charges cannot be doubted. The bad faith of OPA and OES is apparent on every hand.

It may be asked what proof I have of this serious charge. Let us examine the activity of Mr. Porter and Mr. Bowles following the enactment of the House amendments requiring the President, when he determines domestic demand for any commodity or class of commodities has been satisfied, to certify such fact to the Price Administrator, and requiring the Administrator within 10 days thereafter to remove price control with respect to such commodity or commodities. Immediately Mr. Porter and Mr. Bowles hit the press and the radio with excited releases and speeches declaring the amended House bill would render OPA helpless, would destroy price control, and would loose uncontrolled inflation upon the people. The amendment requiring OPA to take into consideration reasonable profits measured by certain base years was denounced as a crime against price controls, and the housewives of the country were told that such provision would require the removal of price controls from practically all items of food.

I say no person can, in good faith, deny the efficacy of removing price controls when supply satisfies demand, nor can the requirement that profits be taken as a factor in the fixing of prices be denied, whether by government or private industry, unless that denial is motivated by a deliberate and malicious attempt to destroy the profit system.

Demagoguery, common dishonesty, and open and frank violation of the law have been the accepted policy of the price regulators.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahome yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. MOORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I simply wish to emphasize what the Senator from Oklahoma has said just now in regard to the profit system, and I desire to add a word to his statement. In referring to the profit system, so-called, I like to call it, and I think the Senator from Oklahome will agree with me, the profit and loss system, because in the long run under our American system there are more people who lose than there are those who are successful. I wish to emphasize that frequently under the so-called profit system there are large losses.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. I can state here and now that, in my opinion, the question to be considered today is whether we are going to have a free competitive economy such as this country has always had, or whether we are going to have a controlled economy. If we wish to have

a controlled economy, we are entitled to have it. But so far as history relates, there has never been a successfully controlled economy in any country which has tried it. I admit that there are evils in competitive free markets; but, on the whole, no country has ever grown great except by adhering to the practice of a free enonomy in a capitalistic system.

Mr. President, I have said that demagoguery, common dishonesty, and open and frank violation of the law have been the accepted policy of the price regulators. As to the proof on this score, let us examine the evidence. As far back as October 1944, Chester Bowles, in a memorandum to all members of OPA advisory committees, said:

> We have always looked upon price control as a stop-gap, a stabilizing wartime control to be dropped as soon as production brings supply and demand *reasonably* in balance. To maintain controls needlessly, even for a few extra months, would be a mistake. * * * When supply and demand come back into balance, price controls will not be needed. * * * Working with industry advisory committees we will watch each field closely. We will rely heavily on their recommendations as to when controls can be safely removed.

In June 1945, Chester Bowles wrote to the majority leader, as follows:

> Price controls were developed solely to meet wartime conditions. We are pledged to remove these controls just as soon as the production of civilian goods and services eliminates the inflationary dangers and permits our return to a free market.

Again, in December 1945, Chester Bowles told the Senate Small Business Committee:

> Save in a period of emergency, price ceilings have no place in a free economy. We shall remove them, product by product, as soon as it can be done without inflation.

Again, on January 1, 1946, as reported in the publication Vital Speeches, Chester Bowles said:

> Price controls should and must be removed as rapidly as supply conditions permit. In industry after industry, during the next 12 months, we will find supply and demand coming into balance. As that occurs, I assure you that your Government will move promptly to eliminate the last vestige of price restrictions in these industries.

On February 27, 1946, before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, John Snyder promised:

> Price controls should be dropped on each product as soon as supply is in reasonable balance with demand. When supply comes into balance with demand or approaches balance with demand, I think competition will take care of the pricing and, certainly, I would think we should remove the controls at that period.

Secretary Anderson, before the House Committee on Agriculture on April 15, 1946, when asked if he thought it was a sound policy to remove all ceilings on any given commodity when supply balanced demand, answered:

> I think it is sound policy; yes.

Mr. Porter has told both House and Senate committees that no attempt will be made to maintain controls on commodities when supply equals demand. But what has been the record?

Since VJ-day in August of last year there has actually been a tremendous surplus of oil and refined products. Nevertheless, the oil industry labors under the same heavy hand of price control that it suffered throughout the war. Gasoline storage is at an all-time high. Early last month gasoline storage reached a peak of 105,000,000 barrels. Domestic stocks of both heavy and light fuel oils of all types and grades were at a high level. Crude-oil production in the field is being curtailed by the State regulatory bodies to prevent both physical and economic waste. Refineries have been forced to cut back crude runs to stills because of the storage situation. Ordinarily, the oil industry has in continuous operation from 1,800 to 2,000 drilling rigs. Today the industry is operating something like 1,400 rigs. The demagoguery and the dishonesty with which OPA officials have dealt with the oil industry prove beyond reasonable doubt that they cannot be trusted to carry out their promises. The Emergency Price Control Act plainly provides that—

> Before issuing any regulation or order * * * the Administrator shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with representative members of the industry which will be affected by such regulation or order, and shall give consideration to their recommendations.

Mr. Bowles, as Price Administrator, and his successor, Mr. Porter, have flatly failed and refused to comply with the spirit and intent of this provision of the law. Representatives from every branch of the oil industry have continuously recommended and urged, first, an increase in the price of crude oil, and, later, termination of price control on crude and refined products because of the supply and demand situation. Mr. Bowles and his successor, Mr. Porter, have refused to consider or give any apparent weight to the unanimous demand of the oil industry. I might also add that the same recommendations have come from OPA's Oil Industry Advisory Committee without a dissenting vote, but likewise fell on deaf ears.

On his resignation from the Oil and Gas Section of OPA a few days ago, Mr. Sumner Pike made the startling and almost unbelievable statement that OPA was anxious to terminate price control over the oil industry, and would have done so except for the fear that the State regulatory bodies might take such action as would create an artificial price increase for the oil producers. Thus, the OPA admitted that there was no existing basis to maintain price control over the oil industry and at the same time disclosed its arrogant intent unlawfully to supplant the authority of State oil and gas regulatory bodies. Furthermore, it proved its promises to be nothing less than hollow demagoguery.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. In all fairness to the OPA, it should be said that they have removed controls on some articles, as testified in the committee hearings. As shown on page 1562 of the committee hearings, Mr. Vinson agreed that the following articles had been decontrolled: Pincushions, shoehorns, wax papers, dinner bells and chimes, book ends and ashtrays when made from worn baby shoes, lightning rods and weather vanes, aluminum horseshoes, sleigh bells, dog beds, cushions, and mattresses, and magician's tricks.

Mr. MOORE. I think the Senator's statement is very illuminating.

Mr. BUCK. Those articles were decontrolled in Hawaii.

Mr. MOORE. The Senator's statement is indeed of some significance. I am glad to have the evidence that there is a possibility of some articles being decontrolled. Ultimately the desired results may be achieved. The greatest result which could be achieved would be an act of Congress removing controls altogether.

Mr. President, the horrible and scandalous black-market situation existing in the meat industry is another example with which every Member of the Congress and the public generally are familiar. The tremendous backlog of beef cattle, hogs, and lambs is capable of supplying the American public with as much meat per capita as at any time in history. Total slaughterings are at an all-time high. Yet OPA disregards its promises to remove controls in this industry, where supply more than exceeds demand, and where black-market diversions continue to cause severe shortages in the legitimate packing industry and in the retail stores that attempt to conduct a legitimate business within the rigid controls of OPA.

The September 1945 report of the Department of Agriculture and the May 2, 1946, press release of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics show that the total meat production in the United States in 1945 was 17 percent in excess of 1941, and over 20 percent in excess of the 1940 production, and more than 20 percent in excess of the production average for the years 1935 to 1944, inclusive.

On April 5, 1946, Secretary Anderson told the House Committee on Agriculture:

> There need not be a scarcity. There is sufficient cattle population to produce all the meat we need.

It is generally admitted that Secretary Anderson is an authority on that subject and his background of experience gives him the know-how to discuss his discretion intelligently. It is fortunate, I think, that we have a man of that character in that position, and I am glad to recognize that fact.

The March 1946 report of the Department of Agriculture, page 11, says:

> The number of cattle and calves on hand January 1, 1946, was the third largest on record and the potential supply of cattle for slaughter in 1946 is large. While some decline in numbers of steers and in beef heifers occurred in 1945, most of the 2 million head decline in total cattle numbers was in the number of milk stock. The number of beef cows and heifers on hand January 1, 1946, was an all-time high, indicating that production of cattle for slaughter in the next 2 or 3 years will continue large.

Federally inspected slaughter of sheep and lambs in February totaled 2.2 million head, 52 percent greater than in the previous month and 35 percent greater than a year earlier, to set an all-time high for the month.

On May 1, Secretary Anderson told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that he estimated something like 40 million range cattle at the present time as against 36 million in 1939 and 1940.

Interim Report No. 1295, May 2, 1946, from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, page 7 says:

Government estimates show a meat supply this year of 150 pounds per capita, the largest amount available to consumers since 1911 and about 20 percent more than the 1935–39 average. Secondly, the evidence shows that there is no shortage of basic livestock numbers for the production of meat. In fact, there is an excessive population of cattle which should be finished for market in order to make more secure the future of the cattle industry.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order. There is audible conversation from all parts of the Chamber. I ask for order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Chamber.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine. I think it would be good manners, at least, if those who do not want to hear what I have to say would leave the Chamber, and, if they want to do that, it is perfectly agreeable to me. I am not expecting to influence any votes. I merely want to say what I have to say for the RECORD, stating what my position is on what I consider to be the most pernicious and damaging legislation the Congress could further impose upon the people at this time.

Proceeding with my statement, the March 1946 report of the Department of Agriculture, page 10, states:

Pork production in 1946 is likely to exceed 10,000,000,000 pounds dressed meat basis. Hog slaughter probably will continue larger than a year earlier throughout the remainder of the year 1946.

I might add here that these estimates were made prior to the time the Agriculture Department went into the black market business by paying 30 cents a bushel above the ceiling for corn, which undoubtedly will have its effect on the production of both pork and beef in 1947. That is just what the Department did, and the producers had to go into the black market to buy corn because they could not buy it in any other way. Such was frankly admitted by the Secretary before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee a few days ago. Corn is essentially an animal food. To artificially price corn out of the market for poultry and hog raisers and cattle feeders is to lay the basis for poultry, pork, and beef shortages in 1947. On the other hand, wheat is the basic food for human consumption the world over, and to artificially hold the price below its intrinsic value for human consumption so that it becomes profitable to be fed on the farm, rather than marketed, creates a livestock surplus and a bread shortage. That is what a controlled and planned economy does for our business and our country. The controlled price on wheat at subnormal levels and an uncontrolled black market for livestock and meat have been the factors that permitted this condition to develop.

Despite the plentiful supply of meat, the favorable estimates of the Department of Agriculture, the findings and recommendations of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and the promises of OPA, there is no indication that controls will be voluntarily terminated over the meat and livestock industries. In fact, the termination of controls is resisted from every quarter and by every bureau and by many of those who desire to see bureaucratic government continued in this country to supplant representative government, as we have always known it in the United States.

It is estimated by some experts that probably between forty and forty-five million bushels of wheat were consumed on the farms as livestock feed during January, February, and March of this year, or at the rate of one hundred and sixty to one hundred and eighty million bushels annually. At this rate, we will consume from twenty-five to fifty million bushels in excess of that normally used for livestock feed on the farms during the very period that we are undertaking the responsibility to relieve the starvation that is stalking the European countries. The answer seems simple enough. Eliminate controls and the price of wheat will find its economic level in relationship to its value for food on the basis of supply and demand.

The corn and wheat mess in relation to their relative values for human consumption and livestock feed is only another example of what happens to the whole economy when any segment of it is thrown out of balance by artificial means. OPA ceilings on wheat have helped to produce more meat than we need, but in so doing have destroyed our bread supply. Our last wheat crop was the largest in history. The operation of the law of supply and demand would have ordinarily adjusted these relationships. Instead, the American public, at the expense of the black market, will consume 25 pounds more meat per capita than ever before eaten in this country, and the most precious of all foods will be scarce in both America and in Europe.

During the first three quarters of this crop year—July 1945 to March 1946 inclusive—we consumed approximately 774,000,000 bushels of wheat for all purposes, including seed wheat, leaving less than 340,000,000 bushels for the last quarter. If we are to ship 125,000,000 bushels to Europe in the present quarter, as hoped for by the Secretary of Agriculture, it will mean that our carry-over will drop dangerously low, far less than 100,000,000 bushels. A short crop this year could very well bring about a national catastrophe. Already, excessive rains in April are causing the Department of Agriculture, in its monthly crop report for May 1, to drop this estimate on the winter wheat prospect by 88,000,000 bushels.

The dangers of an artificially controlled economy cannot be emphasized too strongly. It has led to chaos and destruction in every nation of the world where it has been tried. America will be no exception.

The fact that we have the third largest cattle crop in history and a black-market situation in meat that is comparable only to the speakeasies and racketeers of the prohibition era is a warning signal that only the stupid will disregard. To relieve the meat industry of controls will not cure the situation. The racketeers will merely transfer to other fields of operation.

In his appearance before the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, on April 16, Chester Bowles said:

Black markets are vastly overrated.

These "little minds" either fail to comprehend the situation, or there is a deliberate attempt to bring about economic chaos.

Secretary Anderson told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee a few days ago, flat-footedly, straightforwardly, and unmistakably, that the black-market situation in the meat industry was so admittedly bad that price controls should be entirely removed if the slaughter quotas that had been invoked failed to relieve the conditions. He begged for 90 days' time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator know what the result has been under the slaughter quota which has been in effect during the 6 weeks' period?

Mr. MOORE. I think my friend from Nebraska is better qualified to answer that question than am I.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to suggest that statistics have been given to me which show that, under the slaughter quotas put into effect during the entire month of May and for 2 weeks of June, the period which the Secretary asked to have them imposed, and the 2 weeks more since that time, during the last week in the 10 principal cities, constituting the central markets, less than 16 percent of the total cattle received by those markets were slaughtered by legitimate slaughterers. The balance of them were sent on the hoof to order buyers, the racketeers, and the black markets throughout the country.

That is evidence of the complete failure of the quotas. These markets particularly, as the distinguished Senator knows, formerly slaughtered 75 percent of the cattle which came into the market. Now they are down to 16 percent, which is a new low, and with the quotas in vogue for the last 6 weeks, which Secretary Anderson said was the only thing he knew of that might improve the situation, they have finally brought about a decrease in slaughtering by the legitimate firms, as I have said, to a new low, which is the result of the quotas in force for the 6-week period he asked for. Since the plan has been unsuccessful, since a new low in slaughtering has been

reached, I think the Senator will agree with me that the only other alternative is to do the "something else" the Secretary said they would have to do if the plan failed; that is, decontrol.

Mr. MOORE. And if the Secretary kept the promise he made when he begged for additional time, he would now recommend the decontrol of livestock.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, previously Mr. Truman, according to the press reports, had expressed views in sympathy with this statement. I think Senators will remember the statement he made. But what happened when CIO-controlled Bowles bore down on the President? The President meekly backed up and denied that either he or Secretary Anderson had meant to say price controls would be terminated in the meat industry. He only meant, he said, that the slaughter controls would be removed if they failed to relieve the situation. I thought that was a pretty embarrassing situation the President got himself into.

Such equivocation is destroying the confidence of the people in their Government, and magnifies the ruthless political power of a CIO-controlled bureaucracy and the complete inadequacy and helplessness of our elected officials.

In connection with the black market in meat, which, of course, could not exist without price control—and let me here make it plain that the black market in the meat industry is an example of what will happen in all industry unless the Congress terminates this entire economic atrocity—I call attention to the report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, No. 1295, dated May 2, 1946.

Mr. President, I know this report has been published, and it was produced after abundance of testimony had been taken; but, as a matter of emphasis, as a matter of presenting something of prime importance, and as a matter of citing the best authority that can be had, I shall read the report into the RECORD at this time. I quote from the report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

> The committee is convinced that an extensive and scandalous black market in meat and livestock exists today, and that the Government wartime controls that have been imposed upon the meat and slaughtering industries over a 4-year period have been in a large measure responsible for the black market.
>
> Surveys made by independent marketing agencies, whom the committee believes to be competent and reliable, showed that in late February 1946, 5 out of 6 retail stores, in 11 representative cities from coast to coast—

Think of that representation—

> were charging in excess of ceiling prices for meat—

Yet we called this a price-control law—

> and that two-thirds of the meat cuts sold by these stores were sold at over-ceiling prices. The average overcharge for all meats, as shown by these reports, was 20 percent, and in the case of beef it was 26 percent.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a moment?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I think that if we could make it understood to the people who are buying meat in the black market, and buying what meat they can get in their regular market, that they are taking what is handed to them instead of getting what they should have, it would open their eyes. To me it is very important in this picture to make it plain that in a great many cases, if not most, the people are not getting what they pay for, even when they buy in the black market. They are taking exactly what is handed to them, and they are taking it because the market has been controlled to such a point that the people become impatient and will accept any kind of poor meat cuts or edibles they can get for their money because they are given no competitive choice.

Mr. MOORE. Even in violation of law.

Mr. HAWKES. Even in violation of law; yes.

Mr. MOORE. Then, what does the Senator think about the idea of continuing this hopeless situation, on the theory that what we have is better than nothing?

Mr. HAWKES. I might reply to the Senator from Oklahoma by saying that I voted to decontrol meat and all dairy products, poultry, and so forth.

Mr. MOORE. I did, too, but the matter is before us to vote on again.

Mr. HAWKES. I am going to listen to what the Senator is saying, then I am going to make up my mind.

Mr. MOORE. I shall use all the power of persuasion of which I am capable to get the Senator not to vote for the conference report.

Mr. HAWKES. I am going to listen to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MOORE. Then I shall watch the Senator's vote. I like the way many men talk, but sometimes I cannot reconcile what they say with their votes.

Mr. HAWKES. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma——

Mr. MOORE. Oh, I have no personal reference. I am speaking generally, not referring to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not want anyone to misunderstand, because I think the Senator from Oklahoma and I have voted very much the same on fundamentals all the way through the last 3½ years.

Mr. MOORE. I think we will do well to continue that course.

Mr. HAWKES. I think that is bound up with the proposition that we may each have to give a little in order to do it.

Mr. MOORE. I quote further from the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

> A repeat survey made in the latter part of March 1946 in the city of Washington, showed that in a 4-week period the overcharge on meat in Washington had more than doubled.

I do not know what the price was; I do not think anyone knows. I think people can buy this meat by paying what is asked for it, and it cannot be bought in any other way. If people do not buy it, there will be some competition. The only competition I know of in America in the purchase of food products is in the black market. Probably if the black market is continued long enough competition will bring about competitive free markets again, and that is a thing we might try.

I read further from the report:

> These surveys were conservative in that reports could not be obtained covering sales to hotels, restaurants, clubs, and other of the more flagrant kinds of black market meat operations.

I continue quoting from the report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

> For the past several months cattle prices quoted by the United States Department of Agriculture at many of the principal markets have been in excess of the prices that slaughterers could pay for cattle and still comply with Government price regulations. With cattle being sold at these prices, it is obvious to the committee that most beef must be moving in black market channels.

It simply could not be otherwise.

> For example, the average of Government-quoted prices on choice steers at Chicago has been continually above the OPA maximum permissible price for this grade of cattle since early in 1945. Other grades of cattle at Chicago have at most times been equal to or above the permissible prices which the legitimate slaughterers can pay, and stay in compliance. Similar situations were shown to prevail at other important markets as well as at livestock auctions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it should be pointed out, when the Senator uses the word "compliance," what it means. Apparently the average person does not realize what it meant when it is said they can pay such prices and still be in compliance. If the Senator does not mind, I should like to make a statement about that.

The reason why the legitimate slaughterers, who would kill meat and sell it under this so-called legal price the distinguished Senator is discussing, are precluded from buying the meat is that they have to depend upon the subsidy. The subsidy is what is allowed the processor by the Government. The subsidy is withheld if they go beyond the Vinson price range for the different grades of cattle.

The question may be asked, "Why does not that suffice?" It does not suffice, Mr. President, because the legitimate operator is the big man. His records are available. OPA officials can go to the big man and say, "Give us your records. We find from your records that you are not in compliance. Therefore we are going to withhold your subsidies." I know of one firm that bought a carload of cattle but because the buyer could not tell what the live cattle would dress out—and the packers are judged on the dressed beef as to whether they are in compliance or not—that company went over line 1 percent, and as a result subsidies were withheld from it in the amount of $582,000. So the companies whose records can be investigated, the companies with respect to which there

is a chance to secure enforcement, stay within the price range. They are obliged to stay within the compliance range in order to get the subsidy payments to make up the losses which would otherwise be incurred in processing the meat.

Mr. President, what happens is this. The black marketeers buy animals on the hoof, they even buy animals on the farms, indeed, they buy them wherever they can get them. The black marketeers do not depend on the subsidy. They depend on selling their meats at high prices, without even selling the offal. They depend on selling the meat for whatever the traffic will bear. Eighty percent of the meat sold is sold in the black market, because the black marketeer buys cattle at prices above the price range. The legitimate slaughterer cannot do so because he must stay in compliance.

I am sorry to have taken so much of the Senator's time, but I thought this point should be explained so the housewives and others may know why they cannot get meat.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have in my hands a summary of price surveys recently made. The survey shows the large number of stores in representative American cities which had been visited by housewives or other representatives of those who prepared the survey, most of whom were typical housewives. They visited, for instance, a total of 1,803 stores. The stores were located in New York City; Providence, R. I.; Newark, N. J.; Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Ill.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Memphis, Tenn.; Houston, Tex.; Denver, Colo.; Los Angeles, Calif. The survey showed generally speaking that in 83.2 percent of the stores visited various cuts of meat were being sold above the price ceiling. If I may intrude on the Senator's time for a moment I should like to give a few figures.

Mr. MOORE. I am glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let us look at the record. First let us take Washington, D. C. Two hundred and forty-two stores were visited in Washington, D. C. Those who visited them purchased 516 cuts of beef, and they found in the National Capital violations of the ceiling prices in 81.4 percent of the sales. Yet it is said that we have enforcement of OPA regulations. These sales of meat in violation of ceiling prices were made within view of the Capitol dome.

Let us consider New York City. Four hundred and one stores were visited. Seven hundred and thirty-nine pieces of beef were purchased. Seventy-eight and eight-tenths percent of the sales were made over the ceiling prices.

I now want to consider some of the cities in which the greatest number of violations of price ceilings occurred. Let us take Houston, Tex. One hundred stores were visited in Houston. Those who visited them purchased 192 cuts of meat. and they found that 94 percent of the sales were in violation of the ceiling prices.

Mr. MOORE. Texas is a little careless, anyway.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to point out that in Providence, R. I., which is the only New England city in which this survey was made, 35 stores were visited, 69 cuts of meat were purchased, and 77.1 percent of the sales were made in violation of the law. That figure was a little low. But probably the reason is that there is so little meat coming into New England.

If the Senator will yield further, let me say that I was told very recently of a woman who stood in line in a meat market for almost 2 hours, waiting to buy some meat. She was nearly 80 years old. Before it came to her turn to buy, before she arrived at that position in the procession which was waiting for a little meat to be distributed, she had fainted dead away. She had not had any meat for 9 weeks, and so far as I know she has not gotten any meat yet, because after she fainted they had to carry her out of the store and take her to her home.

Mr. President, the figures I have given show us the conditions we now face. All over the country the stores are absolutely barren of meat. In my section, New England, I think the situation is worse than in any other section of the country, if that be possible.

Mr. MOORE. I want to suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire, who is a New Englander, that the people there are a little more cautious in their buying, and more careful not to be gypped than are the people in Washington and in other parts of the country.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say that if anyone is able to buy meat in New England he is bound to be gypped. He either does not get meat, or, if he does, he is gypped, because there is no meat to be gotten unless it is in the "gyp" market.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his contribution.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I want to give to the Senate what I consider to be the strongest evidence that has come to me in regard to violations of OPA price controls. If Senators have talked recently with American workingmen about their demands for increases in wages, and have discussed with them the matter of the increased cost of living, as set forth by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, they will have found, as I have found from talking with these workmen who called at my office in Washington and with workingmen and businessmen elsewhere, that the statement generally has been "What is the use of paying any attention to the figures set forth by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, because they are based on the price ceilings which have been established, and we cannot buy goods at those prices. We have to go into the black market, and there is no use in talking about the percentage of increase in living cost shown by the Bureau, because it is not in our lives."

Can Senators point to any stronger evidence of how the OPA and its administration have permeated the whole Nation, when honest workmen admit that they have to and are buying in the black market?

Mr. MOORE. I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that of course the working people, and every other class of people, those in every activity, would like to be relieved of the extortionate prices which appear to prevail today in the commodities which constitute the living of the people. If they are led to believe, through the false propaganda and the lies and the pamphlets and other material that go out from the commentators and the radio stations, and the press, and the bureaucrats. to the effect that continuation of OPA will result in a lessening in the cost of living, of course they would be for it, and I do not blame them for taking that position. If they think price control will minimize the cost of living, we would not expect them to take a contrary position. But the people of the Middle West to whom I have talked are almost unanimously of the belief that price control has prevented production, that it will continue to prevent production, and that the final answer to this whole question is to let producers have their head, let them have an opportunity to produce on a competitive basis and sell for what profit they can get, and then when the prices become too high, the people will quit buying. The Senator has heard that statement. The other day I heard a pretty substantial commentator speak in support of the extension of price control. He stated that Harry Truman was a victim of high prices, and that he lost his store by reason of prices being so high, and his inventory so large. When prices decreased and deflation set in he lost his store. But he became President of the United States. After all, sometimes bad things turn out to be good things. Everyone knows that in a competitive economy there are some hardships.

I wish to get back to the proposition I am submitting here today. I believe that every man knows that we are confronted with the question, Shall we restore this country to free competitive markets, in which the law of supply and demand has free play, or shall we commit the country to a planned economy? I have cpposed this system from the beginning. I think it was bad during the war. I do not think it has been helpful. During a war the patriotic motives of the people can properly be appealed to, and the people will respond to a greater extent than they will when there is no emergency. I believe that the appeal for voluntary cooperation in all efforts during the war was much more effective than the compulsion and restrictions placed upon the people. Now that the war is over, I do not think there is any further need for these controls. That is my candid opinion. That is the only reason I am speaking today. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am not pussyfooting in the least. So far as the political angle is concerned, I do not claim to be a political expert.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MOORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I appreciate very much the Senator's yielding.

Does not the Senator feel that the discontinuance of any such system, whether it be the OPA, or any other system, no matter how well administered it may be, leaves us with a problem for a certain length of time? Does not the Senator feel, as I do, that the people of the United States must bear a certain burden while we are getting from where we have been back to where we must go?

Mr. MOORE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not wish to be misunderstood. Merely because I am opposed to the continuation of these regulations, I do not believe that we can immediately move back into perfect balance when they are discontinued, and that everyone will be happy. If we continue this system much longer, I think it will be much more difficult to discontinue it. I believe that no matter what we do, we must be willing to bear a certain burden to get back to the point where a free people can operate in free competition.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. I agree with him that it is more than likely, when price control is removed, that the prices of some items may advance substantially.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. It will inevitably follow that when the subsidies are removed the people will have to pay higher prices. The Government is now paying $1,000,000,000 in subsidies, which the people will have to pay some day, when the subsidies are removed.

Mr. MOORE. We are merely fooling ourselves and deceiving the people. I think it is a horrible thing for Congress not to say frankly to the people, "If we give you price control, do not be fooled by it. This system will not control prices. The inflationary tendency will continue." When prices are high, whether it be in a black market or in a competitive market, the tendency is toward inflation.

I am not much impressed by the Government economists who are so often quoted by the commentators. After having had some experience with them, I do not see how they could impress anyone. Their purpose is to stimulate propaganda to the effect that the country is going to the dogs unless we have price control. The country is going to the dogs unless the people are given an opportunity to produce the things which are so much needed in the market today.

Continuing with the report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

> Numerous instances were reported where even the overriding ceiling price on cattle has been violated at local markets and auctions. Hog price ceilings are likewise being flagrantly violated in one way or another and particularly in the South. Cattle feeders frankly admitted to the committee that they were in a position where they had to depend on black market prices to stay in operation, and pointed out that the uncertainty of this situaiton resulted in confusion, fear, and restricted production of livestock and meat.

No one challenges the soundness of the conclusions reached in this committee report. If it cannot be challenged, we are bound to admit that the system has not worked. Yet it is proposed to continue it, when we know that it cannot work, and that we must suffer all the evils which come from it. I cannot understand it. I am puzzled and confused. I do not know what to say. I do not believe that this speech will change any votes. I am not speaking merely to hear the sound of my own voice. I have never been so anxious about anything in my life as I am about seeing the people freed of the oppressions and burdens which the Price Control Act imposes upon them.

Quoting further from the report:

> Prevailing livestock prices prove, without doubt, the existence of a widespread black market in livestock and meat.
>
> Unprecedented shipments of slaughter cattle from the principal livestock markets can be explained only by black market buying and slaughtering.

This is a considered report. It was made after the testimony was taken. It was made by men of the finest understanding and the greatest influence in the Senate.

> While the current situation is the most serious yet experienced, the committee was impressed by the fact that this diversion of cattle from normal slaughter channels commenced immediately with the institution of price control and has continued to grow to the present.

It commenced immediately with the existence of price control. Of course it did. I am reading about livestock only to emphasize what the system does to all commodities. Let us take the lumber industry. Everyone is more or less familiar with it. We cannot have production of lumber and other building materials until the people have an opportunity to go to work and produce those commodities and sell them at prices which will enable them to stay in business. While I do not come from a State which produces a great deal of lumber, I have had considerable correspondence with lumbermen. A question not infrequently asked is: "Do you want me to liquidate or violate? If I am to stay in business I must violate the law."

I do not know the answer to that question. I am not advising anyone to violate the law. Bankruptcy is a deplorable thing to be approaching, and the loss of one's business is something to be worried about. If I were in business today and approaching bankruptcy, and if I could stave it off only by violating the law, I do not know what I would do. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that I am in full accord with what Benjamin Franklin said, "It is hard for an empty sack to stand upright." I do not know whether I would stand upright if I were approaching the loss of my business.

I do not think anyone can gainsay the fact that the complete disrespect for law which has grown up as a result of these controls has bankrupted the country morally. The country is not only bankrupt financially, but it is bankrupt morally, and it is almost bankrupt from the standpoint of statesmanship. That is what the people think. They have lost respect for their Government; and when they lose respect for their Government, it is difficult to regain the confidence of the people. This country is based upon confidence. The banking system and the economic system are based upon confidence. I do not know what this country is coming to, and I do not think anyone can tell. But I believe that today the greatest uplift we could give the people would be to relieve them of this pernicious thing which has been imposed on them to their great detriment.

I read further from the report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

> Further evidence of the extensive black market is the startling increase in the number of slaughterers during the wartime period. Prior to OPA there were approximately 1,500 commercial slaughtering establishments whose annual sales volume was in excess of $5,000.

That is an important thing to take into consideration. It has been repeated time and again. We had about 1,500 slaughterhouses. The number has now grown to 26,000. There was no legitimate demand for such an increase in the number of slaughterhouses. The law violators were given an opportunity to become rich. There are many instances—and all Senators know about them—of people having become rich by violating the law and practicing extortion in connection with the sale of the things needed to sustain life. When Senators vote to adopt the conference report, when they vote to extend the OPA, they vote to extend this sort of racket in the United States. There is no getting away from that conclusion, I care not what the witnesses may say. That is the situation and that is the morality which is involved in this question. The fundamental question is whether we are to destroy this Government. I have said, and I wish to repeat it time and again, that the issue in this campaign is whether we are to return to a competitive free market, or whether we are to endorse a planned economy. By the vote on the pending conference report the Senate will take a long step in one of those directions. Today millions of dollars are being made by black marketers, and no income taxes are paid on those profits. Yesterday's newspapers carried a story telling of a gesture which is being made by the OPA and the Department of Justice, which say they seek to bring into court those who have been violating the OPA law. That is merely a gesture they are making at this time, when they are begging and pleading for the continuation of the OPA so that it may continue to harass and eventually destroy the people of this country. The Department of Justice and the OPA are trying to prevent the American people from putting the fear of God in the OPA and preventing the OPA from continuing its present

activities. But, Mr. President, 2 or 3 months from now when the people go to the polls we shall find what the politics of this matter is. After all, the people are the judges. In the final analysis, they are the ones who have to make the decisions. The people are not quite so dumb as the OPA considers them to be. I thank God, Mr. President, that in the final outcome we can rely upon the judgment of the American people with respect to their Government, because it is their Government that is being chiseled away.

Mr. President, I continue to read from the report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

These slaughterers were capable of slaughtering all the livestock that came to market and of distributing the resulting meat throughout the country in an efficient manner. During the 1944–45 livestock slaughter-control program, over 26,000 slaughtering permits were issued to commercial establishments by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Before the Senator takes up another point, I wish to refer to the statement he made a few moments ago about the number of slaughterers who have been licensed by the Department of Agriculture. I think the RECORD should also show—and the facts can be obtained from the testimony—that the so-called markets which buy the cattle on the hoof and are killing the cattle which finally come into the black market are known by the Government, they are licensed by the Government, and in many cases the Government even pays them the subsidies. Yet the enforcement against them has not taken the same line of activity at all that has been taken by the enforcement against the markets in the cities which formerly killed 75 percent of the cattle.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I continue to read from the report:

However, only 12,160 commercial slaughterers filed claims for subsidy payments for February 1946. The balance evidently were able to survive without applying for subsidy, even though this subsidy averaged $22.50 per head on cattle and $4.25 per head on hogs. These facts show, first, that Government controls have resulted in an unwarranted increase in the number of slaughterers and, second, that black-market profits are so large that many are able to operate and expand without benefit of the large Government subsidies.

The black market is seriously affecting the well-being and economy of the whole Nation. One of the more obvious results is the apparent shortage of meat brought about by the dislocations in normal distribution. Most of the large centers of population depend upon national slaughterers for a large portion of their meat supply in normal times. Now such slaughterers are unable to purchase livestock in competition with the black-market operator. Therefore, the amount of meat available at ceiling prices for these areas has diminished to the extent that it is actually scarce. The evidence showed that the beef production of many legitimate slaughterers, including national slaughterers, had decreased from 50 to 90 percent by February and March and it has continued to diminish since then.

This decline in cattle slaughter by such representative packers is due to their inability to obtain the livestock at legal prices and not to a decline in the volume of cattle being marketed. The evidence showed that legitimate slaughterers are likewise unable to maintain their hog slaughter and pork production because of the diversion of hogs to black-market channels.

The result is that there are large supplies of meat in some places and extreme shortages in others, depending upon whether the eating place, the wholesaler, the retailer, or the consumer is willing to "pay the price" and patronize the black market.

The surveys made in the 11 representative cities throughout the United States show that at least $1,250,000,000 a year in excess of ceiling prices is being paid by the consumer for meat. In addition, approximately $750,000,000 of meat subsidy per year is being indirectly paid for meat by the taxpayers in this country. The result is that the American public is paying in excess of $2,000,000,000 a year over ceiling prices for its meat.

That is a substantial amount. It is the cost to the American people as the result of black markets and subsidies. Just think of it, Mr. President; it is $2,000,000,000 a year. Is that inflationary? Some economists claim that by hiding the cost of food products by means of the payment of subsidies, such subsidy payments will tend to check inflation. But do they really tend to check inflation, or are subsidy payments in themselves inflationary? What good does it do to buy a certain product at what appears to be a reasonable price, when actually a subsidy is being paid—and of course it is paid by the people who buy the products, and is paid in proportion to the amount of taxes which the people pay in order to make possible the subsidy payments.

I read further from the report:

This represents only the out-of-pocket cost and does not take into consideration the indirect loss caused by the black market such as waste, unemployment, and sickness.

The black market in meat is seriously imperiling the public health. Legitimate slaughterers are subject to constant Federal and local supervision. Their plants are inspected for cleanliness, diseased animals are condemned, and the meat is inspected at all stages of processing, thus insuring that only clean and wholesome products reach the consumer. Many black-market operators on the other hand are not supervised and make no effort to handle their product in a sanitary manner. The evidence before this committee showed that black-market slaughterers are currently operating in buildings wholly lacking in refrigeration, screens, and other sanitary conditions. This committee was shocked by photographs which were submitted showing the horrible conditions under which black-market operators slaughter livestock and distribute meat.

Further, the waste of glands and other byproducts needed for the manufacture of pharmaceuticals is causing a shortage of many vital drugs and preparations such as insulin for the treatment of diabetes, adrenal cortex extract for the treatment of Addison's disease, medicines prepared from pituitary glands for use in childbirth and in surgical cases, adrenalin for the treatment of asthmatic conditions, and liver extract for the treatment of pernicious anemia. Several national pharmaceutical laboratories reported that the situation was critical and that they could not obtain necessary raw materials because the black market was diverting livestock from legitimate slaughterers. This committee believes that the black market threat to the public health is much more serious than any increase in meat prices which might result from the removal of Government controls on livestock and meat.

The open and notorious black market in livestock and meat is doing great harm to the morality of the country. Public observance of the Price Control Act and the livestock and meat regulations is the exception rather than the rule. Disregard of this act and these regulations breeds contempt for all law.

From all the evidence, the committee finds:

1. Government controls and price regulations affecting livestock and meat have completely broken down; price ceilings on livestock and meat are a fiction; and, as a result of the black market and subsidies, meat is costing the American public at least $2,000,000,000 a year in excess of ceiling prices.

2. Most meat is being sold at black market prices. Reliable surveys show that five out of six stores were selling meat at over ceiling prices and the average price of all meat sold at retail was 20 percent above legal ceilings in February 1946. Facts from the surveys also show that the black market has become more serious since that time.

3. There is no shortage of livestock on farms and ranches; in fact, there is an excessive inventory of cattle; but there are severe shortages of meat in some places and in certain stores because of the black market dislocation of distribution and because price controls and subsidies have impeded production by creating fear and uncertainty in the minds of producers and feeders of livestock.

4. The "price squeeze" placed on slaughterers by the OPA from 1942 to date has forced many legitimate slaughterers to close or curtail their operations, thereby fostering the black market.

5. Remaining legitimate slaughterers, both small and large, are willing and anxious to buy livestock at legal maximum prices but are unable to do so because black market operators pay higher prices with the result that livestock is being diverted from the normal channels of slaughter and distribution into the black market.

6. The black market in meat is imperiling the national health through insanitary slaughtering and curtailed production of essential medicinal byproducts.

7. Black market slaughtering is causing a complete economic loss of many millions of pounds of critically short byproducts, such as fats, protein feeds, and hides.

8. Widespread evasion of price controls on livestock and meat by those who are victims of the black market and must overcharge or go out of business, plus the failure of willful racketeering violators to be apprehended, has created a disrespect for all laws, and is rapidly undermining the moral fiber of the country.

9. Thousands of employees with long years of service and valued experience necessarily have been laid off by legitimate slaughterers because such slaughterers are unable to maintain their volume against black market competition. Additional thousands of other employees in these packing plants have had their hours of work reduced for the same reason.

10. Four years of experience with Government controls, culminating in the present scandalous situation, shows conclusively the impossibility of controlling livestock and meat prices and meat distribution through Government laws, regulations, and directives; and any new or reinstated controls on the livestock and meat industry can only create greater confusion and further impede maximum production and legitimate slaughtering and distribution.

11. Removal of price controls and subsidies from livestock and meat will stimulate the

marketing of livestock and the production of meat, drive the black-market operators out of business, save untold waste, safeguard the public health, and make a large supply of meat available to all at a competitive price which will be lower than consumers are now paying as a result of the black market and subsidies.

RECOMMENDATION

This committee recommends that all price controls and subsidies on livestock and edible products derived therefrom be removed at once.

Mr. President, I subscribe 100 percent to that recommendation, and I emphasize it with all the power at my command as being expressive of my views. That is the unconditional recommendation of a committee of this Senate, the members of which are the elected representatives of the people, but which has been wholly ignored and overridden by the price experimenters of OPA who are not the elected representatives of the people, who owe no duties or responsibilities to any constituency, and who will continue to ignore and override these and similar recommendations as long as the life of OPA is extended.

We talk about restricting OPA by law and placing certain mandatory provisions in the act. For 4 years OPA has deliberately, and, I say, in many cases maliciously, violated the plain letter and spirit of the law, as well as ignoring the recommendations of numerous committees of the Congress and of industry advisory committees. On the record, there is no reason to believe that OPA will be bound any more by future provisions of law than it has been or is by the provisions of existing law.

Price controls mean a controlled economy. A controlled economy is wrong in principle and will not work under our American system.

No man in America or no set of men can enforce price control, whatever the law may be and regardless of how many snoopers and inspectors and FBI men are loosed upon the people. The enforcement of price controls is as impossible as the enforcement of prohibition. The American people are not ready for regimentation. I have said on numerous occasions, and I want to say it again, that had price controls been removed on VJ-day we would today be experiencing a flood of production that would already have leveled prices off to prewar relationships. Instead, we still experience shortages in practically every field of consumer goods, and we are now going into a period of severe food shortages for the rest of 1946 and for 1947, and until the Congress has the good judgment to take the Government out of business and to return business to private industry, we shall continue to experience such shortages. Price control means that the Government is in charge of every industrial effort in this country. By the manipulation of price control, the inexperienced experimenters determine the destiny of every industry, business, and industrial activity in America. Such is inherent in price control and a controlled economy.

The OPA's Joint Advisory Committee on Cattle, Hog, Beef, and Pork Industries, on April 16, 1946, adopted the following resolution:

Whereas full legitimate production is the only answer to both inflation and the black-market problems. At this late date an increase in livestock and meat ceilings will not get full legitimate production or eradicate the black market. Also, at this late date improvised regulations, such as proposed today to the advisory committees, are not a remedy nor can additional investigators or more vigorous enforcement bring about compliance with OPA regulations. The black market can only be driven out of business if the legitimate meat packer is permitted to compete with them on even terms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the OPA Industry Cattle, Hog, Beef, and Pork Advisory Committees are unanimously opposed to the proposal that has been submitted to the Advisory Committees and unanimously recommend that subsidies and price controls be immediately removed from the livestock and meat industry.

Mr. President, did Mr. Bowles and Mr. Porter pay the slightest attention to this action of their committee? Did Mr. Bowles keep his word that OPA would rely heavily upon the recommendation of these advisory committees? Did OPA follow the requirements of the statute that they give consideration to the recommendations of this industry committee, which is a creature of the law, just as much as are the offices of Mr. Bowles or Mr. Porter? The facts are, and we all know them, that the Industry Advisory Committees created by OPA have been a sham and a delusion, and in not a single case has OPA paid the slightest attention to the recommendations of these committees. The same has been true in the oil industry, the canning industry, the citrus-fruit industry, the fresh-vegetable industry, and numerous other industries.

Mr. President, provision has been made for a Decontrol Board appointed by the President, the members of which are to be confirmed by the Senate, and are to receive a salary, I believe, of $12,000 a year, with full power and authority to employ clerical staffs, assistants, and do other things which are inherent in a bureaucracy. What is to be done? It has been said by the proponents of the measure that persons may petition the Administrator and make a showing before him that the supply of a certain commodity or article is equal to the demand. The language of the statute uses the word "shall." Does not the language in all similar statutes use the world "shall"? An appeal may be made from the decision rendered in connection with all matters, and all actions are to be under the rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator. My belief, Mr. President, is that there will be no decontrol. I believe that the entire proposal is quite agreeable to the advocates of the extension of OPA, including the Political Action Committee, the CIO, and all similar organizations of whom many persons are afraid. They are all pleased with the bill, and I believe that the President will sign it. Statements about the President vetoing it are all bunk. They are made only to fool the people. I am not at all impressed by them. There is only one answer, namely, to take all authority away from the OPA and turn it back to the people.

Mr. President, relief with respect to individual prices has been almost as difficult to obtain from OPA as has industry-wide relief. A few relief applications have been granted. Political strategy demands that prices here and there be raised. Moreover, there is that class of price increase which constitutes pure favoritism of one competitor as against another. Of course, favoritism may be exercised in many instances. Some persons like it. There may be some engaged in industry who are doing well, but they are generally those who are favorites of the officials. A condition of that kind is always the product of unrestrained and uncontrolled political, economic, or social power, and no legislative restraints will effectively prevent the dispensing of favoritism.

Deputy OPA Administrator Baker told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on April 17 that applications for individual relief passed through 187 separate stages of processing before reaching a final conclusion.

It would be very fine for a man living in Colorado or in Oklahoma, for example, to come to Washington and file an application for relief. All he would need to do would be to come to Washington and pay $15 a day for a room, if he could find one, and wait around until the whole matter had gone through 187 separate stages of processing before reaching a final conclusion.

Mr. President, I have said that Deputy OPA Administrator Baker told the committee on Banking and Currency that applications for individual relief passed through 187 separate stages of processing before reaching a final conclusion. He hastened to say, however, that this had been cut down to 78 steps and hoped that it could be cut down some more. In the face of this admitted intolerable condition, Mr. Porter, at the same time, had the effrontry to tell the committee that all the OPA wanted out of the committee was "more appropriations." That statement appears in the record of the committee hearings. Mr. Porter stated that all the OPA wanted was "more appropriations." There are many persons who would like to see the OPA given such appropriations. We have seen evidences of that fact during the past few days. Mr. Porter stated further:

Only one amendment we ask to the existing law and that is one granting us the power to control commercial rents.

A controlled economy leads to an authoritarian psychology which results in the oppression and destruction of individual rights and liberties under a gestapo system. The oppressive and arbitrary action of OPA officials is a story so repugnant and so rotten that it is hard to believe that such could happen within the confines of a constitutional government such as we have in America.

In Oklahoma it is estimated that 15 percent of all grocers have been deprived from selling or handling sugar, for periods ranging from 30 days to the duration of rationing, because of errors or mistakes in following OPA regulations. In some instances, the penalty was imposed as a result of selling some item for

1 cent above the ceiling. This travesty upon justice and freedom has been perpetrated on the retailers throughout the length and breadth of this country. The OPA gestapo has instilled fear in the hearts of every merchant of America. The price control law and its administration is rapidly destroying respect for all law and order. We must be prepared to suffer the consequences in the years to come.

As a horrible example of the unlawful methods of this Government agency—and I should like to have those who are at all interested in this question listen to this as one of the instances of the procedure followed by the OPA—I call attention to the policy that has been adopted by a local OPA office in Fort Worth, Tex., of sending a printed form to all purchasers of used automobiles in that area during the past 6 months. I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of this form, and it is a pretty impressive looking document. The form is headed "United States of America, Office of Price Administration"—and get this—"Subpena duces tecum." That means, I believe, "bring everything you have with you." It is signed by the district director. Here is the language of the so-called subpena:

> At the instance of the Price Administrator, Office of Price Administration, you are hereby required to appear before Roy L. Snodgress, investigator of the Office of Price Administration, at room 631, Fort Worth Club Building, in the city of Fort Worth, Tex., on the 18th day of April 1946, at 1 o'clock p. m. of that day, to testify concerning your purchase of a used automobile or automobiles in the past 6 months.
>
> And you are hereby required to bring with you and produce at said time and place the following documents—

That may not sound very awful to some of my colleagues, but the time has been when if they had received such a paper, in the absence of the background of experience they now have, they would have had the stuffing scared out of them; it would have looked like an awesome document—

> All papers in your possession pertaining to the above-mentioned automobile, including canceled checks, receipts for cash payments—

It looks as if the law might have been violated there; I do not know; this was in Texas—

> certificate of transfer of used passenger automobile, title certificate, registration receipt, dealer's warranty, chattel mortgage, State tax receipt.
>
> Fail not at your peril.
>
> DISTRICT DIRECTOR.

That is one method, one of the terroristic methods they employ without authority of law.

The mailing of this document is predicated simply and solely upon the fact that the individual to whom it is directed has purchased a car. It is issued without any evidence that the transaction has been illegal and without any reason to presume that it is, and without any complaint on the part of anyone. But they are at work; they have an office, and they have secretaries, assistants, and facilities, and they have to make a showing. It will be noted that this so-called "subpena duces tecum" is issued and signed by no judicial authority whatsoever. This gestapo practice is so shocking as to gag every freedom-loving citizen of this country. It should bring the blush of shame to the face of every supporter of OPA. No possible purpose can be attributed to such tyrannical methods except the establishment of tyranny itself. No doubt, every Member of this Congress, both in the House and the Senate, has had brought to his attention as I have, dozens of examples of the arbitrary tyranny of OPA underlings. We have been too prone to dismiss them as isolated cases and as a mere incident of wartime controls. We should understand that it is the aggregate of such activities that is destroying constitutional government in America and we in Congress, if we fail to act, must accept the responsibility for the consequences. When centralized government plans and executes the orders, rules and regulations under which wages, work, prices, and production of 140,000,000 Americans shall be controlled, it naturally leads to a government by dictation.

I have often said, and I say it again, because the evidence is so convincing that there is no escape from the conclusion, that a large segment of those supporting the OPA has in view the single purpose of permanently continuing a governmentally controlled economy. I know that there are Members of the Senate who will take issue with that statement, but let me read what Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt had to say in her daily column of April 30, 1946:

> It has been a long fight to put the control of our economic system in the hands of the Government where it can be administered in the interests of the people as a whole. Now, Congress, under the influence of powerful lobbies, is rapidly trying to return control to big business.

Is there a Member of the Congress, save possibly one, who would care to defend such a philosophy?

Compare Mrs. Roosevelt's statement with that of a leading Fascist of the Mussolini regime, as found in Mr. Mario Palmieri's book, The Philosophy of Fascism:

> We see thus the Fascist State resolutely enter the economic field to dictate what shall be from now on the relationship between capital and labor, employer and employee, landowner and farm hand, industrialist and worker.

Compare, also, Mrs. Roosevelt's statement with the announcement of Hitler of October 18, 1936, in which he advised the German people that he had appointed Hermann Goering to control and direct, on behalf of the Government, the economic life of the German Nation.

OPA's propaganda for self-perpetuation is confined to two propositions: First, that it has held the line; and, second, that without OPA price controls we will have runaway inflation.

I was very glad to hear our majority leader say yesterday morning that he indulged himself in no wild predictions as to what would happen if price controls were released.

If it can be shown beyond any reasonable doubt that both these propositions are fallacious and, on the contrary, prices are high and shortages exist because of OPA, then certainly, no one who believes in our form of constitutional government and the freedoms guaranteed under it would argue for a continuation of this agency.

Let us then examine the claim of OPA that it has held the line. The Smith committee of the House investigating executive agencies has found that the confused policies of OPA have actually increased inflation and created scarcities in essential goods with resulting widespread black markets and needless rises in the cost of living. It would be an illuminating experience if every Member of the Congress could take the time to read the testimony of Mr. Koppel Wexelblatt, Price Executive, Home Furnishings Branch of OPA, and Mr. Samuel W. Levitties, Price Executive, Apparel Price Branch of OPA, given September 27 and November 30, 1945, respectively, and appearing in part 6 of the hearings before the House Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies. These gentlemen were examined with respect to specific conditions existing either as to market prices or to shortages concerning dozens of items of household furnishings and wearing apparel, and the reasons that caused the issuance of certain orders, rules, regulations, directives, price adjustments, production quotas, roll-backs, cost-plus orders, and numerous other arrangements of OPA.

I have had many years of business experience, and I say frankly that the explanations of these OPA officials are incomprehensible to my mind, and I believe to the mind of the average man.

Grudgingly, Government agencies admit increased cost of living above prewar levels of from 30 to 35 percent. If subsidy payments, deterioration of quality, and black markets could be determined and included as factors in the cost of living, we all know that the index would look more like 135 percent.

Mr. Robert A. Seidel, vice president and comptroller of the W. T. Grant Co., a student of prices and values, states that consumers spent 84 percent more money in 1945 than in 1940 for the same amount of goods. In the year following March 1945, the price of men's shirts, including quality deterioration, has risen 93 percent, women's cotton dresses have risen 147 percent. We have held the line! A recent poll of merchants in Central-Western States shows that 64 out of 100 clothing merchants do not have shirts, 54½ percent are out of hosiery, 90 percent are out of men's knit underwear, 96½ percent are out of oilcloth, and 75 percent are out of cotton piece goods. These figures do not mean that we are out of shirts, but they do mean that we are out of shirts at prewar prices, and the merchants refuse to stock shirts at newly established prices made by new factories or made by old factories on styles that warrant new prices, running from $16.50 for prewar $8.50 grades, to $24.00 for prewar grades

of $16.50. Hosiery, and particularly nylons, cannot be kept in stock. Price controls have driven thousands of women to purchase three, four, and five times their hose necessities.

In 1940, 3 pounds of bulk coffee could be bought for 39 cents. In 1945, the same brand and quantity cost 50 cents. Ten pounds of sugar in 1940 could be bought for 39 cents; the 1945 price was 64 cents. In 1940, tomatoes were selling 3 cans for 25 cents. Today, they cannot be had at any price. The 1940 price of chickens was 39 cents a pound. Today, they range from 50 to 60 cents a pound. These figures are taken from a survey made and published by the United Automobile Workers.

The American Meat Institute has demonstrated before both the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees that the American public today is paying an average of about 20 percent more for meat than ceiling prices. In the better cuts this is as high as 57 percent. This does not include subsidy payment. Officials of the American Meat Institute estimate that inclusive of black market margins and subsidy payment, AA grade steaks are costing the American public not less than $1 per pound.

Representatives of the South Florida Canners Association, testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee on March 15, told the committee that as the result of OPA price ceilings there is not at the present time a single cannery operating in southern Florida. That is the result of what we have done. The canneries are being offered for sale at below book value because the owners cannot operate at prices set for their production by OPA. Let us remember that March, April, and May cover the peak of the canning season in southern Florida. Is there any doubt that we will experience even more severe shortages of canned vegetables than we did last winter? Representatives of the South Florida Canners Association told the committee that the canned tomato pack for 1945 was 64 percent less than the 1942 pack, due almost entirely to OPA activities. Representative PATMAN wanted to know if this was due to a small crop. The answer was:

> No; there was as large if not a larger crop in 1945 than in 1942. The tomatoes rotted in the field because OPA had deprived the canners of their regular marketing channels.

At this point a letter from Mr. W. L. Wilson, director of State markets for Florida, was read into the record, urging upon the Congress the immediate termination of OPA, which the representatives of the canners stated expressed the stand of the entire canning industry. It is a fact that it is not possible to buy canned tomatoes in the stores today. On the contrary, four packaged, artificially ripened tomatoes are being offered at prices ranging from 39 to 42 cents.

The utterly pathetic effort to control the price and production of potatoes is another example of the impracticability of an artificially managed economy. The first potato control order was issued by OPA November 9, 1942. The 1942 crop of 370,000,000 bushels was about normal. The yield was about 13 percent above normal, and the acreage about 14 percent below. The New York price was fixed at $2.15 a hundred, in new bags f. o. b. shipping point. Farm prices were set at $1.83, leaving a differential of 32 cents. That year the Maine and New York crops were normal. Ordinarily, New York prices are about 29 percent above Maine. The 1942 New York ceilings, however, were only 13 percent above Maine prices. By January of 1943 the establishment of these subnormal prices followed by the rationing of canned fruits and vegetables encouraged abnormal consumption of potatoes and we went into the crop year 1943 with a shortage. Seed potatoes were labeled and sold for consumer use. OPA hastily put a 75-cent premium on seed potatoes, but without avail, and the premium was soon removed. The Nation experienced a potato famine. In New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and even in St. Louis potatoes brought $10 a hundred in the black market. Potato chip manufacturers begged for increased prices. The OPA responded by permiting them to reduce the weight of the potato chips in each bag, and congratulated themselves on holding the line and tricking the public.

As a result of this artificially created situation the "little minds," as would be expected, called for a 17 percent increase in acreage for 1943. Fifty cents a bushel subsidy was offered to the farmers which averaged $7.50 per acre for about three and a third million acres of potatoes. Thc result was an increase of 23 percent in potato acreage. Nineteen hundred and forty-three was a marvelous year for potatoes.

The acreage being high and the yield good, we produced 465,000,000 bushels of potatoes, or 9 percent more than the largest crop in history. The increase in acreage and the subsidy payments to farmers cost the American taxpayer $25,200,000 exclusive of administrative cost. We produced a 75,000,000-bushel surplus and the Department of Agriculture then spent $20,000,000 to dispose of the surplus, exclusive of administrative expense. This was done as quietly as possible and with a minimum of publicity. The Government purchased potatoes and shipped to institutions which had not ordered them or had no use for them. Potatoes already graded and labeled on cars for consumers were put back in storage.

I am reciting this only to give an excellent example of what is done under this managed economy. In Maine, the Government acquired potatoes that had been frosted in the fall. When warm weather came, the bins had to be cleaned out. Unprecedented losses occurred through spoilage. Transportation was tight, but still these unneeded potatoes were shipped long distances for conversion into starch, pulp, alcohol, and so forth. Potatoes were even shipped into the West where sugar-beet factories were altered to convert the potatoes into pulp, at Government expense. Later, these factories had to be reconverted to handle sugar beets. Thousands of bushels of potatoes spoiled on the way to beet factories and some spoiled at the plants before the technique of handling the pulp could be learned, and had to be dumped as garbage. Finally, the railroads placed an embargo on potatoes. Cities protested the unsanitary conditions that were being created. Problems arose as to the disposal of the dried pulp. Some of it was eventually used for livestock feed at $50 a ton, although it had cost the planners $300 a ton to produce it. Thus, our planners spend $45,000,000 to produce and dispose of the surplus potato crop in 1943. Mr. John Q. Public took the loss.

But the "little minds" were persistent, and in 1944 they recommended only a 2 percent increase in acreage—why, no one will ever know. Thanks to the good sense and judgment of the farmers, they planted 12 percent less and because of a poor crop year, the yields were 7 percent below 1943, and the 1944 crop was substantially in balance with our consumptive demand. But still the "little minds" had not had enough, and as usual, an expansion of acreage was requested in 23 States for 1945, but the farmers were beginning to understand that the "little minds" were not potato raisers and only 4 States followed the recommendation. For some strange reason, decreases were recommended in some States. About one-third of the farmers in these States complied. The average acreage decrease was about 3 percent that year, but the weatherman tended the crop well; acreage yields were the highest in history; and we turned up with the third largest crop ever produced in this country.

New York ceiling prices for the 1945 crop were set just after the potatoes had come through the ground. Little could be known about the crop and ceilings were boosted. The deluge of potatoes was such, however, that the ceiling could not be sustained and finally, on September 14, 1945, price control on potatoes was suspended. This was planned economy.

This story can be duplicated, Mr. President, in dozens of commodities, and yet, we in the Congress who have the responsibility, sit by and talk about gradual decontrols and lend our support to the simple experimenters that are destroying our country under our very noses. Mr. Bowles and Mr. Porter were never elected by the people. They have no constituency. They have no obligations or responsibilities of elected representatives of the people, as you and I have.

What happened as to the price of potatoes when controls were suspended? The Department of Agriculture reports that the average quotations on the Chicago market, based on Idaho, Colorado, and Texas "old" potatoes as of April 15, 1946, was $4.39 a hundred. On April 15, 1945, under price control, and the third largest crop in history, the Chicago quotation, based on the same sources, was $5.32 a hundred, and $6.96 a hundred, if the Texas "new" is included. Thus, the Chicago market for April of this year, without price control, is 93 cents less per hundred on "old" potatoes than a year ago, under price control, and $2.57 less

when the No. 1 Texas "news" are included in the price computation.

On the same date, April 15, 1945, the New York quotation per hundred, based on Maine, New York, and Florida potatoes, was $4.52, under OPA controls. A year later, April 15, 1946, the quotation on the New York market, based on the same sources was $4.33 per hundred without price control. Without rhyme or reason price ceilings were reimposed on potatoes a few days ago.

Does this indicate that the farmers are incompetent to gage the supply and demand situation of this country? Does it indicate that the farmers are any more incompetent to deal with the hazards of weather than the "little minds" of OPA?

Although control of potato prices was suspended last September, the OPA did not get around to decontrolling potato chips, potato salad, potatoes julienne, and potatoes shoestring until May 15, 1946. What disposition will be made of potatoes mashed, french fried, au gratin, hash brown, cottage fried, and boiled has not yet been disclosed.

I repeat, if Congress will renew its confidence in the good judgment of the people and restore to them their government and their economy, we need have no fear of scarcities or inflation.

Millions of veterans are returning to civilian life, and no quality clothing is to be had for them. Cheap, shoddy suits are being offered in very limited quantities at exorbitant prices. Two suits, a pair of shoes, a hat, six shirts, when they can be had, six suits of underwear, and necessary accessories are costing the average veteran in excess of $300. I was told by a recently discharged youth that he had scoured every store in Washington and had failed to find a single suit in his size. He did find a sport coat for $95. This is what OPA is doing to this great productive country of ours. If that is what you want, then I suggest OPA should be continued.

Nine months have expired since VJ-day, and except for military vehicles that have been converted to civilian use, it is a pitiful fact that we have fewer cars on the road today than we had at the close of the war. The few cars that have been produced have been held in warehouses and showrooms, awaiting the pleasure of OPA to fix a price on them. Only a few days ago, when it was announced that Pontiac production must be curtailed, did OPA get around to giving this matter their serious attention. And what are the prices of new cars? If you have had any experience in pricing them, you will find that although the base price has only increased some 10 or 15 percent over 1941 levels, you are now required to buy a car fully equipped with every gadget in the catalog which you may not want, but which must be bought in order that the dealer can meet his increased labor, parts, and other operating cost.

So long as shortages are artificially made, these conditions must necessarily exist. As long as the shirt manufacturer, the clothing manufacturer, the underwear manufacturer or any other manufacturer, can make new styles, new models from less expensive material, and obtain high ceilings, the American public will not get low-priced quality goods.

The indisputable truth is that OPA has not held the line, nor has it prevented shortages. On the contrary, the evidence on every hand is that it has caused inflation and created shortages. A striking example is reported in the House Committee Investigating Executive Agencies that emphasizes the policy followed by OPA. An established manufacturer of low-priced window awnings required a retail price rise of from $1.59 to $1.79 to cover increases in production cost. OPA refused to allow the increase and the manufacturer was forced to abandon the product, but—and I quote from the report—

> A vastly inferior awning of the same size, made by a newcomer to the field, sells at retail for $3.26 with OPA approval.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator that not only does the new business get an opportunity to establish higher prices, but the old businesses, in order to place merchandise on the market profitably, must resort to substitutions. Testimony from representatives of department stores who appeared before our committee was to the effect that out of 120,000 items sold, more than 75,000 were substitutions. That is why the long-pointed cowboy shirts take the place of white broadcloth shirts. That is the reason for the $76 child's dress which I bought in New York, which before the war sold for $5.95. It had three additional buttons on it, and a little flare which made it different from the model prior to that time.

If an Arrow shirt cannot be obtained for $2.24, what good does it do to have a maximum price on such a shirt? All the buyer is offered is a substitution. The testimony is undisputed that in the department stores, out of 120,000 items more than 75,000 are substitutions, at prices which in many cases are three times the prices which would have to be paid for the legitimate article.

There was the incident of the Barbizon slip. I sent out a buyer in New York to get a Barbizon slip. Twelve stores were supposed to handle this particular brand. The buyer went to every one of those stores. There was not one to be had until the buyer reached the last store, and it was size 46. Of course, not many women would want to buy a size 46 slip.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is making a wonderful contribution. I merely wished to invite the attention of the Senate once again to the fact that legitimate merchandise is not in production. As the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out, there is a scarcity. If we wish to buy clothes today, we must accept substitutions. We must accept something that does not have the value of the legitimate article, something which in many instances is sold for three times the price it ought to bring. We cannot get rid of that practice under OPA, because it is growing, and has greatly increased in the past 3 or 4 years.

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from Nebraska a question?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. STANFILL. What do Mr. Bowles and Mr. Porter have to say? What is their answer, if the Senator from Nebraska can enlighten us?

Mr. WHERRY. They really have no answer. They say that we are magnifying what has happened. They go back to the old story that legitimate merchandise is being produced. They say that we are greatly exaggerating these incidents. With respect to the exhibits which we have shown Senators, they say that they are not typical, and that after a certain number of months they have got those items off the market; that they were sold at prices which were too high, and that the OPA is really enforcing the law.

I will say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that we challenged Mr. Bowles. We had not only testimony from representatives of department stores, but also testimony from operators of variety stores, which handle the lower grades of hardware. One of the items involved was a paring knife. Formerly it was possible to buy a paring knife for a dime. If anyone tries to buy the old paring knife for a dime, he does not get anything like the former quality, and he pays 25 cents for it.

A man from Florida, whose name I cannot now recall, but who owns four stores in Florida, testified that in his stores he handled 11,000 articles of merchandise. He stated that 65 percent of all that merchandise consisted of substitutions, including war materials and inventories which someone wanted to get rid of, the prices of which were far beyond what he ought to have paid.

That is what it means today to do business under the OPA. Yet when Mr. Bowles is confronted with the evidence he says, "That is just an isolated case," and that as fast as those who are manufacturing such articles can be reached the prices will be controlled. But it cannot possibly be done. Think of policing 75,000 items in a department store. Think of policing 11,000 items in a variety store. Think of policing 26,000 slaughterers throughout the country. We cannot possibly get the manpower to do the price enforcement job which must be done.

Mr. STANFILL. What do Mr. Bowles and Mr. Porter say about buying Arrow shirts? Are they able to find them?

Mr. WHERRY. At that time, in December, Mr. Bowles said, "Senator WHERRY, the trouble is that they are withholding the Arrow shirts." At that time we had repealed the excess-profits tax, and Mr. Bowles said everyone was holding them back because it was desired to place them on the market after the first of January. Everyone knows that that was not true, because all the testimony was to the effect that the shirts were not to be had. They could not be made and sold for $2.24.

Finally, the day arrived when the excess-profits tax was no longer effective. Was the situation improved in January,

February, and March? No. There were not as many shirts as before. The difficulty was that under the MAP Arrow shirts could not be produced.

A lady in Kansas City named Nellie Donnelly produces women's dresses. Senators should read her testimony if they wish to learn what the maximum-price regulation does to a manufacturer. The situation in her business was similar to that in connection with Arrow shirts. She could produce only a certain quantity at a certain price, because under the maximum price regulation a manufacturer must produce the same number, the same quality, and the same value in all lines, or he cannot produce any line.

Mr. STANFILL. The evidence before the committee showed that to be the situation; but I am interested to know what the OPA enforcement officials have to say. Do they admit the existence of such a situation, or do they deny it?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not believe that Chester Bowles ever admitted anything about the enforcement of OPA. If one reads his testimony and looks at his charts and statistics, he will see that he has a good argument and a defense for everything. What I am trying to say is that he has no real answer. But even though there were an answer, the thing which the Senator from Oklahoma is pointing out is the actual result in the market place. That is the test as to whether or not we are getting production. The test is not Mr. Bowles' charts and statistics. As I stated yesterday, we cannot eat charts and statistics. We must have food. We must have clothing. The test of whether or not there is production is in the market places of the country. The distinguished Senator says that one cannot buy shirts. Recently a shirt has come on the market which sells for $4.94. Production of such shirts is just starting. It is not like the old Arrow shirt. It is a broadcloth shirt, but the production is very limited.

The only way in which we can get real production is through the old competitive enterprise system. Manufacturers must be permitted to produce at a profit. Competition will settle the price. That is what we must have; and the sooner we can get back to it the better.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not have the floor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. If the Senator from Oklahoma will yield to me, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Before the Senator asks his question, I should like to complete my answer to the question asked by the Senator from Kentucky, if the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma will yield for that purpose.

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to read a paragraph from a letter which I recently received by air mail from a friend of mine in Canada, to show what free competition will do in a country which does not have these controls. I should like to read all of the letter, but this is the important part:

We are enjoying it here, seeing stores loaded with meat and merchandise. This is the land of plenty—strawberries 25 and 29 cents a quart. I canned 7 quarts today; had 10 quart baskets and 3 pounds of sugar mixed overnight and brought to a boil in their own juice. I hope they keep. This is a good place to spend a holiday. Tell your friends in the United States to come to Lindsay for a belly full of beef, etc.

That is what they are doing in Canada. Yet we are continuing to impose these restrictions and these impediments upon our domestic economy; and instead of getting plenty, we are getting a continued economy of scarcity.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I wish to tell the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Nebraska that we on this side of the aisle are interested in this discussion—all of us over here. [Laughter.] I am particularly interested in the statement which the Senator from Nebraska has made with reference to ladies' attire. He seems to be an expert on that subject. [Laughter.] I notice that he sent someone to visit the ladies' wear shops and to buy ladies' clothes. In view of the news that has been published in the newspapers lately, I wish to ask whether he sent Sally Rand out? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I guess there is only one answer to that question: I did not send Sally Rand.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Kentucky, and the Senator from Texas for emphasizing the point I am making by the additional examples which they have submitted.

Such conditions can only be brought about by the ignorance of inexperience or by deliberate design. In either event, let us not condone it by further extending the very set-up that has made these conditions possible. What good would it do to tell OPA that the first manufacturer must be given a profit, measured by 1941 standards on quality goods, when the new competitor is by law pegged at a profit by 1946 standards on low-quality goods? It is worse than stupid to believe that we can write into the law detailed administrative provisions that will prevent these inequities that naturally stem from a controlled economy. Nor will the apprentice mechanics of economy that swarm in and out of OPA like termites in a decaying house ever devise workable formulas to adjust these inequities. The answer, and the only answer, is the termination of OPA; and the quicker we do it, the sooner a sick and discouraged Nation whose health has been seriously injured by the patent medicines of the quacks, will start the long road to recovery.

As a further glimpse into these "little minds", I read in part from two press releases issued May 7 by Mr. Sheets and May 8 by Mr. Kritini, respectively, of OPA. The first release reads in part as follows:

An interim price increase of 12 percent over March 1942 prices—enough to cover fabric cost increases—was granted to manufacturers of awnings by the Office of Price Administration today.

The increase, effective May 8, 1946, applies to sales through distribution channels only, and will be absorbed by wholesalers and retailers before reaching the householder, OPA said.

If a manufacturer sells direct to household consumers or commercial or industrial users, the increase is limited to 7 percent.

It would appear from this press release that a manufacturer could sell to wholesalers and retailers and collect a 12-percent increase which the wholesalers and retailers must absorb, or, if he sold directly to the householder, he could collect only a 7-percent increase. Conversely, if the consumer bought from a wholesaler or retailer he would only be required to pay the 1942 frozen price, but if he buys from a manufacturer he will pay the 7-percent increase. Do you know of any sane person that could figure that one out?

The May 8 release reads in part, as follows:

To keep distribution of live and dressed lamb, yearlings, and sheep in normal channels and to maintain retail cuts of meat from these animals at or below ceiling prices, the Office of Price Administration today announced custom slaughtering limitations on this livestock.

The action, effective May 16, 1946, requires any meat packer custom slaughtering on a fee basis lamb, yearlings, or sheep purchased by a seller of meat cuts—particularly a retailer—to pay his customer an amount which will keep the cost of the dressed meat to his customer at or below the ceiling on the dressed meat for a sale by the packer to the customer.

In order that the slaughterer will be able to determine how much he must "kick back," the purchaser of the live animal is required to notify the slaughterer of the amount he paid for the livestock.

Today's action has a twofold purpose. One object is to discourage custom slaughtering of lamb and mutton animals for retailers, thus repairing the break in normal distributive channels.

Can anyone tell me from this press release who pays who and for what?

Let us examine for a moment the prophecy of doom that is being made by Mr. Bowles and other OPA spokesmen—that if price controls are removed the Nation is headed for certain disaster. They cite the imaginary spiral of runaway inflation the Nation is supposed to have experienced during what they refer to as the "boom and bust" years of 1919, 1920, and 1921 following World War I. The record fails to bear out the statement of these gentlemen. Actually, prices immediately following the close of World War I went down. Oil, for example, dropped from $3 a barrel with a 50-cent premium to $1 a barrel. Cattle feeders throughout the country who were feeding large quantities of beef cattle were caught in the slump, and many went broke. The record shows that foodstuff, including such items as bread, flour, fowl, meat, potatoes, canned fruits and vegetable, fresh fruits, sugar, butter, fats and oils, went down, not up, during early 1919 and through 1922. If anyone doubts this, let him examine the newspaper advertisements of those years and the record that are available in those industries.

Why did these prices go down? It was because America was geared to wartime production which carried on into peacetime, and we actually had in the early years following the war a production

that brought on some deflation, rather than inflation.

In the latter part of 1922 and in 1923 production tapered off, consumption and prices increased, and the speculation spree that finally led to the stock market crash in 1929 and 1930 got under way. Cheap money and loose credits had swung the pendulum back, and we went through a period of inflationary pressure from 1922 to 1929. But such was and is the hazard of a free enterprise and a free economy. During the period following the last war the industrial expansion, home building, and the material benefits to a free society were, notwithstanding the ups and downs of our economy, greater than in any previous decade in history. It is true that after the temporary depression that immediately followed World War I we had high prices in many commodities, but the price tags were out in the open. The price was in accordance with quality. The people indulged themselves in luxuries.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The important thing to remember is that at that time there were not any black markets or any black-market prices. Is not that correct?

Mr. MOORE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. There was legitimate merchandise and there were legitimate prices.

The cure for high prices themselves is to get back to an economy which is not controlled.

Mr. MOORE. Of course it is. No one will deny that in a free economy—it frequently happens that some people are hurt. But the question is whether it is better for a country and better for a people to have a free economy or a planned economy. I desire to emphasize time and time again that the issue before us today is whether we are to have a competitive, free, untrammeled economy or whether we are to have a planned economy. By the vote we cast on the pending conference report, we shall determine our stand on that issue and our decision regarding it.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma will also agree that people are hurt in a controlled economy. The Senator has said that no one will deny that people are injured in a free economy. I myself think that many more people are injured in a controlled economy, with the ultimate extermination of freedom itself, because that is what finally occurs.

Mr. MOORE. For whatever benefits we receive under a planned economy, we pay with the loss of our freedom.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to repeat to the Senator a good definition of a bureaucrat which I heard the other day. I was told that a bureaucrat was a Government official who could draw a straight line from an unknown assumption to a foregone conclusion. [Laughter.]

I believe that when it is realized that in the preparation of all the charts about which the Senator has been speaking, and those which I have examined, only one side of the argument had anything to do with them, namely, the desire of the fellow who wanted to prove something by the charts, the correctness of the Senator's statement will be readily understood. We must beware of charts.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound a question to either the Senator from Oklahoma or the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MOORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. I come from a shoe manufacturing town in New England. One of the great difficulties confronting us there is the apparent total absence of kids and skins which are normally available on the American market. I have been told that hides which used to come in substantial quantities from Brazil and other points, have, because of the OPA price ranges, been entirely diverted from the American market, are unobtainable there, and have been going to England and elsewhere.

I have also been told that the shoe manufacturers of my section of the country find it almost impossible to obtain hides and leather. I am also told that that condition exists because a large portion of the cattle in this country is in control of black-market operators, who are interested only in the meat of the cattle and throw away the hides. Is there substantial truth in that statement?

Mr. MOORE. There must be truth in it. It is unlawful to buy, slaughter, and sell cattle on the black market, and the operators cannot afford to fool with the hides. They cannot afford to allow the hides to remain around as evidence of the illegality of their acts. The hides are destroyed.

Mr. WHITE. Boston is a market for skins and hides. I am told that buyers who have given their whole lives to the shoe business in the purchasing of hides have combed the Boston market and are utterly unable to find hides, which are an essential basis of the shoe-manufacturing business. As I understand, the black market takes the meat and throws away the hides.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I may answer more fully the Senator from Maine. The condition about which the Senator complains is not only true in relation to hides, but offal as well. The operators of the slaughtering plants, who do not wish their black-market operations to become known, dispose of the offal.

Another factor is involved. It is difficult to feed a steer and produce hides which in turn can be manufactured into the high quality of leather which buyers in Boston, Mass., have in the past been accustomed to buying. The class of cattle which is being marketed today does not produce the quality of leather which high-grade shoe manufacturers insist upon using. We do not now produce the long-fed cattle, and we do not, therefore, produce the thick and high-quality hides which we used to offer to the market. That is because the OPA has made it impossible for the feeder of cattle to feed his animals. It would be impossible to add up all the impediments which have been placed in the way of producing high-quality animals. We first could consider the black-market operators, and then the fact that the prices which are paid to cattle feeders do not permit proper feeding.

The OPA ceilings have blocked the production not only of leather but also of textiles. A vast network of impediments has been placed in the path of production of many articles and commodities. That situation, so far as cattle are concerned, will not be eliminated until we have a free competitive system under which the producer may use his own judgment as to how long he should feed his steers, what quality of hides should be produced, and so forth. A high quality of hides is essential, but it is one of the items in the production of cattle.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, as I was saying when I was interrupted, the ups and downs in business cause an inflationary and deflationary trend, but they are natural to a free economy. They are bound to take place. During the period following the last war the industrial expansion, home building, and the material benefits to a free society, notwithstanding the ups and downs of our economy, were greater than during any previous decade in history. It is true that after the temporary depression which immediately followed World War I we had high prices in many commodities, but the price tags were out in the open. The price was in accordance with quality. The people indulged themselves in luxuries. They boldly exercised their constitutional freedom to live as they pleased. Today they meanly slip up back alleys to indulge in black markets for the necessities of life. Luxuries are reserved to the black marketeers. No one knows the true price of any commodity on today's market. Who can tell the true price of meat, sugar, leather, cotton, hard minerals, oil, and dozens of other commodities that are being subsidized from the bottom and black marketed from the top?

In the ninth report of the House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, Appendix No. 4, page 42, are listed 64 items on which controls have been removed and on which the price history is specific. The price on 18 items remained unchanged, 8 rose 5 percent or less, 7 rose 10 percent or less, the increase in 20 items was in excess of 10 percent, and the price on 11 items has actually fallen below the previous OPA ceiling.

The United States Department of Agriculture, with respect to the demand in the price situation on meat, in the March 1946 publication of the Bureau of Agriculture Economics, forecast that—

> Present indications are that without ceilings retail meat prices would advance 15 to 20 percent.

According to the admissions of the Secretary of Agriculture and a wealth of other testimony submitted to the House and Senate committees, this increase would be under the black-market prices today.

The same bureau, with respect to livestock and wool, in their March and April 1946 publications, says:

If price ceilings on meat were removed, the average retail meat price in the second half of the year probably would be 15 to 20 percent above present reported levels and somewhat higher than this for the better grades and more desirable cuts. Present reported levels are OPA retail ceiling prices.

The recent experience in the strawberry market is an example of what production can and will do to prices. Following OPA's release of controls, prices rose sharply, but today, strawberries are selling below the former ceiling. The strawberry crop is fair. Supply, demand, and competition fixed the price, strange as it seems, without the aid of OPA. Nowhere is there evidence to support the claim that termination of OPA would result in runaway prices.

OPA officials have had much to say about the experience of price increases on citrus fruit following suspension of price controls. Let it be noted that price controls on grapefruit and other citrus fruits were removed just ahead of the 1945 Christmas holidays, at the tail end of a short crop. Mr. Carl Loos, representing the California Fruit Growers Exchange, told the House Banking and Currency Committee on March 20, that in spite of the statements to the press by OPA, prices at the peak of the nonceiling rise reached a maximum average of only approximately 2 percent above ceiling prices and had dropped to below ceiling prices at the time OPA reinstated price control. He pointed out that the peak rise during Christmas week was due almost entirely to a shortage of Florida citrus fruit because of bad weather and the inability of the California growers to get their products to eastern markets because of the acute freight car shortages. The witness stated that the citrus fruit industry—oranges, grapefruit, and lemons—had increased its production an average of 50 percent over prewar levels. Can there be any fear of runaway prices in this industry if price controls are removed?

As a further example of the dishonest propaganda that is chilling the housewives of this country with fear, Mr. Chester Bowles, the "Don Quixote" of OPA, in a clash with the windmills over the radio April 24, 1946, said:

For 15 months in 1919 and 1920 prices and rents zoomed upward at a dizzy pace and then came the crash and huge paper profits were turned to losses.

Corporation profits were entirely wiped out in a single year. There were $11,000,000,000 in inventory losses alone. There were 106,000 bankruptcies, and don't let's forget that this time things could be a whole lot worse.

What are the facts? Dun & Bradstreet report 6,546 bankruptcies in the year 1919, 8,880 in 1920, 19,656 in 1921, 23,676 in 1922, and 18,720 in 1923.

In the depression years of 1931 and 1932 we had 28,284 and 31,824, respectively. Mr. Bowles' hand has been forcibly called on this gross misrepresentation by at least one radio commentator and numerous editorial comments. I have not seen or heard of any defense or explanation from Mr. Bowles. The reason is plain. Dishonesty is indefensible.

Those of us who were in business following World War I and those who remember or will take the time and care to check the facts, will find that Mr. Bowles' statements with respect to prices and business failures are simply not true. If it were possible to compare postwar prices after World War I to the inflation that we are suffering today under subsidies, deterioration of quality, black markets, and high ceilings for products of new manufacturers, made of shoddy and cheap materials, we would certainly find the balance strongly in favor of World War I prices. The business failures of 1919–20–21–22 are a mere drop in the bucket compared to the thousands of small businessmen who are closing their doors today because of OPA regulations and the impossible situation under which they are forced to conduct business. I am told by an employee of the Bureau of Internal Revenue that every mail brings stacks of final reports from small businessmen who are closing out. Which is better—a free enterprise and an honest bankruptcy, or to be driven from business by a Government that is leading us to governmental monopoly and regimentation?

I emphatically deny that the termination of OPA would result in runaway inflation. High prices in themselves are a cure for high prices, because when prices reach a peak beyond which the public will not pay, business is forced to bring them down in order to survive. Shortages and nonproduction are the seeds of inflation. High production is the antithesis of inflation. We are constantly told that when production is in balance with demand, price controls will be removed. The OPA has repudiated this statement by its actions with respect to many industries, such as oil, meat, fruit, and vegetables.

So far as durable consumer goods are concerned, we can never have production in balance with demand so long as price controls remain.

The greater part of my life has been spent in business. I think I have some conception of the factors upon which production must be predicated. Every businessman of experience knows that production does not roll up of its own accord. It is something that does not just happen. Production is dependent upon labor, markets, financing, and the availability of raw materials. Production programs include expansion and the building of factories, increased pay rolls, advertising campaigns, the building up of inventories, sales, and marketing surveys and campaigns, all of which must be planned 2, 3, or 5 years ahead. But what businessman today would risk his capital or his credit to increase production when he knows that young, inexperienced, left-wing experimenters in Washington are in control of the prices he can charge for his product? Where could business turn for private financing under these circumstances? What banker of experience would risk his depositors' money in a venture under the circumstances existing today? These are the things that the OPA boys do not understand. They do not understand them because they are men without experience and who are out of sympathy with our capitalistic system. But men of experience who realize and take seriously the responsibility they owe their stockholders and their investors will not venture capital under such circumstances. That is the reason we cannot have production of durable consumer goods until price controls are removed.

These facts are simple. They are true. They cannot be refuted. And if the Congress is to put this country on its feet again, we must recognize these simple truths.

In the fields of basic raw materials such as oil, coal, and hard minerals, and agricultural products and livestock, it is possible for good fortune and nature to give us production equal to our demands, notwithstanding planned production programs. Such, however, is not true of durable consumer goods that must be manufactured and marketed to the public through a system of wholesale and retail distribution.

Does anyone who will examine the operations of the OPA, its unreasonable regulations, its gestapo methods, its complete disregard for constitutional rights and guaranties, doubt that the underlying objective is the implanting in this country of a controlled economy? Let me read from a recent letter of Chester Bowles, speaking of the housing shortage. Listen:

No one believes for a moment that we can get this housing by giving the construction industry its head. No one who argues for reliance on the industry and upon traditional methods is arguing that we ignore the problem we face. * * * If we are going to achieve our goal, I believe we have to abandon traditional methods, just as we abandoned them during the war.

Is there anyone who fails to understand this language? Is it not clear that the inner circle of the planners believe that we must abandon our American tradition of private enterprise and substitute therefor a system of planned economy under a centralized authority?

Representatives of the lumber industry have paraded before committees of both the House and the Senate by the score, explaining that the housing shortage cannot be relieved until we do give the building industry its head and until building materials may be produced free of the restrictive hand of government.

Millions of veterans are tramping the streets of our cities today looking for shelter for themselves and their families. They have long ago ceased to express any choice as to where or how they will live. Any shelter will do. To these homeless men and women the regimenters are holding out the propaganda of price control, priorities, and the revolting promise of a socialized housing plan. Take controls off building material, curtail our exports, and this country will experience a building boom the like of which we have never seen, and, what is more, the competition of such a program will bring the price of houses within the purchasing range of the buyers. The truth about this so-called veterans' housing program is that the veteran's

name is being used and the veteran is being duped to make it politically possible. The veteran who was told that he was fighting for a free society is being used to bring about a controlled society.

One of the important supports on which the OPA has relied is rent control. I readily recognize the serious situation confronting some 16,000,000 tenants in this country, and if it should be deemed wise that protective measures must be taken against the pressure of increased rents because of the severe shortage in which we find ourselves, and if the Federal Government is to undertake this task, there is no reason why this authority cannot be transferred to the National Housing Agency, or other appropriate agency. Certainly the retention of rent control should not be used as an excuse to perpetuate OPA and all of the iniquities that go with it. It is my own opinion that the States themselves are entirely qualified to administer any rent-control law that the people may find they need and desire. Varying circumstances and conditions in the various States would make State control of rents where necessary far more practical in my view. Certainly it would be more in keeping with our constitutional system of government by and for the people.

It is clear from even a casual survey of OPA operations that they have resulted in shortages, high prices, and poor quality goods. I think it clear that the productive forces of this country are such that competition in a free market would in a short time level prices off to prewar relationships. But, for the sake of argument, let us agree that high prices would follow termination of OPA. I pause to ask the very serious question—Are high prices too great a price to pay for liberty and freedom, the preservation of constitutional government, and the continuation of our private enterprise? The founders of this great country found the dangers and hardships of a revolution preferable to the tyranny of taxation without representation. Are we today to be less mindful of the blessings of liberty than the men and women of '76?

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6429) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67 to the bill and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. OVERTON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6429) making appropriations for the legislative branch, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, and 53, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$187,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$65,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 54.

MILLARD TYDINGS,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CLYDE M. REED,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EMMETT O'NEAL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
WALT HORAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will not the Senator state briefly what the report covers?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the House agreed to all the amendments of the Senate with the exception of two. One related to furnishings in the Library of Congress. The other had to do with salaries in the Library.

The result of the conference was that the increases made in the Senate were reduced by one-half. The changes I have mentioned were the only ones made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. OVERTON. I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILSON obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILSON. For what purpose does the Senator ask me to yield?

Mr. TAFT. For the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, there are very important committee meetings being held at the present time, and I know that Senators attending them are anxious to complete their work. I will not yield for the purpose of the Senator suggesting the absence of a quorum. I would appreciate it if the majority leader would return to the floor. He has been temporarily called out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). The Chair has no control over the majority leader.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps a message could be sent to him.

Mr. President, the Members of the Senate must be convinced that an extensive and scandalous black market in meat and livestock exists today, and that the OPA controls which have been imposed upon the meat and slaughtering industries over a 4-year period have been responsible for the black market.

It must be admitted that price control has completely broken down at all levels in the livestock and meat industry.

It is equally clear that in addition to the annual cost of more than $2,000,000,000 in excess of ceiling prices, the black market wastes meat, hides, bones, offal, and grease worth many millions of dollars annually.

We all know that a large percentage of black-market meat, under Federal inspection standards, is wholly unfit for human food and is a serious threat to the public health.

It has also been established that because of black-market waste and destruction of huge quantities of glands and other materials, stocks of many pharmaceutical products are being depleted, and, if present conditions continue much longer, there will be an extreme shortage, if not an entire lack of essential drugs such as insulin, bile, pituitaries, thyroid, and antianemic preparations. This can and may cause the death of many people.

These facts are and have been known to the Office of Price Administration, the

Office of Economic Stabilization, and the Department of Agriculture for many months. It has been obvious that if this situation was to be corrected Congress would have to do it.

The Senate fully appreciated that the public interest required that ceilings and other controls be removed from livestock and meat at an early date, and the Senate bill accomplished this result with the McFarland amendment.

The Senate conferees agreed to delete these decontrol provisions and the Senate is asked to concur for two reasons: First, that if the Senate insists on decontrol of meat it may mean no price control at all; and second that the conference report contains decontrol provisions which will bring about speedy decontrol of meat.

Mr. President, let us examine the conference bill and find out whether these reasons are sound and should prevail.

As to the first reason, while not admitting that it is necessarily true, I respectfully submit that if the Senate must choose between price control and the continuation of this scandalous, criminal, demoralizing, and disgraceful black market, our plain duty and the public interest requires us to vote to end the black market and put this important element in our daily diet back in respectable, legitimate, and law-abiding channels. That, in my opinion, is the far lesser of the two evils.

As to the second question, I do not believe that the adoption of the conference report holds out any hope or expectation of any administrative decontrol of meat in the near future.

If past performance is any evidence of future conduct, the prospects that either Messrs. Porter, Bowles, or Anderson will take any steps to decontrol meat is very slim. That the decontrol of meat was the only remedy for the black market has been obvious and admitted for months. Yet no steps have been taken and the black market has continued to grow worse day by day.

I have examined the conference report with care and I fail to find any mandate or any formula that assures that livestock and meat will be decontrolled at any time in the near future. The most that can be said for the conference report is that it contains a pious wish that the Secretary of Agriculture, or the Decontrol Board, will do so and thus remove from Congress the awful responsibility of not doing something about this scandalous situation when it had the duty and the opportunity to correct it.

Mr. President, let me repeat, I am unable to find either a mandate or formula that is certain to result in an immediate removal of controls from livestock and meat.

The formula which the conference bill sets up deals with "short supply" which is another way of saying that supply equals demand. While it may be ascertained with some certainty what the supply of meat is, how can the livestock and meat industry establish what the demand is?

What legal proof can be submitted on this issue? Can anyone prove what the demand might be when the Office of Price Administration will not permit the laws of supply and demand to function?

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that it would be much better for the Congress to be frank and tell the people that livestock and meat will be decontrolled only when the Secretary of Agriculture, in his uncontrolled discretion, as far as Congress and the courts are concerned, decides that it should be done.

Secretary Anderson, on April 4, 1946, before the House Committee on Agriculture said that he did not know what the present demand for meat is; that he thought it might be as much as 190 or 200 pounds per capita. It is perfectly obvious that the Secretary will not decontrol livestock and meat unless Congress makes it mandatory. I quote the Secretary's testimony:

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Secretary a question: Is there any scarcity of meat in the country at the present time, in view of the large cattle population which we have?

Secretary ANDERSON. Well, there need not be a scarcity of meat. There is sufficient cattle population to produce all the meat we need.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, the supply has reached demand levels; is that right?

Secretary ANDERSON. I do not know how much meat this country would eat if you put on the shelves unquestionably unprecedented levels. We got up to 165 pounds, and it was not too much at all. We had never eaten anything like it. I think if you put 175 pounds or 180 pounds per capita average on the shelves at the present time, this country would wipe it up just as rapidly as it got there. So I do not know what the demand is. I know of no one who does know what the demand is.

I repeat, Mr. President, the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture, who is to have control of decontrolling, that "I know of no one who does know what the demand is."

Mr. COOLEY. Well, is not the relationship more or less normal at the present time; the supply and demand relationship?

Secretary ANDERSON. I am awfully sorry. I do not mean to dodge the question, but I want to say to you that I do not know what the demand is. I say to you that we have a sufficient supply of cattle on the range.

Mr. COOLEY. We never know what the demand is, do we?

Secretary ANDERSON. We have been able to calculate it pretty well here before. But what I am saying is that there is a sufficient supply on the range so that it ought to be able to take care of any demand which the American people may have and it would be a good thing if that demand could be supplied; because we have too many cattle on the range now, and I would like to see them slaughtered.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Secretary, in regard to the demand situation: In your opinion, does not the subsidy, by lowering the price, stimulate the demand?

Secretary ANDERSON. Yes; I have said that a good many varieties of meat are almost too cheap, because the demand tends to build up because of the fact that it is a very cheap form of food.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, was not the only justification for ceilings the fact that there was a scarcity of commodities?

Secretary ANDERSON. No; the justification for subsidies was to stabilize the cost of living.

Mr. COOLEY. I say the ceilings; the justification for OPA ceilings was the fact that there was a scarcity of commodities and you wanted to make those commodities go around and give the poor man the same chance as the rich man had in the market. Now, if supply reaches demand levels, I would like somebody to tell me, you if you can, what justification is there for price ceilings?

Secretary ANDERSON. If you can tell me what the demand level is, I could help you with the answer; but I have not been able to find out what the demand level is.

Mr. COOLEY. Somebody ought to be able to determine what the demand level is with regard to supplies, because they made the determination initially when we put the OPA into effect. We were told then that the demand was greater than the supply. Now, certainly somebody should make a determination somewhere along the way.

Secretary ANDERSON. All I will say to you is that in the second quarter of 1945 the supply level had gotten down to about 117 pounds, and there was ample demand to take care of it. Then it moved up to 140 pounds, and there was plenty of demand to take care of it. Now it has moved up to 175 or more, and the demand is still there; and the same would be true if you moved it to 200.

Mr. COOLEY. The determination will ultimately be made, either by those of us in Government, now or at some subsequent date. It will have to be made, because certainly these ceilings are coming off at some time in the future. My question is: Why can't the determination be made now so that Congress can intelligently legislate with regard to price ceilings in the future. I would like an answer if you can give it to me.

Secretary ANDERSON. I simply go back to the answer I have given. I know of no one who is able to say what the demand for meat is. It seems it is unlimited, for at present at least, and I suggest to you that it would move up at least to 190 pounds if there was a supply on the market.

Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader will indulge me, for the purpose of clarifying the conference report in my own mind, I should like to ask him a few questions.

Official Government reports show that the total meat production in the United States in 1945 was 17 percent in excess of 1941 production, more than 20 percent in excess of the 1940 production, and 20 percent in excess of the meat production average for the years 1934–44, and that meat production in 1946 will be close to the high of 1945.

Does the majority leader think, under these circumstances, that the Secretary could, under the conference bill, certify that meat is in short supply and thereby permit the OPA to continue ceilings and other controls on meat after August 1, 1946?

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the terms of the conference report the Secretary of Agriculture is charged with the duty of making monthly certifications to the Price Administrator of agricultural commodities which are in short supply; and all those which are not so certified are to be taken from under controls, and ceilings are to be lifted. Taking the over-all production of cattle in the United States into consideration with consumption, it is my opinion that the Secretary of Agriculture would not be justified in certifying to the Price Administrator that meat or cattle are in short supply.

Mr. WILSON. I thank the able majority leader.

Goverment estimates for 1946 show a meat supply this year of approximately

150 pounds per capita, the largest amount available to consumers since 1911 and over 20 percent more than the 1935–39 average.

Is supply in balance with demand as a matter of law under the conference bill, and does the bill prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from certifying that meat is in short supply under these circumstances?

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator asking me another question?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator please repeat it?

Mr. WILSON. Government estimates for 1946 show a meat supply this year of approximately 150 pounds per capita, the largest amount available to consumers since 1911, and over 20 percent more than the 1935–39 average. My question is, Is the supply in balance with the demand as a matter of law under the conference bill, and does the bill prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from certifying that meat is in short supply under these circumstances?

Mr. BARKLEY. My answer is the same as before, with this variation: Of course, the Secretary of Agriculture is to be the judge as to whether there is a balance between supply and demand. The Secretary's testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate was that he thought that the imposition of the new quota system would improve the meat situation. When he was asked how long he thought it would take to determine that, he said 90 days. He was asked, if the problem were not solved in 90 days, what would be the remedy? His answer was, decontrol. So with the supply of meat, whether slaughtered or unslaughtered, and with the increased consumption of meat, which is due in part to the fact that people have more money with which to buy meat than they have had heretofore, and also in view of the fact that restaurants and hotels are getting a larger proportion of meat than they have had heretofore, my answer would still be that the Secretary of Agriculture would not be in a position, under those conditions, to certify that cattle or meat are in short supply.

Mr. WILSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILSON. I have two more questions.

Mr. TAFT. In connection with the statement of the Senator, I think it would be well to have in the RECORD Mr. Anderson's exact statement on this subject.

Mr. WILSON. I have some further questions. The Senator may insert the statement following those questions.

Mr. TAFT. It is related to this question.

Mr. WILSON. Another question is, if the majority leader will indulge me:

On January 1, 1946, according to Department of Agriculture estimates, the number of all classes of meat animals was well above the 1935–44 average. Beef animals numbered approximately 41,000,000 head, 10,000,000 head more than 1940, and 6,000,000 head more than the 1935–44 average. Approximately 39,000,000 head of dairy cattle is 3,000,000 head more than 1940, and 2,000,000 head more than the 1935–44 average.

Would the majority leader be willing to say that under the conference bill supply of beef cattle is in balance with demand, and that the Secretary would be prohibited from certifying that beef cattle are in short supply, and that, therefore, all ceilings on live cattle will be removed August 1, 1946?

Mr. BARKLEY. My answer to that question is no different from my answer to the others. It is the same question in a different form.

Mr. WILSON. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is nothing in the conference report which would prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from making a certification that anything is in short supply. But the Secretary of Agriculture is an honest man. He is an intelligent man. He is a faithful public servant, and I do not for a moment suggest that he would deliberately misconstrue the law so as to be arbitrary with respect to the certification of anything that is in short supply or not in short supply.

While I do not wish to impose my own opinion or judgment on that of the Secretary of Agriculture, I think he would be justified, under this formula and under the conditions which the Senator has stated, in omitting beef and cattle from a certification of those things which are in short suppy.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I agree with all the fine statements which the majority leader has made with regard to Secretary Anderson. But the conference committee has brought in a bill, and I am asking the Senator for his interpretation of its provisions, not Secretary Anderson' interpretation.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the figures which have been given to us, and the figures which Mr. Anderson himself gave in his testimony before the committee, are accurate—and I am sure they are—my own opinion is that beef cattle are in full supply; that there is a balance between the cattle now in existence and the demand for meat. Whether those cattle will be slaughtered or kept in pasture is another question. But they are in existence, and in my judgment that existence creates the supply, regardless of any delay which may be brought about in their slaughter, and regardless of who may slaughter them.

Mr. WILSON. I thank the majority leader. I should like to ask one further question, if he will indulge me:

On January 1, 1946, there were more than 62,000,000 hogs on farms, which is more than 1,000,000 head in excess of the figure for 1940, and 7,000,000 more than the 1935–44 average.

Under these facts, does the conference bill automatically decontrol live hogs on August 1, 1946?

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator ask me if the conference bill would automatically decontrol?

Mr. WILSON. Through the certification of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe that the production of hogs has not been increased as rapidly as that of cattle. I believe that the supply of cattle, in proportion to previous demand, or even present demand, is greater than that of hogs. My information is that for one reason or another there has been a decline in the production of hogs for the past several months. But in spite of that, if the figures given by the Senator are accurate, my answer would be the same as in the case of cattle, that there would be a sufficient supply of hogs to supply the demand for pork.

Mr. WILSON. I thank the majority leader very much.

Mr. President, a majority of the Members of the Senate are fully conversant with the facts establishing the existence of a country-wide black market in meat. It is fully understood that the only cure for the black market is the removal of all ceilings and controls from livestock and meat products.

It is clear, Mr. President, that the conference bill does not, as a matter of certainty, require the immediate decontrol of livestock and meat, but leaves the decision to the uncontrolled discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Apparently, Mr. President, Mr. Bowles, by his propaganda, has made this matter a political "hot potato." If such is the case, it is not a sporting thing for the Congress to pass this "hot potato" to Mr. Clinton Anderson. While we all agree that he is a fine upstanding gentleman and administrator, why should we expect him to have any more moral courage than the Congress has exhibited?

Mr. President, a vote for the conference report is a vote to extend the black market in meat for another year. So far as I am concerned, I am not willing to do it.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will yield to me, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	Myers
Andrews	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Bridges	Hoey	Pepper
Brooks	Huffman	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Bushfield	Kilgore	Smith
Byrd	Knowland	Stanfill
Capehart	La Follette	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Swift
Carville	McCarran	Taft
Chavez	McClellan	Taylor
Donnell	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McMahon	Tobey
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tunnell
Fulbright	Mead	Wagner
George	Millikin	Walsh
Gerry	Mitchell	Wherry
Gossett	Moore	White
Green	Morse	Wiley
Guffey	Murdock	Willis
Gurney	Murray	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, for the information of the Members of the Senate I believe that I should advise them that we shall attempt to remain in continuous session until the pending conference report has been disposed of. I have been asked, privately, many questions

with respect to the matter, and I think it is well to advise all Members of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before stating the reasons why I believe the conference report should be agreed to, I wish to refer to one section of the report in order to state my views, inasmuch as a question has been raised.

On page 4, paragraph 6, of the conference report, the following language is found:

> No maximum price and no regulation or order under this act or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, shall be applicable with respect to any agricultural commodity, or any service rendered with respect to any agricultural commodity, unless a regulation or order establishing a maximum price with respect to such commodity had been issued under this act prior to April 1, 1946.

Mr. President, that particular provision attempts to deal with cotton, and to provide that if an article had not been regulated during the war it should not be regulated now. The question has arisen whether it applies to an article such as cream, for example. Milk was regulated during the war and before April 1, 1946, but cream itself was not regulated. My interpretation of the language, and I believe that of the committee, is that in a case of that kind the agricultural commodity is milk, and that if milk was subject to a general order fixing a maximum price prior to April 1, 1946, all the products of milk such as cream, butter, and so forth, may be regulated hereafter even though they were not regulated before.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that milk has been controlled only since about June 1. Am I correct?

Mr. TAFT. No. Milk has been controlled right along. Maximum prices were fixed with respect to butter, but no maximum prices were fixed with reference to cream.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I mean.

Mr. TAFT. The question has been asked, whether the language to which I have referred would prohibit the imposition of maximum prices on cream. The dairy interests, for example, were concerned because they wished to have controls continued on cream if they are to be imposed on butter and other products of milk. My only purpose in making this statement is that, in our interpretation, the words "agricultural commodity" apply only to the original commodity.

Mr. WHERRY. Which is milk.

Mr. TAFT. Which is milk, and do not apply to articles such as cream, processed from the original commodity.

Mr. President, with regard to the OPA, just as in past years I now find myself in a curious position, namely, between two extremes. Yesterday I listened with interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and to those of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], both of whom will vote against the conference report, although for completely different reasons. The issues do not involve, basically, any fundamental principle of government. I believe that in this matter I take a moderate position, and I believe that the fact that there is such a violent opposition on both sides shows that at least the moderate position may be right.

Mr. President, the bill to continue the powers of the Office of Price Administration, as aprpoved by the conference committee, is a constructive proposal to deal with the pricing and inflationary problems during the reconversion period. Those problems are entirely different from the war problems, and there is no reason in the world why the legislative or administrative policy should continue exactly as it was during the war.

The bill is designed to accomplish the following policy:

First. It continues price and rent controls until June 30, 1947, and subsidies at a decreasing rate until April 1, 1947.

Second. It establishes a definite policy of gradually reducing price control and then terminating it on July 1, 1947. Section 1A says:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress * * * that the general control of prices shall be terminated * * * as rapidly as possible and in no event later than June 30, 1947, and on that date the office of Price Administration shall be abolished.

This was drafted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the majority leader, and he stated that Mr. Bowles had no objection to it. In short everyone agrees that price control in time of peace is inconceivable and the only difference is regarding the speed with which it is terminated. The bill, therefore, sets up the machinery by which the Price Administrator, the Secretary of Agriculture, and a Decontrol Board shall release commodities from price control as rapidly as they come into sufficient supply.

Third. The bill attempts to encourage production by requiring fair prices for each product produced, manufactured, or processed, and also gives the customary peacetime margin to wholesalers and retailers. It recognizes that many shortages today have resulted from the pricing policy of the OPA in requiring certain products to be sold at a loss or at cost. It aims to destroy the theory that you can increase wages in the absence of increased productivity without increasing prices. This theory that we could all get something for nothing lies at the base of the inflation which has already occurred and is likely to go further, no matter what is done with this bill. The new pricing formula destroys the "overall industry standard" which required one product to be sold at a loss if a profit is made on other products, and also changes the 1936–39 profit base for which there was never any legal authority. The new pricing formula simply requires that in fixing prices today, producers be allowed to add the increased cost per unit to the prices they charged in the base period fixed in the original Price Control Act, namely, October 1 to 15, 1941. The additional cost to be added is the average increase in cost of the entire industry, and so there is no guarantee of profit to any operator. No one can question the justice of the principle. The smear attacks made upon it only confirm the fact that the OPA has been forcing people to sell products at a loss, and is therefore responsible for the absence of many products from the market. I may add that the formula is to be applied by the OPA after evidence is presented and time given for consideration.

Fourth. The general effect of the bill, therefore, is to permit increases in price caused by increased costs, but to prevent those resulting from speculation and a great excess of demand over supply. That should be the only purpose of price control in the reconversion period. The only final solution for inflation is increased supply. To obtain that, we must encourage production by prices adequate to justify increased investment and extraordinary effort.

Fifth. The bill imposes no specific decontrols, and I am greatly disappointed in particular that it does not decontrol beef. I do not think there is any solution of the beef problem except decontrol, and it will remain a national scandal until such action is taken. Unfortunately, the House has twice voted against such decontrol, and if there is to be any bill at all I believe we must compromise with them. The Secretary of Agriculture is given the power to decontrol beef the day after the act passes, and I think he is inclined to do so. I think we should do so, but we could not get the House to agree.

The remarks of the Secretary of Agriculture made in the Senate committee I think are well worth reading. He said:

> Well, Senator, if I may, I would say to you that there have been many times when I have debated with myself very seriously as to whether or not the removal of many of these controls on meat might not be a good thing in view of the surplus population of our ranches—

At that time the Secretary had no power to do it, but of course he had considered the question—

> I would say that about as far as I have been able to persuade myself to go is to regard this present period when we are trying to reestablish slaughter controls as about the last effort to see if it will work. If with slaughter controls and with the increased force that OPA is now putting on this we are not able to direct these cattle back into decent channels, if we are not able to persuade people that they have got to buy in compliance, and if we are not able to get food for the American people at decent prices, then we surely ought to try something else; and the only other "something else" is an abandonment of these controls. I would hate to see that happen until we again have made a vigorous effort.

Then the late Senator Bankhead asked him:

> Mr. Secretary, right there you have made a very important statement—it impresses me—about your views. How long do you think it will take to make a fair test of whether the new program will be effective?
>
> Mr. ANDERSON. That is an awfully hard question for me to answer, Senator. They should do something with it in 90 days or abandon it.
>
> Senator BANKHEAD. Ninety days?
>
> Senator BARKLEY. Ninety, did you say?
>
> Mr. ANDERSON. Ninety days, or abandon it; yes.

Mr. Anderson was testifying on the first day of May, so that 90 days would expire on the first day of August.

I say to you if you cannot stop the black market that exists, if you cannot stop the situation that the large packers upon whom we have to depend for a good deal of the meat that we ship in export—and that is my principal interest just now—if they cannot handle something like a normal volume of it, if it all goes out where it is wasted, then something is wrong.

So, Mr. President, while we cannot persuade the House to decontrol, it seems to me that the Secretary of Agriculture to whom we have given this power is himself committed to a decontrol policy, certainly if present conditions continue, and I see no evidence to indicate that they will not continue.

There is no reason why petroleum and tobacco should not be promptly decontrolled. I have myself always been more doubtful about hogs, dairy products, and poultry because of the shortage of feed. When we first considered this matter that question had not arisen, but the mere shortage of feed itself is likely to cut down the supply of poultry, the supply of hogs, and the supply of dairy products, so that there will be a shortage simply because of the shortage in the supply of feed, and the demand for food and feed throughout the world.

The immediate decontrol of these products might precipitate a serious price rise in many foods because of the shortage produced by the shortage of feed.

Sixth. The bill provides an over-all, constructive policy for the liquidation of war controls which all agree must be abandoned as promptly as possible. It does not present a fundamental question between radicalism and reaction; it simply presents a question of degree, as to how fast we shall go.

In the conference the Senate conferees did everything they could to insist that the House accept specific decontrol, although I myself had some doubt about the wisdom of some of it.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and I refused to sign the report because we felt we were acting in a representative capacity, that we represented the Senate and our colleagues, and that they felt there should by all means be decontrol of all these commodities. So we did not sign the report. But in spite of that, I feel we should now vote for the conference report in the Senate, and I propose to do so.

Mr. President, I am inclined to think that if we now reject this report we will be ending price control and will be defeating a bill to continue price control and rent control, because there is no evidence that we can reach any further agreement with the House. This is the final vote. We can request another conference, but the House has already voted specifically twice against the decontrol of beef, and I see no reason to think we can get them to change. So price control would be ended, because the two Houses could not agree. In other words, the Congress would end price control.

Of course, those who desire to end price control should therefore vote against the report. From the beginning I have thought that was a debatable question, but I came to the conclusion long ago that the proper thing to do was to continue limited price control throughout the ensuing period of 6, 9, or 12 months, and get rid gradually of the powers which have existed throughout the war.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. For those of us who are in favor of another effort being made to get a conference and an agreement on decontrol as to meat, poultry, poultry products, and dairy products, is there any other mechanical method we can use other than to vote down the conference report?

Mr. TAFT. No. The next motion would be a motion to ask the House for another conference. The House might or might not accede. I rather doubt they would accede. Even if they agreed to meet, having already voted twice against the decontrol of beef, I see no reason to think they would yield. I do not think we can assume that we have anything before us except one choice. It is an unfortunate choice. I should like to have the decontrol of beef in the report. I think it should be there, but I do not think it should be a determining factor in the whole policy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What would the Senator's answer be, however, if there were to be a further conference? That is the only mechanical procedure which can be followed by those of us who would like to see the conferees meet again and bring back a conference report which would provide for decontrol of livestock, dairy products, poultry, and poultry products. That is the only method we could use; it is the usual procedure, and it has been done. Often we have asked to have the conferees discharged after the vote has been taken. I am not in favor of that.

Mr. TAFT. The conferees, I may say, are automatically discharged by a vote against the report. They are then through.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that.

Mr. TAFT. And it then becomes necessary to begin all over again with a new conference committee.

Mr. WHERRY. But the usual procedure is that the same conferees are appointed unless objection is made to their reappointment. What I am trying to get at is, Are we to stand here and not make another effort? Is it simply futile to do anything? Must it be said that a vote against the conference report is a vote against price control, when there are those of us who feel that decontrol of meat should be provided for in the report? In view of the statement by the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, in answer to the questions asked him by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and also in the light of the remarks made by the Senator from Ohio, it would seem that we are all agreed that meat ought to be decontrolled. It is very clear that we cannot get meat controlled under the terms of the present conference report. Then why should there not be another effort made with respect to meat?

Mr. TAFT. I think we come to a time in every bill when we either have to vote "aye" or "no" on the bill as it is, and we are always faced with that problem. We always have a package wrapped up for us with some things we like and some things we do not like, and we have reached that point in this bill, that is all. The House has twice voted the other way, and I do not think we will get an agreement along this line with the House. I say that if the House will not agree with us, I want to agree with the House, and that is what I am urging the Senate to do, even though the report contains one item which we do not like.

Mr. WHERRY. It has been brought out time and again that the House has voted against decontrol. I looked up the record which I mentioned on the floor yesterday, and I find that on the question of decontrol of meat there was a difference of only five votes. It was not until after the Senate had receded from its position respecting decontrol of meat that the question went back to the House for a vote. It was after the Senate receded from its position that the House later took a vote on the question. I ask the distinguished Senator if, in the light of that vote, he does not feel that if the bill were sent back to conference we could get the decontrol of meat in the report.

Mr. TAFT. I think there would be a disagreement, and no bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. The Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader, said the other day that if we did not vote for this bill we would be without price control. If the 1st of July comes and we have not agreed on price control, that does not preclude the Congress from enacting another bill, does it, even after the 1st of July? Is that not true?

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the OPA will expire the 1st of July, and I suppose if we enacted a bill on the 2d or 3d of July it would retroactively put everything into effect again, or at least we could so provide in the bill which might be passed.

Mr. MOORE. Or at any time in the month of July.

Mr. TAFT. In the meantime those in OPA could not draw salaries, and anyone could charge any price he wanted to. I think the situation would become so out of control if we let it go for more than a day or two that we would not be able to regain control of it.

Mr. MOORE. Would not that depend largely on what pressure the people of the country might bring on Congress?

Mr. TAFT. I think all the pressure that can be brought on Congress has been brought to bear on the left, on the right, and on every other side that I can think of. I do not see how the pressure can be any greater than it has been from all directions.

Mr. MOORE. Anyway, there would not be any reason why we should not try

to reenact a price-control law if necessary.

Mr. TAFT. No; but, on the whole, I think this is a good bill. It is only respecting the decontrol of meat that I strenuously disagree with its provisions. But that is only one feature in a very wide economy. I know that in this Chamber it has been built up to more importance than all the other features of the report put together, but, as a matter of fact, it is only a small percentage of the total economy of the United States. While I greatly regret the situation with respect to meat, and I think it is a scandal, I think the machinery the conference report provides will decontrol it, so I think we may well let the House have its way here, and vote for the whole bill.

Mr. President, there is another possibility. If we pass the bill and the President vetoes it, I say that in that event, so far as I am concerned, the President takes the responsibility of ending OPA. In my opinion we are not going to try to pass any bill over his veto or pass any continuing resolution. When he gets this bill he has the same choice we have. He can either sign it and continue OPA on these terms, or he can refuse to sign it and end OPA himself, and it will be his responsibility and not ours.

Today we face that question. Are we going to end OPA or are we going to continue it on what I think is a reasonably restricted basis designed to encourage production, to eliminate the worst features of the checks OPA has put on production, even though we do not accomplish everything that some of us think ought to be accomplished?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOSSETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. There were suggestions made here a few minutes ago that if OPA lapsed and was not renewed for a few days, no harm would be done. I think it is safe to say that all over the United States today dealers and speculators have acquired products of industry and agriculture which they are holding until the first day of July. They know they cannot lose by holding them. They know there is a chance to make money by holding them. Can the Senator imagine what would happen if OPA lapsed and there was a probability of its being renewed again a few days later? We would see $1,000 automobiles—if there are any such in the country now—selling for four or five thousand dollars apiece during those days. We would see meat that ordinarily sells for 18 cents a pound selling for 30 cents a pound by the carload because it would not be illegal to do it. We would see all other kinds of commodities sell for perhaps two or three times their actual value. In other words, during the 2 or 3 days when OPA lapsed there would be a speculators' and gamblers' heaven in the United States, and hundreds of millions of dollars would be made during that time when it would not be illegal to charge prices with only the sky as the limit. I dare say that there are many in this country today who are banking on that very thing happening. If by any chance this bill should go over until next week without any action being taken on it, the gambling fraternity and the speculative fraternity in the United States would be justified in erecting a memorial to Congress, because we then would have been the greatest benefactors they have ever known.

Mr. TAFT. I believe it would be most unfortunate to have a day or two intermission. I do not agree with all the threatening results suggested by the Senator from Vermont, but things would certainly move in that direction.

Mr. AIKEN. Gamblers and speculators would move awfully fast, too.

Mr. TAFT. I want to say only one word. The choice is whether we want OPA at all or not. I feel very strongly that OPA during the war was essential. I feel very strongly that with a $50,000,000,000 deficit we would have had a price rise that would have caused the greatest distress, the greatest upset of econmic stability that could possibly be imagined. Every country in the world had price control during the war simply because of the necessary inflation resulting from war. I think it was better administered in England and better administered in Canada than it has been administered here, but they did have it. And when prices broke loose, as in China, and some of the countries that are today under occupation, they went to three and four and even one hundred times what they were before the war. I think that anyone who calmly examines the question must conclude, no matter what the faults of price control, if we are going to incur annually a $50,000,000,000 deficit to conduct a war, it is necessary to have price control. I have no compunction for the part I played in establishing such control.

Now the question is, Shall we end that all at once on July 1? Shall we take all controls off? Shall we let everything go? Or are we still somewhat in the period when we are suffering from the results of that $50,000,000,000 deficit? We have not got back to a balanced budget. We are getting somewhere near there, but we are not there yet. The effect of that deficit is still felt. We still have great shortages—not shortages brought about as the result of OPA, but brought about by the war and by nature. Even the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] admits that we should continue control of rents, because rents would go up if we removed the control. Why? He admits the principle that a great shortage still exists. If we are to have control in the rent field, why not in other fields where the shortages exist? Shortages exist today in feed and flour, largely because of the demands throughout the world. We all know that they exist in feed. We hear that every day from people in every section of the country who wish to feed livestock. There is a large shortage of edible fats today in the world. It is calculated I think that there exist only two-thirds of the edible fats that are required. If control is released drive butter, lard, and every other edible fat will be driven to a point away beyond the prices of today. Certainly there is still a tremendous shortage of sugar. If there is no control over the price of sugar there will be a tremendous increase in the price of sugar. After the last war sugar went to 25 cents a pound after controls were taken off.

There is a shortage of lead and zinc which apparently is going to continue for some time. There are other serious shortages. If we take control off everything at once I think we are still in a period when there must result a serious increase in all prices far beyond anything that we have to pay today, more than is justified by present costs, simply because of the speculative demand created by war conditions. We are still from this standpoint in the war period. Therefore I believe that we would face a large increase in prices which would be speculative and beyond any cost increase. The result would be to create hardship and economic instability, and almost certainly to bring on a depression when prices come down, as they are bound to come down if we permit them to get out of all proportion to costs. So I feel very strongly that it would be a mistake to take off all price controls tomorrow or the next day. I think that the Office of Price Administration should be reasonable. One of the greatest handicaps we have had is that the present Price Administration is not reasonable. It wishes to hang on to every control, and hold it just as tightly as it did in time of war, although conditions are very different.

We have been denounced by Mr. Bowles at every opportunity during our consideration of the bill. One of the byproducts of the bill which I think would be of the greatest benefit to the entire country would be the resignation of Mr. Bowles, which he threatens to give us if this bill goes through. That certainly would be a very desirable result.

I agree that we are faced with a dilemma. We must take price control as administered—possibly under the present Administrator—or have no price control at all. We have tried to impose very definite rules on the Administrator, to see that his control is reasonable, does not interfere with production, and is abandoned as soon as it ought to be abandoned.

Certainly Mr. Bowles is entirely justified in thinking that the passage of this bill is a vote of no confidence in him. There is no other reason for authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture or a decontrol board to decontrol, except that this Congress has not the slightest confidence in Mr. Bowles. So the passage of this bill is evidence of no confidence, and I hope it may result in his resignation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Just a moment.

If it were not for the position of the Administrator, I should be in favor of simply continuing price control without any limitations, and leaving it to any man who sincerely desires to get rid of control as quickly as he can determine that it should be done.

I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the tremendous labors which the members of the conference committee have performed in bringing out this report. I thoroughly sympathize with them in the job they have to do. But I was very much impressed by the statement of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], who, in speaking about the provision to be found on page 11, in subsection (d) of the rewritten section 6, expressed the fear that the right of advisory committees in every industry to petition for an adjustment of price ceilings, and the provision which makes it mandatory for the Administrator to render a decision within 60 days, would result in producing confusion upon the one hand, and inducing producers of commodities with respect to which applications for increases are made to withhold those commodities from the market.

I quite agree with the Senator that production is the only effective answer to inflation, and I think the introductory paragraphs of this bill are excellent in that respect. It seems to me that if business and the OPA will cooperate in administering this law for the purpose of aiding production, we may, and probably will, enjoy great benefits from the act, even though it is subject to some criticism. But the criticism made by the Senator from California seems to me to be of such tremendous import that I should like very much to have the comment of the Senator from Ohio on the question, since I understand that he is largely the author of this provision.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say to the Senator that, regardless of what kind of price control we have, an industry advisory committee or an individual may always apply for a price increase, and he may wait, hoping that he will get it. That has been done. It is bound to happen. If we wish to avoid that danger, the only answer is to say, "There will be no price increases from now on," in which case we shall have no production of many articles. Many commodities are so priced that they cannot be sold except at a loss.

Furthermore, I suggest that the best thing for the Price Administrator to do is something which he has not done, namely, to sit down with the Industry Advisory Committee immediately, talk the question over with them, and give them the increase prescribed by the standards established in this bill, and give it to them at once. If he misses it by one-tenth of a cent, what difference does it make? If we wish proper enforcement of price control, we must have the cooperation of the industry. If the Administrator can reach an agreement with the Industry Advisory Committee as to what is a proper price increase and what is the proper application of this standard, he may make such an agreement tomorrow, and price increases in that industry are through, and individual operators in that industry are through with applications for price increases.

It seems to me that the objection made by the Senator from California is not sound.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator care to say anything about the suggestion of the Senator from California that this provision might provoke hoarding? We have had that experience.

Mr. TAFT. Today anyone may apply for a price increase; and if he thinks he is likely to get it—and he is often entitled to it—he may hold back some of his goods until he gets it. That is human nature.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The point made by the Senator from California was that since the decision must be made within 60 days, there would be an incentive to hoarding.

Mr. TAFT. All those people hope that the answer will be given within 60 days. They have been disappointed over and over again, but they always come back. They hope that the answer will be given in 60 days. Usually they are promised that it will be given in 30 days. Then the papers remain on someone's desk, and are finally sent to someone else. So the process takes quite a while.

I do not understand the point. If applicants are entitled to an increase, it seems to me that the more promptly the Price Administrator decides the question, the less hoarding there will be.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Ohio will recollect that when the debate was had on this amendment I spoke against it, on the ground that industry did not have the facilities for cost-pricing each individual product. At that time I made the assertion that no more than 20 percent of the units produced by the multiunit producers—that is, producers of various articles—were priced on the basis of cost. The Senator's amendment requires the finding of the 1941 cost and the intervening increases in costs.

To corroborate the position which I took at that time, I sent eight telegrams to well-known accountants throughout the country, and I have received six replies. The question which I asked in each case was the following:

> In connection with debate on stabilization laws, would appreciate your opinion by collect wire on following question: How generally could manufacturing and processing industries present to OPA, on reasonably reliable basis for pricing purposes but without conducting special accounting studies: First, unit total costs (including all manufacturing, selling, and administrative costs) of each major product they produce; and, second, the increase since October 1941 in unit total costs (including all such costs) of each such major product.

I shall not transgress upon the Senator's time to read all the replies. If he will permit me, should like to read one telegram. It comes from Mr. E. L. Kohler, president of the American Accounting Association. I think it would be well to read it into the RECORD at this point, because it bears upon the remarks made by the Senator from Wyoming as to the difficulties which may result from cost-pricing. The telegram reads as follows:

> CHICAGO, ILL., *June 12, 1946.*
>
> Senator BRIEN MCMAHON,
> *Senate Office Building:*
>
> OPA, with staff and time limitations, has no way of passing judgment on unit costs which industry might present. Individual previews are essential to each such presentation since the present temper of business enterprise in too many instances would result in unfairly loaded costs and hence inflationary prices. The spread of manufacturing overhead offers many alternatives, permitting, under current cost accounting principles, wide cost ranges while the spread of selling and administrative costs over different products is almost always impossible, both theoretically and practically. Only solution, in my opinion, lies in permitting OPA to pass on fairness of projected over-all profits of individual companies under proposed price schedules.
>
> E. L. KOHLER,
> *President, American Accounting Association (Practicing Certified Public Accountant).*

Telegrams to the same general effect have been received from T. Dwight Williams, president of the American Institute of Accountants; C. Oliver Wellington, past president of the American Institute of Accountants, and a partner in Scovell, Wellington & Co., certified public accountants; Carman C. Blough, director of research, American Institute of Accountants; and P. K. Knight, a partner in Arthur Andersen & Co., certified public accountants.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these telegrams be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 13, 1946.*
>
> Hon. BRIEN MCMAHON,
> *United States Senator,*
> *Senate Building:*
>
> Your telegram forwarded to me here. With exception of larger companies in certain industries most multiproduct manufacturing and processing industries do not keep cost records on basis which would show unit product costs including allocated selling and administrative expense. I believe certified public accountants retained by individual companies could make reasonable estimates, somewhat similar to those used for renegotiation of war contracts, of such costs without too detailed studies which might serve as reliable guide to pricing policies. Will telephone you at first opportunity to be sure I have understood your question correctly.
>
> T. DWIGHT WILLIAMS,
> *President, American Institute of Accountants (Practicing Certified Public Accountants).*

> NEW YORK, N. Y.
>
> BRIEN MCMAHON,
> *United States Senator:*
>
> Answering telegram eleventh, manufacturing and processing industries cannot generally present total unit costs of each major product without special accounting studies. Certain businesses are reasonable simple and can determine substantially accurate total costs of major products, but most companies produce more than one product, with attendant difficulties of proper allocation of costs to each product. While a single com-

pany might present substantially accurate total costs for each major product, other companies in same industry probably would not determine costs on comparable basis. Special accounting studies made by me for certain industries have demonstrated lack of comparable figures.

C. OLIVER WELLINGTON,
Past President, American Institute of Accountants; Partner, Scovell, Wellington & Co., Certified Public Accountants.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 13, 1946.*
Hon. BRIEN MCMAHON,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building:

Official reply to your telegram of eleventh instant not possible in time available and referred to me for personal opinion. Determination of unit total costs (including manufacturing, selling, and administrative costs) would require special studies in most industries. In many industries such studies would not require detailed accounting investigations provided reasonable estimates would be acceptable. Absence of reliable cost systems in some large companies, but particularly in smaller companies, however, would require the acceptance of assumptions and estimates so broad as to be dangerously unreliable unless detailed accounting studies were made. The problem of determining rise in costs since 1941 would require similar estimates as to 1941 costs. Since unit costs depend upon volume, any estimates of future costs would require the acceptance of assumptions and estimates as to probable future volume, as well as price and wage levels.

CARMAN C. BLOUGH,
Director of Research,
American Institute of Accountants.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 12, 1946.*
Senator BRIEN MCMAHON,
Senate Office Building:

Although manufacturing costs after adjustments for recent substantial increases could be compiled readily by most companies, I seriously doubt that total costs, including selling and administrative expenses, could be presented by very many manufacturers or processors. In my opinion, comparatively few companies have developed unit total costs sufficiently reliable for pricing individual products. In many cases the available cost data reflect arbitrary and untested allocations of selling and administrative expenses.

P. K. KNIGHT,
Partner, Arthur Andersen & Co., Certified Public Accountants.

Mr. MCMAHON. I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio that this only bears out what I said at the time. The Senator has succeeded in inserting in the bill a price formula amendment which I think will make it impossible—if not impossible, certainly extremely difficult—to hold any price control at all. Frankly, I am in a bit of a dilemma as to whether or not to vote for the conference report. I think we all are. That is a decision which each Senator must make for himself.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say in reply to the Senator from Connecticut that in the first place the OPA has followed exactly this formula with respect to cotton textiles, and also with respect to another industry. The Price Administration was not required to place this system in effect. It did so on its own initiative, as a method of determining what the increase should be.

Furthermore, the burden of proof is on the industry advisory committee. It must assemble the figures to prove the need for the increase. If it does not do so, the industry can obtain only the increase which it substantiates to the satisfaction of the Price Administrator. So it seems to me that the objections are not sound.

Mr. President, I have only to conclude. As a matter of policy we should continue price control in a modified form for another year. I would prefer to continue it for 9 months, but a continuation for a year does not make very much difference. Congress will be back here by then, and Congress can end it. I hope that under our general directive, price control will be ended sooner than that. I hope it will be gradually ended, as we have directed. I think it would be a great mistake to bring it to an end now.

Although I think provision for the decontrol of meat should have been included in the conference report, nevertheless, under all the circumstances and in view of the provision that the Secretary of Agriculture shall be permitted to exercise his discretion and in view of his well-known views, I believe that he will decontrol beef, even though we have not been able to persuade the House of Representatives to vote to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio a question. All the arguments which have been advanced in favor of the conference report certainly could have been advanced prior to the conference itself. I do not wish to ask a personal question; but as I understand the situation, the distinguished Senator from Ohio did not sign the conference report.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I now understand that the Senator from Ohio is going to support the conference report.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder what has happened between the two points in time. Has anything happened which fundamentally has changed the Senator's mind in regard to the matter?

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, as a conferee I felt that I was representing the Senate's viewpoint, and I intended to insist upon it to the last moment. Therefore, because of my position in that regard, and also in view of the fact that I felt that a majority of my colleagues on this side of the aisle felt the same way, and because I felt that I was there in a representative capacity, I voted against the report. But I told the conferees on the part of the House that if they would take the question of decontrol to the House and have the House vote upon it, and the House turned it down, I would yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That was with respect to the decontrol of beef, was it?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

But now I think I should vote for the conference report to continue price control for a reasonable period of time on what I think are perfectly logical and reasonable terms. I admit that maladministration may occur. But Congress cannot possibly administer any of the laws it passes. That is a chance which Congress has to take. The administration of the laws is the responsibility of the administration—in this case, of the present administration. If it falls down in the work of administration, that is its fault. It is our job to adopt what we think is the proper policy, assuming that there will be some kind of reasonable administration of the policy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Ohio has been assured in any way by the Department of Agriculture that there might be an early decontrol of meat.

Mr. TAFT. No; I simply read what the Secretary of Agriculture said. He himself said that if the slaughtering quota policy did not work in 90 days, there would be only one thing to do, and that would be decontrol. That was his opinion.

Now we give him the power to decontrol. Under the circumstances, I think he must follow the well-known position he has taken, if we give him the power to carry it out.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking these questions because I wish to obtain the interpretation which the Senator from Ohio makes. I can readily understand why the Senator remained in complete accord with the record made in the Senate, and why he refused to sign the conference report.

Now, because it is the Senator's personal right to vote as he pleases, according to his opinion, I am asking whether he feels in his own mind that meat should be decontrolled.

Mr. TAFT. I think beef should be decontrolled. I have always been doubtful about the decontrol of pork. The decontrol of pork will decontrol corn. The two cannot be separated. The decontrol of pork will decontrol lard; and the decontrol of lard will mean the decontrol of all edible oils, of which a great shortage exists. That will force a tremendous increase in the price of fats at the present moment. I have always been doubtful about that. As a matter of policy, I tried to see whether we could separate the decontrol of beef from the decontrol of pork and the decontrol of dairy products. I think it could be done, just as a technical matter.

But I received no support upon that suggested compromise from either the conferees on the part of the Senate or the conferees on the part of the House or from other Members of the Senate. So I decided that all of it had to get together, and that we either had to decontrol beef and pork and dairy products all at once, or not decontrol any of them. I was doubtful whether the decontrol of all of them would be wise.

As to the decontrol of beef, I have no question about that, because beef has reached a point where it cannot be controlled. It has reached a point where we are bound to have a continued black market in beef if we continue to attempt to have control over beef.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOSSETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In the light of the statement the Senator from Ohio has just made, namely, that beef and pork and grain should all go together——

Mr. TAFT. I do not agree to that. But I said that I could not obtain any support for my view that they could be separated.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the statement the Senator from Ohio has made relative to the short supply of pork, and I believe the Senator made such a statement, does he believe there is any chance of decontrolling any of those products during the life of this measure?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think beef can be decontrolled very easily.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Ohio believe that anything in addition to beef can be decontrolled during the life of this act?

Mr. TAFT. I think probably dairy products can be decontrolled after a reasonable time.

Mr. WHERRY. Within the life of the act?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Ohio believe that can be done under this act?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, of course; if there is a sufficiently large corn crop, perhaps pork can be decontrolled.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the interpretation of the Senator from Ohio that that could happen? Does the Senator from Ohio believe it can be done?

Mr. TAFT. I think it can be done. Of course, we require the administration to decontrol all unimportant commodities by the 1st of January, before the Congress will return. Certainly we indicate our belief that the administration should decontrol the other things just as quickly as possible, and we require the Secretary of Agriculture, if he is to continue to control, to certify that they are in short supply. In other words, if the controls are to be continued, the Secretary of Agriculture must certify that the goods so controlled are in short supply. He does not need to say they are plentiful. He does not need to step in and say, "Decontrol." All he must say is that, "I cannot any longer certify that these things are in short supply." Then they must be decontrolled.

So the formula is all right, if it is administered in good faith, in compliance with the intent of Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Earlier today the Senator from Iowa [Mr WILSON] told the Senate that official Government reports show that the total meat production in the United States in 1945 was 17 percent in excess of 1941 production, more than 20 percent in excess of the 1940 production, and 20 percent in excess of the meat production average for the years 1934–1944, and that meat production in 1946 will be close to the high of 1945.

Under those circumstances, does the Senator from Ohio believe that the Secretary of Agriculture could, under the conference report, certify that meat is in short supply, and thereby permit the OPA to continue price ceilings and other controls on meat after August 1, 1946?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think he can so certify, but I do not think he would do so. I do not know; I have not studied those figures. But the general impression from all the evidence we have would bear that out.

Mr. Anderson himself said there is no solution except decontrol if the present system fails—and it has practically failed since he testified 2 months ago. That seems to me to show that he will wish to decontrol if he possibly can. The evidence seems to show that he can, so far as I am able to analyze it.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask one other question. Would the Senator from Ohio agree with the answer given by the majority leader to the question propounded by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] relative to the decontrol of meat?

Mr. TAFT. I agreed with his statements. I did not hear the last answer, the one with regard to pork. I agreed with the statements with regard to beef.

Mr. WHERRY. If pork were in a favorable position, as the figures which the distinguished Senator from Iowa gave for the year 1946 would show, would the Senator from Ohio agree with the position taken by the majority leader?

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, let me say that I do not know what his position was. I happened to be out of the Chamber at the time.

Mr. WHERRY. He took the same position on it as he did regarding beef, provided that the figures cited by the Senator from Iowa were correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am not sure about pork, because I think the figures were that there were a million head more than there were at a previous time. On the other hand, the demand for fats may have increased. I am not prepared to answer as to pork.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REED. I was very much attracted by the statement of the Senator from Ohio that the conference report would be adequate if the OPA carried out its administration in good faith, in accord with the intent of Congress. Can the Senator from Ohio recall a period when the OPA has done that?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I previously stated my full opinion of the present administration of the OPA Act. I did so when the Senator from Kansas was out of the Chamber, I believe. However, of course in this case we have given the administration of the act to persons other than those in the Office of Price Administration. We have created a board entirely outside the Office of Price Administration. The members of the board are to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and the board is to serve with respect to the question of decontrol. We have given the Secretary of Agriculture, whose views we know, very wide power both to increase prices and to decontrol agricultural products. So I think there is every reason to believe that the policy laid down by Congress will be followed in good faith, at least by those officials.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Ohio that those provisions are a very definite improvement. But I always have had the suspicion, which I think the Senator from Ohio shares, that heretofore the OPA in virtually all of its administrative acts has treated with contempt the intent of Congress and the expressions of Congress. I believe that much of the trouble now arising comes from the failure of the OPA to administer the law with some sense, in accordance with the intent of the Congress and the words of the Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Kansas is correct.

Mr. President, all I have to say is that I believe the conference report represents a reasonable method of gradually liquidating price control over the period of the next 12 months. I believe that to be a policy which Congress should adopt. In spite of some lack of confidence in the Office of Price Administration, in spite of my apprehensions of the manner in which the act may be administered, and in spite of the fact that we shall not have the decontrol of beef which I think we should have, required by an act of Congress, I believe the welfare of the country demands that the Senate agree to the conference report.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, far be it from me to prolong this debate, which has perhaps been prolonged too far already. I rise, however, because the distinguished Senator from Ohio stated that we are going to give to the President a law, and if it does not work the blame will be upon him. That is what I understood the Senator from Ohio to say. If I am correct and he is not correct, and if some of the leading accountants of the United States who have replied to my inquiry are correct, the Senator from Ohio will, it seems to me, have to bear a great share of the responsibility for the nonworkability of this law which we are about to hand to the President of the United States. If results occur which neither he, I, nor any other American desires, I believe the American people will be in a position to judge intelligently as to the quantum of blame which should rest at the door of the senior Senator from Ohio, and that which should rest at the door of the President of the United States. So, Mr. President, only the future can determine the answer to the question.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2543. An act to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation;

H. R. 6064. An act to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6084. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have prepared some extended remarks to make on the subject of the OPA later in the debate which is now taking place. At the present time I wish to make a few preliminary remarks with reference to some telegrams which I have received today.

Yesterday I had the idea that if all the Senators who would like to see the OPA abolished would join in a movement to discuss fully on this floor the OPA, I would be glad to assist them and we could talk until Monday morning. That would result in the expiration of the OPA at midnight Sunday night, and the citizens of America would be enabled to wake up Monday morning and find themselves again under the American flag and not under the Communist flag.

There seems to be hesitation on the part of some Senators to completely abolish the OPA by the method which I have suggested. I have received no promise of any assistance. I received none yesterday, and I have received none today. Indeed, it would be a very difficult task for one man to talk about the OPA continuously from now until Monday morning, although there is plenty which could be said derogatory of the OPA Act. Enough could be said to consume much more time than one human being, speaking under constant pressure, could occupy during the period of time intervening between now and next Monday.

The statement which I issued to the press yesterday has been received throughout the United States, and has resulted in many telegrams coming to me today. I have wondered if perhaps the same persons who are telegraphing me are not also telegraphing other Senators and asking them to assist me to abolish the OPA. I have very little evidence in that direction, but I believe that what I have stated is probably taking place.

I appreciate very much the time which has been consumed today by some of the Senators who are opposed to the OPA. I appreciate the splendid work which has been done by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and other Senators who have spoken. I have received more support than I expected to receive, and none of it was promised to me.

Mr. President, I now wish to read some of the telegrams which I have received from persons throughout the United States. I understand that Senators often receive inspired messages with regard to a particular subject which may be before the Senate. But the telegrams to which I have referred are spontaneous, and they come from the rank and file of the American citizens who are voicing their opinions with regard to OPA.

I am surprised that I have received as many telegrams as I have received because, under the oppression of the communistic bureaucrats who operate the OPA, the people of this country have been regimented until they have almost given up hope. They believe that their Government has gone. I am surprised that some of them would even take time and spend the money necessary to send me the telegrams which I have received. I am sure they have done so because they see a little ray of hope in the United States Senate. The life of the OPA rests at the present time with the Senate. The life of that Communist organization may be snuffed out if Senators will continue to discuss the matter and give to it the consideration which it needs before they decide that they are ready to vote on the conference report which has as its purpose the extension of the life of the OPA.

I may say, Mr. President, that I have also received telegrams from persons who approve the OPA. They do not wish to have it abolished. I will read those telegrams as well as the telegrams which I have received from persons who are opposed to the OPA. It will not take long to read them. They are very few in number. [Laughter.]

Perhaps I should read them first and get them out of the way. Here is a telegram from Texarkana, Ark.:

TEXARKANA, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Believe repeal price control this time would result in repetition 1919 and disastrous to white-collar salaried workers. Respectfully submit price control should be retained another year, but also believe its administration could be greatly improved. Uncontrolled prices for 12 months would pile debt upon white-collar salaried employees that would take years to repay. They are in no position to have living costs doubled.

OTTO ATCHLEY.

Here is a telegram from Emporia, Kans.:

Am railroad man. Kill OPA any way possible.

G. M. HOBROCK.

Mr. President, that telegram got into the wrong pile. The sender of it asks that OPA be killed in any way possible. [Laughter.]

Here is a telegram from Babylon, N. Y.:

BABYLON, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

I bet you are afraid to pull a filibuster. Talk is cheap.

DR. M. W. BROWN.

I have no intention of pulling a filibuster. I merely wish to discuss the subject, and everything which I shall say about the OPA will be germane.

I have also received the following telegrams:

WILMINGTON, DEL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:

Please don't try to veto the OPA bill by a filibuster. Let the majority rule.

WALTER BINDER.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

You say OPA is un-American. Good Americans agree filibustering is far more un-American.

E. W. FAGER.

PORT ARTHUR, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We really do not expect this telegram to change your attitude on price control but wish to let you know that we deeply resent that attitude. We think Chester Bowles has been a friend of the American housewife, and you evidently are not. We regret that we voted for you.

Mrs. A. F. FERRIS.
Mrs. R. F DOERGE.

[Laughter.]

Naturally, a Senator would expect to receive a telegram like that from persons who regretted that they had voted for him.

I have also received the following telegrams:

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Request your abstaining from filibustering or voting against OPA extension.

JOHN K. GRAVEN.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL of Texas,
Care Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:

Press reports you are promoting filibuster to kill OPA. Hope it becomes a boomerang which will sadden your days and your associates exactly as you are planning against the American public.

BENJAMIN NEWMAN.

SHERMAN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

As the poor man's friend we are depending on your support of OPA Senate bill. Don't let us down.

H. C. SCOTT.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please do not use unfair filibuster defeat majority both Houses.

Mr. and Mrs. ROY ROPER.

Mr. President, I have read about eight or nine telegrams all in favor of the OPA. I believe that I have a few more in the same pile. I wish to be fair, and I shall read all the telegrams which I have received on both sides of the subject.

Here are some more telegrams:

BAY CITY, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Floor,
Washington, D. C.:
Join the other immortals of great Texas in your fight for freedom. We are all for you.
Your friend,
EARL F. SELMAN.

ST. LOUIS MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are with you through your fight to get rid of the OPA
BUSIEKS MARKET.

Mr. President, the next telegram comes from a market which probably has bare shelves.

I read the following telegrams:

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Am for you one hundred percent. Keep on filibustering until the thirtieth and make OPA die a deserving death. Get the bureaus of OPA out of Washington and so far back into the hills that they will never bother anyone again.
NEIL L. NEWTON.

Here are the telegrams:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God your courageous fight for American rights. We must win.
Mrs. NANCY GREGORY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Good luck on your OPA filibuster. Chester Bowles and his bunch worse than the Russians.
PHILIP B. WELD.

Mr. President, I am reading these telegrams in the hope that the report of the telegrams pouring in will reach the ears of more disheartened American citizens who have been subjected to abuse and regimentation, so that they will know that there are still some people in the United States who believe in fighting this monstrous thing, and possibly more telegrams will come in.

I have also received the following telegrams:

ENDICOTT, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Honorable Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Senator O'DANIEL threatens to kill OPA by filibuster. You will do your country one of the most distinguished services of recent times.
WALTER L. JOHNSON CO.

BAY CITY, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
House of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Do any and everything to kill OPA. We're for you.
Mr. and Mrs. LUTHER BUNCH.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Hold that line. The future of America depends upon your success. We are with you 100 percent.
SAN ANTONIO BREAKFAST CLUB.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Statehouse, Washington, D. C:
More power for your long talk from now till—
E. B. NORWOOD.

HACKENSACK, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God there is one real American left.
FRANK W. PACKARD.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
If you want food for your country get the Senate floor and hold it until OPA bill dies a natural death. You will be your country's hero No. 1. I wish you well.
HOMER C. WHITE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch hard. I am for you.
WILLIAM H. HODDE.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on the filibuster. Don't quit till OPA is killed. All thinking honest people behind you.
LELAND W. ABBOTT.

DELHI, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
If OPA is continued as is will force remaining egg producers in this section out of business. My 2,000 layers go to butcher next week if you don't help us now. How many Congressmen can operate with larger outgo than income.
M. C. RUSSELL.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Get rid OPA and let's get Uncle Sam back in America. Whole set-up is phony. Four hundred thousand tons potatoes permitted to rot; all our rice shipped abroad. OPA prices prevent selling or buying. OPA makes everything scarce, therefore cost more. OPA harbors and produces strikes and absolutely violates all American laws. Give them —— and stick. Am for you forever.
R. M. BRUNER.

It will be noted that the telegrams come from all over the United States. Here is another one from Texas—and Texas is still in the United States:

SAN ANGELO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You are right. Stay right in there. Don't let them outdo you. We are all for you.
PETE RECTOR.

FORT WORTH, TEX, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Texas will be grateful if you will filibuster OPA. My information from many parts of the State indicate the feeling that we cannot afford OPA and just rise in prices to induce production and people will not buy bonds as long as OPA exists.
HARLAN K. BAKER.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol, Washington, D. C.:
We are back of you, fight on.
MR. AND MRS. GEO. D. GRAY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and good luck to a true American.
IVAN H. BROWN.

CLOVER, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your American way and democratic principles.
W. W. MCCONNELL.

MEXIA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there. We are for you. Forty head of beef cattle in my pasture. Not 1 pound of beef in 10 days in my store.
C. E. HEROD.

Mr. President, is not that a ridiculous statement? There is a man running a store who has 40 head of beef in his pasture, and not a pound in his store.

I have also received the following:

TYLER, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I am for you, Pappy. Give them the works, and God bless you.
W. EDWARD LEE.

ALTON, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Best of luck on your filibuster—hope you succeed.
PELOT BOTTLING CO.

PEARSALL, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL:
Congratulations, do hope you will succeed.
Mrs. G. R. SANDERS.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and talk it to death. Be the David to Goliath.
P. E. GLENN,
LILLIAN GLENN,
JESSE COLE,
EMMA COLE,
VIOLA MCLEOD,
JAMES MCLEOD.

PEORIA, ILL., *June 27, 1496.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Hold the floor, stop the OPA, we want meat.
WILLIAM H. KECK.
JOSEPH W. LEE.

There are many people who want meat, and there is plenty of meat, but OPA has headed it off. It has the cattle in another pasture.

Here is a telegram from Mary R. Long, of Dorchester, Mass.:

DORCHESTER, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Good luck. Keep talking. Americans want free markets, not black markets.

MARY R. LONG.

It is said about 80 or 90 percent of the beef is going through black markets. Someone is buying it. There are many people in the United States who would rather buy in the black market than starve to death.

Listen to these telegrams:

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Eyes of Texas on you. Kill obnoxious OPA.

CHARLIE STOWE.

LOMBARD, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

May your filibuster against the OPA be successful. Millions of Americans support you.

Ten members of Lombard's Women's Republican Club:

MRS. E. G. GODDARD,
Legislative Chairman.

That is quite a number of millions. I also present the following:

CROSBYTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Stay in there and fight. Restore the American form of government. Vote against OPA.

M. L. WILLIAMS.

KIRKWOOD, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

You have our full support in your fight against OPA.

LITZSINGER GROCERY.

NEW YORK, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand. Do away with bureaucracy and return to free enterprise.

FORMER NEW DEAL DEMOCRAT.

It seems that he has become converted to Americanism.

WICHITA FALLS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Talk 'til Monday. We are with you.

PITMAN GRAIN CO.

CROSBYTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep the floor, Senator. Let's kill OPA once and for all. People down here have a bellyful of Government intervention in our business.

JACK ARTHUR.

That is Texas plain talk, Mr. President. They have not a stomach full of very much of anything else. There is a shortage of food in Texas, where we have enough cattle to feed the whole United States, if the other States would secede and let us ship meat to them. In Texas we are still under the United States rule. We did not used to be, but we are now, so we have to abide by the OPA rules, as everyone else in America has to.

Listen to this message:

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We understand that you are going to try to filibuster the OPA out of existence. Stay in there. We are with you.

E. C. DEATON.

This comes from Lillian Chandler, of Dallas, Tex.:

If by the same dauntless courage you have always shown, you on the expiration date help abolish OPA, you should be made—

I am too modest to read the remainder of that telegram. That is making too much out of me. However, many people in Texas think a great deal of me.

Here is a telegram from J. M. Carrington, of Paxton, Ill.:

Thank God for one American in the Senate. Keep talking until OPA dies. Small business needs more like you.

I wish we could get all Senators who want to see OPA abolished to rise on the Senate floor and vote against this report.

REGISTRATION OF TRADE-MARKS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1654) to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 35, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "becomes the common descriptive name of an article or substance on which the patent has expired, or"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with the the following amendments: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Act; or

"(d) at any time in the case of a certification mark on the ground that the registrant (1) does not control, or is not able legitimately to exercise control over, the use of such mark, or (2) engages in the production or marketing of any goods or services to which the mark is applied, or (3) permits the use of such mark for other purposes than as a certification mark, or (4) discriminately refuses to certify or to continue to certify the goods or services of any person who maintains the standards or conditions which such mark certifies."

On page 44 of the House bill strike out beginning with line 18 down to and including line 2 on page 45 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The term 'certification mark' means a mark used upon or in connection with the products or services of one or more persons other than the owner of the mark to certify regional or other origin, material, mode of manufacture, quality, accuracy or other characteristics of such goods or services or that the work or labor on the goods or services was performed by members of a union or other organization.

"The term 'collective mark' means a trademark or service mark used by the members of a cooperative, an association or other collective group or organization and includes marks used to indicate membership in a union, an association or other organization."

And the Senate agree to same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: *"Provided*, That the Federal Trade Commission may apply to cancel on the grounds specified in subsections (c) and (d) of this section any mark registered on the principal register established by this Act, and the prescribed fee shall not be required."

And the Senate agree to same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment and on page 18, line 23, of the House bill strike out "hereof." and insert the following: "hereof; and

"(4) no incontestable right shall be acquired in a mark or trade name which is the common descriptive name of any article or substance, patented or otherwise."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(7) That the mark has been or is being used to violate the antitrust laws of the United States."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLAUDE E. PEPPER,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
A. W. HAWKES,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FRANK W. BOYKIN,
FRITZ G. LANHAM,
FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

I will say, for the information of the Senate, that the conferees were unanimous. The conference report provides for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the conference report has already been adopted by the House of Representatives. A similar bill passed the House three times,

and passed the Senate, I believe, at least twice. As I have said, the conference report is unanimous.

Before the matter is acted on, I should like to have an opportunity given to the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] to make a statement which represents the interpretation and intent of the conferees in connection with the report.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I desire to say, so far as I am concerned, that I think this is the consummation of a very important piece of work which has been under consideration by the Congress for more than 8 years. A similar bill has passed the House, I am told, four times, and has passed the Senate three times, but never in the same session of Congress. It is a matter in which business throughout the United States is vitally interested, and I am sure it will make practically everyone in business throughout the United States happy to know that we have finally brought the matter to a conclusion.

I should like to read into the RECORD practically the same statement of intent as was read into the House day before yesterday when the conference report was adopted by the House. The statement of intent was read into the RECORD in the House by Representative LANHAM, who is the author of the bill:

The legislative history of this act is long and extensive. Many hearings have been held over a period of almost 8 years. Those hearings may, and probably will, be referred to by the courts in construing and interpreting the provisions of the act. However, there is one provision in the act which has no recorded legislative history, and in order that the purpose and intent of the Senate may be made perfectly clear I wish this statement to appear in the record as an explanation of our intent and as a part of the legislative history of the act.

This Trade-Mark Act places in one statute all the Federal law relating to the subject and repeals the prior laws specifically referred to in its provisions. It reenacts much prior legislation and creates new rights, some of which are substantive and others procedural. It implements our international commitments and brings the trade-mark law of the United States down to date, recognizing the changes in business and commercial practices since the act of 1905 became the law.

Mr. President, I might save the time of the Senate by asking unanimous consent to have the remainder of the statement printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point, inasmuch as, with the exception which I will now read, it is practically the same as the statement which was put into the RECORD in the House of Representatives day before yesterday. I should like to add that the exception is that when the trade-mark is used to violate the antitrust laws, then such violation of the laws can be used as a defense against one who sues for infringement.

I should like to read this statement:

This exception means, and should mean, that a trade-mark owner who sues another user for infringement must come into court with clean hands, and if he is using the mark to violate the antitrust law he is subject to be contested and to have his violation used as a defense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Senate amended the act and the conference committee has reconciled its differences. I believe it necessary, however, that specific reference be made to one amendment in order that its interpretation may be made clear.

Paragraph (b) of section 33 of the act has been amended by adding subparagraph (7) in the following words:

"(7) That the mark has been or is being used to violate the antitrust laws of the United States."

The prior statutes enacted by Congress on this subject provide that the certificate of registration shall be prima facie evidence of ownership and the right to use the mark. H. R. 1654 changes this rule and provides that "the right of the registrant to use such registered mark in commerce for the goods or services on or in connection with which such registered mark has been in continuous use for five consecutive years subsequent to the date of such registration and is still in use in commerce shall be incontestable" if the conditions of section 15 of the act are met. Section 33 (a) of this act reenacts the prima facie evidence rule which is applicable from and after the date of registration of a mark under the act of March 3, 1881, the act of February 20, 1905, and under this bill. Section 33 (b) provides that where the registered mark has become incontestable under section 15, the certificate of registration shall be conclusive evidence of the registrant's "exclusive right to use the registered mark in commerce on or in connection with the goods or services specified in the certificate."

However, section 33 (b) contains seven exceptions to the rule that the certificate of registration shall be conclusive evidence of the rights of the registrant even where the provisions of section 15 have been met. Some doubt has been expressed on the following points:

(1) Do these seven exceptions, including the amending paragraph (7) with reference to the violation of the antitrust laws of the United States, lay down substantive rules of law or substantive defenses which go to the validity and enforceability of the mark, or do they relate only to the weight of evidence to be given to the certificate of registration?

(2) What is the meaning of the words "used to violate the antitrust laws", as found in paragraph (7) of paragraph (b) of section 33?

It is clear from the language of the act and from the congressional history of the act as it is found in the hearings and reports that the seven defenses or defects listed under paragraph (b) of section 33 are intended to relate to and to affect the weight of the evidence to be given to the certificate of registration where the owner claims the benefit of the incontestable rule and where the opposite party can, by the weight of the evidence, establish any one of the things listed in the seven paragraphs in paragraph (b); but these seven paragraphs are not intended to enlarge, restrict, amend, or modify the substantive law of trade-marks either as set out in other sections of the act or as heretofore applied by the courts under prior laws. A trade-mark registrant who is shown to have used his mark to violate the antitrust laws is denied the benefit of the rule that his certificate of registration is conclusive evidence of his right of ownership and his right to the exclusive use of the mark, and such use by the language of section 33 (b) of the bill is made a defense just as proof that the use of the mark was obtained fraudulently is a defense. Under these circumstances, his certificate of registration is only prima facie evidence of his right and he must be prepared to carry the additional burden of proof as is necessary under the laws and statutes as they existed prior to the passage of this act. One of the valuable new rights created by the act is the incontestable right after 5 years' use of the mark, and the corollary thereto that the certificate of registration is conclusive evidence of ownership and the right to the exclusive use of the mark. This new and valuable right is denied to any trade-mark registrant who is shown to have used his mark to violate the antitrust laws, but this provision does not and is not intended to deprive the registrant of any rights he would possess or enjoy if this act were not enacted into law. Stated in other terms, proof of violation of the antitrust laws of the United States by a registrant in the use of his mark does not under this act destroy the validity of or the right of the registrant to continue to use the mark, but it places on him a burden of proof in the event of litigation which others do not have to carry, by diluting the weight the court is to give to his certificate of registration as evidence of ownership and the right to use the mark. This is the intent and effect and the only intent and effect of the seven subparagraphs of paragraph (b) of section 33.

Although the words "used to violate the anti-trust laws of the United States" are general in their nature, their meaning is clear. A registrant of a trade-mark might violate the antitrust laws by entering into an agreement to restrict output or to suppress competition and yet the use made by the registrant of his trade-mark in his business might have no legal, causal or efficient relation to the violation of these laws. The relation of the trade-mark to these illegal acts might be purely physical or coincidental. If a trade-mark should be used as the legal, causal and efficient instrumentality to effect a contract, agreement or arrangement which violates the anti-trust laws, then the actual use of the mark to carry out such a scheme would constitute a use in violation of the anti-trust laws; but if the mark is in no true sense an essential legal element of the unlawful conduct, then the fact that the registrant may have violated the anti-trust laws independently of the mark or its use would not bring paragraph (7) of paragraph (b) of section 33 into operation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I have just been advised that during my absence from the floor the conference report on House bill 1654, the trade-marks bill, was considered and agreed to. I thought that I had had an understanding with the other conferees on the part of the Senate that no effort would be made to bring up that conference report unless I was present on the floor. There were some comments which I desired to make. It is my understanding that the action to which I have referred has been taken.

Mr. President, while I have no objection to the conference report, I feel that inasmuch as there has been some discussion of it, an opportunity should be afforded to discuss more fully the report and explain its purpose. I doubt whether it is necessary, in order to gain my objective, to ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to, be reconsidered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should be very glad to have that done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that it would be advisable to do that.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be glad to try to clear up the matter of the adoption of the conference report. I moved a little while ago that the conference report be agreed to because of the request of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]. The Senator from New Jersey put into the RECORD a statement upon the part of the managers concerning the conference report. The Senator from New Jersey understood that the Senator from Wyoming was agreeable to the amendment. I am sure that neither the Senator from New Jersey nor I would desire to have the conference report agreed to without being certain that the Senator from Wyoming was completely satisfied. I believe, in justice to all of us, that it would be advisable to request that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without the Senator from Texas losing the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor, and he is entitled to protect himself.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no desire to take the Senator off the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the conference report was agreed to is reconsidered.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042), to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am reading telegrams that have been coming in to me today from citizens of the United States expressing their opinion as to what should be done with OPA. The senders of eight or nine of them would like to continue OPA. The senders of the rest would like to see OPA abolished.

I read a telegram from Charles Cray, of Miami, Fla.:

> Save Nation. Filibuster OPA. Congratulations. Don't weaken.

I read one from Ralph H. Rolston, of Muskogee, Okla.:

> We have wired our Oklahoma Senators to assist you in your filibuster so that the American people can return to the form of government they have been so long without.

Mr. President, I am very glad to say that both of the Senators from our sister State of Oklahoma needed no prodding. Both have spoken against this monstrosity, OPA, many times. The junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] made a speech against OPA on the floor of the Senate today lasting over 3 hours, and the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has very kindly consented to let me have this time to read these telegrams, prior to another speech he is to make about OPA. I appreciate his kindness in this respect. The telegram from Mr. Ralph O. Rolston, in which he says he has telegraphed the Oklahoma Senators, might be an inspiration for other American citizens to telegraph to their Senators. I know that all Senators, of course, want to pay attention to what their constituents say and what they desire.

I read a telegram from Ray Boltz, independent market operator, Los Angeles, Calif., as follows:

> Filibuster is the name. May you never fail.

I read another telegram from Walter Peckham, Jr., of Houston, Tex.:

> Congratulations on your courageous move to fight the OPA. We need more men like you.

A telegram from Rochester, N. Y.:

> Admire your courage filibustering OPA. Keep up the good work.
>
> Mr. and Mrs. H. A. S. READ.

I read another telegram from Auburn, Maine:

> More power to you. It's time somebody in Washington took a stand for the American form of government.
>
> EVERETT GREATON.

Those are strong words, Senators, coming from American citizens.

Mr. President, there are many people in this country who think Americanism has already been abolished in America, and I am one of them. I used to go back to Texas and tell the people that unless they ousted the New Deal we would lose our American form of government. I do not have to tell them that any more. We have already lost it. I should like anyone who disagrees with the statement that we have lost our American form of government to give me the name of one person in the United States who is running his own business without dictation from some bureaucrat in Washington. Is that Americanism? Just because we have lost our American form of government is no reason why we cannot recover it, but it is time for us to get busy and recover it before it is eternally too late.

I read a telegram from William Smith, of Miami, Fla.:

> Keep up your courage for a free and unshackled democracy. Kick Chester Bowles and OPA out. You will be much appreciated by the hampered legitimate businessmen of America. Stamp out OPA-encouraged black market.

Mr. President, that is a part of the New Deal proposition. They have got all their friends running black markets. Of course the New Deal wants to keep the OPA. It keeps their friends in the black-market business so they can make contributions to the political campaigns of these New Dealers.

I read a telegram from Early Vandeventer, of Wichita Falls, Tex.:

> Your fight to destroy the vicious principle of price fixing is watched by every freedom-loving American. OPA, with its power to punish without trial, with its whimsical and changeable orders, with its threats and arrogant claims, is the greatest menace to individual rights that has arisen in this generation.

That is the voice of the people I am reading to Senators and to visitors in the galleries. There are many indictments against OPA. Those indictments have not all gotten into the telegrams. When I get into my main speech I will tell the Senate what skulduggery the OPA has practiced ever since it was originated by Congress.

I read a telegram from Miller Chevrolet Co., Don L. Miller, president, St. Joseph, Mo.:

> May God give you strength to carry on your filibuster against OPA, since OPA is destroying our trust and respect for our own Government.

No truer words were ever spoken. There are very few citizens in the United States who have any respect for the words of any official in this New Deal administration. They pay no more attention to what the New Deal officials say. The New Dealers promise to do whatever you want them to do, but do they keep their promises? They seldom do.

I read another telegram from C. C. Patterson, of Shelby, N. C.:

> More power to you in your fight against OPA.

Another telegram from Huntington, W. Va.:

> Rooting for you. Our heartiest support to kill OPA quick.
>
> DR. AND MRS. CHARLES O. REYNOLDS.

From Utica, N. Y., comes the following telegram:

> We hope your filibustering will doom the OPA. Lots of luck.
>
> E. SIMON DAMSKY SONS,
> *Wholesale Grocers.*

Another telegram from Saginaw, Mich., as follows:

> I agree with you it would be swell if the American people could wake up Monday morning under the American form of government.
>
> S. A. SOMMERS,
> *President, A. T. Ferrell & Co.*

Yes, Mr. President, that would be a "swell" thing. I would like to see that happen.

A telegram from George W. Armstrong of Fort Worth, Tex.:

> Hurrah for you. Stay with them until that place freezes over.

He does not say which place.

Another telegram from T. G. Pool, of Port Arthur, Tex.:

> Fight them to death. For you 100 percent.

A telegram from Gretna, Va.:

> We are glad to know one Senator in Washington has some guts. Carry on.
>
> DELLIS & AMOS.

I read a telegram from H. W. Hibbard, Cleveland, Ohio, as follows:

> Big home economics convention here. Everyone talked with sure OPA has failed. Production only means of holding and lowering prices. Throw them out. We are for you.

From Odessa, Tex., comes this telegram from A. D. Kirklian Grocery and Market:

Thanks for your courageous stand against the OPA bill to restore us to our freedom again.

Good old Odessa. That is where the mayor blacked the eye of one of the OPA stooges. Now he is running for governor.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you filibuster the OPA bill. Finest thing any Senator could do. We are for you 100 percent.
M. B. MURRAY.
McALLEN, TEX.

STUART, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God there is one true American Senator like you in Washington.
CARL L. BESS.

These telegrams come from many different places. This one is from Gadsden, Ala.:

GADSDEN, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster H out of OPA and save country from dictatorship.
J. E. NOOJIN.
L. G. LOCKRIDGE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Best wishes and good luck in your attempt today.
W. A. KIMBALL.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Free us from the OPA and save free enterprise in America. God bless you.
GEORGE J. WULKER.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:
Millions of long-suffering people are hoping you will carry out your filibuster on OPA. As soon as the victims of Bowles' propaganda learn that life will go on as usual without OPA you will be a national idol. If our country could supply the world in war surely it can take care of its own in peace.
W. G. KESSLER.

Not only could our country supply the world in time of war, but the State of Texas could feed the entire Nation if OPA were abolished and the people of Texas given free rein.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster OPA to death and Texas will return you to the Senate without a run-off.
W. A. ISAACS.

ALTON, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster today. Monday we wake up real Americans again. Hooray.
LOUIS HORNS,
Thrift Market.

Would it not be a grand and glorious feeling to wake up free in America? Some folks might not like it, but if they could not stand America, they might get transportation to Russia, and have an OPA over there, just as we have it here, only in a more advanced stage.

COLUMBIA, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. Keep up the good work.
MRS. A. W. HOLLER.

FITCHBURG, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, from Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
May this give you power and glory forever in your effort to save the country from OPA.
HAROLD WHITNEY.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA and we will be free again. Happy hunting.
R. WALTER WHITE.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Defeat the strangling OPA octopus that is eating out the heart of our democracy. The moral fiber—honesty, fairness, justice to all—will have been spent. Supply and demand has for 150 years ruled our economy. Any other system spells doom for free enterprise. We fought for the five freedoms—let us preserve them now.
A. E. FISCHER.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Only wish there were more Americans like you in public office. Keep up the good work.
AL YAEGER.

FAYETTEVILLE, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster OPA controls until they are removed, particularly on meat, poultry, lard, and textiles.
I. T. WARREN.

These poor people throughout the United States had given up hope. They thought that their country was gone. They received information that the Senate was going to rush this bill through and shoulder the people with the iniquitous OPA for another year. Now they can see a little ray of hope. They hope that other Senators will take courage and rise to their feet and speak.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX ACT AND SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of obtaining unanimous consent to introduce a bill at this time?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Social Security Act so as to authorize any State to use amounts contributed by employees to the unemployment fund of such State to pay cash benefits of individuals with respect to their unemployment by reason of their disability. This is a bill in which the State of California is very vitally interested, in order to broaden social-security coverage.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2381) to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Social Security Act so as to authorize any State to use amounts contributed by employees to the unemployment fund of such State to pay cash benefits of individuals with respect to their unemployment by reason of their disability was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President——

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the present speaker has already spoken twice today on the same subject, and that he is now out of order in asking for the floor again. He yielded first for the consideration of a conference report, without any reservation whatever. He has now yielded for the introduction of a bill, which in my opinion, if I correctly understand the rules of the Senate, constitutes yielding the floor. If recognized again, he would be recognized for the third time in one day on the same subject. I make the point of order. [Manifestations of applause from the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURCH in the chair). Under the precedents of the Senate, if the Senator from Utah insists upon his point of order the Chair will have to sustain it.

Mr. MURDOCK. I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have been expecting something like this from these New Dealers. They do not want the people of the United States to be heard on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I insist upon a ruling on my point of order. The Senator has already been recognized twice.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bridges	Bushfield
Andrews	Brooks	Byrd
Ball	Buck	Capehart
Barkley	Burch	Capper

Carville	Kilgore	Reed
Chavez	Knowland	Robertson
Donnell	La Follette	Russell
Downey	Lucas	Smith
Ferguson	McCarran	Stanfill
Fulbright	McClellan	Stewart
George	McKellar	Swift
Gerry	McMahon	Taft
Gossett	Magnuson	Taylor
Green	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Guffey	Millikin	Tobey
Gurney	Mitchell	Wagner
Hart	Moore	Walsh
Hawkes	Morse	Wherry
Hayden	Murdock	White
Hill	Myers	Wiley
Hoey	O'Daniel	Willis
Huffman	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Johnson, Colo.	Overton	
Johnston, S. C.	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Is the subject now before the Senate debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair be sustained as the judgment of the Senate? That is a debatable question.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to debate it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I just got in trouble by yielding; consequently I must ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Kentucky without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to get the Senator out of trouble.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I appreciate that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kentucky, with the understanding that by so doing he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may yield under those conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that may be done. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was absent from the Chamber when the matter which resulted in the quorum call arose. I have no desire to restrict the Senator from Texas or any other Senator in debating the conference report. I am sure that every Senator, including the Senator from Texas, realizes that it is not only my duty but the duty of every other Senator to try to bring this matter to a determination as soon as possible. When a Senator who has the floor yields for the consideration of a conference report, or for the insertion of matter in the RECORD, he technically loses the floor. If he yields for a quorum he loses the floor, and it is counted as one speech in the rule which prohibits making more than two speeches on the same day on the same subject.

I have no desire to take a technical advantage of any of those rules. However, if an obvious effort were in progress to prevent a vote, it would be my duty to take advantage of any rule of which I could take advantage in order to bring the conference report to a vote. Therefore I wish to say to the Senator from Texas, and to all other Senators, that I hope that during the continuation of this debate no effort will be made to take the Senator from the floor by the consideration of conference reports. No conference report could be considered which could not await the disposition of the conference report which is now before the Senate. It is a privileged matter and it is now pending. There is no conference report or bill, of which I have any knowledge, which cannot await the disposition of the conference report which is now pending. I shall be compelled to object to the consideration of any other business while the pending conference report is under consideration.

Mr. President, as evidence of the fact that I have no desire, certainly at this juncture, to interfere with the right of the Senator from Texas to make his speech——

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am sure that I would be the last one to try to take technical advantage of any Member of this body. But, Mr. President, telegram after telegram was read by the Senator from Texas until they amounted, in number, to 25 or 30, and all of them were on the same subject. It seemed to me that it was wasting the Senate's time during the closing days of this fiscal year to proceed with that type of presentation. If the Senator from Texas had been speaking instead of reading telegrams, I should never have attempted by a point of order to invoke the rule of the Senate as I did. It seems to me that when telegram after telegram is read, all dealing with the same subject, there should be some end to it. Had it not been for that situation, I would not have invoked the rule against the Senator. I do not wish to interfere with any Senator when he is making a speech, and I never do interfere with Senators when they are speaking. However, in this instance, I felt that the Senator was not speaking, but, instead, was reading what, in my opinion, became extraneous matter. That was the only reason for my making the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, earlier in the day the distinguished majority leader asked me if I would yield for the consideration of a conference report. I yielded without making any reservation with respect to holding the floor. I gladly yielded because the request was made in good faith. I am in hearty accord with the position which is now taken by the majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am sure that the overwhelming majority of Senators wish to bring consideration of the pending conference report to a final vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A few minutes ago I became an innocent party to this situation. The Senator from Texas very kindly yielded to me for the purpose of introducing a bill. There was no intention whatever, on my part, that the Senator, by his courtesy, would lose the floor. Therefore, insofar as I may be able to do so, I should like to prevent any possibility of his losing the floor at this time. I do not agree with the Senator in the position which he takes, and I expect to vote against his position; but I would not wish, merely because of a courtesy on his part in yielding, to see the Senator from Texas permanently lose the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is for that very purpose that I urge Senators not to inject others matters into the consideration of the Senate while the conference report is the pending business. There is not a single insertion for the RECORD which cannot wait until after the vote is taken on the conference report. There is no other bill which could be considered which cannot await the disposition of the pending conference report, which is a privileged matter and which is now before the Senate. I urge Senators to pursue the course which I have suggested in order that no Senator will have any ground for taking advantage of a rule which would take a Member of the Senate off his feet.

I may say to the Senator from Texas that I was somewhat disturbed by the statements in the newspapers last night and this morning to the effect that he intended to try to talk the conference report to death. I do not hesitate to say that, considering the present condition of the country and our legislative program, it would be a legislative disgrace for the United States Senate not to be allowed to vote on the pending conference report by the time the present act will expire. I heard the Senator's statement when he began his remarks that he had something of the kind to which I have referred lurking in his mind, but that he had not received much encouragement and could not carry it out all by himself. However, I had no belief that the Senator would try to prevent a vote on the conference report. I have no desire to preclude him from saying anything which he wishes to say about the OPA or the conference report, but I feel that I should resort to every right at my command to bring the conference report to a vote as soon as possible. Therefore I should like to enter into an agreement fixing the hour for a vote, but giving to the Senator from Texas or any other Senator all the time he needs to discuss the matter before the vote is taken.

I have already announced that we will hold a night session as long as the Members of the Senate are willing to remain. I believe that we must vote on the conference report or discredit the United States Senate before the country and before the world. There are other matters of legislation which the Senate must also consider. Appropriation acts for various departments will expire at midnight next Sunday, as will also the present OPA law, unless the conference report now pending is agreed to and the appropriation bills are passed. However, we can pass appropriation bills next week and they will take effect July 1.

Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Texas and other Senators to agree that not later than 9 o'clock tonight the Senate will vote finally on the pending conference report.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I must object to the request. Later on, if I may continue my talk, I shall give consideration to an agreement fixing the time when the Senate will vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator. I am satisfied that the Senator and I can make an arrangement.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I shall be glad to discuss the subject with the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. In view of what has happened on the floor since I made my point of order, I now withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the point of order?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the withdrawal of the point of order automatically withdraws the appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the withdrawal of the point of order would eliminate the appeal, and the question would recur on agreeing to the conference report.

Without objection the point of order made by the Senator from Utah is withdrawn, and the Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, it looks as if we were right back where we started. Out of the goodness of my heart I tried to follow the custom which has prevailed since I have been a Member of the Senate. So I yielded for what I considered a very important matter, the transaction of business. I am not sorry I did. I always try to take my stand on the side of right and justice. I am glad I was able to accommodate the two Senators, one on each side of the aisle. I have no remorse whatever. Even if I had lost the floor permanently, I would still be proud of the fact that I was generous enough to yield to my friends.

Mr. President, I make very few speeches in the Senate. Some of them may be distasteful to some of the other Senators, and if so I am very sorry, but my speeches express my true sentiments, and I still believe any Senator has right to stand on the Senate floor and state what he honestly and conscientiously believes to be facts and to express his opinions.

As a child I was taught Christianity, honesty, hard labor, and thrift. I firmly believe in the old adage that there is no fruit without great labor. Throughout my life I have been guided by teachings of that nature. All through my life I have labored long and hard, and through diligent effort I have met with a reasonable degree of success. At least, I have been able to provide for my family, and enjoy some of the necessities of life, without having to sacrifice my honor, and become a tool to some higher-ups in Government, who are only too glad to promote a man's personal welfare if he will submit to their rule and play their game with them according to their own underground system of ironclad rules.

To become one of these great New Deal statesmen, if you please, I would have to lay aside the honesty that was taught me in my childhood and wipe the feet of the New Deal kings with my hair, and because I did not choose to do those things, I have been subjected to all kinds of ridicule, criticism, and abuse, and received very little consideration where consideration, I believe, has been due from some of my colleagues.

My family has suffered at the slimy hands of these New Deal statesmen. Despite all this, I have stood on my own feet. Mr. President, I have fought for what I thought was right, fair, and honest during my tenure as United States Senator, regardless of what it meant to my own personal or political welfare, and I am happy that I can stand in the United States Senate today with a free conscience, that I can lie down at night and sleep peacefully without nightmares brought on by a guilty conscience, and, last but not least, I still enjoy my own company.

I am sure there are men in the New Deal administration who cannot boast of those blessings, men who cannot bear to sit alone with their conscience and review their own actions, knowing, as they do, that they have served as dummies for the New Deal dynasty. Their every act and every word have been dictated by the New Deal administration. They have stumbled blindly along, accepting the great praise and the many favors bestowed upon them, kidding themselves into believing that they are not responsible for selling the people of this Nation down the river.

But there comes a day of reckoning for all, Mr. President. I do not profess to be infallible, but I do claim to be honest, sincere, and a true American, and I shall fight to the bitter end for America and all that is near and dear to us Americans. If we must have Government officials who cherish communism and are determined to inflict that deadly thing on America, I suggest that they take their belongings and go to Russia, where they will get plenty of that type of government, but, by the grace of the almighty God, let us not permit them to bring Russia over here and force communism upon the great and good people of America.

Mr. President, when I stand on the floor of the Senate and attempt to bring to the attention of Senators the opinions of the downtrodden American people who have almost lost hope, I think I am within my rights. These telegrams have been sent to me without solicitation. They came to me as a result of news dispatches which went out from the Nation's Capital yesterday, to the effect that I expect to speak on OPA, and that if I could secure sufficient support from enough other Senators I would do my part toward talking until Monday morning, in the hope that this iniquitous OPA bill would die at midnight Sunday night, and the American people wake up Monday morning under the American flag.

Mr. President, those who sent these telegrams believe in that. They believe in abolishing OPA. I realize that there are some very good people—though I think they are mistaken—who believe that OPA should be continued. I have no criticism of them. If they believe in OPA, that is all right. Some of them may have been misled, but I am sure they are wrong; I am sure there is no place in America for OPA. It is unconstitutional, purely communistic and socialistic.

Under the great form of American Government that was set up by our wise forefathers, as written into the Constitution, they gave the American citizen certain rights, and if any American citizen has any article which belongs to him, it is his property, and he should be the one and the only one to say what he would take for that article.

The minds of buyer and seller must meet before there is any freedom in the setting of a price. No man has wisdom enough, even if he be the fairest man on earth, to set a price on every commodity in the United States which would be satisfactory to both producers and consumers. It is absolutely impossible for that to be done. We are tinkering with that thing. We are trying to do the impossible.

The OPA was brought forth under the guise of being a war measure, and when this Nation was engaged in war it behooved every one of us to support anything our Commander in Chief said was necessary to the winning of the war. But the war is now over, and every one of our enemies, through the efforts of our brave boys on the field of battle, in the air, on the sea, has been beaten into unconditional surrender. The enemy nations are gone.

Now, Mr. President, those who are interested in the administration of OPA for some reason or other want to continue to foist this un-American agency upon the lives of American citizens, after our boys have fought for our freedom. I am against it, and have been against it ever since it was proposed. I am against it now more than ever, and I would to God that a sufficient number of Senators would join with me and discuss this report until OPA expires Sunday night. I have never made the statement that I could expect to do it all alone, and I have repeatedly made the statement that I had received no promises of any support. It is up to each Senator to decide what he wants to do.

Mr. President, I am of the opinion that every Senator wishes to abide by the desires expressed by his constituents, or at least a majority of them. I realize, of course, that every Senator has a right to disregard his constituents, if he desires to do so, and to use his own judgment. I believe in that form of government. But I think we should take time here today, while this bill is under consideration, to give full consideration to every phase of it.

So these people throughout the United States have sent these telegrams to me. Some may think they are monotonous telegrams. I say they are the voice of the people. No two of the telegrams I have read so far have been alike. I am reading them from both sides. I am absolutely fair in reading the telegrams from those who approve OPA and those who oppose OPA. A reading of the many telegrams which oppose and want it abolished may be just a little obnoxious to the ears of some who approve OPA and want it extended. I am very sorry if that is the case, but I believe it to be my duty, since American citizens

have sent these telegrams to me, to read them, and I believe I have that right and privilege on the floor of the Senate. I should like to know what is more important in this Republic than for the citizens themselves to have a voice. Since they are not permitted to enter this Chamber, but go to the expense of paying for telegrams and sending them, I think they certainly should have the right to expect their telegrams to be read, and I am proud to stand here and read them.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. If I ask the Senator from Texas to yield, and he yields without obtaining unanimous consent, am I correct in understanding that he will lose the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the precedents of the Senate, the Senator can yield for a question without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question if I may have unanimous consent that I do not lose the floor thereby.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has the right to yield for a question without obtaining unanimous consent.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I understand that, but I wanted the double protection.

Mr. WHERRY. I wanted to ask the Senator a question. The Senator just made a statement that the telegrams which he received were not alike. I ask the Senator if it is not true that the telegrams he has received have come to him from all parts of the State, and if they are not coming to him from individuals; farmers, housewives, merchants, and the whole citizenship of the Senator's State? That is true with respect to the telegrams coming to me from my State.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to answer the Senator from Nebraska by saying that, of course, I do not know the vocation of the signers of each one of the telegrams. Some specify the sender is a housewife or is operating a store of some kind or a market. The telegrams come to me not only from my own State, but from various other States.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. The question I ask this time is rather to clarify the first one. Are the telegrams which the Senator is now receiving different from what we call "pressure" telegrams? Do the telegrams which come to the Senator come from individuals who are interested in either the extension or the discontinuance of OPA?

Mr. O'DANIEL. The telegrams which come to me are from individuals and are not what the Senator calls "pressure" telegrams. Earlier in my remarks I brought out the fact that they are not inspired telegrams; that they are telegrams which come from the hearts of the American citizens who have read in the news reports or heard over the radio that there are some in Washington who want to have OPA abolished, and they are sending these telegrams. That is one reason why I am reading them. Another reason why I am reading them is that I surmise that the same individuals who are telegraphing to me are telegraphing to other Senators. As the telegrams come from citizens of other States, I presume those citizens are telegraphing their own Senators. I know there are many Senators who would like to see OPA abolished, and if they could receive a little encouragement from home they might join in trying to abolish OPA.

Our majority leader has been perfectly frank in saying that he will use all tactics at his command to obtain a vote on this question at the earliest possible moment, and I shall be perfectly frank to tell him that I should like to see OPA abolished, and I shall also repeat what I said a while ago, that I do not expect to talk this bill to death until Monday morning unless I can get some help. Unless there is sufficient interest among other Senators to talk the bill to death, I cannot do it alone. That is physically impossible. I have made the suggestion, I have planted the idea in the minds of Senators, and I have invited all Senators who want to participate, to get into the fight with me. That is for them to decide. The telegrams which are coming in to me, if similar to telegrams coming to other Senators, may help them decide. I do not know. I am merely trying to fight for what I believe is a righteous cause. I do not believe there is any place for OPA in America in time of peace. I shall read some more of these telegrams so the people in the States will know I am doing my duty.

I now read a telegram from Angie Souther, of St. Louis, Mo.:

Congratulations. Thank God for one Senator who wants a free America. Trusting others may join you.

Mr. President, that is for other Senators to decide.

I read another telegram from Atlanta, Ga.:

ATLANTA, GA., *June 27, 1946.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Don't let your courage fail. Filibuster until Christmas if necessary. Relegate OPA to its place of conception to the innermost depths of hades. Veterans are not allowed to live in their own homes. Have failed after 4 months to get mine. Down with dictators!

J. E. B. STEWART.

Mr. President, he wants to get rid of OPA so he can get his home back. I read another telegram from Nashville, Tenn.:

Thousands of Tennesseans hope and pray for you. May God give you strength to carry through your courageous program.

A. C. TISSELL.

I have a telegram dated St. Louis, Mo., from Rath Bros. Market. Of course I know from the telegram that Rath brothers have a market. I presume they do not have very much in it to sell, but the telegram shows they have a market. They say:

Let's have free enterprise. Abolish OPA.

They want to get rid of OPA.

Another telegram from Fitchburg, Mass.:

With your thoughts to foresee and do, we cannot lose through the OPA.

WILLIAM O'KEEFE.

A telegram from Cleveland, Ohio:

More power for your filibuster regarding OPA. Will gladly furnish sustenance during your labor.

HUGH G. SELBY.

I will say that a person might be able to talk longer on this subject if it were not for OPA rationing. OPA has cut down the energy and the ability of the American citizen. One simply cannot work without the proper food to eat, and one cannot get the proper food to eat now because of OPA.

I read a number of other telegrams as follows:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator LEE O'DANIEL:

Papers quote you tonight in opposition to OPA control. I hope you stay in there and pitch. We are all for you and wish you lots of luck.

AL BUCHANAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:

Heartily agree with your denouncement price controls. All best wishes for success of proposed filibuster.

A. W. TINKHAM.

McKEES ROCKS, PA., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas.
United States Senate:

Thank the Lord we have one man in the Senate that has guts enough to fight the snake in the grass, the OPA. Let supply and demand regulate prices and give the country back to the people that fought for us. More power to you.

WILLIAM C. SMYTHE.

That is plain language.

Here is a telegram from Albany Stockyards, Albany, Ga. I did not know there were any stockyards left in operation in this country. But apparently there is one left. The telegram is as follows:

Congratulations on your attitude in filibustering OPA. Too bad we do not have more men with your ability. Hope you are successful.

ALBANY STOCKYARDS,
W. M. STORY.

I read a number of other telegrams, as follows:

JUPITER, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:

Filibuster until the end of time and you have won boys' vote for the next President of the United States.

JOHN ZIEGLER.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas:

More power to you. It's time we had one American in the Senate. Thank God for you.

HARRY YARNELL.

FITCHBURG, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Wishing you success on returning to the people the country our boys fought for and died for.

LOUIS M. BROWN.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, from Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your filibuster idea excellent. Go to it. Kill bill.
W. B. McCOY,
Stecher Traung Lithograph Corp.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Many friends and myself feel OPA cannot be enforced. A law that cannot be enforced is all wet. More power to you and the boys that are steering the right course.
DAVID H. MITCHELL.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The OPA is just like a rotten tooth. The sooner we get rid of it the better. With you 100 percent.
J. R. KOWALCZYK.

WATERVILLE, MAINE, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
My hat is off to a Texas Democrat.
MAURICE LORD.

MEDICA, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight to kill the OPA.
Mr. and Mrs. McNEES.
Mrs. C. T. BYE.
Mr. HOLLIS.

FITCHBURG, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL:
May your filibuster on OPA be as strong as my rifle was on the battlefields of Germany.
A. CERIER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
The American people are behind your fight to filibuster the OPA. Good luck.
JOHN EWING.

LAWRENCE, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL:
Senate Office Building:
Three out of four real Americans are with you. Reds and radicals don't count. May you talk long and loud and good luck.
WILLIS RICHARDSON.

HARRISBURG, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL:
Grocers and meat dealers everywhere approve your stand and hope you kill OPA. Give business chance to operate in an American way.
S. S. POMEROY,
Grocer.

FITCHBURG, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, from Texas:
May God give you courage, speech, and health, so we can go back to our American way of life without OPA.
LOUIS CERIER.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:
Keep your courage up for a free, unshackled democracy. Kick Chester Bowles and OPA out. You will be much appreciated by the hampered, legitimate businessmen of America. Stamp out OPA encouraged black markets.
WILLIAM SMITH.

NORTH TONAWANDA, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:
OPA unconstitutional, inconsistent, unreliable, fanatical, dishonest, underhanded, confusing. Kill it.
NORBERT J. BATT.

Here is one from Peoria, Ill.:

PEORIA, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
By filibustering the OPA out you will go down in history as one of the greatest of Americans of all times. God is the only one who can regulate supply and demand—not man, not OPA. The American housewives are the smartest women in the world so there is no fear about price. God is on your side so fight to the finish.
E. D. DONNELLY,
ZIPPER MARKET, INC.

A man is never alone when he is on God's side. He is with the majority when he is on God's side.

I read further telegrams:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:
Please kill OPA before it chokes us corner grocery store.
N. VRAGASSY.

WINSTON-SALEM, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
More power to you in your filibuster. Keep it up through Monday anyway. North Carolina Americans are for you.
Dr. PASS FEARRINGTON.

WACO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Personal Delivery,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Just to show you how unfair the quota and restrictions on meat are. Waco a town of a population of a hundred thousand or better with trade territory of that many or more, the quota assigned to the three packers here is less than 14,000 pounds live cattle daily for all three packers. One packer, Preston Packing Co., whom I represent, has just completed a new packing house at a cost of $55,000, which employs 16 skilled butchers. Their quota is 5,000 pounds daily live weight. We are forced to either get relief or close our doors July 1. Kindly answer at my expense.
PRESTON PROVISION CO.,
ABE BERLOWITZ.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations on your moral courage to stand alone and beat the "Bowleses." Stick by your guns and we'll all get butter.
HOMER LEE RANKV.

SOUTH ST. JOSEPH, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas, Senate Chamber:
This exchange compliments you on your stand and encourages you to persist in your efforts to remedy the chaotic situation existing in the livestock and meat industry as a result of OPA regulations.
ST. JOSEPH LIVESTOCK EXCHANGE,
JOHN W. BENNETT, Jr.,
President.

GREENSBORO, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas:
Just want to congratulate you on your filibuster OPA. Just want to kill it. The greatest curse we ever had.
H. A. TAYLOR,
State Legislator.

ALTUS, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I believe in the Mayflower compact, the Declaration of Independence, and the Federal Constitution with its Bill of Rights. I believe that the Declaration of Independence—that immortal document—is the creed of Americanism. Your fight to end OPA's communism in the U. S. A.; go to it.
H. D. SNELL UNITED GROCERY CO.
OF OKLAHOMA AND TEXAS.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Speaking for some 2,200 retail coal merchants of Illinois, we encourage your continued fight to eliminate price controls. Filibuster if necessary, requesting LUCAS and BROOKS to cooperate.
ILLINOIS FUEL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION.

EL PASO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL:
My congratulations for your stand against OPA. Hope you are successful in eliminating this silly, useless, inefficient bureau, and trust you can override the weaklings that are supporting this impractical group.
Regards,
W. H. WOOLDRIDGE.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:
Good luck on your filibuster. Out with the OPA. Save the taxpayers of the United States billions of dollars.
L. J. BUDDY.

HAGERSTOWN, MD.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:
Give them h—. Keep filibuster going so Americans can live with opportunity for making a living.
WOODIE MOORE.

GLENDALE, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:
Am saving some of my wind for you. Go the limit. We are behind you.
RALPH D. BARTLETT.

FLINT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand regarding OPA.
HARRY WELLER.

HAGERSTOWN, MD., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
America is at the crossroads. Do not let them go down the communistic road. Save America. Kill OPA.
L. W. MUSSELMAN.

HAGERSTOWN, MD., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
If American freedom is to live OPA must die. Filibuster to the end. Don't let the American people down.
G. T. FEDERLINE.

HAGERSTOWN, MD., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
Save America. Filibuster this OPA bill to death.
JAMES H. LYNE.

WYANDOTTE, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
If you can free us from this OPA octopus you will be doing as great a service to your country as George Washington.
FRED HOWARTH LUMBER CO.

I would be willing to wager that he has not a two-by-four in the place.

Here is a telegram from Columbus, Ohio:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your courageous stand against vicious OPA.
THOMAS J. POTTS.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Save the country from the OPA mob. Keep speaking for us farmers.
J. E. KINDER.

Five million American farmers were put out of business since the New Deal administration came in.

I have also received the following telegrams:

SYRACUSE, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
All success to you in filibuster, hope you win out.
K. L. LEEB.

BALTIMORE, MD., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
DEAR SENATOR: I admire your courage and hope you have the strength to carry through your fight to deliver us from the persecution of the Communistic OPA.
Another Texan.
Mrs. MAMIE SINGER.

ERIE PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for your attempt to start us on the road to an American way of operation. We hope you may have the physical strength to filibuster the OPA into oblivion.
HOWARD L. BOOLKEY, *a veteran.*

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, OF TEXAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Stand pat. Kill the OPA. Give us liberty or give us death.
H. F. VALENTINE.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas,
Washington D. C.:
Yours is one filibuster we approved of. More power to you.
W. A. LITTLE,
1129 Grand Ave.

WATERTOWN, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
Fight OPA. Filibuster if necessary.
HELEN I. MCMULLIN.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
Congratulations to you as you take the floor this afternoon. Give them heck. We are with you.
BOB EUBANK.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, OF TEXAS,
United States Senate:
God bless you sir. Kill OPA and have blessing of people of Missouri. I have voted Democratic in past at Denison. I fear revolution if it is continued. It is not democratic. It is fascist.
TOM HALL.

I think I heard the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] prophesy on the floor of the Senate yesterday that unless these restrictions were taken off and American business turned back to American citizens we might expect to have revolution or riots in this country. Tom Hall, of Kansas City, telegraphs to me making the same statement.

The following further telegrams came to my office:

WILKES-BARRE, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Hope your voice holds out. Wish you success in your effort to completely eliminate the OPA.
JOS. JUDGE, *Insurance.*
Dr. JOHN L. ALLEN,
JOHN J. LALLY, *Broker.*

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Not lifting ceiling on dairy products will retard make of butter, encourage the black market on butter, which has prevailed not only in Philadelphia but all over the United States for many months. Believe that 80 percent of the butter sold in the United States is going into black-market channels from 80 cents to $1 per pound. If ceilings removed, feel sure legitimate prices will not advance above current black-market prices. Also the manufacture of butter will increase to such volume that prices will drop in a few months according to supply and demand. We were established 1870, employing at present 50 employees. Lost our last creamery April 26, due to not paying above ceilings. Success in your fight for the manufacturers and legitimate butter dealers and consumers of the United States.
I. WALTER BICKLEY,
A. F. BICKLEY & SON.

Everyone knows that OPA is entirely responsible for the fact that one cannot get butter today. Recently the OPA announced that it was raising the price of butter 11 cents a pound. That will give the American people an opportunity to save more money, if they operate according to the philosophy of the boy who voted for the proposal in a certain city to raise the street car fare from 5 to 10 cents. He was asked why he voted to raise the street car fare from 5 to 10 cents. He said that he lived only 3 miles from his job, and he saved only 5 cents each way by walking to and from work, or 10 cents for the round trip. If the fare were raised he would save 20 cents a day. The same philosophy is suggested with respect to butter. If the price of butter is raised 11 cents a pound and one cannot get butter, he saves 11 cents a pound more than he had been saving.

Here is a telegram from Oneida, N. Y.:

ONEIDA, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL:
Let us return to a democracy, abolish OPA.
H. F. COLWAY.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL:
We are in back of you 100 percent in your fight to end price control. We look with pride on one truly patriotic American who knows that present bill will only end in a black market. American business is based on free enterprise. Do your utmost.
HENRY SCHLACHTER & SONS,
Meat Packers.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We are in back of you 100 percent in your fight to end price control. We look with pride on one truly patriotic American who knows that present bill will only end in a black market. American business is based on free enterprise. Do your utmost.
CINCINNATI WHOLESALE
MEAT DEALER ASSOCIATION,
GUS JUENGLING, *President.*

The last two telegrams seem to be alike. They are the first two which I have seen which are identical. They come from different concerns, both engaged in the meat business.

Here is a telegram from Kalamazoo, Mich.:

KALAMAZOO, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We believe in the American form of government, too. We hope you win.
BARKERS.

LOWELL, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Sincere thanks for your great service to freedom-loving Americans.
JOHN R. BERGIN.

NEW GALILEE, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please lend all your support and influence against the continuance of the OPA in any form. Restore the Constitution checks and balances that they will function in favor of no man or group.
Dr. C. B. MOORE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you on your filibuster. Hope you make it stick.
CARL T. BRELOS.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Good luck to you for having courage to try to return our country to an American form of government. Let's get rid of the OPA forever.
BOWER MOTOR SALES.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We are in back of you 100 percent in your fight to end price control, especially OPA control of meat and meat products. We urge your continued efforts to take OPA control off of meats.
JACOB BAUER SONS.

Mr. President, that is what the majority of the Senate voted to do. The majority of the Senate voted to take controls off of meat. Yet the Senate's desires, as expressed by that vote in this Chamber, have been completely ignored, and that part of the bill has been stricken, so that the controls on meat are not to be eliminated. Yet we are promised that if we adopt the conference report giving the Administrator of the OPA authority to eliminate controls on meat, he will eliminate the controls as soon as the supply equals the demand. How can we be expected to believe anything

that anyone in the OPA says? If the OPA does not believe what the Senate says, why should the Senate and the Senators believe what the OPA promises? If the OPA is sincere in its promise to take the controls off of meat when we give it authority under the pending measure, why does the OPA object to taking off controls under the measure the Senate passed? Everyone knows the answer to that. It is because no one has any faith in the integrity or honesty or the spoken word of anyone in the OPA.

Mr. President, these further telegrams have come to me:

FLINT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Fine, Senator; make your speech.
ARTHUR BUDER.

SCRANTON, PA., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building of Capitol,
Washington, D. C.:
We must have food either legitimately or through black markets. Is OPA going to make storekeeper and housewives criminals? We walk miles to buy scarce items in black market and will walk more miles to save pennies. But we must be able to find merchandise in stores. Sent telegram to President Truman last night from housewives, will he listen to us or to Chester Bowles?
Mrs. PHILIP FISCHER,
President, Consumers Betterment Organization.

Mr. President, it appears to me that under our American form of government the people of the United States, the citizens of this great Republic, should not be obliged to listen to the President of the United States or to Chester Bowles with reference to buying a pound of meat or a pound of butter. If I correctly understand the Constitution of the United States, we are a nation of laws, and the policy of this Nation is decided in accordance with what is written into the statutes, and the only department of our Government which can legally write a law is the Congress of the United States. The Congress is the exclusive, one and only policy-making body of this great Nation, unless we delegate that authority to some other department or some individual. It appears to me that the citizens of the United States have a right to expect the Congress to formulate the policies, without requiring the citizens to go hat in hand before the President of the United States, whose main constitutional duty is to see to it that the laws of this Nation which the Congress writes are faithfully executed. I think the people of the United States should realize that everything good in this Nation is the result of the laws which are passed by the Congress; and everything bad in this Nation, including the OPA, can be laid at the door of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I have also received the following telegrams:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL:
We are in back of you 100 percent in your fight to end price control. We look with pride on one truly patriotic American who knows that present bill will only end in a black market. American business are based on free enterprise. Do your utmost.
GUS JUENGLING AND SONS.

HAGERSTOWN, MD., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
You will do the Nation a great favor if you filibuster this bill to death. Unless this bill is killed now we will have this communistic monstrosity fastened on us forever. You will certainly be the No. 1 American if you can last out the filibuster until Sunday night.
H. L. MILLS.

MILTON, DEL., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I heartily endorse your filibuster to end all OPA control. You will have rendered the country a great service. Let us have freedom once again in America free from dictatorship.
DORSAY V. BURNHAM.

WILMINGTON, DEL., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Agree wholeheartedly with your announced effort to prevent passage of any OPA extension bill.
THOMAS COOCH.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator LEE O'DANIAL,
Washington, D. C.:
I am of the opinion price control is all wrong and un-American. I am for the filibuster.
J. E. TRIGG.

GONZALES, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Thousands poultrymen south Texas, hundreds of whom are your personal friends, jubilant over your stand. American poultrymen must be freed from bondage OPA ceilings or perish. Keep up the fight.
WARREN TAYLOR,
Secretary, South Texas Poultrymen's Association.

Mr. President, down in the Gonzales section of the great State of Texas there are hundreds of farmers who are engaged in raising broilers and fryers for the market. Many of those poultrymen have been entirely put out of business by the OPA. Pleas have been made recently on the floor of the Senate, and I have heard them, for the poultrymen of the northeast section and the northwest section of the United States. The oppression of the poultrymen of my State has been constant ever since the OPA was established. As I have said, hundreds of these poultrymen have been put out of business. I have personally gone to the OPA and have discussed this subject with the representatives of the OPA, and have asked them why they wanted to hold the ceiling price of poultry in Texas below the cost of production. They informed me that for the protection of the consumers, it was necessary to hold the price of that poultry 5 cents below the cost of production. We then obtained statements from the grocery stores that bought the poultry from those poultry raisers, and in those statements the grocery stores agreed to pay 5 cents a pound more for the poultry and not raise the price of the poultry to the consumer 1 cent. Yet the OPA would not permit that increase of 5 cents a pound to enable those poultrymen to stay in business—thus admitting that the OPA's objective is not to hold down the prices to the consumers, but that its objective is to put the poultrymen out of business. That is exactly what the OPA has accomplished, regardless of whether that was its objective.

Mr. President, I now read the following telegrams which I have received:

LYNN, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
We admire your efforts to kill OPA. Hope you will be able to talk it to death.
FRANK S. HASKELL.

ODESSA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster OPA or anything to get it kicked out. Will spend $1,000 to beat anyone voting for OPA.
G. C. FAIREY,
Retired Farmer.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartily endorse your stand on OPA, and honor you for it.
N. O. FANNING,
White Plains, N. Y.

WATSONVILLE, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please do your best to do away with OPA.
H. L. NEWMAN.

BALLSTON SPA, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Do what you can to destroy that unlawful and devastating OPA.
RICHARD FEENEY.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Member, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you and let nothing stop you. Those responsible for killing the New Deal and its tenets such as OPA will be immortal in the minds of all good Americans.
EDWARD SOPH.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Behind your actions against continuation of OPA 100 percent.
W. R. BARBECK.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are in complete accord with your filibuster and all the intelligent businessmen of the Nation are back of you, best of luck.
MILLER WILLIAMS CO.,
By J. A. WILLIAMS.

WOOSTER, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Administration Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your work against OPA. It should be defeated by all means.
E. E. HEITSMAN.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL of Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You are the the liveliest Democrat in Washington, you do something about your convictions. Thought we had a lot of rubber stamps with signatures at Washington and the Senators had gone on vacation. At least we might have a day or more of freedom. It won't be your fault if we turn out to be a bunch of liars, cheats, and law breakers. Foreign countries have used OPA methods—Hitler, Himmler, etc. Remember we had butter, bread, meat, sugar, freedom, prosperity, and everything before without OPA, why not now.

J. T. MORLEY.

STOCKTON, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The OPA is unconstitutional, un-American, furthermore is communistic and dictatorial; it is one of the worst that could be fostered on the American people. Let's kill it by filibuster.

L. R. GIOTTONINI.

ANDERSON, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We believe that 75 percent of our local citizens favor Senator O'DANIEL's effort to kick OPA out the window. We can buy plenty of supposed scarce food and other items from black market. Without OPA could get these items through legitimate places of business at no higher price and cheaper within a short time.

DAN BROWN,
Farmer and Formerly Volunteer Worker for OPA for Over 2 Years.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Texas owes you a debt of gratitude for your stand against extension price control bill. Please don't weaken but continue the fight because this bill must be defeated if we are to have even the necessary things of life. To continue price control means increasing strife and violation of law.

HENRY N. ROBERTS.

GREENVILLE, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Hats off to a Senator who wants to kill the black market and put business back in legitimate channels where it belongs. We know that there will be meat in every butcher shop at cheaper prices than now prevail among black-market operators. May God bless you and give you strength to last until Sunday midnight.

P. L. BRUCE & CO.,
T. S. BRUCE.

LEXINGTON, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Propose OPA filibuster commendable. Senseless Government by bureaus must end. Congratulations.

CLARENCE S. WALKER.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We encourage you to go ahead with filibuster against OPA.

COOPER DAY MOTORS.

CAMERON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Let's make July 1 a national holiday to be commemorated as one day of freedom from official pressure administration.

W. J. RICE.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Make Housing Administration responsible for rent control. Abolish OPA.

G. GUY OWENS.

ALICE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You have our moral support in your plan to outlaw the OPA.

E. D. SOUTHERLAND.
E. J. KLAEGER.
J. A. HUFF.
A. J. HOLZAPFEL.
H. P. KERR.

SAN ANGELO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Stay in there and filibuster OPA measure. Your friends like myself want that OPA done away with. More power to you.

A. R. PERRY.

SHENANDOAH, IOWA, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Kill OPA. Save United States of America. You can do it.

JAMES G. GUTSCHALL.
PHOENIX, ARIZ.

ELDORADO, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations to you on your stand against the OPA.

C. L. PEACOCK GROCERY.
THE CORNER GROCERY.
E. P. TRULL GROCERY.
DUMAS PACKING CO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Under OPA dictatorship not allowed to increase tenancy from 9 to 21 capacity. Housing shortage largely responsible to stupidity. Forced to liquidate. Small prewar rents cannot cover costly repairs. Only hopes of small business and farmers is understanding Senators like yourself.

L. ROGERS.

Mr. President, I believe that is the first telegram which I have received in which any mention was made of rent controls. Those who own property for rent have received no encouragement, whatever, regarding the abolition of rent controls. I assert, however, that, in my opinion, the rent-control law is more responsible for the housing shortage throughout this country than is anything else. With respect to the city of Dallas, Tex., for exemple, I have received a report from a responsible person to the effect that 3,500 apartment units and houses there are vacant and will remain vacant so long as the OPA is in control of rents. The owners of the properties have found that they have fewer rights than do the tenants. They lose control, absolutely, of their property when they allow anyone to move in, so they prefer vacancies to tenants.

Mr. President, here are some more telegrams:

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand on the OPA. Too bad we don't have more Senators and Congressmen who put the good of our country before politics. Keep the good work up.

SUPER P. & C. MARKETS,
By J. A. GLOVER.

SHENANDOAH, IOWA, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Personal friends from Texas way asks you to kill the OPA.

Mr. and Mrs. W. H. FALLERS.

QUEEN CITY, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

One hundred million people with you and will bless you to get them back to constitutional government. Am union carpenter; will pay $100 a day to Senator that will help with filibuster to kill American Gestapo.

R. SCHMID.

PLAINVIEW, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The dairy industry of the Nation will be backing you to the limit in today's battle over OPA. Pour it right on.

PLAINS COOPERATIVE, INC.
WALLACE LOUTHAN.

Mr. President, many of the dairymen of my State have been put entirely out of business as their herds have been sold and slaughtered. There is a great shortage of milk in the State of Texas.

I read the following telegrams:

TROY, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep on keeping on.

IRA THOMPSON.

CLARKSVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on good work; hope our Senators from Tennessee help you.

KLEEMAN PACKING CO.
EVERETT MOORE.

So do I.

I read the following telegrams:

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL.
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We are backing you in your fight against un-American OPA. May God give you strength.

Mr. and Mrs. D. D. FUGITT.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

If successful in blocking extension of price control on livestock and meats, you will have saved established livestock and meat industry from destruction and performed a

patriotic act for the entire Nation. Continuance of present regulations will leave only black markets in operation.

W. J. CHAMBERS,
Secretary, Detroit Livestock Association.

GLADEWATER, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, we favor your proposed filibuster against the amended price control extension bill. Congratulations for your fearless effort.

Signed,

HIGGS GENERAL MERCHANDISE,
W. M. HIGGS,
RALPH HIGGS,
CHESTER HIGGS,
H. A LOVEN,
A. C BAZAR,
A. L. O'BRIEN,
CLARENCE BURNS,
H. F. BICE.

LAINGSBURG, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Honorable Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Go through with your filibuster on OPA. More power to you.

P. M. SMITH ELPIATT AND OTHERS.

Mr. President, here is a telegram from Uvalde, Tex. Uvalde is a name with which every Member of the Senate is familiar. It is the home of John Nance Garner.

The telegram reads as follows:

UVALDE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator D. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Your filibuster should start formation of 100,000 "Pappy for President" Clubs.

JOE W. WATSON.

Mr. President, I have no intention of starting anything like that, but I should like to put an end to OPA.

Here are more telegrams:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

This large butter firm, over 61 years old, has seen its business vanish under 4 years of OPA iniquities and bungling and their unwillingness or inability to prosecute the racketeers and black marketeers who have taken over much butter distribution, applaud you and other Senators for your courageous efforts to get the dairy industry back to normal. If you are successful, farmers will get more money and produce more dairy products, and consumers pay less and get better quality than under OPA mishandling.

FREDERICK F. LOWENFELS & SON.

BECKLEY, W. VA., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:

If you filibuster OPA Act, you will win love of entire United States most sincerely.

HARRY NIXON,
NIXON FURNITURE CO.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Sincerely hope your OPA filibuster threats materialize. Am Democrat committeeman Wyoming temporarily in Nashville. Expect price raises, but supply and demand will soon restore even keel. Heartily approve your plan to rid our country of another relief army.

K. S. ALBERT.

CASPER, WYOMING.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We are behind you 100 percent; hold the floor, kill price control.

TEXAS RETAIL GROCERS ASSOCIATION,
A. W. ALLEN, *Secretary.*

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Hope you and the other Senators who put the welfare of the country above politics will do everything in your power to kill the OPA.

GEORGE E. HOLMAN.
S. D. BARCLAY.

BEAUMONT, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Press reports you are to filibuster OPA. All citizens who believe in our form of government are with you. We the thinking citizens are hoping for enough Republicans in the next Congress to help you restore this Government to the people.

C. M. MABRY.

Mr. President, imagine that telegram coming from Texas. The citizens of Texas certainly must be very discouraged.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator reread the telegram?

Mr. O'DANIEL. The telegram reads as follows:

Press reports you are to filibuster OPA. All citizens who believe in our form of government are with you. We, the thinking citizens, are hoping for enough Republicans in the next Congress to help you restore this Government to the people.

Mr. President, that telegram shows how desperate the people in a Democratic State have become. They hope that the next Congress will have in it enough Republicans to help restore the Government to the people. I am not speaking for the Republicans, because I know that there are Republicans who are New Dealers just as there are Democrats who are New Dealers. I am opposed to the New Dealers, and I am for the American citizens, regardless of what party affiliation.

I read the following telegrams:

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Your statement in regards to OPA in this morning's Fort Worth Star-Telegram I consider the smartest thing that I have heard in regards to it and am sure that the people in the cattle business are all for you.

Your friend,

J. A. TADLOCK, Jr.

NEWTON, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator From Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Keep up filibuster. Kill OPA.

HAYWARD ROLFE.

Mr. President, the reason that so many of the people in Texas are in favor of abolishing the OPA is that they have no faith in its management. The OPA has never done anything that it has promised to do, unless it was purely accidental. The people cannot trust the OPA to administer correctly any kind of law. Any price-control law which the Congress might write—it would make no difference what the law happened to be—would be administered by the OPA in the way it wanted to administer it, regardless of what the law required.

I have heard some talk to the effect that the President will veto the OPA bill. I do not know what the President will do when the OPA bill comes to his desk. That is his business. However, I believe that the administrators of the OPA will want him to veto the pending bill regardless of what it contains.

The officials of OPA do not even read what is in the bill, but they have smart attorneys who are figuring out how they can beat the intent of the law. That is what those attorneys are there for. So the only way we can possibly restore Americanism to America and bring back private industry is to abolish OPA, get it out of the way, eliminate it, do away with it entirely.

We had 150 years of prosperity and progress in the United States without an OPA, and I would be willing to assume the entire responsibility of thrusting Americanism back onto the American citizen. I fear no dire consequences at all. I think every American citizen can stand the shock.

Now I read a telegram from Ada, Okla.:

ADA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

My congratulations to you for your stand on the OPA extension. It is gratifying to know that there is one tall oak among the quaking aspens of the Potomac. The respect which the people of this country at one time felt for the Congress of the United States is receding day by day. I never thought I would live to see the time when Congress would reverse itself in the shameless fashion that it has by reason of pressure of organized minorities. I sincerely hope you can hold out until OPA becomes a memory.

W. A. DELANEY, Jr.

He left out the word "sad" before "memory."

Here is a telegram from Miriam Watkins, of Little Rock, Ark.:

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Supporting you in your filibuster against OPA. Let's return to American way of living.

MIRIAM WATKINS.

American citizens would like to get back to the American way of living. They are willing to give it another trial.

Now let me read a few more of these telegrams:

LULING, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Kill the OPA some way. Give the United States back to the people.

J. N. BRIGANCE.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your stand is courageous. OPA retarding reconversion. Backing your filibuster against OPA.

JOHN N. WATKINS.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are in despair over continuance of meat controls. Our production at lowest

point. No chance of betterment while controls remain. This situation is a boon to black-market operators. Please use every effort to eliminate meat controls.

W. ROEGELEIN,
President, Roeglein Provision Co.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
All befuddled small-business people are supporting your filibuster against OPA.

BLANCHE SMALLWOOD.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Apparently true patriotism is not completely dead in our beloved country; so get that floor at all cost as the hopes of America now rest in your avowed purpose to return to the people our cherished heritage of freedom.

GEORGE B. WOOD.

MARSHALL, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I see in Dallas Morning News you will speak against continuing OPA "as is" bill after veto. You stay in there and talk until Monday noon. I am sure the oil, meat, and bread producers of Texas, with thousands of other citizens, endorse your position. Talk until OPA is dead.

I. C. UNDERWOOD,
Attorney and Stock Raiser.

PINE BLUFF, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for effort to kill damnable OPA. Hope you succeed. It is making nation of liars, creating hate, and creating disrespect for law.

P. D. GATHRIGHT.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster the OPA. Kill it if you can. We all are for you.

Middleton Grocery, Earl Middleton, T. E. Middleton, Fay Martin, T. M. Humphfus, Hubert Extrum, William C. Ferguson, Minnie Alexander, Paul R. Coffee, and Philip Jamail.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
God speed you in filibuster against OPA and return to American way of doing business.

AMIE MIVELAZ.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C:
We heartily endorse position you are taking against OPA. Black market taking over meat industries this section. Hope your filibuster will be successful.

NEUHOFF BROTHERS.

PARKERSBURG, W. VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington D. C.:
Texas is behind you. Back up Senator WHERRY. Hold the floor for the next 84 hours. Remove OPA and all price control, which is pillage and defeat the communistic destroyers of civilization who want dictatorship, statism, and nazism under another name.

R. S. DAVIS.

LINCOLN, ILL., *June 27, 1496.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We as an organization are back of you 100 percent in the fight against the OPA.

LINCOLN RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your stand on the OPA as reported morning papers demands respect and admiration of great majority of the people in Middle West who hope you may be able to talk OPA to death and return our country to the American standards necessary for return of production and solid prosperity. Meat scarce here and even toilet paper is unattainable can anything be more absurd.

W. EDWIN STANLEY.

BENTON HARBOR, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Nearly every farmer in Michigan is against OPA. Building trades and all builders oppose it. The general public has largely turned against it. Here's good luck to you.

STANLEY NOWLEN.

WHEATON, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Du Page County Women's Committee for Free Private Enterprise are applauding your efforts to filibuster out OPA. Stick to it.

HELEN MCCALLUM,
Chairman.

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
Let me have it—people are hungry.

GEORGE HARVESON.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. One more year of control will give us either Russia's government or India's condition.

W. H. ELAM.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Care Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The National Association of Retail Meat Dealers congratulates you on your intelligent and democratic American stand in your fight against OPA controls. We suggest you bring forward to entire Senate body the irrefutable evidence of the fallacy and folly of attempted price control which was presented before the various legislative committees. We are urging other Senators to support you.

GEORGE R. DRESSLER,
Secretary of the National Association of Retail Meat Dealers, Inc.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand. Agree with you on getting back to American way of living.

RICE & LOCKWOOD LUMBER CO.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your reported stand on OPA. It is encouraging to know we have at least one man with nerve enough to express himself and lead the fight for American business ideals. More power to you.

F. L. HOWLETT.

HENDERSON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations to you on your stand opposing extension of OPA. Prevent its passage if possible.

W. Butler, Crimcrest Grocery; M. M. Carter, City Market; E. Pool, S. Marshall Market; C. Stone, East Street Grocery; J. S. Dodson, Ideal Grocery and Market; V. Wade, W & B Grocery; F. Dorough, Deluxe Grocery and Market.

Mr. President, Senators are hearing the voice of the people, spontaneously, coming into their Nation's Capital in the form of telegrams which I am reading for their benefit because I know they want to feel the pulse of the American people on the important bill which is now before this body for consideration.

Most of these telegrams come from downtrodden people who cannot support a lobby in Washington, who cannot afford to buy railway transportation to come to Washington and talk to their representatives. There are many organizations that have representatives who either live in Washington or come here to try to look after the interests of particular lines of industry or particular organizations, but out across the vast acres throughout the States of the Union there are millions of American citizens who place their confidence in the men whom they elected to the United States Senate. They want those men to know their feelings toward the OPA bill; so they have sent me these telegrams, and I am proud to stand on the floor of the Senate and read them. Although they may be obnoxious and monotonous to the ears of some, they should be sweet music to the ears of Senators who may be interested in knowing that their constituents have taken the time and spent money to send these messages. There would be millions of telegrams coming in if many of the people had money enough to pay for telegrams. It means much to some to go to the Western Union and pay cash to send a telegram to the Nation's Capital.

Here is one from Ernst Hammerschmidt, of Lombard, Ill.:

LOMBARD, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I would sure like to wake up Monday, July 1, without OPA.

ERNST HAMMERSCHMIDT.

It would be almost like waking up in heaven, or next to it. Of course, there is nothing as good as waking up in heaven and making sure one has lived in such a way as to get there, but think of waking up in America, after you have known America all your life, going down to the grocery store, and walking in, not having to stick your head in the back

door, not having to have someone call up the merchant on the telephone and tell him you are coming, but walking into the grocery store like an American and having the grocer with a smile on his face meet you, and letting you take your choice of all the cuts of meat, walk up and pick up some toilet articles, some Lux, and perhaps have several choices. Would it not be grand to get back to that condition again? That is the America we used to know, and that is the America we will have again when we get rid of the bureaucrats in Washington who are trying to do the thinking for 130,000,000 American citizens. The bureaucrats simply do not have the ability to do the thinking for all the people. There cannot be found men with brains enough and wisdom enough to administer a bill which will fix satisfactorily to 130,000,000 the prices of the things they buy and sell. If everyone in OPA had the wisdom of Solomon it could not be done. It is an impossibility.

We have had many administrators in OPA. In my initial speech against the bill on January 8, 1942, I said on the floor of the Senate that we would have possibly many administrators of OPA, that they would come and they would go, but that I never intended to take issue with any of those administrators individually. What I take issue with is the system, the process. No man was ever born with sufficient wisdom properly to administer OPA. No man is wise enough to set the prices for American citizens under this new system, after Americans have lived under the system of free enterprise. We picked one administrator out of this very body, a body chosen from among the citizenship of the Nation for its integrity, wisdom, and intelligence. We picked a man out of this body, Prentiss Brown, who stood on the floor of the Senate and, I believe, conscientiously advocated the passage of the OPA bill. He thought it was a good thing. But even Prentiss Brown, with all his wisdom, could not administer OPA. He had a qualification which completely disqualified him from administering OPA. He had honor; he had character. No man with any honor, no man with any character would long attempt to administer such an obnoxious, such a communistic measure as the OPA law, and Prentiss Brown got out and saved his honor.

Mr. President, no man in the Senate, picked out of this great body of men chosen by the people, men in whom the people have confidence for their wisdom and integrity, can possibly administer OPA. If a Senator left this body and went to OPA and attempted to administer that office he would be ruined, because it is impossible to administer it. There must be prices which will fluctuate in accordance with supply and demand. We have the greatest system for fixing of proper prices. The housewives themselves do that. It is the greatest instrument ever devised. An American housewife goes to the stores to buy what she needs. There is one store here and another store there and numerous other stores, every one of them stocked with all kinds of merchandise. The buyer can discriminate. If the price is too high in one store, the buyer will go to the next store. If the price is too high in all the stores, the housewife will buy a substitute. The stores are all out of substitutes now.

We used to have a substitute for oleomargarine. Butter used to be a substitute for oleomargarine. Now there is no quarrel on the Senate floor about whether oleomargarine or butter is best. Neither one can be obtained.

OPA, by setting prices on established brands and articles offered for sale, has encouraged, in fact, it has compelled, the manufacturers to lower the quality of their merchandise. They are prevented from raising the price, so if they are to continue to stay in business they are obliged to lower the quality of their merchandise. Go to any store and try to buy something, and you will find an inferior grade to that which you want to buy. If something is supposed to be made of wood you will find it is made of paper. If there is anything that can be made more cheaply than out of paper it will be made of some other substance. That must be done in order for manufacturers to stay in business. They, on their part, pay higher prices for inferior products.

There is no way to restore the American system except to let prices seek their level. If prices go up, it will encourage production, production will increase, and more manufacturing will be done. More planting will be done. There will be more food and more manufactured products. After a while there will be so great a supply that producers will begin to compete with each other and there will be a buyer's market. The buyer can then set the price.

Then, Mr. President, there will be another great emergency, and then, if the New Dealers are still in power—and God grant that they will not be in power—they will try to do something to raise prices. That is what they did at the beginning of the emergency. They started out with the blue eagle, NRA—the old blue eagle. They were going to raise prices and get everyone organized under the blue eagle. That was tried for a while. But, thank God, we had an honest Supreme Court. That Supreme Court threw the old blue eagle out the window and into the trash can. But the New Dealers never give up. They went out into the alley, reached down into the trash can, and picked the old, bedraggled bird out of the can, the bird with its feathers drooping. They got some red paint from Russia and painted the feathers of the old blue eagle and set it up on the pedestal and they said, "Here is the old bird, but we call it OPA instead of NRA." But, Mr. President, it is exactly the same thing. So I say, let us get rid of OPA. Let us abolish it. Let us put it out of business.

Mr. President, I cannot understand the thinking processes of a man who believes this country could not withstand the shock of returning from communism to Americanism. I cannot understand the thinking of a man who believes America cannot withstand the shock of waking up on Monday morning with the citizens free to pay what they want to for any article they want to buy or free to sell for any price they can get. I cannot understand the mental processes of the man who thinks that then America would go to the bowwows. Mr. President, I should like to see America return to that condition. America has been put to greater tests than that during her existence, and has always come through with flying colors. I believe America will come through successfully again.

Mr. President, prices have always fluctuated from the dawn of history. Prices cannot be kept static or in one place for long, even though all the power and the resources of a great nation were used to maintain them. It simply cannot be done. Effort along that line has been made throughout the ages, but it never has been done completely or successfully.

I read a telegram from Ernst Hammerschmidt, of Lombard, Ill., as follows:

I would surely like to wake up Monday, July 1, without OPA.

I have already read that telegram, Mr. President. That is the one which started me off on my discussion.

Here is one from Minneapolis, Minn.:

Please filibuster.

B. B. Duekme. G. G. Erickson. E. M. Carpenter. Karl Duemke. Florence Duemke.

Mr. President, I am not going to filibuster. I am not filibustering now. I am simply reading these telegrams from people who tell us whether they want OPA continued or not. I think their voices ought to be heard in the Senate, where we are going to decide this matter before we recess.

Here is a telegram from San Antonio, Tex.:

Texas is with you, Big Boy. Stay with 'em.
DAN KENNARD.

That is just Texas language. It is easy to understand what they say down there.

Here is a telegram from Houston, Tex.:

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:

We urgently request you do everything in your power to reinstate in the OPA extension bill the Wherry amendment which would give to wholesalers and distributors their peacetime mark-ups. The committee bill ignores completely the legitimate wholesaler and distributor and if passed in its present form will do nothing more than compel a vital part of our distribution system to go out of business. You are doing a fine job. More power to you.

GEORGE A. DASCOMB, Jr.,
President,
THE VAUGHAN LUMBER CO., INC.

Those poor old lumber dealers are still trying to hang on. There are very few two-by-fours obtainable, or one-by-fours, or two-by-sixes. If they can be made 1⅞ inches instead of 2 inches in thickness and thereby not exactly fit into the OPA regulations, OPA will crack down on them. But I say that OPA cannot outsmart the American people forever. The American people are too ingenious. The American people are going to find some way to keep going, even if they have to abolish OPA. We may not do so this time—I hope we will—but OPA will be abolished sometime.

Here is a telegram from San Antonio, Tex.:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:

I am thoroughly in sympathy with your plan to filibuster on OPA bill. Believe that is our best chance to get from under governmental regimentation. Good luck in your effort.

FRANK L. LAWSHE.

Here is one from Elmhurst, Ill.:

More power to you in filibuster against OPA. Keep it up. Keep it up.

PERRY P. BURR.

Another telegram from Glendale, Calif.:

I hope we wake next Monday morning and find we are in America and that OPA has been a horrible dream.

CHARLES W. BOYLE.

I hope he is right. If I get enough support so that we may succeed in doing just that.

Here is a telegram from Rotan, Tex., out there on the Texas plains:

Keep fighting the OPA. We are with you 100 percent.

PAY AND TAKE STORE,
CHARLES B. KELLY.

A telegram from Bayside, N. Y., S. R. Turinto:

Congratulations on your stand on OPA. Sincerely hope you are able to force them to give America back to the Americans.

Not to the Indians.

I read the following telegrams:

TEXARKANA, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations upon your threat to filibuster on OPA. I truly hope that you can filibuster OPA out of existence forever and thereby hasten the return of this country to decent ways of doing business.

DAVID NELSON.

ROSEVILLE, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Honorable Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Have restaurant trying to feed 3,000 bus passengers each day. Under OPA rule have no meat, bread, flour, butterfats, and short supply milk. Suggest you discontinue OPA and the other racketeers for awhile and see if businessmen can do the job.

I. O. GIFFORD.
BAXTER, CALIF.

The writer of this telegram lives away off in Roseville, Calif., trying to operate a restaurant to feed 3,000 bus passengers, and he is out of everything they want to eat.

I read further from the telegrams which I have received:

BEAUMONT, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Hope filibuster succeeds and we be freed of socialistic controls.

JOHN O. BANKS.

MINEOLA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your proposal to take the floor and all good wishes for your successful filibuster. If you can bury this dead duck on June 30 you will have rendered your country a great service by relieving it of the stench of black markets, illegal trading and the disgrace of a law that is obviously unenforceable.

T. W. BENHAM.

LONGVIEW, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations, "Pappy," we are for you 100 percent. Get on floor now and stay there until Monday.

Longview Used Car Dealers Association; R. L. Fuston & Son; Hubert Kennedy; Bonner, Aycock & Barrow; J. M. Bolls; Dowdy & Seaton; Sam Merritt; N. L. Smith; Bell & Price; Lee Vowell; Wells & Owens.

ROTAN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up your fight against the OPA. We are backing you 100 percent.

ALVIN M. CLARK.

Almost everyone in Texas is backing me 100 percent—all except the New Dealers down there on the Government pay roll.

Here is a telegram from Dallas, Tex.:

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

I wish to congratulate you on your stand against OPA. I admired your position ever since the day I met you in Jesse McKee's office in Fort Worth when you decided to run for Governor the first time.

A. A. LANDER.

Those were happy days. I did not know what was ahead of us then. I had been engaged in private business up until that time. All my life I have been making an honest living. Now look at me. [Laughter.]

Here is a telegram from Rio Grande City, Tex.:

RIO GRANDE CITY, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:

Morning papers give us good news. Fight them to the last ditch. Why fight dictators all around world for 4 years then turn the life, limb, and livelihood of 140,000,000 people over to political fakers for another year.

IRA O'MEARA.

I cannot answer that question. I am not willing to do it. They have had it long enough.

Here is another telegram from Texas:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Believe your constituents overwhelmingly support your filibuster and respect and admire your courage. Suggest your opponents spend a 100-hour week each year doing farm drudgery to see how arduous and hazardous it is to produce food for a currency-rich nation.

B. F. PITMAN, Jr.

That must come from some poor old fellow who has been trying to make a living by beating it out of the ground—farming. My sympathies are with him. I think I have done everything there is to do on a farm, but I never did find any job that was easy. It is all hard, from daylight until dark. Now we have an organization which, because there are more consumers than producers in this country, wants to force that poor old farmer to get up before daylight and milk the cows, bring in the milk, have mama churn it and let the children take it downtown on their way to school and sell it for less than it costs to produce it to someone who has plenty of money and is making an easy living. Is not that ridiculous? Is it not silly? Is it not absurd that the Congress of the United States should ever think that it is its duty to establish the price which a man can get for a pound of butter? If a man has a pound of butter he certainly should have the opportunity to get all he possibly can for it. I do not believe there are very many people in the United States who would pay more than they wanted to pay for a pound of butter, or more than they could afford to pay. If they want to pay $1.50 a pound for butter, and if the farmer wants to sell it for $1.50, why should we take sides? They are both American citizens, and Senators are certainly pledged to be impartial.

We have got ourselves into the terrible mess of taking sides on this question. It is easy to understand how it happened. We became involved in war. The President said, "We must do something to stop inflation." When we are in war there is only one man who is the manager of the war, and that is the Commander in Chief. We cannot all get up and say how we think the war should be conducted when we are in it and the fate of the whole Nation is at stake. We should do willingly what the Commander in Chief wants us to do. The Commander in Chief thought we ought to have a price control bill. I think he was wrong, but it does not make any difference what I think. He is the Commander in Chief and I will support any Commander in Chief of this Nation in connection with anything he asks for in time of war, whether I think he is right or wrong. It is his business. We won the war on that principle.

The war is over. Everyone in the United States, except the administration, knows that it is over. Congress has not yet declared it over. But the war is over. We have quit fighting. Our enemies have all been whipped, and have surrendered unconditionally, as we demanded. Technically the war has not been declared over; and in my opinion the reason it has not been declared over is that the New Deal administration wants to hang on to the war powers so that it can regiment the citizens of this Nation as it did during the war. That is the only reason. Does the administration think we are going to get into another war? Let us get out of this one first. If we need to get into another, we will get into it. It is not necessary to make it continuous. We do not have to be continuously at war. We ought to have a little breathing spell between wars. I hope to God we never get into another one.

The way we are going, we are doing everything under the sun to make every other nation in the world angry at us. The way we are conducting our affairs, I do not see how other nations can respect us. We are handling our foreign affairs just as we are handling our domestic affairs, and making a mess of

the whole thing. We do not even know how to operate the American Government. We have the wrong people in power. Throughout the United States there are hundreds of thousands who could do a better job conducting the affairs of the country than those who are in charge in Washington. I have in mind some of the people operating grocery stores at the crossroads, some of the bankers, housewives, school teachers, and lawyers. We need in government Americans who have not been contaminated, who have not been in Washington so long that they forget that there is a country back in the States.

The way we are conducting our affairs is a disgrace. If there is any way under the shining sun to make an enemy, it is by lending money. Anyone who does not know that has never tried it. That is the best way to make an enemy. We once held a tea party in Boston because there were some sturdy Americans who would not submit to taxation without representation. So they threw the tea into Boston Harbor, and the British did not like it. We got into a war and whipped them. Ever since that time they have been adding up all the taxes we have been collecting, and after kidding us into believing that they were in terrible shape when they were in better financial condition than we were, with one fell swoop they persuaded us to give them all the American taxes which our American people have paid into the States, counties, and cities ever since the Boston Tea Party. We have just been gathering it up and saving it for them, and we are giving it to them in one big pile. Some day that will make them angrier than did the Boston Tea Party.

What we need in the administration of this Government is someone who has good common sense, someone who has had some experience, someone who did not make a failure of everything he ever undertook, and then embraced politics because he could not do anything else successfully.

Our situation is boiled down and represented by this iniquitous OPA bill. I cannot conceive of any group of school children below the sixth grade who could get together and write anything more ridiculous than this OPA bill. It simply has not a bit of sense to it. We have it hooked on to us. I am trying to get rid of it.

How are we going to get rid of these people in our Government? They are entrenched. They have the taxpayers' money, and they are spending it to broadcast propaganda which is not true, statistics which are not facts, and statements which are false, to try to deceive the American people into believing that we must have OPA or starve to death. We are starving to death fast enough with the OPA. It will never get any better. It will get worse. It has been getting worse ever since it was created, and it will continue to get worse. That is not because we have had bad administrators. I am not going to attack Chester Bowles. I believe that the employees of OPA are doing exactly what they were hired to do. I believe that OPA was set up by the New Deal administration with one objective, and that was to overthrow the American form of government. If that was their objective, they have certainly done a fine job. If that was not their objective, they have done a fine job, anyway, in their efforts to overthrow our American form of government.

The OPA is not the only bureau in the New Deal dynasty which has been doing its level best to overthrow our American form of government and to slide the free citizens of the United States into slavery and bondage for the rest of their lives.

Everyone who has ever had any business experience knows that there are two perfect ways to destroy an individual, a business organization, a corporation, or a government financially. There are two infallible ways. If one can destroy the production or the productive capacity of an individual, a store, a corporation, or a government, he has gone a long way toward wiping it out.

The other way is to dissipate the cumulative savings and earnings, reduce the institution to poverty, and keep it from producing. When that is done, it simply cannot survive.

Those are two well-known fundamental methods of destroying a business or a government. Ever since the New Deal was born in 1933 it has been working day and night, using both those methods to destroy our American form of government. It has run us into debt to the extent of $275,000,000,000 or $300,000,000,000, equivalent to more than $10,000 for every family in America.

The OPA tried to make the American people believe that butter was not costing them so much, by taking money out of the Treasury to help pay the butter bill of those who were in better financial condition than their Government was. The subsidy payments are being added to the public debt. That is destroying the savings which our country has accumulated during its 150 years of progress. Not only are they destroying our accumulated savings, but they have stopped production. The OPA is not the only bureau of this Government that is working on the proposition of destroying production. Several government departments are doing that. They are in absolute cahoots with Sidney Hillman and all these labor-leader racketeers in calling strikes throughout the country to stop the production of everything under the sun.

Mr. President, let me say right here that these strikes are not called by the working people of America. They do not have a thing on earth to do with the strikes. There is no fight between capital and labor in this country. Both capital and labor are doing fine. They are not fighting each other; they get along. But it is the labor-leader racketeers who cause the trouble. Many of them are of foreign birth; they are communistic; and they are in cahoots and in comradeship with the high officials of this administration, working in cahoots to destroy the American form of government—to destroy it by stopping our production, to destroy it by dissipating our accumulated savings. They have done a swell job.

So when it comes to criticizing Chester Bowles or any other administrator, I am not going to do it. I think they have done a swell job for what they were hired to do. Chester Bowles was hired to destroy the American form of government. That is his job, and he will do it if left alone. The only people we can blame for it are the Members of the Congress of the United States. Chester Bowles did not pass this OPA law. The Congress of the United States passed the OPA law, and the Congress is not willing now to give it up. So do not blame Chester Bowles. I do not know where they could hire a man who would do a better destructive job than he has done. If he did not do that job, he would get fired. That is what he was hired to do. Of course, they are not going to admit that. They claim that he was hired to hold down the cost of living; but every day that the cost of this or that goes up, they say that if the Congress abolishes the OPA on June 30, prices will skyrocket, will go up and up and up.

Well, Mr. President, the damage has already been done. It does not make any difference whether prices go up on the 1st of July 1946 or on the 1st of July 1947. The damage has already been done. The OPA has already done its dirty work. It has stopped production, and there is scarcity. Sooner or later prices will find their level and will go up. There are many other influences working against production, and prices are bound to go up. It is like having a bull on a rope. If that bull wants to go on a rampage, if he is kept on the rope he will not be able to go on a rampage. But today or tomorrow or a year from now, if he is still alive, he will go on a rampage if he is let off the rope.

So, Mr. President, in the case of the OPA the damage has already been done. There is no use quibbling about whether the damage was done yesterday or will be done today or tomorrow. The American people will have to pay the fiddler. The damage has been done, and the American people will have to pay for it.

I have been reading telegrams which have come to me from many people who do not have enough money to come to Washington and complain. Even if they did come to Washington, if they tried to find out anything, they would be told, "Well, Mr. So-and-So is in conference." Every time you try to get hold of one of the bureaucrats down here, he is in conference or he is in Chicago, or else he is busy with somebody. One day I was told that one of these big bureaucrats was in conference; but they forgot to close the door, and I saw him sitting in his chair, with his feet up on the desk, and he was having a conference all by himself.

Mr. President, I now read another telegram which I have received:

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946*.
United States Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

I heartily approve your filibuster against OPA. You can serve your country in no better manner than to continue your fight against OPA and all other Government restrictions on business.

W. L. PICKENS.

Mr. President, that is just it. We are not going to save America just by abolishing the OPA. It is only one of the many branches or agencies of this Gov-

ernment that is working for the overthrow of the Government of the United States. They have them on every corner; they have their stooges at every crossroad in America. They are all over this country—farm organizations, cooperative organizations, loaning organizations. Not only are they all over the United States, but this Government has bureaus and departments and corporations and subsidiaries in every nation of the world that will let them in. Our Government has millions and billions of dollars to spend, and all of the money is appropriated by the Congress. The Government is spending it for anything it wants to spend it for, and I do not believe there is a soul in the United States who has any idea of the immensity and the expansion of this giant octopus of our American Government, which is trying to meddle in the affairs of every foreign nation, and at the same time is trying to go into business and put out of business everyone else in America. It is such a terrible thing and it has expanded so greatly that it has gotten entirely out of control. In addition, it has gotten beyond the knowledge and comprehension of anyone. We cannot find out anything about it. If the Government starts to build something, we cannot find out what it is going to be. The Government will send you from one department or one bureau to another. It is impossible to run down anything, to get the truth about it, to find out about it. Everything is covered up. Everything is under cover. They seek to deceive.

I think the time has come when the American people are going to demand a change. The Congress has appropriated billions and billions of dollars. Now we brag about some saving we are making in connection with some millions of dollars we have appropriated; but the fact is that because the war has ended the Government cannot spend that money. So there is no real saving there. We have gotten into the habit of appropriating money in such large sums that appropriations for millions and millions of dollars that are wholly unnecessary go through the Congress like a flash of lightning. If certain of the Government departments or bureaus were abolished and closed, the American people would never know it, unless the news was printed in the newspapers or was broadcast on the radio. Many of the Government bureaus and departments are failing to perform any service whatever for the American people. All they do is try to keep voting citizens on the pay roll. The war has been over a long time, but very few employees have been taken off the Federal pay roll. They do not want to take them off now, because election time is coming pretty soon. Everyone on the Federal pay roll is supposed to vote for the New Deal. They want to keep themselves in power.

Let me read another telegram which I have received.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator "PAPPY" O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Hall of Congress, Washington, D. C.:
Kill the OPA. Millions of Americans are afraid to speak against it due to blackmail and intimidation tactics used by them. The OPA have instituted mandamus proceedings against our senior Federal Judge Fee because he upheld Oregon laws not allowing unqualified OPA attorneys to practice in our courts. Plus adverse rulings. OPA refuses to accept affidavits as evidence, or dated city permits issued after freeze date as a fact. Even after renter admits nonresidence until 3 months after the freeze date. I am forced, under above tactics, to rent properties at prices as much as 55 percent under those prevailing on freeze date. Early this month they cut rents below freeze date prices on 5 more places. All I did was tell them they ran their office like a 10-year-old kid. May God give you strength to win.

MARVIN HEDGE.

Well, Mr. President, there you are. The man who sent that telegram no doubt is unable to come to Washington to protest. He is way out in Portland, Oreg. He cannot come here to tell how he is being oppressed by the OPA gumshoe investigators, snoopers, and stooges who are told to go out and arrest American citizens. They have to bring in complaints. I am told that in Texas the OPA stooges are hired on a commission basis, and if they do not bring in arrests they do not get paid, but get fired. Yet the Congress wishes to continue the OPA for another year. How can we expect anything better if the same people are continued in authority? There will be no difference. Chester Bowles says he will resign if the conference report is adopted. Well, Mr. President, if he does resign he will be placed in some other position in the Federal Government, because he has pleased the New Dealers. They like him and they will protect him. If he resigns from his present job we shall wake up the next morning to find him in another bureau. They take care of their own. He is a valuable man for them. They are not going to let him go. They are going to have great difficulty in finding anyone else who will do their dirty job for them, administering the OPA as well as Chester Bowles has done it. But if he resigns someone else will take his place and the OPA will continue to operate if the pending conference report is agreed to.

Mr. President, here is a telegram from Greenville, Tex. It reads:

GREENVILLE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We believe and hope you can kill the OPA bill.

MILLERS FEED MILL, *Commerce, Tex.*
BAGWELL FEED MILL, *Greenville, Tex.*

I believe that is the section of the country in which the OPA board of three counties resigned the other day. The OPA became so rotten that the board resigned.

Here is a telegram from Hazel K. Gregg, of Chicago, Ill. It reads:

The Lord give you strength. You are our only hope.

Mr. President, I surely appreciate anybody who believes in the Lord. He has given me strength to stand up under some pretty heavy loads. As I said a while ago, if I am on the Lord's side I am on the side of the majority.

Here are some more telegrams:

DAVENPORT, IOWA, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA and fear. Put Federal bureaucrats to work. America is equal to freedom.

R. H. HORNBACK.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Sincerely hope your efforts will eliminate OPA entirely.

A. W. BECKER.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God for a real American in the United States Senate. Keep up the fight and don't give up the filibuster until the dishonest and deceitful Communist OPA expires and dies an ignominious death.

STURTEVANT HINMAN.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your efforts to eliminate or revise OPA.

E. LEE MERRILL.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Black markets and confusion will prevail so long as OPA exists. Best wishes for your success in fighting.

F. R. WINGERTER.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are with you all the way to end OPA.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES MCGUIRE.

GALLATIN, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster proceedings—100 percent for you.

CRUTCHERS MEAT MARKET.

They probably do not have a pork chop in the place.

I continue reading from the telegrams:

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand on OPA. We are behind you in your fight.

JAMES O. CARMICHAEL.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your OPA stand. It is gratifying to know that at least one of our representatives is not afraid to be a true American.

DOUGLAS B. MARSHALL.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Am with you 100 percent in your fight against bureaucratic regimentation. Hope you get the floor and that your voice keeps in good shape.

HARRY MEADOR.

WACO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
If you could in any way eliminate the OPA and turn America back to the people, you could be the world's most popular man in 90 days and be elected President of the United States. Regards.
E. L. TORRENCE.

BUTLER, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WILEY O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Another year of OPA and other unwarranted Government interference will ruin our Nation. We fought this war for freedom and democracy. We would like to have it back again. Keep fighting OPA. We are for you.
ARNOLD ELEVATOR MILLS.

MISSION, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Bread lines or breadlines, whether 1932 or 1946. May I urge you oppose with all your strength or line them up and make them beg Bowles.
C. F. SPIKES.

BEAUMONT, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The OPA is ruining my business. Stop it if you can.
MERACLE MOTORS,
HERSHEL MERACLE.

Mr. President, the sender of the last telegram which I read is not the only person whose business has been ruined. I have statistics issued by the Department of Commerce of the United States which show that during World War II more than 2,000,000 American businesses discontinued operations, or changed hands. Before the New Dealers got into control, if a business was unable to continue because of financial difficulties and it had to be turned over to the creditors, the process was called bankruptcy. Since then a new name has been found for it. More than a million American citizens have been classified as having discontinued their businesses during the period 1941 to 1945. More than another million tried to have their honor—possibly not all of them were in that category—and the disgrace of going broke. When they saw that bankrupcy was the inevitable outcome, instead of going broke some New Dealer was allowed to come along and take the business off the person's hands. The New Dealers can get along pretty well with the OPA. But if a person is opposed to the OPA he had better look out and get rid of his business, because the OPA will get him sooner or later.

Some time ago I received a letter from a man in Missouri. The letter started with a statement somewhat as follows:

I am a coward because I am afraid to sign this letter. I own and control 43—

I believe he said—

separate business enterprises which I have built up through my own thrift.

The man said further:

If the New Deal knew that I was writing this letter to you they would handicap me and put me out of business. They would send their income-tax inspectors around who would figure out inaccuracies and discrepancies in my income tax returns, whether such inaccuracies and discrepancies were present or not. If the New Dealers want to punish you, that is the method they can use. Or, if they do not wish to follow that course, they may make it impossible for me to obtain raw materials. They will not allow me to set my prices high enough to receive back the cost of production.

They have dozens of ways by which they can punish a man in business unless he gets down and washes their feet or kisses their feet, or does something else which the New Dealers may ask him to do.

Mr. President, that man admitted that he was a coward. But he is not the only one who has made similar admissions. The people of this Nation have been whipped. A great many of them believe that their Government has gone, that their freedom has been taken away from them, and that they must receive orders from bureaucrats in Washington. They can see no light of day, and they have become discouraged. It is possible to whip most any person into submission if you pound, pound, and pound away at him.

I remember when the New Deal first started in my State to give money to the farmers. Most of the farmers there were honest American citizens. They did not wish to accept money out of the United States Treasury in order to build fences and fish ponds upon their farms. Some of them held out to the bitter end. They said, "We will not accept the money which the New Deal is trying to force upon us for the building of fences. We built fences before the New Deal was heard of, and we will continue to build them. We do not want any lakes to be constructed on our ranches. We want to use the space for the growing of grass."

However, Mr. President, the New Dealers sent their stooges into the county seats of the towns of Texas. Those stooges were charity workers and goody-goody people. They would call around them the people from Main Street and say, "Do you know what this rancher is doing? He will not accept any money. He will not give you any work. We have thousands of dollars at our disposal for the purpose of enabling you people to go to work, but this man will not take any of it."

Mr. President, those persons created so much pressure that they forced the good people of Texas to accept the money.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I cannot yield. I am sorry. I got into a great deal of trouble in trying to be generous on a previous occasion and yield to some of the other Members of the Senate. I do not know of any Senator to whom I would rather yield than the Senator from New Hampshire. I know that he is a good American citizen and wants to do everything possible to restore our American form of government. He probably wishes to put something into the RECORD which will be beneficial in connection with the matter we are now discussing. I wish I could yield to him. However, I endeavored to yield a while ago. Before I obtained the floor I noted that various Members of the Senate asked the Senator who happened to be talking to yield without losing the floor. However, for some reason or other the same courtesy is not extended to me. If I should become big-hearted and yield to the Senator from New Hampshire or to some other Senator, another Member of the Senate would jump up and say, "Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator from Texas has violated some rule." Then Senators would proceed to prove that I actually had violated the rule. I am glad that I did violate it. I was trying to expedite the operation of the Senate machinery. It was desired that the Senate take up and agree to a conference report. I am glad that I yielded for that purpose. My good friend, the Senator from Kentucky, our majority leader, was sorry for what had taken place. It happened while he was out of the Chamber. He came back to the Chamber. I do not know whether he tried to apologize or not, but at least he tried to prevent me from losing the floor, and he told me that he would help me. He did. Afterward the Senator who had made the objection withdrew it, and we were right back to where we started. Therefore, Mr. President, I am afraid to yield. I will yield to the Senator from New Hampshire next Monday. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, here is a telegram from Wichita Falls, Tex. It reads as follows:

WICHITA FALLS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are backing you 100 percent.
Henry Hamilton, McClure Bros., Joe Blackshear Nicholson, Jones Motor Co., W. A. Lofton Used Cars, Jones-Steed Motor Co., Willingham Motor Co., North Texas Motor Co., Cliff's Fine Cars, McFadin's Fine Cars, Monaghan-Jones Motor Co., Joe Pistocco, Ray Puckett, Traynham Motor Co., Barrow-Grace Buick Motor Co., Andree & Allard Farris Used Cars, Hanes Used Cars, Weaver Motor Co., Rogers Motor Co.

Some of those motor boys in Wichita Falls say they are with me 100 percent. I know what that means down in Texas. I went along conducting a nice business in Texas, and people got up petitions carrying 54,499 names urging me to run for Governor. Most of them were my customers. When a man gets 54,499 of his customers asking him to do something, he had better do it. So I did, and now look where it brought me. It brought me here, trying to save the country, and I hope I will get some support.

Suppose every Senator who is in favor of abolishing OPA should rise on this floor and say, "Senator O'DANIEL, I am with you. I am going to talk about this OPA. I don't know how long it will take me, but I have received an inspiration from your reading of those telegrams. I have something I want to say about OPA." It would be almost unanimous, and before they got through saying what they wanted to say, the sun would come up next Monday morning and America would again be free.

Think of that, all of you folks who have been listening to OPA and the advocates of OPA, who made you believe the sun would never rise again if OPA were abolished. You would get up before sunrise, and you would say, "I wonder if it is going to come up." You would look toward the east, perhaps you would look toward the west, you would look every way, and say, "When is the sun coming up again? OPA said it would not come up." After a while old Sol would come over the eastern horizon, where he always comes up. Old Sol will come up whether we have OPA or do not. Thank God, the New Dealers cannot do anything about that.

Here is a telegram from Fort Worth, Tex.:

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Stay in there and pitch. Sending you box throat lozenges by air mail.

GAYLORD J. STONE.

Those folks think about me in Texas. I appreciate that from old Gay, and I bet the lozenges are already on the way by air mail. I hope I may still be talking when they arrive.

Here is a telegram from Buckeye, Ariz.:

BUCKEYE, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

You are on the right track—stay in there and pitch.

A. E. ROOKS.

There are fine citizens in Arizona, as there are everywhere else in this country. They think that at last they have found a friend here in Washington. I am trying to be their friend, and I am trying to save America for them. It will not mean so much to me. I have just about run my race, I am getting to be an old man, but I have some children and I have some grandchildren, and they are going to have a terrible time getting along in America. I think America is the greatest nation on earth. It is just fine if we operate under the Constitution which our wise forefathers wrote for us. But that Constitution is not automatic. The Constitution does not work by itself. There must be people who believe in it and who will stick by it. So I should like to see the Government get back to the Constitution, not for the benefit of myself, but for the benefit of generations yet unborn.

What makes America great? Why is not America down in the gutter like some of the other nations? What makes it the leading nation on this earth? It is because American citizens have freedom to make their own decisions, and whenever there is an educated civilization like the one we have here in America, each man trying to do the right thing and the honest thing, looking after his own business, it is just impossible to help building a great empire. That is the way we built this great empire, and now some are trying to tear it all to pieces, trying to make it like Russia or some other foreign nation.

Mr. President, I believe in America. It is kind of dangerous for one to stand up and say "I believe in America." The Sunday night soft-soapers, the propaganda agents who get all the radio time to make prophesies about what is going to happen according to what the New Dealers tell them is going to happen, begin to smear you all over with some kind of lotion if you stand up for America. They try to smear me. We have better smear artists in Texas than there are here. They took me on down there for quite awhile. They smeared, and the more they smeared the more votes the people gave me. So this smearing does not worry me. What I am worrying about is the future of America, which is the very thing the people who are sending me these telegrams are worrying about.

Mr. President, I was not figuring on discussing OPA until later in the day. After our majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, said we were going to have a continuous session, I thought there would be plenty of time tonight, and I was going to do my talking tonight.

My colleague who sits here before me, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], was all cocked and primed to make a speech, and I know it will be a dandy. He made one a few days ago that was a dandy. His colleague the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] made one today that was a dandy. It lasted 3 hours. But the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] very obligingly agreed to let me take the floor for a few preliminary remarks, and read a few of the telegrams which have been coming in. I wanted to get them into the RECORD early. I wanted the people throughout the Nation to know how the telegrams have been pouring in to me all day.

There are many people who did not think I would receive any telegrams. They thought the people were whipped, they thought they were depressed, they did not think there was any hope left, they thought they would just take it lying down. But it is true there is some hope left, that the American people are alive, that they want to get rid of OPA, that they want to get their America back again. So I wanted to get these telegrams into the RECORD early today so that the news could go out through the news agencies, as it did last night. The press boys who sent out the notice about my going to try to abolish OPA did a fine job. It looks as if it penetrated every nook and corner of every State, and that is what gave these citizens their inspiration.

I dare say many of the people who sent these telegrams have not sent telegrams for a long time. It is an expensive business. But there are quite a number of them, and I intend to read them all, whether they are for or against OPA. I want to be fair. I read the eight that were for when I started. I have been reading those that are against ever since. I wanted to get that news out. It might be just a ray of hope to somebody else in the country, when he discovers that hundreds of people have been sending telegrams, because I believe most of the folks naturally want to get some help for me. They want to get me some help on the Senate floor, so I presume they telegraph their Senators.

Mr. President, it is from the people the Senators should get their instructions. I am not going to stand on the Senate floor and attempt to tell any Senator how he should vote on the pending question or any other question. It is the prerogative of each individual Senator to decide for himself. One of the things we have left in America is that Senators can vote any way they desire.

It seems to me some of the Senators here are in a way discouraged. They may think our American form of government is already gone. I am not going to quote what any of them told me; I am not going to divulge information they gave me in confidence or in any other way; but I think some Senators think the case is hopeless and that they might just as well go along. They think that OPA has already ruined the country. They know prices will go up somehow or other, whether we keep OPA or not, and the political aspect of the situation is that OPA has done all the damage, and if there is any Member of the Senate who looks at this thing from a political standpoint, he can see that if he steps in now to abolish OPA, and prices go up, he is going to get the blame for what OPA did, and Senators in that situation do not want to get that blame. They are scared, I think. Perhaps they are not, perhaps I picked the wrong word. I know the people back home are scared. Many of them are afraid to open their mouths. Some may get into trouble through my reading the names of the senders of telegrams. I hope not. They have not told me not to read their names. But I know that throughout the country the people are scared to death. They are afraid they are on the road to serfdom. They are scared like some of the people who have escaped from Russia and who have written books telling how happy they are that they chose freedom. They have gotten over here but they have found that we are building up the same thing that they left over there. They are a little ahead of us in Russia in this matter, but we have people in high position in America who are trying to copy everything that is going on in Russia.

I am not going to stand here and condemn Russia. The Russians have the right to have any kind of government they want. I hope they get a good form of Government. I do not want the kind of government they have, as I understand it, but I am not going to deny the Russian people the right to have what they want. I think they have a lot of new dealers who have foisted communism on the Russian people. But they also have good people there who would like to get out of the country. And there are many people in Washington who would like to get away from the bureaucrats who have taken the American form of government from us and set up in its stead communism, socialism, or some other form of government absolutely foreign to Americanism.

I have made the statement that I should like to see OPA abolished. That is no news. I have been against OPA ever since it was proposed. After the war was over I introduced a bill seeking to abolish OPA. It went to a committee. I suppose it is hidden under the rug

there. I cannot get any bill through one of these committees. The only way I can get anything done is to stand here on the floor and talk until OPA is abolished. That is another way of trying to get bills passed. I do not say that I am going to do that, because I do not know that I have the strength to do it. But with the telegrams coming to me and telegrams coming to other Senators, I hope enough of them will come to a sufficient number of other Senators to cause them not necessarily to join with me but to cause them, when I am through talking, to rise and start to speak and say exactly what they want to say.

I hope there will be enough of them so when they all get through saying all they want to say the sun will be coming up on Monday morning. That is what I should like to see happen. I have received no promises. I am willing to accept converts and volunteers. I should like to get some help. But so far I have not obtained the promise of help from a single Senator.

Some Senators, without making any promise to me, have made some good speeches today and saved me a great deal of breath. I just sat back here and listened to them. So long as the lieutenants were out in front winning the battle there was no use for me to get up and talk. I did just what Joe Louis did the other day. He waited until Conn had danced himself tired, and then he administered the fatal blow. I was hoping there would be enough Senators who would speak against OPA between now and Monday so I would have nothing to do except provide the idea. I am bold enough to do that; and I shall do a little talking too. I do not know how long it will last. I know there are other Senators who want to talk against OPA. I started to explain a while ago that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] wanted to make a speech, and was kind enough to yield to me, before I wanted to start my speech, simply for the purpose of reading telegrams. When I complete reading all the telegrams, the Senator from Oklahoma is going to make a speech, and then I imagine there will be speeches made by other Senators. I hope this turns itself into a good old-fashioned revival. I hope all Senators will get religion against OPA and that we will get to shouting around here and keep on shouting until we bring Americanism back to America.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I understand Mr. President, that I may yield for a question without losing the floor. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator from Texas agree that the price controls of meat and livestock, as a result of their enforcement, in themselves create black markets in beef, and are destroying the legitimate beef business of the country?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I really believe that OPA not only is destroying it but has already destroyed most of it, and what has not been destroyed will be destroyed if we give OPA a little longer lease on life.

Mr. President, the Senator brought up the subject of meat. I now hold in my hand meat orders issued by OPA. There are 113 general orders in this package, and 1,114 amendments. How in the world could anyone in the meat business attend to his business and read all this "dope"? Those in the meat business must read it and follow it or be put in jail. It has been said that the pen is mightier than the sword. The OPA pen wrote these orders. In writing these orders with the pen OPA shot the bull and liquidated the cows. [Laughter.] That is the reason we have no meat. That is the cause of the present situation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Has the Senator given any attention or thought to the disappearance from the market today of the very necessary products made from the byproducts of meat, a situation which has caused a serious situation in the Nation?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes. I have been informed of the disappearance of many things; not only of drugs, but leather for manufacturing shoes and leather goods, because those who operate in the black market must get rid of everything except the meat. The black-market operators take the cattle out under the trees, string them up to a limb of the tree and butcher them and place them in a car and take them off to sell. They have got to get rid of the evidence. They have got to get rid of the blood, the offal, of the hide and hair. They have got to get rid of all that because the OPA snoopers will come along and catch them, and they do not want to be caught.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. What is the difference, may I ask, between cattle being killed under the black-market conditions and cattle being killed in the regular federally inspected slaughtering plants? Would the Senator explain the difference so that the general public may understand?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Of course, the legitimate packing plants are operated on a very efficient basis. When the animal comes into a packing plant—and we have many fine packing plants in my State—everything is utilized. It is said that not even the squeal of the pig gets away; that it is bottled up. Everything connected with the animal has a useful purpose. The legitimate packers can market all the byproducts of the animal. But those byproducts are lost to the people of the Nation today on all the meat that goes through the black market.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for another question.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator speaks of various telegrams he has received. Is the Senator getting the same type of telegrams I am receiving from sufferers from diabetes who are tremendously alarmed over their inability to buy insulin, and therefore are facing death? Is the Senator getting word from people in his own State along those lines?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have received letters from people in my State along those very lines. They tell me of ailments that have shown up for which they are unable to get the desired and necessary medicine. In addition to that I have received telegrams and have been told by doctors in my State that there are many cases of malnutrition, many cases of people who, because of improper diet, are deteriorating every day.

While certain diseases may not show up quickly, yet they will eventually show up. That is inevitable, because the American people have been used to a certain standard of living, and a certain diet, and when they are unable to get it, the body deteriorates and becomes susceptible to disease and disorders. That is a great factor in public health at the present time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. What will happen to some three-quarters of a million people suffering from diabetes if the situation which now exists, of the inability to buy insulin, continues as it must continue if the black market in meat continues? There can be only one answer. Is that not true?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I presume that the logical answer would be that they would suffer the consequences of the disease unless our scientists come through with substitute remedies, or unless something else is discovered which has not yet been discovered which is beneficial to them, or unless some new method of making the medicine which is needed, is devised. But the black-market situation has already upset the whole economy of the Nation. The easiest way, the best way, the most practical way would be to return to the normal system of slaughter and distribution of the animal.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Has the Senator heard anyone highly connected with OPA express any concern for the people who are suffering from asthma or pernicious anemia, or diabetes, or heart trouble, or hay fever, or any of the other diseases which are kept under control or cured only by the drugs which come from the byproducts of meat?

Mr. O'DANIEL. In my contact with OPA officials I have found no sympathetic heart and no concern for the welfare of any American citizen.

I now resume the reading of telegrams:

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Heartily endorse your stand on OPA and honor you for it.

H. O. FANNING.

WHITE PLAINS, N. Y.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The elimination of OPA would be a proper and modern declaration of independence for our people. Freeing our people from the

clutch of Washington bureaucracy is a vital necessity for survival. You have the courage and integrity of George Washington.

M. I. JAYNE.

ASHEVILLE, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand. Filibuster us back to free men.

C. K. SILER.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association is very disappointed over the failure of the Senate to adopt the amendment releasing control on meat and livestock. We wish you to use every means within your power to prevent passage of bill extending OPA without the McFarland amendment lifting controls on our industry.

TEXAS & SOUTHWESTERN CATTLE RAISERS ASSOCIATION,
C. E. WEYMOUTH, *President.*

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your attempt to save America for Americans and hope your present tactics successful.

F. A. RODGERS.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Stay in there and pitch. We are for you all the way.

KNOX MILLER.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are behind you in your efforts to kill the OPA.

THE ENTIRE STAFF OF GENERAL SUPPLY CO.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I have never voted for you. Appreciate your courage in trying to destroy OPA. Every kind of business affected. Most business houses will have to close unless they get relief. Supply and demand will take care increases in prices if OPA gets out of the way.

G. H. JACKSON.

WHITEWRIGHT, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Stay in there and pitch and talk OPA to death. We are backing you 100 percent.

C. E. AYERS.

GREEN VALLEY, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand on the OPA. Glad somebody thinks of the livestock raiser.

WALTER MILHAHN.

EAST PEORIA.

I believe that many people are beginning to think about the livestock raiser when they go to the meat market and find it empty. But the livestock raiser cannot be blamed for this condition. He has the livestock, but OPA will not let him market it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question. That is all I can yield for without losing the floor.

Mr. MYERS. Everyone is thinking about the livestock raisers. And everyone is thinking about the next election. But I am wondering if anyone is thinking about the next generation?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes. That is what I am talking about. I was discussing that question a few moments ago.

Mr. MYERS. I am sorry I missed the discussion.

Mr. O'DANIEL. So far as I am concerned, my life is almost run. I am a grandfather. But I am thinking about my children and my grandchildren, the Senator's children and grandchildren, and everyone else's children and grandchildren. I am thinking about unborn generations.

Mr. MYERS. I cannot boast about my grandchildren. I am thinking of my children and not my grandchildren.

Mr. O'DANIEL. They will come along. That is another thing that OPA cannot stop. [Laughter.]

Mr. MYERS. It seems to me that many of us are thinking about the pressure groups in the next election, but I fear that few of us are thinking about the next generation. That was the only purpose of my question.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am very glad to have the Senator bring the subject up, because that is what I am talking about. Most of the telegrams I am reading are from individuals. They are not from pressure groups. They are from those who cannot afford to hire a pressure group.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to have the Senator from Pennsylvania, if he will, elaborate a little on what he means by pressure groups.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator from Pennsylvania cannot do any elaborating while I have the floor, or I will lose it.

Mr. MYERS. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I should be glad to do so, but the Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Texas, if I may do so without any danger of his losing the floor——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator cannot yield for a statement.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am yielding for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A question is all the Senator can yield for.

Mr. MOORE. I was about to ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that the Senator from Oklahoma was making a statement in reply to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. I am not talking about the Senator from Pennsylvania now.

I wonder if these telegrams are the result of the activities of pressure groups. I thought they came from individuals. I do not have a list of them.

Mr. O'DANIEL. As I started to say, most of these telegrams—I think practically all of them—come from individual citizens of the United States, many of whom cannot afford to buy a railroad ticket or an airplane ticket, or other transportation to come to Washington to see what is going on here and try to keep the OPA from being extended. They saw a little ray of hope when they read that I suggested that we might abolish OPA if enough Senators would talk until it died at midnight on June 30. They took heart. They were depressed and downhearted. Many of them had given up. But they saw a little ray of hope, and so these people sent telegrams. I am trying to do what I think is my duty to the persons who placed their confidence in me and sent me these telegrams. I am reading them here, because I think this is the place to read them, so that Senators may hear them.

Here is a telegram from Dallas, Tex.:

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We surely appreciate your good work. Command us if we can help.

PROPERTY OWNERS AND ASSOCIATES LEAGUE,
ELMER ADAMS,
Chairman, Executive Committee.

I appreciate that telegram, as well as all the others.

Here is a telegram from a housewife, Mrs. Robert Aiken. A housewife is not a pressure group. She is one of the great army of American citizens. During her lifetime she and other housewives have set the prices on consumer goods. They did a fine job of it. But now they have nothing to say about it. They have the OPA to do it for them. All they have to do is to get a chart and find out what butter is worth according to the OPA and then go down to the grocery store and find out that there is no butter. What satisfaction is there in that? Housewives can find out the price of beef or anything else, and then go to the store and say, "I will take some of that"; but there is none of it there. The OPA does not let it get there. One can buy anything he wishes at a good price if he can find it. But he cannot find it.

I used to have a competitor who used that trick. Some one would come into my place of business to buy something. I would quote him my price. Then he would go over to the other man's place of business and be told, "We do not have it, but the price is so and so," which would be lower than my price. Then the man would come back to me and say, "The other fellow's price is lower than yours." I would say, "Then go there and buy it." He would reply, "Well, he does not have it." OPA is using the same tactics to fool the American people.

What does this housewife say?

GENEVA, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We are depending on your program against OPA. Thanks.

Mrs. ROBERT AIKEN,
Housewife.

This telegram comes from Geneva, N. Y. It was so nice, I thought it came from Texas. There are good people in all the States. It seems that most of the bad ones got into the Federal Government; and the higher they went the worse they became. I should like to see this Government turned back to the people.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. The Senator states that the bad people are all in the Government. Does he attribute that condition to the fact that they have been here too long?

Mr. O'DANIEL. That has helped a great deal. The longer they stay here the worse they become. But, generally speaking, they came here when they could not make a living back home. Now they are here telling everyone else how to operate his business. No wonder the people say that the system will not work.

We have enacted a law which provides that the OPA must do this and that. The OPA officials do not care what is in the law. No matter what we write into the law, the OPA gang does not care anything about it. I have heard Senator after Senator say on the floor of the Senate that the Administrator of OPA was not abiding by the law, was not enforcing the law, was not administering the law according to the intent of Congress. That is no news. We all know that. So what difference does it make what we write into the law? The only thing we can do is to abolish the OPA. If we do not enact any law, it cannot operate. If we give the OPA a law and $1,000,000,000 to spend, it will operate. We can write into the law every restriction we can think of, but if we give the OPA $1,000,000,000 it will pay no attention to the law, except to have its attorneys read it and tell the OPA officials how they can violate it.

It has been said that the President may veto this bill——

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

I do not know what the President is going to do. But I know the OPA gang. If they have anything to say about it, the President will not veto the bill. They do not care what is in it. All they want is a law. I do not know what the President will do, but I make the prediction that, no matter what kind of a bill we send to him, he will not veto it if he is guided by the gang which is running the Government. He may get a little inspiration and veto the bill. I do not know what he will do. I will not prophesy exactly what he is going to do. What I am trying to do is to relieve the President of the necessity and responsibility of vetoing the bill. We can simply not send him a bill.

When we passed the last bill we provided that the law should expire on a certain date. In my opinion, Senators contemplated that when the war was over the law would expire. I do not believe that anyone gave a second thought to the possibility that it might be desired to continue OPA after the war was over. The war was the only reason for enacting the law in the first place. The war is over. All our enemies were whipped and surrendered unconditionally. We may have another war coming on, but let us have a little breathing spell. Then if somebody hops on us again, we shall have to get into another one.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for a question.

Mr. MOORE. Does the Senator from Texas know how much money has been requested for the administration of the OPA during the next year?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have heard them talking about having a billion dollars for subsidies. Of course, the hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars they spend for administration is merely chicken feed. But all of it is unnecessary. If we simply do not adopt this conference report we shall save all that money.

I now read a telegram which I have received from the Independent Food Merchants of Taylor County, Fla.:

PERRY, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

We commend you on your stand against the OPA. We feel America should be free from OPA dictatorship. Fight it to the end.

Respectfully,

INDEPENDENT FOOD MERCHANTS OF TAYLOR COUNTY,
Mrs. J. G. TURLINGTON, *Secretary.*

The following telegram comes from St. Joseph, Mo.:

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *June 27, 1946.*

United States Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Best of luck in your filibuster against OPA. We small-salaried groups are with you 100 percent.

H. P. RUTLEDGE.

Mr. President, what do you think about that? I have heard a great many statements to the effect that the small-salaried group wants the OPA, but Mr. Rutledge says, "We small-salaried groups are with you 100 percent." Thank God for that telegram.

James Esden, of Shenandoah, Iowa, has sent me the following telegram:

SHENANDOAH, IOWA, *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are behind you a million strong. Continue good work.

JAMES ESDEN.

That is from good old Iowa, where Henry Wallace comes from. Henry Wallace is for the OPA and everything else that is communistic.

Let me read these telegrams:

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Filibuster the OPA out of existence. Get rid of it.

Mrs. C. C. BRYAN.

MILTON, W. VA., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Don't pass OPA.

GEORGE HARSHBARGER.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Success to you in your filibuster against OPA. Our country needs more men like you if we are to remain a democracy.

Sincerely,

A. V. A. SANGEERT.

JENA, LA., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on filibuster. More power to you.

T. S. HARP.

That is from the old home town of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

From Dallas, Tex., comes this telegram:

DALLAS, TEX., *July 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We are with you in your fight to kick the OPA into the ash can, and will never forget your great service to our country. We claim to be good American citizens who are disgusted with the present bureaucratic control.

Leo Johnan, Bill Buford, Neil Newton, Jimmie Maddison, Ralph J. Powers, F. B. Clark, Bob Long, Carl Treadaway, Jack Titus, Joe Harper, Dave Mayer.

But, Mr. President, the Senate expects to abolish bureaucratic control by giving the OPA another year to continue on their job of destruction.

I have also received the following telegrams:

ELMIRA, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Were glad to recognize in the Senate a statesman and one who has some idea of economics.

CHEMUNG WHOLESALE BUILDING PRODUCTS CO.,
By NORMAN E. SWEET.

JOHNSTON, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We are with you. Give the OPA h——.

McQUEEN QUATTLEBAUM.
THOMAS FREEMAN.
G. W. WOOD,
T. M. KNEECE.
SAM PADGETT.
H. K. KNEECE.

Mr. President, does the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] hear that? That telegram comes from his home State. The town must have been named after him. I point out that those who send that telegram, say "Give the OPA h———." The letter "h" is followed by a number of dashes.

This telegram comes from Chicago, Ill.:

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*

Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Three cheers for Senator O'DANIEL. You have our full support in the fight to end infamous OPA.

WOMEN'S LEAGUE FOR POLITICAL EDUCATION.

Let me read this telegram:

ARKADELPHIA, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Arkansas we believe is 95 percent behind you in your effort to kill the OPA and preserve our American free enterprise. Stay put.

C. R. WATSON.
B. D. WATSON.
ROY HOUSTON.
J. LEE PORTER.
A. N. SHAW.

That is from good old Arkansas. They believe that Arkansas is behind me in this fight.

From Dallas, Tex., comes the following telegram:

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Your plan to talk the OPA out of existence is meeting with the approval of all thinking people. Congratulations on this and your may other efforts in behalf of the people helping to salvage something from the Washington planners. Hope you tie that OPA into a knot that will be unraveled.

WRIGHT TITUS.

Mr. President, I notice that Mr. Titus says that our plan to talk the OPA out of existence is meeting with the approval of all thinking people. However, I know some thinking people who do not approve of the effort to abolish the OPA. Some of them are not very far from me now, either. But I appreciate that telegram. There are a great many thinking people who give me their approval.

Let me read the following telegrams:

BEAUMONT, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Backing you all the way—end the OPA.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM KEELY and FAMILY.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am back of you in your fight against un-American OPA. I consider it pressure politics and unfair.

Mrs. ERNEST PACE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Wish you success in your filibuster effort. If you put this over I think we can make you President in 1948.

E. W. HULSEY.

Mr. President, is not that nice? That telegram comes from my home State.

I have also received the following telegrams:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please contact conferees and urge to retain the House Gossett amendment or the Senate McFarland amendment, OPA.

Respectfully,

HIGHLAND DAIRIES.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your determined fight against OPA. Read the Declaration of Independence to the bureaucrats.

W. K. POWELL AND FAMILY.

HANNIBAL, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Anyone in our town starting a black market in meat would be a hero. Merchants have been sold down the river to the public so long as criminals that they have no respect any longer for OPA edicts. Put OPA in the ash-can.

WM. HEIBERGER,
Groceryman.

Mr. President, that is where we put the NRA. That is where the Supreme Court, that good old honest Supreme Court, put the NRA—in the ash can. The OPA is the same old NRA with a touch of red. They just doctored up the tail feathers of the old NRA.

I have also received the following telegrams:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

For the sake of that grand old national that was the United States of America prior to 1933 please use your best efforts to procure freedom for its citizens from bureaucratic control with its attending unsound theories. All patriotic citizens not influenced by selfish ends are with you in your efforts to do away with OPA and its vagaries.

JOS. A. AIREY.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep fighting to wipe out OPA.

FRANK AYRES.
C. L. DEBORDE.

BINGHAMTON, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

You are interpreting the mind and will of the American hearts. May your wisdom and courage continue.

R. D. DORSEY.

LUBBOCK, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Power to you in filibustering. You are last hope for free people. Bust OPA.

GEO. W. GRAY.

JACKSONVILLE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We endorse your determined effort to end the OPA. The greatest leech on prosperity and human liberty in the history of our country.

TRAVIS CLINIC,
By J. M. TRAVIS.

CULLMAN, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democrat of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

Thanks for OPA stand. Nothing encompasses more injustice.

C. E. HERRIN, M. D.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Texas, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Kill OPA before it kills business. Filibuster in order.

WM. G. GLICK.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Am with you 100 percent OPA filibuster.

JIM TUCKER THE INSURANCE MAN.

ANDREWS, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Am sure the majority of the American people will stand behind you in your fight to overthrow the OPA. More power to you.

D. D. OVERTON, Jr.

STEPHENVILLE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Fight extension of OPA. Agree with you on filibuster if necessary. Stay our friend.

L. E. ROBERTSON.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations; keep up your fight on OPA. Meat control must go in order to solve black market. We are with you 100 percent.

BONNER FROZEN PRODUCTS CO.,
L. JOHN LEWIS.

Mr. President, that is not from John L. Lewis; it is from L. John Lewis. [Laughter.]

I also read the following telegrams which I have received:

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We are back of you in your fight against OPA as we consider it un-American. May the Lord be with you.

Mrs. M. BUCKALEW.

ELDORADO, KANS, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Whole community here behind your filibuster.

C. L. SEIBEL.

ELDORADO, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

People in this State practically unanimous for your filibuster. Congratulations.

T. S. DUSTIN.

PLATTEVILLE, COLO., *June 27, 9146.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned are supporting your views on OPA. Keep fighting.

Red & White Grocery; Fred Taylor; B. F. Kern, M. D.; Ace Campbell Market; Herbert Miller, Miller's Cafe; Robert Bruce; Donald Morgan; Walter Johnston, Funeral Director; I. G. Cook; Gerald Starr.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Best wishes for death of OPA.

Mrs. BOYDELL.

Mr. President, she is very cheerful about it.

I have also received the following telegrams:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

I operate a 400-acre farm. Unless OPA extension is killed honest farmers and our families have no chance for successful living. Black-market prices make inflation threat a ghastly joke. Public can be trusted to regulate prices; why let cheap selfish politics ruin American way of life.

E. C. WOLCOTT.

UVALDE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Your courageous action winning overwhelming approval. Congratulations and keep fighting.
JACK CARPER.

The latter telegram comes from good old Uvalde.

I have also received the following telegrams:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL: Stay in the fight for small American business. We are with you all the way. Get rid of OPA. From an individual grocer for 25 years in business in St. Louis.
Mr. SCHIMMER.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Democrat from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Wishing you success on your long speeches.
A. S. BROWN, Jr.,
Veteran, World War II.

DENVER, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Stick with it, Senator. Millions of livestock, dairy farmers and small businessmen would be eternally grateful to you for eliminating the tyrannical OPA.
A. C. BARROW.

GAINESVILLE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Fight OPA to last ditch, wish we had more like you.
A. L. CHAFFIN,
C & N Packing Co.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. I am past 71; no income except from home converted into three apartments which wife and I paid out over 20-year period. Rent control caught us with very low rentals. Have wanted to sell but cannot evict tenants nor raise prices. Looks like Government and tenants own the property.
S. S. BURRIS.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We hope for success in your plan against OPA.
WOOD LUMBER CO.

ENGLEWOOD, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your effort to return to Americans an American way of life under an American Government and trust you can successfully accomplish this by Monday.
VALENTINE RUCH.

SAN DIEGO., CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:
Take off the controls and we will build twice as many houses in half the time.
WESTERN CONSTRUCTION CO.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill the OPA extension bill and eliminate Chester Bowles. We want the American way of doing business. Inflation is a scare-all.
W. S. TAYLOR,
FRANKLIN AMERICAN LAUNDRY.

MUNCIE, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.
Hit the line hard. We don't want OPA.
O. F. KIRTLEY,
L. M. WILLIAMS,
C. L. BLADES,
Farmers and Free Holders.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
Filibuster the OPA extension bill. I am with you 100 percent, even if we have higher prices for a while we will save tax money. Get rid of Chester Bowles.
R. L. BLACKBURN.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
You are on the right track. Stick to it. These United States will never get back to normal way of living as long as we have an OPA and Chester Bowles.
R. L. WILHELM.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Hope you can kill OPA quickly.
THOMAS HARRISON WELCH.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Present proposed OPA bill discriminates against lumber wholesalers and will put us out of business on west coast woods if passed. Suggest changing date of figuring costs from January 1, 1946, to December 1941. We appreciate your efforts.
ALLSOP LUMBER CO.

WINCHESTER, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
We are back of you on your fight to remove OPA restrictions.
O. E. ROSS.
OMER W. BROWN.

FAIRMONT, W. VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Production most essential of all questions. OPA not only curtailing production at every corner but a curse to our American way of life. Therefore may I congratulate you upon your intelligent efforts to save our country from slavery under a drastic dictatorship. More power to you.
HOWARD W. SHOWALTER.

WILLIAMSPORT, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Many thanks for your courageous action. The black market instigators, the destroyers of confidence in our own people, namely, the OPA, cannot die too soon to bring back the adherence to our Constitution and free America.
GERSON & CO.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Wishing you success on filibuster. It will be nice to live in free country again.
MR. AND MRS. J. B. KENNY.

GRASSLAKE, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and more power to you in keeping up the good fight against the OPA.
HARLAN SHELLY.

Mr. President, I have already read about eight telegrams which favored the OPA. Here are a few more:

ALEXANDRIA, VA., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly protest your stand on OPA, particularly your threatened filibuster. Texas voters are consumers and need protection during this critical period.
Mrs. R. L. MOFFETT.
SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

GALVESTON, TEX., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge you oppose crippling amendments for extended OPA bill. We want your support extension OPA bill which includes full price controls so that people this State may be able to maintain their families on an equitable standard of living within wages. We demand you make public statement your position supporting OPA with such price controls so that people this State may determine whether you giving full representation. We are now initiating campaign this area refuse buy any commodities save bare necessities of life until such time as justice is done people by their elected representatives.
H. K. DEUCHARE,
Agent, NMU of A.

DARBY, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
COOKIE PUSHER: You produce beef in Texas and we eat it here in the industrial East. If you want all those Democratic friends of yours out of the chips I don't know who is doing any more to elect a Republican President than you are.
ART FRIEL.

I am not talking about electing anybody as President. I am trying to get rid of the OPA. [Laughter.]

Here are two more telegrams:

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I think you are one of the worst representatives of the country when you openly declare OPA detrimental to the poor people.
HARRY WARREN.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
If you cannot vote for the OPA bill, then hold your peace. The opponents of OPA that contend the OPA retards production, take a look at the cotton market. There is no scarcity of cotton. It is the only market open to speculation and the lifting of controls is encouraging wild speculation. What will happen to markets of scarce commodities?
H. E. VAUGHAN.

Of course, we recognize that there is plenty of cotton, but I challenge anyone to try to buy a cotton handkerchief. The OPA will not allow manufacturers to manufacture cotton goods into cloth.

Here is another telegram:

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Please don't make self-respecting Texan ashamed of you by carrying out your filibuster threat. Your action would steal half the income of every citizen.

ERIN COLLEEN MOORE.

I wonder who would get the other half. [Laughter.]

Here are two more telegrams:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are in favor of passing the OPA.

RAY BECKER.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The people of Texas want the OPA preserved and we implore you to change your attitude.

Sincerely,

BURTON W. ALLEN, M. D.

I appreciate that telegram from Burton W. Allen, M. D., but I am not changing my mind. [Laughter.]

I read further telegrams:

CROCKETT, TEX., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Please defeat OPA compromise. To vote for House compromise is direct vote against Texas farmers, ranchers, poultrymen. Black market only solution under OPA regulations.

Rev. R. GAGE LLOYD,
First Presbyterian Church.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Please hold that line until Monday.

Mrs. WOODCOCK.

If I can only obtain a little help, the line will be held.

Here is a telegram from San Angelo, Tex.:

Don't stop talking until OPA is dead.

That telegram is signed "Pete Williams."

I wish I could talk until the OPA was dead.

Here are more telegrams:

DALLAS, TEX., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

The Senate needs a Moses to lead them out of the wilderness. Stay in there and fight.

JACK CHANEY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

More power to you in the fight. Best regards.

S. T. ROSS.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Am for you. Hope you filibuster OPA to death.

SAM R. TATUM.

Mr. President, the word "filibuster" is a great word. I do not know where it originated. We used to bust broncos in Texas and in other sections in the West. The men who did that kind of work were called bronco busters. I do not know that I could qualify as an expert bronco buster, but I did participate in such work and derived some fun out of the falls which I took. I presume that the word "filibuster" comes from "bronco buster" because we used to bust also a few fillies. Some of those fillies were not quite as hard to bust as were the broncos, but the word "filibuster" must have come from that direction.

Here is a telegram from Chicago, Ill.:

Don't let them stop you. Remember the Alamo. Kill that OPA and the Communists are through.

CAPT. THOMAS C. VAN HYNING,
National Chairman, Veterans' Aid and Action Committee.

Mr. President, I remember the Alamo all right. The Alamo is a very sacred place in the State of Texas. That is where a little band of noble Texans gathered together in a small building and tried to preserve the State of Texas when Mexico was trying to conquer it. The situation became quite desperate. It did not look as though the Texans had much of a chance. I wish the OPA did not have any more of a chance than did the Mexicans at that time, however. Colonel Travis was in the Alamo with a little band of men, and the situation was pretty desperate. He drew a line on the dirt floor and said, "All you fellows who want to save Texas, get over on this side of the line. Don't any of you straddle the line. The rest of you get out of here." Those men gave their lives to the last man. Not one of them survived. However, Texas was saved. The Mexican Army under Santa Anna thought that they had whipped Texas, and continued on down toward Galveston. Sam Houston took after them and caught them while they were asleep. He captured the entire army, which was composed of about 1,600 men. Texas became one of the great States of the Union.

So, Mr. President, when you have a cause which seems almost lost, if you have only a little courage to keep on fighting, the situation may change and you may win. I am almost down to the last man in the fight which I am waging against the OPA, but I am hoping that some more converts will come to my assistance. There is now a good opportunity to kill the OPA. Senators will not lose their lives by getting on this side of the line. The men who, under Sam Houston, rushed on to Santa Anna's army shouted, "Remember the Alamo!" They avenged the deaths of those great patriots who gave their lives at the Alamo for their country, and Texas became a great State. Texas voluntarily came into the Union of the United States. Texas is large enough and has enough productivity, if we could get rid of the OPA, to raise all the food that is required by everybody in the United States. I am not bragging. [Laughter.]

I know what we can do down there. I traveled there some time back, after OPA came into existence. I went into that magic valley, and there the farmers were plowing under hundreds and hundreds of acres of cabbage and spinach and other vegetables after they were mature and ready to be marketed. I know that; I have pictures of it.

I went out in the fields and talked with them, and said, "Why are you plowing these things under?" They were plowing them under because OPA would not let them get enough money for those products after they had been raised. They lost less money by plowing under those hundreds of acres of food than they would have received if they had gathered it, harvested it, boxed it up, and sold it.

OPA say they are trying to help the poor people. At that very time we were paying at the rate of $1,500 a ton for cabbage on the restaurant tables. I figured up the weight of a little dish of cabbage which sold for 15 cents, and it amounted to $1,500 a ton in Washington; yet the farmers in Texas were plowing it under.

We have plenty of cattle there. All the meat the people here are getting is the offspring of the "female steers" the OPA talks about.

Here is a telegram from Phoenix, Ariz.:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you go through with your OPA filibuster. If you are short of material read the OPA orders on milk and dairy products. They would last you from now till Christmas. More power to you.

NAT M. DYSART,
Manager, Arizona Milk Producers.

I have those regulations here. If I get time, I shall read them. Congress passed a little law of a few pages and sent it to OPA, and ever since we sent it to OPA it has been passing the laws. Here are part of them on my desk. OPA has stepped into the shoes of the Congress of the United States, and is passing laws. Here are the laws of the United States, not written by the Congress.

Mr. President, I doubt if any Senator here has read all these regulations. But the poor people throughout the United States who have to live under these laws have to read the regulations, the people away out in the filling stations, in the little grocery stores, in the meat markets, in any kind of business. They have to read these laws and abide by them. They have to be very careful and not violate them, or one of the OPA's stooges will be sneaking around the corner peeking through the keyhole and throwing them in jail, or making them pay a fine to keep out of jail.

Mr. President, here is a telegram from New York:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL.
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Kindly hold floor. I approve of what you are doing.

HOWELL.

LYNBROOK, N. Y., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: More power to you for a better America. Kill OPA.

ALLAN HARDER.

Here is one from the Continental Ranch Co., of Del Rio, Tex., away out on the silvery Rio Grande, the border between Texas and the friendly Republic of Mexico:

DEL RIO, TEX., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Present OPA bill makes bad matters worse.
CONTINENTAL RANCH CO.,
HAROLD MARTIN.
COMSTOCK, TEX.

He is right.

Here is one from California:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
In the name of our beloved country I urge you to eliminate OPA gestapo which creates black markets and racketeering and ignores our constitutional rights preventing free enterprise and collective bargaining and renders punishment without a court hearing. You will also save the country from going bankrupt and the world from starvation.
J. L. VITZ, of Illinois.

CANTON, MASS., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations, OPA filibuster heartily supported by Damyankee family and friends. Stopping of citizens on street to explain packages by the leech pay roll gives no alternative.
H. M. SPRING.

Mr. President, is that not a nice condition, that American citizens have to be subjected to anything like that?

Now I read a telegram from R. T. Giles, of Atlanta, Ga.:

ATLANTA, GA., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Congress Building, Washington, D. C.:
Am very much pleased with your stand against the OPA. Hope you will filibuster and kill this OPA dead. Speaking in behalf of all retail food dealers in Georgia.
R. T. GILES.

HIGHSPIRE, PA., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I hope you will carry out your threat of a filibuster and by the help of God you will be able to hold the floor until Saturday night.
J. E. KEEFER.

It is going to take a little longer than Saturday. It will take until Sunday night.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We the average citizens of Texas are 100 percent backing you on your OPA stand. Set them out, Senator, and give Texas a square deal. As American citizens we deeply thank you, sir.
MINNIE B. PEACE.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. Sentor W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Buiding, Washington, D. C.:
Hold the floor until Monday. Make us free again. God bless you.
COLIN L. LETT.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *June 26, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Get the floor and hold it until Monday. Seems that will be our only hope for America's freedom.
RUFUS JACKSON.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I think it would be swell to wake up Monday morning and have a law that we all don't have to violate.
RAY GRANT.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 26, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Do all you can to kill OPA.
W. C. BUFORD.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you, Senator O'DANIEL. St. Louis rental property owners have taken a heck of a beating so far. Eliminate OPA, please. Thanks.
No signature.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster against OPA. Smash OPA.
CARO.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Just heard over radio your plan to filibuster Chester Bowles, Paul Porter, and their OPA. This is the only alternative with which you can save the people of America from this communistic dictatorship. You are loyal to your country instead of to a group of New Deal demagogues and the people are with you in your efforts to do that which is right rather than that which is popular.
JOHN T. BUCKLEY.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Radio report tells of your contemplated filibuster to kill OPA. This will hearten and encourage millions of Americans opposed to any European ideas of government. Should inspire other Senators to join your fight for us. You can do it. We heard you on Town Meeting.
CARL AND HELENE JOHNSON.

This telegram says it will hearten and encourage millions of Americans who are opposed to any European ideas of government.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
The black market controls this country.
R. A. PAGANO.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
With you in your fight for Americanism 100 percent.
HELEN M. LANDENBERGER.

BELLBROOK, OHIO, *June 26, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL of Texas,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Rural people all with you; all others will thank you before Christmas. Filibuster and defeat the most serious legislation in our history.
MARVI BARNETT.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep your word. Bust OPA.
CHARLES DONALDSON.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster the OPA out of existence. Be our hero and the country's savior.
EDGAR F. HASTINGS.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Please do whatever you can to defeat OPA. Why do we have to be shackled by the OPA for another year? Let the people adjust themselves and be free again.
Very gratefully yours,
E. H. MITCHELL.

Mr. President, these telegrams are not an accumulation of messages which have been coming in over a period of time. They came in today and are still coming.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. How long does the Senator expect to speak?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Until I get through.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that; but can the Senator give me a notion as to how long he expects to take?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No. If I knew I should be very glad to give the Senator the information, but at this stage I cannot say when I will get through.

Mr. LUCAS. My only reason for asking the Senator was that the hour is growing late, and I wondered if the Senator had any idea as to how long he expected to speak tonight.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am sorry that I am unable to give the information.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator is going to read what he has in front of him we will be here until breakfast, and I have no objection to that, because I am ready to stay.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am very glad to know that the Senator has no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is doing a great service to the country and to the Senate, and I wanted to find out how long he expected to speak.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator from Illinois does not know how much I appreciate that statement.

Mr. LUCAS. I know it. I am sure the Senator will be able to stay here from now until Sunday night, because he has enough material in front of him to take that length of time.

Mr. O'DANIEL. It does my heart good to know that the Senator of the great State of Illinois recognizes the fact and admits the fact in the Senate that I am doing a great service.

Mr. LUCAS. There is no doubt at all that the Senator is doing a great service to his country in reading these telegrams. It is extremely illuminating.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is more encouragement than I have received in the last few minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to encourage the Senator, because I do not know how long he can stand on his feet, and he ought to set a record here from the standpoint of filibustering.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am not filibustering.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the Senator doing?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Reading telegrams.

Mr. LUCAS. Is he trying to enlighten the Senate on this question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am merely reading telegrams at the present time. I have some more stuff here to read, too.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that, and I know the Senate is greatly interested in what the Senator has, but I was wondering whether he was trying to enlighten the Senate and the country, or whether he was filibustering.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I would not attempt to enlighten the Senate of the United States. I think it is the most enlightened body there is on earth.

Mr. LUCAS. I know it has been so since the Senator arrived.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Then it has been by absorption, because the Senator from Texas has not said much on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. No; he has not said much in his filibuster.

Mr. O'DANIEL. What I have said is to express the words of other people.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the only way that the Senator can talk. I perfectly understand what the Senator is talking about. He is reading telegrams from people throughout the country. That is the way the Senator is filibustering on this measure.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I knew the Senator from Illinois would understand what I was talking about, because he has a high degree of intelligence.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I never misunderstand the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I hope the Senator never does.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not misunderstand the Senator. I understand the Senator from Texas always. I understood the Senator from Texas a way back in the campaign of 1944 when the Senator from Texas went all the way, and completely out of order, and out of place, against the Senator from Illinois when he was running for the United States Senate in Illinois.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Well, that is not a very long memory.

Mr. LUCAS. No; it is not. And the Senator from Illinois has not forgotten it, and he never will forget it either.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That does not show a long memory, because I was in politics before 1944.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, the Senator was, and he got into politics in the Illinois campaign in 1944 when he had no business to come into that campaign.

Mr. WHERRY. Why did the Senator from Illinois enter into Nebraska and get into Nebraska politics when I ran against the honorable Senator George Norris? The Senator from Illinois made broadcast recordings which were sent to Nebraska and used in an attempt to defeat me. Dozens of records, containing speeches against me were sent out there by the Senator from Illinois. Drew Pearson wrote articles against me. The Senator from Illinois joined in attacking me. Why did the Senator get into that campaign? And in view of his having gotten into that campaign; why criticize the Senator from Texas for speaking against the Senator from Illinois in the Illinois campaign in 1944?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I make a point of order.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been looking for a chance to say this ever since I came to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make the point of order, Mr. President, that the Senator from Texas cannot yield to the Senator from Nebraska to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The point of order should be made against the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the Senator from Illinois was asking a question of the Senator from Texas who has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I cannot yield for anything except a question. [Laughter.] I certainly appreciate the questions that are being asked me by the Senator from Illinois, because I am being honored for doing something that I have never before known I have done.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am only trying to help out the Senator from Texas in his filibuster. Will the Senator yield to me that I may answer the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I should love to do so, but I could not do it without losing the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I must insist that the Senator from Texas cannot yield to any Senator except for a question; and to yield to the Senator from Illinois to ask a question of the Senator from Nebraska would result in the Senator losing the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. No, I do not want the Senator to yield for a question. I want to answer the Senator from Nebraska. I have the answer.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois can come here and tell me if he wants to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make a point of order against that procedure.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have a telegram here from Dallas, Tex., from Clara Huber and Aurora Kammann.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it possible for me to ask the Senator from Texas to yield so I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without the Senator losing the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can do that, and if the Senator yields he will lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. If I obtain unanimous consent, does the Senator from Texas lose the floor if he yields?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He can yield for that purpose by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason I make that inquiry is because I think Members of the Senate should be present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be a question for the Senator from Texas to decide.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot yield for that purpose. I can yield for a question and not lose the floor. I do not want to lose the floor. I lost it once today and got it back again all right with the help of our able majority leader, and I appreciate that very much.

The telegram from Clara Huber and Aurora Kammann, of Dallas, Tex., is as follows:

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

It would be a feather in your hat to keep on talking when you get the floor from then till Monday on the OPA as it is unconstitutional and against the freedom of America, for the people, by the people, for what we fought the war for.

I read another telegram:

PATERSON, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Believe me, stick to your guns. Filibuster to the death of anti-Americanism. Wire me at once if I can help, either with material for filibuster or in any capacity. I will fly at once to assist you at my expense.

A. J. KIEVIT,
Secretary-Manager, New Jersey Butchers Association.

There comes the promise of some help, Mr. President.

I wish to read a number of other telegrams, as follows:

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

The eyes of Texas and the Nation are upon you. We will pray while you filibuster OPA. Don't disappoint us.

MRS. T. D. MORGAN.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We, too, would like to wake up Monday morning without price control. Let's go back to the American way of living.

A VETERAN.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Make an end to the OPA. Let the bums go to work for a living like ordinary folks do. More power to you.

EMANUEL GASSMAN,
Attorney.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We glory in your spunk. Filibuster, if possible. We are proud of your Americanism.

Wish America had more like you. God bless you.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM H. JONES.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the filibusters. Get rid of the OPA. Let this be a free country.

SMALL BUSINESSMAN.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Am with you in the fight to end the black market. God give you strength to continue.

VILLAGE MARKET.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Women organizations have fallen for Bowles and labor propaganda fearing inflation. Prices have soared in spite of OPA. Our rents only thing held down, but plumbers', painters', carpenters' prices up 100 percent. Stay with your filibuster, killing all control and become our famous benefactor.

HENRIETTE PYLE,
Renter Division of Real Estate Board.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster. May you get the floor, and Colorado Senators help you to make United States free once more.

Mr. and Mrs. RALPH W. BELL.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: We urge you to secure the Senate floor to kill the OPA in all its ramifications and thus give America back to the American people by next Monday morning.

ESTHER M. BRUCE,
MARIONA RODINE
(And a number of mothers).

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Have no meat in my house. Without OPA I could buy it for less than one or two dollars per pound. Radio reports O'DANIEL intends to filibuster against OPA, and I am for him. Supply and demand eventually must regulate prices.

ED C. SMITH, Jr.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Am thoroughly with you on your plan to end the OPA. Have suffered through it myself and would like to see the Government back into the hands of the people. My best wishes for your success in your endeavor.

JOSEPHINE CHASTAIN.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Agree wholeheartedly your plan to defeat OPA by filibuster. Any means should be used to defeat such a vicious bureau. We are for you 100 percent. Best wishes.

PAUL and WALTER HENSHAW.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are behind your fight. Meeting tonight of 500 small grocers. All are behind your filibuster.

H. R. DEUSER.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill the OPA and save the working man.

S. V. PHILLIPS, Sr.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please start filibuster at once. Stay with it until OPA expires. You have the heartfelt thanks of many. Just a housewife, address 3564 University, San Diego 4, Calif.

Mrs. W. O. BOURNE.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Honorable Senator O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Follow through with filibuster. Sensible citizens in country are backing you. Kill the OPA.

Mrs. BOB COOK.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Tonight's papers say you threatened to hold the Senate floor till Monday and kill OPA. You will win the gratitude of the country if you do.

PINE CREST LODGE,
E. CARROLL TABER.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Continue the fight. We are with you.

T. J. BAUER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Every thinking American will applaud your stand against continuing bureaucracy.

C. T. REVERE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Just learned your intent filibuster OPA extension. We earnestly urge you go extreme limit in final effort to eliminate OPA entirely or otherwise amend to insure systematic but complete industry decontrol and immediate blanket relief to all property owners.

IRVING F. NIGHT.
Mrs. HAZET C. ROWLES.
EDWIN F. ROWLES.
LOUIS SHEPHERD.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Endorse your attitude regarding OPA as radioed. May success crown your efforts.

LINNIE W. BARRETT.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
In my opinion the OPA is un-American, unfair, unjust, inefficient, and serious deterrent to legitimate business. The entire public would be benefited if the OPA was completely and entirely eliminated. More power to you and may your voice ring long, loud, and clear.

SEVENTH AND TYLER SERVICE,
By WILBER JACKSON.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Honorable Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Glad to see there are sane lawmakers remaining. Continue filibuster and save American way of life; abolish OPA.

Mrs. D. C. CURDIE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
We heartily endorse your stand on OPA, and hope you are successful in freeing the country from one of the fetters that is holding back the production of the necessary goods. The sooner all Government bureaus are ended the better. We believe that 70 percent of the people are with you.

Mr. and Mrs. M. W. WAINWRIGHT.

RENO, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas,
Floor of Senate, Washington, D. C.:
In every crisis in our beloved country someone has come forward to save us. You are the man of the hour. God give you strength.

Mr. and Mrs. D. J. CATROW.

OMAHA, NEBR., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Received news tonight that you are going to fight the OPA bill to a finish. Your spirit of patriotism to return the American Government to the people of this great Nation gives us new hope. We are tired of these dictators.

A. A. LEISKE.

EUGENE, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand. Talk them out. I mean OPA. Let's free the American people to competition business instead of economic professors and advertising managers.

ROY DICKSON.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight to dispose of the price-control bill on meats and livestock otherwise retail-meat business is doomed.

WALTER J. ADAMEK.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You are making a courageous American stand for the return to constitutional government. Pull no punches, the real Americans are behind you, and am sure all the people of Texas are.

A. B. SPENCER, Jr.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your Senate fight for a return of our American form of government

D. L. MCCARTY.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator O'DANIEL,
Democrat, of Texas,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We apreciate your support in placing meat of all kinds on the free list and beyond any OPA regulation. The meat industry wants the old return conditions as before the war.

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL MEAT DEALERS.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Packers cannot operate under OPA. Does our Government want all business to go black market? Packers are closing all over the nation. People are getting tired of being pushed around by OPA regulations. Please use your influence for the elimination of OPA controls over meat and livestock so that the legitimate packers can stay in business.

H. M. FOULKNER,
PINKNEY PACKING CO.

The voice of the people is being heard in the United States Senate.

Here is a telegram from Detroit, Mich.:

DETROIT, MICH., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democrat, Texas, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I hasten to congratulate you upon your Senate battle toward restoring to the American people freedom from and against the un-American dictatorial policies of insult of the OPA and its communistic ideologies.

REV. STERLING C. JONES,
Pastor, Christ Staff Baptist Church.

EUGENE, OREG., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Controls essential on OPA. Stay in the fight.

LANE COUNTY MEAT DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
ROY STEEN, *President.*

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Let's get the job done. We don't need them.

ART SEEFELDT.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Junior Senator of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

We heard over the radio this afternoon that you plan to filibuster the OPA bill tomorrow. You have certainly raised your already high stock with many of your friends and supporters in Texas as well as with people over the entire Nation. We admire your fortitude for taking this action and want you to shoot both barrels at this thing as well as this preposterous rent control. If we had more fearless men like you in Washington such conditions as now prevail would not exist. Of course you will become a much loathed and despised man but your opponents will respect you and we appreciate what you are doing to save all of us from continued regimentation.

Mr. and Mrs. TOM SAWYER.

This telegram is from Mr. and Mrs. Tom Sawyer, citizens of the United States of America, expressing appreciation for the feeble efforts of a United States Senator in bringing this deplorable, despicable, outrageous OPA bill to the attention of the Senate at this time, and urging that OPA be abolished.

I continue the reading of telegrams:

EUGENE, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Want you to know we are behind and appreciate your efforts to abolish the controls on meat and dairy products. Because until such control of these vital products is abolished they will remain in the black market and bring inflationary crisis to the American public. Please use all your efforts and filibuster if necessary to stop the gestapo tactics. Supply and demand have been the American businessman's schedule for years. Restore the symbol of Americanism to them. Abolish the controls on meat and dairy products.

LEON YEARWOOD,
Secretary, Eugene Division, Meat Dealers for State of Oregon Association.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

If you wish to prevent a national revolt on the part of all business against Government control you will vote to abolish OPA completely. Listen to the voices that are predicting the tomorrows' present polls; refuse OPA 3 to 1; do not refuse to recognize the sounds of the times. Give industry and labor the opportunity of proving itself by eliminating controls for 9 months. If industry and labor fail to meet the challenge by then you can have a completely free hand. Present regulations are impossible, impractical, communistic, and unenforcable under a peacetime economy. When a widow with three children, who desires to start a combination day nursery and home for three children who are now in an institution for two-thirds of the space devoted to the nursery and one-third of the space devoted for the home is refused permission to build without priority assistance it is almost too late to say we still have the freedom guaranteed under our Constitution.

JOHN B. MCCRADY.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

I am addressing you because your die is cast to fight racketeering and plain dishonesty in Government. To have freedoms is one thing, yet to have them wrongly founded is their nullification. Up to now all forms of belief were founded in the worship of idols in one way or another; an imperfect body as a moral free agent can only live in chaos, unless the imperfections are corrected by adjustment of the ensemble to balance it as it strives toward perfection. Hence the earth's governments must be changed. We must keep each human sacredly guarded by a tax, never a charity. We must find how to divide the treasures of our earthly physical life equally and set that limit as the height of personal ownership—anything above that reverts to the governments as tax to rescue the perishing at the expense of the well and able. Racketeering, intemperance, wanton ruthlessness should be cured in the asylum. This is a simple solution which you have the power and influence to enforce. Until it is done no nation, race, or creed can live with or understand another, and I guarantee you we shall have many wars to the point of extinction and that quickly.

Very truly yours,

VERTNER DAVID BRITTINGHAM.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

The farmers of Tennessee urge you to use all the power at your disposal to kill the unjust controls placed on dairy, poultry, and livestock farmers. Having heard tonight of your efforts, you are the only hope we have to prevent bloodshed if Congress and the President insist on taking our products without allowing us a decent living. Who do these communistic labor leaders think they are? Their high wages won't do them any good when they can't eat. If you need military support to straighten out the rats, please call on us.

H. E. SIMPKINS,
An Aroused Farmer.

Another vivid case showing how American citizens are becoming aroused at this oppression, dictation, and regimentation, and the attempt to take away their American rights. The people are expressing themselves in no uncertain words in telegrams, and I am reading them so that Senators may know how the American people feel.

Hearings have been held on this bill. Those who had the money and could afford it came here or sent representatives and they were heard. This telegram is from a farmer in Nashville, Tenn., who did not come. He could not come. He sent a telegram. Here it is. Many others feel the same way.

Here is a telegram from Hazleton, Pa.:

HAZLETON, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand you are going to filibuster the OPA to death. Thank God there is a real American still in the Senate who does not fear the 15,000,000 CIO, PAC Commies in these United States. The 120,000,000 unorganized Americans who foot the bill want only the return of legal, honest, old-fashioned American way of doing things in industry and business. Please filibuster the OPA and all other "Commie" ideas to death. We are for you. Have our permission to read this before the Senate.

Dan Cassarella, Evan W. Jones, N. Veneroso, Jr., Helen Fedullo, Evelyn Campbell, John Fedullo, Laura Magazzu, J. Rudy, Estell Fedullo, C. J. Lamont, P. A. Magazzu, Licille Cassarella, John B. Cassarella, Mrs. P. A. Magazzu, Boyd H. Kline, and Olgad Veneroso.

The next telegram comes from Seattle, Wash.:

Today's Seattle Times indicates your possible filibuster against OPA. Thank God for such Senators as yourself and WHERRY, of Nebraska.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Has the Senator received any telegrams saying "Thank God for Chester Bowles"?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have not.

Mr. BRIDGES. Has the Senator received any telegrams saying "Thank God" for any one who is out in front shouting for OPA today, and contending for the continuation of its very disastrous control in the Nation?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have received no telegrams thanking God for those folks.

Mr. BRIDGES. As I understand, the telegrams which the Senator has received thanking God are confined to references to Senators who are attempting to maintain the American way in this country.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator familiar with the Biblical injunction to pray for his enemies?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I have received no telegram of that kind.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not talking about a telegram. I am talking about the Bible.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; I think that is a good idea. I am praying for them. I am praying for the enemies of the American people. I hope they may get salvation. I hope they get right with God. I hope America is saved. I pray for them every night. I think my prayers will be answered. I believe in prayer. The people who are sending these telegrams, and who refer to the Deity, believe in prayer. I think we have a great Christian Nation. I do not believe that the people of this Nation want it to become a nation governed by unbelievers or a communistic nation.

I was about to read a telegram from Seattle, Wash.:

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 26, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Texas Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Today's Seattle Times indicates your possible filibuster against OPA. Thank God for such Senators as yourself and WHERRY, of Nebraska. We are for your filibuster 100 percent, and untold millions of real Americans feel the same way. Senator WHERRY is correct if we have another session of OPA we will not only have violence but we will have more thousands of American business people out of business or in violation of many laws. Why allow our country to continue to operate in any such manner? Crush these un-American agencies now before it is too late. If we can help in any way wire us collect, care New Washington Hotel. But get rid of OPA once and for all, even if you have to hold the Senate floor all summer.

Mr. and Mrs. W. W. LOGAN,
Tampa, Fla.

The next telegram is from Amarillo, Tex.:

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Our dear Mr. O'DANIEL, the conditions just passed by the House on the OPA bill are very unsatisfactory to the Panhandle of Texas. As far as meat, poultry, and dairy products are concerned, there is nothing but black market here. As supervisor of Ideal Food Stores Markets, I say, Shall we operate legally and in fair competition or shall we continue to operate with black market? If the OPA continues, the public will be buying at black-market prices, whereas if it is discontinued it would be much cheaper to buy legally and at competitive prices. My belief is that fair competition would discard all necessities of the OPA.

Sincerely yours,

DESMOND DEAN.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator from Texas familiar with the survey which has been made of retail stores with respect to how many were violating the price ceilings on meat?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have seen the survey, but I do not at the moment have the figures in my mind.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator be surprised to learn that in New York City, out of 401 stores which were visited and 739 cuts of meat purchased, the percentage of stores selling at overceiling prices was 78.8 percent; in other words, that 78.8 percent of all the stores visited in New York City were violating the OPA price ceilings? Would the Senator from Texas be surprised at those figures?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I would not be surprised at those statistics and those facts. However, I am shocked that such a condition exists in America.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator be surprised that in Washington, D. C., here in the Capital of the United States, in the case of 242 stores visited and 516 cuts of meat purchased, 81.4 percent of all of the meat purchased was sold in violation of the OPA ceiling prices?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I certainly would not be surprised at that, even here in Washington, D. C.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it not a shock to the Senator to realize that here in the National Capital there are such violations of the OPA regulations?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am not so shocked about it, here in the Capital, as I am in other places.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator be surprised that in Chicago, Ill., 392 stores were visited and 724 purchases of meat were made, and it was found the 91.1 percent of the purchases made were over the OPA ceiling prices—in Chicago, Ill.?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I would not be surprised at all. But I say again that I am shocked that such a condition should exist in Illinois.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator be surprised that in Indianapolis, Ind., in the case of 58 stores visited and 102 meat purchases made, 84.5 percent of the purchases were over the OPA ceiling prices?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I would not be surprised at that at all.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator be surprised that in Milwaukee, Wis., in the case of 70 stores visited, out of 145 purchases of meat which were made, 85.7 percent of the purchases were over OPA ceilings—in Milwaukee, Wis.?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I would not be surprised at all.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator be surprised that in Memphis, Tenn., where 122 stores were visited and 240 cuts of meat were purchased, 88.5 percent of the purchases made were over the OPA ceiling prices—in Memphis, Tenn.:

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I would not be surprised at that.

Mr. BRIDGES. Now I wish to come to the Senator's home State. In Houston, Tex., in the case of 100 stores visited and 192 purchases made, would the Senator be surprised that there were 94 percent—a very high percentage—over the OPA ceiling prices; right in the heart of Texas?

Mr. O'DANIEL. The folks down in Texas like meat. I know that. I am not surprised at that at all. But Texas generally leads in everything. [Laughter.] I am going to have to consider it an honor that Texas is at the top of the list in anything.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, would the Senator be surprised that in Denver, Colo., in the case of 109 stores visited and 224 purchases of meat made, 84.4 percent of all the purchases made were above the OPA price ceilings?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; I am surprised that that is not higher. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator be surprised that in Los Angeles, Calif., in the case of 200 stores visited and 408 purchases made, 83.5 percent of all those purchases were above the OPA price ceilings?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I am not surprised at that.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator be surprised that in my own New England, in Providence, R. I., in the case of 35 stores visited and 69 purchases made, 77.1 percent of the purchases were above the price ceilings of the OPA?

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is a rather low score.

Mr. BRIDGES. I myself was a little surprised at that figure for a city in New England.

Would the Senator be surprised that in Newark, N. J., in the case of 74 stores visited and 136 purchases of meat made, 85.1 percent were above the price ceilings of the OPA?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I would not be surprised at that. That is a fairly good score.

Mr. BRIDGES. To summarize the statistics for these 11 cities, would the Senator from Texas be surprised that out of a total of 1,803 stores visited and 3,495 purchases of meat made, the general average for the entire Nation, based on that cross-section of the Nation in the case of those 11 great cities, is that 83.2 percent of all the purchases made were above the price ceilings set by the OPA?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am not at all surprised at those statistics. But I think it is disgraceful that our American people, who are honored throughout the world for their honesty, their integrity, and for abiding by the law, have been forced into evasion or violation of the edicts which have been issued by the Office of Price Administration. I am sorry it has happened, and I am trying to get the OPA abolished, so that those who are hungry and who want some food will not have to violate the law in order to get it.

Mr. President, I now read a telegram coming from Detroit, Mich., from Clovis C. Ferguson, 15857 Meyers Road. The telegram seems to be in the form of a

poem entitled "Price Ceilings." It reads as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator PAPPY O'DANIEL,
Texas Senator.
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

PRICE CEILINGS

The OPA is here today
To keep the prices down.
If that were true
Then it would do
For Smith and Jones and Brown.
But Chester Bowles and other wits
Would put the damper on
Without a thought
Of damage wrought
In waste, in want, in wrong.
They set the price of rusty cars,
And new ones just as well,
And make it look
By hook or crook
That everything is swell;
The ceiling price on rusty cars,
That almost fall apart,
Is but one phase
Of OPA's
Judgment of the mart.
They freeze the price of needed steel,
They ask that wages rise,
But hold that line
And keep in mind
The OPA is wise.
The ceiling price on building needs
Drives business from our doors,
And lumber flees
Across the seas,
And lands on foreign shores.
And when you buy a shirt or suit
To cover up your back,
The price you pay as per OPA
Will take a lot of jack.
To start the wheels of all the mills,
To have a better day,
Take off controls,
Ditch Chester Bowles,
Throw out the OPA.

You have my permission to print or use if you desire with name and address.

CLOVES C. FERGUSON.

I do not know whether he is any relation to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

From Los Angeles, Calif., the following telegram comes:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

In the name of our beloved country I urge you to eliminate OPA gestapos who create black markets and racketeering and ignore our constitutional rights preventing free enterprise and collective bargaining, and renders punishment without a court hearing you will also save the country from going bankrupt and the world from starvation.

J. L. VITZ, *Illinois.*

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator where that gentleman comes from.

Mr. O'DANIEL. From Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. From what town in Illinois does he come?

Mr. O'DANIEL. He does not say. He is in Los Angeles now. He sent the telegram from Los Angeles, Calif. Let me read the telegram again since the Senator from Illinois is listening.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish the Senator would.

Mr. O'DANIEL. It reads as follows:

In the name of our beloved country I urge you to eliminate OPA gestapos who create black markets and racketeering and ignore our constitutional rights preventing free enterprise and collective bargaining and renders punishment without a court hearing. You will also save the country from going bankrupt and the world from starvation.

J. L. VITZ, *Illinois.*

Mr. LUCAS. Does he say why he is in Los Angeles?

Mr. O'DANIEL. He merely says what I have read.

Mr. BRIDGES. Probably he is there for his health.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The following telegrams also have been sent to me:

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Power to you. Beat the OPA.

JAMES W. FRAZIER.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I trust you and Senator WHERRY will filibuster on the OPA bill and return our country to the American way of life.

Dr. DONALD J. MACDANIEL.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Most Congressmen voted to sell democracy for mess of pottage. Nation's salvation depends upon you now. OPA extension means anarchy and revolution. God help America.

MRS. R. L. THOMPSON.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Just heard over the radio your attitude toward the OPA and we are supporting you all the way.

W. B. MARTIN, Sr.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Your proposed filibuster against OPA will win you the undying thanks of all those who believe in the American system of free enterprise. It is unthinkable to all unbiased Americans that a country which outproduced the world to win our recent war cannot outproduce inflation.

L. A. SMITH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

More power, Senator. Hope you can restore our freedom. Distressfully wired and wrote the President about tenant domination.

C. LENNERT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your fight against Office of Price Administration bill. Take the hands of Communist bureaucrats off our country and it will prosper. Regard OPA as New Deal Communist inspired measure to break down our form of government. Texas leads the way and I'm proud of it.

WILEY S. SMITH.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I earnestly urge you to filibuster to kill the OPA completely. This is our last chance to get rid of it.

A. W. CORSE.

HIGHLAND PARK, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I approve your opposition to the OPA bill as reported by the conference committee. Keep up the good fight. Am happy to learn that we will have some leaders with the spirit of the founders of our Constitution.

MARIE C. CANRIGHT.

MADISON, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

America is back of you and waiting for your very long speech. Good luck and God bless you. Hope for a real America after midnight Sunday once again.

D. RANITZ.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Texas United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

The OPA is causing all kinds of hell in this country. Kill it as you would a rattlesnake. Kill it dead.

JAMES C. RHOTON,
A Corner Grocer.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

I am with you and I hope if necessary you filibuster, not that you will gain a hundred percent but you will win a point. It is time for someone to take a definite action and I believe you are that person. Don't give up.

HAROLD WINTERS.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Happy to know that my failure to reach you by telephone today was because you were busy trying to extinguish OPA, which is now choking the life of the American form of government and untold numbers of new business concerns like my own. I applied for a price formula on a highly seasonable product in which I have $10,000 invested and they have not had the decency to reply, in spite of two urgent telegrams, throughout a period of 23 days.

Yours truly,

DAVID J. LITTLE.

DENVER, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reports reached me that you intend to filibuster for the purpose of eliminating OPA. Because of my knowledge of the intricacies of OPA as operated, I am in full accord, as I believe are all other thinking Coloradans and Americans. I am sure the complete abolition of OPA now is in the best interests of the Nation. My wonder is, if you are successful in filibustering beyond the effective date of the termination of OPA, will the Senate and the Congress be determined to make law even more stringent thereafter. As amended and as per past performance, OPA is inequitable. Were it possible to make it equitable and realistic, all should be for it. Unless this can be by some definite agreement achieved, I say more power to my understanding of your intentions. Americans want no special advantages, only equal and fair opportunity to compete, to try to win the race. OPA as functioned hasn't learned the meaning of the word "Fair" in most every instance.

FRANK E. MCCAMBRIDGE.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Radio news reporter just said you intended to talk the OPA to death. I compare the OPA to a drunk and I have never known a drunk to get sober by continuing to drink. The only way to recover from OPA is to kill it dead as they say in Texas and let our people once more become fully responsible for their own well-being without malguardianship. All power to your success and I assure you the people of Texas and the United States are behind you 100 percent.
FIGHT FOR FREE ENTERPRISE, INC.,
WILLIAM WALKER, *President.*

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Just read of your filibuster idea to kill OPA. God bless you. Why spend millions to keep something going which is ridiculous. I work for a small meat concern as truck driver. Was making $45 per week. Last 3 months I worked 2 days. Restaurants must pay 21 cents for hamburger which you cannot even sell for good fertilizer. I blame this on red tape and mismanagement of OPA.
ANDREW GRANT.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
As national president of a 55-year-old organization represented in 46 States, allow me congratulate you on your filibuster thoughts concerning renewal OPA. Thousands upon thousands businessmen in America realize as you that discontinuance OPA only real solution recovery of America and her democratic principles. Best regards from J. M. McCauley, our New York president, myself, and members.
WILLIAM J. MCCORMICK,
National President, National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetables Distributors.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
One hundred years ago a Texan leader made history at the Alamo in throwing off a foreign yoke. Today you, too, can make history in helping throw off a yoke of Federal regimentation and regulation as un-American as your earlier Texans fought against. May God give you strength to go through to success in your undertaking. The world hates an appeaser but loves a man who fights to the last ditch for a principle.
H. M. COCHRANE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:
Keep up the fight against OPA. The country is with you.
J. B. EASTMAN.

ALTON, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you win. I need my home. Hooray O'DANIEL.
VIC SCHENKE.

FRANKLIN PARK, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please, sir, go to any end to throw out the OPA. Our three sons left home and suffered the hardships of two wars to keep freedom in our America. Now let's have it. Let us have it at any cost.
Mr. and Mrs. WALTER SALAWAY.

ALTON, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Price-controlled business and people have no place in American life. OPA must be abolished. Causing inflation, dishonesty of the worst kind, paralyzed production, manufactures closed down, business at standstill. We are for and will back your filibuster. Overcome OPA rule by all means.
Respectfully,
CARTER BROS.,
DON CARTER, *Manager.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Fight OPA to death to increase production. Kill black market.
WILLIAM LORENZ.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. United States Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
You make me proud of my Texas birth. Keep talking, Pappy.
THOMAS MABRY.

MILLSTADT, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator From Texas,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Please do all you can to kill the OPA.
Yours truly,
EUGENE MARXER.

FREEPORT, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hang on and subdue the OPA. That we may be free again and can move out the undesirables and move in gentlemen and human beings in our rented houses.
Dr. A. C. KISOR.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Your announced intention to talk the OPA to death has our enthusiastic support. Go to it.
AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE ASSOCIATION,
CLIF WOODBURY, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We commend you for the stand you are taking for the decontrol of dairy, poultry, and meat products in any OPA extension bill to be passed by the Senate.
AMERICAN BULK CONDENSED MILK ASSOCIATION,
H. C. DARGER, *Executive Secretary.*

Mr. President, you are listening to the voice of the people. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield with the understanding that he does not lose the floor?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield with that understanding.

Mr. BARKLEY. Four or five hours ago I suggested to the Senator the possibility of an agreement to vote on the conference report at 9 o'clock tonight. The Senator was not then willing to agree, but he stated that he would give my suggestion consideration, and that I might approach him later with regard to the matter. The hour of 9 o'clock has now arrived, and therefore I do not expect to consummate the understanding instantly. But I wonder if we may agree to vote not later than 12 o'clock tonight?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I did not realize that time was passing so rapidly. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say to the Senator that it has dragged on us, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. The time has just rushed by. I had not noticed it go by so fast. It has not been a drag on me. I have been interested in reading the voice of the people. However, I was sincere in my answer to the majority leader when he requested that I enter into an agreement with regard to voting on the conference report by 9 o'clock. When I took the floor I did not intend to make a speech. I have one which I can make, if necessary. I do not intend to make it now. I thought that I would make it at a later hour. I took the floor through the courtesy of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who wishes to make a speech. I should like to confer with the majority leader, but it is difficult to confer with him and read these telegrams at the same time. If I may dispense with the reading of the telegrams for the time being, and allow the Senator from Oklahoma to take the floor without my losing it, and proceed when the Senator has completed his speech, I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, would the Senator object if I ask unanimous consent that he insert the remainder of the telegrams in the RECORD without reading?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I want to be fair with all those who have sent the telegrams. It will not take much longer to read the telegrams, but I will do that after the Senator from Oklahoma speaks.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I do not know anything about any arrangement between the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Oklahoma. The Senator from Oklahoma advised me that he had a brief address to make, and that he expected to get the floor in advance of the Senator from Texas. The Senator from Oklahoma was busy in the Committee on Appropriations during the morning and afternoon, and I assumed that because of that he was not prepared to take the floor at the time he thought he would.

The Senator from Texas has been speaking now for about 5 hours, and it seems we might begin to approach the commencement of an arrangement by which we could vote. I realize how difficult it is for the Senator to give his attention to these telegrams and to me at the same time, and I know that the telegrams have priority over me in the Senator's attention, and I have no complaint of that.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is only because of the parliamentary situation. If I had my preference about it, I would like to give priority to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the Senator's apparent willingness some 5 or 6 hours ago—it was around 3 or 4

o'clock—when he indicated he would give consideration to an agreement to fix a time for voting, I was wondering whether we might approach each other upon that subject and work out an arrangement by which we could bring this matter to a conclusion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, with the permission of the Senator from Texas, without his losing any right?

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I am concerned.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to something which came to my attention a few days ago in Jefferson's Manual, which is a sort of source material for the rules of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. I find this language, which I shall read, and ask the Senator if it is a precedent, and is appropriate to be urged at this time:

> No one is to speak impertinently or beside the question, superfluously, or tediously.

Does the Senator think that rule laid down in Jefferson's Manual is applicable in the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that one of the rules of the Senate? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHITE. I wonder whether, in the absence of a similar rule among the Senate rules, Jefferson's Manual will apply.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not certain whether there is a precedent involved in a ruling from the Chair that that is a matter upon which the Chair could pass primarily, or whether it would have to be submitted to the Senate to decide whether any speech came within those terms. I am not quibbling over technicalities even in Jefferson's Manual. I am very serious in trying to work out a modus vivendi, as is said in Pearl Harbor language.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Will the Senator ask unanimous consent for me to suspend while I talk to him and that I may have the floor again after the Senator from Oklahoma concludes?

Mr. BARKLEY. Would the Senator hold out any hope to me that if we should agree that he suspend while he talks to me the result might be favorable?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Does the Senator mean favorable to abolishing OPA?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; I mean to reach an agreement about voting. I do not want to go through a futile motion. If there is a prospect, I should be glad to accommodate myself to the Senator. I realize he cannot talk to me and to the Senate at the same time.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Of course, I should like to talk to the majority leader in private about this matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows I believe in open covenants openly arrived at, and while I am perfectly willing to talk to him privately about it, any agreement we might enter into would have to be entered into here in the Senate.

If the Senator is in a favorable mood, if he is in a reasonable mood, if he is in a mood that he would give consideration to a suggestion of that sort, I shall be glad, so far as I am concerned, to agree that the Senator may suspend for a few minutes while we see what we can do.

Mr. O'DANIEL. And get the floor when we get through seeing?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, so far as I am concerned, for him to get the floor again. I suppose the Senator has another telegram or two.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes. I am in a favorable mood, and if the Senator will ask unanimous consent——

Mr. BARKLEY. How much time would the Senator want?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I cannot say how much time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I mean to talk to me.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Just until the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] gets through. I will let him finish.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without prejudice to the Senator's occupancy of the floor, he may suspend during the address of the Senator from Oklahoma, and that the Senator from Oklahoma be recognized during that interim.

Mr. LUCAS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator from Texas if he would be willing to enter into an agreement that beginning at the hour of 12 o'clock midnight tonight, and during the further consideration of the pending matter, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 1 hour on the conference report?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I would not like to do that, because I yet have hope of getting some converts among Senators on this matter. I do not see any signs of it; but I have hope of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think, in all good faith the Senator is optimistic on that score.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am of an optimistic nature. I still hope that. I see no signs of it, but I will say to the majority leader, and I appreciate his position, and I want to cooperate as much as I can in getting the bill disposed of, that anybody can realize the futility of one man talking on this bill until Monday. I made the statement yesterday that I would be glad to talk as much as I could on the subject, but that it would be necessary to get some other Senators, who would have the same opinion and the same desire and would like to talk, if we were to talk the OPA to death. I do not see any signs of that around here. I started in early today to read these telegrams because I thought word might get out to the citizens of this Nation, and that some more telegrams would come to some other Senators, and they would get religion right away and come in and want to start talking. I am in that position. I do not care to obligate myself until I can get a breathing spell and talk to the majority leader, but I can say that unless some help comes, and is volunteered pretty soon, we might just as well turn this country back to the OPA.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have done my best to arrange the matter to accommodate the Senator from Texas and other Senators. I have been unsuccessful.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. I merely wanted to point out for the edification of the Senate and the public in general——

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, may I have an understanding that the conversation that is taking place will not deprive me of the floor?

Mr. TOBEY. That is right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. TOBEY. I merely wished to point out to the assembled multitude here that a great tribute is being paid, a silent tribute, to the values inherent in the American cow. I point out that on the desk of the Senator from Texas there is a glass of milk two-thirds gone. He has talked 5 hours on two-thirds of a glass of milk. How far can he go on a quart?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Of milk? [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me in all seriousness, and still not interfering with the Senator's occupancy of the floor, say to him that I think it is the unanimous opinion of Senators present, regardless of their attitude on the conference report, that there should be a vote upon it. I think those who oppose and will vote against it feel that the Senate cannot afford to deny itself the right to vote upon it, and deny the people the right of having the Senate vote upon it. I hope that in view of the situation the Senator will accommodate himself to that feeling, which I think is genuine, and I should be the last one to deceive the Senator with respect to that. I recognize that the Senator is in possession of the floor, and is master of the situation as long as he can hold the floor. The Senator owes it to himself and to the Senate also to facilitate the consideration of a matter of this importance, when Senators wish to vote upon it. I hope the Senator will take that into consideration.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, let me say to the majority leader that I have entertained no hope of defeating OPA by talking it to death unless some recruits come forward among the other Senators. The majority leader states that he thinks there is no chance of that. I should be willing to dispense with any further comments on my part until tomorrow noon, when I presume we will convene again, and if at that time no Senator has told the majority leader that he desires to take part in this debate, I shall be perfectly willing not to attempt to get the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator realizes that the Senate cannot, with that uncertain situation existing, adjourn or recess until noon tomorrow. If the Senate would be willing to fix an hour to vote, even tomorrow, I would not object to a recess being taken tonight. But unless we can obtain some sort of an agreement that will result in a vote I am compelled to ask the Senate to remain in session continuously.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The objective of the effort I am putting forth is to try to get some more telegrams sent to Senators so they will feel inclined to say what they wish to say about OPA.

Mr. BARKLEY. With all due respect to the Senator, I think in that respect he is pursuing a will-o'-the-wisp.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I do not like to dispense with the possibility of such result coming from my plea. If no response comes in by tomorrow noon I am willing to give it up. I think by that time I shall have demonstrated my desire to do my duty. I am trying to do what is right. If no Senator comes along to help by tomorrow noon, I shall not ask for the floor any more, and will let the question come to a vote.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I say a word without the Senator from Texas losing the floor?

Mr. O'DANIEL. If the Senator obtains unanimous consent that I not lose the floor, I will yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak briefly, Mr. President, without prejudice to the rights of the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITE. I want to say a brief word about this situation. I am in very much sympathy with the efforts of the Senator from Kentucky to secure some arrangement by which we can conclude this session at a reasonable hour, and may reassemble tomorrow and dispose of this piece of legislation. I think there is among the whole American people a thorough disapprobation of filibusters. I think they criticize the Senate of the United States on the rare occasions when we talk and talk and talk and postpone definitive action upon legislation of vast importance to the country.

Now, as to this particular piece of legislation, I am not ready to say even now how I shall finally vote, but I do not know of any Member upon the minority side who desires further to discuss the matter. I do not know of any Member of the Senate who desires further to discuss the matter other than the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. It seems, if that represents truly the situation which now exists in the Senate, that we ought to find some way to end the discussion and to come to a final determination of the Senate's attitude on this piece of legislation. It is of tremendous importance. The eyes of the whole country are centered on this legislation and on the attitude and the conduct of the Senate with respect to it.

I submit with the greatest respect to the Senator from Texas and to all others who may wish to speak, that we ought to proceed to the voting stage and get this matter to the President in season for action, if he cares to take it either affirmatively or negatively. I very much hope, because I think it will add to the prestige of the Senate with the country, that an arrangement can be worked out by which a voting time can be agreed upon tomorrow.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I may say that I have the highest respect for the able minority leader, and I realize that this business should be disposed of at the earliest possible date. I think there is plenty of time to dispose of it so that the agency will not die at midnight on June 30. I hope we can decide tomorrow at noon whether or not there are any other Senators at that time who wish to speak. I will take the word of the minority leader as to what the situation is now. But I have hope that there will be a change in sentiment among some Senators. There is a remote possibility of it, but I can see where nothing would be lost if we wait until tomorrow noon to see whether or not any other Senator would want to proceed to talk on this bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am unable to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma unless he receives unanimous consent that I not lose the floor thereby.

Mr. MOORE. I want to ask for unanimous consent. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator——

Mr. O'DANIEL. I cannot yield for that purpose.

Mr. MOORE. Based upon the proposition——

Mr. O'DANIEL. I cannot yield without unanimous consent.

Mr. MOORE. I am going to ask for unanimous consent, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Well, Mr. President, here we are. I have no hope of being able to filibuster the OPA to death by myself. I am calling for volunteers, and I have hope that a great number of American citizens will between now and tomorrow morning realize the situation that exists here, and request their Senators to oppose this bill and to abolish OPA. But that sentiment does not exist at the present time, according to the belief of both the majority and the minority leaders. I do not care to be contentious in this matter. I do want to bring this subject in all its details before the Senate before a decision is made, in case I can get some help. But I do not see any help coming. So I shall continue to read a few more telegrams, and pray that something may happen.

The Gebhardt Chili Powder Co., A. Kronkosky, Jr., of San Antonio, Tex., telegraphs as follows:

Heartily in favor of the stand against OPA. Hoping you are successful in carrying out your plans for forced expiration of OPA Act.

I read another telegram:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We are for you. Hope to wake up Monday morning and find ourselves under American Government.

Wm. A. McAtee, W. C. Porter, R. D. Adams, B. S. Harrison, Geo. Carstens, W. E. Pohlen, Philip Lee Eubank, W. E. Dietert, J. W. Allen, D. A. Skinner

Mr. President, what a grand and glorious feeling that would be.

I read the following telegrams:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *July 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United State Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Senator, congratulations, keep strong. It is fine to know we have Senators who have strong backs and placed Americanism before politics. OPA is oppressive to the point of persecution to property owners and managers. Possession of property to veterans is especially unfair; veterans deserve extra consideration on housing.

BERTHA C. ACKLEY.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Go ahead and filibuster, we're for you.

HOWARD F. MILLETT.
MORGAN A. STIVERS.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Talk till you kill this bill.

J. CURTIS SAMFORD.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your friends in this locality are hoping and trusting that you will do everything you can to help quash OPA.

W. J. MAERZ.

LEAVENWORTH, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA now. Filibuster long and hard.

SHRINER, O. B. DEMATTEIS
UNIVERSAL TOOL CO.,
Kansas City, Mo.

I read one from O. Dale Smith, of Amarillo, Tex.:

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
All heartily approve of your filibuster. There's no excuse for petroleum being left in bill.

O. DALE SMITH.

Mr. President, the sender of that telegram certainly spoke a mouthful. The idea of holding controls on petroleum when everyone knows that the supply of petroleum greatly exceeds the demand at the present time. It is absolutely foolish to continue those controls. If OPA holds onto control over petroleum, in respect to which it is so apparent that the supply exceeds the demand, naturally OPA will hold control on everything if given the opportunity and the authority. That is the reason I think the bill should not be passed and that OPA should be abolished.

I read several other telegrams, as follows:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I deeply appreciate your efforts. Frankly, as both a dairy farmer and a creamery operator, I am convinced that our Nation's dairy industry will suffer great disaster if OPA controls are kept on dairy products.

S. E. KNOWLTON,
Owner, Knowlton Creamery.

MIDLAND, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
We want you to know that we are supporting your effort to abolish OPA 100 per-

cent, and heartily endorse your move to organize filibuster and kill OPA entirely. More power to you.

SCRUGGS MOTOR CO.,
MIDWEST MOTOR CO.
WILLIS WHITE MOTOR CO.
ELDER CHEVROLET CO.
MACKEY MOTOR CO.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

For heaven's sake, get rid of the OPA. Like most New Deal legislation, it is no good. Free enterprise and American ideals of fair play will solve our economic problems. Throw the New Dealers out.

L. W. NEUSTADTER.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

Give the OPA the works. We need industrial freedom. Hope you can organize a filibuster that will last until you witness the death of what is now a national curse—the OPA.

LEYSON PEARSALL CO.

The next telegram is from Santa Monica, Calif.:

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

Good luck on your filibuster. We are rooting for you.

JOHN KILGORE.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are behind you to win OPA battle.

I. W. RINGER,
Secretary, Washington State Retail Grocers and Meat Dealers Association.

HARTFORD, CONN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL:

OPA must go. Talk until it snows.

CHARLES MCGEE.

There is no sign of it snowing around here very soon.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL.
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

What this Government needs is more men like you who are not afraid to fight for what they know is for the best interest of our country as a whole. Good luck to you in your efforts against the continuance of price control.

J. D. ANSLEY.

UTICA, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL:

By all means filibuster OPA, thereby saving the American people their constitutional rights. Congratulations.

GEORGE E. CRESSY.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep fighting; we want to beat the OPA.

E. L. BAKER.

SAVANNAH, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge complete abandonment of OPA as our experience with it brands it un-American, unfair, dictatorial, oppressive, and an instrument for the use of those seeking a change of government.

A. F. KING & SON,
Realtors.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We must kill OPA now or resign ourselves to socialism and totalitarian state. Kill OPA extension at whatever cost and return to constitutional government and law of supply and demand and normal business life.

C. C. WHITTAKER.

That is the opinion of many of those who are telegraphing. We must kill OPA now or resign ourselves to socialism and a totalitarian state.

As I have said several times on this floor today, the people of this Nation are depressed. They are heartsick. They have been browbeaten, dominated, dictated to, and regimented for so long that they have just about given up hope. When the people of a nation give up hope, what have we left? The people who have telegraphed to me have renewed hope. That is the reason why I am pleading for time tomorrow, up until 12 o'clock, so that we may hear from many other citizens of the United States who feel that the cause is not lost, and who now see a ray of hope. I feel that they should have the opportunity to telegraph their Senators in Washington. Possibly a change in sentiment will take place. I hope it will.

The next telegram is from Grand Rapids, Mich.:

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

If you kill OPA you have my vote for President.

W. R. BOROUGH.

I am not running for President. I am merely running to kill OPA.

The next telegram is from Houston, Tex.:

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

My family, my many, many business associates and friends give you our wholehearted support in your wonderful fight against the OPA.

JOHN H. BLAFFER.

TEXARKANA, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Please continue filibuster against OPA.

T. S. HARGIS,
Bowie County Lumber Co.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your effort to end OPA.

MCCAFFREY RUDOCK
TAGLINE CORP.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand regarding the continuance of OPA. The war is over. Let's keep this country American. Let's stop black markets. Let's collect taxes on all the profits. Let's only have laws that can be enforced. Let's give all Americans a chance to remain honest.

R. LESLIE KELLEY.

It seems to me that that is a very sensible telegram. These telegrams are coming from American citizens who like to have their voices heard in the Capital of the United States. They are unable to hire experts and representatives to come to Washington. Many of them are unable to come themselves; so they send telegrams here when they see this faint little ray of hope shining through the clouds. I am reading these telegrams because I feel that it is my duty to do so.

The next telegram is from Pittsburgh, Pa.:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your proposed filibuster against OPA would be the best thing that ever happened to our country. We sincerely hope you go through with same.

C. N. HOWLINGSWORTH, Jr.,
WILLIAM ROGERS DRAVO DOYLE CO.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Texas Democrat, Washington, D. C.:

For the sake of every businessman in America filibuster OPA out of existence. We are all for you.

R. F. ADAIR.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We are behind you 100 percent in your fight against OPA.

C. L., W. B., and J. G. O'BRIEN.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Have we given our funds in vain to fight the Gestapo in foreign lands while we yield to one more deadly and savage in our own America? I and millions of mothers who gave beg you destroy every vestige of OPA. Let us have prosperity. Can we help you?

MRS. JOHN A. IRWIN.

That is another very sensible telegram from a housewife.

I and millions of mothers who gave beg you destroy every vestige of OPA.

These American citizens were told, when OPA was first established, that it was a war measure, and that we needed to establish this agency to try to win the war. When the war was over was OPA abolished? No. It continued in operation. There was no unconditional surrender on its part. That bureau is firmly entrenched in Washington. It is a going concern. It has no intention of ever giving up its authority and power to rule over every American citizen who buys or sells. It sets itself up as a dictatorial organization. There it remains. The war has been over for many months. Our brave boys on the field of battle have beaten to their knees in unconditional surrender every one of the Axis Powers. There is no war, and yet we still have OPA. OPA is still with us, trying to save the poor American people from their fate. All it does is to grind them down more and more every day and make slaves of them. It keeps prices of consumer goods down to the point where production is becoming smaller and smaller, and supply less and less. People are becoming more and more hungry,

and more and more angry. Yet it is said that we should continue OPA, on the theory that in the future it will be good, that it will commence to put itself in order and release commodities from control when the supply exceeds the demand, when everyone knows that there are now controls on commodities the supply of which exceeds the demand.

Why are such controls continued? Because if the controls are taken off, the employees of OPA will lose their jobs and have nothing to do. They want to keep their jobs. They want to keep the dictatorial power to tell the American people what to do, what to eat, what to pay for it, what to wear, what to buy, what to sell, and what to plant.

For 150 years the American people lived without such dictation from Washington. They refused to take dictation from a foreign power. Yet, we readily submit ourselves and bow down before King OPA. Certain Members of Congress wish to continue it. It may be the proper thing to do to continue it, but I do not think so. I am not questioning the judgment of other Senators, or their motives. I may be all wrong, but if I am, I am honestly wrong. I believe that I have a great deal of support for my contention. As a result of my making a brief announcement to the news reporters yesterday, thousands of telegrams have come to me from all over the United States. It seems to me that the citizens of the United States have a right to express their opinion once in a while on matters which deal with their very lives and all their activities. It seems to me that they should be heard in the Halls of Congress. I am reading their telegrams. I started reading them this afternoon in the hope that the news would spread throughout the United States, that some citizens believed that there was a ray of hope, and that they were telegraphing their Senators in Washington. It was my hope that other citizens might be inspired to telegraph their Senators. I feel sure that Senators have a burning desire in their hearts to please their constituents if they only know what their constituents want. They may be misinformed. But certainly if enough telegrams come to a Senator to let him know that a great many people in his State would like to have him join in an effort to abolish OPA and kill this hideous monster, the Senator will pay some attention to it. I hope that such telegrams will be received.

The next telegram is from El Dorado, Ark.:

EL DORADO, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hurray for you. On with filibuster.
W. A. SPEER.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
We, the undersigned voters, congratulate you for your efforts to kill the OPA. Filibuster good way.
G. G. Patterson, Tom Sawyer, H. H. Bruecher, B. D. Gresham, B. B. Heas, H. B. Mazzore, M. E. Cole, T. M. George, W. C. Morse, Frank M. Cowen, Thomas R. Copeland, W. C. Beck.

SENECA, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator "PAT" O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are backing you up in your fight against OPA. Put it 6 feet under.
MITCHELL ENTERPRISES.

Put it 6 feet under.

That is where it belongs, Mr. President. But we are trying to give it another year. If it gets another year it will want still another, and we shall be gone.

I now read a telegram from Bartlesville, Okla.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Just read in newspaper that you contemplate fighting OPA extension to the best of your ability. If filibuster ever was justified it is more than justified against enemies of the American form of government. More power to you from me and the majority of American citizens who wish to retain the American way of life.
A. ARUTUNOFF.

I appreciate that telegram. Some Senators may not like to hear these telegrams. I like to read them.

Here is a telegram from Midland, Tex.:

MIDLAND, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We want you to know that we are supporting your effort to abolish OPA 100 percent, and heartily endorse your move to organize a filibuster and kill the OPA entirely. More power to you.
BURTON LINGO LUMBER CO.
HIGGINBOTHAM BARTLETT CO.
A & L HOUSING AND LUMBER CO.
CHAMBERS LUMBER CO.

Listen to this:

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster communistic OPA out of existence before it completely wrecks American industry and private enterprise. Restore constitutional government by killing OPA.
H. C. GILBERT.
H. B. WRIGHT.

Mr. President, the signers of that telegram represent two more American citizens who are urging that they be given back their freedom, as promised them under the terms of the Constitution of the United States of America, the greatest document, other than the Holy Bible, ever penned by man.

I have also received these telegrams:

TEXICO, N. MEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to your filibuster. Keep up the good work. Show 'em there is something in Washington besides fish, fowl, and nuts.
M. C. ROBERTS, *Mayor.*

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You will receive the thanks of the Nation for killing off the OPA. It is starving the people in food and the businessmen in materials.
QUALITY MIRROR & BEVELING FACTORY,
GEORGE E. SOMERS, *Owner.*

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I support your stand against all President-appointed bureaus and wish you success in your present fight.
Miss MARY ALICE ELGIN.

Mr. President, I am still reading telegrams. All these telegrams have come in today. These are not an accumulation taken from the files. These are spontaneous telegrams thought out and written out by the senders because they see a little ray of hope. They think possibly there will be a change of sentiment in the final citadel of liberty, here in the Senate of the United States. The only place where this measure can be killed at the present time is right here, and I am pleading that it be killed. I cannot kill it all by myself. It will take some help to kill it, but I do not see any help coming.

Will T. Roberts, rural route No. 1, Kansas City, Kans., has sent me a telegram. It is another telegram coming from a good old farmer who lives on a rural route. Those farmers do not have any lobby here in Washington. Will T. Roberts is just a farmer out there. He says:

Stay in and pitch. Filibuster. Kill OPA.

It is not hard to understand that.

From Dallas, Tex., the following telegram comes:

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please accept this in appreciation of your action against OPA.
TOM STRICKLAND MOTOR CO.

Some of these telegrams come from some of the business firms that have not been put out of business by the OPA. The statistics prepared by the Department of Commerce now use a polite term for those that go out of business. They say, "Business discontinuation." Before the New Deal adopted the technique of having the wrong name for everything, they used to call them business failures. During the war more than 1,000,000 American businesses were forced to the wall. They "discontinued" for one reason or another, and today they are out of business. Some of these telegrams come from the few that are left. I cannot speak for those that are gone. They are out of business—more than 1,000,000 of them. Another million, to keep from having the stigma and disgrace of going broke placed on their shoulders, have transferred their businesses to other people. Those are called business transfers.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal said about the small businessman. From 1941 to 1945 more than 2,000,000 of them were put out of business by the New Deal. Moreover, more than 5,000,000 farmers were driven off the farms of this country. Then is it any wonder that we do not have enough food to eat? The 5,000,000 farmers driven off the farms, whom I have mentioned, do not include the boys who went to war. The 5,000,000 I have mentioned were farmers who simply could not make a living on their

farms, so they went into the WPA, and later into the factories. When once they leave the farm, they seldom go back. Work on a farm is too hard. It lasts from before daylight until after dark. But this great big Government of ours says that if a farmer works hard and raises a cow and gets a little milk and skims off the cream and puts it into a churn, and if mother churns it, in the kitchen, and gets a little butter, Chester Bowles will tell her what that pound of butter is worth, and will tell her that the price she gets for it is none of her business—that the butter just belongs to her; that is all. The bureaucrats in Washington are dictating to her as to what that pound of butter is worth.

I know a great many farmers. I myself have done churning. It is hard work. I have milked cows. I have done all the work on a farm, and it is hard work. The farmers milk the cows and skim off the cream and churn the cream into butter and take the butter into town. Perhaps in the town there is a man with a much better job than the job the farmer has, because after all it is impossible to find a job that is much worse than is a farmer's. Perhaps a banker in the town, who is doing fairly well, would like to have some butter on his table. What difference does it make to Chester Bowles or to the OPA or to anyone else, except to the banker and the farmer, what that pound of butter changes hands for? It seems to me we have gotten down to rather small business when we try to tell everyone in the United States how much he can get a pound of butter or a loaf of bread or a pint of milk or anything else he has, it matters not what it is. The OPA crowd are trying to set up an organization in Washington, and now they have the people shaking in their boots for fear that if the OPA is abolished everything will go to the bow-wows. Mr. President, what difference does the exact price make? One American citizen makes the butter or the bread, and another American citizen buys it. Where is there any loss? Those of us who work for the Government receive our salaries—all of us who are sucking the Government's sugar-tit. More than 3,000,000 employees are being paid by the Government. We seem to think we have to tell the people when to get up in the morning, and in fact we even change the clock and try to fool them about when they are getting up. [Laughter.] We are changing the clock and changing the holidays. Then we are told that the prices will not go up. Well, how about coffee? The price of coffee went up. It went up 6 cents a pound. How about butter? The price of butter went up 11 cents a pound. But still we do not get any butter. We just save more money on the butter that we are not able to buy. [Laughter.] In the same way, you can try to go to a store and get some meat, if you have a friend who is running the black market.

So it looks like such a foolish and silly thing to do. It looks as if we have lost confidence in the ability of the American people to run their own businesses.

If we boil the whole thing down, I cannot see anything back of it except a desire to keep this bunch of bureaucrats and Government flunkies on the pay roll, so that they and all their relatives will vote for the New Dealers every time they run for reelection. That is all I can see in it. There may be something else, but in my opinion that is the main thing. I do not think there is any public official in Washington, administering the OPA, who gives a snap of his finger about what anybody pays for a pound of butter or about what those who made the butter get for it or whether they have it or not. I see them; I talk to them. They do not have an ounce of human sympathy in their whole system. They do not care anything about that. All they want is their jobs. They have to do what they are told if they wish to hold their jobs, and that includes voting right.

So, Mr. President, here we are. We have this colossal octopus fastened onto the American people to such an extent that now we are afraid to let go of it. We are scared to death. Where is our freedom from fear? The only freedom from fear we have is no freedom at all. It is fear that somebody will not get elected. God knows that we could not get worse ones elected than the ones we have now. They certainly have gotten this country into the worst fix it has ever been in.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Has it been altogether the people elected by the American public who have gotten the country into this mess, or has it been the people who never face an election who have done the harm? Are they the ones who are primarily responsible?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think the bureaucrats in the Government departments who never have faced an election, or perhaps some of them who were defeated in an election and then came to Washington and were appointed, are some of the ones who have done the dirty work.

But we in Congress have authorized it. The only persons the voting people of American can get back at are those for whom they vote. We in Congress have to take the rap. If we who serve in Congress have done anything for the country that is worth a hoot we should get credit for it. The Congress is the policy-making body of the country. We should get complete credit for any worth-while accomplishments. If anything good should accidentally happen we should get the credit for it. [Laughter.]

If we take the credit for that, we cannot escape taking the responsibility for this mess that we are in now. We in Congress passed the OPA law and we in the Senate confirmed the nominations of the administrators. I have never said a word of ill against any of the administrators. It does no good to pass a law and set up a bunch of bureaucrats in Washington and then, when they start to do something bad, holler, "Wolf! Wolf! Look at Chester Bowles. He is a bad man!" Chester Bowles was hired to do that dirty work. He was picked out for it. His qualifications were examined, just as in the case of any business organization which will look into the qualifications of a man it wishes to hire. When an organization wishes to employ a man who will get a job done, it examines his qualifications before he is hired.

Mr. President, what the administration wanted to do was to overthrow our American form of government. The weapons which it used included the OPA. Chester Bowles was hired as a part of the program. I think he has done a swell job. It has been a dirty job, but he did what he was hired to do. We may talk about having an American form of government; but how can we have an American form of government when a man may not run his own business or work for anyone else, or buy some article without obtaining permission from a bureaucrat in Washington? Not all the damage has been done by the OPA; but no person could get a job administering the OPA unless he were a New Dealer. No one could get a job administering any of the departments of the Government if he were not a New Dealer. Mr. President, I should like to cut loose even one little hold that this giant octopus has on the American people. I am not having much luck, but I am trying to do the best I can. I may be wrong in my understanding of matters, but everyone knows, at least, where I stand. I am against not only the OPA, but I am against the whole New Deal outfit, and I have been against it from the time it originated in 1933 up to the present time. We will never have America until we get rid of the OPA.

Mr. President, we have heard considerable talk about the damage which has been done by the OPA. The New Dealers are in absolute collusion and are working hand in glove with the foreign labor leader racketeers such as Sidney Hillman and others. Those men have the power to call a strike in any division of American industry in which they choose to call out the workers. We witness certain public officials going around and calling labor leaders bad names. Yet, Mr. President, they are all working in cahoots. The American people must pay the bill. The only way to get rid of them is to go ahead and get rid of them. They cannot be eliminated by extending their power from year to year. Do Senators believe that those persons will become good and will improve? Of course they will not. If they improve they will be fired. They must do what they are told to do. They must make good or they will be fired.

I am trying to do what I can with the hope that perhaps I may receive a little help and the OPA will die a natural death on midnight next Sunday. One man telegraphed that we should make July 1 a holiday in the event that OPA dies. I had not thought about that, but if a holiday is suggested around Washington, we may receive some support.

Mr. President, the people throughout the country to whom I have referred are pleading for their lives. They are not asking for hand-outs, subsidies, or appropriations. All they are asking for is to be left alone and to be allowed to operate their own businesses. Yet, are we really looking after their interests? Mr. President, we are afraid that they will be required to pay a nickel more for a pound

of butter, which they are unable to obtain. We are worrying ourselves sick in the Senate about the poor people who will have to pay too much for something which they cannot buy. The people are starving to death while they are getting rich on what they are saving on what they do not buy. The predicament is a silly one for us to be in. The people have been regimented so long and pinned down so long that they are about ready to give up, just as did the people in France. Our attitude is, "Let them lie down and go to sleep; we cannot do anything about it."

Mr. President, I have talked to many farmers in my State. I have said to some of them, "If something is not done about food production, the people in Washington will starve to death." I shall not repeat on the Senate floor what one farmer replied to me. I would not want to use the profanity which he employed. But he did not have a great deal of regard for what might happen to the people in Washington.

Mr. President, the American people cannot be outsmarted. They can be pulled down, thrown into chains, and incarcerated in jail, but some day they will rise. They will say, "Oh, no; you cannot do that to me anymore." Then everybody will want to jump on the bandwagon. I can see it coming. In fact, I saw it coming before the OPA bill was originally passed. I am not a prophet. Any person could have seen it. I thought that deceit and deception were being perpetrated upon us when the original OPA bill was brought before the Senate. I thought the bill had been drawn for the direct purpose of overthrowing the American form of government. The NRA had failed and the "blue eagle" had been thrown into the ashcan. But the New Dealers never give up. If they receive a temporary set-back, they put a new hat on the proposal, dress it up, bring it back, and say, "Here; we have another emergency."

Mr. President, a few days ago I heard the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] make a speech on this floor. He had erected before the Senate a chart, on which there were listed the names of agricultural commodities. He had before him a record of the hearings which were held by his committee on the subject. I refer to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Here is a copy of the record. If I have time, I shall read it.

Mr. President, the farmers throughout the country are dissatisfied with the OPA. They do not like it. They want it eliminated.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have any telegrams which he received from organizations today or prior to today, similar to one which was sent to me from my State? At the city from where the telegram was sent, 600 farmers are now assembled. They have told me that they want the Congress to abolish the OPA. Has the Senator received any telegrams of that kind?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Many of the telegrams which I have received came from farmers. Not all of them came from organizations of farmers, but they came from individual farmers who gave their rural route addresses.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Texas yield for another question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In the telegrams which the Senator has received, or in any telephone conversations which he has had, has he been advised that unless the conference report is rejected there will be violence and strikes throughout the farm areas?

Mr. O'DANIEL. A few minutes ago I read a telegram from a farmer in Georgia which indicated as being true what the Senator has said.

Mr. WHERRY. Yesterday I predicted that if the conference report is agreed to there will be strikes and violence throughout the country. Conditions are bad. A few minutes ago I had a telephone conversation with some farmers of my State who begged me to help kill the OPA.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator for a question, but I cannot yield to him for any other purpose.

I may say that I have received telegrams from many farmers. The situation throughout the country is tense. I am not a calamity howler, but neither the farmer nor any other American citizen can be bound down with chains very long before he will bounce up. The American citizens have been bound down already too long.

Mr. President, my opinion of the OPA is at least consistent. When the original OPA bill was brought before the Senate on January 8, 1942, I was a Member of the Senate. I had been a Member for only a short time, but I was a Member at that time and I still am. I am no prophet, but I have had some experience in business. I could read the plain language of the bill, and I did read it. It was not hard to understand. It was not hard to know exactly what the result of the bill would be if passed. So I rose on the Senate floor and make a few remarks. I was reminded of those remarks the other day when the Senator from Oklahoma was pleading with the Senate to relieve agriculture of this hideous thing known as the OPA. He made an eloquent and forceful address. I thought of the time when, a little more than 4 years ago, I stood on the Senate floor. What did I say at that time that the OPA was? I said that we should not call it a price-control bill but, instead, an antiagricultural bill. Here are my words:

> Mr. President, the antiagriculture bill which is before this body under the name of a price-control bill, is a matter of vital importance, and one which, if put into effect, would greatly affect the welfare of every American citizen.

Mr. President, was that language prophecy? Has the bill not been proven since to be an antiagriculture bill? Has it not affected the welfare of every American citizen?

I am reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 1, January 8, 1942, page 110.

> This price control bill could prove very dangerous and damaging to our Nation.

Has it not?

> And certainly we are all agreed that this is no time to make an unsuccessful venture or experiment which is as hazardous as this proposed price-control legislation.

Mr. President, I was brought up in the West. I know the sentiment of the American people—the rugged individuals of this country, who go out onto the plains of the West and eke out an existence from the soil, true American citizens, the pure American stock. Then here we are legislating, afraid they are going to get too much money for a bushel of wheat, afraid they will get too much money for a pound of butter or a dozen eggs. So we passed this iniquitous bill to hold the American farmer down. They have had these parasites chasing these poor old farmers ever since then. They have them almost scared to death. But the farmers submitted to that because we were in war. Their boys and girls had gone to the front to fight for this Government, to save this Nation, and they did save the Nation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I send to the desk a privileged motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

Mr. O'DANIEL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Do I lose the floor for the consideration of this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not.

The Chair will read:

> June 27 (legislative day, March 5), 1946
>
> We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

It is signed by more than 16 Senators. The Chair will file the motion, and the question will be as to whether the sense of the Senate is that debate shall be brought to a close, and it will be passed upon on Saturday 1 hour after the Senate convenes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senate entitled to know the names of the Senators who signed the cloture petition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is, if any Senator wants the clerk to read.

Mr. PRIDGES. I should like to have the names read by the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator would not object to the clerk reading them, would he?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. The signatures are:

Alben W. Barkley.
James W. Huffman.
Abe Murdock.
Wallace H. White, Jr.
William F. Knowland.
Robert A. Taft.
Robert M. La Follette, Jr.
Homer Ferguson.
Wayne Morse.
G. R. Swift.
Claude Pepper.
Sheridan Downey.
Joseph H. Ball.
Brien McMahon.
Hugh B. Mitchell.
Scott W. Lucas.
Joseph C. O'Mahoney.
Joseph F. Guffey.
Francis J. Myers.
Robert F. Wagner.
H. M. Kilgore.
Jas. M. Mead.
Glen Taylor.
Kenneth McKellar.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I feel slighted in not having been asked to sign the cloture petition. We have had such petitions presented in the Senate before, and I offer no criticism whatever; it is in accordance with the rules of the Senate. Every Senator who desires to do so has the privilege and the opportunity of signing a cloture petition.

I have heretofore spoken on this floor with reference to cloture, and I could not say anything meaner about it now than I have said before. Cloture was most effectively put into operation by Hitler on his Reichstag. I had hoped it never would be invoked in what is popularly supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world. Nevertheless, I am not objecting to it. It is the privilege of Senators to do it when another Senator conscientiously gets the floor and starts talking, and some of the other Senators get an idea, from the material lying on his desk, that he may talk quite a while. In order to gag him, it can be done. But I am telling my colleagues that the American citizens will know what is happening here, and they are just about fed up on this pussy-footing, this fence-straddling. There is going to come a reckoning some day.

I say again, I am not criticizing Senators. They all have a right to do this. It is in accordance with the rules of the Senate. It will not have any effect on my speech, because I am going to keep right on talking. The main objective of this speech and the reading of these telegrams was an attempt to get word through the "iron curtain" out to American citizens that there is a ray of hope left, that there is an opportunity to recover our American form of government by abolishing one of the most disastrous bureaus that has ever been in the city of Washington.

I was hoping that the word would pierce through. It did go through freely, but some safeguards were set up since the first batch of news went through. I was hoping more news would penetrate through and that the American people would hear that there was an opportunity, that there was a chance to save America, or to start in to save America. Abolishing OPA will not save it. We have to do more than that. But they saw a ray of light, a ray of hope. So these men and women, housewives, farmers, businessmen, preachers, lawyers, school teachers, and all the others of them have been telegraphing me. I suppose they thought the Senator from Texas would read their telegrams, and that their own Senators would hear them. I presume that, in addition, if they had enough money left after they sent me a telegram, they would telegraph their own Senators. The glass of milk is about empty, too. [Laughter.] I thought there might be a change of sentiment in the Senate.

It was never intended that one man should rule the Senate. I do not hope to do that. I have said all along that I could not win this fight without the help of others. I know the limitations of man physically. I did not expect that anything I might say on the floor of the Senate would change the mind of any Senator. I think the minds of few Senators are changed by anything that is said on the Senate floor, regardless of whether the words flow from the lips of the most distinguished, the most eloquent, and the most persuasive Members of the Senate. I think each Senator makes up his mind from several causes, and he has a right to do so, and I hope we continue to have that right.

The main objective of reading these telegrams, as I have said before, was that the people throughout the country might know that there was an opportunity, not that they would telegraph me particularly, but that they would telegraph their Senators, because I believe every Senator on this floor is anxious to know the sentiments of his people back home. This is still a democracy, this is still a republic, we are still representing the people.

If an avalanche of telegrams should sweep down upon the Capitol tomorrow morning from the people of America, I believe Senators would pay some attention to it. I would not want to agree to cut off debate. We are all reasonable men. We change our minds, and I wanted Senators to have the opportunity, if they desired, to change their minds tomorrow morning, or at any time while the bill is before us, if they are in favor of the bill, to have the opportunity to change their minds. That is all I am pleading for, which is the American system as I understand it.

It is not hard to see that the OPA law is unconstitutional, un-American, communistic, unnecessary. Everyone knows that. There are a few people, of course—I do not believe they really are socialistic in their hearts—a few good, honest people who believe we should have OPA. But do they realize that OPA is pure socialism, that it is taking something from their neighbors and putting it in their pockets, that it is a leveling-off system? Is there anyone here who thinks he is inferior to any other American citizen in ability to earn, in ability to produce, in ability to do things? Every American thinks he has plenty of ability, more ability than anyone else, more talent. If just given an opportunity to exercise his talent and his ability, he expects to find a place in the sun—in the economic life of America—and up to the time of OPA he has had such an opportunity, but it is gone today.

I call to mind in particular the case of a young man in my State who had been in business for a few years when he was called to the service. He closed up his business and answered his country's call. He was in the Army 4 years. Fortunately, he came back. He was a good Christian boy and taught a Sunday-school class. When he came back he decided to reenter business. But could he? No; he could not go back into business because of Government regulations. He wrote the whole story to me. He said, "I thought I was fighting for freedom, but I come back home and I cannot even get into business. The Government has certain regulations and certain quotas, and I am precluded from going back into business. Is this America?"

Mr. President, OPA and other New Deal bureaus in Washington are the ones that have sold the American people down the river. The American people would not stand for one moment for a communistic foreign enemy who came to our shores and tried to invade this country and overthrow our American form of government. But the Government has already been overthrown from within. Our only chance now is to recover it. In a football game one team sometimes loses the ball, and then perhaps recovers it shortly. But in this case the ball is gone from us now. Every American citizen knows that to be so.

I do not believe many American citizens want to have the Government in Washington take their part. I think they are willing to slug it out, to fight it out, blow for blow, on the economic field and let the best man win. But here in the Government there are bureaus trying to take sides. It is a very peculiar situation that we here are now taking the side of the largest group in America, the consumer group, which has the most votes.

Mr. President, I was recalling the statement I made on the Senate floor on January 8, 1942, when the original OPA bill was under consideration. I had not been in the Senate very long then, but I considered that I was a Senator the first day I came here. I read from my statement made then:

I regard this price-control bill as a very unwise and unsound piece of legislation.

That is what I said then. Many people now agree with that statement.

In all of the argument put forth in behalf of this price-control bill, I have noted that the discussion has been between various Senators who appear to be interested in making this distasteful legislation more palatable to the farmers of America—

Make it more palatable so they could swallow it. Sugar-coat it.

Since it is apparently a recognized fact that the farmers will suffer most under such a law; and I have been hoping that someone would raise the thought that the entire price-control bill should be abandoned and something thoroughly sound and workable

substituted in place thereof, instead of trying to patch up a weak and unsound price-control bill by adding amendments.

Mr. President, it is as unsound as it can be. Anyone can see that. It did not take a prophet to see it. Anyone can see that when it is attempted to set up an organization and bureau in the Government to establish on everything in America a price which will be satisfactory to both the buyers and the sellers, the task is impossible. It cannot be done. There is no one smart enough to do it, even if he wanted to do it. It cannot be done. Pick out two Senators, one has an article and the other does not have such an article, and let all the other Senators try to decide at what price the one who has the article should sell to the one who does not have such an article. It will be found that no satisfactory agreement can be reached. In this case it is the American people who must swallow the pill. I continue to read:

Mr. President, I am opposed to the passage of any bill designed to set up a governmental authority for the purpose of fixing prices along the general lines contemplated in this bill when, in my opinion, it is possible to accomplish the task in a more practical way by an entirely different kind of a bill, which I shall presently explain.

It is useless to condemn any plan unless a better plan can be provided. I condemned OPA, and I proposed something that I thought was better. I said this 4 years ago. I want Senators to know that I was here then and made this statement. I do not think they were paying much attention to what I said then, because they went right ahead and did just the opposite from what I recommended. And they have been doing the opposite ever since. But the situation will change some day. Things will be different.

Whenever we vest in the hands of a governmental price administrator or some governmental board the power to fix prices either of all commodities or of a selective group of commodities, we are in my judgment, setting up an agency which is potentially dangerous and which may be with us—

Listen to this, Senators—

and which may be with us long after this war has been fought and won.

If any Member of the Senate can refer back to anything any Senator said at that time that has come as nearly true as has that passage of mine, I should like to go along with him. The OPA has done exactly what I said it would do, and, if it is extended, I make the statement now that it will continue to do more and more of the same iniquitous thing. That is all it can do. If you get milk out of a cow today you will get milk out of the cow tomorrow. If you have gotten this kind of a mess out of OPA for the last 4 years you will continue to get the same mess out of OPA if you continue to keep it alive. I said this 4 years ago last January:

I certainly do not question the sincerity of purpose of the Members of the House and the Members of the Senate who are urging this character of legislation, but I do question their judgment.

I am not going to question the sincerity of purpose of any Senator. Every Senator is on an equality here. It is not up to me to question the sincerity of other Senators. We were under the stress of war when I made that statement. But I do question the judgment of some Senators. I have been doing it ever since, and I still do it. I said:

I wonder if they are considering and if they have considered all the implications of this measure, and what will be the practical results. I wonder, in the first place, what they hope to accomplish by such legislation.

What have we accomplished? Everyone is angrier at the other than he was then. Prices are no more satisfactory now than they were then. No one is more satisfied now than he was then. It is simply impossible to please everyone. When you try to run the other fellow's business, and he has not hired you and paid you to do it, you are not going to do a very good job for him.

I receive a great deal of mail, but out of the thousands of letters I have received, not one person has ever asked me to initiate any price-control legislation.

Is that not strange? Texas is a very large State. It has a population of more than six and one-half million, and I was pretty well acquainted with some of the people in Texas, and they were pretty well acquainted with me. But here comes a New Deal administration bill into the Senate, and not one single individual citizen in the State of Texas had ever asked me to have any legislation of that kind introduced. The people of Texas were not asking for it. They were not clamoring for it. Where did the idea originate? Who asked for it? Did the people ask for it? I never heard of any of them who asked for it.

Who is it that is wanting this kind of legislation?

I asked that question. No one answered.

I can answer for the farmers and ranchers of my State by saying that they do not want any price-control legislation at this time; but if it must come, they want all agricultural commodities excluded.

The Senator from Oklahoma is still trying to get those agricultural commodities excluded. They never will be excluded so long as there is an OPA. The OPA likes to have them included. The OPA will make all kinds of promises, but will not exclude anything.

And if agricultural commodities are not excluded, they certainly want the control of agricultural-product prices left to the Secretary of Agriculture.

It was an old-fashioned idea that agricultural affairs should be left in the Department of Agriculture; but that was what I was advocating. The Department of Agriculture is ruled by the Secretary of Agriculture. He has a Cabinet post. That is not a new bureau. The Secretary of Agriculture for many years in this Nation has performed a great service, not only to the farmers but to the entire population. You cannot do anything that will benefit the farmers without benefiting those who like to eat the products produced by the farmers. You cannot injure the farmers without injuring the entire Nation. I was not speaking particularly for the welfare of the farmers. Many farmers tonight are sleeping with peaceful minds and full stomachs, while many who are not farmers are not so fortunate. The farmers will take care of themselves all right.

Surely nobody would be so absurd as to claim that the farmers of this Nation are profiteering.

If they are not profiteering, why try to reduce the prices paid to them, and hold them down?

So why aim a bill directly at them?

Surely, it would be unwise for this Government to have one department, the Department of Agriculture, telling the farmers to let a certain percentage of their land lie idle in order to bring prices up, and have another department of our Government, the proposed price-control czar, forcing farm commodity prices down. That is what we shall have if we continue the present Department of Agriculture and set up another price-control department to set farm prices.

In the New Deal government, an emergency must be created and then another bureau must be set up to handle it. That makes two bureaus. Never let it be said that the New Deal will get by with one bureau when it can have two.

Certainly this bill does not contemplate raising prices to the farmer. Consequently, it is intended to do exactly the opposite of what the Secretary of Agriculture is now trying to do. Is that not an inconsistent position into which the Senate is considering plunging this Nation?

Think of it. This great Government of ours sets up one department to help raise the prices of commodities which the farmer produces, and another department to hold the prices down. But the only thing that is produced is more bureaus and more regimentation. The result is not the production of any more food, as we have all learned.

Certainly the laboring people do not want such a bill. At least none of them have asked me to initiate such legislation. The rank and file of labor knows full well that the wages of labor at every turn of the route on consumer goods from producer to consumer have the direct effect of increasing prices. They know that this bill effectively to lower commodity prices, or even to keep them from advancing, tends to lower wages, or hold them where they are, and in all events to prevent any wage increases.

The labor people knew that.

Surely wage earners do not want price control, unless wages are excluded, or unless the price control is placed under the Secretary of Labor on all commodities as to which wages are a component part of the price, which, of course, would include practically every commodity in the Nation.

I continued in that address on the floor of the Senate 4 years ago last January:

Now, if the farmers and ranchers and laboring people do not want this price-fixing legislation, who else is left that might want it? Somebody might suggest that the consumers want it. Well, the farmers and ranchers and laboring people constitute most of our consumers, but surely if any other consumers wanted price-fixing legislation, they would want prices fixed on the things they buy at the place where they buy them, and this bill does not provide for price fixing of all retail commodities. I do not believe that the few consumers remaining outside of the group of farmers and ranchers and laboring people are interested in fixing prices

of farm products, or any other products, except at retail stores where they do their trading. Even a casual investigation of the prices the farmer gets for his products and the prices the consumers pay for finished products processed in whole or in part from farm commodities will reveal that there is little connection.

For instance, the price of beefsteak in Washington was recently checked, and the retail price was found to be 75 cents per pound—

That was 4 years ago. One could buy beefsteak. It was for sale at 75 cents a pound—

while 1 year previously it sold at 45 cents per pound.

Remember those good old days when beefsteak was 45 cents a pound.

During the same year that the price of beefsteak advanced from 45 cents per pound to 75 cents per pound in Washington the price of beef cattle in Texas declined 1 cent per pound.

Was there any connection? In Texas we got 1 cent a pound less for beef cattle, and up here the price of meat advanced from 45 to 75 cents a pound.

What advantage would consumers have from having a price-control czar fix the price the farmer gets for his wheat? Consumers do not eat wheat, and they do not buy it direct from farmers. Consumers eat bread, and the price paid for a slice of bread here in some Washington restaurants would be equal to more than $30 per bushel for wheat, while our farmers get around $1.25 per bushel. The price paid for a cotton handkerchief here in Washington is $1,250 per bale for cotton, while this bill proposes to hold the farmer's price to less than $100 per bale. How does it help the consumer for a price-control czar to set the price of cotton at 19 cents per pound to the farmer and exercise no control whatever over the retail price of the cotton handkerchief and other cotton goods purchased by consumers?

That has been changed since the bill was originally introduced. Now everything is included. Later in my speech I mentioned that if the OPA ever got started it would get everything under its control.

Mr. President, I do not mean to imply that the vast difference between farm prices and consumer prices is all profit. It includes manufacturing costs, transportation costs, handling costs, other expenses, and profit. But I do contend that to protect the consumer, the retail price and all intermediate prices are just as important as the farmer's price. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. Brown] has repeatedly stated that price-fixing legislation is intended primarily to benefit consumers. It must be apparent to all who study this problem that in order to actually benefit the consumers by price fixing we must fix retail prices, because regardless of what we include in the first price-fixing bill we pass, it is obvious to me that if we are going to attempt to fix prices by law, in the end we will be forced to fix prices on everything.

Was that prophecy? If the camel once gets his nose under the tent, he will get in. I knew what the New Deal bureaucrats would do.

So, before we start out on this road of passing price-fixing legislation, vesting in the hands of a price-fixing "czar" in Washington the power to tell every retail merchant in the country what he shall sell a yard of cloth for, what a farmer shall sell a pig for, and what a manufacturer shall sell every article he makes for, I think it is well for us to consider most carefully the ultimate dangers and probable results of such legislation.

We did not study the problem very carefully. We went ahead blindly and passed the bill. I voted for it. After it was amended and fixed up I voted for it for one reason only, and I have explained it many times. We were at war. The fate of the Nation was hanging in the balance. We had to whip some foreign nations. Everyone in America could not conduct the war. We had to have a head. Our Constitution provides for it. It is a great Constitution. It provides for a Commander in Chief. The Commander in Chief said that he wanted the OPA price bill passed, and I voted for every war measure that our Commander in Chief asked for. I intend to vote for every other measure that any other Commander in Chief asks for, if I have the opportunity. I believe in our American form of government. I believe in preserving it at all costs. But just as soon as the war was over I introduced a bill in the Senate to abolish OPA. It was first established because we were at war. I say that when we get out of war we ought to get back to where we were, so far as our form of government and our system of private enterprise is concerned.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wanted to ask the Senator a question. Does the Senator recall that on VJ-day, or shortly after VJ-day, the President of the United States made a statement in which he took rationing off gasoline, and said that other controls would come off in the very near future? I ask the Senator if he recalls that statement; and, secondly, if the controls which were referred to have come off?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I recall some statement to that effect. I do not know the exact wording of it, but I have not seen any controls coming off. What I am trying to do tonight is to get the controls off. The only way to get them off is to abolish OPA. We cannot continue OPA unless it functions and does something; and it is certainly not going to do anything to put itself out of business. So it is not going to take any controls off. It is not interested in the welfare of the American people. It is interested in continuing bureaucratic control over the American people, and that is all.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Can the Senator think of anything more difficult than getting a bureaucrat to yield up control?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have never yet seen it done.

Mr. BRIDGES. That would be pretty nearly the $64 question, would it not?

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is worth more than that.

Mr. President, I further stated at that time:

My experience has been primarily that of a businessman, and I am mentioning some of the commonplace ideas which occur to me about this type of legislation, with the hope that some of the things which I mention may result in causing the Senate to give more careful consideration to some features of this proposed legislation.

Right here I want to take occasion to express my 100-percent disagreement with a philosophy of government which it seems to me is rather prevalent today, that is, whenever we have a job to do and appoint a man as an agent of the Government or as a member of some bureau, board, or commission, the action of making him a public official automatically endows him with all the wisdom of Solomon, and gives positive assurance that the problem which we have thrown into his lap will be properly and completely solved. It seems to me that too much of the legislation which we pass is nothing more than passing the buck by simply leaving the particular problem unsolved, and creating some board or commission with instructions to solve it.

We all know, or should know, that price control was an impossible task. We knew that we could not write a law which would accomplish it, so we simply passed the buck to someone else. Since then we have been kicking around those in that department because they have not done the impossible. They could not operate the Office of Price Administration satisfactorily.

On January 8, 1942, I further said:

Based on the experience which I have had in business, I can foresee many difficulties which will arise from any attempt to fix prices by law. For instance, we must have the maximum production from every industry in this country at this time if our national-defense program is to move forward as rapidly as we hope it will. This means that we must utilize not only our most efficient manufacturing plants, but that we must also utilize our inefficient plants. If a flat price is set on any commodity high enough to enable that the least efficient plants can operate, the result will be that the most efficient plants will be earning a tremendous profit.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the Senator ever hear this statement before—and I am quoting:

I think that the black market in meat has been very wildly exaggerated.

Did the Senator ever hear that statement before?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; I have heard that statement.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the Senator know that that statement was made by one Chester Bowles on April 16, 1946?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes, sir; I knew that.

Mr. BRIDGES. And does the Senator think Chester Bowles was as correct in that statement as he has been in some other statements he has made in the past?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think he was just about as correct in that statement as he has been in most of the statements he has made. But he was entirely off.

Mr. BRIDGES. Has the Senator ever heard this statement before:

I would say that we are in the business of keeping the law of supply and demand from working.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I do not remember that statement, but I know they are in that business. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. Paul Porter made that statement, and I was interested in knowing whether the Senator from Texas had ever heard it, because that is quite a significant statement.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; it certainly is.

Mr. President, in the speech I made on January 8, 1942, I said:

Think of all the problems which would be involved in controlling the prices of wholesalers and retailers. What standards would we adopt? Suppose we took the standard of prices which exist today, and said by law they could not be increased; there would be a thousand ways by which such a law could be evaded. The wholesaler could increase the price to the retailer and state that, so far as the price of the merchandise was concerned, no increase had been made, but that he was furnishing services now which he had not heretofore furnished, in the form of advertising or special discounts; in fact, other things too numerous to mention.

Manufacturers or wholesalers could charge the regular fixed prices for certain commodities, but they could force their customers to take with those commodities other articles which did not have fixed prices, and by putting high prices on those items, they would obtain for the job lot a very profitable price. There are hundreds of marketing combinations and schemes which wide-awake merchants can work out and do it perfectly legitimately, within the law.

I was simply pointing out the things that could happen. Everyone knows that they have happened since that law was passed. I simply emphasize the fact that the American citizens have been taught to use their brains for thinking purposes, and they are going to continue to do that, and they are thinking rather solidly right now.

I continue to read from my January 8, 1942, speech:

Whenever we attempt to fix rigid prices, the small industries of the country will suffer more than the others—

I guess that was true. In fact, they suffered so much that the Senate and the House of Representatives set up small business committees to try to save them. More than 2,000,000 of them are not in business now, although, according to the official report of the Department of Commerce, they were in business when I made that statement in 1942.

I read further from the same speech:

Whenever we attempt to fix rigid prices, the small industries of the country will suffer more than others, the reason being that as the larger industries, which are more fully engaged in national defense, daily take more and more of the efficient workmen, the smaller industries will of necessity be called on to operate largely with those who are less efficient, and this lessening of efficiency must of necessity increase community prices. The larger industries produce in larger volume, and volume production automatically produces at lower costs.

They are trying to put all industry in America in a strait-jacket, and they are trying to put all our industries in the same category. That simply cannot be done successfully. Today we are reaping the results. Most of the giant industries in this country sprang from small businesses. They started in a small way, and with the right kind of management and thrift they grew into the larger industries. But here we come along and at one fell swoop attempt to put all of the small industries out of business. How can we expect to raise a crop of large ones when we put all the young ones out?

In the same speech I also said:

It may be said that the price legislation does not seek to go as far as the matters which I am here discussing. The answer to that is to me obvious; no matter how we start in this field of price fixing, in the end we are going to have to go all the way if we get the job done. So we had as well consider now the whole program before we start out on this course.

Well, we have gone the whole way, clear up to tonight. The war is over. Here we are. We still have the OPA with us.

In the same speech I said:

I think it is inevitable, if we start out on the line indicated in the proposed legislation, that sooner or later, either in the pending bill or in some subsequent bill, we will have legislation which will attempt to fix wages by law.

Well, we have it.

I also said:

and to state that there shall be no increases in wages.

Well, we have it.

I also said at that time:

Whenever we do this, we will be taking the very last step in regimenting the lives and daily efforts of all our citizens; and, furthermore, I think we would be attempting to do that which we could not do under the Constitution.

We got out from under the Constitution, in order to do it, and we did it. We are fixing wages and everything else now.

In that speech I also said:

I say that whenever this Government undertakes to put into effect a price-fixing law which will actually get the job done and which will prevent inflation, we had just as well expect at that time to create a department which, sooner or later, will employ seven or eight hundred thousand people to do the necessary price-fixing, policing, and enforcing.

Mr. President, we now have more than 250,000 paid and unpaid OPA employees, but we have not yet done the policing. It would take more than I prophesied then—the 700,000 or 800,000 I then prophesied—to police the OPA job and catch all the black marketeers on both sides of the fence.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Has the Senator from Texas by any chance received a message from the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] that he is flying back to Washington to assist in the job on the OPA legislation?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I have not received a telegram from the Senator from North Dakota or from any other Senator that he is flying back to help in this fight, but I shall be grateful for the help of any Senator. The Senator from North Dakota is certainly a good one at talking; and he is a good one at getting votes, according to the way I understand the election in North Dakota went.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask the Senator from Texas if he heard a rumor to the effect that the Senator from North Dakota is flying to Washington at this time.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; I heard that rumor here. I have a very keen ear for rumors. It just floated by here a few minutes ago, and I heard it. As I said earlier in the evening, I have been looking for what would seem to be the impossible. I am looking for some converts to this cause.

I should like to say to the Senator from Oklahoma, before he leaves, that I am trying my best to get to the point where I can yield the floor to him. I just wanted a few minutes from him back there yesterday afternoon or this afternoon, or whenever it was. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. When the Senator's keen ear picked up the rumor which passed by—the rumor that the Senator from North Dakota is flying back to Washington to help out—did that rumor lend encouragement to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Oh, yes, sir. The Senator from New Hampshire does not know just how much this Senator appreciates just a teensy weensy little bit of encouragement. [Laughter.] I recognize it and I appreciate it and I hope it will come. It will be encouragement that is justified, and thus we shall get some reinforcements here before it is too late.

In my January 8, 1942, speech I also said:

It is not unreasonable to expect that to get the job done might ultimately require the services of a million employees—

Mr. President, just listen to this—

because every citizen of the United States would be a potential law violator.

I am glad I made that speech. I am proud of it. Almost every American citizen has become a little bit more than a potential law violator, if we consider OPA edicts the law of the land.

I also said:

And if we can believe the experience which we had in attempting to enforce that noble experiment known as the NRA, I believe my colleagues will agree with me that we would need an army of employees to make a price-fixing law work, even if we could make it work under those conditions. If it did not work fully and completely, it would fail completely and bring ruin in its wake.

Mr. President, it did not work completely. It has failed completely and it has brought ruin in its wake, to such an extent that the housewives of this country on this very day are unable to get enough of the proper food for their families. Every American citizen knows that to be true, and it is all due to the iniquitous OPA Act, which is in the process of being renewed by this august body of Senators tonight. I am standing here as a lone wolf letting everyone know that I am against its renewal. I alone cannot prevent it. The majority of the Senate will rule. I would rather have that happen than to prevail against

the majority, even though I know I am in the right. I wish to keep the Senate functioning. I wish to keep it in authority. But so long as I am a Member of the Senate I will say what I believe and I will contend for what I think is right.

Four years ago, when we were considering the OPA bill, I said:

It is claimed that this price-fixing bill will prevent or retard inflation. That is contrary to my belief; in fact, I believe it will tend to increase inflation.

Well, it has. We have inflation now. It is on a rampage.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please be in order.

The Senator from Texas may proceed.

Mr. O'DANIEL. In my speech of January 8, 1942, I further said:

I make that statement because, by arbitrarily holding farm commodity prices down, we are sure to lessen production, and all economists agree that as the stock of consumer goods decreases, inflation increases. In my opinion, it is possible to control inflation, but not by price fixing, and especially when the avowed intention of this price-fixing bill, as stated by its sponsors, is to benefit consumers by reducing prices to the farmers, or at least prevent any substantial advance to the farmers. It appears to me that the philosophy of the bill is backward. If we reverse the process and enact legislation to increase the prices to farmers, and take off all restrictions as to acreage planted, the farmers of America will increase their production of consumable goods, and that will tend to retard inflation, according to most economists' theories.

Mr. President, I ask Senators to listen to that statement. I made it on the floor of the Senate on January 8, 1942. I wish it to be known that I am not posing as a prophet, or the son of a prophet. I have merely read a statement which I made in 1942, and anyone may know how my predictions came true if they will but study the bill.

I continued as follows:

Little attention is now being paid to production of food because we have some surpluses, but with few other nations able to produce food and most of them too poor to buy it, we will face a starving world after the war, if not before the war ends; and now is the time to fill our present storehouses and build more and more food storehouses and pack them to capacity. Unless we do this, there may come a time when we will be as desperately in need of food as we were caught desperately short of war equipment.

Mr. President, that prophecy has come true. We did not build the additional storehouses. We did not give any encouragement to the farmer to increase his production when we knew that all the world was embroiled in a war. We knew that the war would end, and we knew that we would win. And we also knew that the foreign nations engaged in the war would be destitute when the war ended, and that starvation would stalk the world. Every Member of the Senate should have known it. I said it would take place. No one denied the truth of what I said. What I said appears in black and white in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I said that after the war ended, if not before, we would face a famine. All over the world, including our own country as well, there are hungry people who are unable to buy food, although, so far as our own country is concerned, they have the money with which to pay for it. For what little food they do buy they must sneak around the corner and buy it from a bootlegger—a black marketeer. Yet, Mr. President, we are trying to perpetuate that situation. We are trying to continue in control a dictatorial government bureau whose friends are engaged in the black market. Why would those persons want the OPA discontinued?

I continue reading from the speech which I made on January 8, 1942:

Are we to allow inflation to run rampant in this country? Are we to allow all of the evils which come with inflation to go unchecked? My answer to that is very definitely "no."

Mr. President, it seems to be customary when any American citizen fights this communistic bureau that some persons are always ready to say, "Oh, you want inflation." I do not believe any honest American citizen wants inflation. We all know how inflation destroys the substance of cur land. On January 8, 1942, I said, "Very definitely no." My answer still is, "Very definitely no." We do not want inflation, but we are getting it every day. Inflation has been on the increase and is running rampant at the present time. We are raising wages one day and raising commodity prices the next. Where will the procedure end? It is one continuous cycle. It is a spiral. The price of everything is going up. Mr. President, there is a way to prevent inflation, and there was at the time to which I have referred.

Allow me to continue reading from my speech.

I have in mind a perfectly reasonable method whereby we may prevent any unreasonable inflation in this country. The first thing I would recommend would be for the Government itself to stop doing those things which tend to bring about inflation. For instance, if all contracts for Government work were let in a fair and reasonable way, and if a bonus were paid to the contractor based on the amount of money he could save on the estimated cost of the project, instead of awarding contracts on a fixed fee, plus a percentage of the total cost, we would in that case be serving the taxpayer's interests and saving the taxpayer's money, and we would at the same time be preventing conditions in which costs are unreasonably increased and in which the very nature of the contract is such that the more it costs, the more profit the contractor makes. Certainly the Government should have an inflexible rule in awarding contracts, that every contract should carry a provision that it would pay a bonus to the management on the basis of the money saved. It is my belief that the power of the Federal Reserve bank has not yet been used to its full capacity to prevent inflation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe that measuring the effectiveness of OPA operations by a cost-of-living index is almost meaningless when so many of the items making up the index are unobtainable?

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is perfectly absurd.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator also believe that when consumers must pay for subsidies two or three times as much as the price of commodities the measuring effect would be rather meaningless?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Absolutely.

Mr. BRIDGES. When prices are quoted for unobtainable articles the measure which is used would be meaningless, would it not?

Mr. O'DANIEL. It would be plain deceit and deception, and an attempt to fool the people.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe that a great deal of the trouble which has arisen during the past few years has developed a sort of general mental condition which causes people to rely on the Government?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I believe that what the Senator has referred to is one of the most damaging results of the New Deal bureaucracy which have occurred to our Nation. I refer to the effect it has had upon the minds of the people, especially the young people. Persons who were possibly 10 years of age at the beginning of the New Deal era knew very little, if anything, about business, and are now 24 or 25 years old, and all they know is the New Deal philosophy.

Mr. BRIDGES. Has the Senator ever heard it said before that the trouble has been that during the last few years there has developed a state of mind, a psychological condition which causes people to rely on the Government? They say, "The Government must do this for me, the Government must do that for me. I must call on the Government to do it, and I have a right to ask that the Government shall do it, and if the Government does not do it I will curse it." Did the Senator ever hear that statement?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes. That is why the pressure groups are organized for the purpose of coming to Washington to obtain appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad that the Senator remembers the statement. I know that it was made by Mr. Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I did not remember that he was the author of the statement, but he is a good person from whom it could come.

Mr. President, continuing with the reading of my speech made against the OPA on January 8, 1942, I said:

Furthermore, it seems to me it is possible for the Treasury Department to do far more than it has done.

I was speaking of doing something to retard inflation.

When it is necessary to secure additional funds, it should secure those funds directly from the citizens rather than borrowing them through our commercial banks, because when we borrow funds, that within itself is inflation, whereas securing the money from the citizens tends to prevent inflation, and the interests of the Government would be served alike in each case.

As I understand, the basic cause of inflation, as connected with our present war effort, is occasioned from the fact that the pile of consumer goods is reduced for many reasons. It is reduced by virtue of the fact that

millions of people who have heretofore been engaged in the process of producing consumer goods have been moved over to the national-defense industries. Therefore, we have fewer producers within this field of consumer goods. Another reason is that the functioning of the priority system, which gives preference to defense industries, causes the consumer-goods industries to produce under capacity because they do not have enough raw materials. All these things, and others, combined, result in a constantly dwindling supply of consumer goods and a dwindling supply of consumer goods produces inflation.

On the other hand, the almost 100-percent employment of all our citizens at increased wages has resulted in a combined increase in the purchasing power of most of our people. In other words, most of our people find themselves in the position of having more money to spend for consumer goods than they possibly have ever had before, but there are fewer goods to be bought. Then the competitive bidding for the small supply of consumer goods begins, and what we are interested in here today is to find a way to prevent the inflated prices, which it appears are inevitable, if prices are not checked.

To me it seems to be more or less a simple problem how to restore equilibrium between the quantity of consumer goods we have for sale and the amount of money which the people have with which to buy these goods. We already have a tremendous deficit in this country. In addition to that we are spending money at a tremendous rate. We are honest, and we expect to pay our debts, and it seems to me that right now is the time to start working toward that end. I believe that if instead of passing price-control legislation, which means creating another board or bureau to regiment the business of this country to tell us what we can do and what we cannot do, if we would adopt a proper system of taxation and enforced savings so as to take this excessive purchasing power out of the market for consumer goods, the result would be that we would retard inflation and get the job done in a sound, positive, and practical manner.

Many business institutions in this country today are earning enormous profits because of the added volume of work incident to the national-defense program. I think the first thing we should do is to enact an excess-profits-tax law which would be based on a fair formula to determine excess profits, and this law should then tax all profits 100 percent in excess of a reasonable earning.

Then there is another thing which it would be necessary to do, and that is to withdraw from the competitive field of buying all excess earnings of our people. Therefore, I believe that along with a 100-percent excess-profits tax on business should go a combination of excess-earnings tax and compulsory savings tax on individuals.

Let me illustrate just what I have in mind. If a corporation has earnings of a million dollars in excess of fairly determined normal earnings which it enjoyed during the period immediately preceding our national emergency, the Government would tax that million dollars 100 percent.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator have the date handy when the OPA legislation was passed?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I do not have that date before me.

Mr. BRIDGES. Was it sometime early in 1942?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; it was soon after I made the speech from which I have been quoting.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator know whether or not there was a roll call on that particular vote?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; there was.

Mr. BRIDGES. And does the Senator recall what the roll call showed?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I do not remember the exact roll call.

Mr. BRIDGES. There were some votes in opposition at that time, were there?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; I think so.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator does not have the list?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I do not have the list before me.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator be surprised to know that a Washington housewife would pay today at least $18 for the same bundle of groceries she could buy in 1939 for less than $11?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I would not be surprised at that.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator call that good price control?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I claim we have had no price control. Prices have been out of control.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator know that if the same woman shopped at one of the higher-priced grocery stores in Washington she would pay $26.20 for the same groceries?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I would not be surprised.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator call that adequate price control?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I would not.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator know that if the same shopping had been done in 1939 in chain stores here in the District of Columbia the cost would have been $10.94?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I did not know that.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does he know that if the same list were bought at chain stores today, the same lot of groceries would cost $18.06?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I expect it would.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator call that good price control?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I would not call that good price control.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator know examples of commodities which are necessities of life which can be bought at comparable figures to the prices of 1939?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I do not.

Mr. BRIDGES. In fact, does he not believe that prices generally have had a tremendous rise?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I believe they have. It is common knowledge.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does he believe that this bill, as reported by the conference committee, will correct that?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think that the damage has already been done, and that prices are bound to increase a great deal more.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does he think this particular bill is going to have any effect one way or another?

Mr. O'DANIEL. In the long run, no. I think prices will go up just as much with this bill as without it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe that we might get a quicker adjustment of prices to reasonable levels if we had an outright repeal of OPA rather than sort of a slow strangulation of OPA?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think the only way to correct the price situation is to free prices from control and let those who buy and sell determine what the price of every commodity shall be. That would be the quick way, and it would be the surest way. If prices stayed up, production would increase gradually to such a point that prices would soon go down again.

Mr. BRIDGES. How long does the Senator believe it would be before they would start leveling off?

Mr. O'DANIEL. The time would be different for different commodities, depending on when they could be produced, and depending on seasons, and strikes, and other factors.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator does believe, does he not, that production is the answer to our problem?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Production is the only answer to the problem of keeping prices down. We must produce in order to keep prices down.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Kansas for a question only.

Mr. REED. I shall observe the Senator's prerogatives and the Senate rules.

The Senator just mentioned production. I wish to ask him if he does not come from the largest petroleum-produring State, Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Oh, yes; I admit that. I am proud of it.

Mr. REED. The Senator is aware of the fact, is he not, that the production of petroleum in the United States today exceeds the demand for petroleum. Is that correct?

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is absolutely correct.

Mr. REED. And for months past the OPA has been giving those of us from the oil States an intimation that it was going to leave the controls upon petroleum. Is that correct?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I understand that to be correct.

Mr. REED. And the last time the Senator from Kansas, who is speaking now, had the floor, he was interrupted by the Senator from New Mexico, who inquired if the Senator from Kansas wanted performance instead of conversation. Is performance what the Senator from Texas wants from the OPA?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I want the OPA to be abolished. I do not want nor expect any performance from them.

Mr. REED. The Senator does not want either performance or conversation, because all we get from OPA is conversation. Is that correct?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes. I do not believe a word they say, and everything they do,

in my opinion, is wrong, unless it is accidentally right.

Mr. REED. May I inquire of the Senator if he can conjure up out of his rather lively mind and imagination any possible reason why the OPA should continue controls on petroleum and petroleum products, when the stocks of gasoline are increasing every week in this country, when the production of crude petroleum is in excess of the current demand for crude petroleum? Is there any reason the Senator from Texas can think of why the OPA, if there were any good faith, if there were any honesty, if there were any decency in the OPA, should continue controls on petroleum?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I can think of no sound reason. Of course, I know the reasons they have, but they are unsound.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. MOORE. What does the Senator mean by saying that he does not know any sound reasons? What are the reasons?

Mr. O'DANIEL. The reasons are that they want to continue their bureau, to keep their jobs, to regiment the people and dictate to the people, and exercise the power which they think they have, or claim they have, under the OPA law—the same reason why Mr. Stalin likes to keep his power.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question, not for a moment.

Mr. HAWKES. What I want to do is to ask a question. Does the Senator realize that in nearly every request that is made by collective-bargaining committees for increases in wages the argument is advanced that the living costs which are based upon ceiling prices are not the true living costs, and that the workmen have to buy in the black market, and therefore have to have more wages?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, that is not a question.

Mr. HAWKES. I asked the Senator if he realized that was so. That is a question, is it not?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; I realize that is the truth.

Mr. HAWKES. I thought I asked a question.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I understood the question, and I answered the question.

Mr. President, continuing from where I stopped reading a few moments ago, in the speech of January 8, I said:

If the head of a large corporation, by virtue of increased profit, should decide to pay himself a salary of $50,000 annually more than he had normally been earning, this increase should also be taxed 100 percent. If an individual who had normally been earning $2,000 a year suddenly advanced to an earning of $3,000 a year, I think it would be just and right for the Government to say to him, "We expect you to pay to the Government an excess-earnings tax of 100 percent of this increase, with the understanding that 75 percent of this excess earnings will be set aside in nonnegotiable Government securities payable back to you at the end of this emergency or 5 years from date."

The result of a system of taxation built on this broad general principle would be that we would have no excess corporation earnings with which to inflate prices, and we would have no excess individual earnings to serve to inflate prices, but, on the other hand, by a direct system of forced saving, 75 percent of the excess earnings of individuals would be saved for them, and would be available to them to spend during the period which will follow this emergency, which will probably be a period of very substantial depression.

I believe the idea which I have suggested here, with proper safeguards, could be made a part of and added to our present system of income taxing, and I believe it would solve the problem of inflation which we are worrying about here today.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that if that system of inflation prevention had been adopted millions of people in America today would have much money saved up which they have uselessly spent, and there would not be so much money floating around to cause inflation.

The big advantage of the plan I am suggesting is this: If we adopt this plan, it could be made effective and carried out by the Department of Internal Revenue. Business would go along on the same basis on which it is now operating. We would not attempt to say to business how much profit they could make, but we would say to them, "If your profit is excessive compared to pre-emergency profits, we expect to take 100 percent of the excess away in taxes." We would not say to the individual who is making excessive earnings that "We expect to take all your earnings at this time," but we would say to all who are profiting from this emergency, "Your excessive earnings which are coming to you by virtue of this emergency must not be used by you to inflate prices and thereby create a situation which will make it more difficult for other workers in this country to live."

Mr. President, in other words, I was making a suggestion which would have carried into effect the statement made by our President at that time when he said "There will be no war millionaires made during this war." We all know that nothing was done to prevent war millionaires growing out of this war. Many individuals became war millionaires. I continue to read:

We have in this Nation today many millions of people whose earnings have not been increased during this emergency, in fact, there are millions of white-collar workers who today are actually earning less in terms of what they can buy than they have been earning during past years. Certainly any system of taxation which proposes to levy flat pay-roll taxes on all people alike would be unfair. I am perfectly willing to go along if it is necessary to levy a flat pay-roll tax on everybody to supplement our national tax bill, but the first thing I want to do is to take completely out of the field of current purchasing power all excessive earnings, whether they be in the hands of corporations or individuals. Then, when we have everybody on the same basis, we can apply flat pay-roll taxes, if necessary, to the normal earnings of everybody.

I believe that the plan which I am suggesting, of utilizing taxation to its fullest power, would prevent any inflation, and that it could be carried out by governmental machinery which we now have. When the emergency is over, we shall not have created another fat Government bureau with about a million employees, which will want to perpetuate itself long after the emergency is ended, and possibly seek to keep American business regimented and under bureaucratic control for the remainder of our lives and possibly the lives of our children.

That is exactly what we are facing here today. We have before us a proposal to perpetuate the life of OPA, and if we give it another year of life, what excuse will we have for not renewing it for another year when that time is up?

I am convinced in my own mind that we have in departments in Washington today in places of power many persons who would completely destroy the present system of free enterprise and free Government in this country and substitute for it a highly regimented, centralized government in Washington. If we pass a bill which creates a new bureau and provides for a few hundred thousand more employees, we will automatically make more difficult the battle which we shall have when this emergency is over to get back to the normal way of doing business.

We are having a hard time getting back to the normal way of doing business. Everyone knows that to be so.

I do not believe that we are forced to make a choice today between having unrestricted inflation on the one hand or unrestricted governmental bureaucracy on the other hand. I believe we cause taxation to pay our debts, and at the same time prevent any unusual price inflation. Certainly no one wants to profit by this war.

While I am talking on this subject, let me say that it is generally recognized that we can prevent inflation not only by restricting the purchasing power of the people to buy consumer goods, but also by increasing the supply of consumer goods. The best way that I know to increase the supply of consumer goods is to remove restrictions which prevent such supplies from being made available. I believe that the provisions of present laws which limit the hours of labor to 40 hours a week and require time-and-a-half for all overtime are very unwise in the present emergency. I believe that American labor should be encouraged to produce all it can. I believe that it should be paid good wages. I am not in favor of wage reductions; but in this emergency if it is necessary for a man to work 10 hours a day I certainly do not believe that the recipient of the labor of that man should be required to pay a premium at the rate of time and a half for all overtime when he could employ other persons to work the additional hours at the regular rate and thus keep the cost down on the consumer goods produced, which, of course, would help decrease inflation. Laws which automatically result in the average producer producing less certainly aid inflation, in that they reduce the supply of consumer goods. Small supplies of consumer goods are, of course, the fundamental cause of inflation.

It may be that the remedies which I am suggesting here today may not be exceedingly popular—

Well, they were not—

but I believe we should immediately recognize that we are in a terrible war, and the sooner we bravely and fearlessly face these issues and solve them, the sooner we will win the war and recover from its devastation. We cannot evade the issue by creating more boards and bureaus and passing on to some other agency responsibility for doing the job. I think it is a job which it is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to do; and I think the best way to do it is by utilizing the power of taxation. I believe it is the simplest way to do it; and I believe

we are more likely to have free American enterprise in this country when the emergency is over if we adopt this method.

The cost of 1,000,000 men to administer and enforce price-fixing legislation would be more than $2,000,000,000 annually for salaries alone, and possibly another billion a year for expenses.

We have not got to that point yet, but we are not through with OPA, either.

Such a department would be a dead expense, with no income. To bring about more positive results by taxation the additional cost of operating the Internal Revenue Department would be slight. About the same number of income-tax reports would be made, but the figures would be different. Also, the Internal Revenue Department has an income, and is more than self-supporting.

Yesterday the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] discussed the value of money and the effect of a fluctuating currency in connection with price fixing. He delved into ancient history and gave a splendid explanation of our position and the grave problems lying ahead of us in this Nation. While his discourse was eloquent and illuminating, I should like to bring our world problem, or national problem, down to lesser proportions. For illustration, suppose there were only 1,000 people in this Nation and that we used the barter system of swapping and had no money to use as a medium of exchange. Suppose we were then attacked. Part of the thousand persons would devote their efforts to the manufacture of guns and munitions; others would plant crops; some would weave cloth and make clothes; while others would go out and fight the battle. No money would change hands, because they would have no money, and inflation would not be a problem. But they would work, produce, fight, and sacrifice. Those things are the essentials in winning a war.

But there are 130,000,000 American citizens instead of only 1,000, and we must necessarily use money as a means of exchange; but still we must work, produce, fight, and sacrifice just the same in order to win this war. Under our present system the only problem to solve is the money problem. We must keep our entire civilian population working and producing by using money as the principal incentive for their activity, because that is the way we have been trained. Inasmuch as the war is a mutual problem affecting the present and future welfare of each and every one of us we must make sure that not a single person comes out at the end of the war with a greater percentage of our money than he would normally acquire under conditions immediately preceding this emergency.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. REED. May I inquire of the Senator from Texas whether he is laboring under the delusion that the OPA ever started out to maintain the free enterprise system in the United States of America?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am reading now from a speech I made on January 8, 1942, stating exactly what I thought the OPA would do, and in a great many respects what I prophesied has happened.

Mr. REED. May I inquire further of the Senator from Texas whether he is familiar with the fact that the controlling group in the OPA, in the very beginning of its existence, took the position that small business was inefficient; that the mission of OPA in this war was to destroy small business and put all business into large units which an organization like the OPA or its successor could regulate?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes. I had the idea that that was one of the things they would do. At the time I was making my speech in January 1942 I practically stated that, and I have made the statement further on the floor of the Senate tonight that it is my honest belief that the OPA was set up by the New Deal administration with its main objective to help overthrow the American form of government.

Mr. REED. May I inquire of the Senator from Texas if he is familiar with the fact that there has always been, and so far as I know there is yet, a group in the OPA which is almost a controlling group——

Mr. O'DANIEL. I realize that.

Mr. REED. And which has always been prejudiced against the free-enterprise system in America, and especially against small business?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am familiar with that fact. I know their philosophy.

I continue to read from the speech which I made on January 8, 1942:

We could do this by the taxation plan, which I have just explained, and it would be done thoroughly and fairly and at less cost than by the price-fixing method which is now under discussion. By using the plan which I have outlined we could function under our democratic system without having any aftermath to clean up or adjust.

We are now having the aftermath. We are trying to clean it up, but we are not having very much luck. The only way to clean it up is to abolish it. I continued:

We could keep right on after the war ends with the same system, except to reduce the percentage of excess-profits and earnings tax as our national expenses and our national debt might justify.

This excess-profits and earnings plan can be added to the next tax bill which comes along. It will not be long before we have the new tax bill before us, and very little time will be lost in getting it into effect. Furthermore, as soon as such a tax bill is passed, profiteering will suddenly slow down or stop, and retail commodity prices will drop or will come to a standstill, because very few corporations or individuals will take any particular delight in holding up their customers with exorbitant prices just to have their excess profits turned over to the Federal Government.

That is something which no one can deny. That is sound philosophy. If we were to set up such a system, we would not find any grocers, dealers, merchants, or others who would overcharge their customers merely in order to turn the amount of the overcharge over to the Government in the form of a 100 percent excess-profits tax. It would simply eliminate all incentive to try to profit above the normal profit which was being made prior to the emergency, as determined by a formula.

What I have said would apply to all lines of commercial activity, including manufacturing, transportation, wholesaling, retailing, construction, to every line of business, and to all individuals. Our President has said there are to be no war millionaires made during this war. There are some persons who are well on their way to becoming war millionaires at this time. Are we going to stand idly by and permit such a disgraceful thing to happen, or are we going to back up our President? The plan which I have proposed will do the job, and it will eliminate all possibility of any war millionaires being made during this great crisis.

Mr. President, there is another grave danger in this proposed price-fixing legislation. I do not know who will be the Administrator, but it is quite likely that in time to come there will be many administrators. There is no use to talk of personalities. We are concerned about principles and not personalities; and my remarks are not intended to reflect on anyone. But it is easy to see that by this proposed legislation we shall be setting up a most dangerous vehicle if it should be administered by any person who would use it for personal gain. Tip-offs could be made in advance of price changes, and such tip-offs would permit those who received the information to make immense fortunes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. REED. I will put it in the form of a question. I inquire of the Senator from Texas if he is aware that Mr. Bowles hopes to run for Governor in Connecticut on the Democratic ticket, on the basis of his magnificent record in the OPA. Has the Senator heard that?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I have not heard that.

Mr. REED. What would be Mr. Bowles' chance of election in Texas as Governor on that platform?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I do not think his chances would be very good on that platform or any other platform.

I further stated on January 8, 1942:

Tip-offs could be made in advance of price changes, and such tip-offs would permit those who receive the information to make immense fortunes.

We have heard something about those tip-offs. We have heard about the manipulations in OPA, and the deals which have been made to cause prices to fluctuate.

I continued:

Such legislation would lay the foundation for the most colossal ring of profiteering ever imagined.

We have had it. I said 4 years ago last January 8:

Such legislation would lay the foundation for the most colossal ring of profiteering ever imagined.

We have the most colossal ring of profiteering and racketeering today in the black markets that the Nation has ever experienced.

Even if some future Administrator did not take part in the plot, with so many employees it would be possible for leaks to take place, and that would be extremely disastrous. As I said before, we are not dealing in personalities; but we are setting up the machinery, and we should be absolutely sure not to set up machinery susceptible to such grave abuses. Under such a set-up, racketeering could be conducted on an enormous scale—

It is. We have racketeering on an enormous scale. Four years ago last January the Senator from Texas was looking into the bill which was before us,

and plainly saying that that would be the result. We have the proof of it now. I am standing here tonight telling those who are listening to me that if OPA is continued we shall have continued racketeering on a colossal scale. Everything of that nature will become worse. Nothing will become better. The only way we can cure the evil is to get rid of OPA.

Under such a set-up, racketeering could be conducted on an enormous scale—greater than any ever before dreamed of by the greatest crooks in history—

If any of the greatest crooks in history who are still alive have not heard about Washington, D. C., they are dumb.

I continued—

and it would be possible for that to happen without any criminal intent whatever on the part of the Administrator.

That is what I have said all along. I have not dealt in personalities. I have not dealt with Chester Bowles or any other Administrator. I say that there is no man living who has sufficient wisdom to operate the Bureau known as OPA and set prices on all the commodities in this great Nation so that they will be satisfactory to everyone concerned. No one has that much wisdom. No one has that much ability.

As one of the first Administrators of price control, the President selected a Member of the United States Senate, where there is supposed to be much wisdom. He chose one of our ablest Senators. Never a word has been said against him that I know of. He was wise enough to understand the OPA and to guide the OPA legislation through the Halls of Congress and have it enacted. He was the manager of the bill on the floor of the Senate. I think he was conscientious when he was trying to have the bill enacted. He was simply mistaken or deceived.

After Mr. Brown, with all his wisdom and ability, was selected and placed in charge of OPA he soon learned that he could not make it work. There was something wrong with Mr. Brown. He did not fit into that organization. He had in his make-up some character, some honesty. He could not make the OPA work, so he got out.

I continue to read:

And it would be possible for that to happen without any criminal intent whatsoever on the part of the Administrator.

Mr. President, I must have been very brave to have said this:

Mr. President, should such a dangerous department be set up, the blame would rest entirely upon the Congress of the United States.

That brings it down to our own front door. We might as well admit it. Chester Bowles did not organize OPA. Leon Henderson did not organize it. The Congress of the United States enacted the legislation which established this monstrosity. We knew that it could not operate successfully. We wanted to get the problem off our hands, and we established an agency in the hope that it would operate. It did not. It cannot. It never will. It cannot operate in America unless we change our form of government.

I understand that there is price fixing in Russia. They had it in Germany. It can be made to work under some other form of government; but it cannot be made to work under our American form of Government, under which men are supposed to be free citizens. In order to make price control work we must take another step. When we take the single step of price control, we do not go all the way. We must take the next step and have compulsory production. When we have compulsory price control without compulsory production, we do not go all the way. We do not have the finished product. If prices are set too low, producers will not produce. Consumers must have food, clothing, and materials. How are we going to get them if there is no incentive? Under our American form of government we have built up the profit incentive. Every American knows that to be so. Everyone likes to strive to make a little profit, to try to get ahead and lay aside something for a rainy day. If we remove that incentive we retard or possibly stop production.

Are we going to let our people starve? Are we going to run out of food and clothing? Or are we going to take the next step in totalitarian government and have compulsory production along with compulsory price fixing?

The system can be made to work. It works in America in the penitentiaries. We force the inmates to produce. They produce, but they have lost their freedom. Whenever we force men to do something against their will, they have lost their freedom. We took away the freedom of American citizens when we establishment the OPA. There can be no question about that. These people of the United States have found it out. They were trusting; they were patient. They did not know we were setting up such a monstrosity when we started the OPA. They had no idea it would be as bad as it is. They had confidence in their Congress, and they had further confidence when they were told, "When the war is over we will abolish the OPA. We are merely setting it up as an emergency war measure." They thought, "Very well; we will do everything we can do in this battle." They sent their boys and their girls into the fight. Even the mothers and fathers went into the factories. All our people were doing their part.

But now we are out of the war. We have no more enemies to whip. If we keep on doing foolish things we may have some more to whip, but we do not have any now. Goodness knows, it would be a relief to know that we were at peace and to know that the war has ended. Everybody but the Congress knows that the war is over now. The Congress has not yet found that out; the Congress has not passed a joint resolution declaring the war to be at an end. The fact that the Congress has not done so is a technical excuse for continuing the iniquitous OPA Act, because it is said that technically the country is still at war, although everyone knows that that is merely skulduggery and is not putting all the cards on the table, but is holding some of them up a sleeve. The Congress is attempting to say to the people of the country, "We must keep the OPA, because the war has not ended." Mr. President, the boys won the war, but the Congress will not declare that the war is over. The OPA Act is a bad thing, and I want to get rid of it. I made that statement, and no one challenged it.

In my January 8, 1942, speech, I also said:

Mr. President, should such a dangerous department be set up, the blame would rest entirely upon the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I am a Member of the Congress, and I was at the time when the OPA bill was passed, and I voted for that bill. I did so because the President of the United States wanted it passed. He wanted it, so he said, because we were at war. I do not want it now because the war is over and we can get along without the OPA Act. I cannot see any reason for voting for a continuation of the OPA Act. I have had the idea—and I still have—that we do not need the OPA Act now. I thought it would be a grand and glorious feeling to wake up some morning and find there was no OPA—to have the good old sun rise in the East and find that the OPA was no more. I thought that would be a grand and glorious feeling, and I made a statement to that effect, and the newspaper boys printed it in the newspapers which went all over the country. The people of the country read that statement, and they thought, "That is a pretty good idea. Who is this bird in Washington who has that idea? Let's send him a telegram." So they did, and the telegrams started to come in, and I started to read them here. I thought it would be a good idea to read the telegrams to the Senate. I did not see anything wrong in letting the telegrams sent by citizens of the United States be read on the floor of the Senate. We are here. We have a continuous session. No other Member of the Senate appears to wish to talk. So I thought I would put in my time reading these telegrams.

It is an inspiration to me to get these telegrams. I used to like to get telegrams when I was campaigning, and I got some good ones, too. They give a person a great deal of encouragement, and these telegrams have given me a great deal of encouragement. I did not think I would get as many telegrams as I have received. I thought I might get a few. But look how they have poured in, not only from Texas, but from the entire Nation. The telegrams have simply poured in.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question, but that is all.

Mr. REED. Perhaps because I have been out of the Chamber some of the time this evening, I may have missed the information which I now seek. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Texas how many telegrams, if he has counted them or if members of his office force

have counted them, he has received today on this subject.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have not counted them. The majority leader spoke to me about it. I think he said I started reading the telegrams at about 3 o'clock. It was 9 o'clock in the evening when he spoke to me about that, and now this day is about gone, but I have not yet finished reading them.

Incidentally, Mr. President, these telegrams are not an accumulation from my files. All these telegrams have come in today. I shall tell the Senate why they have come in. The people of America had lost hope. They have been so regimented and told what to do and what not to do and have had snoopers coming into their homes and looking into the pantry and under the bed and everywhere else to see if they had been violating the law that they were just about ready to give up. They had no ray of hope, until they heard on the radio that there was a fellow in Washington who was talking about it, who thought that we should keep on talking about the OPA until it is really discussed. [Laughter.] So then the people began to send telegrams. They have had their hope renewed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator tell us how long he thinks it will take to inform the people of America about the incompetency and inadequacy and indecency of the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am sure I do not know how long it will take to tell that. I am just trying it out now. I am just starting it. I do not know how long it will take to get started on my speech, but I will get through after a while. And when I get through we shall know how long a time it has taken.

As I was saying, I did not expect to receive so many telegrams. I knew the attitude of the people. You can whip a fellow down and put him in chains and bulldoze him until finally he begins to think there is no hope, and he decides to give in. That is the condition in America today. But when these folks heard that report on the radio or read it in the newspapers, they thought, "There is a fellow in Washington who thinks there is a possibility that the OPA may die at midnight on June 30." So they said, "Hip, hip, hooray! Let us send him a telegram." So the telegrams have come, and I have read them.

The reason I have read them has been that I thought the reporters who are sitting in the press gallery would hear them and would send out some reports that the telegrams were rolling in here, and so other people who had not thought anyone would send telegrams would take new hope, or their hopes would be revived, and perhaps they not only would commence to send telegrams to me but would begin to send telegrams to some other Senators, and perhaps there might be a change in the attitude of some Senators. I know that some Senators have told me that their minds are not yet made up as to what they should do in this matter, and so I thought their minds might be made up if they got as many telegrams as I have received today.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. REED. Would the Senator from Texas be interested in the fact that the Senator from Kansas has received several telegrams today commending the Senator from Texas for attempting to bring the OPA situation out into the open?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am tickled to death to be encouraged in that way. I surmised that perhaps some people would feel that way, but this is the first actual testimony I have had that such has happened. Of course, the Senator from Kansas does not need that assurance, but I am glad that some people in Kansas have seen a little ray of hope and have telegraphed to their Senators, and I hope that feeling will sweep the Nation. I hope that everyone who wants to get rid of OPA will send telegrams to his Senators. All of them have one or two Senators, and I hope they do it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield for a question, Mr. President.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Texas be further interested in the fact that the Senator from Kansas has received about 10,000 letters and telegrams and petitions and postal cards on the subject of the OPA, and the Senator from Kansas finds that those from Kansas run about 6 to 1 either in favor of having the OPA abolished or regulated and strictly shorn of its powers?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I did not know that, but I am certainly glad to learn that is the case.

Mr. REED. And is the Senator from Texas also interested to know that we made a check, and from it we found that 50 percent of the communications and telegrams have come from housewives who desire that the OPA be curtailed and restricted or abolished because they cannot buy hose or meat or groceries or anything else, and they are tired of the irritating regulations of the OPA?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I did not know that, but I am receiving telegrams from housewives. They are American citizens, and I think they are smart, and I think before we got the OPA they had more to do with holding down prices than did anyone else in the Nation. They know how to shop. They drive around from one store to another, and they get full value for their money. They are the price fixers of this Nation. I think they did a swell job, and I want to turn it back to them.

These telegrams are not coming from lobbyists, about whom we hear a great deal in Washington. These telegrams are coming from individuals who possibly never saw Washington. They probably would not want to spend the money required for the fare to Washington if they had it, to come this far away from their homes. They could not get away from the milking long enough. So they sent these telegrams. I started to read them with the hope that the senders would hear about it and send telegrams to other Senators which would result in some converts to their cause. I did not intend to try to persuade any Senators as to what they should do in connection with the conference report. However, they have constituents who might telegraph them. I believe that Senators really like to hear from their constituents. I have stated that I should like to receive some help from other Senators. I do not believe that one Senator should try to talk the conference report to death. I thought that if other Senators would tell all they know about the OPA, it would take them quite a while to do so. I thought that if we had enough converts to our cause at the mourners' bench, they would consume so much time that the OPA would die before they got through talking. But, as yet I have not received any promises of assistance, and I am taking my time in reading these telegrams. Perhaps in the morning something will show up in the way of assistance.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I hope that the Senator was not referring to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] when he said that he hoped that something would show up in the morning.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I hope that he will arrive and talk. A motion for cloture was filed a while ago. It may be that the Senator will not be able to talk as long as he would wish. I hope that we shall not have to wait until the airplanes come in, because there are some Senators who are already present. If the telegrams which their constituents are sending them have any effect upon them, we will have an opportunity yet to kill the OPA.

Mr. President, I have already said that the blame will still be on Congress. I am a Member of the Congress. I am trying to get out from under the blame. I am not sorry that I voted for the OPA. I am proud of my vote for the OPA, and I am proud of every other vote which I cast to support the President of the United States during the time of war. He was the manager of the war, and I would not care who the President might be at such a time; for the important thing was that he was the Commander in Chief.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas was intrigued a moment ago by a remark of the Senator from Texas to the effect that wisdom was supposed to lie in this Chamber. Surely, the Senator from Texas would want to purge the RECORD of that statement, and say that wisdom does lie in this Chamber.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, there may be some wisdom here, but it is not all here.

Mr. REED. I thought the Senator might wish to correct his statement that wisdom is supposed to lie in this Chamber.

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is supposed to lie here.

Mr. REED. Does it not go any further?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No, I think it stops there.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator believe that any wisdom is being exhibited now?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I believe so. If my belief were put to a vote I am sure that it would receive at least one vote. Perhaps there would be more. I do not know. Anyway, it is a sincere effort which I am making, whether there is any wisdom which may be detected in connection with it or not. I am not trying to brag about myself, but if any wisdom is shown here, it lies in the telegrams which I have before me and those which I have read. They were sent by citizens of this Nation, and I would not wish to say that those citizens are entirely devoid of wisdom. I believe that they possess a great deal of wisdom.

Mr. President, I was about to complete the reading of the speech which I made about 4 years ago. In speaking of wisdom, I said that the people look to this body because there is supposed to be more wisdom here than anywhere else. The President of the United States picked from this Chamber one of its Members, but with all his wisdom he could not operate the OPA. He did not operate it very long. I believe that the President could come to the Senate and find many other Senators who have wisdom, but I do not believe that any Senator possesses sufficient wisdom to make the OPA operate satisfactorily under an American form of government.

I continue reading from the speech which I made on January 8, 1942:

My remarks have come sincerely and from my heart. I ask that this price-fixing bill be replaced with something safe, sound, and practical, which will help carry out our great wartime program, and help retain our democracy after the war is over.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for every piece of legislation that I consider essential to the successful prosecution of this war, but I do not regard this proposed price-fixing legislation as a war-necessity measure in any sense of the word. This war will be fought and won by men and machines, and I will support to the limit any appropriations or taxes or laws to provide those essentials. But in my opinion the passage of this price-fixing bill will only give unfair advantage to some, and will unfairly penalize others. It has already been proven by the arguments presented in this Senate that price-fixing legislation is for class advantage. This bill in its present form will penalize every farmer and rancher in my State, while the political contractors, speculators, money changers, and others will profit by it. It will penalize every small manufacturer in my State, and will put many of them entirely out of business, by setting the price of their products on the basis of cost of production in gigantic factories in which the cost of operation is naturally lower on account of larger volume. The same thing will happen to small industries in other States. The bill will centralize industry instead of decentralizing it, and such centralization will adversely affect every laboring person in the rural area of our large State of Texas. The bill will not benefit the consumers of our State, because many of our consumers produce what they consume. It will hold out to some of our citizens false hope that prices will be held down, when in fact they will be held down principally on articles which will not be obtainable at any price because they will not be manufactured. Mr. President, my people in Texas are anxious and willing to do their part forcefully to prosecute this war. Nowhere on earth will you find people more patriotic and loyal than the citizens of Texas. They are willing to work night and day, and to sacrifice to the extent of giving the last shirt off their back, but they believe the responsibility should be equally and fairly divided, and that each should do his part. Fairness to all and favor to none is all we ask. That is what my excess-profits-and-earnings-tax plan will bring about—fair play to all. At the same time it will accomplish what we now seek to accomplish. I believe it is very important that we should have an opportunity to consider an excess-profits-and-earnings-tax plan before we take final action on the price-fixing plan now under consideration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon wishes to inquire of the Chair if the Senator from Texas has spoken more than once?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The speech which the Senator from Texas is now making is his second speech.

Mr. MORSE. Therefore, if the Senator from Texas should suggest the absence of a quorum, he would lose the floor and could not proceed again on this calendar day and address the Senate on the subject of this bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He could not proceed again. The calendar day is not the determining day. It is the legislative day which is the determining day. The rule is that no Senator may speak more than twice on the same day on the same subject.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, before starting to review the speech which I made in the Senate on the subject of the OPA bill more than 4 years ago, I was reading from telegrams which I had received from persons throughout the country. I interrupted the reading of the telegrams in order to read from the speech which I had made for the purpose of showing that I was at that time opposed, for fundamental reasons, to price fixing. That was before we had had any experience whatever with the OPA. For the same reasons, I am still opposed to price fixing. I expect to continue to be opposed to price fixing, just as will the persons who have sent me these telegrams.

Here is a telegram which I have received from Springfield, Mass.——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make it clear to the Presiding Officer that I do not approve of the technique which the Senator from Texas is using, and I believe the Chair knows that I do not approve of filibustering. At the same time, I believe that Members of the Senate are entitled at all times to know of their parliamentary rights. The parliamentary inquiry which the Senator from Oregon wishes to make is with regard to the effect of what the majority leader did toward vacating, shall I say, the objections which were made to the Senator from Texas proceeding some hours ago when the point of order was raised that he had lost the floor. The question which I ask now is whether or not the so-called vacating agreement, which I thought was reached by the majority leader, did not have the effect of putting the Senator from Texas in the position of making his first speech on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was a quorum call; at least, the record discloses that the Senator had already made one speech prior to that time, and that this is his second speech. The Chair had the Parliamentarian look up the record about 2 hours ago, and it discloses that the Senator is now on the second speech.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that was prior to the announcement of the majority leader that from that time forward it was the intention of the majority leader, as I understood him, to enforce strictly the rules of the Senate, and he put the Senator from Texas on notice. I thought that was a courteous and fine thing for the Senator from Kentucky to do. The Senator from Texas should have been placed on notice. But having been placed on notice, it seems to me that from that point on the Senator from Texas was in the position of making his first speech on the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the point of order made at the time I interposed was that the Senator from Texas had already made his second speech, his first speech having been made prior to a quorum call. When the question arose as to whether under another circumstance he had concluded what might be technically called his second speech, the point was made that he had concluded his second speech, and the Chair so ruled. An appeal was taken from that ruling and was pending when I sought to adjust the matter by asking that the point of order be the appeal from the ruling of the Chair be withdrawn.

The Chair did rule that the Senator from Texas had made his second speech, at the time I interposed and made the arrangement which was consummated. The Senator from Texas has made his first speech and is now on his second speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Oregon that the action of the Senate and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] in withdrawing the point, and the appeal being withdrawn, would have wiped out all the proceedings, so that what the Senator from Texas said before then would have been just one speech, but up to that time the record shows he had already made one speech.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Chair, and I wish to make very clear that the only purpose of my raising this question is to satisfy myself of the rights of the Senator from Texas. I want it very clear that I do not share in his judgment in exercising the technique he is following. I do say that I find it rather painful to sit here and see a Senator, although he is doing, what I think is a great injustice to this body, after he has been occupying the floor for a good many hours, compelled to continue, and if there is any rule by which the courtesy could be extended to him of a slight rest while the Senator from Oklahoma spoke, during which

time he might converse with the majority leader, I should like to see that courtesy extended.

I suppose it would be useless to ask unanimous consent to give the Senator 10 minutes from the floor, but I want to say that even in hours such as this, as fellow Senators, we should be exceedingly lenient with each other, even though we do not agree with the exercise of other Senators' judgment. I think we should in some way, if there is any way under the rules, to give the Senator 10 minutes to leave the floor, and let the Senator from Oklahoma proceed with his speech. But I do not know how it can be arranged.

The PRESIDING OFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Oregon that the Chair had the matter investigated a while ago to see the exact status. what he suggests can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. O'DANIEL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Has it been the ruling of the Chair that I have spoken twice?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD discloses that at the time the first point of order was made the Senator had spoken one time, and the Chair so held at that time. When the point of order was made that when the Senator yielded he lost the floor, the Chair sustained it, because that was already his second speech. That was eliminated on the request of the Senator from Kentucky, and the appeal was withdrawn. But the last incident had nothing to do with affecting what the Chair had already held at that time, that the Senator was in his second speech, and the Chair is merely following that ruling.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The second speech in what period of time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The legislative day.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Which continues for more than 1 calendar day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; it lasts until the Senate adjourns.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am very sorry that the reading of these telegrams from people throughout the Nation is obnoxious to some Senators. I have no desire whatever to be obnoxious in that respect. I thought I had seen it done here before, and that Senators had the right to read articles or telegrams or letters on the Senate floor. I thought I was entirely within my rights.

I realize, however, that there has been no great rush in my direction by Senators who want to speak on this subject, and I understood that we were going to continue in continuous session until the matter was disposed of, or at least until the majority leader wanted the Senate to recess.

I think that I have demonstrated fully my desire to try to abolish OPA. I have never harbored the idea that I could do it all alone, and without any assistance forthcoming. I have listened for hours and hours to the speeches of other Senators without making any criticism of them, because I really enjoyed them. I am a peculiar person; I like to hear such speeches, but I do not like to burden anyone with listening to what I have to say.

I have made my point clear, and I should like to know, if I discontinue speaking now, as I have been hoping to give the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] the floor, if I would have any other opportunity to speak; whether, if I should want to say anything about the bill before the Senate voted on it, I would be precluded from making any further observations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator could speak only by leave of the Senate.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Probably Senators want to stay here and listen to me the rest of the night, then, unless they want to give unanimous consent that I may speak at some other time if something comes up about which I might want to say a few words. I do not suppose I could get unanimous consent to do that.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I can yield only for a question.

Mr. HAYDEN. Would the Senator object to my asking unanimous consent that on the next calendar day he may speak for 30 minutes on the bill?

Mr. O'DANIEL. We are already in the next day now. I have not spoken since before midnight.

Mr. HAYDEN. That upon the recess of the Senate he may be permitted to speak?

Mr. O'DANIEL. On this day we are in now?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I might want to speak for an hour.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator said for a few moments.

Mr. O'DANIEL. A few moments?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what the Senator said. I think we might arrange that.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Make it for an hour, which is only 60 moments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would the Senator from Texas enter into an agreement, or agree that the Senate might enter into an agreement, that during the remaining consideration of the bill no Senator should speak more than once or longer than 1 hour on the conference report?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; I would agree to that. That would include me?

Mr. BARKLEY. That would include the Senator. I ask unanimous consent that from now on during the remainder of the consideration of the conference report no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 1 hour.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may I ask the majority leader if he proposes to recess now if the unanimous consent is given?

Mr. BARKLEY. I would ask the Senate to recess.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then I offer no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Granville Mellen, of Mississippi, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission, for the unexpired term of 6 years from September 26, 1944; and

Commodore Ellis Reed-Hill, United States Coast Guard, for appointment as Engineer in Chief of the United States Coast Guard, with the rank of rear admiral, effective from August 1, 1946, for a term of 4 years.

By Mr. HOEY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

James H. Flanagan, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years from July 1, 1946 (reappointment).

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes a. m., Friday, June 28, 1946) the Senate took a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. the same day.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 27 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

To be assistant surgeons, effective date of oath of office

Ralph Berg, Jr.	Edward M. Tracy
Lindsay K. Bishop	George A. Spendlove
Alton Meister	Robert A. Ravich
Vincent E. Price	Heinz Weisheit
Edwin F. Price, Jr.	Robert F. L. Polley
John D. Rutledge	Edward J. Lowell, Jr.
Joseph Satten	Terrell O. Carver
Robert S. Wallerstein	William E. Petersen
Austin R. Tyrer, Jr.	Samuel P. Bessman
Frederick G. Germuth, Jr.	Roy P. Lindgren
	Eliah M. Nadel
Daniel Shapiro	Milton J. Miller
Clyde H. Dabbs, Jr.	Ivan Lee Bunnell
Robert S. Weinhaus	Everett L. Ellis
Robert E. Greenfield, Jr.	Herbert J. Forrest
	Martin M. Cummings
John G. Clothier	Loring W. Pratt
Robert H. Dysinger	John H. Miller
Kirkland C. Brace	Elroy G. Burgwald
Hans R. Huessy	Robert S. Radding
Oswald P. Erickson	William A. O'Brien, Jr.
Gene H. Stollerman	W. Burton Haley
George M. Ellis	Ralph T. Behling
Robert B. Neu	Edmund V. Cowdry, Jr
David Ira Seibel	Robert B. Dorsen
Morton Orlov	J. Howard Beard, Jr.
Jack Kleh	Gleb A. Nedzel
Virgil Hanson	LaVere G. White

To be senior assistant surgeons, effective date of oath of office

Ernest Jawetz
William G. Hollister
Norman B. McCullough
Robert L. Faucett
William Roemich
Raymond R. Lanier, Jr.
David M. Gould
James O. Davis
George Adams
James T. Hearin
Jules H. Last
Leslie A. Falk
James V. Neel
George J. Cooper, Jr.
Andrew J. McQueeney
Joseph Kovacs, Jr.
J. Frederick Bell
Iva G. Murphy
Connie I. Hood
William R. Sutton
Richard B. Stephenson
Maurice L. Brodsky
Robert Guthrie
Paulo do A. Pamplona
Alfred J. Kahn
Walter F. Edmundson

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

The following-named persons to be foreign-service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John W. Bowling, of Oklahoma.
Rolland H. Bushner, of Oklahoma.
John X. Carrier, of Minnesota.
Thomas J. Dunnigan, of Ohio.
Cornelius J. Lwyer, of New York.
Craig F. Edwards, of Minnesota.
Arthur D. Foley, of Michigan.
William H. Friedman, of Missouri.
Francis P. Gaines, Jr., of Virginia.
Arthur L. Gamson, of Arizona.
Edwin M. Harbordt, of Missouri.
John C. Harley, of New York.
Ben D. Kimpel, of Arkansas.
Miss Mary S. Olmsted, of New York.
Edward P. Prince, of Illinois.
John G. Riddick, of South Carolina.
John L. Stegmaier, of Massachusetts.
Albert W. Ftoffel, of New York.
Kingdon W. Swayne, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Mary Vance Trent, of the District of Columbia.
Harris H. Williams, of Virginia.
Harry R. Zerbel, of Colorado.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

The following-named officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department Reserve for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the Judge Advocate General's Department in the grade specified, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of War, under the provisions of section 24e of the National Defense Act, as amended:

To be captains

(Promotion list)

Eichorn, Joseph F., JAG, [redacted]
Chase, Kenneth B., JAG, [redacted]
Scott, James M., JAG, [redacted]
Conley, William H., JAG, [redacted]
Mills, James R., Junior, JAG, [redacted]
West, John T., JAG, [redacted]
Menter, Martin, JAG, [redacted]
Stafford, John P., Junior, JAG, [redacted]
Kilgore, James L., JAG, [redacted]

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and arm of service specified, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of War, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 281, 79th Cong.):

To be majors

(Promotion list)

Turner, Harold R., Ord., [redacted]
Wilhide, Glenn C., Ord., [redacted]
Szymanski, Henry I., Inf., [redacted]
Chutter, Robert W., Inf., [redacted]
Gimbel, Richard, AC, [redacted]
Hart, Henry G. V., AC, [redacted]
Glore, James, QMC, [redacted]
Gallagher, Harold T., SC, [redacted]
French, Jules K., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Trimble, Ford, FA, [redacted]
McGrayne, Donald, FA, [redacted]
Nero, Ulysses S., AC, [redacted]
Murphy, Allen M., Inf., [redacted]
Sirois, Edward D., FA, [redacted]
Lentz, Harold T., CE, [redacted]
Smith, Grady L., AC, [redacted]
Valente, Frank A., Ord., [redacted]
Gordon, Lynell F., QMC, [redacted]
McGrath, Henry L., Ord., [redacted]
Goodell, John B., Ord., [redacted]
Jones, Harold D., Inf., [redacted]
Stark, Charles R., FA, [redacted]
McMurrin, Gilbert L., AC, [redacted]
Martin, Murry J., CAC, [redacted]
Choinski, Walter F., FA, [redacted]
Pasolli, Emil, Junior, FA, [redacted]
Schweikert, William F., Inf., [redacted]
Varner, Curtis L., QMC, [redacted]
Erwin, Lewis D., Inf., [redacted]
Perry, Lewis E., Inf., [redacted]
Oed, Paul, Inf., [redacted]
Romain, Coleman, QMC, [redacted]
Maury, Dabney H., AC, [redacted]
Hudson, Carroll D., Ord., [redacted]
Owens, Harry E., QMC, [redacted]
Feind, Emory E., Fin., [redacted]
Rosenblum, Abraham J., QMC., [redacted]
Alexander, Donald D., Ord., [redacted]
Young, Clyde G., FA, [redacted]
Odle, William H., CE, [redacted]
Hill, Cyril D., CAC, [redacted]
Northcross, W. M. P., Ord., [redacted]
McClure, George W., FA, [redacted]
Barney, Tyler D., Ord., [redacted]
Harmon, Reginald C., JAG, [redacted]
Leclair, Nelson, Junior, CE, [redacted]
Potter, Wilson, Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Duggar, Llewellyn G., AC, [redacted]
Heathcote, Earl W., CAC, [redacted]
Kaiser, Clifford A, FA, [redacted]
Watson, Whitfield W., QMC, [redacted]
Greene, Francis M., Inf., [redacted]
Hoyne, Raymond E., AGD, [redacted]
Anderson, Alfred H., SC, [redacted]
Mackenzie, Alan F. S., CAC, [redacted]
Smith, George M., AC, [redacted]
Forbes, William R., AC, [redacted]
Barrett, Jesse M., AC, [redacted]
Kiechel, Doane F., JAG, [redacted]
Chase, Earl A, QMC, [redacted]
Rae, John M., QMC, [redacted]
Johnson, Ragnar E., CWS, [redacted]
Merchant, Brintnall H., AC, [redacted]
Summers, Elden J., Fin., [redacted]
Mills, John V., SC, [redacted]
Jaquess, Fletcher P., AC, [redacted]
McKaig, Nelson, Junior, CWS, [redacted]
Belden, Hugh, FA, [redacted]
Jackson, M. C., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Wilson, Ellis H., AC, [redacted]
Hutchinson, D. R., AGD, [redacted]
Mickelson, Earl L., FA, [redacted]
Whittet, Williard A., Fin., [redacted]
Price, John H., AC, [redacted]
Pace, Guy L., FA, [redacted]
Swindler, Perry D., Inf., [redacted]
Miles, William M., AC, [redacted]
Generous, Harry W., AC, [redacted]
Isbell, Robert N., CWS, [redacted]
Browne, Allan R., JAG, [redacted]
Hurlburt, Edward L., AC, [redacted]
Archibald, Edwin P., AC, [redacted]
Tauer, Myron B., CAC, [redacted]
Newell, Charles H., QMC, [redacted]
Joseph, Robert E., JAG, [redacted]
Durst, Robert D., Cav, [redacted]
Moss, Roy P., QMC, [redacted]
Young, Edward R., CE, [redacted]
Gardes, George W., JAG, [redacted]
Cooper, Louis D., AC, [redacted]
Miller, Gay E., CAC, [redacted]
Gershon, Samuel, AC, [redacted]
Nichols, Stephen L., FA, [redacted]
George, Urban F., QMC, [redacted]
Myers, Francis C., AC, [redacted]
Barnette, E. J., QMC, [redacted]
Ingraham, Gordon D., Inf., [redacted]
Holmes, Frank H., AC, [redacted]
Jones, W. Eugene, FA, [redacted]
Fitzgerald, Maurice J., Inf., [redacted]
Benkosky, Stephen W., Cav, [redacted]
Woods, Lebbeus B., CE, [redacted]
Perszyk, Valentine E., QMC, [redacted]
Whiting, Edward T., FA, [redacted]
Morgan, George A., Ord, [redacted]
Marcus, David, JAG, [redacted]
Cooley, Lavell I., CAC, [redacted]
Tarrant, James E., FA, [redacted]
Smith, Emil J., QMC, [redacted]
Kimball, Donald G., CAC, [redacted]
Marshall, Harwood L., Inf., [redacted]
Marshall, Louis W., AC, [redacted]
Bunker, Raymond T., FA, [redacted]
Osborne, Harrold F., SC, [redacted]
Osborne, Harold G., FA, [redacted]
Merritt, Carleton E., FA, [redacted]
Lutz, Robert C., Cav., [redacted]
Spillinger, Harry G., AC, [redacted]
Bittner, John H. F., FA, [redacted]
Green, John N., FA, [redacted]
Carpenter, William E., AC, [redacted]
Kolb, Julius A., AC, [redacted]
Carrigan, John A., JAG, [redacted]
Des Islets, John L. M., AC, [redacted]
Walz, Ivan G., FA, [redacted]
Macsalka, Joseph L., Inf., [redacted]
Harrison, Jean P., AC, [redacted]
Haas, George A., Inf., [redacted]
Barrett, Archibald B., CAC, [redacted]
Hoffman, Frank E., AC, [redacted]
Lee, Robert V., CAC, [redacted]
Albergotti, William M., FA, [redacted]
Hankinson, Frank E., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Shafer, Henry L., FA, [redacted]
Ahalt, Henry C., Inf., [redacted]
Benjamin, Robert E., FIN, [redacted]
Potter, Loren W., QMC, [redacted]
King, Theodore T., Inf., [redacted]
Miller, John K., Inf., [redacted]
Adkins, Paul, AC, [redacted]
Dixon, Fred, CAC, [redacted]
Moody, Charles O., AC, [redacted]
Kidner, Herbert M., JAG, [redacted]
Davis, James P., Inf., [redacted]
Gordon, James B., AC, [redacted]
Allison, Harold O., AC, [redacted]
Moorehouse, Richard A., AC, [redacted]
Juell, Adolph B., CAC, [redacted]
Boyle, Russell T., JAG, [redacted]
Heavey, Wade H., Fin., [redacted]
Robinson, Shayer O. L., Inf., [redacted]
Fleming, Herman R., QMC, [redacted]
Darmody, William J., Ord., [redacted]
Ball, Rura O., CWS, [redacted]
Kirby, William F., Inf., [redacted]
Hillman, Burleigh F., Fin., [redacted]
Hunter, Edgar L., Inf., [redacted]
Sills, Thomas H., Cav., [redacted]
Fleming, William J., QMC, [redacted]
Moody, Marlin S., SC, [redacted]
Peterson, Gerald, QMC, [redacted]
Doherty, Edward, AGD, [redacted]
Peaster, Lowell E., AC, [redacted]
Utke, Russell O., CAC, [redacted]
Fowler, Robert C., QMC, [redacted]
Hoffman, Gus B., AC, [redacted]
Reed, William J., AC, [redacted]
Houston, Thomas A., QMC, [redacted]
Johnson, Bertrand E., JAG, [redacted]
Banville, James H., AGD, [redacted]
MacCloskey, Monro, AC, [redacted]
Langguth, Paul O., SC, [redacted]
Kotick, Ottmar F., FA, [redacted]
Kane, Nicholas AC, [redacted]
Tufts, Sumner P., FA, [redacted]
Gleason, Isaac W., SC, [redacted]
Fish, James H., CAC, [redacted]
Nabell, Edward G., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Thompson, John L., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Crane, Ralph W., AC, [redacted]
Lindstrom, Harold M., Inf., [redacted]
Kranz, Justus W., QMC, [redacted]
Fackler, Homer E., AC, [redacted]
Schmidt, Glen L., Cav., [redacted]
McCahan, Walter D., FA, [redacted]
Parsell, Sidney I., FA, [redacted]

Cooper, Russell B., SC,
Bean, Theron W., CE,
Hardenbergh, E. P., Fin.,
Whitehouse, Benjamin, Ord.,
Bradford, William S., Inf.,
Ruggaber, John C., Inf.,
Duerr, George A., FA,
Fisk, Samuel W., CAC,
Brumbaugh, Aloysius M., QMC,
Morawetz, Francis E., FA,
Doty, Paul I., AC,
Lewis, Paul W., Inf.,
Masters, George C., Ord.,
Thompson, Millard, Inf.,
Jones, Harley S., AC,
Jennings, William A., FA,
Stevens, Richard D., Inf.,
Klinck, Earl F., Inf.,
Perlett, John P., Inf.,
Ware, Charles S., Inf.,
Earle, Hiram W., Inf.,
Bank, Aaron, Inf.,
Berrigan, Donald B., QMC,
Dickey, Calvin A. L., FA,
King, Rosewell H., Cav.,
McDonald, Hugh, FA,
Meader, Glenn S., SC,
Brossard, Louis F., CE,
Bennett, Cletos O., Inf.,
Nemec, Godfrey B., AGD,
Gould, George A., AGD,
Wilson, Edward L., QMC,
Jones, Robert J., CAC,
Mage, Jack D., CE,
Faubion, Richard W., AC,
Freeman, Delbert B., CE,
Coffey, Robert E., Inf.,
Stone, Robert O., CAC,
McDuff, Robert J., AGD,
Richardson, Edward H., FA,
Halstead, Lyle E., AC,
Kirley, Arthur T., Inf.,
Roth, Andrew W., FA,
Nuss, Rudolph W., Fin.,
Theiring, Robert G., Inf.,
West, Harley B., Inf.,
Shankle, Wade L., Inf.,
Adams, John H., Inf.,
Hinds, Paul, AC,
Wellenreiter, F. L., CAC,
Robinson, James H., Inf.,
Sams, Thomas E., QMC,
Bogue, Joy R., FA,
Roberts, Littleton A., Inf.,
Beach, Maurice M., AC,
Hamilton, Harold L., QMC,
Shaw, Leland B., Inf.,
Light, Eugene C., AC,
Youngblood, Norman E., Fin.,
Rigdon, McDonald, Inf.,
Sinsel, Frank C., Inf.,
Perham, Wendell W., FA,
Gribi, Sam G., AC,
Donahue, Francis G., QMC,
Heston, Leroy G., AC,
Sykes, Orin B., Inf.,
McBride, Glen C., Cav.,
Stack, James, QMC,
Lewis, Jackson W., AC,
Shaw, Bradford A., AC,
Kilgore, John O., Inf.,
Nacht, Bernard T., CAC,
O'Donnell, Charles M., Inf.,
Evans, Houston V., SC,
Spinks, Leslie, FA,
Smith, George W., CE,
Eddy, Kenneth A., FA,
Ormiston, Edward J., Ord.,
Collett, Wells, AC,
Maples, Frederic A., QMC,
Scott, Donald H., QMC,
Paulus, Lawrence G., Inf.,
Minton, John H., Inf.,
Hewitt, Albert G., AC,
Fitzgerald, Herbert M., QMC,
Harpole, Russell C., Inf.,
Larson, Werner L., CAC,
Zoller, Solomon J., AC,
Wuest, William J., CAC,
Payne, Earl D., Ord.,
Link, Willard C., QMC,
Agee, Forrest J., AGD,
Hillman, Edgar K., AC,
Beckenbach, Charlie G., QMC,
Widmann, Homer, Inf.,
Ellis, Burton F., JAG,
Saltzman, Charles E., CE,
Hyde, Sydney F., QMC,
Foster, Joshua H., Junior, AC,
Kundel, Tewes, Ord.,
Broyles, Harmon E., CAC,
Lewis, Clarence S., QMC,
Bonifay, Lewis A., FA,
McKee, Basye C., QMC,
Howell, Lylburne M., FA,
McCarthy, Joseph M., Inf.,
Channon, James A., FA,
Nobles, Lawrence E., AGD,
Johnson, James H., Junior, Inf.,
Serra, Manuel, Junior, SC,
Harris, Murray D., SC,
Bankard, Roy T., AC,
Reubel, Harry B., Inf.,
Johnson, Burchard M., FA,
Dishman, Silas B., Inf.,
McAfee, Broadus, Inf.,
Joseph, Henry B., CAC,
Sommer, Henry J., JAG,
Skelly, Frank H., FA,
Alston, Robert P., AC,
Baumeister, Karl E., AC,
Garber, Gares, CWS,
Wilemon, William K., QMC,
Shanks, Joseph M., QMC,
Walton, Leon W., Inf.,
Beeman, Aaron W., QMC,
Tullington, Bernard J., Fin.,
Lewis, Berkeley R., Ord.,
Bond, George O., AC,
Woodes, Raymond C., CAC,
Alfred, Lee L., Inf.,
Cotulla, Louis E., QMC,
Eldridge, William G., Cav.,
Allison, Daniel W., Ord.,
McAteer, Robert H., SC,
Humphrey, Leon B., FA,
Allen, James E., QMC,
Rose, Bernard C., AC,
Holmes, Frank L., Ord.,
White, Edmund D., FA,
Barnes, George L., QMC,
Norwood, Frank, AC,
Keefe, John L., Inf.,
Reed, Herman H., FA,
Hornecker, Harry E., QMC,
Phillips, Terrel E., AC,
Reppard, Roy, QMC,
Page, John U. D., FA,
Munn, Marden M., AC,
Snyder, Ira D., AC,
Donges, Norman A., AGD,
Jackson, Joseph C., Inf.,
Jost, Charles E., AC,
Kelly, Ernest M., AC,
Maloney, Robert E., AC,
Moore, John V., Ord.,
Muller, Marcus H., AC,
Sharwood, Robert A., QMC,
Ingram, Lionel R., CE,
Earl, Edwin O., SC,
Rawls, Vernon C., JAG,
Robbins, Edwinston L., AC,
Nichols, Harry D., FA,
White, Harold R., QMC,
Ege, Charles C., Inf.,
Eason, Robert K., AC,
Bayless, Harry K., FA,
Smith, Carl N., Cav.,
Koeneman, Nathaniel W., Ord.,
Werner, Richard J., Inf.,
Pattison, Donald I., QMC,
DeWitt, John L., Junior, Inf.,
Rudser, Karl L., CE,
Lowry, Thomas S., QMC,
Walker, Roy N., AGD,
Baldwin, Richard L., QMC,
Grey, Joseph R., AC,
Scattergood, E. M., Junior, AC,
Wood, Abraham L., Junior, Inf.,
Dreyfus, James, SC,
Gwynn, Edward O., AC,
Rostenberg, Leo O., FA,
Kaiser, Clifford F., Ord.,
Howell, Llewellyn C., AC,
Snow, Clifford M., FA,
Staub, Leslie J., CAC,

To be captains

Shaver, Claude N., FA,
Liebe, Harold E., FA,
MacDougall, James B., Inf.,
McCauley, Jerome B., AC,
Adams, Ludlow C., Ord.,
Browning, William W., QMC,
McManaway, Fred, Inf.,
Blair, John S., 3d, FA,
Hatch, Carl H., SC,
Forbes, Sidney M., Inf.,
Moffatt, Carroll K., QMC,
Wright, James H., QMC,
Gruitch, Jerry M., Ord.,
Shannon, Leland C., FA,
Dey, John R., Cav.,
Shoemaker, Paul S., Inf.,
Mulligan, William T., AGD,
Bumen, Louis G., QMC,
Nelson, Harold E., QMC,
Johnson, Harold R., QMC,
Schmelz, Russell W., FA,
Rasmusen, Philo O., AC,
Strickland, Erasmus H., Inf.,
Walker, James T., Inf.,
Nichols, James W., QMC,
Tarr, Raymond P., Junior, QMC,
Bennett, Joe A., AC,
Vance, Donovan M., FA,
Volkel, Forrest B., CAC,
Moses, Lloyd R., Inf.,
Williams, Walter J., CE,
Clow, James M., QMC,
Travers, Arthur H., Ord.,
Lackas, John C., Fin.,
Bullock, Edmund T., SC,
Richardson, James C., AC,
Antes, Donald E., CE,
Moore, Norman A., Inf.,
Poutre, Clifford A., SC,
Shirley, Louis H., QMC,
Reinhardt, Arthur F., AC,
Voorhees, Frederick T., QMC,
Collins, Richard, Junior, FA,
Foster, Kenneth W., CAC,
Graham, George H., QMC,
Coony, Thomas E., Fin.,
Langlotz, Wilburn E., CE,
Levings, George E., JAG,
McDonald, John W., QMC,
Kindred, Worth L., FA,
Smith, Gordon K., Fin.,
Hill, Alton A., QMC,
Davenport, Harold A., Inf.,
Bowsky, Merle C., SC,
Bennett, John G., Inf.,
Frederick, W. R., Junior, FA,
McMurray, Russell E., Inf.,
Phyfe, Herbert L., QMC,
Nunamaker, Royal O., CAC,
Cummings, Lawrence E., CAC,
Johnson, Briard P., Cav.,
May, Metticus W., Junior, CAC,
Bridgers, George A., Inf.,
Cosgrove, C. B., Junior, AC,
Key, Algene E., AC,
Spurr, Jerome L., Cav.,
Lindquist, Garfield L., QMC,
Heil, John H., Junior, QMC,
Lentz, Benjamin A., QMC,
Jones, William S., QMC,
Monnett, John R., CAC,
Reitzel, Claude E., Junior, JAG,
Jones, Herman A. E., Inf.,
Johnson, Gordon M., AGD,
Savage, John H., Junior, Fin.,
Whittaker, Howard R., Ord.,
Brown, John J., QMC,
Henderson, John M., Junior, Ord.,
Warner, Richard A., AC,
Martin, Robert J., CAC,
Rowe, Harold C., QMC,
Ashworth, Wilfred B., AC,
Hansen, Karl C., QMC,
Nuckols, William P., AC,
Barrett, Edward T., QMC,
Smith, Ernest E., AGD,
Spies, Gage H., FA,

Gallogly, Lester H., Inf.,
Henderson, Carrol B., Cav.,
Stofft, Frederick R., Inf.,
Youngblood, Robert G., QMC,
Gee, John R., AC,
Barlow, James C., AC,
Renshaw, Willard S., AGD,
Marston, Anson D., CE,
Dunn, Robert V., AC,
Swoger, Frank R., Ord.,
Page, Roger M., CAC,
Johnson, Folkey L., QMC,
Holsinger, James W., FA,
Cox, John T., AC,
Ludington, Marvin W., JAG,
Crosby, Charles P., QMC,
McCone, Howard T., QMC,
Murphy, William E., Junior, QMC,
Freeman, Theodore B., FA,
Emigh, James M., Inf.,
Delmore, Fred J., CWS,
Bell, Jesse D., QMC,
Brandner, Carl S., AGD,
Paullin, Charles S., Ord.,
Stenhouse, William D., AC,
Edelen, Larue M., Inf.,
Newlon, Frank C., AC,
Smith, Robert C., AC,
Peterson, Cleo F., AC,
Stangel, Lyman F., Ord.,
Eckles, William E., Cav.,
Woods, Robert C., QMC,
Berkeley, William P., AC,
Peterson, George W., AC,
O'Connor, Daniel A., CAC,
Pritchard, William C., FA,
Brunner, Clarence O., Inf.,
Coleman, Howard, Ord.,
Ledeboer, F. W. C., CAC,
Howe, John D., AC,
Haines, Robert G., QMC,
Boyer, Joseph C., AGD,
Scofield, Herbert L., SC,
Kerlin, Henry C., FA,
Yeager, Walter B., Inf.,
Shaver, Maurice P., CAC,
Moreland, Howard B., CE,
Ring, William P., Junior, Inf.,
Ward, Charles D., Fin.,
True, Howard R., QMC,
Ramsey, Raymond R., Inf.,
Erickson, Allen L., AC,
Gormly, Samuel J., Junior, AC,
Foster, David F., JAG,
Jackson, Louis W., AGD,
Reed, Charles L., Ord.,
Mapes, Lynne R., AC,
Wing, John C., AC,
Barksdale, William E., QMC,
Connor, James W., QMC,
Wofford, Hoke S., QMC,
Hansen, Kenneth K., Inf.,
Fuller, Harold L., AGD,
Collins, Robert B., AC,
Winburn, Temple F., AC,
Stevens, Fred J., Junior, AC
Sturdivant, Hubert N., AC,
Tilton, Kenneth E., CAC,
Parrish, Bishop P., Junior, AC,
Malone, Thomas R., Junior, FA,
Kibler, George N., CE,
Pursall, Alfred A., Inf.,
Ogletree, James D., FA,
Washburn, Israel B., FA,
Sykes, Ethelred L., AC,
Smith, Richard D., FA,
Pennington, Edward W., Ord.,
Baetcke, Bernd G., Inf.,
Campbell, William D., AC,
Burns, Elmer M., QMC,
Daniel, Derrill M., Inf.,
Parnelle, Samuel W., Junior, Ord.,
Moomaw, Chester C., AC,
Grande, Ira W., QMC,
Stoll, Irwin C., SC,
Beach, Benjamin D., Ord.,
Chirico, Carl F., CAC,
Fewkes, Charles K., AC,
Bidwell, James W., Inf.,
Ives, Hiram D., Inf.,
Merrill, William B., Junior, AC,

Miller, Lillard P., AGD,
Cheyne, Arthur C., Inf.,
Mac Adam, Lloyd R., Ord.,
Christie, Robert H., AGD,
Cliffe, Robert A., QMC,
Smith, Frank P., AC,
Williams, James L., AC,
Smith, Willis T., Inf.,
Munson, Merton E., FA,
Porter, Joseph G., QMC,
Kalberer, Alfred F., AC,
Tisdall, James S., QMC,
Larecy, Eldon H., QMC,
Regan, Harvey W., AC,
O'Connell, Joseph W., AC,
Cerwin, Steven S., SC,
Urbach, Walter, AC,
Cooper, William C., AC,
Barton, Chester T., CAC,
Slaughter, S. D., Junior, Cav.,
Gray, Robert C., CE,
Kait, Harry C., JAG,
Reagon, Paul R., CAC,
Sadow, Peter T., QMC,
Hintz, Alfred E., FA,
Caffey, Thomas W., JAG,
Lewis, Lehman J., Inf.,
Wellendorf, Leonard E., Inf.,
Robinette, William R., CAC,
Rodgers, Robert C., AGD,
Willard, Paul S., Inf.,
Higgins, James W., Junior, QMC,
Ross, Henry F., Inf.,
Rogers, George F., SC,
Logan, Arthur L., AC,
Scollay, Loren P., AC,
Hollister, Paul G., Inf.,
Keene, George F., Junior, AC,
Adler, Eugene T., AGD,
Daniels, Leonard P., Inf.,
Witmer, Lavern G., FA,
Younts, James O., QMC,
Reed, Melvin W., AGD,
Schweizer, John M., Junior, AC,
Schultheis, Leo J., FA,
Isbell, Fletcher F., QMC,
Elser, Fred J., SC,
Jarred, James F., AC,
Monay, William H., AC,
Williams, Ernest F., AC,
Adams, Leslie E., QMC,
Steiner, Wilfred A., AC,
Wood, Thomas, Junior, QMC,
Whelchel, Robert, AC,
Greene, Corston A., Inf.,
Goodley, John T., QMC,
Yeager, Harold R., Inf.,
Capito, Charles E., QMC,
Whitman, Elmer L., FA,
Brown, Wilfred E., AC,
Cox, Ray J., QMC,
Keener, Ervin L., QMC,
Day, Parker S., Ord.,
Holt, Roger H., CAC,
Hurley, Arthur F., JAG,
Greeve, Gerald J., JAG,
Herrod, John T., CAC,
Brewster, James H., Junior, AC,
Bryan, Calvin M., QMC,
Carter, Arthur P., SC,
Gallant, Edward B., CAC,
Thornburg, Karl S., Inf.,
Kinne, Harry L., Junior, Cav.,
Hunter, Anthony G., AC,
Poole, Charles R., AC,
Ritchie, Charles A., QMC,
Dawson, Gordon E., AGD,
Boatsman, Alford C., Inf.,
Shore, Moyers S., Inf.,
Delaney, William M., FA,
Russell, Eber D., FA,
Rose, Buel T., AGD,
Williams, H. V., Junior, AC,
Buchanan, William D., QMC,
Outsen, Robert, Inf.,
Foote, Philip B., AC,
Heim, Charles A., AC,
Penaat, Edward F., Inf.,
Wells, Austin L., AGD,
Backus, Edward N., AC,
McAninch, William T., FA,

Harrison, Leander H., Ord.,
Kirk, Charles G., AC,
Davidson, Roy A., AC,
Putnam, William D., QMC,
McRell, Donald W., Fin.,
Seaman, Ernest C., QMC,
Old, Archie J., Junior, AC,
Holland, Harold L., JAG,
Holcomb, Cornelius C., QMC,
Dodenhoff, David I., QMC,
Davisson, Henry L., FA,
Ladd, Avery J., AC,
Cox, Arthur C., AC,
Pascoe, William W., AC,
Penniman, Charles D., QMC,
Mosher, Kenneth W., AC,
Baker, Harry T., FA,
Miller, Harper B., AC,
Hunt, Leigh H., AC,
Kuenlen, Charles E., AC,
Woodman, Ned H., AGD,
Davis, Lee J., CAC,
Gilman, Sheldon M., QMC,
McDonough, John F., Inf.,
Rainford, William R., FA,
Yule, John T., SC,
Hanes, Donald G., Ord.,
Jackson, Asbury H., Inf.,
Clayton, Harold V., FA,
Harriott, Donald B., FA,
Schott, Charles W., AC,
Paxson, George D., Inf.,
Tarr, James L., AC,
Sullivan, William E. R., CWS,
Callish, Norman L., AC,
Reing, Cornelius M., QMC,
Duncan, William A., Inf.,
Elkins, Marshall A., AC,
Garner, Robert S., Inf.,
Engeman, Leonard E., Cav.,
Kunitz, Marcellus R., SC,
Ellis, Dross, AC,
Thomas, Willie N., FA,
Butler, Herbert H., SC,
Humphrey, Robert G., FA,
Crawford, John, AC,
Anderson, Curtis M., AC,
Thelen, Edward F., FA.,
Hahn, Lawson E., Inf.,
Bode, Donald D., CWS,
Watson, Ernest C., Inf.,
Thompson, Estel A., CAC,
Cole, Harold J., AGD,
Kleinoeder, Leonard P., AC,
Madden, Cecil J., Inf.,
Shaller, Harold H., QMC,
Edwards, Charles W., AC,
Ely, Lawrence D., AC,
Hanford, Thomas B., Inf.,
Barlow, Philip E., QMC,
Stewart, Joseph C., CAC,
Rothrock, James H., AC,
Franklin, Edgar B., AC,
Cook, Eugene G., AC,
Wheeler, Fred J., AC,
Clay, Jeff, 3d, Inf.,
Colson, King D., Junior, QMC,
Crinkley, Francis D., Ord.,
Snodgrass, John T., CAC,
Handwerker, B. J., QMC,
Latta, Kenneth A., QMC,
Hobson, Howard M., Inf.,
Mulvanity, Ralph T., Ord.,
Myrick, Charles M., Inf.,
Brenneman, Loyd W., QMC,
Jacobsen, Walter V., AC,
Toomey, Frederick W., AC,
Stapleford, Zeb V., AC,
Kane, John R., AC,
Redburn, Ralph A., AC,
Richard, Robert B., AC,
Pattison, Hal C., Cav.,
Knight, Alfred C., Ord.,
Cluxton, Donald E., AC,
Hopson, William D., AC,
Brown, Verner O., Fin.,
Johnson, Paul A., AC,
Buys, Joseph H., FA,
Broadus, Wendell M., Cav.,
Barclay, Gordon L., AGD,
Stone, Maurice M., AC,

Darley, George L., QMC,
Taylor, Harold L., Inf.,
Cone, Montie F., Inf.,
Elterich, John A., Inf.,
Killough, James S., Inf.,
Ingram, Forney H., CE,
Laird, Orville, SC,
Striegel, John D., Cav.,
Hatch, Philip W., AC,
Reynolds, Carlos F., Cav.,
Robinson, George L., AC,
Haycraft, Kenneth C., Inf.,
Markham, Donald O., QMC,
Wilmore, Charles W., FA,
Beets, Walter O., FA,
Dymock, Lee L., Inf.,
Johnson, Charles R., AC,
Kirk, Robert P., Inf.,
Goldstein, Mandel N., SC,
Petrolino, Joseph A., Ord.,
LaBuda, Joseph E., AC,
Hutchins, Charles W., FA,
Mallon, Ethan L., AGD,
Holmes, William W., AC,
Newhall, Henry S., Ord.,
Hubbart, Clarence G., FA,
Spicer, William H., Inf.,
Jones, Kenneth P., AGD,
Kaigler, Johnathon T., AGD,
Taylor, Lester M., AC,
Jacobsen, Earl H., AC,
Gill, Edward C., CE,
Allen, William J., Junior, CWS,
Corothers, Earl M., CAC,
Hadfield, William A., FA,
Middleton, Willard R., AC,
House, John M., Junior, QMC,
Watson, Arthur J., QMC,
Willoughby, Earl, AC,
Clark, William H., AC,
Hagen, Bernard E., FA,
Dehorn, John G., AC,
Lewis, David C., FA,
Brooks, James M., QMC,
Burton, Willie G., Inf.,
Smith, Alvin L., AC,
Hoyne, John T., FA,
Gorsuch, Edward C., Fin.,
Smith, Lynn D., Inf.,
Hutchins, Frank D. B. G., AC,
Dolan, Paul G., AC,
Hutchinson, George W., CAC,
Kendall, Quentin L., QMC,
Black, Henry M., CE,
Allard, Henry W., Inf.,
Schewe, Marion W., Inf.,
McGrew, Palmer W., JAG,
Schaller, Ralph H., AC,
Frank, Harold L., QMC,
Davis, William G., AC,
Niemi, Arvo N., SC,
Hunt, Edward E., AC,
Campbell, William W., CWS,
Hite, Eugene G., Cav.,
Martin, Charles P., AC,
Morley, Aubrey R., SC,
Kirchner, Hans K., AC,
McKnight, Clyde W., QMC,
Schonholz, Morris, FA,
Leadbetter, Merton K., QMC,
Blumenfeld, Charles H., CAC,
Nuzum, James R., Junior, AC,
Allen, Frank, AC,
Jefferson, Wayne O., SC,
Hamilton, Andrew W., Ord.,
Miller, Charles A., AC,
Martz, John D., Junior, QMC,
Ashwick, Edwin W., AC,
Mathewson, Nathan S., Inf.,
Taylor, John M., AC,
Welter, William T., AGD,
Burden, Oliver D., Junior, AC,
Malmstrom, Einar A., AC,
Archibald, Herbert R., SC,
Timmes, Charles J., Inf.,
Witsell, Benjamin F., AC,
Slagle, Fred C., AC,
Von Sabo, Theodore J., QMC,
Farnham, Bennett D., QMC,
Hikel, Theodore R., Ord.,
Butler, Arthur B., Inf.,
Bannister, Ray K., QMC,
Halsey, Howard L., AC,
Hedges, Loveaire A., FA,
Slisher, Weldon L., Cav.,
Wyss, Arnold V., QMC,
Hembree, Tom B., Inf.,
Cook, Richard W., Ord.,
Seiler, Frank J., AC,
Clarke, Franklin W., JAG,
Fish, Herbert M., Junior, QMC,
Helm, Hans W., FA,
Graves, Roland D., QMC,
Koster, Alfred M., QMC,
Bent, Joseph G., Junior, SC,
Cole, Robert H., Inf.,
Mauz, Henry H., FA,
Jun, James S., FA,
Learnard, Henry G., Junior, Inf.,
Crain, John C., AC,
Boyles, Francis R., JAG,
Smith, Robert G., Junior, CAC,
Edenfield, Marshall C., AC,
Brown, Marion M., Inf.,
Sasse, Francis M., JAG,
Hart, Ira W., QMC,
Larkin, Alwyn V., Fin.,
Allen, Irvin L., QMC,
Snowden, Paul T., FA,
Gentry, Elbert B., AC,
Blair, Paul S., AC,
Sievers, Harry L., Inf.,
Kale, Lester W., SC,
Parsons, Harold C., Ord.,
Baya, George E., FA,
Myers, Henry T., AC,
Franklin, Oliver R., AC,
Conran, Richard J., FA,
Lowery, James R., Inf.,
Davis, Wiley B., QMC,
Littell, Elmer L., SC,
Smith, Emory C., AGD,
Smith, Harry R., AC,
Atkinson, William K., QMC,
Edson, Frank T., QMC,
Holmes, Robert H., Junior, FA,
Herberth, Frank W., Junior, QMC,
Field, Eugene J., Cav.,
Miller, Dewolfe H., AC,
Earley, Fred O., Junior, AC,
Murray, John W., QMC,
McClendon, James F., AC,
Wurfel, Seymour W., JAG,
Creighton, G. C., Junior, AGD,
Pride, Edward W., SC,
Taylor, Erquiet, QMC,
Strickland, Wilburn L., Cav.,
Standley, C. S., Junior, Inf.,
Simpson, Ralph T., Inf.,
Eger, Arnold G., JAG,
Bush, Ernest L., CAC,
Lolli, Andrew R., FA,
Thomas, William J., AC,
Thames, William M., Junior, SC,
Churchill, Amos B., Inf.,
Cole, Lydon B., Inf.,
Sanders, Lewis M., AC,
Smith, William D., Junior, QMC,
Meinert, Fred H., CAC,
Askins, Charles, Junior, Ord.,
Cooke, Frederick J., FA,
Lambert, John W., CE,
Randall, Robert J., AC,
Johnson, Edward T., JAG,
Gestefeld, Don R., QMC,
Dash, Lawrence P., AC,
Gross, Gardner B., Inf.,
Chapman, Raymond T., FA,
Cassady, George S., AC,
Ferguson, Marion G., Junior, AC,
Wilson, Robert E., AGD,
Buchak, Kirk, SC,
Langlois, Silas R., FA,
McNeil, Joseph L., AC,
Gosiger, Fred J., Ord.,
Conn, Arthur E., QMC,
Davis, Homer L., Junior, SC,
Fitzgerald, Edward D., Inf.,
Ross, Franz H., FA,
Sprake, James M., QMC,
Reichley, Roydon L., AC,
Kriegel, William W., CAC,
White, Frank P., CE,
Druley, Edwin H., FA,
Smith, Frederick G. H., QMC,
Friedmann, Anton R. J., AC,
Henderson, Richard W., AC,
Cole, Lawrence E., AC,
Peterson, Arthur J., FA,
Smith, Kimball C., CAC,
Nichols, Roscoe T., Junior, AC,
Addington, Carl A., AC,
Ebbert, Theodore H., Ord.,
Leidy, Royal L., CAC,
Lattin, John H., Inf., O4516?
Wright, Clifton D., AC,
Loomis, Frederick H. D., Inf.,
Meek, Chester H., FA,
Heltzel, William E., SC,
Rankin, Walter R., Inf.,
Sanford, Teddy H., Inf.,
Quigley, Quentin S., SC,
Palmerlee, Thomas R., QMC,
Fox, Victor B., Cav.,
Davis, Robert G., Fin.,
Mansfield, John S., Inf.,
Gibson, Erwin O., Inf.,
O'Connor, John P., CAC,
Fischer, Harry O., QMC,
Hildebrant, Conrad, Inf.,
Taylor, Robert B., QMC,
Peterson, Robert O., QMC,
Raynor, Spencer W., AC,
Richardson, J. A., 3d, Ord.,
Mayall, Broun H., AC,
Johnson, William H., Junior, JAG,
Conk, Robert H., FA,
Eagle, Alexander G., FA,
Brown, Harley D., QMC,
Bell, James K., FA,
Delaney, Joseph F., AC,
Graeser, Richard G., AC,
Greiner, Reginald R., AC,
Stevens, Alfred E., Cav.,
Del Mar, Roland H., Inf.,
Bagley, Robert A., QMC,
Cowan, James A., AC,
Nalewaik, William J., AC,
Goode, Roy E., QMC,
Jackman, Albert H., FA,
Gibson, John H., Cav.,
Grimes, Lyle C., Fin.,
Blanchard, Weston L., Inf.,
Varian, John F., FA,
Smith, Albert M., 2d, Ord.,
Heliker, Sherburne J., Fin.,
Bates, Paul L., Inf.,
Dettore, William N., AC,
Taylor, Thomas H., FA,
Cochrane, Carlos J., AC,
Dickson, Raymond L., AC,
Bisbort, Harold E., FA,
Peyton, John L., Cav.,
Plahte, Fred L., FA,
Potter, Seymour A., Junior, QMC,
Zimmerman, Legrand O., AC,
Fanning, Charles A., Inf.,
Quanrud, Otto G., AC,
Moore, Lowrey R., SC,
Mac Nees, Frank J., AC,
Dulevitz, Alexander, AC,
Dillingham, M. S., AC,
Cohn, Alexander, AC,
Huneycutt, Robert E., FA,
Lessig, Cecil P., AC,
Taylor, Edward R., JAG,
Silis, Tom W., CAC,
Evans, William T., Inf.,
Sutton, William J., Inf.,
Graydon, Charles K., FA,
Glen, Jay T., QMC,
Charles, Orman G., SC,
Peterman, John D., QMC,
Cassel, Harold A., Inf.,
Ritchie, Ernest L., QMC,
Sibbald, George H., Inf.,
Merchant, Henry R., Junior, Inf.,
Cowles, Herbert N., AC,
Sullivan, John J., Junior, Inf.,
Wells, Clayton W., Inf.,
Williams, Leon F., AC,
West, Charles P., Ord.,
Rust, Charles E., Ord.,

Jepson, Hans G., Ord.,
Locke, William A., Inf.,
Adams, James F., Inf.,
Anderson, Delmer, P., FA,
Cropper, Eugene, C., AC,
Zink, Nicholas P., FA,
Dodge, Philip E., AGD,
Payne, Jack, AC,
Thomson, Edward P., Inf.,
Dunlap, Clarence R., SC,
Green, Fay K., QMC,
Stannah, Joseph E., CE,
Stogner, Ben T., AC,
Baker, Roy C., QMC,
Costello, Maurice J., AC,
Brent, Paul H., QMC,
Dicks, John P., Inf.,
Anderson, Runo C., QMC,
Fulton James H., SC,
Welker, Platt L., AC,
Oroark Dulaney L., SC,
Peter, Richard H., Ord.,
Cain, Charles A., CWS,
Posse, Ernest W., Ord.,
Linthwaite, George F., Cav.,
Harrison, William E., FA,
Rogers, Henry H., Inf.,
Montgomery, Gus H., QMC,
Holt, Francis W., AC,
Bott, Herbert A., AC,
Pryor, Ralph H., CAC,
Seeger, Albert L., Inf.,
Mainor, Andrew, AC.,
Decker, Joseph F., Inf.,
Berryhill, Earl J., AC,
Barker, James W., 2d, CAC,
Nesbitt, Earl J., AC,
Nichols, Wallace J., Cav.,
Woestenburg, John M., FA,
Gasser, Clyde D., AC,
Miller, Edwin T., QMC,
Robbins, Philip S., AC,
Nay, Paul F., AC,
Ballagh, Robert S., CAC,
Du Four, John G., AC,
Snooks, James P., Junior, Ord.,
Mann, Woodward B., AC,
Chambers, Herbert C., AC,
Barrett, Richard A., AC,
Mack, Daniel D., Junior, QMC,
Hampton, John A., AC,
Ellis, Clay D., AC,
Von Kolnitz, Henry, CAC,
Cantey, James, FA,
Soares, Edward J., Ord.,
Baker, Ralph E., AC,
Thompson, Douglas G., CAC,
Stump, George T., FA,
Bennett, William T., AC,
Evans, William J., Inf.,
Ahrens, Ambelten M., CAC,
Rehmann, Edward L., QMC,
Bean, Gerald E., AC,
Darrah, Raymond W., Inf.,
Smith, Joseph V., QMC,
Eberle, Adolph W., Inf.,
Van Dine, William H., QMC,
Lambert, Joe C., AGD,
Conners, John J., Inf.,
Melton, William D., QMC,
Maddox, Edward R., Inf.,
Dresser, Paul A., FA,
Cairns, James C., Inf.,
Spitzer, Samuel E., JAG,
Clark, Harold F., QMC,
Granzin, Alexander C., Inf.,
Johnson, Bruce H., CAC,
Dicks, James H., Ord.,
Weaver, Carl A., Inf.,
Moore, John T., AC,
Ferguson, James L., QMC,
Longacre, Terrance M., QMC,
Farber, Morris, AC,
Glen, George R., QMC,
Guthrie, Paul G., Inf.,
Cook, Dave J., QMC,
Rankin, Carl E., AC,
Coleman, James C., Junior, QMC,
Spinney, Russell G., Inf.,
Street, Frank L., FA,
Whitson, Ray W., QMC,

Smith, Henry D., Junior, AC,
Henderson, Richard H., AC,
Lininger, John B., Inf.,
Allen, Chester F., Inf.,
Nooncaster, Clifton F., Ord.,
Virden, John M., AC,
Kieling, Harry J., AC,
Keach, Thomas C., AC,
Shipe, Burdwell H., QMC,
Rockoff, Richard M., Fin.,
Dooley, Franklin W., AC,
Butler, James J., Inf.,
Chenault, Theodore L., Inf.,
Beebe, James A., AC,
Schellhammer, F. M., Inf.,
Hardman, Wayne, FA,
Hampton, Henry J., Inf.,
Brasington, Dalton K., CAC,
Groves, Willice E., SC,
Hedleston, Robert W., AC,
Amoroso, Leonard, QMC,
Hamilton, Harry S., AC,
Smith, William A., CAC,
Snyder, Harry M., QMC,
Auspitz, Harry, Junior, FA,
Williams, Curtis L., JAG,
Wickland, Daniel W., AC,
Duerson, Samuel H., CE,
Howell, William C., Junior, Fin.,
Streetman, James P., QMC,
Meetze, Adam W., CWS,
Fornes, Gaston G., Ord.,
Tjostem, Marvin L., AGD,
Townsend, James W., AC,
Hitchman, Robert B., QMC,
Sager, Harvid, AC,
McElroy, Arvine W., FA,
Andry, Fernand L., AC,
Gladding, Leon D., Inf.,
Anderson, Chester H., FA,
Forbes, Merwin B., SC,
Billings, William H., Inf.,
Coolidge, John R., AC,
Dorsey, Robert E., QMC,
Voorhees, Charles E., QMC,
Jones, Edmund H., AGD,
Pochyla, Benjamin H., SC,
Magid, Louis B., Junior, AC,
Decker, Nelson I., CWS,
Snyder, Marvin H., CAC,
Thomas, Evert S., Junior, Inf.,
Willoughby, William H., Inf.,
Clinebell, Glenn L., AGD,
Richter, Eugene P., AC,
Webber, Clark, Inf.,
Bill, Arthur T., QMC,
Davania, Richard W., AC,
Carpenter, Clarence C., AC,
Ringgold, Charles L., CAC,
Graham, William R., AC,
Culley, Frank J., CAV,
Stanley, Charles A., SC,
Lewis, Donald L., CAC,
Allen, John E., AC,
Mathews, Don S., FA,
George, John D., Inf.,
Weinland, Arthur A., CWS,
Engstrom, Gustaf A., QMC,
Horton, Russell H., SC,
Perez, Gines, Inf.,
Leach, William H., AC,
Stevens, Kermit D., AC,
Rinker, Cornelius J., QMC,
Dowd, Morris R., AC,
Michael, Joe B., CWS,
Taube, William R., AC,
Shoemaker, John J., CAC,
Williams, Byron E., FA,
McElroy, Alexander T., FA,
Lee, John K., Junior, CAC,
Seitz, John A., FA,
Gaston, James A., Inf.,
Minnis, Gilmore V., AC,
Nida, Glenn E., Ord.,
Fuller, Theodore A., AC,
Clark, Theron O., AC,
Banks, Curtis M., CAC,
Garrison, William C., FA,
Fincher, Joe L., FA,
James, George W., FA,
Redmond, Miles A., AC,

Clifton, John R., CAC,
Robertson, Emanuel M., Inf.,
Hanley, Lloyd G., QMC,
Osborne, Hugh P., FA,
Mac Willie, Donald M., Cav.,
Libby, Millard A., AC,
Seashore, Malcolm D., AC,
Jensen, James C., AC,
Miller, Eugene E., AGD,
Myers, Shelly P., Junior, CAC,
Waskow, Frank H., AC,
Knowlton, Stewart H., FA,
Smiley, Stanley W., QMC,
Goodloe, Mason F., AGD,
Bender, Thomas W., FA,
Killgore, Earl H., AC,
Nutt, James D., SC,
Hubbard, Frank R., Junior, Inf.,
O'Neill, John T., CE,
Grenier, William T., QMC,
Orsino, Guy A., Ord.,
McDonald, William J., QMC,
Phillips, Joseph F., QMC,
Nagel, James R., CAC,
Kent, Frederick T., Junior, Inf.,
Newman, Erman M., QMC,
Eddington, Thomas W., QMC,
Heasley, Morgan B., Inf.,
Long, Homer E., QMC,
Feindel, William B., Junior, SC,
Williamson, Carl E., JAG,
Gaefe, Wilton G., QMC,
Boyd, Lawrence L., AGD,
Messner, Arthur F., CAC,
Olinger, Robert L., AC,
Baker, Elverson E., Inf.,
Petros, Harry C., FA,
Ireland, John W., Junior, FA,
Rose, Orville V., AC,
Cross, Cecil C., AC,
Martin, Lewis T., Inf.,
Rice, Vernon W., AGD,
Graves, Lewis T., Inf.,
Hurst, Richard M., Ord.,
McNally, James B., SC,
Reed, Charles B., FA,
Brogan, William T., Inf.,
Anderson, Townsend C., QMC,
Reed, Albert L., CAC,
Jones, Edward M., QMC,
Stiebel, Henry M., QMC,
Williams, Frank M., AC,
Haas, Manfred J., Ord.,
Jeffery, Arthur B., FA,
Neal, Haskell E., AC,
Conine, James C., QMC,
Mize, Willard W., CAC,
Bush, Howard C., Inf.,
Trail, Harry E., AGD,
Webb, Robert L., Inf.,
Hendrick, Harlan W., QMC,
Turner, William M., AC,
Moynahan, George F., SC,
Ohlsson, Lennart Y., QMC,
Ronka, George R., AC,
Ryan, Charles F., Inf.,
Jones, Thornton E., Inf.,
Evans, Albert B., QMC,
McBride, Robert J., Inf.,
Monroe, Ford M., AGD,
Williams, James R., AC,
Johnson, Raymond L., Ord.,
Bellamy, Paul E., CAC,
Lane, Danna L., Fin.,
Murphy, William J., QMC,
Larner, Thomas M., CAC,
Himes, Donald S., QMC,
Robbins, Richard B., AC,
Caldara, Joseph D. C., AC,
Christensen, Edward W., AC,
Bost, Armon H., AGD,
Jones, Arthur V., Junior, AC,
Hull, Harris B., AC,
Curtin, Edwin P., Inf.,
Nelson, Herbert L., AGD,
Beck, Vancel R., QMC,
Ryan, John L., Junior, QMC,
Miller, Leland V., QMC,
Vardas, Constantine, CAC,
Deagle, Edwin A., QMC,
Parks, Ernest C., Junior, QMC,

Baker, Jack B., QMC,
Dennis, Robert L., Inf.,
Hart, Harry L., Ord.,
Mims, Percy J., AC,
Clisson, Henry M., Inf.,
Stewart, Marion G., Junior, QMC,
Blencoe, Shirley G., SC,
Redd, Denny L., AC,
Wafler, Harold C., SC,
Wilson, Donald C., Inf.,
West, Frank T., SC,
Slaughter, Page H., QMC,
Morgan, Rudolph, FA,
Yanka, Donald E., CWS,
Hattox, James G., QMC,
Fillmore, Robert H., QMC,
Scott, Robert H., Inf.,
Foster, James E., SC,
Finn, John W., Inf.,
Rothermel, John B., Ord.,
Trial, Ernest T., QMC,
Perrin, William K., SC,
Bryan, Loren A., AC,
Harper, Neal W., FA,
Fliniau, Franklin M., Inf.,
Roberts, William W., QMC,
Richmond, Harold R., Ord.,
Miller, James B., Inf.,
Cameron, Arthur T., AC,
Alley, Stuart M., CAC,
McCloskey, Owen T., Ord.,
Rhody, Dean A., QMC,
Eggleston, H. K., Junior, CE,
Mitchell, Earle F., SC,
Gillespie, Kenneth W., QMC,
Edwards, James W., Inf.,
Hale, Thurman A., QMC,
Thompson, Claude B., AC,
Poor, George L., CAC,
Brickles, Franklin R., Inf.,
Farner, Bennie L., AC,
Taylor, W. H., Junior, QMC,
Godbey, Paul, FA,
Davis, Benjamin M., Inf.,
Arnold, Hugh M., CE,
Dehaas, Paul L., AGD,
Raney, Joseph D., Inf.,
Hershey, Jacob R., CE,
Sorrell, Roy W., Inf.,
Wilkes, John S., CAC,
Ochs, Henry J., Junior, AC,
Vering, Joseph F., Inf.,
Foster, Harry G., Inf.,
Bass, Arthur C., QMC,
Nawrocky, Louis M., Inf.,
Allan, Edgar 3d, CAC,
Marshall, Raymond H., AC,
Douglass, George A., Inf.,
Butler, Sanford J., CAC,
Sievers, Henry R., Inf.,
Henry, Charles W., FA,
Carlos, Bernard C., AC,
Pongonis, Joseph A., AGD,
Steves, Fred L., AC,
Tieman, Martin G., Junior, CE,
Litz, Wayne P., SC,
Hoover, Holman D., Inf.,
Barnes, William B., AC,
Rochford, Charles E., QMC,
Loomis, Richard, AC,
Edwards, Perry, QMC,
Patrick, William E., Junior, FA,
Peterson, James D., Ord.,
Seitz, Frank N., CAC,
Willis, Jack E., SC,
Keeler, Raymond H., AC,
Hargus, Lowell U., Ord.,
Vernon, Wesely H., AC,
Mead, Everett V., Inf.,
McMaken, Edward, FA,
Wade, Dallas C., Inf.,
Smith, Marion C., AC,
McDowell, Samuel T., Inf.,
Olson, George H., Inf.,
Edmunds, John D., QMC,
Perez, William D., FA,
Lackro, Paul W., QMC,
Stompler, Russell, AC,
Rhea, Robert L., Inf.,
Hand, James D., FA,
Middleton, Emery D., FA,
Jogl, Joseph W., Inf.,
Brumfield, Henry A., AC,
Maguire, Edward F., QMC,
Laugerman, John B., CE,
Dreyer, Louis E., AC,
May, Arthur G., CAC,
Moats, Wilton B., Ord.,
Shearouse, James D., CAC,
Middleton, W. R., Junior, QMC,
Hanks, Lester, QMC,
Fordham, Emory H., QMC,
Woerner, Leo G., QMC,
Hudleson, Hugh W., Inf.,
Miller, Blake C., AC,
Thomas, Theodore G., QMC,
Eggers, Paul H., Fin.,
Wildforster, F. A. O., QMC,
Ziegler, Herbert A., QMC,
Hoisington, Roy D., QMC,
Rauenzahn, Daniel A., QMC,
Pedersen, Robert W., Inf.,
Scott, Paul T., FA,
Noakes, Gilbert F., AC,
Lange, Chester E., FA,
Anderson, Francis W., Fin.,
Chedister, Joseph C., Inf.,
Klein, Edward C., AC,
Webb, Maurice E., Cav.,
Waite, Frederick G., Ord.,
Wilson, Julian A., AGD,
Hallden, Charles H., Inf.,
Curtiss, John, Junior, FA,
Carrico, John H., Inf.,
Kinzell, Harold J., Inf.,
Moomaw, Lorris W., AC,
Stevens, Wilber A., CE,
Potter, Kenneth B., Inf.,
Stephens, Ralph H., Inf.,
Hartley, Edwin A., AC,
Ritchey, Russell V., AC,
Zinser, Roy F., Inf.,
Lockridge, Robert W., CE,
Motes, Preston M., QMC,
Head, Sidney A., AC,
Neely, Clarence C., Fin.,
McCaslin, Orval H., AC,
Banigan, Calvin B., Ord.,
Sinnard, Chadbourne T., AC,
Cawlfield, Paul A., Inf.,
Feil, Frederick C., Inf.,
Kirton, Edwin M., Inf.,
Giordano, Joseph B., Inf.,
Holmstrom, Helmer A., CE,
McKee, John T., QMC,
Anderson, Berry K., Inf.,
Towne, Clair E., FA,
Silver, Richard F., AC,
Butt, Stanley S., JAG,
Nowotny, Berthold E., AC,
Heavner, William S., AC,
Crakes, Joe H., AC,
Degenhardt, Jacob R., Cav.,
Pine, Lynn W., CE,
Hope, John W., AC,
Burns, Samuel E., Fin.,
Chase, Ned B., AC,
Rohrs, Leonard J., AC,
Shrader, Kenneth C., SC,
Hamilton, Earl M., QMC,
De Maio, Mario, FA,
Poston, Carl M., FA,
Bienvenu, Thomas F., FA,
Landon, Donald C., Inf.,
Ault, John W., AC,
Steffey, William G., CE,
Woodward, Wayne W., AC,
Dahmlow, Peter H., Cav.,
Dodenhoff, Harry C., QMC,
McDonald, Leniel E., Inf.,
Mudgett, Charles F., Inf.,
Jones, Richard I., Inf.,
Goodall, Leslie D., Cav.,
Holzman, Benjamin G., AC,
Dogan, Adam E., SC,
Powell, Elmer R., FA,
Mahoney, James H., Inf.,
Fisher, John L., AC,
Wigman, Edward W., AC,
Simpson, Edward H., Inf.,
Beighle, Jackson E., AC,
Seay, Joseph B., Inf.,
Schoenfeldt, Paul J., AC,
Butler, Allen S., Inf.,
Hornaday, Ralph J., Inf.,
Johnston, Joseph E., Ord.,
Steiner, Raymond B., Cav.,
Wiken, Arent O., CWS,
Cheatham, James A., Inf.,
Burkett, Lyman D., FA,
Culbreth, Oliver C., Fin.,
Houghton, Russell T., Inf.,
Stratton, Chester M., Ord.,
McClish, Ernest E., Inf.,
Coates, Charles F., Inf.,
Colvin, George T., Inf.,
Eason, James F., CAC,
Hauck, Herman A., Inf.,
Overby, Carl H., QMC,
King, Dick A., QMC,
Mayers, Thomas H., CAC,
Brantley, Joseph W., QMC,
Richard, Newton M., Junior, AC,
Giesler, Garnett J., Ord.,
Meier, Walter M., Cav.,
Evans, Gustavus W., FA,
Gerard, Paul T., Inf.,
Ritter, George S., AC,
Tasker, William D., AC,
Hollinger, John C., Inf.,
DeLoach, Wilbur V., FA,
McGrady, Harper L., Inf.,
Hagins, Newton D., AC,
McCown, James H., Fin.,
Brown, Charles A., AC,
Fernandez, Claude E., JAG,
Dyekman, Ivan J., QMC,
McKnight, William L., Fin.,
Matthews, Luther B., AC,
Wickey, Howard W., QMC,
Tisdelle, A. C., Junior, Inf.,
McIlroy, Horace S., Inf.,
Cronk, Jefferson R., Inf.,
Johnston, Joseph W., SC,
Jones, Dailey M., AC,
Cassill, George F., QMC,
Fulton, Lee W., AC,
McClenahan, Edward F., AC,
Nauman, Arthur C., CE,
McCann, James H., Junior, CAC,
Felknor, Robert S., AC,
Bogue, William B., CAC,
Newell, Thomas O., AC,
McKaig, Frank B., Inf.,
Skelly, James E., Inf.,
Ewbank, Ernest W., Junior, Ord.,
Wagner, Jacob F., Inf.,
Berry, Ralph C., AC,
Pringle, Herman E., CAC,
Smith, Leo A., Inf.,
Caron Bruce W., SC,
Jennings, Cleveland H., CAC,
Mathes, Edward S., CAC,
Nottingham, J. O., Inf.,
Stoll, Justin W., FA,
West, William F., Inf.,
Loveman, David B., 2d, SC,
Baker, Robert B., Junior, Ord.,
Bates, Ralph E., SC,
Rackleff, Angus N., Ord.,
Barnett, Frank L., Inf.,
Wegman, Leonard J., Fin.,
Parker, John U., CE.,
Hardiman, Ralph S., QMC,
Roberts, William E., Inf.,
Dixon, Oliver O., Inf.,
Fitzgerald, Edward W., CAC,
Wolcott, William J., Inf.,
Gibson, Comet, QMC,
Bearce, Herrick F., SC,
Workman, William G., AC,
Malankowski, A. J., Inf.,
Alexander, Marvin, AC,
Devos, John F., AC,
Bigger, Paul R., AC,
Waikart, William H., Ord.,
Sampson, Roy P., AC,
Cox, Homer M., AC,
Bryant, Garlen R., Inf.,
Pocock, Dale F., AC,
Frye, John A., Inf.,
Reitz, George W., FA,
Elges, Carl H., Junior, QMC,

Beckner, John O., Inf., [redacted]
McDaniel, Lloyd L., Inf., [redacted]
Turner, Gorman E, AC, [redacted]
Campbell, Lionel T., JAG, [redacted]
Judson, Philip M., Inf., [redacted]
Hoffman, Paul O., QMC, [redacted]
Price, Milton H., FA, [redacted]
Escude, Joseph F., CWS, [redacted]
Fillbrandt, Arthur C., QMC, [redacted]
Calvert, George I., Ord., [redacted]
Currier, Roger M., Inf., [redacted]
Bailey, William W., AC, [redacted]
Betances-Ramirez, C., Inf., [redacted]
Driscoll, Maurice L., Ord., [redacted]
McMahon, Ralph M., Ord., [redacted]
Von Kaenel, Howard E., FA, [redacted]
Gross, Charles A., JAG, [redacted]
Harris, Robert C., Inf., [redacted]
Douglas, Richard M., AC, [redacted]
Fowler, Ira H., FA, [redacted]
Britton, Frank K., Inf., [redacted]
Burke, Leo R., AC, [redacted]
Lorenz, Ralph A., Inf., [redacted]
Johnson, Luther E., SC, [redacted]
Bowen, Millard G., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Needels, Edward V. R., CWS, [redacted]
Mapes, Roland H., SC, [redacted]
Thompson, Orval C., Inf., [redacted]
Lovsnes, Neal W., Inf., [redacted]
Hope, Francis M., QMC, [redacted]
Wilson, William E., QMC, [redacted]
Gidinsky, Floyd E., QMC, [redacted]
Welsh, John B., QMC, [redacted]
Schrock, Ray E., AC, [redacted]
Ammerman, Robert H., SC, [redacted]
Endicott, William H., AC, [redacted]
Hemerda, Louis, Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Ormes, Melvin W., QMC, [redacted]
Peck, Ben J., AC, [redacted]
McMillan, Henry W., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Pace, George A., Ord., [redacted]
Sackton, Frank J., Inf., [redacted]
Ansel, Sture A., Inf., [redacted]
Douglass, Charles R., AC, [redacted]
Tempske, Paul T., AC, [redacted]
Stevens, Pat M. 3d, CAC, [redacted]
Hewitt, Harry, CAC, [redacted]
Smith, Eugene, CAC, [redacted]
Cooke, John G. Junior, AC, [redacted]
Walker, Stephen M., Inf., [redacted]
Sundell, Walden A., AC, [redacted]
Gall, James B., Inf., [redacted]
English, Merton A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Alexander, Henry B., Inf., [redacted]
Dougan, Ramon C., CAC, [redacted]
Scherrer, Leon B., Ord., [redacted]
Tarson, Herbert H., AC, [redacted]
Lansford, Erdie O., FA, [redacted]
McDonald, Audley C., AC, [redacted]
Quinn, Colle A., QMC, [redacted]
Knox, Ohio, QMC, [redacted]
Goodwin, James B., FA, [redacted]
McCann, John H., AC, [redacted]
Crowley, Thomas N., AC, [redacted]
Kahl, Alfred W., CAC, [redacted]
Johnson, Wilbur M., QMC, [redacted]
Townsend, Horace E., Inf., [redacted]
Sutton, Earl, FA, [redacted]
Olson, Harry A., AC, [redacted]
Hardin, William B., FA, [redacted]
Correll, Louis W., Inf., [redacted]
Decker, Arthur D., Inf., [redacted]
Snyder, Charles E., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Low, James L., Inf., [redacted]
Hillebrand, Alvin R., Inf., [redacted]
Hopkins, Edward J., AC, [redacted]
Haskell, Harold G., CAC, [redacted]
Lewis, Clarence H., AC, [redacted]
Warfield, Charles L. QMC, [redacted]
Bacon, Lewis H., AC, [redacted]
Atkinson, Charles W. T., AC, [redacted]
Railing, James M., QMC, [redacted]
Flette, Fred J., Inf., [redacted]
Scott, Eccles H., Inf., [redacted]
Bosbyshell, John H., QMC, [redacted]
Richardson, Walter B., Inf., [redacted]
Woodbury, Leroy B., Junior, Cav., [redacted]
Butscher, Winston, QMC, [redacted]
Duvall, John O., CAC, [redacted]
Deason, Charles A., AGD, [redacted]
Simcox, Lawrence S., Inf., [redacted]

Burkett, Raymond W., Ord., [redacted]
Fisher, Albert P., CAC, [redacted]
Howard, Charles E., FA, [redacted]
Poole, Theodore L., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
McConahay, John D., AC, [redacted]
Billingsley, R. H., QMC, [redacted]
Flanagan, Andrew P., QMC, [redacted]
Murray, Harry M., Ord., [redacted]
Robbins, Charles A., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Huston, Milburn N., Inf., [redacted]
McPhail, Thomas D., Inf., [redacted]
Raber, Thomas J., Ord., [redacted]
Baldry, George A., CAC, [redacted]
Taylor, James C., Inf., [redacted]
Deppe, Howard W., AC, [redacted]
Wilcox, Judson D., FA, [redacted]
Timm, Emanuel A., Inf., [redacted]
Milton, James A., Fin., [redacted]
Pons, Philip E., QMC, [redacted]
Williams, Myron L., SC, [redacted]
Kendall, Bruce E., QMC, [redacted]
Springer, Robert R., FA, [redacted]
McNitt, James R., SC, [redacted]
Horton, Roy W., CAC, [redacted]
Philpot, Ernest W., QMC, [redacted]
Farrell, Carl Y., CE, [redacted]
Kugel, Richard C., AC, [redacted]
Collins, Frank, Junior, AC, [redacted]
Ryan, Lloyd F., AC, [redacted]
Ernst, Raymond J., Inf., [redacted]
Sweek, Jack G., CAC, [redacted]
Dammer, Herman W., Inf., [redacted]
Edgar, James D., QMC, [redacted]
Lanpher, Rollin A., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Schroder, John W., Ord., [redacted]
Brown, Charles P., AC, [redacted]
Reagor, Elmer C., Inf., [redacted]
Olson, Lester K., Inf., [redacted]
Matkovcik, Thomas J., Inf., [redacted]
Arey, Carlyle W., Inf., [redacted]
Howard, Harold F., Inf., [redacted]
Thomas, Jack E., AC, [redacted]
Krebs, Frank X., AC, [redacted]
King, Edward W., FA, [redacted]
Feehan, John P., Inf., [redacted]
Rawley, Roger A., Inf., [redacted]
Langley, Howard W., Ord., [redacted]
Land, James D., CAC, [redacted]
Windham, James E., CE, [redacted]
Fudge, Russell O., Inf., [redacted]
Miller, Clark L., AC, [redacted]
Wells, James F., FA, [redacted]
Carlson, Charles L., AC, [redacted]
Evans, Graham R., CAC, [redacted]
Healy, Patrick J., CAC, [redacted]
Richmond, Budd W., Inf., [redacted]
Boyd, Raymond G., AC, [redacted]
Malevich, Steven, Inf., [redacted]
Champlin, Herbert H., FA, [redacted]
Twining, Elmer E., CAC, [redacted]
Donnell, Thomas W., FA, [redacted]
Sander, George M., AC, [redacted]
Settle, Henry C., FA, [redacted]
Carnes, Norman D., Inf., [redacted]
O'Connell, Francis J., CAC, [redacted]
Babcock, Charles S., FA, [redacted]
O'Keefe, Keith T., Ord., [redacted]
Muth, Edwin A., Fin., [redacted]
Blust, Raymond L., QMC, [redacted]
Forman, Robert D., AC, [redacted]
Black, Richard T., AC, [redacted]
McLeod, Gregg C., QMC, [redacted]
Wherley, Clyde H., Ord., [redacted]
Rogers, Walter D., Ord., [redacted]
Laws, Woodrow, Inf., [redacted]
Frazier, Leroy E., Inf., [redacted]
DeMelker, Bert, CE, [redacted]
Glover, Bob H., SC, [redacted]
Bendler, Fred D., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Shogren, Hugo T., CAC, [redacted]
Lumsden, Reid R., AC, [redacted]
Galanti, Philip J., CE, [redacted]
Hagerty, Harry E., Inf., [redacted]
Brann, Herbert P., QMC, [redacted]
Jones, John T., AGD, [redacted]
Tibbs, Richard B., JAG, [redacted]
Ogden, Charles L., Ord., [redacted]
Campbell, Kermit W., QMC, [redacted]
Farmer, William C., Ord., [redacted]
Bush, Robert B., FA, [redacted]
Hagan, Richard C., JAG, [redacted]

Helms, George J., FA, [redacted]
McArdle, Charles E., Inf., [redacted]
Garrison, Ritchie, Cav., [redacted]
Lamek, William J., AC, [redacted]
Sullivan, John M., Cav., [redacted]
Lobit, William E., Cav., [redacted]
Reger, Hamilton, Ord., [redacted]
Filippi, Frank A., QMC, [redacted]
Hill, Jesse N., Inf., [redacted]
Brady, Lawrence W., Inf., [redacted]
Redfield, Robert S., Inf., [redacted]
Fitzgerald, Joseph O., AC, [redacted]
Preston, Ellery D., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Ziegler, Carl L., FA, [redacted]
Barker, George M., Inf., [redacted]
Musgrave, Philip C., AC, [redacted]
Winterbottom, D. A., QMC, [redacted]
Grigg, Martin C., Inf., [redacted]
Reitzell, William R., FA, [redacted]
King, Laurence T., Fin., [redacted]
Evans, Bill A., FA, [redacted]
Armstrong, Jack L., Ord., [redacted]
McCormac, Weston A., FA, [redacted]
Hector, John R., FA, [redacted]
Ranch, Alfred C., Ord., [redacted]
Cain, Clarence C., AC, [redacted]
Koren, Henry L. T., FA, [redacted]
Moore, Richard H., FA, [redacted]
Hall, Carl C., QMC, [redacted]
Laughlin, George T., Inf., [redacted]
Jones, Dean H., Inf., [redacted]
Mitchell, Donald E., CAC, [redacted]
Shockley, Moir L., AC, [redacted]
Gillette, Shelby L., QMC, [redacted]
Bowman, Clifford A., QMC, [redacted]
Layton, Charles B., Cav., [redacted]
Connerat, William H., Ord., [redacted]
Kuehler, Walter W., CWS, [redacted]
Caulfield, Thomas D., CAC, [redacted]
Hughes, George E., Ord., [redacted]
Olson, Clarence O., QMC, [redacted]
Gramzow, John G., Ord., [redacted]
Cook, Eugene, Inf., [redacted]
Miller, Luther R., Inf., [redacted]
Mason, Grant W., FA, [redacted]
Jones, Virlyn Y., QMC, [redacted]
Paddock, Ralph L., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Hamberg, William A., Inf., [redacted]
Howell, John D., AC, [redacted]
Carson, Nathan S., Inf., [redacted]
Elliott, Ralph H., FA, [redacted]
Buck, Donald G., Inf., [redacted]
Traeger, George A., QMC, [redacted]
Boerner, Otto M., AGD, [redacted]
Du Mond, Kenneth S., SC, [redacted]
Strickland, Robert P., Inf., [redacted]
McSheehy, Robert J., Ord., [redacted]
Blake, William L., Cav., [redacted]
Watts, James K., Inf., [redacted]
Johnson, Edward C., Inf., [redacted]
Slayden, W. M., 2d, Cav., [redacted]
McCampbell, James M., AC, [redacted]
Isrin, Michael D., QMC, [redacted]
Linn, Lavon P., CAC, [redacted]
Twitty, James W., AC, [redacted]
Merriam, Wheeler G., Cav., [redacted]
Ross, Fred L., FA, [redacted]
Brown, Bill R., AC, [redacted]
Alden, Victor W., AC, [redacted]
Jeffrey, Jack C., FA, [redacted]
Jolley, Paul L., Inf., [redacted]
Alford, Truman, Inf., [redacted]
Thweatt, Richmond F., FA, [redacted]
Lutz, Robert R., CAC, [redacted]
Thames, John W., CAC, [redacted]
Ridgell, Joel M., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Schuyler, Elmer V., AC, [redacted]
Clanton, Henry M., CAC, [redacted]
Smith, James P., CAC, [redacted]
Ogilvie, John M., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Hollman, Maurice J., AC, [redacted]
Stakes, Harry C., Inf., [redacted]
Quinton, Franklin L., Cav., [redacted]
Brown, Harold M., QMC, [redacted]
Etter, Richard W., AC, [redacted]
Sutherland, John F., FA, [redacted]
Price, William P., CAC, [redacted]
Clark, Eugene L., AC, [redacted]
Hunt, George M., FA, [redacted]
Pratt, Charles H., QMC, [redacted]
Fulton, Oscar W., QMC, [redacted]

Taylor, William H., Junior, AC,
McNay, Joe K., AC,
Konopaska, Royden A., Inf.,
Swanson, John W., Inf.,
Seigler, Thomas J., Junior, SC,
Salet, Eugene A., Inf.,
Williams, Timothy C., CWS,
Gentry, Allison P., AC,
Parsons, Norman W., Cav.,
McPheron, Wesley F., Inf.,
Leidenheimer, John L., SC,
Woodliff, Clifford L., Inf.,
Morrow, Bob E., QMC,
Funk, Myron A., FA,
Otto, Thomas W., AGD,
Norman, George G., AC,
Faribault, Ben M., Inf.,
Dillon, Mackin R., QMC,
Koenig, Carl J., CWS,
Nicolson, William H., CAC,
Branson, Charles E., Ord.,
Palmer, Edwin S., Ord.,
Jones, John P., Junior, Inf.,
Kinslow, Albert V., Inf.,
Atkins, Edwin L., Inf.,
Claffee, Robert A., CAC,
Williams, Carroll J., Ord.,
Beal, Bert L., Junior, CAC,
Webster, Francis X., CWS,
Reynolds, Burkitt A., Inf.,
Arnold, Leslie A., Junior, Inf.,
Billings, Eugene D., Ord.,
Best, Philip H., AC,
Gerot, Joseph O., Inf.,
Huse, Ralph N., AGD,

To be first lieutenants

Cummings, W. J., Junior, AC,
Haley, Austin, Ord.,
Bryan, Homer R., Inf.,
Porter, Roy V., Inf.,
Beck, Donald C., Ord.,
Northington, L. J. Dean, AC,
Saholsky, Bolick A., Ord.,
Bankert, Ward E., AC,
Nelson, Charles K., Junior, AC,
White, Emett R., Cav.,
Stark, Norvell R., Cav.,
Pickett, Lowell B., Ord.,
Williams, James M., CAC,
Fuller, Roger G., AC,
Adams, Donald L., SC,
Wolfe, Donald A., AC,
Hooker, George B., Junior, AC,
Schoenfeld, Walter E., QMC,
Colbert, Edwin L., Ord.,
Walker, Leonard F., SC,
Woodard, Walter W., AC,
Irwin, Samuel L., Inf.,
Vivian, William R., FA,
Hill, William W., Junior, FA,
Lewis, Lawrence L., AC,
Knott, Joseph W., FA,
Shipe, Fredrick W., AC,
Tully, James R., Inf.,
Dombrowski, Chester, CWS,
Tomlinson, Robert B., SC,
Moore, John J., Inf.,
Keenan, Albert M., AC,
Tawes, John P., CAC,
Colwell, Leonard F., QMC,
MacDaniel, Henry G., AC,
Albro, Robert D., Inf.,
Gebbie, Earl J., Fin.,
Pike, Myron H., AC,
Goodnow, James L., FA,
Kemp, Robert K., Inf.,
Bealke, Jacob W., Junior, Inf.,
Brightman, John Y., CAC,
Smith, Rollin H., QMC,
Walker, Robert T., SC,
Jenkins, Charles A., FA,
Freeman, Lloyd A, AC,
English, Robert O, Inf.,
Williams, Harold C., SC,
Lindstrand, Carl B., AC,
Bowling, Charles M., Junior, FA,
Schiffman, Maurice K., Inf.,
Pickell, Clyde V., Inf.,
Miller, Samuel T., FA,
West, Bland, FA,

Hoskot, Nathaniel R., Inf.,
Marcy, Roy W., Inf.,
Stover, William J., FA,
Witt, George L., Inf.,
Curtis, Richard H., AC,
Whitsitt, Menon W., Ord.,
Dunn, John J., Inf.,
Abercrombie, John C., QMC,
Easton, Harry D., Junior, FA,
Wright, Charles R., Junior, Inf.,
Hilsabeck, Carter L., Inf.,
Harvey, Marvin M., AC,
Woodward, Lester L., AC,
Garrison, Dace J., AC,
Sliker, Roland E., AC,
St. John, F. E., Junior, FA,
Richardson, James A., CWS,
Harrison, Joseph H., FA,
Cuttino, Thomas E., QMC,
Dunphy, Francis A., Fin.,
Olson, Harry C., QMC,
Anson, Paul A., CAC,
Baer, Charles P., AC,
Danald, George E., CWS,
McHugh, Godfrey T., AC,
Noel, John C., Junior, Inf.,
Sommers, Lawrence E., FA,
Carter, Daniel M., Inf.,
Vaughn, Curry N., Cav.,
Sharp, Walter C., Junior, Inf.,
Neelon, Thomas J., CE,
Larson, Gordon E., Inf.,
Stein, Thomas F., Junior, QMC,
Allen, Charles Y., Inf.,
Banke, Henry H., Ord.,
Turner, John G., CAC,
Allen, Henry C., AC,
Hobbs, Morris F., Fin.,
Luker, James W., AC,
Gordon, Michael J., AC,
Kuhn, William A., Inf.,
Marr, Lloyd M., Inf.,
Patterson, Leroy, FA,
Neuberg, Gustav A., Fin.,
Spees, Everett K., AC,
Kinsella, Harry F., QMC,
Butler, Bradford, Junior, FA,
Strathern, William E., AC,
Lindley, Ara G., FA,
Lawson, John K., AC,
Fletcher, Robert I., AC,
Townsend, Dured E., Inf.,
Satterwhite, S. B., Inf.,
Magnusson, John R., FA,
Pratt, Ford E., CAC,
Harris, John L., AC,
Whitney, Carl L., QMC,
Shurn, Vernon A., CE,
Fort, John G., QMC,
Blodgett, W. S., Junior, Ord.,
Fultz, William J., CAC,
Ragland, Richard M., AC,
Murphy, William F., FA,
Yatsevitch, Gratain M., Ord.,
Bunker, Theodore C., AC,
Brinkley, Joseph S., Junior, CWS,
Arp, David H., Fin.,
Howell, Edwin S., AC,
Ranvier, Gene M., SC,
Robinson, L. G., Junior, FA,
Borowski, Edmund J., AC,
Downes, Eldridge, ?d, QMC,
Oberst, Donald A., Ord.,
Gardner, Robert A., AC,
Thurston, Clair H., Inf.,
Quinn, James F., QMC,
Carnes, Sam A., AC,
Carlson, Roland P., FA,
Sweeney, James L., FA,
Hubbard, Thomas H., AC,
Walton, William, Inf.,
Nowe, Charles F., Inf.,
Sweger, Dyson C., FA,
Howell, Clifford W., Inf.,
Smoak, John R., Inf.,
Anglin, William E., QMC,
Goshorn, John A., QMC,
Duncan William D., Inf.,
Keyes, Richard W., Inf.,
Decker, Samuel A., QMC,
Dunham, Leland R., Inf.,

Guthrie, James O., Ord.,
Swan, Thomas H., SC,
Shell, Robert H., Fin.,
Stricken, W. A., Junior, CAC,
Lee, Eugene M., FA,
Hensch, Edward K., AC,
Kane, Michael, Junior, Inf.,
Blair, James G., AC,
Klasing, Waldemar J., CE,
Malone, Duane W., CAC,
Chatham, Arthur B., Fin.,
Gassett, Silas, FA,
McElligott, Joseph P., CAC,
Anderson, Norman A., FA,
Comm, Edward D., CE,
Bailey, Woodrow W., QMC,
Miller, Mabry G., Inf.,
Heuer, Henry J., SC,
Darrow, Howard W., FA,
Magrath, Joseph S., Fin.,
Matchette, Claude H., FA,
King, John L., Junior, QMC,
McKnight, David T., AC,
Dickie, Ralph L., Cav.,
Worley, Thomas G., CAC,
Ellis, Robert R., AC,
Clark, Jack A., FA,
Roscoe, Claude D., Inf.,
Cannon, Howard W., AC,
Voyatzis, Polyvios A., CAC,
Stratton, Max M., AC,
Johns, Glover S., Junior, Inf.,
Bethune, Samuel A., QMC,
Thornton, Virgil H., QMC,
Stone, Loren F., FA,
Hahn, Clarence W., AC,
Clark, William R., FA,
Roper, David N., FA,
Burke, Thomas W., Inf.,
Dalrymple, John C., CE,
Cassell, Raymond W., AC,
McMackin, Charles L., Inf.,
Geddes, John A., SC,
Feidt, Gerald E., Inf.,
Botts, Joseph H., QMC,
Butler, Charles D., AC,
Redling, William N., QMC,
Lagasse, Frederick J., CAC,
Burba, Edwin H., FA,
Leib, Richard C., FA,
Soulliere, Edward J., AC,
Jones, George W., Inf.,
Mangold, Harold B., Inf.,
Rader, Robert M., Ord.,
Post, Charles A., Inf.,
Montgomery, Robin G., Inf.,
Townsend, Clyde F., CE,
Ulrich, John A., Ord.,
Hollis, Jeff F., Cav.,
Smith, William H., AC,
Jarvis, Joseph W., Cav.,
Pace, George D., QMC,
Ord, John A., SC,
Hurley, Emerson F., Inf.,
Clark, Samuel L., AC,
Janney, Norman D., AC,
Peot, Joseph J., SC,
Hinchie, John C., CWS,
Lindsey, Howard W., AC,
Grant, John W., SC,
Jones, David L., AC,
Shaffer, Lewis N., FA,
Yost, Carl R., QMC,
Rader, William F., Ord.,
Pittsford, Jack C., QMC,
Tally, Emmett M., Junior, AC,
Hamill, Estil L., AC,
Schmelzle, C. M., CWS,
Jacobs, Gerald O., QMC,
Gudgel, Floyd J., AC,
Larsen, George E., QMC,
Tolly, Robert J., FA,
Smith, Douglas R., AC,
Mueller, Waldemar M., Inf.,
Payne, Charles J., FA,
Prahl, Robert L., QMC,
Jacobs, Lawrence C., SC,
Bibo, Harold S., Inf.,
Albrecht, Albert W., FA,
Weissman, Edwin W., Inf.,
Davidson, Cecil H., QMC,

Clay, Roy U., FA, [redacted]
Priest, Perry B., CAC, [redacted]
Mason, Edward R., Inf., [redacted]
Wright, Charles E., Cav., [redacted]
Richards, Frederick W., Inf., [redacted]
Benedict, Harold B., Ord., [redacted]
Vaughn, Francis M., CAC, [redacted]
Tait, Albert L., FA, [redacted]
Gavalas, Leonidas G., FA, [redacted]
Gilliam, Arnold C., QMC, [redacted]
Shepherd, Gerald D., FA, [redacted]
Sanford, Arthur L., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Martin, Lonnie E., AC, [redacted]
Chittenden, Albert O., CAC, [redacted]
Connolly, H. A. N., Inf., [redacted]
Sherwood, Frederick H., AC, [redacted]
Gershenau, Louis, Inf., [redacted]
Walter, Edward C., FA, [redacted]
Bigelow, John M., Inf., [redacted]
Jackson, James H., QMC, [redacted]
Roach, Richard R., CAC, [redacted]
Dougherty, John H., Junior, CE, [redacted]
Brown, William M., Inf., [redacted]
Meyer, George F., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Cahn, Joseph M., CAC, [redacted]
Cassell, Lloyd W., Fin., [redacted]
Janes, Ernest L., Inf., [redacted]
Kirkland, S. H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Moon, William P., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Harlow, Paul N., AC, [redacted]
Norris, Carl E., AC, [redacted]
Bledsoe, Carl E., QMC, [redacted]
Nilsson, Erwin G., Inf., [redacted]
Frasor, George M., FA, [redacted]
Gibbs, Asa B., SC, [redacted]
Coote, John F., QMC, [redacted]
Smart, Donald V., Inf., [redacted]
Kostora, Lee H., Inf., [redacted]
Milburn, William R., CWS, [redacted]
Parker, John L., AC, [redacted]
Minion, Edward M., FA, [redacted]
Rogers, William C., Ord., [redacted]
Ryan, Robert E., QMC, [redacted]
Cameron, Harry F., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Ocamb, Lawrence B., AC, [redacted]
White, Barney D., FA, [redacted]
Mounsey, Glen A., Inf., [redacted]
Payne, Roger B., AC, [redacted]
Humphrey, Clarence L., QMC, [redacted]
Rucker, Choice R., Inf., [redacted]
Beckwith, James O., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Burns, Luther W., AC, [redacted]
Temple, Richard L., QMC, [redacted]
Smith, Ralph H., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Smith, Harold A., SC, [redacted]
Gunn, James A., 3d, AC, [redacted]
Teusink, Philip J., AC, [redacted]
Cleveland, Rafael, SC, [redacted]
Taylor, Robert R., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Clark, Arthur M., AC, [redacted]
Fantone, James E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Grotte, Helmer M., CAC, [redacted]
Moncrief, James S., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Tuebner, Harry R., FA, [redacted]
Mitchell, Leonard D., QMC, [redacted]
Douthitt, Ted F., Cav., [redacted]
Harding, John E., FA, [redacted]
Evans, Robert H., Inf., [redacted]
Jackson, Marion H., FA, [redacted]
Cheves, Cecil L., CE, [redacted]
Wittmayer, Raymond C., Inf., [redacted]
McCoy, Toliver G., Ord., [redacted]
Popowski, Michael, Junior, Cav., [redacted]
Learnard, Arthur T., AC, [redacted]
Russell, George B., Ord., [redacted]
Smith, Robert Q., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Ruoff, Herman J., AC, [redacted]
Saylors, John H., Inf., [redacted]
McLaughlin, C. V., Inf., [redacted]
Ishoy, Victor A., QMC, [redacted]
Bond, Ralph W., AC, [redacted]
Philbrick, Kenneth R., CAC, [redacted]
Valiante, Leo F., QMC, [redacted]
Murray, Gordon C., QMC, [redacted]
Tracy, Orrin A., Inf., [redacted]
Peters, Robert E., Ord., [redacted]
Edwards, Earl L., Inf., [redacted]
Knight, Gordon B., AC, [redacted]
McMullin, Elbert F., AC, [redacted]
Toolin, Brendan E., AC, [redacted]
Murch, Gordon E., Inf., [redacted]

Rees, Roger S., Inf., [redacted]
Grant, Carl E., CWS, [redacted]
Brooks, William P., FA, [redacted]
Bennett, William A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Engelbertz, Joseph, SC, [redacted]
Huddleston, Joseph J., AC, [redacted]
Roberdeau, Neywood H., AC, [redacted]
Holland, Charles H., CAC, [redacted]
Griswold, George M., Inf., [redacted]
Bell, Richard, AC, [redacted]
Frandsen, Hugh A., AC, [redacted]
Murphy, Ernest V., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Talbott, Charles Y., Senior, Inf., [redacted]
Bisbing, John, Inf., [redacted]
Langendorf, Walter C., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Samuel M., AC, [redacted]
Minor, Floyd E., Inf., [redacted]
Gallagher, William J., FA, [redacted]
Calabro, Salvatore, SC, [redacted]
Hench, John W., AC, [redacted]
Swortwood, Louis B., Inf., [redacted]
Schaudt, Howard P, Inf., [redacted]
Gould, Elmer M., AC, [redacted]
Rundquist, Douglas L., QMC, [redacted]
Rowden, Burton H., AC, [redacted]
Curry, William C., Inf., [redacted]
Impson, Ivan H., Ord, [redacted]
Pizzati, Henry E., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Townsend, Elias C., Inf., [redacted]
Gray, Andrew J., QMC, [redacted]
Goettl, John P., CAC, [redacted]
Barber, Wilfred F., Inf., [redacted]
Bacharach, Gustav M., Inf., [redacted]
Short, Earl R., Inf., [redacted]
Conner, Karl, FA, [redacted]
Herman, Benjamin J., CAC, [redacted]
Bruch, Ray K., FA, [redacted]
Fuller, Carl W., CAC, [redacted]
Fullerton, Leroy R., QMC, [redacted]
Jenks, Harold F., QMC, [redacted]
McWhorter, John P., Inf., [redacted]
Stopp, Joseph E., FA, [redacted]
Mason, Don A., Inf., [redacted]
Blum, Milton R., Fin., [redacted]
Bush, Jean E., FA, [redacted]
Sadler, John B., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
McDonnell, W. J., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Tyler, Willoughby B., Inf., [redacted]
Bowman, Homer H., Inf., [redacted]
Callahan, James F., Fin., [redacted]
Ewbank, John N., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Jacobson, George D., Cav., [redacted]
Mitchell, Allan W., CAC, [redacted]
Eldridge, George B., AC, [redacted]
Arnett, Thomas N., AC, [redacted]
Berry, John E., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Schneider, Max F., [redacted]
Harris, Riley W., AC, [redacted]
Good, John C., AC, [redacted]
Tyler, Jack H., CE, [redacted]
Haycock, William M., Inf., [redacted]
Payne, Gilbert M., SC, [redacted]
Wilhelm, William E., CE, [redacted]
Coleman, Irving M., QMC, [redacted]
Helderman, C. F., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Grote, Robert W., Ord., [redacted]
Tutt, Junius R., CAC, [redacted]
Dudley, Harold M., CAC, [redacted]
Cox, William S., Junior, Ord., [redacted]
Corcoran, Charles A., FA, [redacted]
Prather, Lawrence H., Ord., [redacted]
Clark, James B., CAC, [redacted]
Millberry, Robert I., AC, [redacted]
Perry, Theodore D., QMC, [redacted]
Olsen, Harold O., QMC, [redacted]
Rowan, Robert L., Inf., [redacted]
Locke, William F., Ord., [redacted]
Wolfe, Harold K., Inf., [redacted]
Speedie, John C., Inf., [redacted]
Bell, Urcel L., Cav., [redacted]
Kincaid, Leonard C., Inf., [redacted]
McCurdy, Leon H., AC, [redacted]
Welch, George A., AC, [redacted]
Clements, Thomas H., CAC, [redacted]
Pervier, George W., QMC, [redacted]
Saunders, William S., QMC, [redacted]
McNamara, Wilson C., FA, [redacted]
Durham, George W., Fin., [redacted]
Walker, Robert M., CAC, [redacted]
Hudiburg, Howard B., CAC, [redacted]
Garden, Frank E., Inf., [redacted]
McGillin, Howard O., QMC, [redacted]

Dixon, Jobie J., QMC, [redacted]
Martindale, John R., Inf., [redacted]
Nold, Woodrow V., AC, [redacted]
Hall, Robert E., CAC, [redacted]
Bronn, Carl H., CE, [redacted]
Ising, George E., Ord., [redacted]
Thomas, Lawrence M., AC, [redacted]
Stambaugh, Edgar L., AC, [redacted]
Sandlin, Joseph C., Inf., [redacted]
Woodard, Vernon E., Ord., [redacted]
Bennett, William E., FA, [redacted]
Booth, Lance E., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Thomas, Henry G., Inf., [redacted]
Surdyk, Eugene E., FA, [redacted]
Santora, Bert, Inf., [redacted]
Harvey, Daniel M., AC, [redacted]
Gillis, Charles F., AC, [redacted]
Davis, John M., Cav., [redacted]
Anderson, George L., FA, [redacted]
Kelley, George T., AC, [redacted]
Dudderar, Sam K., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Taylor, John S., 2d, QMC, [redacted]
Dempsey, Jack H., Inf., [redacted]
Bergquist, Donald P., CAC, [redacted]
Mastrucci, Joseph P., CAC, [redacted]
Judson, William J., Ord., [redacted]
Blase, George H., AC, [redacted]
Crase, Harold J., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Shookus, Anthony H., FA, [redacted]
Hatzfeld, Theodore S., Inf., [redacted]
McNear, Evan A., Inf., [redacted]
Akin, Leroy, AC, [redacted]
Kelly, Dan F., QMC, [redacted]
Walton, Henry L., CAC, [redacted]
Parker, John C., CAC, [redacted]
Velasquez, Ben N., QMC, [redacted]
Lipton, Irving J., Ord., [redacted]
Terry, Augustus T., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Hawes, Daniel G., AC, [redacted]
Brown, Greg J., Inf., [redacted]
Sorensen, Martin O., Cav., [redacted]
Bryant, Randell H., Inf., [redacted]
Ethel, Willis G., Cav., [redacted]
Allen, Leonard S., CAC, [redacted]
George, Claude D., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Angel, Nicholas C., SC, [redacted]
Anderson, Roland, Inf., [redacted]
Smigelow, Howard G., CAC, [redacted]
Elliott, Robert D., AC, [redacted]
Rafferty, Thomas A., Inf., [redacted]
Peterson, Kenneth J., Inf., [redacted]
Schantz, Oliver W., Inf., [redacted]
Mall, Oscar A., Inf., [redacted]
Finch, John E., Inf., [redacted]
Mikulak, Michael N., Inf., [redacted]
Ash, Hughes L., Inf., [redacted]
Flesch, Joseph M., Inf., [redacted]
Tiede, Roland V., FA, [redacted]
Hertzler, John G., AC, [redacted]
Barney, Walter P., AC, [redacted]
Follmer, Jacob, AC, [redacted]
Fraser, A. G., Junior, Cav., [redacted]
Thornton, Albert L., FA, [redacted]
Vestal, Waymoth D., AC, [redacted]
Patton, Joe R., AC, [redacted]
Reid, Clarence E., QMC, [redacted]
Scheurlein, Frank W., FA, [redacted]
Musick, Lawrence A., Inf., [redacted]
Knoche Elwood F., QMC, [redacted]
Ackroyd, Gilbert G., FA, [redacted]
Morgan, Leonard S., FA, [redacted]
Knox, Cameron, Inf., [redacted]
Joslin, Will D., SC, [redacted]
Boling, Jean H., FA, [redacted]
Thornton, Joseph A., SC, [redacted]
Purkhiser, Herman L., SC, [redacted]
Yakshe, John R., FA, [redacted]
Sellers, William W., Inf., [redacted]
Thompson, Nash O., FA, [redacted]
Pyles, Dixon L., CAC, [redacted]
Ruemmele, Albert M., Ord., [redacted]
Pinson, Ernest A., AC, [redacted]
Victory, Homer J., Ord., [redacted]
Loomis, Oliver D., AC, [redacted]
Gregory, Francis G., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Fischer, Ernest W., Ord., [redacted]
Banon James E., QMC, [redacted]
Gilman, Turner W., SC, [redacted]
Werve, Matt W., Cav., [redacted]
Clirehugh, Robert W., FA, [redacted]
Meade, Stephen J., Inf., [redacted]

Barlow, Rudolph, Cav.,
Cushing, C. B., Junior, CAC,
Septfonds, C. E., Junior, Ord.,
Hamrick, William L., AC,
Phillips, Henry J., Inf.,
Holland, Edward C., QMC,
Troutman, John C., Inf.,
Burgy, Eldred J., AC,
Leffers, Richard, Junior, FA,
Stephens, John J., Inf.,
Robertson, Kenneth C., Inf.,
Creasy, Roy V., CAC,
Thorup, Louis G., AC,
Edwards, Wesley B., Inf.,
Merrill Clinton G., Inf.,
Russell, Barton M., AC,
Klos, Lawrence B., AC,
Fischer, Carleton E., Inf.,
McWilliams, E., 3d, Inf.,
Ucherek, Stephen A., FA,
Whitney, Richard W., Inf.,
Hoffman, John G., Junior, CWS,
Hoffman, Ward G., AC,
Linse, Francis D., Inf.,
Nied, George J., AC,
Smith, Myron D., FA,
Berendt, Herbert W., CAC,
Caraballo, Raymond T., QMC,
Elliott, Ivan W., QMC,
Seeley, John M., AC,
Ray, Jeff G., FA,
Reed, David W., AC,
McKee, William A., Inf.,
Rownd, William E., QMC,
North, Harris J., QMC,
Friedman, Robert J., AC,
Andrews, Carl W., AC,
Grady, Frank J., AC,
Oneill, Frederick M., AC,
Hill, Leroy C., Inf.,
Rhodes, Arthur D., AC,
Beck, John N., Inf.,
Armstrong, C. H., Junior, CAC,
Allen, Edward G., Inf.,
Craig, Dan E., Inf.,
Foster, Herbert M., AC,
O'Reilly, Charles A., Junior, CAC,
Hall, Robert J., CE,
Neuendorf, Charles W., QMC,
Reese, Fred J., Fin.,
Peckham, Elisha O., Inf.,
Barrow, Tom L., AC,
O'Hara, Lewis B., FA,
Prentice, Jospeh C., CWS,
Carson, Charles E., AC,
Drennen, William L., Ord.,
Young, Robert W., Inf.,
Harrison, Willard E., Inf.,
O'Connell, James F. X., AC,
Atlas, Reynold, Ord.,
Van de Velde, Louis D., FA,
Muhlbach, Robert P., AC,
Brown, John M., Junior, QMC,
Hill, Kenneth, R., QMC,
Klous, David D., Cav.,
Black, Peter T. L., QMC,
Morneau, Chester H., AC,
Arnold, Edgar L., Inf.,
Emory, George B., Inf.,
Dawson, Harold C., AC,
Stacy, Robert S., CAC,
Langley, Samuel F., AC,
Murphy, William E., Inf.,
Dodds, Lloyd B., SC,
Turner, Carl C., Ord.,
Humphreys, Russell W., QMC,
Underwood, Clarence R., Fin.,
Coates, Donald L., FA,
Mabardy, Mitchell A., Inf.,
Downey, Arthur J., Inf.,
Spaulding, Walter L., QMC,
Nelson, Henry H., CAC,
Richards, Milburn L., AC,
Yardley, Doyle R., Inf.,
Taylor, Everett L., AC,
Aerni, Francis J., QMC,
Turner, Herbert N., Inf.,
Grubb, William F., AC,
Hancock, Edward T., Inf.,
Baldwin, Coy W., QMC,
Walker, Norman M., CAC,
Wygant, Robert M., QMC,
Hall, Donald P., AC,
Marthens, G. W., 2d, AC,
Johnson, James M., AC,
Hardesty, Wilmer A., AC,
Cavender, Joe J., AC,
McGibeny, Arthur D., AC,
Goodall, David M., Ord.,
Ritchey, Andrew W., CAC,
Young, Claude C., CAC,
Childers, Joe E., QMC,
Phillips, John D., Junior, Inf.,
Van Gundy, Daniel F., CAC,
Waters, Martin J., Junior, Inf.,
Davis, Frank L., AC,
Roderick, Charles R., Fin.,
Cullis, Robert E., Inf.,
Polifka, Frank J. F., CAC,
Becker, Henry C., Inf.,
Prosser, Charles M., Junior, Ord.,
Goldsmith, H. F., Junior, Inf.,
Waller, Henry H., Junior, AC,
Hicks, Fred A., Inf.,
Patriquin, Richard L., FA,
Williamson, William P., AC,
Lindgren, Richard W., QMC,
Coleman, Harry S., Junior, AC,
Betz, Albert L., AC,
Sterba, Richard, AC,
Brandt, Arnold N., Inf.,
Volz, William H., AC,
Nicholls, Andrew B. C., Ord.,
Martin, Julian H., Inf.,
Downer, George S., Cav.,
Herrelko, Frank E., AC,
Springer, Raymond L., QMC,
Rockwood, Ralph H., Junior, Fin.,
Blake, Leslie M., Fin.,
Inglis, Edward, Inf.,
Isaacson, Donald F., Cav.,
Hastey, Raymond L., AC,
Staples, John F., Inf.,
Jones, Bertil V., QMC,
Fonger, Robert E., CE,
Shuler, Allen C., Junior, Inf.,
Majors, Edward M., Inf.,
Doerflinger, Oscar M., FA,
Noble, Joseph E., Junior, Inf.,
Lee, Ray M., Inf.,
Devine, Patrick H., Inf.,
Cheston, Elliott B., Inf.,
Sorenson, Morris E., Inf.,
Egerland, Arnold V., AC,
Houston, B. Z., Junior, Inf.,
Birdsall, Frank J., Junior, QMC,
Pope, William P., CAC,
McCormick, John K., CAC,
Crump, William E., Junior, Inf.,
Fair, Felder L., Inf.,
Long, Herbert S., Junior, Inf.,
Wheeler, Harold W., CWS,
Horton, Charles W., Junior, AC,
McDonald, Claud W., AC,
McCredie, Darwin C., AC,
Vinson, Frank M., Junior, Inf.,
Bennett, Herbert H., AC,
Nelson, William H., Junior, FA,
Gorski, Andrew G., FA,
Green, Eugene W., AC,
Messerschmitt, K. D., AC,
Bucha, Paul A., Fin.,
Blue, Daniel L., CAC,
Hill, Jesse G., AC,
McCullough, W. E., AC,
Prentice, George W., AC,
Wood, Benjamin F., QMC,
Fallows, Albert D., AC,
Lawrence, J. S., Junior, Inf.,
Capers, Thomas S., Junior, Fin.,
Ackert, Thomas W., CAC,
Shapard, David C., FA,
Casto, Carl S., CWS,
Regan, James L., Junior, CAC,
Steele, William, AC,
McMillin, Dan S., Cav.,
Woodrow, Charles E., QMC,
Cheek, Russell C., Fin.,
Beeson, John J., 3d, Inf.,
Stegall, Oscar, Junior, Ord.,
Clarke, Earl M., Inf.,
Searles, Frederick W., AC,
Ryneska, Joseph F., Inf.,
Craig, Ellis B., AC,
Burr, Wesley H., Fin.,
Bearss, Ernest H., Inf.,
Cookson, George M., QMC,
Williams, Donald G., AC,
Gerber, Fred E., QMC,
McCool, Edward J., QMC,
Lowrance, Joseph B., Junior, AC,
Hubbard, Mark E., AC,
Bailey, Edward P., AC,
Hicks, Paul S., FA,
Tillapaugh, H. J., Junior, AC,
Perry, Edwin A., Inf.,
Campbell, Charles H., QMC,
Hylton, John T., Junior, AC,
Wicker, Karl J., QMC,
Snoad, Charles W., Fin.,
McSwain, Alex T., AC,
Jenkins, Edward L., AC,
Gregg, Francis H., Inf.,
Alldredge, William S., FA,
Donlon, James D., Junior, QMC,
Arnold, Thomas S., FA,
White, Howard S., CAC,
Fleming, David D., Inf.,
Burk, Walter J., Inf.,
Spiedel, Robert C., Junior, QMC,
Kingman, Dan C., Inf.,
Scott, Lionel E., Inf.,
Veatch, John E., CE,
Edwards, Edward G., Inf.,
Dix, Jewett A., Cav.,
Houser, Harold H., Inf.,
Dueker, Fred E., CAC,
Stone, James J., Junior, AC,
Lesneski, Stanley V., CAC,
Wilson, Weldon W., Inf.,
Gage, Freeman F., Junior, Inf.,
Chapman, Wilson A., AC,
Morgan, Chester H., AC,
Holm, Florian A., AC,
Hess, Philip C., QMC,
Wills, Lloyd E., Inf.,
Perkins, John W., AC,
Benjamin, Roy F., FA,
Hild, Fred E., AC,
Graham, Robert O., Junior, QMC,
Wallace, Lee, Inf.,
Robideaux, Robert J., CAC,
Kinney, Oliver G., Inf.,
Quail, Keith F., Inf.,
Kiely, John J., Junior, Ord.,
Ball, Arthur C., FA,
Hargrave, Warren M., Cav.,
Jameson, Roy A., Junior, FA,
Neal, Bascome L., AC,
Koch, Otto R., Junior, Inf.,
Ferguson, George R., Inf.,
Hollerbach, Eugene J., Inf.,
Williams, George W., Inf.,
Bane, Mark C., Junior, AC,
Rose, Ralph E., Inf.,
Lavell, Robert G., CAC,
Burhanna, Howard, Junior, AC,
Teaboldt, Chase R., Ord.,
Owen, Henry M., Junior, CAC,
Bush, Joseph, AC,
Allen, Ollie J., SC,
Mullinix, Joseph B., Inf.,
Roberts, James F., Junior, AC,
Slad, Harry A., Inf.,
Outlaw, Fredrick B., Inf.,
Munro, Perry A., SC,
Rolph, Herbert F., CAC,
Miller, Austin L., AC,
Gauss, William H., AC,
Dunlap, Nicholas, QMC,
Sansom, Byron M., Junior, AC,
Wheless, Hewitt T., AC,
Albert, Jack F., Ord.,
Stack, Robert C., Ord.,
Reynolds, Norman G., Inf.,
Poff, Clarence G., AC,
Payne, John C., QMC,
Holman, Leslie W., AC,
Allen, Ben E., FA,
Barrell, Richard, Inf.,
Mellinger, Robert T., AC,
Anderson, Herman A. C., Ord.,
Heiney, John W., Inf.,

Parker, Howard C., Inf.,
Sapp, John D., FA,
Haskins, George D., FA,
Harris, Daniel D., QMC,
Norling, Ralph L., FA,
Klein, Phillip I., QMC,
Lively, Richard T., AC,
Curtis, Frank M., Junior, AC,
Thomas, James K., AC,
Smith, Vernon A., AC,
Blocker, Jack S., FA,
Briscoe, Charles A., QMC,
Weaver, Maynard B., Inf.,
Hensley, Joseph W., AC,
Van Horne, Richard W., FA,
Lehnhard, Donald F., AC,
Angster, Robert C., SC,
Drouillard, Eugene G., Inf.,
Twomey, Lawrence A., CAC,
Lavoie, Leon F., FA,
Smith, James W., Inf.,
Lambert, Floyd A., AC,
Rosenberg, Orin W., Inf.,
Brann, Ralph A., AC,
Johns, Robert G., AC,
Hibbert, Richard B., AC,
Harding, Stanley L., CAC,
Gugliotta, Philip A., AC,
Phillips, Royal E., Ord.,
Gray, Millard G., Inf.,
Redington, William M., AC,
Lewis, Daniel M., AC,
Rankin, John A., Inf.,
Fromer, Paul S., Inf.,
Evans, John T., CAC,
Gillespie, John J., CAC,
Miller, Fred W., AC,
Boyer, Jack W., QMC,
Walters, Ernest L., AC,
Gerrity, Thomas P., AC,
Taylor, Roy L., AC,
Edwards, Irwin A., Inf.,
Smith, Eugene, Inf.,
Powell, Kenneth R., AC,
Jowdy, William J., AC,
Sandell, Bertil B., FA,
Osborne, William L., Inf.,
Levine, Lester H., Inf.,
Brannon, John M., QMC,
Nicholson, Leonard T., AC,
Drake, William D., Inf.,
Dooley, Thomas, Cav.,
Myers, William M., Inf.,
Riddle, Kyle L., AC,
Kofahl, Harold E., AC,
Wills, Milton E., Junior, QMC,
Heffner, Charles R., AC,
Moore, Howard W., AC,
Rankin, Alexander J., Cav.,
Bailey, Harle G., Fin.,
Boyles, Samuel J., CWS,
Law, William, FA,
Fives, Paul E., QMC,
Aboosh, Norman D., FA,
Witter, Vincent M., Inf.,
Boland, Harmon L., Cav.,
Compton, John T., AC,
Cappucci, Joseph J., AC,
Cromwell, Samuel M., Inf.,
Burnett, Darrell H., QMC,
Hogan, Julian L., FA,
Clark, James W., AC,
Campbell, Charles T., Fin.,
Murray, James T., AC,
Carmack, Beverly E., AC,
Ruegg, Robert G., AC,
Jenkins, Leaton E., AC,
Brothers, Benjamin M., Inf.,
Carpenter, Sidney C., Inf.,
Bennett, Ralph L., AC,
Brown, William M., Junior, AC,
Croft, Lucian C., Inf.,
Wendt, Walter W., Inf.,
Austin, Wallace, QMC,
Black, George W., Inf.,
Nance, Donald W., AC,
Drysdale, Taylor, AC,
Bruni, Albert V., Inf.,
OBrien, Francis W., Inf.,
Stahler, Charles L., Inf.,
Ax, Clarence F., FA,

Lerner, Gerald, P., SC,
Hatchell, Henry C., QMC,
Rutledge, Hugh M., Inf.,
Peters, Clifton A., Inf.,
Livermore, Francis S., Ord.,
Tharpe, Felix E., Inf.,
Mignola, Harold E., AC,
Guenther, Edgar T., Cav.,
Thorne, Ola P., AC,
Roberts, Gore F., AC,
Holtz, Werner, Inf.,
Dowd, Maxim J., QMC,
Gillum, Virgil M., AC,
Hutson, Richard K., QMC,
Scott, John B., Ord.,
Isbell, James A., AC,
Ambron, Tyrus R., FA,
Maddox, Manley P., Junior, QMC,
Birchard, Glen R., AC,
Jenkins, Park T., FA,
Harty, William E., AC,
Miller, John H., Inf.,
Johnson, Kenneth L., AC,
Henry, Fred G., AC,
Belieu, Kenneth E., SC,
Downard, Donald E., Inf.,
Walker, Jack K., FA,
Sears, Meldrum L., AC,
Gruber, George L., AC,
Starbuck, James H., AC,
Crawford, Alfred H., Junior, QMC,
Lutz, Harry, Inf.,
Graham, Thomas A., Junior, FA,
Dillon, Joseph C., AC,
Barclay, John A., QMC,
Sturgis, James E., QMC,
McBrayer, C. E., AC,
Tuckett, Isaac W., FA,
Von Benge, Herman H., Inf.,
Liakos, Elias F., QMC,
Hampton, McLean, Inf.,
Gordon, William P., Junior, AC,
McClure, Myron, Inf.,
Fargo, Lynn D., Inf.,
Paul, Thurston T., Junior, Inf.,
Moore, Robert E., FA,
Howland, Clark B., AC,
Erdin, Robert A., AC,
Holmes, William W., Ord.,
Grandin, Daniel G., CAC,
Tomlin, John W., Junior, Inf.,
Acker, Holbert H., AC,
Wilcox, Leslie R., Inf.,
Nagel, William E., Inf.,
Rice, Burt H., AC,
Richard Septime S., Junior, AC,
Chamblin, Francis A., Fin.,
Stickles, Ronald R., QMC,
McWilliams, John K., SC,
Pierre, George H., Junior, CAC,
Wansley, Theodore, AC,
Driver, George T., AC,
Salada, Reuben N., FA,
Schaaf, Oscar R., AC,
Johnston, Ronald A., AC,
McKenzie, Walter B., Cav.,
Naudts, Morris J., Inf.,
Delahay, William A., AC,
Armstrong, Edward B., FA,
Verbeek, Harry P., AC,
Pugh, Robert J., AC,
Bruehl, Paul E., QMC,
McConnell, Landon E., AC,
Mosheim, Emil L., QMC,
McElroy, Edgar E., AC,
Hennessey, James T., FA,
Healton, Curtis E., QMC,
Williams, Marcus O., QMC,
Huppert, George H., Junior, Inf.,
Patterson, William G., FA,
Albert, George E., QMC,
Pedersen, Carl E., AC,
Scholl, William P., Junior, QMC,
Nestlerode, H. E., Junior, SC,
Goldsworthy, Harry E., AC,
Bonawitz, Norval C., AC,
Balkman, Austin F., QMC,
Butts, Robert E., CAC,
Hoskins, Harry D., Junior, CE,
Motter, John C., QMC,
Laughran, John J., CAC,

Arthur, Frank M., CWS,
Belville, Robert E., AC,
Bruns, Stockton D., CAC,
Mannes, Conrad O., Junior, CAC,
Hand, Robert D., FA,
Davidson, Henry E., Junior, Inf.,
Bary, Robert S., QMC,
Boy, Pierre D., Inf.,
McCollom, Loren G., AC,
Rosen, Bernard A., AC,
Ryan, Joseph S., Ord.,
Wikoff, William H., Inf.,
Durrance, Virgil H., AC,
Witte, Carl G., Inf.,
Schoonover, James F., Inf.,
Smith, Richard S., Inf.,
Cheek, Andrew R., Cav.,
Andrew, Stephen W., AC,
Cory, Ernest N., Junior, FA,
Hayes, John J., CWS,
Wyatt, William L., CAC,
Redman, Charles L., Junior, QMC,
Nendell, Jack A., AC,
Thackara, Paul N., AC,
Seaburn, Eugene T., FA,
Weigand, Jack L., Inf.,
Schweitzer, John H., AC,
Niccolls, Robert S., Ord.,
Turner, Ian F., Cav.,
Myers, Eugene E., AC,
Jones, Gordon C., Fin.,
Specht, James T., Junior, FA,
Hughes, William M., FA,
Weaver, Frederick, AC,
Martens, Howard W., QMC,
Holland, Robert V., AC,
Holt, Arthur E., CAC,
Westwood, John R., AC,
McKinnon, Samuel H., AC,
Brady, Stuart F., FA,
Hall, Richard E., Junior, Ord.,
Edmonds, Melvin T., AC,
Foster, Gilbert, AC,
Brown, Richard K., Inf.,
Eckland, Kenneth E., Inf.,
Mize, Paul H., Inf.,
Buchert, Joseph R., AC,
Webster, Frank R., Junior, AC,
Wallace, Kenneth W., Inf.,
Brooks, Bascom A., AC,
McTague, Hugh O., AC,
Way, David W., FA,
Raper, William S., AC,
Bird, Robert J., Cav.,
Walters, Rudolph B., AC,
Zeoli, Richard F., Inf.,
Massengill, Walter L., AC,
Frederickson, Erwin, FA,
Lyle, James B., Inf.,
Carter, George W., Junior, QMC,
Wilson, Franklin L., FA,
Solomon, Edward M., Inf.,
Kuehnel, Leonard A., QMC,
Hanson, Bertil E., AC,
Fowell, Byron R., AC,
Hickman, Mahlon D., FA,
Casey, Charles W., CAC,
Wilson, Olin L., AC,
Kellner, Fred W., FA,
Lewis, Samuel H., AC,
Seale, Harmon H., FA,
Yow, John W., Cav.,
Seekins, Earl I., QMC,
Durgin, Chesley F., CAC,
La Mee, William S., 3d, CAC,
Gesell, Robert C., AC,
Steckla, Paul R., Inf.,
Clowes, George C., Inf.,
Christensen, John A., AC,
Sinclair, Lachlan M., Inf.,
Wilson, Harold G., FA,
Juskalian George, Inf.,
Getz, George G., AC,
Hoppenstein, Isaac, Inf.,
Sullivan, Daniel F., AC,
Bottoms, Robert L., AC,
Dameron, Ernest C., Inf.,
Purcell, Charles J., AC,
Kelly, Lem M., Inf.,
Taylor, John R., AC,
Petro, John J., Junior, QMC,

Tutin, Bill J., FA,
Fallows, Ronald F., AC,
Brooks, Edgar R., CAC,
Aebischer, Louis J., FA,
Helfert, Peter A., CAC,
Miller, Josiah B., FA,
Rountree, William C., Cav.,
Kaufman, Sol L., FA,
De Goes, Louis, AC,
Graves, Irwin L., AC,
Crehan, James A., AC,
Becker, Alexander, QMC,
Scannon, Anthony J., FA,
Lewis, John G., Ord.,
Helmuth, Oliver J., CAC,
Zecca, Mario J., Cav.,
Wilson, Frederick W., AC,
Delnore, Victor E., Inf.,
Bjork, Delbert L., Inf.,
Boyce, Beryl L., FA,
Abernathy, Sterling H., Inf.,
McLaughlin, V. J., Fin.,
McIntire, William G., FA,
Devore, Leland S., Jr., Ord.,
Pfaff, Thornton E., QMC,
Query, Jack D., AC,
Jacks, Fred W., Junior, CAC,
Ashton, Thurlo M., AC,
Freeman, Harlan M., QMC,
Crocker, William F., Fin.,
Glessner, Milton F., Junior, AC,
Cowan, Marion G., AC,
Cox, Landon G., Inf.,
Harnstrom, Edmund V., QMC,
Roadman, Charles H., AC,
Mattison, Robert M., AC,
Harrold, Arthur K., Inf.,
Felton, George B., AC,
McCrery, Robert R., AC,
Lossen, Herbert L., CAC,
Sasse, Emil D., Ord.,
Simmons, Joe L., AC,
Bruce, Thomas R., Junior, FA,
Ingenhutt, William W., AC,
Eichholz, Jerome C., AC,
Markovich, George M., AC,
Abraham, Robert, Inf.,
Hannum, Calvin S., Cav.,
Micheau, Charles G., CWS,
Kirkpatrick, M. A., AC,
Husman, Don L., FA,
Paulson, William D., AC,
Petrilli, Frank J., CAC,
Erickson, John L., Inf.,
Fisher, Norman E., CAC,
Jorgenson, Arthur L., Inf.,
Simon, Harold M., FA,
Law, Henry L., Junior, AC,
McKnight, John T., Inf.,
Jarnogin, James L., AC,
Willeford, Edward O., AC,
Forsyth, Allen P., AC,
Hood, Ralph E., CAC,
Duvall, Andrew R., Junior, Inf.,
Leet, Jonathan, AC,
Lawhon, Brooks A., AC,
McCarthy, John F., Junior, AC,
Seim, Howard B., Junior, AC,
Smith, Everett N., FA,
McWhinney, William W., FA,
Simms, Charles W., QMC,
Ackner, Ned E., CAC,
Simeral, George A., AC,
Lunde, Oswald W., AC,
Layman, Ernest M., Junior, Inf.,
Spieth, Harry E., Junior, AC,
Williams, Joe R., AC,
Arnold, Walter E., Junior, AC,
Marlowe, Lon D., Junior, Inf.,
Blakey, George A., AC,
Paulin, Harold D., Junior, AC,
Warner, George P., Fin.,
Clarke, Owen F., AC,
Melton, Robert E., AC,
Taylor, Edward W., Fin.,
Anderson, Bernard L., AC,
Kyckelhahn, Russell H., Ord.,
Arthur, John E., Inf.,
Brown, Bevelle T., SC,
Fowles, Charles V., AC,
Layton, Robert F., AC,

Burns, Ralph D., Inf.,
Smith, Cornelius A., AC,
Friedman, Arthur L., QMC,
Altman, James E., AC,
Longridge, Emmett F., AC,
Eitt, Herbert E., Inf.,
Russell, Clyde R., Inf.,
Schumm, Frederick L., CAC,
Lander, Roberts L., AC,
Fondren, William M., Inf.,
Keith, John W., Junior, FA,
Salisbury, George R., AC,
Cole, Norman E., CAC,
Johnson, Leo H., AC,
Peterson, Lawrence E., AC,
Whittick, John R., Cav.,
Bare, George S., Inf.,
Long, Paul H., AC,
Holzapple, Joseph R., AC,
Ward, Albert N., Junior, Inf.,
Merritt, Harrison J., Inf.,
Demick, Robert L., AC,
McCants, Leland S., Junior, AC,
Brewer, Myron L., Inf.,
Chaney, Christopher W., Inf.,
Brubaker, W. E., Junior, FA,
Andrews, Charles C., AC,
Eaves, Royce L., Inf.,
Buntin, Thomas J., CAC,
Tatum, Robert P., AC,
Callaway, George D., Inf.,
Greenfield, William D., AC,
Doss, Edwin A., AC,
Van Sickle, C. J., Inf.,
Archuleta, Rubel V., AC,
Wendell, Perry F., CAC,
Bodine, Edmund J., AC,
Cannon, Linden K., Junior, FA,
Allen, Samuel L., AC,
Shaw, Eugene A., FA,
Hopkins, Malcolm J., Inf.,
Williams, William A., CWS,
Brooks, Robert L., Junior, CAC,
Maynard, Stanley G., Inf.,
Risely, Richard G., Inf.,
Oliver, Robert R., AC,
Langham, Harauld D., FA,
Bradford, James C., QMC,
Cox, Robert L., AC,
Kendall, Victor S., Junior, Ord.,
Rankin, George H., Inf.,
Gardner, Laurence E., AC,
Carson, James H., AC,
McIlroy, James G., Junior, AC,
Molloy, Robert W., CAC,
Ploetz, Frederick F., AC,
Surber, Charles E., Inf.,
Montgomery, Brian O., Ord.,
Page, Benjamin N., CAC,
Dickson, Donald D., Inf.,
Tardy, Walter E., FA,
McCrackin, Marion R., AC,
Rowlett, Allen B., AC,
Watkins, Howard E., AC,
Perry, William W., AC,
Whitfield, John, QMC,
Killman, Henry P., QMC,
La Combe, James L., Fin.,
Moon, James W., QMC,
Savage, Columbus, AC,
Neely, Russell W., AC,
Lucas, Frank G., Ord.,
Mills, Francis B., FA,
Buck, Francis K., Inf.,
Miletich, Milton M., CE,
Brown, Rodney D., FA,
McGrath, Donald B., CAC,
Macaulay, George B., CAC,
Conn, Charles, FA,
Engelland, Lloyd W., Inf.,
Perpich, Tony F., FA,
Oliver, Thad S., Junior, Ord.,
Ensign, Lewis P., AC,
Petersen, Lawrence A., AC,
Allensworth, Hubert L., AC,
Brice, Maurice R., QMC,
Laliberte, Lawrence A., Inf.,
Gaines, Harold W., Inf.,
Hill, Hudson C., Inf.,
Sammons, James N., AC,
Inman, Clyde R., AC,
Graeves, Raymond B., Junior, Ord.,

Hallums, James B., FA,
Walsworth, William A., Inf.,
Smith, Robert E., AC,
Chick, John H., AC,
Veal, William W., AC,
Hamilton, Edwin J., AC,
La Barbera, S. P., AC,
Perkins, Dale, AC,
Smith, William C., Inf.,
Gordon, Donald B., FA,
Burt, Braxton S., AC,
Lollis, Shelton E., Ord.,
Gillespie, James W., AC,
Whiting, Roger, Inf.,
Coffey, John D., AC,
Downer, Charles B., AC,
Russell, James G., Ord.,
Kinnison, Paul, FA,
Beechley, John C., QMC,
Crossman, Raymond S., Ord.,
Maxwell, Donald W., AC,
Melvin, Benjamin F., Ord.,
McPherson, C. C., AC,
De Spain, Lamar A., Inf.,
Raff, Edward G., FA,
Gilmore, John T., AC,
McGinnis, Paul B., AC,
McColpin, Carrol W., AC,
Toliver, Raymond F., AC,
Daubert, Herbert H., Ord.,
Peterson, Charles O., AC,
Jones, James T., FA,
Bane, Paull A., Junior, QMC,
Morris, Norman G., AC,
Earle, Wilton H., Junior, AC,
Davis, Alpheus M., AC,
Turner, Billy M., AC,
Poage, Oren J., AC,
Jones, Winston A., FA,
Smith, Herald H., Inf.,
Keely, Gerald J., AC,
Barten, George A., Inf.,
Marlow, Herman M., Cav.,
Clarke, Thomas T., AC,
Clark, Alfred K., Inf.,
Coleman, Charles W., AC,
Hamele, Louis F., Inf.,
Hutchinson, W. S., Junior, CWS,
Dunn, Robert T., Inf.,
Nash, Clifford, AC,
Eifler, Charles W., Ord.,
Kendrick, Wallace M., FA,
Campbell, Guy L., CAC,
Cornett, James I., AC,
Sydnor, William D., Junior, CAC,
Halsey, Frank J., Junior, Inf.,
Frank, Selby M., AC,
Duckworth, George H., Inf.,
Allen, Hugh A., Junior, QMC,
Watkins, Tarleton H., AC,
Hall, John O., AC,
Johnston, Warren M., AC,
Dill, Robert M., QMC,
Grimmer, Philip W., AC,
Rice, William S., Inf.,
Cowart, Byron E., QMC,
Franzen, Earl L., AC,
Gravitt, Frank W., AC,
Blalock, John W., AC,
Stark, Kenneth B., FA,
Bowen, Elba W., Inf.,
Adler, Vernon T., Inf.,
Robbins, Edward S., Inf.,
Hardman, Charles F., AC,
Merritt, Hiram M., Inf.,
Cook, Howard G., AC,
Moran, Timothy A., FA,
Walther, Dale L., AC,
Murray, Lester K., AC,
Hilton Wilbur S., Inf.,
Bates, Henry E., Fin.,
Wolff, Paul B., CAC,
Delashaw, Robert L., AC,
Mark, Louis, Inf.,
Marshall, John F., CAC,
Herrman, George R., AC,
Earthman, Henry B., Junior, AC,
Greer, William R., SC,
Jones, Jarvis P., AC,
Teats, Edward C., AC,
Vaughn, Harley C., AC,
Payne, Carroll H., AC,

Flanigan, Joseph T., QMC,
Keisler, David S., CAC,
Cassaday, George E., FA,
Kidd, Giles H., Inf.,
Dodson, Minot B., CAC,
Jones, William, AC,
Hooper, Philip L., Inf.,
Byrtus, Joe R., AC,
Arnold, Samuel R., Fin.,
Kudrna, James F., FA,
Keller, William D., AC,
Sullivan, C. E., Junior, AC,
Fralish, John C., FA,
Evans, John L., AC,
Farren, James H., CAC,
Dillender, Clyde M., Junior, Inf.,
Callahan, Eugene H., AC,
Clay, Carmon L., SC,
Brooks, Nelson S., AC,
Elliott, Robert W., AC,
Hughes, John W., Junior, Inf.,
Bussolati, Emile J., Inf.,
Sunderlin, William W., QMC,
Reichert, Earl T., AC,
Ekstrand, Carl V., AC,
Kirk, John E., Fin.,
Wise, William D., Junior, Inf.,
McCord, James H., FA,
Jenkins, Francis L., Junior, Inf.,
Kolpin, Shirley A., AC,
Gaines, Weaver H., Inf.,
Adams, William B., AC,
Whitenack, G. M., 3rd, AC,
Herber, David, Inf.,
Bradford, Earl M., Ord.,
Radzwich, Edward R., Inf.,
Lundy, William G., Inf.,
Goodrich, Merle L., Cav.,
McCarter, Elmer H., AC,
Clark, John B., Inf.,
Birch, Thomas H., Inf.,
Worrell, Raleigh O., CAC,
Alvey, Thomas W., Inf.,
Joiner, Reese W., AC,
Lyle, John R., Inf.,
Judson, Harold I., AC,
Patterson, George D., Inf.,
McMillan, William S., Inf.,
Peters, Lester M., AC,
Stockett, John C., Junior, AC,
Welsh, Charles E., FA,
Large, William R., Junior, AC,
Huffaker, Kenneth E., AC,
Steinbacher, R. L., FA,
Fawcett, Willard E., AC,
Brown, Kenneth E., AC,
Sparra, Charis R., FA,
De Lapp, John R., AC,
Hart, William A., AC,
Bright, Roy R., AC,
Malloy, Verne H., AC,
Kingsley Edwin C., QMC,
Magness Woodrow W., AC,
Yerby, Harry L., FA,
Le Bailly, Eugene B., AC,
Donaldson, John H., Junior, Inf.,
Lundak, Edward E., AC,
Wood, Milford W., FA,
Ross, Thomas B., Junior, Inf.,
Owen, Glenn B., Inf.,
Rainville, Leon H., Inf.,
Blumensaadt, Paul E., FA,
Latourette, Harry H., AC,
Hart, Allen G., AC,
McCoy, Frederic E., AC,
Bull, James T., AC,
Vilhauer, Jonas A., Inf.,
Thrasher, Warren A., Inf.,
Boldt, John C., AC,
Long, Talton W., Inf.,
Bloch, Orville E., Inf.,
Montrone, Alfred J., CAC,
Wall, Edgar C., CE,
Kerr, Ernest L., Junior, AC,
Hardenbergh, Hal, Inf.,
Neighbors, Lloyd W., AC,
Gillespie, Joe G., Junior, AC,
Heim, Harry V., CAC,
Murray, Clarence F., Junior, FA,
Riddle, John R., FA,
Ernst, Sol E., AC,

Beckham, John B., Inf.,
Buhmann, William G., QMC,
Dexheimer, Robert, FA,
Kays, Lee G., FA,
Lamb, Oakley M., Inf.,
Dittman, Henry, AC,
Cribbs, Jerome H., AC,
Miles, George W., AC,
Leidy, Carl S., QMC,
Watson, William W., CAC,
Loberg, Edwin A., AC,
Peck, George W., AC,
Gremmler, Paul E., AC,
Hannah, Raymond W., FA,
Tibbets, Paul W., Junior, AC,
Ward, P. J., AC,
Kalberer, Klem F., AC,
Sun, Jack K., AC,
Wright, Ralph, FA,
Murphy, Paul C., AC,
Hogg, James A., AC,
Guth, Henry T., CAC,
Crowell, George T., AC,
Moon, Richard H., AC,
Stutzman, Oliver G., QMC,
Garland, Lloyd H., Junior, AC,
Schloss, Jeremy K., AC,
Swope, Francis A., QMC,
Walker, Templeton S., AC,
Mette, Clarence A., Junior, Inf.,
Tipton, Henry C., Inf.,
Dyer, Richard W., AC,
Patteson, Harry O., AC,
Kellams, Clinton M., AC,
Clark, Thomas J., AC,
Oettinger, F. N., Junior, Inf.,
Harper, Robert E., Ord.,
Phillips, John T., AC,
Hubbard, Ronald D., AC,
Swain, Frank S., AC,
Johnson, Chester H., Ord.,
Lowry, Leon L., AC,
Hunt, Jay, Inf.,
Dean, Charles E., AC,
Wall, James W., AC,
McNeely, Arthur M., Inf.,
Brooks, Peter, Inf.,
Fletcher, Albert W., AC,
Wessman, Everett C., AC,
Whitehouse, Bernard P., AC,
Howell, Alvis M., Inf.,
Allan, John C., FA,
Anderson, Edler J., AC,
Mace, Wallace P., AC,
Cook, Benjamin F., Junior, Inf.,
Gaitley, Edward D., Junior, AC,
Bickford, James W., AC,
Sass, Edward J., Junior, AC,
Twyon, Donald E., CAC,
Glover, John G., AC,
Dillon, Wilbur S., Inf.,
Davis, John N., Inf.,
Cassidy, Patrick F., Inf.,
Page, Harry R., AC,
Dame, Frederick R., AC,
Meisell, Harry E., QMC,
Henry, Harold L., AC,
Walmsley, Hallock, P. K., AC,
Hopper, Bristow S., FA,
La Plante, Robert W., AC,
Holt, James W., Junior, AC,
Witty, Robert W., AC,
Porterfield, Waldon R., QMC,
Wilson, William H., QMC,
Scott, Cecil H., Junior, AC,
Woodman, Ernest A. H., CAC,
Beekman, Milton R., AC,
Wade, Richard E., Inf.,
May, Joseph G., QMC,
Valusek, John, Junior, AC,
Hewitt, Henry H., QMC,
Fackler, Paul H., AC,
Lingenfelter, W. N., Ord.,
Hastings, Henry S., Inf.,
Mason, Joe L., AC,
Whitsitt, Samuel J., AC,
Beyer, Johnson, AC,
Prodanovich, George, AC,
Imig, Paul J., AC,
Jones, Eben R., Inf.,
Morrison, Allen L., QMC,

May, Franklin J., QMC,
Freedman, Roswell, AC,
Burchinal, David A., AC,
Armstrong, F. M., Junior, AC,
Duvall, Everet W., Inf.,
Penn, Frank A., Cav.,
Thompson, Donald G., Inf.,
Stover, Harold G., Inf.,
Curlee, Robert B., AC,
White, William R., Inf.,
Fazio, Frank M., AC,
Lewis, Peter R., SC,
Bond, Charlie R., Junior, AC,
Jeffers, Marshall A., FA,
Kimball, Curtis Y., Inf.,
Colvin, Lloyd D., SC,
Willis, Joe M., QMC,
Hay, Frank O., AC,
Evans, James A., Junior, AC,
Sanford, Charles A., QMC,
Murphy, Robert E., AC,
Bratton, Leslie R., AC,
Dean, Arthur L., Junior, Inf.,
Lillyman, Frank L., Inf.,
Cannon, Walter G., AC,
Clark, Leroy F., Junior, Cav.,
Richardson, Beverly T., Inf.,
Krueger, Russell C., SC,
Lewis, Emmett M., Ord.,
Avery, James T., Junior, FA,
Avery, Arthur C., Cav.,
Behnke, Paul R., Inf.,
Blakely, Carl P., Ord.,
Swaim, Allan L., Inf.,
Mahon, James E., AC,
Pritchard, Gilbert L., AC,
Hoover, Charles M., AC,
Breathwit, Carl E., AC,
Cook, Joseph E., Junior, FA,
Vaughn, William E., Junior, AC,
Randolph, Richard L., AC,
Richard, Delos E., AC,
Lind, Marcel, AC,
Dietzel, Joe M., Ord.,
Jamieson, Alex C., AC,
Williams, Trevor E., Inf.,
Britt, Jimmie W., AC,
Tate, Willie L., QMC,
Kolster, Kenneth K., Inf.,
Sagebiel, Louis W., AC,
Way, Evert C., Inf.,
Long, Floyd H., Junior, QMC,
Allard, Charles E., AC,
McChristy, A. J., Junior, AC,
Rozamus, Walter J., FA,
Blewett, Aaron E., Inf.,
Riegel, William E., Inf.,
Reeve, Paul G., Ord.,
Pirruccello, Joseph S., AC,
Kingen, Elmer F., AC,
Leonard, Allan L., Junior, Inf.,
Blacklock, Ward T., QMC,
Anglin, Everett H., AC,
Hatter, Harlos V., Inf.,
Starr, Stephen A., Junior, AC,
Driscoll, John J., AC,
Prysi, Henry F., Inf.,
Friederichs, G. F., AC,
Zaumeyer, Lawrence M., Ord.,
Stone, Rolle E., Junior, AC,
Verbeck, Peter, AC,
Gaffney, George P., AC,
Daily, Edwin B., AC,
Huffaker, Robert L., Inf.,
Johnson, George E., AC,
Gunderson, Robert S., AC,
Warford, Victor E., AC,
Champion, John D., Junior, AC,
Beda, Edward E., Ord.,
Critchfield, R. E., AC,
Carson, Thomas M., CAC,
Wogen, Joseph G., AC,
McConnell, B. F., 2d, AC,
Young Harry C., Junior, AC,
Perrotta, Carmine J., Inf.,
Cormier, Everett L., CAC,
Prunty, Thomas C., QMC,
Stewart, Charles W., CAC,
Kimmel, Robert E., AC,
Alexander, Douglas G., Inf.,
Ellis, Lewis N., AC,

Rogers, George W., AC, [redacted]
Morand, Leon F., Ord., [redacted]
Thayer, Arthur L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
White, Donald B., AC, [redacted]
Royal, Francis R., AC, [redacted]
Hall, Leondard R., AC, [redacted]
Fulcher, G. H., AC, [redacted]
Parker, Robert M., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Judy, Hubert S., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Macey, William H., AC, [redacted]
Warnick, Ernest L., SC, [redacted]
Olson, Winston L., Inf., [redacted]
Phillips, Ivan G., Inf., [redacted]
Erwin, William H. B., AC, [redacted]
Gammon, Edgar G., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Schmucker, George C., AC, [redacted]
Garton, Edward R., Cav., [redacted]
Densley, Hilton, FA, [redacted]
Bearly, James H., AC, [redacted]
Epperson, Elmert H., AC, [redacted]
Fortney, Camden P., Junior, Ord., [redacted]
Braid, Robert B., Ord., [redacted]
Colovin, James E., AC, [redacted]
Moreland, Hugh H., AC, [redacted]
Maples, Clyde A., AC, [redacted]
Rohan, Thomas C., CAC, [redacted]
Whitney, Neil P., QMC, [redacted]
Trickey, Fred L., AC, [redacted]
Sands, Joseph N., QMC, [redacted]
Roth, Howard G., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Gordon K., Inf., [redacted]
Jemmott, Herbert K. B., AC, [redacted]
Douglas, James L., AC, [redacted]
Swancutt, Woodrow P., AC, [redacted]
Swenson, Shirl H., AC, [redacted]
Donaldson, I. B. J., AC, [redacted]
Callaway, Roy L., AC, [redacted]
Wood, E. Garrison, AC, [redacted]
Lain, James L., FA, [redacted]
Wilder, Richard L., CAC, [redacted]
Preston, William D., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
McCarthy, E. A. P., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Nevins, Hugh J., AC, [redacted]
Cornett, Jack G., Inf., [redacted]
Good, Robert O., AC, [redacted]
Rowley, John W., AC, [redacted]
Duncan, William F., AC, [redacted]
Deppen, William C., AC, [redacted]
Utley, Robert L., Inf., [redacted]
Hickey, Sanford W., AC, [redacted]
Harding, James V., AC, [redacted]
Mitchell, John W., AC, [redacted]
Haskell, Lyman G., FA, [redacted]
Gerard, Max H., CAC, [redacted]
Newlin, Charles A., SC, [redacted]
Carstensen, Dale L., AC, [redacted]
Stripling, Coleman, AC, [redacted]
Crowe, John H., CAC, [redacted]
Stokely, Joe E., AC, [redacted]
Trearse, Albert, AC, [redacted]
Wilson, Willard W., AC, [redacted]
Schafbuch, Donald V., CAC, [redacted]
French, Russell L., AC, [redacted]
Hesler, Robert A., AC, [redacted]
Alford, Julius E., AC, [redacted]
Horras, Lawrence E., AC, [redacted]
Strom, Lavere H., FA, [redacted]
Benson, Frank T., AC, [redacted]
Matthews, Maurice H., CAC, [redacted]
Sullivan, Charles P., AC, [redacted]
Morat, Charles D., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Berol, Alexander F., Inf., [redacted]
Johannes, John M., SC, [redacted]
Walborn, George S., AC, [redacted]
Koontz, Ray W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Denton, John H., AC, [redacted]
McIlhiney, William G., QMC, [redacted]
Perry, Leland D., AC, [redacted]
Hardman, Tracy J., QMC, [redacted]
Roberts, Sam A., CAC, [redacted]
Lutz, Charles J., FA, [redacted]
Kearney, Lester A., Inf., [redacted]
Hale, Russell D., AC, [redacted]
Davis, Everett, AC, [redacted]
Beasley, William D., AC, [redacted]
Malone, Robert H., CAC, [redacted]
Tudor, David B., AC, [redacted]
Miles, Charles C., AC, [redacted]
Fincke, Robert T., AC, [redacted]
Griffin, James C., Inf., [redacted]
Lasly, Walter D., AC, [redacted]

Edwards, Edward D., AC, [redacted]
Schell, Rieder W., Inf., [redacted]
Pittman, Walter C., FA, [redacted]
Wall, Thomas G., QMC, [redacted]
Branagan, Robert D., QMC, [redacted]
Cobb, Robert B., Inf., [redacted]
Wilson, John M., Junior, Fin., [redacted]
Crosson, Norman R., AC, [redacted]
Stewart, Carl W., AC, [redacted]
Conover, Thomas M., Fin., [redacted]
Mullarkey, James P., QMC, [redacted]
McDonnell, Heston, AC, [redacted]
Scherer, Harold E., FA, [redacted]
Clifford, Walter H., Ord., [redacted]
Lang, Ralph W., Inf., [redacted]
Pace, Brice, Fin., [redacted]
Creech, Robert M., AC, [redacted]
Creo, Andrew B., AC, [redacted]
Bykerk, Norman H., Inf., [redacted]
Osborne, Vincent E., FA, [redacted]
Banks, William M., AC, [redacted]
Petty, Norman E., QMC, [redacted]
Smith, Leslie D., Inf., [redacted]
Carrie, Hector, Junior, Ord., [redacted]
McEvoy, Edwin W., AC, [redacted]
Odell, William C., AC, [redacted]
Ferrell, Frank E., AC, [redacted]
Bowes, Henry E., AC, [redacted]
Delaney, Joseph J., QMC, [redacted]
Ruck, Fred M., CAC, [redacted]
Egan, John C., AC, [redacted]
Sprawls, Philip C., AC, [redacted]
Minch, Robert F., Ord., [redacted]
Smith, Robert N., AC, [redacted]
Fahey, Paul V., FA, [redacted]
Bieri, Alfred C., FA, [redacted]
Mills, Thomas H., AC, [redacted]
Hunt, Milton T., Junior, Cav., [redacted]
Chin, Wah G., Inf., [redacted]
Sanders, Roy C., AC, [redacted]
Stephens, Blackburn, Inf., [redacted]
Lacy, Albert J., AC, [redacted]
Szaniawski, Edward W., AC, [redacted]
Boone, Lewis P., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Smith, Thomas E. W., QMC, [redacted]
Rawlings, James G., CE, [redacted]
Gorman, George D., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Murray, Robert H., AC, [redacted]
Reeve, Roy L., AC, [redacted]
Curtis, Richard, AC, [redacted]
Wade, Robert E., AC, [redacted]
Webster, Daniel, Inf., [redacted]
Marriott, Richard G., FA, [redacted]
Whitfield, Fitzhugh A., AC, [redacted]
Boyle, Charles T., Inf., [redacted]
Milholland, George W., AC, [redacted]
Wilson, Lucius E., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Warmbrod, Karlton, Inf., [redacted]
Rosa, Robert J., Inf., [redacted]
Haslam, Jame T., Inf., [redacted]
Wilson, Grover L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Johnston, Clifford A., AC, [redacted]
Blades, Jack, Inf., [redacted]
Skipper, John D., CAC, [redacted]
Niffenegger, Ralph E., Inf., [redacted]
Green, John H., SC, [redacted]
Waugaman, William I., QMC, [redacted]
Kent, Frank J., Inf., [redacted]
Robinson, Gerald G., AC, [redacted]
Brown, Therman D., AC, [redacted]
Downing, Leighton F., AC, [redacted]
Van Sickle, Wendell M., AC, [redacted]
Taylor, Alton R., Inf., [redacted]
Steadman, Beverly E., AC, [redacted]
Kehe, Arlin J., Inf., [redacted]
Merriam, John H., FA, [redacted]
Reitz, James T., CAC, [redacted]
Leahy, John P., Inf., [redacted]
Dickson, Lon R., AC, [redacted]
Dickson, Dwight B., Inf., [redacted]
Wilkinson, Robert N., AC, [redacted]
Smyser, Willis M., AC, [redacted]
Sullivan, W. A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Moorhead, Jesse J., AC, [redacted]
Bowden, Marion P., Inf., [redacted]
Cole, Edward L., AC, [redacted]
Downey, Walter G., FA, [redacted]
McGehee, Thomas K., AC, [redacted]
Hill, John F. P., FA, [redacted]
Sluga, Emil L., AC, [redacted]
Hogan, Raymond E., AC, [redacted]

Fletcher, Melvin, Inf., [redacted]
Cobb, Robert H., AC, [redacted]
Thompson, C. A., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Manning, Leo W., Inf., [redacted]
Halber, Alexander D., AC, [redacted]
Wanner, William S., CAC, [redacted]
Sloan, Nicholas E., Inf., [redacted]
Oliver, George L., QMC, [redacted]
Smith, Thomas R., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Ireland, Loren E., AC, [redacted]
Bass, Feris A., Junior, CWS, [redacted]
Walker, William A., AC, [redacted]
Campbell, William J., AC, [redacted]
Paul, Leo F., AC, [redacted]
Batten, Earl E., AC, [redacted]
Miller, Wilbur O., Ord., [redacted]
Irving, Richard R., Inf., [redacted]
Nye, Richard S., AC, [redacted]
Sassard, Dupre, Inf., [redacted]
Alexander, David W., AC, [redacted]
Gibson, Robert D., AC, [redacted]
Keeling, Gerald F., AC, [redacted]
Soukup, Reynold A., AC, [redacted]
Tenney, Frank L., AC, [redacted]
Kramp, Joseph J., AC, [redacted]
McLean, William R., Inf., [redacted]
Meyer, Robert S., AC, [redacted]
Smedley, Arthur A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Naffke, John H., AC, [redacted]
Johnson, Herbert A., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Higgins, William J., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Scanlon, John H., Inf., [redacted]
Englehardt, Joseph E., Fin., [redacted]
Crocker, John P., AC, [redacted]
Fairbanks, G. C., 3d, CAC, [redacted]
Miller, Kenneth W., AC, [redacted]
Adams, John D., FA, [redacted]
Miller, Boulton B., Fin., [redacted]
Moore, Walter E., FA, [redacted]
Blair, Melvin R., Inf., [redacted]
Campbell, John W., Ord., [redacted]
Batson, Curtis C., FA, [redacted]
Sieben, Herbert U., Inf., [redacted]
Stringer, Robert D., AC, [redacted]
Welch, Howard K., Inf., [redacted]
O'Hern, Luther, AC, [redacted]
Cage, Phil B., AC, [redacted]
Moore, Benjamin G., CWS, [redacted]
De Mers, Robert J., Inf., [redacted]
Magruder, Eugene R., AC, [redacted]
Summers, Thomas B., AC, [redacted]
Robinson, Robert T., AC, [redacted]
Park, Herman C., Inf., [redacted]
Bobo, Carl E., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Medley, Donal I., FA, [redacted]
Pullman, Milton A., Inf., [redacted]
Kaine, Thomas M., Inf., [redacted]
Bettinger, Sterling P., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Paul F., Inf., [redacted]
Lundberg, John W., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Greene, John S., Inf., [redacted]
Martinson, John M., Fin., [redacted]
Carter, Wendell E., AC, [redacted]
Carter, John H., Inf., [redacted]
Andrews, John A. C., AC, [redacted]
Yeager, Pearson B., Inf., [redacted]
Patterson, James T., AC, [redacted]
Sandholm, Frank A., FA, [redacted]
Sebille, Louis J., AC, [redacted]
Wood, Allen H., AC, [redacted]
Ware, Keith L., Inf., [redacted]
Goldoni, John E., Inf., [redacted]
Youngman, Charles W., QMC, [redacted]
Quattlander, Frank P., AC, [redacted]
Fontana, Robert E., AC, [redacted]
Joos, Walter J., AC, [redacted]
Weigel, Levene J., Inf., [redacted]
Porter, Lester W., AC, [redacted]
Sparks, Harold P., AC, [redacted]
Humfeld, Harold E., AC, [redacted]
Sykes, Philip A., AC, [redacted]
Peck, Gaillard R., AC, [redacted]
Davis, Howard A., AC, [redacted]
Trueblood, Wayne F., AC, [redacted]
McLaughlin, John A., AC, [redacted]
Poe, John E., AC, [redacted]
Bohman, Thomas S., AC, [redacted]
Glover, Fred W., AC, [redacted]
Goolsby, George, S. AC, [redacted]
Hutchinson, Philip A., QMC, [redacted]
Ritter, Herbert W., AC, [redacted]
Cabral, William M., AC, [redacted]

Porteous, Charles E., Inf., [redacted]
Loomis, Richord E., AC, [redacted]
Deterding, Floyd M., AC, [redacted]
Gravel, Edwin J., Inf., [redacted]
Melcher, John N., AC, [redacted]
Austin, John F., Inf., [redacted]
Reichmuth, W. E., Junior, Fin., [redacted]
Igo, Harry C., AC, [redacted]
Bowman, John E., CAC, [redacted]
Fussell, James G., AC, [redacted]
Prudhomme, Andrew H., QMC, [redacted]
Duddy, Robert R., Inf., [redacted]
Brown, Boyd L., Inf., [redacted]
Manary, Eugene D., Inf., [redacted]
Wright, David W., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
French, Uel W., Cav., [redacted]
Guy, John J., CAC, [redacted]
Sayre, Edwin M., Inf., [redacted]
Ragon, Dale A., AC, [redacted]
Pryor, Daniel F., AC, [redacted]
Jennings, Elton J., AC, [redacted]
Drewry, Ivey O., Junior, Ord., [redacted]
Merrill, John T., Inf., [redacted]
Hamilton, Samuel D., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Paulson, Robert W., AC, [redacted]
Garrett, Leslie F., AC, [redacted]
Starbuck, Dustin H., FA, [redacted]
Shi, James D., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Johnson, Herbert E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Keller, Ralph W., AC, [redacted]
Wynne, John D., AC, [redacted]
Nelson, Neelian O., QMC, [redacted]
Fahy, Albert F., Junior, AC, [redacted]
McRae, Robert B., Inf., [redacted]
Baucom, George E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Dahlstrom, Edward N., FA, [redacted]
Caldwell, Herman B., Junior, [redacted]
De Kemper, Ralph E., Inf., [redacted]
Creel, George R., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Warden, Henry E., AC, [redacted]
La Vier, Eugene C., AC, [redacted]
Ziglar, Frank C., AC, [redacted]
Davis, Warren P., Inf., [redacted]
Hilliard Lee H., Inf., [redacted]
Venable, Charles P., QMC, [redacted]
Keller, Kenneth R., QMC, [redacted]
Barberis, Cesides V., Inf., [redacted]
Humphries, Bert W., AC, [redacted]
Howell, Ernest M., AC, [redacted]
Bleymaier, Joseph S., AC, [redacted]
Tatman, Paul P., AC, [redacted]
Campbell, Thornton W., AC, [redacted]
Taylor, William E., AC, [redacted]
Moore, Lloyd E., AC, [redacted]
Hillard, George O., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Dowling, James K., AC, [redacted]
Richardson, Chester A., FA, [redacted]
Smith, Jack D., QMC, [redacted]
Halsey, Fryer P., AC, [redacted]
Davidson, Richard O., Fin., [redacted]
Kyle, David M., FA, [redacted]
Russi, Gilbert C., Inf., [redacted]
Keithley, George J., AC, [redacted]
Hamby, Henry G., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Bland, Edwin A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Wilson, John L., Junior, SC, [redacted]
Lewis, Robert C., AC, [redacted]
Hively, Howard D., AC, [redacted]
McDannel, Carlyle F., Inf., [redacted]
Cotter, Harold E., AC, [redacted]
Meacham, Gerard S., AC, [redacted]
Hanna, George T., Ord., [redacted]
Northington, H. H., CE, [redacted]
Conroy, Raymond C., QMC, [redacted]
Marble, Hugh H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Haysel, George R., AC, [redacted]
Choniski, William J., AC, [redacted]
Nielson, Chester D., Ord., [redacted]
Clerici, Henry J., AC, [redacted]
Walker, Glenn D., Inf., [redacted]
Tarkenton, James C., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Ewing, Thomas P., FA, [redacted]
Paciorek, Stanley J., CAC, [redacted]
Schott, Carl V., AC, [redacted]
Buckey, Loren E., AC, [redacted]
Mahon, Herschel D., AC, [redacted]
Goodman, Gilbert E., AC, [redacted]
Speer, Maurice E., AC, [redacted]
George, Walter R., AC, [redacted]
Henry, Stephen W., AC, [redacted]
Leimbacher, Robert J., AC, [redacted]

Verbruggen, George J., AC, [redacted]
Donnell, Francis S., QMC, [redacted]
McGuire, Thomas C., Inf., [redacted]
Neff, Edward R., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Lawson, Joel W., Inf., [redacted]
Shellum, Alford C., Inf., [redacted]
Elder, Harold W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Prewitt, Daniel W., Inf., [redacted]
Oyler, George C., AC, [redacted]
Fouts, John E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Meeker, Robert J., Ord., [redacted]
Alexander, James M., Ord., [redacted]
Troup, Paul A., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Werner, Franklin A., CAC, [redacted]
Vaught, Donald O., QMC, [redacted]
Hoffman, Arthur E., AC, [redacted]
Coyle, Gervais G., AC, [redacted]
Schade, Howard G., CWS, [redacted]
Boardman, William M., Ord., [redacted]
Rector, Walter S., AC, [redacted]
McGinnis, Edgar M., Ord., [redacted]
Campbell, Herbert M., AC, [redacted]
Pryor, Frank D., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Holmes, Eugene J., FA, [redacted]
Arnold, Robert W., AC, [redacted]
Townsend, Barry B., AC, [redacted]
Ashley, George R., AC, [redacted]
Loiselle, Postford A., CAC, [redacted]
Baughn, Julius H., AC, [redacted]
Goodman, John M., SC, [redacted]
McCrary, Robert R., AC, [redacted]
Riegle, Charles A., Inf., [redacted]
Collinson, William S., AC, [redacted]
Brooks, James M., AC, [redacted]
Ryan, Phillip W., FA, [redacted]
King, John J., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Bushway, Collen, Ord., [redacted]
Hemminger, George C., AC, [redacted]
Lee, Gail B., Inf., [redacted]
Bowen, Thomas J., CE, [redacted]
Gooding, Earl R., CAC, [redacted]
Karably, Louis S., AC, [redacted]
Costigan, Charles H., Inf., [redacted]
Arnold, Dixon J., AC, [redacted]
Blair, Paul K., AC, [redacted]
Rasmessen, Edward B., AC, [redacted]
Wood, Frank P., AC, [redacted]
Bramble, Philip H., QMC, [redacted]
Bowker, Robert F., SC, [redacted]
Welsh, Albert M., AC, [redacted]
McCarthy, John F., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Sims, Charles L., QMC, [redacted]
McDaniel, Marion E., FA, [redacted]
Orr, Levi G., FA, [redacted]
Wilkerson, Steven R., AC, [redacted]
Paul, Charles A., QMC, [redacted]
Flynn, Edmund P., QMC, [redacted]
Bachman, Lawrence F., AC, [redacted]
Ramsey, Lloyd A., Ord., [redacted]
Price, Galen B., AC, [redacted]
Miller, Danforth, P., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Keyser, Robert W., FA, [redacted]
Lawrence, Rolla C., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Briley, Joe C., AC, [redacted]
Geer, John H., AC, [redacted]
Quinlan, Edward W., Junior, Fin., [redacted]
Corley, Laurence J., Inf., [redacted]
Johnson, Laurence A., Inf., [redacted]
Harris, Frederick A., FA, [redacted]
Conlan, Douglas M., AC, [redacted]
Baker, James M., Ord., [redacted]
King, James P., Fin., [redacted]
Jones, Richard G., AC, [redacted]
Krainik, Edward B., Inf., [redacted]
Exon, Arthur E., AC, [redacted]
McGregor, Oris E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Vande-Hey, James M., AC, [redacted]
Leach, George, AC, [redacted]
Harrington, Patrick W., QMC, [redacted]
Duke, Robert W., Inf., [redacted]
Clark, Walter E., AC, [redacted]
Terry, James K., Inf., [redacted]
Roderick, Walter H., AC, [redacted]
Thomson, Edwin W., AC, [redacted]
Longenecker, D. R., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Burge, Roland C., CAC, [redacted]
Swenson, J. E., FA, [redacted]
Barber, George A., AC, [redacted]
Heldreth, Charles H., Inf., [redacted]
Ortenzi, Anthony H., QMC, [redacted]
Hanes, Wallace M., Inf., [redacted]

Thompson, Howell B., Inf., [redacted]
Coulter, James E., QMC, [redacted]
Johnson, James W., QMC, [redacted]
Daly, William T., AC, [redacted]
Thorsen, James G., AC, [redacted]
Latane, David E., AC, [redacted]
Echols, George B., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Cole, William R., Inf., [redacted]
Cogswell, David G., FA, [redacted]
Curtis, Glaire S., Cav., [redacted]
Linn, Phillip J., Inf., [redacted]
Young Gail, AC, [redacted]
Bradley, Theo D., AC, [redacted]
Govocek, Joseph G., AC, [redacted]
Corbin, Frances J., Inf., [redacted]
King, Glendon N., AC, [redacted]
Lucree, Morris J., Inf., [redacted]
Karas, Christopher J., AC, [redacted]
Mantaz, William M., Inf., [redacted]
Leen, Gerald A., AC, [redacted]
Vogt, John E., AC, [redacted]
Denny, Robert M., QMC, [redacted]
Bowman, Frank M., AC, [redacted]
Martin, Charles A., AC, [redacted]
Lieblich Jerome F., Fin., [redacted]
Debons, Amhony, AC, [redacted]
Ford, John H., Junior, Ord., [redacted]
Shick, Dale H., SC, [redacted]
Hilton, Sidney D., Inf., [redacted]
Schuler, Richard H., CAC, [redacted]
Jones, Robert M., Inf., [redacted]
Witt, Lynn E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Gross, Clarence H., AC, [redacted]
Avery, Edward S., AC, [redacted]
Hubbard, James H., AC, [redacted]
Dean, Dodge H., AC, [redacted]
Garrett, John W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Shelden, Harold J., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Giles, Melvin C., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Walter S., QMC, [redacted]
Collins, Fred W., Inf., [redacted]
Johnson, Dan W., FA, [redacted]
Sperry, Willard S., AC, [redacted]
Jones, Richard, AC, [redacted]
Cooke, Sherman C., AC, [redacted]
Cooper, Charles G., Inf., [redacted]
Warner, William B., FA, [redacted]
Vitek, Richard D., AC, [redacted]
Randolph, John P., AC, [redacted]
Burner, Charles E., SC, [redacted]
Martin, John R., AC, [redacted]
Seeley, Robert B., FA, [redacted]
Burnett, John C., AC, [redacted]
Cooper, James H., AC, [redacted]
Waugh, Edgar S., CAC, [redacted]
Darlington, David H., QMC, [redacted]
Stewart, Claude H., QMC, [redacted]
Hunnicutt, Cecil F., Inf., [redacted]
Abney, Thomas M., AC, [redacted]
Bender, Frank P., AC, [redacted]
Lucas, Peyton R., CAC, [redacted]
Frisbie, Curtis L., AC, [redacted]
Greer, Frank B., Ord., [redacted]
Gibbons, Robert J., AC, [redacted]
James, Albert W., AC, [redacted]
Freeman, Richard G., Inf., [redacted]
Shenk, David E., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Stenglein, Joseph A., AC, [redacted]
Gillespie, Clyde G., AC, [redacted]
Sutterlin, Howard D., AC, [redacted]
Wright, Wallace A., AC, [redacted]
Kercher, Ferris A., Inf., [redacted]
Bertsch, William P., AC, [redacted]
Cruver, Larry F., AC, [redacted]
Laven, George, Junior, AC, [redacted]
Davidoff, James E., CAC, [redacted]
Cox, Chester C., AC, [redacted]
Curtis, Clifford A., Cav., [redacted]
Holstrom, Everett W., AC, [redacted]
Tirey, James H., Inf., [redacted]
Machnicke, Max R., Inf., [redacted]
Hignett, Forest E., AC, [redacted]
Brown, Robert C., AC, [redacted]
Anderson, Arvid W., AC, [redacted]
Lent, Morris A., QMC, [redacted]
Melton, Jack R., Inf., [redacted]
Zais, Melvin, Inf., [redacted]
Wells, Selmon W., AC, [redacted]
Anderegg, Arnold H., Inf., [redacted]
Duffie, Johnnie D., QMC, [redacted]
Anders, James D., Inf., [redacted]

Marston, Bruce T., AC,
Aguglia, John R., FA,
Carey, Robert H., AC,
Peairs, Douglas D., FA,
Beckham, Walter C., AC,
Stublarec, Michael J., AC,
Kamp, Anthony M., Junior, FA,
Goodsell, Vincent F., Inf.,
Bryson, William F., AC,
Kirkbride, Max V., Inf.,
Marritt, Woodrow W., Inf.,
Brown, Mills, Inf.,
Jones, Albert W., Inf.,
Withycombe, Howard J., AC,
Rand, Heinz P., FA,
Ellis, Richard N., AC,
Kane, Robert W., Inf.,
Doane, Leslie O., CAC,
Burnett, Melvin M., AC,
Krebs, John E., Inf.,
Smith, Robert R., AC,
Williams, William M., AC,
Schonka, Joe M., AC,
Devine, John E., AC,
Johnson, Andrew E., AC,
Holbrook, Charles C., Inf.,
Killian, John J., FA,
Burke, Walter J., AC,
Mengel, Ralph H., 2d, FA,
Baccus, Donald A., AC,
Stovall, Jack N., AC,
Hammond, Homer H., Inf.,
Howard, Thomas J., Cav.,
Cole, Richard H., AC,
Johnson, James K., AC,
Carter, George A., AC,
Kneen, George H., AC,
Watson, Ralph J., AC,
Hussey, John J., Junior, AC,
Smith, Jack L., Inf.,
Meconi, Rocco F., FA,
Clinger, Dallas A., AC,
Lunsford, James N., Junior, Inf.,
Denlinger, Martin L., CWS,
Baile, Kenneth R., AC,
Thompson, James H., AC,
Petersdorf, John E., AC,
Underdahl, Conrad R., Inf.,
Davis, John K., AC,
Hallock Edward C., AC,
Bennett, James W., AC,
Nelson, John A., Junior, AC,
Nelson, Alex N., Inf.,
Sobke, Llewellyn, CAC,
Seab, Malcolm W., AC,
Wiper, Thomas L., AC,
Jamison, Marshall V., AC,
Stubbs, Robert R., AC,
Bradford, Oscar A., Junior, AC,
Banks, Wilson H., AC,
Oneill, Richard J., Inf.,
McWhorter, William A., AC,
Riordan, Robert P., AC,
McBride, Francis G., CE,
Frazier, Sydney F., Inf.,
Coulter, John A., QMC,
Miller, Robert J., CAC,
Miller, Carl L., AC,
Reichal, Joseph C., AC,
Fielder, Leo E., AC,
Perego, Frank S., AC,
Stafford, Charles L., AC,
Pearsall, Raymond D., Fin.,
Galbreaith, Robert B., Inf.,
Collins, Matthew R., Junior, Ord.,
Hopkins, Walter G., Junior, FA,
Haveman, Allen E., AC,
Reid, Robert J., Junior, AC,
Connelly Charles H., AC,
Martensen, William B., AC,
Brown, Harry C., CAC,
Lyle, Lewis E., AC,
Ritter, Frank N., Cav.,
Odom, Archibald D., AC,
Christmas, Charles H., AC,
Thieme, Leo V., Inf.,
Downs, Bruce C., AC,
Trachsel, William H., AC,
Ebbeler, Harold R., AC,
Brownell, Gerald S., AC,
Ahlgren, Frederic F., FA,
Buck, Arthur W., AC,
Brown, Mearle M., AC,
Kursar, August, AC,
Best, Everett W., AC,
Richardson, Elmer W., AC,
Harlow, Henry M., AC,
Batie, John S., AC,
Pyle, Clifton, AC,
Dade, Lucian A., Junior, AC,
Schiliereff, R. E., AC,
Bell, John A., Ord.,
Heikkinen, Risto M., AC,
Berger, Walter P., FA,
Hoile, John D., Inf.,
Veatch, Bernard W., AC,
Hoewing, Ralph C., AC,
Young, Franklin F., AC,
Shankle, Williard M., AC,
Vogel, John F., FA,
Hook, Fred G., Junior, AC,
Fishburn, James B., AC,
Hunziker, Richard O., AC,
Peterson, Lee L., AC,
Burbridge, Leo M., AC,
Webb, Rudelle B., AC,
McDaniel, Armour G., AC,
Oliver, Frank E., AC,
Smith, Gerald T., AC,
Harris, Frederick, V., Inf.,
Mather, William A., AC,
Erickson, James L., Inf.,
Knox, Jonathan H., AC,
Hedlund, Earl C., AC,
Cates, Cecil H., Inf.,
Locke, Norval M., FA,
Lee, Merle J., AC,
Hartzler, Gordon J., Inf.,
Kalina, Edwin C., Inf.,
Roper, Willard, AC,
Schuck, Edwin G., CAC,
Read, Jackson Y., AC,
Manasco, Raymond O., Inf.,
Horton, James H., QMC
Childress, Peter M., AC,
Stevens, Robert D., AC,
Shelton, Frank W., CAC,
Maurel, Anthony J., AC,
Keith, Benjamin M., Junior, AC,
Beezley, Wilbur B., AC,
Brakonecke, Morgan A., Inf.,
White, John M., Junior, CAC,
Montgomery, Robert P., AC,
Hutchison, Leroy C., AC,
Martin, Brice J., Inf.,
Val Preda, Peter, AC,
Mitcham, Gene L., FA,
Dale, Jack D., Junior, AC,
Christy, H. R., Junior, AC,
McBride, William P., AC,
Shaw, Robert C., Inf.,
Schmid, Eldon W., FA,
Bourne, Evan F., Junior, AC,
Bowman, Julian H., Fin.,
Krampitz, Charles T., Cav.,
Duncan, Edward K., AC,
Baker, Bazil L., AC,
Hargett, William M., AC,
Goodfleisch, Don M., AC,
Wilson, Walter J., AC,
Gentry, Ralph P., AC,
Hunsaker, Ben W., AC,
Conley, Bruce R., AC,
Bell, John H., AC,
Tyner, Layton C., Ord.,
Wells, William L., Inf.,
Thrasher, Tom G., Ord.,
Dodd, Aulevian M., Junior, AC,
Smith, Willard H., AC,
Quayle, John W., AC,
Ward, Donald R., Inf.,
Wittrock, Howard H., AC,
McCarthy, Paul N., CAC,
Jones, Osce V., AC,
Morton, Charles W., AC,
Sidle, Winant, FA,
Nichols, John D., Junior, AC,
Davis, Charles I., Junior, AC,
Schott, Murry M., AC,
Robinson, Leo H., AC,
Saylor, Henry S., AC,
Redden, Donald R., SC,
Riley, Thomas W., Junior, SC,
Graves, John C., AC,
Warren, Benjamin C., AC,
King, Glennis L., QMC,
Duke, Jack W., Inf.,
Barton, Claud D., Inf.,
Vetort, Francis J., AC,
Gardner, Glenn H., Inf.,
Gray, Belfrad H., Junior, Inf.,
Furtwangler, Alex C., Inf.,
Lacey, Peter J., CAC,
Black, Vance E., AC,
Stewart, Neil G., FA,
Green, Donald J., AC,
Keating, Robert E., AC,
Faver, Dudley E., AC,
McHale, Robert V., AC,
Fandel, William H., AC,
Lewis, French G., Inf.,
Scott, Edward W., Junior, AC,
Hensler, John A., AC,
Freed, Lyle C., AC,
Madding, Albert S., Inf.,
Harvey, Luther R., AC,
Farry, Albert B., AC,
Tanner, John L., Inf.,
Vollmer, Fred J., Ord.,
Conover, Charles M., Inf.,
Byrne, Geo. T., AC,
Patterson, William P, Ord.,
Andrews, Theodore H., Inf.,
Meseroll, Melvin R., CAC,
Colkitt, Thompson M., Inf.,
Ladner, Pat H., AC,
Eaton, Dudley P., AC,
Nussbaumer, Joe J., AC,
Coykendal, F. W., QMC,
Cormier, Lionel J., AC,
Todd, Ralph L., FA,
Noble, Daniel J., AC,
Reed, Jack L., AC,
Shipley, Alden P., Inf.,
Ferguson, Harvey E., AC,
Palmer, Raymond A., AC,
Haesler, John D. W., AC,
Sisk, Eugene B., Junior, AC,
McKenna, John J., CAC,
Moore, Ballinger B., AC,
Smith, Forrester M., Junior, AC,
Alexander, L. E., Junior, AC,
Fatzinger, C. W., Junior, AC,
Sakas, Julius A., Inf.,
Walters, Edward E., Inf.,
Blackwell, Anslum M., AC,
Beth, Elman J., AC,
Gerzin, Walter J., AC,
Meranda, Mark D., AC,
Hiers, Maurice D., Ord.,
Newton, Preston C., AC,
Spriestersbach, D. C., QMC,
Gueydan, James E., AC,
Burns, Bernard W., AC,
Barnett, Wendell H., AC,
Tabb, Jack S., QMC,
Bierer, Benjamin R., CWS,
Kellum, George A., CAC,
Harkins, John H., Inf.,
Edler, William C., FA,
Kemble, William H., Junior, AC,
Nash, Albert M., Inf.,
Phillips, Ernest C., Junior, Inf.,
Whiting, Troy E., QMC,
Salisbury, Arthur G., AC,
Bean, Joe M., AC,
Smyrl, J. T., Ord.,
Roberts, Henry G., Inf.,
Blackburn, Donald D., Inf.,
Thomas, Glen J., AC,
Weyand, Frederick C., CAC,
Farr, Richard, CAC,
Thompson, Glen W., AC,
Hasson, Albert N., AC,
Calhoun, Harold C., Fin.,
Anderson, Arthur J., Inf.,
Keogh, William T., CAC,
Haney, Otto R., AC,
Kesling, Earl W., AC,
Jacobs, Kenneth C., AC,
Dudley, Robert L., Inf.,
Schrader, Albert T., SC,
Schofield, Martin B. J., AC,
MacDonald, Henry G., AC,
Thornblom, Carlton C., Inf.,

Cox, William H., Inf., [redacted]
Webb, John D., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Stetson, Alvin E., AC, [redacted]
Muir, John E., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Crowell, Dick M., AC, [redacted]
Joseph, John T., Inf., [redacted]
Stauffer, Charles J., CAC, [redacted]
Silvey, Owen W., AC, [redacted]
Howard, Homer B., AC, [redacted]
Shelton, William M., AC, [redacted]
Benton, Deward E., Fin., [redacted]
Chambers, Walter E., AC, [redacted]
Herndon, Robert E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Wendle, Hugh M., CAC, [redacted]
Rector, Edward F., AC, [redacted]
Balkman, John P., QMC, [redacted]
Trainor, Alfred T., QMC, [redacted]
Brooks, Ernest A., QMC, [redacted]
Poland, Marvin E., AC, [redacted]
Hawel, Leo, Junior, AC, [redacted]
Petersen, George T., Ord., [redacted]
Caple, Charles E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Clark, James T., Inf., [redacted]
Wright, Graham, Junior, AC, [redacted]
Yancey, Gordon A., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
White, Fred F., FA, [redacted]
Compton, Joe W., AC, [redacted]
Tobey, Nelson W., FA, [redacted]
Darwin, George H., SC, [redacted]
Cumbaa, Noel T., AC, [redacted]
Miller, Paul D., AC, [redacted]
Brown, Leroy C., Inf., [redacted]
Bronson, Fred F., AC, [redacted]
Howard, Marion L., Inf., [redacted]
La Barre, Louis V., AC, [redacted]
Miller, Jesse W., AC, [redacted]
Penson, David, CAC, [redacted]
Montgomery, John G., Inf., [redacted]
Livingston, John W., AC, [redacted]
Quenin, James H., AC, [redacted]
McNair, Donald C., CAC, [redacted]
Perry, Lucius A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Antrim, Harold F., FA, [redacted]
Walsh, John E., SC, [redacted]
Martin, John F., AC, [redacted]
Calhoun, Robert T., AC, [redacted]
Rountree, Denton C., Inf., [redacted]
Iseman, Joseph D., FA, [redacted]
Dyson, James H., FA, [redacted]
Ditamore, Earl L., Inf., [redacted]
Caspers, Ronald C., Ord., [redacted]
Wojcik, Walter K., FA, [redacted]
Lackey, Archer E., AC, [redacted]
Pope, Francis J., AC, [redacted]
Ross, George L., AC, [redacted]
Weinheimer, Jacob, AC, [redacted]
Gavin, Robert J., Inf., [redacted]
Caprino, Charles T., Inf., [redacted]
Rulien, Donovan W., AC, [redacted]
Hale, Ivan L., AC, [redacted]
Campbell, Paul W., AC, [redacted]
Muggelberg, Glenn E., Inf., [redacted]
Partridge, Lewis J., AC, [redacted]
Locher, James R., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Spears, James H., QMC, [redacted]
Casey, Edward T., FA, [redacted]
Scott-Smith H. H., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Wilson, Eugene A., FA, [redacted]
Jordan, Wallace R., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Raymond E., AC, [redacted]
Grierson, Walter H., AC, [redacted]
Hinman, John M., CAC, [redacted]
Craig, Richard M., AC, [redacted]
Terry, Henry W., 3d, AC, [redacted]
Roberts, Paul F., Inf., [redacted]
McCullough, Chris, Inf., [redacted]
Towne, Raymond L., AC, [redacted]
Duckworth, Ernest M., AC, [redacted]
Parziale, Charles J., Inf., [redacted]
Wys, Robert A., CWS, [redacted]
Jennings, Payne, Junior, AC, [redacted]
West, Alden E., AC, [redacted]
Kappel, Carl W., Inf., [redacted]
Wilson, Gerald P., AC, [redacted]
LeRoy, Robert E., Ord., [redacted]
Hough, Parkhurst C., Inf., [redacted]
Stein, William H., Inf., [redacted]
Dexter, Robert B., Inf., [redacted]
Downey, Clyde J., AC, [redacted]
Brakebill, James H., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Chadwick, Roscoe L., AC., [redacted]

Fielder, Jesse W., FA, [redacted]
McKenna, C. F., 3d, AC, [redacted]
Edwards, Bob E., Inf., [redacted]
Bryant, James R., AC, [redacted]
Gould, George, AC, [redacted]
Ficke, Robert H., AC, [redacted]
Dascombe, Charles B., AC, [redacted]
Karstedt, Warren H., QMC, [redacted]
Stewart, John E., AC, [redacted]
McKee, Seth J., AC, [redacted]
Bailey, Carl E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Lydon, Joseph P., Inf., [redacted]
Sumner, Norman R., FA, [redacted]
Gallagher, Raymond K., AC, [redacted]
Tolliver, Edward M., QMC, [redacted]
Teschner, Charles G., AC, [redacted]
Webster, William T., Ord., [redacted]
Jella, Leonard L., AC, [redacted]
Lawton, Thomas O., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Preston, B. S., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Cutcher, Solomon, AC, [redacted]
DePriest, Wilson M., AC, [redacted]
Murray, Joseph F., QMC, [redacted]
Stutzman, Robert G., AC, [redacted]
Tope, William A., AC, [redacted]
Wipff, Kenneth R., FA, [redacted]
Campbell, Robert B., Inf., [redacted]
Schumacher, Fred W., Inf., [redacted]
Kundrat, Andrew, AC, [redacted]
Hergert, Thomas M., AC, [redacted]
Garris, Herbert L., FA, [redacted]
Johnson, Hugh W., Inf., [redacted]
Alton, Carol W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Neal, George C., AC, [redacted]
Michel, Frederick H., AC, [redacted]
Villars, Paul E., AC, [redacted]
Todd, Albert A., Inf., [redacted]
Overstreet, C. S., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Greis, Raymond C., Inf., [redacted]
Washburn, Walter R., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Ingelido, Michael J., AC, [redacted]
Hayes, Oliver T., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Wiley, Woodrow J., AC, [redacted]
Green, Giles G., AC, [redacted]
Davis, Robert J., QMC, [redacted]
Silvey, Robert M., Ord., [redacted]
Davis, Gerald W., CAC, [redacted]
White, Hoyt E., SC, [redacted]
Kramers, John T., FA, [redacted]
Avery, Delwin B., AC, [redacted]
Bogner, Charles, FA, [redacted]
Morris, Wesley D., AC, [redacted]
Hornsby, Thomas W., AC, [redacted]
Firebaugh, Charles M., FA, [redacted]
Bexfield, Frank W., AC, [redacted]
Beumeler, Wayne M., AC, [redacted]
Dell, John W., SC, [redacted]
Hawk, Keith C., AC, [redacted]
Schwind, Robert J., Inf., [redacted]
Flenniken, John C., FA, [redacted]
Birdsall, Charles D., AC, [redacted]
Stetson, Francis A., AC, [redacted]
Lombard, Richard J., QMC, [redacted]
Daniel, David E., AC, [redacted]
Gillespie, Calvin E., AC, [redacted]
Heimer, Gerard, CAC, [redacted]
Andrews, John T., Junior, Ord., [redacted]
Saltsman, Ralph H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Nechanicky, William G., FA, [redacted]
Lage, Wilbur J., Inf., [redacted]
Paul, William E., AC, [redacted]
Stefonowicz, Leroy L., AC, [redacted]
Roberts, John A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Barrow, Leonard J., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Barnett, James A., AC, [redacted]
Downing, Edward P., FA, [redacted]
Hatch, Merrill G., FA, [redacted]
Kreager, Raymond F., FA, [redacted]
Sifford, Wilson, FA, [redacted]
Rossoff, Isidor, AC, [redacted]
Smith, Herman R., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Sanders, Cecil M., Inf., [redacted]
Palizza, Maurice J., CAC, [redacted]
De Young, Guy O., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Tilley, Bill R., FA, [redacted]
Blakefield, William H., Inf., [redacted]
Coghill, C. W., Jr., Inf., [redacted]
Milledge, Henry L., AC, [redacted]
Neill, William H., CAC, [redacted]
Glenn, Donald W., Inf., [redacted]
Glassen, Chester E., CAC, [redacted]

Connor, John E., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Tate, Roy A., CAC, [redacted]
Boulger, Jack A., Inf., [redacted]
Rawlins, Phillip C., AC, [redacted]
Clark, Harry A., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Barco, Ernest T., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Skardon, Beverly N., Inf., [redacted]
Grady, John W., FA, [redacted]
Hill, Garrett L., Ord., [redacted]
Hoffmeister, Donald E., FA, [redacted]
Glauser, Floyd L., FA, [redacted]
Ball, Frank E., Inf., [redacted]
Birdsong, W. H., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Desper, Dale D., AC, [redacted]
Rainey, William R., CAC, [redacted]
Vincent, Dale L., CWS, [redacted]
Bonham, Dwight D., Inf., [redacted]
Farrell, Wilfred F., Inf., [redacted]
Salleer, Donald L., FA, [redacted]
Turner, Leonard C., Inf., [redacted]
Townsley, Floyd W., Cav., [redacted]
Benson, John S., FA, [redacted]
Baker, Warren S., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Hughes, James F., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Galbraith, John M., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Brown, Merle C., AC, [redacted]
Henley, Jack J., Inf., [redacted]
Connor, Robert E., Inf., [redacted]
Brown, Paul D., AC, [redacted]
Hawthorne, Harry J., AC, [redacted]
Anderson, Wesley A., AC, [redacted]
Williamson, Walter H., AC, [redacted]
Walker, George A., AC, [redacted]
Hall, Conway S., AC, [redacted]
Evers, John C., AC, [redacted]
Hall, William L., AC, [redacted]
Koehne, George H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Griffin, Louis G., AC, [redacted]
Netterblad, A. T., Junior, Cav., [redacted]
Bestor, Richard J., FA, [redacted]
Carlson, Thorgny C., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Williams, Albert C., CAC, [redacted]
Fleming, Elmer P., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Andrews, Stephen E., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Shirley, Jackson E., Inf., [redacted]
Georgelas, John G., FA, [redacted]
Seitz, Richard J., Inf., [redacted]
Powell, Ross F., Inf., [redacted]
Crosby, Ralph D., Inf., [redacted]
Bailey, F. J., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Lanterman, Jack V., CAC, [redacted]
Armstrong, Ben K., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Hrdlicka, Edward B., FA, [redacted]
Hickman, David, Inf., [redacted]
Brown, Ernest L., Inf., [redacted]
Leslie, George A., AC, [redacted]
Pierce, Henry J., Inf., [redacted]
Edwards, Spencer P., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Emerson, Kary C., Inf., [redacted]
Mastalir, Milton J., Inf., [redacted]
Sharp, John F., AC, [redacted]
Cole, James L., AC, [redacted]
Briggs, Loran D., AC, [redacted]
Thyng, Harrison R., AC, [redacted]
Lancey, William S., FA, [redacted]
Carlisle, Richard T., AC, [redacted]
Selman, James C., AC, [redacted]
Johnson, Leland W., AC, [redacted]
Carey, Edwin F., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Allen, Franklin S., AC, [redacted]
Jones, Wilson T., AC, [redacted]
Wallace, John B., AC, [redacted]
Marts, Kenneth E., AC, [redacted]
Corey, Robert R., Inf., [redacted]
Taynton, Lewis C., Cav., [redacted]
Grossmith, Louis B., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Moseley, C. L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Lyster, David K., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Berry, Maurice A., AC, [redacted]
Thornton, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
Wright, Ellis W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Hornby, David A., AC, [redacted]
Fitzgerald, John E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Wanderer, Ralph M., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Farley, Orville B., AC, [redacted]
Hoover, Travis, AC, [redacted]
Hollingsworth, G. H., AC, [redacted]
Will, Joe O., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Foster, Byron W., AC, [redacted]
Robinson, James C., AC, [redacted]
Craft, Winfred O., AC, [redacted]

Schilling, David C., AC, [redacted]
Walters, Benjamin B., AC, [redacted]
Love, James W., FA., [redacted]
Witt, Emitt C., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Kelsay, Clyde B., AC, [redacted]
Rowe, Everett C., AC, [redacted]
Triplett, Austin, Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Woodard, Robert L., FA, [redacted]
Irby, John J., AC, [redacted]
Elder, Edwin W., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Hislop, Albert H., Cav., [redacted]
Mataxis, Theodore C., Inf., [redacted]
Pitts, George T., Junior, Cav., [redacted]
Barsanti, Olinto M., Inf., [redacted]
Green, Robert W., Inf., [redacted]
Teegarden, Alfred P., Inf., [redacted]
Dennison, Richard F., Inf., [redacted]
Smith, Harry M., Inf., [redacted]
Washington, William R., Inf., [redacted]
Schreiber, William L., CAC, [redacted]
Smith, Albert H., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Watters, John F., AC, [redacted]
Davis, Charles W., Inf., [redacted]
Mabry, George L., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Ross, Donald H., AC, [redacted]
Morgan, William O., Inf., [redacted]
Rountree, Councill P., CAC, [redacted]
Wood, Edgar C., Inf., [redacted]
Guerin, Vincent C., Inf., [redacted]
Farrar, William L., CAC, [redacted]
Efnor, Sam, Junior, CWS, [redacted]
Callahan, Donald M., Inf., [redacted]
Unger, James F., FA, [redacted]
Sexton, Morrell R., Inf., [redacted]
Velde, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
Jones, James O., Inf., [redacted]
Morris, Thomas J., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Sage, Rex R., Inf., [redacted]
Linder, Kenneth A., AC, [redacted]
Eakes Raymond T., AC, [redacted]
Johnson, Lorin L., AC, [redacted]
Shapiro, Leonard, AC, [redacted]
Cool, Paul E., AC, [redacted]
Fish, Robert W., AC, [redacted]
Kelly, Thomas C., AC, [redacted]
McCauley, Harris K., AC, [redacted]
Egan, John L., AC, [redacted]
Bottomly, R. V., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Wilcox, Roland M., AC, [redacted]
Berry, Austin L., AC, [redacted]
Barr, Bernice S., AC, [redacted]
Coffey, Robert L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Zubko, Boris M., AC, [redacted]
Doolittle, Glenn A., AC, [redacted]
Ohl, William C., Ord., [redacted]
Davis, Edward L., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Murphy, Robert E., Inf., [redacted]
Smith, Herbert A., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Wilcox, Frank H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Flora, Marvin W., FA, [redacted]
Dunn, George R., Cav., [redacted]
Hogoboom, Dale D., Inf., [redacted]
Chapman, Daniel T., CAC, [redacted]
Boggs, William M., CE, [redacted]
Strong, John L., Inf., [redacted]
Genetti, Frank V., AC, [redacted]
Boyle, Herman B., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Dickson, Ned R., Inf., [redacted]
Webb, William E., Inf., [redacted]
Jeffries, Charles C., CAC, [redacted]
Rice, Johnny M., QMC, [redacted]
Van Dyke, William C., AC, [redacted]
Gray, Asa P., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Stambough, Claude K., AC, [redacted]
Carpenter, Earl M., QMC, [redacted]
Johnson, Milton W., AC, [redacted]
Pettit, Morris W., CAC, [redacted]
Cannady, Preston B., CAC, [redacted]
Inman, Roy L., Inf., [redacted]
Kent, Harold R., Inf., [redacted]
Allen, Fred C., QMC, [redacted]
Barnhart, Norvel H., FA, [redacted]
Hill Harry G., Cav., [redacted]
Williams, John W., Inf., [redacted]
Farnell, John M., Inf., [redacted]
Redfern, Ira C., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Girard, Charles J., Inf., [redacted]
Hubbard, William H., CAC, [redacted]
Ross, Hezekia J., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Lemmon, James C., AC, [redacted]
Wynn, Edward H., AC, [redacted]
Negron, Rafael, Inf., [redacted]
Edwards, Richard A., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Ciccolella, Richard G., Inf., [redacted]
German, Edgar P., FA, [redacted]
Moise, Harold, 2d, AC, [redacted]
Jennings, Raymond J., Inf., [redacted]
Herrington, Jay W., Inf., [redacted]
Glover, William C., FA, [redacted]
Parker, James C., CAC, [redacted]
Lecnard, Theodore, Inf., [redacted]
Pillsbury, Glenn T., FA, [redacted]
Lewis, James T., AC, [redacted]
Moore, Lynn R., AC, [redacted]
Heath, Norval K., AC, [redacted]
Donahue, Vincent J., AC, [redacted]
Page, Roger W., AC, [redacted]
Witham, Bertram H. J., AC, [redacted]
Gillett, Harry R., AC, [redacted]
Richardson, Lester E., AC, [redacted]
Richards, Lawrence M., AC, [redacted]
Phillips, Maurice C., AC, [redacted]
Livesay, Earl J., AC, [redacted]
Harlan, John S., AC, [redacted]
Meyer, John C., AC, [redacted]
Smedley, Robert R., AC, [redacted]
Kane, Roy A., FA, [redacted]
Brooks, Robert R., Ord., [redacted]
Ransone, Alexander L., Inf., [redacted]
Alexander, George W., Ord., [redacted]
Moss, Vaughn R., FA, [redacted]
Taylor, Peter R., AC, [redacted]
Flint, Brilsford P., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Mihailov, N. N., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Benoist, Thomas M., SC, [redacted]
Taylor, Powell H., AC, [redacted]
Bryan, William C., Inf., [redacted]
Miller, Crosby P., Inf., [redacted]
Jones, James B., Inf., [redacted]
Burnes, Philip D., QMC, [redacted]
Davis, Harry J., Junior, Cav., [redacted]
Hollingsworth, J. F., Cav., [redacted]
Roane, Nathan A., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Bennett, Verde W., FA, [redacted]
Galloway, Neal C., FA, [redacted]
Celio, Gove C., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Pearch, Lowell D., AC, [redacted]
Williams, Howard W., AC, [redacted]
Keller, Charles R., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Larson, John C., AC, [redacted]
Meng, William J., AC, [redacted]
Jones, Frank G., AC, [redacted]
Wright, Lewis J., AC, [redacted]
Gough, Jamie, AC, [redacted]
Junkermann, Howard C., AC, [redacted]
Jones, William A., AC, [redacted]
Darby, George C., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Schuck, Francis J., AC, [redacted]
Rumsey, Herman, AC, [redacted]
Kemp, James D., AC, [redacted]
Ogas, Bernard V., AC, [redacted]
Franklin, Charles F., AC, [redacted]
Wood, Wilson R., AC, [redacted]
Packard, Peter L. M., AC, [redacted]
De Lacey, William H., AC, [redacted]
Howe, Everett B., AC, [redacted]
Long, Joseph W., Inf., [redacted]
Howenstine, Kenneth K., AC, [redacted]
Hinton, Bruce H., AC, [redacted]
Stickler, Lee R., FA, [redacted]
Stewart, L. L., Fin., [redacted]
Stiles, Joseph E., AC, [redacted]
Pratt, John B., Inf., [redacted]
Smith, Anderson Q., Inf., [redacted]
Hale, Samuel, AC, [redacted]
Dickerson, George W., Inf., [redacted]
Fulbruge, Charles R., QMC, [redacted]
Cooper, Earl M., Inf., [redacted]
Denby, Roland E., CAC, [redacted]
Murphy, James O., CAC, [redacted]
Sharp, Edward J., AC, [redacted]
Pavlick, Charles R., AC, [redacted]
Speaks, Robert J., Inf., [redacted]
Adams, Willis J., Inf., [redacted]
Cloud, Howard H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Ayer, Franklin A., CAC, [redacted]
Gillespie, John P., AC, [redacted]
Cook, Charles H., Inf., [redacted]
Sullivan, Edward D. S., AC, [redacted]
Hopkins, David L., AC, [redacted]
Conrad, Eugene B., Inf., [redacted]
Saunders, Robert S., Fin., [redacted]
Olney, Richard B., AC, [redacted]
Stewart, George B., AC, [redacted]
West, Roland P., CE, [redacted]
Bennion, Karren L., AC, [redacted]
Bower, William M., AC, [redacted]
Rosenthal, Herbert, AC, [redacted]
Fowler, Stanley V., AC, [redacted]
Erb, Gilbert E., AC, [redacted]
White, Joseph D., AC, [redacted]
Evans, Edwin C., AC, [redacted]
Curtis, Gilbert L., AC, [redacted]
Sanders, Edward A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Eddy, Ernest C., AC, [redacted]
Steele, Kenneth S., AC, [redacted]
Duncan, Glenn E., AC, [redacted]
Eichel, Henry H., AC, [redacted]
Bishop, Edwin, Junior, AC, [redacted]
Foley, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
Larson, Robert H., AC, [redacted]
Lambert, Blake W., AC, [redacted]
Moll, Robert G., AC, [redacted]
Dames, William H., AC, [redacted]
Ludwikosky, John P., Inf., [redacted]
Witt, Theodore J., Cav., [redacted]
Tiffany, Williard D., SC, [redacted]
Martin, Allen C., FA, [redacted]
Ross, William E., AC, [redacted]
Swan, Arthur B., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Edmond, Emil V. B., Inf., [redacted]
Andrew, George S., Junior, Cav., [redacted]
Eberenz, Richard J., AC, [redacted]
Neslen, Alfred J., AC, [redacted]
Jones, Bruce D., CE, [redacted]
Jones, Bruce B., CAC, [redacted]
Jones, Felix H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Vallery, Joy K., Inf., [redacted]
Harris, James F., Junior, Ord., [redacted]
Walker, Lawrence H., Junior, Fin., [redacted]
Blackburn, William W., FA, [redacted]
Borns, Charles R., QMC, [redacted]
Holsclaw, Gerald R., AC, [redacted]
Robb, Harry W., AC, [redacted]
Norton, Malcolm E., AC, [redacted]
Werner, Wesley, AC, [redacted]
Schieber, Hudson M., AC, [redacted]
Sampson, Raymond D., AC, [redacted]
Moore, Harold E., AC, [redacted]
Crawford, Dalson E., AC, [redacted]
Dysinger, Leonard S., AC, [redacted]
Thacker, John M., AC, [redacted]
Shields, John R., AC, [redacted]
Patterson, Ralph R., AC, [redacted]
Cleven, Gale W., AC, [redacted]
O'Keefe, Timothy F., AC, [redacted]
Neeley, Richard C., AC, [redacted]
Bowe, Hugh H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Hill, Frank A., AC, [redacted]
Griffin, Richard V., AC, [redacted]
Saad, John I., AC, [redacted]
Prasse, Frederick T., AC, [redacted]
Miller, James E., FA, [redacted]
Stroup, Ray B., Inf., [redacted]
Lynch, William R., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Gattis, Floyd D., FA, [redacted]
Nathan, Aubrey P., Inf., [redacted]
Hughes, John L., FA, [redacted]
Street Jack B., Inf., [redacted]
Call, George W., AC, [redacted]
Massingill, J. H., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Muhl, Fred J., AC, [redacted]
Butler, Edward G., AC, [redacted]
Chaffin, Andrew A., AC, [redacted]
Ross, Samuel R., FA, [redacted]
Homan, Sammie N., Inf., [redacted]
Benton, Roy H., SC, [redacted]
Mixon, Sidney T., Inf., [redacted]
Irby, Pierce B., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Dukes, Dan K., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Talmage, Henry G., QMC, [redacted]
Weitzenfeld, R. W., AC, [redacted]
Lawrence, Leon S., FA, [redacted]
Goerder, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
Etchemendy, John M., AC, [redacted]
Warren, Sam F., FA, [redacted]
Shy, William M., AC, [redacted]
McAllister, Gerald B., AC, [redacted]
Mueller, Edmund Z., Inf., [redacted]
Roesch, John E., AC, [redacted]
Cook, John M., Inf., [redacted]
Laiche, Weldon E., Inf., [redacted]
Barr, Thomas A., Inf., [redacted]
Crawford, Luther S., Cav., [redacted]
MacDonald, Daniel V., AC, [redacted]

Edris, Gordon L., AC, [redacted]
Messenger, Lester C., AC, [redacted]
Dempster, Kenneth C., AC, [redacted]
Wikstrom, Floyd E., AC, [redacted]
Bailey, Bryson R., AC, [redacted]
Wahlstrom, Norman O., AC, [redacted]
Kruzel, Joseph J., AC, [redacted]
Crane, Vincent M., AC, [redacted]
Perna, Anthony J., AC, [redacted]
Burke, Archie M., AC, [redacted]
Levine, Robert, AC, [redacted]
Hayes, Jack W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Schinz, Albert W., AC, [redacted]
Parker, Ben L., AC, [redacted]
Tavasti, Roy E., AC, [redacted]
Lanford, Horace W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Irwin, Robert B., AC, [redacted]
Lillard, James W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
McGhie, Richard D., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Mayo, Joseph B., Inf., [redacted]
Snyder, Neil N., Junior, Fin., [redacted]
Smith, Allen T., Inf., [redacted]
Quashnock, Emro J., SC, [redacted]
Stabler, Warwick, B., FA, [redacted]
Bodenhamer, Ross E., AC, [redacted]
Saltzman, Stephen G., AC, [redacted]
Davis, Willis H., Inf., [redacted]
Kjeldsen, Donald E., CAC, [redacted]
Kenny, Thomas F., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Bonin, Dwight E., AC, [redacted]
Murphy, James H., AC, [redacted]
Mullins, James A., AC, [redacted]
Marinelli, Jack L., FA, [redacted]
Green, Robert W., Cav., [redacted]
Hansen, John C., Inf., [redacted]
Schweiter, Lee H., Inf., [redacted]
Goodwin, Frederick C., FA, [redacted]
McWatters, John A., Inf., [redacted]
Underwood, Charles C., Inf., [redacted]
Aldridge, George T., AC, [redacted]
Featherston, Howard H., Inf., [redacted]
Bristol, Delbert L., FA, [redacted]
Hearn, John V., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Dunn, Jerry F., FA, [redacted]
Christol, Max S., Ord., [redacted]
Robinson, James D. C., AC, [redacted]
Payne, James O., AC, [redacted]
Galbreath, Samuel C., AC, [redacted]
McBride, Edward E., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Schmidt, Graham E., Inf., [redacted]
Garland, Ben A., AC, [redacted]
Easley, Gregg P., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Hovik, Clifford S., AC, [redacted]
Hatch, Horace E., AC, [redacted]
Hodges, John, Inf., [redacted]
Watson, Richard R., FA, [redacted]
Rutherford, Robert D., CAC, [redacted]
Southall, Russell M., AC, [redacted]
Woody, Robert E., AC, [redacted]
Schroeder, Allen W., AC, [redacted]
Donnelly, W. J., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Schindler, Andrew R., AC, [redacted]
McCafferty, George O., AC, [redacted]
Hayes, Thomas L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Walker, Leland A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Brandon, William H., AC, [redacted]
Grumbles, Wilbur J., AC, [redacted]
Gonzalez, Horace R., AC, [redacted]
Dorn, Wilfred C., AC, [redacted]
Brown, Howard E., AC, [redacted]
Timlin, Francis E., AC, [redacted]
Grable, Francis L., AC, [redacted]
Rush, Arthur C., AC, [redacted]
Hamberg, Walter, Junior, AC, [redacted]
Von Arb, George W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
May, Richard H., AC, [redacted]
Walker, Norvell M., Cav., [redacted]
Bergamyer, Roland W., AC, [redacted]
Kutschera, Walter F., AC, [redacted]
Zambon, Louis B., AC, [redacted]
West, Howard B., AC, [redacted]
Hopkins, James I., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Glenny, Gale S., AC, [redacted]
Martin, Clarence A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Swanson, Darwin E., AC, [redacted]
Bullock, Joe R., AC, [redacted]
Koser, Jack D., AC, [redacted]
Lundquist, Gustav E., AC, [redacted]
Crumly, Harold J. J., AC, [redacted]
Andresen, Carroll W., FA, [redacted]
Bauley, James E., AC, [redacted]

Sidwell, Lowell G., AC, [redacted]
Lake, Jack F., Inf., [redacted]
Steichen, Woodrow J., CAC, [redacted]
Lindmark, Marvin L., FA, [redacted]
Wood, Thomas L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Sjodin, Daniel L., AC, [redacted]
Mandt, William F., AC, [redacted]
Gordon, William T., Inf., [redacted]
Vollendorff, Robert E., Inf., [redacted]
De Camara, Richard P., Inf., [redacted]
Hawkins, Gabe C., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Bauch, Alfred R., Ord., [redacted]
Prusaitis, Joseph J., FA, [redacted]
Weldon, Thomas F., AC, [redacted]
Carter, Robert A., AC, [redacted]
Wilson, Thomas N., AC, [redacted]
Philbin, Tobias R., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Nealson, William R., Inf., [redacted]
Remick, Charles E., FA, [redacted]
Colley, Gordon T., AC, [redacted]
Swann, Franklin W., AC, [redacted]
Wells, George L., AC, [redacted]
Briggs, James D., AC, [redacted]
Jurkens, Edward A., AC, [redacted]
Mason, Reginald H., AC, [redacted]
Ward, Kenneth A., Inf., [redacted]
Swofford, John F., AC, [redacted]
Davis, Green R., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Wallen, Francis L., AC, [redacted]
Oaks, Delmar L., Jr., FA, [redacted]
Winder, Wayne M., Inf., [redacted]
Fausset, Louis R., FA, [redacted]
Labounty, Jack V., QMC, [redacted]
Bengel, Lawrence W., SC, [redacted]
Propst, John R., AC, [redacted]
Pregaldin, C. V., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Burn, Richard C., CWS, [redacted]
Leghorn, Richard S., AC, [redacted]
Dick William H., AC, [redacted]
Bauer, Maurice H., AC, [redacted]
Salter, Richard D., AC, [redacted]
Mayer, William H., AC, [redacted]
Sisler, Orland O., AC, [redacted]
Renz, L. Jay, AC, [redacted]
Johnson, Donald W., AC, [redacted]
Newman, Frank M., AC, [redacted]
Smiley, Bert N., AC, [redacted]
Calhan, Robert J., AC, [redacted]
Downing, Harry L., AC, [redacted]
Larkey, Isaac F., AC, [redacted]
Brett, Raymond E., AC, [redacted]
Davitt, William J., AC, [redacted]
Steeves, Jerome I., AC, [redacted]
Griffin, Loyd D., AC, [redacted]
Matthews, Jewell, Junior, AC, [redacted]
Hoffman, Theodore C., AC, [redacted]
Conley, David M., AC, [redacted]
Jones, David J., AC, [redacted]
Beam, James C., AC, [redacted]
Furman, William B., AC, [redacted]
Hoerner, Leroy D., AC, [redacted]
Willard, Harry E., AC, [redacted]
Snyder, John T., AC, [redacted]
Wiley, James R., AC, [redacted]
Gallup, Charles S., AC, [redacted]
Adair, Archie S., AC, [redacted]
Brown, Jack O., AC, [redacted]
Orr, Richard L., AC, [redacted]
La Clare Edward F., AC, [redacted]
Davidson, Collier H., AC, [redacted]
Lingamfelter, C. B., AC, [redacted]
Walker, Joe, AC, [redacted]
Hillyer, Roy N., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Wojick, Kazimiers, AC, [redacted]
Jones, Robert J., AC, [redacted]
Gay, Alex H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
O'Donnell, John C., AC, [redacted]
Porter, James L., AC, [redacted]
Wight, Carroll H., AC, [redacted]
Du Val, Robert J., AC, [redacted]
Teasley, Frank S., AC, [redacted]
Martin, John L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Pease, John H., AC, [redacted]
Henderson, Harvey E., AC, [redacted]
Whitlow, Floyd B., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Galligan, Clarence J., AC, [redacted]
Moore, William H., AC, [redacted]
Patch, Horace W., AC, [redacted]
Lambert, John L., AC, [redacted]
Kable, Max S., AC, [redacted]
Porter, Howard E., SC, [redacted]

Alexander, J. P., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Gandy, Raymond E., AC, [redacted]
Neal, Van E., AC, [redacted]
Williamson, Ellis W., Inf., [redacted]
Sweeney, Francis P., Inf., [redacted]
Dal Ponte, Peter L., Inf., [redacted]
Bailey, Don W., AC, [redacted]
Dalton, Ralph L., Inf., [redacted]
Flower, Frank A., AC, [redacted]
Akers, Marion J., AC, [redacted]
Henry, John F., FA, [redacted]
Glaisyer, H. B., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Kincade, Norman T., QMC, [redacted]
Gilbert, Olain E., AC, [redacted]
Humphries, Donald H., AC, [redacted]
Burns, Burton, CAC, [redacted]
Henry, Albert C., QMC, [redacted]
Dowtin, Rex, AC, [redacted]
Tower, Donald O., AC, [redacted]
Moody, Joe L., AC, [redacted]
Poncik, Victor J., AC, [redacted]
Stimpson, Ritchie P., AC, [redacted]
McAfee, Harry E., AC, [redacted]
Todd, Walter F., AC, [redacted]
Burns, Berton H., AC, [redacted]
Rawl, Robert C., AC, [redacted]
Keator, Randall D., AC, [redacted]
Dannel, Abram B., AC, [redacted]
Hassler, Ira E., AC, [redacted]
Shultis, Donald C., AC, [redacted]
Thompson, Royal S., AC, [redacted]
Wallace, Albert L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
White, Thomas D., AC, [redacted]
Kruck, Charles W., AC, [redacted]
Mumford, Harry G., AC, [redacted]
Grashio, Samuel C., AC, [redacted]
Seward, Wayne J., AC, [redacted]
Nichols, Franklin A., AC, [redacted]
Barrowclough, R. I., AC, [redacted]
Robb, Stewart W., AC, [redacted]
Rasmussen, Philip M., AC, [redacted]
Gross, James O., AC, [redacted]
Elder, Robert A., AC, [redacted]
Gibson, Harold C., AC, [redacted]
Wagnon, Manford K., AC, [redacted]
Michie, Robert E. L., AC, [redacted]
Kale, James S., AC, [redacted]
Holsey, Raymond E., AC, [redacted]
Wood, Delmore P., AC, [redacted]
Mize, Seth A., AC, [redacted]
Schneider, Albert H., AC, [redacted]
Caviness, Roy B., AC, [redacted]
Taylor, Kenneth M., AC, [redacted]
Chappell, Frank B., AC, [redacted]
Lawrence, Henry W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Dewey, George G., AC, [redacted]
O'Neal, Julius E., AC, [redacted]
Farnell, Leland B., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Bacon, William C., AC, [redacted]
Barrett, Joseph A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Lancaster, James W., AC, [redacted]
Noland, Harold B., AC, [redacted]
Andrews, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
Eakins, William W., AC, [redacted]
McKean, Harold L., AC, [redacted]
Lyle, James P., AC, [redacted]
Witzenburger, E. J., AC, [redacted]
Beckelman, Jack D., AC, [redacted]
Hill, Homer T., AC, [redacted]
Jindrich, Leonard J., AC, [redacted]
Milling, John B., AC, [redacted]
Monroe, Melvin C., FA [redacted]
Temme, Eugene J., CAC, [redacted]
Wooten, Clyde C., AC, [redacted]
Terrel, Cader C., Inf., [redacted]
Stafford Robert S., FA, [redacted]
Whitley, Charles G., AC, [redacted]
Powell, Marcus L., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Abbott, Lysle I., Inf., [redacted]
Williamson, R. H., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Langford, Ernest K., FA, [redacted]
Bethell, George W., Ord., [redacted]
Jones, William W., AC, [redacted]
Maroni, Robert J., AC, [redacted]
Brodbeck, William D., Inf., [redacted]
Rhodes, Hugh E., AC, [redacted]
Burton, Lewis R., CAC, [redacted]
Minson, Roscoe T., FA, [redacted]
Boggs, Adelbert D., Inf., [redacted]
Vanderpool, Jay D., FA, [redacted]

Cooksley, Leo C., QMC
Rogers, Jack A., CAC,
Griest, Oliver E., FA,
Curnutt, James L., AC,
Burke, James T., Cav.,
Bryant, James B., AC,
Delaney, F. G., Junior, AC,
Chisholm, Henry J., AC,
Harris, William D., AC,
Cresswell, Arthur S., AC,
Good, Robert B., AC,
Burcky, Max C., AC,
Lipscomb, Woodrow W., AC,
Lawson, Robert M., AC,
Sartz, Jacob P., Junior, AC,
Yates, William J., AC,
Martin, Wallace S., Junior, AC,
Smith, Carroll C., AC,
McTaggart, Elmer E., AC,
Byerley, Sam J., AC,
Orban, Henry A., AC,
Patterson, Willard A., AC,
Feist, Robert D., AC,
Zumwalt, McLyle G., AC,
Robinson, Donald A., Junior, AC,
Coward, James S., AC,
Falletta Charlie, AC,
Kinney, William E., AC,
Kasler, Charles L. CAC,
Newton, George L., Junior, AC,
Hillman, Donald E., AC,
Nuttall, Lloyd R., AC,
High, James R., AC,
Congleton, Boyd E., AC,
Nigro, Edward H., AC,
Stover, George E., AC,
Woodbury, Willard G., AC,
Wise, John W., AC,
Campbell, C. M., Junior, AC,
Morris, Howard A., CAC,
Hutton, Leonard J., AC,
Anderson, Herbert, AC,
Scott, Franklin H., AC,
Crandell, John A., AC,
Russell, Roy D., AC,
Ogara, Warren M., FA,
Williams, George V., AC,
Toole, Richard A., AC,
Chapman, Lloyd D., AC,
Cheever, Russell E., AC,
Ford, Louis W., AC,
Cornett, Billy, AC,
Jones, Curran L., AC,
Van-De-Car, Howard T., AC,
Worley, Robert F., AC,
Runyon, Theodore H., AC,
Sherrill, James C., AC,
Bixby, Orin M., AC,
Williams, Walter A., AC,
Miller, William E., AC,
Van Ausdall, Robert L., AC,
Ivey, William G., AC,
Nelson, Carl M., AC,
Brown, Harold R., AC,
Via, Harold F., CAC,
McCuller, Louis P., FA,
Smith, Willard A., FA,
Watkins, George W., FA,
Pickard, Andrew D., FA,
Bloodworth, Joseph C., CE,
Buck, Charles A., CAC,
Luehring, Dale W., AC,
Casey, Jack M., CAC,
Jordan, George B., Inf.,
Hoagland, Charles E., Inf.,
Massey, Donnell, AC,
Duncan, Jack M., Inf.,
Baker, Robert N., AC,
Williams, Frank S., QMC,
Lindner, Kenneth R., Inf.,
Williams, Floyd D., FA,
Downey, Robert J., AC,
Linn, James W., Inf.,
Puetz, William M., Ord.,
Kerr, Billy H., FA,
Gaby, Walter E., Junior, Inf.,
Hiett, Joseph C., CWS,
Brink, Johnnie C., Inf.,
Fletcher, Joseph O., AC,
Wood, Jean L., Inf.,
Gibbs, Wells H., FA,

Duffy, David A., QMC,
Kugler, William R., QMC,
Yoder, Donn W., Inf.,
Hart, John M., FA,
Griscti, Walter E., Inf.,
Aldrich, Earle W., Inf.,
Henderson, David L., AC,
Roth, Floyd E., AC,
Schrank, Milton A., AC,
Calder, Henry L., Junior, Inf.,
Carney, Daniel J., Inf.,
Hosman, Richard S., AC,
Piper, Robert M., Inf.,
Geer, Donald L., Fin.,
Billmyer, C. D., Junior, Inf.,
Angers, Walter J., Junior, Inf.,
Kent, James R., Inf.,
Jordan, Sam P., AC,
Heard, Clovis D., Inf.,
Keirsey, Jim D., Inf.,
Crayton, Robert B., Cav.,
Kelley, Jack H., Inf.,
Syptak, Raymond A., AC,
Wilson, Lloyd G., Inf.,
Wignall, Paul R., AC,
Keeth, Eugene L., Cav.,
Brenizer, Chase, Junior, AC,
Stephens, John M., Junior, Inf.,
Snoddy, Cecil C., Cav.,
Walker, Frank E., Junior, QMC,
Nelson, Joseph W., Inf.,
Davis, Art H., Cav.,
Smith, Norvin E., Junior, Inf.,
Spann, Charles W., CAC,
Turnbull, John F., AC,
Kinney, Howard D., Junior, Inf.,
Kjelland, James O., AC,
Pickoff, Julius, AC,
Mueller, Arndt L., Inf.,
Mansell, Morris E., Junior, AC,
Dailey, Howard M., Inf.,
Brady, James F., AC,
Simpson, George H., Cav.,
Fee, Henry J., Inf.,
Balthis, Jack L., Inf.,
Murphy, Dennis E., AC,
Hitchcock, Raymond H., Inf.,
Hoffman, Robert J., Inf.,
De Puy, William E., Inf.,
Swearingen, John C., Inf.,
Stewart, Thomas N., Inf.,
Marfing, Thomas E., CWS,
Newton, Dalton F., AC,
Muller, Frank M., Cav.,
Gompf, Clayton N., Cav.,
Hiatt, Charles E., Inf.,
Harmon, David N., AC,
Spencer, Houck, Inf.,
Waters, Robert L., Inf.,
Matthews, Jack B., Inf.,
Urban, John W., Inf.
Kessler, Roy M., Inf.,
Moore, Felton H., Inf.,
Richeson, Hugh A., Ord.,
Zeigler, Robert P., Inf.,
Hutchison, Mortimer J., FA,
Cryer, James M., Junior, AC,
Siebeneichen, Paul O., Ord.,
Holmes, Francis S., Junior, AC,
Bonta, James C., Inf.,
Ayres, Harold B., Inf.,
Bruner, William P., AC,
Gunn, Frank L., Inf.,
Moore, James H., Inf.,
Burke, William, AC,
Stengele, Harry E., 3d, AC,
Hayes, Thomas F., FA,
Murray, George A., Junior, Inf.,
Davis, Ernest H., CWS,
Angwin, Keith, Inf.,
Schmedemann, Keith M., Inf.,
Kooken, John J. D., Inf.,
Walker, John K., Junior, CAC,
Maling, Robert C., FA,
Smith, Edward L., FA,
Conner, Charles R., AC,
Lowe, Henry A., CAC,
Shtogren, Anthony T., AC,
Bautz, Edward, Junior, FA,
Dale, Theodore R., AC,
Robbins, Jay T., AC,
Wreidt, Niel M., CAC,

Eairley, John J., AC,
Thomsen, Henning A., Ord.,
Herrington, William F., Inf.,
Rivette, Donald E., Inf.,
Johnson, Ivan C., FA,
Laidlow, David O., AC,
Seaton, Stuart M., FA,
Packman, James L., Inf.,
Ellis, Clarence H., Junior, FA,
West, Shelton J., AC,
Brooks, Engle R., Junior, CAC,
Herbold, Robert V., AC,
Wallace, Winston E., Inf.,
Kellman, Myron H., AC,
Dyas, John R., AC,
Knox, Robert B., AC,
Schoenfeldt, Verl B., AC
Olson, Royce G., AC,
Banbury, Richard C., AC,
Deans, Edwin G., AC,
Carpenter, Hervey B., AC,
Williams, A. F., Junior, AC,
Lindley, William C., AC,
Adamina, Robert E., AC,
Reynolds, Andrew J., AC,
McCord, Louis B., AC,
Bryson, William C., AC,
Turner, William L., AC,
Duncan, Charles H., AC,
Orr, Robert H., AC,
Blackwell, Lynn D., AC,
Robert, Wade H., Junior, AC,
Tomlinson, Franklin E., AC,
Christian, Shannon, AC,
Wemple, Neil, W., AC,
Roessell, Jack, AC,
Jantzen, Charles D., AC,
Youngblood, Lucian N., AC,
Knobloch, Richard A., AC,
Ryan, Richard E., AC,
Wisman, William W., AC,
Bailey, Malcolm A., AC,
Murray, David H., AC,
Lewis, Leon G., AC,
Bailey, William B., AC,
Bolt, William T., AC,
McIntire, Howard J., AC,
Tice, Clay, Junior, AC,
Sims, Jack A., AC,
Renick, Charles R., AC,
Reid, Charles A., AC,
Simons, William J., AC,
Harriger, Robert L., AC,
Lewis, Charles D., AC,
Cavanagh, John T., AC,
Johnson, Barney L., Junior, AC,
Case, Harvey L., Junior, AC,
Laubrich, Herman A., AC,
Latiolais, Stanley P., AC,
Habeger, Joseph E., AC,
Gill, Alfred R., AC,
Caton, Earl D., AC,
Miller, Rufus O., AC,
Stark, Smylie C., AC,
Strozier, Buddy A., AC,
Rath, George E., AC,
Gilmore, Byron H., AC,
Johnson, Oris B., AC,
Parmele, Charles C., AC,
Shaw, Charles H., AC,
Craven, Virgil E., Inf.,
Rawlinson, Bolling H., AC,
Teberg, Daniel E., AC,
Moore, Jack E., AC,
Bingham, Robert H., FA,
Kent, Herbert W., AC,
Deck, H. A., AC,
Billings, Linwood W., Inf.,
Lucier, Alphonse F., Junior, Inf.,
Latimer, Raymond L., FA,
Burnside, Barrie C., AC,
Prouty, Leroy F., Junior, AC.,
Pfeffer, Joseph M., FA,
Finley, Gibson R., FA,
Chrietzberg, Abb, FA,
Becker, Wilfred C., FA,
Jackson, Burwell B., SC,
Carhart, Thomas M., AC,
Brantley, Joseph R., AC,
Ellis, Frank W., AC,
Phippen, Daniel K., AC,
Palmblad, Frederic H., SC,

Jensen, Dale R., Ord., [redacted]
Cundiff, Ellsworth, Inf., [redacted]
Hall, James H., AC, [redacted]
Paschall, B. F., 3d, AC, [redacted]
Taylor, Tom R., AC, [redacted]
Gwynn, Philip S., AC, [redacted]
Delaney, Donald J., FA, [redacted]
Skinner, Eugene E., SC, [redacted]
Downer, William W., Ord., [redacted]
Smith, William A., AC, [redacted]
Henshaw, Philip B., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Semmens, Clifton P., CAC, [redacted]
Ledbetter, Henry F., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Smith, William E., Inf., [redacted]
Davoli, James E., AC, [redacted]
Pattillo, James L., AC, [redacted]
Gold, Norman H., QMC, [redacted]
Norris, William A., AC, [redacted]
Burley, Charles F., AC, [redacted]
Moore, Hugh C., AC, [redacted]
Harrell, Irving J., Junior, Ord., [redacted]
Appleton, Irvine, FA, [redacted]
Stevenson, Don W., FA, [redacted]
Pearson, Raymond L. V., FA, [redacted]
Withers, John L., AC, [redacted]
Daniel, Emile W., Junior, SC, [redacted]
Ellis, Rodney C., Inf., [redacted]
Rahaeuser, Charles J., SC, [redacted]
Cole, Frederick J., AC, [redacted]
Powell, William K., AC, [redacted]
Weinbrenner, George R., AC, [redacted]
Geery, Billy B., CE, [redacted]
Wilkinson, Richard G., AC, [redacted]
Eastlake, Donald E., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Lynch, Donald H., AC, [redacted]
Canfield, Robert J., FA, [redacted]
Shea, Gerald H., Inf., [redacted]
Sold, George A., FA, [redacted]
Isenson, Raymond S., CAC, [redacted]
Donahue, Patrick H., CAC, [redacted]
Moody, David B., AC, [redacted]
Donley, Edwin I., Ord., [redacted]
Claytor, Roy F., AC, [redacted]
Fraser, Powell A., Inf., [redacted]
Jolissaint, John M., AC, [redacted]
Fryer, Rex E., AC, [redacted]
Cassity, Russell, AC, [redacted]
Kyes, William B., AC, [redacted]
Colson, William B., AC, [redacted]
Belsma, Alfred D., AC, [redacted]
Wheeler, Joe D., AC, [redacted]
Wimberly, Charles L., AC, [redacted]
Shahan, Elza E., AC, [redacted]
Stevens, Kenneth R., AC, [redacted]
Beard, Dearl L., AC, [redacted]
Wallace, Robert D., AC, [redacted]
Catt, Harold J., AC, [redacted]
Gattis, Robert H., AC, [redacted]
Telzrow, Thomas E., AC, [redacted]
Treat, Mark G., AC, [redacted]
Scepansky, Joe T., AC, [redacted]
Graham, Gordon M., AC, [redacted]
Weber, Henry L., AC, [redacted]
Lund, Harold G., AC, [redacted]
Wild, Hugh E., AC, [redacted]
Hydo, Paul J., AC, [redacted]
Redman, Russell L., AC, [redacted]
Riley, Martin E., AC, [redacted]
McClellan, Howard W., AC, [redacted]
Milner, Victor, Junior, AC, [redacted]
Jackson, Willie O., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Nix, William E., AC, [redacted]
Turner, John M., AC, [redacted]
Seawell, Charles H., AC, [redacted]
Compton, William B., AC, [redacted]
Langdale, Robert H., AC, [redacted]
Thomas, Arthur D., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Gilbert G., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Kelly, Albert S., AC, [redacted]
Kline, John W., AC, [redacted]
Sapp, James F., AC, [redacted]
Mehaffey, Nathan G., AC, [redacted]
Howard, Rodger L., AC, [redacted]
Powers, Kenneth H., AC, [redacted]
Paine, John B., AC, [redacted]
Ledoux, Elzia, AC, [redacted]
Connors, Wayne S., AC, [redacted]
Muller, James L., AC, [redacted]
Harbour, David F., AC, [redacted]
Nelander, Frederick J., AC, [redacted]
Holbrook, Joseph C., Junior, AC, [redacted]

Porter, Robert A., AC, [redacted]
Wilkins, Sherman W., AC, [redacted]
Barrett, William S., FA, [redacted]
Trimble, Harry B., AC, [redacted]
Kjeldseth, Clarion J., CE, [redacted]
Ponder, Paul H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
McClellan, John B., AC, [redacted]
Garrett, Louis H., AC, [redacted]
Minch, Howard G., CAC, [redacted]
Harris, Jack H., AC, [redacted]
Nance, Nicholas H., AC, [redacted]
Mulliken, David F., Ord., [redacted]
Wheeler, Sheldon H., FA, [redacted]
Johnson, Charles C., Inf., [redacted]
Parker, Harold E., FA, [redacted]
Allen, Donald C., Inf., [redacted]
Schlosser, John R. D., QMC, [redacted]
Daniels, Edward L., AC, [redacted]
Carson, David M., Ord., [redacted]
Burney, Samuel M., Ord., [redacted]
Hilt, William M., AC, [redacted]
Hood, John R., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Brown, James J., AC, [redacted]
Williams, Ralph I., FA, [redacted]
Sampson, Allan T., AC, [redacted]
Anzelon, George J., AC, [redacted]
Boardman, Dumas H., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Neary, Elmer J., QMC, [redacted]
Conaty, Francis S., Inf., [redacted]
Harrell, Richard O., Junior, AC, [redacted]
France, Douglas C., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Hobrecht, Alfred P., FA, [redacted]
Withers, David M., AC, [redacted]
Whall, Winston G., Inf., [redacted]
Zdanzukas, Vincent R., Inf., [redacted]
Tudor, William L., AC, [redacted]
Manch, Jacob E., AC, [redacted]
Ferguson, Clay V., AC, [redacted]
White, Jack C., AC, [redacted]
Battison, W. J., Junior, CE, [redacted]
Harden, John H., Inf., [redacted]
Reppa, Robert B., Cav., [redacted]
Patterson, Douglas H., FA, [redacted]
Burris, John F., AC, [redacted]
Meanor, James B., Junior, Ord., [redacted]
Schenk, Peter J., AC, [redacted]
Austin, Oscar E., AC, [redacted]
Howell, Joseph W., AC, [redacted]
Lunceford, Sigmon A., AC, [redacted]
Sharpe, Granville A., Inf., [redacted]
Rochte, Lucian S., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Osander, Edward M., AC, [redacted]
Dix, Gerald J., AC, [redacted]
Busching, Richard W., AC, [redacted]
Bausser, William J., AC, [redacted]
Gilbert, Lawrence G., AC, [redacted]
Findley, Harry W., AC, [redacted]
McFadden, James N., AC, [redacted]
Lloyd, Marion G., AC, [redacted]
Phillips, Charles R., AC, [redacted]
Gaff, John W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Trotter, Claude A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Brocklehurst, R. L., AC, [redacted]
Brissey, Forrest L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Disher, Raymond J., AC, [redacted]
Jones, Charles O., AC, [redacted]
Wright, Frank E., AC, [redacted]
Dixon, Jacob W., AC, [redacted]
Hammond, Mahlon B., AC, [redacted]
Crowley, William F., AC, [redacted]
Cook, Edmund G., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Shick, Robert W., AC, [redacted]
Walker, Ralph L., AC, [redacted]
Goodrich, Earle A., AC, [redacted]
Riggin, Francis D., AC, [redacted]
Anderson, Nels A., AC, [redacted]
Bender, Richard C., AC, [redacted]
Hoag, George F., AC, [redacted]
Davidson, William H., AC, [redacted]
Kimbrel, Claud R., AC, [redacted]
Foster, George M., AC, [redacted]
Dallam, Welwyn, Junior, AC, [redacted]
Smith, Walter A., AC, [redacted]
Davenport, Dean, AC, [redacted]
White, Oscar E., AC, [redacted]
Benton, D. L., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Grable, John, Junior, AC, [redacted]
Massengale, W. M., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Glass, Burl E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Jordan, Charles E., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Earle M., AC, [redacted]

Hill, Kenneth E., AC, [redacted]
Roscoe, Marion F., AC, [redacted]
Hodges, Kenneth S., AC, [redacted]
Sims, John W., AC, [redacted]
Savage, Frank S., AC, [redacted]
Walsh, Howard B., AC, [redacted]
Slocumb, Clyde B., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Martin, Gene I., AC, [redacted]
Powers, Arthur D., AC, [redacted]
Hunter, James E., AC, [redacted]
Liebman, David I., AC, [redacted]
Vinzant, Warren E., AC, [redacted]
Berger, Jack C., AC, [redacted]
Watkins, James A., AC, [redacted]
Keefe, Thomas W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Van Pelt, James H., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Aley L., SC, [redacted]
St. Clair, Carney E., AC, [redacted]
Sharp, Paul E., FA, [redacted]
Burke, James L., SC, [redacted]
Silman, James B., QMC, [redacted]
Hidalgo, Stanley P., Inf., [redacted]
Huey, Sam L., AC, [redacted]
Aycock, William B., FA, [redacted]
Riddle, Samuel S., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Datnoff, Arthur R., Inf., [redacted]
Jenkins, James R., CAC, [redacted]
Kinney, George W., AC, [redacted]
Easley, Claudius M., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Anderson, George K., CAC, [redacted]
Baldwin, Garde B., AC, [redacted]
Beaumont, Harry C., Inf., [redacted]
Maier, Oscar L., WO, AC, [redacted]
Ross, Finlay F., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Carney, Arthur W., AC, [redacted]
Scanlon, Blair F., Inf., [redacted]
McClure, Richard, Inf., [redacted]
Healey, James F., AC, [redacted]
Rose, Charles E., QMC, [redacted]
Brooks, Charles A., AC, [redacted]
Johnston, Kingsley M., AC, [redacted]
Aykroyd, Albert W., Cav., [redacted]
Froeschle, Helmuth O., Inf., [redacted]
Hill, John M., AC, [redacted]
Rehrer, Harvey E., AC, [redacted]
Carroll, Joel A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Furchner, Fred T., AC, [redacted]
Hull, William T., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Jones, Edward L., AC, [redacted]
Buckwalter, Raymond E., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Robert W., AC, [redacted]
Jones, Edward M., AC, [redacted]
Harris, Ernest A., AC, [redacted]
Barber, Rex T., AC, [redacted]
Snell, Gale E., AC, [redacted]
Morgan, Roy, AC, [redacted]
Holbert, Kenneth W., AC, [redacted]
Metcalfe, Lee E., AC, [redacted]
Taylor, Oliver D., AC, [redacted]
Duren, Elton W., Inf., [redacted]
Keene, Thomas J., AC, [redacted]
Sheeks, Robert M., AC, [redacted]
Griffin, Joseph H., AC, [redacted]
Rydstrom, Jean F., AC, [redacted]
McKinnis, Burdette J., AC, [redacted]
Seeds, Dale S., AC, [redacted]
Duncan, Earl D., AC, [redacted]
Rasor, Frank J. P., AC, [redacted]
Van Deusen, George H., AC, [redacted]
Scott, Wendell H., AC, [redacted]
Willey, Carl R., AC, [redacted]
Grubaugh, Boyd L., AC, [redacted]
Brown, Charles W., AC, [redacted]
McCord, Robert R., AC, [redacted]
Lollar, Clarence L., AC, [redacted]
French, John, AC, [redacted]
Newman, Ralph F., AC, [redacted]
Morris, Paul H., AC, [redacted]
Schultz, Leonard C., AC, [redacted]
Smith, B. J., AC, [redacted]
McClernon Glen J., AC, [redacted]
Christ, Charles M., AC, [redacted]
Bailey, Frank A., AC, [redacted]
Vaughan, William R., AC, [redacted]
Farnham, Sheldon W., AC, [redacted]
Williams, William I., AC, [redacted]
Settles, Ben H., AC, [redacted]
Eggleston, Donald E., AC, [redacted]
McKee, Daniel D., AC, [redacted]
Petrovich, John R., AC, [redacted]
Bastian, Earl L., AC, [redacted]

Ferguson, Robert I., AC,
Jones, Paul A., AC,
Sherman, Lenard A., AC,
McClelland, Harold M., AC,
Garrigan, Robert J., AC,
Sill, Leo G., AC,
De Bord, Robert L., AC,
Carmody, Richard J., AC,
Van Wyk, Arthur J., AC,
Welch, George C., AC,
Robie, John W., AC,
Popovich, Taras T., AC,
Crestadoro, M. A., Junior, AC,
Kinnaird, Virgil G., Junior, AC,
Loisel, John S., AC,
Tyler, Morgan S., Junior, AC,
Palmer, Garnet B., AC,
Rood, Ralph W., AC,
Van Dyke, Edward A., AC,
Streete, Alec B., AC,
Beale, William H., Junior, AC,
Dawson, Peter P., AC,
Bounds, William F., AC,
Perry, Edward A., AC,
Markey, Edward W., Inf.,
Greeley, Donald H., Ord.,
Newell, Robert L., Inf.,
Bolender, Carroll H., AC,
King, Ernest S., SC,
Snyder, Vincent L., AC,
Schulte, Henry G., FA,
Counselman, Orville L., AC.,
Merrill, Charles T., AC,
Purkitt, Claude H., FA,
Knowles, Yancey H., QMC,
Ligon, Lawrence R., CAC,
Lightner, Lawrence S., AC,
Derey, Cloyd H., AC,
Standifer, Lee R., Junior, AC,
Paige, Harold W., AC,
Homburg, Albert H., Junior, Inf.,
Reid, Samuel L., CAC,
Austin, Benton M., Inf.,
Wilson, Frank B., FA,
Gundlach, Robert L., Inf.,
Gooldy, Penn L., Junior, AC,
Williams, W. L., 3d, Ord.,
Datres, Eugene B., SC,
Parris, Howard L., AC,
Cocke, James W., Cav.,
Todd, William E., AC,
Abbott, Nathan M., AC,
Havel, Frank L., Ord.,
Brownfield, Albert W., AC,
Clarke, Ritchie H., Inf.,
Edmunds, James M., CAC,
Franklin, George H., QMC,
Mears, James F., AC,
Lassiter, Charles B., AC,
Moore, Clayton H., Junior, SC,
McDonald, M., Junior, Inf.,
Trail, Charles D., FA,
Bowden, Theodore W., AC,
Stanford, Marvin N., CAC,
Taylor, Richard, AC,
Strickland, James M. S., Inf.,
Benedict, Maurice S., AC,
Brannock, Joseph F., AC,
Stough, Charles S., Junior, Inf.,
Cravens, Gerald M., SC,
Lian, Elmer T., Inf.,
Hankins, Curtis L., Inf.,
Tilley, George F., Junior, AC,
Coss, Walter L., AC,
Gehrig, Raymond M., AC,
Stoddard, Edward F., AC,
Adams, Alan F., AC,
Courtney, Ralph H., CAC,
Stubbs, Claude M., AC,
Foster, William W., Junior, AC,
Johnson, Lynwood M., Junior, Inf.,
Sipes, Richard R., AC,
Suddeth, David A., AC,
McDowell, Bert, Junior, AC,
Fay, Fergus C., AC,
McDowell, William D., Inf.,
Stewart, Thomas H. 3d, Cav.,
Otten, Leonard J., Junior, SC,
Simpson, Harold B., AC,
Boedeker, Charles W., AC,
Greiner, Paul E., AC,

Thacker, Robert E., AC,
Truscott, James C., AC,
Gorham, John D., Junior, AC,
Gregory, Samuel S., Junior, CAC,
Roberts, F. C., Junior, AC,
Heatwole, James W., SC,
Taylor, Charles E., AC,
McDaniel, H. A., Junior, AC,
Richardson, Harold W., AC,
Tyler, Robert A., AC,
Browning, James M., Inf.,
Scarbrough, Ben A., AC,
Gaynor, Wayne J., Junior, FA,
Allen, Charles G., AC,
Ambrose, Elmer E., AC,
Baumgardner, Brucs K., AC,
Pruitt, Harold A., AC,
Riha, Amos F., AC,
Shoop, Richard R., AC,
Wooley, Preston B., AC,
Evans, Harry L., Junior,
Whitworth, T. C., Junior, FA,
Roberts, Cecil E., Inf.,
Kreiger, Andrew E., Junior, AC,
McDonald, Everett A., AC,
Sather, Harley, AC,
Medvedeff, Harold C., AC,
Shaefer, Robert R., AC,
Tisdale, Paul A., AC,
Myers, Albert F., FA,
Spawn, Douglas W., AC,
Beery, Harold F., AC,
Smith, Herman F., AC,
Rice, Arthur T., AC,
Frizen, John E., AC,
Hall, Robert T., Junior, AC,
Hatfield, Douglas H., AC,
Stafford, Robert F., AC,
Good, Donald E., AC,
Catton, Jack J., AC,
White, Stanley W., Inf.,
Thrift, John C., AC,
Aiken, Albert S., AC,
Hathorn, Vernon B., Junior, AC,
Fisher, Russell F., AC,
Thompson, Frederic C., Inf.,
Powell, William H., Junior, AC,
Hankins, Grat B., Inf.,
Ferry, Allan B., Inf.,
Naselroad, Winfred C., QMC,
Morgan, John J., Inf.,
Timmons, Gordon D., AC,
Nelson, Conrad N., AC,
Orr, Daniel B., AC,
Bird, Daniel C., Inf.,
Cudlipp, Charles L., Ord.,
Thompson, Kenneth D., AC,
Tiede, Richard E., AC,
Harrelson, Jay B., AC,
Boylan, George S., Junior, AC,
Shaver, Dale A., AC,
Moore, Alan D., AC,
Harper, Earl L., Inf.,
Jacoby, Joseph H., AC,
Drewry, Guy H., Junior, Ord.,
McComas, Edward O., AC,
Hardage, Quentin R., Inf.,
Martin, James T., AC,
Wall, Wallace, Junior, AC,
Brownyard, Fred R., FA,
Burgess, Albert F., Junior, SC,
Hancock, Daniel W., SC,
Williams, Walter P., AC,
Wise, Jowell C., AC,
Whisonant, William B., AC,
Rubottom, Donald C., Inf.,
Huber, Paul M., AC,
Bruce, Sidney C., AC,
Milloy, Albert E., Inf.,
Bertran, William E., AC,
Liles, Robert L., AC,
Reyes, Antonio V., FA,
Rathbun, Wayne H., AC,
Ruark, William E., Junior, AC,
White, Maynard E., AC,
Wilder, Harlan C., AC,
Hawkins, Harry L., AC,
Hench, Ralph V., AC,
Castle, Edmund, CAC,
Spillner, Siegfried H., Inf.,
Noel, Dana E., AC,

Couch, Llewellyn H., AC,
Gildee, John J., Junior, Inf.,
Toler, Richard G., AC,
Dwight, William A., Inf.,
Arnold, Hugh C., AC,
Garrett, Leonard E., Inf.,
Dzamba, John P., AC,
Fain, Robert S., AC,
Deegan, Leo F., AC,
Coe, Grover K., AC,
Adams, Bill R., AC,
Price, Edward C., AC,
Roy, Clyde, AC,
Osgard, James L., Inf.,
Hockett, Chester A., AC,
Kimbell, Earl S., AC,
Neely, Dale, AC,
Larkin, John J., AC,
Smith, William J., CAC,
Laughlin, Joseph L., AC,
Blinn, Ashley A., FA,
Deason, Robert H., FA,
Berman, Alvin L., AC,
Wolters, Elmer H., AC,
Sage, Jerry M., Inf.,
Shivers, Julius D., Junior, AC,
Dregne, Irwin H., AC,
Franz, Fred J., AC,
Fredericks, Jacob W., AC,
Krause, Lester L., Junior, AC,
Patton, William W., AC,
Yarsky, Melvin J., AC,
Snyder, Edgar E., Junior, AC,
Farrar, John W., AC,
Anderson, Delynn E., AC,
Halloran, Robert P., AC,
Geary, Leo P., AC,
Stansbury, Jay W., AC,
Williams, James M., AC,
Strickler, Marshall H., AC,
Waldmire, Henry W., AC,
Tilley, Thomas M., AC,
Small, Arthur, AC,
Sullivan, W. T., Junior, AC,
Radetsky, Harold A., AC,
Omohundro, Thomas T., AC,
Uhrich, George A., AC,
Roth, John Y. C., AC,
Kelly, Converse B., AC,
Riva, Daniel F., AC,
Rathbun, Edward L., AC,
Crawford, Robert N., QMC,
Tainsh, Alexander S., AC,
Ferguson, Robert M., AC,
Slocum, Paul J., AC,
Douglas, Paul P., Junior, AC,
Ritchie, William D., AC,
Chapin, John M., AC,
Roddy, Edward F., AC,
Whittaker, Roy E., AC,
Durbeck, Arthur G., AC,
Mitchell, Mack A., AC,
Glyer, John R., AC,
Renwick, Donald D., AC,
Wymond, Gilbert O., Junior, Cav.,
Klein, Raymond P., AC,
Walsh, Martin R., Junior, AC,
Willetts, David L., AC,
Calhoun, William R., Junior, AC,
Ramsey, Glyn W., AC,
Carey, John A., AC,
Smith, Martin L., Junior, AC,
Gaston, Arthur D., AC,
Marks, Leonard P., AC,
Dunham, William D., AC,
Cook, Walter V., AC,
Little, James W., AC,
Killen, Leo W., AC,
Gregory, James M., AC,
Williams, Charles C., AC,
Johnson, Charles W., AC,
Cruikshank, A. W., Junior, AC,
McGee, Donald C., AC,
Wright, Theodore R., AC,
Williams, Marvin E., Inf.,
Hawkins, William B., Junior, AC,
Aenchbacher, Arthur E., AC,
Oglesby, Sam R., Junior, AC,
Carter, Washington C., Inf.,
Pressentin, Vernon F., FA,
Thorne, James H., AC,

Dumas, James L., AC,
House, A. T., Junior, AC,
Rogers, Robert C., AC,
Carpenter, David E., AC,
Hutchison, Jacob A., AC,
Teubner, Harold C., AC,
Robertson, Raynor E., AC,
Neece, Richard D., Junior, AC,
Hollingsworth, Dal O., AC,
Gohmert, Roland L., Junior, Inf.,
Long, Albert R., AC,
Craven, Charles W., AC,
Bones, James C., AC,
Tarvin, Russell W., AC,
Cranfill, Niven K., AC,
Palmer, James M., AC,
Crosland, Roy T., AC,
Martin, Fred A., AC,
McAbee, William H., AC,
Ziler, William D., Inf.,
Beahan, Kermit K., AC,
Ard, Roswell W., AC,
Waszak, Edwin J., Inf.,
Moore, James M., Junior, AC,
White, Foster L., AC,
Knowles, Richard T., FA,
Goewey, Donald C., AC,
Dean, John W., Junior, FA,
Peters, Gustov W., FA,
Lucas, Walter Y., AC,
Larson, Harold J., AC,
Bieber, Russell S., QMC,
Barfield, Thomas H., CAC,
Greer, Howard W., Inf.,
Knox, George L., AC,
Lee, James H., Cav.,
Jackson, Howard E., AC,
Stell, Glenn A., AC,
Dobbins, Edward L., Inf.,
Hodge, Dexter L., AC,
Hayes, Burgain G., AC,
Robinson, James B., Junior, AC,
Sims, Ralph, Inf.,
Brown, Harold L., AC,
Hey, Winson S., AC,
Glaser, Leonard T., AC,
Dieffenderfer, J. C., AC,
Weltzin, Richard F., AC,
Johnson, Leonard L., Inf.,
Parsons, Samuel P., AC,
Des Portes, John A., AC,
Kennedy, William D., Junior, CAC,
Smith, Phillip R., CAC,
Patterson, Fred, CAC,
Perry, Ben W., CAC,
Hardin, Ernest C., Junior, AC,
Von Burg, Robert H., Cav.,
Cook, George L., QMC,
Shaw, Clayton A., FA,
Weeks, James L., AC,
Blazzard, Howard C., Inf.,
Cook, Gordon W., QMC,
Williamson, George A., AC,
Stephens, Albert T., QMC,
Bruley, Henry L., Inf.,
Snetzer, Robert E., CE,
Roth, Myron A., AC,
Gardiner, Paul E., AC,
Gilbert, Raymond A., AC,
Pricer, Donald C., AC,
Fallwell, Marshall L., CWS,
Soskey, Alphonse A., Fin.,
Brabson, Kimberly, FA,
Hamblen, William, AC,
Allen, Frank M., AC,
Howes, Francis B., Junior, AC,
Selden, Littleton C., AC,
Thompson, Dan F., AC,
Black, William M., AC,
Brodie, George F., Junior, AC,
Guyer, Loren E., AC,
Meggs, Ernest L., Inf.,
Sabolyk, Robert, Inf.,
Heuberger, Newton J., Inf.,
Jones, Randolph L., Inf.,
Gibson, Thomas A., Junior, CWS,
Benfield, John K., Junior, Inf.,
Nunn, John W., AC,
Wood, William P., AC,
Svore, Ferdinand L., AC,
Coonan, Daniel J., Junior, AC,
Lyle, James W., FA,
Krebs, John L., AC,
O'Hea, John T., CAC,
Hutsinpiller, H. H., Inf.,
Copeland, James R., AC,
Thom, Albert N., AC,
Thomson, Donald E., FA,
Thompson, Raymond G., AC,
Nestor, Vergil N., AC,
Tibbs, Charles E., AC,
Ramsay, Robert H., SC,
Neil, Charles V., AC,
Hunter, Floyd W., Junior, AC,
Williams, De J., AC,
MacKay, Neill C., AC,
Peck, Fred R., Junior, AC,
Sabin, Flavel P., AC,
Relfe, Robert W., AC,
Johnston, George H., AC,
Beal, J. Mac, AC,
Papania, Ralph, Junior, AC,
Sorte, Martin E., AC,
Britton, Wilbur R., AC,
Ramer, John L., AC,
Redd, Thomas L., Junior, SC,
Roberts, Sam A., AC,
Lewis, Stanley C., AC,
Martin, Lloyd, Junior, AC,
Winkler, John M., AC,
Tanberg, Lawrence F., AC,
Johnson, Neil R., AC,
Whitehorn, K. W., AC,
Magness, Ped G., AC,
McGuire, Troy B., AC,
Saliba, Ernest J., AC,
Rankin, Warner F., Junior, AC,
Burns, Harold W., AC,
Fischer, Henry A., Junior, AC,
Forbes, Daniel H., Junior, AC,
King, Max J., AC,
Parr, Stanley F., Inf.,
Atherton, Holt, AC,
Payne, Carl W., AC,
Cook, Leo W., AC,
Tucker, Norman P., AC,
Witsell, Edward F., Junior, AC,
Paulson, Myhre E., AC,
Mansfield, Richard M., AC,
Morris, Robert C., Junior, AC,
Yarbrough, Walter R., AC,
Quimby, James O., Junior, CWS,
Fulmer, Hoyt L., Junior, QMC,
Browning, Earl S., Junior, Inf.,
Boston, Joffre H., Inf.,
Van Dusen, Roy R., Junior, Inf.,
Rees, James B., FA,
Selenger, Walter K., AC,
Gallogly, William F., AC,
Hensley, William N, AC,
Waters, William P., Junior, QMC,
Barlow, Lester E., Inf.,
Cronin, Henry J., FA,
Kline, Richard B., FA,
Jack, Chester A., AC,
Schroeder, Martin F., Inf.,
Roberts, Ben H., AC,
Leugers, George W., FA,
Lee, Richard M., Inf.,
Bailey, Jack L., QMC,
Roberts, Samuel H., Inf.,
Perry, Bruce L., Fin.,
Kullmar, Malcolm, Inf.,
Merrill, Earle B., QMC,
Key, William D., AC,
Allard, David W., Inf.,
Hollstein, Jean W., Inf.,
Meier, Arthur C., FA,
Lowe, Herbert S., Inf.,
Doupe, Robert L., Inf.,
Kennedy, Paul R., Inf.,
Thomas, Arthur J., Fin.,
Dannelly, Frank P., AC,
Ulrich, Fred R., Inf.,
Taylor, Fitz G., AC,
Keleher, William P., Inf.,
Sheffield, Paul R., Ord.,
McEvoy, Robert W., Ord.,
Webb, Robert M., FA,
Neubauer, William C., SC,
Pearce, Charles, 3d, AC,
Du Fresne, Roland J., AC,
O'Connell, William H., FA,
Hoover, James O., Inf.,
Cody, George R., Inf.,
Butler, Ernest C., QMC,
Vandebogart, Warren M., AC,
Lucas, Henry E., AC,
Chappelle, Thomas O., CAC,
Harmon, Clarence L., Junior, AC,
Beaman, Horace E., FA,
Roberts, Robert V., Fin.,
Wagstaff, Jack J., Inf.,
Campbell, Gay, QMC,
Dunn, Edward T., AC,
Brookreson, Wade Y., Inf.,
Dreiss, Edward, FA,
Haynes, Nathan C., Junior, AC,
Blaney, Kermit B., Inf.,
Thomas, Harry J., AC,
Robertson, Gavan C., Junior, AC,
Myers, Raymond B., AC,
Sullivan, Robert J., AC,
Kucheman, Henry B., Junior, AC,
Shumway, John R., AC,
Grimes, William L., QMC,
Berglund, Arnold A., QMC,
Hardin, Fariss, Inf.,
Vivian, Edward A., AC,
Nolan, Robert J., AC,
Sinskie, Daniel A., AC,
Schmidt, Ferdinand R., AC,
Simmons, Hal F., AC,
Tahsequah, Meech, AC,
Keefer, William E., AC,
Thury, Joseph L., AC,
Anderson, John H., AC,
Johnston, Robert D., AC,
Randall, Burr J., Junior, FA,
Ferguson, Roy E., AC,
Jensen, Willard C., AC,
MacQueen, Laurence P., FA,
Hokenson, Charles K., Inf.,
Ramsel, Arthur J., FA,
Wilson, Richard A., AC,
Clark, Gordon B., AC,
Merritt, Herchel R., AC,
Gruetzemacher, R. O., AC,
Raines, Martin L., FA,
McCorkle, Howell P., AC,
Tyson, John, AC,
Sammet, George, Junior, FA,
Cronkhite, John L., AC,
Minton, Heber L., Inf.,
Summers, Charles L., AC,
McCulla, Robert W., AC,
Foulk, John D., Inf.,
Clary, Ralph L., AC,
Gladstone, James T., AC,
Wilson, Edward L., Junior, AC,
Sorey, Robert L., AC,
Price, Thomas J., AC,
Simpson, Drewry N., AC,
Johnson, Donald L., Inf.,
Smith, William R., AC,
Turner, Stevens H., AC,
Suggs, Ralph G., AC,
McClure, Paul J., Junior, Inf.,
Heske, Richard F., Inf.,
Dunn, Lamar J., AC,
Palm, Eugene W., Inf.,
Lingo, Jack W., AC,
Hubbard, Joseph E., AC,
Skousen, Samuel J., AC,
Vail, Edwin W., Inf.,
Williamson, James B., SC,
Roberts, George T., Junior, AC,
Nye, Francis W., AC,
Ellis, Eugene B., AC,
Carroll, John W., AC,
Downing, Harry L., Junior, AC,
Beard, William A., AC,
Adams, Albert C., Junior, AC,
Robinson, John W., AC,
Oldham, Nile W., Junior, AC,
Bruns, Roy H., AC,
Boyer, Max W., AC,
Herman, Boyd F., AC,
Woods, Willie G., Junior, AC,
Watkins, John J., AC,
Davis, William F., AC,

Anderson, Brooks D., Inf., [redacted]
Watson, Foster B., Fin., [redacted]
Lown, Franklin D., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Urban, John A., AC, [redacted]
Leaverton, George B., AC, [redacted]
Williams, Daniel B., CAC, [redacted]
Baccus, George W., QMC, [redacted]
Nichols, Frederick K., SC, [redacted]
Redheffer, George E., CAC, [redacted]
Appold, Norman C., AC, [redacted]
Allyn, Robert H., AC, [redacted]
Allison, Royal B., AC, [redacted]
Abernethy, Robert J., AC, [redacted]
Reber, Marlen E., AC, [redacted]
Miller, Jerry D., AC, [redacted]
McDonald, John R., AC, [redacted]
Baumgardner, Myron L., AC, [redacted]
Wockenfuss, Wilbur E., AC, [redacted]
Harding, John B., AC, [redacted]
Thomas, Bruce K., CWS, [redacted]
McGill, John R., AC, [redacted]
Vickers, Laverne D., AC, [redacted]
Barrow, Thomas A., FA, [redacted]
Thompson, Shelden L., Inf., [redacted]
McLeod, Eldon L., Inf., [redacted]
Ward, Robert J., QMC, [redacted]
Byrne, Eugene W., AC, [redacted]
Bennett, Warren K., Inf., [redacted]
Grant, John C., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Morrison, John E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Diamantes, Thomas, Inf., [redacted]
Drake, Robert M., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Darby, James A., AC, [redacted]
Gussie, Michael, Inf., [redacted]
Harvey, Julian A., AC, [redacted]
Gower, Wilford D., Inf., [redacted]
Fredrikson, Graydon F., Inf., [redacted]
Barton, Terry R., AC, [redacted]
Correll, Tommy E., AC, [redacted]
Alexander, Donald, AC, [redacted]
Oneil, Donald E., AC, [redacted]
McGuire, Paul M., Inf., [redacted]
Ward, Oliver C., AC, [redacted]
Begg, Charles F. H., AC, [redacted]
Brake, Ralph W., Inf., [redacted]
Durham, Ernest E., Inf., [redacted]
Coleman, William S., Inf., [redacted]
Marsiglia, Joseph P., AC, [redacted]
Reid, Robert D., QMC., [redacted]
Simmons, Wesley J., Inf., [redacted]
Hessberger, George W., Inf., [redacted]
Paap, Donald H., AC, [redacted]
Marchesi, William, AC, [redacted]
Bradley, Raymond A., AC, [redacted]
Ritter, Lattie A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Walker, George C., Inf., [redacted]
Hensley, Emery M., Inf., [redacted]
Slade, Alliston. AC, [redacted]
Barker, Stephen R., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Welling, William B., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Scullion, J. D., AC., [redacted]
Cary, Charles M., AC, [redacted]
Massengale, Herbert W., AC, [redacted]
Brown, Ralph L., AC, [redacted]
Odren, Harry M., AC, [redacted]
Reed, Donald A., AC, [redacted]
Chairsell, William S., AC, [redacted]
King, Donald H., AC, [redacted]
Halton, William T., AC, [redacted]
Du Bois, William J., AC, [redacted]
Hughel, George K., AC, [redacted]
Cowles, Donald H., Cav., [redacted]
Barthel, Carl C., AC, [redacted]
Cook, Charles W., CAC, [redacted]
Bryan, Albert H., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Kinder, Albert E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Abbott, Raymond J., AC, [redacted]
Ford, Harry E., Fin., [redacted]
Hume, Robert A., AC, [redacted]
Bell, Carl H., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Bushue, Bernard J., AC, [redacted]
Brainerd, Jackson W., AC, [redacted]
Armbrust, Carl W., AC, [redacted]
Huston, Laverne F., AC, [redacted]
Regan, John M., AC, [redacted]
Schulstad, Louis M., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Walters, Joe P., AC, [redacted]
Blakely, Everett E., AC, [redacted]
Lindberg, James O., AC, [redacted]
Glover, Donald S., AC, [redacted]
Whipple, Donald E., AC, [redacted]

Tueller, Jack L., AC, [redacted]
Stewart, John S., AC, [redacted]
Belongia, Blair, G., AC, [redacted]
Pedersen, James C., AC, [redacted]
Williams, Lee R., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Scott, Robert R., AC, [redacted]
Powell, Russell, AC, [redacted]
King, Arthur J., CAC, [redacted]
Jones, Wayland, Junior, FA, [redacted]
Gray, Billy C., AC, [redacted]
Baker, William V., AC, [redacted]
Fross, Horton L., AC, [redacted]
Leary, Richard E., AC, [redacted]
Dean, Philip F., Inf., [redacted]
Sweetland, Earle E., AC, [redacted]
Hoffman, John M., AC, [redacted]
Gardinier, Russell J., AC, [redacted]
Fiumara, James M., AC, [redacted]
Wheeler, Frederick G., AC, [redacted]
Shimanek, Robert J., AC, [redacted]
Lavens, William L., AC, [redacted]
Butts, Earl A., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Roy E., FA, [redacted]
Swiren, Alfred M., AC, [redacted]
Artiglia, Aldo, AC, [redacted]
Robbins, Robert A., Inf., [redacted]
Zagorsky, Stanley C., AC, [redacted]
Griffin, Ralph H., AC, [redacted]
Payne, Gordon L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Crawford, Kenneth C., FA, [redacted]
Edholm, Robert M., AC, [redacted]
King, Lester S., AC, [redacted]
Bell, Marion S., Inf., [redacted]
Gunther, Robert W., AC, [redacted]
Grant, Wilburn E., Inf., [redacted]
Dereus, Clarence C., Inf., [redacted]
Boyle, Thaddeus A., Inf., [redacted]
Bone, Howard C., Cav., [redacted]
Norman, Brooks O., Cav., [redacted]
Nickell, John S., Cav., [redacted]
McNamara, Harry, Junior, Cav., [redacted]
McNally, Joseph D., QMC, [redacted]
Anderson, Charles L., QMC, [redacted]
Sharp, Daniel F., AC, [redacted]
Branch, Matthew D., Inf., [redacted]
Miller, Paul B., AC, [redacted]
Kadel, Edgar R., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Taylor, Neil, Inf., [redacted]
Kay, Marvin E., AC, [redacted]
White, William T., AC, [redacted]
Junker, Jules X., 3d, AC, [redacted]
Simmons, Herbert W., AC, [redacted]
Wicklund, Harold A., AC, [redacted]
Tipton, Richard P., AC, [redacted]
Shubin, Murray J., AC, [redacted]
Rowe, Gerald W., CAC, [redacted]
Ducey, Donald L., CAC, [redacted]
Woods, James R., CAC, [redacted]
Carter, John D., AC, [redacted]
Sweet, William J., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Stielau, Walter E., Fin., [redacted]
Gannon, John E., AC, [redacted]
Dougherty, Edward J., SC, [redacted]
Armour, Jack C., Fin., [redacted]
Hansen, Chester B., Inf., [redacted]
Speirs, Ronald C., Inf., [redacted]
Schrader, Jerome W., Inf., [redacted]
Stephens, Sidney A., AC, [redacted]
Meara, William D., Cav., [redacted]
Larson, Harold B., AC, [redacted]
North, Charles A., AC, [redacted]
Otto, Stanford J., AC, [redacted]
Davis, Henry P., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Gordon, Preston O., Inf., [redacted]
Campbell, William A., AC, [redacted]
Pennington, Donald J., AC, [redacted]
Bigart, Robert J., Inf., [redacted]
Winter, Waldron J., Inf., [redacted]
Mulroney, Frank A., Inf., [redacted]
Cline, Harold F., AC, [redacted]
Hansley, Frank W., AC, [redacted]
Kuykendall, J. W., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Lekson, John S., Inf., [redacted]
DuBose, Edward E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Reed, John P., FA, [redacted]
Walters, John W. B., FA, [redacted]
Canary, Monford M., QMC, [redacted]
Milberg, Arthur W., FA, [redacted]
Hanna, Loyd G., QMC, [redacted]
Bennett, William, Inf., [redacted]
Kruger, Carl W., QMC, [redacted]

Boomer, Eugene F., CAC, [redacted]
Hopper, Roy J., AC, [redacted]
Casart, William M., QMC, [redacted]
Zakel, John, Junior, Cav., [redacted]
Tolbert, Stanley R., Fin., [redacted]
Scovill, Elmer B., Inf., [redacted]
Cross, Kenneth W., QMC, [redacted]
Niles, Richard H., QMC, [redacted]
Hemingway, Jack W., Inf., [redacted]
Curtis, Lewis A., AC, [redacted]
Totten, Jerry M., AC, [redacted]
Ariano, Richard A., AC, [redacted]
Moseley, Woodford T., CWS, [redacted]
Patten, Clarence W., Inf., [redacted]
Steiner, Fred G., Inf., [redacted]
Harlan, Robert D., CAC, [redacted]
Jones, Jerome J., AC, [redacted]
Matson, Wayne, AC, [redacted]
Parkerson, Eugene C., AC, [redacted]
Staebell, Edward F., AC, [redacted]
Brown, Jack R., AC, [redacted]
Hunter, William A., AC, [redacted]
Weatherford, Sydney W., AC, [redacted]
Beall, Lewis S., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Sydney P., AC, [redacted]
Westmoreland, L. Q., AC, [redacted]
Beary, Kermit E., AC, [redacted]
Biberstein, Arthur L., AC, [redacted]
Bragg, Russel M., AC, [redacted]
Klemme, Meade, AC, [redacted]
Barnes, Roy I., AC, [redacted]
Black, John L., AC, [redacted]
Burgeson, Darell G., AC, [redacted]
Eells, Irving C., AC, [redacted]
Hancock, Jack L., AC, [redacted]
Sanford, Raymond P., AC, [redacted]
Gleason, Frank A., Junior, Ord., [redacted]
Howell, Maurice W., Cav., [redacted]
Reed, James W., QMC, [redacted]
Johnson, Frederic E., QMC, [redacted]
Denchfield, Robert D., QMC, [redacted]
Hollinger, L. E., AC, [redacted]
Phillips, Adolph H., Inf., [redacted]
Jarvis, Melvin E., AC, [redacted]
Jones, Fred G., AC, [redacted]
Midkiff, Richard L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Blair, Hubert M., AC, [redacted]
Jeffrey, Arthur F., AC, [redacted]
Myers, Joseph, AC, [redacted]
Vestal, Howard L., AC, [redacted]
Benz, Walter G., AC, [redacted]
Campbell, Richard A., AC, [redacted]
Dauphin, Ray, AC, [redacted]
Johnson, Gerald W., AC, [redacted]
Mahurin, Walker M., AC, [redacted]
Vogt, John W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Kehoe, Nicholas B., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Stewart, James T., AC, [redacted]
Ayers, Jerry H., AC, [redacted]
Rhodes, William J., AC, [redacted]
Fackler, Robert F., AC, [redacted]
Green, Herschel H., AC, [redacted]
Long, Benjamin F., AC, [redacted]
McCord, George E., AC, [redacted]
Rogers, William B., AC, [redacted]
Taylor, Ralph G., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Carlton, Paul K., AC, [redacted]
Curry, James H., AC, [redacted]
Gallmeier, Charles F., AC, [redacted]
Hewett, Henry B., AC, [redacted]
Kendig, Robert E., AC, [redacted]
Rex, John L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Richmond, George M., AC, [redacted]
Setterich, Jack, AC, [redacted]
Alexander, Wiley L., AC, [redacted]
Carter, Walter T., AC, [redacted]
Crumm, William J., AC, [redacted]
Long, James A., AC, [redacted]
Nettles, Bydie J., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Reecher, Kenneth A., AC, [redacted]
Schuyler, Dean H., AC, [redacted]
Barnes, John W., AC, [redacted]
Bartos, Edmund J., AC, [redacted]
Turner, Barney E., AC, [redacted]
Clymer, Harvey C., AC, [redacted]
Jones, William J., AC, [redacted]
Robins, Nathaniel B., AC, [redacted]
Cosner, Richard E., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Barney, William S., AC, [redacted]
Abeloff, Lester G., AC, [redacted]
Koepp, Harry J., AC, [redacted]

Millin, John A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Jones, Dorrie E., AC, [redacted]
Parthum, Alfred H., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Dimel, James J., AC, [redacted]
Rodgers, Louis N., FA, [redacted]
Corrie, Wirt H., AC, [redacted]
Kandel, Alfred, AC, [redacted]
Gibson, Richard C., AC, [redacted]
Crosby, John W., AC, [redacted]
Berenson, Morris, AC, [redacted]
Maze, Charles L., AC, [redacted]
Denham, William O., CAC, [redacted]
Hyde, Radford D., Inf., [redacted]
Yeates, William E., AC, [redacted]
Koch, Harry E., AC, [redacted]
Thurston, Joseph W., AC, [redacted]
Grace, James D., AC, [redacted]
Dufour, Jerome P., AC, [redacted]
Coen, Oscar H., AC, [redacted]
Neumann, James D., Inf., [redacted]
Bilotta, Joseph P., AC, [redacted]
McKean, William A., Inf., [redacted]
Poole, Edgar R., Inf., [redacted]
Watkins, Morris H., AC., [redacted]
Lynn, William J., Cav., [redacted]
Moore, Milton R., AC, [redacted]
Boyd, Harwell L., Junior, SC, [redacted]
Briten, Roy C., Fin., [redacted]
Tallon, William P., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Livingston, Robert P., AC, [redacted]
Tyson, James L., AC, [redacted]
Briel, Karl L., AC, [redacted]
Hall, Abner J., Ord., [redacted]
Sutton, George M., CAC, [redacted]
Shannon, Robert M., Inf., [redacted]
Spiker, Robert C., Inf., [redacted]
Fickessen, Jack W., Cav., [redacted]
Murray, Jack H., Junior, SC, [redacted]
Melton, F. C., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Tally, William S., AC, [redacted]
Tippen, Forrest W., AC, [redacted]
Knox, Richard F., AC, [redacted]
Ator, Dexter L., QMC, [redacted]
Loeffler, Victor J., Inf., [redacted]
Duty, Clifton O., CWS, [redacted]
Titley, Richard J., CAC, [redacted]
Cooper, George T., FA, [redacted]
Pappas, Thomas R., AC, [redacted]
Arbogast, Thomas J., AC, [redacted]
Bond, John R. F., Ord., [redacted]
Johnston, William F., Inf., [redacted]
Walck, Richard E., AC, [redacted]
Milotta, David E., Inf., [redacted]
MacDonald, Earle F., AC, [redacted]
Andersen, Eldon B., FA, [redacted]
Tilton, Rollin J., Ord., [redacted]
Whitmore, Harry E., Ord., [redacted]
Cardarella, Vincent C., AC, [redacted]
Woodworth, George B., FA, [redacted]
Hickman, Don R., Inf., [redacted]
Lyons, Thomas L., QMC, [redacted]
Soderberg, James W., AC, [redacted]
Camp, Marlin W., FA, [redacted]
Eddy, Leonard A., AC, [redacted]
Curran, Arthur R., AC, [redacted]
Wray, James W., Junior, AS, [redacted]
Elder, John L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Fahringer, John C., AC, [redacted]
Kingery, William W., AC, [redacted]
Lutman, Charles C., AC, [redacted]
Andrews, John W., AC, [redacted]
Johnson, Timothy R., AC, [redacted]
Cathcart, Richard E., AC, [redacted]
Coleson, Roger D., AC, [redacted]
Duff, David D., AC, [redacted]
Dunn, Bruce C., AC, [redacted]
Jones, James S., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Martindale, Ward W., AC, [redacted]
Patton, James D., AC, [redacted]
Sheppard, Chris J., AC, [redacted]
Tara, Hollis B., AC, [redacted]
Hayes, James M., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Herring, John H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Slay, Melvin F., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Gault, James A., AC, [redacted]
Tatum, Theodore P., AC, [redacted]
Boyle, John H., AC, [redacted]
Brooks, Philip, AC, [redacted]
Davis, William M., AC, [redacted]
McLaughlin, George W., AC, [redacted]
Pearson, William O., AC, [redacted]

Head, Willie C., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Keith, Joseph L., AC, [redacted]
Solomon, Joseph L., AC, [redacted]
Lane, George V., AC, [redacted]
Briggs, Richard F., Cav., [redacted]
Healy, Richard D., Inf., [redacted]
Styer, George D., Inf., [redacted]
Swickard, Jack D., AC, [redacted]
Barley, John N., AC, [redacted]
Weaver, James W., AC, [redacted]
Hemphill, Robert F., AC, [redacted]
Manteuffel, Roger W., AC, [redacted]
Schultz, Melvin R., AC, [redacted]
Lockard, Chancy H., AC, [redacted]
McKee, Harvey A., AC, [redacted]
Walters, Therwin S., AC, [redacted]
Kenney, Richard F., AC, [redacted]
Allbritton, John L., AC, [redacted]
McCarty, Billy S., AC, [redacted]
Shelton, E. G., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Ayles, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
Banks, Jack R., AC, [redacted]
King, Joseph F., AC, [redacted]
Biggs, Ernest E., AC, [redacted]
Curtis, James E., AC, [redacted]
Hicks, Roger L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Ruddell, George I., AC, [redacted]
Kramme, Raymond W., AC, [redacted]
Abramson, Charles E., AC, [redacted]
Hopkins, Truman A., Inf., [redacted]
Lemley, Samuel A., AC, [redacted]
Pleasant, James C., Inf., [redacted]
Swenson, Wilbur E., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Calvert, George M., QMC, [redacted]
Steinwinter, Howard D., AC, [redacted]
Weller, Russell K., Inf., [redacted]
Fitzgerald, Vernerd, AC, [redacted]
Henderly, Harold B., Inf., [redacted]
Keiser, Carl P., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Coates, Harry R., Inf., [redacted]
Gibney, Raymond F., Inf., [redacted]
Cory, William R., Cav., [redacted]
Hackleman, John L., AC, [redacted]
Lifsey, John J., AC, [redacted]
McDermott, Joseph W., AC [redacted]
Hayes, Leland R., AC, [redacted]
Rees, John W., AC. [redacted]
Cobb, John T., AC, [redacted]
Spencer, Andrew, FA, [redacted]
Dieterich, Virgil C., AC, [redacted]
Vogelsang, Edward C., Inf., [redacted]
Dabinett, John T., SC, [redacted]
Bragalone, Alfred A., Inf., [redacted]
Royalty, Lester D., Inf., [redacted]
Dieterle, Jack W., AC, [redacted]
Grant, Jonathan M., FA, [redacted]
Parson, Merlin H., Inf., [redacted]
Peterson, Eugene I., Inf., [redacted]
Sammon, Charles E., Inf., [redacted]
Van Tassell, F. E., Inf., [redacted]
Reddell, William H., AC, [redacted]
Townsend, James M., Inf., [redacted]
Loesing, Vernon T., CE, [redacted]
Skidmore, L. J., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Cole, John L., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Parrish, Alexander H., AC, [redacted]
Brown, David A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Parsons, George E., Junior, Ord., [redacted]
Hickok, James N., CAC, [redacted]
Power, William D., AC, [redacted]
Silvis, Bruce V., CAC, [redacted]
Beachler, William C., Inf., [redacted]
Shirley, Paul, AC, [redacted]
Shepard, Ernest B., AC, [redacted]
Ish, George D., Inf., [redacted]
Jensen, Robert B., AC, [redacted]
Bixby, Willis W., QMC, [redacted]
Stoutner, Everette A., Inf., [redacted]
Saunders, Phil W., Inf., [redacted]
Salyer, Everett G., QMC, [redacted]
Meads, John A., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Hackwood, Arthur W., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Vias, Felipe, Inf., [redacted]
Lowe, Orville T., Inf., [redacted]
Stanley, Leroy S., Inf., [redacted]
Morey, Arthur W., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Whitenton, Robert M., CE, [redacted]
Walker, Demelt E., AC, [redacted]
Dougherty, Ralph E., AC, [redacted]
Ciraldo, Robert I., QMC, [redacted]
Stevens, Donald K., CAC, [redacted]

Shipp, Robert E., FA, [redacted]
Hard, William H., Inf., [redacted]
Bane, Frank P., CE, [redacted]
Bell, Theodore S., Inf., [redacted]
Lafko, John W., AC, [redacted]
Hale, William C., Inf., [redacted]
Mangerich, Walter E., AC, [redacted]
Black, Don W., CAC, [redacted]
Janousek, Neal F., CAC, [redacted]
Marconi, Sabatine R., CAC, [redacted]
Wilson, Louis A., CAC, [redacted]
Kirk, Leonard M., Inf., [redacted]
Cagle, James B., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Mulling, Eugene G., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Huie, Perry L., AC, [redacted]
Robinson, John L., CAC, [redacted]
Brownfield, Lee B., SC, [redacted]
Davis, Charles L., AC, [redacted]
Dunn, James E., Inf., [redacted]
Gude, Joseph L., Inf., [redacted]
Huggins, Lloyd G., Inf., [redacted]
Welling, Mordecai G., Inf., [redacted]
Cheek, Leon B., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Paul, Donald T., Inf., [redacted]
Swearngan, William R., Fin., [redacted]
Dale, Joseph W., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Heisler, William F., CAC, [redacted]
Anderson, Andrew C., FA, [redacted]
Samusson, Lewis F., Inf., [redacted]
Stutler, Warren H., Inf., [redacted]
Mehlinger, Walter E., FA, [redacted]
Ellis, Arthur P., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Dennis, William J., Inf., [redacted]
Hamilton, Stuart A., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
King, William I., CAC, [redacted]
Morgan, Reuben T., QMC, [redacted]
Mundhenk, William H., QMC, [redacted]
Nash, John F., AC, [redacted]
Nottingham, Allen H., FA, [redacted]
Brown, Clarence W., AC, [redacted]
Walior, John T., AC, [redacted]
Farrell, Edward L., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Williams, Louis A., Inf., [redacted]
Blake, William R., SC, [redacted]
Curran, Charles E., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Mankin, Jack C., AC, [redacted]
Ream, Ellis A., CAC, [redacted]
Thorne, John H., CAC, [redacted]
Barnum, Richard V., Inf., [redacted]
Jones, Erwin B., Inf., [redacted]
Lyon, John W., Inf., [redacted]
Sheridan, Francis P., FA, [redacted]
Church, William V., Inf., [redacted]
Woodruff, Owen E., Junior, Cav., [redacted]
Weeks, Raymond W., Cav., [redacted]
Olson, Arthur A., Cav., [redacted]
Honea, John C., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Kogstad, Arthur W., Inf., [redacted]
Fiedler, Harold I., Cav., [redacted]
Guntharp, Walter A., Inf., [redacted]
Scudder, Willie B., FA, [redacted]
Burgher, Frank E., Inf., [redacted]
Kennedy, Clarence C., AC, [redacted]
Nash, Grover E., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Higgins, Hugh R., QMC, [redacted]
Fuson, Jack C., QMC, [redacted]
Hill, Edward M., Inf., [redacted]
Liggett, William V., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Ahern, William F., FA, [redacted]
Moore, Robert, QMC, [redacted]
Godby, Garland D., Inf., [redacted]
McKee, Henry H., Inf., [redacted]
Mullen, James J., Inf., [redacted]
McMillin, Wallace D., AC, [redacted]
Richardson, Hugh F., Inf., [redacted]
Stearns, Lewis F., Inf., [redacted]
Walker, Berrisford H., CAC, [redacted]
McCaughey, Mack, Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Yucker, Julius L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Burton, Jonathan R., Cav., [redacted]
Knutson, Sidney A., Inf., [redacted]
Driver, William J., Fin., [redacted]
Leister, Albert F., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Null, Jack G., Inf., [redacted]
Stevens, Kenneth T., Inf., [redacted]
Underwood, Vernon W., Inf., [redacted]
Wells, John A., QMC, [redacted]
Snipes, James C., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Walrath, Charles F., Inf., [redacted]
Mazzucchi, Reno A., CAC, [redacted]
Raub, Stanley C., FA, [redacted]

Hays, Reginald L., AC,
Bussey, Donald G., AC,
Crilly, James C., AC,
Girard, Henry J., AC,
Roberts, Leo P., AC,
Wilson, William A., Junior, AC,
Carss, Walter L., Junior, AC,
Murray, James E., AC,
Scariano, Frankie R., AC,
Harris, Charles A., AC,
Wendel, Edmund, Junior, FA,
Riles, William L., Inf.,
Clark, Delbert M., AC,
Hinton, Jay S., AC,
Sartor, Samuel O., AC,
Whitmore, Robert A., AC,
Barton, James R., AC,
Williams, F. E., Junior, Ord,
Ramsey, James D., FA,
Foster, Virgil P., Junior, Inf,
Cann, William D., Junior, Inf,
Harrington, Charles L., QMC,
Robinson, William B., AC,
Hurt, Charles C., AC,
Fox, George F., Inf,
Nichols, Steward H., AC,
McCormick, John D., FA,
McDonald, Donald M., AC,
Orsi, Francis J., QMC,
Ward, Patrick B., Inf,
Guthrie, John R., FA,
Avery, Philip S., Inf,
Young, George H., Junior, CWS,
Frederick, Floyd, FA,
Bonneaux, William K., AC,
Tennant, Charles W., AC,
Tapp, James B., AC,
Whitsett, Jack W., AC,
McGlynn, Francis J., AC,
McCarthy, Max R., CAC,
Omsted, Kenneth A., AC,
McCoid, Chester B., Inf,
McElree, Hall B., Fin,
Matheson, Salve H., Inf,
Horton, Paul N., Inf,
Webber, Paul E., AC,
Eldridge, George W., AC,
Pilliod, Dallas A., Inf,
Prather, Herb D., Inf,
Rounsaville, Tom J., Inf,
Carleton, Linwood A., Inf.,
Grady, Robert J., AC,
Brackley, William L., AC,
Fulton, Raymond A., AC,
Winchester, C. W., Junior, QMC,
Whitfield, Joe M., AC,
Ryan, Lloyd M., AC,
McCullough, John H., AC,
Nigra, Leroy, AC,
Van Marter, William H., AC,
Roberts, Robill W., AC,
Hoggatt, James L., AC,
Tuten, Wilson P., AC,
Hauser, Elmer F., AC,
Inman, Lloyd J., Inf,
Appel, Charles A., AC,
Beckley, Raymond E., AC,
Turner, Robert W., AC,
Stoney, Paul R., AC,
Carter, James R., AC,
Johnson, Ralph A., AC,
Peterson, Arthur H., AC,
Le Febre, Frederick H., AC,
Allred, Owen R., AC,
Cohen, Irving E., QMC,
Johnson, Kenneth L., Inf,
Keller, Robert W., AC,
Weiss, Alfred V., QMC,
Simpson, Charles E., AC,
Sherman, Fred P., AC,
Dustin, Daniel E., SC,
Creighton, Vernon F., AC,
Hanson, Kermit T., AC,
Thompson, John R., Junior, QMC,
Kirkendall, James F., AC,
Johnson, James T., AC,
Carpenter, George W., AC,
King, James W., AC,
Deadwyler, W. H., Junior, CAC,
Froehlich, Vernon W., AC,
Toland, Butler B., Junior, AC,
Pedone, Vito S., AC,

Milburn, Walter B., AC,
Kolstad, Robert F., AC,
Moore, Robert F., Inf,
Anderson, Ralph W., Inf,
Higgins, James L., Inf,
Rodewald, Donald L., AC,
Young, Hugh D., AC,
Glick, Howard L., AC,
Richardson, Rolland L., AC,
Cuzick, Robert A., Inf,
Scott, Samuel B., Junior, Inf,
Bonnett, Charles D., AC,
Mead, Charles E., Inf,
Johnson, Charles W., Inf.,
Dorn, William C., Fin.,
Prosser, Lamar M., Cav.,
Sprigg, William H., CAC,
Buelow, Wallace R., FA,
Thomas, Jesse R., Inf.,
Lutz, Raymond K., AC,
Shanahan, James G., FA,
Adams, Dwight L., Inf.,
Casey, Edgar L., CAC,
Moore, Bryce S., QMC,
Stewart, James A., AC,
Young, Hugh F., Inf.,
Putnam, George D., Inf.,
Moore, Robert D., Inf.,
Gust, Daniel G., Inf.,
Cahill, Harold E., Inf.,
Nemethy, Frank J., Inf.,
Baden, Clyde H., Junior, Inf.,
McManus, Vincent J., CAC,
Alba, Carmelo V., AC,
Manbeck, Lester E., AC,
Foelsch, Richard G., QMC,
Wilson, Gerald R., Inf.,
Kissam, Richard V., Junior, CAC,
Williams, George P., AC,
Dews, Charles A., AC,
Van Laethem, George, SC,
Kimmitt, Joseph S., FA,
O'Leary, Robert J., FA,
Capshaw, B. D., Junior, FA,
Tallerday, Jack, Inf.,
Waldie, James R., Inf.,
Watts, James H., CWS,
Jackson, Kenneth E., QMC,
Young, Willard, FA,
Mitchell, Joseph W., Junior, Inf.,
Buchanan, Earl W., Inf.,
Gelling, Louis, Inf.,
Uglade, Jesse G., Inf.,
Millar, Edward G., AC,
Luke, Edward S., Ord,
Garth, Marshall B., Inf.,
Le Febvre, Henry E., Inf.,
Lorck, Horace C., CAC,
McKinley, James W., AC,
Cunningham, James E., Inf.,
Young, John C., Fin.,
Luttrell, James A., Inf.,
Petruzel, Frank, Inf.,
Sawyer, Charles W., AC,
McIntire, F. P., Junior, AC,
Anderson, George S., AC,
Stay, Jesse E., AC,
Ramsey, Robert L., AC,
Dornacker, Charles H., FA,
Howard, George C., QMC,
McCloskey, John A., QMC,
Condon, David E., FA,
McLeod, Bill G., FA,
Davis, Paul W., FA,
Griffiths, Jack D., FA,
Kaufmann, Paul R., FA,
Blackwell, John L., Inf.,
Fox, Alton E., AC,
Hunnicutt, John O., Junior, Fin.,
Knaus, John V., AC,
Satterwhite, Albert W., AC,
Phillips, Henry G., Inf.,
Kelly, Robert L., AC,
McClure, John E., AC,
Harris, Louis E., AC,
Lingner, Frederick A., CAC,
Arnold, William E., Junior, CAC,
Whitfield, Morgan A., Inf.,
Timbers, George T., AC,
Anderson, Edward G., Junior, CAC,
Weiner, Nathan, AC,
Webber, John D., Inf.,

Blake, Robert J., AC,
Rosebush, Kenneth E., AC,
Smith, George R., AC,
Peterson, M. R., Junior, AC,
Wilcox, Lawrence R., AC,
Tyler, James O., AC,
Nelsen, Maynard P., AC,
White, Robert H., AC,
Gaston, Allen B., AC,
Cameron, William R., AC,
Beck, Richard W., AC,
Kreidler, Howard E., AC,
Sandlin, William B., Junior, Inf.,
Burnett, John J., Junior, AC,
Pinson, William C., Inf.,
Lipscomb, Ralph E., FA,
McKay, Calvin R., AC,
O'Connor, Joseph F., FA,
Ross, Raymond H., Inf.,
Pardue Wallace D., FA,
Rettgers, Forrest I., CAC,
Hand, Robert, Inf.,
Napper, Frank E., Ord.,
Wolff, Peter M., AC,
Daley, Edward J., CAC,
Finch, Peyton N., Junior, CAC,
Vandeveer, Lawrence E., AC,
Harris, William F., AC,
Brinegar, John F., AC,
Henson, Ira C., Junior, FA,
Mallett, John P., FA,
Schmidt, Harry U., FA,
Blakely, Larry A., FA,
Jeffries, John H., FA,
Stanley, Felix W., Inf.,
Schwalje, John M., FA,
Schlabs, Sylvester F., AC,
Haller, Roscoe R., AC,
Moore, Robert W., AC,
Dinker, William R., AC,
Abdallah, William P., AC,
Isaacson, Clayton M., AC,
Prickett, Donald I., AC,
Harrigan, William F., Inf.,
West, David H., AC,
Younkin, Leland A., AC,
Rash, John F., AC,
Vetter, Lawrence E., AC,
Carrigan, Thomas M., AC,
Maggart, Robert E., AC,
Adams, William P., Junior, AC,
Kaufmann, Leonard, Junior, AC,
Bradburn, Gordon F., AC,
Frank, Donald H., AC,
Adduci, Vincent J., AC,
Simpkins, Alan P., AC,
Morgant, Clyde J., AC,
Sanders, James B., AC,
Simler, George B., AC,
Tissue, Jimmie L., AC,
Wiseman, Lee V., AC,
Simpson, Thomas S., AC,
Wiggins, Edward G., QMC,
Keene, John H., AC,
Watson, George H., AC,
Schroeder, Jack E., Inf.,
Crozier, Gordon W., AC,
Gehring, Frederick R., Inf.,
Cook, Robert F., AC,
Smith, James M., AC,
Bench, Herbert G., AC,
Cox, William T., Jr., AC,
Cassada, Randall C., AC,
Wedding, John F., AC,
Layhee, Harold F., AC,
McNally, Lawrence M., AC,
Black, Walter E., Junior, AC,
Culp, Merle H., AC,
Allen, James L., Cav.,
Le Van, Jay E., AC,
Schroeder, Robert W., Inf.,
Greenlief, Dale R., Inf.,
Duvall, Duncan E., Inf.,
Surum, Henry, CAC,
Poindexter, William R., AC,
Hochella, Michael F., CWS,
Gallinger, Herald B., FA,
Blake, Lynn T., Junior, AC,
Buel, Joseph G., AC,
Brubaker, Jack P., FA,
Cavanaugh, S E., Junior, Inf.,
Ryan, Joseph V., Junior, FA,

Vivian, Lawrence, AC,
Buskey, Paul G., AC,
Mitchell, Arthur F., FA,
Oppenhimer, John S., FA,
Pynes, Oats A., Junior, FA,
Lathrop, Briggs, FA,
Bredewater, Arnold R., AC,
Schweiger, W. J., Junior, AC,
Zink, Harry J., AC,
Peterson, Paul L., Inf.,
Dadisman, Chester E., Inf.,
Creighton, James R., Inf.,
Smith, Vincent P., Inf.,
Donovan, Charles W., Inf.,
Stowbridge. Robert W., AC,
Albright, Charles R., SC,
Keating, William J., QMC,
Brindley, Arthur F., CAC,
Clarke, Howard P., FA,
Godley, Lawrence E., AC,
Tarbet, Dale F., AC,
Mecke, Harold J., AC,
Webb., Travis E., Inf.,
Ligon, Wayne E., QMC,
Bolt, Jones E., AC,
Wikan, Walter W., FA,
Huck, Terence W., FA,
Eney, John K., Inf.,
Karnes, Howard L., FA,
Barnhart, Frank H., Junior, Inf.,
Martell, Robert J., FA,
Hubert, Enrique J., Inf.,
Balcer, Charles I., Inf.,
Crisson, Robert C., Inf.,
Underwood, Joe H., Inf.,
Sadler, Robert E., Inf.,
Sharp, Hunter L., SC,
Green, Norman E., AC,
Runte, Walter G., Inf.,
Callahan, Walter, CAC,
Brockhouse, F. W., AC,
Keown, James L., Inf.,
Keene, Leonard L., Junior, Inf.,
Woodruff, Stanley W., Inf.,
Bradley, Charles H., AC,
Iverson, Richard J., AC,
Donnelly, Ross I., Inf.,
Nollkamper, James L., AC,
Cummings, Earl W., AC,
Hannah, George L., Junior, AC,
Bradley, Jack T., AC,
Thompson, Shirley B., AC,
Basel, George P., AC,
Austin, Orlo L., AC,
Fisher, Jay N., AC,
Oglesby, Herbert W., AC,
Cline, Charles L., FA,
Kuhn, Francis L., AC,
Hall, John J., AC,
Byers, Vic L., Junior, AC,
Curtis, Elbert R., FA,
Herold, John W., CAC,
Patterson, James A., Inf.,
Boehmer, William J., Cav.,
Walker, William J., Cav.,
Unger, Irving, AC,
McPherson W. R., Junior, AC,
Washcoe, Wilfred C., SC,
Hoff, Burton M., AC,
Halloran, James P. S., AC,
Andrews, Leon, AC,
Peeples, Russell C., Inf.,
Kirchner, Alfred W., Inf.,
Nielsen, Austin, AC,
Cook, Marshall A., Inf.,
Smith, Horrell H., Inf.,
Whitworth, Mancil R., FA,
Morrow, Jesse L., Inf.,
Bates, James M., FA,
Wilson, Samuel V., Inf.,
Marr, John W., Inf.,
Restani, Raymond, Inf.,
O'Connor, Henry M., AC,
Taylor, Norman N., AC,
Hemmer, Albert B., AC,
Robertson, E. E., Junior, AC,
Prien, Kenneth W., QMC,
Deck, William L., AC,
Kruger, Richard O., Ord.,
Freeman, David L., AC,
Myers, Thomas L., AC,

Berry, Everett O., Junior, AC,
Collins, Frank J., AC,
Smith, Cornelius M., AC,
Hilbert, Faye W., AC,
Walker, James R., AC,
Archer, John H., Junior, AC,
Heym, Howard F., AC,
Fitzpatrick, J. T., Junior, AC,
Fuller, Edwin W., AC,
Chrismon, Harold L., AC,
Williams, Robert G., AC,
Lancaster, Rayburn D., AC,
Roberts, Allyn E., AC,
Heaton, Robert L., AC,
Althouse, Donald I., AC,
Miller, Edward L., AC,
Witt, Thomas F., AC,
Manda, Francis S., AC,
McLain, Mack A., AC,
Nesbitt, James W., AC,
Keiper, John A., Junior, QMC,
Rogers, Thomas E., AC,
Russell, Cecil R., QMC,
Lisack, John P., AC,
Gissel, Julian R., FA,
Short, David S., FA,
Quinn, Ray B., Inf.,
Bray, Clifton L., AC,
Dickson, Jean H., FA,
Westmoreland, R. M., FA,
Hughes, Maurice L., AC,
Millhouse, Felix G., FA,
Logan, Edward O., Inf.,
O'Rourke, Donald C., Inf.,
Richey, Robert H., AC,
Blakeslee, Donald J. M., AC,
Cafarelli, John, AC,
Crown, Richard P., AC,
Seaman, Harold D., Inf.,
Ickes, Gordon C., AC,
Bond, William R., Inf.,
Evans, David L., III, AC,
Reafleng, Harry E., QMC,
Webster, Raymond S., Inf.,
Chandler, William F., AC,
Womer, Richard E., Junior, Inf.,
Phillips, Steve F., Junior, Inf.,
Hash, William A., Inf.,
Owen, James C., AC,
Jones, Oval W., AC,
Boyle, John H., AC,
Edner, Selden R., AC,
Woods, Jesse L., Junior, AC,
Howell, Joseph V., AC,
Nichols, William C., AC,
Peterson, Chesley G., AC,
Gourley, Harold H., AC,
Thompson, James B., FA,
Herndon, William H., QMC,
Goddard, Ernest D., AC,
Parker, Lester L., FA,
Schnebli, George A., FA,
Kennedy, William M., FA,
Harris, Carll T., Inf.,
Pitcher, Conrad B., Inf.,
Finneran, Thomas C., FA,
Willis, Robert F., AC,
Sullivan, Vincent J., CAC,
Lapatka, Thomas M., Inf.,
Embrey, Ralph C., AC,
McKee, Ralph D., AC,
Hull, George R., AC,
Ford, Claud E., AC,
Johnson, Richard L., AC,
Barrett, Laurence O., QMC,
Causey, Rufus F., AC,
Borchers, Clyde R., AC,
Fisher, Edwin O., AC,
Schwartz, Louis J., Inf.,
Uhalde, John H., Inf.,
Boyd, Hugh K., Inf.,
Beeson, Duane W., AC,
Edwards, Wilson V., AC,
McClain, Ralph E., Inf.,
Gordon, Thomas L., FA,
Robertson, Benjamin F., FA,
Cleveland, Robert E., FA,
Robens, Robert F., Inf.,
Connolly, George I, Junior, FA,
Kranc, Robert T., QMC,
Klein, Donald A., Ord.,

Mitterling, Robert O., AC,
Lee, Oscar W., Junior, FA,
Hicks, Charles K., AC,
Hallum, William D., AC,
Fitzsimmons, Robert J., AC,
Vincent, Donato N., QMC,
Murphy, Benjamin S., AC,
Taylor, Richard I., SC,
Shaima, Adolph L., FA,
Prochaska, Joseph R., AC,
Anders, Charles T., FA,
Chapman, Carl J., AC,
Artwohl, Arpod J., AC,
Knutson, Gerald P., AC,
Long, Maurice G., AC,
Pippin, T. C., Junior, AC,
Brooks, Robert J., AC,
Valentine, William J., AC,
Elliott, Elmo A., AC,
Wolf, Gayle C., AC,
Gilbertson, Merle J., AC,
Nacy, William P., AC,
Voorhees, Roy D., AC,
Combe, John, 3d, AC,
Bolton, Willard L., AC,
Stephens, Robert W., AC,
Grunzweig, Nicholas J., Inf.,
Mitchell, Harold G., Fin.,
Duke, Robert C., QMC,
Monsarrat, George F., Inf.,
Cox, Charles T., FA,
Barner, John H., Inf.,
Angley, Clyde C., AC,
Goodbody, Robert E., AC,
Braxton, Joseph C., CWS,
Hannigan, John F., AC,
Irvine, Richard H., Fin.,
McAuley, Jack A., Inf.,
Williams, Paul R., Cav.,
Lockett, William L., Ord.,
Douglas, Robert E., AC,
Dickson, Edgar V., AC,
Magruder, Lawson W., Junior, Inf.,
Roquemore, Frank U., Junior, Inf.,
Pasta, Melvin J., FA,
Harris, Elva, FA,
Tauber, Bernard L., FA,
Lueck, William J., FA,
Hood, Charles T., AC,
Klette, Immanuel J., AC,
Bowers, Thomas E., AC,
Lee, Raymond C., Junior, AC,
Solem, Herman S., AC,
Fulmer, Harold G., AC,
Thompson, John K., AC,
Coonly, William J., Junior, CAC,
Larsen, William A., AC,
McAdams, William B., AC,
Benson, Bertil E. W., AC,
Barber, Robert K., Inf.,
Fly, Hugh G., AC,
Miller, Jean B., Junior, AC,
Cavin, Edgar R., Fin.,
Zeine, Merle M., AC,
Dwight, John F., Junior, AC,
Mourer, Lester C., AC,
Orr, George W., AC,
Tarbutton, Jean D., AC,
Cline, Richard A., AC,
Johnson, Robert H., AC,
Chilstrom, Kenneth O., AC,
Nowak, Edwin H., Junior, AC,
Driver, Elwood T., AC,
Shareck, Michael W., Junior, AC,
Compton, Gordon B., AC,
De Dera, Joseph E., AC,
Stolarz, Andrew R., AC,
Peller, Bertram, Ord.,
Stubbs, Gail L., AC,
Barrios, Willie W. J., Inf.,
Beasley, Carl J., AC,
Cadger, Edward J., AC,
Wishart, James H. N., AC,
Botts, Luther B., Inf.,
McKinney, David W., CWS,
Angel, Ralph E., AC,
Lutz, Edwin M., Inf.,
McCauley, Robert H., CAC,
Stoeckert, George I., Inf.,
Collins, John M., Inf.,
Everett, Harold M., AC,

Burdick, James R., Fin.,
Clifford, Richard W., Inf.,
Lyon, Aubrey G., AC,
Nolte, Marvin C. O., FA,
Weller, Irwin V., Inf.,
Klein, David, QMC,
Eager, George, Junior, QMC,
Kaufman, Frank L., AC,
Erskine, Jasper N., QMC,
Goodman, Raymond E., AC,
Triantafellu, Rockly, AC,
Davis, Eldon R., Cav.,
Bee, Robert J., Junior, Inf.,
Light, Morgan C., Ord.,
Robinson, Reaford L., Inf.,
Knox, Freal C., AC,
Murphy, John T., Inf.,
Hunt, George T., QMC,
Rogers, Charles I., Inf.,
Pezdirtz, Joseph W., Inf.,
Wright, Raymond J., FA,
Campbell, Harold E., Junior, CAC,
Aquilina, Raymond F., CAC,
Kolesar, Armand M., CAC,
Chance, Francis A., Junior, FA,
Schnelker, Gerald C., Inf.,
Hoffman, Ralph W., Inf.
Applewhite, Kermet H., QMC,
Petty, Morris E., AC,
Ashley, Clower F., AC,
Carter, William P., AC,
Svenvold, Harold R., AC,
Alley, Amos D., Junior, AC,
Reber, Carl J., AC,
Young, Maurice L., Inf.,
Froman, Howard W., AC,
Collins, Thomas J., AC,
Payne, Kenneth J., AC,
Tyborski, Alexander J., AC,
Cunningham, Donald H., Inf.,
Kinhes, Ralph, Inf.,
Schwellenbach, T. W., AC,
McNees, Richard A., AC,
Opper, Clifford R., AC,
Stone, Herbert B., AC,
Meroney, Virgil K., AC,
Waller, Walter R., Junior, AC,
Kearney, John L., AC,
Reppert, Leonard B., AC,
Metcalfe, Alvin C., FA,
Wells, Sidney L., CWS,
Seay, Patrick H., CWS,
Ramsaur, Robert T., AC,
Basham, Edward A., AC,
Paul, Richard I., Inf.,
Reade, Chadwick G., AC,
Sutton, Arthur J., Inf.,
Gossard, Philip D., AC,
Schuster, Robert C., AC,
Carwile, Ernest D., AC,
Smith, William E., AC,
Biggio, Charles P., Jr., FA,
Walker, Everitt D., AC,
Mielke, Alton C., AC,
McCash, Stuart, Inf.,
Marshall, Marsh S., CWS,
Ambos, William G., AC,
Petrie, Glen E., QMC,
Willey, Clifford A., AC,
Westfall, Russell B., AC,
Heifner, George E., AC,
Bailey, Richard F., AC,
Tilley, Douglas G., AC,
Personett, Thomas A., AC,
Steiner, Everett W., AC,
Molland, Leland P., AC,
Meyer, Herbert J. M., AC,
Herway, Loren W., AC,
Janssen, Jan W., Junior, AC,
Duncan, John D., AC,
Horr, Wayne L., AC,
Jespersen, Glenn E., AC,
Miller, Charles L., AC,
Broaddus, Donald A., AC,
Smith, Richard B., AC,
Ewing, George W., Junior, AC,
Stevens, Richard D., AC,
Donovan, Joseph N., AC,
Disbrow, Lorin C., AC,
Brown, Dean B., AC,
Higgins, Donald H., AC,
McGovern, Donald H., Inf.,

Bliss, Arthur M., Inf.,
Knapp, John B., QMC,
Byrne, Robert G., Inf.,
Parkins, James F., Inf.,
Norris, Arthur J., AC,
Lowe, Horace A., Junior, QMC,
Berlin, George A., Inf.,
Evans, Byrne A., FA,
Bennett, Ralph O., FA,
Seibel, Paul, FA,
Fraleigh, C. S., Junior, QMC,
Miller, Robert G., Inf.,
Baldwin, James L., Inf.,
Nobles, Lloyd E., Inf.,
Degiovanni, Joseph I., QMC,
Sumner, Robert S., Inf.,
Haughton, Richard E., CAC,
Lakin, John W., AC,
Tilly, James L., Inf.,
Brehm, John C., AC,
Murphy, John J., QMC,
Hendricks, John C., FA,
Strode, Ross D., AC,
Broyles, Enoch E., AC,
Hale, Blair, AC,
Anderson, John B., AC,
Healy, Warren R., AC,
Rochez, Louis A., 3d, AC,
Drake, Leo A., Junior, AC,
Quigley, Edward C., AC,
Carens, Richard, AC,
Boland, Joseph E., AC,
Brown, Donald H., AC,
Sands, Warren H., AC,
Bryant, Harold F., Inf.,
Davis, Paul A., Junior, FA,
King, Edward C., Junior, AC,
Hanchey, Charles W., FA,
Shirey, Clair L., AC,
Sharra, George F., Inf.,
Biggs, Bradley, AC,
Larsen, Gerald E., Inf.,
Shaeffer, William F., AC,
Trimble, William W., AC,
Muhl, James H., CWS,
Zdrubek, Julius E., AC,
Blum, Charles K., Inf.,
Lucich, Stanley, AC,
Helsley, Llewellyn S., Fin.,
Zuckerbrot, Irving, QMC,
Wilson, Ronald C., AC,
Bammer, Wyndham H., Inf.,
Clarke, Donald L., AC,
Hyde, John F., Inf.,
Smith, William D., Fin.,
Lanen, William J., FA,
Shaw, Allan W., Junior, AC,
Kimsey, James W., AC,
Hunt, Paul E., FA,
Haley, Norman R., FA,
Bollinger, George W., AC,
Kilcullen, William P., AC,
McLain, Steven J., AC,
Hart, Fred L., AC,
Sullivan, James K., Inf.,
McClellan, Oliver M., Inf.,
Phillips, Robert F., Inf.,
Eisler, Walter J. J., Inf.,
Bolick, James O., FA,
Hughes, William, AC,
Starr, Norman B., Fin.,
Epperson, George M., AC,
Kellogg, Robert E., AC,
Goss, Richard R., AC,
Myers, George G., AC,
Steinhauer, Raleigh F., AC,
Wisniewski, Raymond F., AC,
McDonald, William G., AC,
Hallock, Benjamin, Junior, AC,
Ross, James T., Junior, FA,
Field, Kenneth S., FA,
Yeater, James W., AC,
Richardson, Howard B., Inf.,
Taylor, Dale W., FA,
Lochrie, Wilmer R., CAC,
Freestone, James E., FA,
Miceli, Domenic L., QMC,
Vandiver, Robert S., AC,
Burt, William A., CAC,
Gossett, Henry M., CAC,
Pieklik, Joseph E., QMC,
Smith, James W., AC,

Roberts, James B., AC,
Younger, Douglas G., FA,
Friedrich, Walter R., AC,
Smith, James W., CAC,
MacFarlane, W. G., CWS,
Ewald, William, Inf.,
McCoy, Richard L., Inf.,
Noel, William H., AC,
Patton, Phil M., AC,
Wells, Ray E., AC,
Claunch, John G., AC,
Maguire, Robert F., QMC,
Young, Fred W., AC,
Schmitt, Armin A., AC,
Saunders, Patrick H., AC,
Duch, Walter F., AC,
Seaman, Robert A., AC,
McRae, Roland L., AC,
Andres, Joseph E., AC,
Griffin, Edmund D., Junior, AC,
Fahringer, F. H., AC,
Bowry, Donald W., AC,
Keeffe, Donald J., AC,
Gonye, Leonard F., AC,
Alder, Robert T., AC,
Williamson, Felix D., AC,
Churchville, Louis J., AC,
Sloan, William A., Junior, AC,
Waltz, Robert W., AC,
Warner, George E., FA,
Balliet, William E., AC,
Hoplin, Herman P., Ord.,
Gresham, Walter V., Jr., AC,
Marks, Sidney M., Inf.,
Ohlmeyer, Harold Z., AC,
Bujol, George W., AC,
Guinn, Mortimer G., FA,
Cawthra, James H., Inf.,
Murray, Paul, Junior, Inf.,
Bard, Paul F., QMC,
Anderson, John V., Ord.,
Booth, Herschel A., QMC,
McKinney, Hugh L., QMC,
Holman, Jefferson T., QMC,
Stahl, Laddie L., FA,
MacDonald, A. G., Inf.,
Lilly, Grady F., FA,
Plunkett, H. T., Junior, SC,
Emerson, Jack G., AC,
McGuigan, William J., QMC,
Sledge, Thomas E., Junior, AC,
Del Toro, Miguel A, Inf.,
Barraclough, Donald F., Inf.,
Harth, John F., Inf.,
Smith, Robert F., FA,
Seifert, Henry L., AC,
Taylor, Robert A., AC,
Davis, Claiborne W., Junior, FA,
Oleary, Joseph E., Inf.,
Maloney, William R., AC,
Meadville, Harry W., AC,
Williams, C. O., Junior, AC,
Hurst, Harry K., Inf.,
Greene, Clarence R., AC,
Looker, Carl S., AC,
Frink, Horace E., Junior, AC,
Campbell, Mansel R., AC,
Kelly, James D., AC,
Davis, Murrit H., AC,
Charbonneaux, D. D., AC,
Osborne, Earle L., AC,
Wickham, Wallace, AC,
Keish, Frederick C., AC,
Karnezis, Demetrios, AC,
Decker, Lynne E., AC,
Clark, Lyman H., Inf.,
Robertson, Thomas D., AC,
Conway, Lewis W., Inf.,
Lyle Vernon J., AC,
Helms, Kenneth R., FA,
Blume, Robert F., Inf.,
Eastham, Warren C., Inf.,
Riegert, Carl, Junior, Inf.,
Sullivan, Leo J., Inf.,
Johnston, Ben D., Junior, AC,
Caffall, Joseph M., CAC,
Anderson, C. E., Junior, AC,
Runyan, Samuel H., AC,
Beveridge, Andrew L., AC,
Cloud, Carlton, Junior, AC,
Smyrl, James A., AC,
Fritsch, Edward M., AC,

Fikes, Charles W., AC, [redacted]
Salter, Max D., FA, [redacted]
Damico, Robert H., AC, [redacted]
Nogar, Eugene T., AC, [redacted]
Singlaub, John K., Inf., [redacted]
Miller, Jesse M., AC, [redacted]
Turk, Wilbert, AC, [redacted]
Jemmott, Arthur H., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Sams, Monroe S., AC, [redacted]
Langford, Floyd J., AC, [redacted]
Smith, James F., QMC, [redacted]
Andrew, James W., AC, [redacted]
Proudlove, Lloyd E., AC, [redacted]
Westbrook, Robert L., Cav. [redacted]
Stanton, Charles R., AC, [redacted]
Cummings, Louis H., AC, [redacted]
Barrow, David C., AC, [redacted]
Oswald, Garth B., AC, [redacted]
Pruett, George J., QMC, [redacted]
McCulloch, Robert C., AC, [redacted]
Garner, Gordon, Junior, AC, [redacted]
Ryan, Neil B., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
Dozier, John C., FA, [redacted]
Pullen, Howard V., AC, [redacted]
Burgasser, Francis X., FA, [redacted]
Duke, Thomas A., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Moore, Roy, Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Barnes, Carroll E., QMC, [redacted]
Osborne, William F., AC, [redacted]
Knapp, Ralph W., AC, [redacted]
Scott, Robert I., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Bowers, William H., AC, [redacted]
Hovatter Elbert T., AC, [redacted]
Kapp, Ronald A., Inf., [redacted]
McAlduff, H. J., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Camp, Eugene C., Inf., [redacted]
Logan, Douglas H., Ord., [redacted]
Huffman, John M., Inf., [redacted]
Miller, Monroe M., AC, [redacted]
Obenshain, Ray L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Miley, William M., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Glisson, Roy, Junior, Fin., [redacted]
Stevens, Wilmer B., SC, [redacted]
Vognild, Alden E., FA, [redacted]
Thomas, George, Inf., [redacted]
Wiley, Harlow R., FA, [redacted]
Torgersen, Maxwell S., FA, [redacted]
Nelson, Oliver W., Inf., [redacted]
Frazier, Frank W., Inf., [redacted]
Files, Vernon, Inf., [redacted]
Halpin, Edward V., AC, [redacted]
Armstead, Seth A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Carpenter, Dustin E., AC, [redacted]
Dolk, Carl E., AC, [redacted]
Riepe, Quenten A., AC, [redacted]
Cherry, Clyde S., AC, [redacted]
Fellers, Russell D., AC, [redacted]
Brooks, Charles L., AC, [redacted]
Bryan, William E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Schmidt, Robert C, AC, [redacted]
Coble, Walter M., AC, [redacted]
Hutchens, David D., AC, [redacted]
Hiatt, Charles R., FA, [redacted]
De Loughary, Robert D., AC, [redacted]
Terry, George W., Inf., [redacted]
Giere, Henry J., AC, [redacted]
Hess, Robert W., AC, [redacted]
Fetters, Rolland F., AC, [redacted]
Heller, Edwin L., AC, [redacted]
Collett, Charles E., AC, [redacted]
Withers, Raymond R., AC, [redacted]
Wilson, William M., AC, [redacted]
Wywal, Felix B., AC, [redacted]
Searles, Dewitt R., AC, [redacted]
Leaser, Earl R., AC, [redacted]
Janssen, Carl A., AC, [redacted]
Jackson, Earle E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Savage, Cary L., AC, [redacted]
Wood, Thomas W., AC, [redacted]
Johnson, Jack D., AC, [redacted]
Dettmar, Henry G., QMC, [redacted]
Conrad, Henry W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Long, Mahlon H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Cunnningham, Robert K., Inf., [redacted]
Hevener, James W., SC, [redacted]
Davidson, Shirley, Inf., [redacted]
Gommel, Hugh E., AC, [redacted]
Duffus, John D., AC, [redacted]
Novinski, Norbert L., AC, [redacted]
McCabe, John T., Fin., [redacted]

Halliday, Robert W., AC, [redacted]
McLaughin, C. M., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Garner, Merritt G., AC, [redacted]
Grabowski, Francis T., AC, [redacted]
Leeds, John C., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Merrick, Thomas L., Inf., [redacted]
McLendon, George P., Inf., [redacted]
Wallach, John A., AC, [redacted]
Crutchfield, W. B., AC, [redacted]
Filley, Oliver D., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Brewer, Lonnie C., AC, [redacted]
Stone, Lloyd E., Inf., [redacted]
Sansone, Philip, AC, [redacted]
Fulcher, Kenneth M., AC, [redacted]
Thompson, James A., AC, [redacted]
Allbee, Harold J., FA, [redacted]
Ladner, Gerard J., CAC, [redacted]
Hogan, James H., CAC, [redacted]
Groom, Kenneth G., FA, [redacted]
McCrory, R. J., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Dehner, Vernon E., CWS, [redacted]
Kleinhelter, Robert W., FA, [redacted]
Branson, Roy E., CWS, [redacted]
Johnson, Robert J. D., AC, [redacted]
Lilliedoll, Jarrold D., AC, [redacted]
Hooper, William D., AC, [redacted]
Poulson, Ernest L., AC, [redacted]
Friedrich, Roy E., AC, [redacted]
Kelley, Thomas E., QMC, [redacted]
Jones, Billy J., AC, [redacted]
Hughes, Paul A, SC, [redacted]
Lemming, Joseph L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Bright, Charles W., CAC, [redacted]
Richardson, Donald H., FA, [redacted]
Barrett, Robert F., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
O'Sullivan, Michael N., QMC, [redacted]
Jordan, Arthur C., AC, [redacted]
La Chaussee, C. E., Inf., [redacted]
Turnquist, Roy H., AC, [redacted]
Berg, William W., AC, [redacted]
Loughran, Joseph P., QMC, [redacted]
Luckadoo, John H., AC, [redacted]
Hart, John J., QMC, [redacted]
Lambert, Henry R., AC, [redacted]
Anderson, Richard K., AC, [redacted]
Eldridge, Truman K., AC, [redacted]
Baughman, Claude G., QMC, [redacted]
Dale, Hugh, W., AC, [redacted]
Swap, Arthur M., AC, [redacted]
O'Donnell, Joseph J., Inf., [redacted]
Martin, L. D K., CWS, [redacted]
Hunter, John B., FA, [redacted]
Kennedy, Stanley Y., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Spencer, Robert V., AC, [redacted]
Callan, Thoma H., AC, [redacted]
Ewing, Frederick E., AC, [redacted]
Fischgrund, Harold S., CWS, [redacted]
Williams, Harry O., Inf., [redacted]
Holsclaw, Jack D., AC, [redacted]
Marts, Harry H., SC, [redacted]
Jones, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
Boyer, Joseph M., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Wydner, Clarence S., AC, [redacted]
Lyman, Edward M., AC, [redacted]
Little, Edwin L., AC, [redacted]
Hall, Felton W., AC, [redacted]
Shenk, Frank L., Inf., [redacted]
Pascoe, Harry, AC, [redacted]
Sams, Richard H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Daughtrey, Buddy R., AC, [redacted]
Ogletree, Robert C., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Camp, Clyde H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Douthwaite, W. T., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Cox, Emmett W., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Scott, James M., Fin., [redacted]
Boyer, Richard J., QMC, [redacted]
Schilke, James F., AC, [redacted]
Sprinkel, Milton D., CWS, [redacted]
Boyd, William H., QMC, [redacted]
Bartell, Frank A., QMC, [redacted]
Peyer, Gustave A., CAC, [redacted]
Ippolito, Charles J., Inf., [redacted]
Jones, William M., Cav., [redacted]
Pool, Fain H., AC, [redacted]
Doerfler, Eugene A., Inf., [redacted]
McNary, Quentin L., Inf., [redacted]
Jones, Russell G., Inf., [redacted]
Wright, Elam W., Inf., [redacted]
Doup, Clarence N., FA., [redacted]
Farnsworth, Frank A., FA, [redacted]
Ancker, Jack P., FA, [redacted]

Leber, Charles B., FA, [redacted]
Durbon, Roy C., SC, [redacted]
Assimotos, Samuel A., AC, [redacted]
Honeyman, Robert E., Cav., [redacted]
Markley, William C., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Schutten, B. J., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Michael, Edward S., AC, [redacted]
Thornton, Charles H., AC, [redacted]
Barry, Billie J., AC, [redacted]
Gaylord, Donald A., AC, [redacted]
Balliet, Byron F., AC, [redacted]
Rafael, Thomas F., AC, [redacted]
Combs, John H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Sickler, Robert L., Inf., [redacted]
McGinnis, Norris D., FA, [redacted]
Wilhelmy, John F., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Norton, William J., AC, [redacted]
Puskar, Steven, Junior, AC, [redacted]
Davis, Wilbert E., AC, [redacted]
Harms, Thomas H., AC, [redacted]
Cook, Harry D., AC, [redacted]
Moler, John E., AC, [redacted]
Lane, Edward E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Avery, Charles M., AC, [redacted]
Lindgren, John R., AC, [redacted]
Loflin, William A., AC, [redacted]
Horn, Willard L., AC, [redacted]
Taylor, Emery D., AC, [redacted]
Woodward, Jesse E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Lawley, William R., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Walker, Junior L., CAC, [redacted]
Dingwall, Allan G., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Dusenberry, Robert K., AC, [redacted]
Wathen, Roy D., AC, [redacted]
Schooley, Jim C., AC, [redacted]
Babb, Robert G., FA, [redacted]
Treyz, Oliver E., Fin., [redacted]
Brown, Percy D., Junior, SC, [redacted]
Ernest, Russell W., Inf., [redacted]
Bailer, Harold W., AC, [redacted]
Boyea, Gerald E., Inf., [redacted]
Duffy, James F., AC, [redacted]
Miller, Thomas B., AC, [redacted]
Needham, C. C., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Shadle, William J., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Cashman, William J., AC, [redacted]
Koenig, Sabastian B., AC, [redacted]
Voigtmann, Frank L., AC, [redacted]
Hjertberg, F. M. I., QMC, [redacted]
Holder, Leonard D., Inf., [redacted]
Easters, Robert D., AC, [redacted]
Sherwood, Vernon M., AC, [redacted]
Bishop, Edward L., AC, [redacted]
Hyle, Archie R., Inf., [redacted]
Blair, John D., 3d, Inf., [redacted]
Brothers, James T., AC, [redacted]
Brooks, James G., AC, [redacted]
Wright, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
Fraser, Bruce H., Inf., [redacted]
McBride, R. B., 3d, FA, [redacted]
Kocour, Max G., Inf., [redacted]
Andrews, George H., AC, [redacted]
Wesson, Thomas E., FA, [redacted]
Adams, Harold D., FA, [redacted]
Martin, Thomas S., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Willis, Jean P., CAC, [redacted]
Smith, Robert E., AC, [redacted]
McCain, Earl S., AC, [redacted]
Spitler, Lee W., AC, [redacted]
Paradise, Charles H., AC, [redacted]
Crozier, Roswell L., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Spring, Charles E., AC, [redacted]
Carter, William C., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Buchanan, R. B., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Bass, Thomas E., AC, [redacted]
Rockwood, Charles A., Inf., [redacted]
Handley, George E., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Moore, Thomas N., QMC, [redacted]
Lutz, George A., QMC, [redacted]
Shook, Carmel M., AC, [redacted]
Thompson, Donn G., AC, [redacted]
Sharkey, Neil J., Inf., [redacted]
McMahan, Jack E., Inf., [redacted]
Sagert, Stanley A., AC, [redacted]
Miller, Ralph B., FA, [redacted]
Rogers, Felix M., AC, [redacted]
Hall, Paul M., AC, [redacted]
Young, Curtis F., CAC, [redacted]
Matthews, Darrell W., Inf., [redacted]
Gilbert, Harold N., Junior, Inf., [redacted]

Abernathy, William C., Inf.,
McDowell, Charles T., Inf.,
Stephens, Robert L., Inf.,
Forbrago, Maurice H., AC,
Cammack, Vernon K., AC,
Champlin, Milton P., Junior, Inf.
Pierce, Milton R., AC,
Stout, Robert A., AC,
Lucas, Lee R., FA,
Forbes, Brown C., AC,
Jack, William A., AC,
Tapscott, Wilbur A., AC,
Boggs, Wallace M., AC,
Carroll, Benjamin L., FA,
Thiel, Victor G., Fin.,
McAuliffe, Eugene V., Inf.,
Patton, Roderick R., AC,
Ireland, Thornton E., Inf.,
Brigham, Robert L., SC,
Waters, James H., FA,
Perry, Benjamin E., QMC,
Ingle, Paul T., Inf., 0516480
Schaffer, Louis, AC,
Whalen, William W., AC,
Sullivan, William C., AC,
Bradford, James W., AC,
MacNicol, James J., QMC,
Gibbons, John P., AC,
Gray, George E., AC,
Aamodt, Duane A., AC,
King, Walter S., AC,
Rule, Richard I., AC,
Haynie, Frank M., AC,
Morley, Harry C., Inf.,
Gipson, Guy M., AC,
Barr, Richard E., AC,
Ramsey, J. W., AC,
Branton, Harold M., Inf.,
Gleason, Jerry F., Junior, CWS,
Saltzman, Ernest C., Junior, AC,
Smith, Luther J., Junior, AC,
Duffy, Jack W., FA,
Erdman, George W., CAC,
Fry, Wallace J., Junior, SC,
Neubarth, Paul R., AC,
Smith, Orvil T., Inf.,
Bockoven, Frederic T., Inf.,
Carr, William F., Inf.,
Miller, Robert E., QMC,
Cunningham, Donal B., CE,
Dunn, William E., AC,
Reberry, Gerald V., Cav.,
Gourley, Theodore J., AC,
Trail, Reo C., AC,
Carscaddon, O. C., Junior, AC,
Garvin, Loyd C., AC,
Hershey, Charles G., Junior, Ord.,
Young, James R., Inf.,
Fuller, Ellis L., Inf.,
Hallock, Richard R., Inf.,
Arrington, Henry T., AC,
Patterson, John V., AC,
Work, Victor G., Ord.,
Prahler, Robert H., AC,
McGee, Robert B., AC,
McKinney, Walter A., AC,
Evans, Edward J., QMC,
Schoos, Robert B., FA,
Beck, Charles J., AC,
Apter, Leonard, AC,
Fruth, Clarence R., Fin.,
Bashor, Owen H., AC,
Bradley, Clyde W., Junior, AC,
McCall, Ray N., Fin.,
Overbey, George D., AC,
Booth, Joseph L., AC,
Russell, Thomas P., 2d, AC,

To be second lieutenants

Chmar, Paul, Inf.,
Wilson, Stephen C., AC,
Brown, Leroy M., AC,
Waage, Amos E., AC,
Davenport, Ellie E., AC,
Gaither, John M., AC,
Rothman, Russell H., AC,
Stewart, Dana W., Junior, AC,
Condon, Robert W., AC,
Oldfield, Charles S., AC,
Walsh, Roy M., AC,
Fry, Robert M., AC,
Quisenberry, G. B., AC,
Mathis, William H., Inf.,
Edwards, K. J., Junior, FA,
McManmon, Leo J., AC,
Mayer, Donald V., AC,
Kundinger, Donald J., AC,
St. Sauver, Richard T., Inf.,
Sullivan, Roy M., Junior, AC,
Creech, Norman O., AC,
McElroy, Howard C., AC,
McLain, John V., FA,
Schoning, Richard H., QMC,
Halle, William W., CAC,
Roemer, William A., FA,
Anderson, Arnold V., Cav.,
Kolvas, Stephen F., AC,
Rhodes, Edwin, AC,
Howard, Wilson W., AC,
Goforth, Robert C., FA,
Anderson, Russell G., AC,
Downer, Joseph P., FA,
Allen, James S., SC,
Foster, Charles H., CAC,
Williams, W. R., Junior, Inf.,
Angus, Ralph H., AC,
McSoley, George F., FA,
Igersheimer, Milo, CAC,
Krometis, August A., FA,
Chapman, Harman E., AC,
Ingham, Frederick L., CAC,
Schlichting, W. L., Fin.,
Neiman, Robert E., Junior, Inf.,
Apperson, Edward B., AC,
Buttler, Robert M., Inf.,
Horton, John N., AC,
Tassie, Willis H., CAC,
Ramsey, Edward L., Inf.,
Worrad, Edward G., AC,
Cooksey, Howard H., Inf.,
Pennington, Alvin L., AC,
Bossa, Amos L., AC,
Hughes, Claude A., Junior, AC,
Mahoney, John J., QMC,
Gamble, Jack K., AC,
Blount, Delbert F., AC,
Mott, Maurice K., AC,
Shamblin, Richard R., AC,
Bridges, Wyman M., AC,
De Sutler, Ralph B., AC,
Richmond, Joe F., AC,
Kaufman, Glenn O., AC,
Nixon, Stanley J., AC,
Gibson, Billy P., AC,
Moore, Howard M., AC,
Casey, George W., AC,
Henderson, William G., QMC,
Drummond, John W., AC,
Trumbo, Charles E., Junior, AC,
Louden, James L., AC,
Cooney, John T., CAC,
Maggio, Charles I., AC,
Kropenicki, John J., AC,
Hansen, Richard H., FA,
Fye, John H., 3d, FA,
Fort, William G., AC,
Patterson, Harvill H., Inf.,
Shelly, James E., AC,
De Witt, Charles W., AC,
Gurd, Stephen J., AC,
Mathwin, Albert V., Inf.,
Byers, John R., AC,
Raschke, Wendell M., AC,
Davis, Lavoi B., AC,
Dick, Wagner W., AC,
Marcum, Everette L., AC,
Neiswender, Van A., AC,
Crego, John C., AC,
Gearhart, Fred Z., AC,
Morris, Charles A., Inf.,
Cahelo, George, Junior, AC,
McElwee, Daniel W., SC,
Boechler, Andrew J., CAC,
Dring, John P., Inf.,
Robinson, Edward A., Inf.,
Buls, Milton R., Cav.,
Mathews, Stanley R., Junior, FA,
White, Lawrence J., Cav.,
Bullinger, Rollin R., AC,
Wehrman, Kenneth E., AC,
Porter, Ray E., Junior, FA,
Hoge, William C., FA,
Wilton, David N., AC,
Green, Charles W., Inf.,
Keeling, Rufus K., AC,
Bradford, Leo G., AC,
Cotter, Richard H., AC,
Grundmann, William J., AC,
Scheer, James H., QMC,
Mitchell, Robert J., AC,
Newman, James W., CAC,
McHugh, John F., Junior, AC,
Harris, Harvey J., AC,
Gordon, John H., AC,
Schneider, V. J., Junior, AC,
Preston, Roy W., Inf.,
Brown, Charles W., AC,
Dew, James R., Cav.,
Parker, Albert J., Inf.,
Ripley, Richard M., FA,
Onks, Marvin C., AC,
Cather, Robert M., AC,
Boggs, Kenneth S., AC,
Duff, Robert T., AC,
McCarty, Harold H., AC,
Aylor, James L., FA,
Gilliam, Claude W., QMC,
Jett, John J., QMC,
Rosser, Samuel E., AC,
Tarwater, Benjamin W., AC,
Ellis, Pelton W., AC,
Broughton, Thomas E., AC,
Fassler, Robert J., AC,
Loughrey, Robert P., AC,
Eversole, James W., Junior, AC,
Titsworth, James H., Junior, AC,
Nickerson, Richard L., AC,
Moench, John O., AC,
Cook, Norman W., AC,
Manor, Leroy J., AC,
Fitch, Arthur J., AC,
Arbogast, Filbert E., AC,
Barzee, Kenneth G., AC,
Gray, Lawrence U., AC,
Morrison, Manley J., AC,
Neidigh, Kenneth E., AC,
Barbour, Alfred E., QMC,
Stuart, Whitney D., FA
Patterson, Joseph B., AC,
Braun, Eugene J., QMC,
Johnson, Warren D., AC,
Butler, James J., Junior, AC,
Teague, Homer F., AC,
Rooks, John J., Inf.,
Steele, Ralph J., AC,
Goldsberry, William D., AC,
Sensor, John W., AC,
Loudermilk, James A., CAC,
Cann, Richard T., 4th, CAC,
Stewart, John A., Junior, FA,
Koburger, C. W., Junior, Inf.,
Lewis, Robert B., FA,
Young, Robert M., FA,
Koczak, Richard, QMC,
Walters, Gene A., Inf.,
Dinsmore, Oliver R., Junior, QMC,
Mize, Robert C., FA,
Mann, Edwin, AC,
Miller, Roger H., AC,
Mattox, William P., FA,
Simpson, Thomas L., AC,
Creel, Elnomac V., FA,
Kenney, William R., AC,
Holt, John H., Inf.,
Mohl, John L., Inf.,
Dempsey, Jack T., Inf.,
Walker, Joseph, Junior, Inf.,
Thompson, Harold C., AC,
Dolan, Edward F., Inf.,
Pierce, Sammy A., AC,
Ramer, Richard L., AC,
Godfrey, Hampton J., CAC,
Swisher, Keith D., AC,
Jones, Gordon E., FA,
McClurkin, James H., FA,
Fitzpatrick, S. N., Junior, FA,
Meholic, James J., AC,
Hopkins, Barney Q., Junior, Inf.,
Russell, Earl L., Junior, FA,
Soprano, Quentin C., Ord.,
Archer, Lee A., AC,
Steele, Arthur J., Inf.,
Nelson, Richard G., AC,
Truitt, Robert G., AC,
Brown, Billie B., AC,

Fenton, John A., AC, [redacted]
Diggs, William E., AC, [redacted]
Wagner, Kermit A., AC, [redacted]
Hurley, Richard M., AC, [redacted]
Cronin, August J., AC, [redacted]
Mims, Edwin T., AC, [redacted]
Mayo, William C., AC, [redacted]
Cartwright, R. H., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Waters, Alfred L., AC, [redacted]
George, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
Hubbard, James M., AC, [redacted]
Henderson, Jack J., AC, [redacted]
Gerber, Norris H., AC, [redacted]
Goodlad, Harold G., AC, [redacted]
Grimes, John P., AC, [redacted]
Henry, Patrick H., AC, [redacted]
Fitzpatrick, John F., AC, [redacted]
Dougherty, John E., FA, [redacted]
Smith, Donavon F., AC, [redacted]
Ferguson, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
Aschoff, John F., Inf., [redacted]
Bailey, William A., AC, [redacted]
Krams, Cortland T., Inf., [redacted]
Bonitz, George E., AC, [redacted]
Thomure, Richard F., CAC, [redacted]
Coggins, Samuel M., QMC, [redacted]
O'Dwyer, Phillip W., AC, [redacted]
Tallent, Girard S., AC, [redacted]
Gregg, Frank A., Inf., [redacted]
Kessinger, Walter F., AC, [redacted]
Wells, Mac C., AC, [redacted]
Cochrane, Robert G., AC, [redacted]
Westerman, Raymond S., AC, [redacted]
Hodges, Warren D., CAC, [redacted]
Cummings, Robert D., AC, [redacted]
Cook, Walter E., AC, [redacted]
Vizi, Joseph C., AC, [redacted]
Walker, James C., AC, [redacted]
Giles, Warren A., Cav., [redacted]
Stowell, Lester D., AC, [redacted]
Waldrop, Ramon A., AC, [redacted]
Hiltenbrand, John R., AC, [redacted]
Jelley, Alfred P., Cav., [redacted]
Wennergren, William A., AC, [redacted]
Moore, Jerry P., AC, [redacted]
Crawford, Donald A., Inf., [redacted]
Parker, Russell E., Inf., [redacted]
Barclay, Charles F., AC, [redacted]
Dunn, John H., AC, [redacted]
Smith, Ralph L., AC, [redacted]
Schwab, Vern R., AC, [redacted]
Stobie, William H., AC, [redacted]
Campbell, David D., AC, [redacted]
Crowe, Donald A., AC, [redacted]
Ursano, James J., Inf., [redacted]
Buerger, Delbert E., AC, [redacted]
Hixon, Robert C., FA, [redacted]
Shotts, Bryan M., AC, [redacted]
Lafield, William C., Junior, CWS, [redacted]
Riemensnider, R. H., AC, [redacted]
Call, William T., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Darby, Dale L., AC, [redacted]
Gleason, George W., AC, [redacted]
Grant, Archie W., AC, [redacted]
Franklin, George W., AC, [redacted]
Stone, Carroll M., AC, [redacted]
Johnson, Alfred E., AC, [redacted]
Hill, Harold I., AC, [redacted]
Prather, Jack F., AC, [redacted]
Wilson, John E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Alexander, Glen R., AC, [redacted]
Wood, Denver, J., AC, [redacted]
Laird, Henry L., AC, [redacted]
Thoms, James C., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Morgan, Wayne D., AC, [redacted]
Kregloh, Edwin R., AC, [redacted]
Heintz, James E., AC, [redacted]
Guffey, Herman F., AC, [redacted]
Hutchins, Alfred G., AC, [redacted]
Donnelly, Leonard F., AC, [redacted]
Legge, Leonard M., AC, [redacted]
Beeson, Robert L., AC, [redacted]
Schlipf, Harold A., AC, [redacted]
Sweeney, Frank C., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Bush, Cecil T., AC, [redacted]
Goss, Donald K., AC, [redacted]
Vincent, Donald W., AC, [redacted]
Keith, Jack B., AC, [redacted]
Reid, Raymond T., CAC, [redacted]
Blair, Victor P., QMC, [redacted]
Shelton, Melvin D., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Heyroth, James W., AC, [redacted]
Mowrey, Loren G., AC, [redacted]
Iles, George J., AC, [redacted]
Holden, Lloyd B., AC, [redacted]
Libby, Jack P., Cav., [redacted]
Cherry, Bob S., Inf., [redacted]
Holman, Averill F., AC, [redacted]
Dow, Hugh D., AC, [redacted]
Dukes, Ernest F., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Jones, Daniel B., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Rufener, Kenneth E., AC, [redacted]
Schmidt, Fred J., AC, [redacted]
Tychsen, Charles E., SC, [redacted]
Cartmill, John B., AC, [redacted]
Guiraud, Rene J. A., Inf., [redacted]
Dalton, Charles H., 3d, Inf., [redacted]
Hydorn, William E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Shook, Abraham E., AC, [redacted]
Hauser, John R., QMC, [redacted]
Dangelo, Jacob U., Inf., [redacted]
Beavers, James L., 2d, AC, [redacted]
Richardson, C. W., Junior, Cav., [redacted]
Morton, William G., AC, [redacted]
Richardson, C. W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Craddock, W. P., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Leighty, Robert M., AC, [redacted]
Larsen, Lauritz, S., AC, [redacted]
Pascoe, Herschel T., AC, [redacted]
Runner, William C., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Steinkrauss, L. W., AC, [redacted]
Wilde, Adna, G., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Lowry, Walter C., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Henry, William R., QMC, [redacted]
Graft, Charles V., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Wilbanks, W. H., Junior, FA, [redacted]
Turner, Walter M., Inf., [redacted]
MacGregor, Jack M., AC, [redacted]
DeCamp, Virgil Y., AC, [redacted]
Strand, George E., AC, [redacted]
Beaty, Edward E., AC, [redacted]
Twedt, Orlean L. J., AC, [redacted]
Chetneky, Steve J., AC, [redacted]
Lindsey, John E., AC, [redacted]
Kinney, James F., AC, [redacted]
McDaniel, Robert E., AC, [redacted]
Baumgardner, Haynes M., FA, [redacted]
DeZonia, Lawrence E., AC, [redacted]
Howard, Ronald M., AC, [redacted]
Cushman, Gene M., FA, [redacted]
Malkiewicz, Frank J., AC, [redacted]
Nixon, Lewis D., AC, [redacted]
Zimmerman, Robert E., AC, [redacted]
Friend, Robert J., AC, [redacted]
Rettinger, Henry P., AC, [redacted]
Palmos, Peter G., AC, [redacted]
Copeland, Phillips J., AC, [redacted]
Deckert, George F., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Dunlap, Glen R., AC, [redacted]
Ridgway, Guy E., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Rolin, Mitchell A., AC, [redacted]
Havard, David J., AC, [redacted]
Mosher, Francis L., AC, [redacted]
Arnold, William A., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Griffis, John W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Newman, John C., AC, [redacted]
Stillie, Edward O., AC, [redacted]
Moats, Sanford K., AC, [redacted]
Faver, William A., AC, [redacted]
Bulli, Dante I., AC, [redacted]
Stenger, Edward J., Cav., [redacted]
Stokes, Arthur J., AC., [redacted]
Dyer, James T., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Koslow, Stanley L., AC, [redacted]
Kuehn, Albert J., Inf., [redacted]
Kriz, Howard W., FA, [redacted]
Mahone, Nelson A., Junor, FA, [redacted]
Hamlin, Jack I., QMC, [redacted]
Armstrong, Hugh H., SC, [redacted]
Hicks, Grady L., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Simmons, John W. II, Ord., [redacted]
Thebaud, Charles C., FA, [redacted]
Goodwin, Morris W., Inf., [redacted]
Miller, John H., Inf., [redacted]
Carne, William B., Inf., [redacted]
Green, Jack C., AC, [redacted]
Lewis, George W., QMC, [redacted]
Yantis, Myron D., CAC, [redacted]
Rokey, Ned W., CAC, [redacted]
Walker, Joseph W., Jr., CAC, [redacted]
Wernimont, Wayne H., SC, [redacted]
Oneal, James D., FA, [redacted]
Streeter, Donald A., AC, [redacted]
Brame, George F., AC, [redacted]
Gillespie, George F., AC, [redacted]
Woolam, Charles W., AC, [redacted]
Mowery, Lawrence L., Inf., [redacted]
Smith, Lloyd G., Ord., [redacted]
Nance, Paul M., Inf., [redacted]
Lance, John E., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Sheridan, Roger W., Inf., [redacted]
Myers, Kenneth M., Inf., [redacted]
Williams, David H., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Blewett, Rex R., Inf., [redacted]
Pfeiffer, Dewey T., Inf., [redacted]
Mattick, Stephen, AC, [redacted]
Rose, Milton, AC, [redacted]
Hurley, Raymond L., AC, [redacted]
Graham, Neil J., FA, [redacted]
Hite, Merle L., CAC, [redacted]
Toffler, Alan R., FA, [redacted]
Evans, William W., Inf., [redacted]
Blunk, John R., QMC, [redacted]
Hardy, Nathan C., AC, [redacted]
Benster, Dixon W., AC, [redacted]
Box, Clyde H., AC, [redacted]
Culver, Gordon P., AC, [redacted]
Melton, Ramon R., AC, [redacted]
Rattie, Joseph J., AC, [redacted]
Pratt, Ervine C., AC, [redacted]
Johnson, Daniel C., AC, [redacted]
Wilhelmi, William H., AC, [redacted]
Swigler, Adam W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Iannacito, George J., AC, [redacted]
Waterhouse William C., AC, [redacted]
McDaniel, Henry B., Junior, CAC, [redacted]
Torgesen, Elmer, AC, [redacted]
Laster, Tom G., AC, [redacted]
Nourie, Robert B., AC, [redacted]
McCullouch Donald E., AC, [redacted]
Spicer, Cyril B., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Moore, Robert E., AC, [redacted]
Meintsma, Seward M., AC, [redacted]
Sewell, Jack K., AC, [redacted]
Stringer, Thomas H., AC, [redacted]
Young, Herbert L., AC, [redacted]
Warmack, Charles W., AC, [redacted]
Butler, Ralph J., AC, [redacted]
Johnston, Edward R., AC, [redacted]
Lindsey, Wilbur R., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Kelly, Joseph P., AC, [redacted]
Fish, Charles R., Ord., [redacted]
Gephart, John W., Ord., [redacted]
Allan, Robert H., Inf., [redacted]
Burke, John T., AC, [redacted]
Ashbrook, Truman R., AC, [redacted]
Elrod, John H., AC, [redacted]
Caton, June C., Inf., [redacted]
Clark, Frederick A., AC, [redacted]
Hobbs, Robert A., AC, [redacted]
Downey, Richard F., AC, [redacted]
Doherty, John P., AC, [redacted]
Hanlen, John W., AC, [redacted]
Brandenburg, W. H., FA, [redacted]
McNaught, David R., Inf., [redacted]
Bartek, Joe J., AC, [redacted]
Hacker, William C., Inf., [redacted]
Dittberner, Robert H., Inf., [redacted]
Matto, Daniel V., Junior, Inf., [redacted]
Edens, Billy G., AC, [redacted]
Flash, Edward T., Inf., [redacted]
Des Champs, Elzeard J., Inf., [redacted]
Benner, John S., Junior, QMC, [redacted]
Brown, Henry W., AC, [redacted]
Orange, George W., AC, [redacted]
Johnson, Milo C., AC, [redacted]
Abbott, Charles W., AC, [redacted]
Brown, Albert J., FA, [redacted]
Workman, John R., AC, [redacted]
Anderson, Robert S., AC, [redacted]
Bird, Raymond C., AC, [redacted]
Cardin, Philip G., AC, [redacted]
Goodson, John S., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Hartzell, James H., AC, [redacted]
Reinert, Robert A., AC, [redacted]
Sawyer, Russell, AC, [redacted]
Harris, Paul E., AC, [redacted]
Roe, David A., AC, [redacted]
Wilson, Joseph G., AC, [redacted]
Brady, James W., AC, [redacted]
Blizzard, A. W., Junior, AC, [redacted]
Beasley, Roland C., AC, [redacted]
Herman, William J., AC, [redacted]

Gammons, David B., AC,
Reeves, Robert H., AC,
Baxter, James M., AC,
Stamm, Eugene C., AC,
Butscher, Frederick W., AC,
Hesse, George A., Junior, AC,
Harris, Ray G., Junior, AC,
Hearne, Alfred C., AC,
Prichard, Artist H., Junior, AC,
Barnes, James H., AC,
Ashby, Charles B., AC,
White, Herbert R., AC,
Klibbe, Frank W., AC,
Osborne, Lloyd A., QMC,
Le Van, C. J., CAC,
Oberg, John J. W., AC,
Dickhoner, William H., CAC,
Farrar, George B., AC,
Barth, George W., QMC,
Thompson, Edmund G., Inf.,
Jones, John P., AC,
Angelakis, Charles, AC,
Lawrence, Willard J., AC,
Cook, Harvey A., Junior, AC,
Provancha, Earl D., AC,
Aldrich, Thomas A., AC,
Harrop, John W., Inf.,
Allen, Wallace B., AC,
Bartels, George D., CWS,
Smith, Glen W., Junior, FA,
Duncan, Carl R., CWS,
Marxen, Edward H., Junior, AC,
Olney, Gregory L., Inf.,
Curtis, Jack F., AC,
Cairns, Oliver W., AC,
Marshall, William E., AC,
Bernier, Norman W., AC,
Clark, Lester E., AC,
Buie, James C., AC,
Curfman, Arden B., AC,
Smith, John C., AC,
Lake, Gordon W., AC,
De Wolski, C. T., AC,
Peterson, Carl H., AC,
Hallas, Gerald E., AC,
Engler, Harold S., AC,
Lindsay, John C., AC,
Currie, Donald A., Junior, AC,
Birnbaum, Stanley J., CAC,
Griffith, William W., AC,
Plotkin, Martin H., QMC,
Sherrard, James L., AC,
Smith, George K., QMC,
Treadwell, Jack L., FA,
Porter, Philip B., AC,
Smith, Bascom P., AC,
Libell, Robert W., AC,
Eisman, Charles F., Junior, AC,
Dooley, Edward M., Ord.,
Sutton, James G., AC,
Bassett, Charles A., AC,
Wise, Richard A., Inf.,
Crockatt, George W., Junior, AC,
Irvin, David W., Junior, AC,
Williams, Richard K., Inf.,
Weathermon, Gerald E., AC,
De Longa, Peter R., AC,
Frazee, Malcolm C., AC,
Nolton, Lee B., AC,
Bailey, Robert A., AC,
Wells, Jack A., AC,
Moulton, Carl F., AC,
Stone, Addison W., AC,
Thomas, John L., AC,
Hunnicutt, Samuel Z., AC,
Donnelly, George C., AC,
Saubers, Jerome I., AC,
Rafferty, Charles D., AC,
Wright, Charles F., AC,
Johnson, Lewis T., AC,
Lane, Roland E., Junior, AC,
Braun, Gustav J., Junior, Cav.,
Canham, Robert C., Inf.,
Jackson, Charles W., AC,
Plummer, Donald I., Junior, AC,
Holliday, Ben L., AC,
Neel, Edwin E., AC,
Maret, Paul L., AC,
Skurkis, Charles J., Inf.,
Styve, Lester O., QMC,
Martin, James M., AC,
Hudson, Dugald W., Inf.,
Uhlman, William F., 3d, AC,
Deyoung, Daniel, Inf.,
Metzinger, Dale J., AC,
Evans, Lawrence J., Inf.,
Henion, John Q., Inf.,
Hoy, Thomas H., QMC,
White, Cecil W., Inf.,
Barfoot, Van T., Inf.,
Hutter, Dean E., Inf.,
Lownds, John G., Inf.,
Adams, Edwin C., CAC,
Parker, George W., AC,
Bowers, James B., AC,
Hutchinson, William G., AC,
Jepson, Warren H., QMC,
Ratchford, William M., AC,
Betchtel, Robert W., Inf.,
Evans, James W., Junior, AC,
Folk, Drue W., AC,
Blake, Stewart P., Inf.,
Swegle, Wayne F., AC,
Ray, Robert L., AC,
Hampton, Luther P., Junior, FA,
Riddling, William P., FA,
Borgen, Dale E., AC,
Stefanowski, L. J., AC,
Johnson, Charles W., AC,
Kearney, Lester T., Junior, AC,
O'Brien, James V., FA,
Schaffer, Donald C., Inf.,
Smyth, Delbert R., AC,
Woods, Thomas K., Inf.,
Weinberger, Howard W., Inf.,
Washburn, Robert L., Ord.,
Lemay, Robert W., Junior, Ord.,
Storer, Todd C., Inf.,
Cook, Thomas A., Cav.,
Wilder, Lee L., AC,
Ellias, Willie J., AC,
Brouns, Robert C., AC,
O'Bryen, Kenny D., AC,
Coleman, Bernard H., Inf.,
Truman, Paul N., Inf.,
Blaha, Charles R., Junior, Ord.,
Allman, Conrad S., AC,
Noid, William D., Inf.,
Miller, Ralph H., Junior, Ord.,
Schoomaker, Fred B., FA,
Myers, Gordon R., FA,
Halvorsen, Gail S., AC,
Kjellstrom, John A., Inf.,
Malone, Eubert H., Junior, Inf.,
Bradley, Ernest E., Junior, AC,
Murray, Donald H., AC,
Killian, Milford, L., Junior, Cav.,
Critchlow, David M., AC,
Griffith, Ray M., AC,
May, Ray B., Inf.,
Archbold, William E., AC,
Long, Emmett N., AC,
Watters, Burr S., Junior, AC,
Beyer, Richard A., Inf.,
Winter, Ferdinand J., AC,
Urban, Robert S., AC,
Moore, Fred L., Junior, Inf.,
Hendricks, William T., AC,
Graves, Grover C., AC,
Adams, John S., Junior, AC,
Hopkins, Curtis E., AC,
Starkey, Robert E., AC,
Williams, Wayland W., AC,
Hill, Harry M., AC,
Van Atten, William T., Cav.,
Gist, William W., 3d, Cav.,
Kight, Freddie C., AC,
Johnson Richard L., AC,
Pushnick, Chester J., AC,
Williams, Paul E., AC,
MacDonald, Jack G., AC,
Scherer, Donald O., AC,
Weed, Edward R., AC,
Scott, Shelby D., 3d, Inf.,
Blomberg, Julian M., AC,
Gordon, Ray C., Junior, AC,
Pelland, James G., SC
MacKechnie, T. R., FA,
Rowan, Paul J., Inf.,
Siska, John R., Inf.,
Smith James H., AC,
Jackson, Robert A., AC,
Nixon, Benjamin O., AC,
Webb, Arthur P., AC,
Wood, Branson L., Junior, AC,
Hamrick, James Q., AC,
Hackett, Paul T., Inf.,
Raese, Donald W., AC,
Bruns, David L., FA,
Barco, Barney M., FA,
Loving, George G., Junior, AC,
Stanley, Spencer G., Junior, CAC,
Carter, Jack A., Junior, CE,
Mendenhall, F. E., Junior, CAC,
Pagels, Roger E., AC,
Felts, Marion C., AC,
Campbell, Edwin R., SC,
Davis, Robert E., SC,
Sicklesteel, M. E., 3d, FA,
Allen, Norman F., Inf.,
Scott, George A., Junior, Inf.,
Maxey, John G., Junior, Inf.,
Cox, Charles B., Junior, AC,
Cloppas, William P. J., AC,
Smith, James C., FA,
Crawford, Robert J., QMC,
Prater, Otis A., AC,
Whitmire, Warren T., AC,
Loomis, Robert G., AC,
Pierce, John T., 3d, Cav.,
Latimer, Harry D., CAC,
Lynn, Arthur G., AC,
Tate, John A., Inf.,
Maillot, George E., AC,
Daher, Anthony J., AC,
Johnson, William F., Inf.,
Collins, Burt H., AC,
Moeller, Robert L., AC,
Nowak, James L., QMC,
Deatsch, Orval B., Inf.,
Gordon, Earl H., AC,
Rich, Francis M., Junior, Inf.,
Sweet, Frederick, Inf.,
Reese, William H., AC,
Manning, Clark P., AC,
Ross, Donald H., AC,
Patterson Eugene C., FA,
Weaver, William G., Junior, Cav.,
Waldo, Peter, QMC,
Matta, Elmy L., Inf.,
Gibson Harold B., Junior, Ord.,
Ulrich, Robert J., AC,
Dow, Harold R., AC,
Felder, Louis F., Inf.,
Archer, Robert E., Inf.,
Short, William P., Junior, Inf.,
Schmidt, Walter A., FA,
Martin, Charles C., Junior, Ord.,
Tassey, George, Inf.,
Brown, Harold W., AC,
Powers, John F., Junior, Inf.,
Yanker, Frederick W., Ord.,
Marsett, Robert C., Inf.,
Dietrich, William A., AC,
Winters, S. P., Junior, AC,
Mateny, Henry, AC,
Baker, John C., AC,
Fair, Robert L., Inf.,
Childress, Floyd S., Junior, CAC,
Williamson, W. B., Senior, AC,
Green, Kenneth J., AC,
Harrington, Charles E., AC,
Lamb, Charles M., Junior, AC,
Elliot, Pat K., Inf,
Whitehead, Kenneth G., SC,
Knight, James A., Junior, AC,
Schneider, Walter E., QMC,
Kelly, Robert M., Inf,
Routh, William N., AC,
McKenna, James O., Inf.,
Moore, Spurgeon A., Inf.,
Shaffer, Robert L., AC,
Hammond, George R., AC,
Stogner, Hulen D., CAC,
Roquemore, William A., AC,
Kennedy, William E., AC,
Bennett, Charles I., AC,
Harkins, Walter C., AC,
Pittenger, Edwin C., Junior, CWS,
Lindahl, William C., Inf.,
Bryan, Raymond J., AC,
Pierce, John R., Junior, Ord.,
Jones, Robert H., AC,
Thursby, Reed A., Inf.,
Pope, Bruce W., AC,
Burton, James A., AC,

Hughes, Joseph D., QMC,
Martin, Clarence A., Junior, Inf.,
Berry, Julian F., AC,
Goldes, Joseph A., Inf.,
Stephens, Norman M., Inf.,
Short, Irving R., Inf.,
Lynch, Denis P., Inf.,
Trawick, Claude M., Junior, AC,
Amis, Gilbert H., QMC,
Hoy, Charles F., Junior, AC,
Yde, Erik F., FA,
Dickson, Doyle D., AC,
Klingenberg, R. D., AC,
Kelly, Richard H., Inf.,
Jensen, Alvin C., SC,
Zotter, Leroy P., AC,
Van Houten, Warren G., AC,
Smith, Rowland D., Junior, AC,
O'Neal, Benjamin F., Junior, AC,
Brown, Oscar W. L., AC,
Burke, Billy C., AC,
Mize, James H., AC,
James, Gordon J., SC,
Maeder, Richard H., Inf.,
Coers, Myron B., AC,
Lester, Loren R., Inf.,
Summer, Peter D., Ord.,
Duncan, Marshall R., AC,
Cline, Robert H., AC,
Elliott, Rodger S., AC,
Beardsley, Charles E., AC,
La Fevers, Fred O., Junior, Fin.,
Monroe, Paul B., Junior, AC,
Hutson, Lowell, R., QMC,
Newell, John H., Inf.,
Gray, Ruffin W., AC,
Jones, Edward F., AC,
Farmer, Jiles G., AC,
Jamieson, John F., QMC,
Goering, Werner G., AC,
Seed, Donald J., QMC,
Ashbridge, T. L., 3d, AC,
Ticknor, Ernest J., AC,
McKinney, Herbert S., AC,
Crovo, Edward P., FA,
Starnes, James R., AC,
Hutter, James R., Junior, Inf.,
Myers, Robert F., AC,
Stoner, John R., AC,
Stoner, Rex K., Junior, AC,
Weldon, James T., AC,
Gambell, Robert A., AC,
Brigham, Erwin R., Cav.,
Blair, Robert A., AC,
Wilson, Nelton R., AC,
Vance, Daniel, Junior, Ord.,
Chapman, Andrew J., AC,
Patrick, John W., Junior, Inf.,
Davis, Burton A., AC,
McMurray, Robert B., AC,
Roney, Paul A., AC,
Boyd, William, Junior, AC,
Swanson, William A., AC,
Leonhard, James E., AC,
Francis, John R., AC,
Van Dyke, John M., QMC,
Mikhalevsky, A., Inf.,
Von Tongeln, Walter W., CAC,
Reitman, F. J., Junior, AC,
Monaghan, John T., Inf.,
Mode, Clayton D., AC,
Bezich, Vincent W., CAC,
Trogdon, Floyd H., AC,
Crane, Joseph J., Inf.,
Evans, Vaughn G., FA,
Fisher, Ellis L., AC,
Reeves, Andrew R., Junior, FA,
MacFarlane, Jack, Cav.,
Tomlinson, Robert C., AC,
Miller, Robert D., FA,
Potter, Francis H., AC,
Morgan, Cullen B., AC,
Tom, Jerry W., AC,
Lowell, James R., AC,
Stutts, Martin L., AC,
O'Connor, Charles D., FA,
Baker, Kemper W., AC,
Anderson, Fred G., Inf.,
Lavite, Anthony, Junior, Inf.,
Bennett, David N., Inf.,
Green, Kimball S., Inf.,
Mertel, Kenneth D., FA,
Shumway, Leslie E., Cav.,
Ormond, Merle F., FA,
Nicol, David J., Inf.,
Nee, Robert F., AC,
Proctor, William D., Inf.,
Small, William D., Junior, AC,
Connolly, James J., AC,
Vann, John P., Inf.,
Gillette, Harvey W., AC,
Edmonds, Edmund W., Junior, AC,
Farrell, William J., FA,
Sumner, Gordon, Junior, FA,
Miller, James M., AC,
Bartschi, Paul E., Inf.,
Keefer, Loren R., SC,
Newman, Robert C., AC,
Neal, Thomas J., AC,
Curry, Hayden C., AC,
Ledford, Edward B., FA,
Monroe, Ernest M., Junior, QMC,
Stockton, Glen W., AC,
Coffman, William F., AC,
Kroman, George F., AC,
Pierce, James W., Inf.,
Griffin, Hiram, AC,
Quinn, John T., AC,
Raine, C. O., 3d, AC,
LeMay, George D., AC,
Shearer, Wayne G., AC,
Prater, Robert M., Inf.,
Smith, Roscoe B., AC,
Smith, William S., Inf.,
Warren, Willard, AC,
Rooke, Allen D., Junior, FA,
Rowland, Hampton, Junior, Inf.,
Collins, David C., AC,
Ahern, Timothy I., AC,
Collins, Harold E., AC,
Viney, George C., Inf.,
Kinsey, John D. Z., Inf.,
Miller, Judson F., Cav.,
McCullough, Joseph A., AC,
Ventres, Robert L., AC,
Henck, Noel J., AC,
Jones, Bud L., Inf.,
Von der Bruegge, J., Junior, FA,
Hughes, Robert M., AC,
Adams, Donald D., AC,
Laughlin, William E., AC,
Armstrong, Douglas A., FA,
Smith, Charles A., AC,
Kult, Milton L., SC,
Crisp, Harold N., AC,
Smith, Clyde B., Inf.,
Prebbanow, James C., AC,

To be majors

(Nonpromotion list)

Rodriguez-Molina R., MC,
Thompson, Milton S., MC,
Hunter, George W., 3d, PhC,
Davidson, James R., Junior, Ch.,
De Mars, Edward J., Ch.,
Gibbs, Frederick H., PhC,
Tucker, Anthony C., PhC,
Malumphy, Charles P., Ch.,
Appleman, Robert M., DC,
Naselli, George E., DC,
Jones, Richard B., MC,
Quest, Charles N., Ch.,
Wheeler, Charles M., PhC,
Giergerich, Paul J., Ch.,
Koch, John I., Ch.,
Boland, James M., DC,
Crawford, Henry A., MC,
Baty, James B., PhC,
Haughey, John E., PhC,
Keeney, Paul A., MC,
Dismukes, Jackson B., MC,
Gibson, Elmer P., Ch.,
Dirksen, Lynn C., DC,
Buttermore, Charles W., DC,
Gilbert, Charles L., PhC,
Taylor, Howard M., DC,
Mullaney, John J., Ch.,
Hill, Ralph A., Ch.,
Shaeffer, Joseph R., MC,
Cox, Ralph L., MC,
Buck, Charles M., Ch.,
Matsuka, Walter H., MC,
Radlinski, John C., CH,
Ryan, Maurice P., DC,
Sewell, Dan R., MC,
Carter, Philip R., VC,
Ogrady, Charles S., DC,
Smith, Emmett M., MC,
Houck, Joseph F., DC,
Gleason, Wallace A., MC,
Knies, Herman E., Ch.,
Bennett, Harry J., PhC,
Schroeder, Wilburt A., DC,
Eveland, Warren C., PhC.,
Zund, Emil A., Ch.,
Cayton, Alfred M., DC,
Hamilton, Frank E., MC,
Cooper, Elven R., MC,
Kotte, Bernard J., PhC,
De Chant, Wilson B., Ch.,
Hall, Robert S., Ch.,
Fisher, Earl E., DC,
Draper, William B., MC,
Whitfield, R. L., Junior, MC,
Cleland, Ralph R., PhC,
Melugin, Kermit T., Ch.,
Cameron, Joseph M., MC,
Imrie, Matthew H., Ch.,
Bullis, Stanley W., PhC,
Britell, Claude C., PhC,
Schwinghamer, W. L., DC,
Strippy, Clarence G., Ch.,
Disch, Frank A., DC,
Goriup, Othmar F., PhC,
Starnes, Mervyn B., VC,
Bristow, Jack H., MC,
Dominick, John F., MC,
Ramsey, Harry E., DC,
James, Ottis E., DC,
Gunther, Carl F., Ch.,
Kothe, Herman H., DC,
Moran, William J., Ch.,
Green, George B., MC,
Bowers, Warner F., MC,
Cornish, Paul A., DC,
Smith, Charles M., Ch.,
Priest, Leroy R., Ch.,
Ferguson, Gordon T., PhC.,
Fleetwood, Phillip G., PhC,
Reed, Kenneth H., PhC,
Shea, Thomas F., Ch.,
Salley, Colvin W., MC,
Aronson, Roland S., MC,
Warren, F. W., Junior, DC,
Harms, Herbert E., MC,
Becker, Walter H., DC,
Richart, Earl A., PhC,
Kellogg, Frederick, MC,
Jobe, George R., PhC,
Knoepp, Louis F., MC,
Elmstrom, Clarence L., PhC,
McFall, Thomas A., DC,
Hargreaves, Robert P., MC,
Taylor, William F., Junior, Ch.,
Hanner, James Z., Ch.,
Cehrs, Bernice J., DC,
Collins, Gerald J., DC,
Fair, George K., MC,
Hopson, Brannon J., Ch.,
Craig, Charles W. G., DC,
Stoltz, Ray E., PhC,
Parsons, John B., PhC,
Gordon, James H., MC,
Struble, Gilbert C., MC,
Blake, Allen J., PhC,
Zimmermann, Edward A., MC,
Gorman, Cornelius E., MC,
Revell, John H., DC,
Bell, Morris B., DC,
Hoblit, Noel E., DC,
Rosen, Samuel, Ch.,
Richardson, C. T., DC,
Bonsignore, Marco R., MC,
Kettrick, Donald P., DC,
Aabel, Bernard, PhC,
Hollenbach, Albert M., DC,
McGee, Charles E., Ch.,
Homiston, Robert M., Ch.,
Lynch, Louis A., DC,
Byrne, William H., MC,
Peel, Alfred R., DC,
Pfanner, Carl W., DC,
Glass, Albert J., MC,

McBurney, Harold S., MC,
Eanes, Edward W., Ch.,
Donellon, Geo E., Ch.,
Sexauer, Leo C., DC,
Gracie, John M. 2d, PhC,
Schlaak, Melvin V., PhC,
Faison, Thomas G., MC,
Hale, John M., PhC,
Wilson, Neil O., VC,
Canada, Charles C., MC,
Wicher, Herbert W., Ch.,
Bradley, Alford V., Ch.,
Morse, Frederick E., Ch.,
Anderton, John L., Ch.,
McCarroll, William H., MC,
Galvin, James D., Junior, PhC,
Bowers, William H., DC,
Maxwell, Roy D., PhC,
Riley, John B., MC,
Duggan, John P., Ch.,
Sheen, Ernest T., Ph,
Habetz, Leonard C., Ch.,
Pincus, Philip, Ch.,
Webb, Joseph E., Junior, PhC,
Hill, Guy C., PhC,
Heffernon, George A., MC,
Shea, James F., Ch.,
Anderson, Ronald C., MC,
Kemp, Edward H., PhC,
Hughes, Raymond P., MC,
Thomas, Henry S., MC,
Cocks, Charles E., Junior, MC,
Switzer, Ralph E., MC,
Gross, John G., PhC,
O'Grady, George L., DC,
Bruton, Ogden C., MC,
MacLeod, Roy M., Ch.,
Rhea, Robert L., Junior, MC,
Holmes, Harry C., DC,
Long, Arthur P., MC,
Prince, Carl M., PhC,
Boeck, Virgil H. F., MC,
Marchek, Carlyle S., PhC,
Dietrich, Frank S., MC,
McLane, Robert B., MC,
Walsh, Patrick J., Ch.,
Webster, Harry W., Ch.,
Kamish, Robert J., MC,
Clayton, Rex P., PhC,
Northen, Ernest E., Junior, Ch.,
Smith, Ralph J., Ch.,
Love, Robert C., MC,
Mackin, James H., PhC,
Roberts, Roy F., MC,
Woods, William G., Ch.,
Van Sickle, Albert W., MC,
Whitaker, John O., DC,
Mitchell, Stuart M., DC,
Resseguie, Roy A., VC,
Brayshaw, Horace A., DC,
Orth, Richard H., PhC,
Pearce, Robert L, DC,
Morris, Charles A., PhC,
Huff, Rufus D., PhC,
Stepp, William H., DC,
Hage, Gunnar H., PhC,
Delaney, Joseph H. MC,
Griggs, Oscar B., MC,
Coddington, Harvey W., PhC,
Nolan, John F., Ch.,
Blumenthal, Ralph H., Ch.,
Kerr, George M., VC,
Taylor, Robert P., Ch.,
Hiebert, Samuel L., Ch.,
Lind, Carl J., Junior, MC,
Johns, Onas L., DC,
Maurer, Fred D., VC,
Marsh, Edward T., VC,
Goldberg, Solomon, MC,
O'Connor, James C., Ch.,
Holmberg, Gerald W., VC,
Roth, Henry D., PhC,
McGill, Dan P., Junior, PhC,
Thompson, Roger S., MC,
Blumberg, Joe M., MC,

To be captains

Jarman, Julian A., MC,
Breton, Philip C., Ch.,
Jensen, Walter N., MC,
Clark, Hugh G., MC,

Bowers, George S., MC,
Naderhoff, Adolph C., DC,
Meador, Maurice A., DC,
Little, Tom F., MC,
MacKown, John L., Junior, DC,
Avary, Hugh D., DC,
Quinn, Gene, PhC,
Karr, James R., VC,
Hlopko, John J., Ch.,
Byrne, Thomas D., Ch.,
Miller, Paul A., DC,
Fairchild, James M., DC,
Collins, Horace R., Junior, VC,
Saunders, Edward J., Ch.
Kennedy, Gregory R., Ch.,
Spearman, Walter D., MC,
Van Sant, Willard M., VC,
Pine, Ernest F., Ch.,
Fitch, Henry B., DC,
Winn, John D., VC,
Reiss, William J., Ch.,
Glascock, Harold W., Junior, MC,
Disheroon, Charles D., DC,
Madore, Lucien A., Ch.,
Nichols, Earl R., DC,
Ehrlich, Karl F., DC,
Wallace, Edwin S., MC,
Hiesser, Frank G., DC,
Weaver, Oswald M., MC,
Seay, Thomas B., DC,
Lamb, Roland D., MC,
Ames, Kenneth L., Ch.,
Mainwaring, John W., Junior, DC,
Monroe, Floyd E., VC,
Fowler, Thomas G., DC,
Zacherle, George H., Junior, VC,
Shaffer, Glen C., Ch.,
Lesemann, George C., DC,
McCain, George H., MC,
Miller, Robert R., VC,
Mengel, Dwayne H., Ch.,
Smith, Jerome T., DC,
Bryant, Robert A., Ch.,
Francis, Garnet P., Junior, DC,
Reighter, Kenneth M., MC,
Van Sicklin, Roy, MC,
Murphy, Charles J., Ch.,
Groover, Marshall E., MC,
McDonald, Thomas J., Ch.,
Gale, John, VC,
Carriker, Elmer I., Ch.,
Montgomery, John W., MC,
Knight, Lonnie W., Ch.,
Brooks, B. L., DC,
Silvinski, Alphonse B., Ch.,
Goder, George A., MC,
Wanderman, Sidney E., MC,
Hall, Durward G., MC,
Frost, William M., Ch.,
Guerin, John W., MC,
Calley, John H., MC,
Dick, Harry J., MC,
Heuer, Herman H., Ch.,
Kastner, Manuel C., VC,
Lancaster, Harry R., VC,
Collier, George T., PhC,
Powers, William E., Ch.,
Sparks, John W., Ch.,
Chalker, Everett M., MC,
Keating, Joseph M., MC,
Hayes, Paul W., MC,
Lauer, David P., MC,
Ream, William M., DC,
Crawford, James P., VC,
Early, Frank S., DC,
Twiehaus, Marvin J., VC,
Henahan, James P., DC,
Kostecki, Walter A., MC,
McClench, George S., DC,
Snodgrass, William B., VC,
Bayne, Joseph K., MC,
Robinson, Charles E, VC,
Alden, Carlos C., Junior, MC,
Eastman, John R., DC,
Lookatch, William C., DC,
Gollehon, Charles W., VC,
Sprinz, Helmuth, MC,
Harwood, George W., MC,
Jarboe, Jesse J., PhC,
Sibert, Herbet F., VC,
Berthelsdorf, S. R., MC,

O'Brien, John A., Ch.,
Swanson, Raymond W., DC,
McWilliams, Alfred E., Ch.,
Reierson, Clarence N., DC,
Irey, Nelson S., MC,
Ganfield, Douglas G., DC,
Cutress, Albert L., Ch.,
Mostofi, Fathollah K., MC,
Spillane, John H., Junior, MC,
Garner, James R, DC,
Johnson, Andrew L., Ch.,
Durden, Lewis M., Ch.,
Chase, Edward D., DC,
Kerns, Raymond P., Ch.,
Nerone, William S., MC,
Midura, Thomas M., Ch.,
Pennington, Henry C., Ch.,
Nettles, John R., Junior, VC,
Finkelman, Ellis, DC,
Ellenbogen, Edward, Ch.,
Lawrence, Howard R., MC,
Lehman, George A., Ch.,
Geigel, Francis G., Ch.,
Emling, Arno H., DC,
Miller, Donald A., MC,
Crunden, Allan B., Junior, MC,
Madden, Raymond H., DC.,
Sampson, Francis L., Ch.,
Smith, Phillip B., MC,
Ciccone, Roy, MC,
Stewart, Russell J., VC,
Clark, Marley C., VC,
Downey, Vincent M., MC,
Hutchinson, W. R., Junior, DC,
Montgomery, Lee E., DC,
Sullivan, Jeremiah E., Ch.,
Moser, Ernest H., DC,
Bosscher, Gerard P., DC,
Andreson, Paul S., MC,
Shannon, Daniel F. X., Ch.,
Harley, William M., Junior, DC,
Hummer, Robert L., VC,
Palen, Joseph S., VC,
McKelvey, Lowell E., DC,
Smith, William S., MC,
Moore, Denis G., Ch.,
Schick, Robert, PhC,
Wurm, Urban J., Ch.,
Mead, Walter P., PhC,
Tracy, Gilbert W., MC,
Sullivan, Arthur D., PhC,
Hollis, Dwight S., PhC,
Thurston, Kenneth J., Ch.,
Goodall, Henry A., DC,
Baumgaertner, M. W., Ch.,
Flowers, Elijah V., Ch,
Berge, Trygve O., PhC,
Cruzan, Winston V., DC,
Campbell, Kennth D., MC,
Rice, James E., PhC,
Eisner, David G., MC,
Boysen, John E., MC,
Osborn, Ewalt M., DC,
Partin, Delbert C., Ch,
Farrell, Clement A., DC,
Coers, Burt N., MC,
Clapp, Stacey W., Junior, DC,
Mobley, Carlos V., PhC,
Moore, William S., MC,
Sabin, George M., Junior, MC,
Christopher, Burton C., VC,
Deemer, Walter L., Junior, PhC,
Hardesty, Lawrence B., PhC,
Brucker, John C., Ch,
Connell, Thomas B., DC,
Anderson, Murray O., DC,
Luft, John, PhC,
Day, Robert W., VC,
Quarantillo, Edward P., DC,
Andrew, Joseph D., Ch,
McFadden, Glenn M., VC,
Cavender, Savind W., MC,
Hoffman, Archie A., MC,
Dungan, William M., Junior, VC,
McDonough, Joseph F., MC,
Potts, Edwin H., PhC,
Cook, Robert W., VC,
Carlquist, Philip R., PhC,
Scott, Rolland O., VC,
Miller, Hubert W., MC,
Fry, Lloyd V., VC,

Bloomquist, Ernest W., VC, [redacted]
Allison, Aaron F., VC, [redacted]
Biddulph, Wesley G., DC, [redacted]
Wert, Earl B., MC, [redacted]
Bertram, Harold F., MC, [redacted]
Kennedy, Julien C., MC, [redacted]
Murphy, Leslie C., VC, [redacted]
Burns, Charles R., DC, [redacted]
Paige, Ralph E., PhC, [redacted]
O'Brien, Edward J., Ch, [redacted]
Coburn, George C., VC, [redacted]
McNelly, Justin E., DC, [redacted]
Dever, Charles A., Ch, [redacted]
Watkins, Ernest S., VC, [redacted]
Butler, Henry M., PhC, [redacted]
Tierney, Gerald M., MC, [redacted]
Quinn, Edward F., Junior, PhC, [redacted]
Miller, Ernest L., DC, [redacted]
Fechner, Walter W., VC, [redacted]
Pickhardt, Woodrow L., MC, [redacted]
Irby, William B., DC, [redacted]
Braude, Max A., Ch., [redacted]
Raley, Perry T., Ch, [redacted]
Colquitt, Alfred O., Junior, MC, [redacted]
Romick, Francis H., DC, [redacted]
Osborn, Lowell A., VC, [redacted]
Kessler, John N., Ch., [redacted]
Orr, Kenneth D., MC, [redacted]
Whitlock, Harold T., Ch., [redacted]
Adams, James J., PhC, [redacted]
Angell, Howard H., MC, [redacted]
Luettgen, Edward M., Ch., [redacted]
Murphy, George E., PhC, [redacted]
McGrath, Denis J., MC, [redacted]
Traub, Forrest E., DC, [redacted]
Tate, Charles W., VC, [redacted]
Beckjord, Philip R., MC, [redacted]
Gerth, Eugene W., MC [redacted]
Perri, Frank A., MC, [redacted]
O'Donohoe, Michael R., Ch., [redacted]
Manges, Joseph D., VC, [redacted]
Pappas, Allen, PhC, [redacted]
Parker, R. L., PhC, [redacted]
Alexander, L. G., Junior, PhC, [redacted]
Plowman, Floyd C., PhC, [redacted]
Wilson, George M., VC, [redacted]
Stine, Robert C., PhC, [redacted]
Lang, Norbert S., DC, [redacted]
Waddill, William C., PhC, [redacted]
Sine, Arnot C., MC, [redacted]
Hillebrand, Richard J., DC, [redacted]
Zwack, John A., Ch., [redacted]
Guenther, A. J. D., PhC, [redacted]
Rustigian, Barj A., PhC, [redacted]
Mudgett, Louis E., PhC, [redacted]
Hepner, Thomas G., Ch., [redacted]
Olsen, Edmund S., Junior, DC, [redacted]
Neiman, Watson E., MC, [redacted]
Smith, Auburn H., PhC, [redacted]
Bunnell, James B., Junior, DC, [redacted]
Bohn, Gordon A., PhC, [redacted]
Dandridge, William S., MC, [redacted]
Poulin, Frederick K., DC, [redacted]
Horn, Wiley H., VC, [redacted]
Brennan, George J., Ch., [redacted]
Fisher, Sam S., VC, [redacted]
Grugan, Owen P., PhC, [redacted]
Domanski, Thaddeus J., PhC, [redacted]
Beadner, Harold F., VC, [redacted]
Comella, Martin S., PhC, [redacted]
Crowley, Robert E., DC, [redacted]
Curd, Howell L., PhC, [redacted]
Roadman, Charles H., MC, [redacted]
Nuttall, James B., MC, [redacted]
Hunt, John M., Junior, PhC, [redacted]
Jones, Gordon A., PhC, [redacted]
Wills, Charles F., Ch., [redacted]
Hester, Warren R., DC, [redacted]
Anslow, Ralph O., VC, [redacted]
Bell, Miles G., PhC, [redacted]
Hatfield, Carl R., Ch., [redacted]
McCaslin, Kermit J., PhC, [redacted]
Jimison, Robert L., VC, [redacted]
Wingo, Roland H., PhC, [redacted]
Partlow, Frank A., PhC, [redacted]
Covey, William T., PhC, [redacted]
Frank, Ogden M., DC, [redacted]
Hollander, Milton H., MC, [redacted]
Taylor, Albert A., VC, [redacted]
Tolbert, Raymond F., PhC, [redacted]
Crow, Allen R., PhC, [redacted]

Whitley, Fenner H., Junior, PhC, [redacted]
Antley, Hampton L., PhC, [redacted]
Clary, John J., PhC, [redacted]
McMeen, Edwin D., PhC, [redacted]
Doyle, James M., PhC, [redacted]
Atchley, Oren C., PhC, [redacted]
Helvey, Robert B., DC, [redacted]
Thomas, Frederick W., PhC, [redacted]
Lull, George F., Junior, MC, [redacted]
Krall, Morton S., PhC, [redacted]
Tatch, David, PhC, [redacted]
Germond, Robert C., DC, [redacted]
Burnett, George W., DC, [redacted]
Sturb, Giles J., MC, [redacted]
Seaman, Oliver R., MC, [redacted]
Healy, William J., DC, [redacted]
Campbell, Donald MC, [redacted]
Evans, Jon P., MC, [redacted]
Mulholland, Richard F., MC, [redacted]
Comstock, Jack A., MC, [redacted]
Stack, Andrew J., PhC, [redacted]
Zolenas, Anthony J., Junior, PhC, [redacted]
Rudisill, John W., DC, [redacted]
Curtis, George B., PhC, [redacted]
Wallace, Albert D., DC, [redacted]
Wallace, John K., 2d, MC, [redacted]
Wiley, Irving B., PhC, [redacted]
Sumner, John W., MC, [redacted]
Schucker, Charles L., MC, [redacted]
Lasher, Norbert A., VC, [redacted]
Clifford, William B., DC, [redacted]
Jefferis, Tomas C., PhC, [redacted]
Peterson, Emmett L., PhC, [redacted]
Gorman, Lester J., VC, [redacted]
Ransom, John P., PhC, [redacted]
McHugh, Thomas P., Ch., [redacted]
Jessen, Lothard T., VC, [redacted]
Beeson, Walter L., PhC, [redacted]
Lord, Willys E., VC, [redacted]
Streidl, Edward G., PhC, [redacted]
Kirchoff, Arnold W., DC, [redacted]
Kjolsrud, Gordon S., PhC [redacted]
Miller, Robert J., VC, [redacted]
Scott, Robert F., MC, [redacted]
Brennan, John J., MC, [redacted]
Lightner, Lee M., DC, [redacted]
McIntyre, Edward J., PhC, [redacted]
Frank, Charles B., VC, [redacted]
Moore, Arlice J., PhC, [redacted]
Herrin, William V., PhC, [redacted]
Rushmore, Rowland W., VC, [redacted]
Benhart, Sherwood F., DC, [redacted]
Parrish, Henry N., PhC, [redacted]
Geyer, Harry M., Junior, MC, [redacted]
Frick, Edward H., PhC, [redacted]
Patterson, Robert A., MC, [redacted]
Cochran, Ernest E., Junior, PhC, [redacted]
Curran, Francis M., PhC, [redacted]
Shealey, Percy R., PhC, [redacted]
Frazee, Edward B., PhC, [redacted]
Wilhoit, Edward, PhC, [redacted]
James, Willard W., PhC, [redacted]
Cohen, Ben F., PhC, [redacted]
Hall, Edward W., PhC, [redacted]
Archer, Harvey E., PhC, [redacted]
Meeter, Urquhart L., MC, [redacted]
Slaughter, John C., Junior, MC, [redacted]
Gersoni, Charles S., PhC, [redacted]
Rooney, John E., DC, [redacted]
Reid, William O., PhC, [redacted]
Martin, Arthur D., DC, [redacted]
Koepke, Theodore V., Ch., [redacted]
Shepperd, Lewis A., MC, [redacted]
Runyon, Merlyn W., PhC [redacted]
Mullins, Dewitt F., Junior, MC, [redacted]
Kane, John P., DC, [redacted]
Davis, Chester H., PhC, [redacted]
Brennan, James T., MC, [redacted]
Johnston, George W., PhC, [redacted]
Brookreson, Kendrick, DC, [redacted]
Carlozzi, Michael, MC, [redacted]
Spellman, Richard E., Ch., [redacted]
Scott, Osborne E., Ch., [redacted]
MacEachern, Neil G., VC, [redacted]
Allen, Denver I., PhC, [redacted]
Miller, Ellsworth L., MC, [redacted]
Wright, Elwood, PhC, [redacted]
Baer, Reuben A., PhC, [redacted]
Cummings, Harold L., PhC, [redacted]
Hack, Raymond L., MC, [redacted]
Offutt, Harry D., Junior, MC, [redacted]

Taylor, Lloyd W., MC, [redacted]
Dalsheimer, Seymour, PhC, [redacted]
Hamilton, Henry E., MC, [redacted]
McKeown, Clarence E., PhC, [redacted]
Ingram, James L., PhC, [redacted]
Deragisch, William J., PhC, [redacted]
Gamble, Robert H. D., PhC, [redacted]
Butler, James M., DC, [redacted]
Burus, John E., PhC, [redacted]
Alvari, George, MC, [redacted]
Gruver, George A., PhC, [redacted]
Sumnicht, Russell W., DC, [redacted]
Clark, Robert E., PhC, [redacted]
Burns, Kenneth F., VC, [redacted]
Gochenour, W. S., Junior, VC, [redacted]
Brockman, Sidney C., MC, [redacted]
Cheek, Russell C., PhC, [redacted]
Pope, John J., MC, [redacted]
Foster, Ivan M., PhC, [redacted]
Rowe, James W., PhC, [redacted]
Dauer, Maxwell, PhC, [redacted]
Dieterich, William H., VC, [redacted]
Anderson, Ned H., DC, [redacted]
Currier, Clyde C., PhC, [redacted]
Kramer, John J., PhC, [redacted]
Gorman, Harry A., VC, [redacted]
Bailey, James M., MC, [redacted]
Ross, Martin A., VC, [redacted]
Harrington, Daniel R., PhC, [redacted]
Nicolary, Carl W., PhC, [redacted]
Polkinghorn, James W., PhC, [redacted]
Zubkoff, Harry, PhC, [redacted]
Watson, Robert E., PhC, [redacted]
Egan, Frank B., PhC, [redacted]
Keller, Robert J., VC, [redacted]
Walbert, B. L., Junior, VC, [redacted]
Underwood, Edgar H., Junior, MC, [redacted]
Kadets, Martin, VC, [redacted]
Snider, Charles H., VC, [redacted]
Prather, Elwin R., VC, [redacted]
Reid, Joseph E., VC, [redacted]
Brooks, Roy E., PhC, [redacted]
Goetz, Carl, PhC, [redacted]
Fox, Murl A., VC, [redacted]
Jerome, Shepard, MC, [redacted]
Kegerreis, John B., PhC, [redacted]
Schwartz, Roland C., PhC, [redacted]
Baker, Thomas E., PhC, [redacted]
Brandt, Jerome N., PhC, [redacted]
Nibbelink, Arion B., PhC, [redacted]
Boeckman, Franklin P., PhC, [redacted]
Hastings, William O., PhC, [redacted]
Homs, Jose M., PhC, [redacted]
Thompson, Joseph C., PhC, [redacted]
Ferguson, Harry A., PhC, [redacted]
Ryer, Robert, 3d., PhC, [redacted]
Merriken, John E., PhC, [redacted]
Sheeley, William F., MC, [redacted]
Stout, Arthur O., PhC, [redacted]
Anderson, Edward J., Junior, PhC, [redacted]
Beckwith, James R., DC, [redacted]
Rawlins, William A., PhC, [redacted]
Alchian, Armen A., PhC, [redacted]
Coats, James G., PhC, [redacted]
Cairns, James V., PhC, [redacted]
Oettinger, Vernon S., PhC, [redacted]
Houser, Jack, PhC, [redacted]
LeMoon, Ralph G., PhC, [redacted]
Andersen, Herman S., PhC, [redacted]
Sweet, Fred W., Junior, PhC, [redacted]
Czaja, Rudolph P., PhC, [redacted]
Nedds, Ivan L., PhC, [redacted]
Pupshock, George, DC, [redacted]
Loyd, Charles M., PhC, [redacted]
Darling, James O., PhC, [redacted]
Carlson, Carl E., Junior, PhC, [redacted]
Segal, Martin L., DC, [redacted]
Emory, Louis, DC, [redacted]
Rudy, Lester H., MC, [redacted]
Flaherty, Bernard E., MC, [redacted]
Wilson, John T., DC, [redacted]
Crundwell, Joseph B., VC, [redacted]
Foster, Robert T., PhC, [redacted]
Chadwick, Ralph D., VC, [redacted]
Farrell, Thomas A., PhC, [redacted]
Shaw, James I., PhC, [redacted]
Levens, Arthur J., MC, [redacted]
Lacombe, James L., PhC, [redacted]
Hunt, Albert B., PhC, [redacted]
Nielsen, George L., PhC, [redacted]
Crowell, Gene W., PhC, [redacted]

Phelps, Allan W., PhC,
Gleiser, Chester A., VC,
Haines, Charles C., PhC,
Hutchins, Gordon, Junior, Ch.,
McNulty, M. F., Junior, PhC,
Oxnam, Philip H., Ch.,
Streeter, Russell E., PhC,
Davison, Neville W., PhC,
Evans, Murray F., PhC,
Lineberger, Ernest C., MC,
Failing, Frank W., VC,
Noe, Herbert A., PhC,
Dean, James W., PhC,
Parker, James F., PhC,
Harrison, James W., MC,
Nelson, Robert K., VC,
Pendlyshok, Charles A., PhC,
Meagher, Harvey E., PhC,
Bouton, Arthur G., PhC,
Marsh, Edwin S., PhC,
Hood, Patrick W., PhC,
Vacura, Gordon W., VC,
Lichnovsky, Joseph F., VC,
Berwick, Leonard, PhC,
Jones, Herman A., Junior, PhC,
Hastings, Frederick W., PhC,
Nelson, Francis C., PhC,
Carter, James A., PhC,
Morgan, Richard B., VC,
Quackenbush, Robert O., PhC,
Jones, Elmer A., PhC,
Bach, Sven A., MC,
Haase, Fredrick, Junior, PhC,
Conroy, Robert J., Junior, PhC,
Kavanagh, John J., MC,
Pacey, William A., PhC,
Henderson, Clyde W., PhC,

To be first lieutenants

Stith, Marion C., PhC,
Lemire, Joseph A. W., PhC,
Monnen, Millard C., PhC,
Zachar, Martin, Junior, PhC,
Morrison, Manley G., PhC,
Leonard, Edgar W., PhC,
Helsel, Wilford P., PhC,
Lackey, Robert W., MC,
Tillman, Hjalmar A., PhC,
Thornton, William H., PhC,
Lawford, Frank K., PhC,
Barham, Roy I., PhC,
Erpelding, Leander F., PhC,
Brown, Eugene T., PhC,
Chapelle, Francis O., PhC,
Behrens, Donald H., PhC,
Kondrat, William V., Junior, PhC,
Walker, Herman A., PhC,
Austin, William L., PhC,
Bullard, Perry C., PhC,
Gott, William E., PhC,
Wood, Ross A., PhC,
Leibovitz, Albert, PhC,
Hoover, Chris D., PhC,
Miller, Robert C., PhC,
Medwed, John D., PhC,
MacMillan, Thomas R., PhC,
Lipscomb, Edward V., PhC,
Burris, Layton O., PhC,
Laughlin, Thomas, Junior, PhC,
Levesque, Paul M., PhC,
Mendenhall, John V., PhC,
Hilcken, John A., PhC,
French, Stanley H., PhC,
Wagner, Owen B., PhC,
Fakes, Robert D., PhC,
Schaller, Rees F., PhC,
Walden, Jack T., PhC,
Bryant, Russel L., PhC,
Ford, Walter, E., PhC,
McCleary, Gordon F., PhC,
Rogers, John M., PhC,
Trenholm, John H., PhC,
Liles, Ben C., PhC,
King, Paul W., PhC,
Gordon, William M., PhC,
Hill, William A., PhC,
Davis, Scott H., PhC,
Benade, Leo E., PhC,
Wright, Lester J., PhC,
Moore, David L., PhC,
Love, Jack P., PhC,
Murphy, Paul W., PhC,
Wilkins, Arthur L., PhC,
Ahr, Lee A., PhC,
Francis, James R., PhC,
Eledge, William W., PhC,
Good, Otto S., PhC,
Loisel, Vernon H., PhC,
Shanahan, Eugene L., PhC,
Shepler, Lloyd B., PhC,
Maybell, Robert E., PhC,
Roberts, Clifton W., Junior, PhC,
Krause, William O., PhC,
Hutchinson, M. C., PhC,
Traub, Robert, PhC,
Thompson, Jerry V., PhC,
Schlicher, Norman R., PhC,
Scroggs, Howard R., PhC,
Mitchell, Oscar D., PhC,
Bryan, Roy A., PhC,
Riddle, Hasty W., PhC,
Cowgill, Charles J., PhC,
Pytlewicz, Marion J., PhC,
Turnipseed, L. L., PhC,
Dowless, Joseph D., Junior, PhC,
Meyer, Alvin F., Junior, PhC,
Thomas, Hughie C., PhC,
Jarboe, Wallace E., PhC,
Russell, Harold E., PhC,
Southard, W. W., Junior, PhC,
Edwards, Sam A., PhC,
Wolf, Charles R., Junior, PhC,
Johnson, William M., PhC,
Lenn, Claude R., PhC,
Cubbler, Charles A., PhC,
Swanson, Fred H., PhC,
Creamer, Raymond J., PhC,
Conrad, George F., PhC,
Sadler, Hayes M., PhC,
Egense, Stanley W., Junior, PhC,
Sandman, Otto H., Junior, PhC,
Tutor, Ralph C., PhC,
Caito, Thomas P., PhC,
Hallahan, John M., PhC,
Gray, John T., PhC,
Casteel, Ralph T., PhC,
Hooker, Claude L., PhC,
Retzky, Clarence, PhC,
Jonson, Wayne H., PhC,
Richards, Ralph J., Junior, PhC,
Chandler, Melbourne C., PhC,
Barney, Leonard C., PhC,
Alexander, Eugene S., PhC,
Carmichael, Jack C., PhC,
King, Henry, PhC,
Doidge, William T., PhC,
Hammaker, Bernard W., PhC,
Snider, Albert H., PhC,
Sorrells, William M., PhC,
Thompson, Willard E., PhC,
Kowalsky, Matthew J., PhC,
Strnad, Joseph J., PhC,
Kilmer, Joseph M., PhC,
Edwards, Thomas R., PhC,
Nashold, Donald K., PhC,
La Manche, Philip L., PhC,
Otter, Henry F., PhC,
Beaudry, Stephen J., PhC,
Wehrman, Edwin M., PhC,
Kelly, Francis J., PhC,
Brown, Charles T., PhC,
Huffman, James V., PhC,
Rossi, Joseph P., PhC,
Buchanan, Dee C., PhC,
Sixberry, Leroy R., PhC,
Swall, Ross F., PhC,
Hrdlicka, Otto G., PhC,
Thompson, Elmer L., PhC,
Shedivetz, Clayton L., PhC,
Grindell, James D., PhC,
Reich, Norman, PhC,
Plemmons, Sam A., PhC,
Blue, Lonnie K., PhC,
Scarpitta, Anthony, PhC,
DeVine, Joseph R., PhC,
Luehrs, William C., PhC,
Wisser, Nathan R., PhC,
Torgerson, Fernando G., PhC,
Clark, Jack K., PhC,
Godwin, Frank D., PhC,
Eslick, Orville J., PhC,
Lindsay, Charles W., Junior, PhC,
Maguire, Robert F., PhC,
Dempsey, Richard W., PhC,
Kifner, Daniel R., PhC,
Graham, Harrold E., PhC,
Nichols, Maurice W., PhC,
Peters, George M., PhC,
Breyfogle, William V., PhC,
Howell, Louis G., PhC,
Gans, Harry L., PhC,
Martindale, Robert W., PhC,
Newbold, William M., PhC,
Whitaker, Harry T., PhC,
Parker, Elliott G., PhC,
Magness, Willie C., PhC,
Clegg, William J., Junior, PhC,
Rivas, Ernest G., PhC,
Gottry, Samuel M., PhC,
Mercer, Charles G., PhC,
Smith, Stuart S., PhC,
Cook, Paul M., PhC,
Smith, Glenn R., PhC,
Hepp, Louis H., PhC,
Howard, Kenneth G., PhC,
Britt, Arthur E., PhC,
Wallace, Ernest H., PhC,
Saling, James T., PhC,
Hamilton, William M., PhC,
Graber, Charles D., PhC,
Manrow, William E., PhC,
Pomphrey, Patrick J., PhC,
Specht, Murvel F., PhC,
Maher, Dale R., PhC,
Gelby, Walter H., PhC,
Kropp, Arthur J., PhC,
Gibson, Wilmot L., PhC,
Holmes, Warren H., PhC,
Buckler, Philip J., PhC,
Hoover, Thomas H., PhC,
Burleson, Derwood E., PhC,
Kerwin, Bernard F., PhC,
Evans, Robert D., PhC,
Watts, Foster L., PhC,
Hall, Edwin T., PhC,
Sykes, Edward G., PhC,
Nall, Scott M., PhC,
Grow, George L., PhC,
Rajecki, Felix G., PhC,
Wells, Floyd B., PhC,
Landers, George C., PhC,
Bates, Elvis E., PhC,
Morden, Harold R., PhC,
Washburn, Robert E., PhC,
Deverick, Theodore R., PhC,
Burke, Charles S., PhC,
Smiley, Frank H., PhC,
Schmahmann, Lionel H., PhC,
Strobel, Edward M., PhC,
Valentine, Robert G., PhC,
Carter, Russell J., PhC,
Hill, Leonard D., PhC,
Wiscarson, John W., PhC,
Osmun, John V., PhC,
Julian, Russell E., PhC,
Hughes, Robert L., Junior, PhC,
Reilly, Thomas J., PhC,
Spika, Howard J., PhC,
Rocchio, Fred J., PhC,
Stock, William E., Junior, PhC,
Wood, Norman E., Junior,
White, William F., PhC,
Gwin, Jack W., PhC,
Kiefer, Lester, PhC,
Henry, James E., PhC,
Knight, Ovid L., PhC,
Bowers, Gerald V., PhC,
Piercy, Clarence H., Junior, PhC,
Fink, James L., PhC,
Waters, John F., 2d, PhC,
Sterzinger, Morris M., PhC,
Dumond, Paul A., PhC,
Smith, Charles R., PhC,
Butler, Stanley E., PhC,
Hanna, Edward J., PhC,
Keating, Edward J., PhC,
Schwartz, Seymour, PhC,
Kadrovach, Dan G., PhC,
Whitmore, Robert O., PhC,
Lumpkin, Walter L., MC,
Thomas, Herrick M., MC,
Conlin, Gerald J., Junior, MC,
Pappas, George N., MC,
Neel, Spurgeon H., Junior, MC,
Schwab, Linden H., MC,
Lindhome, Donald B., DC,

Pracher, John R., MC, [redacted]
Cudlipp, Ralph L., Junior, MC, [redacted]
Dixon, George F., VC, [redacted]
Jackson, Marshall D., MC, [redacted]
Lockwood, Robert S., MC, [redacted]
Madigan, Emmett P., MC, [redacted]
Dunn, Albert A., Junior, MC, [redacted]
Stropes, Lloyd R., MC, [redacted]
Miller, Byron L., MC, [redacted]
Oelhafen, Wayne R., MC, [redacted]
Hall, Robert J., MC, [redacted]
Smelsey, Samuel O., MC, [redacted]
Hogge, Arthur L., Junior, VC, [redacted]
Grudin, Edward L., DC, [redacted]
Queary, Charles H., Junior, MC, [redacted]
Moncrief, William H., MC, [redacted]
Nims, Robert M., VC, [redacted]
Kuhn, Ulysses S. G., 3d, VC, [redacted]

To be second lieutenants

Williams, John R., PhC, [redacted]
Statler, Robert A., PhC, [redacted]
Willett, Joseph E., PhC, [redacted]
Deems, William A., PhC, [redacted]
Hoover, David F., PhC, [redacted]
Erb, John J., Junior, PhC, [redacted]
Foley, Joseph S., PhC, [redacted]
Holladay, Norman C., PhC, [redacted]
Conour, Ronald T., PhC, [redacted]
Redmond, John, PhC, [redacted]
Zielazinski, Harry R., PhC, [redacted]
Hart, Bernard A., PhC, [redacted]
Stanley, Forrest H., PhC, [redacted]
Pfeiffer, Lawrence J., PhC, [redacted]
Wilson, James A., 2d, PhC, [redacted]
Graf, Leonard G., PhC, [redacted]
Prettyman, W. O., Junior, PhC, [redacted]
Epperson, Jordan L., PhC., [redacted]
Flora, Jack L., PhC, [redacted]
Cook, Dudley P., PhC, [redacted]
Darling, Kenneth P., PhC, [redacted]
Dexter, Wade H., PhC, [redacted]
Edmonds, Clarence W., PhC, [redacted]
Smith, Frank K., PhC, [redacted]
Northing, John W., Junior, PhC, [redacted]
Kanaya, Jimmie, PhC, [redacted]
Boyd, Lester R., PhC, [redacted]
Joyner, Charles A., PhC, [redacted]
Frase, Robert C., PhC, [redacted]
Franklin, C. L., Junior, PhC, [redacted]
Brady, Joseph V., PhC, [redacted]
Keagy, Charles W., PhC, [redacted]
Justice, Lonzo D., PhC, [redacted]
Kinney, Charles R., PhC, [redacted]
Souvall, George W., PhC, [redacted]
Share, James M., PhC, [redacted]
Akers, Stephen E., PhC, [redacted]
Shelton, T. J., PhC, [redacted]
Wigger, James R., PhC, [redacted]
Gilliam, Robert N., PhC, [redacted]
Pascal, Andre R., PhC, [redacted]
Cramer, Roger L., PhC, [redacted]
Van der Aa, Robert E., PhC, [redacted]
Covington, Robert L., PhC, [redacted]
Neal, Forest L., PhC, [redacted]
Hunter, John H., PhC, [redacted]
Walpole, James R., PhC, [redacted]
Krough, George R., PhC, [redacted]
Braaten, Conrad S., PhC, [redacted]
Craycraft, Ralph E., PhC, [redacted]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1946

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, high above all, wrapped in tranquil infinity, yet in mercy dost Thou look upon this world with its tragedies, its storms and defeats. We praise Thee for the care and the love which have gone into Thy children. Wherefore may we not glory in wealth, or in man, or in station, but in the everlasting gift with which we have been endowed. Look into our hearts, and mayest Thou hear the music of charity and justice to all men. Make it gloriously possible for us to do the utmost things for those whose lives are dark and flat and sorely distressed. Thou great Shepherd of the sheep, lend us strength and courage to smite temptation and guard Thy fold from polluting taint of any kind. Forgive our sins and bridge our weakness; increase our sense of the divine until Thy excellence, purity, and love appear in everything. Through Jesus our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6335) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 6, 18, 19, 20, 85, 87, 115, 141, 166, 239, 272, 276, and 277 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4512) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain excerpts and copies of letters from constituents.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute on the subject The OPA and Our Present Food Prices and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Mark Sullivan.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Reserve Officers' Association.

Mr. HEALY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Mr. Leon Henderson.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a baccalaureate sermon by Dr. James A. Reeves, at Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pa.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain newspaper articles.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. TRAYNOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include quotations.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include several newspaper articles.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RIVERS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the grounds upon which he seeks recognition on a question of personal privilege.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 180]

Adams	Clark	Fernandez
Anderson, Calif.	Clippinger	Fogarty
Andresen, August H.	Cochran	Gamble
	Coffee	Gardner
Andrews, N. Y.	Cole, N. Y.	Gearhart
Bailey	Colmer	Geelan
Baldwin, Md.	Courtney	Gibson
Barden	Cox	Gillespie
Barry	Cravens	Granger
Bates, Mass.	Crawford	Grant, Ala.
Beall	Crosser	Gwinn, N. Y.
Bell	Curley	Hagen
Bennet, N. Y.	Davis	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Boren	Dawson	
Boykin	De Lacy	Hancock
Bradley, Mich.	Domengeaux	Harness, Ind.
Bradley, Pa.	Douglas, Calif.	Harris
Buffett	Doyle	Heselton
Camp	Engel, Mich.	Hoch
Cannon, Fla.	Ervin	Hoffman, Mich.
Case, N. J.	Fellows	Holifield

Izac	Murphy	Starkey
Jackson	Norrell	Stevenson
Johnson, Okla.	Norton	Stewart
Jones	O'Brien, Mich.	Stigler
Kee	O'Hara	Stockman
Keefe	Pace	Sumner, Ill.
Kefauver	Patrick	Sumners, Tex.
Kelly, Ill.	Patterson	Talbot
Kerr	Peterson, Ga.	Tolan
King	Powell	Torrens
Lea	Ramey	Vinson
LeCompte	Reece, Tenn.	Wadsworth
Lewis	Robertson, N. Dak.	Weaver
Ludlow	Robinson, Utah	Welch
McGehee	Roe, Md.	West
McKenzie	Roe, N. Y.	Wickersham
Madden	Rooney	Winstead
Mahon	Sabath	Wolfenden, Pa.
Mansfield, Mont.	Sharp	Wood
Mansfield, Tex.	Short	Woodhouse
Marcantonio	Somers, N. Y.	Worley
Miller, Calif.	Sparkman	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 303 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CHARLES MARVIN SMITH

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 4492) for the relief of Charles Marvin Smith, be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6429) making appropriations for the legislative branch, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6429) making appropriations for the legislative branch, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, and 53, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$187,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$65,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 54.

EMMET O'NEAL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
WALT HORAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

MILLARD TYDINGS,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CLYDE M. REED,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6429) making appropriations for the legislative branch, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 1 to 39, inclusive, relating to the Senate: Appropriates for salaries and other items, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 40 and 41, relating to the House: Adjust the salary of one employee and correct the total for items in the paragraph, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 42, relating to Capitol buildings: Appropriates $415,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $409,500, as proposed by the House.

No. 43, relating to the Senate Office Building: Appropriates $518,400, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $517,600, as proposed by the House.

No. 44, relating to general repairs, etc., Library of Congress: Appropriates $187,100 instead of $209,600, as proposed by the Senate, and $164,600, as proposed by the House.

No. 45, relating to furniture, etc., Library of Congress: Appropriates $65,340 instead of $77,680, as proposed by the Senate, and $53,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 46, relating to salaries, Library of Congress: Appropriates $2,100,000 instead of $2,203,370, as proposed by the Senate, and $2,004,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 47, relating to the Copyright Office, Library of Congress: Appropriates $526,925, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $500,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 48, relating to the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress: Appropriates $425,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $400,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 49, relating to printing and binding, Library of Congress: Appropriates $381,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $369,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 50, relating to printing catalog cards, Library of Congress: Appropriates $447,482, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $410,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 51, relating to salaries, Library buildings: Appropriates $437,760, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $427,600, as proposed by the House.

No. 52, relating to contingent expenses, Library buildings: Appropriates $34,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $32,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 53, relating to the Government Printing Office: Includes a provision permitting the purchase of uniforms for guards, as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENT REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

No. 54, relating to the prohibition against the payment of salary to employees who are members of an organization that asserts the right to strike against the Government or advocates the overthrow of the Government by force or violence: The House managers will move to recede and concur.

EMMET O'NEAL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
WALT HORAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi, and I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

SMEAR ATTACKS AND FAKE LAWSUITS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] for giving me this time. I would not ask it, but I am compelled to leave for home today.

A vicious smear campaign against me has been carried to its ultimatum in the filing of a couple of fake lawsuits here in the District of Columbia, one by a man who calls himself Holdridge and the other by what he calls the Veterans' League of America, of which he claims to be the head.

He attributes to me a statement over the telephone that I never made, and is doing this in order that it may go into the press and affect my primary, which takes place next Tuesday.

I do not believe in all the history of Congress I have ever known a man to be the victim of so much vilification and abuse as I have had to take, and as the other members of the Committee on Un-American Activities have had to take, coming from those elements that are largely dedicated to the overthrow of this Government.

I want to show you who this man Holdridge is. He entered the Military Academy in 1913, on June 14, under the name of Herbert Charles Heitke. I am reading now from the record of the Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the United States Military Academy. Later his name was changed by the War Department. This is the first time I ever knew that the War Department had the right to change anybody's name. It was changed to Herbert Charles Holdridge. He served under that name until he was recently discharged from the United States Army; that is, he was retired, and I am going to quote from a secret document from the War Department showing you what he was retired for. He was retired for incapacity, and that incapacity was psychoneurosis. So he sues me because he says that I said he was crazy.

The gentleman from Nebraska, sitting before me, Dr. MILLER, who in civil life is a practicing physician, and a very able one, told me that this man Holdridge came to his office for an interview, and that he was thoroughly convinced that the fellow was demented.

He claims to be the head of this American Veterans' League. I am reading now from a letter that is being sent out by the American Veterans' League attempting to raise money to be sent into my district with which to fight me. They are either violating the laws of the State of Mississippi and the laws of the United States against corrupt practices or else they are using the mails to defraud, to raise money under false pretenses. That is the reason these suits are filed.

This letter reads:

Veterans' League of America, national headquarters, 45 Astor Place, New York 3, N. Y., Gramercy 5-0085, Brig. Gen. H. C. Holdridge, chairman, legislative committee.

On May 9 this confidential letter they are sending out—and it is marked "Confidential"—went to people all over the State of New York, I presume, because several of them were sent to me by the ones who received them.

It says:

JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, is up for reelection this year. There is an excellent possibility that he may be defeated in the primary by a progressive veteran.

It goes on to say:

Five thousand dollars, beyond the funds already available, are needed immediately.

It goes on to say that the Veterans' League down there, of which nobody ever heard, has called on them, and I quote him again:

We urge you to make a generous contribution. You will thus be doing your share to strengthen the democratic forces in Congress. Your check should be made payable to the Veterans' League of America and sent in the enclosed stamped envelope as quickly as possible.

That letter is signed by several men. The first man who signed it is A. Philip Randolph, the Negro who is the head of the Pullman porters' union.

The next one who signed it is a man named Davidson, Ben Davidson, then Charles Davis, George S. Counts, Albert Sprague Coolidge, and Horace M. Kallen.

There is also enclosed a little blank for them to fill in and send in for the amount of money they are contributing to my opposition.

In addition, they enclose a stamped, addressed envelope with a special delivery stamp on it, which I hold in my hand. It is addressed as follows:

To: Messrs. Coolidge, Counts, Davidson, Davis, Kallen & Randolph, c/o Veterans' League of America, 45 Astor Place, New York 3, N. Y.

Now let us see who those people are—but first, before we go that far, let us see about this man Holdridge. I have in my hand some speeches he has made, one of them is headed, "Why I shall vote for the Socialist Party."

It is useless for me to read that speech to you, because you can understand what kind of quirk any man has who will vote the Socialist ticket. He proceeds here to malign both the Democrats and Republicans. Another one of his speeches is headed, "Why I shall vote for Norman Thomas." I suppose that cinches it, and leaves no doubt as to where he stands.

Then I have another one which is headed "The Enemy—Capitalism." And he goes on to argue that capitalism must be destroyed. What does he mean by capitalism? He simply means the system of free enterprise that enables you and me or anyone else to own our homes; to own our farms; to own our factories; to own our business establishments. In his argument here for the destruction of capitalism he announces the policy of communism as completely as Lenin or Stalin or anyone else could have expressed it. If that isn't communism, I do not know what to call it.

Mr. Speaker, let us see about these others who signed this letter. Suppose we just take a look at the records of this outfit. This Negro, A. Philip Randolph, as I said, is head of the sleeping car porters and has been connected with other Communist fronts.

This man Counts who signs his name "Dr. George S. Counts" has a long record of communistic affiliations. In 1930 he took a trip through Soviet Russia, undoubtedly as a guest of the Communists, and has been spreading his vicious communistic poison throughout this country ever since. He has been an officer, in or sponsor of, or active in, 15 of the leading communist front organizations in America, many of which have been branded by the Department of Justice as subversive. He signed this letter along with this Negro, A. Philip Randolph, who as I said also has a communist front record with about 10 or 15 different organizations that I may refer to later. They signed this letter to raise money in flagrant violation of the corrupt practices act to send down into the First Congressional District of Mississippi to try to corrupt the electorate in the coming primaries.

Another signer is a man named Albert Sprague Coolidge, also a member of the provisional committee for the Union May Day meeting in Boston 1938, which was sponsored by the World Communist Movement. He has been mixed up with communist front organizations from that day to this. In 1936 this Albert Sprague Coolidge was found to be a Communist by one of the great police bureaus of the United States. He signs his name to these letters that are going out to raise money to fight me with.

Another signer of this letter is Horace M. Kallen, who has held high positions in leading communist front organizations for many years and, with the help of the Soviet agents, has distributed communistic propaganda over the United States through the motion pictures.

Another of these signers is Charles Davis, who the record shows became a member of the Communist Party in 1931 and who was known at that time to carry a Communist card. The Communists then were plotting, and are still plotting the overthrow of this Government.

This Negro, A. Philip Randolph, who, as I said, is head of the Pullman Operators' Union, has associated himself with numerous Communist front organizations, many of which have been branded subversive by the Department of Justice as well as by the Dies Committee and the FBI.

The other signers of these letters—and I say these letters because there are many of them—are just as bad as these men are. You will note at the top of this letterhead that the executive director of this outfit is one E. Muravchick. The chairman of the policy committee is Leo Johnson, and the chairman of the legislative committee is H. C. Holdridge, alias H. C. Heitke. All of these men have records with the Dies Committee and the FBI and the Department of Justice, of Communist front affiliations throughout the country.

There is one other matter I would like to mention. I have before me a letter that this man Holdridge, alias Heitke, sent out attacking the people of Arkansas in a most vicious manner. One of my friends in Washington sent me this letter. It is signed by this H. C. Holdridge. It says:

"How would you feel if you were colored and lived in Arkansas?"

Then it proceeds to denounce the authorities of Arkansas for sending to the penitentiary a Negro criminal who shot an officer who was trying to arrest him.

If you will investigate you will find they were behind this trouble in Tennessee. He says:

Send in a hundred dollars, fifty dollars, twenty-five dollars, or whatever you can spare to help free Tee Davis and to continue the vital work of the Workers' Defense League in the fight against injustice, hate, and intolerance.

Mr. Speaker, I did not want to leave here with all this smear going on through the press without saying a few words. As I said, this is nothing in the world but a fake lawsuit. It is trumped up for the purpose of sending a report of it into the district I have the honor to represent, in order to try to injure me in the campaign which closes on next Tuesday.

I have nothing to hide. I have stood by my convictions. I have put the welfare of my country first and I shall continue to do so. I will meet this bunch in the Federal court, or in any other court whenever they get ready, but if the United States Government and the legal authorities of Mississippi do their duty, they may not get out of jail in time to try this case.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California such time as he may desire.

NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for naval appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 6496.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, this is the legislative branch appropriation conference report. There is absolute unanimity on the part of the conferees as to what is contained in the report. Unless the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] desires recognition, I will move the previous question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in dispute in the bill. I have nothing further to say.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 54: Page 57, strike out all of section 107 and insert a new section, to read as follows:

"SEC. 107. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5990) "making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 17, 19, 22, 50 and 64.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 5, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 52, 54, 55, 57, 60, 61, 62, 63, 68, 69 and 72, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$174,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$190,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "purchase and maintenance of one passenger automobile;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$425,972"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,710,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,248,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,297,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from the disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$859,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$767,309"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For the acquisition of parcel 101/25, known as the Emery estate, as a site for recreational, library and other community purposes in the discretion of the Commissioners, $204,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,106,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$75,000", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,630,657"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$723,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert " 'Victory' gardens and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,033,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$581,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Capital outlay, District Training School: For the construction and equipment of laundry building, $140,000; and for the improvement of roads, $35,000; in all, $175,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$586,152"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,211,923"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 67, and 71.

JOHN M. COFFEE,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
EMMET O'NEAL,
KARL STEFAN,
WALT HORAN,
GORDON CANFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
ELMER THOMAS,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
RAYMOND E. WILLIS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5990), making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 2, relating to the general fund: Includes the words "Veterans' Services" authorized in Public Laws No. 376 and 385, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved since this appropriation bill passed the House, the funds for which is carried in a proposal of the Senate which is agreed to by the House conferees.

No. 3, relating to the office of the corporation counsel: Appropriates $174,200, instead of $182,530 as proposed by the Senate and $165,870 as proposed by the House. It provides for the salaries of 1 assistant corporation counsel, P–6 and 1 clerk-stenographer, CAF–4.

No. 4, relating to the Auditor's office: Appropriates $308,544 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $271,920 as proposed by the House.

No. 5, relating to the Department of Weights, Measures, and Markets: Appropriates $124,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $121,391 as proposed by the House.

No. 6, relating to the Office of Recorder of Deeds: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate.

No. 7, relating to the Office of Recorder of Deeds: Appropriates $190,850 instead of $199,036 as proposed by the Senate and $185,672 as proposed by the House. The amount added to the amount proposed by the House will provide the salaries of 1 guard, CPC–4, and 2 clerks, CAF–2.

No. 8, relating to the Public Utilities Commission: Language amendment proposed by Senate to authorize Public Utilities Commission to hold hearings upon any application made for the installation of meters in taxicabs if such Commission cares to do so.

No. 9, relating to the general administration expenses of the public schools: Includes language authorizing the purchase and maintenance of one passenger automobile for $1,290 for the Franklin School, which is the administration building.

No. 10, relating to the general administration expenses of the public schools: Appropriates $425,972 instead of $430,372 as proposed by the Senate and $421,572 as proposed by the House.

No. 11, relating to general supervision and instruction, public schools: Appropriates $10,710,300 instead of $10,881,200 as proposed by the Senate and $10,539,900 as proposed by the House. The amount added to the amount proposed by the House will provide the salaries for 19 class 1-A elementary-school teachers, 2 class 2-A junior-high-school teachers, 3 class 2-C junior-high-school teachers, 2 class 3-A senior-high-school teachers, 2 class 5-A vocational-high-school teachers, 2 class 5-C vocational-high-school teachers, and provide $106,000 for instruction for veterans.

No. 12, relating to operation of buildings and grounds and maintenance of equipment, public schools: Appropriates $2,248,500 instead of $2,264,500 as proposed by the Senate and $2,218,520 as proposed by the House.

Nos. 13 and 16, relating to furniture, equipment, continuing construction and contract authorization for the Alexander Graham Bell (Abbott) Vocational School: Senate proposes elimination of all items for this school and House concurs in same.

No. 14, relating to furnishing and equipping Anacostia Senior High School, Logan Elementary School, Tyler Elementary School. Includes these schools along with others to receive funds for such purposes.

No. 15, relating to furnishing and equipping schools: Appropriates $189,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of $275,080 as proposed by the House.

No. 17, relating to Taft Junior High School: Eliminates the proposed additional construction to this school.

No. 18, relating to Logan School: Authorizes construction of an eight-room elementary-school addition to this school at cost of $200,000.

No. 19, relating to Walker and Jones Schools: Eliminates construction of new twenty-four-room elementary-school building to replace present school building.

No. 20, relating to Richardson School: Authorizes construction of a sixteen-room extensible elementary-school building at a cost of $100,000.

No. 21, relating to the Anacostia Senior High School: Authorizes remodeling of present building at a cost of $93,320.

No. 22, relating to the Cranch and Tyler Schools: Eliminates construction of new elementary-school building to replace present school.

No. 23, relating to Slowe School: Authorizes an amount of $50,000 for construction of an eight-room extensible elementary-school building in the vicinity of Fifteenth and Hamlin Streets Northeast.

No. 24, relating to the Western Senior High School: Authorizes expenditure of $147,900 for alterations at this school.

No. 25, relating to Terrell Junior High School: Authorizes not to exceed $1,350,000 for plans and specifications and construction of new junior high school building to replace present school building.

No. 26, relating to Armstrong Senior High School: Authorizes not to exceed $1,560,000 for plans and specifications for an addition, necessary remodeling of present building and treatment of grounds.

No. 27, relating to the Eliott Junior High School: Authorizes not to exceed $350,000 for preparation of plans and specifications for an addition of ten classrooms, a gymnasium, necessary remodeling of the present building, and treatment of grounds.

No. 28, relating to construction of school buildings: Appropriates $2,297,680, instead of $3,348,200 as proposed by the Senate and $2,008,000 as proposed by the House. This is in conformity with the action taken in amendments No. 17 to No. 27, inclusive.

No. 29, relating to free tuition of pupils who dwell outside the District of Columbia: Eliminates language proposed by the House to require pupils who dwell outside the District of Columbia to pay tuition for attending District schools.

No. 30, relating to operating expenses for the Public Library: Appropriates $859,500 instead of $906,210 as proposed by the Senate and $848,900 as proposed by the House. It provides for the salaries of 2 librarians, P–2, and 2 junior librarians, P–1.

No. 31, relating to operating expenses, Recreation Department: Appropriates $767,309 instead of $782,719 as proposed by the Senate and $751,900 as proposed in the House.

No. 32, relating to the acquisition of a parcel of land for the Recreation Department: Appropriates $204,000 as proposed by the Senate for the purchase of parcel 101/25, known as the Emery estate on Georgia Avenue near Concord Avenue, for recreational, library, and other community purposes. It is understood that the amount herein stated is the full purchase price of the parcel of land.

No. 33, relating to Metropolitan Police: Appropriates $5,225,000, instead of $5,344,275 as proposed by the Senate and $5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

No. 34, relating to the Fire Department: Appropriates $3,106,000 instead of $3,211,138 as proposed by the Senate and $3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

No. 35, relating to Veterans' Services: Authorizes title of "Veterans' Services" for the new items that follow.

No. 36, relating to Veterans' Services: Appropriates $75,000 instead of the $100,000 as proposed by the Senate. This is a new item of appropriation authorized by the enactment of Public Law 376, 79th Congress.

No. 37, relating to Veterans Housing: Authorizes an appropriation of $250,000 for providing necessary utilities for veterans' housing furnished and erected by the National Housing Administrator.

No. 38, relating to operating expenses, Health Department: Appropriates $1,630,657 instead of the $1,654,623 as proposed by the Senate and $1,605,423 as proposed by the House.

No. 39, relating to operating expenses, Glenn Dale Tuberculosis Sanatorium: Appropriates $1,389,308 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,319,592 as proposed by the House.

No. 40, relating to operating expenses, Gallinger Municipal Hospital: Authorizes $8,750 as proposed by the Senate instead of the $8,000 as proposed by the House. The increase is to provide for the salary increase authorized under Public Law 106.

No. 41, relating to operating expenses, Gallinger Municipal Hospital: Authorizes $1,500 as proposed by the Senate for a residence for the superintendent. This is now authorized by legislation.

No. 42, relating to operating expenses, Gallinger Municipal Hospital: Appropriates $3,150,000 instead of $3,841,148 as proposed by the Senate and $2,341,148 as proposed by the House. A tremendous increase in personnel was requested, bringing the number of employees per patient to more than two employees for each patient, or in excess of any other comparable hospital concerning which the committee had any information. It is the thought of the committee that better administration rather than an overstaffing is the answer to the problem at this hospital, and the committee demands more efficient administration and better utilization of the services of employees.

Nos. 43, 44, 45 and 46, relating to care and treatment of indigent persons under contracts by medical charities: Appropriates $225,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $185,000 as proposed by the House. The increases are found necessary because of higher

costs of operation and inability to secure contracts at the former prices.

No. 47, relating to operating expenses, child care, Family Welfare Service: Appropriates $723,260 instead of $758,380 as proposed by the Senate and $688,140 as proposed by the House.

No. 48, relating to Capital outlay, child care, Family Welfare Service: Appropriates $50,000 as proposed by the Senate for an additional amount for the construction of a receiving home and classification center. An appropriation of $285,000 is available but has been found insufficient to meet requirements.

No. 49, relating to public assistance and children's services: Authorizes language as proposed by the Senate for vocational rehabilitation of disabled residents of the District of Columbia in accordance with Public Law 113, approved July 6, 1943.

No. 50, relating to public assistance and children's services: Appropriates $55,500 as proposed by the House instead of $63,500 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 51, relating to public assistance and children's services: Eliminates language for the "supervision of" Victory gardens and permits the change in name to "Victory" gardens.

No. 52, relating to public assistance and children's services: Eliminates the words "of home gardens" in conformity with the change in name in the preceding amendment.

No. 53, relating to public assistance and children's services: Appropriates $2,033,500 instead of $2,041,500 as proposed by the Senate and $2,008,500 as proposed by the House.

No. 54, relating to public assistance and children's services: Eliminates the word "home" and inserts in lieu thereof the word "Victory" relative to gardens, and in conformity with earlier amendments.

No. 55, relating to operating expenses, Juvenile Correctional Service: Appropriates $499,908 as proposed by the Senate instead of the $475,748 as proposed by the House.

No. 56, relating to operating expenses, Adult Correctional Service: Appropriates $2,200,000 instead of $2,238,407 as proposed by the Senate and $1,873,407 as proposed by the House. The reduction from the amount as proposed by the Senate is to be made in personnel.

No. 57, relating to capital outl.y, Adult Correctional Service: Appropriates $116,600 as proposed by the Senate for improvements at the jail.

No. 58, relating to operating expenses, District Training School: Appropriates $581,600 instead of $587,120 as proposed by the Senate and $542,580 as proposed by the House. The amount authorized provides for 1 P–2 physician, 22.5 CPC–2 attendants and 2 P–1 parole officers, and $5,000 for provisions.

No. 59, capital outlay, District Training School: Appropriates $140,000 instead of $420,000 as proposed by the Senate for construction and equipment of laundry building and employees' housing by eliminating all employees' housing; and $35,000 instead of $50,000 as proposed by the Senate for improvement of roads.

No. 60, relating to operating expenses, Office of Superintendent of District Buildings: Authorizes language for "uniforms and caps for guards" as proposed by the Senate.

No. 61, relating to operating expenses, Office of Superintendent of District Buildings: Appropriates $548,200 as proposed by the Senate instead of $545,700 as proposed by the House. Provides funds for uniforms and caps for guards authorized in amendment No. 60.

No. 62, relating to Department of Inspections: Authorizes three members of board of special appeal and two members of electrical examining board at $300 per annum each as proposed by the Senate to provide fire inspection of hotels, etc.

No. 63, relating to Department of Inspections: Appropriates $421,100 as proposed by the Senate instead of $408,500 as proposed by the House.

No. 64, relating to Department of Vehicles and Traffic: Reinstates language proposed by House.

No. 65, relating to Department of Vehicles and Traffic: Appropriates $586,152 instead of $603,852 as proposed by the Senate and $547,600 as proposed by the House. Eliminates $11,500 for traffic lights and $6,200 for payment of director of Motor Vehicle Parking Facility as the activity is to be directed by the Director of Traffic.

No. 66, relating to operating expenses, Water Department: Appropriates $1,450,000 instead of $1,476,600 as proposed by the Senate and $1,420,000 as proposed by the House.

No. 68, relating to capital outlay, Washington Aqueduct: Authorizes funds for construction of new mixing and sedimentation basins for the Dalecarlia filter plant and completion of clear water basin at the same plant.

No. 69, relating to capital outlay, Washington Aqueduct: Appropriates $1,980,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $989,000 as proposed by House. Increased amount to take care of items mentioned in amendment No. 68.

No. 70, relating to National Capital Parks: Appropriates $1,211,923 instead of $1,223,846 as proposed by the Senate and $1,200,000 as proposed by the House.

No. 72, relating to purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles: Eliminated language as to ceiling price for automobile as it is necessary to purchase heavier cars for the Fire Department.

AMENDMENTS REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

Following is a statement of the amendments reported in disagreement and of the motion that has been authorized by the managers on the part of the House to be made in regards to each:

Amendment No. 1, relating to the contribution that the Federal Government will make towards the expenses of the District of Columbia. The House has approved $6,000,000 and the Senate proposes an amount of $10,000,000. A motion to further insist on the amount approved by the House will be made.

Amendment No. 67, relating to the sale by the Secretary of the Treasury of securities held for and on account of the water fund of the District of Columbia. A motion to concur in the Senate amendment will be offered.

Amendment No. 71, relating to employees that assert the right to strike against the Government of the United States or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States. A motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment will be offered with an amendment reading as follows:

"Sec. 3. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

JOHN M. COFFEE,
J. VAUGHN GARY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
EMMET O'NEAL,
KARL STEFAN,
WALT HORAN,
GORDON CANFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GARY (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there is nothing controversial in the conference report or the statement which the Clerk is reading until the amendments in disagreement are reached, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 1, line 8, strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1.

May I say, however, in making this motion that the House did not include this amount in its bill because they felt it was a legislative matter. The amendment was added by the Senate. The House managers felt that they were under instructions from the full committee.

The motion is made, however, for the sole purpose of bringing the matter before the House. Some members of the subcommittee feel that an increase in the amount is justified and the motion is made without prejudice to their right to take any position they wish.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 and concur in the same.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia had this bill under consideration the matter of the Federal contribution was discussed. It was generally believed by the majority of the membership of the subcommittee that while the sum of $6,000,000 which represents the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia was out of date the committee itself was powerless to include that it in its bill for presentation to the House because it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Public Law No. 225 of the Seventy-sixth Congress specified that Federal lump sum should be $6,000,000, the committee felt that the legislative committee on the District of Columbia should go into this matter, study it and bring in some authorization legislation. When the bill reached the Senate, that body increased the Federal contribution from the authorized amount of $6,000,000 to $10,000,000. Your committee reached an agreement with the leadership to bring the report here and give the House an opportunity for a separate vote on the problem of Federal contribution to the District of Columbia.

For the information of the House, may I say that in 1923 the Federal contribution was on a 60–40 basis. Before that it was on a 50–50 basis. Public Law 225 of the Seventy-sixth Congress authorized the Federal contribution, as I said before, of $6,000,000. In 1924 the contribution of the Federal Government to the District was over $9,000,000; in 1925, $9,000,000; in 1931 it was nine and a half million dollars; and then it started dropping down in 1933, at which time it was $7,775,000; in 1934 and 1936 it was $5,700,000; and in 1937, 1938, and 1939 it was $5,000,000 even. Therefore, the Federal Government was paying more back in 1923, when the budget for the District of Columbia was around $19,000,000, than it is at the present time, when the budget is around $76,000,000. It is generally thought that the real-estate tax here is very low, and I agree that it is. Many people in Washington feel the same way. The nontaxable land, such as the Federal Government property, runs over $708,000,000. The nontaxable District land is over $91,000,000, and the land belonging to foreign governments and foreign people, which is not taxable, runs over $122,000,000. Therefore, this cuts the taxable land down to around 49 percent. However, that is not the entire picture, and the taxpayers of the District of Columbia really have a case in point here. For this reason, your committee thought we should bring this question out in the open and see how the Members felt about it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. At what rate is real estate taxed in the District of Columbia?

Mr. STEFAN. At $1.75 a hundred, or $17.50 per $1,000.

Mr. DONDERO. On what basis is real estate assessed in the District of Columbia?

Mr. STEFAN. I will tell the gentleman from Michigan that it is supposed to be assessed at actual valuation, but my information is that it is not entirely on complete full assessed valuation. I agree that the taxes of real estate are low in the District of Columbia, and no one is arguing that point. Certainly it is lower than in my State of Nebraska.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The members of the legislative committee for the District of Columbia, and the Members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, have had this problem and challenge before them for many, many years. The gentleman from Nebraska, now speaking, has given most careful attention to the considerations involved. I think that I should say for the record that I made a special study of this matter and I am of the considered opinion that the Federal contribution is not commensurate with that which the District of Columbia deserves. I trust that the contention made by the gentleman now speaking and others who join him will be given favorable consideration by this House of the proposal offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative FLOOD.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that contrary to a popular opinion that our constituents do not desire adequate Federal contribution that the opposite is true. I believe that the men and women throughout America take justifiable pride in their National Capital, and they desire the Congress always to be fair about a problem of this type, and I do commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and I join him heartily in his movement.

Mr. STEFAN. We want to do what is fair.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield in order that I may propound a question to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman and his committee, who are charged with the legislative duty and responsibility of reporting legislation affecting the interests of the District of Columbia feel that the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia should be increased, why does not the gentleman's committee bring legislation before the House to increase it rather than to urge the Committee on Appropriations to legislate on the subject?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I think the inquiry made by the gentleman from Georgia is certainly pertinent to this discussion. I do not have the responsibility now of the chairmanship of the District of Columbia Committee, and I cannot speak for our able chairman except to say that as a member of that committee, and in the past its chairman, we did bring from time to time such legislation before the House of Representatives.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a member of the District of Columbia Legislative Committee and also the Committee on Appropriations, and interested in the appropriations for the District of Columbia, will remember that not once but many times the legislative committee has acted for an increased Federal contribution. I have always supported such efforts.

Mr. STEFAN. Your subcommittee is bringing this matter before you, following the gentleman's suggestion in the committee that there should be some legislation, but we are in a different position now. The Senate has written an increase into this bill and we bring that to you for the consideration of the House, to vote it up or vote it down.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman continue to yield to me in order that I may address a further inquiry to the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. If I understood the gentleman correctly a few moments ago, he undertook to speak for the Committee on the District of Columbia and to voice its views.

Mr. RANDOLPH. No, I spoke individually and so stated at the very outset of my remarks.

Mr. TARVER. Very well. The gentleman's committee has not reported the legislation up to this time, during the present Congress.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct.

Mr. TARVER. When they did report it during previous Congresses, it was overwhelmingly rejected by this House.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It was rejected by the House. I once again say to the gentleman from Nebraska and Georgia that I speak individually. I am in favor of the proposal which is made and will support it just as vigorously as I can, with my voice and vote.

Mr. STEFAN. We bring it again before the House for rejection or adoption. I feel, however, that there should be some real consideration given to the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, especially in view of the rising prices of everything, the shrinkage in the amount of land, and many other circumstances which work to the disadvantage of the taxpayers of the District. I am told we have several thousand Nebraska people here. Many have purchased property. They want representation.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. As a member of the subcommittee, may I say that it was natural that this matter should come before the subcommittee. We reviewed past appropriation totals; inquired as to taxing rates, and discussed all forms of revenue-raising. We were convinced that the Federal participation in the expenses of the District of Columbia should be increased if the expansion program of the Commission is to prevail. At the same time we feel that every taxing method should be reviewed by the Legislative Committee and appropriate suggestions

made by them. I am sure that if the Legislative Committee holds hearings it will arrive at the same conclusion. I do hope the House acts wisely on this preferential motion.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I include a statement from local civic associations on this subject:

STATEMENT ADOPTED BY CIVIC ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ON JUNE 25, 1946

The undersigned organizations, representing in the aggregate a majority of the residents of the District of Columbia, urge the Congress to adopt the provisions for an increase of $4,000,000 in the Federal payment contained in the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1947 as passed by the Senate, as a temporary expedient pending the adoption of legislation providing a method of measuring the Federal payment.

There are innumerable compelling reasons testifying to the equity of an increased Federal payment which have convinced those who have studied District of Columbia fiscal conditions—members of the Senate and House Subcommittees on Appropriations for the District of Columbia—that now is the time to recognize the obligation of the National Government to its National Capital.

For example, between 1934 and 1945 Federal Government land holdings increased 17.7 percent and now approximate 42 percent of the total area of the District, exclusive of streets and alleys.

During the fiscal year 1945 the "free taxes" of the Federal Government, the value of water delivered, and the cost of improving, operating, maintaining, and policing parks owned by the Federal Government amounted to $14,638,800. Substantial additional costs are charged to local taxpayers such as the care of Federal prisoners and hospital patients and the education of nonresidents—all of which contribute toward requiring of District of Columbia residents more revenue per capital annually than is the case in the great majority of comparable major American cities.

During the past 25 years general fund costs of operation alone have increased 50 percent per capita, not including the recent 14-percent pay raise to District of Columbia employees adopted by the Congress. During the same period the per capital Federal payment to the District of Columbia has been cut from $23.04 to $6.38, or 75 percent.

We urge the Congress to recognize now that Washington is the Nation's Capital which was created for the benefit of all the people of the United States. It is governed by those people through you, their elected representatives in the Congress. Moral reasons as well as those involving fiscal equity support our belief that the United States should render full justice to the Nation's Capital City through bearing its fair share of its costs.

Washington Board of Trade; Federation of Citizens' Associations; Central Labor Union, A. F. of L.; American Legion; Washington Real Estate Board; Federation of Business Men's Associations; Washington Industrial Union Council, CIO; Washington Building Congress; Washington Restaurant Association; Merchants and Manufacturers Association; Hotel Association of Washington, D. C.; Washington Zonta Club; Motion Picture Theater Owners of the District of Columbia; American Veterans of World War II, District of Columbia Department; Women's Bar Association of the District of Columbia; Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Washington; District of Columbia Society, Sons of the American Revolution; District of Columbia Building and Loan League; District of Columbia Chapter, American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers; Voteless District of Columbia League of Women Voters; The Washingtonians; Society of Natives; Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia; Laundry-Dry Cleaning Owners Association; Cosmopolitan Club; Master Builders' Association, Inc.; Graphic Arts Association of Washington; Kiwanis Club of Washington, D. C.

NOTE.—Original signed by representatives of the above organizations.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that all the members of the subcommittee on appropriations for the District of Columbia, on both sides of the aisle, apparently feel that my motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment should be supported, and I have the impression that the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], is of the same opinion. I think the gentleman from Georgia is supported in his suggestions by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and I agree.

Yes, there should be some yardstick, there should be some formula, and I suppose that should come from the Legislative Committee of the District of Columbia, but until that time arises there is no reason why we should not now raise this Federal contribution. If and when the legislative yardstick and formula is presented we can make any readjustments that may be necessary.

The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, began hearings on the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1947 on February 25, 1946. Those hearings continued through March 8 and comprised some 1,100 pages. In that period of time, there appeared before the committee, not only the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, but every department head, so that a careful examination of the hearings before the subcommittee will give anyone interested a good picture of the municipal set-up, its progress and its problems. In the very beginning of the hearings, the Committee realized that they had a problem confronting them vastly different from that of the preceding years. The amount of increases provided for was somewhat staggering, and forcibly called our attention to the fact that we were no longer dealing with a small town but with a great city that had suddenly almost reach full maturity. We realized that the time had come when the inequitable relationship existing between the District and the Federal Government should be finally and definitely adjusted. We had hoped that our subcommittee and the full committee might take the lead in bringing this to pass and, with that in mind, we made certain representations to the full committee which we were unable to bring to fruition. I am glad that another body has seized the opportunity to attempt to adjust what is undoubtedly a very unjust financial relationship, and I am firmly convinced that every member of the subcommittee feels exactly the same way I do because they have studied the matter and are acquainted with the Federal-District fiscal relationship.

This subject matter may be new to some of the Members of the House, but it is an age-old argument which some of us here have taken a considerable amount of time to analyze. There are a few highlights and points which I would like to get across to you for your consideration.

Point 1: In the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, the bill defining the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia was passed. With the bill's approval, the Committee on the District of Columbia submitted a unanimously adopted report, from which I quote the following:

There is another class of property which is accorded exemption under this bill from taxation, and that is federally owned property. The inclusion of this property raises the age-old question of what part the Federal Government should play in the operating expenses of the District government. For many years the Federal Government contributed to such expenses a sum equal to 60 percent thereof. And this at a time when the land holdings of the Government were less than one-third of the present holdings, and the value of the buildings erected thereon was pitifully small as compared to the colossal figure which now represents their valuation. While the growth of the Federal holdings was taking place, and the value increased to a staggering figure the Congress, periodically and consistently, lowered the Federal contribution annually until today it is less than 10 percent or $6,000,000. This creates a situation which ought to receive the early, if not the immediate consideration, of the Congress of the United States.

In these days of adjustment, it is important that the capital city should know what to expect in the way of funds for its maintenance and operation. There is no reason to pass legislation of a piecemeal character, and it should not be difficult to arrive at a fair and equitable figure which will render it unnecessary, year after year, for the officials of the District of Columbia to resort to haphazard and makeshift measures to collect a sufficient amount of revenue to run the affairs of the city. This committee feels that proper adjustment in the fiscal relationship between the two governments should be brought about without delay and recommends immediate steps be taken by the Congress.

This was 1942. Let us assume our responsibility, now.

Point 2: The total land area of the District of Columbia, exclusive of streets and alleys, is 31,068 acres. The taxable land is steadily decreasing and, as territorial limitations are definitely defined, there is no way to expand. Hardly more than 15,000 acres of land is now taxable in the entire District of Columbia. During the period of July 1, 1934, to July 1, 1945, the Federal Government acquired 1,946 acres of land in the District valued at $28,607,544. During the period July 1, 1934, to July 1, 1945, total tax-exempt land increased by 2,031 acres. This is a very serious problem. We are told by those who should know that, because of

this reduction in taxable land area and certain other changes, many families who were substantial taxpayers are moving beyond the District line. This is a Federal city; we will continue to exempt embassy property, charitable and national organization property; and we will continue to fill the city with a shifting population. Therefore, let us assume our responsibility now.

Point 3: A shifting, unstable, changeable population may be satisfactory from a political viewpoint, but from the local financial "love of city and civic pride" viewpoint, such a population is not ideal. In 1930 the population was 486,869. That population has been increased over 90 percent. In 1930 the United States was paying $9,000,000 toward the expense of the District, and in 1931 $9,500,000. It is evident that, as the District revenues increased due to population increase, the Congress felt that the people of the District should assume more and more of the burden. The national characteristics of the city at times were apparently completely forgotten, and the services rendered to the Federal Government by the taxpayers of the District were likewise almost completely forgotten. No matter how great the population or how adequate the revenues, our responsibility should not be evaded. Let us assume our responsibility now.

Point 4: There are over 350,000 persons gainfully employed in the District of Columbia, but because of our insistence on relieving certain taxpayers, only a little more than 85,000 individuals filed income-tax returns last year with the District tax assessor. Think of it.

All District of Columbia real estate is valued at $2,304,000,000.

The United States owns $986,000,000.

The District of Columbia owns $98,454,000.

Private exempt is $122,250,000, which leaves taxable $1,382,000,000. As you think of it, remember that the taxable area is steadily decreasing and that expansion is out of the question.

Notwithstanding this record, the revenues per capita in the District of Columbia are higher than in most cities of comparable size. By a very substantial margin, they exceed Buffalo, Milwaukee, San Francisco, Baltimore, Cleveland, St. Louis, and Pittsburgh. The small group who are compelled to pay the taxes are doing their part. Let us assume our responsibility now.

Point 5: Congress has exclusive legislative control over the District and Congress does not hesitate to exercise that control, regardless of the wishes of the District officials. In most instances, District officials are consulted, but in a great many we proceed regardless of their wishes and even without consultation.

The plain fact is that Congress has authorized, in many instances, appropriations to be paid for by local taxpayers without the slightest idea of where the money was coming from.

The plain fact is that we have relieved ourselves and thousands upon thousands of our constituents from paying taxes in the District of Columbia.

The plain fact is that we have endeavored to satisfy selfish interests and selfish groups without attempting to ascertain all the facts in connection with the items they have advocated.

The plain fact is that by far the great majority of our members know little or nothing of the District Government and have little or no time to bother with it.

The plain fact is that until we can create a joint legislative and appropriation committee, formed into a single city council for District affairs, Congress is going to continue doing a messy job for the District.

Point 6: We have created a municipal corporation, and we have made no provision whatsoever for its protection in this body. When we passed the 40-hour-week law, the pay acts providing for overtime and night differential, was there a single individual in the Congress who gave any thought whatsoever to how this legislation might affect the intricate functions of our municipal structure? Certainly not. And neither did anyone consider the manner in which the municipal corporation was going to find the funds to meet its obligations, imposed upon it by this body without consultation or consideration. In 1943, we added to the District of Columbia expenses through overtime and bonuses $2,043,257. This increased in 1944 to $3,588,093; in 1945 to $3,830,238; in 1946 to $7,720,798; and in 1947 to over $11,000,000.

Point 7: On page 24 of the hearings before the subcommittee, there is shown a summary of the free taxes and value of free water rendered the Federal Government and the cost of improvement, operation, maintenance, and policing all parks owned by the Federal Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945:

Taxes	$12,407,257
Free water	872,095
Improvements, maintenance, and policing of nationally owned parks	1,009,466
Expenses of National Capital Park and Planning Commission	53,705
Operation, maintenance, and policing National Zoological Park	296,277
Total	14,638,800

This represents just a portion of the items that could be fairly and justifiably allocated as District charges against the Federal Government and has nothing to do with the broader aspects which are hardly susceptible of calculation. Your constituents and mine located in the Nation's Capital, in the vast majority of cases, maintain their voting privileges back in their States, and pay little or nothing toward the maintenance, operation, and upkeep of the municipal structure. And those others, the smaller group—natives or lifetime residents—who pay the principal portion of the bill are also subjected to disenfranchisement. Let us assume our responsibility, now.

Point 8: Many say that the real explanation of congressional contempt for the fiscal rights and civic needs of Washington is that the District of Columbia is voteless. They suggest that, if the District had capable representation here and in the Senate, we would not quibble for a moment on whether the Federal lump-sum payment to the District budget should be six million or twelve million. Let us kill this idea that Congress has no respect for anything but votes. Let us assume our responsibility now.

Point 9: When you question the tax paid on real estate of $1.75 per hundred valuation, you should know that this valuation represents, full, fair-market value. You should also bear in mind that there are only 149,372 pieces and parcels of land taxable in the entire District, and, as many individuals own more than 1 piece of property, the number of people paying real-estate taxes is considerably less than this figure. This small number of individuals paid into the District treasury last year $24,225,718. It looks to me like the real-estate owners are paying their share. Let us assume our responsibility now.

Point 10: The officials of the District are awake to the seriousness of the problems confronting the municipality and are engaged in a study of the entire tax structure. They know that many additional millions in revenue will be necessary to maintain Washington as a progressive, modern, and wholesome city, worthy of being the Nation's Capital. The 6-year plan as proposed by the very energetic and capable Engineer Commissioner shows foresight and broad vision. This appears to be a comprehensive program to develop the city in accordance with modern needs and in keeping with service standards for the increased population.

Point 11: The District of Columbia is called upon to pay the expenses of many other activities which are not common to other municipalities. Some of the items that fall within this category are: Maintaining schools for nonresidents, use of Metropolitan Police in national functions, 60 percent of such purely Federal functions as the sedition trial, maintenance of Federal prisoners in District jails, and maintenance of a Soldiers' and Sailors' Home. Protests are made against these charges, but the taxpayers continue to pay. Let us assume our responsibility now.

Point 12: The time has come to assert the fact that we are interested in the local welfare and that we would maintain that interest, even though we lived in far-distant places. We are the custodians of the hopes of the residents of Washington and, as Representatives of the American people charged with shaping the policies of the District, we feel a special interest in the proper development of the seat of government. That proper development cannot proceed in an orderly manner if we are going to be niggardly in our financial relationship. Let us assume our responsibility now.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why is it not possible for us to turn back a lot of this property to the private individuals, property that has been rented and made tax-free by the Government during the last 3 or 4 years? If we did that we would give the District a great deal of revenue which they are not now getting, and we would save this country a great deal of money that should be retained in the Treasury.

Mr. FLOOD. From time to time the gentleman's fiscal observations have had merit. I think that this is one.

Mr. RICH. That is one time. Now, let us get another time. Everybody has got his hand out now to take care of the people all over the land. It does not make any difference whether it is in the District of Columbia or your State or any other State. It is about time that the people of this country realized that the Federal Government is about bankrupt. It is about time for Congressmen to recognize that fact.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Why cannot the District revalue the assessable property today, and then we could determine what the Federal contribution should be?

Mr. FLOOD. I can say to the distinguished gentleman that I think that is the problem that was introduced by the gentleman from Georgia for the legislative committee. There has been a tremendous increase in property valuation, from 300 to 500 percent in residential property and more than that in commercial property. But rent ceilings have not been imposed on commercial properties. However, the assessor tells us he has not even caught up with the current problem. I can say to the gentleman that a committee for the District of Columbia Commissioners is doing exactly what the gentleman just requested.

Mr. SHERIDAN. When will that committee report?

Mr. FLOOD. I believe within the next 2 or 3 weeks.

The third point I had in mind was this probable shifting and unstable and ever-changeable population. From a political viewpoint that might be very satisfactory. From the local financial point of view, where you have love of city or civic pride, such population is anything but ideal. In 1930 the population of this town was over 486,000. That population since 1930 has increased around 90 percent.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Do you mind if I take 3 or 4 minutes and then I will be glad to yield.

Mr. RICH. Well, just right at that point.

Mr. FLOOD. Very well.

Mr. RICH. The reason why the population has increased in this District is because the Federal Government has increased the number of employees from 500,000 to over 3,000,000. That is the trouble. It is the fault of the administration.

Mr. FLOOD. I presume the gentleman from Pennsylvania is reiterating for an emphatic purpose. I have heard that from him many times.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the District revenues have increased as the population increased.

The Congress felt the people of the District should assume more and more of the burden. The national characteristics of this city, as has been mentioned by some of my colleagues so far, have been completely forgotten from time to time. The services rendered to the Federal Government by the taxpayers of the District were likewise almost completely forgotten. No matter how great its population or how adequate the revenue from that population, our responsibility should under no circumstances be avoided or evaded, as seems to be the instance. I should like to use the phrase, and I repeat it for purposes of emphasis: Let us assume our responsibility now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ELSAESSER] may revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection?

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by civic organizations.)

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN].

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, this is nothing in the world but an attempt to have the House, in connection with the passage of an appropriation bill, enact legislation which it has refused to enact when the proposal was submitted in prior years from the legislative committee having jurisdiction. Upon those occasions the proposition was overwhelmingly rejected by the House. The Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia included in its original report a statement indicating that it favored an increase in the Federal contribution to the governmental expenses of the District of Columbia. On motion submitted by myself in full committee I recall that language was stricken and that there was no objection to striking it out except upon the part of the members of this subcommittee. For some reason it seems that when Members serve on committees or subcommittees dealing with fiscal or legislative problems of the District of Columbia they find it difficult to maintain a national viewpoint on those problems.

I cannot undertake to review in the 5 minutes which have been allotted to me the arguments for and against the proposal to increase the Federal contribution to the District, and I would not undertake to do so even if I had the time because I do not think that subject matter ought to be considered and determined by the House in connection with the passage of an appropriation bill.

It is admitted here that the legislative committee during this Congress, which has lasted now for 18 months, has not reported to the House any legislation on the subject, despite the statement of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] to the effect that he personally favors the enactment of such legislation. However, it is not improper to say that a great many people regard the District of Columbia as a taxpayers' paradise, and the committee doubtless realizes that no such legislation could be enacted.

The tax rates in the District are lower than in your district and mine, and I say that to every Member of the House. If any Member differs with that conclusion I will be glad for him to indicate that he does so differ.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. I want to make an observation, not to differ with the gentleman's conclusion. The other day it was reported in the Washington papers that some property on Dupont Circle had sold for three times its assessed value. It was stated on the floor this morning that property in the District here is assessed at its full value.

Mr. TARVER. Yes. But I think all of us recognize the fact it is not assessed at full value.

The real-estate tax here, as I understand it, is $17.50 per thousand, which takes the place of our county, State, municipal, school district, and all other types of taxes, and there is not a city of comparable size in the United States where higher taxes, including State and other taxes, than obtain in the District of Columbia are not paid. The gas tax here is 2 cents per gallon, whereas in most of the States it is 5, 6, and 7 cents.

The District of Columbia is very fortunately situated. The city of Washington would not be a city except for the Government of the United States and it does not have the burdens to bear in the way of taxes that your cities and mine have to bear. So the proposal to come in here at this time of troubled national financial conditions, when the Government owes $270,000,000,000, and increase the Federal contribution at the expense of your constituents and mine to the government of the District of Columbia, when that government is already so much more fortunately situated than are the city governments in your

districts and my district, is to my mind, absolutely ridiculous.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the House will maintain the position which it has maintained in former years and decide at this time that it ought not to legislate in connection with an appropriation bill in contradiction of the actions which it has heretofore taken. I trust that the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] will be overwhelmingly defeated so that we may not again be troubled with this proposal in connection with an appropriation bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, we are facing a responsibility which we owe at the present time to the people of the United States. That is, to be fair with the District of Columbia, to be fair and honest with our own constituents.

I have been looking over this bill a little bit and I find that the expenditures for public parks are $1,200,000 a year. In my community with a population of about 3 percent of what the District has, our expenditure is more than 3 percent of that figure. We have the most beautiful set parks in central New York, and hundreds of thousands of people come there every summer to take advantage of the facilities which those parks offer. We pay for them out of our own tax money that we levy upon the real estate of the community. Our real-estate tax is $32 a thousand or $3.20 a hundred. The District of Columbia tax is $17.50 a a thousand, or $1.75 a hundred. We have in our community as much exempt property in proportion as there is here in the District of Columbia. Our assessments are on 125 percent of value basis. The assessment in the District of Columbia are on a 65 percent of value basis, and have been for years.

Why would it hurt the District of Columbia to increase its tax rate so that it came more near in line with the communities elsewhere in the United States? The trouble with this situation is that it has not been given a thorough analysis by those who have urged that the tax rate be kept down here in the District and the money levied upon the people out in our home districts. Let us take this into consideration. Let us meet our responsibility. The gas tax here is 2 cents a gallon. The gas tax at home is 5 cents a gallon. Everything else is in the same proportion.

Are we to create a group which lives by special privileges here in the District of Columbia or should we treat them like human beings and treat them the way the folks back home are treated? That is the question. Should we give them $4,000,000 beyond what they have or should we represent the people of the United States and meet our responsibilities to the people of the United States?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Who determines the valuation placed on the property in the District for taxation purposes?

Mr. TABER. The assessor.

Mr. WILSON. Who determines the tax rate?

Mr. TABER. The Commissioners.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. In treating them like human beings, as the gentleman suggested, would he be willing to extend them the right of suffrage in the District?

Mr. TABER. Why, on some things; yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the bonded indebtedness of the District of Columbia, if any?

Mr. TABER. Nothing, and I do not believe there is another community represented here that can tell that story. Because we have been so liberal with our gratuities to the District of Columbia they have no bonded indebtedness. Why should we do more?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Washington is to a greater extent than any other city on the globe the Capital of the world. It is one of the great cities of the world and ought to be supported in proportion.

Champ Clark, one of the greatest Speakers who ever presided over the House, once said that no man is educated until he had had three experiences: Until he had taught school, until he had run for office and been defeated, and until he had visited Washington. He said he proposed to someday introduce a bill which would provide expenses for every citizen in the United States to make one trip to Washington to see his own Capital. I grew up under his tutelage, inheriting his political philosophy and with it his interest in the adaquate support of the Nation's Capital. I have spent a larger part of my life in Washington than in any other city. It is to that extent more my home town than any other town in which I have lived. I am deeply interested in it. I am under obligations to it and its institutions. But, Mr. Speaker, we should temper pride and appreciation with prudent business consideration of its obligation to the Nation as well as the Nation's obligation to it. We must face the fact that the average income per capita in Washington is greater than that of any other city in the Nation, that its average per capita wealth is greater and that taxes in proportion to benefits received are less than in any other American city—and under present conditions that means any other city of the world.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is neither the time nor the place to discuss the merits of the proposal. This is not a legislative bill and the committee reporting it is not a legislative committee. The questions involved are too intricate and too important to be decided offhand in a casual discussion here on the floor of the House.

I suggest that for the present you insist upon the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendment and send the bill to conference.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recede and concur presents to my mind a somewhat anomalous condition on the part of the members of the subcommittee who are supporting this motion. When the Budget estimates came before us, they provided that the District of Columbia should have $6,000,000 for a contribution and $81,500,000 by way of appropriations. This committee, of which some of the members are making and supporting this motion to provide $10,000,000 instead of $6,000,000, said, "We are willing to give you $6,000,000 and $72,000,000 plus by way of appropriations." The Senate took the bill passed by the House and said, "We are willing to give you $6,000,000 and $79,000,000, but we want to increase that $6,000,000 by another $4,000,000." So the House conferees agreed to $76,700,000 by way of appropriation and declined to increase the $6,000,000 contribution. Certain House committee members and conferees are supporting the motion to recede and concur and to give the District of Columbia an additional $4,000,000. This amount is almost equal to the total amount that the House District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee was able to save out of the request for appropriations. So some members of this good committee, composed of fine and intelligent public servants, who have worked hard for years to save money and have found the total appropriation request saved by a little over $5,000,000, are seeking to restore almost all the savings, by increasing the contribution by another $4,000,000. Now a motion is made to increase the contribution by a sum almost equal to the result of their labors in paring the appropriations. Why trim appropriations at all, gentlemen? Why not give the sum the Budget asked for rather than to come here and ask to recede and concur by this amendment and give them a lump contribution which puts back practically all that this committee saved? It strikes me as a most amazing thing. It would have been better not to have any hearings if that was the feeling of some of the gentlemen on the committee. They should have said, "Since they ought to have $10,000,000 and they only got $6,000,000, let us not have any hearings and give them the full $81,000,000." But, no, they took off some four or five million dollars and now they want to put most of it back again.

I concur fully, gentlemen, in the idea that an appropriations committee, except on smaller matters involving legislation should keep out of the legislative field. This matter has been before the Congress for a long time. It has been voted against by the Congress. This is

increasing the amount more than it has been for many, many years. Certainly some legislative committee should go into that proposition and consider it thoroughly. Perhaps it is the right thing to do—I do not know. I am not speaking with any prejudice, but it is a matter for a legislative committee and not for an appropriations committee particularly when the legislative committee has already been overruled on the proposition submitted today in this motion to recede and concur. The motion should be voted down.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I hope, in all fairness to the District of Columbia, in which we all take great pride as the Nation's Capital, that the House will adopt the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to recede and concur in the action of the Senate. I think we ought to look back a little bit on the history of this whole relationship between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia. It is not comparable to any other city. The gentleman talks about what other cities do and what they can do. But this is not a comparable situation. All of the land in the District of Columbia originally belonged to the Government, I believe, with some exceptions. That land was gradually sold off to private individuals and Congress adopted then a policy that, in view of the services which the Federal Government received, the Federal Government would pay 50 percent of operating the District of Columbia, as the Federal City—the Federal project, if you please. That situation went on from time to time and then the Congress began to do a little cheese paring and parsimonious operations on the District of Columbia and gradually cut that down by the appropriations, although the law calls for a 50-percent contribution. Subsequently, that law was changed. I want to recall to you what the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] told you awhile ago. He was giving you cold facts—that is, that in the District of Columbia there are properties exempt, by reason of the action of this body and by the fact that it is Government-owned property, to the extent of 50 percent of the property in the District of Columbia. It is exempt from taxation. The District government has to service all those properties. Now, that is not fair or right. We complain about conditions in the District of Columbia, yet when the District people come here and need something for a righteous cause we sit around and talk about saving a few dollars when we all want to see this city what it should be—the most beautiful city in the world. Still we are cheese paring and parsimonious with them all the time. It is not right. Let us be right and give them the $10,000,000 that they ask. Let us remember that in the last few years the Government has taken over an enormous amount of taxable property and removed it from taxation, in order to build Government buildings and housing projects. Outside the District of Columbia the Government pays communities certain lump sums in lieu of taxation. Why are you not willing to do it in the United States Capital, that belongs to every man, woman, and child in this National Government, in which we all take pride?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a happy solution to this dilemma that confronts us. I shall vote against the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], to concur in the Senate amendment so that the bill can go back to conference. I then very respectfully suggest to the conferees that you reexamine the matter and see whether a compromise cannot be effected. After all, the only reason you brought it back was because you wanted some indication from the House, as I understand it. That can be worked out. Perhaps make it $8,000,000. I concur in your views on this matter.

Since I came here in 1933 the Federal holdings have increased 17 percent. Forty-two out of every hundred acres in Washington today belong to the Federal Government. You cannot tax it. March out Massachusetts Avenue sometime and see all the beautiful embassies. They are not taxed. Every time a national organization appears before the Judiciary Committee to secure a Federal charter, it sets up a fine headquarters and by virtue of the Federal charter you cannot tax them. Therefore the District is broke today. Do not kid yourselves about it. The District is broke. The District Commissioners have been in my office from time to time imploring me and other members of the legislative committee to go along with a sales tax.

I was the one, and I say it modestly, who helped kill off the sales tax before. I am not so sure that I will take that attitude again. You cannot run a town on wind and water. When you talk about benefits to your constituents, how many of your boys in uniform came here to the Nation's Capital and enjoyed the benefits of this great city, the parks, and everything that go with it? I have some pride in the Nation's Capital. Let us not be so niggardly about it. I can challenge almost every tax figure that has been recited on the floor today. Of the 30 cities of comparable size in the United States, there are about 15 which have a tax rate higher than Washington. There are fifteen that have a tax rate lower than Washington. So there is a case for the conferees. I suggest you take it back and come back with a compromise. I am for you on this.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I hope this additional appropriation passed by the Senate will be agreed to by the House. As was stated a moment ago by my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], we should make the Capital of the United States the greatest, the most beautiful city in our country.

In the District of Columbia practically all taxes have to come from homes because there are no great industries or factories here to assess, and a great proportion of the land has gone to governmental use on which no tax can be assessed.

I wish in particular to point out one instance that very definitely shows the need for more money here in the District, and that is the situation prevailing at the District Training School at Laurel, Md., to which unfortunates of insufficient mental capacity, non compos mentis, are sent. Due to lack of safety facilities and to lack of sufficient funds to properly care for these unfortunates a disgraceful situation prevails there. A short time ago this was brought into the public press. Some investigation has been made, and I hope it will be carried through. I thought first this condition was probably due to improper management, but upon investigation I find that the management is doing the best it can with grossly inadequate funds. I have not time to go fully into the letter which was sent to me by the District Commissioners as to this institution. I asked for a report on the more or less frequent escapes and crimes being committed by some of those who have escaped from the District Training School. In 1943 there were 340 absconders from this mental institution, 300 of whom are still at large. In 1944 there were 399 absconders, 391 of whom are still at large. In 1945 there were 331 absconders, with 306 still at large. In 1946 there were 286 absconders, with 275 of them still at large.

At this institution there are little children hopelessly insane, definitely of the idiot class. The inmates range from children to aged adults.

Due to lack of appropriation, due to a gross lack of security facilities, there over 300 escapes a year occur and over 300 inmates a year stay at large.

In this article that broke in the papers some months ago a sex crime was alleged to have been committed by one of those who escaped. I am told that some of the absconders are young feeble-minded girls without homes who go back onto the streets as prostitutes, and in some instances I understand they are still on the streets. I merely call that to the attention of the House to demonstrate the fact that the budget of the District of Columbia is grossly inadequate. The safety, health, and morals of the Capital City are being imperiled through loss of assessable basis and inadequate Federal contribution to offset this loss of revenue through Federal acquisition of land. If we are to maintain Washington as it should be, the most beautiful, most progressive, and greatest city in the Nation, then the Congress of the United States charged with legislating for a voteless people should see that adequate funds to augment their budget are voted to them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia asked for some facts and I propose to give him some.

The District of Columbia has no bonded debt. The City of New York is bonded to the hilt. The District of Columbia has no sales tax. The City of New York has a sales tax of 2 percent. The tax rate in the District of Columbia is $1.75 a hundred. The tax rate in the city of New York is $2.70. Assessed valuations in the city of New York are in excess of true value. I know of an instance in Washington where a property assessed at $11,000 sold for $35,000.

On the basis of the above figures I cannot see any possible justification for an increased Federal contribution to the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FLOOD) there were—ayes 32, noes 69.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 112, nays 209, not voting 111, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—112

Almond	Gary	Marcantonio
Angell	Geelan	May
Bailey	Gordon	Monroney
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gorski	Morgan
Barrett, Pa.	Granahan	Morrison
Beall	Gregory	Murdock
Bender	Hagen	O'Brien, Mich.
Biemiller	Hale	O'Hara
Bland	Harless, Ariz.	O'Toole
Bloom	Hart	Outland
Bolton	Hartley	Pittenger
Brown, Ga.	Havenner	Pratt
Buchanan	Hays	Price, Ill.
Buckley	Healy	Quinn, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Herter	Rabaut
Canfield	Heselton	Rabin
Carnahan	Hinshaw	Randolph
Case, N. J.	Hobbs	Rayfiel
Combs	Holmes, Mass.	Riley
Cunningham	Holmes, Wash.	Robertson, Va.
D'Alesandro	Hook	Rogers, N. Y.
Daughton, Va.	Horan	Rowan
Delaney, James J.	Huber	Sadowski
	Johnson, Calif.	Sasscer
Delaney, John J.	Johnson, Luther A.	Savage
		Simpson, Ill.
D'Ewart	Kelley, Pa.	Slaughter
Dingell	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Dolliver	Klein	Somers, N. Y.
Douglas, Calif.	Kopplemann	Stefan
Douglas, Ill.	LaFollette	Stockman
Elliott	Larcade	Sumners, Tex.
Engle, Calif.	LeFevre	Traynor
Fernandez	Lemke	Trimble
Flood	Lesinski	Voorhis, Calif.
Fogarty	Link	Weaver
Forand	McCormack	Woodhouse
Fulton	McMillan, S. C.	
Gardner	Manasco	

NAYS—209

Abernethy	Andersen, H. Carl	Arends
Allen, Ill.		Arnold
Allen, La.	Andrews, Ala.	Auchincloss
Barden	Grant, Ind.	Philbin
Barrett, Wyo.	Griffiths	Phillips
Bates, Ky.	Gross	Pickett
Beckworth	Gwynne, Iowa	Ploeser
Bennett, Mo.	Hall, Leonard W.	Plumley
Bishop		Poage
Blackney	Halleck	Price, Fla.
Bonner	Hand	Priest
Brehm	Hare	Rains
Brown, Ohio	Hedrick	Ramey
Brumbaugh	Hendricks	Rankin
Bryson	Henry	Reed, Ill.
Buck	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Buffett	Hill	Rees, Kans.
Butler	Hoeven	Resa
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Pa.	Rich
Campbell	Hope	Rizley
Cannon, Mo.	Howell	Robsion, Ky.
Carlson	Hull	Rockwell
Case, S. Dak.	Jarman	Rodgers, Pa.
Chapman	Jenkins	Roe, Md.
Chelf	Jensen	Rogers, Fla.
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ind.	Ryter
Church	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sabath
Clason		Schwabe, Mo.
Clements	Jonkman	Schwabe, Okla.
Clevenger	Judd	Scrivner
Clippinger	Kean	Shafer
Cole, Kans.	Kearney	Sharp
Cole, Mo.	Kilburn	Sheppard
Cooley	Kilday	Sheridan
Cooper	Kinzer	Sikes
Corbett	Kirwan	Simpson, Pa.
Crosser	Knutson	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Kunkel	Smith, Wis.
Dirksen	Landis	Spence
Dondero	Lane	Springer
Drewry	Lanham	Sullivan
Durham	Lewis	Sundstrom
Dworshak	Luce	Talbot
Earthman	Lyle	Talle
Eaton	McConnell	Tarver
Eberharter	McCowen	Taylor
Ellis	McDonough	Thom
Ellsworth	McGregor	Thomas, N. J.
Elsaesser	McMillen, Ill.	Thomas, Tex.
Elston	Madden	Thomason
Feighan	Maloney	Tibbott
Fellows	Mankin	Towe
Fenton	Martin, Iowa	Vorys, Ohio
Fisher	Martin, Mass.	Vursell
Flannagan	Mason	Wadsworth
Folger	Mathews	Walter
Fuller	Merrow	Wasielewski
Gallagher	Michener	Weichel
Gamble	Miller, Nebr.	White
Gathings	Mills	Whitten
Gavin	Mundt	Whittington
Gearhart	Murray, Tenn.	Wigglesworth
Gerlach	Murray, Wis.	Wilson
Gifford	Norblad	Winter
Gillette	O'Brien, Ill.	Wolcott
Gillie	O'Konski	Wolverton, N. J.
Goodwin	O'Neal	Wood
Gore	Pace	Woodruff
Gossett	Patman	Zimmerman
Graham	Peterson, Fla.	

NOT VOTING—111

Adams	Doughton, N. C.	LeCompte
Anderson, Calif.	Doyle	Ludlow
Andresen, August H.	Engel, Mich.	Lynch
	Ervin	McGehee
Andrews, N. Y.	Fallon	McGlinchey
Baldwin, Md.	Gibson	McKenzie
Barry	Gillespie	Mahon
Bates, Mass.	Granger	Mansfield, Mont.
Bell	Grant, Ala.	
Bennet, N. Y.	Green	Mansfield, Tex.
Boren	Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Calif.
Boykin	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murphy
Bradley, Mich.		Neely
Bradley, Pa.	Hancock	Norrell
Brooks	Harness, Ind.	Norton
Bunker	Harris	Patrick
Byrne, N. Y.	Hébert	Patterson
Camp	Heffernan	Peterson, Ga.
Cannon, Fla.	Hoch	Pfeifer
Celler	Hoffman, Mich.	Powell
Clark	Holifield	Reece, Tenn.
Cochran	Izac	Richards
Coffee	Jackson	Rivers
Cole, N. Y.	Jennings	Robertson, N. Dak.
Colmer	Johnson, Okla.	
Courtney	Jones	Robinson, Utah
Cox	Kee	Roe, N. Y.
Cravens	Keefe	Rooney
Crawford	Kefauver	Russell
Curley	Kelly, Ill.	Short
Davis	Kerr	Smith, Ohio
Dawson	King	Sparkman
De Lacy	Latham	Starkey
Domengeaux	Lea	Stevenson
Stewart	Torrens	Winstead
Stigler	Vinson	Wolfenden, Pa.
Sumner, Ill.	Welch	Worley
Taber	West	
Tolan	Wickersham	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Norrell against.

Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Cravens against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Short.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Coffee with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Jones.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Taber.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Davis with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Jackson with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. De Lacy with Mr. LeCompte

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Green with Miss Sumner of Illinois.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Adams.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Gwinn of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Senate amendment No. 67: Page 54, line 6, insert the following:

Water fund, investment, District of Columbia: The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell United States securities now held for and on account of the water fund of the District of Columbia in such amounts as may be certified by the Commissioners as necessary and credit the proceeds of such sale to said water fund.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 71: Page 60, strike out all of lines to 22 inclusive, and insert the following:

"SEC. 3. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the

United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 3. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or the government of he District of Columbia, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization, that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 680 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of housing and include a newspaper article.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial and a newspaper article.

Mr. WILSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in Monday morning's Indianapolis Times.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some editorial material.

Mr. WEAVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Washington Star.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address made by John C. Payne, president of the Society of Authors, Composers, and Publishers.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therewith an address delivered by Maj. Paul H. Douglas entitled "A House Undivided."

The Public Printer advises me that the address will make two and two-thirds pages in the RECORD and will cost $160. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6885, with Mr. COOLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in every State in the Union the leading businessmen, the men who do things, who set the machinery in motion and keep the business of the country going, the men upon whom we must depend to initiate and maintain production and employment are beginning to say, "What is the use of opening up a new enterprise and making more money if it all goes out on taxes? We are merely working for the Government. They take all we make away from us in income taxes."

The great demand today, and the great need of business in the reconversion period, the great requisite to encourage production and employment, is to reduce taxation sufficiently to reward and compensate the entrepreneur, the man who can start business and keep it going and thereby increase the national income. We cannot reduce taxes unless we reduce expenditures, and there will be no reduction in taxes and there will be no permanent prosperity until we have reduced national expenditures and national obligations, to a point where we can balance the Budget, provide tax reduction, prevent inflation, and reach the standard of living which this Nation has every right to expect.

Not only in this bill, Mr. Chairman, but in every bill which the Committee on Appropriations has reported to the House this session we have had this in mind. We have endeavored to follow a program of retrenchment and economy. We have cut the Budget estimates. We have endeavored to get the country back off its spending spree, away from the huge appropriations which have been necessary

during the war and to initiate a post-war readjustment in costs of operation of government which will make it possible for us early in the next Congress to reduce taxes. That is the only way it can be done. This bill is a fair sample.

Of the amount carried in this bill, a very large bill, carrying appropriations of over three-quarters of a billion dollars, only $16,300,000 is for purposes other than those incurred by reason of the war. In this bill we cancel outstanding obligations and contractual authorities in excess of $3,000,000,000. In other words, Mr. Chairman, when we pass this bill we will have canceled, rescinded, and saved for the Treasury in excess of $64,000,000,000.

In future years, when we look back upon the accomplishments in the fiscal conduct of this war, that is the one thing which will stand out above all else—the efficient and businesslike fiscal administration of this war and epecially the prompt action, beginning on VE-day, by which we put into operation machinery which has saved for the Federal Treasury the huge sum of more than $64,000,000,000.

If this bill had been brought in before the adoption of the present budgetary system, if this were back in the old days, we would call it the general deficiency bill. In the old days, at the end of a session of Congress we lumped together all the odds and ends. The agencies came in and requested us to furnish funds to wind up their business for the remainder of the fiscal year. This last bill was a general catch-all, and was supposed to make final provision for deficiencies in any Federal activity. It was the final appropriation.

I can emphasize that "final appropriation" as to this bill, because this, as far as we are now aware, this is the last appropriation bill which the committee will report in this Congress. That is an important consideration, because the prospect is that Congress will be in recess until January, the longest period that this Congress has been in adjournment since the beginning of the war in 1941. During the war it was necessary for Congress to remain in session continuously. We barely had a chance to get home before the elections. Congress was ready at any time to meet any emergency which might arise. Now that this necessity is past we are entering upon the longest absence from Washington in the last 5 years. It follows we must make provision for all contingencies which may occur in these coming months. We have endeavored in this bill to provide for every foreseeable emergency. The result is we have a bill which is in some effects contingent. That is true of the war agencies for which the bill provides. It is particularly true of the Selective Service Administration. At this time the bill authorizing appropriations for OPA and Selective Service operations have not yet been enacted. The OPA bill is still pending between the two Houses. It is impossible to foresee what the financial demands of these two bills will be. So we are considerably handicapped in providing for them during the long period in which there will be no recourse to the Congress for further deficiencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

Now we provide for that situation in this wise. We have reduced such appropriations by one-fourth. In addition, we have provided that the Bureau of the Budget shall within 30 days after the passage of the OPA and selective service laws make a survey of the situation; and taking into consideration the final form of the bills authorizing the OPA and selective service, shall publish its findings and freeze any unnecessary amounts which have been provided in the pending bill. Then, having appropriated only three-quarters of the amount for interim expenses, on our return in January we will be able on a basis of actual computation and factual estimates, to make any further provision for them which may at that time be found necessary.

We make final provision in this bill for UNRRA. The appropriation includes the last $465,000,000 necessary to carry out the obligations which this Government has assumed to dispose of our responsibility for feeding the world and maintaining order abroad.

In the War Assets Administration a very acute situation obtains. There are billions of dollars worth of Government property of every character which the Government has on hand and which it must dispose of at the earliest possible date and at the highest possible price. The men in charge of this administration are faced with an impossible task. No matter what they do—actually irrespective of any decision they may make or any contract they may enter into—they are going to be charged, first, with unwarranted delay in disposing of this property; and second, with selling the property at less than it ought to have brought on the market. And you can add, third, that they will be charged with collusion in selling these goods at prices which enable buyers to make unconscionable profits. So no matter what these men in charge of the War Assets Administration and in charge of surplus property do, they will certainly be condemned. They are damned if they do and they are damned if they do not. But this committee facing that situation has urged upon them an accelerated action in disposing of everything that we have if possible within one year after the close of this fiscal year.

That is done, first, in order to provide needed commodities for which there is a market and for which there is meager supply. It is done, in the second place, in order to avoid demoralization of the market after reconversion starts and legitimate production puts goods upon the market which will be in competition with anything which may remain unsold.

Of course, the third purpose is economy, in order to decrease the custodial care, warehousing, and the extensive personnel necessary to sell billions of dollars' worth of property of every character scattered throughout the world, in the shortest time possible.

We included in the bill a provision which has been carried in all of the general appropriation bills up to this time, with the exception of the first two, a prohibition against the employment of personnel in Government who are members of unions which permit strikes against the Government. I think there is absolutely no necessity for such a provision. It is inconceivable that Federal employees would engage in a strike against the Government. They never have, and in my opinion they never will. But there is a feeling that in order to be certain about the matter, we ought to include this provision. So in response to that sentiment, and in response to frequent amendments inserted by the other body, we have included in this bill an all-embracing blanket provision that the Federal employees shall not belong to any union which permits or encourages strikes against the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could have at this time presented a general résumé of all the appropriations for this session. It is impossible for the reason that we have not yet reached the final stage of enactment of some of the important appropriation bills. But before the end of the session I will follow the long-established custom of submitting such a report, a summarization of all the appropriations which have been made in this entire session. It is a very encouraging report and a very creditable record.

Mr. Chairman, I want at this time to make acknowledgment of the great service rendered by the minority members of this committee in achieving that record. We have had cooperation from all members of the minority, both on the subcommittees and on the whole committee, all of whom have had their part in a program showing a greater reduction over previous appropriations than ever made before in the history of the Congress.

This remarkable rescission makes possible the saving in appropriations of an amount so large as to be beyond the comprehension of the finite mind of man.

I wish especially to acknowledge at this time the obligation of the committee, of the House, and of the country to the one man who has had more to do with the exceptional record we have made this session than any man connected with the program. That is the clerk of the committee, John Pugh, diplomat and financier par excellence. He has been tireless, exhaustless, indefatigable in the work he has devoted to this huge program. I have called on him at midnight and found him in his office here.

I have come here on Sunday and found him working as assiduously as on any other day of the year. As a matter of fact the burden of handling all these bills—the most extensive hearings, the greatest amount of money involved in the history of the Nation—passed through his capable hands. We could not have made this record, we could not have as efficiently and effectively handled the fiscal program of the Nation through this critical period without John Pugh's cooperation, his admirable management of the many difficult problems involved, and especially without his comprehensive

knowledge of every detail of the fiscal operation of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, let me again express appreciation of the cooperation of every member of the Committee on Appropriations, and particularly of the invaluable service rendered by the clerk of this committee, Mr. Pugh.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides what we used to call "an enormous amount of money." The cash appropriations involved run into $726,000,000. According to the report of the committee that is $184,000,000 below the Budget estimates. That cut is made up very largely of $120,000,000 that was provided in the Budget for the State Department set-up to be transferred for the handling of surplus property. That we eliminated. The surplus property situation is in a rather difficult situation and frankly it begins to have me disturbed.

I have in front of me the comparative analysis of receipts and disbursements on page 2 of the Treasury report. There the receipts for the month of June from surplus property are $4,573,000. Down below there is an item "Surplus property disposal agencies, disbursements, $32,644,000." We are only paying out $32,600,000 to get back $4,000,000. Maybe that is good business, but it seems to me that whatever we have in the way of collection agencies and business management in that surplus outfit ought to begin to get busy. It is about time that we begin to get in more money than we pay out and it is about time that this picture begin to show on the right side of the ledger.

There has been a reduction made in the proposal sent up here by the Budget to provide funds for the War Assets Administration in connection with its operations on surplus property. There we have made a cut in the amount that was estimated for the corporation from a figure of $545,000,000 to $435,000,000. They have an enormous number of employees—probably they have to have—but I do think that there should be more speed and that there should be more cleaning up of the things that they have to do. Frankly, it does not present a satisfactory picture to me. I question whether that outfit will need any such volume of funds if it were run by a first-class businessman. I have been advised by people who should know that 10 percent would be a fair figure out of the receipts to cover expenses. The results we have been getting the last 2 months show more disbursements than receipts and we certainly are down in the pit when it comes to any efficiency in connection with the operations of the War Assets Administration. I would hope that we might get better results in the future out of this organization. If we do not, it is about time somebody found out what is going on and did something to remedy the situation.

In reference to OPA, that organization had a Budget estimate up here for $142,000,000. The committee allowed $106,650,000. We all know that under the bill that has passed the House and which will probably pass the Senate they are no longer empowered to get out crazy regulations providing for the control of production. They will not be able to keep production down as that bill is drawn in the way they have been able to do it for the last 12 months. They will have only straight pricing regulations, the small amount of rationing that is necessary with reference to sugar and the enforcement problem that will be legitimate.

They have been spending an enormous volume of funds upon propaganda, in violation of the law, and those funds should not be spent in the next year. In my opinion, we should adopt a rider to that language carried here which will prevent the use of these funds for propaganda purposes and we should cut out the crazy schemes for getting out all sorts of press releases that have misrepresented this whole picture and misrepresented the Congress to the entire Nation. It is about time that we began to wake up and realize our responsibilities and to put the brakes on a group of irresponsible bureaucrats.

There are other items involved here that seem to me need attention. The Civilian Production Administration has been allowed $20,000,000.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. As to this advertising by OPA that the gentleman refers to, the gentleman reads the newspapers, and so does everybody else, and we certainly have seen plenty of ads in the newspapers by organizations that were certainly directly opposed to OPA. Now, should we expect OPA, as an agency of this Government in trying to keep the spiral of inflation from going wide, right out into the sky, to lie down and just take it? Would that satisfy everybody? I do not think so.

Mr. TABER. Let us see what the picture has been. The OPA has been putting out statements to the effect that if this bill that the House has passed is put through, that we would have uncontrolled inflation. We all know that the way in which they have throttled production in the last year that they have produced terrific black markets and uncontrolled inflation as well. It is going a long way for us to expect the Government of the United States to provide funds for a group of irresponsible bureaucrats to present misleading information to the people of the United States and to stir up all sorts of broadcasters and newspaper writers to make statements that we know are absolutely different from the facts that exist. They try to cover up their responsibility for this situation by talking about the things that are proposed without in any way having met their responsibilities or done the things that they should do to keep down the prices in this country and protect the consumers.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in the first place, whatever they advertised, or whatever notices they broadcast, were not about the bill as it passed the House. If it was anything, it was against the proposed bill which did not pass in the House. Everybody admits that the proposed bill was unsatisfactory and everyone around here feels somewhat relieved that that bill did not pass. That is No. 1.

The other thing is that we constantly hear them referred to as bureaucrats, but the OPA was organized for the protection of the people and, as such, as the people's agency, it has every right in the world to make it known to the people. It is their duty to make it known to the people, and it cannot make it known except by those charged with the enforcement of OPA, or the care of OPA, or whatever you want to call it.

Mr. TABER. I cannot agree with the gentleman that the OPA has been trying to protect the people. I have seen them operate and I am going to give you some illustrations.

Mr. RABAUT. I will agree with the gentleman that there have been some errors.

Mr. TABER. They have not protected the people. They have tried in every possible way, by wildcat regulations declaring the quantity of production of this thing and that that could be made, to throttle production and prevent the people from getting the things they need. They have also brought about large increases in prices by promoting scarcity. Those thing have had a very bad effect upon our price situation. There has not been a normal trend of production that would result in the heading off of increases in prices. We have had enormous increases growing out of these things and we have had tremendous black markets. We have gotten right now to the point where our food situation is nearly all black market. We are not going to get any better if we give the OPA money to do things and continue this agitation that has resulted in their being in the position they are in. They would not be there if they had done their duty and passed on these questions that have been presented to them with reference to prices. They would not have throttled production, they would have increased it, and we would have gotten through with this situation and would not need in any way to have price control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The Civilian Production Administration has been allowed $20,000,000. We have in previous bills provided them with all the funds they need to look after the housing proposal. What kind of a mess they are going to make of that I do not know. I do know that they are not proceeding to handle the things as expeditiously and promptly as I would wish. What else there is for them to do it is difficult to say. I cannot understand how they can use $20,000,000 this coming fiscal year.

The Selective Service has been allowed $27,000,000 out of a Budget estimate of $37,000,000. I am just using rough figures. There is no draft for July and there is no draft for August. If

there are enlistments enough resulting from the increased pay and the efforts that are being made to make the men who are enlisting in the Army feel easier, we will have no draft in September or the rest of the year, according to the policy the Army has laid down. I do not believe that organization is going to need any $27,000,000. I do not know what ought to be done, but I do believe there will be no occasion for them to use any such amount of money.

The lend-lease proposition was presented to us. I do not know how many Members of the House know what the situation is with reference to the lend-lease business at this time, but it has been extended and shipments to other countries have been projected down through the 31st of December.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Can the gentleman tell the committee just how much funds are available for lend-lease purposes at this time?

Mr. TABER. I will do the best I can, but I cannot tell exactly. The reason is that we found on checking up, their obligations to the Commodity Credit Corporation were overstated $400,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Overstated?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Can the gentleman tell us who was responsible for that overstatement?

Mr. TABER. I do not know whether it was the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Lend-Lease Administration, or both, but I assume it was both. I would not figure a thing like that could happen without the——

Mr. WOODRUFF. A bit of conspiring, will we say?

Mr. TABER. Well, I do not know about conspiring—I would not say that. I would say it merely indicated lax bookkeeping or accounting methods. I should say accounting because bookkeeping is a "horse and buggy" phrase.

Mr. WOODRUFF. In other words, the gentleman is in a very charitable state of mind?

Mr. TABER. Yes. But I will try to tell the gentleman about how much there is. As of May 1, there was an unexpended balance of $2,787,000,000. They had obligations outstanding as of that date, according to their books, amounting to $2,118,000,000. I am not mentioning the thousands of dollars, but am just using round figures. That leaves an unobligated balance of $669,000,000. They estimated savings as of that date amounting to perhaps $300,000,000 in those obligations as the result of cancellation of contracts.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Did I understand the gentleman to say they were savings?

Mr. TABER. They estimated savings in the obligations, that is a reduction of the obligations due to the cancellation of contracts.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And they term the reductions savings?

Mr. TABER. They may be savings, but they are only savings from the standpoint of the obligations existing as of the date that they make the cancellation. They do reduce the obligations.

Mr. WOODRUFF. That is the first time, may I say to the gentleman, that we have known of anything that even smells of savings coming out of Lend-Lease.

Mr. TABER. I do not know, of course, but they claim they are going to obligate something like $236,000,000 more. A very large portion of the set-up for Lend-Lease along the line of obligations is owed to the War Shipping Administration. The War Shipping Administration is from 6 months to a year behind in its collections. Part of it is due to the volume of things that are shipped to distant parts of the world which are off the regular lines and are considerably difficult to check up on.

Now they have a program of shipments for the rest of the year which runs into considerable figures. During the period from September 2, 1945, they have shipped to other countries, according to the tables before me, approximately $450,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

That is as near as I can tell it from the tables on pages 656 and 657 of our hearings. The proposed shipments through the rest of the year run into considerable figures, as I remember it about $150,000,000 for the balance of the year. Their liquidation expenses are heavy, but the figures have been given as well as I can do it.

As the bill is read for amendment, amendments probably will be offered at different places in the bill. I have not mentioned UNRRA. I will leave that for some of the others to talk about. They have been provided, with the $465,000,000 which is carried here, with funds that would carry them well into 1947. I do not believe they will be able to procure the material and ship the goods to use up all of the funds that have been provided them within the time limits that are set for their operations.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I notice by the report that the bill carries the $465,000,000 for UNRRA.

Mr. TABER. It does.

Mr. SPRINGER. There has been a lot of confusion in the administration of these UNRRA funds. What does the gentleman have to say in regard to that particular matter?

Mr. TABER. Well, there has been a great deal of confusion and there has been a great deal of question as to how far it was doing the job it is supposed to do. The relief problem all over the world is exceedingly difficult. The picture is so confused, and their accounting has been on such a basis down to the time that Mr. LaGuardia took charge, that you could tell very little about it. That is about the situation. You can tell a little more now, but it is not satisfactory.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time in the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill to put the House on notice that a mistake has been made in dealing with one of the Bureau of Reclamation projects in the regular Interior Department appropriation bill.

In the Snake River Valley in southwestern Idaho we have one of the most productive and one of the most highly developed irrigation districts in the entire United States.

When President Roosevelt made his tour of the country and wanted to see irrigation in its perfection he stopped the Presidential train in the city of Boise, the capital of Idaho. He left his train there and made a tour for a whole day to see what had been accomplished with reclamation. That was in the Boise project supplied with water from the Boise River. Due to the extension of this early day irrigation project it is in an intensely settled area of fine homes, productive farms on small tracts. The system of farming in this country has changed in large measure. We found out there that the dairy business was profitable. The pastures are small and the herds of dairy cattle large. I might say that handling the dairy products of this section of the country we have one of the finest cooperative creameries and dairy industry in the whole State if not in the whole United States. This land which produces possibly two crops of alfalfa a year is used in the fall months for pasture so that we may produce milk and butter. Due to the shortage of water there has been a demand for a long time and an effort to secure supplemental water. The regular supplies from the existing facilities and dams runs low along in the month of August, leaving us short of water and with scant pasture in the fall months. There is another reason why water is urgently needed on this land in the late summer and that is because we have gone into the production of sugar. We are raising sugar beets. We have two of the finest sugar refineries in the Snake River Valley, one near Nyssa, Oreg., and the other at Nampa, Idaho.

The sugar beet is peculiar in that it must receive water at the time the sugar is formed in the root. You may have a fine looking field of sugar beets in the summer, but fall is the time of the year the sugar is formed and that is the time the beets must have water.

The Bureau of Reclamation has been endeavoring to relieve this situation by finding a new source of additional water. The Bureau of Reclamation made a survey and study of the water resources of the Boise River and found a suitable site for a storage dam at a place called Twin Springs some time back and all arrangements were made, the tests were made, the rock was bored, and everything was ready to begin building a big dam and store water for supplemental use in the late fall at Twin Springs. Then the Army engineers went into the field, made their own survey and examination and found a better site. They found a site at a place called Anderson

Ranch. At Anderson Ranch they found they could impound a vast supply of water. The project was estimated to cost $29,000,000. It was finally adopted by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers and a shift was made from Twin Springs to Anderson Ranch. Work was started and we have appropriated money from year to year to carry on this work. One of the biggest contracting firms in the whole West, the Morrison Knutson Co., these people are now doing the construction work. They have run the tunnels to divert the stream and construction work has been going steadily forward. We kept the work going forward during the war realizing the loss the Government would incur should this work stop.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Idaho five additional minutes.

Mr. WHITE. So, during the emergency of the war we kept the work going and kept the contractor and the equipment on the job.

Through an error this item was reduced far below the Budget estimate in the regular appropriation bill. We are asking you to give us money to continue this work. The Budget estimate was $2,847,000. When the matter went to the Appropriations Committee of the House the amount was reduced to $1,224,475.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I would like to complete my statement because this is a very important matter and I would like to put the House on notice with reference to this situation.

Mr. SPRINGER. The question I was going to ask is, How much money has already been appropriated for this project?

Mr. WHITE. I was coming to that and I thank the gentleman for his question. We have already appropriated and spent over $18,000,000. The contractors are on the ground, the facilities are there for crushing rock, pouring cement, and so forth and this huge outlay of equipment is now there and in operation.

The difficulty comes through a formula adopted by the House and Senate conferees on the Appropriations Committees. I am told that when the conferees came to reclamation projects they adopted a formula. Where the Senate had raised a number of these appropriation items over the House figure they agreed on the formula that if the job could be completed in 1 year then they would accept the increased amount of the Senate Appropriations Committee so that the job could be completed and sent on its way. If it cannot be completed in 1 year it was agreed that they would drop back to the House figure. So, in connection with this Anderson Ranch matter, the Senate raised the figure of $1,115,660 as passed by the House to the Budget estimate of $2,782,659, but, as stated, in adopting this formula that if the project could not be finished this year they cut the amount back to the House figure, which will have a very disastrous effect. It will result, so I have been told by the Commissioner of Reclamation, in having to close this work down before we reach the month of August. Just imagine the loss that the Government will take on an investment of $18,000,000 by the failure to appropriate the full Budget amount. We will have to shut down. We already have this equipment, we already have the tools, all of the organization. We will have to pull out just for the reason that the formula does not work in this particular case.

I am calling the attention of the House to this matter. I am cautioned that if I offer an amendment on the floor and let the House exercise its prerogative and its judgment and the amendment fails, then we are ruined, and the item will be ruled out by the conferees when the bill comes back to the House; that the thing for me to do is to let the House blunder through, make its mistake, let the bill as it is go to the Senate; they will correct the matter, then it can come back to the conferees and the conferees will accept the item because it was not voted on in the House and the matter will be straightened out. I am sick and tired of this way of correcting mistakes in making appropriations. We should find a better way than by waiting for another body to correct the errors made by the House. I am putting the House on notice that a serious mistake has been and is being made. In deference to the plans of my colleagues, I am going to defer offering this amendment because I do not want the people of Idaho to lose out and I do not want the Government to lose out on a proposition of such magnitude.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the gentleman if the basic reason for reducing the appropriation from the amount which the Senate has fixed back to the amount the House provided was on account of not being able to use this money during the present year? What was the basic reason for the change?

Mr. WHITE. Answering the gentleman's question, evidently the Appropriations Committee misunderstood the situation. I think the Bureau of the Budget made a very careful estimate and allowed the amount necessary to carry on the work for the coming year. They are disposed to cut the estimates of the Bureau of Reclamation and Irrigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Under the present rules no matter what the Bureau of the Budget does in cutting down the appropriations estimates asked for by the departments, when it comes out that is just what they want. They accept it and say they like it. The Bureau of Reclamation submitted its estimates to the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget adopted the $2,782,659 figure. They knew the needs of the project. But, an error has been made here in applying the formula adopted by the conferees.

I stand behind this Committee on Appropriations in efforts to reduce expenses by cutting the estimates of these departments and cut these appropriations and save the taxpayers money; I am 100 percent behind it, but if they make an error I think it should be corrected, and my purpose in getting on this floor this afternoon is to help correct a mistake that has been made and save a loss that will be incurred if this money is not forthcoming to keep this work going.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. I want to say to the gentleman that he has made a most interesting contribution here this afternoon, and I hope he will keep up the fight. I am going to vote against this bill for a number of reasons, not because I am against some of the appropriations but because I do not like the method and I do not like the procedure. I certainly agree with the gentleman that there is no agency of this Government that is sacred or sacrosanct, and if we are going to yield to some bureau downtown, then Congress has surrendered its rights and its jurisdiction.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries appropriations of over $726,000,000, and in addition to that authority to use operating receipts of over $438,000,000, or a total of about $1,165,000,000.

The appropriations show reductions compared to the Budget of over $184,000,000, and the operating receipts show an apparent reduction of over $110,000,000. I call attention, however, to the fact that most of the latter reduction is a paper reduction rather than a real one, representing deferred action to be based on actual expenditure.

The bill covers a wide range of items, some of them in my judgment based on inadequate data and providing for considerable duplication of functions.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. The gentleman says they are based on inadequate data. They have had week after week and month after month to bring in figures to the gentleman's committee, and they are bringing them in at the last minute, are they not?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If the gentleman will allow me to proceed, I think he will see what I had in mind in making the statement.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Take, for instance, the War Assets Administration. This agency is the result of Executive order, serving to combine the War Assets Corporation, formerly known as the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, with the Surplus Property Board, which the Congress set up, and the Veterans Certification Functions of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

The effect of that Executive action, by the way, is to place property outside of the continental limits of this country under the State Department, leaving the property within this country under the War Assets Administration, as contrasted with the provision which the Congress made when both types of property were placed under the Surplus Property Board.

This Administration asked for no less than $545,000,000 of administrative expenditure and a personnel of 50,761 as compared with something under $200,000,000 and a personnel of 22,000 in this fiscal year.

If we add to that $120,000,000 desired by the State Department in respect to property outside of the continental limits of the country, we have a request for over $665,000,000 for the purpose of disposing of surplus property in the fiscal year 1947.

What is the disposal program for the fiscal year 1947, Mr. Chairman?

To boil it all down, the Administration tell us they are going to sell about $15,400,000,000 worth of property in this country and hope with good luck to realize on it about $2,900,000,000, or 18 percent of the original cost of the property to Uncle Sam. In order to realize that $2,900,000,000 they ask for $545,000,000 for administrative expenditure. Deducting this request from $2,900,000,000 means a net return of only 15 cents on the dollar on the original cost of the property. To put it another way, it means that on $15,400,000,000 worth of property we are going to sustain a net loss of about $13,000,000,000.

The request, to my mind, is an enormous one. It embodies among other things, some 17 regional offices and some 1,706 sub-regional offices. It includes $16,000,000 for advertising purposes. It includes payments running all the way from 12½ percent to 40 percent as commissions to approved manufacturers or dealers. I think the amount requested is entirely out of line with the sum it is hoped to collect.

Just to give you a few examples, you will find in the hearings at page 580 a table showing the war plants that have been disposed of. You will find a plant costing $9,573,000 disposed of for $1,500,000; another costing $8,086,000 disposed of for $2,500,000; another costing $200,585,000 disposed of for $47,500,000; and another costing $32,246,000 disposed of for $13,000,000.

If we turn to the shipyards you will find a similar situation. I have here a table from the Maritime Commission that was given to me a few minutes ago, referring to shipyards. It is not wholly completed as yet. Nevertheless it shows the California Shipbuilding Corp., costing the Government $25,266,000, apparently disposed of at an added cost to the Government of $2,500,000. It shows the St. Johns River Shipbuilding Co. at Jacksonville, costing $17,603,000 disposed of to the Tampa Shipbuilding Co. for $1,928,000. It shows the McEvoy Steamboat Co. at Savannah, Ga., costing $1,333,000, disposed of apparently for the large sum of $10.

Mr. PITTENGER. How much? $10?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Apparently for the sum of $10.

If we look at page 575 of the hearings you will see what the Interior Department has been doing in the territories and insular possessions. You will find property costing $11,000,000 disposed of for $1,000,000; property costing $20,000,000 disposed of for $2,000,000; property costing $162,000,000 disposed of for $17,000,000; and property costing $173,000,000 disposed of for $18,000,000.

A similar situation is found in the General Land Office, the testimony in respect to which appears on page 575 of the hearings. Property costing $103,000,000 was disposed of for $1,000,000. Other property costing $111,000,000 was disposed of for $22,000,000.

Under the Federal Works Administration, on the same page of the hearings, you will find property costing $200,000,000 disposed of for $8,000,000, and other property costing $237,000,000 disposed of for $8,000,000.

Mr. PITTENGER. What agency was that?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The Federal Works Administration.

Mr. PITTENGER. What was the nature of the property?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not have the details here, but the gentleman will find them on page 575 of the hearings.

Mr. PITTENGER. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to say we ought to take that mattter up on December 25. That is Christmas Day and unless they want to advance the date of Christmas, why the gentleman's figures are very illuminating and more properly apply to the Christmas spirit.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman mentioned the General Land Office incurring such losses in the disposition of property. As a matter of fact, the General Land Office has a policy here where a veteran or citizen of the United States cannot get anything if they want to acquire any of the public domain land and they are holding onto everything while foreigners can step in and get anything they want at half price.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If the gentleman will study the tables in the RECORD, I think he will be impressed by how little we have been receiving for the property that has been disposed of.

General Gregory testified "that there are 20 objectives in the act and only one of the objectives, the twentieth, is getting the most money."

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The gentleman refers to the disposal of various pieces of surplus property. Was this disposal made to governmental subdivisions or private purchasers?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The items are pretty well set out, I think, in the hearings.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I think the WAA is asking for an enormous amount of money and holding out hope of very little return for the money that is spent.

It comes down to putting up anywhere from 20 cents to 25 cents for every dollar we get back from this surplus property. That figure, to my mind, just does not make sense.

If we were to provide as much as 15 cents on the basis of every dollar they hope to recover, the property being disposed of through normal channels, we will say, with those disposing of the property doing their own advertising on a fair commission basis we could cut this appropriation, according to my figures, approximately $108,000,000.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. As I understand from the gentleman's remarks, we are selling this property at about 25 cents on the dollar?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. They hope to realize 18 cents on the dollar for the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. VURSELL. All right, I stand corrected. We are selling the property at 18 cents on the dollar at a time when there is a tremendous market for material of all kinds. Now we are spending 25 percent of that 18 cents for administrative costs, advertising, and so forth. Is that approximately correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct according to the request which the WAA made. The committee has on paper reduced that request by $110,000,000, but that reduction is a paper reduction more than an actual reduction because what the committee said is, "You go out and dispose of the property and then come back to us later for reimbursement on the basis of actual expenditure." But if you take the $545,000,000 that the agency requested, your statement is approximately correct.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Slaughter committee will be interested in the table appearing on page 588 of the hearings dealing with cases of fraud and abuse in connection with the work of this agency. The cases have been rising steadily from 213 in February to 739 in May and they are said to include bribery, fraud against the Government, conspiracy, theft of Government property, and so on.

I think the same committee will also be interested, if they have not already seen in it, in the comment under date of June 19, 1946, by the Comptroller General of the United States condemning the situation with respect to surplus property at the time the work was taken over by the present agency.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the RECORD extracts from the Comptroller General's report referred to:

At March 25, 1946, when War Assets Administration assumed the surplus property disposal responsibility, and when RFC and War Assets Corporation were relieved of it, the following conditions existed:

1. No program for the internal audit of surplus property disposal transactions had been developed and little, if any, progress had been made toward this end.

2. No system of inventory record-keeping had been successfully installed, and for all practical purposes there were no reliable

records reporting the description and quantity of commodities and property available for disposal.

3. No determination had been made of either the quantity or the total cost amount of surplus property declarations received by WAC but not yet recorded in its accounts. In Chicago these papers were said to have existed on March 25, 1946, in a volume approximately equal in cubic content to that of two ordinary-sized office desks.

4. Substantial quantities of surplus goods had been recorded in the inventory as available for sale without any determination having been made of the accuracy of quantities or descriptions reported in the declarations. This condition has been said to be responsible in part for the adverse criticism publicly directed at the disposal program.

5. Substantial numbers of sales had not yet been adequately identified with the entries recording availability of the commodities concerned. The detailed inventory records in these cases continued to report the items as available for disposal. Consequently, the sales organization was confronted with the hazard of selling the same item over again even though delivery could not be effected.

6. War Assets Corporation had made sales of some surplus property, and it had in its warehouses some surplus property with respect to which declarations had not yet been received.

In addition, at March 25, 1946, no important attempt was made to determine the financial status of War Assets Corporation or the results accomplished through its operations. No important progress toward the making of such an accounting has been made or could have been made to this date. The fact of the matter is that RFC has given up (or has been required to give up) the means of making such an accounting, all of its records relative to the disposal activity having been transferred out of its possession.

It is our opinion, in the case of the surplus property disposal activity, that no satisfactory accounting could be made without practically the complete reconstruction of the accounting records. It is our further opinion that such a reconstruction could not be made with any assurance of accuracy, because of the omission on the part of the company to make important determinations at the dates on which the responsibilities changed hands.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

The hearings disclose that during the past five fiscal years the cost of price control to the American people has been $6,168,000,000, $626,000,000 of this being appropriations and the balance being price-control subsidy payments.

The Office of Price Administration reports that its rationing function is to be reduced largely to the rationing of sugar. It reports it will be out of the capital goods field in 3 months; that it hopes to get out of other commodities rapidly and be practically out of the picture by June 30, 1947, if not compelled to retire before then.

Nevertheless, it has requested $142,200,000 as compared with $150,171,000 in the present year. It actually shows a substantial increase in its requests, with reference to pricing, a $3,000,000 increase; with reference to rent, a $5,000,000 increase; with reference to enforcement, a $14,000,000 increase; with reference to travel, a $1,000,000 increase; and in other respects.

As the chairman has pointed out, in the absence of knowledge of what legislation there will be in this field, your committee has slashed the request 25 percent and has asked the Budget to freeze whatever may be possible beyond that point within 30 days after the applicable legislation is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself ten additional minutes.

I think the committee will be interested in the table on page 80 of the hearings, showing upwards of 100 commodities where price increases have been granted, but granted only after formal intercession by CPA, in many cases the price increases being much less than recommended.

You will also find a complete list of price increases in the last 90 days at page 811 of the hearings.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has referred to the abuse of the informational work under OPA. I think that has been very apparent. I think OPA has stepped way over the line of proper information, and into the field which can only be characterized as unwarranted propaganda.

The committee has been fully justified in reducing the request for informational purposes from $2,379,000 to $1,750,000.

Some of the propaganda appears to be harmful to OPA itself. A senior consumer-relations officer drawing $5,180 a year under instructions to furnish national officers of various groups, materials which will effectively promote understanding of OPA programs is quoted in the New York Journal-American of May 16, 1946, as making the following statements:

It is going to be necessary to scare the pants off the American people to convince them of the need of permanent price control.

Of course, OPA, set up as a wartime emergency measure, has no legal status now, but if OPA can be propagandized into 2 more years of life, OPA can be sold to the American people as a permanent thing under a constitutional amendment.

We are all familiar with the law on the statute books which, in effect, says you cannot use appropriated funds, directly or indirectly, by advertising or otherwise, to influence Congress on any pending legislation or appropriation.

I want to read you a letter, that came to me from a recipient in Massachusetts, put out by one of the OPA local boards under date of April 22, 1946. It reads as follows:

GENTLEMEN: Countless women's organizations, men's organizations, church groups, and race and nationality groups, have emphatically gone on record as being in favor of the retention of the Price Control Act without change.

In direct defiance of this mandate, the Congress has seen fit to create a new OPA which would be powerless to combat inflationary pressures.

This, of course, would have a devastating effect on the people of New England. Since we are already suffering the effects of being an isolated area during a period of scarcity of essential commodities, such an action can only lead to disaster. Even groups which had been highly critical of OPA actions in the past have expressed their dismay and consternation at the action of the Congress.

Movements have already been started in a frenzied attempt to correct this terrible error. The Massachusetts League of Women Voters began immediately to campaign against this action. Women's groups in Boston have opened up offices on Boston Common to obtain signatures to be forwarded to Congress asking that this ridiculous mistake be immediately corrected.

You are urged to write or telegraph to your Congressman immediately if you are interested in saving price control for New England.

PRICE CONTROL BOARD NUMBER —.

Mr. Chairman, that letter was written on official stationery. It was signed by a local OPA board. It was undoubtedly prepared on Government time. It was sent out under Government frank. In my opinion it was a clear violation of the criminal statute to which I have referred.

It seems to be impossible to correct abuse of this character with resulting waste of the people's money under the present OPA administration.

CIVILIAN PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION

The Civilian Production Administration hoped to be practically out of business by this time. When last before your committee, it expected to be down to a personnel of 600 by this time. Nevertheless, CPA now requests an appropriation of $20,600,000, and a personnel of 4,600.

It is a very large request. It reflects an extremely high salary average, a large increase in its other obligations, and the maintenance of some 71 district construction offices in the field, in spite of other field offices maintained by such agencies as NHA, FHA, FPHA, and others.

For my part it is impossible to escape the conviction, after considering the six specific functions which CPA enumerates in the hearings, that more money is requested than is necessary for fiscal year 1947.

For my part it is also difficult to escape the conviction that there is great duplication in functions reflected as between such agencies as the CPA, OPA, USES, Housing Expediter, OES, and OWMR.

The reason given for the continuance of CPA at this time is the slow reconversion resulting in large part from the disputes in the field of labor and management. The agency says that if production really gets under way it may be possible to wind up its work in 6 months.

I do not want to do anything that will handicap reconversion, but it is my belief that this agency could function with considerably less money.

OFFICES OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take too much time. I may mention, however, in passing that OWMR came before your committee with a request for $900,000.

This agency, as you know, is largely an umpire among various other agencies, acting for the President in coordinating over-all policies.

Here again it is very difficult to escape the conviction that there is great duplication of functions; that we have two, three, or four agencies doing what one efficient set-up ought to be able to do. If it is desirable to have an umpire, as

I assume it may very well be, I personally cannot see the necessity for a set-up of 134 persons on top of the staffs of all the other agencies.

The committee has reduced the request from $900,000 to $725,000.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION

The OES comes along on top of OWMR.

This is an agency the value of which I personally never have been able to understand. I recommended its abolition and transfer to OWMR, as the Members may recall, last summer; and this, in fact, was done toward the end of the summer, September 30, to be exact. But it was set up again on February 21 of this year, and it now defines its functions as those of formulating policy in regard to control of civilian purchasing power, price, rents, wages, salaries, profits, rationing, subsidies, and related matters.

If anybody in there can draw a proper dividing line between its functions and the functions of the other agencies to which I have already referred, he can do a better job than I can.

One of its principal functions, judging by its request for publicity activities, would seem to be the distribution of publicity or propaganda.

In fact, the justifications of the agency contain the following specific statement:

Increasing demands upon the Director for speeches, radio talks, and magazine articles, explaining the stabilization program, make it necessary that staff personnel be available to provide this material.

A list of specific decisions and actions during this fiscal year which was requested from this agency with a view to throwing light on just what the agency has been doing was not furnished in time for the hearings or for this debate.

The request for $266,000 that was made was cut down by the committee to $200,000. Nevertheless, this agency will receive an actual increase of 12½ percent over the present fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, there are other agencies I could speak of, but I just want to mention one more matter, then I will conclude.

RESCISSIONS

The bill carries with it a rescission of something over $3,239,000,000 and brings the total for rescissions in terms of both appropriations and contract authorizations up to over $64,342,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

MARITIME COMMISSION AND WSA

Mr. Chairman, included in the rescissions, which cover a wide field, as the Members will observe, are substantial reductions in appropriations and contract authorizations for the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration.

I hold in my hand a cartoon appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 9, 1946. It pictures a giant pirate standing about 7½ inches high, with "Eight Billion Dollar Shipping Scandal" written across his chest, and a diminutive individual entitled "Congress," about 1¼ inches high, looking at the pirate and saying, "Well?"

In the editorial accompanying the cartoon is the statement:

Either there will be an investigation of the Shipping Administration now, as Senator AIKEN and Representative WIGGLESWORTH demand, or the merchant marine may flounder in misspent public funds.

As the Members will recall, I introduced under date of January 23, 1946, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the Comptroller General's audit for these two agencies up to and including the fiscal year 1943 showing among other things the expenditure of over $8,000,000,000 not properly accounted for.

Almost 5 months later, on June 4, 1946, no action having been taken, as far as I could learn, by the President, by the Attorney General, or by the standing committees of the Congress, I introduced a resolution calling for the appointment of a select committee to conduct a thorough investigation of the financial operations of these two agencies.

Two days later, on June 6, 1946, to my amazement a resolution was offered and adopted in the House, without notice and while I personally was busy with committee matters, which provided—

That the further expenses of conducting the study, inquiry, and investigation authorized by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, continued by House Resolution 52 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 38 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, not to exceed $40,000 in addition to funds heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

What were the resolutions referred to Mr. Chairman, and how much money has been made available?

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of all three resolutions:

House Resolution 281

Resolved, That the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed (a) to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the progress of the national defense program, insofar as it relates to matters coming within the jurisdiction of said committee, or administered by the United States Maritime Commission, or any other agency under the jurisdiction of said committee, with a view to determining whether such program is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously, and economically; (b) to make such inquiry as said Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries may consider important or pertinent to the merchant marine or fisheries of the United States or any of the Territories thereof, or to any matter coming within the jurisdiction of said committee.

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned; to hold such hearings; to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers, by subpena or otherwise; and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

House Joint Resolution 52

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1943, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed to continue the study, inquiry, and investigation begun under the authority of House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purpose shall have the same powers and duties as those conferred upon it by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. The committee shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of its studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations of legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

House Resolution 38

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1945, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed to continue the study, inquiry, and investigation begun under the authority of House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purpose shall have the same powers and duties as those conferred upon it by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. The committee shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of its studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

The Members will note that the first resolution adopted back in the summer of 1941 provided that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries was directed to conduct an investigation into the national defense program as administered by the Maritime Commission and any other agency under the jurisdiction of that committee, with a view to determining, among other things, whether such program was being carried out economically, and to make such inquiry as the committee might consider important or pertinent to the merchant marine or to any other matter coming within the jurisdiction of the committee.

The Members will also note that all three resolutions—that for 1941, that for 1943, and that for 1945, provided that the committee should report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress, that is, the Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and Seventy-ninth Congresses, the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation as the committee should deem desirable.

Mr. Chairman, 5 years have elapsed since the adoption of the first resolution.

The Committee on Accounts advises me that no less than $139,000 has been authorized in this connection which, if added to the $40,000 authorized a few days ago, brings the total up to $179,000.

As far as I know, there has been no general report to the House of the results of the investigation by the committee at any time. As far as I know, there have been no recommendations for legislation submitted to the Congress. As far as I know, aside from a few reports on special topics, the House has little or nothing to show for the $139,000 that has been authorized.

A thoroughgoing investigation, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, is imperative. It should include operations under the so-called ship sales or ship gift bill. This is too big a job for any standing committee busy with other matters. It is the people's money that is involved. The people are entitled to the facts. I hope that it will not be long before a select committee is created, composed of able and independent-minded Members of this House, directed to make a complete investigation, letting the "ships" fall where they may.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I propose to address myself to a few observations with reference to the UNRRA section of the appropriations. I want to begin by saying that there is no Member in this House who is more wholeheartedly in support of UNRRA than am I. Before I came to the Committee on Appropriations I had the honor of serving upon the great Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House. In that committee and on the floor, on every occasion, I have done everything humanly possible in debate and in discussion on and off the floor to win support for the magnificent program of UNRRA, and I am still dedicated entirely to the purpose and to the object of UNRRA. I extend to this House again my heartiest compliments for the manner in which, speaking for the people of America, this House and this Congress has supported UNRRA time and time again and will, as this committee is doing, today again.

However, I want to direct the attention of the powers that be in UNRRA to a situation existing especially and for the purpose of my remarks at this time, entirely in the Industrial Rehabilitation Division of UNRRA, and particularly here in the Washington office though the associates of the division abroad must not be forgotten. I also want to say at this time that I in no way refer or reflect upon the personnel director, Mr. Howell, who is an estimable gentleman, doing a good job, in my opinion. I think he is honest, loyal and sincere, and I compliment him at this time highly.

I want it understood that I am entirely aware of the fact that UNRRA is not an entirely American organization. It is an international organization. Before anybody here or before anybody in UNRRA later on takes the time or the effort to remind me of that fact, may I reiterate, for an emphatic purpose, that I know that. However, there is no reason why we should not give attention to the political philosophy of employees of UNRRA who are American citizens.

Communism is a political belief; it is a way of life. I am not sure just what it is, and I do not care, if only they keep it out of here. But in an international organization people from nations who embrace communism as a political belief have that right, and in UNRRA they are entitled to employment and to membership in UNRRA. Of that I am entirely aware. But I see no reason why those employees who are citizens of the United States should add to that number. Our employees should embrace the democratic way of life, in a political and scientific sense, of the country of which they are citizens.

I believe that in the Industrial Rehabilitation Division there are some American citizens who, if they are not Communists—I do not know whether they are or not—but there is reasonable cause to believe they are being influenced, maybe not in their personal convictions, but certainly they are being influenced, I feel, by the strong, shall I say, personalities of some of their associates in that division who are Communists but are citizens of other countries, Russia and Yugoslavia. They have a perfect right to be Communists. But I think my good friend, the Director General, Mr. LaGuardia, is not aware of these things. I am an admirer of Mr. LaGuardia. I have admired him and many of the great things he has done, and I do not think there is a greater public servant, citizen of the United States, than the gentleman from New York, who is a former Member of this body, a great American, soldier, patriot, and administrator. But I do not think he is aware of these things. I think he should look with great care and great pains into this Industrial Rehabilitation Division of UNRRA here and abroad. He is a student of Shakespeare, and I quote to him, "Something is rotten in the Kingdom of Denmark."

I want to add this. The opinion is curent that UNRRA is folding up. There is a time limit set on UNRRA by this Congress, as it should be. A lot of the employees there are looking for greener pastures. I am for that; more power to them. But may I take this opportunity to direct the attention of the American section of the United Nations organization to this. I know the United Nations organization is an international organization. I know it is not entirely an American organization. But I repeat that certainly the employees of the United Nations organization, or the United Nations, if you want to be technically exact, I suppose, need not be fellow travelers of those who are flirting with communism, and as to any employees of UNRRA who are on the way to New York to seek employment in the United Nations, I think the American members of the personnel section of the United Nations should be given to understand by our State Department that they should be very thoroughly examined, not for the purpose of casting a reflection upon Russia or anybody else within the United Nations, because I would oppose that vehemently, but I do say that we should screen here any Americans who seek employment in the United Nations organization and for whose employment the United States quota is credited. That is all I ask.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to send a letter to Mr. LaGuardia dealing with this problem so far as he is concerned at this time with reference to the Industrial Rehabilitation Division of UNRRA. I might point out the set-up of that division. The Director of that division is an American. His name is Gold. I am not aware of Mr. Gold's political philosophy, but I feel he is dominated by the other members who are under him, a Russian and a Yugoslav. This is a very important division. This is the division of UNRRA that sends heavy industrial equipment to the nations entitled to UNRRA relief. I oppose, and I want it looked into further by somebody, this purchasing of entire plants—cement plants, paper-wallboard plants, sugar plants, machine-tool plants—lots of machine-tool plants—asphalt plants, the entire lay-out being purchased and shipped to Byelorussia, the Ukraine, and Yugoslavia. I see no reason for that. The purpose of UNRRA is not to reestablish or to establish, as in Albania or Yugoslavia, which are not industrial nations, industrial set-ups for the future. We are to try to rehabilitate those countries and not set them up in industrial business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. The Industrial Rehabilitation Division of UNRRA, then, is as follows: Norman Leon Gold is the Director. He is an American. Ernest Weissman, the Deputy Director, is a Yugoslav. The Program and Control Branch is headed by Ernest Weissman. The Industries and Materials Branch is headed by Victor Rodnov, a Russian. The Inland Transport and Tele-Communications Branch is headed by an American, Grey Leslie. But the influence exerted there because of the work to be done and the source ultimately of the goods to be acquired is being exerted by Weissman, the Yugoslav, and Rodnov, the Russian, to the exclusion of the Americans, by or with the consent of Gold, I do not know, but at least they are being bypassed.

Now, my friends, I would like to say to the Director General that I am concerned over the accumulation of reports in the press and from other sources to the effect that the UNRRA industrial equipment and facilities are being misused. It is understood they are being used as a means of furthering political movements in foreign countries which are contrary to the aims of relief and rehabilitation operations. I am aware of the newspaper controversies. I am aware of the report that was issued by UNRRA saying that these things are not so in Yugoslavia. By the way, I wonder about Tito as a name. I think the original Broscz Tito is no longer there. Tito stands for Third International Terrorist Organization—that is Tito. That

is a Russian-dominated state as most states in the Balkan group are. I know of the apologia issued by UNRRA with reference to the Yugoslav charges that Tito is using UNRRA trucks and equipment in his army and that that has been disposed of. Now I do not think so. I think that the report explaining the position of UNRRA in Yugoslavia was prepared by a gentleman by the name of Tomasovitch, a Russian of the country's program division who has charge of the Yugoslav debt.

I am not sure whether Tomasovitch is a Russian or Yugoslav, but for my purposes what difference does it make? So these are things in which I ask the directors of the authorities of UNRRA to reexamine—I am simply asking for reexamination of personnel, administration, and function, as well as the budgetary set-up, of the Industrial Rehabilitation Division here and abroad, and out of an abundance of caution let me reaffirm my love for UNRRA.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that Tito was using UNRRA funds for the purpose of carrying on his army rather than for relief purposes?

Mr. FLOOD. I think so. UNRRA has denied that, and they have issued a well-prepared statement to that effect, but I think the statement was prepared by Tomasovitch of the country's program bureau, who is chief of the Yugoslav desk.

Mr. PITTENGER. Does not the gentleman think that is a horrible charge to be made when the American people, through the American Congress, are appropriating the funds to help these famine-stricken people, to have it misused in that way?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman can select his own adjectives. I just want to see if the charge has merit; if the statements that I make, upon reexamination and investigation, will indicate that condition. I am not satisfied with the statement that has been made and I am raising these additional things, asking just to have that bureau only looked into. If the gentleman wishes to go further, of course he can, but I am concerned about the Industrial Rehabilitation Division, which I think is sending to Yugoslavia and to the Ukraine heavy industrial equipment which I do not think they need and which should not be sent there. I think it should be sent to China if it has to be sent some place.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Since the gentleman is a student of this situation, I would like to know whether there is any truth to the rumor, the statement in the press that Yugoslavia and Tito have been using UNNRA sugar and selling it for a dollar a pound or a dollar and a quarter a pound.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, I do not know exactly about that case but I am sure the gentleman recalls that during the general debate on UNRRA, we who are friends of UNRRA, including myself, admitted freely and frankly that there were flagrant instances of black marketing of UNRRA products, not alone sugar, in the early days. I think a great deal of that has been eliminated. At least I feel that now. But in the early days I would agree that it was so. We had indisputable evidence that it was so. As to Tito and sugar at a dollar a pound, I do not know. I had not heard that.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. I did not take the position that the gentleman had heard of it. I just wondered if it was true.

Mr. FLOOD. I did not even hear the statement made. Of course, I hasten to add that I always felt, and still do, that 90 percent of the criticism directed against UNRRA by the enemies of UNRRA were false, sheer rumor, and that we destroyed point after point in the debate.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. My point is that I do not like to vote the public's money for one purpose and have it used for a different purpose. It is for that reason I asked the gentleman the question.

Mr. FLOOD. I agree with that. I want the gentleman to know I am supporting this bill as is. As a matter of fact, it would not take much to convince me that they should have more. I would vote for a further extension of UNRRA under certain circumstances. I am a great believer in it. I just want this one division of this one bureau looked into.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that at least 75 percent of the money that is being used by UNRRA is American money and that most of the people who are getting this money are not aware of the fact that the United States is helping them?

Mr. FLOOD. I say to the gentleman from Ohio that I do not agree that most of the people who are getting the money do not know where it comes from. I think that today—this is my opinion and I feel I know something about it—I am convinced that the vast, vast majority, all you could expect under the circumstances, of the people in the nations who are recipients of UNRRA aid know that good Uncle Sam is giving it to them; and they are grateful and thankful. I am sure of that.

Mr. BENDER. Does the gentleman think that the people of Russia who obtain benefit under UNRRA know that the United States is giving it?

Mr. FLOOD. There is a practical situation there that the gentleman must understand in relation to certain people who are getting the benefit of UNRRA. It is due to a technical situation. The gentleman is aware that Byelorussia and the Ukraine are separate independent states. There is some dispute over the matter of censorship. There has been no censorship of the press in the Byelorussia-Ukraine area with reference to UNRRA. The censorship is with respect to other news and the press representatives there are treated by the censors just the same as the Russian writers are; but so far as I know there is no difficulty in the newspapers writing about UNRRA and American press reports are coming out uncensored.

Mr. BENDER. Does not Russia control the facts that are available to the people of the country?

Mr. FLOOD. I believe the facts are available and are honestly being given to the public.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania one additional minute.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do feel that the administrative officials—and I feel that they will once it is brought to the attention of UNRRA—will take a look at this industrial rehabilitation section applying to these people there. Understand, I hope I am wrong; I would be delighted to find out that any suspicion that exists in my brain with reference to this personnel or its efficiency or the way it is operating is entirely wrong. Nobody would be better pleased than I; but out of an abundance of caution if for no other reason I appeal to them as being the best friend, or one of the best friends of UNRRA in the House, that some attention be given to that problem at once.

UNRRA

The industrial rehabilitation of those countries within the orbit of UNRRA's operation has deteriorated. It has assisted materially in supporting the continued war effort of the countries under the Russian sphere of influence, as evidenced by articles recently published in many newspapers. A few outstanding examples are as follows:

New York Times, May 9, title "Yugoslavia Parades Armed Might in Celebrating Victory Over the Axis." This stresses that not only the gasoline which was sent by UNRRA for use in distribution of relief supplies is being used for military purposes, but also the trucks.

Washington Post, Vienna, April 26, title "Yugoslav Guards Stop Removal of American Goods at Gunpoint." This is another shining example of their appreciation for assistance rendered them in time of need.

Washington Post, Trieste, May 6, title "Tito Diverts UNRRA Goods." The trucks labeled "from Tito" transport UNRRA food into the Allied military areas.

New York Times, Spalato, Dalmatia, May 6, title "The Yugoslavs as Indicated Are as the Russians Completely in the Dark as to the Source of Relief Supplies Provided Them. There Is No Likelihood That Any Yugoslav Is Going to Forget His Country's Debt of Gratitude to the Russians." In such an instance as this there must be some reason why the same feeling for the hand that is helping this country cannot be returned to the country that has helped them even greater than the Russians. There has been much change with reference to this—America's position has improved.

That is just a few of the numerous articles that happen along this direction

which do not confine themselves to the Yugoslav Government, but also Poland and Czechoslovakia.

The reason for this is that the headquarters set up for the screening, procurement, and allocation of industrial supplies and equipment is such that it will permit these irregularities to occur. As in most countries today there is no basis for requirements as to the extent of actual damage and need. This is due to the fact that UNRRA representatives are not permitted to travel freely to observe. The set-up of the Industrial Rehabilitation Division is as follows:

Gold, Chief of Division, Canadian.

American: Machinery and Equipment Branch, Rodnov, Chief, Russian; Program Control Branch, Weissman, Chief, Yugoslav; Transportation Branch, Leslie, Chief, United States.

This set-up permits the screening, allocations of requirements to be made by the Program Control Branch.

A check of the key employees in this branch reveals that a majority of them are Communists or so inclined. All machinery and equipment procurement is under the direction of Mr. Victor Rodnov, Russian. Distribution of industrial supplies and equipment are distributed to the liking of the two branch chiefs listed above and are under their complete control. This also meets the approval and support of N. L. Gold, Director of the Division, and is influenced greatly by the Yugoslav and Russian lobby here.

The Transportation Branch is headed up by an American, but is actually under the control of the Program Control Section for the obtaining of approved requirements and the procurement authorization budget and the allocation of materials. The situation of Mr. Grey Leslie, who heads up this branch, is such that it results in a continuous battle with support going to the Reds, and it is time that someone should put a stop to this.

The present incumbent is influenced by an intercircle of aliens who are motivated by their own national self-interest and furtherance of their political beliefs which is contrary to most of ours. Suggestions to correct such operations are scorned and labeled nationalistic or partial. In fact, most important meetings where such matters are discussed and determined, officers and personnel who are American are deliberately excluded. Further, the Director of the Division is without any industrial or manufacturing experience and has permeated his position by surrounding himself with others whose knowledge and experience in industry and economics are as limited as his own. He has consistently ignored the constructive and qualified advice of trained technicians and has made decisions in ordering purchases which have resulted in sheer waste of relief money, as example:

1. Airplanes, Lockheed: Purchased from United States last March or April for Yugoslavia, $25,000 each, now completely reconditioned. Total cost, $225,000. Check with United States Treasury, Procurement Division. Purchased three C–47 for Yugoslavia from New Delhi, India. Question as to cost and use in Yugoslavia check Foreign Liquidation Commission.

2. Purchase railroad cars.

3. Purchase of depots containing foreign surplus: Complete records available Foreign Liquidation Commission.

These are not incidents but typical examples which will give you some idea as to the condition under which a program of approximately $700,000,000 of industrial supplies are being purchased of which $500,000,000 have been purchased or committed to date with the largest portions going to countries under Russian domination.

This same concentrated effort to procure and ship industrial supplies and equipment to China is very definitely lacking simply because we have no lobbyists in the organization who are concerned particularly with the urgent needs of the Chinese. This is believed to be against the resolutions of UNRRA, having nationals from reciprocant countries in such positions.

The article, This Changing World, of the 16th of May, by Constantine Brown, in the Washington Evening Star, well illustrates what is meant and will give a basis for starting some detail follow-up work:

The expenditures for Yugoslavia during 1945 and 1946 amount to $450,000,000, a sum representing nearly the entire income of that country in 1938, the last normal peacetime year. Yugoslavia's import trade in the same year represented only one-sixth the amount which UNRRA is shipping over a 2-year period. * * * The Yugoslav budget provides no less than 54 percent of the revenue for national defense. * * * In order to replenish the empty treasury much of the "salable" UNRRA supplies are being sold and sums realized are accredited to the account of the Government. UNRRA's American and British officials are powerless.

It is suggested that changes be made as follows:

First. Reorganization and replacing officials and other personnel of the Industrial Rehabilitation Division with people more capable of performing this kind of work more efficiently and satisfactorily.

Second. All industrial supplies now being procured be diverted to China.

Third. Suggest that the Director General install an organization to streamline the operations throughout UNRRA.

Fourth. Steps should be taken immediately to prevent undesirables being appointed to UN. Steps have been initiated for some appointments.

Fifth. Eliminate the shipping backlog which exists.

Sixth. Suggest that the director and the deputy directors of the Industrial Rehabilitation Division be investigated as to qualifications and other background.

Seventh. Also summon persons recently returned from Yugoslavia.

It should not be overlooked that the United States has the least to say as to the workings and control of this organization. This is partially due to the fact that United States representatives are placed in such a position that they may be overruled.

A check as to the control should be made by an inspection of the organization chart.

Another point for investigation is the basis for procurement which has been initiated of complete glass plants for Czechoslovakia and Poland. As you know, these countries are in a position, as Yugoslavia, to provide the minimum industrial rehabilitation if the industries are utilized properly. As a matter of fact, they are in a position to export. It is also understood that complete manufacturing plants are also being procured for Russia.

In view of this activity, it is suggested that all procurement for heavy industrial machinery be investigated thoroughly and specific justification for use be checked.

The food situation, as evidenced by the New York Times, May 22, is an operation to which the Industrial Division is accustomed. That is, having industrial policy of, and operation for, all countries dictated by the Russians and Yugoslavia. It is time someone woke up to this "smooth" operation and asked for a complete investigation of the Industrial Rehabilitation Division.

Here is a table of the procurement up to May 31, 1946, of industrial and agricultural equipment in the areas of Byelorussia, Ukraine, and Yugoslavia:

Domestic procurement of United States owned surpluses through May 31, 1946

Division	Byelorussia	Ukraine	Yugoslavia	Total
Industrial	$1,245,107	$1,204,494	$1,747,423	$4,197,024
Agricultural	36,809	43,435	978,718	1,058,962
Total	1,281,916	1,247,929	2,726,141	5,255,986

Mr. Chairman, I now insert a copy of a letter I am sending to Mr. LaGuardia with reference to information I desire on the Industrial Division operations:

Hon. F. H. LAGUARDIA,
Director General, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Being previously connected with the Foreign Affairs Committee, and in my present capacity with the Appropriations Committee of the United States Congress, I am greatly concerned over the accumulation of reports in the press and from other sources, to the effect that UNRRA industrial equipment and supplies are being misused. It is understood these are being used as a means of furthering political movements, which are contrary to the aims of relief and rehabilitation operations, and consist of types and quantities which have no part in a relief program. This is far beyond what was intended in the approval of Relief and Rehabilitation Administration by the Congress.

It is requested that information be provided me for the following questions concerning the Industrial Division's operations:

1. List of staff, detail of qualifications, responsibilities and salaries, present responsibilities, and national affiliations.

2. Who finally approves industrial programs and what is the criteria in detail.

3. What checks are there to supervise proper use of equipment upon receipt at destination, and proper use as to application of relief and rehabilitation, exclusively.

4. Composition of staffs in various countries, their qualifications and salaries.

5. What is the personnel turn-over in the Division? From whom, and why, have resignations been submitted?

6. What statistics are being produced, and for what purpose are they used? How many

persons are employed, and salaries involved?

7. Detailed break-down, giving brief description, quantity, and cost of all industrial equipment, and materials for each country of destination in the following categories, from United States contributions, as:

(1) Requested by recipient countries.
(2) Approved by UNRRA.
(3) Procured to date.
(4) Shipped.
(5) Balance to be procured.

8. Also same data for industrial equipment being supplied from the United Kingdom, Canada, and other sources.

Where complete manufacturing or fabricating plants and other large equipment and machinery such as construction, equipment, mobile and stationary machine shop; transportation and stores; land, water, and air have been or will be supplied, provide substantiating data in detail.

Mr. Chairman, I now wish to submit a series of newspaper articles having to do with this subject:

[From the Washington Post of April 21, 1946]

EXPORT PERMIT DEMANDED—YUGOSLAV GUARD STOPS REMOVAL OF AMERICAN GOODS AT GUNPOINT

VIENNA, April 20.—Authoritative informants said today an American officer had been stopped at gunpoint from removing American equipment from the Belgrade Airport on grounds Yugoslavia was demanding that export permits be obtained.

The United States Army Air Transport Command installed some facilities at the Belgrade Airport, much of it to help supply Marshal Tito's forces in the final days of the war.

Recently, these sources said, Maj. Joseph B. Gurley, of Oregon City, Oreg., the only ATC officer still left at the airport, tried to put some United States radio gear aboard an ATC plane for shipment out, but was halted by a Yugoslav guard who threatened to use his gun.

Although the ATC still is making daily flights to Belgrade, Yugoslav restrictions have made it impossible to replace seven ATC officers and enlisted men who were redeployed, they said.

Officials said the UNRRA has presented Yugoslavia with eight C-47 transport planes. Two have been delivered to Belgrade, but the ATC there has declined to turn them over, pending settlement of the present difficulties. The Yugoslavs also have 15 American-made Dakotas parked on the field, but only five are in service.

The Belgrade field was built up by both the ATC and RAF when practically the only supplies reaching Tito's Partisans were being flown from Italy by United States and British planes. The Yugoslavs also have begun charging a transit fee of $4 for passengers on American planes, officials here said.

[From the Washington Post of May 7, 1946]

TITO DIVERTS UNRRA GOODS, OFFICER SAYS

TRIESTE, May 6.—An administrative officer of UNRRA here said today he had submitted his resignation in protest to what he termed "mishandling" by Yugoslavs of UNRRA goods.

There have been frequent reports here that UNRRA goods earmarked for rehabilitation in Yugoslavia recrossed the Morgan line into the Allied military zone and were distributed among elements who support the claims of Marshal Tito's regime to Trieste and Venezia Giulia.

The officer, a former United States Fifteenth Air Force major, who asked that his name be withheld pending a complete report to Washington, is an inspector who frequently crossed the temporary Morgan line dividing Yugoslavia-controlled territory in Venezia Giulia from the Allied military area. He said that three times he saw a truck labeled "from Tito," bringing UNRRA food into the Allied military area, where roads are plastered with signs calling for Yugoslav annexation.

Berry K. White, UNRRA chief in Trieste, said tight civil police patrol control had kept such use of the supplies to a trickle.

White praised the head of the UNRRA mission in Yugoslavia, Michael Sergeichic, a Russian, and said no obstacles had been placed in the way of distribution of UNRRA supplies there.

An authoritative source said Allied military authorities have impounded 120 reels of Canadian newsprint labeled "UNRRA supplies for Yugoslavia," which were brought back to Trieste for use by three Trieste newspapers favorable to Tito.

[From the New York Times of May 7, 1946]

YUGOSLAVS IN DARK ON FREE UNRRA AID—UNAWARE THAT FOOD BELGRADE SELLS IS UNITED STATES-BRITISH GIFT—NEEDS FOUND SLACKENING

(By Albion Ross)

SPALATO, DALMATIA, May 6.—Some 3,000,000 persons in the desolate devastated regions of western Yugoslavia behind this Dalmation coastal port owe their escape from starvation to the free contributions of the American and the British through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, but they are ignorant of that fact. A group of correspondents and public-relations representatives of the UNRRA touring the region discovered that in general the populace seems to have no idea to whom their salvation this last winter is due.

Five hundred thousand tons of grain, 115,000 tons of quartermaster food, and thousands of tons of other foodstuffs have been poured into the western Yugoslav area as a whole. This is sold by the Government emergency board. The Government gives money or grants credit to those who cannot pay.

Conversations in the villages and towns proved that the people themselves do not know that the food is provided free by the nations overseas.

PRESIDENT CITES MEASURES

The President of the Government of Croatia, Dr. Vladimir Bakaritch, who also is an important figure in the Communist Party, was asked if measures had been taken to inform the people that the UNRRA supplies were a gift and that their own Government received the money from their sale. He assured the correspondents that such measures had been taken, but an investigation on the spot indicated that these measures had been completely ineffective—if they were taken.

Dr. Bakaritch in his address to the correspondents made reference to facts in the matter that had been published in the logical press of Croatia, but the head of the UNRRA for Croatia said that to his knowledge this was the first time they had been pointed out by Croatian authorities. On the other hand, Communists have written all over the walls throughout the area slogans thanking Premier Joseph Stalin and the Red Army for the deliverance of their country. In stores, schools, offices, houses and in every nook and corner, pictures of Premier Stalin and Marshal Tito are seen side by side. There is no likelihood that any Yugoslav is going to forget his country's debt of gratitude to the Russians.

The UNRRA public-relations officers intend to bring the matter to the attention of the Government again, their request that the Yugoslav public receive a little better picture as to the reason why the devastated regions came through the winter safely.

The period when heavy supplies of foodstuffs, clothing, and household essentials will be needed is seen as drawing to an end here. The most urgent needs now seem to be medical and hospital equipment and certain necessities for improving the transportation system.

The UNRRA will put into the country during the summer an increasing volume of medical and hospital equipment.

[From the Washington Star of May 16, 1946]

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

The expenditures of UNRRA for Yugoslavia during 1945 and 1946 amount to $450,000,000, a sum representing nearly the entire national income of that country in 1938, the last normal peacetime year. Yugoslavia's import trade in the same year represented only one-sixth the amount which UNRRA is shipping in over a 2-year period.

There would be no criticism of this lavish expenditure if the supplies were distributed fairly and would answer the purpose for which Congress has appropriated large sums for the relief of the suffering people, and the rehabilitation of the country's economic life.

But from all accounts, many of which exist in the files of the State Department and are cataloged as "confidential," the Yugoslavian people themselves are deriving little benefit from the Good Samaritan actions of the American people. The vast quantities of food and raw materials are being used by the Government, which exercises a complete though indirect control over them. Maj. Gen. M. A. Sergeichik, the former quartermaster general of the Red Army in Iran, is now director of UNRRA in Yugoslavia and as such supervises the sale and distribution of the supplies.

As an example of how it works, 54,000 long tons of sugar have been transported to Yugoslavia. The sugar is being sold on the so-called black market—which is authorized by the Government—at a price equivalent to $1.25 a pound. This figure has been fixed by the Ministry of Supplies, which controls prices in that country.

In the last few weeks six American and three British high-ranking UNRRA officials in Yugoslavia have resigned, despite the alluring pay and other advantages, as a protest against the manner in which supplies are being used.

When it was decided that Yugoslavia would receive assistance from UNRRA its former director, Herbert Lehman, nominated a Britisher as regional director. This nomination was vetoed by Marshal Tito. Mr. Lehman then proposed an American, C. B. Brock, who before the war had large interests in Yugoslavia. He also was rejected. Finally Mr. Lehman agreed to appoint General Sergeichik.

As soon as Marshal Tito gave his unrestricted approval to the appointment of the Red Army officer, a staff of about 550 British and American officials gathered at Bari, Italy, to cross the Adriatic and start their supervisory and control work. The Yugoslav Government decided that the number was too large and refused to grant the necessary visas. Eventually a compromise was reached, whereby the total was reduced to 150.

The Americans and the British soon discovered that their job was more difficult than they had anticipated. At first they had difficulty obtaining travel permits within the country. The Yugoslav authorities were courteous whenever an UNRRA official asked for "internal passports," but the OZNA (the secret police patterned after the Soviet NKVD) was always slow in granting them.

For instance, the British official in charge of the rehabilitation of the mining industry received requests for the tools and dynamite needed for the mines. He demanded that he be permitted to go and see for himself the quantity required, but he was never allowed to do so. Finally, he resigned in disgust and

General Sergeichik immediately named a loyal Soviet citizen to the position.

The sale of UNRRA supplies by the recipient government is not against the provisions of the laws which govern that organization. But they were not supposed to serve as sources of revenue, which according to the reports received by the American Government has been the case in Yugoslavia.

The Yugoslav Government, which had an empty treasury after the collapse of the Nazis, is now trying to refill it in any way possible. Harsh methods have been taken, such as arbitrary taxation and change of the currency whereby all citizens have had to turn in their old money for the new and have received $98 regardless of their wealth in the past. The balance is deposited in state banks and the citizens are permitted to withdraw only the equivalent of $20 a month.

These devices are not sufficient because the Yugoslav budget provides no less than 54 percent of the revenue for national defense. In order to replenish the empty treasury much of the salable UNRRA supplies are being sold and the sums realized are credited to the account of the Government. Regional Director Sergeichik, who is regarded by all as an able administrator, is cooperating with the Tito government and allows such transactions.

UNRRA's American and British officials are powerless. Some who are sympathetic with the Communist doctrines and Tito's totalitarian regime are not opposed to departing from the spirit of the laws governing UNRRA. Others who take their jobs seriously have already resigned, refusing to be a party to irregularities which have begun to come out in the open.

[From the New York Times of May 10, 1946]

YUGOSLAVS PARADE ARMED MIGHT IN CELEBRATING VICTORY OVER AXIS—STAGE LARGE DEMONSTRATIONS IN BELGRADE AND ZAGREB—SIGN PACT WITH CZECHS—UNRRA DISTURBED BY MILITARY EXPENDITURES

(By Albion Ross)

BELGRADE, Yugoslavia, May 9.—The signature late this afternoon of a Czechoslovak-Yugoslav pact of friendship and alliance was the central point in a celebration today of the first anniversary of the victory over the Axis Powers. An elaborate reception has been given to the Czechoslovak delegation headed by Prime Minister Zdenek Fierlinger and Foreign Minister Jan Masaryk and great stress has been placed on the brotherhood of the two Slav peoples.

A display of Yugoslavia's new motorized military equipment in a 3-hour-long review this morning by Marshal Tito, the visiting Czechoslovak statesmen and officers representing the various Allied armies was calculated to emphasize the importance of Yugoslavia in the system of alliances that now bind Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia to the Soviet Union.

The most impressive portion of this morning's review of the Yugoslav Army was the large display of heavy types of Russian tanks and a considerable volume of motorized artillery. The equipment as a whole was a mixture of the armaments of many nations, with guns and other material captured from the Germans occupying an important place.

DISPLAY DISTURBS UNRRA

A similar demonstration of military power was held in the new Yugoslav State of Zagreb, where a youth congress has opened.

This bringing together of mechanized forces, constant drills, and trial runs of tanks, half tracks, and other mechanized equipment in the vicinity of both Belgrade and Zagreb has been a headache to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. A United States official said that the lines of mechanized equipment he observed in nearby districts literally stretched for miles.

The affair served to revive a difficult question for the UNRRA as to what petroleum supplies Yugoslavia really has and what use is really being made of the petroleum imported by the UNRRA. Relief officials here say that they would have preferred to have the Yugoslav Government refrain from using up so much gasoline and Diesel oil at this time for the movement of a large number of military vehicles.

The shortage of petroleum in February forced the UNRRA to shut down sharply on the operation of the truck fleet that provides citizens with food and other necessities and the situation barely has been reestablished so there is now some surplus to meet essential demands. Although the UNRRA now has been operating in this country for more than a year the petroleum control office of the UNRRA here said that it never had an adequate accounting on the distribution of gasoline.

The same office said that it never had received any full accounting on the petroleum products brought in from Rumania. These are matters on which the UNRRA, under contract, expects to receive full information so that it can distribute its total supplies according to the real needs of the various peoples receiving aid.

MILITARY EXPENDITURES HEAVY

The problem fits into the larger question of heavy expenditures on an army in a state that is heavily dependent on outside aid. The Government's budget report has shown that 50 percent of all the central government's budgeted expenditures and one-third of the total expenditures of the central government plus all federal states of Yugoslavia is being devoted to national defense.

Since the Government receives considerable income from the sale of UNRRA goods to the public the relief organization is concerned with the expenditures of this money, which ostensibly should go for relief and rehabilitation. So far Government reports on these sales have been coming in slowly, and UNRRA has received complaints on unusually high prices.

Some trouble has been encountered in the matter of the use of UNRRA trucks for the transport of guns and munitions, particularly in Croatia. Some resentment was felt in UNRRA offices over a recent incident in which an UNRRA employee was arrested for having taken the numbers of UNRRA trucks moving strictly military equipment in Zagreb.

Meanwhile, responsible foreign observers here say that many industries and businesses taken over by the Government often represent a heavy loss that must be met in some fashion. In part this loss is laid to some rather remarkable transition period conditions.

Attention was drawn to one example in which a peasant without business experience who had been a partisan became a commissar and was managing a considerable industrial establishment in the Zagreb area, and it was asserted that such conditions were anything but uncommon.

[From the New York Times of June 3, 1946]

UNRRA EXPLOITED BY COMMUNISTS—AUSTRIAN PARTY CREDITS ITS YUGOSLAV PROTOTYPE FOR AGENCY'S RELIEF WORK

VIENNA, June 2.—The Communist Party is beginning to make concrete propagandist use of its advantage accruing from the circumstance that the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's heavy relief and reconstruction program in this part of Europe has been concentrated by chance in countries with Communist governments or regimes friendly to the Communists.

The country in this region that has benefited the most from the UNRRA is Yugoslavia. The Austrian Communist Party's official organ, the Voice of the People, presented a lengthy article today telling the hungry Austrian worker about the food that the Yugoslav has and that he cannot get, and about the articles of clothing that can be bought in Yugoslavia and are unavailable here.

Virtually everything to which the article refers either has been delivered by the UNRRA or results directly from the UNRRA's program. However, the article does not say even once that the UNRRA's goods are entering Yugoslavia or that the UNRRA has anything to do with Yugoslavia. The credit for the better conditions in Belgrade is given to the Communist-controlled government there. The article concludes with the moral:

"There is so much that our people could learn from the Yugoslavs. For the moment we can say only: 'Yugoslavia, you have it better.'"

Although the western portion of Yugoslavia was saved from starvation by the UNRRA's delivery of more than 10,000 trucks and of the food supplies that they distributed, the Communist paper presented the situation in these terms: "Half the nation was near death from hunger. The people gritted their teeth and went to work collectively. They put together means of transport and machines out of old wrecks and junk. Thus production began slowly. Agriculture was helped by the delivery of industrial goods and tools. The peasants brought food on long and difficult roads with the most primitive means of transport."

Such strict attention to party advantage and not much else is not limited to the Communist press. The Vienna press carries so little news and the morning papers have become so completely political organs that the Upper Austrian News from Linz, in the American zone, is now being sold here with a special section of Vienna news. This is a good deal as if readers in New York had to seek their news in a special Manhattan edition of a Trenton paper. The Upper Austrian News now has approximately double the circulation of any other strictly Austrian newspaper and is surpassed only by the American forces' Vienna afternoon paper, the Vienna Courier. The Linz paper was founded by the United States Army as strictly a news organ and was later turned over to Austrian management, but it has continued its policy of presenting news.

[From the New York Times]

LAGUARDIA'S ATTACK ANSWERED BY WRITER

In reply to charges attacking the accuracy of dispatches written by him for the New York Times from Yugoslavia, Albion Ross said in a message yesterday that he felt his stories were "much too hesitant and cautious and failed to give an adequate picture of the outrageous situation existing in Yugoslavia."

F. H. LaGuardia, Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, had taken issue last Saturday with an editorial in which the Times cited its own dispatches and those of other papers showing that UNRRA's administration in Yugoslavia permitted relief supplies to be used for Marshal Tito's military machine. Mr. Ross asserted in his message that he believed Mr. LaGuardia's report had been based on material received from "a strongly left-wing UNRRA mission headed by a skilful former Red Army colonel."

The correspondent said that Tom Healy, a New York Post writer, also had obtained a "very different impression" from that of Peter Furst of Newsweek and Edward Clark of the United Press, both of whom had criticized his dispatches.

Mr. Ross quoted Nathaniel Farbman, a Life magazine photographer, as differing with Mr. Furst and Mr. Clark and as saying that "tires

were taken off UNRRA trucks under repair and rolled next door into the gate of a military depot."

[From the Baltimore American of June 9, 1946]

SOVIET OVERLORDS RULE PUPPET TITO'S YUGOSLAVIA—FOOD DONATED BY UNITED STATES USED TO AID SOVIET

(By Eric L. Pridonoff, former special economic attaché in the United States Embassy at Belgrade)

Marshal Tito is not the real dictator of Yugoslavia.

He is a puppet.

His own political commissars rate him no higher than sixth in the civil government of Yugoslavia.

Over that civil government is a supercrust of Soviet Russian domination that wields the power of life and death of judicial, legislative, and executive prerogatives rolled into one—and ruthlessly exercised.

The most powerful single individual in Yugoslavia today is Major General Kisilev, head of the Russian military mission to Yugoslavia, a shrewd politician and clever diplomat of the Soviet brand.

He alone, directly or through members of his staff, can—and does—give orders to Yugoslavia's civil government heads.

The voice may be that of Tito, but the hand at the helm of the Yugoslav state is the hand of Moscow, manipulated through the person of Major General Kisilev.

RANKOVITCH TOP MAN

In Yugoslavia's own official family, the real No. 1 man is Gen. Alexander Rankovitch, Minister of Interior, general secretary of the Yugoslav Communist Party.

Under his direct control is the dreaded OZNA, secret police organization, all-Communist in membership and as brutally powerful as Hitler's Gestapo or Soviet Russia's NKVD.

Controlled by the OZNA and, to some extent, officered by its members is the KNOJ, Yugoslav counterpart of Hitler's SS storm troopers. There are 14 divisions of the KNOJ corps, a total of 150,000 men.

Though Tito holds the title of Premier, Rankovitch is actually the keyman in the civil government.

Next in actual power behind the camouflaged facade of Yugoslavia's Government come four other Communist master minds who compose the tunes that Tito plays:

Moisha Piada, member of Parliament and Russian-trained Communist, who has authored many of the brutal "people's laws" of Yugoslavia.

Gen. Milovan Djilas, Minister Without Portfolio, a ruthless Montenegrin Communist.

Edvard Kardelj, another Russian-trained Communist, who serves jointly as First Vice Premier and president of the "Control Commission" of Yugoslavia.

Sretan Zujovic, Minister of Finance and veteran Communist.

Then comes Tito himself, Premier, Minister of National Defense, the bemedaled puppet of Moscow and his own Yugoslav Communist peers.

NO PERSONAL LIBERTY

There is no personal liberty in Yugoslavia today, although an agreement signed by Tito and Dr. Ivan Subashich, setting up a provisional government, was supposed to guarantee personal freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly; freedom of religion and respect for private property.

Today those pledges are a hollow mockery in Yugoslavia.

Yet misled Americans are pouring over half a billion dollars in UNRRA supplies into Yugoslavia.

They should know that Tito has been using these supplies in whatever way the Communists dictate.

Americans should know that, while thousands were starving, Tito held up entrance of UNRRA supplies until two demands were met:

1. Appointment of Maj. Gen. M. A. Sergeichik, of the Soviet Russian Army, as UNRRA director in Yugoslavia. This general was former quartermaster of the Red Army in Iran.

2. Delivery of all supplies to Tito-controlled ports, to be handled from there exclusively by Yugoslav authorities, under Major General Sergeichik, as they saw fit.

Americans should know that after Sergeichik took over American and British UNRRA officials were unable to get permits to travel to areas for which vast quantities of machinery, foodstuffs, and other goods had been requisitioned.

Thus they were not permitted to make check-ups on the uses to which the UNRRA supplies were put.

Several technical experts, including a British mining expert, Mr. Jeffers, resigned from UNRRA because they would not blindly rubber-stamp approval of requests from Tito's Ministry of Supply.

Americans, who furnished 80 percent of UNRRA funds, should know that only requests for shipments first approved by the Russian major general, Sergeichik, went forward to London, Washington, or the other Allied Powers.

Tito used UNRRA goods for barter in Albania and other neighboring countries to further Yugoslavian-Communist political aims.

Yugoslav recipients of UNRRA goods—outside of a few large cities—never knew that American, rather than Tito, generously fed, clothed, and housed them and gave them machinery to rehabilitate their war-torn country.

REPORT IN RED JARGON

The first 1946 UNRRA report from Yugoslavia, submitted to UNRRA's former director, Herbert Lehman, was edited by a British woman, known to be pro-Communist, in language easily recognized as the jargon of Reds the world over.

Clothing, so generously donated in America and intended for free distribution to the needy in war-ridden countries, was sold at high prices to needy Yugoslavs by the Tito authorities.

There was a daily delegation at our American Embassy in Belgrade of Yugoslav purchasers of such clothing, who came to protest about the high prices charged for such goods.

Drugs, such as penicillin, sulfa, and insulin, sent by UNRRA to relieve human suffering, were brazenly sold by Tito's army doctors at black-market prices.

When people began to come to the Embassy seeking these drugs, I found many instances where 10,000 dinars, equal to 3 months' pay of the average Yugoslav wage earner, had been charged by Tito's doctors to treat a single venereal case.

Often these applicants were plain soldiers, who didn't rate treatment reserved for the Communist elite or for those wealthy enough to pay the black-market prices.

Every ranking Allied officer who resigned from Yugoslavia's UNRRA in disgust has been replaced by an "expert" from the Soviet Union.

I know these things are true. I have documented many of these cases, and these statements are made from a background of many investigations in each category.

Reports of abuses in the UNRRA distribution in Yugoslavia were forwarded to the State Department in Washington, but up to the time I left Belgrade the misuse of UNRRA supplies was continuing.

[From the Baltimore American of June 16, 1946]

EX-UNITED STATES ATTACHÉ SAYS ALL "YUGOS" FEAR RED POLICE

(By Eric L. Pridonoff, former special economic attaché in the United States Embassy at Belgrade)

Every city in Communist-ruled Yugoslavia is divided into wards by the Tito regime.

Every ward is headed by a committee whose members are tested Communists.

The wards, in turn, are divided into streets with Communist street committees. And each street is divided into blocks under Communist block secretaries.

These ward, street, and block officials report daily to the OZNA, all-powerful secret police, controlled by Gen. Alexander Rankovich, Minister of the Interior, who is general secretary of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.

No man, woman, or child may move in or out of his block, street, or ward without it being included in the daily reports to the OZNA.

Each individual must have in his possession at all times a "karakteriska" signed by his block secretary.

Without this document he cannot buy food, obtain lodgings, clothe himself, or travel.

FILES KEPT ON ALL RESIDENTS

The OZNA maintains files on each individual, and in those files is written the most confidential and secret opinion of the block secretary about the holder of every "karakteriska."

The file gives the Communist Party stamp of approval or disapproval of the individual.

People not of the Communist front are classified as unreliable, lawless, even as killers. They are game with ever-open season for the OZNA, for the reliable or the authorized or those labeled "ours" in the favorable dossiers.

In Yugoslavia the "karakteriska" is a document of life—or death.

Based on reports of the block secretaries, OZNA men may enter any home, check food supplies, wood, clothes for each family.

Smoke is checked as it comes from the chimneys, to indicate whether fuel is burned too often, and also to check the source of the fuel supply if more than the meager ration seems to be consumed.

Visitors, for even a few minutes, are reported. Casual street contacts are noted, with special emphasis on contacts with British or American persons.

In order to buy a pair of shoes, a yard of cloth, or any consumer goods, except food, the individual must get a coupon from the ward headquarters—impossible unless the "karakteriska" is in order and the official file at headquarters places the applicant on the approved list.

Prices, with a coupon, are reasonable. Getting the coupon is the trick.

TITO OFFICIALS WELL DRESSED

Yet Tito's military officers and Government officials have shoes in multiple pairs.

They live in the best housing. They have ample food. Their wives wear silk and furs and diamonds. They have automobiles and ample American gasoline. Their stoves have ample fuel.

On the farms, in the forests, in the mines, each group has a production quota, carefully estimated, watched, and checked by the never-ending chain of OZNA espionage.

The farmer must sell to the Government, at fixed prices, such quantities of foodstuffs as the Government in that district estimates it needs to furnish 600 grams of flour per day to heavy laborers, 450 grams for other laborers, and 300 grams for all others—in American measure 600 grams is about a

The farmer with more than five head of sheep must sell all wool in excess of five head to the Government at fixed prices.

Those with less than five head can keep two fleeces for each member of his family, the rest being sold to the Government.

The Government fixes prices on all items.

Any semblance of thrift is called hoarding and carries penalties up to death. Raw materials, semifinished materials—all must be sold to the only authorized buyer—the Government.

Owners of agricultural land may not sell it.

Owner of factories, or production plants of any kind, frequently find themselves accused of having made profits during the German occupation, if they were in occupied territory.

Charges of war profiteering bring commissars to take over their plants.

Fines and taxes put the plants into Government hands in short order after that.

Under the Tito-Subashich agreement private property was guaranteed. Under the Tito-OZNA regime more than three-quarters of all property in Yugoslavia has been liquidated.

Any denunciation of an individual in the people's courts—any charge by a Communist that the individual collaborated with the Nazis—is equivalent to guilt.

Milosh Minich, public prosecutor of Serbia, appearing before the legislative committee, made the following comment on justice as it is meted out in present-day Yugoslavia:

"If we had judges—jurists as permanent judges—we would give preponderance to formal justice. But material justice should be rendered by men, regardless of whether they are jurists."

DEATH SENTENCES IN 10 MINUTES

"Justice should be pronounced by men who know how to guard the achievements of the national liberation struggle.

"Men of the national liberation struggle appreciate better the significance and importance of the new laws than would jurists who interpret the letter of the law."

Just how this works may be shown by some examples.

In Sandjak a court composed of a Communist, a gypsy, and a Turk sits in judgment at night, sentences people to death by shooting without a proper hearing and without a lawyer present—the whole proceeding lasting less than 10 minutes in some cases.

GROUP OF WOMEN FORM A COURT

A group of women of the Anti-Fascist Front of Women, suddenly decided to form a court in Belgrade last July.

They tried a Yugoslav woman and sentenced her to 5 years' imprisonment.

The authorities recognized the sentence, set it up as an example.

The urge in Yugoslavia is to judge somebody and to sentence somebody.

Every member of the Communist Party seeks to have some public part in sitting in judgment on some unfortunate victim.

The new Communist judiciary, literate or illiterate, ignorant of law as law is understood throughout the world judges quickly and efficiently on the basis of Communist directives.

The Tito-Subashich agreement guarantees freedom of religion.

Records in the Government-controlled press itself show literally hundreds of priests and others of the clergy have been "liquidated," usually on charges of "disloyalty."

Records show hundreds of "suicides in jail, awaiting trial."

OZNA VISIT FEARED BY ALL

There are no men or women in Yugoslavia, other than the small percentage of Communists, who are not afraid of a visit from the OZNA or the militia to their homes; of torture, jail, plunder, persecution, and death.

Many thousands of Yugoslav refugees are now in Italy and Austria, ready to kill themselves rather than be sent back to the homeland they knew before the arrival of Tito and the locusts of communism.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 19, 1946]

(By Charles T. Lucey)

United States officials returning here from Yugoslavia have reported military use of equipment supplied by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and intended for use in bringing aid to needy civilians.

These officials also have reported efforts by the Yugoslav press to identify Russia as the source of UNRRA aid going into the country.

Still another report of returning United States officials is that while Yugoslavia has made requests for extensive UNRRA aid in industrial rehabilitation, obstacles have been put in the way of UNRRA officials seeking to inspect industrial facilities to justify such aid.

A controversy has arisen between UNRRA Director Fiorella LaGuardia and certain United States newspaper correspondents in Yugoslavia over reported use of UNRRA supplies for Tito's military machine. Mr. LaGuardia says that investigation of such charges showed they were unfounded.

EYEWITNESS STORIES

But American officials returning to Washington verify the reports and say they have seen UNRRA vehicles being used to haul men and supplies of the Yugoslav Army. In at least one instance, it was reported that huge UNRRA trailers were used to transport army tanks. In another, use of UNRRA trucks to haul Yugoslav soldiers and guns in Slovenia and Croatia was reported.

Even nonmilitary supplies given Yugoslavia may have the result of bolstering the armed strength of the country, returning officials say, because this kind of help—industrial and highway rehabilitation, for example—allows the Tito government to concentrate efforts on military development that otherwise would have to go to rebuilding a war-torn country.

Officials returning from both Poland and Yugoslavia have reported that political favoritism has had an important part in distribution of relief goods in some cases.

SUPPLIES CAN BE SOLD

Where people have money to pay for foodstuffs, supplies are sold. The proceeds go first to pay UNRRA administrative expenses in the country concerned, and then to the government to be used for rehabilitation. But in some cases it is contended that use of UNRRA-derived funds for rehabilitation indirectly benefit the building of a military machine. More than 70 percent of UNRRA funds are supplied by the United States.

United States officials also have brought back reports that at the same time UNRRA is providing relief and rehabilitation aid to Albania, that country's Government is concentrating its efforts on building a military machine. In both Yugoslavia and Albania there have been many reports of UNRRA officials being treated with hostility. Some UNRRA reports, it is known, have mentioned military use of UNRRA goods in Albania as well as in Yugoslavia.

* * * * *

One of the problems which has perplexed even some UNRRA people abroad is how to use certain supplies bought in entire depot lots from the Army. In one case a big supply of searchlights was acquired, and in another rudders and other marine parts. Some officials overseas have called these supplies virtually worthless in the relief job UNRRA is supposed to do.

Misuse of UNRRA equipment by untrained personnel has been reported both from Yugoslavia and Albania. One United States official has described the wrecking of many thousands of dollars worth of huge truck-trailers and road rollers between Zagreb and Trieste, attributed to handling by natives who lacked training.

Returning officials agree that in many areas UNRRA has accomplished vast good, but some UNRRA overseas workers have expressed dismay, nevertheless, at diversion of UNRRA goods into channels never intended.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 20, 1946]

TAKE IT EASY, SOL

Chairman SOL BLOOM and others of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, have worked up quite a lather over what they describe as the "premature" publication of news about a subcommittee report on UNRRA and America's Russian policy.

What happened is that the enterprising Scripps-Howard reporter, Charles T. Lucey, got the information on what was in the report and wrote a couple of stories which were published in the News before other Capitol Hill correspondents could get their hands on a copy of the report.

Chairman BLOOM may have been embarrassed by having been deprived of the formality of issuing a release simultaneously to the press as a whole, and some of the other reporters may have been embarrassed by Mr. Lucey's "beat." But no harm has been done. The public was entitled to the information. And things like that will happen in a country which has a free press and resourceful reporters like Charlie Lucey.

Incidentally, Mr. BLOOM, you have been unfair in accusing Representative KARL MUNDT of "leaking" the story. Take it from us, SOL—and we know—Charlie got his information elsewhere. Not that it matters. All that matters is that Charlie's stories were accurate—which they were—as well as being the first in print.

[From the New York Times of June 20, 1946]

BLOOM AND MUNDT IN ROW ON REPORT—LATTER DENIES HANDING PRESS ADVANCE COPY OF DOCUMENT ON RUSSIAN RELATIONS

(By Charles E. Egan)

WASHINGTON, June 19.—The mystery of who handed reporters advance copies of a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee report criticizing appeasement of Russia remained unsolved today, but the row its publication caused continued to furnish Capitol Hill with one of its choicest bits of gossip in years.

On opposite sides of the dispute were Representative SOL BLOOM, Democrat, of New York, who has been chairman of the powerful Foreign Affairs Committee for years, and Representative KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT was hotly accused—and as hotly denied the charge—of having been responsible for turning over to the press advance copies of a four-member subcommittee report urging a firmer stand in diplomatic dealings with Russia. The report, which received wide publicity, was described by Mr. BLOOM as "malicious and vicious" and likely to disturb the work of the Big Four Foreign Ministers, now in session in Paris.

The committee clash came at the close of a hearing on a bill authorizing a military mission to China and the turning over of surplus military supplies to that nation. It was started by Representative JOSEPH F. RYTER, Democrat, of Connecticut, and one of the four signers of the report. He asked Chairman BLOOM if the committee could go into executive session and consider the report.

"The committee meeting stands adjourned," Representative BLOOM snapped.

"But I want to know what's going to be done about this report," Mr. RYTER said. "I

read in the papers this morning that the committee would consider it. I want to know if the report is going to be published."

"It's already been published," Chairman BLOOM answered with asperity. "Somebody on this committee gave out an advance copy of the report. In all my years here I have never known of a breach of confidence by any member of the committee until now. I was mortified when I saw the stories, indicating that someone had been guilty of giving out a report that hasn't even been considered by the committee."

"That still doesn't answer my question," Mr. RYTER retorted. "I want to know if the committee is going to meet and whether or not the report will be published."

The committee stands adjourned." Mr. BLOOM thundered.

At this juncture other committee members joined in the fray, with Representative JOHN M. VORYS, Republican, of Ohio, demanding to know if there was an intention to suppress the report.

"You can't suppress what's already published," Mr. BLOOM rejoined. "Somebody's already given out the report."

"Are you accusing me?" Representative RYTER asked.

"No; but the Chair knows who did give it out," Mr. BLOOM answered.

"Then I think the Chair should name the person," Mr. RYTER said.

"I think it was Mr. MUNDT," Mr. BLOOM responded.

"It certainly wasn't me," the South Dakota Representative asserted. "I wasn't even in town yesterday. I was up in Buffalo."

"There are ways of giving things out even if you are absent from the city," Chairman BLOOM responded.

"What I want to know——," Representative RYTER chimed in.

"The committee stands adjourned." Mr. BLOOM called for the third time.

Committee members later said that they would insist upon an executive session of the Foreign Affairs Committee and demand consideration of the report. They thought the matter could be brought up before the close of the week.

[From the New York Times of June 19, 1946]

HOUSE GROUP BARS APPEASING RUSSIA IN REPORT ON TOUR—SUGGESTS MEETING OF TRUMAN AND STALIN TO GET A FRANK EXCHANGE OF SENTIMENT—BORDER STATES CRITICIZED—POLAND AND YUGOSLAVIA FOUND TO REFLECT SOVIET IDEAS—UNRRA UNDER ATTACK

(By John D. Morris)

WASHINGTON, June 18.—House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee, reporting on a tour last year of Europe and the Near East, called today for an end to our unwise appeasement methods in dealing with Russia and recommended a meeting between President Truman and Premier Stalin for a frank, across-the-table exchange of sentiment.

The 41-page report, printed for private distribution among members of the full committee, which will decide tomorrow whether officially to make it public, reflected a considerable degree of alarm of Soviet activities in countries under USSR domination and over growing Russian influence in other nations.

It also criticized activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for creating hopeless confusion and said that the United States recognition of the present Polish and Yugoslav regimes was too hasty.

SIGNATURES DIVIDED

Representatives KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, and FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, Republicans, signed the entire report while two other members of the subcommittee, Representatives THOMAS S. GORDON, of Illinois, and JOSEPH F. RYTER, of Connecticut, Democrats, limited their sponsorship to the first half because they had been unable to complete the tour, which was made in August, September, and October of last year.

All four members subscribed to the recommendations for "immediate abandonment of any semblance of appeasement" toward Russia and for a Truman-Stalin conference.

A "stiffer attitude" toward Russia, the report asserted, is necessary not only because appeasement harms the United States influence in the world but also because, "when we yield to Russian positions unjustifiably we discredit in Russia the high-ranking leaders of the Kremlin who, in their own party councils, argue that only a policy of complete reciprocity with the United States will bring enduring results for Russia."

The purpose of a Truman-Stalin meeting, it was stated, would be "to determine what policies and problems of each country seem to hold Russia and America apart," and what can be done to bring them closer together.

The subcommittee, in other recommendations dealing with Russia, urged "complete reciprocity" between the two countries; an "unequivocal determination" by the State Department of "the attitude and policy of the Russian Government toward the countries now either absorbed by or under the control of the U. S. S. R.," as a guide for United States policy toward Russia; and improvement of cultural relations between the two countries by exchange of persons and information.

By "complete reciprocity" the committee said it meant that "no greater privileges should be extended to Russians in the United States than are extended to Americans in Russia," and that "since the United States engages in and encourages no type of political activity in Russia that the U. S. S. R. should exercise the same restraints in the United States."

CRITICAL OF POLAND

All four members of the subcommittee were also highly critical of Soviet activities in Czechoslovakia and Poland and of ineffective American effort to counter them. In Poland, their report stated, freedom of speech is unknown; freedom from fear is a mockery as a result of ex-members of the Red Army's plundering, raping, and living off the country as they go and each man, woman, and child lives in daily fear of want.

The report told of large numbers of armed Soviet soldiers in Warsaw streets and of Soviet arrogance toward the population. The subcommittee heard numerous tales of pillage, rape, and torture at the hands of both the NKVD (Soviet police) and the Russian military, it was stated.

"The committee feels," the report stated, "that our Government has acted too hastily in granting even conditional recognition to the present provisional government. It strongly believes that the indulgence of our Government has been greatly abused and the action presented to the Polish people in an utterly false light."

UNRRA in Czechoslovakia, it said, was described as almost entirely a Russian show, with the United States receiving very little credit for its substantial contributions.

UNRRA IN YUGOSLAVIA

UNRRA was further criticized in the portion of the report signed only by Representative MUNDT and BOLTON. Reporting their observations on Yugoslavia, they said:

"From our conference with the Russian director of UNRRA, Dr. Sergeichik, and his staff, we came away reinforced in our conviction that those who are not contributing substantial percentages of supplies to UNRRA should have no position in the directorate of its operations." They said that inefficiencies and maladministration in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia had caused hopeless confusion.

Marshal Tito and his government are ruling Yugoslavia today as completely as the men of the Kremlin rule Russia, they asserted. The situation there, as in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, reflects the vicious harvest which comes from the appeasement policies which the United States has followed with regard to Russia ever since the days of Yalta and perhaps before.

[From the New York Times of June 3, 1946]

YUGOSLAVS TO BAR MAJOR IN UNITED STATES ARMY

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA, June 2.—A United States Embassy official said today that United States Army Maj. Richard Coombs had been declared persona non grata by the Yugoslav Government because he had tried to intervene in the arrest of a Yugoslav who was making anti-Government remarks at an American Memorial Day service Thursday. Harold Shantz, embassy chargé d'affaires, announced the Yugoslav Government's action.

Major Coombs, a graves registration officer assigned to Belgrade, left Friday on a honeymoon trip to Italy, and embassy sources said the Yugoslav action was tantamount to forbidding his return to Yugoslavia.

George Nikolic, the arrested Yugoslav, was detained after a United States Memorial Day ceremony at the graves of fallen American soldiers in Belgrade.

A report in the newspaper Borba said that anonymous sources had sought to stage a demonstration against the Yugoslav Government during the American service. M. Nikolic, the paper said, "in a loud voice and in a vulgar way cussed out the present regime of Yugoslavia."

The newspaper added that Major Coombs, "in a very rude and unlawful form, tried to intervene for Nikolic, but the Yugoslav authorities in a polite manner refused the intervention.

"At that moment, Major Coombs, to shock all spectators with his sarcastic tone, shouted, 'This is liberty for you, Tito. Heil Hitler!'" the Borba report added.

The newspaper also said that United States Army Chaplain William R. S. Donaghy, of Lowell, Mass., had misused the hospitality of Yugoslavia by having read to the Memorial Day crowd a letter from an unnamed Yugoslav woman. The newspaper said that the woman's charge that the "people do not have the means of showing their gratefulness to the fallen aviators is without basis."

LONDON, June 2.—British press dispatches from Belgrade reported tonight that the Yugoslav Government had dispatched notes to the United States and British embassies asking that the American and British War Graves Commissions stop work for sanitary reasons.

[From the New York Times of June 3, 1941]

YUGOSLAVIA TODAY

The American and British Governments have sent formal protests to the Government of Yugoslavia against its incitement of obstruction to the Allied military government in Trieste, where any incident might set off an explosion that would be hard to cope with. This diplomatic step is merely one of a number of recent representations made to the Yugoslav Government.

Yugoslavia today is dominated by a small Communist minority headed by Marshal Tito, who not only views both the capitalist and the socialist west with doctrinal suspicion, but who also considers himself to be a Russian proconsul and the leader of the Communist spearhead toward the west. He is now imposing on his country a totalitarian regime which is ruthless in its methods.

Having legalized his rule by a typically totalitarian election boycotted by whatever

remained of an opposition, Marshal Tito is putting into effect all that he learned during his long years of training in Communist revolutionary practice. There is neither political nor religious nor any other freedom in Yugoslavia. The press is shackled, the opposition has been crushed, and the OZNA, or secret police, sees to it that all Yugoslavs without exception join the Tito forces and hail the leader, or they do not eat. The least sign of opposition entails the confiscation of ration cards for food and clothing, even the loss of identification papers, which might mean arrest. Private property, from the nation's industries and larger landed estates to stores, hotels, and private homes, is being confiscated without compensation to its owners, who are generally imprisoned as collaborators or profiteers. Even the UNRRA must serve as a weapon of the revolution, for the supplies it sends free to save the starving are not only represented as coming from Russia but are also sold by the government at profiteering prices.

Such practices are sometimes represented as the inevitable concomitants of a revolution. But there is no right of revolution by a minority in a country that is free. And it must be kept in mind that these are not excesses of undisciplined mobs committed in the heat of passion, but integral parts of the policy of a government claiming international recognition. The assurances given to the people of Yugoslavia and other countries of eastern Europe during the war must still be redeemed.

[From the Washington Post]

POLES HUNGER DESPITE ALL THEIR EFFORTS

(Post Reporter Michael Frome, who has served as navigator of trans-Atlantic planes carrying UNRRA supplies to Europe, spent much of the last fortnight in Warsaw. There he interviewed nearly all government and opposition leaders. This is the third of five uncensored articles.)

(By Michael Frome)

The Polish people need food desperately, and the need will continue into 1947.

Brig. C. M. Drury, head of the UNRRA mission to Poland, and Jerzy Sztachelski, Minister of Supply, were blunt in stressing that—regardless of gains already made—Poland must continue to receive outside help before it can begin to feed its entire population.

Warsaw is a paradox, a picture of plenty in the midst of famine. Within a few blocks of the Polonia Hotel, the center of foreign life, the shops are shockingly full. Meats, eggs, fresh fruit, and vegetables—anything can be bought.

This is the free market, which feeds about one-half of 1 percent of the Polish population. It came into being last year when the Government found itself unable to requisition sufficient farm produce to feed everyone.

At that time the Government was forced to adopt the callous position: "Since it is impossible to give the entire population enough to eat we must cut off the nonproducers."

Ration cards were issued only to persons directly concerned with the job of rebuilding the nation and its industry. The others were forced to get food where they could find it.

And, although strict penalties are placed against farmers who do not meet their quotas, there are too many small farmers for the system to function well. The free market is designed to encourage farmers, through the opportunity for larger profits, to bring their food before the public.

Another source of free market supply is UNRRA indirectly. To the peasant receiving an UNRRA package, the cigarettes it contains are of far less value than the money it will bring; money with which to purchase a far more basic commodity. This practice is frowned on by the Government and UNRRA officials in Poland but they both recognize that, in the final analysis, it serves the paramount purpose of getting more food to the people.

The free market, however, does not yet reach a very large buying public. Under the weak and staggering postwar Polish economy an average worker earns about 1,200 zlotys a week ($12 at the nominal rate of exchange) and a professional about four times that much. In the cafes of Warsaw, a small cup of coffee costs 30 zlotys and a piece of cake about the same.

A full meal in a Warsaw restaurant would cost a workingman at least 1 day's wages.

PRICES REMAIN HIGH

The demand for food and merchandise is so far in excess of the supply that prices remain high and the shops generally empty of customers other than foreigners. The Government is lenient with and encourages the free market, both to bring more food to the public and to provoke a drop in prices.

For the great majority of the people, then, this picture of plenty is merely a facade to intrigue foreigners. To Brigadier Drury the problem of feeding the Polish Nation is on a large scale and far distant from solution.

Drury, one of the few foreigners in Warsaw who enjoy the confidence of the Polish Government, is a 34-year-old Canadian with an already distinguished career. A graduate of the Royal Military College, McGill University, and the University of Paris, he was a Montreal lawyer before entering the Army in 1939.

SERVED IN WASHINGTON

He served as military attaché of the Canadian Embassy in Washington in 1942 and 1943 and commanded the Fourth Canadian Division in Europe when the war ended. In Poland he is responsible for the largest UNRRA allocation to any single nation.

"In spite of Mr. Hoover the food crisis will not be over by the middle of this summer." Drury told me at UNRRA headquarters. "The situation has been so bad that the Poles have had to remove seed for planting from the stores in order to meet the need for food. That means that the productivity of the land is not being increased. This year's harvest will be only slightly larger than last fall's and there is no reason to think the shortages will be overcome by next year.

"In addition, even in normal times the Polish peasant produces first for his own use and secondarily for market consumption. Unlike American wheat markets, the Polish market is supplied by a tremendous number of small producers—so that a 10-percent drop in farm production would cause a 100 percent market drop. And this is a country in which nearly half the diet consists of grain or grain products."

THRESH ONLY AS NEEDED

"Also, because the peasant lacks machinery he is threshing his crops only as they are needed. In other words, a great deal of grain will be harvested in the winter instead of being stored as seed in the fall."

Drury pointed to Poland being the only nonenemy country with large territorial changes. "Other nations have suffered losses of population and physical damage," he said, "but the Poles, in addition, are moving millions of people in different directions. The moving, feeding, and resettling of barren, unseeded farm lands makes it impossible for these people to be self-supporting this year, let alone able to produce for the market."

Admitting that the UNRRA program in Poland is far behind schedule "because of factors beyond our control," Drury urged that shipments be increased manifold. "The Poles are not trying to rely on outside aid indefinitely. They have already made remarkable progress in getting the land back to work."

SPEAK OF AMERICAN UNRRA

Americans, he said, have the "curious sensibility" that their Nation is not getting credit for relief activities, leading to demands that the United States withdraw from UNRRA and establish its own agency. "Actually, however, the people here speak of us as the American UNRRA, causing considerable dissatisfaction to the British and other nationals in our work."

He illustrated the need for increased aid by pointing out that, while in the United States the average consumption of soap is 24 pounds per capita annually, UNRRA has been able to purchase only half a pound per capita for Poland. "Soap is extremely important here. Disease, stemming from a combination of lack of cleanliness and the destruction all around us, is one of the country's biggest enemies.

"Malnutrition is another cause of the high rate of disease. Because the German plan was to exterminate the Polish Nation (and they did kill off nearly all the Jews and intellectuals) or reduce it to serfdom, those who survived had no reserve to fight disease."

HIGH TUBERCULOSIS RATE

"And today tuberculosis is 10 times as prevalent in Poland as in the United States. In some sections, as high as 17 percent of the children are either in need of treatment or observation for tuberculosis. A balanced diet is one of the principal weapons against tuberculosis and that is impossible."

Just before I left, Drury called me to the window of his office. "Come here and take a look," he said.

The UNRRA Building, one of the best in Warsaw, was undergoing repairs. Drury pointed to the workmen in the courtyard below.

"This is their lunch hour. Yet how many do you see eating?"

A dozen or so were sitting and talking. One of them was eating a sandwich.

"Well, don't the rest of them get any lunch?" I asked.

"No, they don't."

But just what progress have the Poles made to feed themselves? What part has the government played? Has it given any leadership to the food program? To some Warsawans I met, the government has been more of a retarding factor, an agency for diverting UNRRA supplies away from the people.

DETAILS PROBLEMS

Sztachelski (Shtakelskee), the Minister of Supply, detailed the nation's problem and accomplishments.

At the outset, he said, the country faced three main difficulties:

1. A complete lack of food reserves, everything having been taken by the Germans.

2. There was no trade or commercial apparatus through which to distribute supplies. The majority of businessmen and traders had been murdered by the enemy.

3. Transportation was in a state of complete disorganization. Virtually not one automobile remained. Almost all railroad stations, locomotives, and railroad cars had been destroyed.

"So we were really starting from the beginning," the Minister said. "In the first period of our greatest need we received aid from Russia. The USSR sent 60,000 tons of flour in January 1945 as a gift for Warsaw and another 150,000 tons of cereal just before the first crops last year."

LIVING STANDARD VERY LOW

"Our standard of living then was very low, and these gifts helped us to survive. It is important to note that in the first period it

was primarily on the basis of Soviet assistance that we pulled through.

"We have striven to solve the distribution problem in a difficult but fundamental manner—through the cooperative system. It is the only method we can find to handle such a large-scale distribution. Along with the cooperatives, the government is encouraging private initiative, always important in the development of commerce.

"To get the full utilization of our shattered transportation system, we had to get the complete use out of every railroad car. We endeavored to speed up the loadings and shorten the stay of trains in the station. In spite of small gains, movement of supplies was made with delays and irregularities."

SUPPORT VITAL NEED

"What we needed most of all for the success of the program was the support of the people. Although we could neither pay nor feed them, the workers responded with enthusiasm and effort in moving supplies.

"Then, last May, when the need was even more than desperate, the first UNRRA transport came to us. With our harbors in ruins, we had great difficulty in receiving the early UNRRA shipments. And, although the shipments were small, they were extremely important and helped save many lives.

"When the first ships came to our rebuilt ports of Gdynia and Danzig last September, we could handle only one ship a day. Since then, Gdynia alone has handled 220 ships. On March 1 we were able to unload 2,400 tons a day; on April 1 we unloaded 4,000 tons, and our capacity is increasing daily.

"Not long ago—January and February—we rebuilt and opened grain elevators for the first time. We are able to receive more and more grain in two ports, not counting all the little harbors, not counting Stettin, where the grain elevators are now being rebuilt."

SAVED FROM DIFFICULT FATE

"And so, the first period, of direst need, when our people worked without skill or technique or transportation facilities, came to an end. The UNRRA shipments of 80,000 tons, first of wheat and then rye, have saved us from a difficult fate. They came at the last moment. Every delay brought us that much closer to catastrophe.

"There are now 20,000 additional tons of grain on the way from America. The best proof of how much we need this grain is that we have had to use 20,000 tons of sowing reserve for food. If the shipments are delayed, the country will have to go still further into its reserve. The 20,000 tons already used decreases next year's crop by 100,000 tons.

"The best UNRRA help was the meat we received—20,000 tons of it. But we have only started to feel this assistance recently when the shipments became much larger."

FAT SITUATION IMPROVING

"The situation in regard to fats is quite difficult for we have only received 10,000 tons of lard, butter or margarine; it is improving, however, for half that amount arrived since the first of the year.

"Our perspective for the future is not immediately bright. The government has introduced many restrictions to diminish consumption. In spite of this, we will need help badly in June, July, and August. Our country needs a million tons of grain.

"The productive capacity of the land has decreased; we have no manure, no fertilizer; the occupation period has not helped the rotation of crops—and now we are feeling it the most.

"Because we have used the sowing reserve for consumption, 30 percent of the land is not being sowed this year. We will have the same shortage of meat and fats next year as this. We are short about 70,000 tons of fats and 120,000 tons of meat—which we must cover not only with meat but fish, as well. Otherwise, it would be impossible.

"We are watching the meetings of the food and agricultural organization with anxiety; we cannot picture the consequences of relief activities coming to an end. America must realize that whether the help comes through UNRRA or any possible new agency, it must continue until we are once again able to feed ourselves."

[From the Baltimore American of June 23, 1946]

TITO SCORNS UNITED STATES "YUGO" AID

(By Eric L. Pridonoff, former special economic attaché in the United States Embassy at Belgrade)

British and American military supplies saved Tito's Yugoslav Partisans from extinction during the war.

British and American supplies through UNRRA saved Yugoslavia's economic life after liberation from Hitler's rule.

But today Tito, his Communist secret police, his generals, and his civil government officials openly scorn anything American or British, anything not within the orbit of communism.

YUGOSLAVIA'S FORLORN HOPE

Yugoslavia—below the crust of military and political dictatorship—lives in the forlorn hope that some day, somehow, the Americans, or the United Nations, will save them.

I have been told this, not once but literally hundreds of times, by non-Communists all over the country—in trust, because, through an American, I could speak to them in their own tongue.

Tito and the Communists in Yugoslavia were not always openly scornful of and antagonistic to Americans east of the Adriatic.

Once, we and the British were most welcome there.

That was when our aviators and our supplies were parachuting to earth to aid the Partisan effort against Hitler.

CHURCHILL REPORTS TO PARLIAMENT

That was when Prime Minister Churchill, reporting to his Parliament after the Big Three conference at Teheran, declared:

"Between General Mihailovich and Tito, we are taking sides with Tito and shall give only him our greatest possible assistance."

The good will of Tito and the Communists held as long as we gave them armaments and food for their armies, great numbers of trucks for their transportation system and later vast UNRRA supplies to feed the starving people.

It held until the incident at Trieste when Allied troops stopped Tito's Partisans from flowing westward beyond Fiume into northern Italy, and stopped their plunder and mass murder.

Then came the change.

BANNERS SHOW ALLIED LEADERS

Before the Trieste incident when parades were held in Yugoslavia and Tito's victorious army strutted—often on UNRRA shoes—or rode, often in UNRRA relief trucks, the banners showed pictures of Stalin, Tito, Roosevelt, and Churchill.

To the shouts of "Long live the Soviet" and "Long live Tito" were added shouts of "Long live America" and "Long live England."

After the Trieste episode, however, there were no shouts for the American and British leaders, no placards for America or England.

The American trucks, driven by American gasoline, carried Tito's troops all over Yugoslavia, but there was no mention that America gave them to the Partisans.

OZNA forbade posters of the Allied leaders of the Western Powers.

WILLING TO TAKE, NOT TO GIVE

That Tito and his Communists were willing to take but not to give is evidenced by this statement of Yugoslav Gen. Arsa Jovanovic before he left, dressed in the uniform of a Soviet lieutenant general, for Russia to undergo 2½ years training in Russian military and political tactics:

"You will never buy us with UNRRA supplies.

"You will never buy us.

"Our sympathies are with the East."

The Tito feeling toward Americans showed when the Embassy was ready to move into Belgrade.

Daily complaints began to come in about Tito seizures of American enterprises in Yugoslavia.

Usually a committee of three, headed by a commissar, took over.

Up to April 1946, when I left, no such seized property was returned to American ownership-control.

CITIZENS ACCUSED OF AIDING GERMANS

Some of our citizens were accused of "collaboration with the Germans," others merely of "making profits during the occupancy"—all without evidence.

The J. G. White & Co. property at Novi Sad is one instance.

First the holdings were taken over.

Then a forced sale was put through at 10 percent of the original investment.

Then charges were made for "back wages."

A penalty was assessed for profits during the war—Hungarian occupation forces occupied the plant—so that the final return amounted to less than 1 percent of the original investment.

Another case is that of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. holdings at Belgrade.

KNOW THE FACTS FROM INVESTIGATION

I personally investigated both cases and so I know the facts.

I went with two American representatives to look over the plant owned by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. at Zemun.

We presented our credentials to the commissar in charge.

He said he had nothing to say to us, that he was in charge and that we could not even come into the waiting room.

It was tough for an American to take a slap in the face like that, but every American now in Yugoslavia can testify that Tito and his Communists are slapping all American faces just that way.

Even employees at the American Embassy are subject to persecution and insult.

About a year ago the Embassy electrician, a Yugoslav, was arrested without specific charge and jailed.

We never learned what happened to him.

FIVE MEMBERS ARE JAILED

While I was in Yugoslavia five native members of the United States Embassy staff were arrested without charges and jailed without trial.

On one of them, no reports were ever received.

Two of the others were still in jail when I returned to America.

The other two were released after a time.

A score of Embassy employees were told from time to time by OZNA, secret police agents:

"You will not work for the American reactionaries forever.

"You are either with us or against us.

"If you choose to work for the reactionaries, we will remember."

CONSTANT TERROR AMONG EMPLOYEES

There is constant terror in the Embassy among Yugoslav employees.

They never know when they will be arrested.

Diplomatic immunity is not recognized by Tito or his men.

Americans coming in or going out of Yugoslavia are searched.

Embassy food supplies come in by air from Italy or Austria.

Tito customs men require each box to be opened.

They put their fingers into their mouths, then into sugar, or flour, "to test it."

Any Russian officers in Yugoslavia who demonstrated friendship for the Americans at the Embassy were quickly arrested on trumped up charges of "bribery" or some other alleged offense and whisked away to an unknown fate.

There were several such instances, of which I have first-hand knowledge.

SUDDEN MESSAGE TO MOVE CARS

Last February the Tito Foreign Office sent a sudden message to the United States Embassy that all cars parked in front of it were "blocking traffic" and would have to be moved.

While plans were being made in the Embassy to move the cars, and assurance had been given by Tito's Foreign Office of ample time to complete the removal, the chief of the traffic patrol arrived and presented an ultimatum that if the cars were not moved within 5 minutes he would move them.

At the end of that 5 minutes his men began to break locks on the cars and to move them away.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 26, 1946]

YUGOSLAVIA UNRRA PRESS CHIEF IS OUSTED BY RUSSIAN SUPERIOR

BELGRADE, June 25.—Leo Hochstetter, public information officer in the UNRRA mission to Yugoslavia, has been ordered back to Washington for reassignment by the mission chief, Col. Mihail Sergeichik, a Russian.

Mr. Hochstetter said his dismissal was a result of "basic differences in concert on the conduct of public information activities in Yugoslavia."

(A spokesman at UNRRA headquarters in Washington had no comment on the announcement from Belgrade, and said he had not heard of the development until informed by newspapermen here.)

Colonel Sergeichik described the dismissal as an interoffice matter and said UNRRA rules forbade a statement by him on the factors involved. He said he had asked Director General Fiorello LaGuardia for permission to make an exception to the rule in this case.

According to newspapermen in a position to know, the crux of the dispute, which may become a full-sized blow-up, seemed to be whether a public-information officer should act as a press agent, glossing over deficiencies if necessary, or use his office to give correspondents and the public a complete picture.

Mr. Hochstetter, a native of Pittsburgh, Pa., and a former Washington newspaperman and wartime OWI officer in Turkey, said his personal relations with his Russian chief were cordial, but that "I have found that the attitude of Colonel Sergeichik and his advisers had made it increasingly difficult for me to carry out my responsibilities as I see them."

"It is my view that a public-information officer of UNRRA is an international public servant charged with the twofold responsibility of explaining all aspects of the UNRRA program to the beneficiaries and of accounting for UNRRA's activities to the contributors," he said.

Once before, after a sharp disagreement over policy, Colonel Sergeichik had requested Mr. Hochstetter himself to ask for reassignment. The latter refused.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 26, 1946]

UNITED STATES MAY BLOCK UNRRA FUNDS TO REDS DUE TO BAN ON PRESS—HOUSE MEMBERS IRKED BY REFUSAL TO ADMIT WRITERS

A "none-for-Russia" tag on this country's $465,000,000 final contribution to UNRRA became a definite possibility today.

President Truman's disclosure that Moscow had balked at letting American correspondents report on the relief agencies' activities in two Soviet Republics sent influential House Members into an angry huddle.

They tried before but failed to ban the use of United States funds in nations which refused to give American press and radio representatives free access to UNRRA news.

Finally they settled for a provision requiring the President to seek through "appropriate channels" to obtain admission of American correspondents to recipient countries.

"Apparently we did not go far enough and will now have to get together," Representative BROWN, Republican, of Ohio, told a reporter. "It may be that the House now will be willing to insist that no UNRRA funds supplied by the United States be used in countries which don't allow our reporters to go inside and find out how the money is being used."

Mr. BROWN was one of the leaders in the previous fight to put a "no reporters—no money" provision into UNRRA legislation.

Acting Secretary of State Acheson told a news conference today that so far as he knows no American news dispatches about UNRRA activities in the Ukraine and White Russia have been censored so far.

SOVIET RULES EXPLAINED

He pointed out that the Soviet Government did not refuse to permit American reporters to check on UNRRA activities in the two republics, but at the same time insisted that the usual Russian censorship rules would apply, making their reports subject to censorship.

He said he understood that a group of American newspapermen have made a trip through the two Soviet Republics in which UNRRA aid is being distributed, and have arranged for another trip.

The final $465,000,000 American allotment to the UNRRA fund is included in a deficiency appropriation bill scheduled for House consideration late this week. It will bring this country's total contribution to $2,700,000,000.

Mr. Brown said he was unable to see why Russia refused to permit American reporters to check on UNRRA operations when all other nations have removed press bans in that respect.

ARRANGEMENTS O. K. ELSEWHERE

Reporting to Congress on Russia's position, Mr. Truman said yesterday, "Satisfactory arrangements are in effect to permit American press and radio representatives to report without censorship on the UNRRA programs in all UNRRA receiving countries except the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

In his report to the House through Speaker RAYBURN, the President transmitted a Soviet diplomatic memorandum asserting that "the censorship rules in force for all correspondents in the Soviet Union will be applied to correspondents desiring to report on the utilization and distribution of UNRRA supplies."

Accredited UNRRA representatives, the President said, have been given "necessary facilities for observing and reporting" the agency's activities in the two Soviet Republics involved.

Through these representatives, the Soviet memorandum added, American official circles and the public "will have the possibility of receiving information."

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 26, 1946]

AMERICAN PROTEST ON RUMANIAN CURES REJECTED BY SOVIET

Acting Secretary of State Acheson today said Russia had flatly rejected a strong United States protest against suppression of news freedom in Rumania, and has forced Reuben Markham, of the Christian Science Monitor, to leave that country.

Mr. Acheson told a news conference the United States had registered its objections to the treatment of Mr. Markham in both Moscow and Bucharest a month ago and that it had been turned down in both places.

Word had just been received from the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, he said, contending that the American argument furnished no foundation for rescinding the Soviet action against the American newsman.

POTSDAM VIOLATION SEEN

The Kremlin takes this view, Mr. Acheson said, despite the fact that the American Government considers suppression of news freedom in Rumania a violation of the Potsdam agreement made a year ago by Prime Minister Stalin, President Truman, and Prime Minister Attlee.

Mr. Acheson said the Christian Science Monitor has advised the State Department that Mr. Markham left Rumania June 22 and is now in Athens. Colonel General Susaikov, ranking Soviet military authority at Bucharest, had ordered him out at the latest by today.

Mr. Markham had written stories on conditions in Russian-occupied Communist-dominated Rumania to which the Russians objected.

UNITED STATES EMBASSY INTERVIEWED

Mr. Acheson related that on May 21 the Soviets ordered Mr. Markham out of the country by May 26. Thereupon the American Embassy in Moscow tried to persuade the Russian Government to rescind the order.

The United States also made strong protests, Mr. Acheson said, to Soviet military authorities at Bucharest on May 25. Subsequently, however, the State Department was informed that Susaikov had refused to consider the protests.

Furthermore, Mr. Acheson said, the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs has sent word that there is no foundation for rescinding the order.

It evidently was in connection with this latest decision of the Kremlin that Susaikov finally ordered Mr. Markham out of the country.

BOSTON, June 25.—The Christian Science Monitor, commenting last night on the expulsion from Rumania of its correspondent, Reuben H. Markham, said in a statement, "There can be no question of Mr. Markham's integrity."

Mr. Chairman, the following additional information, with specific reference to Yugoslavia and Albania, I think, is pertinent at this time.

In the case of Albania, the desire of the present regime there to subordinate the building of roads to the building of any army eliminated any urgency for road-building equipment to be sent there. The Albanian Government has banished all foreign nations from that country, with the exception of UNRRA and diplomatic personnel, which has removed practically all of the technicians that were once available in that country. Road maintenance is purely the hand shovel and dirt variety. The writer has seen good road rollers standing idle while the primitive method was being followed on the main road in Albania. The people of that country are not mechanically inclined and the present government is not interested in educating the population to anything other than bearing arms. Therefore, it is believed that money and materials will be entirely wasted by sending any mechanized road-building equipment there.

Yugoslavia is doing a very fine job of reconstructing her roads with the small quantities of equipment on hand. Her people are industrially minded and are rebuilding all of her transportation facilities rapidly. However, it is the opinion that most of this is the result of military aims rather than any earnest desire to rehabilitate a war-ravished country.

I deem it necessary to protest the sending of industrial supplies into countries like Albania and Yugoslavia where such supplies are being used chiefly to build military armies which are potentially menacing to the peace of the world. It is strongly urged that a high-level investigation by UNRRA officials should be made in these countries immediately to determine if our organization is actually performing a relief and rehabilitation job there or is unwittingly fostering the development of armed forces.

Albania appears as a country which is most unfriendly to the UNRRA ideals. The Albanese do not seem to want UNRRA aid. They treat the UNRRA staff and visitors as if they were spies and renegades. They are most high-handed about accepting UNRRA relief. Also, they are a very backward country. UNRRA is trying to reeducate, not rehabilitate Albania. This is particularly true in regard to industrial rehabilitation. Albania has always been an agricultural country, never an industrial country. They have never had industrial equipment and do not want it, and would not know what to do with it if they had it. Yet UNRRA insists on sending industrial equipment to them. Also, the country is in the midst of a military upheaval. Every male in the country is in uniform. The writer cannot understand why UNRRA food, clothing, and supplies should be furnished a country which is spending all available internal effort and money on the maintenance of a huge standing army.

The Yugoslavs, like the Albanese, are most unfriendly toward UNRRA. Again they are a militaristic country. Here UNRRA supplies are being used by the Yugoslavian Army. UNRRA vehicles around the Morgan line are hauling Yugoslav soldiers and supplies. Between Zagreb and Belgrade the 16- and 20-ton trailers UNRRA sent to Yugoslavia to be used in the transportation of heavy machinery pulled army tanks. An immediate investigation should be made by UNRRA as to the end use of the supplies being furnished Yugoslavia.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I was genuinely interested in the remarks on UNRRA that the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], who addressed us a minute ago, made on this subject.

This I hope will be the last appropriation for UNRRA under its present form and as a single relief entity. There is some hope that if this relief function must continue that it will be transferred to the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations. Director LaGuardia gave us some hint of that. Perhaps the request for funds would be diminished in its entirety, that they would not ask for more than $500,000,000 in some succeeding year. There is, of course, a considerable difference between $1,850,000,000 and $500,000,000.

As I assess the value of UNRRA there is not any question that it did a lot of noble good and contributed to healing, but no one will deny that it also became something of a joy-ride for some of our cultural misadventurers.

It is just as well that it is handed over to the United Nations for probably better operation. I am not unmindful of the difficulties involved. There have been a good many. Every once in a while I have to pause to smile a little bit at the documentary evidence that comes to my attention proving some of the contentions we have made in other days. You will remember that in November last year and on previous occasions I was rather unsparing in my criticism of UNRRA. There were a good many people in the country who wrote me unkind and critical letters, stating, among other things, that I was wholly misguided. There was one in particular that came from a man identified with the Middle West, a man of considerable perception. It so happens that he is with the organization now. He used to take great umbrage over the things he read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I said about UNRRA. But today he is in some far-off field and I shall not identify him because I do not want to give him away. But he wrote to one of his intimate friends very recently and said: "Whatever DIRKSEN had to say about UNRRA in other days was not very wide of the mark."

That comes from a very emphatic critic of the criticisms I made before, who is now tasting of this adventure himself.

Mr. LaGuardia in an off-the-record conversation with us in committee indicated that when this $465,000,000 is appropriated it ought to come with good grace and with the spirit of the traditional American giver to go with the gift so that no bitterness will go with the bread the hungry people will have to eat elsewhere in the world. I share that viewpoint. I let the spirit of the giver go with the gift, but I am not unmindful also that if we are going to go anywhere in the world with the eloquent, idealistic plans that we have to bring durable peace and to develop certain mutuality between our own country and other countries that there is a requirement in confidence on the part of those other people. Of course, that confidence has not been evidenced as yet to me. It certainly has not been evidenced in the case of Soviet Russia.

I believe in calling a spade a spade. I do not believe in this appeasement policy. I want to say to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] that I read the report which he and his associates made the other day, and it was a magnificent report that he and the committee prepared. I am in sympathy with those recommendations because I think they are on solid ground when they call for firmness in policy and no appeasement. What appealed to me more than anything else was paragraph 2 of the recommendations with respect to the Soviet Union which called for reciprocity. That is all important and, as the gentleman so well pointed out in the report, if the Soviet Embassy here in Washington enjoys a second-class mailing permit, why should not the United States Embassy in the Soviet Union enjoy the same privilege? If they have the free run of our country, why should we not say to them: "Now, we will be reciprocal in our treatment. In proportion as we do not get an equivalent in your country then obviously, in the interest of firmness and in the interest of self-respect, it becomes necessary that we put on some restrictions."

That leads me up to the item I want to discuss, namely, this matter of free press.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman on behalf of our subcommittee for his very nice words in connection with our report, and to announce for the benefit of the Members who may not be advised of the fact that the Foreign Affairs Committee has authorized the publication of sufficient copies of that report so that every Member of the House will receive a copy on his desk by the end of the present week.

I want to say that it is not only in the interest of firmness that we should have a reciprocal policy with Russia, but it is also in the interest of fairness. Possibly one reason why we do not have some of the same concessions in Russia for American citizens which are granted to Russians in America is because we have not asked for them specifically and definitely. We should make that request forthwith and insist on that type of reciprocity.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

That brings me up to a proposal that I expect to present after a while when we read the bill, and that is a different version of the free press amendment, so drawn, of course, that it is germane and also comes within the rule requirement for a limitation.

There has been too much going on to indicate that the type of freedom of the press in which we are interested is not a condition today over there. The other day the Director of Information at the Yugoslav Mission in Belgrade was evidently let go or discharged—maybe he was fired, for all I know—by Mr. Sergeichik, who is the Director of the Yugoslav Mission. Evidently there was conflict of viewpoint between the two.

I believe we are not asking too much to request that as a condition for receiving farm machinery, for receiving food, for receiving machine tools and all the other items that are contemplated by that $465,000,000, that one of the conditions should be that press representatives, if they want to go over and take a look, shall have the free and uncensored right to report. Why, gracious me, you do not lend a dollar to a single State in this Nation or to a State agency unless we require a report. We want to know all about it. We do not lend any money to any Federal instrumentality unless we

get a full report. When out of the goodness of their hearts the American people have charged the custodian of their Treasury to appropriate not only the $465,000,000 in this bill, but the other $1,350,000,000 that we have appropriated, and the balance of the second $1,350,000,000, is it too much for the generous people of America to ask that if a newspaperman wants to go abroad and ascertain how distribution is being made, that he ought to be able to write a report and send over the facts without the strange kind of censorship that goes on in some of these policed countries that are living under NKVD and OSNA, as they have in Yugoslavia? That just makes no sense to me, and I think the time has come to speak our piece.

On another occasion we were speculating some whether or not food, purchased out of UNRRA appropriations, was being used as it was intended. Of course, there was the broad-gage denial, but I am prepared to disprove it to you. The department director of one of the missions over there was in my office last Friday. I shall not mention the country. I said to him, "Do they use food as a political weapon?" He said, "That is true." The food is sent over there and distribution is made by the natives, the citizenry of the country. It is turned over to their country, the administrative director of the government, and they distribute it on a ration-book basis, and the people that belong to a favorite party—if you know what I mean—the people who embrace a certain ideological line, have far better ration cards than the rest of the people in the country. I think the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] will bear me out, because he had a chance to examine into that matter. In consequence the people who are following that particular line of political philosophy are enjoying an advantage out of the food and the fiber and the clothing and the textiles and the machinery that is purchased with funds that are appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman know if any of the UNRRA food is given away to starving people who have no money?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I presume it is. I presume some of this food is given away. At least, that has been my impression.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not generally sold by the Government to whom it is given?

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a general thing, yes. But, I expect there are a great many instances where payment would not be made, so I think it is quite within propriety and also within the contemplation of the appropriations which we made that the hungry and destitute people be fed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I should like to have the gentleman's comment on this. I learned this morning that the Department of Agriculture is having 100,000,000 pounds of canned pork set aside to go to Russia, and that is being set aside by the packers who can this meat. They are now waiting for this appropriation so that they can pay for that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am afraid if there is no more time left except 5 minutes that the answer might take too long. I have no specific comment at the moment, because I want to get back to this matter which I first mentioned.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does it not seem rather strange that we are giving 100,000,000 pounds of canned meat to Russia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It does seem strange, manifestly.

Let me get back to this bill. I want to discuss a lot of things in connection with this bill. I could speak on it all afternoon. I want to get back to this free-press matter.

I noticed in the papers yesterday that Earl Browder arrived from Russia. He had gone over for a visit with Marshal Stalin. They would not let him land in Britain, so he made what could be called a technical landing. He did and yet did not make a landing because he was turned over to the custody of the pilot who was flying the plane. So good old Earl arrived back in New York, and how glad he was to get the pavement of Broadway under his feet again.

I presume you are advised as to what he did over there. He is going to take charge of the sale and distribution of Soviet publications in the United States. The first one he is going to plug, of course, is The Problems of Leninism, which has recently been revised and approved by Stalin. You should read it. You do not have to kid yourself as to what is going to happen in this world from here on out. Marshal Stalin does not pull any punches. He simply says that a capitalistic philosophy and the Communist philosophy cannot coexist in the same world. One must go. There is no doubt about that, is there? That is why the NKVD can come over here, and that is why they can shadow a man like Kravchenko, a Russian engineer, who escaped from them right down here on Sixteenth Street in Washington, and who has set forth in naked detail the whole brutal story in that great adventurous volume, I Chose Freedom. It ought to be "must" reading for every adult American citizen.

So Mr. Browder can fill us with a lot of Soviet literature, yet we can get no people over there to enjoy the freedom of the press, and without the restrictions of censorship tell the generous 135,000,000 Americans how our money is being spent.

Do not forget that we put up 72 cents out of every dollar of this whole appropriation. We put up $1,900,000,000 out of $2,700,000,000. That is about 72 percent. For the administrative funds to run the show, 72 cents out of every dollar comes out of the pockets of the American taxpayers. In the face of that kind of generosity, is it asking too much to let the AP and UP and INS and the New York Times and the Herald Tribune and anybody else that wants to go over there and send back a story of what was purchased, how it was delivered, whom it got to, and whether it finally alleviated and mitigated that destitution that the American people had in mind and heart and soul when they said to us that perhaps we ought to approve all of the money that has been requested?

So when we read the bill for amendment, in the very first portion of the bill I want to offer this amendment. I will tell why. It does not make any difference if another body takes it out, I want to be on record for what I regard as a great traditional American concept, that when our money goes abroad we want somebody there to take a look, then give us a report. That is not only good Americanism but that is good business.

I regret exceedingly there is no more time, there is so much to talk about.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

THE UNRRA APPROPRIATION

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, UNRRA is today operating in high gear. It is delivering foodstuffs, seed, fertilizer, medicine, industrial rehabilitation equipment, and other supplies to millions of war victims who must have this assistance if they are ever to get back on their own feet again. UNRRA helps primarily those liberated countries which are not able to pay for their own relief and rehabilitation imports, because they had the geographical misfortune to have to suffer the full physical impact of the common enemy. Today, UNRRA is providing general relief to Albania, Austria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Czechoslovakia, the Dodecanese Islands, Greece, Italy, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and Yugoslavia. UNRRA is also providing emergency or special assistance to Finland, Hungary, the Philippines, Ethiopia, and San Marino, while its personnel are busy assisting the military in Germany and Austria in connection with displaced persons operations.

Some of these countries being helped by UNRRA ask for only limited kinds of help. For example, the Byelorussian and Ukrainian Republics are not getting any wheat or other bread grains from UNRRA, but they have requested supplies of fats and oils because most of their livestock was destroyed by the Nazis, and their people are desperately in need of these items. But other countries—like China, Greece, and Italy—must have large amounts of wheat and other food, and medicine, and other relief supplies if vast numbers of helpless men, women, and children are to survive the months ahead. We have the expert and authoritative report of Mr. Herbert Hoover himself that hundreds of millions of people are on the border line of starvation. UNRRA is not responsible for taking care of the food needs of all these people, but only of the people of

those countries which I enumerated a moment ago.

But that work is indispensable at this critical time, and the job must go forward. There can be little doubt now that UNRRA is in high gear; its international machinery is functioning effectively; it has now managed to get many efficient administrators who were formerly frozen to war or military jobs; it is delivering the goods.

President Truman stated the other day in his letter of transmittal accompanying the seventh report to Congress on operations of UNRRA:

> Through March 31, 1946, UNRRA shipped 8,251,736 gross long tons of relief supplies valued at $1,140,419,000. Every American can take pride in the fact that our share in this achievement was 5,917,785 tons valued at $750,563,000, which is 71.7 percent of the tonnage and 65.8 percent of the value of all UNRRA shipments.

I have learned that UNRRA has now delivered more than 11,500,000 tons of supplies—the largest relief undertaking in history. I have little doubt that of this mammoth tonnage, the American contribution continues to represent as high a percentage and proportionate value as those mentioned by President Truman.

What I have said so far proves two facts: one, that the work of UNRRA is indispensable to world recovery, and must go ahead until the job is done; and, secondly, that the support of the United States is in turn indispensable to the work of UNRRA.

I think it only fair to point out, however, that we as individual Americans have not been asked to pay any more proportionately than the taxpayers of many other member countries of UNRRA—such as Australia, Canada, Great Britain, the Dominican Republic, and so on. President Truman now calls upon us to appropriate the rest of the second contribution which has been authorized. In other words, we are now asked to contribute $465,000,000 in order to pay up our second contribution in full—just as Great Britain, Canada, and other countries have already paid up their second full contributions.

With those additional funds quickly appropriated, UNRRA will not find itself in the unhappy position of last December, when, for lack of early enough action by Congress in appropriating funds for which this Government had obligated itself, the international relief organization had to make drastic cancellations of much-needed medical supplies so as to scrape up enough money to keep food moving overseas. If we act with foresight today, we can avoid a repetition of a situation which caused unnecessary suffering abroad among people who were looking to us for aid.

You and I know that the American people are not going to stand by and allow innocent men, women, and children to starve. You and I also know that the food needs of the postwar world are without precedent, and that UNRRA has been keeping millions of people alive in a dozen countries. To see these war victims through the next critical months, and to permit UNRRA to terminate its operations as scheduled, we must appropriate $465,000,000 which represents the balance outstanding on the American contribution.

Let us be under no illusions. This action on our part is not only humanitarian and a moral obligation; it is a matter of basic self-interest. There is overwhelming evidence available at hand here in Washington to prove that in every country where UNRRA is today operating, the recipients of its help know that most of its supplies come from the United States, and they are profoundly grateful. In fact, in the Ukrainian and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics, newspaper reports and the UNRRA mission personnel have continually reported home that the people of those areas are largely under the impression that all of UNRRA's aid is coming from the United States. At any rate, when almost every can on the store shelf is clearly labeled with the name of its country of origin, it is impossible for the people in UNRRA-helped countries not to know how generous has been the contribution of the American people.

This is the best kind of publicity in the world for us at this time of strained international relations. The people of Europe are obsessed with fears of a possible third world war. In such a war, they would be virtually obliterated. They know this, and they are praying that the creaking machinery of international cooperation will not grind to a standstill. But for three decades, these people have heard high-sounding phrases about peace, and have had to endure two wars. Today, the average European is putting little faith in charters, or promises of peace, or meetings between governmental officials. There is only one bit of tangible evidence which he has that international cooperation is still a reality, and not just a hypocritical phrase.

And that tangible evidence is UNRRA. Every day UNRRA cargoes are unloading in a dozen European ports. Night and day the freight cars carry their life-saving shipments from city to city. And every day the housewives in thousands of communities stand in queue to receive the rations which alone can keep their children from hunger and sickness. So long as these cans of food are handed across the store counter, so long as the farmer in Greece or Italy or elsewhere gets some seed and fertilizer, and perhaps a draft animal, with which he can make his scorched earth produce again, and so long as UNRRA doctors and nurses work day and night in improvised hospitals—then the peoples of war-torn Europe have proof that international cooperation is a living reality.

Take away that assistance, and not only have you taken away from the people of Europe those tangible supplies which all too often mean the difference between life and death, but you have also robbed them of their last hope that the nations of the world can work intelligently and decently together at common tasks.

We have a tremendous responsibility to fulfill in Congress. Let us appropriate the sum for which we have obligated ourselves, and let us do it swiftly and in a true spirit of friendship and helpfulness. In that course of action lies peace, and security for the world and ourselves.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

WHY IS THERE NO BEEF IN THE MARKET PLACES?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, the American people should begin to realize that except during the World War I period, the United States has depended partially upon beef of other lands for domestic use, this in spite of the fact that this Nation is the greatest livestock-producing country in the whole world.

Before 1913 our country was a large beef-exporting nation, but the Underwood Tariff Act levied such a low duty on beef that from then on our domestic production was too small to furnish enough beef for domestic consumption.

The following table from the United States Tariff Commission indicates the production and apparent consumption of beef and veal from 1931 to 1944:

[Millions of pounds]

	Production [1]	Apparent consumption [2]	Net exports or net imports [3]
1931	6,834	6,878	−44
1932	6,613	6,669	−56
1933	7,332	7,422	−90
1934	9,489	9,582	−93
1935	7,629	7,913	−284
1936	8,435	8,764	−329
1937	7,908	8,266	−358
1938	7,903	8,206	−303
1939	8,004	8,418	−414
1940	8,162	8,481	−319
1941	9,124	9,497	−373
1942	9,972	10,059	−87
1943	9,685	9,493	192

[1] Estimated production, in dressed carcass weight, from total United States slaughter, plus the estimated dressed weight of domestic exports of live cattle.

[2] Apparent consumption calculated from production plus imports minus exports.

[3] Difference between actual reported exports and imports (minus sign indicates excess of imports) of live cattle and calves, and of beef and veal in all forms.

Nineteen hundred and forty-three was the first year in 22 years that American beef had all the American market. Is it any wonder that Mrs. Housewife cannot find any beef in the markets? Is it any wonder that it is difficult to find beef for export? After depending upon food imports for 20 years, our country cannot become a food-export Nation over night.

In 1900, there were approximately 75,000,000 people in the United States, and we produced 6,500,000,000 pounds of beef, or over 86 pounds per capita; in 1910 our population was 91,000,000, and we produced 7,300,000,000 pounds of beef, or 80 pounds per capita; in 1920 there was a population of 105,000,000 people in the United States and 7,100,000,000 pounds of beef was produced, or 67 pounds per capita; in 1930 our population was 123,000,000 people, and we produced 6,700,000,000 pounds of beef, or 56 pounds per capita; and in 1940 we had a population of 131,000,000 people and we produced 8,100,000,000 pounds of beef, or 61 pounds per capita; and in 1943 with an estimated population of 135,000,000 people in the United States there was a per capita production of 70 pounds.

When we realize that our population may go upward to 140,000,000, we can

readily see what our present-day beef situation is.

The time has come to ask whether or not food is a critical material. The time has come to decide whether or not food is a strategic material. Before our American people are provided the necessary foods of life, and before any considerable amount of food can or will be furnished for world needs, someone had better be obtaining some food facts.

The present administration has carried on a program of scarcity. They shiver at an apparent "enough" and they cannot face an abundance. An abundance would keep the bureaucrats off the farmers' necks and the bureaucrats would lose their jobs.

The bread picture is the same. Bread shortages and bread lines are the result of New Deal bungling. In 3 of the 7 New Deal prewar years, there was twice as much wheat imported as exported, and now they are trying to find an enormous surplus for shipment to other countries. Overseas shipments are made from the normal stock piles of our country, and the per capita amount of 1945 wheat on hand now is less than three-fourths bushel. The UNRRA jumped its wheat requirements 800 percent in the first quarter of 1945—over their previous quarter estimate.

Mr. Chairman, if you perpetuate the OPA, the scarcity program, and a managed economy, Americans will approach ever nearer the Asiatic diet, and this at unbearable cost. Less hogs and poultry, less dairy cows, less feeder cattle can mean only less food at home and abroad. This is aggravated by the loss of production in farm machinery, that cripples farm production. These strikes should cease. Surely Jefferson was right when he said: "If we look to Washington as to when to plant, and when to reap, we shall soon want bread."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

REORGANIZATION PLANS 1, 2, 3

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to make an announcement before I address myself to the merits of the bill.

We were led to believe that certain highly privileged resolutions would come before the House for consideration today, either correctly or incorrectly. For reasons over which I have no control, they have not been reached. I refer to House Concurrent Resolution 151, which disapproves Reorganization Plan No. 2 of the administration; House Concurrent Resolution 154, which disapproves Reorganization Plan No. 3 of the administration, and House Concurrent Resolution 155, which disapproves Reorganization Plan No. 1 of the administration.

I wish to say to the membership of the House and to everybody else interested that those resolutions are highly privileged, and as the author of those resolutions I expect to exercise the privilege that goes with the resolutions under the rules of the House. I do not intend to yield for any other order of business unless circumstances over which I have no control make that necessary. At 11 o'clock tomorrow, when this body meets, we expect to call up those resolutions and to exercise the rights and privileges we have under the rules of the House, because unless the reorganization plans are disapproved within 60 days by both branches of the Congress, then they become law. I do not intend to have that happen without a vote by both bodies of Congress, if possible.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to say to the gentleman that he is absolutely within his rights. It is a matter of high privilege. The gentleman and others on the committee have cooperated with me in every way possible. Under no circumstances have I the least thought in mind critical of the gentleman's observation and his intentions.

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. As far as I am concerned, I made an agreement with the gentleman and others interested, and, as far as I am able, the agreement shall be kept, and I hope the gentleman will help me keep that agreement.

Mr. PITTENGER. I will give you 101-percent cooperation.

PENDING BILL IS OBJECTIONABLE

Mr. Chairman, if I needed any argument to convince me to vote against this appropriation bill and send it back to the committee for further study and let them bring in some emergency legislation for these departments which need funds, that argument was furnished by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and others. I think this appropriation bill is a monstrosity. I think the taxpayers of America are entitled to have further consideration of these items which one of the members of the Appropriations Committee told me came in here at the request and recommendation of who do you suppose? The Bureau of the Budget. Since when did one agency of this Government become either indispensable or infallible? I believe that these items, except those that are necessary to carry on the affairs of Government, need more study. Some of them ought to be cut down; some of them ought to be thrown out of the window. Take this item that has to do with lend-lease. That was a wartime expedient. No Member on this floor can justify spending the funds for purposes for which that legislation was not enacted.

There is a great deal more I could say, Mr. Chairman. As long as my time has not yet expired, I want to pay my respects to UNRRA. I think if UNRRA ever had any justification—and I do not concede that it did, although all of us supported it for humanitarian reasons—I think that agency ought to be thrown out of the window, and, as some of us have indicated in days gone by, this country ought to carry on its own relief work in foreign countries through the agency of our churches, through the agency of the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, and with the exercise of some common sense by those who represent the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT'S LACK-WIFDOM WHEAT POLICIES CONTRIBUTE TO BREAD SHORTAGE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, Thomas Jefferson once said with deadly prophetic accuracy, "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread."

It now appears, sir, that we are witnessing the fulfillment of Jefferson's dire prediction. By its policy of telling American farmers when they can sell their wheat, where they can sell it, to whom they must distribute it, how much they can receive for it, and how long they can store it, the Truman administration has so badly confused the wheat situation that it is small wonder the country's restaurants and housewives are without bread and that America is falling short of its food commitments to the rest of the world.

Mr. Chairman, Government meddling appears to be an intoxicating pastime. Not content with directing our farmers what to do with their wheat, the White House oligarchy has been using its wartime authority to jump the price of wheat around so fast and so often that a jitterbug on a hot stove would find it impossible to keep up with the confusion. Not long ago three quick-change, now-you-see-it-and-now-you-do-not-see-it price peggings were established by the Government with solemn implications that "this is now the top price—sell your wheat at once." Unfortunately, the faster the farmers responded to the patriotic appeal to sell their wheat so the world could eat, and the quicker they sold it, the more they lost. Quite naturally, the farmers have now lost all confidence in governmental promises and price fixing.

The newest bright idea of the bureaucrats who carry out the White House policies is embodied in War Food Order No. 140, amendment 9. They now require that when a farmer elects to put his grain in commercial storage he must sell 50 percent of it at the price he can get on the day he hauls it to town. Twenty-five percent of the wheat he is forced to sell is distributed in the United States and 25 percent is sold abroad; but if wheat prices move up in the next few months, the farmer loses 100 percent of the price increase.

The bright young man in the big New Deal who thought that one up and sold the men from Missouri on the idea that this would stimulate the sale and distribution of wheat must be a fugitive from the "association of writers of seed catalogs," since seed-catalog writers are about the greatest optimists in circulation. Obviously, such bureaucratic balderdash will decrease rather than increase the flow of wheat to market.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believes that it is time this administration starts shooting square with the Nation's farmers. Until it regains the confidence of the farmers in its good word and its good intentions, our food shortage is very understandably going to become worse. As a start back to the road of square dealing with the food producers of America, I suggest the following steps:

First. The Government should correct the injustice suffered by American farmers who responded to its plea to sell their wheat prior to May 14, 1946, at the substantially lower price then established as the ceiling price.

Second. War Food Order No. 140 should now be repealed insofar as it requires the forced marketing of wheat.

Third. Wheat growers should be urged to market their wheat immediately through mills, elevators, and the normal channels of trade.

Fourth. Market or ceiling prices should be paid at the time of delivery with a definite guaranty that farmers complying with the sell-now request will be given the full benefits of any price advance in wheat prices between now and July 1, 1947. This guaranty should be in writing in the form of a reimbursable certificate so that the farmers cannot be duped again.

Mr. Chairman, along with wheat farmers, the corn farmers and many other food producers in this Republic have suffered from the dogmatic and ill-considered welter of edicts and mandates which the executive department has directed against our farmers.

Mr. Chairman, America's farmers are not villians and rogues. All they ask is a square deal and they will do their full part in seeing that the world gets back where it can again eat three square meals a day.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, today there is before us the last big appropriation of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Throughout the past 2 years I have stood before the microphone in this House and urged economy. I find myself here today again on the same mission.

Last week, in a determined fight led by the minority Members, with the assistance of a few of the Democratic Members, we killed a bill saving the taxpayers $130,000,000. We will have an opportunity within a few minutes now to save the taxpayers another $100,000,000.

Congressman WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, will offer an amendment to reduce the amount of $445,000,000, written into this bill, by striking out $100,000,000, wanted by the War Assets Administration to pay for the cost of liquidating surplus property.

The American people will be amazed when they learn that there has been such a tremendous waste in the legislation of surplus property that the net return to the Treasury for the sale of over $100,000,000,000 worth of surplus property will be less than 18 cents on the dollar.

This organization is asking for more money than they had last year. They want to add an additional 14,000 high salaried employees to the 28,000 they now have.

When we come to vote on this amendment, I hope enough of the members representing the majority party and this administration will join with us of the minority in our effort to reduce the amount by $100,000,000. When the time comes to vote on this amendment think of the men and women you represent back home in your districts who have to pay the bill for all this waste and extravagance.

Let us join together on both sides of the aisle and save this $100,000,000 in the interest of the taxpayers we represent.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no other requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 182]

Adams	Gillespie	Patrick
Anderson, Calif.	Granger	Patterson
Andrews, N. Y.	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Ga.
Baldwin, Md.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Pfeifer
Bates, Mass.	Harness, Ind.	Ploeser
Beckworth	Harris	Plumley
Bell	Heffernan	Powell
Bennet, N. Y.	Hinshaw	Rains
Boren	Hoch	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Hoffman, Mich.	Rich
Bradley, Mich.	Holifield	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bradley, Pa.	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Buckley	Jackson	Roe, N. Y.
Bunker	Johnson, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, N. Y.
Camp	Kee	Rooney
Cannon, Fla.	Keefe	Shafer
Celler	Kefauver	Sheppard
Clark	Kelly, Ill.	Slaughter
Cochran	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Coffee	King	Sparkman
Cole, N. Y.	Kirwan	Starkey
Colmer	Kopplemann	Stevenson
Cox	Lea	Stewart
Cravens	LeCompte	Stigler
Crawford	Lesinski	Sumner, Ill.
Curley	Lewis	Tolan
Daughton, Va.	Ludlow	Torrens
Davis	Lynch	Traynor
Dawson	McGehee	Vinson
De Lacy	McKenzie	Wasielewski
Domengeaux	Mahon	Welch
Douglas, Calif.	Maloney	West
Doyle	Mansfield, Mont.	Wickersham
Durham	Mansfield, Tex.	Winstead
Eberharter	Miller, Calif.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Engel, Mich.	Murphy	Worley
Ervin	Norrell	Zimmerman
Folger	Norton	
Gavin	Pace	
Gibson		

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6385) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum he had directed the roll to be called, when 313 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration: For an additional amount to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the act of March 28, 1944 (Public Law 267), as amended, to be consolidated with the appropriations for the same purpose in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Participation Appropriation Act, 1945, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Participation Act, 1946, and the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, $465,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1947: *Provided*, That said consolidated funds may be expended without regard to the limitations in the proviso clause of the first paragraph of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Participation Act, 1946.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 4, line 14, after the colon, strike out all of the balance of line 14 and all of lines 15 to 18, inclusive.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment so that the law may be left the way it was in the Extension Act brought in here by the Committee on Appropriations last winter which provided a limitation that none of the rehabilitation supplies procured out of the funds herein appropriated shall be shipped to any country except in the Far East after December 31, 1946, and in the case of any country in the Far East after March 31, 1947.

The provision that is carried in the present appropriation bill would wipe out this proviso which, as I remember it, was offered by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. BLOOM] chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. On page 248 of the hearings, Colonel Wood, who represented the State Department before us on UNRRA, stated:

Yes. That leaves us a carry-over for the January to March period in this table which is based on finishing by the end of the year except as to China of about $20,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, they have laid this thing out on the basis of getting through according to the law. Now, why should we wipe out that proviso which protects this item and provides that it shall terminate on the 31st of December 1946, as to

other countries and in the Far East on March 31?

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be adopted and that this proviso repealing the limitation in the law will prevail, so that UNRRA will be ended according to the way they have the funds set up and according to Colonel Wood.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. Chairman, when the facts are understood clearly as to what the amendment is designed to do there should be no doubt as to what action the committee should take. There was a limitation in Public Law 259, for which the proviso is designed to control, as follows:

Provided, That no relief or rehabilitation supplies procured out of funds heretofore or herein appropriated shall be shipped to any country except in the Far East after December 31, 1946, and in the case of any country in the Far East after March 31, 1947.

Everybody was perfectly satisfied with that proviso in the law, but due to shortages and due to strikes UNRRA is not able to get those things shipped within that limitation of time. They were perfectly willing to have the limitation on there, but having bought the material with this money the only way they can get it all over there to the foreign countries is to remove the limitation of time. We have bought the material. It is here and paid for; that is, most all of it. The entire amount will be expended soon.

I fail to see the logic of not giving them time enough to ship it. If the gentleman from New York had offered an amendment such as we have here that the time be extended 90 days, I can see why that would possibly be justified. We all want to end UNRRA. We want to close it up. But where you have bought the goods, and you cannot make delivery to the points where you want it delivered, the only way you can get the goods there is to remove this proviso, and therefore, in order to carry out the proper delivery of these goods it is necessary to eliminate the proviso. All there is in the bill is an extension of time for getting this material over there, and the gentleman moves to strike that out, so there cannot be any extension of time. I do not believe that is sound or what the House wants to do.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. If we do not adopt this amendment there will be no limitation on it and it can last forever; that is the picture.

Mr. O'NEAL. If the gentleman will permit a suggestion, if he would offer an amendment along this line I think it would meet the situation so the goods we have bought could get there. I would suggest an amendment of this character: "The dates named in the proviso clause of the first paragraph of UNRRA administration, 1946, are each hereby extended for 90 days."

That would give time enough for these goods that are bought to get there, and it would extend the time 90 days beyond what they are now permitted to use.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. As I understand the present law, it provides that no goods shall be shipped to any country except the Far East after December 31, 1946, and in the case of any country in the Far East after March 31, 1947. That is exactly the testimony that Director LaGuardia gave our committee, as I recall it, of what he proposed to do.

Mr. O'NEAL. If the gentleman will turn to page 233 he will find that that is not exactly the testimony. He stated that it did not give them sufficient time to deliver the goods that are already bought that we want to get there.

I trust the amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 109, noes 112.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 125, noes 105.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'NEAL: On page 4, line 14, after "1947", insert *"Provided*, That the dates named in the proviso clause of the first paragraph of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Participation Act, 1946, are each hereby extended for 90 days."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill not authorized by existing law.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The gentleman makes the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The amendment offered applies directly to the legislation referred to in the same paragraph, the Rehabilitation Administration Participation Act, 1946. The provisions of that act are referred to in this paragraph, and the amendment affects one of the parts of the Participation Act. It seems clear to me, since it touches on the very matter referred to in the paragraph, that it is certainly not legislation which is not in conformity with the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. TABER. The law now provides a period within which certain things may be done. This changes the law so as to make that period 90 days longer. There is nothing in the bill at the present time to which this amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOLEY). The Chair is ready to rule. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 4, at the end of line 18, add the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition, transportation, delivery or distribution of any supplies, commodities, or equipment to or for any recipient country which fails or refuses to permit the properly accredited representatives of the American press to enter, observe, and report without censorship on the distribution and utilization of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services furnished to such countries."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, one day last week a very considerable number of interesting documents reached my desk, as it must have yours. The first one was styled The American Soviet Reporter, published in New York. That particular issue was an analysis of an article which appeared in Life magazine by John Foster Dulles. I am glad that Reporter came to my desk because I like to have that information.

In the same mail there appeared upon my desk a series of speeches from the Yugoslavia Ministry of Information in Washington, D. C., carrying the speeches of the Prime Minister, extolling the virtues of OSNA, which is the Yugoslav equivalent of NKVD. I was glad to have it.

In the same mail came brochures with reference to the eastern Ukraine and the Balkans, all of which evidences what we mean when we talk about freedom of the press.

Accredited to the Press Gallery above you is what is known as the Telegraph Agency of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, of which Mr. Lawrence Todd, a really fine newspaperman, a man of character, is in charge. Some of his associates are S. S. Krafsur, Olive Chuba, and Boris N. Kaigler.

They sit in our Press Gallery. We do not mind that. We want them to be there to tell all the world what we are doing here. Free exchange of information is one of the real safeguards of freedom.

Accredited to that Press Gallery is Reuters, which can send messages, speeches, and explanations into every corner of the world. That is what we mean by "freedom of the press."

Now, it occurs to me that there ought to be reciprocity about this press freedom. It should not be necessary, as befell the New York Times, as related by Mark Ethridge, that it took them nearly 1 year to qualify their second man in Russia. Strange proceeding.

I contend that if the American people have been generous to a fault in pro-

viding nearly $1,900,000,000 of funds to relieve distress and destitution elsewhere in the world, when the American people have charged us as the custodians of the Treasury to appropriate another $465,000,000, certainly we are entitled to ask free entry and observation for every newspaper man who wants to go abroad for the purpose of informing our people, whose taxes made this money possible, how such food, supplies, equipment, and machinery have been distributed abroad. That is all this amendment provides. It simply provides that none of the funds shall be used for any recipient country unless they permit the entry of our American accredited newspaper correspondents for the purpose only of reporting upon the distribution of relief and rehabilitation supplies that are purchased out of these funds.

Is that asking too much? There is something important involved here. It is a principle. It does not make any difference to me whether a single newspaper man goes abroad. That does not count, but the time has come for this country, in an hour when difficulty haunts us over on the far horizon, to stand up and speak our piece. The time has come to quit appeasing. The time has come to demand a little reciprocal treatment in this world. Otherwise, I shall despair here and now of ever achieving durable peace and the restoration of order everywhere in the world. So the time is at hand when appeasement must stop. We should insist on reciprocity, and this is one way to do it. This is to stand up for the principle of freedom for our people so that they can report upon goods that are purchased out of the generosity of the American people. That is the whole story and I sincerely hope that in this rather uncertain hour that the Congress can give a good account of itself and insist that freedom of the press be upheld everywhere.

It was only last week that at the instance of the Russian authorities the Christian Science Monitor's representative was taken out of Rumania. General Hodges had his problems over in Korea and had to forbid Russian newspapermen from coming into the American zone because our newspapermen were not permitted in the Russian zone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are squarely up against that proposition at the present time, and in my judgment this matter of freedom of the press is probably one of the most important principles and one of the most important issues that will ever confront this Congress and this country So I appeal to you today that we go through on this matter and assert the freedom of the press to all the world.

When this matter was before us in November last when we were dealing with an extension of UNRRA at that time obviously it was in the realm of speculation. We did not have all the information and all the data that we needed in order to make a good case, notwithstanding the fact that the State Department seemed to be willing to go along with a modified amendment. But today we have the information, today we know, today we know to what extent the freedom to report on the distribution of relief and rehabilitation has taken place in many sections of the world.

On every hand it has been denied when the assertion was made that food was being used as a political weapon, yet it was reported only last week from China that food was being used as a political weapon over there, and yet we have not gotten the facts. It has been reported on occasion by the grapevine and otherwise that food was being used as a political weapon in Yugoslavia. I asked the Director General when he was before the committee and he said everything was going along very nicely. The trouble is we do not get the facts. The Deputy Director of one of those nations was in my office last Friday morning and told me that when goods arrive at certain countries they are distributed on ration cards to the people by the authorities of that country. The people who hold the cards, who get the extraordinary benefits and decided advantages, are those who are affiliated with a certain political party and who embrace a certain political ideology. If that is not the political use of food that has been paid for by the American people then my name is not EVERETT DIRKSEN. There is only one way to stop it if this is going to be a continuing program, and if sometime in the future American funds beyond the limits that have already been established in UNRRA legislation are to be used for the relief of the destitute people everywhere, and that way is to let the sunlight of publicity shine in.

I am not so naive as to believe that this will be the end of our relief activities, notwithstanding the fact that we wrote into the law that UNRRA would terminate sometime next March when we got to the end of the authority for the relief of China. The Director General said it would probably be turned over to the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations. Then, of course, there is every possibility that additional funds will be requested from the American people until the relief job has been fully accomplished. If that is going to be the case then I want to see something a little tangible for the generosity of our own people, and that is a full and unvarnished and uncensored and unadulterated report of the way it is being used.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I am inclined to believe that the gentleman has changed his attitude and position from that which he held when UNRRA was before the House some time ago. The gentleman was of the opinion, was he not, that even though the same conditions prevailed then as prevail now we should still go along with it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Illinois has never changed his position on this matter. While he found much fault and while reports from the field have sustained every criticism he made in the well of this House, he still believes there is before us the discharge of a great humanitarian duty. That does not mean we should not be realistic; that does not mean we should permit Tito to run off with American food and use it for some political purpose or let anybody else in the world who runs a closed corporation over there plays ducks and drakes with hundreds of millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money that is used to buy food, machinery, and equipment to be sent over there. That is what is involved.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that often the supplies we send over to other countries are accredited to some other ally rather than to us, which makes trouble for us? I think if the press were in there, and I mean the American press, the conditions would be changed very materially.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That has been officially denied, of course, but there has been a good deal of evidence on that point that we were not getting the credit.

I beseech for this the utmost of grace because I think it is important and involves a high principle in an anxious hour of the world's history.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as the gentleman from Missouri well knows, I am the author of the original amendment on this particular subject and, if possible, I would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 55 minutes, including 10 minutes for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr BROWN], the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I used to be in the newspaper business. I know many newspapermen and I have been interviewed. I want to say that you cannot always depend upon them. You send them into a foreign country and they will just write about UNRRA, they will write about the political conditions in that country and you cannot stop it.

I believe men should be appointed by the American Government you can depend on to do this work. If you will remember there was one man when we were at war who had a release ready and he was discharged and sent home.

I want to say that newspapermen have to be watched.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Since a similar question was debated before this House a number of months ago and a compromise was finally reached whereby the President of the United States was requested to use his good offices in order to secure the passage of American newspapermen into countries where UNRRA was operating so that they might be able to report freely to us on what they found in connection with those operations, a number of things have happened, and I think they have a direct bearing on this amendment and on the position that we ought to take in connection with it as it appears in the limited form in which it has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

In the first place, the refusal which came to the President's request to allow American newspapermen to report without censorship from White Russia and from the Ukraine did not come from either of those two countries. The answer came from the Soviet Embassy here in Washington, which said that in view of the fact that those two republics were not carrying out their own independent foreign missions it, the central government, was speaking for them, and the regulations that applied in Russia as a whole must apply in those two republics. In other words, the hoax which has fooled a good many people, that began at San Francisco when Russia was given three votes in the United Nations Council, of setting up these two sections of Russia as independent, autonomous republics, is completely blasted by the fact that they could not speak for themselves and that the Russian Government is speaking for them in this particular matter. That is one thing that has happened.

Another thing has happened. Since we last debated this matter, Poland came to the United States for a loan. Negotiations in regard to that loan were, I am informed, suspended for the reason that Poland refused to reveal the text of its secret trade agreements with its neighbors. When those negotiations began to bog down the Soviet Government offered to make a loan to Poland in place of the United States and said that it was not necessary for Poland to continue negotiations with us; that loan to be in the form of an open line of credit given to Poland to allow Poland to buy rehabilitation and reconstruction machinery throughout the world. Once again we have an example of a nation through claiming that it could not pay for the relief of its component parts offering another nation credits with which to buy very much the same type of things which we are now being obliged to give freely as a matter of relief to these two independent Republics, so-called.

There is one other thing. The amendment that has just been offered is narrower in scope than the amendment previously debated here. It is a very simple amendment which merely required that American press representatives be allowed to go into these various countries that are receiving UNRRA relief and report without censorship.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This amendment does not ask. It just simply literally provides that no funds shall be expended unless these representatives of the American press are permitted to enter.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is quite correct. It is a limitation on the appropriation. But let us examine that limitation on the appropriation a moment as far as the practical effects are concerned. In the last 2 months American press representatives have been allowed to go to Minsk in White Russia and to Kiev in the Ukraine. They went in under the regular procedure that is provided for American press men when they go within the territory of Russia anywhere. It so happens that the dispatches which they sent out with respect to UNRRA activities were not censored. That may or may not be repeated, but at least the precedent was then set of allowing them to send out dispatches without censorship. In other words, I cannot see that there can be any serious objection and certainly no one can say that hungry people are going to starve if this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to inflict myself upon you for the full 5 minutes, but I would like in a minute or two to say that I cannot understand for the life of me how any man in this House can oppose this amendment. Here we are taking the funds of the American people and sending them abroad, and in the next breath they say to us, "We refuse to give you any information whatever as to what goes with it or what use is being made of it or who is getting the benefit of it."

I have had some reports from the type of gentlemen that Members have just referred to, and they have disturbed me greatly. I sat in my office a few days ago and talked to an old college mate of mine who has been over there in charge of one of the areas. He told me things that almost made me sick. At the conclusion of that conference I felt as though we had simply been saps in the fullest sense of the word.

There is nothing in this amendment that would discriminate against anyone. There is nothing in it unfair. There is nothing in it that would cause anyone to go hungry. There is nothing in it that should be objectionable to any well-intentioned fair-minded person. The amendment simply says that we would like to have the privilege of knowing what happens to our own money. That I do not regard as being anything but a very sincere responsibility that we have. We owe the people that. We are not justified in taking their money on any other basis.

As far as I am concerned, I propose to vote for the amendment. I am opposed to any further appeasement. I will not duck my head and shy around every time Mr. Joe Stalin or Mr. Tito or anybody else says, "Be careful, son, you might step on my toes." We have been doing that right consistently.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I just want to say to the gentleman's remarks, Amen.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Permit me to observe that it is to be regretted that a condition exists in this world that makes this kind of an amendment necessary.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman, it is to be regretted that it is even necessary for this amendment to be debated on the floor of this House. I have nothing further to say.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. I am concerned about the fact that the money in UNRRA is not all American money. Can we bind every other country in making this restriction on the American appropriation?

Mr. BARDEN. I do not think the gentleman is as much concerned about that as he is concerned about the principle involved in this thing, which is the same principle that was involved in the matter before the House on yesterday. I should like to say this to the gentleman. As far as I am concerned, from here on out I do not propose to pull my punches where any inference of this type is made. If there is one red penny of American money involved, the principle of honest spending and full public accounting is there. I am opposed to even just a little bit of stealing on this appropriation.

Mr. SAVAGE. We are trying to tell a country, "We are going to feed hungry people, provided you do what America says."

Mr. BARDEN. No.

Mr. SAVAGE. America is only one part of this thing.

Mr. BARDEN. No. This is what we are saying to them, let me remind the gentleman. We are just saying, "Here is tax money we have taken from our people. You may use it if you use it for the purposes and in the manner for which it was appropriated. If you do not propose to let us know what happens to it, then you do not have to use it; just let it alone."

That is all.

Mr. SAVAGE. But there are 44 nations in UNRRA, and this is a unilateral action.

Mr. BARDEN. I want to know why the gentleman does not want this.

Mr. CHELF. There may be 44 nations, but 1 nation, the United States, puts up 72 percent of the entire amount.

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; and I think more of this one Nation than I do of the other 43. That is my position.

Mr. CHELF. Amen.

Mr. SAVAGE. We are able to put up 72 percent, because it is determined on an equal basis of contribution according to national income. We are as able to put up the 72 percent as all the rest of the nations are able to put up the 28 percent.

Mr. BARDEN. No; the gentleman wants to continue the policy of appeasement toward some of these nations, and he would seek to do things that the people of America will not stand for.

Mr. SAVAGE. Either we are going to feed the people or we are not. That is the question.

Mr. BARDEN. If we are going to appropriate American tax dollars to feed hungry people, then the American people are entitled to know whether or not those tax dollars are being used properly, fairly, and honestly, and that is all this amendment proposes to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, about 8 months ago I presented to this body an amendment concerning the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration legislation which would have prohibited the expenditure of UNRRA funds in any country, or the distribution of any goods or food purchased from such funds, in any country which prohibited freedom of the press as far as reporting the activities of UNRRA might be concerned. That amendment, after considerable debate, was defeated by the very narrow margin of only a few votes and a rather weak, namby-pamby, pussywillow type amendment was substituted which requested the President to use his good offices by saying to nations partaking of UNRRA largess, "Please, will you not let us see and learn what is being done with our own money and our own food that we are giving to you in your great hour of crisis and need?" The President, in good faith, has tried to find out what was being done, and to get permission for the American press to report upon the way in which our contributions of food and medicine and other supplies were being used and distributed. But he failed. Now, 8 months later, the correctness of the position which I took then has been demonstrated, and I believe proven, to the satisfaction of every true American and every right-thinking person. We cannot compromise on a thing like this. I am glad to see so many of my fellow Members come up to the mourners' bench today, and join in the support of this amendment.

After all, it is the American people whom we are presumed to be representing here; but sometimes I wonder whether all of us actually are representing the American people, or are as much interested in their welfare as we claim to be, or as we take our constitutional oath of office to be. But I thank my God that there is still a majority of this House who believes it is our duty and our responsibility, first of all, to serve and represent our own people. So I say to you, with all the emphasis at my command, that those Americans whom we represent here, who have been going without themselves because of the charity and the humaneness within their hearts, are entitled to know how this food they send abroad is being distributed. There has been a great shortage of food in America. There have been many families which have not had the food needed for their own children. Our people have made sacrifice after sacrifice, willingly and gladly, in order that a little of the food which they saved might be sent overseas to help starving people of other nations. We owe a duty and responsibility to those Americans to see to it that they are properly informed as to how that food is being distributed and used and if for the purposes for which they gave it and not to build up and strengthen any organization, political or otherwise, which, after all, may not be, in the end, for the benefit of America or best interest of Christianity and the humanity in which we believe and for which our people have sacrificed so much in the last few years.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mrs. LUCE. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE], pointed out that there are 44 contributing nations in the UNRRA program. Could the gentleman perhaps tell me how many of those 44 nations have protested the entry of the American press or of their own press into the recipient areas?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is my understanding that there has been but one nation, and only one nation, that has refused to cooperate by permitting the American press to tell the American people what is being done with the American food that is being sent to them through the charity of American citizens.

Mrs. LUCE. Then, does not the gentleman agree that if 43 nations wish to take certain action and approve of it, and one nation holds out, it is not this Nation that can be accused of taking unilateral action?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly the gentlewoman is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. On an earlier occasion when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] presented certain amendments, I supported those proposals. I felt then that I did correctly. My belief has been reaffirmed. I shall again support the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

I want to reiterate today what I said on a previous occasion, 8 months ago, that we are simply providing in this amendment if we furnish the food to meet foreign distress, one of the conditions must be that our press be given permission to report, without censorship, on what is done with that food and with the other goods we give for the relief of the suffering people of the world. Therefore, I am happy to join with the gentleman from Illinois in presenting and supporting this amendment.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This amendment relates to the relief and food that we furnish.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We do not undertake to interfere with what the other 40 nations do?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We are not telling any other nation what sort of press it must have, but we are insisting that if we furnish this food and other relief, that we give it only with the understanding that the American people, through their own press representatives, have a right to be informed as to how such food and relief is being distributed and used.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I want to commend the gentleman's strong stand on this matter and to say that I have followed and supported him since the first time he introduced this proposition.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SAVAGE. It is my impression that the UNRRA Board is supposed to set down the policy and each of the 44 nations that are contributing the money——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand the gentleman's question but let me say to the gentleman as far as I am concerned there is no international board, or no authority over the American people higher than the American Congress; and I hope there never will be.

Mr. SAVAGE. But we have agreed to help——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, no; we agreed only upon our own arrangement.

Mr. SAVAGE. We agreed to cooperate in UNRRA, to help furnish the money and the policy would be laid down by UNRRA.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not know what agreement the gentleman may have made, but I do know what agreement the Congress of the United States has made, and I do know what the American people understood our agreement to be, and what the American people expect us to do toward protecting their proper interests.

Mr. SAVAGE. Will not the gentleman admit——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not yield further.

Mr. SAVAGE. I will be through in a minute.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot yield further. Does the gentleman understand me?

Mr. SAVAGE. Well, the gentleman cut me off in the middle of a sentence.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And I say that now is the time for those who believe in the American way, and are opposed to the continued encroachment of radical philosophies of government, to stand up and be counted. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, let us not get the idea that this amendment involves withholding food from women and children because of the political beliefs of their government. One purpose of having the reporters from a free press report back is to make sure that food goes to the needy rather than distributed on a political basis. This amendment will help protect needy women and children. Let us also remember that out of this $465,000,000 we are talking about only $40,000,000 is going to be spent for food. Less than 10 cents on the dollar is going to the kind of relief that most of you think is represented by the work of UNRRA. You will not find that figure in the report or in the hearings, but I have found it, and that is the fact. Let us understand the issue clearly that is involved here.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. Would the gentleman object to giving the authority for that statement?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I found it in the records of the Appropriations Committee, and it ought to be reliable.

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman identify those records so we can see them?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes. I will show them to the gentleman shortly. I have not time to go into it now.

Mr. Chairman, in this postwar world there is an ideological struggle between two ways of life and one of the great weapons on our side is free information, coming from individuals through the right of free speech and circulated by a free press. Opposed to that is the totalitarian weapon of government censorship and propaganda. Each way of life is vulnerable to the information weapons of the other. Democracy, typified by our system, will die when there is state censorship and state-controlled propaganda. Autocracy, typified now by the Soviet system, cannot survive where there is free speech and a free press. On this issue, to my amazement and shame, I find that my Government has not only followed a policy of appeasement but a policy of imitation of the other side. I not only find that my Government, which I love and which I want to revere, has opposed and is opposing this amendment, which is designed not to force a free press on other countries but to protect our own press from foreign censorship; I find that in that most important means of international mass communication, international short-wave radio broadcasting, my Government has been insisting upon a Government monopoly in this country, with complete Government control of all the time of all the stations. Our State Department was instrumental in killing this amendment last fall, and in killing my antimonopoly amendment to their appropriation for short-wave broadcasting this spring. We, here on the floor of Congress, have got to fight this battle for free speech and a free press and free communications in order to preserve in this struggle this most important weapon of democracy, and our fight is not so much with foreign governments as with the executive branch of our own Government. This is not a secret weapon but a public weapon; this right of free expression by private individuals and their press. We have got to make sure that this great weapon of ours is used in defense of freedom all over the world and in our own land.

Mr. Chairman, in the hearings on this bill Director LaGuardia, of UNRRA, is reported as saying that all is well now in the distribution of UNRRA supplies in Yugoslavia. I have information from official Government sources which makes me absolutely certain that he is not stating the truth as to conditions respecting UNRRA's distribution in Yugoslavia now, information which he could easily find out and which our Government has through its representatives and should have presented to the Appropriations Committee; that is, that the use of UNRRA for political purposes in Yugoslavia is still going on.

We are not interfering with the administration of UNRRA by this amendment.

All we do by this amendment is to find out whether, after supplies have been officially ordered to be distributed in a certain way by UNRRA, the international organization, they are in fact distributed in a different way, through graft or politics, as is now the case in some countries. All we want to do by this amendment is to use the American press to find out what is going on and inform the American public. All we do is to prevent some other government from gagging our own press on information which we have a right to have.

When we furnish 72 percent of the supplies, and when an international organization, UNRRA, to which we belong, has decreed how these supplies shall be distributed, we have a right to know whether they are being distributed that way or not, and no country has the right to bar us from obtaining that information. The issue here is not whether there shall be a free press in other countries but whether other countries shall censor the American press. I am sorry that the executive branch of our Government is on the wrong side on this issue. We here in Congress have a duty to be on the right side. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I was one of those who supported a similar amendment to this when we had UNRRA before us the last time, and I am glad that we now have an opportunity to discuss this very important issue again.

I am like the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]; it is difficult for me to understand how any American can vote against a proposition as simple and as logical as this one. It simply provides that the American people have a right to be advised through American press and radio representatives as to what is being done with the money they are forced to contribute to this type of relief. I supported UNRRA appropriations every time they have come up. I intend to do so again, but certainly I should think that the American public is entitled to know what use is being made of the funds and of the money since Americans pay 72 percent of the entire cost.

I want to straighten out a point which a great many people fail to understand who are not closely connected with this UNRRA legislation, and that is that the UNRRA itself has nothing whatsoever to do with the distribution of the food and the relief supplies of all types once UNRRA shipments have reached the country of consumption. We have got to keep that in mind. The local government has the complete control of how the goods are distributed, and if you are not even going to be allowed to tell the American public what use is being made by the local governments of these supplies, it seems to me you are certainly engaging in profligate use of the taxpayers' funds.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact that America can never gain for herself and other nations the world leadership for peace that we desire if we weaken one of our great institutions in dealing with these other countries?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is precisely correct; and I assure the gentleman that every other country in the world, save one, is expecting us to take this action today, and I think that one is expecting it but hoping that we seek to appease her instead by shying away from our responsibility.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I supported the last amendment and I expect to support this one. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: If we do not adopt this amendment, can it not be said that we are aiding and abetting in building up an empire for Tito in the Balkan States and thereby contributing American money to the promotion of communism in Europe?

Mr. MUNDT. I am afraid you are going to be able to say that, regardless of whether we adopt the amendment or not. However, this amendment should slow down the process and it will at least give the world a ringside seat to observe what is actually taking place.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I opposed a similar amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio some 8 months ago because I believed at that time that the amendment was a little bit premature. I did not want to take any chances so far as our relationships were concerned with Russia. But after the conduct we have seen in evidence on the part of Russia, and after the rebukes we have seen administered to our great Secretary of State in his sincere attempts to secure and preserve world peace, we must be

firm and uphold his hand. I say that it is now high time that we adopt this amendment, and I intend to support it.

Mr. MUNDT. Good for you. I hope that many others like the gentleman will see the light of day.

Before I yield any further, I want to quote the final paragraph of the subcommittee report which is being published today by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs dealing with the subject of UNRRA in Yugoslavia. I am happy to advertise this report a little bit because I was afraid for awhile it was going to be Sovietized by not being made available to the press of the country. It was earlier and erroneously reported that this committee document was not to be printed and made available to the Congress and the country. However, its printing has now been authorized by action of the full Committee on Foreign Affairs so you and your constituents may read it if you so desire.

Let me read this sentence:

Finally, our committee recommends that if UNRRA is to measure up to its responsibility in assisting the needy of Yugoslavia, its operations must be open to free inspection and reporting by the newspaper and radio reporting people of the world.

The opportunities for its misuse in Yugoslavia are both numerous and tempting.

I am certain that if we actually have freedom of press and freedom of reporting in Yugoslavia more of the food and more of the supplies will go to those who actually need it.

I am sure the President of the United States reported to Congress in good faith the other day when he said he had been advised, I presume by the UNRRA people, that there is now freedom of reportorial service in Yugoslavia and in Poland. However, I suggest a good way to test the situation would be for the Chicago Daily Tribune to send a reporter to Warsaw to report back on UNRRA activities in unhappy Poland. I am inclined to believe that experiment would cause the President to revise his report to us.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that if one of our reporters went in under this proviso and were to report on other things than the distribution of UNRRA supplies, that Government would have a legitimate right to censor his dispatches on those matters?

Mr. MUNDT. This amendment applies only to reporting on UNRRA.

Mr. JUDD. But we are not insisting on a free press in every respect in those countries, we are merely demanding information on this one particular field of effort.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is exactly correct. I hope the House will support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be allotted to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

UNRRA AND THE PRESS AMENDMENT

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Dirksen amendment to the UNRRA sections of H. R. 6885. The purpose of this amendment, like that of the amendment which was defeated during the last consideration by the Congress of UNRRA appropriations, is to withhold UNRRA relief from a recipient country which refuses to allow accredited American press representatives to report on the use of UNRRA supplies.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago, in reporting to my district on the actions of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I made a statement on UNRRA which I should like to repeat today, for what I warned could happen with UNRRA has, unhappily, happened.

The Seventy-eighth Congress authorized the expenditure of $1,350,000,000 as our first contribution to UNRRA. On April 11, 1944, I pointed out in relation to this appropriation that:

This is the amount of the people's money that the Congress has authorized the administration to spend on Europe's postwar grocery bill. I was heartily in accord with the passage of this legislation. The rehabilitation of postwar Europe is vitally necessary, not only to a peaceful world but to American postwar prosperity. But I would feel much better about voting that sum if I were sure that the American people were totally aware of two facts:

First. That this $1,350,000,000 is really only about half the amount we are going to be asked to lay out for Europe's grocery bill, for another billion and a half, for postwar feeding of Europeans and Asiatics, is concealed in future Army and Navy appropriation bills, for food to be used in the wake of our armies, and in lend-lease military protocols to our allies, notably our lend-lease protocols to the Russians. Once the Russians have crossed their old frontiers, they will be using American groceries in all the countries they occupy. I would like it if in the countries soon to be occupied by the Russians the peoples were as well aware of the source of their groceries as they are of the nationality of their Russian liberators, for food is a very great political weapon, both in war and in postwar strategy. "Who eats my bread sings my song." And I think it would serve both the cause of democracy and American interests best if the peoples of Europe and Asia would sing Yankee Doodle Dandy quite as loudly as they will sing the Internationale or Britannia Rules the Waves. In short, I hope this $3,000,000,000 European grocery bill, which will be presented to the American taxpayer, will be as much a matter of common knowledge in foreign lands as it is bound to be in America.

The second fact I am not certain that Americans are aware of is that many of our present domestic agricultural policies may well result in such serious American food shortages that when the war is over we may not be able to feed the peoples of Europe, anyway.

Today, the American people are suffering the serious food shortage I warned against; worse actually—as any housewife can testify—than the shortages caused by our vast shipments of food to our now demobilized Army and Navy overseas. These shortages have not been caused by contributions of food to starving Europe. They have been caused by absolutely incompetent policy makers in our national administrative branch.

Moreover, the food that we have sent abroad has, in far too many instances, not reached our friends at all, but has been turned over to groups and governments which have used it to get rich in foreign black markets or to make political capital against us.

No one questions the moral necessity of aiding the sick, and feeding the hungry to the very utmost of our ability to do so. That is not the question. The necessity for UNRRA is clear. The manner in which this organization is administered, however, increasingly gives us cause for anxiety.

Let us not reduce our contributions to UNRRA, but let us make sure, both by congressional control and by Executive surveillance that all we have to give, and do give, is used in our name and in the name of greater freedom for individuals under God, rather than to promote an empire for those who use our gifts as though they were plundered booty from a subject nation.

Common sense demands that as the overwhelmingly greatest contributor Nation to UNRRA, the United States should be permitted to inspect and to report on the distribution of our foods and medicines wherever and whenever they reach their ultimate beneficiaries.

And it would seem that common sense should suggest to Soviet Russia that they permit us to do so. In this connection, the following editorial from the New York Times of yesterday is most persuasive:

CENSORSHIP AT ITS STUPIDEST

Outside aid of the sort UNRRA can give is badly needed in the Soviet republics of White Russia and the Ukraine, both of which were terribly ravaged during the advance and retreat of the German armies. Americans who understand how much the Russion resistance did to destroy Hitler have been eager that we should do our part; so eager, indeed, that Congress turned down an amendment to the UNRRA appropriation bill which would have withheld American aid in any country from which American reporters could not send out uncensored reports. Instead the President was requested to do what he could to secure transmission of uncensored news as to how the UNRRA program was working out.

The President has done this. In every beneficiary country except the Ukraine and White Russia (or Byelorussia), as he advised Speaker RAYBURN on Monday, "satisfactory arrangements have been made." The Russian Government, under date of March 26, advised Mr. Truman "that the censorship rules in force for all correspondents in the Soviet Union will be applied to correspondents desiring to report on the utilization and distribution of UNRRA supplies." In other words, Moscow will suppress and delay as it pleases.

Apparently Moscow has not taken this action for the purpose of concealing pertinent facts from UNRRA itself. Mr. Truman states that the organization's accredited representatives have been given "necessary facilities for observing and reporting on the distribution of UNRRA supplies" and have already "submitted extensive and detailed reports." What seems to be at work is the heavy hand of a bureaucracy. It may seem

vital to the Russians to keep the news of failures from the outside world. But it is plain stupidity to try to suppress facts which will come out anyhow, and which are not discreditable to Russia, simply because they fear even the lightest breeze of a free press. The effect may be to stir up Congress against further UNRRA grants for White Russia and the Ukraine, and so to injure the people we would very much like to help.

Mr. Chairman, most of the debate this afternoon has concerned the use, or rather abuse of UNRRA relief supplies that have gone into the European areas controlled by the Soviet Union. I should like to draw your attention briefly to the fact that the same abuses exist in those parts of Asia which are under Communist domination.

I hold here in my hand a clipping sent to me a month or so ago by an American soldier in China. It is from the People's Herald, a paper printed in Tsingtao, which has a Chinese editor, and, he tells me, a great many Chinese readers who speak the English language.

Let me read you that editorial dated March 3, 1946:

[From the People's Herald, Tsingtao, China]

RELIEVE WHERE RELIEF IS NEEDED

The UNRRA policy of distributing relief without distinction of race, religion, and political belief is in complete accord with the Christian spirt of love and therefore deserves the support of all interested in a better world for the human race in future. It is more than unfair to leave people in deep water simply because they are born with a certain skin color, have faith in a certain form of government or believe in a certain religion. The fact that people are Negroes, Europeans, Asiatics, Christians, Buddhists, Democrats, Communists, does not deprive them of the right to be human beings and all human beings are equal before God. They should be treated equally, at least so far as relief is concerned.

There is, however, another angle to the noble undertaking of relief, and that is, relif must be given where the people need it. Since it is now out of the question to relieve all the poverty-stricken people existing in large numbers in every corner and nook of the earth, the relief and philanthropic organizations will do well to apportion their limited available supplies in such a manner that those people who are suffering worst will benefit by the relief first.

In the case of Shantung Province, the urban population is undoubtedly suffering greater privations than the country people. The comparatively rich veneer of the cities, including Tsingtao and Tsinan, is deceptive and must not be taken as an indication that the city people are better off than the rural population. As a result of the prolonged Communist blockade of the cities, supplies of foodstuffs and vegetables are extremely short, whereas in the Communist-dominated rural regions such shortages either do not exist or are much less acute. In consequence of the Communist policy of persecuting those who do not believe in their principles, large numbers of refugees have fled to nationalist-held cities, thus further aggravating the already serious food situation in the cities.

We are not suggesting that UNRRA relief supplies should not be sent to the Communist areas, where there are bound to be a sizable number of needy people awaiting relief. We do emphasize, however, that on the average the city people are in a much more serious plight than the country people, and for this reason they should be entitled to more UNRRA relief goods.

There is another point we want to take this opportunity to stress: UNRRA relief must be distributed to the needy, strictly irrespective of politics. While the UNRRA policy of neutrality in political matters has been strictly adhered to in nationalist administered cities, the same cannot be said of the Communist-ruled regions. We have received reliable information that the better part, if not all, of the UNRRA relief supplies recently dispatched to the Communist areas, have been distributed to Communist soldiers or civilians working for them. Not a single person unconnected with the Communists in one way or another has received anything in the way of UNRRA relief. Families of the middle classes which have been able to live on their own until the Communists confiscated their properties through the so-called process of class struggle, are living in untold misery but cannot have the benefit of the UNRRA relief. What is the use of relief when the Communists are busy creating poverty and destitution in their areas?

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that any Member of Congress, who is interested in building up a strong Communist China, which will then become a political puppet state of the Kremlin, knows precisely what he is doing when he votes against this amendment. But I do not believe this Congress is interested in spreading, with American money and American food, the strength and power of Soviet Russia and the Communist doctrine throughout Europe and Asia. We want to feed everyone who is hungry. We want to feed Communists if they are hungry. We want to feed Democrats if they are hungry. We want to feed people of all religions, colors, and political faiths, if they are hungry. But I, for one, do not want to see the food that the American people, out of their generosity, send to Europe, and for which they pay out of their own pockets, used as a political tool to crush by starvation everyone who disagrees with Communist political ideology.

To subscribe to such a policy is inhuman, un-Christian, and undemocratic. It is also incredibly stupid from the point of view of our own national self-interest. There was perhaps little this Nation could or would do to prevent the growth in World War II of the Frankenstein monster, communism, that was born of World War I. But in the name of common sense, do not let us use American food to feed that monster. For that was not the intent of the American people when they gave us a mandate for UNRRA.

Any man or any women in this House who sincerely believes that the true intent of UNRRA is to feed hungry people, rather than to create communism in Europe or Asia cannot fail to support this amendment.

I repeat, this amendment does not deny Communists food; it simply insists that we Americans shall have a chance to reassure ourselves that Communists themselves are not denying food to hungry people because of their political convictions. And if they are not doing so they have no reason to fear this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, the House will soon be called upon to vote again on the price at which the monetary reserves of silver in the Treasury can be sold. There is a determined effort and a very determined and well-financed campaign of the jewelers to buy silver from the Treasury at 71.11 cents per ounce—58 cents less than its monetary value. I want to call to the attention of the House that if this plan goes through, which is being advocated by the jewelers, we are simply opening the doors of the Treasury to speculators to come in and buy silver at 58 cents less than its monetary value in this country and less than its value in most every country, and dispose of it in any part of the world where silver is higher than its monetary price of $1.29 in this country, thus making a profit for the speculator. I do not think the Congress should open the door to these speculators or sell silver at less than its monetary value of $1.29. The difficulty many people have in understanding the silver situation is that in an ounce of silver there is enough silver to make a dollar and have a remnant of 29 cents toward making the next dollar. In considering the monetary value of silver we find that since this country was first established and our monetary system was first adopted, the monetary value of silver has always been $1.29 an ounce. We have $20,000,000,000 worth of gold in the Treasury, most of which was acquired at the old price of $20.67 per ounce. It is just as illegitimate for the jewelers to come to the Treasury and ask to buy that gold, which we hold as a monetary reserve at $35 an ounce, for the old price of $20.67 per ounce. Silver is worth more than its monetary value here, in India, and in most every part of the world. Any Member who is interested and wants to confirm this fact can call the Monetary Research Department of the Treasury and ask for the price of silver in other countries, or call the Department of Commerce and get the British Empire Unit and get the facts. Why should we sell our silver monetary reserve in the Treasury for less than its coinage value? We were assured when we passed the Silver Purchase Act, under which we bought silver at 35 cents from foreign countries and at 69 cents an ounce domestically, that for every silver certificate issued we would have double the amount of silver in reserve or 2 ounces for every certificate issued. Under the provision of this law, we accumulated almost 3,000,000,000 ounces of silver and issued $2,000,000,000 in silver certificates. Of this accumulation, we had 1,350,000,000 ounces of so-called free silver which the Treasury refused to put in circulation as money.

Today we find we have frittered away most of 1,350,000,000 ounces of silver, until we have got down to less than 225,000,000 ounces. Most of this silver has

gone out of our country to England and her Empire colonies under lease-lend, if you please, and we did not get a dollar in return for it. Why should we dispose of the last little silver reserve that we have for less than its monetary value?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. The gentleman says that the silver is principally for use by the jewelers. Does the gentleman realize that hospitals, research laboratories, the movie industry, the photographic industry, and a great many other industries as well are vitally interested in being able to obtain silver? The jewelers do not use very much silver so let us not kid ourselves on that score.

Mr. WHITE. If the gentleman will make himself conversant with the present law, he will find that under the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act the Treasury has authority now to sell all the silver that the industries want at $1.29, the monetary price.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. These hospital and research laboratories cannot pay $1.29.

Mr. WHITE. That is what you pay for silver certificates when you get your salary. You pay $1.29. Why should the jeweler come in and get the silver at less than you get it? Why should the jeweler and these people you mentioned get silver at 58 cents less than you pay for it? If you walk down here to the office of the Sergeant-at-Arms and cash the check for the money you receive for your services here on the floor of the House you will be paid in silver certificates in 1, 5, and 10-dollar bills, and you accept them in payment of your services at $1.29. Why do you want to be better to the silver users than you are to yourself and why do you want to permit the jewelers of this country to raid the last monetary reserve you have for the only redeemable money that you have which is, in other words, silver certificates.

Mr. Chairman, the silver in the Treasury was placed there for monetary purposes and nothing else. But we of the silver-producing States realize that there is an acute shortage of silver. For that reason, and that reason only, we agreed to a compromise before the Senate Appropriations Committee where both the producers and consumers, and their Senate representatives, agreed to a price of 90.3 cents per ounce for 2 years and $1.29 per ounce thereafter. The Senate accepted this gentleman's agreement and passed the bill in that manner. Now the bill is in conference, and I want to warn the silver consumers that unless they accept that compromise, including the price of $1.29 per ounce in 2 years, that they may get no silver now and that the price in 2 years will probably be $3 per ounce with very little silver even at that price, and I will tell you why. Silver has been the money of the Orient from time immemorial; they reluctantly accepted paper money a few years ago, but are afraid of it, and are again demanding silver. Then the industrial use of silver has increased 200 percent while domestic production has dropped 57 percent. In the past 400 years the total production of silver has been less than 18,000,000,000 ounces, and while silver is indestructible, yet losses and other uses have decimated that so that in the entire world there is probably less than 14,000,000,000 ounces. Three thousand silver-producing mines in the West have been closed because their reserves were depleted in the patriotic war effort. It will take 2 years to restore those reserves—by sinking shafts, driving tunnels, making raises and blocking out ore. They are unable to finance this work unless assured of fair prices at the end of that time, so if the price is not set at $1.29 per ounce in 2 years no ore will be blocked, and the industrial users will face a famine in silver. Managed economy and managed currency is a snare and a delusion. All the present frenzied efforts for peace and recovery and full employment are just so much sound and fury signifying nothing, unless we adopt a sound world economy based on a dollar or other monetary unit of a universally recognized value. Such a dollar is only possible when backed with redeemable monetary reserves.

Since there is not enough gold in the world—less than 1,250,000,000 ounces—the only solution of our monetary problem is a return to bimetallism with a fixed and proper ratio between gold and silver.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I can give the place where I found the information I cited previously?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. On page 15 of the request for the appropriation for United States participation in the work of UNRRA is the item: Food, $40,100,000, out of a total of $465,000,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. Is that the statement the gentleman made on the floor?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes; I think I said $40,000,000, but I left out the $100,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. I thought the gentleman said one-fourth of it was for that purpose.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I said less than one-tenth, I think.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman from Kentucky who is addressing you is not very optimistic as to the result of anything he may say on this proposition today. I am also strongly of the opinion that a very serious mistake would be made in doing what this amendment asks us to do. It is very easy to stand here and make a patriotic, fine American speech. I could do it also. I think I am just about as much interested in protecting America 100 percent as probably any other man on the floor. I do not believe I am championing, crawling or cringing to Russia. That is not the proposition here today. We have had this matter under consideration time after time and there were sound reasons why we have defeated it in the past.

We must think of Europe not as we think of America. There you have a small bit of land divided and torn between many, many nations, with animosities going back generations and centuries; the people distrustful of each other; hereditary enemies; all that welter of confusion, fear, and distrust which we call Europe. That is the situation that we must face, practically.

UNRRA is composed of 44 nations. In those 44 nations are many nations that have been enemies with the countries being assisted; that have been on the opposite side from those little countries we are trying to help. When America says, "Now, we have a loaf of bread in our hand and you do not get it unless you do what we tell you to do," every other nation in UNRRA has the same right to say to those afflicted nations, "Do what we say or you do not get food." We are asking every country over there, before they will get food—and in some places 90 percent of it comes from America—we are saying, "Unless you let us dictate everything about this proposition you will not get a loaf of bread." The other countries are equally entitled to demand the same, and hereditary fears, perhaps justified, arise from such demands.

We have other means of doing away with too close censorship and national seclusiveness. We have other plans working and other agencies. The Secretary of State has been over there trying to open up certain countries so that our people can move about freely. But, no. We are not leaving it to that method. We are now saying, "We have the food. You must have it and you may not unless you consent to stipulations. We have not accomplished the open-door policy with the threat of the atomic bomb, but with a loaf of bread we are going to demand that they must surrender to our will. It is not in the spirit of the United States of America to approach the problem from that viewpoint. The facts are, and I think it is freely conceded, that there has not been any censorship that is causing any great trouble. The press, when we last debated the proposition, had no complaint that they could not move about freely. They can now go where they please. We are getting reports everywhere UNRRA goes. We know the whole situation. UNRRA is making its own investigations. But now to say to those little countries, to those afflicted peoples, that we demand they shall do exactly what we tell them to do or they do not get a loaf of bread, that is not America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 5 minutes to close debate.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I asked that 10 minutes be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. But the gentleman gave 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Oh, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will be recognized for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is based upon a premise for which there is no foundation of fact. There is not, nor has there been, any such situation.

Russia has not refused to admit American reporters to check UNRRA activities. There is no denial of admission of newspapermen to any of the countries named in the amendment. There never has been. And there is not today. The entire charge is a fabrication out of the whole cloth.

No official or credible source warrants any such interpretation. All evidence adduced before the committee was emphatically to the contrary.

On page 269 of the hearings both Governor LaGuardia and Colonel Wood, of the State Department, testified:

Mr. WOOD. There has been no evidence that there has been any censorship or reports regarding UNRRA distribution by American correspondents and we know positively that the UNRRA mission in both the Ukraine and White Russia has had complete freedom to report, to go back and forth, to come back here and report on their observations of distribution of UNRRA supplies.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And this newspaper mission is going into Byelorussia now. That is recently.

Mr. WOOD. That is right. So I think, on the whole, the response has been satisfactory.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I can assure you if any mission complains to me that any United States or relief agency correspondent is prevented by the Government from observing operations I will call attention to the situation immediately.

No more authoritative statement could be made. Director General LaGuardia served for years as a Member of this House. And no man ever won and held the confidence of his colleagues more completely than Governor LaGuardia. His evidence is unimpeachable.

The Director General has not subsequently notified the committee, or any member of the committee, that there has been any change in the situation. On the contrary, the press for the last 2 days has carried official statements corroborating Governor LaGuardia's statement and bringing it down to date. Here is a quotation from the Under Secretary of State, Hon. Dean Acheson, in charge during the absence of Secretary Byrnes, appearing in the New York Times of yesterday, June 26, 1946:

Russia has not refused to admit American reporters to check UNRRA's activity within the Soviet Union. What she has done, he explained, is to say that the same provision with reference to censorship will apply in the two republics as apply elsewhere in the Soviet Union.

So far, he added, nobody has been barred and as far as we know no reports have been censored in the two republics.

These two republics are the countries named in the pending amendment. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if the House of Representatives proposes to go on record by a vote of the House in contradicting all the evidence, including that of Governor LaGuardia and Secretary Acheson, and declaring that a situation exists which as a matter of fact does not exist.

The State Department goes further and says:

Nobody has been barred and as far as we know no reports have been censored in the two republics. There has been complete freedom of movement of UNRRA missions in each of the two republics, and there has been a full report of the UNRRA missions from the two republics.

There is complete refutation of every irresponsible charge made here in behalf of the amendment now before the House. Could it possibly be made plainer or given with more authority?

And he adds:

In addition a press group, which included American correspondents, has toured the two areas and the correspondents are soon starting back for another tour.

There cannot be under the widest stretch of the imagination such a situation as the pending amendment seeks to have the House officially misrepresent the American people—and the world.

Again, in this morning's issue of the New York Times, the issue for June 27, 1946, Governor LaGuardia is quoted as saying:

There has been no evidence that there has been any censorship and we know positively that the UNRRA missions in both Ukraine and White Russia have had complete freedom to report, to go back and forth, to come back here and report on their observations and the distribution of UNRRA supplies.

In order to leave no possibility of doubt on the subject I called up the State Department just now and was informed by Secretary Acheson himself that the situation referred to by the pending amendment has never existed, does not now exist, and so far as can now be judged, will never exist. In other words, Mr. Chairman, it simply is not true.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, does the House want to base a resolution intruding upon the internal affairs of another nation, and involving implications of too serious a nature to be discussed on this floor, on the strength of an apocryphal tale in support of which there is not the slightest shred of credible evidence to be found? Mr. Chairman, have we taken leave of our senses?

No one even casually acquainted with the history of the times will deny that it was action taken by the Congress of the United States at the close of the First World War which left the way open for the Second World War. Is it possible that we are once more heading down the same path?

A proponent of the pending amendment says cynically that no one will starve if the amendment is adopted. Can he also give us the assurance that a million boys will not march away to die if this spirit of undocumented braggadocio is incorporated in the legislative enactments of the Congress?

Another refers to the taxpayers' money involved. He does not mention the fact that it is money which we have contracted by international treaties, with 44 nations, to pay. He does not mention the fact that the proposed amendment is a potential proposal to abrogate such treaties and welch on our promissory note. He does not allude to the amount of the taxpayers' money which would have to be spent if insult was answered with insult and the international ill will thereby created followed to its ultimate conclusion.

And, Mr. Chairman, who will suffer from this myth-supported proposal, even if the complications it creates can be adjudicated? I quote from an editorial in the St. Louis Dispatch, one of the great papers of the Nation:

RECOURSES OF THE STARVING

UNRRA's report of the desperate extremity of starvation throughout the world gives urgency to President Truman's appeal to Congress to appropriate the remaining $465,000,000 it has pledged but not yet given to the world relief agency.

UNRRA tells of Chinese eating grass, roots, bark, clay; of Viennese cooking nettles. It was in the same terms of human degradation and misery that the Save the Children International Union reported 60,000 children without milk in Budapest, 14,000 derelict children foraging the streets of Milan, a Europe in which new-born babies are swaddled in paper and families suffer out the rigors of winter with cardboard for windowpanes.

UNRRA is not enough but it is an essential beginning, and after that the nations and their peoples with enough to eat should do everything addditional they can to give from their plenty to the hopeless, tortured millions that hover on the brink of death from slow starvation.

Even if no more serious results follow, it is the innocent and the helpless who will pay the price of this unnecessary and uncalled for folly.

Someone here tells us, with righteous indignation, that we pay more than any other nation. The inference is that for that reason we are justified in dictating to the other 44 nations with whom we are associated in UNRRA. We do not pay more. Under the formula adopted by the contracting nations no nation pays more than any other nation. Each pays an equal percent of its national income.

The greatest Advocate of Peace in all the flood of time, standing with His disciples in the Temple saw the purse-proud Pharisee ostentatiously casting their alms into the treasury to be seen of men. But when the widow timidly dropped in her mite He said "She has given more than all the rest. She has given of her penury while they have given of their abundance." I have not the slightest doubt that if the truth could be known there are nations which have, out of their limited means, given more than we, the richest Nation on earth, have given out of our wealth and abundance.

The charge that food supplied by UNRRA is being used for political purposes is also unsupported. Here is the testimony in response to inquiries by the committee. It is by Governor LaGuardia and it is all the evidence—and the only evidence requested by the author of this amendment:

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Mayor, are you satisfied with General Gale's report on Yugoslavia that food there is not being used as a political weapon?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; I have to be satisfied with it. He is the top man in Europe, and a man of good judgment. He has no prejudice or bias. I believe it is a constructive report.

Incidentally, I have the No. 2 man in Yugoslavia, a gentleman whom we got from the Department of Agriculture, right here in the room, and if you would like, you may question him or you can talk with him afterward.

He will tell you the story. He has been on the job from the very beginning.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What report have you had from Mr. Scandrett up in Byelorussia?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is going fine. There cannot be any question of using food for political purposes in that country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is all.

What could be more conclusive? And no attempt was made either to impeach the testimony or to produce other testimony. To sum up the whole matter, there is not the slightest evidence that this food is being used for political purposes. Mr. Chairman, are we willing to base scandalous and slanderous legislative enactments, indicting and impugning the motives of sovereign nations of the world, on such testimony as this?

What would be the reaction and the response of the American people to a foreign nation—any foreign nation—which would falsely accuse the American Government of such reprehensible actions as are charged here in this amendment and on that ground proceed to indict us before the world for something of which we were not guilty—something of which there was no evidence or confirmation?

We are at this moment in the most delicate phase of postwar negotiations. Our diplomatic representatives are now meeting in Paris with the representatives of the other great powers in a final endeavor to establish permanent peace. If they fail the possibilities are too serious for contemplation. War today means not only the destruction of armies and navies but the sacrifice of civilian populations, the annihilation of nations.

It is a critical time. Can we afford to rock the boat? Will this proposal contribute to the peace of the world? Will these truculent, jingo, saber-rattling declamations against "appeasement" here on this floor assist Secretary Byrnes and the American delegation at the peace conference in reaching an amicable agreement with our sister nations? Why take a chance?

I do not believe there will be another war. I do not believe any nation on earth wants war and I am certain the American people do not want war. But why take a step which might start a train of circumstances leading in that direction? We have the assurance of all the witnesses who testified before the committee. We have the reports of all established news agencies. We have the releases in the morning newspapers. And we have the emphatic testimony of our own State Department. All agree that there has been no curtailment of the freedom of the press. So far as UNRRA is concerned the American people have had access at all times to unbiased, unprejudiced, unvarnished, uncensored reports on all supplies sent to all foreign countries, including those named in the amendment.

Let us be sensible. Let us keep our heads. Let us not pass a bill carrying statements that will certainly give mortal offense. There is nothing in the amendment which will contribute to the peace of the world. It is charged with dynamite. It is fraught with potential catastrophe. It is hopelessly freighted with international ill will.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment should be voted down.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, since the gentleman's time was extended 5 minutes, that I be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, my time was not extended. The original request was for 10 minutes for the committee. The Chairman simply failed to count the gentleman from Kentucky, who was standing in the aisle at the time. There was no extension of time to the committee. In the second place, the gentleman from Ohio could have asked and secured 5 minutes or 10 minutes at the time had he so desired. He now asks to set aside the rule under which the committee closes debate. There has been 55 minutes' debate controlled by his side and 15 minutes by the committee. I am constrained to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. DIRKSEN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 154, noes 53.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVILIAN PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Civilian Production Administration, fiscal year 1947, including salary of the Administrator at $12,000 per annum, and salaries of six principal officials at $10,000 per annum each, and other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the employment of aliens; the employment of expert witnesses; acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; not to exceed $10,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service or classification laws; contract stenographic reporting services; lawbooks, book of reference, and periodicals; reimbursement at not to exceed 4 cents per mile, of employees for expenses incurred by them in performance of official travel in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations; not to exceed $2,000,000 for travel expenses, including travel to and from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Standardized Travel Regulations, including travel in privately owned automobile (and including per diem in lieu of subsistence at place of employment), of persons employed intermittently away from their homes or regular places of business as compliance commissioners and receiving compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis and expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Administration; not to exceed $157,850 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364); not to exceed $494,000 for printing and binding; and the rental, maintenance, and operation of passenger automobiles and one airplane; $20,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the maintenance or operation of an airplane or for the payment of rental of any airplane.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 8, line 1, after the semicolon strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$18,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to try to save $2,000,000. Frankly, that is not a big percentage of this appropriation. It is only 10 percent of this particular figure. It is difficult to see why there should be $20,000,000 for the Civilian Production Administration as against an estimated expenditure of $26,473,000 for the present year. On top of that, they have funds to carry them along on their housing program. It seems to me they can take a cut of $2,000,000 and get along very easily. The committee cut out only $600,000. They will have an average of 4,600 employees with the $20,000,000 as against 6,000 in the present year. It seems to me that is perfectly ridiculous. If we are ever going to get through being regimented, and all that sort of thing, it is about time for us to begin. The only way we can do it is by cutting down the amount of money we give these people who are placing restrictions upon the business operations of our citizens. It is time we begin to get back to the point where we have production instead of restricting production. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, apparently the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations would exercise the authority that is now given in restricting freedom of expression, freedom of press, and free speech. He asked for additional time himself, and after that was granted he refused to grant additional time in order for me to answer an argument which is wholly unfounded.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. In the spirit of fair play, Mr. Chairman, and I know the gentleman from Ohio himself is for fair play, possibly the gentleman does not know that at the time the gentleman

from Missouri made the request he asked anyone who wanted to speak on that amendment during that time to stand, and he asked for a full 5 minutes for everyone, reserving the closing time for the committee. It is common practice, everyone knows, for the closing time to go to the committee. It does not seem to me the gentleman should be criticized for declining to extend the time after the committee has closed.

Mr. BENDER. I am fully aware of what the gentleman says. I know the rules of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. To make the story accurate, an additional 5 minutes was granted to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENDER. That is right. The gentleman asked for an additional 5 minutes and no objection was made. Under the circumstances, if the gentleman will grant me a minute's time I will be glad to use a part of his time to answer the gentleman's argument.

The gentleman says we have full freedom of the press as far as the operations of UNRRA are concerned. Apparently he did not read this morning's paper. Here is an article from the New York Times of this morning:

UNRRA IN BELGRADE OUSTS AN AMERICAN—DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION SENT BACK TO WASHINGTON BY RUSSIAN CHIEF OF MISSION

BELGRADE, Yugoslavia, June 25.—Leo Hochstetter, American member of the UNRRA mission to Yugoslavia and director of its office of public information, revealed today that he had been removed from his post and ordered to return to Washington by Col. Mihail Sergeichik, Russian chief of the mission, because of a disagreement over the censorship of UNRRA news releases by Colonel Sergeichik.

Mr. Hochstetter said that Colonel Sergeichik's policies prevented the Yugoslav public from being fully informed about the source and nature of UNRRA aid and directed the efforts of the UNRRA public information office toward presenting the most favorable aspects of UNRRA in Yugoslavia instead of giving a full, truthful account of its successes and failures.

Mr. Hochstetter, a former newspaper reporter and recently an official of the Office of War Information in Turkey, was informed yesterday that he had been relieved of his duties through an order informing the rest of the UNRRA staff that his place was being taken by his British assistant, Leo Fuller. The order was dated Saturday.

Asked about his impending departure, which became known through other members of the UNRRA staff, Mr. Hochstetter issued a formal statement, saying:

"Because of basic differences in concept on the conduct of public information activities in Yugoslavia, Col. Mihail Sergeichik, chief of the UNRRA Yugoslav mission, has ordered me to return to Washington.

"It is my view that a public information officer in UNRRA is an international public servant, charged with the twofold responsibility of explaining all aspects of UNRRA's program to beneficiaries and of accounting UNRRA's activities to the contributors.

"In any case I have found that the attitude of Colonel Sergeichik and his advisers made it increasingly difficult for me to carry out my responsibilities as I see them."

As one of the basic causes of disagreement, Mr. Hochstetter cited a memorandum dated June 12, stating that by order of Colonel Sergeichik all press releases, whether originating in Washington, here or elsewhere, must be approved by Colonel Sergeichik before being released to the Yugoslav press.

Obviously the gentleman from Missouri is in error when he states that there is no censorship and that there is freedom of expression as far as UNRRA's practices are concerned, when an UNRRA official, in fact, the man charged with the responsibility of the distribution of these UNRRA funds, is sent back to our country by this Russian dictator. The people of America want the needy people of all nations to be cared for. There is no disposition on our part to withhold bread in order to foist our own ideology onto the people of the world, such as some of our allies insist upon doing, even in their own country. Not a Member of the House would be so callous as to withhold an appropriation for the feeding of the hungry and the clothing of the naked. All that the amendment provides is that the people of America be given an opportunity to see how their money is spent. There is no other question involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the request for 10 minutes time was due to the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] were given 10 minutes and the committee should therefore have 10 minutes to close.

Now, with reference to the excerpt that has been read from the Times, that was an instance in which one individual correspondent was persona non grata. During the war and since the war, every nation has at times sent home individuals for personal reasons. But the gentleman did not read all the article. If he had read the entire article he would have found on page 5 the statement that there was no censorship in the past, no censorship at present and complete freedom of the press.

The gentleman very carefully avoided reading the most pertinent paragraphs of the article. They completely refute the gentleman's argument. I trust those interested will take time to read all of the article in the New York Times of June 26, 1946, page 5. The gentleman has read only an irrelative excerpt.

With regard to the amendment before us, you are here affecting the distribution of critical materials. The amendment proposes to interrupt the building program. It has nothing to do with prices but merely with the distribution of essential supplies. If you are to provide for housing and if you are to provide for the veterans' program you must have a means of channeling building material equitably and in the right direction. That is what this agency does. We are giving them in this paragraph barely enough money to discharge their duties.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. Does the gentleman feel that by cutting this appropriation it will very vitally affect the emergency housing program?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It cannot be otherwise. We cut the appropriation to the lowest figure and if cut lower, especially by the amount indicated in the pending amendment, it will make it impossible to adequately perform the duties of channeling construction materials in the reconstruction program.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 109, noes 85.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6885 had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill today may extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain amendments.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS CHARGED WITH ESPIONAGE

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Accounts I submit the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 682) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 430, to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation of the disposition of the case against certain individuals charged by the Federal Bureau of Investigation with espionage and possession of confidential Government documents, including such printing and binding and the employment of such clerical, stenographic, and other assistance as the committee may deem necessary, and all other expenditures, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts, but shall not exceed $2,500.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 683), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That FRANK BUCHANAN, of the State of Pennsylvania be, and he is hereby,

elected a member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: On Census, Flood Control, and Elections No. 3.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 2341, an act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. SPENCE. This bill merely extends the authority of the Federal Housing Administrator to insure mortgages on existing houses, which otherwise would expire on the 30th of this month. It gives him no additional authority. They are acting within the authorization previously granted them by the Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. SPENCE. There was no objection in the committee to the report, and I understand there is no objection by anybody to the bill.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. GAMBLE. This is section 2 of the Federal Housing Act?

Mr. SPENCE. Section 2 of the Federal Housing Act.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 203 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the second and third provisos and by striking out the colon at the end of the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE FIRST WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 6890) to amend the First War Powers Act of 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will there likely be minority views filed?

Mr. HOBBS. Not that I know of.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman make the same request, in the event there are minority views to be filed?

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly. I include that in the request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE SECOND WAR POWERS ACT OF 1942, AS AMENDED

Mr. HOBBS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5716) to amend the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended, for printing in the RECORD.

EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT OF 1933

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6477) to amend section 32 of the Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and section 3 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make some explanation of the bill, particularly the necessity for action at this time?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I intend to offer an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and extend what is known as commissioner loans for 1 year. The commissioner loans will expire on the 30th of this month if not renewed and I think now that all of the members of the Committee on Agriculture are of the opinion that this extension should be made in order to give the committee time to work out, if possible, a way of servicing these farmers, who are now being serviced by commissioner loans, by similar loans made through the Federal Land Bank System.

Mr. HOPE. May I ask the gentleman, is it not the understanding of the committee that if this extension is made consideration will be given before the matter comes up again to work out some program which will make it unnecessary to have further extensions of this act?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I have a section 3 to the amendment I shall offer which directs the administration to make a thorough study of the situation and make recommendations to the committee not later than March 1 next year, so we will have time enough to work out legislation before the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment I have offered would simply extend what is commonly known as the commissioner loans for a period of 1 year, this in order to give further time to the question as to how the farmers who at present are served by reason of the commissioner loans may be served in a similar manner under the Federal farm bank system.

H. R. 6477, as originally introduced, would have extended the commissioner loans for a period of 2 years. The House Committee on Agriculture adopted an amendment to the bill striking out the provision in the bill extending the commissioner loans for 2 years, and in lieu thereof prohibiting the making of such loans unless, and until, the Congress by joint resolution specifically authorized the making of such loans.

Permit me to first draw the issue: H. R. 6477, as introduced, extends the lending authority of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, which expires on June 30, 1946, for a period of 2 years. This means that the authority to make commissioner loans would be extended for a period of 2 years. The amendment to the bill, adopted by the committee by a vote of 11 to 8, and herein complained of, while extending the lending power of the Corporation for a period of 5 years, prohibits the exercise of this lending power unless, and until the Congress, by concurrent resolution expressly authorizes the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to make loans. In other words, the amendment while extending the lending power to make commissioner loans for a period of 5 years would, as of June 30, 1946, prohibit the making of all commissioner loans, and this prohibition could only be lifted by concurrent resolution passed by the Congress. To say the least, such action smacks of the philosophy enunciated by the mother in graciously giving her consent to her daughter's request to go swimming:

"Mother, may I go out to swim?"
"O, yes, my darling daughter,
But hang your clothes on a hickory limb
And do not go nigh the water."

In the second place permit me to line up the forces for and against H. R. 6477:

First. The Secretary of Agriculture.

Second. The Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

Third. The Land Bank Commissioner.

Fourth. Eleven of the twelve Federal land banks.

Fifth. The National Grange.

Sixth. The American Farm Bureau.

Seventh. The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

Eighth. The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

Ninth. The National Farmers Union.

Tenth. The Bureau of the Budget—approved.

Against H. R. 6477 as introduced; that is, for H. R. 6477 as amended so as to cut off the authority to make commissioner loans as of June 30, 1946:

First. The American Bankers Association.

Second. The Federal Land Bank of Houston.

BACKGROUND

In order to understand the issue it is necessary to give a brief history of both the Federal land-bank system and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

(a) Federal land-bank system: The Federal Land Bank Act of 1916, creating the Federal land-bank system, designed "to provide capital for agricultural development" and to "equalize rates of interest upon farm lands," has more than justified its existence. Had it no other accomplishment to its credit than the reduction of farm interest rates from a national average of 6½ percent in 1916 to 4 percent in 1946, it would be considered a Godsend to the farmers of America. Add to this accomplishment the bailing

out of the banks, insurance companies, and other farm mortgage lending institutions, during the depression, when loans in 1 year jumped from $222,446,223—1933—to $1,283,503,456—1934—over $1,000,000,000—thus saving not only thousands of farmers, but thousands of financial institutions holding farm mortgage paper by swapping cool cash for their agricultural paper, and you begin to realize what an important part the system has played in our financial picture.

While the Federal Government supplied the original capital that went into the land bank system, the system was designated from the first to become farmer-owned and farmer-controlled, this objective to be accomplished by the farmers subscribing for stock in an amount equal to 5 percent of the loan granted, and in a very short time will have accomplished this worth-while goal. There are 12 land banks in the system, and at present 11 of these banks have paid back every cent of Government capital and are really and truly farmer owned and farmer-controlled, and the remaining bank, the St. Paul bank, in a few years will have retired all of its Government capital, at which time the whole system will become farmer-owned and farmer-controlled. This has been accomplished by the farmers, when obtaining loans, purchasing stock in the amount of 5 percent of the loans so obtained.

I also call attention to the fact that in recent years due to greater efficiency in administration and improvement in farm prices the Federal land bank system has been able to greatly reduce its loans, both in numbers and amount, and also its personnel. From 1938 to 1945 the record shows:

	1938	1945	Percent reduction
Number of loans	1,086,272	644,518	59.3
Amount of loans	$2,803,764,000	$1,370,123,000	48.9
Number of Federal land bank central office employees	205	97	40.1
Federal land bank district employees	5,024	2,014	47.3

(b) Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation was set up in 1933 in order to go to the relief not only of the farmers but to the relief of the banks, insurance companies, and other financial institutions holding farm-mortgage paper. Under the act of May 12, 1933, creating the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the sum of $200,000,000—all of which except $50,000,000 has been returned by the Corporation to the Government—was made available to the land-bank commissioners for the purpose of making loans to farmers on the security of a first or second lien on real estate or personal property in an amount not to exceed 75 percent of the appraised normal value of the security. These loans, commonly known as commissioner loans, were handled by the Federal land banks.

The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation makes two types of loans, known as the first- and second-mortgage commissioner loans. The type known as the first-mortgage commissioner loan is made principally in those areas where the risk is high and consequently no local farm-loan association, confined as it is to a small local area, can safely assume the risk. However, when the risk is spread over the entire United States, as these commissioner loans are, the losses are greatly minimized. This loan is based upon the same principal insurance companies operate under. These high-risk areas are usually found in irrigation, drainage, and level districts; areas subject to excessive field erosion or erosive action of streams; and where the character of farming is undergoing a change.

The second type of loan, known as the second mortgage commissioner loan, is supplemental to the straight land bank loan, and today is widely used in order to service farmers who are unable to get by on straight land bank loans. For instance, suppose a farmer needs $7,500. He applies to his local Federal Land Bank Association for the loan. Land bank appraisers are sent upon the farm to make an appraisal, based upon its normal agricultural value; that is, upon the earning capacity of the farm during normal times. The appraisers, we will say, value the farm, based upon the normal value yardstick at $10,000. The land bank, of course, could only lend 65 percent of this value, or $6,500, which would be $1,000 short of the farmer's need. Now if it were not for the second mortgage commissioner loan the farmer would be forced to go to other sources for his loan, but with this supplemental service what happens is this: He is granted a land bank loan for $6,500 at 4 percent interest, taking stock in the local Land Bank Association for 5 percent of the amount of the loan, and granted a second mortgage commissioner loan for $1,000 at 5 percent interest.

The commissioner loans, first and second, are both needed in order to adequately serve the farmers of America, and should be continued until there is worked out the proper changes in the Federal Farm Loan Act to take care of the service these loans at present are rendering the farmers.

The commissioner loans, originally inaugurated to meet the desperate emergency occasioned by the depression in the thirties not only successfully took care of the emergency, but, from purely a business standpoint, so far, have proven highly successful. The financial statement of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation as of December 31, 1945, is as follows:

Land-bank commissioner-loan operations, May 12, 1933, to Dec. 31, 1945, inclusive

[Even thousands of dollars]

Earnings:		
Interest on mortgage loans, purchase-money mortgages, etc		$369,461,000
Loan fees		12,012,000
Other fees and miscellaneous income		1,386,000
Gross earnings		382,859,000
Deductions:		
Interest expense	150,375,000	
Operating expense:		
District offices	107,400,000	
Central office	12,182,000	
Total deductions		269,957,000
Net earnings		112,902,000
Less: Loss on mortgage-loan and real-estate transactions		62,145,000
		50,757,000
Interest at 2 percent on all Government capital		39,708,700
Net balance		11,048,290
Reserve set aside to cover future losses		68,998,396

On the same date, namely, December 31, 1945, there were outstanding commissioner loans in the sum of $228,397,216. Hence, the financial statement reveals, it is believed the best record ever made by a governmental emergency agency, namely:

First. After paying all losses, amounting to $62,145,000, the Corporation has net earnings of $50,757,000.

Second. The Corporation has a reserve fund set aside to take care of all future losses of $68,998,396, which is 30 percent of the outstanding loans. This reserve is three or four times the amount of the anticipated losses.

Third. If the Corporation paid the Government interest on all capital advanced at the rate of 2 percent, which would amount to $39,708,710, it would still have a net operating profit of $11,048,290, and a reserve fund of $68,998,396.

There is no other emergency agency, so far as I know, that has a comparable record.

The land-bank loans until June 30, 1945, were limited to 50 percent of the normal agricultural value of the farm plus 20 percent of the permanent insurable improvements. Under this yardstick of determining values, the loans in truth and in fact were about 43 percent of the normal agricultural value of the farm.

During the early part of 1945 a bill was introduced revamping the Federal Farm Loan Act along lines that experience dictated were necessary in order to bring about greater efficiency and service. At that time a careful study by the House Committee on Agriculture was made of the whole act. Among the changes recommended was raising the loan limitation from 50 to 65 percent of the normal agricultural value of the farm. The Congress approved of this

recommendation, and on June 30, 1945, this recommendation became law.

At the time the House Committee on Agriculture held hearings on the bill revamping the Federal Farm Loan Act, careful consideration was given to commissioner loans, and while the hope was expressed that in raising the loan limit from 50 to 65 percent, commissioner loans could be discontinued, the bill extended the loaning authority of the Federal Mortgage Corporation for a period of 1 year in order for the Farm Credit Administration to give further study to the problem. In reporting the bill to the House the committee stated:

The authority for the making of Land Bank Commissioner loans will expire under the present law on June 30, 1945. The bill as introduced would have extended this lending authority for an additional period of 2 years. This has been reduced by the committee to an extension of 1 year as provided by section 13 of the bill as reported. This will be sufficient time to observe the extent to which the change in the lending power of the Federal land banks under section 4 (c) of the bill will make it possible for them to make loans which have heretofore required credit from the Land Bank Commissioner.

The Farm Credit Administration made a thorough and complete study and embodied its findings in a printed report under the title "Study of Federal Land Bank and Commissioner Loans Made Through 1945." This study gives a complete picture of the operations of the Federal Land Bank System from the very beginning, and its reading is recommended to those who really want to obtain a better knowledge of the system. I believe that it is not inappropriate to commend Governor Duggin and his able assistants upon the thorough manner in which this study was made. Based upon this study the Secretary of Agriculture recommended to the committee that commissioner loans be continued for a period of 2 years in order to give further time to the consideration of the problem. This request is thought to be not only reasonable but proper. Further time is needed in order to make a proper study of the problem, and then, too, the next Congress should have ample time to go into the matter thoroughly. If an extension of only 1 year is made the next Congress would only have 6 months within which to work the matter out. Moreover, the financial statement shows that the extension will involve no loss to the Government.

The study referred to, among other things, shows that since July 1, 1945, the date on which the loan limit was advanced from 50 to 65 percent, until March 31, 1946, loans have been made as follows:

	Number	Amount
Land-bank loans	18,043	$81,522,000
First-mortgage commissioner loans	1,874	3,064,000
Second-mortgage commissioner loans	8,483	6,610,000
Total	28,400	91,196,000

Hence, the study shows that even after the loan limit was raised from 50 to 65 percent, had it not been for the commissioner loans, 10,357 of the 28,400 farmers applying for loans could not have been served by the Land Banks. In other words, 37 percent of the farmers applying for loans could not have been served by their own institution.

Let us take the record, as revealed by the study, for the year 1945. In 1945 loans were made as follows:

	Number	Amount
Land-bank loans	22,905	$92,986,000
First-mortgage commissioner loans	3,684	6,470,000
Second-mortgage commissioner loans	15,320	22,415,000
Total	41,909	121,871,000

Hence, the study shows that during the year 1945, had it not been for the commissioner loans, 19,004 of the 41,909 farmers applying for loans could not have been served by the land banks. In other words during the year 1945 a fraction over 45 percent of the farmers applying for loans could not have been served by their own institution.

Another thing, with respect to these commissioner loans that we desire to call attention to is the fact that under the changes made in the Federal Farm Loan Act when it was revamped last year, the law now forces the holders of commissioner loans to go into the land-bank system as soon as they qualify. The present situation is this:

First. All farmers who can qualify for land-bank loans are required to take such loans. These farmers are required to take 5 percent of the loan in stock but they are only charged 4 percent interest.

Second. When the 65 percent limitation will not give the farmer the amount of loan he needs, then he is forced to take a land-bank loan for 65 percent of the normal agriculture farm value and is given a second commissioner loan for the extra 10 percent. He takes stock for that part of the loan carried by the land bank, which, of course, is at 4 percent interest, and pays interest at the rate of 5 percent on that part of the loan covered by the second commissioner loan.

Third. If, on account of the risk involved, the farmer is not eligible for a land-bank loan, he is given a first commissioner loan and pays 5 percent interest thereon. As soon, however, as the risk is removed, the farmer is required to convert his commissioner loan into a land-bank loan.

The farmers have cooperated in maintaining the system, and the land banks have experienced no trouble in getting farmers to convert from commissioner to land-bank loans as soon as they become eligible. Last year 39,084—July 31, 1945, to March 31, 1946—farmers holding commissioner loans converted their loans into land-bank loans.

REASONS FOR EXTENDING COMMISSIONER LOANS

First. The authority of the Federal land banks to make loans up to 65 percent of the normal agricultural value became effective less than 12 months ago and the actual lending program under that authority has necessarily been in operation only approximately 9 months. Although the Farm Credit Administration diligently undertook a study to see whether the 65-percent lending authority would enable the land bank system to attain its goal of complete farmer ownership within a reasonable period of time, as desired by the Congress, it has not been humanly possible for the Farm Credit Administration, within the short time available and operating under wartime conditions, to make an accurate recommendation as to the ultimate effect on this cooperative land bank system of discontinuing the authority for the Land Bank Commissioner loans. Such evidence as has been obtained, however, indicates that the system must be in position to offer farmers mortgage loans up to the extent of 75 percent of normal agricultural value in order to survive without subsidy in the form of congressional appropriations from time to time, increased Government capital, or increased interest rates to farmers.

Second. If the maximum loan which can be made is reduced to 65 percent of normal agricultural value and the volume of business declines further, especially in the areas where the loans are small, it may be necessary to make a substantial increase in interest rates in order to continue the services and pay operating costs. We think that it is much better to extend the authority for Land Bank Commissioner loans for 2 years than to incur the risk of having to increase the interest rates to farmers.

Third. Until such time as Farm Credit Administration and the land banks are in position to make a positive recommendation as to the maximum loan in relation to normal agricultural value which a cooperative system can safely make, it would seem unfair to those present stockholders and members of the system who have built up the reserves in the system to deprive them of the aid of the Commissioner lending authority.

Fourth. The study conducted by Farm Credit Administration and the Federal land banks shows that, during the last half of 1945, for example, approximately 45.7 percent of the land bank and commissioner loans which were made by the banks would not have been made if there had not been authority in the system to go up to 75 percent of the normal agricultural value. With many private lenders basing their loan rates on present inflated values, with ample funds available in the hands of these lenders, the usual normal lending volume of the land banks would, in any event, be curtailed. But, to remove from the system at this time the added 10 percent of loan value which it can utilize through the Commissioner's lending authority, would be a step toward reducing the system to some sort of stand-by organization which might not be able to remain as an efficient and effective farmers' cooperative lending organization without Government subsidy or increased interest charges to its borrowers.

Fifth. There is nothing in the record to indicate that other private lenders are as concerned with the interests of the farmers in making loans as the cooperative land-bank system. Farm Credit Administration has a creditable record

of carrying out the congressional mandate embodied in the original act of contributing to "agricultural development." Private lenders, on the other hand, in most instances are concerned primarily with the safety of their funds and profits on their investments in the form of interest. As a result of these different points of view, private lenders in most cases are highly selective as to areas, often lending in only the best areas and in many cases only to the best farmers in these areas. This may make it impossible for the other farmers to obtain farm-mortgage funds at reasonable rates if the cooperative land-bank system cannot lend as much as 75 percent of the normal agricultural value.

Sixth. There can be no disadvantage to the Government in continuing the authority for Land Bank Commissioner loans for 2 more years. Since the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation commenced operations in 1934, it has created an earned surplus of over $50,757,000 which can be used to meet any losses on future loans. In addition, it has set up approximately $68,998,396 as a direct valuation reserve against loans already made. Aside from the $50,757,000, the $68,998,396 in reserves are estimated by Farm Credit Administration to be greatly in excess of the losses that will be sustained on its loans. Such valuation reserves are among the other evidences of the sound and conservative practices of Farm Credit Administration in its lending operations. The ample reserves created in the operations of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation are further justification for the Congress relying upon the sound judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Farm Credit Administration, and 11 of the 12 Federal land banks, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, in asking that the Commissioner's lending authority be extended for two more years.

Seventh. There is certainly no reasonable prospect for loss to the Government by extending the Commissioner's lending authority for the additional 2 years. There is no reason to believe that Farm Credit Administration would depart from the sound practices in lending which it has heretofore followed. In addition, the evidence shows that it requires, at the present time, only a small amount of funds to make the Land Bank Commissioner loans. Of the approximately $43,697,000 of loans between the percentages of 65 and 75 percent of normal agricultural value made by the Federal land-bank system with second-mortgage commissioner loans during the period July 1, 1945, to March 31, 1946, only approximately $5,000,000 of first- and second-mortgage loan funds was required from the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

Following is a table showing the volume of Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans for the period 1925 through December 31, 1945.

Eighth. The Commissioner's lending authority is being utilized in such a way as to foster, rather than interfere with, the growth of the land-bank system as a farmer-owned and farmer-controlled system. The land banks, themselves, are the agencies used by the Land Bank Commissioner for making and servicing Land Bank Commissioner loans. Thus, they have the opportunity as well as the duty to utilize the Commissioner's lending powers in such a way as to aid, rather than deter, the growth of the cooperative farm-mortgage credit principle. The record bears out the fact that the banks have performed this duty properly in the past and are doing so at the present time.

Ninth. It would seem that the Congress would be playing into the hands of private interests and acting against the welfare of the farmers if it did not grant the extension. It is admitted that the land-bank program has reduced interest rates to farmers. It is apparent also that these high interest rates may return unless the extension is granted. We believe that the land-bank system must be maintained as an efficient and going organization with adequate authority to serve promptly, and without waiting for congressional action, those worthy farmers who prefer or require the cooperative system as a means for obtaining their farm-mortgage credit. We think that it would be illogical and that it is unnecessary to cripple the cooperative farm-mortgage system by allowing the authority to expire.

Tenth. There is no prospect of cost or loss to the Government by continuing the authority. But, if the authority is not continued at least during this period when others are lending on inflated values, the earnings of the banks may decline to where they must increase the interest rates charged their farmer borrowers.

OPPOSITION TO ENACTMENT OF H. R. 6477

As heretofore stated, the only opposition the hearing developed came from the Land Bank of Houston and the American Bankers Association.

(a) Land Bank of Houston: The opposition of the Houston Land Bank is based on the belief that the commissioner loans should be discounted and the land banks authorized to make loans up to 75 percent of the appraised normal agricultural value. As heretofore stated, we do not think we have had sufficient experience with 65 percent loans to take this step. Further study and experience are both desirable.

It may be that the solution to the high risk field and to bridge the gap between the 65 and 75 percent loans will be found in giving the Federal land banks authority to make loans similar to those now made by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation — commissioner loans—charging an extra rate of interest for such loans, and setting aside the extra interest charge as a reserve fund against losses.

(b) American Bankers Association: It is unfortunate that the American Bankers Association saw fit to enter into the controversy by advocating the cutting off of all commissioner loans as of June 30 of this year. I cannot believe that the association gave very much, if any, consideration to the question. Surely this committee has expressed every desire to preserve private lending agencies in every way, and not to hamper or burden them by setting up competitive farm lending agencies operating on Government capital. This committee, on more than one occasion, has expressed the desire to see all farm lending agencies farmer-owned and farmer-controlled; but in bringing this working objective about, we cannot believe that either the committee or the American Bankers Association desire to either destroy or cripple our great Federal land bank system. Only this year this committee brought in legislation laying the foundation upon which to erect the farm lending agencies, with the avowed purpose in mind of following up the legislation with further legislation to coordinate and properly integrate the agencies. The American Bankers Association joined in this worthy undertaking. Yet, we now find the American Bankers Association rushing in, in an attempt to cripple, if not destroy, the greatest of these farm-lending agencies, the Federal land bank system.

Probably it would not be out of place to remind the American Bankers Association of some of the governmental subsidies and concessions the banks of this country have been enjoying over the years. Lest we forget, let us catalog a few of them:

First. Private banks buy and sell Government bonds, notes, and certificates. They have made profits on the purchase and sale of Government obligations. Bonds are priced to allow handling charges for the banks.

Second. Banks have a large volume of Government deposits on which no interest is paid. Banks purchase Government bonds, notes, and certificates and establish an account for the Government on which they pay no interest.

Third. The Federal Reserve banks help their member banks to avoid losses on Government bonds bought by the member banks by furnishing an immediate market for the bonds.

Fourth. According to the annual report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitted August 21, 1945, the Government has a substantial investment of noninterest-bearing capital—$150,000,000—in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the benefit of the banks.

Fifth. The Government is guaranteeing loans by banks, including GI loans, housing loans, and loans to small business.

Sixth. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a wholly Government-owned corporation, has been, and still is, rendering numerous services to private banks.

Seventh. The banks have available without cost a large volume of free funds made up of deposits by the Government and the public generally.

Eighth. The private banking system, through the Federal Reserve System, has the power to issue currency.

It ill behooves the American Bankers Association to rush in and call the kettle black. We are striving, in a sensible and constructive way, to bring about farmer-owned and farmer-controlled lending agencies, agencies that are free of all

Government subsidies and concessions, and if the American Bankers Association would take a like view and make a like effort, we would probably get along a little better. Certainly it is not asking too much to ask the American Bankers Association to clean its own house before voluntarily offering its services to clean house for the farmers.

TO SUMMARIZE

First. Cutting off the commissioner loans as of June 30, 1946, as provided for in the amendment adopted by the committee, means, at best, that no commissioner loans could be made until sometime next year. Congress will adjourn in a short while, certainly until after the election, probably to the first of the year, and no action could be taken to revive such loans until Congress gets back in session.

Second. If such loans are cut off on June 30, 1946, some 40 or 50 percent of the farmers will be forced to abandon their own institution and go to some private lending agency for their loans. If such a condition should prevail, it is unreasonable to expect that the farmers will lose faith in a system that furnishes relief to so few?

Third. Cutting off such loans at one fell swoop will greatly cripple the Federal land-bank system, probably do irreparable damage to the system, in that it would greatly curtail the earning capacity of the system and force the system to either run in the red or increase interest rates.

Fourth. The Federal land bank system has been a godsend to the farmers of America and should be strengthened, rather than weakened. It is operating efficiently and successfully at present without any cost to the Government, and common sense and just ordinary prudence dictate that it would be not only unwise, but manifestly unfair to the farmers of America who have their money invested in the system, to take hasty and uncalled for action that would, in all probability, strike the system such a blow that it would take years to recover from. "Haste makes waste" is an oft-quoted maxim. Haste in this case may mean more than waste, it may mean the beginning of the end of a great institution that has served the farmers over the years faithfully and efficiently.

No wonder the farmers from one end of this land to the other are exercised over the action of the committee in cutting off the commissioner loans as of June 30 of this year. They are demanding that the system be held intact until time has been given to make a comprehensive study upon which action can be taken that will, at least, preserve to the farmers the service they are today enjoying under the system. This is not only a reasonable, it is a sensible, request, and one, in our opinion, the Congress should comply with.

A complete picture of the loans made by the land banks from 1925 to 1945, and by the Land Bank Commissioner from 1933 to 1945 is as follows:

Loans made, number and amount, by calendar years, Federal land-bank loans, 1925 through 1945, Land Bank Commissioner loans, 1933 through 1945

Year	Federal land banks		Land Bank Commissioner loans						Total Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans	
			First-mortgage loans		Second-mortgage loans		Total commissioner loans			
	Number	Dollars (000 omitted)	Number	Dollars (000 omitted)	Number	Dollars (000 omitted)	Number	Dollars (000 omitted)	Number	Dollars (000 omitted)
1925	39,905	127,355							39,905	127,355
1926	36,893	131,317							36,893	131,317
1927	39,268	140,384							39,268	140,384
1928	26,988	102,236							26,988	102,236
1929	17,132	64,252							17,132	64,252
1930	12,572	47,971							12,572	47,971
1931	10,898	42,015							10,898	42,015
1932	7,208	27,570							7,208	27,570
1933	38,568	151,634	20,821	31,372	23,218	39,440	44,039	70,812	82,607	222,446
1934	190,147	730,363	129,205	205,188	117,149	347,948	306,354	553,136	496,501	1,283,499
1935	58,968	248,671	38,509	71,985	52,495	124,410	91,004	196,395	149,972	445,066
1936	26,362	109,170	15,910	28,255	23,019	49,003	38,929	77,258	65,291	186,428
1937	15,989	63,092	8,228	13,375	13,645	26,645	21,873	40,020	37,862	103,112
1938	14,171	51,419	6,184	9,310	11,269	20,085	17,453	29,395	31,624	80,814
1939	13,624	51,582	5,566	8,463	10,857	18,954	16,423	27,417	30,047	78,999
1940	17,027	64,275	7,243	11,198	14,518	25,465	21,761	36,663	38,788	100,938
1941	16,825	65,068	6,690	11,007	14,795	26,526	21,485	37,533	38,310	102,601
1942	13,862	53,974	4,287	7,393	11,909	21,141	16,196	28,534	30,058	82,508
1943	16,103	61,900	3,406	5,782	13,699	24,715	17,105	30,497	33,208	92,397
1944	18,914	70,275	4,015	6,623	15,856	28,394	19,871	35,017	38,785	105,292
1945	22,965	92,986	3,684	6,047	15,320	23,415	19,004	29,462	41,969	122,448
Total	654,389	2,467,509	253,748	415,998	397,749	776,141	651,497	1,192,139	1,305,886	3,689,648
Loans made, July 1, 1945, through Mar. 31, 1946	18,043	81,522	1,874	3,064	8,483	6,610	10,357	9,674	28,400	91,197

Mr. Speaker, the extension of commissioner loans has been endorsed by all the great farm organizations, as shown by the following letters and telegrams from the National Grange, American Farm Bureau, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union, and National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, which I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1946.

Mr. JOHN FLANNAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: As you know the authority of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to make loans expires June 30 of this year. To meet the needs of farmers and meet the competition of other lenders, it has been necessary for the land banks to grant a supplemental or Commissioner loan in nearly half the cases of loans closed. After June 30, unless the right to make Commissioner loans is extended, it seems apparent that the banks will lose from a third to half their business. This loss would necessitate either a sharp curtailment in the loan facilities in district and field, or an increase in the interest rate, neither of which contingencies is in the interest of the farmers.

The National Grange has constantly worked to strengthen this farm-loan system, especially its cooperative features, and has tried to bring about conditions under which the direct loans by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation could be discontinued. However, we do not want to see the discontinuance effected in such a way that it will handicap or injure the cooperative land-bank system. At the time the Congress raised the loanable base from 50 percent to 65 percent, we strongly opposed the change on the following grounds:

1. We maintained that the interest rate on bonds would suffer by increasing the hazard, and all farmers would thus be penalized.

2. We maintained that these was a field for a 75-percent loan which would have to be filled, and that the banks would soon be back asking for the renewal of direct lending.

3. We maintained that loans in excess of 50 percent could be made on a self-supporting basis if the interest rate was increased sufficiently to meet the additional hazard, and that a system of applying such increases would enable the land banks to make the higher loans and thus eliminate the need for the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation as a lending institution. We proposed a definite practical way in which this could be done.

4. We said it would be far better to provide a permanent cure than a fair weather cure which would necessitate opening up the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation with every squall.

During the year all 12 land banks have come to concede that we were right in our contention that the 65-percent loan would not fill the bill. A number of them also now agree on the principle we advocated for a higher-rate loan adjusted to meet the additional risk. We are confident that if the committee studies the question thoroughly, it will concur with us that the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation can be discontinued as a lending agency and at the same time benefit instead of injuring the land-bank system, by adopting some plan similar to that which we have recommended. Obviously there is not time to develop and pass legislation of this kind before June 30. In fact that is a task which may require some months of research and study to develop it on a thoroughly sound basis, and since Congress is about to adjourn, and there would be little time before June 30, 1947, we recommend:

1. That the lending life of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation be extended to June 30, 1948.

2. That the Farm Credit Administration be requested to report to your committee recommendations for a loan system with a loanable base of 50 percent of the value of the farm, with a plan for increasing the interest rate to meet the increased hazards arising from advancing the loanable base from 50 percent to 75 or 80 percent.

Very truly yours,

A. S. GOSS,
Master, the National Grange.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN FLANNAGAN: We are very much concerned over the action taken

by the House Committee on Agriculture in approving an amendment to H. R. 6477 which practically nullifies the authorization for commissioner loans by prohibiting any more such loans after June 30, 1946, unless both the Senate and the House by concurrent resolution specify when these loans may be made. We believe it would be a serious mistake to discontinue commissioner loans at this time, particularly due to the delay in the enactment of the Flannagan bill, H. R. 4873, which provides for the reorganization of all farm credit facilities. Authority for such loans should be continued until a proper study and reorganization of all farm credit facilities can be made.

As you know, under present authority, Federal land banks may make loans up to 65 percent of the normal value of the land. In order to provide for loans in excess of 65 percent, the land bank commissioner is authorized to make loans jointly with Federal land banks and in some cases in high risk areas where Federal land-bank loans cannot be made, he may make the entire loan up to 75 percent of the normal value of the land.

Due to the competition of insurance companies and private banks, almost half of the loans made during the last 6 months of 1945 were joint Federal land bank and commissioner loans. Unless authorization for commissioner loans is continued, many farmers will be unable to obtain any loan in certain areas where lending hazards and many economic situations necessitate the use of commissioner loans alone. Federal land banks cannot make loans in these areas. Higher interest rates may result if commissioner loans are not authorized.

We therefore wish to respectfully urge that the committee amendment be eliminated and that H. R. 6477, as introduced, be approved in order to permit the continuation of authority to make commissioner loans for another 2 years so that the needs of farmers may be adequately served, pending the reorganization of farm credit facilities.

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL, *President.*

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: As you know the life of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation terminates with this fiscal year, June 30.

The recent lending reports of the Farm Credit Administration indicate that between one-third and one-half of the current loans now make use of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. Therefore, if this agency is not continued the operation of the Farm Credit Administration will be restricted.

It was our hope a year ago when the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation was extended for 1 year that during that period some basis could be worked out for handling loans up to 75 or 80 percent of the appraised valuation through the Federal land banks. Obviously this cannot be done now in the short time remaining. Therefore, we recommend that the life of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation be extended through June 30, 1946, and that during the interim the Farm Credit Administration be instructed to present to your committee recommendations for a program for integrating the functions of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation with the Federal land banks on a self-supporting basis.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DAVIS,
Executive secretary.

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1946.

JOHN W. FLANNAGAN,
Chairman, House Agricultural Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FLANNAGAN: The National Farmers Union is strongly in favor of the approval by the committee and the adoption by Congress of H. R. 6477, the bill sponsored by you which would extend through June 30, 1948 the authorization for the making of land-bank-commissioner loans through the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. Indeed, we favor the extension of the law covering these loans for a 5-year period, and are inclined to believe that there is a permanent place in the cooperative agricultural credit system for this type of authority.

Of all economic groups, farmers have greatest need for flexibility in their credit system. Commissioner loans were devised in order that they might be available for use in special instances. If it became necessary to attempt to meet such emergency loan needs through the land-bank loan, there is no doubt that over a period of years serious losses to the latter system would be entailed. Moreover, without the authority to make loans up to 75 percent of normal value being lodged somewhere in the agricultural credit system, great numbers of farmers would suffer hardships that otherwise they might avoid. We believe that commissioner loans help materially to keep farm ownership in the hands of operators who otherwise would be forced out of agriculture or reduced to the status of tenant or laborer.

The present provisions of law, placed on the statute books in considerable part because of your own efforts, authorize the land banks to make loans up to 65 percent of normal appraised value. But the land banks have not had sufficient experience in operation under this new authority to enable them to determine accurately to what extent this provision can replace commissioner loans. It is our view that there probably always will be need for making a limited number of loans of the type of commissioner loans. At any rate, we believe it is too early to risk dispensing with the authority or curtailing it.

Accordingly, we hope your bill will be approved without amendment.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL SMITH,
Legislative Secretary.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 16, 1946.*

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN,
Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

It would be in the public interest for your bill H. R. 6477 as introduced to be enacted into law.

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include two telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6477 in effect ends the operation of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. This Corporation was established in 1933 when the demand for farm mortgage credit far exceeded the funds available. The main purpose of the corporation was to provide funds for the Federal land banks and for commissioner loans to farmers who needed more funds than were possible under Federal land-bank mortgages.

To accomplish this the Corporation was authorized to issue and have outstanding at any one time $2,000,000,000 of bonds fully and unconditionally guaranteed both as to principal and interest by the United States. The Corporation is further authorized to invest its funds in mortgage loans made in the name of the Land Bank Commissioner, under provision of section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933. The Commissioners' lending authority under this act, as amended, expires July 1, 1946.

In testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations concerning Government corporations, the need for the continuance of this corporation was definitely established. The need is twofold:

First. The Federal land bank cannot make loans of more than 65 percent of the normal agricultural value. The first mortgage commissioner loans are usually made in areas that are considered hazardous and to farmers who cannot qualify for land-bank loans.

Second. The continuance of this corporation is needed so that the corporation can buy Federal land bank bonds when there is not any other market available. It is true the amount of our standing loans has been greatly reduced. The peak of land-bank-commissioner loans was in 1936 and amounted to $836,778,547. In December, 1945 these were reduced to $228,397,216, or 25 percent of the former amount. While this particular type of credit is being curtailed at this time, it was most urgently needed in 1933 when the corporation was set up and the time may come again when these loans will be very seriously needed to carry farm operations through deflation periods, drought periods and other hazards of the farming industry.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution be so amended as to permit the continuance of the operation of this corporation.

In support of this plea, I submit two telegrams giving the need of commissioner loans in Montana.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 12, 1946.*

Congressman WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Washington, D. C.:

Until adjustments permitting greater liberality in land-bank loans are made discontinuance of commissioner loans would be disastrous to land-bank system and would divert business to competitors. Urge defeat of bill to discontinue commissioner loans.

F. F. LYMAN,
President, Rocky Mountain National Farm Loan Association.

MILES CITY, MONT., *June 11, 1946.*

Hon. WESLEY A. D'EWART,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Understand that House committee reported out to discontinue commissioner

funds as of June 30, 1946. We feel this action if approved by Congress, will work a severe hardship in eastern Montana. Many prospective borrowers can't make the grade on straight loans due to increased costs and the fact that this section of the State was much slower in coming back to normal than other parts of the Nation. Appreciate anything you can do to see that commissioner funds are continued for another year.

RAY BAILEY,
Director Powder River National Farm Loan Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the eleventh sentence of section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended (title 12, U. S. C., 1016), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1946" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1948."

SEC. 2. The last two sentences of section 3 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (title 12, U. S. C., 1020b) are amended to read as follows: "The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation is authorized to repay to the Secretary of the Treasury on behalf of the United States from time to time such portions of the amounts subscribed to the capital stock of the Corporation as are found by the board of directors to be in excess of the capital necessary to enable the Corporation to carry out its functions as authorized by law. The proceeds of such repayments shall be held in the Treasury of the United States as a fund available for subscription, by the Governor on behalf of the United States with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to the capital of the Corporation when, in the judgment of the directors of the Corporation, additional subscriptions to its capital are necessary."

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLANNAGAN: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the eleventh sentence of section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended (title 12, U. S. C., 1016), is amended by striking out 'July 1, 1946,' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1947.'

"SEC. 2. The last two sentences of section 3 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (title 12, U. S. C., 1020b), are amended to read as follows: 'The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation is authorized to repay to the Secretary of the Treasury on behalf of the United States from time to time such portions of the amounts subscribed to the capital stock of the Corporation as are found by the board of directors to be in excess of the capital necessary to enable the Corporation to carry out its functions as authorized by law. The proceeds of such repayments shall be held in the Treasury of the United States as a fund available for subscription, by the Governor on behalf of the United States with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to the capital of the Corporation when, in the judgment of the directors of the Corporation, additional subscriptions to its capital are necessary.'

"SEC. 3. The Farm Credit Administration is hereby authorized and directed to make a thorough study of ways and means of making available to the farmers through the Federal Land Bank System loans similar to those now made by the Land Bank Commissioner through the Federal Mortgage Corporation. The study shall be completed as soon as practicable and shall be submitted to the Agricultural Committee of the House of Representatives and Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with recommendations not later than March 1, 1947."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include several letters and telegrams with reference to the necessity of extending this act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] may have permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the cooperative credit provided by the Federal land-bank system is preferable to any direct Government-lending program. The Land Bank Commissioner loans are direct Government loans of Government money. They served a valuable purpose during the days of depression. These loans were, and were intended to be, inflationary. They are still inflationary. I do not think that it is good judgment to treat our present bad case of inflation with this remedy, helpful as it was during a period of deflation.

I have, therefore, opposed the continuation of the commissioner loans. I still believe that we would be well advised to take the Government out of the direct land-loan business, holding the organization intact for use at a future date if a recurrence of deflationary conditions should make it desirable.

The record of the Houston Land Bank is the best in the Nation. It was the first to repay all the money it owed to the Government. It was the first to become entirely farmer owned. On April 17, 1946, the directors of the Houston bank passed resolutions suggesting the abolishment of the commissioner loans. I quote from the minutes of the directors of that great institution:

The directors entered into a discussion as to the future needs for the lending powers of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. It is the feeling of the directors that, even though this bank now uses commissioner loans, the time has come when we should consider making loans without the aid of this emergency type of lending. Upon motion by Director Denny, seconded by Director Pumphrey, and unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation was established in January 1934, at a time when a severe economic depression had gripped the country; and

"Whereas the availability of these funds has helped thousands of farmers retain their homes and, through the medium of refinancing, make more stable the farm economy as well as that of business institutions; and

"Whereas the credit needs of the country today are not as acute as they were in 1933; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this board is of the opinion that the emergency period has passed and that we should state to the Texas Representatives in Congress of the United States that it is our opinion that the authority to make commissioner loans should be discontinued after June 30, 1946 in order that the fine record that has been made can be used as an example of the wise use of Government emergency lending in times of distress to the end that such funds may be available again should economic conditions in the future become so acute as to cause the need for the return of such a Goverment agency."

Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago the Farm Credit Administration suggested that if we would but allow them one more year, they would be able to wind up these inflationary loans. Now they suggest a 2-year extension. I cannot but believe that such an extention would be to establish them on a permanent basis. I could not support that, but we have today been able to work out an agreement for a 1-year extension with an agreement that the Farm Credit Administration should make a study of methods of turning this business over to the land banks and that such a report should be in the hands of Congress not later than next spring. I believe that this course may well result in a final settlement of this problem, and I shall not, therefore, oppose the measure at this time.

RIGHT OF FILIPINOS AND EAST INDIANS TO BECOME NATURALIZED CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

JOHN LESINSKI,
EDWARD H. REES,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
HOMER FERGUSON,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes

of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3517) combining the principal features of H. R. 776, granting certain privileges in the immigration and naturalization laws to Filipinos, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report, namely:

That the substance of the amendments offered by the Senate in effect represent the substance of action taken by the House on separate bills dealing with East Indians and Filipinos. The managers on the part of the House recede from their disagreement so that the bill may pass both Houses in order to become law before July 4, 1946, the day on which the Philippines will receive their independence. The managers believe that at a later date minor desirable amendments can be introduced and enacted.

JOHN LESINSKI,
EDWARD H. REES,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman to explain the conference report?

Mr. LESINSKI. The House had previously passed H. R. 3517, known as the Indian bill, and H. R. 776, known as the Filipino bill. The Senate also passed the two bills. They now find that if the President signs one bill the other bill will be null and void. Senator BALL again brought up H. R. 3517, took a portion of the Filipino bill, H. R. 776, and offered it as an amendment to H. R. 3517, to which the House agreed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Both bills had previously passed the House?

Mr. LESINSKI. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BELL (at the request of Mr. GOSSETT) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. GOSSETT) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Nodel.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some letters.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York (at the request of Mr. HANCOCK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a baccalaureate address by Chancellor Samuel P. Capen of the University of Buffalo on June 2, 1946.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial from the Des Moines Tribune, and in the other some figures regarding exports and imports of beef and pork.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today and include several House resolutions, certain extracts from a recent report by the Comptroller General, certain extracts from committee hearings and newspaper articles.

THE LATE PRESIDENT OF CHILE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, we learn with deep regret of the untimely passing of a distinguished leader of a great people. President Rios of Chile has laid aside the performance of his executive duties and gone to his permanent rest. My association with President Rios, both in Santiago and in Washington, convinced me that he was an exceptionally able leader of his country which has suffered a great loss in his passing. I am very confident that the entire membership of the House join me in expressing to the great people of Chile our deep and heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3420) to provide for refunds to railroad employees in certain cases, so as to place the various States on an equal basis, under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, with respect to contributions of employees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain this legislation?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. This bill endeavors to correct an inequity that has existed for the past several years, as a matter of fact, ever since the creation of the Railroad Retirement Act. Prior to that time 10 States collected from both the employer and the employee whereas in the other 38 States the employees did not pay, and this is an attempt to have that money refunded in those 10 States. Incidentally, Massachusetts is one of the States that paid in.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is all it does? It merely seeks to refund the money to these railroad employees?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any case where an employee amount (as hereinafter defined) was paid from a State unemployment fund to the Unemployment Trust Fund, an aggregate amount equal thereto shall be paid from the Unemployment Trust Fund, as refunds, to employees who paid into the State fund the contributions upon which such payment into the Unemployment Trust Fund was based, except that in case any such employee is deceased, payment shall be made to his estate; and the payment so made in the case of any employee shall be in proportion to the contributions paid by such employee into the State fund: *Provided*, That payment in any such case shall be made only if application therefor is made to the Railroad Retirement Board within 12 months after the date of enactment of this act.

(b) As used in this act—

(1) The term "employee amount" means any amount paid from a State unemployment fund to the Unemployment Trust Fund which would not have been required to be paid, under the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, if such section 13 (c) had not required payment of amounts based on contributions collected from employees.

(2) The term "Unemployment Trust Fund" means the fund established by section 904 of the Social Security Act.

(3) The term "employees" has the same meaning as in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 677 was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HENRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared on June 25, 1946, in the Daily Jefferson County Union of Fort Atkinson, Wis., on the subject of the British loan.

Mr. CLASON and Mr. FULLER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and further to extend his remarks and include some extraneous material.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

EXISTENCE OF IMPORTANT SMALL BUSINESS THREATENED BY BIG BUSINESS PATENT MANIPULATION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly I have pointed out

that control of patents and manipulation of patent rights can become, wrongly used, one of the most powerful instruments of monopoly in America today.

I do not refer to the basic provision of the patent law which gives to an inventor the right to a monopoly upon his invention for a 17-year period. I refer instead to the practice of powerful corporations in prostituting legitimate patent rights to monopolistic ends, and particularly to the action of such large corporations in preventing scientific and industrial development from taking place as a deliberate policy. The case that I want to bring to the attention of the House today is that of the Bodine Soundrive Co., of Los Angeles, Calif., and the relationship it has had with the Curtiss-Wright Corp.

On January 2, 1943, Curtiss and Bodine entered into a contract under the terms of which Curtiss agreed to pay not in excess of $5,000 per month to enable Bodine to carry on inventive scientific and development work in Bodine's factory in Los Angeles. In return for this Curtiss was given an option to take exclusive licenses on any patents taken out by Bodine covering inventions made by this company. These licenses were to be given to Curtiss at half price.

These option rights extended even to inventions made and paid for by the Bodine Co. prior to entering into the contract with Curtiss. The contract further provided that Curtiss could discontinue the agreement and stop the payments to Bodine but would still continue to be able to exercise the option agreement until such time as a proper termination of the agreement had been made. And while Bodine has the right under the contract to terminate on 1 year's notice, it was provided that even if Bodine took this action it would not impair Curtiss' right to demand an exclusive license on any inventions made prior to the effective date of termination and to prevent Bodine from licensing any other company to use such inventions or processes unless released by Curtiss.

The present situation is that in August 1945 Bodine informed Curtiss that it wished to terminate its agreement, the reason being that Bodine found itself completely hamstrung and unable to proceed either with its business or with the further development of jet propulsion, which was its principal line of endeavor. However, as I have already pointed out, this notice of termination will become effective in August of 1946 as to any future inventions of Bodine. It will not, however, release inventions or developments made prior to that date. These will still be controlled by Curtiss.

The next fact is that while Curtiss has ceased payments to Bodine, it has not released Bodine from the option agreement and has thus effectively tied up the company. The reason for this action, as will be clear as we proceed further, appears to be that Curtiss has decided not to proceed with the Bodine developments, but to push, instead, certain other inventions which it more directly controls.

One of the most serious aspects of this whole affair lies in the fact that Curtiss appears to have effectively prevented Navy representatives from actually seeing the jet-propulsion developments made by Bodine during the period of the war and at the time when Germany's buzz-bomb weapons were being used against England with such telling effect.

An account of the events which took place in connection with this matter as reported by Mr. A. G. Bodine in a statement signed by him on April 26, 1946, follows:

During the latter part of June 1944 Soundrive was visited one afternoon by S. T. Robinson, lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve, of the Power Plants Branch, Bureau of Aeronautics. This visit was arranged the previous evening during a preliminary interview of Mr. Bodine by Mr. Robinson in the Los Angeles apartment of Mr. Burnam Adams. Mr. Adams was then manager of Wright-Aero, Ltd., a west coast division of Curtiss-Wright Corp, the latter who was also Mr. Robinson's employer before he entered the Navy. This preliminary meeting was arranged by Mr. Adams' telephoning Mr. Bodine and explaining that Mr. Robinson was in town and desired an interview.

During this interview Mr. Robinson stated that he was in England during the early landings of the German V-1 missile. He had observed a periodic combustion phenomenon which seemed to be an essential feature of this German missile. When Mr. Robinson observed this missile he was reminded of some information he had previously noted at Curtiss-Wright concerning the periodic combustion, "resonant" propulsion engines being developed by Soundrive under Mr. Bodine's direction.

Immediately upon his arrival in the United States after seeing the German weapon, Mr. Robinson planned to discuss the general engineering features of this pulse-jet propulsion subject with Mr. Bodine, and this was the primary reason for his desiring an interview with Mr. Bodine. Preliminary discussions in Mr. Adams' apartment consisted mainly of a brief résumé of Soundrive's work in this general field. It was decided that a personal visit by Mr. Robinson to Soundrive's laboratory would be of benefit to the war effort. This visit was arranged for the following day.

During his visit to Soundrive's laboratory Mr. Robinson learned of Soundrive's theories and aims in the pulse-jet field, and he also had an opportunity to see the pertinent apparatus which was being tested at that particular time.

At the close of his visit Mr. Robinson pointed out to Mr. Bodine that very probably the major portion of the pulse-jet activity at Soundrive was of great importance to the Nation's war effort. Mr. Bodine pointed out that at that moment Soundrive was completely dependent financially upon Curtiss-Wright and probably would have to follow their instructions relative to any program.

Mr. Robinson replied to the effect that because of the importance of the subject Mr. Bodine should bear in mind the patriotic feature in any matter of joint decision relative to the advisability of further investigation of pulse-jet propulsion. Mr. Robinson also pointed out that very soon he would be visiting Navy headquarters and would be turning in a report on this subject. Mr. Bodine invited further inquiry and offered any assistance which he might possibly supply.

On the morning of June 28, 1944 (10 a. m. Pacific war time or 1 p. m. eastern war time), Mr. Bodine received a long-distance telephone call from Mr. Robert L. Earle, general manager of Curtiss-Wright propeller division, with whom all Soundrive contractual relations were concerned. Mr. Earle said that he had just recently received word that the Navy Department had learned of Soundrive's activities in the field of jet propulsion; and he said that he would have to ask Soundrive (Mr. Bodine in particular) to make no further disclosures of Soundrive's work in the field of jet propulsion to Navy personnel. Mr. Earle inquired of Mr. Bodine regarding the possibility of Mr. Adams' disclosing Soundrive's activities to additional Navy personnel who were visiting the west coast with Mr. Robinson. Mr. Bodine replied to the effect that he did not know whether Mr. Adams had disclosed the subject to any other Navy personnel. Mr. Earle pointed out that he felt that Soundrive would be visited again by Navy personnel quite soon.

Mr. Earle further pointed out that he was sending one of Curtiss' engineers, who would be thoroughly instructed by Mr. Earle as to how these Navy personnel should be met when they arrived at Soundrive. Mr. Earle stated that he would also have one of Curtiss' representatives take some sort of story to Navy headquarters in Washington to quiet down immediately Navy enthusiasm regarding Soundrive's activity. Mr. Earle then stated that the necessity of an early visit to Curtiss' offices by Mr. Bodine was indicated. Mr. Earle said that such a visit was necessary in order for Mr. Bodine to be clearly informed of Curtiss' plans relative to Soundrive research program.

The next communication received from Curtiss was a telegram, July 1, 1944, informing Soundrive that a representative from the engineering department at Curtiss-Wright would arrive at Soundrive within a week. This telegram also included further instructions from Mr. Earle (Bob) to Burnie (Mr. Burnam Adams) to the effect that Mr. Adams should not disclose Soundrive's jet propulsion work to any party.

The Curtiss engineer arrived July 8, 1944, and conveyed again the anxiety of Mr. Earle, and the management of Curtiss in general, concerning Navy interest in Soundrive's jet propulsion work.

Mr. Warfle, lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve, telephoned Soundrive on the morning of July 10, 1944. Commander Warfle asked for an appointment for further discussions regarding Soundrive's work in jet propulsion. Commander Warfle mentioned that he would have with him Lieutenant Parker, also of the United States Naval Reserve.

The Curtiss engineer sent a telegram from Los Angeles to Mr. Earle telling of the intended visit of Commander Warfle and Lieutenant Parker. Mr. Earle replied immediately with a telegram pointing out that he was under the impression that Commander Warfle would be the only visitor from the Navy. Mr. Earle asked, who was Lieutenant Parker? This latter question was apparently answered by communication to Mr. Earle directly from the Curtiss engineer. This Curtiss engineering department man also pointed out to Mr. Bodine that apparently Mr. Earle was extremely anxious about the whole situation and that he was instructed by Mr. Earle to hold Soundrive disclosures to the Navy to a minimum.

The Curtiss engineer further pointed out that Mr. Earle particularly did not want the Navy to know about the most recent and novel forms of Soundrive's apparatus; and therefore in following out Mr. Earle's instructions this Curtiss representative would have to ask that Soundrive personnel dismantle the most recent forms of the apparatus before the arrival of Commander Warfle and Lieutenant Parker. Under the direction of Curtiss' instructed representative the spherical wave forms of the Soundrive combustion resonator were dismantled and the

apparatus was removed from the immediate premises and hidden behind the test-yard fence. Curtiss' representative seemed reluctant to do this; however, it was clearly apparent that he was working under direct instructions from Curtiss' management.

During the visit of Commander Warfie and Lieutenant Parker only very early forms of Soundrive's apparatus were shown. It was further pointed out during this meeting that Navy financial aid, or advice concerning desirable trends of Soundrive's pulse-jet development program, was not useful in Curtiss' program. The general story given to Commander Warfie and Lieutenant Parker was to the effect that the Soundrive program was concerned only with fundamental research and it was most desirable to maintain the program in this form to comply with Curtiss' plans.

The Curtiss engineer and Mr. Bodine arrived at the Caldwell, N. J., plant of Curtiss-Wright, July 21, 1944. Upon his arrival Mr. Bodine was informed by Mr. Earle that Curtiss had not been successful in completely satisfying Navy interest at Washington headquarters and therefore a visit to Navy headquarters was necessary.

Approximately July 26, 1944, a conference was held in the office of Captain Spangler at the Bureau of Aeronautics' headquarters, Washington, D. C. During this conference Captain Spangler pointed out to Mr. Earle that Curtiss owed the Navy the favor of accepting an experimental contract or, in any other way the Navy might find desirable, aid the Navy as much as possible in its investigation of the German V-1 weapon. Mr. Earle promised Captain Spangler that Curtiss would do anything it could to aid the Navy in this investigation. Captain Spangler pointed out that probably some forms of the apparatus should be built and tested; and he had been given the impression by Navy engineers that the Bodine Soundrive Co. could probably be of assistance in this program.

With the help of the Navy Department, Curtiss engineers and Mr. Bodine were escorted to see a recently captured model of the German V-1 weapon at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio. After studying this weapon the group who visited Captain Spangler returned directly to Caldwell, N. J. Mr. Earle again repeated his instructions to Mr. Bodine to the effect that Mr. Bodine, or other personnel of Soundrive, were not to make any disclosures to Navy personnel. Mr. Earle pointed out that the management of Curtiss had instructed him that Curtiss, and not Soundrive, was the more experienced party for dealing properly with the Navy.

Soon after the first of August 1944, Mr. Bodine returned to Los Angeles. Mr. Bodine received a letter from Mr. Earle dated August 19, 1944, outlining Curtiss' views and instructions to Soundrive relative to the subject of pulse-jet propulsion. In this letter it was clearly pointed out that Soundrive should continue excusively upon the bazooka form of the program. This bazooka program was a recently new project at Soundrive concerned with the development of a high-pressure gas compressor for running turbines which in turn could be connected to propellers for aircraft propulsion. It had been previously pointed out by Mr. Earle and other members of the management of Curtiss that Soundrive should concentrate upon the development of equipment which would tend to maintain propellers as an essential element in aircraft propulsion rather than develop the earlier pulse-jet work of Soundrive concerned with propulsion apparatus which eliminates propellers. Therefore, Mr. Earle's letter instructing Soundrive to stay exclusively with the high pressure, or bazooka, form in its research program was in part apparently a continuation of the previous desires of Curtiss.

In this letter of August 19, 1944, Mr. Earle specifically pointed out that Soundrive should not work upon the forms similar to the German V-1. Mr. Earle further pointed out that it was not Curtiss' desire to obtain a Navy contract to work upon these pulse-jet forms. In this letter Mr. Earle indicated that a member of Curtiss would visit the Navy Department to make possible carrying out Curtiss' desires.

Soundrive was subsequently visited a number of times by Navy engineers but because of the exclusion of pulse-jet work there never was, during these later visits, any really pertinent data to show regarding further development in the direction of pulse-jet propulsion in which the Navy was primarily interested. Curtiss had effectively prevented development in this pulse-jet field by ordering Soundrive to do no work in this direction and also by Curtiss' declining any Navy contracts for Soundrive to work in the pulse-jet field. Curtiss' contract with Soundrive prevented Soundrive from dealing directly with the Navy Department. However, Curtiss' instructing Soundrive to stop research on pulse-jets was in violation of the Curtiss-Soundrive contract. Soundrive's complete financial dependence upon Curtiss made possible this sort of contractual violation by Curtiss. Also Soundrive assumed that Curtiss' instruction possibly reflected a reversal of Navy headquarters feelings concerning pulse-jets, altering those feeling indicated during Mr. Bodine's visit in July 1944. This assumption was later proven incorrect during discussions with Navy engineers. On October 9, 1945, Mr. Bodine notified Mr. Earle that Soundrive desired a friendly termination of its relations with Curtiss.

The Curtiss-Soundrive contract includes a provision whereby Curtiss "adopts" inventions of Soundrive. This "adoption" consists of a first option to take an exclusive license controlling the disposition of Soundrive patents. The contract stipulates that this option is maintained until each particular patent or application is released from "adoption." Therefore, the December 21, 1945, telegram indicating in the last line that releases will be forwarded to Bodine within a week thereafter has provided a continuing restraint by Curtiss, which restraint has been implemented by Curtiss' failure to provide these releases-from-adoption. All of Soundrive's jet propulsion patent applications were adopted by Curtiss.

A. G. BODINE, Jr.

APRIL 26, 1946.

Furthermore, at the present time the fact that Curtiss has refused to release Bodine from its agreement, the further fact that Curtiss meanwhile refuses to make any payments under the agreement, and the further fact that Curtiss continues to control all the inventions of the Bodine Co., creates a situation in which it is impossible for Bodine to continue its business or to enter effectively into a contractual relationship with the Navy or anyone else for that matter for the further development of its important inventions.

Curtiss evidently does not intend to proceed with the development of Bodine's inventions nor to release Bodine, until forced to do so, to carry on its business by licensing its inventions elsewhere or entering into contracts for their development. It will be recalled that the excess-profits tax was repealed as of the first of the year 1946, and it is therefore significant that as a condition to Curtiss releasing Bodine from their agreement, Curtiss stipulated that all outstanding expenses incurred by Bodine in 1946 should be billed in 1945. To this Bodine refused, and I believe quite properly, to agree.

A study of documents connected with this case as well as conversations with Mr. Bodine about the matter make possible the following summary of contractual relationships between Curtiss-Wright Corp. and Bodine Soundrive Co.:

CONTRACTURAL RELATIONS BETWEEN CURTISS-WRIGHT CORP. AND BODINE SOUNDRIVE CO.

A contract dated January 2, 1943, was written by Curtiss and signed by Curtiss and Bodine. This contract recites that financial reimbursement will be provided by Curtiss to aid Bodine in the development of Bodine inventions. It further recites that Bodine inventions are considered to be of value in the Nation's war effort.

The contract provides that Curtiss directs Bodine regarding the selection of Bodine inventions upon which Bodine laboratory work emphasis may be placed. At the suggestion of Bodine's attorney, a clause was inserted during Curtiss' writing of the contract which provided that United States Government people may also direct the emphasis of Bodine's invention development work. However, the contract restricts Bodine regarding the selection of Bodine tions to others (than Curtiss).

Bodine inventions include those inventions conceived by employees of Bodine Soundrive Co. which employees received draft deferment through direct aid by Curtiss. Curtiss also provided war materials priority ratings (AA-1 and AA-2) for Soundrive. Bodine entered into the contract in good faith and assumed that Curtiss' apparent consideration of the war effort was sincere.

Curtiss' rights under the contract include the option to take exclusive licenses thereby controlling the disposition of Bodine inventions from time of conception during both option and license period. The contract provides that a Bodine invention may be disclosed (at the insistence of Bodine) to a third party only after a United States patent has issued on the invention (usually 3 or 4 years after a patent is filed) and only to the extent necessary to arbitrate the royalty rate of a license taken on the invention by Curtiss.

During the time of these contractual relations Curtiss repeatedly instructed Bodine to not disclose Bodine inventions to Government people. Bodine's complete dependence upon Curtiss made compliance necessary. During the peak of Germany's activity with the "buzz-bomb" V-1 weapon Navy Department people made a number of visits to Soundrive with the helpful intention to study Soundrive's long established activity on this same type of rocket engine. However, Curtiss insisted that Bodine follow Curtiss' instructions regarding not disclosing Bodine inventions or progress thereon to the Navy Department. All pertinent facts, including the novelty, was effectively kept from the Navy Department. Subsequently, Curtiss again notified Bodine that it was also not Curtiss' desire to have a Navy contract for development of Bodine inventions. Curtiss repeated that Curtiss preferred retaining full control of the disposition of Bodine inventions in the jet-propulsion field.

Also during the time of these contractual relations Curtiss went further than mere direction of emphasis and actually instructed Bodine to work on only two projects and stop all other projects. Curtiss did not release option control on the other projects, however. The contract specified that Curtiss retain control under option until "release from adoption" of Bodine inventions.

During 1945 Bodine learned, in technical discussions with Navy engineers who visited Soundrive Co. laboratories, it was generally known amongst aircraft people that the V-1 type jet-propulsion engine was of considerable value to naval and military programs. In view of Curtiss' asserted position effectively shelving Bodine inventions, Bodine served

notice in the summer of 1945, terminating a year hence, Curtiss' acquisition of control over further Bodine inventions. Under the contract Bodine's termination of Curtiss' option acquisition right for further inventions becomes effective after a year's notice, and Curtiss may also retain existing invention option control for 5 years after any notice of termination by Bodine.

On December 31, 1945, Curtiss telephoned Bodine and notified Bodine that Curtiss did not desire to commercialize Bodine inventions. Also, if Bodine would agree to certain terms Curtiss would send a telegram promising to pay promptly amounts owed Bodine and indicating intent to release Curtiss option control on Bodine inventions, and further the telegram would promise to give Bodine immediate clear title to these inventions for negotiating with other parties by forwarding the confirmatory releases within the first week of January.

One of the terms Bodine had to agree to in confirming the December 31 telegram from Curtiss was to adjust billing for 1946 outstanding expenses, for which Bodine was liable in 1945, so that this billing for outstanding expenses would all be shown as overbilling for December 1945. Curtiss explained that it was their desire to throw all expenses back into the higher-income-tax year 1945. Bodine confirmed this telegram December 31, 1945.

Bodine subsequently learned from his accounting firm that this method of billing was in violation of income-tax regulations. On January 15, Bodine telephoned Curtiss asking about promised payment of bills and releases from option and also Bodine pointed out the legally improper features of the telegram agreement.

Curtiss promised a reply by January 17. On January 18 Curtiss sent another telegram to Bodine saying that Bodine would have to proceed as per the December 31 telegram.

Various discussions have ensued but Curtiss has maintained its demand that 1946 "clean up" expense of Bodine caused by 1945 expenses will have to be billed as 1945 expenses.

To force Bodine into this tax juggling procedure Curtiss has refused to otherwise pay regular 1945 bills. Counsel in the Federal Tax Office, Los Angeles, has substantiated the statement of Bodine accountant. The financial position at Bodine Soundrive Co. has now reached the point whereupon the company will soon have to discontinue operations and release its carefully chosen group of specialist employees.

Bodine Soundrive Co. has to take a loss on its past 6 months of operations because Curtiss will not pay for costs during this period even though Curtiss has not yet released clear title to Bodine inventions as promised in Curtiss' December 31 telegram. Contractual negotiations of Bodine with the Navy Department have been held up because of lack of clear title from Curtiss. Also Curtiss still maintains that Curtiss has no desire, or right, to proceed with commercialization of Bodine inventions. The lack of proper release from Curtiss is primarily a restrictive hazard for the Bodine Soundrive Co.

On March 23, 1946, Curtiss notified Bodine (in Curtiss' lawyer's office at Los Angeles) that Curtiss would not pay any part of its bills or consider giving confirmed releases from options, unless Bodine would undertake to indemnify Curtiss against all forms of action which might be brought against Curtiss for Curtiss' relations with Bodine. This demand by Curtiss has not been complied with by Bodine.

Mr. Speaker, the sum and substance of this whole business from my point of view is that it ought not to be possible for one powerful company to tie a small company up by securing exclusive rights to the fruits of the small company's work, then to refuse to carry forward the development of the small company's inventions, but at the same time to effectively block that small company from proceeding in other directions with the development of the results of its own work.

Obviously, small business and the Nation suffer from such a condition. Obviously, too, it is one of those things that makes most effectively for monopolistic control in our country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HEDRICK, from 3:30 p. m., June 27, 1946, through Saturday, June 29, 1946, on account of official business.

To Mr. DOLLIVER, for Friday and Saturday, June 28 and 29, on account of official business.

To Mr. BYRNE of New York, for an indefinite period, on account of sickness in family.

To Mr. KLEIN, for Friday and Saturday, June 28 and 29, on account of official business.

To Mr. STOCKMAN, for Friday and Saturday, June 28 and 29, on account of official business.

To Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) for June 28, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2543. An act to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation;

H. R. 6064. An act to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6084. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 28, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Committee on Banking and Currency will begin hearings on S. 1592 (the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill) at 10:30 a. m. on Friday, June 28, 1946, in the Banking and Currency Committee Room, Room 1301, New House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1423. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to change the name of the Chemical Warfare Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1424. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1945, the number of pieces procured, the estimated mailings, and the estimated cost, by departments and agencies, for the period July 1 to March 31, 1946; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1425. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture be included as a member of the Advisory Board of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and as a member of the National Advisory Council of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1426. A communication from the President of the United States, requesting consideration of an amendment to the Securities Exchange Act (H. Doc. No. 682); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

1427. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution granting certain property to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and relinquishing jurisdiction therein; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1428. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting a first supplementary report on patents, processes, techniques, and inventions; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1893. An act to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 2357). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 35. Joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; with amendments (Rept. No. 2358). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 3593. A bill relating to the disposition of public lands of the United States situated in the State of Oklahoma between the Cimarron base line and the north boundary of the State of Texas; with amendment (Rept. No. 2359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 6609. A bill to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6795. A bill to provide military advice and assistance to the Republic of China to aid it in modernizing its armed forces for the fulfillment of obligations which may devolve upon it under the Charter of the United Nations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6744. A bill to provide that every Saturday

shall be a holiday for banks and building and loan associations in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2386). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6274. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 2392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6642. A bill for the relief of certain postmasters; without amendment (Rcpt. No. 2393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 682. Resolution to provide for expenses authorized by House Resolution 430; without amendment (Rept. No. 2396). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2341. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6890. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 2398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4492. A bill for the relief of Charles Marvin Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 2356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 437. An act for the relief of W. S. Burleson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 661. An act for the relief of Harold H. Rhodes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. S. 884. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Patuxent Development Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 933. An act for the relief of the estate of Sybel Spence; without amendment (Rept. No. 2365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 1051. An act for the relief of William J. Simpson and John R. Rogers, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. S. 1061. An act for the relief of Violet Ludokiewich; without amendment (Rept. No. 2367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. S. 1132. An act for the relief of Aeronautical Training Center, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1150. An act for the relief of John Leberman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. S. 1314. An act for the relief of Frederic P. L. Mills; without amendment (Rept. No. 2370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1517. An act for the relief of Lofts & Son; without amendment (Rept. No. 2371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. S. 1569. An act for the relief of Gwynn C. Triplett, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. S. 1683. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Sufronia Andrus; without amendment (Rept. No. 2373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. S. 1748 An act for the relief of Ivor E. Nicholas; without amendment (Rept. No. 2374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. S. 1773. An act for the relief of Frederick Uhrmann; without amendment (Rept. No. 2375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. S. 1852. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Arlis Earl Teekell; without amendment (Rept. No. 2376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. S. 1912. An act for the relief of Brig. Gen. Carl H. Seals; without amendment (Rept. No. 2377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1965. An act for the relief of the estate of C. Benjamin Stapleton; without amendment (Rept. No. 2378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 2015. An act for the relief of William H. Morris; without amendment (Rept No. 2379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 2107. An act for the relief of certain postal employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 2380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 2292. An act for the relief of the Miami Herald, the Key West Citizen, and the Miami Daily News; without amendment (Rept. No. 2381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2222. A bill for the relief of J. L. Harris; with amendments (Rept. No. 2382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3043. A bill for the relief of Wilma E. Baker; with amendment (Rept. No. 2383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3742. A bill for the relief of Kay Tomlinson and Larry Max Tomlinson; with amendments (Rept. No. 2384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4406. A bill for the relief of Loyal F. Willis; with amendments (Rept. No. 2385). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1268. A bill for the relief of Baxter Campbell and Glestie Campbell Jones; with amendments (Rept. No. 2387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1349. A bill for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5368. A bill for the relief of W. G. Magruder; without amendment (Rept. No. 2389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6472. A bill for the relief of John E. Peterson, James M. Hiler, Vivian Langemo, Floy Sibrie, and Ross Lee Brown; without amendment (Rept. No. 2390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6593. A bill for the relief of Milton A. Johnson and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 6894. A bill providing for State control of housing accommodation rents in certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULLER:

H. R. 6895. A bill to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 6896. A bill to grant to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain land in Custer County, Mont., for industrial and recreational purposes and as a museum site; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PATTERSON of California:

H. R. 6897. A bill to suppress the evil of anti-Semitism and hatred of members of any race or religion because of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 6898. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide for refunds of deductions from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of certain temporary employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. R. 6899. A bill to authorize the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge, or a free bridge, across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Dearborn County, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 6900. A bill to grant increased service pensions in certain Spanish-American War cases not included in recent legislation providing increases to other Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. R. 6901. A bill to amend paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (a), as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 6902. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national system of air-markings for the facilitation, encouragement, and safety of aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6903. A bill to provide benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 6904. A bill authorizing the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. Res. 681. Resolution authorizing that there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives additional copies of a report prepared by Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. Res. 684. Resolution making H. R. 3914 a bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6905. A bill for the relief of Andre Lan; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 6906. A bill for the relief of Senzo Usui; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 6907. A bill for the relief of W. B. Hussey and J. O. Hussey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TALBOT:

H. R. 6908. A bill for the relief of Rev. William R. McCarthy; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2037. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 103 operating and nonoperating railroad employees of New Castle, Pa., and vicinity, urging an amendment to House bill 1737, the railroad retirement bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2038. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of C. M. Bedell, Jr., and other residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., in opposition to any legislation or restrictions which may bring about partial or national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2039. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of the American Legion, Department of Texas, opposing H. R. 2346, granting members of the merchant marine similar rights and privileges as given veterans of the armed forces; to the Committee on Rules.

2040. By Mr. PLOESER: Resolution No. 382, adopted by the House of Representatives, State of Missouri, June 12, 1946: The Congress and the United States engineers establish a policy of adjustment, compensation, and replacement to persons in Missouri regarding property destroyed in connection with the construction of a dam on the White River near Bull Shoals in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Claims.

2041. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of Reserve Officers Association of the United States, at convention in Chicago May 31 to June 3, re disability compensation for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2042. By The SPEAKER: Petition of the Colorado State Federation of Labor, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for extension of price control, without crippling amendments; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 1946

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, the fountain of all wisdom and goodness, we thank Thee for the gift of sleep when the tangled web of weary thought emerges clarified and straightened by the touch of the new day. Like a bird that flashes from the darkness through the light back to darkness again, so our day of light is but a moment—a sudden call, and we are gone. Since we know not what a day may bring forth, but only that the hour for serving Thee is always present, may we wake to the instant claims of Thy holy will; not waiting for tomorrow, but yielding ourselves today. So may the service of our brief hour contribute to the beauty and glory of our America as in a darkened world she looks forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, in the splendor of Him who is the Light of the World. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, June 27, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow in order to attend the funeral of a very dear friend.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 27, 1946, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1834) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Iowa or the Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Des Moines River at or near Farmington, Iowa.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2341) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3517) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3420. An act to provide for refunds to railroad employees in certain cases so as to place the various States on an equal basis under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act with respect to contributions of employees; and

H. R. 6477. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and section 3 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS BY SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the committee has continuously examined instances of waste and excessive profits in war production. Since the end of hostilities, however, it has intensified its efforts in this particular phase of the committee's work. For months the committee staff has examined records in the Federal departments and in various companies, and executive hearings have been held. The committee is now ready to announce its first public hearings on a case of this character since the cessation of hostilities.

The public hearings will commence on Monday, July 1, 1946, in room 318 of the Senate Office Building and will concern a group of corporations located in the Chicago, Ill., area, of which the principal companies are Erie Basin Metal Products, Inc., an Illinois corporaton, of Elgin, Ill.; Batavia Metal Products, Inc., an Illinois corporation, of Batavia, Ill.; and the Interstate Machinery Co., an Illinois corporation, of Chicago, Ill. Affiliated with these companies, in connection with approximately $78,000,000 worth of war contracts, were some 11 other corporations and partnerships.

The committee's interest in investigating war contractors is to examine procurement procedures and financial aspects of the operations of war contractors for the purpose of ascertaining the manner in which Government officials have policed and supervised the expenditure of substantial sums of public funds in war procurement. This will include the safeguards set up to protect the Government where sizable advances have been made to enable the contractor to perform, the readjustment of prices in fixed price contracts, the renegotiation of profits on war work, the administration of regulations concerning the awarding of contracts, the granting of priorities for machinery and materials, cut-backs, pricing, manpower controls, "E" awards, termination, auditing, proper administrative overhead expenses and maintenance and repair costs, pyramiding, and practices and operating methods affecting the bill which the taxpayers have paid for goods produced for the war effort.

This is the first case of this character on which the committee has held public hearings since the termination of hostilities last September.

Over $315,000,000,000 had been spent in war procurement up to the end of hostilities. With procurement in World War II of such volume, with the need for haste which faced us during the early stages of the war, with need for relaxing ordinary safeguards in the expenditure of public funds because of the necessity of relative freedom of operation on the part of contracting officials of the Government and producing companies, it was perfectly obvious that there would be some wasteful and improper practices, and some instances of downright fraudulent and criminal practices.

During the war period, when the committee concentrated its activities especially on those phases of the war effort in which corrective action could be taken, of necessity, the committee could not examine closely any but the most flagrant cases which came to its attention in the course of the committee's other work. However, the committee has reported publicly in various interim and annual reports upon a number of such cases, among which are the following: Empire Ordnance Corp.; Engineers Group, Inc.; San Jacinto Shipbuilders, Inc.; Corrigan, Osborne & Wells; Clifford E. MacEvoy Co.; Basic Magnesium, Inc.; Colonial Mica, Inc.

In addition, the committee urged the adoption of measures to prevent inordinate profits on war business. As a result, the law for renegotiation of contracts was enacted. The committee has continued to follow the manner in which that law has been administered. Although production for World War II is completed, the renegotiation of profits on that war work is not completed. The committee's interest in war profits and in the administration of the renegotiation law continues.

Furthermore, the committee has continually examined the methods employed in the handling of procurement of war supplies and plans to make a report on the results of its studies throughout the war period, which will provide a basis for future war procurement policies.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Hayden	Overton
Ball	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Hoey	Radcliffe
Bridges	Huffman	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Bushfield	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Smith
Capehart	La Follette	Stanfill
Capper	Lucas	Stewart
Carville	McCarran	Swift
Chavez	McClellan	Taft
Donnell	McKellar	Taylor
Downey	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tobey
Fulbright	Mead	Tunnell
George	Millikin	Wagner
Gerry	Mitchell	Walsh
Gossett	Moore	Wherry
Green	Morse	White
Guffey	Murdock	Wiley
Gurney	Myers	Willis
Hart	O'Daniel	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO and Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business, having been appointed to the commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 214)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Post Office Department, amounting to $8,179, fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 213)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Navy Department, amounting to $23,750,000, fiscal year 1947, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the Naval Establishment (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, UNITED STATES SENATE (S Doc. No. 215)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative branch, United States Senate, amounting to $60,000, fiscal year 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL (S. Doc. No. 210)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative branch, Architect of the Capitol, amounting to $3,365, fiscal year 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 216)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, amounting to $50,000, fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 212)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Veterans' Administration (readjustment benefits), amounting to $1,848,000,000, fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. Doc. No. 211)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia, amounting to $45,200, fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES SUBMITTED BY WAR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 222)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damages to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, amounting to $289,767.94, and which require an appropriation for their payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES SUBMITTED BY NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 222)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay a claim for damages to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death in the sum of $1,365.07 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. Doc. No. 223)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of appropriation amounting to $412,448.88 to cover claims allowed by the General Accounting Office and for the services of the several departments and independent offices (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIM ALLOWED BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE UNDER TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 225)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation amounting to $269.99 under the Treasury Department for payment of a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST GOVERNMENT BY DISTRICT COURTS (S. Doc. No. 220)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation for payment of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, amounting to $4,530.82, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY DISTRICT COURTS (S. Doc. No. 219)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of $17,088.31, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY COURTS OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 218)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision relating to a judgment rendered against the Government by the Court of Claims (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY COURT OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 217)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which has been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for payment, amounting to $2,369,549.74 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CERTAIN CLAIMS ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. Doc. No. 224)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation under the Treasury Department for the payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $23,145.33 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO OR LOSSES OF PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTY (S. Doc. No 227)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property, in the sum of $10,452.85, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), and which require appropriations for their payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO ROADS AND HIGHWAYS OF STATES (S. Doc. No. 226)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Public Roads Administration to pay claims for damage to roads and highways of States or their subdivisions, in the sum of $1,092,120.11, and which require an appropriation for payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO AN EXISTING APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. Doc. No. 228)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to an existing appropriation and to appropriations for the fiscal year 1947, for the Department of Commerce (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DRAFTS OF PROPOSED PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1947 (S. Doc. No. 229)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Joseph S. Mendoza, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the continuation of the Office of Price Administration; ordered to lie on the table.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Lester Washburn, international president, United Automobile Workers of America, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee (Wis.), praying for the continuation of the Office of Price Administration; ordered to lie on the table.

JUST PEACE SETTLEMENT WITH ITALY

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by Americans of Italian origin, representing the Grand Lodge of Rhode Island, Order of Sons of Italy in America, and many other fraternal welfare organizations, assembled in Providence, R. I., on June 23, 1946, requesting a just peace settlement with Italy.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a just peace settlement with the new democratic Italy and her restoration to freedom, self-respect, and contentment are indispensable to world stabilization and a lasting peace;

Whereas by finally overthrowing fascism in 1943, 2 years before the end of the war, the people of Italy struck a mortal blow to the Axis and thus tremendously helped the cause of the Allied Nations; and, thereafter, during the decisive phase of the war Italy was no longer an enemy but a cobelligerent with the Allies, rendering an invaluable moral and military contribution to the victory over the common enemy;

Whereas the late President Roosevelt and former Prime Minister Churchill affirmed coram popoli in the Atlantic Charter their most solemn engagement that in the post-war settlement the United Nations would seek no territorial aggrandizements; and the Allied Powers promised to the Italians their peace treaty would take in full consideration Italy's great contribution to the defeat of Germany;

Whereas a self-respected, laborious, and democratic Italy, as mother of western civilization for 2,000 years, will be a strong bulwark against the advancing ideologies of bolshevism;

Whereas Trieste and the Istrian Peninsula claimed by Yugoslavia; South Tyrol, which is on this side of the Alps, claimed by Austria; the Valleys of Tenda and Briga in the Maritime Alps, claimed by France, are geographically the natural borders of the Italian Peninsula since the time of creation, and politically an integral part of the Italian nation, because of more than one century of struggle for the unification of Italy which culminated with the redemption of Istria and Tyrol during World War I, when Italy was our ally and sacrificed 600,000 killed and 1,500,000 wounded;

Whereas the Italian colonies in north Africa, now under British military rule, were developed by Italy at great sacrifices years before this war and fascism; and the most appropriate solution would be to revert them temporarily to Italy under the aegis of the United Nations until the world problem of colonial empires, many times richer and larger than Italy's, would be solved by an international covenant, applying the same principle to all colonies and to all countries;

Whereas the economic resources of Italy are at the lowest ebb, and to become an element of peace and progress Italy needs loans and not the burden of reparation, of which she has already paid some in various forms to various allies;

Whereas the interest of the United States and Italy coincide, because both are interested in maintaining the European equilibrium for the good of the western civilization;

Whereas the people of Italy are bound by many ties of affection and admiration to the people of the United States;

Whereas the United States of America, more than any other country, won the war: Be it

Resolved, That we, Americans of Italian origin, representing the Grand Lodge of Rhode Island, Order Sons of Italy in America, and many other fraternal welfare organizations, assembled here in Providence, R. I., on the 23d day of June 1946, do hereby affirm our conviction that Italy does not deserve a punitive peace, and should not be humiliated nor mutilated to satisfy the revengeful and imperialistic appetites of any country;

And we voice our faith and confidence in the wisdom and good will of President Truman; and in the initiative and ability of Secretary of State Byrnes, so that the Paris Conference now being held there will be agreed a treaty of peace with Italy worthy of the traditions of the United States; which will be signed by the representatives of America without the remorse of having compromised with principles of justice in the face of unjust and arrogant pretensions; neither of having failed the vital interest of western civilization, in which is rooted our

American way of life; nor of having frustrated the longing of free peoples everywhere for an enduring peace.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2304. A bill to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1627);

H. R. 1498. A bill to correct the naval record of former members of the crews of the revenue cutters *Algonquin* and *Onondaga*; without amendment (Rept. No. 1620); and

H. R. 5911. A bill to establish an Office of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy; to plan, foster, and encourage scientific research in recognition of its paramount importance as related to the maintenance of future naval power, and the preservation of national security; to provide within the Department of the Navy a single office, which, by contract and otherwise, shall be able to obtain, coordinate, and make available to all bureaus and activities of the Department of the Navy world-wide scientific information and the necessary services for conducting specialized and imaginative research; to establish a Naval Research Advisory Committee consisting of persons preeminent in the fields of science and research, to consult with and advise the Chief of such Office in matters pertaining to research; with amendments (Rept. No. 1628).

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1372. A bill to officially name the flood-control project authorized by Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 22, 1944, on Lytle and Cajon Creeks, near San Bernardino, Calif., the Sheppard Floodway; without amendment (Rept. No. 1621);

S. 2036. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Rhode Island to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Sakonnet River between the towns of Tiverton and Portsmouth, in Newport County, R. I.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1622);

H. R. 6222. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1623); and

H. R. 6597. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1624).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 669. A bill to name a dam on the Little Missouri River in Pike County, Ark., and the reservoir created by the same; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1629).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 5186. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1625); and

H. R. 5820. A bill relating to mail service on Lake Winnepesaukee, N. H.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1626).

By Mr. DONNELL, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 271. A bill for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1630).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 920. A bill to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States; without amendment (Rept No. 1631); and

H. R. 4180. A bill to amend the law relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 1632).

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 6682. A bill to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and to repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1633).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, ETC., 1947

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 6739) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1619) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6739) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 44, after line 2, insert the following:

"Civilian war benefits: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and travel, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the civilian war benefits program heretofore financed from the emergency fund for the President, to provide medical and hospital care (including prosthetic appliances and medical examinations) by contract without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments, to (a) civilians within the United States who have been injured as a result of enemy attack or of action to meet such attack or the danger thereof, or who have been injured while in the performance of their official duties as civilian defense workers, (b) civilians disabled as a result of illness, injury, or disease which occurred during detention by the enemy, and (c) the dependents within the United States of individuals injured or killed under circumstances described in clause (a) or (b) or reported as missing as a result of enemy action, $158,000."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6739, the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and so forth, appropriation bill, 1947, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of the amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6739) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 44, after line 2, insert the following:

"Civilian war assistance: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the Civilian War Assistance program heretofore financed from the Emergency Fund for the President, to provide (a) temporary aid (including medical care by contract, transportation, and other goods and services without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments) to citizens of the United States or their children under 18 years of age who have been interned or stranded, and returned to the United States, or who have been evacuated from any area under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States, and (b) for the return of civilians evacuated from the Philippine Islands or Hawaii to the United States under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States during the period from December 7, 1941, to September 15, 1945, $5,495,000, which amount may be expended by advances or grants of funds or otherwise, to such Federal or other agencies as the Administrator may designate."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6739, the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and so forth, appropriation bill, 1947, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of the amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2385. A bill exempting bonuses paid by States, Territories, possessions, and political subdivisions thereof, from the Federal income tax for those who served in the armed forces; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2386. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey; and

S. 2387. A bill for the relief of Devir M. Wood; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2388. A bill for the relief of Ryohei Kubota; and

S. 2389. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 2390. A bill granting an increase in pension to Mrs. Mary W. D. Perkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2391. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to advance Lt. Alfred R. Eubanks, United States Navy, retired, to the grade of lieutenant commander on the retired list of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2392. A bill for the relief of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. MEAD, and Mr. DOWNEY):

S. 2393. A bill to provide benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a

Marine Corps Memorial; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of the Distinguished Flying Cross to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—AMENDMENT

Mr. GREEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6407) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FOURTH DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURDOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed as follows:

Bureau of Reclamation, Provost River project, Utah: For an additional amount for construction, $1,756,960, from the reclamation fund, special fund, to remain available until expended.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their title and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3420. An act to provide for refunds to railroad employees in certain cases, so as to place the various States on an equal basis, under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, with respect to contributions of employees; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 6477. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and section 3 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 296), which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

Resolved, That the resolution, Senate Resolution 155, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 26, 1943 (relating to an investigation with respect to the supply and distribution of hydroelectric power), as amended and supplemented by Senate Resolution 304, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 5, 1944; Senate Resolution 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to September 5, 1944; and Senate Resolution 31, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to January 29, 1945, is hereby amended by inserting before the colon at the end of clause 4 of the first paragraph thereof a comma and the following: "and all matters relating to the utilization and disposition of the water resources of the Central Valley project in California, including the terms and conditions of contracts offered by the Department of the Interior for the disposition of such resources."

ADDRESS BY THE UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR BEFORE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF NEW YORK

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War, at the Seventh Biennial State Convention of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York, at New York City, on June 21, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I had intended to discuss the pending measure at some length, but in the interest of expedition I have decided to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some editorial comments from selected newspapers on the subject of the OPA. I have before me an editorial entitled "Joy Ride to Inflation," from the Christian Science Monitor of June 15, 1946; an editorial entitled "Hoping for the Best Is All That Is Left," from the Louisville Courier-Journal; an editorial entitled "Dying Price Control," from the Detroit News of June 15, 1946; an editorial entitled "Congress Decides To Gamble on Inflation," from the Baltimore Sun of June 14, 1946; an editorial entitled "Wrecking OPA," from the Washington Post of June 15, 1946; an article entitled "OPA and the New Spiral," written by Ernest K. Lindley and published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune of June 15, 1946; an editorial entitled "The Seeds of Inflation Will Grow Votes of Wrath," from the Philadelphia Record; an editorial entitled "Both the OPA and Prices Still Need Controls," from the Philadelphia Inquirer; an editorial entitled "Lifting the Price Lid," from the Washington Star of June 15, 1946; and an editorial from the New York Times entitled "The Future of OPA," beginning with this statement:

The sweeping amendments to price control extension that the Senate finally adopted are full of inconsistencies.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials and article be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of June 15, 1946]

JOY RIDE TO INFLATION

In the badly battered price control extension bill, Congress has readied the vehicle for what Stabilization Director Chester Bowles has called a joy ride to inflation. It is all primed to climb dizzying heights, and there is little likelihood of effective brakes being applied in the Senate-House conference committee.

First ascent will be on meat, milk, poultry, eggs, butter, other dairy products, and gasoline on which ceiling prices are slated to be removed June 30. Moreover, removal of these controls, by indirectly encouraging feeding of more grain to livestock, is likely to seriously decrease the grain available for flour, bread, and cereals in the United States and abroad.

Higher priced clothing appears inevitable. For instance, unrestricted cotton would add $60,000,000 to consumer apparel costs for every penny rise in cotton prices.

Even more inflationary are the amendments eliminating OPA's cost absorption program, and guaranteeing producers and handlers of every commodity their cost plus prewar mark-ups. With many items in limited production due to strikes and scarce basic materials, the consumer will have to stand the temporarily high production costs which might otherwise have been leveled off within many industries as volume increased. Moreover, administering such a provision would be practically impossible, since no product-by-product cost and profit figures are said to be available for 85 percent of American business firms.

If Congress wants to scrap price controls—and risk inflation, a cut in everybody's dollar and a new wave of strikes—it should kill OPA, not cripple it and then put it in chains.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of June 15, 1946]

HOPING FOR THE BEST IS ALL THAT IS LEFT

We suppose the only thing to be said about price control, after the Senate's action on the OPA bill, is that one may yet hope for the best. But the best that can happen now is bound to approach the worst that many optimists had thought, not so long ago, could possibly happen. Both Houses of Congress having passed bills that present merely a choice between evils, the brightest prospect is that something may be left of authority after the conference committees carve out a compromise.

This, or that the President may veto the final bill if it turns out to be simply too bad. In which case there is, of course, the danger that nothing will be substituted and that all controls, including even rents, will be ended on June 30.

Kentucky consumers, at any rate, may take what comfort they can find in the fact that their two most stalwart fighters for their dollar's security are still fighting. The bill, says Senator BARKLEY, "falls far short of what I had hoped for." Representative SPENCE says it will lead to "a spiral of inflation that will be disastrous." Both are on the conference committees. Senator BARKLEY voted for the bill on its final passage, although he disapproved of it, because he hoped to get another crack at it in the process of adjusting differences between the two versions. Mr. SPENCE, as chairman of the House Banking Committee, handled the bill in the lower chamber and fought to the last against weakening OPA.

However, what lies ahead is dogged, sweating argument in the cloister of the committee room. The time for oratory is past. This is too bad, for we should like to have heard somebody tell the truth, quite out loud, about the Senate bill and its guarantee of profits—"costs plus prewar mark-ups." The Senators may insist that this comes under the head of saving free enterprise from bureaucratic tyranny. What a travesty of freedom, when a law is written to protect profit and normalcy, come what may of destruction thereby.

[From the Detroit News of June 15, 1946]

DYING PRICE CONTROL

We have believed and still believe that a serious state of price inflation will afflict this

country if adequate Federal control of prices ceases. It is so argued by economic experience and the human side of business.

Group A gets higher prices for the goods it sells, group B demands and gets the like. So on and on, as to things we buy and as to wages.

The Senate price bill, passed Thursday, we believe, if enacted into law, would blow the lid off the prices of food and many other things just about completely. Although differing in numerous respects, the House bill is as bad.

As to what's coming, if either bill or a bad composite is enacted, also note the inflation existing because of many price increases already in effect.

But the time for sounding warnings, and dealing in dire predictions, has passed. Faint hope remains perhaps that, since the bills differ and the House-Senate conferees may, where differences exist, adopt new texts, a better measure may be the result. It's no more than a glimmer of hope, however, in view of the big majorities in both Houses for riddling OPA's powers over prices.

We are into the time of wait-and-see now. Each citizen while waiting will do well to remember the voting records of his Representative and Senators as these bills made their tortuous ways through Congress.

If, during this summer and fall, prices rocket up and the worth of everybody's dollar shrinks more and more, Members of Congress who are responsible for it may on a good ground be blamed by angry voters in November. That many Congressmen are highly nervous on this account about their political outlook is, in the light of these facts, easily understood.

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 14, 1946]

CONGRESS DECIDES TO GAMBLE ON INFLATION

The Senate yesterday passed its bill extending the life of the OPA for another year from June 30. The final shape of the OPA Extension Act will not be determined until the Senate bill and the House bill have been reconciled and resubmitted to both Houses. But the visibility for an extension of the OPA with its powers substantially intact is now zero. The House bill and the Senate bill differ a good deal in detail. But they have this in common: both of them greatly restrict the power of the OPA to control prices. It is hard to conceive of any combination of the features of the two bills which will not leave the OPA greatly weakened.

What this means is that Congress has decided to engage in a gigantic gamble, affecting all of us—a gamble in which we can't possibly win and are almost certain to lose. Advocates of price control, while conceding that price control by itself is not enough, argue that an OPA with adequate powers is necessary to hold back the forces of inflation until the time when production begins to approach demand. Congress, on the other hand, is gambling that the relaxation of price controls will prove so powerful a stimulus to production that supply will begin to equal demand much more rapidly than it would otherwise.

This is an appealing argument, considering how thoroughly fed up the country is with governmental controls. The same argument was produced following the First World War, and acted upon by Congress then—and proved utterly fallacious. The system of controls then prevailing was repealed and the boom-bust cycle of the early twenties was the result.

Now, Congress is gambling again. If it is right, the spurt of inflation will be relatively short-lived. If it is wrong, everyone suffers, particularly those with fixed incomes. Prices will skyrocket, commodity supplies will be subjected to speculative hoarding, and a new cycle of major industrial disputes will confront the country.

[From the Washington Post, June 15, 1946]

WRECKING OPA

Only by the most obtuse reasoning can what is left of the OPA be considered price control, and in no sense should Congressmen be permitted to palm it off as such. Price control after June 30 will be like the outer shell of a building left standing after the innards have been gutted by fire If the product of the combined Senate and House action actually becomes law, the door is open for another boom-and-bust cycle The best, and indeed only, prospect of averting this disaster lies in a Presidential veto.

What makes the Senate's 53-11 vote obviously a concession to special interest is the complete disregard of the wish of the majority as expressed in letters and in both national and regional public opinion polls. In October 1945, the Gallup poll showed that 72 percent of the people disapproved of removal of all price ceilings. The National Opinion Research Center in two separate national samplings in February and April 1946, revealed that 85 and 82 percent, respectively, thought price control necessary for the next year. The Des Moines Register Poll in March disclosed that 81 percent of Iowa residents felt that OPA controls should be continued for another year. In the same month the Philadelphia Bulletin poll showed 63 percent of Philadelphia residents as believing that price controls should be more rigid. And in the District of Columbia, the Post poll of last December indicated that 83 percent of the people favored continuing price control. These, it would seem, should have been enough evidence of national feeling to convince any politician.

The consequences of what Congress has done, if not revoked, will hang over Members' heads for years to come as a monument to political stupidity. It is ridiculous to say that controls on rents and other vital segments of the economy can be continued rigidly if essential cost-of-living items are allowed to rise sharply in price. Moreover, as costs go up, wages must also rise, or production—the very production relied on to prevent inflation—will again be choked by strikes. This is not mere calamity howling, for the handwriting already has been put on the wall by the labor unions. These considerations will no doubt be submitted to Congress by the President.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of June 15, 1946]

OPA AND THE NEW SPIRAL

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

It now looks as if there might be a period of relative peace on the industrial front, in which production can forge ahead. The delays caused by the major stoppages of the last 6 months have been very costly to the public, as well as to industry and labor. They have also impaired the influence of the United States in the world.

Several months of soaring production would go a long way toward repairing the damage done on the international front and checking the losses on the home front—provided, however, that soaring production is not accompanied by soaring prices.

If prices also soar, another round of major demands for wage increases is certain to begin. If the increases are granted, the result will be still higher prices. If they are granted only after strikes, the additional penalty will be further delays in production, which in themselves further prolong and increase inflationary pressures.

This is the problem which is now causing top officials in the administration the sharpest anxiety. It would be hard to overstate their anxiety, for Congress is ripping the muscle, bone, and heart out of OPA. If OPA collapses, whatever the ultimate consequences, the short-term effects almost certainly will be a further sharp rise in living costs, which will in turn touch off another series of demands for major wage increases, backed, when necessary, by strikes. How far this wage-price spiral might go no one can forecast.

The situation is further complicated, of course, by the fact that the large wage increases recently granted may not have been fully reflected yet in the cost of living. They will show up in still higher costs for some manufactured articles, higher freight rates, and higher taxes. State and local public employees, along with white-collar workers in many lines of private employment, will gradually win salary increases. A large part of the cost of settling the threatened maritime strike will be paid for out of increased Government subsidies for the American merchant marine.

Food costs will go higher still unless OPA is extended with approximately its present powers in this field, including enough subsidy money.

In one way, the argument against continuing food subsidies is sound. But one practical effect of dropping them, together with the dropping or serious weakening of other controls on the cost of living, will be to hasten and aggravate the demand for still more wage increases.

Labor is bound to lose part of the benefits of the wage increases already granted. It has lost a little already and it will lose more, even if OPA by a miracle should be extended in effective form, for the increases granted have been, on the whole, too large to be absorbed within the price structure of 6 months ago. The millions of professional, white-collar, and other workers, and pensioners, who have not received increases in dollar incomes as great as those won by organized workers, will suffer relatively even more.

If the rise in living costs can be held to approximately the minimum forced by the wage increases already granted, the threat of an ascending spiral probably can be removed. But at some point the demand for more wage increases is likely to become very determined again. If OPA is gutted, that point may be reached soon. No labor legislation that Congress will or can pass would prevent that determined demand from being made. The OPA weak extension bills which the House and Senate have dished up are indirect incitements to labor to start another round of strikes.

[From the Philadelphia Record of June 15, 1946]

THE SEEDS OF INFLATION WILL GROW VOTES OF WRATH

In one respect the United States Senate was helpful when it removed OPA's vital organs, sewed it up, and pretended the patient hadn't died on the operating table.

It got the dirty work over quickly.

That's exactly what the Record urged.

The bill the Senate passed is a phony, hypocritical measure which actually kills OPA while pretending to extend its life for a year.

Speed in getting this OPA-wrecker through Congress is paradoxically the only hope of preserving any semblance of price control beyond June 30, when present controls expire.

The faster it is cleared by a Senate-House conference committee, approved and sent to the President, the better.

As we said before, the President must jam that bill back into Congress with a stinging veto. He must make it clear to the public that the majority of Congress is trying literally to "get away with murder."

Let the President put the spotlight on Congress so that it will have to kill off price control honestly before the public gaze and suffer the public's wrath or—

Congressmen, to save their political skins, will feel compelled to continue, unimpaired, the present controls.

It's difficult to decide which is worse, the Senate bill or the House bill passed in April. The Senate measure was put together piece by piece, amendment by amendment, by "statesmen" who over and over made stirring profession of their good intentions.

The Record did not print the final roll call on the Senate OPA killer. It had no more meaning than the price of beets compared with the price of cabbage.

It did not show where Congressmen really stood on this issue.

Some pro-OPA Senators voted for it as the best measure they could get, hoped to improve it in conference. Others of the administration forces couldn't stomach it at all, rejected it.

At the same time the enemies of price control voted for or against it, depending on whether they thought it reduced price control sufficiently to a state of inertness.

All motives were possible—good, bad, or indifferent. Any Senator could profess any of them and change his story to make political capital, no matter how his constituents were disposed.

By all means get that No-OPA bill through fast and back again from the White House for a show-down test that will prove where each Member of Congress really stands.

If prices go kiting out of sight, and dollars buy less and less, the American public should know where to place the blame—right on Congress.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 15, 1946]

BOTH THE OPA AND PRICES STILL NEED CONTROLS

Now that both Houses of Congress have passed bills embodying radical changes in OPA controls, it would be well to consider a few economic facts which cannot be altered by any legislation.

It goes without saying that nobody wants to see prices rise any more. In most lines they are too high now even for widely inflated wages, while they constitute a heavy hardship on those with fixed incomes.

As for producers, distributors and retailers—outside the black market—they realize that prices which go up like a rocket are bound to come down like the stick.

OPA was established as a necessary wartime agency to hold prices in check. The initial mistake was the failure to apply equally rigid controls to wages, the chief element in costs and therefore in prices.

President Roosevelt constantly told labor that its abnormally high wartime wages would be maintained after the emergency was over. When the war did end, President Truman lost no time in throwing off wage controls and asserting employers generally could pay even higher scales without higher prices.

His open invitation to fresh wage demands was, of course, promptly accepted. Secretary Wallace gave inflation another powerful push by issuing a report, which he later admitted was based on faulty guesswork statistics, that wages could be boosted 24 percent while prices remained static.

OPA accepted these false statements as gospel truth and proceeded to damage its good record by refusing to make price concessions to fit the administration's new wage-raising policy. The undeniable effect was to keep moderate-priced goods in large quantities from the market.

In considering the question of extending the life of OPA after June 30, Congress was beset by two major pressure groups—both wrong.

One urged Congress to abolish all price controls and let competitive enterprise have full play in the hope that after only a brief period of higher prices adequate production would cause them to settle down.

The other major pressure group demanded that OPA be kept without any correction of its faults since the slightest attempt to regulate its activities would ruin the country.

Congress has endeavored to legislate between these extremes, imposing certain needed restraints on this agency's enormous powers. In the hope of stimulating production, it has decreed that prices must allow fair profits.

Today OPA is not curbing inflation, as every housewife knows. Many of its price ceilings have stimulated production of only the most expensive goods. Some of the new provisions are open to question. But if this new bill is finally enacted, it will make still more necessary a radical change in the administration's policy of encouraging wage increases all along the line.

[From the Washington Star of June 15, 1946]

LIFTING THE PRICE LID

The overwhelming vote by the Senate in favor of price decontrol on most market-basket items and to lift the price lid on many other commodities obviously paves the way for a decisive test of conflicting theories as to what will happen if OPA restrictions are relaxed in the critical reconversion period. The Senate's action on the heels of a similar though not so far-reaching revolt against OPA by the House makes inevitable a conference bill completely unacceptable to OPA, if the vehement warnings of OPA supporters are a reliable omen.

The less-drastic House bill evoked dire predictions of economic catastrophe from Economic Stabilizer Bowles and OPA Administrator Porter, and Senator BARKLEY, just before the Senate voted on its broader decontrol measure, declared that President Truman has said he would veto the legislation if it came to him in the form passed by the House. If such a veto were sustained, the only thing that could save OPA after June 30 would be adoption by Congress of a last-minute resolution to extend the present price-control law—a development that does not appear likely in view of the present mood at the Capitol.

It is obvious that the developing rebellion in Congress against continuance of price control in its present form was in no way quelled by the vigorous attacks which OPA supporters have made on those who disagreed with their own theories on the complex price-control question. Charges of selfishness and greed have been hurled indiscriminately against many in Congress and out who sincerely believe that controls in many instances have been ineptly applied or have been unnecessary and that they have defeated their objective by creating additional scarcities, encouraging black markets, and increasing the dangers of inflation.

It is just as unfair and absured to impugn the motives of the majority in the Senate and House who voted to curb control of prices as it is to charge the OPA with bureaucratic self-preservation instincts in seeking extension of stringent controls. The truth of the matter is that an honest difference of opinion exists as to whether there is need for strict application of price ceilings in certain fields and as to how long such restrictions are essential to prevent an inflationary blow-up.

The majority in Congress have registered their view that while a lifting of the lid may result in a temporary rise in prices, the effect will be to stimulate production to such an extent that the law of supply and demand soon will operate to bring prices down again to fair and reasonable levels. Congress now is evidencing its determination to give this theory a test in actual practice. If it carries out its determination, it will be taking a calculated risk, the results of which only time will reveal.

[From the New York Times of June 15, 1946]

THE FUTURE OF OPA

The sweeping amendments to price-control extension that the Senate finally adopted are full of inconsistencies. They would take price controls off such basic necessities of living as meat, poultry, eggs, butter and milk, and also off gasoline and cigarettes, but leave them on high-priced automobiles and on hundreds of other luxury and semiluxury products. This is the opposite in theory of what price control is supposed to do.

OPA once ventured the quick estimate that it was fixing 8,000,000 different prices. When it is considered that before the war, Government price-fixing of coal alone, which constitutes less than 2 percent of the national annual product, involved the fixing of 350,000 different prices, this 8,000,000 estimate does not seem excessive. It is obviously impossible for any single human mind or small group of minds arbitrarily to fix 8,000,000 different prices without unsettling and distorting the whole structure of production. For each price must be fixed in relation to all other prices. We cannot fix a legal ceiling on corn without a very exact relation to the legal ceiling on hogs. We cannot fix a legal ceiling on butter without similar exact relations to the legal ceilings on fluid milk, cheese and ice cream. We cannot fix a ceiling on automobiles without relation to the ceiling on steel. We cannot fix ceilings on prices in general while allowing wages to remain free or even boosting them by Government decision. The administration and OPA have made errors at all these points. They have unbalanced the proportions in which thousands of different products are produced and have forced some products out of production altogether.

If they had realized the immensity of the problem with which they were confronted they would have begged Congress to reduce its dimensions; to narrow the realm of their discretion and responsibility. But they did precisely the opposite. They insisted on retaining in peacetime all the controls they had maintained in war. They criticized every amendment passed by the House and all the amendments recommended by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and refused to suggest any amendments that might better accomplish the same basic purposes. They implied in advance that every amendment would be a crippling amendment.

In these circumstances Congress was led to feel that OPA was bent on holding on to practically all price controls indefinitely. OPA had itself laid down only the vaguest criteria of when it would drop price control on specific articles. One of these was that it would stop controlling prices for particular commodities when supply had caught up with demand. This overlooked the fundamental economic fact that supply comes into balance with demand only at a price, and that by keeping the price too low it is possible indefinitely to prevent supply from catching up with demand. But even where OPA's own criterion had been fulfilled, as in the case of cigarettes and gasoline, OPA failed to take off ceilings. That is apparently why the Senate felt itself obliged to demand the removal of price controls on these specific articles. In other cases, as in meat, the Senate recognized that the product had already, in fact, got out of the control of OPA, and that the prices now actually being paid for the bulk of meat supplies are black-market prices.

We may hope that a wiser and better considered amendment than either those of the House or of the Senate will emerge from conference. Meanwhile, it is well to keep in mind that price control is at best only a secondary and transitional weapon against inflation. It deals with the symptoms and

consequences of inflation, not with its causes. The real battle against inflation must be fought on another front. It must be fought against budget deficits and all the other policies that tend to swell the money and credit supply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The Chair will ask the clerk to read at this time the unanimous consent order under which the Senate is acting, so that all Senators may be aware of it.

The CHIEF CLERK. The order is as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, that during the further consideration of the conference report on H. R. 6042, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have only 1 hour. I regret very much that I cannot yield.

Mr. President, before a vote is taken on the conference report I feel impelled to submit some observations for the record. I am under no illusion that anything I may say will have any effect upon the vote on this report. The report cannot be amended. Senators will either have to vote for the report or vote against it. I desire to state for the record my interpretation of what the report means.

It means, first, that the life of OPA is to be extended for 1 year; and that is all-important. A single line in the bill extending the life of OPA gives that organization all the power it needs. Any additional verbiage or provisions are so much surplusage because, judging from the past history of this organization, it pays little or no attention to any provision which the Congress enacts into law.

Neither this bill nor any other bill or law even that I know of embraces any provision with respect to wages. I am not complaining about that. I am simply making the statement that the OPA has no control over wages, and exercises no control over wages except to permit wages to go higher and higher and higher. As wages go up, as a necessary corollary the prices of the things which wages produce must likewise go up. So no one can assert that this bill has any effect over wages. Wages are exactly what labor demands that wages should be.

The bill reduces the former drastic controls over nonagricultural products. It provides for a relaxation of such controls. To that extent industry is benefited. Industry has been taken care of. Thus we have this picture before the Senate today: Wages and wage earners are free and uncontrolled. Industry has been helped. But what about the other great group of our population? I refer to the farmers of our country.

Mr. President, I came from the farm. I have been associated with farming all my life. I think I know the problems of the farmer. Since I became a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I have been continually embarrassed because the administration of whatever party is in power pays little or no attention to the wishes of the farm population of America.

Many years ago my former colleague from Oklahoma, the distinguished Senator Thomas P. Gore, was chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That was back yonder during World War I. He tried to help the farmer. He proposed relief for the farmer, and he stood for the interests of the farmer while he was a member and chairman of that committee. Because he did so he fell into bad repute with the administration, and that bad repute lingered with him all the days of his service in the Senate of the United States.

At a later time, under another administration, our late distinguished colleague Senator McNary, of Oregon, was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He espoused what was known as the McNary-Haugen bill. His administration did not favor that legislation. He managed the legislation through the Senate, the House concurred, and the President vetoed the bill. Senator McNary did not stand well with the party in power, of which he was a part. During more recent years our late distinguished colleague Senator Smith of South Carolina was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He stood for the farmer. Because what he stood for was not agreeable to the administration, Senator Smith fell into bad repute with his administration, and such bad repute lingered with him during the remaining days of his life.

Now I have fallen heir to this committeeship. I find that as a rule the things the farmers want are not accepted by the administration. The farmers want a new parity formula. The administration says "No." The farmers have made a fight for years to have their labor costs included in the parity formula. The administration says "No."

Mr. President, the original OPA bill originated in the Committee on Banking and Currency, and that committee has had control of this legislation on behalf of the Senate from its inception up to the present time. That committee is considered to be not too friendly to the farmers. The farmers knew they would receive little, if any, consideration by going before that committee. So the various groups of the farm population of the United States made appeals to my committee to hear them. The committee secured a small appropriation to cover hearings and printing, and during the past year the committee invited the farm groups of the country to come to Washington to make their recommendations and voice their several protests. I have before me one volume of the hearings taken before my committee.

As a result of those hearings, the committee has made four interim committee reports, which I now have on my desk. One report is with respect to livestock and meat. The report was submitted on the 15th day of May 1945, now more than 1 year ago. Mr. President, without reading the findings and recommendations contained in the report, I ask unanimous consent that the recommendations to be found on pages 5 and 6 of the report be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVESTOCK AND MEAT, MAY 15, 1945

FINDINGS

Causes which have contributed to the shortage of meat for civilian consumption include:

1. The substantial and increasing quantities purchased by the armed forces and lend-lease.

2. A decrease in pork production of over-one-third in 1945 compared with 1944 resulting from a decline in the 1944 hog production of approximately 30 percent.

3. The marketing of improperly finished cattle and calves and the failure to market the number of cattle warranted by the record numbers of cattle on farms and ranges.

4. The "squeeze" of processors of livestock between livestock prices and product ceilings resulting in losses and causing many reputable processors to curtail their operation.

5. The diversion of livestock from normal channels of slaughter and distribution into the black market, and the failure of the Office of Price Administration to take effective enforcement measures.

6. The diversion of livestock and meat into local distribution channels and away from interstate distribution.

7. An increased purchasing power resulting in a record civilian demand for meat.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommend for the purpose of improving the supply and distribution of meat the following:

1. A forthwith increase in the return to the feeders of AA and A grades of cattle through a fair and sufficient subsidy to feeders to encourage them to feed out range cattle to the maximum degree, thereby encouraging the feeding of more cattle and increasing not only the quality but the weight of AA and A grades of cattle.

2. An immediate incentive program to encourage, during the spring and early summer, the marketing of more grass and unproductive dairy cattle.

3. Raising the support price of hogs and extending support prices to cover all weights of hogs.

4. That assurance be given producers that support prices and ceilings for livestock will not be lowered unless adequate notice of such change be given.

5. That the Price Control Act be amended to require and direct the Office of Price Administration to give processors of livestock a reasonable margin of profit for processing each species of livestock.

6. The withdrawal of all slaughtering licenses and permits and a sharp reduction in the number reissued together with restrictions on slaughter by use of quotas so that meat will be directed into the normal interstate channels of distribution. The refusal to issue new slaughtering licenses and permits to known violators of governmental regulations and the concentration of enforcement efforts on fundamental major problems instead of marginal technicalities.

7. The extension of Federal inspection and set-aside orders to small slaughterers above local farm and retail level.

8. The limiting of lend-lease purchases of meat products consistent with domestic civilian supply.

9. That the Price Control Act be further amended to direct the Administrator to proceed without delay to remove all price

controls and regulations from any and all commodities just as fast as any such commodity becomes sufficiently plentiful so as to permit the law of supply and demand to operate to keep the price of any such commodity within the range of the cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

10. The committee recommend that a supreme Administrator for Food be created to have supervision and jurisdiction over both the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the hearings continued, and we heard the livestock growers and ranchers of the country, the feeders, the processors and the distributors, of meat throughout the country. On May 2, 1946, the committee submitted a supplemental report upon livestock and meat, and in it the committee recommended that—

This committee recommends that all price controls and subsidies on livestock and edible products derived therefrom be removed at once.

Without reading the findings in full, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the findings referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVESTOCK AND MEAT, MAY 2, 1946

FINDINGS

From all the evidence, the committee finds:

1. Government controls and price regulations affecting livestock and meat have completely broken down; price ceilings on livestock and meat are a fiction; and, as a result of the black market and subsidies, meat is costing the American public at least $2,000,000,000 a year in excess of ceiling prices.

2. Most meat is being sold at black-market prices. Reliable surveys show that five out of six stores were selling meat at overceiling prices and the average price of all meat sold at retail was 20 percent above legal ceilings in February 1946. Facts from the surveys also show that the black market has become more serious since that time.

3. There is no shortage of livestock on farms and ranches; in fact, there is an excessive inventory of cattle; but there are severe shortages of meat in some places and in certain stores because of the black-market dislocation of distribution and because price controls and subsidies have impeded production by creating fear and uncertainty in the minds of producers and feeders of livestock.

4. The "price squeeze" placed on slaughterers by the OPA from 1942 to date has forced many legitimate slaughterers to close or curtail their operations, thereby fostering the black market.

5. Remaining legitimate slaughterers, both small and large, are willing and anxious to buy livestock at legal maximum prices but are unable to do so because black-market operators pay higher prices with the result that livestock is being diverted from the normal channels of slaughter and distribution into the black market.

6. The black market in meat is imperiling the national health through insanitary slaughtering and curtailed production of essential medicinal byproducts.

7. Black-market slaughtering is causing a complete economic loss of many millions of pounds of critically short byproducts such as fats, protein, feeds, and hides.

8. Widespread evasion of price controls on livestock and meat by those who are victims of the black market and must overcharge or go out of business, plus the failure of willful racketeering violators to be apprehended, has created a disrespect for all laws, and is rapidly undermining the moral fiber of the country.

9. Thousands of employees with long years of service and valued experience necessarily have been laid off by legitimate slaughterers because such slaughterers are unable to maintain their volume against black-market competition. Additional thousands of other employees in these packing plants have had their hours of work reduced for the same reason.

10. Four years of experience with Government controls, culminating in the present scandalous situation, shows conclusively the impossibility of controlling livestock and meat prices and meat distribution through Government laws, regulations, and directives; and any new or reinstated controls on the livestock and meat industry can only create greater confusion and further impede maximum production and legitimate slaughtering and distribution.

11. Removal of price controls and subsidies from livestock and meat will stimulate the marketing of livestock and the production of meat, drive the black-market operators out of business, save untold waste, safeguard the public health, and make a large supply of meat available to all at a competitive price which will be lower than consumers are now paying as a result of the black market and subsidies.

RECOMMENDATION

This committee recommends that all price controls and subsidies on livestock and edible products derived therefrom be removed at once.

ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee.
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD.
B. K. WHEELER.

My Small Business Subcommittee on Complaints studied the meat-control question and held hearings last winter. The Barkley-Bates amendment was considered. We recommended consideration be given to setting a program for gradual removal of price controls and subsidies by December 1946, at least, but conditions have rapidly changed and I feel sure immediate removal of controls should be given.

TOM STEWART.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, later, on May 25, after the committee heard the dairymen of the country, the committee submitted another interim report in which it made the following finding:

This committee recommends that all subsidies and price controls on milk and dairy products be removed at once.

I ask unanimous consent that the findings and recommendations contained in that interim report may be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the findings and recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINDINGS

1. Dairy production is declining nationally and the declines are greatest in the areas of greatest shortage.

2. Since dairy production is a long-time planning operation and cannot be expounded rapidly, the current trend must be reversed immediately if a prolonged disaster is to be avoided.

3. The responsibility for this condition resides in the price and subsidy policies of the stabilization agencies.

4. The refusal of such agencies to deal adequately with local problems is reflected in declines in deficit areas, the threat of permanent injury to production in such areas, and the uneconomic burdening of transportation facilities to import milk not meeting peacetime local health standards.

5. The maladministration of dairy pricing has had a bad effect in all segments of the industry, but due to dairy industry price structures the effect has been notably concentrated on butter. In substance, OPA has determined that the American consumer shall not have butter.

6. The subsidy program has not served to replace necessary price adjustments to stimulate production.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This committee recommends that all subsidies and price controls on milk and dairy products be removed at once.

ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman.
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD.
TOM STEWART.
B. K. WHEELER.

I concur in the above findings of the committee. I also concur in the recommendations, provided that the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the net income of dairymen will not be reduced thereby nor a substantial segment of our population be deprived of the use of milk and other dairy products.

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, industry has been recognized and helped by this proposed OPA extension bill. The wage earners and the laboring people are not retained under the controls provided by this bill. I am not complaining about that. But the farmers are retained under the controls of the proposed legislation. Mr. President, under this bill the farmers of America are the goats of our domestic economy. This bill, if it shall be enacted, will sentence 30,000,000 farmers to remain at least for another year the economic goats of our economic system. I do not consent that that shall happen, Mr. President.

After my committee had held these hearings and had submitted these reports, when this bill came before the Senate, I prepared and submitted an amendment which of necessity had to be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The amendment proposed to remove from controls a number of the leading farm commodities. Mr. President, it proposed to remove timber from under the controls. Jurisdiction over timber has remained in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Timber is grown upon the land, so the Senate, in deciding about the jurisdictions of committees, placed timber under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We had a hearing on timber. We found what the conditions were. The committee was of the opinion that timber should be removed from all controls under this legislation. So a provision to that effect was inserted in the amendment. Petroleum was likewise recommended to be decontrolled. Petroleum comes from under the land, mostly from farms. Very little petroleum is produced from under cities. When it comes from the land on the farms the farmers are interested in it, because they

receive royalties from it and they receive lease money for the use of their lands. The amendment proposed to take out from under controls milk, livestock, tobacco, poultry, fish and shellfish, grain, peanuts, fruits and vegetables, and the products processed in the main therefrom. Mr. President, my committee did not undertake to interfere with anything that did not appear to be a farm product.

What happened? The amendment was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. In that committee, Mr. President, we have some very able men. In the first place, they are specially selected—for various reasons, but, for one, because of their outstanding ability. I have been a member of legislatures for a long time. I have learned a good many things as a result of my service in various legislative bodies. Mr. President, there is one rule which is used in military strategy, in economic strategy, and in legislative strategy. That rule is to divide and destroy. The Banking and Currency Committee, being wise in the ways of legislation, proceeded, I would not say deliberately, but the effect of it was just the same, to divide these several groups and then to destroy them. The committee picked out livestock and placed in this bill a recommendation that livestock and meats be decontrolled. They took the next largest group, perhaps—the dairy industry, which covers the entire United States—and the committee placed in the bill a recommendation that milk and dairy products likewise be decontrolled. Third, in order still further to divide the farm groups the committee took the third largest group, perhaps, one which affects everyone—poultry—and the committee recommended that poultry likewise be decontrolled.

So the committee proposed to have livestock and the products of livestock, which means the little packers and the big packers and the ranchers and the feed-lot operators, come out from under this bill—relying upon the psychology that if they took out that large group, such group or groups would not be further interested in having any other group of agriculture decontrolled. When they proposed to decontrol livestock and when they proposed to decontrol poultry and when they proposed to decontrol dairy products, they found they had covered in that way more than one-half of the farm groups of these United States.

When the bill was reported providing for the decontrol of these various commodities, no doubt many farmers of America interested in those commodities thought, "Well, I am taken care of; why should I interest myself further in other groups of farmers who produce articles which I perhaps must buy and on the sale of which I cannot profit."

Mr. President, the bill came on the floor in that condition. There were a number of other products which we thought should be controlled, such as tobacco. The evidence before the committee was that there was a surplus of tobacco, and that it was not selling at ceiling prices. A motion was made to decontrol tobacco. By a voice vote the amendment was agreed to. There was no opposition so far as we could learn to decontrolling petroleum. Therefore my colleague the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] offered an amendment to decontrol oil and oil products. The amendment was agreed to.

As the bill passed the Senate it contained provision to decontrol livestock and livestock products, poultry and poultry products, and dairy and dairy products. Decontrol was also provided for tobacco and tobacco products. Some of the Senators being satisfied with such decontrols lost interest in the bill and some of them voted against my amendment. They had been protected and they thought they would be able to retain their assumed protection. My amendment secured only 21 votes here in the Senate. What happened thereafter, Mr. President? The rule of divide and conquer, the rule of divide and destroy was working.

Mr. President, I wish sincerely to pay a compliment to my old time friend and colleague the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I did not become a Member of Congress as soon as he did. I reached the lower House in 1923. I found the now senior Senator from Kentucky at that time one of the most influential Members of the House of Representatives. I knew that he would sooner or later become a Member of the Senate of the United States. I likewise wanted to become a Member of the Senate and was successful. On March 4, 1927, the senior Senator from Kentucky and myself walked across to the Senate from the House of Representatives. Each of us took the oath of a Senator here in this Chamber. I am glad that the senior Senator from Kentucky has been a Member of the Senate during all the time which has intervened since that date. I am glad he is a Member of the Senate now, and I hope that he will remain such for many years to come.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Kentucky is the best informed man in public life today. That is a broad statement, but I believe it. He is the most efficient and successful legislator this Government has developed in 157 years of its existence. That is also a strong statement, but it is justified by the record which the senior Senator from Kentucky has made. What the Senator favors he secures. He gets what he wants. He defeats what he opposes. I regret that I do not find myself in agreement with him more often. If I did I would not suffer defeat so frequently. I realize that when I oppose the senior Senator from Kentucky I am doomed to lose. If I win in the committee I lose on the floor. If I win in the committee and also on the floor, I lose in the conference. [Laughter.] So. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky approaches more nearly the status of being a general specialist than any other man I have ever known.

What I am saying is not idle talk because the Senator is opposing me on the pending proposal. It is now too late for me to do anything about it. I realize what will be the fate of the farmers of this country during the next 12 months to come. I am fearful that a year from now we will have the same fight again. The longer these controls remain on the people of the United States, the harder it will be to remove them. It may be that we are today sealing the fate of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I have explained what happened to my amendment. Some amendments were agreed to in the committee, later in the Senate, and went to conference. Then what happened? The conference report came before the Senate and we found that everyone had been taken care of but the farmer. Controls were eased on industry. Controls, instead of being released on farmers, were clamped down upon them like a crown of thorns. Mr. President, I cannot agree to such treatment of the farm population of this country. Oh, it may be said that the farmers are now in good condition. I cannot deny that. Wars always bring higher prices, but I make the positive assertion that during the war the farmers did not fare on an equality with the wage earners and industry. Any time the wage earners wanted an increase in salaries, in wages, or in liberalized rules, they asserted their desires, went fishing, and got what they wanted.

During the war the Congress found it necessary to pass legislation providing for the renegotiation of contracts in order to prevent industry from making unconscionable profits. What about the farmer? Only last November did farm prices increase approximately to parity.

My State, Oklahoma, is an oil-producing State, Texas is an oil-producing State, and Kentucky also produces oil. Mr. President, the oil industry has not been permitted to increase its prices above 61 percent of parity. In other words, oil and oil products today are selling at only 61 percent of what they were selling at back in 1926, the era of so-called Coolidge prosperity. Yet this Congress proposes to keep them on that level.

Mr. President, I do not wish to do anything which will cause me to lose the floor, because I may talk for only an hour. However, I should like my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky, to answer one or two questions so as to clarify the Record.

In the committee no objection was voiced to taking petroleum and petroleum products out from under control. No objection was voiced on the floor of the Senate to taking petroleum and petroleum products out from under controls. I ask the Senator from Kentucky what reason exists today for maintaining petroleum and petroleum products under OPA control?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I cannot tell the Senator the reason that petroleum and petroleum products are still under control. It was stated during the debate that one of the reasons why those products had not been decontrolled was the threat of a maritime strike, in which event the eastern seaboard of the United States and New England might be found short of oil, and therefore it was advisable to maintain controls over petroleum and petroleum products. However, that danger has now passed. I shall be frank with the Senator, as I tried to be yesterday with other Senators in regard to meats. I know of no

reason, so far as supply and demand are concerned, why petroleum should be any longer maintained under control with price ceilings.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. While the Senator is on his feet, I will ask him to explain why the decontrol of livestock and meat was not retained in the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the reasons have been explained. The House conferees would not agree to that provision of the bill. When the bill was originally before the House the Members of the House voted against the decontrol of livestock, beef cattle, and meat. Inasmuch as the Senate bill has provided for a decontrol board, the other House did not feel that it was logical to set up another board and at the same time take away from it jurisdiction with respect to important items of food such as poultry and poultry products, dairy products, livestock, and meat. Therefore, they would not agree to those provisions in the Senate bill.

In order to get an agreement it was necessary of course for somebody to yield. The conferees retained practically everything the Senate put into the bill except those specific decontrols. The House conferees would not accede to them and would not yield. So under the circumstances, the Senate conferees felt that they were justified in yielding; and evidently the judgment of the House conferees was sustained by the later action of the House, for when the conference report was before it and a motion was made to recommit the bill to the conferees with instructions to agree to these very items which were in the Senate bill, namely, poultry, dairy products, livestock and meat, that motion was defeated by a vote of 221 to 150, a majority of 71 votes. That is the reason, frankly, why the provision for the decontrol of these specific items was removed from the Senate bill. The same thing applies to tobacco and petroleum. The House conferees took the same position as to all the specific items mentioned, and the Senate conferees could not very well assume the position that one or two of these items should be kept in and decontrolled if the House would not agree to all of them. So the entire list was eliminated from the conference report.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his explanation, and I hope it will satisfy the 30,000,000 farmers in the United States, but I am afraid that it will not be entirely agreeable to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me—I do not want to take his time because he is limited to an hour—let me first thank the Senator for the very generous compliment he paid me a moment ago. I do not deserve such praise, but I know of no man in the Senate, or out of it, from whom I would rather hear it than from the Senator from Oklahoma, who, as he has said, has been associated with me and I with him for many years in the House and in the Senate. But I do not think it is quite accurate or fair to say that the bill does something for industry and nothing for the farmers, because in the conference committee, whereas the bill of the Senate mentioned only manufacturers and processors in the formula that would include costs since 1941, in conference we inserted the word "producers" so as to include all producers. A farmer is neither a manufacturer nor a processor, but he is a producer. So, in order that the formula might apply to all people on equal terms we inserted the word "producer," which of course includes farmers.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, at no time in the consideration of this bill, so far as I know, was there a proposition to decontrol a single specific item of industry; but it was proposed to decontrol a number of specific commodities produced by the farmers. So that the bill, insofar as industry is concerned, it is in general terms; it was developed in general terms; it was passed in general terms, and it comes back to the Senate in general terms. But, so far as the farmers are concerned, the Senate put in specific items that should be decontrolled and the conference committee took those items out.

Mr. President, the Congress is presumed to be the policy-making branch of the Government. The makers of the Constitution intended it to be. The makers of the Constitution put the legislative branch first in the Constitution. Of the 3,000 words or so in the Constitution 65 percent, approximately, are devoted to the powers of Congress. The Congress controls all other branches of the Government. The Congress can impeach any member of the executive branch; the Congress can impeach any member of the judicial branch; the Congress can make laws under which they are supposed to act. But, Mr. President, that is not the case. If we pass this law simply extending the life of the OPA that is all the OPA wants. The Congress has failed to establish any direct policy over anything in this bill. Its terms are all in generalities, so that when the Administrator gets this bill he will look it over and will see that the life of the organization has been extended, and he can then say that the Congress itself did not know what it wanted; that the conferees did not know what they wanted, hence all is left to the discretion of the Administrator.

Here is the way things go in the administrative branch. Mr. President, who has charge of the foreign relations of our Government? The answer—the State Department under the President. Who calls the signals on the team that represents the State Department? The Secretary of State, of course, calls the signals, and his staff, his personnel, and his employees play on his team according to the signals he calls, and if anyone does not play according to his signals, out he goes. Who calls the signals in the War Department? Of course the Secretary of War is the manager of the team, but I doubt if he presumes to act as the signal caller. At the present time the man who calls the signals there is the General of the Armies, General Eisenhower. I do not complain of that; I do not know that a better choice could be made. Who calls the signals in the Department of Justice? There is only one answer. The Attorney General calls the signals.

Now, Mr. President, following the analogy, who calls the signals on the price-control program? There is only one answer, and that answer is Generalissimo Bowles. So long as his organization has life he does not need any law; the law is in his way and he pays little or no attention to the law enacted by the Congress.

In 1942 Congress passed a law containing a provision that in fixing maximum prices of farm commodities the element of farm wages should be considered and included. He has never read that law, or, if he has, he has paid no attention to it.

The Congress passed the Bates-Barkley amendment, but, so far as I can learn, he paid no attention to that law. The distinguished author of that amendment said that it was not being carried out as he thought it ought to be carried out. So he conferred with the Generalissimo himself, and after his conference, with his keen sense of perception, his fine eyesight, and acute hearing, he made the statement that he thought he could discern a slight improvement. That is not very assuring, Mr. President, to the farmers of the United States.

Getting back to meat, I exhibit to the Senate a copy of the Evening Star, printed in Washington, D. C., dated June 26, and I read the headline as follows:

> Meat famine spreads in district area with distributors depleted. Retail grocers report scant stock and no relief in sight.

After 4 years of manipulation of the price-control system, at a time when there is more meat in the country than ever, at least more live meat on the hoof—eighty-one or eighty-two million head of livestock—we come to the point under the control of the OPA that we have no meat in the city of Washington. The shelves are bare, and there is no prospect of any meat. Yet today the Senate will vote to approve that record.

Mr. President, it has been stated on both sides of the aisle that the management of OPA is a national scandal. Yet today the Senate, if I do not mistake my guess, will vote to approve and to continue what Senators admit is a national scandal.

Mr. President, the OPA has made every citizen of this Republic a law violator. All producers are law violators. That might be a little too broad, because many do not know they are violating the law. The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] had on his desk last night a stack of orders and laws 2 feet high. Those laws are orders and regulations and amendments which the OPA has promulgated for the government of the people of the United States. While I have not read those amendments and those orders, I think I would not be far wrong in stating every citizen of the United States has unknowingly violated some of those innumerable orders, rules, and regulations.

So, Mr. President, under this national scandal the producers today stand as law violators in the United States, and the processors likewise are law violators, in the main. Perhaps they do not know

it, perhaps some have escaped, but the statement stands.

Mr. President, the distributors are law violators under the rules and regulations and amendments of OPA. Finally, the consumers of the country, great and small, old and young, if they are eating, are violating the provisions of some rule or regulation of OPA. Every time a citizen puts a piece of steak in his mouth, the chances are it is a black-market steak. The citizen has no idea where the steak came from. There is practically no meat going through the regulary examined and inspected slaughter houses, so the chances are about 9 out of 10 that the meat the people of the country are eating today is black-market meat, ungraded and uninspected.

What does anyone know to be the condition of that meat? Nothing. Yet the Senate today in all probability will vote in favor of continuing a system whereby the people of the United States are forced to continue for another year at least eating uninspected and ungraded meat, and from an unknown source. I cannot support that kind of a proposal.

Mr. President, as I view the question, those who vote for the conference report vote to pass the buck and ball to Bowles. Thereafter, as to what he does with it, they will have no say.

Mr. President, a vote for the conference report means a vote to approve of the national scandal about which we have heard so much on the floor of the Senate during the discussion of the bill. It is admitted that there is plenty of meat in our country. It is admitted that there are plenty of milk products, though they may be scarce in some sections. It is admitted there are plenty of poultry products. Yet, Mr. President, in this land of plenty there is a scarcity, and a vote in favor of the conference report in my opinion is a vote of approval of a near famine, practically, in a land of plenty.

Therefore, Mr. President, assuming to speak for the farm population of this country—and I do that by the authority of many thousands of letters and telegrams which I have in my office—I cannot vote for the conference committee report. So, when my name is called, I shall vote "no."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a statement of a former distinguished Member of this body, now Governor of my State, Hon. Mon C. Wallgren, regarding the question now pending before the Senate, together with Governor Wallgren's letter to Mr. George Pepper enclosing the statement.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Olympia, May 29, 1946.

Mr. GEORGE PEPPER,
Executive Director, Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, Seattle, Wash.

DEAR MR. PEPPER: Response to your letter of May 14 has been delayed because of my absence from my office. I have been in the East in the interest of the livestock and other industries of the State. I am glad to comply with your suggestion that I make public a statement in support of the OPA extension bill without crippling amendments and I shall cooperate with our State delegation in Congress in accomplishing this result.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of my public statement relative to the OPA controls.

With kind regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

MON C. WALLGREN,
Governor.

STATEMENT BY HON. MON C. WALLGREN IN SUPPORT OF OPA EXTENSION BILL WITHOUT CRIPPLING AMENDMENTS

The threat of unbridled inflation will continue to endanger us unless and until Congress gives approval to the OPA extension bill, without crippling amendments. There is no question but what the OPA can screen out certain nuisance items but controls must be maintained over all necessities. It is evident that selfish groups in this country are attempting to bring about the defeat of this measure or to so amend it as to make it ineffective. Once OPA controls are removed, prices on all commodities will immediately rise and inflation will be upon us. Inflation and speculation go hand-in-hand. The price of raw materials to the manufacturers will jump and the race to secure such materials will bring a constantly increasing manufacturers' cost. Merchants will then face increasing prices. The buying public will find that its dollar, saved during the past productive years, will shrink in value.

In 1920 inflationary prices, as many will remember, reached the point where sugar cost 25 cents per pound, bacon 58 cents per pound, eggs 90 cents per dozen, and many other items proportionately high. Clothing prices rose 30 to 50 percent. After the last World War, when pressures were far weaker than at present, rents climbed more than 50 percent.

The effect of all of this inflationary and speculative pressure would mean demands for increased wages which would again boost prices. The standard of living for the average family would be reduced to a distressing level, and for those on low fixed incomes it would result in wretchedness.

Some people misguidedly believe that taking off controls will mean spurt in production and that competition will then serve to hold prices down. But the present depletion of all consumer goods it so great that production could not be expected to increase to a point where competition would operate to bring prices down again for a considerable period of time. The more likely effect of this inflationary-speculative era would be that consumers would be unable to purchase enough goods and services to sustain the prices brought about by inflation and we would have another collapse similar to that which took place in 1929. Let us urge Congress to approve firm controls on prices and thus avoid repeating this frightful blunder.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a notorious and habitual violation and disregard by the Office of Price Administration of section 201, title 18, of the United States Criminal Code, commonly known as the Antilobbying Act.

Mr. President, I read a section of the code, as follows:

No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers and employees of the United States from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Any officer or employee of the United States who, after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, is found to have violated or attempted to violate this section shall be removed by such superior officer from office or employment. Any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate this section shall also be guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. President, this section prohibits the direct or indirect use of any part of money appropriated by any act, except where expressly authorized by Congress, to pay for any—(a) personal service, (b) advertisement, (c) telegram, (d) telephone, (e) letter, (f) printed or written matter, (g) or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation.

Any officer or employee, after notice and hearing by the superior officer who has the power of removing him, found guilty of violating or attempting to violate section 6, must be removed from office or employment.

Furthermore, any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate section 6, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction must be punished by a fine not to exceed $500, or by imprisonment for not to exceed 1 year, or both by fine and imprisonment.

The self-evident language of the section was explained to the House on May 29, 1919, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, page 403 by Representative Good, of Iowa, a member of the Committee on Appropriations and, from the noted applause, met with laudable approval by the House. Representative Good stated, page 403:

The bill also contains a provision which I am frank to say is subject to a point of order. It is new legislation, but it will prohibit a practice that has been indulged in so often, without regard to what administration is in power—the practice of a bureau chief or the head of a department writing letters throughout the country, sending telegrams throughout the country, for this organization, for this man, for that company, to write his Congressman, to wire his Congressman, in behalf of this or that legislation [Applause.] The gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Sherley, former chairman of this committee, during the closing days of the last Congress was greatly worried because he had on his desk thousands upon thousands of telegrams that had been started right here in Washington by some official wiring out for people to wire Congressman Sherley for this appropriation and for that. Now, they use the contingent fund for that purpose, and I have no doubt that the telegrams sent for that purpose cost the Government more than $7,500. Now, it was never the intention of Congress to appropriate money for this purpose, and sec-

tion 5 (later changed to sec. 6, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD p. 911) of the bill will absolutely put a stop to that sort of thing. [Applause.]

Mr. President, Congress has not expressly authorized that any moneys appropriated for the Office of Price Administration could be expended contrary to the payments prohibited in section 6 of the act of 1919. In the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1945 (ch. 271, Public Law 132, approved July 5, 1945) which provided, among other things, appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the Office of Price Administration was limited to "all necessary expenses of the Office of Price Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the act of October 2, 1942, and the provisions of the act of May 31, 1941 (55 Stat. 236) as amended by the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and acts amending or supplementing such acts, and all other powers, duties, and functions which may be lawfully delegated to the Office of Price Administration, including expenses of in-service training of employees, including salaries and traveling expenses of instructors."

It should be noted that Congress has recently revived and specifically referred to section 6 of the 1919 act in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1946 (ch. 109, Public Law 52, approved May 5, 1945, H. R. 2689), as follows:

Provided further, That no part of any funds available to the Department of Agriculture, the War Food Administration, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department or Administration shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201) to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

Thus, the direct or indirect use of appropriated moneys by an officer or employee of the United States to pay for personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed to influence a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, either before or after the introduction of the bill, is a misdemeanor subject to a penalty by fine or imprisonment or both and removal of the officer or employee from office or employment.

Mr. President, every Member of the Senate has knowledge of both Mr. Bowles' and Mr. Porter's flagrant violation of this statute.

We have all been bombarded with telegrams, telephone calls, petitions, letters, post cards, and delegations, importuning us to "extend OPA without amendment"; to "vote against crippling amendments"; not to "kill price control," and similar inspired pressure.

We all know that this pressure on Congress was the direct result of literally hundreds of thousands of pamphlets, articles, charts, booklets, news releases, radio talks, and magazine articles prepared at the expense of the Government and out of funds appropriated by Congress and sent out at Government expense to women's clubs, labor unions, veterans and their families, schools, churches, newspapers, radio stations, and farm and similar organizations.

Recently many of us witnessed the spectacle of an airplane writing in the sky over the Capitol Building "Save OPA."

Mr. President, I am not so naive as to believe that Mr. Bowles or Mr. Porter or any other bureaucrat will ever be removed from office, or fined, or imprisoned for this flagrant, open, and notorious violation of this Federal statute.

However, this attitude of many bureaucrats that they are above the law and bigger than the Congress of the United States should cause the Congress to pause before it again surrenders the power of life or death over our business enterprises.

Mr. President, the people and the Congress of the United States have become indifferent, cynical, and calloused toward this kind of thing. Who would have believed a few years ago that a couple of obscure citizens, after becoming minor bureaucrats, could or would use millions of dollars of the public funds to publicize and glamorize themselves and build a powerful propaganda machine that can be turned on or off as one switches a light on or off?

Mr. President, who would have believed a few years ago that appointed public servants, responsible to the Congress, would have the effrontery publicly to brand a major committee bill "a monstrosity," "an economic booby trap," or, in effect, charge Members of Congress with being senile, doddering old men.

Who could anticipate that appointed public servants could or would organize and use a propaganda machine that overnight would be unleashed against Congress and its considered legislation. We all remember the next day after the House of Representatives passed the Price Control Act, how certain radio commentators, newspaper columnists, labor organizations, front organizations, all followed the lead of Messrs. Porter and Bowles in charging that "OPA was dead," the "Price Control Act was emasculated," "the pressure lobby had gutted OPA," "runaway inflation is on the way," and similar oft repeated untruths.

Mr. President, we all know about the protest meetings organized from coast to coast, the mass protests to Congress, the delegations from all over the country chanting the same chant "Kill the crippling amendments passed by the House."

This was not a strange coincidence, but was a cleverly organized propaganda campaign, financed with Treasury funds in violation of a United States criminal statute.

Mr. President, it is time for the Congress of the United States to take in hand and curb this vocal Frankenstein it has created.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have been asked by some who are opposed to the adoption of the conference report rather to summarize the position which some of us have taken in the Senate relative to this legislation, and to make plain our feelings respecting it, and the reasons for the way we shall vote upon this most important measure.

First, I want to say that I think the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] rendered the Senate and the people of the country a distinct service last night when, during his speech he read telegrams from people all over the United States which he called "the voice of the people."

I should like to say for the RECORD that the distinguished Senator from Texas is not the only Senator who has received telegrams on this issue. I, too, could have brought into the Senate hundreds of telegrams and letters which I have received, most of them within the past 24 hours, but many of them received over the period of the past 2 weeks, telling of the deplorable conditions throughout the United States. I wish to add to the "voice of the people" which was so eloquently and forcefully presented by the distinguished Senator from Texas a few of the telegrams which I have received. I do not wish to offer them all. Time would not permit me to do what the distinguished Senator from Texas did, because of the limitation of debate. However, I have selected from hundreds of telegrams and letters which I have received approximately 115, from many States in the Union, including my own State.

These telegrams are not what we call pressure telegrams. They are not sent by organizations, or by persons who have been asked by pressure groups to write or telegraph Senators in the interest of some minority group. They are examples of telegrams which are being received from individuals all over the country. They come from housewives, merchants, farmers, businessmen, wholesalers, manufacturers, processors, jobbers, distributors, retailers, and laboring people. They come from all classes of our economy. I wish to read only one of these telegrams, but I shall ask unanimous consent that the others be printed in the RECORD.

Some may believe that these telegrams are part of a propaganda drive, and that we are exhibiting them to make a show of pressure. Let me say in all seriousness that anyone who reads the RECORD will notice the names of the small towns from which many of the telegrams come. They are telegrams voluntarily sent, imploring the Senate to take these controls off the backs of the people.

The following telegram is from Kearney, Nebr.:

KEARNEY, NEBR., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have had no beef for college cafeteria feeding 600 students since May 1 this year.

Little of anything but chicken since September 1, 1944. We are in no position to compete with agencies using black market. Believe prices might rise for a time if OPA eliminated, but that eventually prices would level off. Continuation of present meat situation intolerable.

HERBERT L. CUSHING,
President, State Teachers College.

This is a typical message from an educational institution. I have received messages from doctors and from directors of hospitals, telling about meat famines in various districts, and pleading that something be done to obtain meat for the famine areas. I wish I had the opportunity which the distinguished Senator from Texas had to read these telegrams. They are not telegrams commending me, but graphically bringing to the attention of Members of the Senate the pleas which are made for relief from totalitarian controls in order that the people may get food and clothing.

I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN, NEBR., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
You are putting up a grand fight and so right; keep it up.

T. B. STRAIN.

OMAHA, NEBR., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
Hold your ground OPA bill. Filibuster out if necessary.

C. S. HAINES.

HASTINGS, NEBR., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good fight. Remove ceilings on stocks, poultry, dairy products; filibuster if need be.

S. A. COATS.

FALLS CITY, NEBR., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY of Nebraska,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work, Senator.

FRED HSCHOCK.

NATIONAL STOCKYARDS, ILL.,
June 26, 1946.
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building:
As erstwhile Nebraskan I congratulate you on your fight against OPA. Keep up the good work.

JOHN CLAY & CO.,
W. J. MCGINNIS,
Manager.

COZAD, NEBR., *June 25, 1946.*
Hon. Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
Contacts and personal conversation satisfy me that central Nebraska merchants and farmers are about to revolt against OPA livestock and meat regulations. Meat markets in small towns closing. My patients unable to buy meat. Please vote out OPA at once.

Dr. C. H. SHEES.

COZAD, NEBR., *June 25, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Present OPA regulations on meats and all other food products are making people lose all respect for Government. People are naming prices through black market regardless of OPA. As a producer of live stock, I urge you to use all your power to defeat OPA.

C. T. YOUNG.

SUMNER, NEBR., *June 25, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Building:
For God's sake do something to save the livestock and meat industry of these United States.

GUY SCUFDER.

COZAD, NEBR., *June 25, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
With OPA regulations live ceilings and so forth the livestock and meat industry is in terrible mess. Practically impossible buy meat anywhere except through black-market operators and even then only very limited supply of inferior quality. Present bill before Senate if passed will make it worse and will force livestock feeders and growers and legitimate meat industry out of business. Request you do everything possible oppose this legislation and insist upon livestock and meats being removed from OPA controls.

NOEL COVER.

BI-LO MARKET,
Hastings, Nebr., June 23, 1946.
DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: Please fight to kill the OPA on everything except rents and sugar.
Beets should be $2 per ton higher at least.
Answer is not needed, just fight to save this country.

L. J. COATES.

NORTH PLATTE, NEBR., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
It is inconceivable that Senate will reverse itself and approve present OPA bill. In our judgment retention of meat price and slaughtering regulations will completely stop supplies and create situation far worse than anything we have ever experienced. I urge you to use every means at your command to defeat present bill and immediately abolish livestock controls in the interest of common sense and sensible meat distribution and prices.

RAY FARQUHAR,
Executive Director, Frozen Food Locker Manufacturers and Suppliers Association.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
My honest butcher has no meat. The black market got above my reach. I was forced to close my restaurant. My Jewish black-market butcher wants the OPA for at least one more year. My honest butcher and myself want to end the OPA now.

THOMAS ODRIEN,
Restaurant Owner.

ELMHURST, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
I would like to wake up Monday, July 1, without OPA. Please help Senator O'DANIEL.

ERNST HAMMERSCHMIDT.

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Suggest OPA bill be amended to give Comrade Bowles right to immediately liquidate all American kulocks rather than slowly starving them to death. Farm tractors went up $127 apiece yesterday. Present bill first attempt of American Congress to enslave an entire class of people. Filibuster your job.

CLAYTON E. KLINE.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *June 27, 1496.*
Senator WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Female steers are as ridiculous as OPA. Help Senator O'DANIEL return America to America.

CHARLES W. BOYLE.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
According to Fulton Lewis, Jr., you are our last defense against the dominating bureaucrats in OPA. Don't give up.

HERBERT BUTTON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: As a citizen of United States I have a right to pass my opinion that the OPA is ruination of small businessmen. Will you kindly analyze this situation. Thank you for same.

LOUIS REST.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
We cannot operate anything without violating the law. Please kill OPA.

WALTER GARVIN CO., INC.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I trust you and Senator O'DANIEL will filibuster on the OPA bill and return our country to the American way of life.

Dr. DONALD J. MACDANIEL.

TAFT, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senator, Capitol,
Washington, D. C.:
You true friend of California housewives. They have empty bowls and too much Bowles, but no meat, bread, butter, or anything else. Knock out OPA.

Mrs. J. W. TRAVERS.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY of Nebraska,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Please do everything you can to remove price controls off our foodstuffs. Thanking you very much to do whatever you can. Do hope that you gain enough of support to roll it back as everything is at a standstill.

E. H. MITCHELL,
Silver Dollar Motor Court.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Radio report tells of O'DANIEL's contemplated filibuster to kill OPA. This is good news to Americans opposed to European bureaucratic methods. Urge you fight with the same spirit you showed on town meeting OPA discussion. House has failed us. May the Senate save us from this step to statism.

CARL AND HELENE JOHNSON.

TROY, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
All my family and everyone I know are heartily sick of OPA and senseless restraints.

Also disapprove of subsidies. Only Communists want continued regulations.

BLANCHE VAN EVERY GEER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I earnestly urge you to filibuster to kill the OPA completely. This is our last chance to get rid of it.

A. W. CORSE.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate House, Washington, D. C.:

We are in back of you 100 percent in your fight to end price control. We look with pride on one truly patriotic American who knows that present bill will only end in black markets. American businesses are based on free enterprise. Do your utmost.

GUS JUENGLING & SON MEAT PACKERS.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We sincerely urge you to fight most vigorously to remove meat control and thereby break the black market which has made it impossible for us to purchase meat legally during the past 5 months.

BONNEE FROZEN PRODUCTS CO.,
L. JOHN LEWIS.

MARION, IOWA, *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Kill the OPA now. We are sick to death of it. Vote against the inclusion of railway mail service pensions with social security. We want no part of it. It is our pension bought and paid for and we want no tampering of administration by New Deal politicians. Sincerely,

JACK W. COMSTOCK.

DES MOINES, IOWA, *June 26, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Nebraska should praise God for a Senator who sees the danger ahead if OPA were continued.

A. G. PETERSON.

RADFORD, VA., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Away with OPA.

MAX C. RUPE.

WEEPING WATER, NEBR., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Sure help Senator O'DANIEL filibuster OPA 'till Sunday.

CARL E. DAY.

WATERTOWN, N. Y., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Don't give up fight against OPA. Filibuster.

HELEN I. MCMULLIN.

HARRISBURG, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
United States Senate:

Stick to your guns and compel controls lifted from meat and butter. Better still no OPA hampering Americans.

S. S. POMEROY.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Minnesota congratulates you. Trusts you will succeed in removing price control on meats. Butcher shops are out of meats, many closed. Nearly everybody driven into the arms of black marketeers. Through their weakness the House betrayed the public interest.

H. L. PRESTHOLT.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We are in back of you 100 percent in your fight to end price control, especially OPA control of meat and meat products. We urge your continued efforts to take OPA control off of meats.

JACOB BAUER SONS.

NEW GALILEE, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Please lend all your support and influence against the continuance of the OPA in any form. Restore the Constitution or checks and balances that they will function in favor of no man or group.

Dr. C. B. MOORE.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are in back of you 100 percent in your fight to end price control. We look with pride on one truly patriotic American who knows that present bill will only end in black markets. American businesses are based on free enterprise. Do your utmost.

CINCINNATI WHOLESALE MEAT
DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
GUS JUENGLING, *President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Under OPA dictatorship not allowed to increase tenancy from 9 to 21 capacity. Housing shortage largely responsible to stupidity formed to liquidate small prewar rents. Cannot cover costly repairs, only hopes of small business and farmers is understanding Senators like yourselves.

L. ROGERS.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. One more year of control will give us either Russia's Government or India's condition.

W. H. ELAM.

ELDORADO ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations to you on your stand against the OPA.

C. L. PEACOCK GROCERY.
THE CORNER GROCERY.
E. P. TRULL GROCERY.
DUMAS PACKING CO.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Keep up your fight to eliminate price controls.

ILLINOIS FUEL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senator from Nebraska, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Make Housing Administration responsible for rent control. Abolish OPA.

G. GUY OWENS.

EUGENE, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Continue the good fight. Filibuster till Monday for free enterprise and true prices based upon supply and demand.

TAYLOR LUMBER CO.
REVES TAYLOR.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Admire your OPA stand. God gave us freedom, let us keep it.

GRANGE GROCERY.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your red-blooded heman determination to fight to the end OPA chaos, confusion, and un-Americanism. I strongly endorse your stand for a free America.

WALTER S. PARKER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Present proposed OPA bill discriminates against lumber wholesalers and will put us out of business on west-coast woods if passed. Suggest changing date of figuring costs from January 1, 1946 to December 1941. We appreciate your efforts.

ALLSOP LUMBER CO.

WHEATLAND, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:

Encourage O'Daniel continue filibuster until present OPA bill is defeated.

WHEATLAND MERCHANTS COMMITTEE,
LEM KIMMON, *Secretary.*

LIMA, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senators TAFT and WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

May the memory of our gallant sons who gave their all be an inspiration to you to take up where they left off for the sake of freedom.

TOM MOORE.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand against vicious OPA.

THOMAS J. POTTS.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

OPA smells to high heaven. America needs fresh air. Save free enterprise. End OPA. This is the show-down.

WOMEN'S LEAGUE FOR POLITICAL
EDUCATION.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your efforts to eliminate or revise OPA.

E. LEE MERRILL.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Sincerely hope your efforts will eliminate OPA entirely.

A. W. BECKER.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Black markets and confusion will prevail so long as OPA exists. Best wishes for your success in fighting.
F. R. WINGERTER.

BUTLER, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
Another year of OPA and other unwarranted Government interference will ruin our Nation. We fought this war for freedom and democracy. We would like to have it back again. Keep fighting OPA. We are for you.
ARNOLD ELEVATOR MILLS.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are back of you 100 percent in your fight to end price control. We look with pride on one truly patriotic American who knows that present bill will only end in a black market. American businesses are based on free enterprise. Do your utmost.
HENRY SCHLACTER & SONS MEAT PACKERS.

ELMIRA, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We're glad to recognize in the Senate a statesman and one who has some idea of economics.
H. D. WOOLF, HARRIS MCHENY & BAKER CO.

ANDREWS, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Am sure the majority O. K. The American people will stand behind you in your fight to overthrow the OPA. More power to you.
D. D. OVERTON, Jr.

CULLMAN, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
Thanks for stand on decontrolled meat. Farmers are suffering OPA-itis.
C. E. HERRIN.

INDEPENDENCE, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Honorable Mr. WHERRY,
United States Senator from Nebraska,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you carry on and defeat the very un-American bill which is a great danger and disgrace to humanity.
SCOTT BROTHERS, Since '99.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge you to back O'DANIEL in his important fight.
BONNEE FROZEN PRODUCTS CO.,
L. JOHN LEWIS.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA. Honest men and women sick of Bowles.
M. MONTGOMERY.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
This exchange compliments you on your stand and encourages you to persist in your efforts to remedy the chaotic situation existing in the livestock and meat industry as result of OPA regulations.
ST. JOSEPH LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
JOHN W. BENNETT, Jr., *President.*

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator K. S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. More power to you and your fight on OPA. Evidently you remember when we had democratic government.
E. T. COUCH, Jr.,
COUCH SUPER MARKET.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Urgently recommend strong filibuster or any other tactics necessary to relieve the oil industry of the burden of the OPA.
ALFRED C. GLASSELL, Jr.,
Director of the Texas Independent Royalty Owner and Producers Association.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand against OPA. Let me urge you and all red-blooded American Senators to assist O'DANIEL all possible to kill the OPA now.
J. E. FRICE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please help Senator O'DANIEL in his fight to abolish the un-American, unconstitutional, and communistic Office of Price Administration.
O. W. RICHARDSON.

TARENTUM, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We urgently request you to support Senator O'DANIEL now in his courageous fight to restore the American form of government. Here's hoping that we can start out Monday morning free and unhampered by asinine OPA curbs and restrictions, free to let the law of supply and demand and common sense work out our economy.
E. C. West, J. E. Scheid, F. F. Huber, R. L. Shaffer, Cecilia Miscosky, Esther Miscosky, Alice Stitt, F. R. Lardin, T. H. Bender, and F. E. West.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Against filibustering as principle, but help Senator O'DANIEL against OPA.
ELBERT EASTMAN.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Important you win your fight re OPA program.
W. RINGER, *Secretary.*
Washington State Retail Grocers and Meat Dealers Association.

UTICA, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY:
Stick to your guns on OPA and help us get rid of the gestapo. Congratulations.
GEORGE E. CRESSY.

SILVER LAKE, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
The Honorable Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
We livestock farmers apparently have been sold down the river again. Appreciate your efforts to protect the basic industry of our American agricultural program.
W. R. WEDRICK (Democrat).

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Nebraska Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
I deeply appreciate your efforts. Frankly, as both a dairy farmer and a creamery operator, I am convinced that our Nation's dairy industry will suffer great disaster if OPA controls are kept on dairy products.
KNOWLTON'S CREAMERY,
S. E. KNOWLTON, *Owner.*

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Very few of the worst evils in the present OPA Act will be cured by passing the proposed bill recommended by conference committee and passed by House. We prefer no OPA at all rather than that. We urge you to fight for bill more in line with one passed by Senate or do away with OPA entirely.
M. A. WYMAN LUMBER CO.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We commend you for the stand you are taking for the decontrol of dairy, poultry, and meat products in any OPA extension bill to be passed by the Senate.
AMERICAN BULK CONDENSED MILK ASSOCIATION,
H. C. DARGER, *Executive Secretary.*

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.
SIR: We respectively urge you to use your influence against OPA. We raise a lot of cattle down here but we have no meat. We have a large lumber industry in east Texas, but no lumber for veterans' houses.
T. A. BLAKELEY,
President, The Mortgage Corp. of Texas.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KEN WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
My family, my many, many business associates and friends give you our wholehearted support in your wonderful fight against the OPA.
JOHN H. BLAFFER.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
I appreciate and favor your fight against continuation of the OPA and believe that your fight is for the best interest of all the people of the United States. I am in favor of your filibuster and hope for its success.
GLENN H. MCCARTHY.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
Gratifying to see your efforts in behalf of meat industry against OPA. Billion dollar subsidy appropriation would do more good to help balance budget. Supply and demand is only answer to meat industry problems.
DAVID BERNARD,
HANFORD MEAT & PROVISION CO.

NATIONAL STOCK YARDS, ILL., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Your fight against OPA commendable. Balance of legitimate livestock will go black market if price ceilings remain.
M. H. WATKINS.
BELLEVILLE, ILL.

FAYETTEVILLE, N. C., *June 25, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
If you have to, filibuster OPA controls to death.
I. T. WARREN.

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., *June 25, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We are informed OPA bill out of conference committee leaves control on meat. This means that many legitimate packing houses will be forced out of business and the black market will be in control. You have the facts brought out before Banking and Currency and Agricultural Committees. We have done everything possible to present the gravity of the situation. We urge that you do everything possible to block passage of bill in present form.
HUNTER PACKING CO.,
FRANK A. HUNTER, Jr., *President.*

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate:
We urgently request you do everything in your power to reinstate in the OPA extension bill the Wherry amendment which would give to wholesalers and distributors their peacetime mark-ups. The committee bill ignores completely the legitimate wholesaler and distributor; and if passed its present form, will do nothing more than compel a vital part of our distribution system to go out of business. You are doing a fine job. More power to you.
GEORGE A. DASCOMB, Jr.,
President, The Vaughan Lumber Co., Inc.

NATIONAL STOCK YARDS, ILLINOIS,
June 26, 1946.
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
I am farming about 1,000 acres; am half interested in 2,500 head of beef cattle. If controls were taken off, livestock production would greatly increase. To keep controls on, production will go lower and black markets will get much worse. Why not let supply and demand govern and legitimate packers operate?
W. H. YOUNG.
EDWARDSVILLE, ILL.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Montana packers have been losing $5 to $10 per head on cattle purchased at compliance prices and sold at OPA wholesale dressed prices since January 1, 1944, when the Vinson cattle stabilization plan became effective. Black-market operators have established cattle prices in Montana, as well as the country at large, $10 to $30 per head above compliance prices. All real friends of producers and small packers should vote for the elimination of livestock subsidies and the decontrol of livestock and meat—the only way to eliminate the black market.
E. S. HOLMES,
President, Montana Meat Packers Association.

NATIONAL STOCK YARDS, ILLINOIS,
June 26, 1946.
Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
To say we are heartsick at the action of the conference committee toward the OPA is mild. For years from our farms we have been among the largest producers of meat animals in the State of Illinois. In recent years at very short profits, and this year is showing up the worst of all. But we were living in hopes that this body would not resort to supposedly public opinion that is founded on vote-getting propaganda without facts. We at the present time are producing enough meat to feed 6,000 people per day. We have never sold one head in black market, but now we are sure there is no other way out or quit business, and this business is all we know. We think the American people are capable of running their affairs. Give them a chance.
ARTHUR KNAPP & SON.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are wholesale carload distributors of lumber—have been for over 25 years. Under OPA regulations we have been directly discriminated against and put out of business. Senate-House conference committee report on OPA of no benefit to ourselves or other direct mill shipping lumber wholesalers. Would appreciate your rejecting the report and instruct committee to renew efforts for revision of bill more in line with that passed by the Senate. Will appreciate this consideration, as otherwise black market will continue grow bigger and bigger.
ARLING FUNCH LUMBER CO.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Joint conference committee report on OPA leaves wholesale lumber distributors in less favorable position than present discriminatory regulations. We solicit and urge your support in rejecting this report for revision by committee. We feel that wholesale distributors should at least be allowed the percentage of trade commissions they received prior to OPA as mark-up on ceiling prices. The joint committee report, if enacted, will surely put thousands of legitimate dealers out of business and will further encourage black-market operations.
THOMAS B. THAMES LUMBER CO.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Since 1908 we have operated retail lumber business in North College Hill, Ohio. Under OPA regulations we have been directly discriminated against and put out of business. Senate-House conference committee report on OPA of no benefit to retail lumber dealers. The report should be rejected and the committee instructed to renew efforts for revision of bill more in line with that originally passed by the Senate. If this is not done, black market will continue to flourish and legitimate concerns with enviable records for years will be out of business.
KNOLLMAN LUMBER CO.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY:
Since press reports indicate price-control conferees failed to definitely include your amendment intended to provide same protection for wholesalers and distributors, as does Taft amendments for manufacturers and processors, and since failure to recognize the plight of this essential segment of industry and commerce spells disaster for them, may we respectfully urge that you stand by your guns and insist that they be provided for as your amendment intended they should be. We lumbermen appreciate your good fight. More power to you.
LEGISLATION COMMITTEE THE CINCINNATI LUMBERMEN'S CLUB.

ERIE, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.:
The 500 home-owned food stores of Erie and Erie County, Pa., who distribute more than 80 percent of the food products in a trading area of more than 200,000 people, protest and demand that OPA controls and ceilings on livestock, meats, dairy, and poultry products be removed as of July 1, 1946.
We believe that free enterprise on these foods will provide an uninterrupted flow of livestock, meats, dairy and poultry products in our community and the entire United States. We feel that with free enterprise that prices on those products will soon be lower than is now being paid.
HOME-OWNED STORES, INC., OF ERIE AND ERIE COUNTY, PA.
FRED D. MCCAULEY, *Executive Secretary.*

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
If you wish to prevent a national revolt on the part of all business against Government control you will vote to abolish OPA completely. Listen to the voices that are predicting the tomorrows present polls, refuse OPA three to one. Do not refuse to recognize the sounds of the times. Give industry and labor the opportunity of proving itself by eliminating controls for 9 months. If industry and labor fails to meet the challenge by then you can have a completely free hand. Present regulations are impossible, impractical, communistic, and unenforcible under a peacetime economy. When a widow with three children who desires to start a combination day nursery and home for three children who are now in an institution for two-thirds of the space devoted to the nursery and one-third of the space devoted for the home, is refused permission to build without priority assistance it is almost too late to say we still have the freedom guaranteed under our Constitution.
JOHN B. MCCRADY.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senate Whip KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.
OUR DEAR MR. WHERRY: The conditions just passed by the House on the OPA bill are very unsatisfactory to the Panhandle, Texas. As far as meat, poultry, and meat and dairy products are concerned there is nothing but black market here. As supervisor of Ideal Food Stores markets I say, "Shall we operate legally and in fair competition, or shall we continue to operate with black market?" If the OPA continues the public will be buying at black-market prices, whereas if it is discontinued it would be much cheaper to buy legally and at competitive prices. My belief is that fair competition would discard all necessities of the OPA.
Sincerely yours,
DESMOND DEAN.

SALEM, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Something over 100,000,000 people are beginning to stoop, sneak, badger, and bluff to get sugar, soap, syrup, clothing, feed, lumber, radios, nails, autos, flour, bread, butter, cheese, meat, and or anything else they want and should have. Should black or free markets prevail? These are the people of what was and we believe is the finest nation on earth, the most enlightened, aggressive, upstanding, and compassionate. Consider coffee up, butter up, cheese up, bread up, beer up. Where is the held line? Consider no lumber, no autos, no sugar, no radios, no meat,

No soap. Where is production? Gobs of these people know the death of OPA on Sunday is just another of the Bowles crowd's propaganda scares to mislead the Nation's thinking people. They know Congress can reenact or relegislate whenever they see fit to do so or feel it necessary for the national welfare. Does someone or anyone think America must be kept in or returned to swaddling clothes? And if to what group of bureaucrats consider themselves competent to be pappy to us all. If we must die let us die fighting. Gentlemen don't give up the ship.

E. L. DICKSON.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Stand by your guns. You are absolutely right about price control. But rent control is the worst culprit of all. Owners of rental housing are afraid to complain about OPA because OPA has instituted a "reign of terror" like the Commune of Paris, 1792–94. They collect fines out of court, without trial, like the five kings of Ireland in the Middle Ages. OPA sends out letters telling landlords to dig up $500 or $1,000 (without trial) for some infraction of their Communist rules, and two policemen to collect or go to jail. And like the "dark ages" no appeal is allowed. And no one can know their laws, not even lawyers, because their word is law. And the owners of rental property have no rights in their own homes. Why should anyone have to rent at a loss or charge the same rent in 1946 as they were charging during the depression 10 years ago just because that was what they were charging on March 1, 1942? No profit for the landlord is a cunning device of OPA to Russianize the United States of America. An excerpt from article VIII of the Constitution of the United States of America reads: "Nor excessive fines imposed nor cruel or unusual punishment inflicted." But Spokane OPA pompously fined a 73-year-old landlord $9,000 (AP) news item (excerpt) from Syracuse, N. Y. "71-year-old widow who charged 50 cents a week above the OPA maximum rental for an apartment, had to pay $1,500 to a tenant," and so on, ad infinitum. Could you beat that in Russia? And the OPA has something on everybody. Is that the new Russian plan and specification for the land of the free and the home of the brave? Remember? Socialists and Communists say "Get the landlord first and the rest will be easy." Save the United States of America. Repeal or modify rent control and blow up the OPA. Remove the ball and chain.

SCOTT C. SHARP,
A Bricklayer.

Mr. WHERRY. As the second part of the evidence, I should like to introduce a number of letters and telegrams received from pharmaceutical and chemical laboratories throughout the country. Time does not permit me to read them, but anyone who thinks for a moment that the situation is not serious need only go to the chemical laboratories of the country to discover the shortage of glands and chemical materials necessary to produce insulin, adrenalin, and dozens of other important drugs. I ask Senators to read these telegrams. There is no pressure about them in any way, shape, or form. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks letters and telegrams which have been received from pharmaceutical organizations.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS AND TELEGRAMS FROM SOME OF THE LARGEST PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES

A letter from Parke, Davis & Co., of Detroit, Mich., dated April 12, 1946, reads as follows:

"You are certainly aware of the fact that the available supplies of animal glands for medicinal use during the past several years have been constantly decreasing. This has variously been attributed to a shortage of labor, a shortage of feed, or a dislocation of animal production on the farms.

"At present the situation is perhaps more critical than at any time since the beginning of the war, and we believe that one important cause is diversion of cattle away from the regularly inspected packing houses into black-market channels. This, of course, not only presents a danger from supplying the public with uninspected meats but results in a total waste of all the animal glands, fats, hides and other byproducts. This is particularly serious to the manufacturer of medicinal and pharmaceutical products which are necessary for the maintenance of public health.

"At no time during the war were we able to fill our orders for products made from the pituitary gland of cattle, many of which were strictly military orders. This pituitary gland produces two important products, one of which is used in childbirth and the other in most surgical cases and for shock. We are unable, at present, to obtain more than about one-third of our normal requirements of these glands.

"Another extremely important gland is the beef suprarenal gland, which also yields two separate medicinal extracts: First, Adrenalin—so necessary in the treatment of asthmatic conditions as well as a heart stimulant. Second, the extract of the suprarenal cortex, which is the only known treatment for the many people suffering from Addison's disease. This is not curative but has to be taken daily to keep these people alive. We are not obtaining more than 50 percent of our estimated requirements of the beef suprarenal gland.

"Records indicate that patients suffering from diabetes are becoming more numerous each month and the only known preparation which will keep these people alive is insulin, which is made from the pancreas gland and which has to be taken daily in most cases. These glands are also used in connection with production of protein hydrolysates, representing amino acids, most recently finding wide application in the nutritional field.

"There is also a very large demand for ox bile which forms the raw material for several important products used and recognized by the medical profession for various disorders of the human gall bladder.

"Anything which will serve to direct the flow of normal supplies of cattle into the usual reliable packing house channels is not only desirable from the standpoint of procuring these various byproducts but would seem to be positively imperative if we are to maintain the public health standards of our people.

"We trust that this very important problem will receive the most serious consideration of any Senate committee dealing with it."

A telegram from Eli Lilly & Co., Indianapolis, Ind., April 10, 1946 says:

"It is our sincere hope you will be able to fully impress the proper authorities with the very serious shortage of supplies of raw materials necessary for important drug manufacture which are obtained from the meat packing industry. During the past several months have personally called on approximately 100 slaughterers in Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, Missouri, and Illinois, and have just today returned from trip including Spokane, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Phoenix, San Antonio, and Houston for the specific purpose of procurement of additional supplies pancreas glands, beef bile, thyroid glands. Almost universally have heard the same story on all of these contacts, namely that current regulations and conditions do not permit profitable operations especially in beef and that losses coupled with the virtual impossibility of staying in compliance make the situation nothing short of desperate.

"Cannot personally verify these facts; but after hearing the same story so many times from meat packers, both large and small, feel definitely that considerable change is necessary if the legitimate meat packer is to stay in operation at profitable volume and be honest. If situation continues much longer, someone must be prepared to accept responsibility for shortage of essential drugs, such as insulin, and other important drugs such as bile, pituitaries, thyroid, and perhaps antianemia preparations. Our current procurement is very much short of minimum needs and appears to be getting worse right along."

A letter from Wilson Laboratories, Chicago, Ill., dated April 6, 1946, reads as follows:

"The marked falling off in receipts of cattle has resulted in our supplies of certain glandular raw material being reduced to the point where we will have to discontinue operations.

"For example, beef pancreas are largely used in preparing insulin and other medicinal products. There is a shortage of pancreas of all sorts for insulin production. The failure to get insulin is very serious for the diabetic person who must rely on a daily injection of insulin.

"Pituitary glands are used to make extracts that are very largely employed in childbirth, in surgery, and in cases of shock. We are unable to produce these essential extracts because of a lack of raw material. We are practically shut down in that department.

"The failure to get cattle means our being unable to get ox bile, for which there is an enormous medical demand. You are familiar with this, since ox gall is used in the production of dehydrochloric acid. Bile products are used in the treatment of certain liver and gall-bladder and intestinal disturbances.

"There is a very serious disease known as Addison's disease, which involves the adrenal gland. We have been preparing an extract from beef adrenals that is capable of restoring those afflicted with Addison's disease to economic independence. The extract must be administered daily very much like the use of insulin in diabetes. Addison's disease patients are very susceptible to infection. Unless they have available an adequate supply of adrenal cortex extract they are in grave danger of dying.

"I do not know what becomes of these glands from cattle that are killed through black-market operations. To the best of my knowledge there is no indication that these materials are being saved. The failure to save them constitutes a definite menace to national health."

A second telegram from Eli Lilly & Co., dated April 12, 1946, says:

"If our telegram of April 10 does not in your opinion fully express the position which we as pharmaceutical manufacturers are now in due to severely reduced slaughter of many legitimate meat packers we shall be glad to have you wire or phone us, and we will endeavor to work with you to the fullest extent. Our situation with respect to essential drugs such as insulin is such that we must not overlook any opportunity to place our position to the attention of authority responsible for changes which will make the saving of pancreas gland and other important animal products possible in a quantity which is necessary. We consider this extremely serious

situation which demands attention as soon as possible."

A telegram from the Cudahy Packing Co., Chicago, Ill., dated April 12, 1946, says:

"One most unfortunate result of the present impossible situation in the livestock and packing industry is the wanton waste of valuable animal glands used by manufacturing chemists and makers of pharmaceuticals in the preparation of medicines essential in medical and surgical practice. Black-market slaughterers possess neither the facilities nor the technical skill required to recover these glands, and as a result the lives of many thousands of people under physicians' care are seriously endangered. For that reason, among many others, we urge action now to restore normal operations in the livestock and packing industry."

A telegram from G. D. Searle & Co., Chicago, Ill., dated April 12, 1946, says:

"As a result of current price policy in meat industry causing great diversion of animals from usual packing plant, we are unable to purchase but very small quantities of animal glands which we use in pharmaceutical manufacture. Consequently, supply only minor portion of physicians and hospital demand for necessary drug prepared from these materials."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in my speech on Wednesday I called attention to the fact that labor should be interested in seeing that price controls are lifted. They are causing wholesale unemployment. At that time I stated that I had received a message from the president and secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butchers Workmen of North America, an organization which covers the entire industry. I wish to read the first paragraph of this telegram, and then I shall ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the telegram, which is five pages in length, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. The first paragraph reads as follows:

We are firmly convinced that present Government regulations in the meat-packing industry are unenforceable. These inoperable prohibitions have already resulted in thousands of men and women in packing plants being unemployed. They have resulted in scores of meat-packing plants closing their doors. Unless something is done quickly, hundreds more will do likewise. It is impossible to prohibit the flow of necessary edibles to the consumers where there is always available a ready source of supply. There is no acute shortage of livestock. The public wants it. Legitimate packers are willing to slaughter it, but governmental restrictions apparently make this extremely difficult. The Nation had its experience with prohibitive measures in alcohol during the prohibition era. Even the life-for-a-pint law in Michigan did not prevent bootlegging.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks the entire telegram, of which I have read the first paragraph.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF TELEGRAM SENT TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN, SECRETARY ANDERSON, AND MESSRS. PORTER AND BOWLES, BY THE PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY-TREASURER OF THE AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHERS WORKMEN OF NORTH AMERICA, A. F. L., ON APRIL 5, 1946

We are firmly convinced that present Government regulations in the meat packing industry are unenforceable. These inoperable prohibitions have already resulted in thousands of men and women in packing plants being unemployed. They have resulted in scores of meat packing plants closing their doors. Unless something is done quickly, hundreds more will do likewise. It is impossible to prohibit the flow of necessary edibles to the consumers where there is always available a ready source of supply. There is no acute shortage of livestock. The public wants it. Legitimate packers are willing to slaughter it, but governmental restrictions apparently make this extremely difficult. The Nation had its experience with prohibitive measures in alcohol during the prohibition era. Even the "Life for a pint" law in Michigan did not prevent bootlegging.

Bootlegging and black marketing are twin brothers. The consumers of our Nation no longer feel that they are under a patriotic obligation to observe unnecessary wartime restrictions. Black marketing in meats even when the war was at its height was widespread. It was impossible to enforce the prohibition of the sale and manufacture of alcohol, it is all the more impossible to enforce inoperable restrictive regulations in the flow of a commodity that the consumers need and which certainly, under even half-normal conditions, ought not to be interfered with.

It seems to us rather inconsistent to adhere to a hold-the-line principle when every consumer knows that the line is not being held. In many commodities, prices have been increased as much as 300 percent without any attempt being made on the part of the OPA to regulate them. It is also very inconsistent for our Government agencies to determine to hold the line on some commodities produced by some industries and completely ignore rising price levels of commodities in other industries. We offer strenuous objection to the plan of the OPA to place more rigid restrictions upon non-federally inspected slaughterhouses which would even make the situation worse. It is contrary to every concept of fairness to impose general restrictions upon small slaughterers that to some extent at least puts the Government in a position of finding legitimate small businessmen guilty of black marketing before they have been accused of such an offense.

The present national situation is such that offers opportunity to Federal inspected meat plants to engage in black market operations as well as non-Federal establishments. If meat can be purchased, the public is going to buy it. They consider that the war is over and that personal sacrifices need no longer be made in their principal table commodity. It is not surprising, therefore, that black market operators are springing up in all sections of the country. The owners of these establishments see an opportunity to make money. They do not consider it unpatriotic to do so; and very definitely the impossible restrictions now being imposed by OPA upon the meat industry will cause an increase in black market operations rather than a decrease. These regulations only result in a terrific increase in the cost of meat to the consumer, and the Government and the OPA is responsible for the situation. It is responsible for the loss of the thousands of jobs of our membership and responsible for the present inability of hundreds of legitimate slaughterers to continue their business.

We feel sincerely that if these restrictions were eliminated the prices of meat to the consumer would within a very short time level off which would result in cheaper purchases of the product. It would result in the packing industry generally booming as it has never boomed before because of the responsibility of our Nation to do all in its power to feed a famished world as well as to slaughter for the needs of ready purchasers within our own Nation.

The whole plan of meat price control as presently constructed is a crazy quilt of impossibilities. The purchaser of livestock is criminally libel, but the seller is not. The slaughtering industry, while to some extent at least, is influenced greatly by the larger packers; nevertheless it has always been highly competitive. We feel it will continue to remain a highly competitive industry. There is an abundant supply and there is an overabundant demand. Why not give these men who have been in the meat business all of their lives an opportunity to prove what they can do and release the controls. If they do not succeed in eliminating the present existing evils, there is no reason why the Government then cannot restore restrictions that would be workable even to the extent of actually operating the entire industry including the sale of livestock. At least the men who know the industry ought to have a chance to operate it so the consumer may have lower prices and so that the thousands of men and women, who earn their livelihood in the industry might have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. In my speech of last Wednesday I called attention to the fact that there was black marketing not only in meats, but in all industry. It is Nation-wide. I challenge any Member of the Senate to rise and say that there is not black marketing in lumber. Those of us who conducted hearings in connection with lumber know that today black marketing in lumber is almost as extensive as in connection with meats and foodstuffs. There is also to a great extent—and it is becoming more prevalent each day—black marketing in grain. The black market in grain today is tremendous. Times does not permit me to go into all the black-marketing operations in connection with grain, but at this point in the RECORD I should like to have printed a memorandum which was handed me, from the National Association of Commodity Exchanges and Allied Trades. I place it in the RECORD at this point because it graphically shows the break-down in enforcement, the law violations and the chaotic conditions in the production, sale, and distribution of grain.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMATION FROM NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMODITY EXCHANGES AND ALLIED TRADES SENT TO SENATE AND HOUSE OPA CONFEREES

I

Complete chaos rules in the grain situation in this country due to unworkable price controls. Our humanitarian efforts for famine relief have been impeded by reason of this chaos to the point where administrative departments of the Government have been forced to resort to one expediency after another in their attempts to secure necessary grain to meet famine commitments. Only to the extent that such governmental action has been toward eliminating fictitious price distortions in grains has it been successful. But, the elimination of one inequity has created another and worse one in its place. Farmer resentment has mounted. Our mills producing breadstuffs for home consumption have shut down. Animal feeders have become desperate. Black markets have spread and flourished. According to competent testimony before congressional committees, three-quarters of the country's greatest grain crop, corn, is moving in black markets. The flow of grains have virtually disappeared from many important commercial channels. Conditions are getting worse.

II

Threats of real disaster loom if livestock, poultry and meats are to be freed from price controls while grains remain under price controls. Livestock and poultry are but the end product of grain. It is inequitable and untenable to expect grain to be shipped off the farm to feed our people at one level of price when it can be walked off the farm at another and entirely different level of price. Breadlines in America will become a commonplace.

Postulate: The freeing of grain prices will facilitate assembly of supplies for humanitarian export shipments.

There is today, with uncertainty over OPA's future, a marked tendency on the part of farmers to hold back grain crops. Even if grain price control is continued until early in 1947, the possibility of increased prices then will convince many producers that the cost of storage for those months ahead will be less than the price increase to be expected in 1947. And if there is release of controls over animal foods, without decontrol of grains, the tendency to put price-controlled grains into commercial channels will fall off sharply as farm feeding ratios get better. In the meantime, grain sought for the relief program from commercial channels will be under influence of Government set-aside orders which farmers resist, and the competing influence of black markets which apparently cannot be controlled by the OPA. It will be a struggle between USDA controls and black-market prices, to get food for famine relief.

The only deterrent on some hoarding of grains would be the black market, itself both a corrupting influence in our Nation as well as a higher price level in fact. Grain crops of 1946 can be stored until the estimated end of OPA in 1947 with logical hope of a gain in price greater than the storage costs.

Industrial costs are advancing rapidly, mainly through increasing costs of labor, both in hourly rates and changing productivity per worker. Agricultural producers will not be content to have progressive increase of urban labor costs while their own labor wage figured in price obtained for their output, is strictly limited by OPA.

At a somewhat higher level, grains would flow more freely and famine relief needs could be more surely met, upon a free price basis.

If we are to set aside 250,000,000 bushels of wheat for secondary relief program needs in 1946–47, the surest way to get the grain is by price. While people abroad cry for food, it will seem difficult for governments here or abroad to explain that they cannot get enough grain at a low price; and decline to get sufficient grain at a somewhat higher price.

Shortages, both for domestic and foreign needs, result from maldistribution caused by price distortion. Grains have been wasted in unbelieveable quantities over the past few years due to this phenomena. For instance, wheat, the human consumption grain, has been fed to animals lavishly. Under the wartime stimulus of just a moderately favorable feed price ration around 350,000,000 bushels of wheat were fed to animals in one recent year.

The necesssarily clumsy efforts of artificial adjustment of price distortion by fiat has always been too little and too late. Without the automatic adjustment of delicate price ratios the disappearance of 400,000,000 bushels of wheat or more as feed this crop year is entirely possible. As the result of past policy, we have the unthinkable condition where mills are shut down in this country when our people need food, and breadlines actually exist today.

Postulate: Price ceilings must be lifted from livestock, meats, and poultry to correct well-defined evil conditions in these markets. Livestock meats and poultry are but the end products of grains. One cannot be decontrolled without the other. If ceilings are removed from prices of livestock, meats, and poultry, without simultaneous removal of ceiling prices on grains, the following results must be expected: (1) Further expansion of an already over-expanded animal population on farms; (2) a tremendous stimulation of the black markets in feed grains and ingredients; (3) producer resentment against congressional discrimination, in prices, as between farms producing grains principally, and producers of animal foods.

1. Numbers of animals on farms in the United States reached unusually high, and record numbers during World War II. This increase was made possible by Government administered ceiling and support prices, which insured exceptionally favorable feeding ratios; and because these record high numbers of animals could be fed from very high carry-overs of grain at the start of war years, heavy imports of grains, and by the four greatest years in succession, of volume of grain production in our Nation. During these 4 years this record animal population consumed over a billion bushels of grain more than we produced. Animal numbers today are too high for normal years of grain production, but numbers will not be reduced while feeding ratios are favorable.

2. Recent grain price increases by OPA-OES made the feeding ratio slightly less favorable (although OPA hastened to increase prices of milk and dairy products to prevent a reduction in the milk flow). But if price controls are removed from animal foods while price controls remain on grains, Congress itself will have re-established the favorable feeding ratio which the USDA-OPA have been trying to correct: Congress will have encouraged further expansion in our animal numbers. Heavy demand for famine relief abroad will be added to heavier demand for feed grains at home, and a chaotic black market will compete further with the Government relief program for available grain. Also, where crop and animal production occur on the same farm, diversion of grain from commercial channels (where it is needed for industrial as well as famine relief program) will be immediately made to farm feed lots.

3. Where the farm is in a principal grain producing area, such action as proposed by Congress would impose a strict limitation on price of its grain products, while freeing prices on other (animal) farms. These commercial and surplus grain area producers would resent bitterly such marked price discrimination as better classes of producers.

The further effect of such action would be to increase confusion in all price relationships between all farm products, compared to any reasonable demand-value. It would set up legal chaos in the American farm-price structure.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to another subject. Yesterday afternoon on the floor of the Senate the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] stated, in his explanation of certain phases of the bill, that the provisions which prohibit ceiling prices on agricultural products which were not so controlled before April 1 will not apply to such products as milk. This, he said, is because there were ceilings on some uses of milk prior to April 1. For example there was a ceiling on the farm price of milk sold as bottled milk. On the other hand there was no ceiling price on the farm price of cream made into butter, nor on milk made into cheese or evaporated milk.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio is not in the Chamber at this moment, but I should like to propound a question. Do other Senators agree with the Senator from Ohio that the bill would permit a ceiling price on such cream or milk for manufacturing into such dairy products as cheese and evaporated milk because of the fact that the farm price for some uses of milk were under a ceiling prior to April 1?

If it be true that all milk production is included, both that which was under a ceiling and that which was not under a ceiling, then I wish to refer the Senator from Ohio to the tables for the production of milk, as they present comparisons for the years 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946. If those figures are correct, I wish to ask him whether he believes that milk should be decontrolled immediately upon the passage of this measure. That question is similar to the question asked yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] relative to the surplus of beef and the demand for beef and also the surplus of butter and the demand for butter and the surplus of pork and the demand for pork and the surplus of poultry and the demand for poultry and the surplus of dairy products and the demand for dairy products; and of course some time later I also asked those questions.

Mr. President, in summarizing the matter briefly, I desire to point out that the definite points at issue that have been brought out by the debate upon this measure justify the position which I took when this conference report automatically was brought up for vote last Wednesday. An impartial analysis of the interpretations placed upon its provisions by the proponents of the measure and by the opponents of the measure should convince the most skeptical that the conference report should have gone back then for further consideration in conference. Because of the parliamentary situation in which we now find ourselves, namely, the limitation of debate, and in view of the fact that the time will soon arrive when the life of the OPA under the present act will terminate, it is now practically impossible to send the bill back to conference for further consideration. The defense has been made and will be made that it would be of no use to do so, and yet I submit that it is not unusual to send back a conference report for a further conference. It is not unusual to proceed in that manner. Conferees have been sent back for a further conference on other measures time and time again, for further consideration of issues which have been closely contested in connection with a conference report.

The defense that further conference is useless is attempted to be made, especially by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], on the ground that the House has voted twice not to decontrol meat. Yet I wish to point out to the distinguished Senator from Ohio and to other proponents of the measure that a proposal to decontrol meat, submitted by Representative WADSWORTH, of New York, lost in the House by a very close vote.

I further submit to the Senate that the House did not even vote upon the question of the decontrol of meat, milk, livestock, poultry, and dairy products, as

covered by this measure, until after the Senate conferees receded from the Senate amendments on decontrol. That fact should be borne in mind. What would the House have done if the Senate conferees had refused to recede from the Senate amendments? In that event the present picture might be entirely different. But the Senate conferees receded from the Senate amendments, and then the House conferees returned to the House and told the House, "This is what the Senate conferees have done. Now we want to to take a vote on the meat situation." The very arguments which are used here at this time were used then in the House of Representatives. The House was told "Here is what the Senate conferees did. Now the only thing for the House to do is to vote not to decontrol meat, livestock and livestock products, milk, poultry, and dairy products." I think that is the primary reason for the pending conference report.

Again I ask, Why does it happen that the Senate of the United States, which by 2 to 1 voted into the measure five amendments for decontrol, now has before it a conference report which deletes them from the bill or else emasculates them beyond recognition by those who wished to have them adopted? Why should not another effort be made to see to it that the Senate amendments are not receded from?

But, no, Mr. President; we are told that it is useless to do so because the House voted not to decontrol meat. But we must remember that the House voted that way after the Senate conferees receded from the Senate amendments in the conference.

The defense of the conference report is also made on the theory that there has been set up within the provisions of this so-called price-control bill the machinery for decontrol. Oh, Mr. President, just think of what the proponents have said they were going to do. I hope they do even one-half of what they have said they will do in respect to decontrol if the conference report is adopted. The statement has been made by the proponents of the measure, time and time again, that we can expect an early decontrol of livestock, dairy products, and poultry. Once again I hope that the distinguished majority leader will help us get these decontrols, because that is his interpretation and that is the basis on which this conference report is presented. Its advocates say they hope to have the conference report adopted on that basis.

To those who believe in such a defense, let me say that this is an administrative procedure; and, as I said on the floor of the Senate last Wednesday, if we are to judge the future by the past, the act will be interpreted by Chester Bowles as he sees fit. Certainly if we are to take the statement of the President at face value, there will be little chance, if any, of getting decontrols during the extension of the OPA Act.

The interpretation placed upon the Barkley-Bates amendment, the interpretation placed upon the Bankhead amendment, the interpretation placed upon the entire Stabilization Act by Chester Bowles time and time again, in the face of the provision that there should be no change in business practices—the provision was written into the act, Mr. President, that there should be no change in business practices—the interpretations which have been made by Mr. Bowles, in the face of that provision which is written into the act, should convince us all, because of the violations and the overriding thereof, that we in the Congress cannot expect decontrol of anything under Chester Bowles, if the OPA Act is extended.

While I admit that the machinery for such procedure is set up—and, Mr. President, what window dressing there is in this measure—yet, stripped of all its window dressing, the cold fact remains that this measure does not provide for the accomplishment of anything more than could be accomplished under the present act, if it were properly administered. I hope every Member of the Senate understands that fact. There is nothing in the pending measure which, even if properly administered, will give us anything more than we could have had under the act already on the statute books, if it had been properly administered. If it had been properly administered, we would not find ourselves in the present chaotic condition. Today conditions would be different if the present Stabilization Act had been administered as the Congress of the United States interpreted it. That one fact alone justifies a vote against the conference report.

Mr. President, all of us have to tell the American people, and I must tell the people of Nebraska when I go back home, if I tell them the truth, that this act will avail us no more than the one now on the statute books. In fact, the provisions of the pending measure legalize the cost absorption and profit-control program which Chester Bowles initiated without authority of Congress. Do not ever forget, Mr. President, that the pending measure provides for the extension, in the future, of the cost-absorption program upon the basis upon which it has been put into effect by Chester Bowles. It was never legalized by Congress. It is an invention of Chester Bowles. Now the pending measure, which we are asked to approve, condones the practice in which he has engaged during the past 4 years. Every cost-absorption requirement which has been imposed on any segment of industry is now to be legalized, for the first time, by Congress. The pending measure gives Chester Bowles the green light; it gives him the "go" sign by approving those practices, even though, as I have said, the Members of Congress, or at least I, have held them to be illegal. By the adoption of the pending conference report we shall condone profit control, and we shall say that Chester Bowles can decide how much he will take from the pockets of the dealers. We shall thus authorize that to be done. Before now we have contended that he had no right to do it. But the pending measure approves it and permits it, and under the pending measure he will be able to continue to apply the cost-absorption policies which have been imposed prior to 1946, for by this measure we shall be giving him the legal authority to do so. That is a fair statement. That is the proper interpretation. Just as sure as anyone goes to Chester Bowles to obtain relief, the first thing he will tell them is that this is the correct interpretation of the act.

Mr. President, we now serve notice upon the American people that we approve the black-market operations of Chester Bowles. We sanction what he has done for the past 4 years, because we extend the act on practically the same basis, without the restrictions. We tell the American people that even though 80 percent of the meat is black marketed and sold through racketeers, we condone it. There is no dispute about it. The fact has not been disputed by anyone. We condone it. We say to the country that we believe in that kind of practice. We say that that is what the American people should tolerate.

Mr. President, I do not have time to read into the RECORD everything which I should like to have the RECORD show, and I shall therefore ask that certain matters be placed in the RECORD without reading them. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks a portion of a statement of Royal C. Stephens, from page 1159 of the hearings, which gives a picture of what I have been talking about.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am informed that since Congress had indicated they are going to relieve the American people from a lot of unfair rulings by the National Price Administration, just last week Mr. Louis H. Budd, Jr., OPA administrator of Sussex County Price Control Board since 1942, resigned his position, effective within a week, at the conference of OPA officials held at Newark, N. J., when Mr. Budd was told by the State OPA officials that under a new ruling he would be expected to produce a minimum of 15 docket cases every month. "Docket cases" is the OPA term used for violations. Mr. Budd informed that the national office "has selected a minimum of 15 docket cases per month as an arbitrary figure below which a board should not fall and still be able to justify its existence."

I now request your committee to subpena Mr. Louis H. Budd, Jr., of 24 Church Street, Sussex County, N. J., who last week resigned as OPA administrator of the Sussex County Price Control Board which is located at Newton, N. J., and request him to tell your committee of some of the unfair and un-American and unconstitutional rulings of the National Price Administration, and at the same time request Mr. Paul Porter, OPA Administrator, and Mr. Chester Bowles, the former OPA Administrator, to be present and listen to Mr. Louis H. Budd reveal some practical information that will make them more efficient in handling OPA affairs.

In conclusion, I wish to submit for the record a letter from Mr. Harold B. Simmons, a Democratic justice of the peace, and a veteran of World War No. 1, from Bryan Township, Sussex County, N. J., to the Newark Evening News under the date of Saturday, April 27, 1946, that expresses the feelings of the American citizens of Sussex County over Mr. Louis H. Budd resigning as administrator of the price control board of Sussex County, N. J.

Very truly yours,

ROYAL C. STEPHENS.

NETCONG, N. J.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks a memorandum in the form of a synopsis of black-market operations in meat from 1942 to the present date.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON LIVESTOCK AND MEAT SITUATION

THE BLACK MARKET

Prior to 1942 approximately 1,500 meat packers produced all the meat entering domestic commercial channels. In 1945 Federal slaughter licenses were issued to more than 26,000 slaughterers. In February 1946 subsidy payments were made to approximately 12,000 of them.

The 14,000 who do not apply for subsidies, and many other slaughterers are operating in the black market. They have moved in and taken over a large percentage of the production and distribution of meat.

A large percentage of the livestock marketed is sold at prices in excess of legal ceiling prices. When the black market finishes buying there are relatively few head left to be purchased at legal prices. The result is that all law-abiding slaughterers have been forced to close or curtail drastically their operations.

The margin between legal livestock prices and wholesale meat ceilings is such that an efficient packer cannot recover all of his costs if he sells the carcass as dressed meat. It is obvious that the meat of all animals purchased in excess of legal prices is sold to the retailer or consumer at illegal prices.

Most retail dealers, if they wish to stay in business, must pay illegal wholesale prices for a large percentage of their meat. The result is that more than 83 percent of the retail stores from coast to coast, and from border to border are selling meat above ceiling prices and making overcharges at the rate of $1,250,000,000 annually.

Many black-market slaughterers are killing and dressing livestock in uninspected plants, in barns, sheds, and fields lacking adequate refrigeration or other sanitary requirements. They are grading their own meat, and are selling upgraded, contaminated, and in some instances diseased meat. A large percentage of black-market meat, under Federal inspection standards, is wholly unfit for human consumption.

The black market wastes meat, hides, bones, offal, and grease worth many millions of dollars annually. Either the farmer or consumer must absorb this loss.

Huge quantities of valuable glands and other materials, the sole source of raw materials for many pharmaceutical products, are destroyed by black-market slaughterers. The principal pharmaceutical companies who produce these medicines inform us that stocks are being depleted. On April 10, 1946, Eli Lilly & Co., in a telegram filed with the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, said:

"If situation continues much longer, someone must be prepared to accept responsibility for shortage of essential drugs such as insulin and other important drugs such as bile, pituitaries, thyroid, and perhaps antianemic preparations. Our current procurement is very much short of minimum needs and appears to be getting worse right along."

The black market has caused widespread unemployment and drastic reduction of working hours in plants of law-abiding slaughterers. On April 5, 1946, the president and secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butchers Workmen of North America, A. F. of L., the long-time established union of packing house workers and meat cutters, sent a telegram to President Truman, Secretary Anderson, Messrs. Porter and Bowles complaining about this condition and urging that all controls be immediately removed from livestock and meat.

Prior to 1942 the livestock and meat business was a respectable business, conducted by honorable and law-abiding people. During the last 3 years the black market has grown steadily. In 1946, in a large percentage of the transactions, everyone, from the farmer who raised the animal to the consumer who purchased the meat, was a party to a violation of a Federal statute or regulation.

When you add to the $1,250,000,000 consumers are now paying in excess of ceiling prices the $750,000,000 paid in meat subsidies and the cost of administration of OPA, it is clear that the cost of maintaining the fiction "that the line is being held on meat" exceeds $2,000,000,000 annually, more than one-half of total Federal expenditures in 1929, and more than one-half of the proposed loan to Britain now being debated in Congress.

THE CAUSE OF THE BLACK MARKET

The nature of the livestock and meat business is such that it does not lend itself readily to price control. It was a very difficult problem, notwithstanding the established industry's full and complete cooperation with the Office of Price Administration.

There are serious doubts whether the Meat Division of the agency, if staffed with meat experts, could have held a rigid price line and avoided the black market.

Unfortunately, the OPA concentrated on "profit control" instead of "price control." Its first order rolled back meat prices and "froze" them at levels below other competitive food prices and below levels justified by livestock prices, the supply and demand, and the consumers' ability to pay. The consumer roll-back and the interjection of subsidies in 1943 imposed further pressure on "the meat price line."

From the inception of price control one or more species of livestock has been in a "price squeeze." Companies whose sole income was derived from the class of livestock in the "squeeze" were faced with the alternative of going "broke" or "black." This, and the unprecedented consumer purchasing power and his desire for meat, opened wide the gates for the black-market operator and invited him to enter the field. The extent of the response is demonstrated by the fact that in a 2-year period 26,000 new commercial slaughterers and more than a million farmers and retailers applied for and received licenses to slaughter livestock and sell meat.

Testimony before congressional committees, official reports, letters to Congress, speeches, and press releases by officials of the Office of Price Administration clearly establish the agency's full knowledge of the continuous existence of a growing black market in meat since shortly after the inception of price control.

In the early stages it is possible that the black market might have been restrained within reasonable bounds had the OPA eliminated the "squeeze" and established prices at reasonable levels which would have permitted all packers with average costs and efficiency to recover all of their costs and a reasonable margin of profit. Notwithstanding a direct mandate of Congress in 1945 (the Barkley-Bates amendment), the Office of Price Adminisration neglected or refused to change its faulty pricing policies, and, 1 year later, we now find a large percentage of the meat business firmly in the hands of the black market.

The OPA has used two different methods to eliminate or control the black market—(1) more controls and (2) well-publicized threats of prosecution—neither of which has been effective.

Controls have been added to controls until we now have a multitude of complicated, involved, and unworkable regulations, and an almost complete break-down of price control at all levels in the meat industry. Since May 11, 1942, in the Beef and Veal Division alone, 112 regulations and directives and more than 1,100 amendments have been issued. No single individual does or could understand all of these regulations, and many of them could not be complied with if understood.

Enforcement against the deliberate black-market operator has been wholly ineffective. The scattered prosecutions and nominal fines have been considered a minor annoyance and part of the cost of doing business. In spite of everything the OPA has been able to do, the black market has grown steadily.

It seems that the OPA has concentrated its enforcement activities against the legitimate operators. A review of the reported cases indicates that many of the prosecutions were for technical, unintentional, or unavoidable violations. The record shows that the meat packer who has observed the law and regulations has been forced to curtail his operations or discontinue his business.

Enforcement at the retail level has been left, in the main, to volunteer price panels. The futility of this amateur policing is demonstrated by the fact that five out of six retail stores are selling meat above ceiling prices.

It appears that the OPA has approximately 350 employees in its Meat Enforcement Division country-wide, one out of every five being a lawyer. This number is more than 100 less than the number of employees in the OPA's Information Section.

The Government figures, which show that a large percentage of livestock sold on public markets is sold at prices in excess of legal ceilings, necessarily mean that the meat is sold at illegal wholesale prices. This demonstrates how ineffective the OPA has been at curbing the black market at the slaughter and wholesale level.

THE REMEDY

It is the firm conviction of all segments of the industry—the rancher, the feeder, the packer, distributor, and retailer—that the only remedy is the immediate removal of subsidies and all price controls from livestock and edible meat products.

Full legitimate production is the only answer to both the inflation and the black-market problems. At this late date, an increase in livestock and meat ceilings will not get full legitimate production or eradicate the black market. At this late date, improvised regulations are not a remedy, nor can additional investigations bring about compliance with OPA regulations. Price control appears to have completely broken down, and effective enforcement is no longer possible.

Black-market operators cannot compete with legitimate commercial meat packers under a free economy. They are not interested in the meat business at the industry's normal profit margin. They are inefficient and wasteful operators. They will disappear from the market and go out of business if the legitimate meat packer is permitted to compete with them on even terms.

WHY CONGRESS SHOULD DECONTROL MEAT

After more than 3 years of an expanding black market it is obvious that if subsidies and price controls on livestock and meat are to be removed and the business returned to law-abiding and taxpaying citizens the Congress will have to do it.

Under the formula of the often-announced price decontrol policy the removal of controls on livestock and meat is long past due. Livestock on ranches and farms is in abundant supply. In fact, there is a larger potential domestic per capita supply of meat available than has ever been consumed in

this country at any price. Also feed demands and a sound farm economy require an orderly liquidation of several million head of livestock, beginning now while the consumer is ready, able, and willing to buy the meat at fair prices.

Present inventory value of this surplus livestock represents cash, high wartime production costs, and future subsidy payments. Consumers, as indicated by black-market prices, want, and are able, to buy this extra meat. All that is needed is the removal of controls and the legitimate meat packers will buy, slaughter, and distribute it at fair competitive prices that will be a gain to the farmer and a saving to the consumer.

On the other hand, if the removal of subsidies and price controls is delayed until meat prices decline, the financial stability of many ranches and farms may be impaired.

WILL THE REMOVAL OF SUBSIDIES AND CONTROLS ON LIVESTOCK AND MEAT CAUSE RUN-AWAY INFLATION?

The public is now paying on the average, 20 percent more than legal retail ceilings for all the meat consumed, or $1,250,000,000 annually. Almost $750,000,000 is paid out of the United States Treasury annually as meat subsidies. Undoubtedly it costs several additional millions of dollars to administer the Livestock and Meat Division of the OPA.

Whether costs in excess of $2,000,000,000 annually above ceiling prices for meat is inflation is a moot question. We now have it.

Notwithstanding near record livestock numbers on ranches and farms we now have an acute shortage of meat in most large consuming centers caused by the black-market waste and maldistribution. Well informed, conservative people testified before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that unless controls are removed promptly the country will be faced with a meat famine during the next year.

Because of scarcity of meat in many consuming centers, and the black market's illegal overcharges, the consumer is overpaying an average of 20 percent above ceiling prices for inferior meat.

If the controls are removed and legitimate trade channels reopened there will be an abundance of meat in every retail store. Surely, the consumer will not pay legitimate operators as much per pound for meat in abundance as they now pay the black market for a short supply. In any event, the United States Treasury will save the $750,000,000 it is now paying out in subsidies and the costs of maintaining the meat section of the Office of Price Administration. Black-market waste will be recovered and the serious threat to the public health removed.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, in its publication the Livestock and Wool Situation, March–April 1946, is of the opinion that "if price ceilings on meat were removed, the average retail meat price in the second half of the year probably would be 15 to 20 percent above present reported levels, and somewhat higher than this for the better grades and more desirable cuts." (We understand that "present reported levels" are OPA retail ceiling prices.)

Discontinuance of subsidies and removal of controls from livestock and meat will not cause runaway inflation. In fact it will increase the return to the farmer for his livestock, increase the quality, and reduce the cost to the consumer.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished minority leader asked some questions about hides. He asked why hides could not be obtained. During the afternoon, over the telegraphic news service, there came a new order issued after the inquiry of the Senator had been made on the floor of the Senate. Here is the story which came to us from the Chicago Journal of Commerce:

The Government tonight revoked all import controls on hides, skins, and leather and relaxed price ceilings to permit free competition for world supplies.

Both actions resulted from a decision of the combined hides, skins, and leather committee on which this country and 13 other nations are represented to dissolve. The decision was made tonight simultaneously with the scrapping of all previous rulings of the committee.

OPA announced that American importers now may figure their ceilings by adding a mark-up margin of 5 percent to the cost of skins as landed.

The action, while it will undoubtedly result in higher import prices for the hides and skins, OPA said, will have no immediate effect on prices for leather or leather goods because ceilings on the latter are not changed.

Today's ending of international distribution controls will mean that importers throughout the world will probably begin to compete for supplies, OPA said.

If American importers were bound by the dollar and cent ceilings that have formerly applied to some of the imported skins being priced today, they would not be able to match offering prices of buyers from other countries.

Apparently the OPA have consented to American tanners buying hides on world markets at higher prices and without ceilings, while the American cattle producer has the doubtful pleasure of selling his hides to American tanners on the basis of ceiling prices. It seems strange to us that the American tanner may pay whatever is required to buy South American hides, but is forced by OPA to pay a very low ceiling for American hides.

Mr. President, by the modification of the Lucas amendment, we afford little relief from the gestapo methods practiced by the OPA enforcement officials. I have already asked and received consent to have printed in the RECORD a certain portion of the testimony of Mr. Royal C. Stephens, which will be, I am sure, very illuminating on this subject.

Mr. President, I wish to read a telegram which has come from Kansas City, Mo. The telegram reads as follows:

We are today rejecting the following advertisement from Kansas Feeder:

I ask that Senators listen to this telegram. I repeat:

We are today rejecting the following advertisement from Kansas Feeder:

Mr. President, the feeder is the man who feeds cattle and gets them ready for sale. Some processor buys the cattle, kills them, and later the consuming public receives the meat. That is, it receives the meat if it can obtain it.

I continue reading from the telegram. It refers to an advertisement which has been rejected by the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram, one of the finest periodicals of its kind printed anywhere in the Middle West. I read:

We are today rejecting the following advertisement from Kansas feeder "For sale, 7 loads of choice fat cattle, weight 1,100 pounds. Having had to compete with Government black market in corn wish to get into contact with a black market meat operator."

Mr. President, do Senators know what that means? It means that the feeder, in order to feed his cattle, was required to pay a black market price for grain.

I continue reading from the telegram:

We are passing this information on to you with the idea of the thoughts of the man in the country fearful that it may be the development of a trend. You are at liberty to use.

That telegram is signed by Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram. They would not accept the advertisement.

Mr. President, I wish to say with such force as I can, that today the cattle feeder is being forced into the black market in order to obtain grain to feed his cattle. Without it, he cannot do business. The price of grain runs all the way from $1.50 to $2.50 a bushel. It is necessary for a cattle feeder to find a black market operator in grain, or he cannot carry on his business.

Mr. President, in the extension of this act we tell the American businessman and the American public generally, that they are to be governed by executive orders issued by bureaucrats who never stood for an election. I wish that some of them had to stand for election in Nebraska.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I add also the State of Kansas?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; the same is true with reference to the State of Kansas. Whatever is true, in that connection, in the State of Nebraska is true also throughout the Nation.

Literally, thousands upon thousands of orders are issued by the OPA, and they are misinterpreted, contradicted, and rescinded. It means something more than merely so many figures on paper when I tell you, Mr. President, that from March 14, 1936, to November 4, 1945, there were issued 107,138 directives, orders, grants, permissions, and prohibitions. To print them would require more than 62,000 pages and 93,000,000 words.

Since May 11, 1942, 112 regulations and directives, and more than 1,100 amendments have been issued. All of them affected the beef and veal division of the meat industry. No single operator can possibly understand all of the regulations, much less comply with them. How in the world is business of this country expected to proceed in an orderly fashion when it is required to interpret directives which even the bureaucrats themselves cannot interpret when they come before our committees? Time and time again bureaucrats have been asked to interpret this directive or that directive, and disagreements have been developed between the bureaucrats themselves with reference to the proper interpretation which should be applied. Time and time again there have been disagreements between the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration when ceilings should have been raised. Long ago I stated that the agency which is responsible for production should be responsible for prices. An agency which is responsible for production should know what is required in order to obtain production. But we do not have that kind of a situation in our administration. If the Department of Agriculture says that so much production of a certain commodity is required, the Office of Price Administration will often overrule it.

Mr. President, I believe that the Senate has the power to end price controls. The rejection of the conference report will have the effect of ending them.

At the beginning of my remarks I said that the time has grown too late to send the conference report back to the conference committee for further consideration. Once again, referring to the statement which was made by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] that we are now making a choice between two evils, and he certainly spoke the truth as he saw it—either the present bill or no price control at all. I think the time has come when this country would be better off without any price control than to continue to operate under the present chaotic conditions.

I wanted to send the report back to the conferees, but I could not have that done.

I am never going to vote to condone cost absorption; I am never going to vote to continue black-market prices and regulations in this country. I base my position upon the following reasons:

First, because there is wholesale disrespect for law in this country. It is unnecessary to make a further statement on that point. Every housewife knows, every Member of the Senate knows that the only way food, clothing, and other necessities of life can be obtained is on the black market.

Secondly, because under the Bowles system we cannot get maximum production. It makes me laugh—if it were not so serious I would indulge in a good laugh—to hear this man Bowles continue to talk about production. The fact is we do not have production. There is not in the market places even the food we need, let alone the things we need to wear or the articles we need in our homes; indeed, under the Bowles system which is now in operation, there are not even homes enough where the people may live. The result has been absolute failure. I do not want it to continue for another year.

Third, because production can only be obtained by the elimination of price impediments. If we would remove price impediments then we would restore our legitimate markets and be able to carry on in the American way.

Now let me contrast production under the American way with production of other nations of the world under the totalitarian way.

What has our American system accomplished in peace? Under our liberal American system we have in 160 years achieved the greatest degree of personal, religious, and political liberty, the highest living levels, the highest wages, the best working conditions, the finest educational systems, the finest railroads, the most magnificent highways, the greatest airways, and the greatest array of luxuries ever achieved by any people in any period of time anywhere. But the subversionists now say, "Close your eyes to all that, the American system is a failure; we must have totalitarian control."

What has our American system accomplished in war? Not only have we achieved all these wonderful advantages and comforts of life in peace, but certainly we have proved the efficiency of the American system in war.

For 40 years the Japanese war lords drove their people to get ready for the struggle against the Occident. For 20 years Mussolini drove Italy, boot and spur, to get ready for the war he knew was coming. For 20 years Stalin forced the Russian people to intense sacrifices and efforts to get ready for the war he knew was to come. For 12 years Hitler and the Nazi ruffians drove the enslaved and terrorized German people day and night to prepare for the war he and his cohorts planned against civilization.

Now what about the American way? In just three short years, under our free Government, with our free industry, our free labor, our free agriculture, our free people of every religious faith, every political creed, every race and color united, cooperated and overcame that 40-year Japanese, that 20-year Italian, that 20-year Russian, and that 12-year German lead. Our production put us on an offensive basis in the greatest war of all time. Not only that, Mr. President, but we fought two wars at once—one in the Pacific, without any help from the Allies, and one in the Atlantic into which we poured billions of lend-lease—gift machines and munitions of war, and supplies.

We gave Russia more than $9,000,000,000 worth of war supplies, civilian foodstuffs, and clothing. We gave Britain more than $25,000,000,000 worth of the same kind of lend-lease supplies. In addition we poured billions of dollars worth of other machines and munitions and foodstuffs into other countries including China. And yet, these Communists would tell you our American system cannot defend itself in a modern world.

Lastly, we have got to decontrol some time if we are to keep the American way; otherwise, we have gone completely totalitarian. I think we should make a start now. The fear which some are trying to put into our hearts has no basis, because conditions are so chaotic now that they cannot become worse; under the free competitive system they can only become better.

The whole decontrol system boils down to one thing, namely, administration. I think there are those in the United States of America who, if they had the job, could do it in the American way, but apparently the administratior wants to continue with the program of Chester Bowles. That is the way it would deal with the economy of 140,000,000 American people.

I am now going to say something about political strategy. Let me say that I believe in the Republican Party and in its principles, and I think I can safely say that no one has been more loyal or worked harder for the Republican Party than have I; but some of our Republican strategists say this is a hot potato and that the thing to do is to let the administration settle its own bungling on OPA. They say that we must pass the bill as it is and let the President veto it; let him assume the responsibility. It is my judgment that the Congress has the responsibility, and that this responsibility is above partisan politics. I want the Senate to know that when it comes to an issue of this kind I place my Americanism above party loyalty and party politics. It is our job as Members of the United States Senate to do the best we can to provide legislation which will aid the American people to get back to an American economy. That is our responsibility. It transcends party responsibility. It cannot be shirked. It can not be shifted. When we of the Congress have done the best we can, we send it on to the President of the United States. Then and only then is it his job to handle the legislation as he sees fit.

But it seems to me that any legislative leadership on either side of the aisle that wants to transfer a hot potato to the President's lap, without taking action on it, is weak-kneed and spineless. It is not the kind of leadership the American people expect from the Senate of the United States, and especially from the minority party.

The Republican Party is already charged with a failure to decontrol livestock, dairy and dairy products, poultry and poultry products. Let me prove it. There have only been two votes in the House on the decontrol of meat; one was on the Wadsworth bill, which I have already mentioned. The other was taken after the Senate conferees had receded from their decontrol amendment. The Senator who cast the deciding vote which permitted the conference to recede from the Senate amendment was a Republican, and we are already being charged over the radio and in the press as the party responsible for the failure to decontrol meat.

Here is what Fulton Lewis, Jr., said last night about the recession from the Senate amendment:

> As one of the Republican members of the House-Senate Joint Conference Committee which was working out the final details of the OPA extension legislation, it was Senator TOBEY, a Republican, who swung with the Senate Democrats even when one of the Senate Democrats persisted in holding out against the President and decided the fateful issue of whether there should be a specific change or continued controls of meat and other commodities on the side that President Truman wanted. Senator TOBEY voted to strike out those provisions as Mr. Truman had requested.
>
> On top of that record on the part of Senator TOBEY, Mr. Truman's letter of yesterday did not sit well either with Republicans or Democrats.

I wish to say to my distinguished friend from New Hampshire that I think he has a perfect right to vote as he pleases on OPA extension. I know he feels conscientiously about its continuance, and he has the right to vote as he pleases; but I also wish to say in all fairness that I feel that as a Senate conferee he should not have receded from the amendment on the decontrol of meat, nor should any other Senator on the conference committee have receded, at least until after the House had taken a vote on that provision. I shall be of that opinion as long as I live, and I say that in all frankness and in all fairness as I make this statement on the floor of the Senate.

So, whether we like it or not, whether it is the wise political thing to do or not,

the Republican Party is charged with that responsibility.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say that now is the time to show leadership. The way to demonstrate leadership is not in talking the conference report to death. The way to show leadership is in voting. If we as a Republican Party are to perform the responsibilities imposed upon us, it is our job to defeat totalitarianism. That is what we were sent here for. Each and every one of us was elected on a platform obligating us to speak and to vote against totalitarian controls. We cannot remain faithful to our party, and certainly we cannot be faithful to our Government, if we vote to continue the totalitarian controls which are written into the provisions of the bill we are considering.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator think any Senator can vote for the conference report——

Mr. WHERRY. I made that perfectly clear, and the question requires no answer. I said that if a Senator believed he could vote for the conference report, that was his prerogative, and he should do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I think any Senator could be perfectly true to his party and vote for the conference report.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not think one could be true to the platform of the National Republican Party, or the State platforms I know of, and now vote to continue totalitarian controls.

Mr. AIKEN. If being true to the party consists in taking orders from those who consider themselves party leaders——

Mr. WHERRY. I would rather take orders from those men than from Chester Bowles, as the Senator has been doing for the last 4 years.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is not telling the truth.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall not challenge those words. I could have the Senator taken off the floor for them. But I will say that anyone who supports Chester Bowles' program for 4 years supports totalitarian controls, and that is what the Senator has done. He voted for the extension of the act and he is going to vote for this conference report.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Wilbur J. Brons appearing in the Chicago Journal of Commerce under date of June 26, 1946, and entitled "OPA Extended Bill Gives Black Market New Lease on Life."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROUND TABLE

(By Wilbur J. Brons)

OPA EXTENDER BILL GIVES BLACK MARKET NEW LEASE ON LIFE

The final conference version of the OPA extension bi'l was bad news.

This hodgepodge of political conflict, confusion, and appeasement will postpone urgently needed economic adjustments for the better part of another 12 months. Delay in price relief will continue to plague producers in many lines. This will mean a further distortion of the production picture.

And if the conferees failed to bring distinction upon themselves for the measure as a whole, they flopped even more miserably when they decided at the last moment to keep meat and dairy products under OPA control. This was a pure gift to the black-market boys, who now buy most of the cattle and peddle most of the butter.

Monday, while the conferees were busily gumming up the works, 10,000 head of cattle and 2,000 hogs arrived at the Union Stockyards here. Of the 10,000 cattle, Swift & Co. was able to purchase five. Wilson & Co., Inc., got three. Armour & Co. got none. Most of the remainder of the 10,000 cattle went to eastern markets—to bidders who pay no attention to OPA regulations and have no need of Federal subsidies.

The details of the story have been told so many times they are hardly worth repeating. But the 14,000 slaughterers who did not apply for subsidy payments this year are only a fraction of the total slaughterers who sell black-market meat. How many are killing cattle without having gone through the formality of obtaining a license is anybody's guess, but it would have to be several times the number of licensed slaughterers to account for the steady decline in stockyard receipts.

As this is written, more than half of Chicago's retail butcher shops are closed. The majority of those still open are paying illegal prices for the meat they sell over their counters. That is the only way they can stay in business. The housewife who raises her eyebrows when she gets her bill for meat is soon dropped from the butcher's list of preferred customers.

The butter situation is almost identical. Reputable retailers are now handling about 16 percent of the volume they handled in 1941. If these retailers were able to get their proportionate share of available butter, they would be handling about 50 percent of their 1941 volume. About 50 percent of the butter produced today is moving to consumers through illegal channels, at an average price of about 80 cents a pound. In some communities, it is being peddled from door to door at prices ranging from $1 to $1.50 a pound.

As of January 1, this year, there were 889,000 fewer milk cows on farms than on January 1, 1945. Dairy herds are being liquidated at an alarming rate in the States which normally produce most of the farm-separated cream for butter manufacture. Exclusive of Government requirements, there will be only about 6 pounds of butter available this year for each man, woman, and child in the country.

Other aspects of the OPA compromise will be discussed from time to time. Despite Messrs. Bowles, Porter, Wallace, et al., there will be no "boom or bust" this year. Progressive price rises are, nevertheless, inevitable under the administration's present wage policy. Economists outside the administration are quite generally agreed that if there are any sharp price disturbances this summer, they will be in nondurable goods.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning about 30 minutes after midnight, as we left the Senate Chamber and proceeded out into the street, the lightning was flashing, it was very humid, and as I got outside I heard a woman say, "What's the matter with our country?" It will be remembered that all last evening the galleries were filled, as they now are, with folks who are interested in their Government. But that one sentence, "What's the matter with our country?" struck me very forcibly. I remember that William Allen White once wrote an editorial on the subject, What's the Matter with Kansas? It was that editorial which precipitated him into the national arena where he gained recognition as a sane political thinker.

This morning I heard my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] praise the ability and integrity of the majority leader, and with every word of it I agree. I would characterize the majority leader as a great general, who usually, as the Senator from Oklahoma said, succeeds in getting his way.

But what is the matter with our country? As I saw my distinguished friend the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] proceed yesterday through 8 hours of debate with a smile on his lips, constantly the master of himself, I thought it was a good demonstration that we in the Senate, in the heat of debate, at least are keeping our heads. I marveled not only at the way the Senator from Texas handled himself, but at his physical ability and endurance, and his humor, interrupted, as he was, time and time again.

In that connection I compliment the other Members of the Senate, because feelings run deep on the subject we are considering, tremendously deep, and what is more, we are the target, as it were, of thousands of people throughout the country who also have felt the impact of this issue and have, as indicated by the thousands of telegrams the Senator from Texas received yesterday, expressed themselves about it.

Of course, frequently telegrams are the result of emotion, of fear, and for months previously many of the telegrams on this subject were nothing but channeled telegrams, as letters were channeled. Messages came in on printed postcards, indicating that Tom, Dick, and Harry were simply obeying the direction or the request of someone else. But the telegrams which have come recently are the result of individual thinking on this subject.

Of course, something else has caused the people to be more or less mentally upset. It has been the conflict on the radio. Fulton Lewis on one side, and several prominent commentators on the other, have precipitated into the minds of people who listen to the radio their individual concepts on the pending issue.

What is the matter with America? Nothing is the matter with America. Would we change a great public forum of 140,000,000 people, even though many of the expressions which have come to us indicate that they are not the result of thinking the problem through, but the result of impetuosity caused by the impact of somebody else's strong words? No; we would not change it. We would not have our thinking channeled, as took place in Germany, or as it is in Russia. Stalin told our negotiators that he could not understand why we permitted our newspapers and commentators to criticize public servants. In other words, there we have a frame of mind on the international scene in Russia which cannot comprehend one of the great rights of America—that is, the right of each individual to think a problem through—and, what is more, to express his convictions to his public servants. So, in that respect, I say there is nothing wrong with America.

As I proceeded home about 15 minutes later, at almost 1 o'clock this morning, I was accompanied by my good friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], but the words of the woman's question rang constantly in my mind: "What is wrong with America?" So, prefatory to my remarks on the issue we are debating today, I noted down a few things I wanted to say on that most important subject.

Mr. President, there is nothing inherently wrong with America. In my opinion, there are a few people who have gone wrong in their thinking and who, as a consequence, because of their exalted position, have placed this country in the particular situation in which we now find it. What I mean to say is that a great deal of thinking has to be straightened out. We must get down to "brass tacks" and think every issue through if we truly want to put this, our beloved country, in a position where it will function as it should function. I say to the occupants of the galleries that it is not solely their public servants whose duty it is to make sure that the country will function properly. Each and every American citizen in this critical atomic age has the duty to see to it that the country functions properly.

Now, Mr. President, what must we do? We must get rid of the racketeers. What is a racketeer? A racketeer is one who wants to run the Nation or other people's business, not according to the law of the land, but according to what he says the law is. In other words, he puts himself above the law. He makes himself the legislative branch, the executive branch, and the judicial branch of the Government.

Mr. President, the racketeer mind is too much in evidence in this country. It is in evidence particularly, as has been shown on the Senate floor in the few days we have been discussing this measure, in pretty nearly every market of America in which citizens have to buy necessities of life. It is also in evidence in government administrative branches, as was clearly demonstrated earlier today by my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who said that the OPA, instead of recognizing that it is a creature and a servant of the legislative branch, openly, in a racketeering frame of mind determined what the law was, different from what the legislative branch of the Government said the law was. The result is what always happens when racketeers enter the picture—they mess things up. That is one reason why we are debating OPA today.

It has been said on innumerable occasions in this debate that if OPA had been administered according to the intent and the direction of Congress, there would not be the critical situation which prevails today. I think we can accept that statement as fact. Anyone who attempts to add or multiply contrary to the rules of mathematics, comes out wrong. If he says 2 times 2 equals 6, the result is wrong.

Anyone who violates the law of the land creates a condition which is not sound. Any administrator of the law of the land who violates the law, creates a balled-up condition, and that is what we are facing now.

What I wish to stress, Mr. President, and I repeat what I previously stated, is that a great deal of thinking has to be straightened out. What do we have to do first? First we must get rid of the racketeers; not simply the racketeers who are operating in the OPA black market but the racketeers of our fundamental American thinking. That word fundamental means something, and I hope that every school teacher who is helping to shape the young minds of tomorrow will understand and appreciate what fundamental American thinking is, because the youngsters of tomorrow are either going to accept the concepts of fundamental American thinking or they are going to accept the racketeer's concept of American thinking, and there are plenty of those who are racketeering the fundamentals of America.

Second. There is not any question that we have to have greater efficiency in government. We must get rid of excess bureaucrats and stop riotous spending.

Third. There is not any question that we have to balance our budget. In saying that I am replying to the lady's question: "What is the matter with our country?" The budget can be balanced. It must be done. But we will have to stop appropriating millions and billions of dollars for public improvements, most of which have no business being in the picture at this time. What do I mean by that? Senators know that every dollar we spend in public improvements competes with private enterprise and the needs of our people, which now run into the billions of dollars—yes, Mr. President, into the billions of dollars' worth of goods required for everyday living.

Fourth. We must go to work and produce. That means that the workers of America, and management and particularly the labor leaders, must acquire a different slant on their obligation to the Nation.

England is exporting more today than she has ever exported in her history. In Britain, workmen know there is only one answer to their problem, and that is work and more work. With millions of their homes destroyed by war and their industry damage, the people of England went to work after VE-day, and worked as one team.

Recently we were privileged to have in this body a delegation from Britain. They were legislators, leaders of the labor government in Britain. They stood on the Senate floor in front of the desk of the President of the Senate, and we passed in front of them and shook their hands. It was my privilege to become pretty well acquainted with them. They were more like us than are many others from Britain whom I have heretofore met. I got close to them. I talked with them.

What did they say? They said that there was only one answer, and that was work. Further, they said that they had no particular faith in a number of our great labor leaders. Mind you, with millions of their houses destroyed and many of their factories gone, they went to work, and today England is exporting more goods than ever before in her history.

Furthermore, they said, "We learned long ago that the way to get production is not to make it worth while for anyone to remain idle." That is another thing which we must learn.

What is the matter with America? Nothing is inherently wrong with America. We are a growing nation of 140,000,000. Our land is the garden spot of the earth. Not one home has been destroyed, not one factory blown to pieces. Our railroads, our highways, our farms, and our cities are all ready to go. But I was informed today that there is no meat to serve in the Senate restaurant. A few days ago I was informed by the chef that the restaurant had run out of oatmeal, and could not buy any more. Some of us have been trying to buy common white cotton shirts.

What is the matter with America? Britain can answer that. We must get rid of the communistic-minded folks who consciously or unconsciously are throwing monkey wrenches into our economy. We must get rid of those who want everyone with means, energy, and inventive genius liquidated so that they can apply their remedies. We must get rid of those who pretend to believe that money is a curse, but are always looking for it. The Master said that it was the love of money that was the root of all evil, meaning that when a man violates the first commandment and lusts after money or anything else, to the point where he forgets that man is something more than mere physique, that is the root of all evil.

What is the matter with America? I repeat that there is nothing wrong with America, but there is something wrong with some of us. The OPA picture is an illustration. Everyone agrees that there is something wrong in the set-up. I remember a story about two darkies. One of them was buying a mule from the other. The first one said, "Mose, am dat mule sound?" The other replied, "Sure dat mule am sound." The first one asked him, "Do you guarantee dat mule is sound?" The other replied, "Sure; I guarantees dat mule is sound." The first one said, "I will buy him." The next day the man who had bought the mule noticed the mule in the pasture. He was running around and butting his head into every tree and fence post. So he decided that the mule was not sound, but that he was blind. He went to the darky from whom he had bought the mule and said, "Did you guarantee dat mule as being sound?" The other replied, "I sure did." The first one said, "Well, look at him butting his head into that tree." The other man said, "Boss, dat mule am sound, only he just don't give a damn." [Laughter.]

That story illustrates a condition of mind which we find in this country. The Senator from Oklahoma illustrated it today by pointing out two laws with respect to which the OPA "didn't give a damn." It failed utterly to follow the legislative mandate. That is what makes things rotten. It is the racketeer mind. It is not merely the man who slaughters a cow and disposes of the meat in violation of OPA prices. It is the OPA itself, which violates the mandate of the legis-

lative branch. The OPA officials set themselves up as overlords.

I am talking about fundamentals. I have met many fine men in the OPA organization. I could give the names of 6 or 10 of them who have been very cooperative, who were distressed because of the complicated machinery in that organization, and who literally cried because of their inability to get things done. When I showed them that month after month went by without any heed being given to a critical business situation, they admitted it. I asked, "What can be done?" The answer was "We do not know. We have tried to pry things loose."

I have a great deal of respect, and in some cases affection, for some of the men upon whom I have called in OPA. They have helped me to find the solution to many problems. As I say, I have met many cooperative men in that organization who were disgusted with the mechanics of it, who realized the inequity of the set-up, who have seen injustice done, and who have admitted the injustice. Those men have seen loafers on the job constantly coming in late in the morning, men who, when we are working 80 hours a week, cannot be found on Saturday. The is partially the responsibility of the President, who after VJ-day said to the workers downtown that they should have a 5-day week. In this challenging period when we are working for production, when we are trying to harness the tremendous evil forces resulting from the war, we find these synthetic people in the Government saying by their acts and deeds, "Let things go." The result is the situation in which we find ourselves today. The men of whom I speak have worked diligently, but they have been unable to get results because of the ineptitude of the administrative organization.

What is wrong with America? Nothing; but we must get rid of some of the fake medicine men, many of whom have harassed the economy of this Nation for more than a decade, and are interfering with our really getting under way.

I could amplify that statement by citing a thousand examples in my own State, which is 50 percent industrial and 50 percent agricultural. Business after business has been damaged and injured and workmen have been put out of jobs because of OPA. In wartime we could overlook OPA's mistakes, but now there is no further need for such action on the part of Americans. Time and time again I have seen how prewar industry failed to get a necessary and just increase. But some new, favored son who opened up an industry 10 or 15 miles away got an increase of 10 percent or in some cases 50 percent for a product and thus the old industry was put out of business, or seriously injured.

So, Mr. President, we must get rid of the racketeer mind, the fake-medicine mind. I remember the old fake-medicine guy. When I was a boy he used to come around, and the lumberjacks would gather around him. He would hold up a bottle of medicine and tell them that the medicine in that bottle would cure everything from gray hair and toothache and stomach ache to consumption and cancer. He would tell his story, and he would get all the crowd mesmerized. His chant was, "$1 a bottle, six bottles for $5!" I have seen those people, mesmerized by the very magic and dramatics of his voice, pay their hard-earned dollars which they had to work 10 days in the woods to earn.

What was that medicine? When I was older I had it analyzed once by a brother-in-law of mine who was a druggist. He said, "Counting the bottle, the whole thing costs about 5 cents. It is made up of a little sarsaparilla, some roots, a little brown sugar, and water." But it fooled those people, and enabled the medicine man to take in a lot of money. The worst thing about it was that the racketeer tactics of the medicine man planted in the minds of those who listened to him many ideas about diseases which they never had.

So today the medicine men in Government and out of Government who harass our economy must be taken care of. You and I in the Congress must take care of them.

Another thing we must do is to get rid of a lot of the synthetic-thinking, wild-eyed professors who are teaching our youth in some of our great educational institutions. I wish I had time to tell the Senate about the parents who come to my office and tell of the impact which such professors have on their children.

An impact of the same sort took place here in this city yesterday. Some Senators may have read in the newspaper that the PAC held an educational institute in Washington yesterday. I was privileged to be classified there as one of those whom the PAC does not like. If I were running for office this year, that would bring me 50,000 more votes in my State. The people know about the PAC.

Mr. President, let me refer to an incident which I related on the floor of the Senate not very long ago. A group of them—17 of them—headed by one of the CIO leaders from Milwaukee, came into my office, some 5 or 6 months ago. They laid before me a paper on which were listed some 11 or 12 bills. They said, "We came down here to demand that you vote for these bills."

I lined those men up around my office. I said to the leader, "Have you read these bills?"

He said, "No."

Then, to one after another of them, I said, "Have you read these bills?"

In each case the answer was, "No."

I said to them, Well, I shall let you in on a little secret: Neither have I. Only one of those bills is before my committee. Now, gentlemen, I will give you 30 minutes to talk, if you want to talk that long. First, I will talk 10 minutes to you. But after I have talked 10 minutes, you will probably not have anything to say.

I do not know who sent you down here or who is paying your expenses. But just think what you are doing. You come here and tell me to commit myself on legislation which is not yet born, legislation which you have not yet read. Don't you know that a bill may go into a committee looking like a dove, and may come out looking like a jackass?

They did not know that.

I said then, "Gentlemen, those measures may go into a committee in the way in which they are framed now, but the committee may amend them to such an extent that when the committee reports them they will not be recognized as bearing any semblance to the bills which were sent to the committee." I said to them, "I remember that last year one of the distinguished Members of the Senate, Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, stated on the floor of the Senate that he would have to vote against his own bill because of the fact that the committee had amended it to such a great extent." So I said to them, "Now don't you understand how ridiculous it is to tell a Senator what he should do when you do not know what you are talking about?"

The delegation's leader said, "Well, you listen to the chamber of commerce."

It so happened that my secretary was present at that time, so I said to him, "Have you seen any representative of the National Chamber of Commerce around here."

He replied, "No."

I said to them, "Well, gentlemen, I recall that twice since I have been here, representatives of the chamber of commerce have come to this office. But instead of demanding that I do certain things, they suggest what they think should be done. They know better than to demand." I said, "Wouldn't this be a terrible country if 17 men could tell a United States Senator what he should do? How long do you think the great laws on the statute books which protect the rights of labor would remain intact if that were the case?"

Then one of the men said, "Well, Senator, we think you are antilabor."

I said, "Wait a minute. Where did you get that notion?"

They did not answer.

I said, "I will tell you where you got it. Last fall I ran for office, as you know. I suppose that none of you voted for me; but that is all right, and you have the right of petition, and I am ready to listen, any time, and I am ready to receive letters."

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, on the average I receive 300 communications a day, the year round.

I said to those men, "Gentlemen, I am ready to receive your petition, but I will tell you something. A year ago last fall when I ran for office, I went to the northern part of Wisconsin, where workmen had worked with me in the sawmills for 15 cents an hour. Can any of you say you ever worked 11 hours a day for 15 cents an hour?"

They could not say that.

"All right," I said, "then do not say that I am antilabor. But I will tell you something. The Friday before the election, the stewards of the CIO throughout the State called their unions together, and said to the men, 'There is one guy we have got to get; that is Senator WILEY.'"

Mr. President, that is what this newspaper says the PAC again stated yesterday.

I said, "Some of the workmen in Eau Claire and La Crosse and in other places, after they had learned who that 'guy' was—and I was the guy—said, 'What is the matter with WILEY?' The answer was, 'He does not take orders.'"

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to get that, because it shows the racketeering mind in action again.

The answer was, "He does not take orders." That is the point, Mr. President.

If a man does not take orders from this outfit, they are out to get him. What a wonderful and safe Nation this would be if each and every one of the 96 Members of the Senate took orders. What kind of a country would we have? "He does not take orders." That is one of the demands of this racketeering outfit which we will get rid of if we take the proper action. If we take a little political action on our own part, if we start to live straight, act straight, and think straight, we will not permit any individual, group of individuals, or combination of individuals to tell us—by "tell us" I mean command us—what to do.

I recall the statement of a Britisher which was about as follows: "I would think there was something wrong with my son if he were not a Socialist before arriving at his twenty-fifth birthday. But, if he continued that way after he was 25, I would think he was crazy."

Mr. President, I would not go that far because the term "socialism" means one thing to one man and something else to another. However, I was speaking of the impact of some of the so-called educated leaders—as they believe they are—on the formative minds of the youth of America. Such so-called leaders are striving to give the impression that the political life and the economic life of Russia are superior to ours. That kind of propaganda is impressed on the young formative mind, delicately attuned to receive impressions and ideas, be they right or wrong. Those leaders plant their poisonous seed.

What is wrong with America? Nothing. However, there is something wrong with some persons in America. Yes, Mr. President, some of us, including the businessman, the farmer, and the sober, sane, thinking workingmen of America—and, thank God, they are becoming more and more numerous and are beginning to realize that some labor leaders have sold the rank and file down the river—must understand that it is necessary to get down to brass tacks and do some work in order to combat all subversive forces and all kinds of synthetic thinking.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that yesterday, at a PAC conference, my name was mentioned as one of those whom the PAC has sworn to defeat. I welcome the challenge. I do not like to indulge in personal references, but when I was a young man I was a scrapper. For three terms as a district attorney, I filled the jails and prisons with murderers and rapists of that time. The record still stands. Since then, I have mellowed somewhat, but when I observe the way some people in this country are raping the American concept, I am somehow or other renewed in my youth, like the eagle, and am ready for another fight. So I say the challenge is made to all Americans in open debate to meet the racketeers of American values.

I repeat, in talking with the English labor delegates who were here a few days ago, one of them said, "We do not have much time for some of your labor leaders. We know that the only answer for putting the Nation back on its feet is work." Another statement which the same gentleman made was this: "We found out long ago that it is unsound economics to pay folks to loaf."

What is wrong with America? There are too many loafers. Yes; there are those who would legislate out of existence the men who build and create, and put the loafers into running business and government. Who taught such nonsense as "Get all you can for nothing—to hell with the Government—the less you work the better—lend and spend?" Who made possible the chiseler, the grafter, and the racketeer? Who in this period set the example for a 40-hour week; who crippled production by suggesting a 25-cent-an-hour increase; who sold the synthetic idea that this wage could be paid by management without price relief? Who catered to the labor leaders and the PAC through the years until we are in the fix we are now in?

Mr. President, in 1932 Governor Roosevelt, of New York, campaigning for the Presidency, made this statement:

> Let me propose a text which, in my opinion, expresses a sentiment that is widely held this year. It is presented so clearly, so distinctly, and so admirably that I would not change a word of it, even though it was spoken 12 years ago. Coming from a great figure in our national life, it deserves serious consideration; and coming from a great Republican, it deserves particularly consideration from Republicans: "For one reason or another even a wisely led political party, given a long enough tenure of office, finally fails to express any longer the will of the people; and when it does so fail to express the will of the people, it ceases to be an effective instrument of government. It is far better for such a political party—and certainly better for the state—that it should be relegated to the role of the critic and that the opposing political party should assume the reins of government. This condition appears to have arrived in America."

In this statement he answered, What is the matter with our country?

Mr. President, I believe that in this quotation of ex-President Roosevelt we have the answer to the question, What is wrong with our country?

Every good business, after a number of years, changes its auditor, so as to have a double check on his business. This Government needs a check on what is going on.

In my own State, as I have said, we are 50-percent industrial and 50-percent agricultural. We have lived through the OPA regimentation of businessmen and farmers.

I believe the best indication how the milk producers of my State feel on the subject is expressed in a letter signed by Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, and I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The most serious defect in the conference committee bill is the elimination of the McFarland amendments which appeared in the Senate bill. Those amendments were designed to remove controls over livestock, dairy and poultry products, because price controls on these commodities had broken down and were drastically curtailing production. To leave these commodities under price controls is to assure continued black markets, increasing shortages, and continued distress among farmers.

Section 11 of the committee bill would not only continue control policies which are destroying dairy production but would aggravate their effect. Under this language it would be possible to establish maximum prices on agricultural products which would return to the farmer less than his present returns. Furthermore, the section pemits stabilization agencies to continue in effect maladjusted prices between localities and various products within the dairy industry. Existing provisions of law requiring grade, location, and seasonal differential have not prevented these maladjustments in the past and there is no reason to expect them to do so now. This bill, if enacted as presently drawn, will prove a disservice not only to the dairymen of the Nation who have been struggling to maintain adequate production of milk and other dairy products, but will deprive the consumers of much needed dairy foods.

Section 11 of the bill establishes the calendar year of 1941 as a base period from which to measure cost increases in production of agricultural commodities. In 1941 dairy prices were in a violently unbalanced state. The lend-lease program was demanding enormous quantities of cheese and evaporated milk. Government prices for these products were high. Consequently, diversion of milk to cheese and evaporated milk resulted in all-time record production of these products at the expense of other dairy products, mainly butter. If maximum prices for dairy products were based on the price prevailing in 1941, the chaotic shifting of producers between plants and of plants from the production of other dairy products to production of evaporated milk and cheese which occurred in 1941 would be repeated.

No one knows what method OPA would use in calculating increases in production costs. A common method of estimating approximately the increases in United States average production costs is based on an index of costs in which feed prices are given a weight of 50 percent, farm wage rates 25 percent, and all other production costs 25 percent. This index has increased 83 percent from 1941 to May 1946. Applying this percentage increase to the 1941 average prices gives an estimate of the increase in costs of milk production to May 1946. Some prices calculated by this method are shown in the following table, in comparison with the approximate actual annual returns to farmers including subsidies:

Product	Approximate price required by sec. 11	Approximate actual annual return [1]
Whole milk, United States average dollars per hundredweight	3.98	4.48
Butterfat, United States average dollars per pound	.625	.815
Condensery milk, United States average dollars per hundredweight	3.31	3.78
Whole milk, New York State do	[2] 4.27	4.65

[1] 1945 annual average price plus current subsidies on an annual average basis, plus allowance for price increases effective in June 1946.

[2] Costs of dairy farming in New York increased 81 percent according to Cornell University calculations.

To a degree, calculated costs may be irrelevant in setting farm price ceilings. Milk prices may cover calculated costs but still be so low that other farm products pay the farmer more for his labor. Such conditions were important in the 8- to 10-percent decline in cow numbers in important butter-producing States last year. By allowing prices to reflect demand, production of farm products will be increased, and so balanced as to overcome the most acute shortages which now prevail.

The various decontrol provisions of the committee bill will be no help to the dairy farmer. Stabilization agencies have priced dairy products so low that production in the foreseeable future cannot possibly satisfy demand. Thus we may never get out from under price controls. In sum, policies will continue which on one hand will further reduce dairy production and on the other will so inflate demand that controls will not be lifted.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, may I be informed as to how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 12 minutes more.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, decontrol of dairy products and livestock was and is proposed as the solution for unsatisfactory conditions which price control has brought about in the dairy and livestock industries. The conditions I refer to are the break-down in distribution of meat and dairy products, the diminution of dairy production, and the great incubus of subsidies which current theories of price control have placed upon the Nation.

It has been 4 years since Congress first authorized the application of price controls. Four years ago we had entered a vast and grim war. The Government took requisitioning and allocation powers to marshal all our resources as quickly as possible for that war. Price controls were established to buffer the economic impact of arbitrary controls over the flow of resources. After 4 years we find that too rigid price controls have had secondary effects, like the first effects of allocation, which seem to demand the contiuation of price control. But too rigid price control itself proves inadequate to solve its own problems, and must be reinforced again by allocation and rationing, long after the original need for such controls has passed. Thus, a vicious circle has been started, which must be broken.

It seems reasonable to undertake the relaxation of price control on classes of products which show no ills other than those ascribable to price control itself. This the price control agencies themselves have refused to do. The facts of the situation have been fully developed in hearings before both Houses of Congress.

Two industries in particular, the dairy and livestock industries, are in chaos at the present moment. Price control has abrogated economic laws which always have caused these complex industries to maintain a fine balance in production and distribution. As a consequence of arbitrary pricing policies, conditions have arisen which the Office of Economic Stabilization asserts require quotas and limitations even more rigid than those which were needed for successful prosecution of the war. These added restrictions inevitably will further stifle production and thus intensify the one problem which we are assured requires the extension of price control.

I should like to recount in some detail the evidence which influences me to believe that less, rather than more, price control is needed on dairy products.

Mr. President, I had a friend who several months ago was engaged in the milk-producing business. He is a man somewhat over 80 years of age, and he spends his winters in Florida, but his home is in a little town of about 700 people in the neighborhood of 40 miles from where I live. I received a letter from him stating, "I notice that in Wisconsin you cannot get any butter, and that you cannot get any butter in the Senate". Parenthetically, I might say I do not know how long it has been since I last saw any butter in the Senate restaurant. This man said further, "In Florida we can get plenty of it if we are willing to pay $1.25 a pound." Think of that, $1.25 a pound for butter—black market. That illustrates how OPA does not and cannot regulate.

Price controls were applied to fluid milk and cream in May 1942, and to butter, cheese, and evaporated milk in October 1942. That year this country reached a peak production of 119,000,000,000 pounds of milk. Thereafter, dairy production subsided. Actual milk production was lower for the next 2 years than in 1942. In 1945 a substantial decline in milk cow numbers set in, offset for the time being by heavier production per cow which increased total milk production by 3,000,000,000 pounds over 1942. Thus, the effect of price control has been to contract the dairy industry. Contrast this with the 12.5-billion pound increase in milk production during the 3 years before price control.

After the close of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee hearings last month the Office of Price Administration issued a statement with reference to the dairy problem. Therein it cited the increase from 1941 to 1945 as occurring under price control. From 1941 to 1942, a period partly free from any price control and wholly before price control achieved its "hold the line" rigidity, the increase in 1 year exceeded the total increase in 3 years from 1942 to 1945.

The full extent to which dairying has been retarded under price control is shown by production trends in the extensive deficit areas. Down the Pacific coast, across the South, and up the Atlantic coast the war brought revolutionary shifts in demand. In the South, particularly, demand for fluid milk outstripped what had been a rapidly growing local supply of milk. In State after State prewar production trends were reversed downward due to a refusal of OPA to make adjustments based on local conditions.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry found that repeatedly local price relief which would have increased production was denied on the simple ground of "hold the line." OPA has taken the position that local cost increases have nothing to do with local price increases. The cumulative effect of such a policy pursued in market after market has been to aggravate the national shortage of milk for all purposes.

Nowhere is there an indication that OPA will change this policy if price control is continued on dairy products. All the evidence is to the contrary. In announcing an enlarged dairy subsidy program on April 15, Mr. Bowles said, "Since early this year special local price relief has been provided in a number of fluid milk market areas. To the extent that relief was given in anticipation of the increases announced today, corresponding reductions in milk prices will be made in those areas. Additional increases in particular markets to offset cost increases will not be needed." In the program embodied in the May 29 directive, the Office of Economic Stabilization canceled all of the local recognition previously granted in New Mexico and Arizona, and half of that granted in four other areas.

Another aspect of this selective discrimination, is the discrimination against butter which has forced thousands of dairymen out of production. In vast areas, particularly in the tier of States from Oklahoma through North Dakota, dairymen have no markets for anything but farm-separated cream. The ceiling on butter puts a ceiling on this cream. In these States milk cow numbers were reduced 8 to 10 percent.

Think of it, when the world was hungering for our products, when we needed them more and more, the OPA program caused an 8- to 10-percent reduction in the number of cows.

The current dairy programs do not fully correct the severe penalty which producers of farm-separated cream have carried ever since 1941. Regardless of diversion problems, which I shall discuss in a moment, such a penalty on at least 50 percent of the dairy farmers of the country should be removed.

Mr. President, I have spoken many times on the floor of the Senate in relation to the cheese situation in the State of Wisconsin. I demonstrated that because of OPA's inept approach to the problem this great State of mine, which produced up to 56 percent of the total production of Cheddar cheese of the Nation, felt the impact of maladministration.

Flagrant mistreatment was also accorded the evaporated milk industry and the casein industry. The butter and livestock ceilings must be removed together. I know no way to accomplish that result unless it be assurance from Secretary Anderson and from Mr. Bowles that that will be done. But we have no such assurance. If the past foreshadows the future, then we will see a continuation of these crippling activities and to me that means serious damage not only to my State but to the Nation.

WHY DAIRY PRODUCTS AND LIVESTOCK SHOULD BE DECONTROLLED

Decontrol of dairy products and livestock was and is proposed as the solution for unsatisfactory conditions which

price control has brought about in the dairy and livestock industries. The conditions I refer to are the break-downs in distribution of meat and dairy products, the diminution of dairy production, and the great incubus of subsidies which current theories of price control have placed upon the Nation.

It has been 4 years since Congress first authorized the application of price controls. Four years ago we had entered a vast and grim war. The Government took requisitioning and allocation powers to marshal all our resources as quickly as possible for that war. Price controls were established to buffer the economic impact of arbitrary controls over the flow of resources. After 4 years we find that too rigid price controls have had secondary effects, like the first effects of allocation, which seem to demand the continuation of price control. But too rigid price control itself proves inadequate to solve its own problems, and must be reinforced again by allocation and rationing, long after the original need for such controls has passed. Thus, a vicious circle has been generated, which must be broken.

It seems reasonable to undertake the relaxation of price control on classes of products which show no ills other than those ascribable to price control itself. This the price control agencies themselves have refused to do. The facts of the situation have been fully developed in hearings before both Houses of Congress.

Two industries in particular, the dairy and livestock industries, are in chaos at the present moment. Price control has abrogated economic laws which always have caused these complex industries to maintain a fine balance in production and distribution. As a consequence of aribitrary pricing policies, conditions have arisen which the Office of Economic Stabilization asserts require quotas and limitations even more rigid than those which were needed for successful prosecution of the war. These added restrictions inevitably will further stifle production and thus intensify the one problem which we are assured requires the extension of price control.

Raising dairy prices to offset and permit the removal of subsidies is no more than should be done in any event. It has been the consensus of dairy industry witnesses that the over-all rise in dairy prices upon complete removal of controls would only approximate the effect of removing subsidies. The prices of various dairy products would settle down in somewhat different relationships to each other than under present ceilings, but this would have a salutary effect on consumption and production. With dairymen free to bargain for fluid-milk prices suited to the needs of their local areas, and freed of the onus of the subsidy program, we would see a stop to liquidation of dairy herds and a turn toward the more abundant production of dairy products.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, last evening, in the debates upon OPA, the Senator from Illinois was engaged in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and during that debate the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] also had something to say which I am going to read into the RECORD at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator indicate what page of the RECORD he is reading from?

Mr. LUCAS. I am reading from page 7661 of the RECORD. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska said this:

Mr. WHERRY. Why did the Senator from Illinois enter into Nebraska and get into Nebraska politics when I ran against the Honorable Senator George Norris? The Senator from Illinois made broadcast recordings which were sent to Nebraska and used in an attempt to defeat me. Dozens of records, containing speeches against me were sent out there by the Senator from Illinois. Drew Pearson wrote articles against me. The Senator from Illinois joined in attacking me. Why did the Senator get into that campaign? And in view of his having gotten into that campaign, why criticize the Senator from Texas for speaking against the Senator from Illinois in the Illinois campaign in 1944?

The Senator from Nebraska further said in that connection:

I have been looking for a chance to say this ever since I came to the Senate.

Later on in the colloquy I requested the distinguished Senator from Texas to yield in order that I might answer the able Senator from Nebraska, but due to the parliamentary situation the Senator from Texas could not yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. What is the page from which the Senator is reading?

Mr. LUCAS. From page 7661 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday.

Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity of denying categorically some of these unusual statements. First, I want to say that I never entered into Nebraska politics when Senator WHERRY ran against Senator Norris—an independent—and a Democrat, whose name I have forgotten.

I want to deny categorically that I ever made a broadcast recording which was sent to Nebraska and used in an attempt to defeat Senator WHERRY.

I want to deny categorically that "dozens of records, containing speeches against me"—meaning Senator WHERRY—"were sent out there by the Senator from Illinois."

I want to deny categorically the inference that I joined with Drew Pearson in attacking the Senator from Nebraska.

I want to say definitely and unequivocally that I did not get into the Nebraska campaign in 1942. We had enough to do in Illinois at that time.

Now, Mr. President, it may be that the Senator from Nebraska was laboring under a misapprehension because of something that I said about the late Senator George Norris on August 17, 1942. I rose in the Senate at that time and made a statement, which can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 5, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, on page 6856. These are the words I spoke on the floor of the Senate at that time:

Mr. President, the able, distinguished, and eminent senior Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, will soon complete 30 years of service as a Member of the United States Senate. His achievements over this long period of time in the field of sound progressive legislation are known to every student of government in the Nation.

The question which concerns the people of Nebraska, as well as the people of the Nation, is whether or not this elder statesman will become a candidate to succeed himself at the general election in November next. As one who is serving his first term in the United States Senate, it would be presumptuous upon the part of the Senator from Illinois to suggest a decision which should be made by this grand old man. But, Mr. President, his friends in Congress, as well as millions of other people in this country, hope that Senator George Norris, regardless of his age, will soon announce that he is a candidate for reelection.

Everyone knows that our Nation is imperiled. We need the eyes of vision, the voice of experience, and a flow of reason to help guide our legislative activities during the next 6 years to come. Oliver Goldsmith once said:

"I love everything that's old: old friends, old times, old manners, old books, old wine."

Another great writer said that—

"Age is not all decay; it is the ripening, the swelling, of the fresh life within, that withers and bursts the husks."

I see that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nebraska, just came into the Chamber, and I will say to him that I am reading from a statement which I made on the floor of the Senate in August 1942. For his benefit I am going to reread that statement. I am sure the able Senator from Nebraska has been laboring under a misapprehension as to the part I am supposed to have taken in his campaign in 1942. I am now attempting to explain to the Senate, and in doing so I had just finished reading part of my statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator what he was reading? I understood him to say he was reading some of the speeches.

Mr. LUCAS. No, I am reading an address which I made on the floor of the Senate in 1942, which probably the Senator has never seen. I hoped by reading it at this time it would give the background for perhaps the Senator's misunderstanding of what I was supposed to have done in his campaign of 1942. I am going to read it again for the benefit of the Senator. I rose on the floor of the Senate on August 17, 1942, and said the following:

Mr. President, the able, distinguished, and eminent senior Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, will soon complete 30 years of service as a Member of the United States Senate. His achievements over this long period of time in the field of sound progressive legislation are known by every student of government in the Nation.

The question which concerns the people of Nebraska, as well as the people of the Nation, is whether or not this elder statesman will become a candidate to succeed himself at the general election in November next. As one who is serving his first term in the United States Senate, it would be presumptu-

ous upon the part of the Senator from Illinois to suggest a decision which should be made by this grand old man. But, Mr. President, his friends in Congress, as well as millions of other people in this country, hope that Senator George Norris, regardless of his age, will soon announce that he is a candidate for reelection.

Everyone knows that our Nation is imperiled. We need the eyes of vision, the voice of experience, and a flow of reason to help guide our legislative activities during the next 6 years to come. Oliver Goldsmith once said:

"I love everything that's old: old friends, old times, old manners, old books, old wine."

Another great writer said that—

"Age is not all decay; it is the ripening, the swelling, of the fresh life within, that withers and bursts the husks."

Mr. President, there will be many husks to burst during the next 6 years, which will decide what course this Nation is to carve out for future generations to come.

Mr. President, in the Chicago Sun on Saturday last appeared an editorial about our distinguished colleague. It is entitled "The Grand Old Man." I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Then follows the editorial.

Mr. President, I do not believe that I am the only Member of the United States Senate who praised and eulogized the late George Norris. I have not carefully examined the RECORD, but I distinctly recall that a number of Members of this body praised the late George Norris for his great ability as a legislator and the progressive principles of government which he advocated throughout his career.

I do not know what happened after I made this speech on the floor of the Senate. It may be that some of George Norris' friends in Nebraska took this speech, or parts of it—which they had a right to do—and used it as a recording which was broadcast to the voters of the State of Nebraska. But I want my friend from Nebraska thoroughly to understand that I categorically deny the statements which he made last night. The Senator from Nebraska said:

The Senator from Illinois made broadcast recordings which were sent to Nebraska and used in an attempt to defeat me.

I will say to the Senator that I did not even know the distinguished Senator from Nebraska at that time. I never made a recording against him. I never caused any recordings to be sent to Nebraska at any time.

Furthermore, the Senator said:

Dozens of records, containing speeches against me, were sent out there by the Senator from Illinois.

A moment ago I made the explanation that we had a pretty busy campaign in Illinois in 1942, and I had all I could do to help defend the Democratic cause. We were unsuccessful in that campaign. I did not send dozens of speeches to Nebraska. I sent no speech at any time.

The Senator from Nebraska further stated:

Drew Pearson wrote articles against me.

The Senator from Nebraska further stated:

The Senator from Illinois joined in attacking me.

I do not think the Senator means that I joined with Drew Pearson in attacking him. If he does, of course, I categorically deny that charge.

The Senator from Nebraska continued:

Why did the Senator get into that campaign?

The thing that struck me was the statement which the Senator from Nebraska made later. He said:

I have been looking for a chance to say this ever since I came to the Senate.

In view of that statement, I thought that perhaps the Senator was laboring under a misapprehension as to my actual participation in his campaign. If the Senator from Nebraska can say that the speech which I made on the floor of the Senate in behalf of the late Senator George Norris was something which interfered with his campaign, then his conclusions are correct. But I want the Senate distinctly to understand that the Senator from Illinois never made a single recording, or a group of speeches to send into Nebraska. As to what might have been done with what I said on the floor of the Senate, which became a matter of public record, of course I do not know. I had absolutely nothing to do with it. I thought an explanation was due and I could not permit the record to stand as it is without saying these few words.

In conclusion, let me say that I take nothing back of what I said about the late Senator George Norris. When I came to the Senate from the House of Representatives I frequently counseled with George Norris. George Norris was my friend, and he was the friend of every Senator who sought counsel and advice from him. I always liked him. The people of my State always liked George Norris. When most of us who are now Members of the United States Senate shall have been forgotten, the name of George Norris will continue to shine on the pages of history. Many may disagree with his theory and philosophy of government, but his name will stand out as a beacon light to lead progressive citizens up the rugged paths of unselfish interest. This is the type of public service which has made America great.

Mr. President, that is all I care to say. In view of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska last evening, I felt that I should make this explanation in justice to myself, in the hope that I might remove what seems to me to be a misapprehension that has been in the mind of the Senator from Nebraska ever since he has been in the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I sincerely thank the Senator for his explanation of the part which he took in that campaign. I appreciate the explanation. Let me say to the Senator that there is no further misapprehension. However, I owe the Senator an everlasting debt of gratitude, because it was those speeches which circulated through Nebraska which helped to elect me to the United States Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very glad to have that reaction from my able friend. I am a little puzzled to know why he made the statement last night that he had been waiting for an opportunity to say certain things ever since he came to the Senate. I thought the Senator probably should have complimented me for helping to elect him, if he had taken the same position last night he assumed today.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I shall be glad to come over and shake hands with him and tell him that I deeply appreciate the service which he rendered me in that campaign. Would the Senator like to shake hands with me? I shall be glad to shake hands with the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment.

I am very happy to find the Senator from Nebraska in such a genial attitude, because I thought I detected just the opposite last night when he was charging me with sending speeches into Nebraska and making recordings in Illinois and sending them out to his State in 1942. It seemed to me that the Senator believes I had more or less conspired with someone to defeat a candidate for the Senate whom I did not even know at the time. Now that the Senator is convinced and everyone is happy, I am very glad to subside. I yield to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was wondering whether the Senator's speeches which were sent to Nebraska were the same sort of speeches that I made in Vermont a few years ago when I was sent up there to make a speech in behalf of the Democratic candidate for the United States Senate, who was running against the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. I spoke in the Senator's home town, and I had a great many complimentary things to say about him, which he deserved. After the speechmaking was over the chairman of the Democratic campaign committee asked me whether I came up there to speak for Senator AUSTIN or his opponent. Perhaps the Senator from Illinois was paying a compliment to the Senator from Nebraska and it may have been misinterpreted.

VOTING RECORD OF SENATORS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, our constituents are entitled to know how we voted on every issue that has come before us during the Seventy-ninth Congress. I therefore urge that the Senate publish a document containing a tabulation of the votes cast by every Member, together with a brief description of all of the measures voted on. Such a booklet should be published in a quantity large enough so that it could be available to every voter in the country. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has all of these records readily available, and could compile their pamphlet within a few days.

The people of the United States are becoming more aware of the political responsibilities which inhere in citizenship in a democracy. They are taking greater interest in politics and they are becoming increasingly informed upon the measures which come before us. Politics is no longer the private game of

clubhouse hangers-on, ward heelers, office seekers, and big-business lobbyists. Ordinary citizens are beginning to realize that the measures we pass here affect them just as much as they affect big business. Consumers are learning of the impact of legislation upon their grocery baskets. They will learn even more when price controls are suddenly removed or drastically weakened. For the past decade women's clubs have given more and more attention to politics and their members are among our best informed citizens. All of these people are vitally interested in knowing the voting records of their Senators. They have a right to know them. I therefore urge that the Senate make the voting records of its Members available to the public as soon as possible, and to this end I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 295), submitted by Mr. TAYLOR, was received and referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be directed to compile and to publish within 3 weeks after the close of the present session of Congress a tabulation of the voting record of its Members during the Seventy-ninth Congress on all roll-call votes, together with brief descriptions of the issues voted upon. For the purpose of easy readibility and quick reference, each Member's votes shall be gathered in one place. The Superintendent of Documents shall sell copies at cost, and shall print sufficient copies so that a supply is on hand at all times until the end of 1946.

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall vote for the conference report on the OPA. My reason for doing so, however, is not because I approve the conference report, but because I think we should get the whole thing before the President at the earliest possible time. When this measure reaches the President, I think he should determine whether, in effect, it does away with all price controls and will allow the cost of living to rise sky high and will open the floodgates of inflation. I think the pending measure will do that. In my opinion the President should veto it. The time has come to stop fooling the people. If certain Members of Congress are willing to take action as will bring about the high cost of living which prevailed after the last war, with the same ruinous effect on all, except perhaps the very rich, and followed by a depression similar to the one which occurred after the inflation following the last war, they have a right to do so. But the people also have a right to know who did it, and to pass judgment in November upon those who did it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that I, too, think the President of the United States should veto the conference report. But I intend to support the President of the United States to that end by voting my convictions and in doing that I shall vote against the conference report. If the Senator favors a veto then I say logic, consistency, and support of the President dictate his vote against the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Oregon for saying that, and I shall comment upon his suggestion at the close of the brief statement which I wish to present first.

When certain Members of Congress set out to assure profits to all producers and processors and manufacturers, they forgot what they were doing to the masses of the people of America. According to a survey recently announced by the Federal Reserve Board today, two out of every five American families have savings of less than $40. I wish to repeat that statement, Mr. President: Two out of every five American families today, as revealed by the Federal Reserve Board, pursuant to a survey made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, have less than $40 in liquid savings. That means that in cash, in bonds, or in other liquid assets they have $40 or less. That situation applies to two out of every five American families. Their savings are about 1 percent of the total liquid assets in the country. Those figures are not mine. They are given out with the approval of the Federal Reserve Board, in connection with a study to ascertain who has the savings in the United States.

Two-thirds of the families of the United States make less than $40 a week, which is just a little more than $2,000 a year. Mr. President, what is the size of the average family in the United States? It is about four. The average family has four members. Two-thirds of the families in the United States make less than $2,000 a year with which to care for the average family of four members. They are the so-called rich, who are said to be clamoring for a chance to pay high prices, according to the opinions of certain gentlemen who speak on this measure. What will happen to those families when inflation comes?

Mr. President, the overwhelming majority of the children of the United States live in the homes of the poor. When the cost of living rises, their standard of living and their health care go down. If the President vetoes this measure, as I hope he will, then he should ask the Congress for a joint resolution continuing the OPA as it is until February 1, 1947.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Assuming that the Congress did not follow that recommendation, then where would we be?

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator refer to the continuing resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. If the President were to veto the measure now pending, and if he then requested the Congress to pass a continuing joint resolution—and it would be my expectation that he would ask the able majority leader of the Senate and the able majority leader of the House of Representatives to introduce such a resolution, or else he would ask the chairmen of the appropriate committees in the House and the Senate to do so—then it would be up to the Congress to determine whether it would pass the joint resolution continuing the OPA as it is until February 1, 1947, at the President's request and for the reasons given by the President.

If the Congress were to fail to do so—and I wish to answer my able friend the Senator from Illinois in two ways—first, a record would be made of those in Congress who were willing to stand behind the President and were willing to stand behind the people on such a clear-cut issue as that.

As the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] has pointed out, the American people are entitled to know our record in this body. Then the people of the United States would know who favor inflation, who favor bringing back the high cost of living which existed after the last war, and who are willing to stand by the President and the Government and the people in this crisis which threatens their very security and their very existence.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator to permit me to make one further statement in response to the question asked by the Senator from Illinois.

If, however, the Congress were to persist in that attitude, and still were not to pass any continuing joint resolution at all, then we would have no OPA, we would have unbridled inflation, and we would have an incalculable increase in the cost of living, just as we shall have under the pending measure, if it becomes law. But the advantage would be that the American people would know who gave them that bitter medicine and who tried to spare them from its iniquitous effects.

As the situation is today, we would accomplish the same economic result if we adopted the pending conference report and if it became law, yet the responsibility is so diffused and so confused that the people can hardly tell who has been responsible for bringing this evil in their lives perhaps for many years to come.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield, first, to the Senator from Oregon, to whom I have promised to yield. I ask the Senator from Illinois to wait for a few minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida agree that if the Congress made the record which I think is alluded to in the question put to him by the Senator from Illinois, the knowledge on the part of the American people as to who was responsible for the inflation which will flow from this bill would in no way alleviate their conditions insofar as their suffering from such inflation? It would be a rather empty satisfaction, would it not, for them to have

merely the knowledge of who made the record that inflicted inflation cruelties upon them. Frankly, I am at a loss to understand the illogical position of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. It might be of little benefit to them insofar as changing the situation would be concerned. But I dare say that their discomfiture would not last longer than the early days of next year, because if, in the November elections, the people disapproved of the action of Congress in opening the floodgates of inflation, the new Congress that would be elected could not get to Washington fast enough to pass effective price-control legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator answer this question, please: From a parliamentary standpoint, is it not the obligation of the Senate to make certain that it has exhausted every possibility of getting a better bill, before it takes final action?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I think so. I say that I think we have exhausted all such possibilities, and I say that the bill now before us is the best bill we shall be able to get from this Congress, unless the President takes this issue to the American people and asks for a decision upon a clear-cut issue.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit several questions in relation to that conclusion?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure that the Senator from Florida recalls that the other day, the Chair ruled that, from a parliamentary standpoint, the only way by which the Senate could get the pending measure back to conference would be, first, by rejecting the conference report. Then we would be in a position to request a further conference. Did the Senator from Florida hear that ruling?

Mr. PEPPER. I did, and of course, that is the parliamentary procedure.

Mr. MORSE. Let us assume that we are able to defeat the conference report, and let us assume that the bill goes to a further conference. Does the Senator from Florida think that the result of such conference could be in any other direction, if we are to have any bill at all, than in the direction of a bill more nearly like the original Senate bill than the pending bill?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Oregon that, in my opinion, in view of the bill on which the conferees on the part of both Houses had to work, the result in the form of the pending conference report is better than we had a right to expect. The bill as passed by the Senate and the bill as passed by the House of Representatives were so bad that there was no leeway for a committee on conference to bring out a good bill and submit it to the Senate and to the House. That leads me to believe that even if the Senate rejects the pending conference report and orders the measure to be sent to a further conference, we shall never get out of conference, on the basis of the bill as passed by the Senate and the bill as passed by the House, a better conference report than the one which we now have before us.

Mr. MORSE. But if we reject the pending measure, is it not true that thereby we shall serve notice on the conferees that they must bring from the further conference a better bill, if they hope to have it enacted into law?

Mr. PEPPER. But if they do not bring back a better bill, we shall be back where we are today. After all, in the conference the conferees debated the measure for days. After that has happened, and after the measure has been fought out in the committees and in the Senate and in the House, and after it has become obvious what the philosophy and attitude of both bodies are, I do not see how it is possible to expect to receive from any further conference which might consider the matter any better measure than the one now before us.

Mr. MORSE. If they do not bring back a better bill, will they not have made exactly the same record which the Senator from Florida has pointed out he believes will be made if the President vetoes the bill and the Congress does not then take any action on the basis of the veto? The same record will be made in either case, except under the procedure which I have suggested we would put squarely up to the conferees, on reconsideration, the question of submitting to the two Houses a better bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but the able Senator from Oregon is overlooking the time element which is involved. It is now 3 o'clock Friday afternoon. The Price Control Act will expire midnight next Sunday. So, at best, there is only the time which remains between now and midnight next Sunday for anything to be done to save price control for the people of the United States. If the conference report comes back to the Senate and is again debated, there will be further delay in making an appropriate adjustment before price control lapses entirely. But if, this afternoon, we agree to the conference report and let the bill go to the White House this evening, the President, who will be anticipating its arrival and will have in the meantime made a study of the questions involved and advised with his counselors, will have all night tonight and tomorrow to determine what he wishes to do, and the Congress will have an opportunity later, including Sunday, if necessary, to consider a continuing resolution. In an emergency there is no reason why the Congress should not sit on Sunday. In that case the issue would be clearly presented of whether we want price control to continue until next February. At that time a new Congress will be in session.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon that, if I believed it was possible to get from the conference not a better bill but one comparable to what we now have, I would be in favor of returning the bill to conference. But I ask Senators to take into consideration the time element, and the fact that the other House has already acted, and that the conference committee could not meet unless the House agreed to another conference. I ask Senators also to consider the uncertainty with reference to whether the House would agree to another conference, and the time which would be involved in getting the conferees together. It seems to me that if we were to follow such procedure there would be no prospect of extending the present act. I am sure that the Senator from Oregon and I, as we usually do, have the same end in view. We only differ with reference to the best way to reach the end. The question is one of allowing this Congress to decide whether it will do away with price control. I am not quarreling with the Senators who take the point of view that it would be better not to have price control. However, I believe that it would be terrible to do away with price control at any time during the next few months. But we should let the Congress decide squarely whether we will kill the Price Control Act or extend it. I believe that the method which I have suggested, namely, that of adopting the conference report this afternoon, allowing it to go to the White House, giving the President the opportunity to send a message of recommendation back to us tomorrow, and allowing us the rest of the day and Sunday, if necessary, to consider the matter, would be the best method to follow.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for permitting me to interrupt him. I have not at all overlooked the time element which is involved, but I have a point of view in regard to the time element which is exactly opposite to that of the Senator from Florida. I believe that it is necessary to consider the time element from the standpoint of how long it will take to put this bill into any form of effective administration. I assert that it will never be effectively administered. I believe that a hiatus period of a few days would help and not hinder the situation.

With all due respect to the Senator from Florida, I believe that a vote for the conference report would be a vote against a Presidential veto. I believe that the Senator from Florida is "passing the buck" to the President, and I think we should now support the President's position by voting against the bill, and thereby demonstrating to him that the margin between those who favor it and those who oppose it is very small.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I know how earnestly the able Senator from Oregon feels. I admit that there is an honest difference of opinion with reference to what is the better method to follow in achieving the result which both of us wish to attain. I believe that the method which I have suggested is a better method than the one which has been suggested by the Senator from Oregon, although I do not quarrel at all with the sentiment expressed by the able Senator from Oregon. If we send the bill back to conference at this time and the House of Representatives does not agree to a new conference, the act will expire at midnight next Sunday and we will not have any legislation at all on the subject. The President would still have to make some recommendation to the Congress, or we would have to pass a continuing resolution, and that much more time would be consumed in arriving at the same place.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida wants the President to veto the bill and request Congress to pass

a resolution for the continuance until February of next year of the OPA Act as it now appears on the statute books?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. From a parliamentary angle, I may say that there is nothing, I believe, which would prevent any Senator from offering amendments to such a resolution when it came before the Senate. So, what I fear is that we would find ourselves in the same position in which we now are. If the Senate should agree, as the Senator has suggested, to take a straight-out vote upon the question of whether we shall continue or not continue the OPA Act, of course, that could be done. But I fear that when the resolution gets here and amendments which have been offered heretofore to the OPA bill are again offered to the resolution, we will find ourselves in the same position we are in now. The country ought to know definitely whether we are in favor of continuing the OPA, or whether we are opposed to it. There is no doubt that the amendments now contained in the bill are crippling in character. As the Senator from Oregon said a moment ago, if I understood him correctly, this act cannot be effectively administered within the life of the act.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator said in the last part of his remarks, and I agree with reference to the possibility of what could happen if a resolution such as the one I have described were presented. However, we know very well, Mr. President, that what we say on the floor of the Senate is not nearly so clear in connection with a matter of this kind as what the President of the United States would say. He has the vantage point of his great office. I repeat that what we might say would not be so effective and clear as what the President might say. We can debate this matter. Some have said that the pending bill practically destroys price control. Others say that it does not. However, I believe that if the President of the United States, backed up by his advisers, were to tell the American people that we might just as well not have price control as to have this bill, and that the time had come for the Congress to make a decision as to whether or not we shall have price control, and he vetoed the bill in furtherance of that policy and asked the Congress either to pass a continuing resolution preserving price control or to kill it and let the people know what we have done, we would face a different issue than the one we face this afternoon.

Mr. President, not all our people are as familiar with the parliamentary situation in Congress as are we. We know that we do not have the power to amend the conference report on the Senate floor. There may be persons in the galleries and throughout the country who wonder why, if the bill is not a proper bill, we do not amend it here in the Senate. We cannot do that. Under the rules of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, we must adopt the conference report in toto or reject it in toto. We must accept it or have nothing. We do not have any power to amend it.

A little while ago there was a bill before the Senate with reference to which at least 17 Senators expressed themselves. I offered a substitute amendment proposing to continue the present price-control law until February 1 of next year.

There was a record vote, and 17 of us voted at that time, even for a simple continuing provision. But a majority of the Senate chose to adopt the bill which the Senate did pass at that time. That bill went to conference with the House of Representatives, and there the conferees considered the Senate bill and a bill which the House had passed some time ago.

Senators will remember and the country will remember, that when the House bill was passed, it was emblazoned on the headlines of nearly every paper in the country that the crippling amendments of the House of Representatives had, for all practical purposes, destroyed price control in the United States. It was stated that the same effect attached to the bill passed by the United States Senate. So when the conferees met they had to deal with two bills, each of which had been properly castigated, in my opinion, as to all practical purposes destroying price control.

I think the conference is to be complimented for having brought back as good a conference report as it has, taking into consideration the bills with which the conference had to work in the consideration of the measures.

Mr. President, I believe that we might just as well have no price control at all as to have the bill which would become the law if this conference report should be agreed to by the Senate as it has been adopted by the House of Representatives.

What does it do? It guarantees, in the Taft amendment, that every producer, which means anyone who grows or makes anything anywhere in the country and every processor and every manufacturer, and that includes practically all the creative people in this country, practically all those who put goods and commodities into the channels of trade, shall be guaranteed the price he got between October 1 and October 15, 1941, plus all industry-wide increases which have occurred between October 15, 1941, and the present time.

Mr. President, what will that mean? It will mean that in the automobile business, for example, the man who sells raw materials will be able to get a great mark-up on his raw materials. It means that the man who processes will get a mark-up on his processing service, and, finally, when many things come together in a given part of an automobile, the price of the whole part will have been increased, and when that part becomes a part of a larger part, then the larger part will get an increase in price. Eventually all these parts which have had increases will become the whole automobile, and goodness knows—in fact, no one has been able to estimate—what the total increase in the price of the finished product will be when all these lesser increases all down the line have been granted by the OPA.

Mr. President, not only is that allowed, but there is no real, practical standard which is defined; it is practically left to the OPA to ask a man what he thinks he is entitled to, and they have little discretion except to give him what he demands as his price increases. As I have said, no one has been able to tell how much that is going to add to the cost of food, to the cost of wearing apparel, to the cost of practically every kind of goods the American people use.

Mr. President, if we are to have that kind of a law, it means for all practical purposes no price control, because I do not believe prices would be substantially higher without such a law than they would be with such a law upon the statute books of the country.

We will destroy the law of supply and demand if we enact legislation of that sort, we will guarantee to the people that they will not have low prices, and we will guarantee to every producer, processor, and manufacturer that he will get the largest profits, in my opinion, he could expect to get.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. What would be the opposite of the plan the Senator just described, under which each manufacturer, producer, or processor would make a profit? What would be the opposite to that?

Mr. PEPPER. The opposite would be the plan we are now superseding, and I will say to the Senator from Indiana that I admit readily that there are many defects and there are many hardships under the plan we presently have. There are some producers, there are some processors, there are some manufacturers, who are undoubtedly bearing very heavy onerous burdens, but when we deal with public matters in most cases we have to balance interests between the harm we do and the good we do, and I say to the Senator that the burden that is being suffered by the producers, the processors, and the manufacturers today, under the present law, in my opinion is far less dangerous and less onerous and less obnoxious than the burden the consuming public—taking into consideration the fact that most of them are poor people—would have to bear if we assured the profits this bill guarantees to the producers, the processors, and the manufacturers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. If I understand the present OPA law correctly—and I believe I do—it provides that every manufacturer and processor is entitled to a reasonable profit, and that no maximum price shall be fixed that does not show a reasonable profit. What is the difference between the present law and the one the Senator has just described? I am certain that the Senator is not advocating that anyone in America handling merchandise shall manufacture or process or produce at a loss.

Mr. PEPPER. Neither does the OPA, as I understand the administration of it, expect people to sell things at a loss, generally speaking. There may be cases where, under past regulations, they may not let a man make a profit on a particular article if he manufactures more than one; they will not make him take a

loss on any part of his production, but if he is making cost of production on a given article, we will say article A, and if his over-all profit position is reasonably satisfactory, they will not give him a profit on article A. I realize that there are some disadvantages about that, but if it is a question of keeping a manufacturer from making a profit on article A when his over-all profit position is fairly satisfactory, or raising the cost of living to the masses of the people, with all that brings about, I prefer the former policy, and that is the policy that is now in effect.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if I remember correctly, the so-called Taft amendment merely provides that the manufacturer shall be given the same mark-up or profit he was receiving on October 1, 1941, and if he was receiving no profit or had no mark-up at that time, he likewise would get no mark-up at this time.

I have listened to a good deal of talk about businessmen handling certain items without any profit, and I rather suspect they have done so in the past, not intentionally, but unintentionally. I should like to ask the able Senator what percentage of the business in America, either today or 5 years ago or 10 years ago, has been handled at a loss. I do not suppose the Senator can answer the question; I am certain I cannot.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let us say it was 10 percent, which I am certain is 10 times too high, but I am willing to use 10 percent as the figure. Let us say it is 10 percent, or 10 times too high. What particular disadvantage is that going to be, or what material effect is that going to have upon prices, 10 percent, or 5 percent, or 1 percent, or 2 percent, or whatever it may be? In other words, we are talking about the small end of our economy. On the floor of the Senate we are prone to use the exception to try to prove the rule. We are trying to take a very small percentage of our business, of our national economy, and say, "If you permit that 5 percent to make a little profit, prices are going sky high," when there is not any basis for the statement. It is a small percentage of our economy, and means nothing, in the net result, on whether we have inflation or whether we have stable prices.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator has a right to his opinion about that matter. I do not care about the opinion that has been expressed on this floor by Mr. Chester Bowles or Mr. Paul Porter. I know there are no more devoted public servants in this country than those two men. I think they are able, are competent, are devoted to the public service. I attach great consideration and great respect to the figures they give to the Congress and to the country about what the effect of these various proposals would be upon the cost of living. I know what they have said. I have seen their public statements, I have talked with them personally. I know they feel that for all practical purposes we might just as well have no price control at all as to have perhaps the legislation that is contemplated by the conference report. But I do know, Mr. President, that if the Senator from Ohio and others who placed this amendment in the bill had not thought that the amendment was going to add to the profit of the producers and the processors and the manufacturers over what they are now getting they would not have put it in the measure.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I know the Senator from Florida wants to be fair in giving the reasons why the amendment under discussion was placed in the bill. As the authors of it have told me—and I believe they are accurate because my whole experience in business bears out their statement—their reasons were to create production on the theory that production cannot be created unless there is some profit. They wanted to give a reasonable profit to stimulate production.

I want to tell the Senator from Florida, if he will permit me——

Mr. PEPPER. I want to say one thing before the Senator goes further. I did not suggest that there was any sinister motive behind the proposal.

Mr. HAWKES. I realize that the Senator does not think there is.

Mr. PEPPER. But the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] raised the question as to whether this amendment would add any more profit to the producers and processors and the manufacturers. I was merely saying that if the authors of the amendment had not thought it would, obviously they would not have put it in the measure.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. Will the Senator pardon me a moment. I am not criticizing what the Senator from Florida is saying. I am merely trying to enlarge upon it and to show that we are all seeking to obtain production. I think the Senator from Florida will agree that I am just as much interested in seeing that the ordinary men and women of this country—I have been one of them all my life—get the things they need on a fair basis as is any other Member of the Senate. It is only a question of difference of opinion as to the way to get those things.

If the Senator from Florida will permit me to make one other remark, I will say to him, and all my other colleagues in the Senate, that we are not going to cure the difficulties of the present situation without passing through a period in which we are going to be tried. We are going to have some injustices, hardships, and unfairness. There is no question about that. We are not going to get from where we are to where we want to go without some trouble no matter what course we choose to follow.

I want to tell the Senator a very interesting little story of a real happening, which, from my point of view, is justification for voting for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. A few weeks ago seven little boys about 10 years old were sitting in my living room and I wanted one of them to do an errand which was a little difficult to perform. I said to the boys, "Which one of you boys will go to the store and get a big package and bring it up to the house?" Not one of them moved. They looked at each other, and each one was hoping that someone else would say he would do the job. Finally I thought I would try a little experiment. I said, "Which one of you boys will go to the store and get this package if I give you a quarter for doing so?" Everyone of them sprang to his feet. That was an illustration of what is the mainspring behind production. That is what we are trying to do to get production. That is what I am hoping we will accomplish.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say to the able Senator from New Jersey, for whom he knows I have the greatest admiration and the warmest affection, that if he were a hungry man and had but a quarter with which to buy what he needed to eat, he could not have given the boy a quarter to go to the store for him, no matter how much of an incentive that quarter might have been to that boy.

Mr. HAWKES. I may say to the Senator that he is talking about one thing and I am talking about another. I am talking about the mainspring that impels people to produce, and production is the only answer to this situation; that is all.

Mr. PEPPER. I thoroughly respect the point of view of the Senator, but what I am saying is, Mr. President, that we proceed on the assumption that the people can afford to pay the prices that will result in this production through the incentive motive. If the Senator will allow me just a moment more. I asked a while ago, "Who are the American people?" We hear some carelessly say from time to time, "Why, everyone has money." It is considered that money is just growing on trees, practically.

Mr. HAWKES. May I say to the Senator that I do not agree with that idea. That is not my thought.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is too able and sound a businessman to believe any such thing.

Here, Mr. President, are the figures on savings carried out in a little more detail than I gave them a while ago, as reported by the Federal Reserve Board after making a study of the savings of the people of the Nation. As I said, two out of every five families in the United States have total savings, per family, in liquid assets, of less than $40. Those two families out of five families represent 40 percent of the families of the whole of the United States, and they have 1 percent of the savings of the whole people of the United States. Just think of that. The Federal Reserve Board wanted to see what was the distribution of our savings. It wanted to know: Where are all these savings that we are talking about, of the riches accumulated as the result of the war? Who has the riches that came out of the war? It was found that 40 percent of all the American people had 1 percent of the savings of the American people.

It was found that the top 10 percent had 60 percent of the savings. Think of that. The top 10 percent of the American people had 60 percent of the savings, or an average per family of $10,500.

Senators remember when Mr. Henry Ford, Jr., and some other businessmen

said, "Let us take off all controls. In the long run we will be much better off without them." I do not blame Mr. Ford for taking that position. I do not blame the man who has $10,500 saved up for taking such a position. Perhaps he can weather the storm for 6 months or maybe for a year. Of course we know the storm will die down sometime. But I am talking about the period during which the storm is upon us. Mr. Ford has his millions, and the top 10 percent of our families have an average of $10,500. But 40 percent of the American people have but $40 for each family. How can a family weather much of an economic storm on $40—a family which averages four persons? Suppose the head of the family loses his job. Suppose his wages are cut. If prices go up and his wages are cut how long will that $40 last? If he has sickness in his family how long will the $40 last. That is what I am talking about, Mr. President. I am not talking about those who feel they do not need to have any controls, who would just turn everything loose and let the devil take the hindmost for about a year, and go on a buyers' strike; those who do not have to buy luxuries. But I am talking about the men and women and children of this country who have to buy food and have to buy clothes and have to buy houses in which to live, or rent houses, those who have to buy the essentials of life. I say that they do not have the money with which to weather the storm of inflation. When inflation comes to them, not only are their savings taken, but it has a direful effect on the health of their children. That is the reason, Mr. President, why I do not favor doing away with price control.

I stated that the top 10 percent of American families have 60 percent of the savings. The top 30 percent of American families have 87.5 percent of the total liquid assets or savings of the country. Ninety-two percent of the families of the United States have incomes of less than $3,000 a year. And, as I stated, two-thirds of the families of this country have incomes of less than $2,000 a year.

Mr. President, this amendment guarantees the profits of 1941 plus industry-wide cost increases to the producers and the processors and the manufacturers. I have before me some figures that come, I believe, from the Department of Commerce, and I am going to quote the figures. They give the profits of all corporations in 1936 to 1939, before taxes. They were $5,300,000,000. But in 1944 the same corporations, before taxes, made profits of $24,100,000,000, and in 1945 made profits estimated before taxes of $20,900,000,000. After taxes the profits of all corporations in the United States, from 1936 to 1939, were $3,900,000,000. In 1944 they were $9,800,000,000, nearly three times as much. In 1945 they were estimated at $9,100,000,000, approximately three times as much.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-six to 1939 was not such a bad period for the corporations of this country. They were not the best years in our history, but they were not the worst. Yet in 1945 the corporations were making nearly three times as much, after taxes, as they made between 1936 and 1939.

I am now going to give the figures of the profits of 2,152 leading industrial corporations. Before taxes, 1936 to 1939, they made $3,100,000,000. In 1944 they made $10,100,000,000. There was no report in 1945.

After taxes, in 1936–39, they made $2,600,000,000. In 1944, after taxes, they made $3,900,000,000. There was no report for 1945.

Now I give the return on net worth of 2,152 manufacturing corporations. That is the dividends, as it were. In 1936–39—I leave out the figures before taxes and simply speak of the figures after taxes—they made 8.2 percent. In 1944 they made 10 percent. There is no report for 1945.

Now, Mr. President, let me mention something else that these corporations have gotten. Under the carry-forward-carry-back tax law that Congress passed, if a big corporation does not make as much money in the first 2 years after the war as it made during the war, when it paid excess-profit taxes, it can draw back from the Federal Treasury some of the excess-profits taxes it paid in during the war. Mr. President, that means that billions of dollars are going to be drawn out of the Federal Treasury by the corporations of this country which they paid in in taxes during the war. At this point I should like to insert in the RECORD some profit data of nondurable manufacturing concerns and distributive trades in the first quarter of 1946 as compared with 1945.

Profits before and after taxes of 125 large corporations, first quarter of 1946

	Profits		Percentage change first quarter 1945	
	Before taxes	After taxes	Before	After
100 nondurable manufacturing	$306,000,000	$192,000,000	−18	+23
25 miscellaneous services	70,000,000	40,000,000	+11	+80

Of the 25 miscellaneous service groups, 13 trade corporations earned $39,000,000 before taxes and $24,000,000 after taxes, or 61 and 166 percent respectively above the 1945 level. The increase in the profits after taxes for the nondurable manufacturing group and for the miscellaneous distributive services is due in part to the lowering of their taxes.

I wonder how much is going to be drawn out by the little taxpayers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has until 3:36.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the Senator think the RECORD should show that corporations will not draw back any taxes unless they lose money, so as not to leave the impression that they are going to draw back this money, and in addition make billions of dollars? They will draw back money only if they lose money.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not a fact that the carry-forward carry-back provision also permits them to draw back certain money in case their standard of earning falls below that of the base period?

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand that.

Mr. PEPPER. That does not mean that they must have a loss.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think we should correct the RECORD so as to show that they draw money only in case they lose money. In other words, they do not make profits in their normal operations and in addition draw money from previously paid excess-profits taxes. They draw back money only in case they lose money.

Does not the Senator also believe that the RECORD should show that while he is speaking of 2,500 of the large corporations of America, those which have monopolies to a greater or less extent, we should likewise protect the 3,000,000 small businessmen of America—the little corner grocery store, the little drug store, the little man in the pressing business, and the shoe-shine man? There are about 3,000,000 in that class.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is speaking about 2,500 corporations. We must protect the 3,000,000.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, we want to protect the masses of the people; but primarily those who will profit from this amendment are the major production groups of the country, the big manufacturers, the big processors, and the big producers.

During the debate on the minimum-wage bill I pointed out that about 10 percent of the farmers of the country produced 54 percent of the agricultural output of all farmers. So, when there is an increase in the prices of farm products, primarily the benefit goes to about 10 percent of the farmers of the country, and not so much to the little fellow who is farming on the side of a hill.

Mr. President, I rose to say that I feel that for all practical purposes this bill destroys price control. I wish there were some way by which I could vote against the conference report, as I voted against the bill when it was before the Senate and open to amendment. At that time I offered a resolution continuing price control as it now exists until February 1, when the new Congress, from the people, will have a chance to act on the matter.

There is no way that I can get a better bill, the conference report which is now before the Senate not being open to amendment. If we kill it in the Senate, we kill price control altogether, without the executive branch of the Government having an opportunity to suggest any alternative to complete repeal of price control. Moreover, the House of Representatives has already acted upon the conference report. We have no assurance, on Friday afternoon, that the House could be persuaded to set aside its action in agreeing to the conference report so that the bill could be sent to a new conference.

For that reason, much as I disapprove of this measure, much as I think that in

general it is giving to those who have and taking from those who have not, much as I think it will penalize the poor of America and add to the already swollen profits of the processors, the producers, and manufacturers, nevertheless, I shall vote for the conference report in the hope that it will get to the President at the earliest possible time, so that the President may have an early decision by his advisers as to what the effect of the measure will be.

If it does in substance kill price control, tomorrow he can send a message to Congress courageously vetoing it, as he courageously vetoed the Case bill because it was inimical to the public interest. Then he will call upon those who are going to stand by the public interest in this matter, as well as by him, to support in the Senate and in the House of Representatives a simple continuing resolution preserving price control, with all its defects and shortcomings, as it now is, until February 1. Then if the Congress, with that clear-cut issue presented to it by the Chief Magistrate, supported by factual argument, turns down the request of the President, the American people will know, as they have a right to know, who it is that has broken the dike, who it is that has stricken down the dam, who it is that has opened the floodgates and deluged them with the destructive effects of the high cost of living and inflation and set the stage for the inevitable depression to follow. (Manifestations of applause from the galleries.)

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, like the Senator from Florida, I feel that I owe it to myself to explain my vote on the conference report. I feel that the bill as it is presented to the Senate, with no opportunity for amendment, is so emasculated as to be utterly ineffective as price control. It has left only a few vestiges of price control.

I also feel that, having operated for 4 years on an all-out total war basis, we need more than a few months to make adjustments and permit prices to seek their normal level. Prices cannot reach their normal level until we are assured that production meets demand. Until that time arrives, the type of price control which is needed is a flexible price control which will operate until prices of various commodities become adjusted.

This is the only bill on which we can vote that has any reference to price control. I believe that as it is now organized the Office of Price Administration is not an office of price administration at all. It is merely a screen, a subterfuge behind which to hide in blaming an executive agency for what will inevitably happen in the future with rising prices.

However, in spite of that fact, because there still remains the possibility of holding an organization together that can be used in case of grave emergency—and I fear that such an emergency will come sooner than we think—in spite of my revulsion for the bill as drafted, and my feeling that it is a subterfuge, a legal fence or hedge behind which to hide during the coming inflation and the resulting deflation, I shall vote for that little subterfuge because it still maintains an organization that can be used when the situation becomes critical in the future. I shall support it with a clothespin on my nose, so to speak. Nevertheless, because it is a small step in the right direction—and it is such an infinitesimally small step I dislike to think of it—I shall support it, protesting to my conscience as I do so, but nevertheless endeavoring to hold together an organization which can be used for emergency purposes in the future when the situation becomes too stringent, as it may become when all controls are released.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, although I am anxious to reach a vote on the conference report, I wish to speak for a few minutes on this subject.

In the debate on the conference report there has been so much discussion on profits that I fear we have lost sight of the real reason why price control, and possibly rationing, are now necessary in the United States.

One year ago today we were engaged in the greatest war in history. Between 13,000,000 and 14,000,000 young Americans fought in that war. Nearly 300,000 of them died. Seven hundred thousand more came home wounded, sick, or injured in some way. The terrific impact of the war has been felt all over the world. We do not know how many millions of men died; probably we shall never know, but we know that the number was staggering.

We know that today perhaps 50,000,000 people are in ill health or crippled as the result of the war. We know that millions of homes throughout the world were destroyed. In White Russia the people destroyed their own homes in order to hold back the enemy. All over the rest of the world homes have been destroyed and broken, and families have been separated. The commerce of the world has been disrupted in almost every nation, our Nation being the most favored of all. Factories have been razed. Great electric plants have been destroyed. Finances have been exhausted, governments have toppled, and 400,000,000 people are faced with starvation.

We are living in a chaotic world, which is the inevitable aftermath of the great World War through which we have gone. The United States is trying to do what it can to restore the economy of the nations which were engaged in the war. We are trying to bring to the world everlasting peace.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKFN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPPER. I am very much impressed with what the able Senator has said about the many fine men and women who lost their lives, their health, or their limbs in the public interest. So even if a few processors, producers, and manufacturers lose a little money by reason of our efforts to protect the public interest, their burden will not be comparable, will it, to the burden which our soldiers had to bear during the war in the public interest?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, what the Senator has said is true. But today America is the only nation which can restore stable government to the other nations of the earth and can free their populations from the fear of starvation and hunger. When we find ourselves with a short supply of food because of the contributions we have made to the rest of the world, it is necessary that we use artificial means to keep prices here in the United States from getting completely out of hand.

But, Mr. President, shall the United States say to the rest of the world, "We will keep all our food and all our machines and all our technicians and equipment at home"? Shall we say to the rest of the world, "We will seize all the commerce of the world, because we now have the power to do it, and other nations do not have the power, either financially or in any other way?" Shall we say to them, "You must let your women and children go hungry. You must let millions of them starve or die of disease for want of care and medicines, and you can let the dictators rule in your countries"? because a starving country will invariably grasp at dictatorship if it is forced to do so. Shall we say to them, "You must do this while we in America will have the food and will be the best fed people in the world, and we will maintain the biggest and best military force the world ever saw, so that if you ever attempt to get any of our food, we will defeat you"?

No, Mr. President; I do not think that is the American way and I do not think that is what our people want us to do.

I think they want us to do all that it is possible to do to keep the hundreds of millions of people on this earth from starving. They want us to do all we possibly can do to restore sound and stable governments to the other nations of the world. They want us to do all that it is possible to do to restore commerce and industry to the world, and, above all else, they want us to do everything it is possible to do to build and maintain an organization for permanent peace. They want us to do this, even if it means that they will not have everything they want for themselves, even if it is necessary to have legal controls for a short time.

Mr. President, that is why this measure is before the Senate today. It is not here for us to discuss whether someone in business should make a profit of 16 percent or a profit of 18 percent. This measure is before the Senate because it is a means by which we hope to restore peace and prosperity to the world. We could have surpluses in the United States today if we wanted to have them. If we simply said, "We will not send our food and our materials to any other country in the world," we would not be talking about price control today. More likely we would be talking about support prices.

So this bill is before us. I do not think it is a good bill, but I think it is the best bill we are going to get, and I think it is infinitely better than no bill at all.

If the pending conference report is adopted, as I hope it will be, I realize that it will not prevent certain high prices from going higher. Undoubtedly, if the pending conference report is adopted, there will be more inflation than we have

now; but if we adopt the conference report, although it is not all it should be, I think it will be sufficient to prevent complete collapse in this country because of high prices.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. AIKEN. I shall conclude my remarks in just a moment.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask the Senator a question in regard to an agricultural matter.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well; I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that the views of the Senator from Vermont on agricultural problems have a great deal of influence with the Senator from Oregon.

The following problem has been presented to me at a conference which I attended this afternoon, and I should like to have the views of the Senator from Vermont regarding it. It was pointed out to me that the recent interim report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry makes plain that one of the greatest defects of the OPA's pricing policies in regard to dairy products is the insistence of the OPA upon adjusting the producers' prices on a national average basis.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. The OPA does not consider, so I was told, cost increases in a particular area, but measures its adjustment solely by the national average increase in cash costs. Of course, as to the individual producer, that varies a great deal throughout the United States. His cost varies greatly, depending upon the particular section of the country in which he is located; and frequently as to an individual producer it is much higher than the national average.

This has worked a great hardship on dairymen in the Northwest, the South, the Northeast, and other areas where costs have risen higher than the national average. The OPA, by means of the national average cost device, is destroying the dairy industry in those areas by keeping prices to local producers below their costs.

In my section of the country, for example, the record is perfectly clear that a great many dairy herds have simply disappeared. The dairymen have gone out of business. At the same time, the OPA allows dealers to pay for milk coming from distant areas as much as $1.75 per hundredweight more than can be paid for local milk. For instance, I know of cases in Portland, Oreg., of milk being imported from Idaho and the purchasers of the milk being allowed to pay as much as $1.75 a hundredweight more for it than they could pay for the milk of local producers.

My question is this: In light of these facts, does subsection (f) of section 6, as contained in section 11 of the report, require the addition to the 1941 local price to producers of the amount of the average total cost increases in the particular locality since that time?

Mr. AIKEN. I have mislaid my copy of the report for the moment, but I say at once to the Senator from Oregon that I do not try to defend some of the actions of the OPA, and I think what he has said about that action and the orders in regard to the dairy industry is entirely true. In fact, sometimes the OPA has been so grievously wrong that there has been a very strong temptation to join those who say we should simply eliminate it.

But when I reach that point in my thinking, I also begin to think of the 30,000,000 people in this country who still do not really know how they are going to live through the next week, and I also think of conditions in the world and of the over-all situation, and then I come back to thinking that I must support the OPA.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. That particular subsection, as the Senator has said, provides that the maximum prices in the case of producers "shall be computed by adding such increase"—that is, the increase of cost—"to the average 1941 price for such agricultural commodity (with appropriate adjustments for grade, location, and seasonal differentials)."

It seems to me that with that clause in the bill and with the provision "as determined and announced by the Secretary of Agriculture," the Secretary of Agriculture would have authority to correct the situation which the Senator has described.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio, because, as I am sure he knows, my purpose in raising this question is to lay a legislative basis for a judicial interpretation, if necessary; and in a moment I am going to put the question to the majority leader.

But in order to make certain that I correctly understand the response the Senator from Ohio has made, let me say that I understand it is his interpretation of this bill—and certainly he has had much to do with its drafting—that in the case suggested by me the wording of the act would permit the making of the adjustments which would alleviate the dairy problem I have mentioned.

Mr. TAFT. That is my opinion.

Mr. MORSE. Does the majority leader share that view?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have only a few minutes more.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I must say that I was out of the Chamber at the time when the Senator made his remarks, and I do not clearly understand what he wishes to have an answer to.

Mr. MORSE. I shall wait until the Senator from Vermont concludes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Oregon that I myself am satisfied with the interpretation which has been made by the Senator from Ohio. Had he not made it as he did, I would have requested him to do so, because I knew he could make such an interpretation for the RECORD in much better language than I could.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to say that if we are willing to tighten up our belts and dispense with some of the quantities of food which otherwise we would like to have, and if we are willing to do that for one more year, I think after 1 year we can dispense with price controls for good. Western Europe and north Africa and other parts of the world are producing more and are getting back into production. So I think if we continue these controls for one more year, thereafter we shall be able to get away from them. None of us likes these controls, and sometimes they become almost unbearable. I shall not say anything about the mistakes the OPA has made in the States, and how troublesome they have been to all of us, because everyone knows about that.

This bill is not perfect. It will not be perfect if it becomes law. But I think it is the best we can get, and I think we should do the best we can with the best we can get.

At a time such as this, I do not think there should be any talk by anyone about quitting his job merely because he cannot get the tools with which he would like to work. All during the recent war the farm people of America were not able to get the tools they wanted to have, but they worked their hardest with the tools they were able to get, and they produced crops in almost unbelievable amounts.

I have heard it said that the President may veto this bill if it goes to him in its present form. I think it would be most unwise for him to do so. If he vetoed the bill, I do not believe that he would be doing any good to himself, to his administration, or to his country. The bill is infinitely better than no bill at all, and I am satisfied that that is the only alternative before us.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Inasmuch as the bill contains a provision with reference to a decontrol board, and assuming that the board functions with any force whatsoever, under the intent of the law does the Senator not believe that the decontrols will increase from time to time within the year?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe so. I believe that the decontrols could start almost immediately, and I also believe that the success or failure of this law or any other law depends largely on how it is administered. I believe that if the bill is properly administered, control can be exercised over the goods and articles which need control, and that decontrol will take place as rapidly as possible with relation to those goods and products which should be decontrolled. In the meantime, if we have no controls at all there will be at least 30,000,000 people in this country, with no savings and with little income, who will be in almost immediate distress because of high prices. The separation pay of $200 or $300 which we gave to the veterans would mean almost nothing to them. Increases in prices would wipe out their money almost immediately. The men who would otherwise be building homes would have to postpone such building because they would not be able to afford to buy or build homes if there were no control over the prices to be charged for the homes, or the materials with which new homes

are constructed. If there were no price-control law at all, Mr. President, there would be financial killings by speculators. I am not in favor of that. Another result might be political chaos. I know that there are those who favor, for one reason or another, political chaos and financial killings by speculators. I am not in favor of either, and I shall fight against them to the best of my ability. I am sure that most of the people of this country take the same position that I take with regard to that matter.

So, Mr. President, let us agree to the conference report. It is not what we want. I do not believe it is entirely satisfactory to any Member of the Senate. But it is the best we have, and we cannot take the risk of bringing about confusion which would inevitably follow the abrupt decontrol of goods and commodities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from Vermont and the junior Senator from Oregon are striving for the same objective.

Mr. AIKIN. I am sure that we want the same kind of a bill.

Mr. MORSE. I regret that I find myself in complete disagreement with the Senator in the approach which he is taking in meeting the parliamentary problem before the Senate.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the able majority leader a question in order to lay a legislative foundation for a subsequent judicial interpretation if necessary. Before the majority leader came into the Chamber I pointed out that one of the practices of the OPA, in establishing producers' costs in the dairy industry, had been to measure its adjustments on the basis of the national average cost, thereby resulting in a great deal of disparity and many injustices in certain sections of the country. Particularly in the Northeast, and in the Pacific Northwest dairy costs have been much higher than the national average, with the result that our dairymen have suffered greatly, and a great many dairy herds have been disposed of.

What I wish to know from the able majority leader is whether or not subsection (f) of section 11 will permit adding to the 1941 local price to producers the amount of the average total cost increases in the particular locality since that time.

To put the question in another form, I wish to know whether, under the subsection to which I have referred, it will be possible for OPA, if it succeeds in setting up any administration of this act, to take into account the disparities in cost of production as they exist in various sections of the country.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order to answer the Senator's question consecutively, I wish to take time to read the section to which he has referred:

(f) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, in the case of any agricultural commodity, the base period shall be the calendar year 1941, and in lieu of computing the maximum prices required or permitted by this section by adding the increase in the weighted average of per unit costs to the base period prices of particular producers, such maximum prices shall be computed by adding such increase to the average 1941 price for such agricultural commodity.

Then, in parentheses, are the following words:

With appropriate adjustments for grade, location, and seasonal differentials.

The language then follows:

As determined and announced by the Secretary of Agriculture.

I have no doubt, and I believe it was the view of the members of the conference committee, that that language meant that differentials should be taken into consideration in respect to location. Otherwise there would have been no purpose in incorporating the word "location" in the language.

Therefore, Mr. President, my answer to the Senator's question is that the Secretary of Agriculture not only may but is practically directed to take those differentials into consideration in determining the items of cost.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I do not know to what extent any view of mine might influence any judicial tribunal. But as one of the conferees who discussed the matter, and as a member of the committee which discussed it when the language was being drafted, I have no doubt that what I have stated was the intention of the conferees, and will, of course, be the intention of Congress if the law is enacted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his statement, because I want to say that his views, as one who had charge of the bill on the floor, will have great influence in determining the congressional intent when the matter comes before the court.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, as one of the conferees I should like to endorse fully the interpretation just given by the senior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that the chief objective of this country in preventing inflation, is to get production and more production. We need it now. One of the great problems with which we have been faced under the OPA regulations has been that of getting a price ceiling level which would encourage production. In the lumber industry, in the building industry generally, and in many other fields of activity we were not able to obtain production because there was a lack of a realistic price ceiling.

At the same time, Mr. President, I believe that all of us recognize a sense of responsibility, because this is one of the most important measures which have come before the Senate during the post-war period.

The bill, as has been pointed out already, is certainly not a perfect piece of legislation. Yet, I doubt very much whether legislation which comes out of this or any other legislative body is perfect, or at least would seem to be so to partisans on one side or the other.

Mr. President, I believe that it is urgently necessary that next Sunday should not come with no price control whatever. Not very long ago my able colleague from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] whom I see sitting across the aisle, and I were members of a subcommittee which made a 30,000-mile trip around the world, investigating the disposal of Army and Navy surplus property. In Asia and in Europe we had the opportunity to see some of the devastating effects of inflation and what it does to a Nation's economy and to its people.

I happen to have before me a little diary which I kept on that trip. During the time the Senator from Delaware and I were in Athens, Greece, we were furnished with certain figures. I believe that I should read them into the RECORD now because they show something which every person dealing with this subject must keep in mind.

First of all, the drachma rate of exchange amounted to 150 to the dollar in the prewar period.

The official rate at the time we were in Athens amounted to 500 to the dollar.

The semiofficial rate for payments to British troops and to UNRRA amounted to 3,000 to the dollar, and the black market rate was about 6,000 to the dollar.

What is even more important and more illuminating is the fact that during the war period Greece had, as we had in this country, a system of controls. Even under those controls food had risen 10 times over the prewar period, and wages had risen only six times over the prewar period.

A combination of businessmen in Greece—and, strange to say, the left-wing organizations in Greece—had gotten together and had forced the taking off of controls in that unhappy country. What resulted? Food hit figures 92 times the prewar figures, while wages went up only from 30 to 50 times the prewar figures. So the wage earner and the pensioner, was caught in the squeeze, prices rising far more rapidly than did income.

Mr. President, this country has much, and it has much to lose. It seems to me that at this time in our country's history we need, more than ever before, certainly equally as much as in the period during the war, the spirit of cooperation in order to meet this problem. The loss of production from strikes in the automotive, steel, and coal and kindred industries, has done more to place us in a critical situation, so far as inflation is concerned, than have the modifications which have been made in the pending bill.

It is an old American pastime to try to find a whipping boy or goat for some of our problems. I do not believe Mr. Chester Bowles or Mr. Paul Porter should be blamed for what has happened in the field of OPA regulations and their administration. In the dealings I have had with these two gentlemen I have found them to be conscientious public servants. With many of their policies I have disagreed, but that certainly does not mean that they are interested any less in the preservation of the American system. I feel certain that, according to their lights, they are just as much interested in maintaining the American system as is any man sitting on the floor of the Senate today.

However, it seems to me, Mr. President, that the hope of holding the line, in the sense that phrase has been sometimes

used, was scuttled at the time the administration abandoned the wage control policies and abandoned rationing. I think at that time we lost all possibility of holding the line in the real sense of the word.

Recently the New York Times contained a very able editorial dealing with this situation. One problem with which we have been faced has been the squirrel-cage economics that some people seem to deal with these days. They entertain the belief that it is possible to increase costs and increase wages, and that it will not be necessary to increase prices. Of course, that is absurd.

This is what the New York Times had to say on Thursday, June 27. The editorial is a brief one, and I think it is quite apropos that it should be read into the RECORD at this time:

WAGE-PRICE RECORD

The myth that large wage increases could be granted without the need for price increases has been completely exploded by the events in the first half of 1946. The most recent evidence of the inadequacy of this theory is found in the 91-cents-a-ton increase in the ceiling price of anthracite coal, authorized to compensate producers for the wage increases recently granted. The record is replete with similar experiences in other industries:

Steel: A wage increase of 18½ cents an hour was accompanied by a price rise of $5 per ton, an amount equivalent to the entire wage increase.

Bituminous coal: An increase of 18½ cents an hour plus extras made necessary a rise of 40½ cents a ton in the price.

Meat: An increase of 16 cents an hour was accompanied by price increases equivalent to more than two-thirds of that amount.

Railroads: An increase of 16 cents an hour, later made 18½ cents an hour, led to the recently approved 3- to 6-percent rise in freight rates.

Automobiles: An 18½-cents-an-hour increase made necessary an increase of $16 to $60 a car for General Motors. In addition, a further rise of 5 percent has been permitted in order to compensate for the higher costs of steel and other parts which in turn had been caused by higher wages.

These instances are typical. Building materials, work clothing, textiles, and many other products could be added to the list. The full impact of these wage increases has not yet been felt. This is particularly true concerning the price increases permitted for coal, steel, and freight rates. Clearly, workers cannot benefit from wage increases which necessitate price increases and hence limit the rise in real earnings. The only fundamental basis for an expansion in real income is found in increased productivity. When wage increases are sharply in excess of those that can be paid out of production, the inevitable result will be higher prices.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say, in conclusion, that it seems to me that under the parliamentary situation with which we are faced, we have a choice of either passing the bill we are considering or ending up with no bill at all on Sunday evening. We have a clear duty and obligation to adopt the conference report.

It is true, as I pointed out before, that the legislation will not please all elements of our economic community. I believe it is the best legislation that can be achieved at this time. If, perchance, the Senate should not adopt the report, if new legislation could not be passed by Sunday night, and the country were left without any benefit of controls whatever, I believe a great multitude of our people would be very seriously hurt in the months ahead.

Many veterans have returned and are trying to get started in jobs or in business. There are many millions of people who are dependent upon fixed incomes, upon pensions, upon insurance policies. All of these have a vital stake in what we do here today.

Finally, Mr. President, I believe that there is an even greater reason for preserving the economic stability of America. I believe it is only by preserving a sound national economy and a solvent Federal Government that we can perform our full duty in helping to maintain the peace of the world.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything on the conference report, but I think perhaps I should speak for a few minutes, and I promise not to take much of the time of the Senate.

I am very much disappointed in the conference report, as I suppose every other Senator is. I do not suppose it suits the conferees, so far as that goes. But in my particular State, and I dare say it is probably true in others, there is very great disappointment because of the poultry, meat, and dairy-products provision.

In Delaware we have been very hard hit by the OPA rulings as to poultry. I have tried my best, as have others, to secure relief. I remember the Senator from Georgia and I were together before representatives of the OPA with reference to a ruling on poultry. However, we received very little satisfaction as to what might be expected with reference to that particular item. I believe we were told that perhaps in August there would be an abundance of poultry anyway, and that then the ceiling would be raised, which does not help us at all. The poultry industry amounts to well up toward $100,000,000 a year in the area from which I come, and that of course strikes at the very root of the economy of so many of our people that they are disappointed.

What makes the situation very difficult for us is the way in which the problem now appears. We cannot vote for what we would like to vote for, and we cannot vote against what we would like to oppose. I suppose every Senator is receiving telegrams—I know I am—from people asking that we work for particular items, that we have this put in or that taken out, and we cannot do it. So we are faced with the problem, as I see it, of either taking the conference report or leaving it.

The Senator from California has told the Senate of some instances of inflation which we observed on our trip. I do not know what the Chinese dollar was worth in American money before the war. I do know that I picked out the cheapest breakfast in Shanghai that I could get, and it cast $240 in Chinese money. In France we were told that we could get a perfectly good 50-cent meal for $17.50. Wherever we went we found that prices had gone out of sight.

Mr. President, I am afraid of such a situation coming about in America, and I am apprehensive that it may result if we let go of all controls. There are those who say we should do away with all price controls. I do not know whether they take that position because they have a hatred of the agencies that have handled price control. I do not know whether they are wrong, or whether I am wrong. I think those in control of prices have had a hard task to perform, and that they have done a great work. I say that notwithstanding the fact that my particular section of the country has been hit about as hard as any other section of the United States by the rulings of OPA. I do not think the OPA made the rulings for the purpose of doing anyone an injury. I think, as a whole, that organization has done a great work for the American people. I do not have any feeling of antagonism toward either Mr. Bowles or Mr. Porter. I have great respect for both of them. If OPA is continued, I hope they will see the situation as it exists in the country today and will realize that there must be a relaxation of controls when supply overtakes demand.

In the last few months 365,000,000 pounds of poultry were in cold storage. That was a time when there should have been a relaxation of control. So far as I am able to judge, there is absolutely no excuse for an attempt to continue price controls when supply reaches, as it did in the case of poultry, a point where it is much higher than the demand. Whenever there can be a relaxation of controls I think it should be made gradually. I think the conferees have tried to bring about a possibility of gradual relaxation. Whether it will work out in practice I do not know. I can only say that so far as poultry is concerned in my section of the country considerable damage has been done. Many millions of pounds of poultry have been driven from the market, and I do not think there can be a return to a normal condition in any reasonable time. I hope those in control will see to it that this situation is not benefiting anyone. I believe the members of the conference committees had the right idea when they provided for a gradual relaxation of controls. If those in control of OPA will do what the conferees had in mind they should do, I believe benefits will result to the people.

Mr. President, I, for one, want no part of the responsibility for bringing about such conditions with respect to rising prices as I have attempted to describe. I will say, in addition to what was stated by the Senator from California, that while we were in Greece 3,500 drachma would buy one American dollar. The price was stabilized after that at 5,500 drachma to the dollar. We saw the state of inflation in that country where there was a scarcity of food. There was a scarcity, of course, of everything else, as Greece had been an invaded country, but food was what everyone had to buy. So the price of food has gone out of sight. Inflation was so great that it was impossible for men to support their families with the work of

their hands. Therefore UNRRA had to support about 75 percent of the people of Greece at the time we were there. If I am wrong, and if the Senator from California has the exact figures, I wish he would correct me. As I remember, however, approximately 75 percent of the people of Greece were supported by UNRRA at that time. Shortage of crops, shortage of production, of manufactures, of everything, had led to the bidding up the price of everything the people needed, until the prices had risen so high that it was impossible for anyone by his hands to make sufficient money to support his family.

Mr. President, that is a condition which I fear in America. If such a condition should come upon us it would not only wipe out the savings of millions of people but it would put millions of others on some kind of an UNRRA, some kind of a charitable or philanthropic organization.

We are told that what we want and need is production. That is true; we do want and need production. I do not know whether adoption of this measure will increase production. I am of the opinion that in our impatience at conditions resulting from the war, we are inclined to abuse or criticize our public officials, and not take into consideration the fact that we have been in a long hard war, and that we are now paying a part of the penalty of such a war.

Mr. President, in spite of the fact that many of our people would like to have OPA wiped out, and take a chance on inflation, or bet on there being no inflation, so far as I am concerned—and I am speaking only my own opinion—I do not think I can afford to take any part of the responsibility for bringing on such conditions in America as the Senator from California and I found to exist in different parts of the world. Therefore, Mr. President, whether it be right or wrong, I have decided to vote for the report on the theory that it is the best plan we now have before us. We cannot vote for what we want. We cannot vote against what we do not want. We can only vote for or against what is before us. Therefore I shall vote for the report.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to speak at length on this bill, but I do wish to make it perfectly clear that I do not consider the bill providing for the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act as it comes to the Senate from conference, and upon which we are about to vote, the kind of a bill that the Senate should pass. While I fear that many features of the conference report are unworkable and cannot be successfully administered, still, considering the fact that the Price Control Act would completely expire at midnight on June 30, I am going to vote for the conference report. It is my considered conclusion that this course is far better than to take a chance on all controls collapsing suddenly at midnight on Sunday night.

Mr. President, the question of continuing price controls and the gradual lessening of them, as I see it, is indeed important to the economy of our country. Those who would remove controls entirely say that they are willing to take a chance and that they feel that prices, through the law of supply and demand, will soon seek their level and that we will not have dangerous inflation.

On the other hand, those who oppose such removal of price controls and favor the gradual lessening of them, a tapering off of them, and who want some price control retained, say that they will not take a chance on removing them or swiftly relaxing them as it might place us in a position of having run-away inflation.

So it is between these two forces that we have contention and disagreement, not only here in the Senate, but throughout the country. Adoption of the report provides the only hope possible for continued control at this time, unless the President should veto the measure, and it should be returned in time for Congress to reconsider it or take action otherwise on it before the expiration date. That might take place. However, I am not willing to take a chance on the country being left without some controls. For that reason I will vote to support the conference report.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I have not changed by mind about how I shall vote on the conference report. I know that I shall not disappoint Senators when I say that I am not going to make a further speech. However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks numerous telegrams which I have received concerning the OPA situation. As my friend from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] says, they constitute The Voice of the People.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We are wholesale carload distributors of lumber—have been for over 25 years. Under OPA regulations, we have been directly discriminated against and put out of business. Senate-House conference committee report on OPA of no benefit to ourselves or other direct mill shipping lumber. Wholesalers would appreciate your rejecting the report and instruct committee to renew efforts for revision of bill more in line with that passed by the Senate. Will appreciate this consideration as otherwise black market will continue grow bigger and bigger.

ARLING FUNCH LUMBER CO.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Do your utmost against this un-American OPA.

ROGER J. BAINBRIDGE.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the following citizens, agree with you 100 percent that OPA is unconstitutional, Communist, un-American, and unnecessary, and the people at the top are positively dishonest.

JAMES J. CORRELL.
ETHEL W. CORRELL.
JOSEPHINE TURNER.
JOHN KUHN.

MADISON, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Tremendously admire your guts for exposing OPA racket. Please accept my thanks as veteran one of millions of citizens backing your fight to kill OPA.

ROBERT BENSON.

OSHKOSH, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. EDWARD H. MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Your speech on OPA today was splendid. Thanks and congratulations.

RICHARD LLOYD JONES.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senator of Oklahoma,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep on fighting this un-American, unconstitutional, and communistic Gestapo, the OPA. Give America back to the American people.

LEE JENKINS.

MCALESTER, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE, of Oklahoma,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Continue that good fight for freedom of our people as against communistic OPA. You are gaining admiration of all the best and leading people by your good work.

Dr. J. C. BENTLEY.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. ED MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your 3-hour speech; it shows your great statesmanship. We admire your efforts to overcome the tyrannies of OPA and the communistic bureaucrats.

OKLAHOMA STATE BOARD CHAPTER PRO AMERICA.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We appreciate what you have done and ask that you extend your moral support to Senator O'DANIEL in his filibuster.

TULSA USED CAR DEALEPS ASSOCIATION,
R. N. MILLER, *Vice President.*

Senator ED MOORE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your great speech upholding American principles. We are back of you 100 percent.

TULSA COUNTY CHAPTER PRO-AMERICA.
By Mrs. C. W. GRIMES.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator ED MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We appreciate your fight to abolish OPA entirely; don't weaken.

MILDRED TUTTY,
MURLE TUTTY,
Rev. TURLEY,
CLARA NOE,
MARIE BENT,
ROBERT TURLEY.

ANDARKO, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. ED. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up fight to rid country of OPA.

R R. CLARK.
CLARK BOYLES.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator ED MOORE,
Washington, D. C.:
We are with you to the finish on that OPA fight. Our women want food for our families at normal prices. We also want production. Keep up your fight.
MRS. HOMER D. WILSON,
President, Tulsa County Republican Women's Precinct Club.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Honorable MOORE,
Washington, D. C.:
Gratifying to see your efforts in behalf of meat industry against OPA. Billion dollar subsidy appropriation would do more good to help balance budget. Supply and demand is only answer to meat industry problems.
DAVID BERNARD,
Hanford Meat and Provision Co.

PASADENA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on speech against OPA.
J. B. WRIGLEY.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator MOORE of Oklahoma,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your good work to discontinue OPA and put an end to all the confusion, uncertainty, and black markets that OPA has caused. Let competition, supply, and demand again go into effect for a better, happier, and more prosperous United States.
SORENSEN'S RESTAURANT,
Anoka, Minn.

LOCKLAND, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Senator from Oklahoma,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Heartiest congratulations to a real American. Keep up the good work to get rid of the octopus. God and all true Americans are with you.
The KING, GROLL, OSTERMANN, AND ALMER FAMILIES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. ED. H. MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
In this day of political cowardice it is most heartening to find a man who is willing to stand up and speak out courageously. Your speech in the OPA will live long and if this Nation lives it will be recorded with the declaration of freedom which Franklin, Clay, and Jefferson gave us. I congratulate you upon your forthright statement in saving our country from those who seek to put it in shackles.
WALTER S. HALLANAN.

QUINCY, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
United States Senate Office,
Washington, D. C.:
Please join Senator O'DANIEL, filibuster OPA out of existence Sunday midnight.
FRANK H. WHEELOCK.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Republican, Oklahoma,
Care United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Why don't you help Senator LEE O'DANIEL in his fight; it seems to be your duty?
MRS. LUCILLE ROBINSON.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:
Mere consumer urges your active support O'DANIEL to defeat this or any OPA extension.
JOHN M. DAVENPORT, Jr.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator ED MOORE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
An Oklahoman in Washington says "Keep up your good work; stretch 3 hours to 3 days."
WM. GILL, Jr.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator ED MOORE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Your help was grand in saving America from OPA which is part of plan for complete socialism. Thanks, great work.
BEN WILEMAN,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

ST. LOUIS MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
You are right; hold the floor and keep talking.
DAN O'BRIEN,
Member, Retail Grocers Ass'n.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE, *of Oklahoma,*
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your efforts in the fight. Here's strength to you.
J. COCHRAN.

TARENTUM, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We urgently request you to support Senator O'DANIEL on the floor in his courageous fight to restore the American form of government. Here's hoping we can start out Monday morning free and unhampered by asinine OPA curbs and restrictions, free to let the laws of supply and demand and common sense work out our economy.
E. C. West, J. E. Scheid, F. F. Huber, R. L. Shaffer, Cecelia Miscosky, Esther Miscosky, Alice Stitt, F. R. Lardin, T. H. Bender, F. E. West.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Press dispatches indicate you are waging a mighty battle against price control extension. More power to you. However, if price control is extended, lumbermen will appreciate your influence to insure for wholesalers and distributors the same protection Taft amendments provide for manufacturers and processors. The Wherry, Capehart, and Wolcott amendments made this provision, but Senate-House conferees were indefinite. Unless corrected by allowing wholesalers and distributors their historic margins, this segment of industry faces disaster. Your interest in our cause will be much appreciated.
LEGISLATION COMMITTEE, THE CINCINNATI LUMBERMEN'S CLUB.

GUTHRIE, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
ED MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Support "PAPPY" O'DANIEL in killing OPA.
SAM J. BELL.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
Senator Washington, D. C.
SIR: OPA is ruining the country. The thinking people are greatly opposed to the continuation of the OPA.
T. A. BLAKELEY,
President, Mortgage Corp. of Texas.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We need more men like you in Congress. Best regards.
O. G. BITLER.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Since 1908 we have operated retail lumber business in North College Hill, Ohio, under OPA regulations we have been directly discriminated against and put out of business. Senate-House conference committee report on OPA of no benefit to retail lumber dealers. The report should be rejected and the committee instructed to renew efforts for revision of bill more in line with that originally passed by the Senate. If this is not done black market will continue to flourish and legitimate concerns with enviable records for years will be out of business.
KNOLLMAN LUMBER CO.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Everybody here with you 100 percent. Keep talking.
ERWIN BURMAN.

DENVER, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE of Oklahoma,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
You're making history. Stick to your guns. Our employees have been playing baseball account unable to buy cattle within compliance. Please save our industry.
CAPITAL PACKING CO.

LOCKPORT, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator E. H. MOORE,
United States Senator From Oklahoma,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA. Talk it to death.
RAYMOND RUHLMAN.

WILLIAMSVILLE, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep the good word going. Beat the OPA.
H. P. SHEPHERD.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and thanks for your speech to the Senate on OPA. You are just 100 percent correct and most citizens agree.
W. W. TROIT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. Millions of Americans back you. War is over, so should the OPA.
JOSEPH A. WADE.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE, of Oklahoma,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Good work. Hope you kill the OPA.
T. M. BAILEY.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Hope you kill the OPA.
GEORGE P. URBAN, Jr.

LOUISVILLE, KY., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your good work. A real-estate widow. God bless you.
Mrs. FORST.

SALISBURY, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE, of Oklahoma,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
The United States needs less of Chester Bowles, Paul Porter, and OPA. Meat, poultry, and dairy products must be freed from price control now.
GLENN E. KETNER.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Washington, D. C.:
You are doing a splendid job. Keep up the good work.
L. WEHERING LUMBER CO.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. America's behind you.
A PROPERTY OWNER.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate, Washington D. C.:
I urge you to do your utmost in repealing the OPA amendment as I feel that by eliminating this destructful agency industry will increase production from the present 40 percent to 50 percent to capacity rate, thus bringing America back on a free competitive basis. The OPA has failed on all counts with prices soaring each day and the distribution system of commodities practically destroyed. OPA has stifled everything dead in its tracks.
F. J. WARNER.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Washington, D. C.:
You are doing a splendid job keep up the good work.
CORPUS CHRISTI BRICK & LUMBER CO.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
For the safety of the Republic, Federal control of individual economics must cease forthwith. OPA must not be permitted to continue any longer its pernicious tampering with our American way of life. Your efforts to that end will be considered by 100,000,000 people as a master stroke for our country equal to the winning of the war.
E. O. EDWARDS.

BERKLEY, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work we are all with you.
FRANK PUSEY.

BALTIMORE, MD., *June 28, 1946.*
Senators MOORE, of Oklahoma, and O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We commend your stand on OPA, CIO, PAC. The war is over. OPA has fulfilled its objective, should be permanently abolished, eliminating black markets. It is time that business be permitted to pursue its normal course. Continuance of OPA policies are definitely detrimental to good business ethics. When business is permitted to function normally supply and demand will regulate prices through competition.
KIRSON CONSTRUCTION CO.

DENVER, COLO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Republican, Oklahoma, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Long of opinion OPA should terminate and natural economic laws function. Believe many of our opinions has been reticent to speak up. Keep fighting.
GEORGE W. MASTEN, Jr.
GEORGE C. HAHN.

ANDREWS, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Am sure the majority of the American people will stand behind you in your fight to overthrow the OPA. More power to you.
D. D. OVERTON, Jr.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator MOORE,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your courageous stand against vicious OPA.
THOMAS J. POTTS.

MUSKOGEE, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Please assist Senator O'DANIEL in his filibuster so that the American people can return to the form of government they have been so long without.
RALPH H. ROLSTON.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Oklahoma Senator E. H. MOORE,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope it is possible for you to join with W. LEE O'DANIEL in his proposal to talk the OPA out of existence and help save the country from the bureaucrats.
WRIGHT TITUS.

MUSKOGEE, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE,
Care Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.:
No doubt you agree with Senator O'DANIEL in his filibuster movement to kill OPA. For said action we are grateful.
WM. WILSON LUMBER CO.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. EDWARD H. MOORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D C.
Today sent the following wire to Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL: Quote, Just read in newspaper that you contemplate fighting OPA extension to the best of your ability. If filibuster was ever justified it is more than justified against enemies of the American form of government. More power to you from me and the majority of American citizens who wish to retain the American way of life—unquote.
A. ARUTUNOFF.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Oklahoma Senator MOORE,
Washington, D. C.:
I deeply appreciate your efforts. Frankly, as both a dairy farmer and a creamery operator I am convinced that our Nation's dairy industry will suffer great disaster if OPA controls are kept on dairy products.
S. E. KNOWLTON,
Owner Knowlton's Creamery.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator E. H. MOORE, of Oklahoma,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on fight against OPA. Hope you join O'DANIEL's filibuster.
C. P. ALLEN.
W. O. MORSE.
D. W. FARNHAM.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I had intended to make a speech against the conference report. I intended to do so yesterday. I had some notes prepared, but I started to read telegrams expressing the voice of the people, and I read so many of them that we ran short of time. We recessed a little after midnight last night. The speech which I have prepared, and did not have an opportunity to make yesterday, is so long that time would not permit me to make it now under the limitation of debate. I have conferred with our majority leader. I have told him that in order to expedite consideration of the conference report I would dispense with making my speech at this time if he thought it would be possible for me to obtain unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the telegrams which I did not have an opportunity to read on the floor of the Senate yesterday. It seems that the reading of those telegrams has caused a change of sentiment in some quarters. A rumor is now circulating to the effect that the President may veto the bill, which leads me to believe that he has looked at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and has read what I said last night. If that happens, it will be simply another way of accomplishing what I wished to accomplish, because I wish to see the OPA eliminated, abolished, and done away with. I hope he will veto it, but I do not believe he will.

While reference has been made in some quarters to the effect that I have been engaged in a filibuster, the RECORD will disclose that there has been no filibuster. I have simply read into the RECORD telegrams from citizens of this Nation expressing their views about OPA and making some comments of my own on the conference report designed to extend the life of OPA. These telegrams can truly be considered as "the voice of the people."

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Three hundred citizens of East Flatbush, Brooklyn, signed petitions today to extend OPA without any crippling amendments. They are outraged at your proposed filibuster and demand that you carry out the will of the people which is to extend OPA as is. They will hold you responsible for any trifling with the lives of the American people. Signed petitions on file with Senator Barkley.

HALDANE AND EAST FLATBUSH CLUBS OF COMMUNIST PARTY.

NEW YORK., N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We fought for the right to live. Death or OPA will make living impossible. Urge end of filibuster and complete support of OPA.

MR. AND MRS. MICHAEL SAPHIER.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

You have been raised in a nuts patch. OPA must survive.

W. D. KING.

GALVESTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Forwarding to you 1,376 signatures on petitions collected today in which citizens pledge refusal to buy any commodities except the bare necessities of life until elected representatives legislate continuance OPA bill with full price control to allow citizens maintain families on equitable standard of living within present wages.

H. K. DEUCHARE,
Agent National Maritime Union.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Glad to see we have one American with guts in the Senate.

Ex-Col. BRUCE R. DODDS.

ERIE, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Americans Veterans' Committee demand that for once you think of the national interest instead of your own. Stop obstructing OPA.

ERIE CHAPTER,
AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE.

ENNIS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Keep up good fight against OPA.

W. G. WOOD.
F. L. WADSWORTH, Jr.
T. Q. MOSELEY.
BILL MCCALL.

MARTINSBURG, W. VA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Try your best to keep talking until the OPA expires Sunday night. Abraham Lincoln freed the Negro slaves. Help us to free ourselves from the d—— blood-sucking leeches in Washington who want to artificially control our lives.

HOMER N. PANKEY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Sir, I think your actions on the OPA legislation are outrageous and a mockery to our system of government. Please do not go through with your intended filibuster.

HAROLD KLARMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As a Texas lawyer with a lawyer father and family in Texas, I oppose your OPA stand and urge you to support OPA.

GERALD WEATHERLY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

If your filibuster kills OPA the public will not forget O'DANIEL when they see their savings vanish in the consequent inflation.

JOLIS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE SAPPY O'DANIEL,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

The eyes of Texas are upon you as well as 47 other foreign States. If you can secure an interpreter I would suggest you read Constitution and the American Bill of Rights during your filibuster as you indicate you need help. Please reply.

J. S. ANTONY ADAM YANKEE.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

To a grand Governor from Texas we of the State of Florida are rooting for you. Don't stop talking.

Mrs. DAVID GEORGE.

CRESSON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Wish you all the success in your efforts against OPA.

SLOCUM BROS.

ODESSA, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
PAPPY LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I've always been against you but now I'm for you. You did your best to kill OPA. Wish I had been there to of helped you out.

L. R. CARTER,
Carter Hardware Co.

RUSK TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, OF TEXAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You are performing the greatest public service of your career. Keep talking. You can expect bureaucrat parasite employees, their friends, and relatives to try to keep jobs, but unorganized and until yesterday unrepresented Americans will back you.

J. PERRIN WILLIS.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank God that not all of the Senate Members are selfish little men. That silly filibuster of yours in this humble man's opinion should make the free-enterprisers mighty happy.

E. J. STIDSTON.

ENID, OKLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your effort to kick the two-bit Hitlers out.

O. L. STITH,
SARAH STITH.

FORT DODGE, IOWA, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand against OPA. We surely hope Iowa Senators will back you.

L. R. SCHRADER STEAK HOUSE.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington D. C.:

My address is 420 West Alabama; we hope you will kill the OPA and get the Government out of private enterprises so business of America can survive.

R. C. WORTHY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As a veteran and resident of Illinois, I want to register a strong disapproval of your filibuster against necessary price controls.

WARD H. WHIPPLE.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand in behalf of your constituents and your convictions against extension of the bungling, bureaucratic, undemocratic OPA. We appreciate your standing for right even though you had no support whatsoever.

P. C. NAYLOR,
Manager, Austin Hi-way Lumber Co.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We fought for your security. Demand that you relinquish floor for passage of OPA extension.

TWENTY-THREE VETERANS, WORLD WAR II REGISTRATION DIVISION, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION.

HIGHLAND, MICH., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL OF TEXAS,
Washington, D. C.:

Good for you. Keep on talking. Kill OPA. Detroit is rotten both with Republican and Democrat New Dealers.

CHAS. NEEDHAM.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We demand that you stop shameful attack on welfare of American people. Citizens of Texas and the country cannot buy the necessities of life if OPA dies.

A GROUP OF TEXANS IN WASHINGTON.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Was certain when we Texans sent you to Senate that you would represent us brilliantly. Your stand on OPA disproves our belief.

WILLIAM WALTER,
Dallas, Tex.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your sincere efforts. Unfortunately, we do not have more men of your courage and understanding in Washington.
BRYAN SPARKS.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We heartily endorse your stand on OPA. More power to you.
Leo Owens, Mrs. Owens, F. F. Bell, J. F. Perkins, Mrs. J. F. Perkins, Howard Hollingsworth, J. W. Cole, H. H. Hollingsworth, J. F. Berrias, H. H. Kelton, Chas. Day, L. M. Peacock, J. R. Allison, John F. Perkins.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are heartily in accord with you in your stand against OPA. It is time that the bureaucrats with their petty ways are ousted.
JAMES MILLER.
S. M. BYRNE.
OMER DREILING.
JAMES E. FERGUSON.
FREEMAN TAYLOR.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Throw OPA into trash can. Chester Bowles yesterday dismissed 18 pending suits against price violators in Houston alone, showing their cases have no merit. How much longer must taxpayers be burdened with such an outfit as Bowles is operating, unless, of course, they stay to have expensive jobs. Air-mailing paper today.
P. G. SACKENREUTHER.

MIDLAND, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We hope you stay in there and get us farmers some relief from OPA. We are behind you.
O. C. COLLINS.
R. O. BROOKS.
W. B. FRANKLIN.
R. C. VEST.
R. D. JONES.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Read this one, sir: Austin Chapter, Americans Veterans Committee, wonders who you're speaking for. Certainly not Texans, veterans, or common citizens. Suggest you do something constructive for a change, like being quiet and/or voting for OPA.
STUART LONG
(For 125 Texas veterans).

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The "meadow dressing" you are spreading not only stinks but has no fertilizing qualities.
W. J. BRIGGLE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:
For over 2 years my wife and I have been working practically day and night, working as much as 18 to 20 hours a day, in an effort to establish ourselves in an honest, reputable business. Our net returns have been but fair and our worries many, but we have kept doggedly to our work in the hope of someday having a well-established business. We have no desire to work as hard as we do and would like to limit ourselves to a 10-hour day, but this would mean hiring additional employees and would result in very little, if any, profit for our efforts, so to make some profit on the venture, we are forced to work these many hours each day. A little over 3 months ago the OPA director here ordered price ceilings for us that were asinine for this type of operation and evidently a complete lack of knowledge as to this type of business, and demonstrated a decided lack of even good business judgment. Were we to invoke the prices set forth, we would suffer a gross loss on sales. That is a loss on just the difference between income from sales and cost of sales and is before operating expenses, administered expenses, etc. Were we to adopt those prices, we would be in a position of "hot dog" vendor who bought his "hot dogs" for a dime and sold them for a nickel. He'd have a tremendous business and maybe have a lot of fun. But he wouldn't last very long. Similarly, we would last just about 2 weeks, at which time we would have been wiped out. When this was pointed out to the OPA, we were allowed some relief, in that the new prices would have wiped us out in about a month instead of in 2 weeks. The unfair price was again brought to the attention of the OPA and a new set of prices were given us. All of this, mind you, by pure guesswork and without business basis or justification. This final price ceiling is still silly for this type of operation, and we are now forced to operate in violation of the OPA and will continue to do so in an effort to scrape together by our combined 135 hours a week of hard labor, just the means of a fair living and the building of a small, honest business. Senator O'DANIEL, is this too much to ask? Isn't this the American way of life or has that way changed? Thanks a lot for starting your talk of enlightenment, for which you shall long be remembered and ever be highly regarded. We do hope and pray that you will continue your talk through Sunday midnight and a few hours beyond, just to play safe. You may be sure that every fair-minded American is with you in your fight to restore the American way of life to the American people. Please see the fight through to a finish. Thanks.
H. N. DIXON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Texas is the largest State in the Union but Mr. O'DANIEL is not nearly as big as Texas or as large as the United States of America. The Senator pro tempore cannot and must not slaughter the Office of Price Administration, causing an unparalleled rise in food costs to the little people. Why cannot the Senator see that the small people need a control that his eminence is opposed to.
W. M. CROSBY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Stop your foolish filibuster. I served on Guam. Please sit down.
JOHN S. TODD.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Stop sillybustering at wives of overseas veterans; both did our patriotic duty. Unpatriotic action detours us. Forget patronage. Remember us and others. Keep OPA.
MRS. FRANCES M. TODD.
SILLYBUSTERING PPC.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Your activities are unpatriotic. Millions will suffer. Please sit down.
Dr. J. W. TODD.

MONAHANS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
If you are talking for me you can shut up.
T. L. TODD.

BEAUMONT, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I am a 2-by-4 groceryman. Have never voted for you before. Stay in there and pitch. Will vote for you next time.
HUBERT MONCRIEF.

ENNIS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The fight you are making for your people is appreciated.
M. W. GLASPY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. Greatest need for America that OPA be eliminated. All Oklahoma behind you; also Wheeler, Tex.
BEN WILEMAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Texas can do it. Keep it up.
WM. GILL, Jr.

YANKTON, S. DAK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As an old Texan who put my buck in the flour barrel years ago, luck to you.
E. P. BELLAMY.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The eyes of Texas are upon you and proud of you. Don't stop. Kill OPA.
Mr. and Mrs. LEON KANE.

EL PASO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
I am glad that the junior Senator from Texas put his country before politicis. Only a statesman would undertake your present task. Wish you success.
JOHN G. OECHSNER.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Capitol,
Washington, D. C.:
To bad people who voted for you have to regret it with a betraying knife between their shoulder blades.
JOHN HANSARD.

DALLAS, TEX., *July 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are with you.
JOHN F. MYERS.

HEREFORD, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
We wish you success in your fight for the people to get rid of OPA and all the other elements of Government which would deprive the people of their freedom.
TOM SANDERS.

COLLEGE STATION, TEX.,
June 27, 1946.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.
Your filibuster stinks. We hope to have enough money left to vote against you when you run again, that is, if you have enough guts. We remain, four ex-servicemen who came back to this. If OPA goes, you can, too.
LOHN.
CRAIN.
JONES.
TEAGUE.

CORSICANA, TEX.,
June 27, 1946.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your stand. We beg you to save us from the OPA. Stay on the people's side. Freedom from fear. There is more fear in this country now than ever in the history of the United States. Those in favor of OPA are in favor of higher prices. Do away with OPA, and competition will lower prices. The strikes caused by the unions and OPA control is causing a depression right now. Business is off. Do away with OPA and let merchandise come through. The war is over. OPA was a war measure. Surely they don't want to keep OPA until the next war. Do all you can to save us now. If OPA goes on, a depression will surely follow.
Sincerely,
GEO. DANIELS,
Care Simon Daniels Co.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The people of Texas are disappointed in you. Do not filibuster, and let the OPA bill pass.
E E. ORNALD, Jr.
A. G. LONEY.

CHATHAM, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill the OPA and become Texas' greatest man since Sam Houston.
R. S. HUGHES.

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hurrah for Texas. Here is some help for for your filibuster. I prefer to run my business the American way and minus the OPA.
L. CASARETTO.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The American flag is as beautiful in coloring and as artistic in design as ever but its unseen beauty, liberty, and freedom are no longer there. May God guide you in your unselfish attempt to restore our constitutional rights to us.
MARY O'DONOHOE.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are in back of your filibuster. The OPA refuses to set my rent at that prevailing in the neighborhood. They use seven of the slum houses in Detroit to prove that my modern home should rent for no more and that this is their practice always. We property owners are being robbed of our homes.
MRS. ALOYSIUS VERHOVEN.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: The war is over; give us back the American form of government. By all means try and talk till Monday. Talk them to death.
M. TAGER,
A Haggard Businessman of Bridgeport, Conn.

BURLINGTON, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I hope God will give you strength to talk until Monday morning so that we may wake up under the American form of government. I hope there will be others who will have the good old American spirit and fall in line with you. We are getting sick and tired of every individual being told what he can and can't do. Best wishes.
J. H. SMITH.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: I am all for your efforts to eliminate OPA and rid ourselves of that communistic influence.
J. F. HUBBARD.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
The purpose of this telegram is to assure you of our sincere appreciation and to let you know you have the high regard and support of every livestock producer and member of the packing industry in the State of Montana as well as the Nation. You have the courage of your convictions and have set an example that will prove to be an inspiration to every one of us.
MONTANA MEAT PACKERS ASSOCIATION,
E. S. HOLMES, *President.*

SAFFORD, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
We are gratified to know that you are taking every possible means to eliminate OPA and all it stands for. We, the people of Arizona, are behind you 100 percent and only hope that you can continue this good work until midnight Sunday. Best wishes for your continued success.
JENNINGS LUMBER CO.
LOUIS JENNINGS.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Backing you with prayer to defeat OPA.
MRS. MADSON.
GLADYS AMUNDSON.

ELDORADO, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for your efforts in defeating the vicious and communistic bureaucratic OPA.
Dr. J. G. MITCHELL.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Floor, Capitol,
Washington, D. C.:
The American people have already liquidated OPA, only Chester Bowles and Members of Congress have not yet discovered the fact. We are at the cross roads. Do you gentlemen have the courage to vote to return us to free markets, a free economy with enough meat, butter, fats, clothing, for our people, and enough fuel oil for heat this winter or will you continue to vote the communicrats the power to ruin and destroy our country? The farmers, the women, the shopkeepers, the small business people don't want OPA. Can't you men realize that? Keep up the fight, Mr. O'DANIEL. Texans never have the reputation of being quitters. Thousands of people are counting on you. I'm from Houston, unfortunately visiting in Washington.
SAMMY LANE.

BROCKTON, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Good work. Millions of Americans are with you. Rid America of un-American OPA.
E. A. HOLLANDER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your heroic stand on the floor of the Senate on behalf of commercial democracy demands the unqualified commendations of every farsighted and progressive American.
C. A. GOULD.

KIRKWOOD, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: You have my encouragement to keep up the fight to save America. America will only be America with the capitalistic form of government, the individual being able to buy or sell in a competitor market.
Sincerely yours,
GEO. J. CLARK.
CLAYTON, MO.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Senator, stay in and keep pitching. We need bread and meat for our working people.
G. DEVITA.

BAINBRIDGE, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I wish you 100-percent success. Keep up the good work.
J. E. WHITE.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Gratifying to see your efforts in behalf of meat industry against OPA. Billion-dollar subsidy appropriation would do more good to help balance budget. Supply and demand is only answer to meat-industry problems.
DAVID BERNARD HANFORD MEAT & PROVISION CO.

DENVER COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations to you on your stand on OPA. John Hancock Lee Raley, of Dallas vacationing in Denver, Colo.
JOHN HANCOCK.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washigton, D. C.:
Kill the OPA.
NORTHWEST DUROC BREEDERS ASSOCIATION,
Beaverton, Oreg.

BENTONVILLE, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I am for you 100 percent. If only had more Senators like you and Senator MOORE, of Oklahoma. Senator WHERRY was right when he said the OPA didn't know one critter from another. Last year a cowman from Osage County, Okla., wrote the OPA to get feed to fatten his 400 steers and they wired fatten half of them and keep the other half for breeding purposes.
JAY FIERCE.

TROY, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Success for your filibuster. Is haymaking time. Pick-up balers, use baling wire, or special twine. None to be had on account of OPA ceiling. Manufacturers cannot make or will not release farm machinery, and parts are tied up same way.
BERT FAVORITE.
TROY, OHIO.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please keep up the good work. We're pulling for you.
JACK DEMING.

PACOIMA, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Defend the American way. Repudiate the office of prolonged agony.
C. H. ROBINSON.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Laud your efforts. Defeat OPA.
Mrs. BUSCHE and Mrs. NEWELL.
LILLIAN SCHOENING.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
You are to be highly congratulated on your stand against the OPA. Hope you will continue.
E. A. FARRISS.

FORT PIERCE, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Please hold out to kill OPA so we can get some meat.
A. E. Sasser, Mrs. Ebner, Mrs. Thompson, Fred R. Carlile, A. J. Cummer, Buelah Mackson, Carl A. Johnson, Mrs. C. W. Nicholson, Jr., New Hoard Neu; Mrs. Earl Copenhaver, H. W. Kendall, N. L. Kendall, F. Smith, H. H. McFern, B. A. Robinson, H. W. Forbes, Mrs. G. R. Sammons, Roy Carlile, Dill Forsyth, Mrs. J. W. Knowles, Thelina Weaver, Mrs. Karl Gorcy, Mrs. Carl Lignoski, F. E. Cramer, H. E. Goforth, C. A. Cleveland, New Hoard Newu.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA. Free Americans from present bondage.
RODINE, YOCUM, AND MILLER.

TAMPA, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
SIR: My company and other automobile dealers of Tampa are solidly behind your position against OPA. We are wishing you the best of luck in your filibuster proceedings.
HARGROVE USED CARS.

JOLIET, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
As Teddy Roosevelt said, "Bully, bully" for your intention to talk the OPA to death. We hope you do, as it is the most unjust, unfair, and obnoxious department ever created in our Government. We are with you and hope you win. Bully, boy.
HUGH H. BOLTON.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA. Today's breakfast, two eggs, one slice bread (OPA regulations), no butter; 40 cents requested; bread charged extra, 15 cents for two slices toast.
S. L. UTSEY.

PANAMA CITY, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We approve of your filibuster and wish you luck in your fight to kill the OPA, as we believe Americans have sense enough to tend to their own business; also it will remove 70,000 parasites from the taxpayers' shoulders.
CITIZENS OF BAY COUNTY, FLA.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
FILIBUSTER HURRAH, INC.,
Care Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Democracy threatened with OPA bureaucratic strangulation. History should record your filibuster greatest step toward morality in Government in 15 years. Kiss Chester Bowles for me.
C. J. NYALDNER HIWAY FEED STORE.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Every good wish for success in your filibuster against OPA. Hope you kick it back where it belongs. If you need filibustering material, will gladly send you Encyclopedia Britannica.
GEORGE O. BETTIS.

SAVANNAH, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Indiscriminate use of veto power will result either in abolishment of the power or destruction of representative government. Suggest you discuss abdication of Reichstag under Hitler, also American Revolution resulting from deadlock George III and Parliament, also corruption of courts under Hitler, also discuss Charles I and Cromwell.
KARL M. FLEEHURST.

STORMLAKE, IOWA, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster the OPA law out of existence and the OPA Gestapo set up by men who tried to make many laws similar to Hitler's dictator ideas. Let us free business enterprise in the United States of America.
C. V. LARSON.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep the good work up. We are for you.
P. J. O'BRIEN.

BURLINGTON, VT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are fighting with you. Great job.
HAROLD R. LEACH.

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Care of Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Hoping you successfully wage your battle against the OPA.
R. E. DE CAPRIO.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please filibuster the OPA out of existence.
CHARLES E. NIEHUSS, M. D.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand against OPA. Our heartfelt gratitude to you in your fight to give the country back to the people.
Mr. and Mrs. DANIEL HURLEY.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Three hundred rooms vacant due to OPA. Congratulations your fight.
FAE BOLLINGER,
GI's Wife.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Successful filibuster will restore businessmen's confidence in democratic government. My business contacts with feed dealers and farmers throughout Pacific Northwest proves disgust for OPA.
VYTOBOLATOR SALES CO.,
GEORGE E. SMITH.

BURLINGTON, VT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Doing a fine job; keep it up.
W. E. PLAISTED, Jr.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
You did your part trying to save country from Office of Price Administration un-American domination. Hope you keep on fighting for Americanism. OPA in present form gives New Deal Communist pay rollers opportunity to continue stifling production, life of Nation, and wresting long-established enterprises from legitimate owners and turning them over to thieving Communists and fellow travelers and profiting through operation of foreign-born black marketeers, and that, I believe, is the main thing OPA'ers wanted. Keep on fighting, for America is awakening and will some day throw the rascals out.
WILEY S. SMITH.
Lexington Hotel.

HEREFORD, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
I wish to encourage you in your actions to rid the Government of those bureaucrats, including OPA, which stand in the way of a democratic government.
JAMES W. WITHERSPOON.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
You will be most popular presidential candidate if you kill OPA.
E. T. BOURDEN.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work; we are behind you.
HAROLD CURRY.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
As an income property owner, a southern woman, and a widow dependent upon her rentals, I congratulate a fellow countryman for the courage of his convictions in setting aright a hopelessly tragic situation of antiquated earnings and soaring expense on one hand and tempting black-market offers on the other, which we of honest purpose who own multiple building know and are forced to suffer. Tell 'em Mr. Texan and God bless you.
LOUISE S. TOWNELEY,
149–1513 South Elm Drive.

WILMINGTON, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Please accept my encouragement in your filibuster against OPA. You are showing the same courage that the Texans demonstrated at the battle of the Alamo. Assisted by brave men from every State of the Union I am sure that many courageous men of the Senate will rally around you today to save this Nation from OPA as our forefathers rallied to save Texas.
FRANK L. ALEXANDER.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hold the floor in the filibuster for 48 hours. There is 6,000,000 votes in Texas for you. We are very grateful for your efforts put forth in this piece of legislation.
AUBREY C. MITCHELL,
1312 Richmond Street, Fort Worth, Tex.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for your gallant fight against bureaucrats' oppression.
PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION.

EL DORADO, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You have opportunity to save this Nation.
H. B. GEEVES.

SHELTER ISLAND, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The OPA and prohibition both noble experiments—never can work. Filibuster this OPA that is crippling this country and you might be the next President.
ARTHUR W. CORSE,
575 West End Avenue, New York City.

ATLANTA, GA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Don't lose your grip on the viper. Kill it completely.
MRS. LAURA B. JONES.

CHESTERFIELD, MO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Honorable Senator, keep talking, we are with you.
CHESTERFIELD FARMERS ELEVATOR & SUPPLY CO.

CHATTAHOOCHEE, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. L. O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
If OPA is allowed to continue, the Nation will be on starvation in 30 days. So keep talking.
G. B. ROSS.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill the OPA. Kill the black market.
NORCO METAL PRODUCTS CO.

MARFA, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
First time you have done anything we approve of.
PAISANO HOTEL,
E. S. POWERS, *Manager.*

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
SIR: I hope that this message reaches you before you give out; and I might add we in Texas, after many, many years, are glad for a humble flour salesman with intestinal fortitude to fight another bureau. You will probably lose, but that shall not change our affection for you, because the writer is raising a family of one 17-year-old son, twin daughters, 15, and another cotton-top 10-year-old boy, and also the writer does not want, after educating these people, for them to become a part of a bureau set-up by our dear Government nor a potato-weighing, tire-inflating cog in any chain store or other chain who buys from the War Assets Administration on a 30-day credit and sells the merchandise, reinvests the money again, buys, reinvests the money from our dear Government, while the poor veteran must pay cash in advance before he gets the merchandise. You will probably be called another Huey P. Long, but there is one consolation: you have even the late President turned to Texas and allowed his picture to appear on a 25-foot billboard shaking the hand of a big dear friend to break the flour salesman out with all due respect to our past commander, God rest his soul. Our bureaucratic friend lost the race and the poor little flour salesman wound up in Washington. You don't know me; I don't know you. God bless your heart if you can kill one bureau. Like Jack the Giant Killer, they may hate you, but Texas loves you and respects you and elects you. Fight as long as you can, and we may add that if you want talking time, try to name the bureaus that have been set up by our puppet Government, plus Phillip Murray, plus John L. Lewis, and you can talk for 3 years by just naming the bureaus that have been set up for little Murph. You might add in your talk, since our dear bureaucrat Government hasn't thought of it, why they can't think of a bureau to establish a one-room apartment for GI Joe and the other fellows that can't find a place to stay for wife and kiddies. We stop now not to embarrass you, not to pay you homage, but to raise our kids in our American public schools to where they will not have to weigh potatoes, wipe a windshield, scrub a bathroom, or join the other bureaus or chain organizations that are gradually taking charge of our God-loving country.
J. O. CLOYD,
A Small Businessman That Worked His Way Without Any Education From a Bootblack to a Businessman.

PITTSFIELD, MASS., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for your courage to protect the American worker from unemployment and business from bankruptcy.
JOHN J. ROSE.

ALAMOGORDO, N. MEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. You have our support.
E. M. DALE, JR.,
ALEX WYKA,
W. H. ASHBY.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:
Hurray. It's about time someone protected the Government and our beloved county apartment-house owner who does not intend to increase his rent.
HENRY R. PIQUETTE.

LAINGSBURG, MICH., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Stay with your program. Filibuster the OPA out the window.
MARY D. WILLIAMS.

DOVER, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Amend rent and save Tuscarawas County.
RICHARD CLEMENS.

BURLINGTON, VT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work.
JACK LINDSAY.

NEW PHILADELPHIA, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. Keep up the good work.
CARL E. RICHARD.

LANSING, MICH., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL:
Please put shevik on the end of Chester's name and send him back to his own country and if he can ruin that half as much as he has ours maybe they won't come over here and lick us.
ERASTUS BAKER.

WEEHAWKEN, N. J., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Save America. Kill the political football, OPA. The prayers of all who love the American way of life are with you in your glorious fight.
HENRY MULLER.
NELSON GOODWIN.

EAU CLAIRE, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
On your OPA program we are backing you.
J. M. BEATTY.

WILMINGTON, DEL., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas:
Go ahead Senator, make your speech, and make it long. Am all for you.
HARRY H. ROSEN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
Keep up good work. OPA must be abolished if un-American.
Mrs. AGNES M. LEWIS.

DOYLESTOWN, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL:
Congratulations on your stand against un-American OPA. Keep up good work.
BERTRAM KENDLE, Jr.

FLINT, MICH., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator, Texas:
Hitler's Gestapo, King Henry VI's, Mortons Fork, and the New Deal's OPA in same category. Keep the New Deal's mercenary votes in the bag with a renewal of OPA, congratulations Senator.
ROBERT A. GRIMES, Sr.

POCOMOKE CITY, MD., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Continue fight against OPA. No meat in my store. Truck operating 1 day instead of 4.
E. CARMEL WILSON.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:
We are with you 100 percent. Give us more O'Daniels for a better America.
ALBERT FOX.

SELMA, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL:
We are wishing you every success in your campaign against OPA.
SELMA DRESSED BEEF CO.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Your filibuster threatened the budget of all families who pay rent. Am sure your stand is opposed by majority of people of moderate means. Hope you will stop your efforts to block OPA.
HENRY TUMEN.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please discontinue your disgraceful conduct while we American citizens anxiously await action by our Representatives on this issue which so vitally affects all of us.
Mr. and Mrs. S. H. KAHMANN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Keep the filibuster going. May God bless you and help you get things back to the good old American way. Oust OPA and use the money for building more and better highways. Everyone will benefit then.
CLARK WELLBEARGER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep that filibuster going whatever you do. I am proud of a man like you. I am an ex-vet in business for myself. I agree with you very much.
L. C. OXBORNE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the filbuster. Hats off to men like you. Oust the OPA and let us live like real Americans. Send those OPA home wreckers back to Germany. God bless you and keep up the good work.
BERT RATHMANNER,
Home Owner and Taxpayer.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. People at home admire you for your efforts to defeat the OPA.
Mrs. DON GIBBONS.

HEREFORD, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you're able to kill OPA, and by far the majority of citizens want this done. We appreciate all you are doing for good government and for the liberty and freedom of our people.
J. H. SEARS.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
America means freedom. We don't want communism. Fight on for freedom, Pappy.
CORA HUFF MACKIE,
Kentucky Democrat.

PLEASANTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Give OPA both barrels. We are behind you.
PLEASANTON JAYCEES.

LIBERTY, MO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Our belly is full of the OPA. How in the heck did they get that way?
FRANK BOYD,
ROBERT THOMASON,
Farmers.

APPLETON, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Three cheers to you, Senator PAPPY O'DANIEL. Kill regimentation, kill OPA. Let the parasites who administer dig ditches. Talk on, O'DANIEL, talk on.
RONALD N. SCHOMISCH.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Persevere. You are the only hope the people have to preserve our Constitution. May God bless you.
E. G. SIADOUS.

LUBBOCK, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight on OPA and save the landlords of Texas from financial ruin and injustice.
MAX M. COLEMAN.

DENVER, COLO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Denver merchants are feeling pinch more every day. Meat industry, if some relief doesn't come soon, black market will take full control. We're on your side.
ROBERT L. NORTON.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Go to it. We are for you 100 percent.
L. B. WEHERING LUMBER CO.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Those of us who still believe in the American form of government give you our heartfelt thanks, our gratitude, and sincere support in your courageous stand in attempting to return those revered principles so long missing from the American scene. Thank you. Good luck.
RAYMOND N. BOWMAN.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Bless your soul for having guts to take your stand against the political leeches and dictators. Tell those lightning bugs that any thinking American can see through their lies. The mess stinks and we citizens want our rights in and the apes out.
F. E. BRIDGES.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Capital Building, Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. Thank the Lord we still have a few public men who believe in constitutional government.
HAROLD MAHAN.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up good work. I am for a filibuster, so are 1,500 members of the I. R. G. A. of St. Louis, Mo.
EDWARD ROOK.

EAST ORANGE, N. J., *June 28, 1946*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Go to it. Throw the OPA out. They have shackled our country for the last 5 years. We don't want any dictators here.
CORA E. STOELLER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Keep the filibuster going. Maybe you can show those New Deal yes men that they are wrecking our country.
EMILY WHEELBEARER.

SALINAS, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: "Dare to be a Daniel, dare to stand alone, dare to have a purpose

firm, and dare to make it known." I want OPA abolished. I will then have $1,000 to pay income tax with. We want no left wing in America.

Gratefully,

Dr. K. W. BLAYLOCK.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the filibuster. American housewife oust the OPA and let us feed our families, the things we want and work for.

Mrs. LAURA RATHMANNER.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Praise the Lord for one American left in Washington that will stand up express himself against Moscow. May the Lord help you in defeating OPA.

C. M. VAN DUSEN.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Backing you in your attempt to restore constitutional government in this Republic. Down with mobocracy and bureaucrats. Remember what Daniel did to the lions. May God give you strength.

H. O. SCHUMACHER,
Monroe Street Lumber Co.

MIDDLESBORO, MASS., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your vigorous stand against OPA, one of the worst outrages against the American way of life.

Lt. Comdr. F. L. BARROWS.
Mrs. F. L. BARROWS.
Mrs. GRACE P. BARROWS.

ELBOW LAKE, MINN., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the fight. We are backing you up and hope you win. We feed livestock extensively, and if OPA is not killed livestock feeders will have to quit.

FLINT BROS.

WHITE OAK, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank God for men like you. Trust you will hold out and help restore freedom to our country once more.

E. A. P. MCCARTHY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We on the west coast are calling on you to smash OPA.

ROBERT L. KRIEGER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep that filibuster going whatever you do. We need more men like you. We Americans are used to freedom so keep that good work up.

LEE S. WILCOS.
GEORGE JACOBSON.
BILL WOODS, Jr.

TAMPA, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

More power to you in your excellent efforts against OPA extension bill. OPA was a wartime measure and should have ended with VJ-day. Since then OPA has impaired the Nation's economy, weakened the people's morale, destroyed respect for government, and created unnecessary shortages. Let's bury it for keeps, together with subsidies and other crackpot brainstorms emanating from bureaucratic Washington.

Dr. LOUIS LOMBARD.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Floor,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. You are a brave American. Kill the OPA, which is the Soviet secret weapon in America and has successfully communized the whole country. We are rooting for you, the only fearless man in America.

S. C. LLOYD,
President, San Fernando Valley Poultry Producers Association.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Please start talking and keep talking till Monday.

Dr. CARL C. CHRISTENSEN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am the president of Braun, Ray Bros. & Finley, wholesale lumbermen in Omaha, Nebr., and I am leaving tonight by plane for home thoroughly disheartened and disgusted with the situation in the producing district. There is no competition. Why should there be? The OPA price is the same to everyone and with the multitude of Government regulations there is no incentive for anyone to operate. Unquestionably the most healthy and most stimulating thing that could happen to American industry would be the elimination of the OPA. Western papers today carried a smear campaign against the lumber industry by the OPA officials and I naturally wonder why if they know these things about lumber companies they did not prosecute them long ago. Why wait until deadline day to create excitement that might result in a public demand for OPA's continuance? Let us hope this will be the final smear campaign and that with competition restored through the elimination of this Government monstrosity we may all go ahead, manufacture, distribute, and use the lumber and get somewhere. I sincerely hope that you carry out your intentions of filibustering and wish you lots of luck. If you doubt whether I know my business ask Senator HUGH BUTLER.

AUSTIN BRAUN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

In this day of political cowardice it is most heartening to find a man who is willing to stand up and speak out courageously. Your speech on the OPA will live long and if this Nation lives, it will be recorded with the declarations of freedom which Henry Clay and Jefferson gave us. I congratulate you upon your forthright statement in saving our country from those who seek to put it in shackles.

WALTER S. HALLANAN.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Keep it up. We are behind you.

E. R. WARD.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank God there is an American left of your caliber. Keep up the good work.

B. I. VIGNAUX
General Manager, Emoryville (Calif.)
Golden West Meat Co.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Keep up the good work.

SIMPSON PHILLIPS.

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

You are a true American. We hope you succeed.

Mr. and Mrs. W. J. REED.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Senator O'DANIEL, keep up the filibuster and give America back to the Americans.

O. W. COTTON.

CULVER CITY, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the fight. We support you as Republicans.

W. J. SHIELDS.

ASHLEY, N. DAK., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Good work. Wish you all the luck in the world that you will succeed and get rid of OPA. Wish we had more men in Congress like you.

REINIE FEIL.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Stay in there pitching biscuits and remember the Alamo.

A TEXAN.

DENVER, COLO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

You are performing a great patriotic service. Continue the filibuster.

FRANK DELANEY.

GRAHAM, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

Fight OPA to a finish—middle westerners are for you.

WRIGHT'S LOCKER & GROCERY.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations your stand against OPA. Texas should be proud of a Senator with the intestinal fortitude to be an American. May I live to see the day that I can vote for you for President.

FRED A. STANDIFORD.

LAFAYETTE, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for your courage. Hope you are successful in your fight.
STERRETT PROCTER.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D.C.:
May you succeed in defeating OPA and save American business.
WILLIAM BARSOTTI.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your patriotic stand regarding the extension of the Office of Price Administration. You have the solid backing of all clear-thinking democratic Americans. We appreciate your courage in these times of governmental bureaucracy and law by directive instead of congressional action. More power to you.
SOUTHTOWN MOTORS.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Keep talking. Give us back our country. Praying for you.
CARL SANDERS.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D.C.:
Filibuster the un-American, unconstitutional OPA out of business. Save the taxpayers' money and people from ruin.
M. C. REESE, *Democrat.*
JERRIE LEE, *Republican.*

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D.C.:
OPA cause of dissension and civil war here. Please protect us.
ELIZABETH IDEN.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Luck be with you. We are for you. Down with the OPA.
HOOVER STOVE & FURNITURE CO.
JOHN F. HOOVER,
Formerly With United States Navy.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office,
Washington, D. C.:
Agree with you about the OPA. Hope that price controls will be removed. Think it will put an end to black market. It would be grand to shop normally and be able to get meat and hosiery without standing in lines for hours.
MRS. H. G. CLARK.

EUGENE, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
The meat industry must be released from OPA.
BLUE BIRD PACKING CO.

SEASIDE PARK, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep talking good work.
A. R. MATHIS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your good work against the OPA. Glad someone in the Senate is there to protect our American ways.
O. E. OLSEN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish to encourage you in liberating our country from bureaucratic regimentation. Kill the OPA rent control now. A monument should be erected for you.
Sincerely,
BLICKSHIRE HOTELS AND
MOTOR COURT, INC.
BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please go through with your plan to filibuster the OPA bill.
WILLIAM, MARY, MARGARET, JAMES,
JOHN LAHEY.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
As a native daughter of Texas and now a property owner in California, keep up the fight for our rights.
ANN SHUGRUE.

VICTORIA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We join with other interests in this area in urging you to use your influence with OPA for permission to ship western sugars into this area. The situation here is alarming and will get progressively worse unless we can obtain some western beet to relieve situation.
GROCE WEARDEN CO., INC.

OLNEY, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations on your stand on OPA. American business is for you.
W. W. PRICE.

TYLER, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Being in the poultry, egg, feed, hatchery business, I come in contact with most farmers in this area. OPA has created ill will among farmers and food producers. I can definitely see as long as OPA is in force farmers will only produce what they have to. This means shortages. You cannot fight inflation with low production. Low production with OPA and God's law of supplying demand means black markets. Black markets are handled by racketeers. Racketeers with big incomes are dangerous. Choose higher price through black market or legitimate channels. Through black market it will get worse. Through legitimate channels it will encourage production, competition, and fair prices.
LOUIS H. KLAYMAN.
L. & L. POULTRY FARMS.
TYLER POULTRY & EGG CO.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Texas Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We extend the best of luck to a real American Senator and only wish we could do more than just give our moral support. Suggest if necessary start filibuster. Best regards.
RALPH FLEMING DUNGENESS CRAB, INC.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and thanks. We do hope the Lone Star State will return America to the people.
W. W. TROUT.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
There is no question that the OPA is fostering the black market and other underhanded practices. It is actually causing inflation by retarding normal production. Anything that you and your friends in the Senate can do by filibuster or otherwise to kill this totally un-American agency will be appreciated by us and by thinking people everywhere.
THE SUPERIOR OIL CO.,
W. B. JAYRED,
Vice President.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I'd filibuster against OPA if it were the last thing I did on earth. OPA belongs in Russia where it came from. Not in America. More power to you. Regards.
M. H. MARR.

LUBBOCK, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kick out the OPA by filibuster or other means at your command. The eyes of Texas are upon you.
HUGH W. THOMAS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Hall of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
We want price control; California veterans must have homes. Sit down.
FLORENCE ZOE CHASE.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch. We're with you 100 percent.
LOUIS E. SEIN, Sr.,
ALBERT C. SEIN, Sr.,
ALBERT C. SEIN, Jr.

LAWTON, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator "PAPPY" LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Excellent representation. You and MOORE are real Americans. Good luck.
C. TOM BULLOCK.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator From Texas,
Floor of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are supporting you.
J. L. BOONE,
Meat Merchant.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator From Texas,
Floor of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are supporting you.
KARUNAS & FULLERTON.

BALTIMORE, MD., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Admire your stand against OPA. Most Americans do suggest that Wallace, Bowles, and the CIO leaders all take a trip to Russia.
R. W. JOHNSON.

ORLANDO, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your OPA stand. The merchants of Florida are 100 percent with you.
J. D. BLEDSOE.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
House of Senate, Washington, D. C.:
A meeting was held this afternoon in which it was unanimously voted to wire you our sincere appreciation in your efforts to allow the businessmen to go back to the American way of doing business, and to inform you that the association and other businessmen in Kern County, State of California, are behind you 100 percent.
KERN COUNTY BUSINESS OWNERS ASSOCIATION.

NICHOLS, IOWA, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Best regards from a tired merchant. Stay in and pitch.
SHAFERS SUPERMARKET.

MINEOLA, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand against OPA and black market. We need more men like you in Washington. What is wrong with the other Senators? We need fair competition, not highjacking gangsters, to make an American way of life.
I. LINCOLN NASH.

SALISBURY, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The United States needs less of Chester Bowles, Paul Porter, and OPA. Meat, poultry, and dairy products must be freed from price control now.
GLENN E. KETNER.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Please keep up the good fight. It is good to see a real American with the courage of his convictions and farsightedness stand up and fight for what he knows is fundamental. I respect you.
RAY A. ROC,
MALT MIXER CO.

RUSTON, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA. Feed advanced 100 percent, labor 133⅓ percent, car repairs 400 percent, and milk 6⅓ percent.
S. E. TARBUTTON,
Pine Ridge Jersey Farm.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work against OPA. We want it out.
JOE W. MCCLANAHAN.

AIKEN, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
You deserve the thanks of all Americans for attempting to save your country. God bless you.
S. W. O'TOOLE.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God there is one red-blooded American left in Washington, D. C.
Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE D. GRAY.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Plenty of cattle and no meat. More power to Pappy. All Texas now is praying for you to hold out for a democratic form of government.
HOLLAND MEAT CO.

PONTIAC, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stick with it Senator, we are with you.
DANS MARKET.

WEST NEWTON, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Definitely with you in ousting OPA. Good luck.
TOWNE LINE MARKET.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care of Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch. All real Americans need you.
JACK FROST.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
In your battle against OPA you are fighting for the American way of life. Much strength to you; fight on, Senator. You are not alone.
CLYDE PIERCE.
E. H. BANKER.
FAY BRATCHER.
J. E. SUFFOLK.
DOUGLAS HENDERSON.
G. K. BROCK.
A. E. KLAGGE.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Your friends here heartily approve your efforts to put an end to OPA by whatever means necessary.
W. H. DAVIS.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly favor your filibuster and believe you are right.
M. R. ROCHE.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hundred rental units vacant here because OPA.
Mrs. H. W. SCHULLE.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are all praying for your great effort to defeat communistic OPA. Give us production and plenty and not scarcity and black markets.
MARK R. HOLORAN.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your fight in our behalf. Property owners 100 percent behind you.
MARY C. LEWIS.

WILLIAMSVILLE, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep the good word going. Beat the OPA.
H. P. SHEPHARD.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Trust you are successful in opposing arbitrary, autocratic, bureaucratic OPA.
E. J. DUNIGAN, Jr.

HADDON HEIGHTS, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
New Jersey takes off its small hat to Texas. We are proud of you, sir, for your battle on OPA. Let's hope we can be equally proud of our own New Jersey Senators. Just read of your anticipated filibuster. Keep pitching for us; we need your help. Congratulations.
WILLIAM I. MILLER.

RICHMOND, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations in your effort to discontinue OPA
HARVEYS MARKET.

PONTIAC, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stick with it, Senator. We're with you 100 percent.
HOFFMANS MARKET.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA. You are doing the best job of this century.
L. SPENCER.

MATTOON, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are back of you 100 percent. We pray you have strength to hold out.
J. HARLEY CATON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work and break the OPA. Communist-dominated politics are starving

the American people while taxing them beyond all limits of human endurance. Patriotic Americans stand 100 percent behind you to break this economic atrocity.

E. KATERINE OBOLENSKY.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Success to you. You have our support out here.

GENE ROBBINS.

WASHINGTON, *D. C., June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We don't want OPA. More power to you.
MR. AND MRS. WILLIAM D. LEETCH,
Hollywood, Md.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Wholeheartedly support your stand against OPA extension. Continuance means greater inflation, black marketing. Success in your battle for our America.

JOHN M. DAVENPORT, Jr.

BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Throw out OPA and all subsidies. More power to you.

MRS. ARTHUR S. GRISWOLD.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Let's return to the good old system of free enterprise which has made America great.

FLORENCE FRANKIN.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As a veteran of two wars, as a father of four children, as a direct descendant of John Hancock, and as an American, I thank God for a man that has the guts to attempt to relieve the strangulation of Government agencies and controls from our necks.

CURTIS E. HALEY.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your decision to filibuster against OPA. Bust it wide open.

HOME JACOBS.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep on talking. Knock OPA out.

MRS. MARY E. MORSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Stop the OPA and give us some freedom of action. Keep up your filibuster.

ILMA F. STOELK.

OGDEN, UTAH, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator "PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and thanks to you for your brave attempt to free the American meat industry and people from the clutches of a handful of bureaucrats.
Sincerely,

OGDEN LIVESTOCK AUCTION CO.,
J. E. MANNING.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work—100 percent with you.

J. A. BAILBARY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your action. It is time we had free speech and freedom from the OPA. Wish you luck.

VIVIENNE V. TAYLOR.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator Lee O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. We are with you.

LEE MCKINDREE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are behind you 100 percent. Wish we had more like you in the Senate. Stop the OPA and return to the American form of government.

LEE N. LAYPORT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
If it's talking it takes, we know you can do it. Down with the OPA.

VERA K. LOCHNER.

LAS VEGAS, N. MEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work and really help the veteran.

JUANITY D. LAW.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch; we're with you 100 percent.

LOUIS E. SIEN, Sr.
ALBERT C. SIEN, Sr.
ALBERT C. SIEN, Jr.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work and get rid of the idiotic theorist back of OPA.

T. J. LAW.

LAREDO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Give them hell, Pappy, we're with you.

CHAS. A. ZEGUB.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
I am backing you in your fight against OPA. God bless you.

MRS. F. C. HOLLAND.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
You are right, hold the floor and keep talking.

DAN O'BRIEN,
Member, Retail Grocers Association.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate,,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up fight against attempt by administration to make OPA permanent. If you don't win now, there will be another manufactured emergency in another year to extend OPA. Compromise bill sells farmers down river; will greatly increase shortages of butter, beef, and other farm products. Prices higher now with OPA than after last war without OPA.

MINNESOTA PEOPLES POLITICAL FEDERATION,
A. J. OLSON, *Chairman.*
RICHARD S. WILSOX, *Secretary.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Veteran without apartment sends best wishes in OPA filibuster.

W. L. HOCK, Jr.,
7067 North Wolcott.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations; remember the Alamo; kill OPA.

CLETUS M. D. ESTE.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
There is no freedom in America as long as we have the OPA. Accept my personal congratulations for your truly gallant fight.

STANLEY MACPHERSON.

EL PASO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in thar and pitch. Dethrone the ocholacrats.

W. S. FRIAR.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. We are pulling for you.

O. A. RITTENHOUSE,
Manager, Gable Lodges.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
More power to you, Senator. Termination of OPA would be greatest blessing since cessation of war. Continuance in any form will defer recovery from its evil effects just that much longer. "Our prolonged agony" is what continuance will mean.

N. W. TARR,
President, Tarr & McComb Oil Co.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Let's return to the government of the people, for the people, by the people.

GEORGETTE GIBBONS,
High school student.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You are doing the greatest service for your country that anyone could possibly do at this time. All power to you.
MARIE TOMLIN CORP.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C:
You are 100 percent right on this filibuster. Stay on with it.
WILLIAM G. COURY.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator From Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Let's return America to the Americans.
CHARLES F. JARRETT.

HARTFORD, CONN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on the stand you are taking. Keep up the fight for the welfare of the people.
RALPH DELILLO, GI,
38 Months' Service Overseas.

DENVER, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
You're making history. Stick to your guns. Our employees have been playing baseball account unable to buy cattle within compliance. Please save our industry.
CAPITAL PACKING CO.

LLANO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster to bitter end. Texans tired of being told prices they get and prices they have to pay.
PAT MARSCHALL.

OGDEN, UTAH, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator "PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations to you for your thought for freedom for the American meat producers and packers. We wish our Senators from Utah had half as much intestinal fortitude as you are showing.
OGDEN DRESSED MEAT,
MYRON LOEWENSTEIN.

DAYTON, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Hope you talk that bill to death, as any other good American would do.
WALTER J. MCGARY.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Admire your spunk and courage for standing up for right. Ousting of the OPA is a step which must be taken to restore our freedom. Luck to you in your filibuster against the passing of any bill to perpetuate the OPA. Ex-Texans.
Mr. and Mrs. ROY LOWRY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Every Red and ALP member is on New York streets soliciting signatures to extend OPA.
MERLE S. DAVIS.

FRESNO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I am a retail meat merchant and must close tomorrow unless you win. My 65 employees are through tonight. In the heart of California meat-raising district, and nothing to sell.
WASHINGTON MARKET.
A. C. ZENGEL.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you filibuster OPA and Chester Bolosky out of existence.
WHALEY GRAHAM.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. "PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
Senator of United States,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and talk till Monday morning. You are the greatest Senator alive.
G. H. KENSINGER,
Towers Building, Memphis, Tenn.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:
I am behind you in your fight against OPA. Keep up the good work.
R. J. KLEIMANN.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:
All the dairymen are behind you 100 percent. Keep fighting OPA.
SOUTH TEXAS PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
B. E. STALLONES, *Manager.*

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Hope you kill the OPA.
GEORGE P. URBAN, Jr.

LUBBOCK, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hogs cost $23 per hundred, cattle cost $3 per hundred above OPA price. Won't be any cattle fed, any hogs raised until conditions are changed. Please try to give us liberty.
N. C. MAPLES.

IRVING, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand on OPA. It should be abolished at once.
LOUIS BLAYLOCK.
B. P. BROWN, *Veteran.*
J. W. BRATTON.
MORGAN H. BROWN,
Overseas Veteran.
HARRY E. SPENCER, Jr.,
Overseas Veteran.

SALINA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. We are for you.
THE OFFICE ASSISTANT.

ODESSA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We believe the best interest of all demand OPA be abolished.
F. L. BURROUGHS.

WINDER, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We congratulate you Senator for your noble effort to abolish OPA. We Americans do not need this bureau. What America needs is to be restored as a free nation.
BARROW MANUFACTURING CO.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As a royalty owner, please stay in there and do all you can.
BESS ROREX.

LAKE VILLAGE, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
It's time to return to the American form of government. We are all for you in your fight against the OPA.
J. H. Holloway; Sam Forte & Co.; J. H. Duncan; F. W. Nunn; Paul Duncan; James Duncan; W. T. Duncan; Ray Tillam; A. G. Black; Mrs. C. W. Tillam; C. W. Tillman & Co., by C. B. Tillman; Klakve Village Motors, by Ivan McInney; C. W. Tillman; T. B. Tillman; John S. McCalum; W. T. Loyd; Pinkus Bros.; Lakeview Grocery; Sam Wall & Co.; Lake Village Food Palace, by J. A. McDill, Sr.; J. A. McDill, Jr.; Grady D. Hicks; V. I. Whitaker; S. A. Masour; Idell Smith; Tommy Karam; Haynes Hardware Co.; M. Mancil.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you will fight the renewal of OPA to a finish. The cattlemen of Texas are behind you.
W. T. BONNER.
GAINESVILLE, TEX.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Pass the biscuits to the OPA, "Pappy." We are with you 100 percent.
G. M. CULTON.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I like your fight to put out OPA—Stay put.
E. J. WADE.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As a returned vet was told what to do long enough. Now I would like to run my business my way. Do away with OPA.
C. O. RATLIFF.

BROWNSVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep talking "Pappy"!
MARY DREW WITHERINGTON.

SAFFORD, ARIZ., *June 72, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish we had more real men like you in the White House. We admire your courage and hope you will get this OPA out of good old

U. S. A. We are with you and your supporters. Don't back up an inch, stay right there.

Marvin Pollack, Luke Accord, H. E. Johnson, N. Poltkin, Z C. Prino, Preston Larson, C. Lowell Richards, A. E. O'Bryan, Lamar Bellman, Curtis Long.

FOREST HILLS, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We heartily approve of your action because it sponsors the American way of life.
G. W. SCHARF.

PONTIAC, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stick with it, Senator. We are behind you.
ED GREGERSON.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
May God give you courage and strength to save America.
GEORGE MORRIS.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for your courageous fight against a group that threatens our very existence as a free people.
SAM C. SUTTON.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Surely there are some who can and will help you in your stand against continuation of the OPA. Industry must be freed of the OPA's stranglehold and prices must be set by the law of supply and demand. The end of the OPA will bring simultaneously the end of the black market. Goods of all kinds will come out of hiding. Goods will cease to be moved from your back yard to ours and vice versa to create delusions of shortage. And most important, goods will cease to be hoarded by a Mr. or Mrs. America who now grossly overbuy and overpay because they live in constant fear that our Government will take something more away from them next week and because it is a thrill to have what the Jones are still trying to get. Thereby a large new 44.22 percent of our so-called short items will cease to be short almost immediately. Equipped as we are to produce, production will exceed demand very soon. The result will be low prices, abundant supply, and a drastic cut in the present great waste of material, especially food which is now spoiling due to holding over buying, etc. Can it be possible that we have only you in Washington who can see all this and have the courage to bring it to a fight? There are any number of American citizens like ourselves who could talk for days on just the OPA and its crippling effects on the whole world. Please make them all see the harm in OPA control, make their see the futility of OPA, make them understand you must succeed in your present endeavor. And you, Senator O'DANIEL, please accept our sincere thanks.

R. F. JOHNSON DAIRY PRODUCTS,
R. F. JOHNSON,
J. JOHNSON.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1496.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Keep up the fight for our rights.
ADELL M. GLEASON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to your efforts. Keep on talking for those who believe in a free America, and there are many more of us than you can even dream of. Congratulations and good luck.
WALTER F. BRITTAN.

HADDON HEIGHTS, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your forthright stand against OPA, the black market's friend. I beg you to carry on your worthwhile fight. I humbly suggest you enlist efforts of New Jersey Senators SMITH and HAWKES. For this you have the gratitude of New Jersey residents. We are with you, Senator.

Respectfully,
LEIGH R. SMITH.

SUFFOLK, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Texas Democrat,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Success to you as an opposer to OPA. May God give you strength to talk until Monday.
A GROUP OF MERCHANTS.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your opposition to high-handed OPA policies.
MEL DAVIS.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Trust your efforts to eliminate OPA are successful.
J. W. GARMAN.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Leaving it to you to filibuster the OPA out of existence.
W. A. DAVIS.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish you all success in filibuster against OPA. God bless you.
CORPUS CHRISTI BRICK & LUMBER CO.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
My full endorsement price filibuster. Urge complete abolishment price control.
W. O. HUGGINS, JR.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL (Democrat, Texas),
Washington, D. C.:
Whoop it up Texas style. We've been corralled long enough.
H. M. FOSTER.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senatorial Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Good luck. Keep up fight, abolish OPA. With God's blessing and strength.
G. ERHARDT & SONS, INC.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Don't like filibuster but if such is necessary to eliminate OPA, then go to.
J. P. BROWN.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Have just finished reading preamble to abominable OPA legislation as reported in conference report. It reminds me of an alleged scientific analysis of the Aurora Borealis which might be offered as clarifying amendment as follows: When the molofigiastical temperature of the horizon becomes such as to coloracize the impruient indentations of the hemispheric anology thus affected, a rapid change takes place in the thorambumpter of the borax kerbustus, and the aquaverusale which can only be seen when it is visible. Good luck and good voice to you.

EDWARD D. GRAY,
Bellport, N. Y.

SAND SPRINGS, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We note you are going to talk against OPA. Talk, talk for America as we know it and love it. Talk for every man, woman, and child that loves America. We are tired of being told what, when, and how to do everything. Let's kill OPA and bureaucracy. Talk.
S. M. HOUSE,
Muleskin Brown Furniture Co.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are completely in accord with your action against the OPA.
R. W. DAVIS, Jr.

CHARLESTON, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
O'DANIEL (Filibuster),
Washington, D. C.
Mr. O'DANIEL: I have small grocery business in Charleston, S. C. Have had 5 pounds butter for year 1946. Would like to help you prove to the public of the United States of America what is going on within the United States.
NORMAN BAXLEY.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work, let's get rid of the OPA and bureaucracy in general.
GEO. E. FRANKLIN.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep on talking, "Pappy." I'm for you.
E. BENNETT.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Am pulling for you.
SAM LARD.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch. We're with you 100 percent.
LOUIS E. SIEN, Sr.
ALBERT C. SIEN, Sr.
ALBERT C. SIEN, Jr.

EL CAJON, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Take your time.
GORDON H. SPENCER.

WETHERSFIELD, CONN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are with you, Senator O'DANIEL, in your fight to abolish the economic monstrosity that is OPA.
Mr. and Mrs. S. E. FITTING.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep talking "Pappy"; we're behind you.
F. M. and W. R. DOLAN.

HOT SPRINGS, S. DAK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hold the floor; abolish OPA if possible.
A. MAIKA.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Admire your courage; do not let up now.
JAMES A. PATTON.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you, Papa; stay there and pitch.
Mrs. HARRIS.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care the Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
You are fully justified in filibuster on OPA. No holds barred; hundreds of Texans are backing you in your position to kill OPA bill. Best wishes.
ERNEST COCKRELL AND MANY FRIENDS.

WINDER, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
I hope you are successful in abolishing the whole OPA program so America can once more be free. My congratulations to you, Senator, for even trying. Regards.
W. H. JENNINGS.

TRENTON, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Assure you you have my full support on your OPA policy.
MURIEL L. THROPP.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on courage. Continue price fight.
TROY VAUGHN.
REO ELLSWORTH.
B. H. NELSON.
O. J. LAYMON.

SANTA ANA, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on stand against extension of OPA.
O. W. HUMPHREY.
W. L. COPELAND.

CULVER CITY, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Let's have a free America July 1. Congratulations.
A NATIVE SON.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C:
Keep up the wonderful work. We admire your courage and fortitude. You will have our solid backing and support in all your forthcoming actions.
THE BLUE DIAMOND AUTOMOBILE EXCHANGES OF TEXAS.

ORLANDO, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your good fight. The future welfare of this country depends upon your leading this country out of the insidious agency that is gnawing at the fundamentals of this country. Nine out of ten people are with you in your fight but they have been misled by propaganda until they don't know how to express their convictions.
H. F. MOORE, *Attorney.*

SAFFORD, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish we had more real men like you in the White House. We admire your courage and hope you will get this OPA out of good old U. S. A. We are with you and your supporters. Don't back up an inch, stay right there.
Marvin Pollack, Luke Accord, H. E. Johnson, N. Plotkin, Z. C. Prino, Preston Larson, C. Lowell Richards, A. E. O'Ryan, Lamar Bellman, Curtis Long.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay right with them. Let's get the country back into the hands of the people instead of in the hand of bureaus and when his fight is over please for the sake of America put through a bill doing away with all bureaus. Let the Congress run the country according to the way originally intended. At present we have men who the people never heard of or never elected outlining all the policies of the Government.
CHARLES E. POND.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are behind you 100 percent.
EDWIN HUME.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God we have one American who has the intestinal fortitude to fight so-called American freedom for his fellow Americans. I have been forced to endure OPA oppression and injustices for 4 years and can prove it. God be with you.
Mrs. HERBERT HUES.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations upon heroic measure started by you. Hope the Lord gives you strength to carry through. Bold step, freeing country of one tentacle of Bolshevic octopus hindering reconversion.
D. A. FRASER.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
"PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We appreciate your efforts. Let's put America back in the hands of Americans.
KING MOTOR CO.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We support you in defeating OPA. Save our country.
Mrs. ESTHER RITTER.
SHIRLEY RITTER.

ANNISTON, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I want to congratulate you on your stand on the OPA.
E. C. LLOYD,
Lloyds Bakery.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, OF TEXAS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Please do filibuster and kill OPA.
EDNA HOWARD.

HYNES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Member, Congress, Washington, D. C.:
Keep pitching. Texas should be proud of you, and I am. The Lord and 50,000,000 of red-blooded Americans are behind you.
M. R. PAYTON.

NEW CARLISLE, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We the people of Indiana are with you and are praying for success.
W. C. TAYLOR.

ROCKMART, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
A group of businessmen from Rockmart, Ga., stand behind you and glory in your spunk. We believe by getting OPA out of the way it will knock black market in the head and give the businessman a better chance to do something.
S. H. Hutchings, G. W. Burnham, Dock Head, C. A. Smith, W. L. Waters, C. B. Westbrooks, Manco Irvin, Rufus Camp, Kirby Whitton.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 9146.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
We are for you hundred percent. Do not weaken. Good luck.
ARTHUR J. MEIER.
MILTON H. MEIER.
HARRY HARRISON.
FOSTER DAVIS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
More power to you, Senator. Termination of OPA would be greatest blessing since cessation of war. Continuance in any form will defer recovery from its evil effects just that much longer. "Our prolonged agony" is what continuance will mean.
TARR & MCCOMB OIL CO.,
N. W. TARR, *President.*

HOLLY OAK, DEL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
The food merchants of America are behind you. Go to it. Give us a chance to survive.
OVERLOOK MARKET,
Claymont, Del.

LOCKPORT, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA. Talk it to death.
RAYMOND RUHLMAN.

WILMINGTON, DEL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Honorable Senator, we are behind you and heartily in accord with filibuster, too. We small restaurant operators trying to operate legitimately. This is life or death—full speed ahead.
HENRY P. BURROWS, Jr.,
WM. D. CHALLENGER,
Veterans, World War II,
Operators Hob Tea Room, Inc.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
We wish to assure you that your efforts to terminate the OPA stamps you as a worthy leader of the people. More power to you. We sincerely believe a large majority of the people are with you and recognize you as a loyal American only interested in the welfare of our own country.
E. L. O'Malley, S. W. Wilcox, Harold B. Spotts, J. A. Skinner, Grace O'Connell, Earl Cox, Louise Stone, Hazel Baxter, Lee Beitel, Paul Denney, J. A. Beaman.

CASTINE, MAINE, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democratic Senator From Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight because you are right. The real Americans are back of you.
THOMAS H. TAYLOR.

LEWISTOWN, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Speaking as a housewife with my family and my countries welfare at heart, I am thankful that at least one Senator can see through OPA destructive power and has the courage to really fight for the rights of the people. I sincerely hope that you succeed in your purpose.
Mrs. H. J. WHITEHEAD.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
DEAR SIR: We're behind you 100 percent, keep up the good work, and may God bless you. A humble family man who is trying to get meat on his table—Your friend.
J. E. BROWN.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill the OPA and give the billion dollar subsidy and salaries of the OPA officials to veterans that fought for freedom and need it much more.
TED BENTLEY.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The OPA has just about ruined my small toy business. Congratulations on your filibuster. All my business and Republican friends are for you here in St. Louis.
EMIL STRAND,
Hazel Novelty & Cabinet Co.

HOT SPRINGS, N. MEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are all for your filibuster on OPA; more power to you.
LADDER RANCH.

DENVER, COLO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Hold on until OPA expires. I admire your courage and Americanism.
STANLEY MELNICK.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
It is encouraging to know that we have one Senator from Texas who feels free to speak for what he thinks is right. We are a small manufacturing concern employing about 100 people. We believe you are 100 percent correct in your effort to eliminate OPA. We sincerely believe that (1) OPA is the creator of black market; (2) OPA is driving all merchandise from regular channels of distribution; (3) our economy will adjust itself quicker and better under competitive conditions than it will by governmental regulation and interference. I would rather have the right to say I can't afford it than to have to say "Can you slip me a steak, Bud, for $4?" For the next time I should go back it would be six bucks, and so on. Wherein, then, is OPA with its huge appropriations for personnel and subsidies saving the taxpayer and consumer anything? We hope sincerely that you may be able to wage a victorious campaign against the adoption of the extension of this bill.
C. C. BINGHAM.

MIDLAND, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Dozens of people in Midland, Tex., are commending you for your stand on OPA and hoping you go through with filibuster.
DON THOMPSON,
PAUL MCHARGUE,
GEORGE T. ABELL.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay with this fight. As native-born Texan I hail you as the greatest Texan since Sam Houston.
J. N. POWELL.

TYLER, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Tolerance of OPA ended with the war. To continue it will add to the further degeneration of national morale.
W. C. WINDSOR.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations from ex-serviceman. Give us the freedom in business we fought for. Let the OPA die.
H. A. BUTTON.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Keep on trying to give us the American form of government.
R. A. BURT.
OILDALE, CALIF.

BILLINGS, MONT., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Get help if needed. Kill that OPA.
HARRIET NIELSEN.

PINE BLUFF, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch. Kill OPA.
AN O'DANIEL ADMIRER, VOTER,
Brookings Advertising Co., Pine Bluff, Ark.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. We want America for Americans.
S. D. WIDNENER.

FALL RIVER, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Keep going.
WILLIAM B. PORTLOCK.

ROCKWOOD, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Entirely out of meat and lard. Have had none for weeks. Keep talking.
MCNEAL FAMILY.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. We hope you win.
G. D. HATFIELD.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your fight. Would like to see you our next President.
BOB SCEARCE,
World War I Veteran.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The OPA necessitated by war and unnecessary in peace in the interest of preservation of fourth-grade arithmetic should be entirely or almost so abolished. A Federal bureau that refers to bronze mines and prohibits the slaughter of female steers and operates on the theory that you are better off not to get a steak for a dollar than you are to get one for $1.50 has in my opinion overtried the patience of Johnny Q. Public. I hope you succeed in the fine fundamental endeavor you have undertaken.
WM. F. DOWDALL.

FRESNO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We the people do not need OPA. We need a market to get rid of what we have raised.
CARL HOWELL.

BOSTON, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You have many supporters, keep up the talk.
F. A. MCDONALD.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Myself, and hundreds of thousands, yes, millions, of Texans are behind you to eliminate the bureaucrats, drones, deadheads, and parasites. Keep up the good work, kill the OPA force of scarcity and inflation. Return the Government to the people for a better, more honest, healthful, prosperous, happy, and contented free people.
E. M. ZERR & Co.

DEL RIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Pleased with your action against OPA. Keep up the good work.
BOB GURLEY.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Independent oil producers solidly behind you in your stand against OPA. Continue all possible opposition. OPA's untenable position toward the oil producer cannot be understood. More power to you.
R. E. SMITH.

ODESSA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We feel sure the best interest of all demand OPA be abolished.
BUNCH CONSTRUCTION CO.

DELRIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish to congratulate you on your OPA stand. Keep it up.
WALTER GILLIS.

HARDEEVILLE, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Fence in that monster called OPA and let him die a natural death at 12:01 o'clock Monday morning.
V. B. GLISSON.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Just returned from a trip covering parts of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and biggest part of east Texas; find 95 percent of all business for you on your stand against the buzzards of hell. Please hold the line.
S. O. WOMACK.
C. P. GUTHRIE.

LUBBOCK, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The Lubbock Used Car Dealers Association has instructed me to wire you our endorsement of your stand on OPA.
C. E. DAVIS,
Secretary, Lubbock, Tex.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The dairy farmers of America are back of you in your efforts to purge the Nation of OPA. They are mindful of the fact that the Senate attempted in its bill to remove price controls on dairy products. Because of the fact that the conferees struck from the bill these provisions for dairy decontrol, there now appears no other way than the course you have chosen to free our industry from the controls which are drying up dairy supplies and causing countless producers to drastically liquidate their herds.
CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. We are pulling for you.
BATON ROUGE, LA.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Keep on trying to give us the American form of government.
BERNARD & SONS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Talk OPA to death.
BEACHWOOD MARKET.

RICHMOND, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
We are very thankful that we have a Senator in this Senate with guts to stand up for the rights of the people, as the OPA is doing nothing but protecting the black market. My business is not closed because of black market but on the OPA ceiling.
J. H. SHELTON.

HANFORD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
After 2 years fighting on Tinian, Saipan, and Okinawa to eliminate the Gestapo of another country have returned home to find another gestapo, none other than Mr. Chester Bowles. It seems I gave up my rifle too soon. Please do away with OPA so I can make a living for my wife and three children.
GUY M. BURTON,
Meat Salesman,
Former United States Marine.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
SIR: My wife and I send our firm support in your courageous fight against extension OPA. We resent Government suppression of free enterprise, which many of us fought for in World War II.
JOHN A. B. BROWN.

PONTIAC, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stick to it; we are behind you 100 percent.
DISON FOOD MARKET.

PAMPA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
OPA unnecessary and hope you are successful in eliminating it.
JOE SCHRAEDEL.

HAMMOND, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations, Senator O'DANIEL, for your tireless efforts in trying to send the OPA to its death. We're right behind you. Keep it up.
MIKE RAK & SONS,
Chicago Merchants.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your gaining the floor for your fight to the finish of communistic OPA. We are with you 100 percent.
D. L. WHITTLE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
Have always been 100 percent for you. Am now 1,000 percent since your gallant fight against OPA. Please talk until Monday noon. Millions of other Texans feel the same way.
NASH OSBORN.

LIMA, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I hope you talk OPA to an early grave. Don't weaken.
CURTIS COAL CO.
F. A. CURTIS.

SEASIDE PARK, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Keep talking. God bless you.
HARRY L. SMITH.

WINDER, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish you every success in fights against bureaucrats and communism. Hope your efforts will restore freedom of enterprise and democracy to America.
W. H. JENNINGS, Jr.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
In the present emergency when backbone and sound judgment seem so lacking in the Capitol of our Nation we take our hats off to you who have the guts to stand up and use whatever weapons are available in fighting for elimination of OPA. Your efforts to kill this monster called OPA is certainly appreciated by millions of straight-thinking freedom-loving Americans, and here's hoping that some of your colleagues may be inspired to jump in and do a little fighting.
FRED W. SIMPSON.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
SENATORS OF UNITED STATES, VOTING ON OPA EXTENSION,
Care of Senator W. Lee O'Daniel,
Washington, D. C.:
Price stabilization as war emergency is a patriotic sacrifice and not worse than the slaughtering of our boys by our common enemy. Peacetime price stabilization by dictatorship is too costly to be practical for enforcement. Too many diversified methods of production make it impossible for one school of thought to apply one particularly selected method of application.

Peacetime OPA can only clog up our wheels of production to such an extent that our people must go naked and starve to death. By all means let the OPA (a wartime black-market experiment) die a natural death on June 30, 1946, and let America once more build up its economy on individual ambition and constructive initiative. Kill the OPA.

PROPERTY OWNERS AND ASSOCIATES,
PROTECTIVE LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
By MRS. FRANK MORRIS, *Chairman.*

NORTHVILLE, MICH., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Resolution of Michigan Farmers Guild on OPA price ceilings:

"Whereas in our opinion the OPA has created distrust and a hardship on the American farmer as shown on the late market reports and the working people of this country;

"Whereas sooner or later we will have to depend upon supply and demand to furnish food and fiber for our Nation; and

"Whereas in order to obtain a smooth leveling-off period for our Nation we believe that cost of production should be substituted for farm commodities in place of OPA price ceiling: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That members of the Michigan Farmers Guild are asking the Congress of the United States to discontinue OPA in any and all forms."

H. S. ATCHINSON,
State President of Michigan Farmers Guild.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. (CLAGHORN) O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Suggest you listen to Fred Allen's program next Sunday and realize how you sound to the American people. Suggest you leave your hot air in Texas and stop this despicable filibustering.

D. C. DORWARD.
W. A. BAKER.
S. U. GREENBERG.
F. G. ALBRIGHT.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you help save OPA.

SYLVIA SCHUSTER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Shame on grown men who use filibuster tactics.

L. L. LANCASTER.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Entirely in sympathy with your efforts. Hope you win.

MARGIE and C. J. HULL.
MILDRED and C. L. (MIKE) HORACE FIELD.

CROWLEY, LA., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We are with you in your fight against OPA. Anything you do to discontinue OPA is a favor not only to us but the people of the United States.

JAKE JOHNSON.
RHUL BENOIT.
TOM PRATHER.
NOBLE M. CHAMBERS.

CUMBERLAND, MD., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Keep up good work. Lead way to constitutional government.

W. D. WENZEL,
Moorefield, W. Va.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand on OPA. More power to you.

W. C. DENISON, Jr.

BROOKINGS, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas, Washington, D. C.:

Keep up your good work. We have as a result of OPA chaos in industry and black market. It's time to kill gestapo germs to safeguard what has made our country great.

A. H. GARDNER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

God be with you. OPA definitely unfair.

MATTS AUTO PARK.

CHILLICOTHE, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work. Bust the OPA by all means.

DRUMMOND MEAT CO.

CORSICANA, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your filibuster. Headlines Texas papers say one-half butcher shops in America closed. The dishonesty practiced by the OPA heads has no place in the American Government. The OPA is being used for political purposes, and Bowles and his tribe cannot face the light of truth. Conserve your energy and talk these bums out of Washington. The forces of economy will work through competition to keep prices where they belong. Best wishes.

LLOYD WHEELOCK.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Good for you, Senator. Keep up the good work; do not give up.

J. SHANNON.

DALTON CITY, ILL., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Millions of American citizens are against the continuation of OPA but are not organized to present solid front. Thanks for your efforts in our behalf.

JOHN G. ALBRIGHT.

COATESVILLE, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand. Keep up the good fight.

I. LANDIS HAINES.

UTICA, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up good work.

SAMUEL DEMMA.

PORT ARTHUR, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your stand on OPA. Keep the good work up.

ED F. LOHMAN.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We commend you on your stand regarding the OPA.

THE LUMBER MARKET.

MURRAY, KY., *June 28, 1946.*
United States Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

I admire your courage and intelligent reasoning regarding OPA. I regret that I cannot say the same of Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky.

W. O. CAUGHN.

CHARLESTON, MO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL:

Stay with them. We are behind you 100 percent in southeast Missouri.

R. C. MCBRIDGE CO.
MCBRIDGE COOPERATIVE CO.

GLENS FALLS, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:

Eliminate OPA and get prices back to normal again. Competition will avert inflation.

MONTY B. INGALLS.

GLENS FALLS, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:

Bring back the American way of living by doing away with the OPA.

X. J. BROMLEY.

GLENS FALLS, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:

OPA should go. It throttles free enterprise. Keep up the fight.

MARJORIE BALDWIN.

GLENS FALLS, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:

Congratulations on your fight to quash OPA. Keep up the good work.

GORDON THOMPSON.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Praying success your filibuster; grateful your efforts to abolish OPA.

Mr. and Mrs. J. H. ALBERT.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up your courageous work; will send you a bushel of throat lozenges. I am a small businessman threatened to be put out of business by the Communist pincers, namely, between the OPA and the CIO. My industry is a bottleneck to housing and household furnishings. Makers of woodworking machinery, we employ 150 machinists. Thousands like us are threatened. Small business represents 90 percent of the Nation's economy. Wishing you every success.

ONSRUD MACHINE WORKS, INC.,
R. F. ONSBUD, *President.*

BAR HARBOR, MAINE, *June 28, 9146.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Texas Delegation:

May you have strength to last out. My reasons as housewife: Six weeks no red meat; price turkey, chickens, limits quantity; fish a staple; no beans; no butter; no lard. As a business, rooms rented. Cannot buy wholesale. Small stores as bare as my larder. What to feed them? How find black market? Elite trade and large places manage. Work for me.

VILLA STANLEY PUMPHREY.

TULARE, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

May the time soon come when those whom we trust in Congress strike OPA like the knights of old without fear or favor. Lay this greedy, unfair, unethical, and business-disrupting giant low. May the hosts of this great country give him a fitting funeral. May a spray of skunk cabbage adorn his bier, representative of his rotten methods. May

the plot surrounding his grave be strewn with cockleburrs, puncture vine, and Canada thistle, that the ghost of the OPA may direct its movements with carefulness and concern. May a hedge of thorns and poison ivy cover the cemetery gate, a significant warning to anyone who may be tempted to extol the virtues of this giant or worship at his tomb. May the happy, trustworthy evergreens and the lilies of the valley grow miles away, that their purity and sanctity may not be contaminated by the stench of the burial place of the OPA, the dead representative of disloyalty, greed, deception, business bribery, special privilege, and hunger.

HARRY CROWE.

WATERTOWN, WIS., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We appreciate your good work; we definitely favor getting back to our good old American way of doing business. We want no future dictatorship.

DAIRY DISTRIBUTORS, INC., CO-OP,
J. C. SCHUMANN.

MIAMI, OKLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your effort.

W. A. HUMPHREY.

MIAMI, OKLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your effort.

CLAUDE KIDWELL.

MIAMI, OKLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Appreciate your effort.

J. S. GAMMON.

BEAUMONT, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand for OPA. All power to you.

M. J. CARROLL.

RAYMONDVILLE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your work against OPA. Good luck.

E. J. KROGMAN.

BILLINGS, MONT., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senator, State of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Your courage and lasting fight for true American living is appreciated by Montana people. God bless you and success in your fight for our livelihood.

NORTHERN HOTEL,
M. W. CARTER,
General Manager.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
The OPA is Mussolini's brain child. Why should we keep it alive?

MRS. A. C. DOYLE.

FLOYDADA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
You are urged to continue your efforts to protect the farmers. Unfair regimentation is not our idea of democracy. No OPA at all would be better than one not workable, with nothing to buy.

HERBERT SIMS.

FLOYDADA, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Member of Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Your effort to protect the farmer is appreciated and urge you to continue your filibuster.

T. G. HERRING.

CROSBYTOWN, TEX.

GAINESVILLE, GA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
As a veteran of two wars let me congratulate you on your stand for freedom. Kill the OPA.

WALTER J. SHAFFER.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
In behalf of the membership of this organization who are being forced out of work because of restrictions we urge you to oppose any legislation to extend any OPA restrictions on meat, butter, poultry, and eggs beyond July 1.

MEAT CUTTERS LOCAL UNION No. 408,
G. W. WEIKEL, *Secretary.*

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on the stand you have taken this morning in the Senate. We need commodities on the market in order to restore free enterprise which is the inherent right of us citizens. Prices will return to normal once restrictions are completely lifted. Here's to the end of OPA.

C. OLWELL.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Highly commend your effort to restore right of American citizens. You have the whole-hearted support of majority of citizens with best interests of the country at heart. Inflation is economic not political problem and can be controlled only by increased production through full enterprise. Best wishes for success.

D. L. GRANGER.

PALESTINE, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good Texas spirit. Your efforts are appreciated.

SCHMIDT FURNITURE CO.

FRANKFORT, IND., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. It is gratifying that at least one Senator has guts enough to try to do away with this OPA which is the worst sort of regimentation ever to be tried on a supposedly free people. Best wishes and good luck.

HOWARD WILSON.

CRANDALL, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Stick it out, Pappy; we admire your efforts.

KEITH POSTON.

HANOVER, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the filibuster. Bury OPA deep. Thanks.

R. H. SHEPPARD CO., INC.
THOMAS P. STRAUSS.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:
Your courageous stand to discontinue OPA, and other New Deal regimentation, will be the greatest help to the American people in our history, for unless OPA is eliminated entirely and free enterprise restored that always made it possible for industrialists to build more and better war implements than our enemies and give us higher standard of living for if OPA is continued another year I believe Russia will be doing the commerce of the world and we will become a second-rate Nation within 5 years. They are working while we are loafing and quarreling. Please filibuster or do anything necessary to save and perpetuate our good United States as leaders of the world. You will become the greatest man living.

JOHN R. BATTLE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We have come to the conclusion that OPA is trying to perpetuate itself for the purpose of saddling on the country a planned economy and that, under its direction, we will be faced with continued scarcities and progressively higher prices. We are heartily in accord with your program to rid the country of that agency which has done more than any other Government agency to retard recovery.

E. CONSTANTIN, JR.
W. H. ROGERS, JR.
DORIS M. BROOKS.

TAMPA, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
May God bless you and give you strength.

W. M. HAMILTON.

TARENTUM, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your fearless and outspoken stand to eliminate OPA. The Congress needs men of vision like yourself who really wish to restore the American form of government. We have asked Senators WHERRY, CAPEHART, and TAFT to support you now. Don't give up the fight.

E. C. WEST, J. E. SCHEID, F. F. HUBER, R. L. SHAFFER, CECELIA MISCOSKY, ESTHER MISCOSKY, ALICE STITT, F. R. LARDIN, T. H. BENDER, AND F. E. WEST.

SAN ANGELO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We want you to know that we are supporting your effort to abolish OPA 100 percent and heartily endorse your move to organize filibuster and kill OPA entirely. More power to you.

SAN ANGELO AUTO DEALERS ASSOCIATION, KENDALL WRIGHT MOTOR CO., C. M. KENLEY CO., OGLESBY MOTOR CO., PERRY MAXWELL CO., ANGELO FEED & GRAIN CO., SID BOLDING GARAGE, BOB FULLER MOTOR CO., BANKSTON MUNSELLE MOTOR CO., BAILEY AUTO CO., A. B. MOTOR CO., SCHUCH MOTOR CO., MUSTANG CHEVROLET CO., CECIL WALTON MOTOR CO., O AND S GARAGE, MACKS AUTO EXCHANGE, KEY & NIX OLDS CO., FOX BEAVER MOTOR CO., WESTBROOK MOTOR CO.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Press reports of your contemplated action against OPA conference bill gratifying. You have our full sympathy and earnest con-

gratulations. Apparently too few legislators sensitive to impact of any new bill of similar character on civilian economy. No honest informed person can deny there is chaos in industry due to impractical if not fanatical OPA administration. Hope you can talk it to death; failing that, that we may count on you to use your best offices for sensible, practical solution. Honestly believe nothing short of entire elimination will accomplish it. Good luck.

HOLBROOK LUMBER CO.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep your fight up against the OPA. We believe you are helping the common man. Congratulations.

Mrs. C. A. BRAZIL.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Home builders and realtors are for you and your fight against OPA 100 percent. Bowles has made black marketeers and bootleggers or failures out of building industries and subsidiaries. If you can kill OPA, you will have accomplished one of the greatest achievements in American history. Some examples of sabotage by Chester Bowles and his henchmen are as follows:

Veterans' housing is costing more than 50 percent above 1 year ago because materials cannot be produced profitably at OPA ceiling prices, therefore bootleggers are handling practically all materials for large operations. The veterans pay the bill. Of course this is a part of the Bowles-Wyatt program to pass the W-E-T bill and make public housing a permanent over-all dictatorship in the building industry. Plumbing supplies are selling for about double OPA ceiling price. Oak floorings the same. Asbestos materials are not available. Many industries are refusing to operate at a loss or to become outlaws. Their only alternative being to shut their plants down. More power to you.

FRED M. SEALE,
Director, National Association of Home Builders and President, Amarillo Real Estate Board.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Three cheers "Pappy" for your courageous stand on the liberties of the people of these United States. If there were only more like you to aid you on your stand against bureaucratic government.

LOUIS HERSEY.

BEAUMONT, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Outside of Government employees, New Deal nuts, and fanatics, Texas people squarely with you in opposition to OPA. Talk bill to death. Turn Texas loose. Competition and buyers' strike will do away with inflation in reasonable time. I have served as member of Texas Legislature and passed 72 years of age and this is my first appeal to any Member of Congress on any subject.

J. HOMER GADDY.

WITTENBERG, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:

I heartily agree, as do most Americans, that it would be swell to wake up Monday morning under the American form of government and tell the world that the America of our fathers stands as firm as Plymouth Rock. This would end once and for all the hedging and quibbling at Paris and New York and witness an exodus of bureaucrats from Washington. I urge you to lead the fight back to sanity and the American way of life. In this you have the support of all loyal citizens. More power to you.

J. WILL GATES.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator of Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the fight. We are for you.

CHARLES ETHERIDGE.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courage. It takes a Texan to speak his mind. It certainly would be very refreshing for the American public to wake up Monday morning once again under the American form of government. Hundreds of thousands of famished home owners and realty taxpayers, the backbone of every municipality, are stunned by the word "freeze," while there is no freeze on any form of house repairs, painting, roofing, plumbing, etc. We want the real American way of life.

THOMAS PILUSO.

MILTON, DEL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Do all you can to rule out the OPA by June 30.

J. D. ROWINS, *Mayor.*

WATERTOWN, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas:

Congratulations for your stand on the OPA. This un-Americanism must go.

DEWITT L. MARSHALL.

CAMDEN, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE W. O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. You are performing a great service for the entire country.

SAMUEL RAYMOND DOBBS.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Care of White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Please accept my sincere gratitude on your stand against OPA from a tired, discouraged, young businessman.

VICTOR C. KOEHLER.

ATHENS, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate House, Washington, D. C.:

Everyone in Athens is with you. Go ahead with your filibuster.

WESTFALLS RESTAURANT.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I heartily approve the action you are taking and I sincerely hope that you will be successful in your fight to completely eliminate and do away with the OPA.

N. R. ROYALL, Jr.

MASON CITY, IOWA, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Democrat, Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

We are getting darn sick of Bowles' Gestapo, so keep in there fighting. We are for you.

RUSSELL L. COOK.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Rush your filibuster and bring back the American way of life. We are backing you 100 percent.

W. E. MASSEY.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I do hope you are able to fight the OPA with filibuster against the measure.

W. J. WEAVER.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Best wishes for success in fight against OPA. Support efforts.

S. C. ABERNATHY.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

Believe your position on OPA is in the interest of our Nation's welfare. Hope you can stand and fight it out.

WILLIAM D. MCBEE.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Keep up the good work. My opinion is if you are successful in talking the OPA out of existence you will be doing the United States a fine service.

E. C. STONE,
Stimson Mill Co.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Ex-GI in business will be put out if OPA is retained. Keep up the fight.

ALEX WHITE,
Used Car Dealer.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

By killing OPA you will save America and keep it honest and block Stalin's racket. Keep up the good work.

E. A. KLUSMEYER.

MILTON, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Keep on. Talk OPA to death.

FRANK M. REBER.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We admire you as you give the political bureaucrats heck.

R. D. MOREAU.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

I heartily support your filibustering the OPA out of existence.

R. A. BURNETT.

BEAVER FALLS, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Glad to know we have a real American Senator. Backing you 100 percent.
Mr. and Mrs. E. L. KOCH.

WATERTOWN, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL:
Heartily approve your stand against OPA.
L. W. BALDING,
Hotel Brighton.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL:
Every American should appreciate your efforts to end OPA before Bowles completely stabilizes the black market.
J. P. FLIPPEN.

WHITTIER, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Building industry confused and thwarted by inequitable and unsound economical directives of OPA. Vast numbers here convinced abolishment of OPA essential to progress of our country. May Divine guidance and strength be yours in the crucial hour.
CORIN SWAIN.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Liquidate the OPA. Do it now.
LES CROUCH.
GEORGE B. SANDERSON.

MOUNTAIN HOME, IDAHO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for your fighting spirit. Cut red tape that is strangling livestock industry and business. Supply-demand competition will rebuild the Nation.
G. ANDREWS.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Care Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
We knew you wouldn't let us down. With you 100 percent.
L. FOGLE.

DAYTON, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
"Pappy" hold on. Hold on. The welfare of our Nation is at stake. Hold on. May God give you strength.
PAUL D. YODER.

ROCK HILL, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Care Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Representing 2,000 South Carolina farmers. We heartily endorse your stand against OPA and hope you hold out through Sunday.
FARMERS LEAGUE,
JOHN HINSON.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartily commend your patriotic action in filibuster against OPA Gestapo.
M. A. REINER,
ARTHUR WALKER.

WATERTOWN, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas:
Time to live under American form of government; talk OPA to death.
CLARK SHERMAN,
Depauville, N. Y.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 72, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
More power to you; please stage filibuster or anything else necessary to defeat this un-American OPA before we become bankrupt or land in an insane asylum.
Mrs. HAZEL K. DUNN.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
We heartily support your filibustering the OPA out of existence.
HERRMANN BROS.,
A. E. HERRMANN.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge you to continue fight on OPA and other restrictions. Regards.
H. H. COFFIELD,
Rockdale, Tex.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Talk OPA bill to death and you have more friends than any man in the United States.
D. E. SMITH,
Locomotive Engineer.
TOM WRIGHT,
Car dealer.

LULING, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your fight. Only wish you had more help.
M. C. WALKER, Sr.
B. R. MILES.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
May God give you strength in your noble fight for America.
R. HARRINGTON FIELD.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Your sentiments are right as rain. The world will remember and thank you for the defeat of OPA and all that it stands for. Get in there and fight.
ART KELLY.

JACKSONVILLE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please register our strong opposition against the OPA. We recommend it be destroyed. We are all for you. Lots of luck.
B. A. King, E. E. Starkey, B. O. King, Homer Ragsdale, P. J. Pavletich, A. E. Lowe, Geo. Trezise, L. B. Kern, H. H. Holcomb, Sampson Bros. Grocery, A. J. Brazil Star Grocery and Market.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Hope you will go on fighting the OPA, as I believe it definitely is trying to put people out of business. Am a veteran of World War II, having just purchased my own business and am completely out if OPA continues their stupid restrictions in the restaurant lines. Hope you will be successful in your great fight.
PAUL BORCHERT.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Earnestly, I am convinced that we have to depend upon you alone to reestablish government by the people and for the people. Please have courage and faith in your gallant fight.
W. R. MCBEE.

ALICE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We are for you 100 percent if you filibuster the OPA extension bill.
LESLIE COSTLEY, ROBERT M. FRANKS, J. H. DUNN, G. DUDLEY FITZSIMMONS, J. W. PORTER, J. A. GARCIA, N. G. NORTON.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your intention to filibuster OPA deserves the support of every true-blooded American. The Bowle weevil has already done great damage to American industry. Bowles' high pressure advertising salesmanship has scared a lot of people, but a vast number of Americans want OPA liquidated. You can do a great national service to help kill it. It would be like releasing an avalanche of water on arid lands.
N. T. SHEPHERD CHAIR CO.
SALT LAKE CITY AND CHICAGO.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hold the line. Kill that OPA.
BARNES ROOT BEER,
MR. BARNES.

MIDLAND, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on most patriotic and American gesture. Give them h——. We are behind you 100 percent.
WILLIS WHITE MOTOR CO.,
ROBERT K. WHITE.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I am, as you seem to be, opposed to use of filibuster except in extreme cases. However, it is vitally important that this country return to free constitutional government. I urge that you use all honorable means to terminate OPA and all other Executive bureaus.
OTIS MEREDITY.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand; everybody here is for you. Major stronghold of OPA is on rent ceiling; think this should be sustained in modified form. Suggest, if possible, transfer of rent regulations to local boards of respective states would meet with hearty approval both landlords and tenants.
JOHN M. DAWSON.

SAN ANGELO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D .C.:
Stay in there and pitch against OPA. We are with you.
USED CAR DEALERS OF SAN ANGELO.
Guy F. Davis, B. F. Harris, D. H. Emerson, F. E. Luce, Shiel Barth Henry, G. Turner, R. M. Kennedy, D. L. Luce, J. T. Jackson, E. J. Darby, A. J. Rhyne, O. S. Shultz, L. J. Sparks, Dale Miller, Sewell Kenley, Brents Kenley, Jerome Luth, Hughes L. Mason.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
DEAR SIR: Am backing you 100 percent in fight against OPA, as I believe it to be unfair and un-American.
MRS. ZELDA TRACY.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Do away with OPA and other un-American agencies.
W. J. HEWITT.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR FRIEND: I have seven houses under construction now. They are needed badly by the owners of which I can't finish at this time due to the OPA. Do what you can to let the OPA die a natural death. We are backing you sincerely.
H. J. WIMBERLY.

OLNEY, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulate your stand of you and associates. Can defeat OPA as it now operates you will be doing our country and all true Americans great service. The quota system especially vicious and detrimental to livestock industry and consumers. It should be eliminated immediately in livestock industry and many others.
ART L. WAGONER.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:
I am unqualifiedly opposed to executive bureaus. Therefore, do all you can to abolish the OPA.
Miss W. A. PETTIT.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Your stand regard the OPA bill is greatly appreciated and is the best news we have heard in a long time. This is to show our appreciation and we are behind you 100 percent.
MIMMO MOTOR CO.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your able leadership and best wishes for complete success and victory in your current battle which will well serve friends throughout the Nation. Our Texas people are proud of you.
GEORGE F. ROZELLE.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As an ex-GI trying to stay in business I will be forced out if OPA is continued in its present form. Let 'em have it, Senator. We're for you.
JOHN AYERS, *Used Cars.*

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are all waiting and hoping that you really carry through. More power to you.
G. W. HOLDEN.
CLEVE THOMPSON.
FRANK DAVIS.
M. SNOW.
B. D. GARRISON.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As a representative of Texas we are proud of you, as you are the only representative we have with the guts to speak his own sentiments.
FREEMAN MOTOR CO.,
223 West Sixth Street.

TYLER, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
I am in favor of abolishing the OPA entirely and hope you will work to that end.
R. L. PEVETO.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Your filibuster has my wholehearted approval. Keep up your fight against the OPA and all other Government restrictions on business.
BERT FIELDS.

BEAUMONT, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Speak until OPA is dead. I wish I could help you speak. I would read the Constitution over and over again to my audience. I vote for you.
NELLSON CARTER.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946*
Hon. Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartily favor your proposed filibuster opposing OPA. Full-time production without Government manipulation will soon cure our economic ills.
W. N. BARRICK,
Barrick Cattle Co.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartiest congratulations on being one of the real Americans in the Senate. Stick to your guns and block price controls on food. OPA propaganda against you but the people are back of you.
ADAM F. EBY.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D .C.:
OPA is unfair, unjust, inequitable, dishonest, and un-American. It is the cause of black market and unethical practices. Makes bread, meat, butter, sugar, and necessities of life scarce. Soup lines and hunger will prevail if OPA continues. OPA is unconstitutional—down with the OPA.
W. A. ASKEW.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your Texas friends endorse your stand against OPA and bureaucracy.
FELIX DEVANS,
Texas Bank Building.

COLUMBIA, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator "PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA with filibuster, if necessary. Congratulations on your stand. Let's get back to the American way of life.
J. R. HANSHAW.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol, Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch. Let's get rid of this big chunk of bureaucracy right now.
R. C. KAY.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
You have my full support in your filibuster against the OPA and all other Government restrictions. You are doing your country a great service.
JOHN R. BLACK.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Good luck, we need more men like you in the Senate. Hope you succeed.
KARSTEN & SONS.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Sincerely hope other Senators support your fight for American rights.
C. L. GOPPERT.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you as you take the floor this afternoon on behalf of the taxpayers of Texas, as we are backing you to the last minute.
J. O. FREEMAN.

INDEPENDENCE, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations to you, also Senators WHERRY, BRIDGES, and MOORE, upon your statement to prevent passage of OPA extension bill. The American form of government is what we sent our boys to die for. Stand firm on your present convictions. Supply and demand will clarify the situation if given a chance and not throttled by the OPA.
MYLES A. and LILLIAN LARSON.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Urgently recommend strong filibuster or any other tactics necessary to relieve the oil industry of the burden of the OPA.
ALFRED C. GLASSELL, Jr.,
Director of the Texas Independent Royalty Owner and Producers Association.

LITTLEFIELD, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Deliver us from the oppression of OPA, if you by any means can.
HENRY BANKS.

ALPINE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Your friends appreciate your efforts to restcre democracy; hope you filibuster.
Mrs. MAE M. AMENT.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I appreciate your opinion regard the OPA bill, and from conversation with my customers and other dealers here in Amarillo, Tex., we feel that the discontinuance of the OPA would be a benefit to the country and we are behind you 100 percent.
W. B. PARK.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations your stand against OPA bill. Farmers throughout Nation definitely behind you. Hope your voice holds out until you kill the thing deader than Hector's pup.
BRUCE B. DERRICK,
Secretary-Treasurer, Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association.

WEYMOUTH, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Roy V. Nelson, building contractor, father of three sons, one a returned veteran, why do I agree with your filibuster? I hate black market. Number one supply and demand will adjust prices.
P. S.: I need a new hat and suit, so does my father and three sons; we will not buy at present price level.
ROY V. NELSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL OF TEXAS,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA; let's return honesty.
WILLIAM A. SARGENT.

PALESTINE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
We, the undersigned businessmen of Palestine, wish to congratulate you on your efforts to defeat OPA and urge that you continue to fight all moves to continue OPA beyond June 30. Again thanking you, we are sincerely,
Raymond F. Rantzen, A. R. Johnson, Allen Grocery Co., Ben Kelly, Mrs. H. N. Davenport, R. M. Odom, Aubrey Meadors, J. C. Dickey, B. F. Callaway, D. L. Nobles, J. F. Callaway, E. D. Bobbitt, E. M. Dickey, J. R. Wilson.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on fight against OPA. Hope you kill it.
W. O. MORSE.
C. P. ALLEN.
D. W. FARNHAM.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster till Sunday midnight. I am for you.
A MISSISSIPPI-BORN TEXAN.

EUGENE, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C. :
True Americans tired of Stalin. OPA nightmare.
H. W. HALL.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As a Texas oil producer I am sure you are right. Go ahead.
W. W. HOLMES.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
I am back of you 100 percent in your fight against OPA, as I consider it un-American and believe it to be pressure politics.
Mrs. M. J. POOLE.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C:
The businessmen in the Panhandle of Texas admire a man with the guts to speak his sentiments. Power to you.
W. M. TRUMAN.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democrat From Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Keep filibuster going. Let's all be Americans once more.
MARY L. CROSBY.

LONGVIEW, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Shortening $30 a case because OPA won't turn it loose. Sugar, all you want at $27 a hundred. Kill OPA and we will get normal prices. If shortening is not loosened up soon I will have to close my doors. I fought in this war for freedom and Japan and Germany have it and we do without or pay black-market prices on account of OPA.
HOLLYWOOD CAFE,
J. D. MONTGOMERY.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartily endorse and appreciate your efforts against OPA.
T. B. TIMBES.

TACOMA, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Having lived 25 years in Texas I firmly believe you are the man to talk the OPA to death. It has convicted itself and does not deserve to live. Since VJ-day it has lived upon borrowed time.
GEORGE B. FRANKLIN.

DENVER, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Your OPA fight is worthy.
PAUL L. CLARK.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are proud of you as a layman, also as a representative of Texas, in doing your best to protect the taxpayers against a bunch of political bureaucrats who are wanting nothing but a job.
Mrs. WM. FREEMAN.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Today's Dallas News intimates that you intend to conduct a filibuster against the OPA compromise bill. I thoroughly endorse such an idea and hope you succeed in such undertaking. Legitimate dealers in building materials are being put out of business by black-market practices and will have to close their doors unless the whole set-up now functioning is discarded.
LYON GRAY LUMBER CO.,
W. B. MARSH, *President.*

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I want to commend you for your ardent efforts to abolish the OPA. No one realizes the fallacies of price regulation better than do we independent oil producers. It applies likewise to all other businesses and industries. I wish to personally urge that you continue in your valiant fight. Kindest personal regards.
P. N. WIGGINS, Jr.

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God we still have men who remember American democracy. Congratulations on your proposed filibuster. Maybe you can save us.
COUCH SUPER MARKET,
E. T. COUCH, Jr.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Things the so rotten they stink. Central Council of America, War Dads, of St. Louis, went on record 100 percent to have FBI investigate the OPA.
UNCLE BILL FLORI CARONDELET,
CHAPTER 89.

ATLANTA, GA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill Office Price Administration. Restore freedom. Become America's greatest benefactor.
J. E. FAVER.

FRESNO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
If you filibuster until the OPA dies a much-deserved death, come out to California and rest for a month. Our home is yours for as long as you wish.
Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE A. FRANCIS.

FALLS CITY, NEBR., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Good work, Senator. Best of luck from Nebraska.
FRED H. SCHOCK.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Start filibuster. Keep it up. We're with you.
CLAUDE MCREYNOLDS.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
"PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Cancel OPA; carry filibuster through; good luck.
JIMMY LITTLE.

ARLINGTON, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand opposing the continuation of the OPA. It is gratifying that there are Members of Congress who vote intelligently.
H. F. KJAERBYE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Americans need no foreign controls. OPA dictatorial, extravagant, unconstitutional. Kill it if possible. God bless you.
HELEN COURTOIS, E. BUCHANAN, and IMOGENE KRAMER.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Admire your OPA stand. God gave us freedom; let us keep it.
GRANGE GROCERY.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Backing you in your fight against the OPA and for our freedom again.
BLANCHE MCFARLAND,
Teacher.

ATCHISON, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
God bless you in your fight to eliminate the bureau that calls the American businessman a crook. We are behind you in your fight to eliminate this bottleneck to production.
CLANCY P. MILLER,
President, Miller Chevrolet Auto Co.

CHARLESTON, S. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We are wiring Senators and Congressmen to support you in your patriotic battle to exterminate OPA. More power to you.
E. H. PRINGLE.

CARTHAGE, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for your fight on OPA issue. Regardless of OPA propaganda to the contrary, the public is convinced OPA retards recovery; also disgusted with regimentation. May I salute for you for your courageous stand.
WALTER OTT.

GALLATIN, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster proceedings. One hundred percent for you.
HOGINS MARKET.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
We foresee no meat available at all unless you are successful in your present efforts. Keep up the good work.
L. H. MOODY.
A. DELISLE.
G. A. FLADING.
W. TAYLOR SMITH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand on OPA. Keep filibuster going until killed.
LES KELLEY,
Ford Dealer.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your red-blooded heman determination to fight to the end OPA chaos, confusion, and un-Americanism. I strongly endorse your stand for a free America.
WALTER S. PARKER.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. We're all for you.
BISCAYNE PARK CIVIL RIGHTS FOUNDATION.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We want no more OPA or rent control. Keep fighting.
G. G. MCFARLAND.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I admire your sincere OPA opposition as a loyal American.
L. O. SCHNEEBERGER.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I heartily approve your filibuster against OPA. You can serve your country in no better manner than to continue your fight against OPA and all other Government restrictions on business.
V. D. BOSTICK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Five Republicans say your OPA stand O. K.
A. V. STUCKER.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Talk for 1 week. Kill OPA.
GUY P. BAIRD.

ONEONTA, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your fight against price control welcomed by our farmers. Don't give up.
G. H. MCCULLOUGH,
Blount County Farmers Association.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and best regards for your fight from two GI's.
Maj. RALPH L. SUMMERILL,
Capt. BOB GLEASON,
United States Marine Corps.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The board of directors of the Republican Club of Pima County endorse your courageous move to abolish the OPA. The free American customer buying in a free competitive market coupled with immediate stoppage of deficit financing is the American way to stop further inflation and the effective way to promote production.
RICHARD CHAMBERS,
President, Republican Club of Pima County.

DAYTONA BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I want to congratulate you on your stand opposing the OPA bill. You will earn the undying gratitude of the American people if you will prevent its passage and kill the OPA for good.
E. W. COBB.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up filibuster. People of America are behind you for death of OPA.
BARRY SULLIVAN.

WINSTON-SALEM, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations your technique for terminating OPA. Every good wish for your success. Many North Carolina citizens are in complete accord.
MARTIN P. GUNBY.

COLUMBIANA, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Congressional Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for your stand against OPA. More power to you.
C. F. COPPOCK,
Coppock's Market.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your attitude against continuation of OPA is admired in Illinois as well as Texas. It is sincerely hoped OPA will not continue.
RALPH A. TRIERCHMANN.

EDINBURG, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and fight. We are behind you 100 percent.
W. P. SMITH.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Tell the United States Senate that the war is over. All wartime agencies should be abolished immediately, especially the OPA, and the bureaucrats should all go home and start working for a living. More power to you.
KENNETH KRAHL.

MONTEREY, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA any way possible.
B. A. BAILEY.

CHARLOTTE, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster OPA out. Freedom of American people at stake. An old retired butcher.
WILLIAM C. MCINTIRE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The thinking people of Texas are strong with you in your fight against OPA and all Government restrictions.
W. P. LUSE.

GAY HILL, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and fight; farmers are with you.
W. H. WERCHAN.

GALLATIN, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster proceedings. One hundred percent for you.
SINDLE PRODUCE CO.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
In the interest of public welfare we heartily approve proposed OPA filibuster.
CONSOLIDATED MOTORS, INC.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill the OPA and American business will support you. Good luck from 10 white-collar workers.
J. C. APPLETON.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Kill OPA for the sake of America.
A. F. BLUNT.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA and give us back the American form of Government.
ARMIN F. OBERBECK.

CULVER CITY, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We admire your stand on OPA; carry on. Pass this on to California Senators.
ANDERLS MEATS.
TWO GI's.

EUGENE, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Continue the good fight. Filibuster till Monday for free enterprise and true prices based upon supply and demand.
REEVES TAYLOR,
Taylor Lumber Co.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand on OPA. We are behind you 100 percent.
CENTRAL ARIZONA CATTLE
FEEDERS ASSOCIATION.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I thank God we do have a few real Americans left. Buck Fulford is my name. I own and operate two fried-chicken places in the city of New Orleans—fine dressed poultry places. At the present time it is almost impossible to keep my places going, due to the fact that the OPA has retarded production of spring chickens to such an extent that what is produced are consumed in the black-market channels.

Now, Senator O'DANIEL, last September I invested several thousand dollars to put in a poultry-buying place and dressing plant at Giddings, Tex., just 40 miles from Austin. You have been there many a time.

Senator O'DANIEL, I have talked with the farmers of that section and have tried to get them to raise fryers for me. They have all the equipment for raising fryers, brooders, and everything necessary for raising fryers. The only reason that they are not producing fryers today is that they cannot produce them for 28 cents per pound with the high cost of feed.

Senator O'DANIEL, you know those good old people in Texas. Good Baptist, good Methodist. You know many of them will not violate any law. Therefore, those few which are taking chances of producing are getting 34 cents per pound, whereas if it were possible for all of them to be producing we would have more poultry on the market than we could consume at reasonable prices. Senator TAFT knows me. He has been in one of my places of business in New Orleans. I'm sending a copy of this letter to Senator TAFT. If the OPA does not die June 30, then our real America cannot survive. Thank God we have two real Americans left in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,
BUCK FULFORD.
BUCK'S FAMOUS FRIED CHICKEN.

MUSKOGEE, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Have wired Oklahoma Senators to join you in your laudable efforts to remove American people from domination of OPA.
WM. WILSON LUMBER CO.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Hope you talk out the OPA.
H. S. CORBETT.

COLORADO CITY, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Think practically all Texans appreciate your views and action on OPA. More power to you.
J. B. MILLS.

BEAUMONT, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Press reports your determined fight to last ditch for elimination of OPA and for freedom from bureaucratic controls. Congratulations. You have our hearty support.
J. E. BROUSSARD.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
May Lord give you strength to lead this country out of the OPA, the most oppressive yoke ever worn by a nation.
Rev. and Mrs. GEO. M. KEEZEL.

SALEM, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Something over 100,000,000 people are beginning to stoop, sneak, badger, and bluff to get sugar, soap, sirup, clothing, feed, lumber, radios, nails, autos, flour, bread, butter, cheese, meat, or anything else they want and should have. Should black or free markets prevail? These are the people of what was and we believe is the finest Nation on earth. The most enlightened, aggressive, upstanding, and compassionate. Consider coffee up, butter up, cheese up, bread up, beer up. Where is the held line? Consider no lumber, no autos, no sugar, no radios, no meat, no soap. Where is production? Gobs of these people know the death of OPA on Sunday is just another of the Bowles' crowd's propaganda scares to mislead the Nation's thinking people. They know Congress can reenact or relegislate whenever they see fit to so do or feel it necessary for the national welfare. Does someone or anyone think America must be kept in or returned to swaddling clothes? And if so what group of bureaucrats consider themselves competent to be pappy to us all? If we must die let us die fighting. Gentlemen, don't give up the ship.
E. L. DICKSON.

CULPEPER, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I wish to express my appreciation and gratitude for your wonderful stand on OPA yesterday.
Miss EDITH WEAKLEY.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
America is with you in your valiant fight to kill the OPA. Every place I go clerks, businessmen all bitterly complain about this Marxist despotism. Give me production and plenty and not scarcity and cheating.
FREDA MAUNE.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL:
Ex-GI in business will be put out if OPA is retained. Keep up the fight.
ALEX WHITE,
Used-Car Dealer.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
The morning papers give me the best news yet regarding your efforts toward keeping the future open for business. As an ex-GI am trying to stay in business, and you and your efforts only will keep others like me doing business. Keep up the fight, Senator.
PANHANDLE USED CAR DEALERS,
HOMOR RICE, *President.*

CULPEPER, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building:
Congratulations on your stand yesterday regarding OPA. Keep the good work going.
W. EVERETT CIPPEGE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL:
You are on the right track. Stay on that floor and knock that OPA out of the box. They think that the 100,000,000 Americans in the U. S. A. are of kindergarten age. We think that we are old enough to run our own business, and as one of the thousands of independent retail grocers I think you are doing a great service to our country.
E. A. ROGERS GROCERY.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate:
Many thanks for your strenuous efforts in our behalf.
DIXON PACKING CO.
HUBBELL & MCCORD PACKING CO.

NIXON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay with them, O'DANIEL. Kill the OPA in spite of high water so we can live again.
A. N. MARROU.

ANOKA, MINN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
God bless your efforts. Go to it and win.
Mrs. LEWIS A. SORENSEN.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Gen. Claude V. Birkhead and I have concluded that you are one of the few real Americans left in Washington, D. C.
E. A. HARRIS.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you, Old Man. Keep on talking.
Mrs. ASHTON GLASSELL.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:
The hearts of all the Southwest and all America are with you. If filibuster required to save our country then your name should be a symbol to a future free America.
AN AVERAGE CITIZEN.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. It is my belief that OPA has crippled production and distribution of critical materials for housing and is thereby jeopardizing the whole veterans' housing program.
TOM KUHN.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We want to get rid of OPA. Stay in there and fight.
ELTON WILLIAMS.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator from Texas,
Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:
The OPA has forced black market and law violations on this country until there is now absolute disregard of all lawful authority with reference to all things including rents, food, oil, and lumber that OPA pretends to control. The propaganda put out by Bowles, Porter, et al., spending public moneys therefor, are the most nefarious, outrageous misrepresentations and lies the world has ever seen, including Goebbels. I urge you to talk this OPA to death in this hour of its last struggle, lest we have to shoot it to death later on.
J. E. PRICE.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Care United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your fight against OPA and other bureaucratic restrictions.
LADD DINKINS.

CULLMAN, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please talk OPA to death. People down here are Americans, too.
TROY PULLEN.

FORT MYERS, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Every decent citizen fervently praying for your success. Keep fighting.
CORD S. J. WHITAKER.

CENTER LOVELL, MAINE, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
By all means filibuster. Conditions are critical in Maine. Ask TOBEY and BREWSTER to help.
Regards.
EDNA M. HEIM.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.:
I commend you on opening the eyes of American form of government. Success on filibuster.
FRANK E. BARTKO.

COLEMAN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
We are behind you 100 percent. Americans are capable of running their own affairs. OPA is responsible for black market, low production, and chaos. The whole bunch ought to be kicked out in order that business may be carried on in the American tradition.
E. H. Ray, Junk Pipe & Supply; W. J. Stevens; William W. Shoemaker; F. E. Stevens; Theo Griffis; F. W. Taylor, Jr.; George D. Rhone; E. A. Cezeaux; E. H. Henning; E. H. Henning, Jr..; J. V. Thames; Morrison D. Taylor.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The unorganized masses of our people who are hesitant to communicate with you and other Senators are praying that your eloquence may convince enough of your brother Senators that OPA must be ended June 30 to preserve the American ways of life, and so that the smaller businessmen and producers of the necessities of life can continue their work and business and so that the larger producers of all needed necessities and other desired commodities will be produced in volume to provide the necessities and needs of our people. This OPA is destroying and corrupting all official and private life to a far greater degree than did national prohibition, and if OPA is continued, unemployment on a large scale is inevitable. Talk to them until they see the light. Please convey this message to Senator MOORE, of Oklahoma; and Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska; and other understanding Senators.
HENDERSON STOCK.
S. N. KARAM.
FERNE R. WIRT.
THELMA S. MILLS.
L. L. HENDERSON.
FRED J. ELLIOTT.

DEL RIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
A very high percentage of local producers are bitterly opposed to OPA price control. We endorse your stand, which is the only relief in sight. Sincerely.
C. T. LAKE,
Fort Worth, Tex.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you; do whatever necessary to kill OPA. We only regret we don't have a Senator with as much ability and nerve.
E. G. GRAZIER,
CHARLIE W. CLARK,
Lawyers.
Z. T. HELM,
Realty broker.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your fight in our behalf. God be with you.
VIOLET FRANKEL.

RACINE, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The best thing to do with a skunk is to kill it or deskunk it. I don't care which you do with the OPA.
WIER.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We commend you for your efforts.
We believe the Senate should reject the Senate-House Conference Committee report on OPA and renew their efforts for revision of a bill more in line with that originally passed by the Senate or else let OPA expire. We honestly feel that this country is in better shape today to get rid of OPA than it will be a year from today. In fact, we feel our future is dependent upon getting back to a free economy.
CARLOS RUGGLES LUMBER CO.

PECOS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Fight OPA and bureaucrats. Your popularity increasing in leaps and bounds in west Texas.
BILL DAUGHERTY.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are for you on your fight against OPA.
AMARILLO GARAGE AND STORAGE.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
After you toss out OPA, toss out the rest of the bureaucratic control to let industry go back into production and competition, so that living costs will return to normal sooner. Have heard many applaud you in this area since reading paper this a. m.
E. A. BLACK.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I beseech you to protect property owners from this Gestapo form of government, by filibuster method if necessary. Our Congressman from California, ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, has protected the American way but it seems not enough. This terroristic drive on real property owners must cease. You have our wholehearted support.
EVA C. BECK.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Statesmen like O'DANIEL are only one. Your OPA work is outstanding. Sincerely hope your efforts will relieve us from OPA, the black-market agency. Florida needs an O'DANIEL.
RALPH HARDWICK.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Since 1908 we have operated retail lumber business in North College Hill, Ohio. Under OPA regulations we have been directly discriminated against and put out of business. Senate-House conference committee report on OPA of no benefit to retail lumber dealers. The report should be rejected and the committee instructed to renew efforts for revision of bill more in line with that originally passed by the Senate. If this is not done, black market will continue to flourish and legitimate concerns with enviable records for years will be out of business.
KNOLLMAN LUMBER CO.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Care of United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We here in Bakersfield are with you on your stand relative to OPA in bringing our country back to the American way of living.
KELLER METALS, INC.

WATERVILLE, MAINE., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
I commend you for your stand on OPA. More power to you.
EDMUND F. LONGLEY,
A Maine Republican.

KARNES CITY, TEX., *June 27, 1946*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations to you on your stand with OPA. Stay in there; we are with you.
S. J. KUHNEL.

RIVERSIDE, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
To prevent the ultimate eclipse of liberty in America the OPA must be killed and killed now. Congratulations on your fight. See it through.
DADA E. KEECH.

GREENVILLE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are behind you 100 percent in what you are trying to do for the people of the United States, for we would like to be a free people again. Give J. W. Abbott answer on this.
J. W. Abbott, Lester Collum, Carl S. Suddath, John Collum, Inie Holmes, J. W. Hamilton, Tom Mooney, Ike Isaacs, E. C. Hagan, Roy Collum, Tom McNatt Motor Co., J. B. Banks, J. A. Moore, F. M. McCoullough, C. F. Dowell, Jr.

FORT WORTH, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:
Talk this OPA bill to death and let's get lots of parasites out of Washington.
H. T. BIBB.

FORT PIERCE, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Please kill OPA—we need meat.
David E. Harrison, Steve Johnston, M. D., G. Cay Coggins, Mrs. Billingsley, Belle D. Parks, Mr. and Mrs. G. B. Crose, Bart Milton, Earnestine Melton, J. T. Morgan, M. Church, Ralph Rubin, Charles D. Lells, W. R. Higgins, L. S. Hubbs, Mr. and Mrs. C. D. Mustain, J. D. Stafford, Jack Odom, E. Register, Ann Mack, Charles E. Getchell, N. E. Skaggs, H. B. Masters, M. L. Coker, R. B. Pickett, Piggly Wiggly, W. J. Rodway, Table Supply, D. T. Homan, Lovetts Corbertt Keen, W. P. McCormick, Clyde W. Cato, Mrs. Joe Othes, J. T. Kelly, J. T. Russel, H. J. Smith, Lollie Canaday, Mr. and Mrs. M. D. Hutchison, Mr. and Mrs. John D. Keffer, J. T. Tidwell, Mrs. Allen B. Garrett, Bus Campbell, Arnold J. Barrett, D. A. Church, M. Haskell, Mrs. A. C. Purdy, Otis Kelly, J. B. Brewer, C. Costas, W. E. Vassar, Mr. and Mrs. Buddy Hopkins, William White.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democrat of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep fighting for our American form of government. Bust OPA bureaucracy.
Mrs. E. L. BLOTE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Lord give you strength to fight this OPA communistic group. All real Americans against it.
JOSEPH A. WADE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Free the property owners from the tyranny of the OPA.
Mrs. ELLA MAY GRAHAM.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate House Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I agree with you wholeheartedly in the stand you have taken on the OPA bill now being considered, and I approve of any action you might take in defeating this bill as it now stands. Beef and petroleum particularly should have controls removed.
Regards,
MILLS BENNETT.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. Hope you are successful and take OPA out of existence. Think you are doing a very fine service for your country.
V. O. STRINGFELLOW.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
No one who appreciates the public service you are performing in setting forth your views on price control can pronounce your effort as merely an attempt to frustrate the vicious purposes behind the bill you are opposing. Your objective is far higher than this. It is an honest attempt to set before the people, in the only form available, the truth behind this effort to fasten upon our people a planned economy that is a system of regimentation entirely at variance with the American principle of a free economy.
M. FRANK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Don't give up.
S. R. BROWN.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you are successful talking OPA out of existence. If you can do that you will have done something.
NED STONE.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight against OPA; we are with you all the way. It takes a Texan to save democracy. Stay with it.
C. H. PETRICH.

SEMINOLE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
OPA has destroyed the lumber, dairy, meat, poultry, automobile, sugar, and every other business that can be mentioned. Every businessman and every farmer in America is against it. The Jews are for it. Please stay in there and fight. We are all with you.
C. E. RAWLINGS.

RICHMOND, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
House of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep going until the OPA is dead if it takes a month. You will get plenty of votes from Wayne County, Ind., for any national office you want from a transplanted Texas.
DRANCES M. SHORE.

DEL RIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Your attitude in regard to the OPA and meat controls is appreciated by us 100 percent. We, the livestock growers, strongly recommend your attitude.
JIMMY MILLS,
Livestock Order Buyers.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Census Bureau Special Housing Report, series H-46, No. 1, May 16, 1946, comparing November 1945 with April 1940, shows increase in number of occupied dwellings of about 8 percent, mainly in towns and cities, against National Conference Board figures showing population increase including armed forces overseas of no more than 6.3 percent.
Average size of occupied dwelling increased slightly from 4.78 to 4.85 rooms per dwelling.
Average number of occupants per dwelling declined from 3.29 to 3.06, resulting in increase in number of rooms per person from 1.45 to 1.58, or 9 percent.
The report also shows, page 10, an increase of 30 percent in number of occupied dwelling units inhabited by only six persons and 22-percent increase in number occupied by only two persons against a decrease of 13.4

percent in number of dwellings occupied by six persons—a decrease of 24.1 percent in those occupied by seven persons and 33.1 percent occupied by eight or more persons.

Official figures also show that new homes were built since 1940 faster than population increased, including armed forces overseas.

None of the above figures and comparisons includes trailers and garages as dwellings, although the people in them are counted in population figures. Therefore they are overconservative in showing increase of homes over population.

These figures show conclusively how rent control has caused the housing shortage by keeping rents down while individual and family incomes rose, permitting spreading out by more fortunate occupants.

This causes great hardship, especially for returning servicemen, newly married couples, and lower-income persons who cannot afford to buy homes yet may be forced to change residences to get jobs or promotions.

Evasions of rent controls are rampant with illegal rentals at exorbitant levels to cover added risks.

Reconversion is greatly impeded by resulting immobilizing of workers. Social, political, and economic discontent and family difficulties are increased.

Investment in housing is impeded, yet residential sales values are inflated by difficulty of obtaining rentals.

This situation will continue as long as rent controls are effective in keeping rents below supply-and-demand level in free markets.

Removal of rent controls would result in gradual rise of 15 to 25 percent in average rentals or 3 to 5 percent in cost of living.

But it would relieve inflation pressure on other consumers' goods, especially in durable lines. It would bring rents into accord with renters' ability and willingness to pay, secure more efficient use of housing facilities by removing artificial advantage which controls now give to single person and small-family renters.

It would be especially beneficial to returning veterans who cannot or should not buy homes especially at present prices.

If it caused only one in eight of households now having two persons or less to accept one person from six-person dwellings, a normal 5-percent vacancy condition would be created. This amount would be greater than could be built in 2 years of building at the highest rate ever recorded in this country, namely that of 1925, and a rate far above any that can be expected within at least the coming year.

V. ORVAL WATTS,
Economist, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

TEXARKANA, ARK., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please continue filibuster against continuing OPA.

RICHARD BURGDORF.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C:
Best wishes in your great American fight to defeat continuation of the OPA. Kill the OPA and stop OPA-fostered black market and scarcity of goods.

SPALDING KENNEDY.

HAMMOND, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United State Senator, Washington, D. C.:
Gratifying to know you have courage to filibuster against the un-American OPA bill. Wishing success.

W. M. A. FUZY, *Attorney.*

EUGENE, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:
Following telegram sent today to Senators CORDON and MORSE: "Front page morning papers smeared with OPA diatribe directed to a small group of 40 out of more than 4,000 western lumber manufacturers and wholesalers, including Roseburg Lumber and Tony Lausmann, Medford. Charges filed by an OPA jackanapes named Golub and charges include practices permitted in OPA regulations at that time. How much longer are you going to be sucked in by OPA dictum and propaganda? When do you intend to throw out this OPA rabble and return our country to "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Earnestly hope you are successful in preventing passage of OPA extension bill.

H. J. COX,
President, Eugene Chamber of Commerce.

SAFFORD, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish we had more real men like you in the White House. We admire your courage and hope you will get this OPA out of good old U. S. A. We are with you and your supporters. Don't back up an inch. Stay right there.

Marvin Pollack, Luke Accord, H. E. Johnson, N. Plotkin, Z. C. Prino, Preston Larson, C. Lowell Richards, A. E. O'Bryan, Lamar Bellman, Curtis Long.

EVERETT, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Smash OPA. You should receive Congressional Medal. Congratulations for being a red-blooded American.

WILLIAM GUERRA.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:
The American people are looking forward to attending funeral services of OPA with you. Keep talking.

G. L. COOPER.

BETHEL, VT., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator "PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I hear you are trying to table the OPA to death. This sounds good to me. I think OPA only aggravates a difficult and inflationary situation and the sooner we get rid of it the better for the country.

M. S. MILLER.

LEWISTON, MAINE, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep talking until Sunday if necessary to kill OPA. You will receive the appreciation and blessings of all real Americans.

FRED GIVEN.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Continue the good work, holding up your hands in prayer.

MRS. ETHEL CAMPBELL.

GADSDEN, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations, Senator. It's refreshing to know there's one non-Communist left in Washington.

MRS. W. M. COLE.
G. H. HALL.

OLNEY, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Your filibuster on OPA if made will be the greatest service rendered to free enterprise and the American people in the last 100 years. Business 100 percent for you.

J. F. CARTER.

CULPEPER, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care Senate Office Building:
I am truly glad we have one Senator for the people that is not afraid to stand up for their rights. We hope we can have more just like you and we will certainly have a better Government for everyone to live under.

ROBERT M. STULTZ.

CULPEPER, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building:
I am certainly glad we have one good sound minded man to look out for our interest in Washington, D. C., a man for the people.

MRS. JOHN PLEVAKIS.

CULPEPER, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate Office Building:
I wish to thank you for your stand yesterday in behalf of the citizens of the United States and will say you have lots of good honest people's hearts and minds with you. So keep the good work going on.

G. T. CLARKE.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We salute you on your stand re OPA. Living costs are rising in spite of bureaucratic control. Your opinions and attitude are highly appreciated by many in this area. Wish we had a Representative like you.

J. C. LOCKETT.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
In accord with your action; kill OPA.

JOHN ZOTOS.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA entirely or talk until you succeed. Your support appreciated.

MERRILL W. SMITH.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
One hundred percent behind you.

SAN ANTONIO LAUNDRY & DRY CLEANING ASSOCIATION.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We congratulate you on the stand you have taken in reference to OPA legislation.

MARICOPA PACKING CO.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Thoroughly concur with and assure of my wholehearted support of your action as regards the OPA. Sincerely hope all good Texans will back you to the utmost in your stand against this menace.

KEN MCNEALY.

CONROE, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
If you prevent the extension of OPA it will be the smartest move you ever made for the benefit of the country.
A. T. BALL.

SALISBURY, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Fulfill your filibuster threat against OPA. We, the people, back you up.
D. F. STRAUGHAN.

JEANERETTE, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United State Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Don't give up, you have got OPA licked. Their policy and management is unfair to all producers. Here in southwest Louisiana and Texas sugar and rice are in the hands of black market. Its magnitude is out of OPA control. Black-market sugar selling twenty-five and thirty cents per pound; black-market rice equally as much. Chester Bowles' arrogance and dictatorial tactics are unbearable. This is the opinion of thousands of people in our district so don't give up.
D. MORESI AND THOUSANDS OF OTHERS.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your stand on the OPA bill as reported today's paper is to be commended.
H. D. THOMPSON.

SAN ANGELO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We want you to know that we are supporting your effort to abolish OPA 100 percent, and heartily endorse your move to organize filibuster and kill OPA entirely. More power to you.
San Angelo Auto Dealers Association, Kendall Wright Motor Co., C. M. Kenley Co., Oglesby Motor Co., Perry Maxwelcbco, Angelo Feed & Grain Co., Sid Bolding Garage, Bob Fuller Motor Co., Bankston Munselle Motor Co., Bailey Auto Co., A. B. Motor Co., Schuch Motor Co., Mustang Chevrolet Co., Cecil Walton Motor Co., O & S Garage, Mack's Auto Exchange, Key & Nix, Olds Co., Fox Beaver Motor Co., Westbrook Motor Co.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Office of Senate, Washington, D. C.:
I joined your many friends in congratulating you on your courageous stand against price control agency.
HILLTON T. HOWELL.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your efforts to kill OPA appreciated in San Antonio.
TOM HOPKINS.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are wholesale carload distributors of lumber, have been for over 25 years. Under OPA regulations we have been directly discriminated against and put out of business. Senate-House conference committee report on OPA of no benefit to ourselves or other direct-mill shipping lumber wholesalers. Would appreciate your rejecting the report and instruct committee to renew efforts for revision of bill more in line with that passed by the Senate. Will appreciate this consideration as otherwise black market will continue to grow bigger and bigger.
ARLING FUNCH LUMBER CO.

WINSTON-SALEM, N. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your technique of terminating OPA. Every good wish for your success. This is the sentiment of 95 percent of our patrons.
J. T. GREEN,
Nissen Building Barber Shop.

COLLIERVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You will do the country a distinguished service if you can talk the OPA to death.
W. W. MCGINNIS, *Merchant.*

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate House, Washington, D. C.:
It would be swell to wake up Monday morning in America.
Dr. and Mrs. HUGH HEATON.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please keep it up until Saturday night. You represent more people than you suspect. So if your way is the only way, here's more power to you.
C. W. KISTLER,
President Miami Board of Realtors and Chairman Miami Chapter National Home & Property Owners Foundation.

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Heartily in accord with your program regarding OPA.
W. R. KNIGHT,
MARVIN W. STAHL,
Gonzales, Tex.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I appreciate and favor your fight against continuation of the OPA, and believe that your fight is for the best interest of all the people of the United States. I am in favor of your filibuster and hope for its success.
GLENN H. MCCARTHY.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Glad we have at least one statesman in Washington. OPA should be discontinued on basis you have outlined. Keep up the good work to benefit we common people.
J. K. BLACK.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Joint conference committee report on OPA leaves wholesale lumber distributors in less favorable position than present discriminatory regulations. We solicit and urge your support in rejecting this report for revision by committee. We feel that wholesale distributors should at least be allowed the percentage of trade commissions they received prior to OPA as mark-up on ceiling prices. The joint committee report, if enacted, will surely put thousands of legitimate dealers out of business and will further encourage black-market operations.
THOMAS B. THAMES LUMBER CO.

FRANKLIN, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
There has been a desperate need for eight long years for someone who would rise up and lead our people back to the American form of government. Your position is admirable, and I am 100 percent behind it.
T. F. LANCE.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The morning papers report your stand against the black-market agency. I just returned from overseas and highly appreciate the fact that you see that OPA control is ineffective and may lead to greater industrial trouble here at home. Many people here are saluting you today.
FRANK GORNTO.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your fight against OPA greatest service of modern times. If you succeed in killing OPA this Nation will call you great.
REPUBLICAN MINUTE MEN OF TULSA.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulation on your fight against OPA. Trust your filibuster will be successful. We are behind you.
CLARK & COWDEN.

SAN SABA, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Go ahead with filibuster. Kill OPA. Everybody with you.
J. D. ESTEP HARDWARE CO.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
This telegram is a token of moral support and an expression of appreciation for your present action against OPA. Keep it up.
C. A. POST.

NEWTON, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations to you in your fight against the CIO-OPA.
MRS. FRANK RUPE.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:
SIR: Millions of Americans are supporting you in your fight against OPA. Thousands of Texans have already expressed their disgust with OPA bungling. We are with you all the way.
T. A. BLAKELEY,
President of the Mortgage Corp. of Texas.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Government bureaus do not run our Government. Continue the fight.
LEWIS E. PRICE.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartily endorse your stand regarding Senate action on OPA bill.
RIP C. UNDERWOOD.

LULING, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill the OPA. We are behind you 100 percent.
EARNES WILSON,
CLARENCE A. WILSON.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hurray! Keep on a-talking. Stars and Stripes are with you.
HELEN BAKER.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
If you need any help for your plan, count on us.
M. C. HARRISON.

TROY, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Telegrams, night letters, air-mail to follow.
BERT FAVORITE.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
You are right; Give America back to Americans, and regimentation under OPA and other Government agencies. War is over; let us have liberty.
A. BOWLES.

LEAVENWORTH, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Stay in and pitch, filibuster, kill OPA.
WILL T. ROBERTS.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The OPA does not control the Government; we control the Government.
PAUL E. BUTTS.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL:
Sentiments in the Panhandle of Texas are at its highest for you because you have the courage to represent them in their belief.
SIXTY SIX MOTOR CO.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
In accord with your action. Kill OPA.
JAY D. PADGITT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Good work, Pappy. Keep it up. More power to you.
Mr. and Mrs. G. A. RICHARDS.

LINCOLN, NEBR., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
If OPA staffs can be compelled to go to work and quit interfering with others that want to work the Nation's production will increase so fast inflation will be in reverse in 6 months' time and it's deflation, not inflation, which the administration is subtly seeking to prevent by the effect of continued OPA and subsidized unemployment scarcities. This un-American fascism must be ended sometime, why not now? Thanks for your efforts.
L. H. PAULEY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We're backing you. Hope you win.
Mr. and Mrs. O. C. BRYAN.

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations for really working for the people. Other Representatives skating on thin ice politically. One person in Washington is consciencious objector to everything. Commodities and food only obtained through black market. Five rooms rent at $25 per month. Others $12 per night for one room. OPA—that's a joke, son.
ANNA LONGWORTH HILLYER.
SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
We are behind you. Practically all our friends, rich or poor, believe you are right about OPA. Don't give up.
ALBERT MONK,
Manager, Associated Research, Los Angeles.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God for at least one United States Senator with the courage to risk the ire of the CIO-PAC and of the petty bureaucrats who have flagrantly expended tax moneys to propagandize for the perpetuation of their jobs in which they find relief for their sadistic tendencies by ordering citizens to produce and sell and rent without profit. I wish there were more who had the courage. You are eternally right. OPA is not just part bad. It is the sole cause of our economic stagnation and the greatest injustice among its crimes is its insistence that property owners whos operational expenses have doubled must still charge only 1941 rents unless they can show approaching bankruptcy. Rent control is no less evil than other OPA schemes to take one man's property and give it to others under the guise of law.
C. S. GILBERT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Texas Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Abolish OPA and free many property owners from an existing condition worse than war or slavery and win our eternal gratitude.
Ex-serviceman, Sgt. W. H. E.
Mrs. B. E. E.
Mr. and Mrs. LEROY.

MONROVIA, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA and you kill another branch of the great bureaucracy. Kill OPA and you kill inflation. Kill OPA and tens of thousands of little black-market racketeers will die. Kill OPA and tens of thousands of legitimate business houses will again have something to sell. Kill OPA and you return America to the people. Kill OPA and the people will again have more to eat, more to wear, and live in better houses. Kill OPA and the people won't know how to live and act after living a life of slavery and fear under New Dealism for so long. Kill OPA and America will produce so much for so little that the people will live so luxuriously dictatorship will lose its strangle hold on America. Kill OPA and the people won't know what to do with their new-found freedom. Kill OPA and you give democracy another blood transfusion, but by all means kill OPA and deliver us from the greatest system of mass racketeering ever experienced by any people anywhere since the beginning of recorded time. Kill OPA and you will deserve a reward greater than anyone is able to give.
G. M. KNAPP, *Rancher.*

VENICE, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Congress, Washington, D. C.:
Please use every effort to annihilate the OPA. The noose is around our necks now so tight we are strangling. God bless you.
ANN MARSHALL.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay on the floor; kill OPA. I'll support you as President next term.
L. E. GAY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Admire your courage, keep up the good work. Perhaps we can return to a normal economy with less money spent in cocktail bars and more in correct amounts for necessities.
HAROLD J. KURT,
President, Retail Reporting Co., Inc., and 25 Office Employees.

LAFAYETTE, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
One hundred and thirty million Americans are depending on you with possible help from Senator MOORE of Oklahoma, to filibuster OPA to death beyond any possibility of resurrection. Please do not fail.
R. C. WALLACE.

WHITE PLAINS, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
DEAR MR. SENATOR: We are thoroughly grateful for your work toward destroying the stupid OPA. The country should reward you with the Presidency if you want it.
Mr. and Mrs. B. H. KREIDER.
HARTSDALE, N. Y.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your good work to discontinue OPA. Put an end to all the confusion and uncertainty and black markets that OPA has caused, and let competition, supply, and demand again go into effect for a better, happier, more prosperous United States.
SORRENSEN'S RESTAURANT.
ANOKA, MINN.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator "PAPPY" O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster. Don't give up; hold until Sunday at all cost. America's greatness was built on her ability

to produce in vast quantities—this was mainly what won the war for us. OPA now has a large portion of this production stymied. Let's remove the controls and get production going in full swing again. This is the American way.

T. H. SLEDGE.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are backing you 100 percent. Kill the OPA. Get America back.

A. M. RUSSELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C:.
Congratulations. Tie a can to those New Dealers. Fine work.

WALTON PARKET.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:
We are behind you. Do away with OPA. Legitimate dealers can't exist under present system. Only black markets can survive.

CITY FOOD MARKET.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We landlords are desperate in Baton Rouge. Please help us. If possible, filibuster until Monday.

A TEXAN.

AKRON, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Suggest you continue filibuster on the un-American, unconstitutional, and unnecessary OPA legislation.

GEORGE E. BOSTON.
J. H. JOHNSEON.
J. F. STARK,
L. M. EWING.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
God bless you. Keep up the good work. From a Texas boy who is glad to know that there is still an American in Washington. Keep up the fight for America, we don't want communism like the OPA.

FRANCIS CHATHAM.

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We appreciate your fight on OPA. The war is over. We do not want our business and property controlled by bureaus in peacetime. Get us free again.

THE ELK LUMBER CO.
R. E. RINARD.
HOBART NEWCOMER.
T. C. OWENS.
PAUL C. DAVIS.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Don't give up the fight. Nevada is with you.

E. G. HAMILTON.

GAINESVILLE, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Death OPA in your battle for rights. We prayed all night. Don't give up.

Mrs. WILLIAM J. ALLEN.

HOT SPRINGS, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Talk long and loud against OPA. Win for us the right to own what we fought for.

JOHN G. and LIELA M. RANDEL.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Good work on the OPA. Kill it. Fifty meat dealers here will have to close their doors under present system as black-market operators are doing the business. Let us operate on a businesslike manner.

S & B SELF-SERVICE GROCERY.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Democrat Texas, Washington, D. C.:
Stay on the floor—kill OPA.

W. M. McDOUGLE.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Talk against OPA until you are as hoarse as a Nueces River bottom bull frog, but keep talking. Regards.

MIKE JARMAN.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work and kill the OPA. Ninety percent of meat business is in the black market. Don't let them drive all legitimate meat dealers to that. Approximately 50 markets here out of meat at present time.

RETAIL MEAT DEALERS ASSOCIATION.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thanks for your American efforts—hoping you success.

J. F. KYLE.

LINDEN, N. J., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please talk—preserve the American system, abolish OPA and communism.

GEORGE SWEET.
LINDEN, N. J.

CLEVES, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The farmers of southwestern Ohio are behind you to kick OPA completely out of agriculture.

FRANK MINES,
President of Farmers Guild of Hamilton County.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democratic Texas Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We the following citizens agree with you 100 percent that OPA is unconstitutional, Communist, un-American, and unnecessary and the people at the top are positively dishonest.

JAMES J. CORRELL.
ETHEL W. CORRELL.
JOSEPHINE TURNER.
JOHN KUHN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: I wish to congratulate you on your stand against the continuation of the Office of Price Administration. I hope you have the courage and stamina to filibuster against the constitutionality of an un-American law which is gradually putting smaller business on the rocks.

E. DELUCA.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
I am not from Texas, but keep up good work. Bust OPA and get rid of black market.

Mrs. RINNE, *Pennsylvania.*

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:
A government worthy enough to be fought for should be good enough to be returned to the people. More power to you.

B. F. KIRKLAND.

LEXINGTON, KY., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you, Senator. Keep up the fight. Real Americans will never forget you for your efforts in the OPA fight.

H. D. WRIGHT.

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Congress,
Washington, D.C.:
The OPA is forcing honest man to do dishonest business, fostering wanton neglect and abuse of property by unscrupulous tenants and breeding countless other evils. I and thousands other citizens here thank you for your courageous attempts to destroy this scourge.

J. S. ARNASON.

LOCKLAND, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Heartiest congratulations to a real American. Keep up the good work to get rid of the octopus. God and all true Americans are with you.

The KING, GROLL, OSTERMANN,
and ALMER FAMILIES.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I'm betting on you. Make that two-faced Chester Bowles resign. We are Texans too.

BATON ROUGE, LA.

NEWARK, N. J., *June 28, 1946*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
It's about time that someone spoke up so people can make their living. Thanks, Senator.

WILLIAM ORR.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight against OPA. Christian Americans are praying for your success, and we will make ourselves felt against this communistic ideology in the coming and all future elections until the America we have fought for is free again.

WALTER A. WOOD MEADOR.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Give us back our freedom. Keep up the filibuster. God give you strength, citizen.

ADELE RAKLE.

ELKHART, IND., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I am a Republican. Your statement which appeared in this morning's issue of the Chicago Tribune is about the most American statement that has emanated from the Democratic Party. May I offer you my congratulations?

OTIS B. FIELD.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stick violently by your guns, Senator. Slay the Moscow reptile, OPA. Save our competitive system and our American freedoms. Away with New Deal despotism and regimentation. Filibuster them to an ignominious death. Foil the treacherous schemes of our enemies and be the Nation's liberator. God with you for victory.

MARIE I. BROWN
(An American consumer).

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Seldom a day passes in our country towns or our cities that I do not hear someone say, "I used to be against O'DANIEL, but now I see he has taken the stand against the PAC, etc., and for the people. Therefore, I am for him for any office he may choose and only wish we had more men like him instead of the Fascist dictators we now have." More power to you.

PAUL MAUNDE,
Retired Druggist.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
House of Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Red-blooded American. Rather live in tent with bread and water than in luxury bought at price of freedom. Our last hope rests with you. "Give me liberty or * * *."

ALMA THOMPSON.

PASADENA, CALIF., *June 82, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
In the name of justice emphatically demand California Senators aid your OPA filibuster.

ARTHUR G. BAKER.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. Kill the OPA. If not, only recourse is black market. Good-by our American way of free enterprise. OPA has utterly and miserably failed. Relegate it to the scrap pile and place necessary controls in hands of permanent Government departments where it will be properly administered.

SUPR SAVE MARKET.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We like your stand in regard OPA. Go to work.

CORPUS CHRISTI LUMBER CO.

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the filibuster, Pappy. Shortages of meat, steel, etc., are hard on returned veterans. My wife is from Texas, and we are all for you.

Ex-Lt. S. R. MEEK.

RUSTON, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight. Kill the OPA. They are killing the producers, causing black market. May God bless you.

COOK'S DAIRY.

PORTSMOUTH, VA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:
Thanks for your efforts to give us back a free America. Have requested BYRD to support you.

NORMAN W. PHILIPS.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Please accept my congratulations for statesmanship shown in your fight to rid the Nation of the strangling methods of OPA. Keep up your fight because we believe that if all of the wartime bureaus are abolished that our Nation can get into full production and within 6 months economic conditions will be improved instead of continuing chaotic, as they are today.

B. E. HEARN.

LITTLE VALLEY, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We have been following your fight against OPA very closely. Keep up the good work. Wish I could be there to help you.

J. B. F. CHAMPLIN,
President, Cattaraugus Cutlery Co.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Have courage and keep talking. As the owner of a large meat market, I know that the OPA does not and cannot control meat prices. The OPA only aids black markets. I am forced to close 3 and 4 days a week regularly as a result of it.

PETER CASPER,
Casper Meat Market.

WINSLOW, ARIZ., *June 28, 1946.*
Texas Senator Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch; you are a real American.

Mr. and Mrs. FRED AMES.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Go to it, Lee; all real Americans glory in your courage.

G. E. PITSCHKE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations from two California Republicans. Too bad we have not more men of your caliber. More power to you, sir.

FLORENCE and ARTHUR NEILSEN.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:
Here is praying you hold out. More power to you.

MARION HILL.

LYNBROOK, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight, Senator, and get out OPA dictators. Tired standing in line for an hour for a pound of chopped meat. Paying high price, it's half fat. We're sick of it. More power to your speech.

B. CAROLINE COLGAN.

DENVER, COLO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democrat, Texas,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Long of opinion OPA should terminate and natural economic laws function. Believe many of our opinions had been reticent to speak up. Keep fighting.

GEORGE W. MASTEN, Jr.
GEORGE C. HAHN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 28, 1946*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Personal, Washington, D. C.:
I hope that you succeed in your wish to eliminate the OPA. America is tired of unnecessary restrictions. Stay with the job.

WALTER W. RIEHL.

PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE, *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Every sane American citizen will be eternally grateful to you, and hope you will succeed in paralyzing the OPA octopus. May God give you strength.

DR. LINDLEY DOBSON.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The people of Oregon are with you 100 percent. Keep talking; if short of material, wire Portland.

ARCHIE MANSFIELD.
ELMER BERGLAND.
BURTON COAM.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building:
More power to you in your stand against OPA and the continued regimentation of business when not necessary on behalf of the Montana Meat Packers Association. We back you 100 percent in your efforts to decontrol meat, dairy products, and poultry, and put these products through legitimate channels which is impossible under the OPA regulations as applied to the meat industry. I hope your strength holds out on this filibuster. God bless you.

THE MONTANA MEAT
PACKERS ASSOCIATION.
MATT BROWN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Glad to know there is one American left in our Government.

GEORGE P. KEARNEY.

OLEAN, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL:
Keep up the fine work on the floor. We're all behind you.

BLUE AND WHITE STORES,
M. J. LOSKEY.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:
Since a return to peacetime economy and the free enterprise system cannot be accomplished by continued Government controls and artificially regulated prices that are only holding essential commodities off the market

rather than preventing inflation, I register my opposition to the continuance of OPA. Keep America the land of the free.

ELBERT D. JONES.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand of talking on Senate floor until OPA expires. While the over-all purpose of the OPA to keep down prices was commendable, its administration has been disembodied, un-American, and absolutely impractical, and is the root of most of our present difficulties. Fighting is over; let's remove all wartime restrictions and start to live like we used to.

L. H. PRICE.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

It is an honor for every good American citizen to have a Senator like you in the White House. Wishing you success in your efforts to abolish the OPA, which is against justice and liberty.

HARRY SIEGEL.

LANSING, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We sincerely hope you succeed in killing OPA. Many of your friends feel the same way. Property ownership has become a hardship. Landlords have nothing to say about their own property rights; the tenants are the only ones OPA will listen to. More power to you; best regards.

EDRIE FINDSEN,
Seventh Ward Democratic Chairman.

GAINESVILLE, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator "PAPPY" O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:

Power to you, Senator. Keep up the good work.

A. L. JUNEAU.

BOSTON, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your determination, as reported in the Boston newspapers, to defend America against the continuation of the OPA, which has Europeanized America to a point where we have a meat famine, a housing famine, a butter famine, a shirt famine, and one has to violate the law in order to buy a pound of butter or a loaf of bread. Friends and foes of OPA alike can find nothing to point to as causing these famines in everyday things, in our splendidly productive country, except the OPA itself.

Up here, the OPA benefits only the rich. People with money to give need only pay small amounts, under present ceiling prices, to purchase the products of working people who have only their labor to sell. And working people with only their labor to sell find they can only receive small amounts in prices for their products, under OPA ceilings, from purchasers who have the money to spend. Under price ceilings, people pay high in labor for the money they get for their products, and people pay low in money for the other fellow's labor and products. Meanwhile, the working people, managers and purchasers, are flypapered down and shortages result because nobody can do anything without the say-so of some nonproducer in Washington.

The Puritan magistrates in the Massachusetts Bay Colony at the time of King Charles II tried price ceilings on men's labor and products, but the plain people revolted and Massachusetts went ahead again.

Wouldn't it be wonderful to get back to a free, prosperous, and secure America and regain freedom to make our own prices and wages and to produce the ordinary things for our houses and tables in a plentiful, economical way and send the OPA back to the tomb of Hitler and Mussolini, who were the first to bring totalitarian wage and price control on us in this generation?

Everybody here is for the removal of OPA except those who have been poisoned by the prattle of paid radio propagandists peddling perfidious bureaucrats' paralyzing policies.

JOSEPH LEE,
National Committeeman from Massachusetts on American Democratic National Committee.

DAVENPORT, IOWA, *June 27, 1946.*

W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Wishing you success and keep fighting. Thousands in the Midwest are pulling for you. If petitions with signatures would help, will forward the same.

R. H. Elliott, J. W. Mohr, A. E. Larson, Ed Westphal, Ross Wyoke, W. E. Dohrn, *Rock Island, Ill.*

GAINESVILLE, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator "PAPPY" O'DANIEL, *of Texas,*
Washington, D. C.:

Power to you, Senator; keep up the good work.

A. L. JUNEAU.

YAKIMA, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Senate building, Washington, D. C.:

Since packers' meat prices were rolled back the end of 1942 by OPA, also due to three times former expense of labor and enormous losses from inefficient labor, also due to double the expense of hay, feed, pastures, and supplies, we have been forced to reduce our sheep and lamb operation by several thousand head. We also have a lot of sows just farrowing. Due to low OPA ceiling on pork and lard, and high cost of feed, labor, and pasture, we expect to kill and plow under 70 of these young pigs, unless relief offered from OPA. Understand most hog raisers throughout country contemplate doing the same. It is useless to start these pigs out with economic waste to finish them staring us in the face. We also have several hundred head high-quality Hereford cows, calves, and steers we expect to liquidate with our sheep and hogs unless unjust OPA ceilings are removed. If removed there is more than ample live meat supply in this country, especially beef, to regulate itself on a slightly higher basis. While so far we have always operated legitimately, if we are forced to go out of livestock business to save from as much loss as possible, we shall probably have to contact black-market operators and become criminals.

COFFIN BROS.
COFFIN SHEEP CO.
H. STANLEY COFFIN.

CULVER CITY, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

We are 100 percent supporting your program.

HAROLD LANDLEY.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep that filibuster going. America is behind you.

ATLAS AUTO SALES.

BEAR, DEL., *June 28, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Senator O'DANIEL you are like myself. You are a true American. I hope you win. May I have the pleasure to meet you sometime? May your strength hold out for the good of America.

E. C. BROWN.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your fight for complete retirement of the OPA is what every right-thinking citizen wants. Rent control on residences and no limit on commercial rents is enough evidence that they are inconsistent with their rules. The people handle their own postwar problems in their own individual way. Wake the Senators up before it's too late.

WM. P. LANDFIELD.

PASADENA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building:

Congratulations on filibuster. May you succeed in your heroic effort to end OPA.

H. W. CLAWSON.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations. Your action depicts democracy. Let's have more of it.

R. CECIL BENDER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*

Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

God bless you and give you strength to carry out your plans to kill the OPA and give us control of our property. You are a real American with red blood in your veins. Loads of the people we elect are a bunch of politicians who have no regard for the poor property owner.

ALTA SCHURTZ.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA., *June 28, 1946.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Millions of genuine Americans, those who have honestly and laboriously created and acquired and those who are now working, sweating, and humble look upon you as a leader possessing that today rare intestinal fortitude so necessary in these darkest hours to kill OPA forever and bring back to us our rightful heritage and freedom. The OPA personnel for the most part are autocratic, insolent, offensive, rude, parasitic, and communistic—a gang of storm troopers who invade your property, your home, and murder your rights as an American citizen, an increasing colony of termites or leeches devoid of honest energy and red blood.

JAMES C. HOWELL, *Taxpayer.*

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate of United States,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work, don't stop. None but a Texan could do it, don't stop. This may make you President, don't stop.

WOLFE HOTEL,
QUAKER HOTEL,
PURITAN HOTEL,
Hollywood, Calif.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep it up, you are a real American. From a real American.

FRANK W. CLARK,
Los Angeles Country Club,
Los Angeles, Calif.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
United States Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.:

Am also sending telegram tonight to Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, who attended University of Nevada with my mother. Requesting him to hand to you an 11-page letter written to him, dated May 17, telling of our trouble with OPA as Los Angeles landlords. I thought you may be able to use my Saga of a Bereaved American Citizen's Persecution Under OPA, representative of the feeling of the majority of the American people. I can assure you let me shout my heartfelt praise to you for your good American conclusions and your courage. Keep up your good fight for God's sake; God is freedom.

MARY T. VOIGHT.

NEWARK, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Your stand against OPA extension is the act of a true American. The thinking people of the Nation are with you.

A. L. PALMER.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulate you on your stand against the extension of price control. Sooner or later this evil bureau must pass into oblivion. Why not now? To prolong it means breathing more life into black market.

J. S. BAILEY, Jr.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are 100 percent back of you in your filibuster and are asking our Senators MOORE and THOMAS of Oklahoma to give you their support.

TULSA USED CAR DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
R. N. MILLER, *Vice president.*

TROY, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Meat packers, retailers, and producers in our section of Ohio are 100 percent in agreement with your attempt to block passage of proposed OPA extension bill, enabling that bureau to continue unfair controls over livestock slaughter and production. Your stand in this controversy is our last ray of hope that an impossible situation may finally be corrected.

THE BRAUN BROS. PACKING CO.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Many thanks for your valiant effort to restore the American way of life.

M. V. BOTHWELL.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Lo, a Daniel has arisen. A real statesman and patriot has emerged from the halls of mediocrity. You are doing a fine job. Keep it up, I am sick of the OPA tomfoolery and its commissars. Get them out together with the grafting black marketeers. Revise the American way of life. Let supply and demand operate as it will. Take our necks out of the OPA yoke.

FRANK STARR.

PEORIA, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations to you for trying to save this country for the people. You are my only Democrat.

M. A. LANGSTON.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

We are for you 100 percent. Keep on talking. Texas is behind you.

MRS. W. B. MCBEE.

DALEY CITY, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Continue good work. Kill OPA.

RENSTERMAKER, MCKAY & PACKER.

COLUMBUS, IND., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Best regards in your fight against the industrial menace.

H. D. ADAMS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations for your last-ditch fight to save our American system. Suggest you ask for bodyguards to protect you from the hundreds of thousands of gangsters and hoodlums who cannot afford to let you end their OPA rackets. Prohibition was like a Sunday-school picnic when compared with present-day bootlegging.

JOHN B. MCCRADY.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. We need more men like you who have the guts to fight for the freedom we're all entitled to. Keep it up. Best wishes.

JOE FALES.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Keep the filibuster going. You can't imagine how happy we are to know there is one man in the United States Senate who is 100 percent red-blooded American. We wish you success in ousting OPA and all the other bureaus.

SUPER AUTO SALES.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

We of the Panhandle Livestock Association are behind your move to add meat and livestock to the OPA abolishment list.

Sincerely,

J. M. WEYMOUTH,
President, Panhandle Livestock Association.

AKRON, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE (PAPPY) O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Stick to your guns, Pappy. Bust the OPA wide open. Let them know it's a real racket legalized by the Government in Washington. You'll have backing of all ex-GI's.

EDWARD G. MAXIM,
An Ex-Prisoner of Japan.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Keep up filibuster. God bless you in your work.

HOUSEWIFE.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:

Give them heck, Senator. We are ex-GI. We are small businessmen. We are still Americans. We agree with you, we don't like OPA. More power to you today. Give them heck again.

Private BOURASSA.

DENVER, COLO., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

America needs more men like you. Keep up the good works. Here's hoping you sink OPA.

FRANK, GLADYES, and ELIZABETH TAYLOR.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Press dispatches indicate you are waging a mighty battle against price-control extension. More power to you. However if price control is extended, lumbermen will appreciate your influence to insure for wholesalers and distributors the same protection Taft amendments provide for manufacturers and processors. The Wherry, Capehart, and Wolcott amendment made this provision but Senate-House conferees were indefinite. Unless corrected by allowing wholesalers and distributors their historic margins this segment of industry faces disaster. Your interest in our cause will be much appreciated.

LEGISLATION COMMITTEE, THE CINCINNATI LUMBERMEN'S CLUB.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Stick to it and kill the OPA. Only increased production and corresponding taxation can stop inflation. People must go to work and produce goods to make business or go hungry. We cannot get farm equipment.

W. R. O'BRIEN.
ST. JOE, MICH.

COLUMBUS, GA., *June 28, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Apparently the black market is operated by the OPA. It seems that since OPA came into power certain people would buy stock in such things as shoes, sugar, or wheat, then have the OPA announce the product to be rationed at some definite date. Results are that millions of people have purchased unnecessary commodities. If anyone tells you that prices are in line with what they claim that person is either misinformed or lying. Honest merchants with quality merchandise are forced out of business. Cheap, chiseling wartime factories are permitted to flood the markets at enormous prices. The OPA has taken competition out of business and is encouraging our people to be dishonest. Humbly suggest you either discontinue OPA or replace them with men who will and can handle situation like it should be done. The OPA price on dime-store shirts originally sold $1.19, now $4.95; handkerchiefs were 5 cents, now 25 cents; beer, 10 cents, now 25 cents; automobiles, $100, now $600. Since everything is out of their control, why pay half million people our good money to promote dishonesty?

Regards.

CLARENCE WEEKS.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work. We are all with you.

FRANK PUSEY.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I am with you in your fight against OPA. I consider it un-American.
Mrs. LEE WALKER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep your filibuster going. America needs more men like you. We want freedom. Keep going.
H. J. FLECK.

TULSA, OKLA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please oppose OPA extension. Save our Government that big expense. Didn't have OPA after last World War. We sure don't need it now. Millions feel as I do—just neglect to write you. Hold the floor; keep on talking until midnight, June 30. I pray you Americans will stamp out dictation.
Mrs. JACOBS.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care of United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Your courage at this hour of destiny is admired and condoned by all true Americans.
W. SEFTON.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Power to you. The eyes of Texas are upon you, and 90 percent are for you.
C. E. KING.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
More power and good wishes. Kill all Government regulations. Enforce antimonopoly laws against capital and labor. Let supply, demand, and service take care of economy.
FLOP HOUSE, ROOM 142.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Boy, I am for you; steam the New Dealers out.
CHAS. M. SUMMERS.

INGLEWOOD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster against the OPA.
Mr. and Mrs. C. MUHLHAUSER.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Thousands here agree with you. OPA is unconstitutional, undemocratic, and communistic. Glamour boys, Bowles and Porter, have had the floor long enough. Keep talking, brother.
E. ROSALYNE HEARD.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep talking and kill the OPA once and for all. Property owners of Santa Monica, Calif., are all pulling for your success.
HARRY P. TALBOT.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator PAPPY O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for your fight against a hypocritical bureaucracy which, while claiming to fight for the American way and the Four Feedoms, forbids the sending of American newspapers and magazines to the American zones in Germany even as filler scrap in relief parcels, evidently considering every American newspaper or magazine as subversive. A few more years and we will all be subversive for daring to think.
FREDERICK G. HEHR.

MALIBU, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you. Support you 100 percent. Let's kill the OPA once and for all, so we can get back to normal supply and demand.
MACNICOL and MAJOR ULRICH.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
One hundred million fellow citizens unite in praying for the termination of OPA forthwith. Twenty million taxpaying property owners have been and are being mercilessly reduced to poverty. Your reward and gratitude from a grateful nation cannot be estimated.
C. G. EDWARDS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Filibuster OPA out and their gestapo methods. Keep going, we are with you. America needs you.
FLECKS USED CARS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I hope you have success in ridding the country of OPA. Good luck.
PHILIP GILLESPIE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We are right behind you. Don't stop talking.
MURPHY MOTORS.
J. W. NEAL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Splendid work. Every red-blooded American is with you.
DON WADDELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Good luck, "Pappy."
E. B. HALL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You are supporting millions of Americans. We depend on you and thank you.
L. W. MCGOWAN.

PALMDALE, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. I hope you win.
EDGAR LEPAGE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. We are depending on you to put OPA in discard. My earnest request is that you do all in your power to knock out OPA.
ALPHA M. DRAPER.

LYNN, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Wake up America. The OPA rent control has lived its life. In my opinion, it has catered to the bad actors. Its acts unconstitutional, brazen, willful, and criminal.
HOWARD F. GILBRIDE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You are making history. Let's get back to Americanism. Best regards.
J. H. HALES.

SEWICKLEY, PA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
If you could arrange for help in your "talkaphon" program to kick the OPA out of the window you would go down in history as a great man. I have influence in Texas and will see that you are backed up in the future to the limit.
JAMES H. CHILDS,
President of Four Corporations.

JAMAICA, N. Y., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:
Break the OPA deadlock. Return America to free enterprise and let's get going to the ideals we once knew.
IRENE and GEORGE DOUGLAS.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
The end of OPA means freedom once again.
GENE TOLOMER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United State Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Good work and more power to you. Do away with OPA and you will see prices fall in short order. We already have inflation, why kid ourselves? With OPA out of the picture, competition between merchants will be revived and prices drop—not rise. Just a corner druggist.
D. J. ORTMAN.

AKRON, OHIO, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
The Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. We have at least one man in our Senate with a backbone. Wish you success.
FERRIS SCOTT,
Member, Home Owners League.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and fight. You are a great statesman.
T. B. LYNES.

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
The Honorable W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Livestock producers this area very angry. Feel have been let down, threatening discon-

tinue raising cattle, hogs, receipts livestock at this market estimated next week very slim and this company on verge of closing completely next week through lack of livestock to kill or raw material to manufacture. If the packing industry, one of the country's largest, is not to be destroyed and its business turned over to black marketeers, it is absolutely essential that price control be eliminated. You are familiar with the intolerable conditions, and we appreciate the support you have given us. We hope for your continued support to effect decontrol of livestock and meat.

HUNTER PACKING CO.,
FRANK A. HUNTER, Jr., *President*.

DAWSON, ILL., *June 27, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democrat of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
For God's sake, save America.

ERNEST SAUERS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the great fight and give Americans a chance to recover.

ROBERT S. BURNS.

CLARKSBURG, W. VA., *June 27, 1946*.
Senator WILBERT LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill OPA, then we will again be American citizens. Thank you.

HARLEY W. HARMER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL OF TEXAS,
The Senate Chamber, Capitol Building,
Washington, D, C.:
Our friends and I of San Antonio certainly appreciate your efforts in our behalf against OPA.

A. J. SWEARINGEN.

BELMONT, MASS., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Read Bill of Rights, Gettysburg Address, Boston Tea Party. The Revolution started in Boston. Cheers for you.

BARBARA FRITCHIE.

EL MONTE, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight. Let's give the American way a chance again.

POPPY FOOD PRODUCTS CO.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Keep it up.

WILLIAM H. BREVORT, Jr.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Nation is indebted to you beyond expression for courageous filibuster to abolish OPA, breeder of rackets and black markets. Return America to the Americans.

CHAS. B. JUSTICE.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR O'DANIEL: Congratulations on your OPA fight. God bless you forever. I'll vote for you anytime.

IRENE M. FRANKS.

SPRINGFIELD, MO., *June 28, 1946*.
United States Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there; prevail on other Senators if help needed.

J. L. COLEY.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I think and believe you do. OPA headquarters most business antitrust enforcement. If you can stay awake, you should lead America to freedom. Excuse me, but all of you should be running the Government, not business. You have taken us to capital or labor; better back off from both—remember Germany. OPA closed plenty business places. Last ruling closing 300,000 retail lumber yards account 60 percent manufacturing going retail. Thirty percent advance for manufacturing. American and business housing bridled by local retail lumber yards now out thinking they could still get job done. Doubtful about OPA doing if spending five billion, and might be good example most businesses.

NELSON DAY COMMERCIAL LUMBER CO.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Intelligent Texans as a whole are 100 percent with you in your stand against OPA. Fight hard. May God bless you.

JEWELL MCANELLY.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Nearly 4 years infantry overseas. OPA refused possession my own house, bought with combat pay, not GI loan. Where is the freedom I fought for and my buddies died for? With OPA, America no longer place for freeman stand.

Capt. JOHN MCDOWEN.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the filibuster and God be with you.

A BUSINESS WOMAN.

MONTEBELLO, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster. Let's do try to return to the American way of living. Success to you.

Mr. and Mrs. LORY KING.
Mr. and Mrs. O. M. TROMPETER.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Keep up the good work. Honest Americans are behind you. God bless you.

CELESTE and HARRY A. SALLO.

SANTA ANA, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Best of luck to a Texan who is willing to fight. Kill the OPA. We are behind you.

JACK V. CLABORN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You're of the stuff that made America great. I would almost move from California to Texas to vote for a man with your courage.

AN AMERICAN.

PEORIA, ILL., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
In spite of the fact we were already paying our janitress double the amount another janitor received for like services in same block, OPA rent control ordered us to increase her wages $3 a week, retroactive to last October. This is beyond their jurisdiction but they did it, showing if you give them an inch they will take a mile to cut our throats. At 103 Louisa Street, Peoria, less than a block from church, fine stores, transportation, etc., we recently finished a nice living apartment, all painted and stained, new linoleum cemented to floor, good furniture, furnished all utilities, including water for toilet and other uses, gas and electricity paid for by us and we charge a veteran and his family only $7 a week rent, but rent director ordered us down to $4. This is only two of the many abuses handed us. Life is almost unbearable. We appreciate your effort to end OPA. May God help you. Read this on the floor if you wish.

NIERSTHEIMER & HELLYER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
More glory to you. Down with the OPA and black market.

DETROIT GRIFFITH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and pitch.

D. B. MCDANIEL,
Houston, Tex.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Need more men like you to adjust America's future life. Open their eyes to what lies ahead. It is a wonderful thing you are doing. We back you to the limit.

UNION CAR MARKET.

CAMBRIDGE, MD., *June 28, 1946*.
Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
We retail grocers have ridden the toe of OPA since origin—kill it.

LUTHER A. PARKS,
President, Retail Grocers Association.

DAVENPORT, IOWA, *June 27, 1946*.
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
We and thousands more in the Midwest are for you, Senator. Keep on fighting. Wishing you success. If petition with signatures would be helpful, will forward same.

Fred A. Berger, Attorney; V. J. Ciesielski, Restaurant; Glen Griffin, Baker; Frank Palmer, Restaurant; Herman Farber, Wholesale Grocer; R. A. Lindberg, Auto Dealer; R. S. Little, Tax Consultant.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.
Keep fighting, Texan. If you kill OPA you will do as much for our country as Washington did by defeating the British.

J. G. YANCEY.

ALPINE, TEX., *June 27, 1946*.
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Stop OPA at all costs. I am for you. Filibuster or what have you.

R. W. CASTLEBERRY,
County Attorney, Fort Davis, Tex.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We are for you 100 percent your stand OPA. Go to work.
D. D. FRAZIER.

EVANSTON, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
God speed you to success in the complete elimination of the OPA testified by the inviolability of the law of supply and demand. Get Bilbo to help. Keep up your 100-percent Americanism to the entire restoration of the Government to the people.
OLIVER L. BEAR.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
May you and your truly American Senators be given strength and courage to fight OPA until it has been wiped clean from our statutes and we can again live as free men.
W. S. RATTRAY.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your proposed filibuster or any method you may use to rid this country of the OPA and any other restricting agency.
A. M. BOSWORTH.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *June 27, 1946.*
United States Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Don't give up the fight—Nevada with you.
HERMAN HOFFMAN.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you a million for your untiring efforts to bestow on this country its legal rights by stopping OPA. What our Congress needs is a whole lot more real Americans like you and Senator MOORE. Hope you are 100 percent successful in your efforts. More power to you and may God bless you.
Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR H. FABER.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The hopes and prayers of many property owners in our city and county are with you in your courageous fight to kill OPA and give America back to the American people.
EDWARD A. KELLY.

QUINCY, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations. Hope Senator WHERRY and others will join you in filibustering OPA out of Government agency by midnight Sunday.
FRANK H. WHEELER.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
A representative government demands representatives who abolish government control.
ALFRED MICHEL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you and WHERRY carry on talkathon until July 4. Sad situation when homeowner can't get possession of his own property or must keep undesirable tenants for 6 months because "Chessie" Bowles, OPA bureaucrat, says so.
FRANK I. HOGAN.
HUNTINGTON PARK, CALIF.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I am 100 percent behind you. Do keep up the good work.
ALA BONNER.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your valiant fight against continuance of OPA. Your efforts merit strongest support from fellow congressional Members.
JOHN M. MCCOY.

MCALESTER, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Hold your friends together and free the American people and be the best loved and respected man in America by the leading people.
Dr. J. C. BENTLEY.

CUERO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Stop OPA. Get them out of lumber, hardware, and other lines of business and the businessmen of the United States will get the job done in the proper manner and will only ask a legitimate profit. Businessmen of the United States are not liars and thieves. If the President would call in the main manufacturers, ask them to make only a fair profit, I know they would do it, and the small businessman would do the same. Stop OPA any way you can and you will be the "man of the hour."
J. T. NEWMAN & SONS.
NEWMAN-MARQUIS HARDWARE CO.
CUERO BUILDING CO.
J. T. NEWMAN, *Mayor, City of Cuero.*

AKRON, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: Keep it up if you can. Millions of good Americans will thank you for ridding the country of this darn communistic OPA. Thank you.
NED MARTIN.

GLENDALE, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Millions of Americans like ourselves are hoping that you have strength and courage to carry on to the final destruction of OPA.
R. P. CURTIS.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
Stay with them, Pappy. Let's have more of American democracy.
H. A. REYNOLDS.
HELEN L. BROWN.

MARSHALL, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep on fighting as the OPA is sure destroying our country. We want the American way of living and not dictatorship.
Mrs. VINCENT ZULL.

LOS ANGELES, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
My prayers are with you to free us from this octopus-parasite affinity. You will go down in history as our liberator. Breaking bonds of limit, OPA has killed our business, robbed us of our home, reduced income from $600 per week to $60 per month. Insults, months of muddling waits.
MABEL MINOR.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Please keep up the good work you are fighting for. Down with the OPA. We are behind you 100 percent here in Cincinnati.
F. P. MCGEE.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill the OPA. It has made crooks of honest people, also hampered full production. Keep up the filibuster.
Yours truly,
J. N. NORWOOD.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Our prayers and hopes are with you in your fight to eliminate OPA for all time. The dawn of a new day will arise upon the American people when the shackles of bureaucracy have been removed and free enterprise restored.
J. H. THORNBER.

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
Hoping you and your colleagues will be able to hold out until the OPA expires, so competition will regulate prices as of old.
RUSSEL L. PRUDIE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
You have the profound respect, admiration, and sympathy of millions of Americans. They, too, are tragically aware that constitutional government is on trial. The sacred traditions of free men and the intellectual integrity of their public servants should transcend in importance any and all considerations of unenforceable price control. It is inconceivable that Congress will knowingly condone a continuation of the inexcusable and disgraceful abuse of administrative power which has characterized OPA since its inception. The letters "OPA" have of late taken on a new significance more accurately defined as "obnoxious political appeasement," calculated to exploit the political support of the less fortunate by appealing to their frugality. It is an edifying spectacle to find a man who alone is determined to stand by principle as against political expediency. No one can question your sincerity and integrity.
C. F. HUTCHES.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You have our best wishes and prayers in your fight to rid our Nation from the OPA monstrosity.
LULA KAMP.

AURORA, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL, OF TEXAS,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR: More power to you. Break this crazy regimentation and the eyes of the Nation will be on you to be our next President. Read this telegram from the floor.
Your ardent supporter,
GEO. B. GELAKOSKI.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God we have men from Texas representing Texas, with convictions as strong as yours. Keep up the filibuster until all Government bodies recognize we do have a Constitution in the United States.
GEO. E. ROSS.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Our prayers are with you as you follow your righteous and just convictions.
ROSS A. COLE.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I am for you. Hope you win. Praying for you.
BETTIE KAMP.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:
No one in Nation has shown democratic spirit as yours. Agree that OPA end will bring full freedom and free economy. Hope our trembling country has stamina to endure crisis before returned health.
FRANCIS MUSIC.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God we have one real American in Washington.
WILLIAM L. PEDICORT AND PARTY.

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
May God help you in your patriotic effort to end the vicious and destructive Office of Price Administration.
ALFRED K. HIGGINS.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
We are for you 100 percent. Keep on talking, Texas is behind you.
MRS. W. CURTIS DE WARE.

GUNTERSVILLE, ALA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Talk a week; that will be one time you are talking for the common man.
M. F. ELROD,
Commander, Post No. 8, American Legion.

MIAMI, FLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Dear Senator, we the people of the United States should all appreciate the great service you are trying to render us, and I assure you many do. May the good Lord give you strength to carry it through to victory. O'DANIEL for President should be our motto.
J. FRANCIS WILLIAMS.

CANTON, OHIO, *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Every Senator, deep in his heart, knows you speak the truth about OPA. You are the only Senator with courage enough to stand on your hind feet and speak the truth. If you could defeat OPA bodily you would be the biggest man in America. More power to you.
C. S. BOLENDER.

BRENTWOOD, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your lone fight for our constitutional rights has given me the first ray of hope that the American flag may again proudly wave over the land of the free and the home of the brave.
MRS. I. R. GAERTNER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I have been in the business of publishing lumber market information here for 25 years. If you wish to confirm this suggest you call Congressman ELLSWORTH who is well acquainted with me and my business. What I want to say is this: OPA has turned loose a propaganda program here in the Northwest today wherein they are trying to create the impression that the Northwest lumber industry, as a whole, has been violating major provisions of OPA ceilings and that their attitude in general has resulted in holding down the production of lumber which could otherwise be going to GI's for home building. Nothing could be further from the truth. I have made a careful study of the propaganda issued today and I am convinced that making liberal allowance there is not over 1 percent of the alleged charges which they make that have any foundation whatever, or could be prosecuted to a successful conclusion. They have purposely selected well known concerns and announced that they are suing them for triple damages on imaginary violations which they know do not exist. The facts are the OPA with its duplicity of complicated and impractical rulings has our lumber industry in such a position that the OPA itself is today the greatest encumbrance to a maximum output of timber products of all kinds. I note in Washington press report today you are considering taking steps necessary to allow this measure to die Sunday night. May I say to you as one American citizen to another that you could perform no greater service for your country as a whole.
C. C. CROW,
Editor and Publisher, Crows Pacific Coast Lumber Digest.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Have talked to lots of Dallas people today, and they are proud of your stand against the OPA. Do hope you can filibuster the darn nuisance out of existence.
The WHOLE DAVIS FAMILY (OF SIX)
HENRY R. DAVIS.

SALEM, OREG., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the fight for freedom. America needs it.
E. W. HARLAND.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your courageous fight against the most warped and unfair bureaucrat of them all. If you kill the OPA, you will be the most popular man in Arizona as well as in Texas.
BOB BARBER,
Native Texan and Practicing Attorney and Present Member of the State Legislature of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God, there are a few Americans left with some guts. More power to your effort to let the oppressive OPA die.
E. G. BECK.

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster. A careful canvass of some 600 of our wholesale customers scattered throughout 30 States indicates that they and their thousands of customers feel very strongly that all controls on meat, poultry, and dairy products should be removed as soon as possible and hope that some bill can be put through removing those controls.
ULTRA LIFE LABORATORIES, INC.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Let Monday, July 1, 1946, be celebrated by the American people as another day of independence. God give us more patriots like O'Daniel.
D. G. RIDGEWAY.
E. C. SPENNY.
HOWARD NEWCOMB.

ODESSA, TEX., *June 27, 1496.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I glory in your spunk for what you are doing. Am 100 percent agreement in your opinion of OPA.
J. J. WILLIS.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep on talking and get rid of OPA.
VICTOR MILLMAN.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
On with filibuster. We are behind you 100 percent.
L. Z. BROWN.
GAYLE WALKER.
DEAN KNIGHT.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your stand against OPA is the greatest act of your successful political career. Congratulations.
WALTER A. IRWIN.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We small meat dealers are in this fight with you all of the way. Stay in there and pitch. Do all in your power to kill OPA so that the people can get the things that they need.
EUGENIA MARKET.
ED GOLDMAN.

COLOMA, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Can get 100 signatures in 1 day to kill OPA. Houses being held from rent. Lumber cannot be manufactured at ceiling.
PERLEY D. PITCHER.

SILVERTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Your position concerning OPA meets my approval 100 percent and I'm a very small farmer.
WM. PEAUGH.

DENVER, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
As a freedom-loving citizen I glory in your courage and pray that your strength shall be preserved to defeat the forces trying to destroy our great country.
GEORGE E. ROBERTSON.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We greatly appreciate the fight you are making against OPA and we will back you up.
WARD ORSINGER.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and more power to you and all associated with you in your filibuster against the OPA, the most un-American monstrosity ever fostered upon the American people. A 68-year-old American citizen born and raised in America with no group nor union affiliation takes his hat off to you. Keep talking until the Bowles' gang hoists the white flag.
J. J. HORSELY.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Hurrah. Kill OPA if for no other reason just to prove that all the dire things predicted by the administration will not happen. The American people have forgotten how to be free. Make them self-reliant in spite of themselves by ousting the whole OPA set-up.
EDWARD N. MARCUS.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Good work. What this country needs is more Senators like you.
WESLEY GILLILAND.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senator of Texas,
Washington, D. C.:
Stay in there and fight this un-American fifth column Gestapo. Chester Bowles, give America back to the people.
LEE JENKINS.

BASTROP, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Americans want democracy and not a Gestapo. Fight hard to kill OPA. The people are backing you.
DURANT BELL.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Wish I could help you filibuster. End OPA.
LYDA H. WADE.

DANVILLE, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
What you are doing is the only justice to the citizens of the United States and the world. All producers, merchants, and that part of labor with sense are all on your side. Don't fail. Keep talking.
T. H. STULTZ.

SAYRE, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
We undersigned meat and poultry dealers in Sayre, Okla., and vicinity commend your stand on opposition to further OPA regulation of meat and poultry prices. Unless these regulations are repealed many meat and poultry dealers, even in this area of plenty meat and poultry, will have to go out of business.

Sayre Butchering Co.; United Grocery Co.; Furr Food; Phillips Food Market; J. T. Brown & Son; Hostetler Hatchery; Sayre Hatchery; Buck Wright Produce; Danner V. Fushs; Elder Market Grocery; Austin Cochran, manager; E. C. Mills; Pucketts Food Store; Phillip W. Andrews, owner; J. F. Brown, Jr.; C. R. Kimberlin; Jack Littlefield; Ivesters Grocery & Market.

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Your fight against OPA commendable. Please don't fail. After you win, let's hope America will awaken and elect responsible men like yourself, thus eliminating racketeers.
Dr. and Mrs. HURD.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you do filibuster the OPA out of existence. Let's have some sane government in the future.
J. C. LANE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:
Your fight against OPA typifies the spirit of free America. Congratulations and success.
Dr. FRANCIS B. QUINN.

MCALESTER, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I mean free the American people of OPA and gain admiration of all good people as leading man in America.
Dr. J. C. BENTLEY.

BOSTON, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your courage to eliminate the Bowles OPA. You are the only man with courage to stand against it. The politicians naturally want it, including Bowles.
FRANCIS HASTINGS.

HEREFORD, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We are for you in your fight against the OPA and all other organizations which deprive the people of their freedom. Any help we can be to you we will do so.
J. A. PITMAN.

DANVILLE, VA., *June 27, 1946.*
LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your opinions of OPA are shared by producers, livestock raisers, as well as the informed public of this section of Virginia and North Carolina. Unless controls are removed from produce, livestock, poultry, and dairy products, production will continue to decrease. This is my opinion from contact with a large part of the producers of the Piedmont section of Virginia and North Carolina.
DANVILLE LIVESTOCK AUCTION MARKET, INC.,
C. C. FINCH, *Manager.*

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas, Washington, D. C.:
The OPA is no doubt wrecking this great country and I appreciate the fact that you are fighting bureaucracy, but I am afraid if you filibuster against the OPA bill now before the Senate, and succeed in letting the bill die at the end of the month, that Congress will, in retaliation, write a more unjust bill than the one now being acted upon. I sincerely hope you will consider this matter in every way before taking action.
H. R. CULLENOPA.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations and success on your OPA filibuster.
Mr. and Mrs. E. F. LOONNIE.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
As one of the directors of the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association I appreciate and favor your fight against the continuation of OPA and am in favor of filibuster you are now waging.
V. W. FROST.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your courageous move to abolish OPA by filibuster.
Mr. and Mrs. L. A. WILLIAMS.

MORRO BAY, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
OPA is wrecking the country. Keep up your good work.
EDITH S. NOYES.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:
Hundreds of local Americans will not forget the man who fought to free this country of its most un-American controls, nor forgive those whose selfish political interests prompted them to work for its retention in the face of growing industrial paralysis and its inevitable byproduct inflation. On the verge of commercial ruin Americans are losing faith and patience as never before. They are watching and remembering.
FREDRICK C. LEWIS.

HONOLULU, VIA GLOBE, *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
Millions of American citizens applauding your courageous fight to kill crime breeding and dishonest propaganda factory presently foistered on Nation in name of price control.
ROBERT BENSON.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you hold out as planned, for your success means that there will be 5,000 houses and apartments for rent in Dallas when there is no more OPA. Thanking you very much for your efforts,
Yours very truly,
J. J. WOMACK.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We compliment you upon your stand against OPA and other autocratic bureaus. Stay in there and pitch.
C. A. MOHRLE.

LOUISVILLE, KY., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Kill the whole OPA, especially rent control. Very few people are for it after they understand how it operates.
W. F. HAAS.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Vote-seekers, parasites, and its pay roll want OPA. I am only a common laborer, family of five, but willing to take chance with other freemen. Stay with us.
FRED and JEWELL BAILEY.

CULVER CITY, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.
MY DEAR COUNTRYMAN: If you can save America and the Constitution that stands for the right to competitive bargaining, the Bill of Rights, justice, and freedom for all, you will be the greatest emancipator since Abraham Lincoln. I am a persecuted property owner working 15 hours a day, so that OPA can keep one of their high salaried sympathizers in my low-priced 5-room apartment at $23 a month. All alone, I picketed the Broadway Emporium of the OPA protesting their putrid Nazi Bund but suffered their means of exploiting their ire against freedom of speech and the right to picket. If you can save America now you will save it for many years.
JUNE C. BUNCHE.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank God for the heroic stand you have taken on the OPA matter. Let us get back to the real American plan of living.
HUBERT W. SWENDER.

MISSOULA, MONT., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your foresight and more power to you on your fight against OPA bill. Can we help you in any way?
MISSOULA MERCANTILE CO.,
W. J. HOWELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
More power to you, fellow. Keep up the good work. We are all for you.
LOS ANGELES COUNTRY CLUB,
L. C. WORMAN, *Toledo, Ohio.*

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
The eyes of Texas are upon you as well as the eyes of the world. You have been a man in every sense of the word during your term of office. Don't let down now to the Communist and the idiots. Stay in there and pitch.
G. D. WILLIAMS.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work of the filibuster. Standing by you to break the OPA. From a GI family. We are all property owners in Long Beach.
Mr. and Mrs. W. C. ASKEW,
WILMA G. BURGESS,
Mr. and Mrs. WILLARD H. RHODES.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator, State of Texas,
Washington, D. C.
A fair-minded gentleman from the confused Lone * * * State has something to offer the friendly United States. Till we meet again.
Friendly yours,
TAYLOR FURNITURE CO.
CLYDE M. TAYLOR.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work.
RAY HAYES.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL:
Keep talking. Our prayers are with you. We want a free America.
KATE R. FOSTER, *Teacher.*

WICHITA FALLS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Kill that OPA and receive the thanks and appreciation of the majority of the people of Wichita Falls, Tex.
G. W. RUSSELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 28, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
For gosh sakes, Pappy, keep talking.
GAYNELLE MILLER.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Heartily in favor of the stand against OPA. Hoping you are successful in carrying out your plans for forced expiration of OPA Act.
THE GEBHARDT CHILI POWDER CO.
A. KRONKOSKY, Jr.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., *June 28, 1946.*
Hon. LEE O'DANIEL:
Congratulations on your decision to filibuster OPA bill. American people take new hope of there being one Senator in Washington believing in American principles.
W. F. BECKWITH.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your courage in trying to eliminate OPA returning America to normal way of life.
RODNEY DELANGE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations to you. Kill OPA. Two GI's.
ERNIE EBELING.
HAL HEBER.

BUNKER, MO., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you talk until OPA gives out.
O. J. SCHOLENDON.

LOGANSPORT, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
If it takes a Texas Senator to restore the United States Government to its original status, we, the people of Indiana thank God for his courage. We count on Senators WILLIS and CAPEHART to give you their support.
OWEN L. LAIRD.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Wishing you great success in getting the OPA killed.
Yours sincerely,
ZANE J. SEMANDER.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
I personally congratulate you on stand taken relative OPA. If possible filibuster out of existence.
J. R. SIKES.

AMARILLO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
As one of the charter members of the rationing board of Potter County, Tex., which resigned in a body this week, I wish to heartily commend your plan of filibuster against the OPA extension bill. I am one of the many producers of livestock and grain in the Panhandle who are behind you 100 percent.
MILES G. BIVINS.

HOUSTON, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
You can do a great service to the American people by filibustering OPA out of existence. In 90 days all of Bowles' and Porter's propaganda will be debunked.
H. J. PORTER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We congratulate you for your superb stand in the American way and, above all, for the American people.
AMERICAN POULTRY CO.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Care Senate, Washington, D. C.:
American people appreciate your efforts to eliminate OPA. Their employees can better serve the country on production line.
P. C. HOLNBACK.

GREENWICH, CONN., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. W. L. O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
OPA past, present, sabotages all America, promotes black market, and gets benefits from black-market returns. OPA regimentation wholly un-American. Decisive defeat most urgent sake free public, free industries, free labor, and all American system. OPA meddling, bungling, purposely responsible all labor strikes and shortages artificially produced.
JOHN BROSS LLOYD.

ENID, OKLA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Don't give up the ship. Give her all you've got.
A. P. MORGAN.

WATERTOWN, MASS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster. Kill the OPA.
JOE CRYAN.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulate you on your OPA stand.
EARL DONNELL.

DALLAS, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
God save America. Thankful for a leader like you.
ELLA PUGH.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *June 27, 1946.*
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Do everything possible to kill OPA.
M. G. PERRY.

SOUTH BEND, IND., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
All thinking, productive Americans are behind you and WHERRY. Kill OPA.
CARL WINKLER.

NORTH CONWAY, N. H., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator W. L. O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Talk on. We are praying for you.
KEARSARGE HALL.
E. L. RICKER.
E. F. ABBOTT.

AUGUSTA, MAINE, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The milk dealers and farmers of Maine are with you in your effort to eliminate OPA, and especially the control of dairy and farm products.
FORDON W. DREW,
Secretary, Maine Milk Dealers Association.

FITCHBURG, MASS, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
We admire the stand that you are taking to retain American way of life against the OPA. Congratulations and the best of luck.
WILLIAM POPP.

APPLETON, WIS., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Good work. Hope you get other Senators to join in filibuster.
CHESTER SHEPARD.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *June 27, 1946.*
Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.:
Highly pleased at press report of your threat to filibuster OPA out of existence which we read on our way home to Crockett, Tex. Hope valiant efforts of you and others can stop Chester Bowles et al. for all time.
H. M. GODSEY.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF, *June 27, 1946.*
Senator O'DANIEL,
Democrat of Texas, Washington, D. C.:
I am just one of the millions of freedom-loving citizens of the United States. I am weary of being hampered with OPA restrictions that blocks every effort I put forth trying to make an honest living for myself and children. Go to it and filibuster this giant monster out of existence and let America rise in a world of freedom once more. We fought the war to keep Hitler from coming into our country and let's fight the battle to drive him out.
E. H. HERTH.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, whether this bill becomes law or not, I feel that a large number of increases in prices will result from past policies of the administration. I therefore ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a list of some 500 price increases which have been granted since March 1, as some evidence of the fact that if this bill is followed by price increases, they cannot necessarily be attributed to any provisions of the bill. A list of 500 price increases was furnished to the House committee by the Price Administrator, and appears in the House committee hearings on the third deficiency appropriation bill, at page 811.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Price increases

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
Mar. 1, 1946	Automatic nonelectric temperature controls	All	5 percent over October 1941.
Do	Crude oil (Rodessa Field, Tex.)	Producer	10 cents per barrel.
Do	Crude oil (10 pools in Arkansas, Kansas, Michigan, Oklahoma, and Texas).	do	5 to 35 cents per barrel.
Do	Iron and steel mill products	All	Varied.[1]
Do	Live cattle and calves (at Leavenworth, Kans.)	Producer	15 cents per hundredweight for choice grade, and 20 cents, all others.
Do	Northern softwood lumber	do	$1.75 per M b. m.
Mar. 2, 1946	Packed tomatoes (certain counties of Idaho)	Packer	5 to 11 cents per dozen No. 2 cans; 20 to 44 cents per dozen No. 10 cans.
Mar. 4, 1946	Corn (sales in area B to feeders in lots of more than 5,000 pounds, or for l.c.l. sales, except to a trucker-merchant).	Country shipper	1½ cents per bushel.
Do	Innerspring mattresses (with wired tied units)	Producer	Producer: 16 percent over October 1941.
Do	Wheat and corn	do	3 cents per bushel.
Do	Oats	do	2 cents per bushel.
Do	Rye and barley	do	4 cents per bushel.
Do	Grain sorghums	do	9 cents per hundredweight.
Mar. 6, 1946	Douglas fir, western hemlock, and true fir lumber	do	Average 3 percent.
Do	Hard rubber products	do	15 percent.
Do	Hudson automobiles (7 models)	All	Producer: 10.8 to 18.3 percent over 1942. Retailer: 0.6 to 7.6 percent.
Do	Putty and calking compounds	Producer	15 percent.
Do	Vitrified clay sewer pipe and allied products (northern California).	do	6.5 percent.
Do	White trucks	do	1.3 to 48.6 percent.
Mar. 7, 1946	Concrete reinforcing bars, spirals, and welded stirrups	Fabricator	20 cents, 15 cents, and 30 cents per hundredweight, respectively.
Mar. 8, 1946	Cotton textiles	Producer	5 to 10 percent basic plus 5 percent incentive on specified low-end production.
Do	Maple sirup (bulk quantities)	do	4 cents per pound or 44 cents per gallon.
Do	Ohio clay tile (deliveries in Virginia, northwestern New York counties, and Cuyahoga County, Ohio).	Producer and reseller (in New York and Virginia).	$1.10 per ton.
Mar. 9, 1946	Burlap (sales of less than 25 bales)	Importer	10 percent.
Mar. 11, 1946	Beef liver	All except retail	$2 per hundredweight.
Do	Custom-milling and kiln-drying of lumber (New England)	Producer	20 percent.
Do	Beef and veal, lamb, and pork (dressed carcass, civilian sales).	All except retail	Average 45 cents, 50 cents, and 55 cents, respectively, per hundredweight.[2]
Do	Lard	do	Sales to civilians, 25 cents per hundredweight; sales to Government, 75 cents.
Do	Lumber custom-mill clipping (New England)	do	50 cents per M. b. m.
Do	Sausage products	do	25 cents to $1.75 per hundredweight.
Do	Chrysler, DeSoto, Dodge, and Plymouth automobiles (1946)	All	Producer: 2.5 percent. Retailer: About 1 percent.
Do	Ford, Lincoln, Mercury, and Hudson automobiles (1946)	do	Producer: 4 percent. Retailer: About 1 percent.
Mar. 12, 1946	Binders board (sold east of the Rocky Mountains)	Producer	$6 per ton.
Do	Custom log sawing (low-cost operators in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont).	do	$1 to $3 M. b. m.
Do	Green coffee (RFC subsidized)	Importers	3 cents per pound on sales.
Do	Steel castings and railroad specialties (except armor, Navy, ordnance).	All	4 percent.
Mar. 13, 1946	Mack trucks (3 models)	do	8.0 to 12.9 percent.
Do	West coast logs	Producer	$1.25 per M feet.
Do	Builders' hardware and certain screen cloth	do	10 percent over October 1941; and 16 percent on low-end items.
Do	Container ship paperboard (east of Rocky Mountains)	do	$4 per ton.
Do.	Diamond T trucks (6 models)	All	19.6 to 33.3 percent.
Do	Electrical clay conduit	Producer	About 10 percent.

[1] Reflects $5-per-ton increase for carbon and alloy steels, ordered by Stabilization Administrator.
[2] On sales to Government 25 cents additional.

Price increases—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
Mar. 13, 1946	Live hogs (sold to buying stations, terminal and interior markets in Kentucky, Alabama, Virginia, Tennessee, Illinois, Indiana, and Washington).	Producer	5 to 15 cents per hundredweight.
Mar. 14, 1946	Canned dried beef (sales to civilians)	All except retail	$3.75 to $6 per hundredweight.
Do	Canned pork products (sales to the Government)	do	70 cents to $2.70 per hundredweight.
Do	Nonpork canned meats (except dried beef to civilians).	do	Sales to civilians, 75 cents to $1.75 per hundredweight; sales to Government, $1.25 to $2.32.
Mar. 15, 1946	Black and white pepper (ex-dock New York, except CCC imports of black pepper from India).	Importer	Black pepper, 5 cents per pound; white pepper, 11½ cents per pound.
Do	Cuprammonium (Bemberg) sheer grey goods	Producer	3 cents per yard.
Do	Domestic cookers and heaters (except electrical)	Producer and wholesaler	Producer, 5 percent.
Do	Hardwood charcoal (ton or more quantities)	Producer	Michigan-Wisconsin area, $9.50 per ton; New York-Pennsylvania area, $10.50 per ton; Tennessee-Arkansas area, $11.80 per ton.
Do	Pig iron	do	75 cents per gross ton.
Do	Strawberry crates (complete with cups and dividers)	do	10 percent.
Do	Western softwood plywood (construction grades)	do	Average, 20 percent.
Mar. 16, 1946	For sash and windows (Boise, Puget Sound, Portland, and Spokane).	Jobber	Varied.[4]
Mar. 18, 1946	Fuel oils (residual Nos. 4, 5, and 6, including Navy special, gas enrichment, heavy Diesel, and bunker C) and asphalt and asphalt products (except road oils).	All	PAW district 5, 15 cents per barrel; PAW districts, 1–4, 21 cents per barrel.
Do	Kerosene and lighter distillate fuel oils	do	PAW districts 1–4, ½ cent per gallon; district 5, ¼ cent per gallon.[5]
Do	Tractor fuel (PAW districts 1–4)	do	0.5 cent per gallon.
Do	Shelled almonds (in small containers)	Sheller, packer, primary distributor.	Blanched, 2 cents per pound; natural, 1 cent.
Do	Shelled pecans, walnuts, and filberts (packaging differentials for additional sizes and package types).	do	Varied.
Mar. 19, 1946	Thermostats (for home gas and electric cookers)	Producer	10 percent.
Do	International Harvester trucks (13 models)	All	Producer, 13 to 24 percent.
Do	Dodge trucks (13 models)	do	Producer, 19.3 to 27 percent.
Mar. 20, 1946	Gas appliance valves (for gas or petroleum heaters or cook stoves).	do	Varied.
Do	Hay	do	$1 per ton.
Do	Western softwood shingles	do	30 cents per square.
Mar. 21, 1946	Automobile radios (Chrysler, Hudson, Nash, and Studebaker).	do	Producer: 49.7, 51.3, 56.7, and 35.4 percent, respectively. Retailer: 11.2, 7.5, 12, and 10.4 percent, respectively.
Do	Ferrous forgings	Producer	16.3 percent over 1941.
Do	Fresh spinach	All	Country shipper: 5 cents per bushel until April 20. Retailer: About ½ cent per pound.[6]
Do	Specified steam-generating equipment, and cast-steel rolls	do	12 and 9 percent, respectively.
Do	Studebaker trucks (6 models)	do	Producer: 31.5 to 42.9 percent.
Do	Nash automobiles (1946)	do	Producer: 3.5 percent. Retailer: About 1 percent.
Mar. 22, 1946	Hardwood flooring (maple, birch, and beech)	do	Average, 9 percent.
Do	Hardwood heel blocks	Producer	18 percent.
Do	Mill-finished cotton piece goods and sheeting	Wholesaler	Regular wholesalers: 9½ per cent. Institutional wholesalers: 11 percent.[7]
Mar. 24, 1946	Roofing flux (St. Paul-Minneapolis area, Wichita, Kans. reference point).	Refiner	About $1.50 per delivered ton.
Mar. 25, 1946	Bituminous coal (from strip mines in district 15)	Producer	6 cents per net ton.
Do	Forge steel freight car axles	do	35 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Machinery, parts, and industrial equipment	All	4 percent.
Do	Wrought steel freight car wheels (two common sizes)	Producer	$2 and $2.20 per hundredweight.
Mar. 26, 1946	Low-pressure valves and fittings	All	Producer: 10 percent for five groups and 20 percent for 6 low-end groups, until Aug. 31, 1946.
Do	Ponderosa pine cut stock (for doors, window frames, and sashes).	do	6 percent.[8]
Do	Steel shipping containers	Producer	10 percent.
Mar. 27, 1946	Bed linens, towels, napery, and blankets	Wholesaler	Regular wholesaler: 5 to 7 percent. Institutional wholesalers: 8½ to 13 percent.
Do	Innerspring mattresses	All	At retail, up to $1.50 over 1942.
Do	Cast-iron plumbing drainage staples (specified items)	do	10 to 20 percent.
Do	Eastern railroad cross ties (5 sizes)	Producer	5 cents per tie.
Do	Heavy-duty mechanical jacks (except automotive)	All	15.8 percent.
Do	Radish crates (western area)	Producer	$2 per M b. m.
Do	Ready-mixed concrete (southern United States producing area).	do	Varied.[9]
Do	Snap beans (f. o. b. Pompano, Fla.)	Country shipper	Country shipper: 25 cents per bushel until Apr. 20, 1946. Retailer: About 1 cent per pound.
Mar. 28, 1946	Cast-iron radiation	Producer and jobber	Slightly over 5½ cents per square foot.
Mar. 29, 1946	Imported vegetable tanning materials	Importer, grinder, liquefier	4 and 9 percent.
Do	Soft mattresses	All	Producer: 15 percent over 1942. Retailer: Up to $1.25 per mattress.
Do	Softwood lumber items (retail distribution yard sales)	Retailer	$1.56 per M b. m.
Do	Western shingles (retail distribution yard sales)	do	35 cents per square.
Mar. 30, 1946	Coal, coke, and other solid fuels (except to resellers)	do	10 cents per ton.[10]
Do	Western softwood plywood (construction grades)	Reseller	Average, 17 percent.
Apr. 1, 1946	Bolts, nuts, screws, and rivets	Producer	7 percent.
Do	Brass mill products	do	Average 1½ cents per pound.
Do	do	Warehouse distributors	Average 1.5 cents per pound.
Do	Carcass veal (freezing and storage allowance on Government sales).	Packer	15 cents per hunderedweight.
Do	Chestnut corrugating medium paperboard	Producer	8 cents per M square feet.
Do	Clay glass melting pots, tank blocks, accessories	do	16 percent.
Do	Crude oil	do	10 cents per barrel.
Do	Fireclay and silica refractory brick (Missouri and east of the Mississippi).	All	11 percent, rounded to the nearest 5 cents.
Do	Fourdrinier Kraft containerboard	Producer	$8 per ton.
Do	Imported Hawaiian molasses (f. o. b. west coast tank stations).	Importer	$2.78 a ton.
Do	Paperboard	Producer	Varied.
Do	Railroad parts and assemblies (90 percent steel castings)	do	15½ percent (over October 1941).
Do	Retail meat and variety items	Retailer	Beef and veal, average ½ cent per pound; lamb and mutton, ¼ cent.
Do	Retail pork items	do	Average ¾ cent per pound; 1½ cents per pound on 80 percent of all sausage products.
Do	Waterproof rubber footwear	Producer	10 percent.
Do	West-coast ethyl alcohol (from imported Hawaiian molasses).	Distiller	About 5 cents per wine gallon.
Do	Wire-tied cushion-spring units (with sisal pads)	Producer	11.2 percent on base models.

[3] Wholesalers absorb 25 percent and retailers 75 percent of rise.
[4] Increases reflect ½ the exact increase in cost resulting from a 10 percent producer increase.
[5] Indefinite extension of increases scheduled to terminate Apr. 30, in districts 1–3, and June 30 in district 5.
[6] Continuation of an increase scheduled to expire Mar. 30, 1946.
[7] Pass-through of prior Bankhead increases.
[8] For extra services, 24-100 percent.
[9] Reflects pass-through of 10 percent rise in portland cement ceilings.
[10] Continuation of an increase scheduled to expire Apr. 30.

Price increases—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
Apr. 2, 1946	Cast-iron gas-fired heating boilers	All	10½ percent.
Do	Dried fruits	do	Processor: 0.8 to 1.6 percent.
Do	Hog pancreas glands	Slaughterer	4 cents per pound.
Do	Home laundry machines	Producer and wholesaler	Producer: 9.5 percent (over 1941).[11]
Apr. 3, 1946	Blankets (cotton-wool and cotton-wool-rayon mixtures made by Chathan and Pepperell).	Wholesaler and retailer	Wholesaler: 16 to 25½ cents. Retailer: Indeterminate.
Apr. 4, 1946	Carded cotton yarns	Producer	¾ to 1½ cents per pound.
Do	Douglas-fir doors	All	Producer: Average 28 percent.
Do	Ford auto radios (2 models, uninstalled)	do	Producer: 56.6 percent (above 1941); wholesaler: 28 percent; retail 14 percent.
Do	Special cherry boxes and display lugs (Yakima and Wenatches, Wash., area).	Producer	About 3 cents per box.
Apr. 5, 1946	Plug fuses	do	21.4 percent over 1941.
Do	Southern hardwood lumber (all species except yellow cypress and all grades except construction).	Mill	8½ percent.
Do	Western pine and associate species	All	Average $4.60 per M b. m.
Apr. 6, 1946	Douglas fir and western hemlock lumber	Mill	About $3 per M b. m. for Douglas fir and hemlock boards; about $2 per M b. m. for Western hemlock.
Do	Sand lime building brick	All	$2 per M.
Apr. 7, 1946	Wooden beverage cases (printing charge—east of and including Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas).	Producer	$1 per 100 cases, half-depth cases; $2, full-depth.
Apr. 8, 1946	Awning cloth	Converter and jobber	Indeterminate.
Do	Berry cups and dividers (sold separately)	Producer	10 percent.
Do	Electrical wire and cable (containing silver)	All	Varied.[12]
Do	Friction tape and splicing compound	Producer	10 percent (over October 1941).
Do	Hard rubber SLI battery containers, covers, and vents, and standard items of molded, extruded, lathe-cut, and chemically blown sponge rubber.	do	15 percent over January 1942.
Do	Maraschino, glace, and brine cherries	Processor	½ to 1 percent.
Do	Metal stampings	Producer	19 percent.
Do	Nonneoprene rubber hose, belting, and packing	do	12 to 26 percent.
Do	Red sour pitted cherries (packed in Utah and Colorado)	Processor	13 cents per dozen No. 2 cans, 43 cents No. 10 cans.
Do	Retail meat and variety items (Kosher)	Retailer	Beef and veal, 4/10 cent per pound; lamb and mutton, ⅗ cent.
Do	Rubber braid building wires (low-end items)	Producer and wholesaler	Indeterminate.
Do	Specified medium and low capacity tanks and vessels, 585 gallons or less (except tanks designed for use with industrial equipment).	All	Producer: 17 percent (over July 1941).
Apr. 9, 1946	Barrels, nail kegs, and slack (except west coast)	Producer	10 percent for staves, hoops, and headliners; 5 percent for all headings, 2 cents per finished keg; 5 cents per barrel.
Do	Canned slab bacon (sold to Government)	All except retailers	$1.70 per hundredweight in 14-pound tins.
Do	Pine nail keg stave and heading bolts (truck deliveries in 11 Virginia counties).	Producer	11 percent.
Do	Pork chops (sold to purveyors of meals)	All except retailers	25 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Smoked hams	do	$1 per hundredweight for smoked, skinless, boneless, and fatted hams weighing over 12 pounds.
Do	Work clothing (jean, drill, twill, and poplin)	Producer	Varied.
Apr. 10, 1946	Basic construction machinery, equipment, and parts	All	4.8 percent.[13]
Do	Glazed sash, windows, and garage doors	do	Producer: Approximately 1 percent.
Do	Ground black pepper	do	Processor: About 8¾ cents a pound for bulk; 9 cents a pound for 3 pounds or less. Retailer: 2 cents for 1½-ounce tins, 3 to 4 cents for 4-ounce tins.
Do	Ground white pepper	do	Processor: About 13 cents a pound for bulk; 12 cents a pound for 3 pounds or less. Retailer: 2 cents for 1½-ounce tins, 3 to 4 cents for 4-ounce tins.
Do	Men's waterproofed garments, (low-end items)	Producer	10 percent.
Apr. 11, 1946	General Motors, 50 models (Pontiac, Buick, Oldsmobile, and Cadillac).	All	Producer: 8.3 to 17.5 percent over 1942. Retailer: 5 to 15.9 percent.
Do	Appalachian hardwood (except timbers and dimensions)	do	10 percent.
Do	Carded cotton coutils (gray goods)	Producer	35.2 and 26.5 percent.[14]
Do	Photographic equipment (except commercial 35-millimeter motion-picture cameras, and items already released from control).	All	Producer: 14 percent over October 1941, or 7 percent over March 1942. Retailer: About 9 percent over 1941.
Apr. 12, 1946	Western agricultural shook	Producer	$7.50 per M b. m.[15]
Apr. 13, 1946	Ceylon No. 2 cinnamon	Importer	5 cents per pound.
Apr. 15, 1946	Defluorinated phosphate (100-pound paper bags)	Processor	$1.48 per ton.
Do	Distribution transformers (industrial transformers 500 kilovolt-amperes and under, and parts and accessories with specified exceptions).	Producer and reseller	5.4 percent.
Apr. 16, 1946	Chrysler auto radios (2 models, uninstalled)	All	Producer: 49.7 and 34.7 percent; special brand purchaser: 23.6 and 17 percent; distributor: 22 and 15.6 percent; retailer: 10.3 and 10.6 percent, respectively.
Do	Fruit preserves, jams, jellies, and apple butter	do	Retail: About 1 cent per pound jar.[16]
Do	Southern pine grain doors (for freight cars)	Producer	11 percent.
Do	Women's, girls', children's, and toddlers' outerwear	Retailer	Indeterminate.
Apr. 17, 1946	Cotton textiles (2 combed broadcloths for men's shirts)	All	5 percent.
Do	Little cigars	do	$1 per M.
Do	Oranges, lemons, and tangerines	do	Country shipper: Oranges, 20 cents in California and Arizona, 15 cents in Florida and Texas; lemons, 28 cents; tangerines, 22 cents in California and Arizona, 14 cents in Florida and Texas. Retailer: About 1 cent per pound.
Do	Overwrapping packaged rice (heat sealed, moisture-proof cellophane).	Distributor	30 cents per hundred 12- or 16-ounce packages.
Do	Peeled pine and hardwood insulation bolts (Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana east of Mississippi River).	Producer	$1.10 per cord for pine and 5 cents for hardwood.
Do	Primary slab zinc (packing and loading charges)	Supplier	10 cents per ton for wiring and strapping in bundles, and 50 and 70 cents, respectively, on wooden and steel pallet.
Do	Staple work clothing (men's and boys'—made of chambrays, coverts, denims, drills, jeans, and whipcords).	All	Producer: 12 to 15 percent. Retailer: About 22½ to 29 cents per garment.
Do	Wool floor coverings	do	Producer: 4½ percent.
Apr. 18, 1946	Dyed carded and combed cotton yarns	do	Producer: 5½ to 6¾ cents, per pound, by type and ply.[17]
Do	Household mechanical refrigerators	do	Producer: 8 percent. Retailer: About 4 percent.
Do	Packard (10 new models)	do	Producer: 14.1 to 19.7 percent. Retailer: 10.8 to 15.4 percent.
Apr. 19, 1946	Industrial power transmission equipment	do	7.8 percent.
Do	Machine tools (including hand- and foot-powered immobile machine tools).	Producer and reseller	Producer: 20 percent over October 1941.
Do	Screw-machine products	All	Producer: 5.2 percent.
Do	Screw-machine services (except bolts, nuts, screws, and rivets, and automotive parts).	do	Supplier: 10 percent over 1942.
Do	Snap beans	do	Country shipper: 50 cents per bushel.[18] Retailer: About 5 cents per pound.[18]

[11] Instead of 7.7 percent granted in October 1945.
[12] To reflect higher cost of foreign silver content.
[13] Until June 15.
[14] For mills paying and not paying, respectively, WLB wage increases.
[15] Increase effective until May 31, 1946.
[16] Reflects rise in sugar costs. Only processors with a no-balance inventory processed from sugar purchased before Feb. 10, 1946, may take the increase.
[17] Distributed in 2 bands for producers paying and not paying WLB wage rises.
[18] Increases effective until Apr. 30.

Price increases—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
Apr. 20, 1946	Cotton bedspreads and table napery	Wholesaler and retailer	Wholesalers: 14 to 34 percent. Retailers: 1 to 20 percent.
Apr. 22, 1946	Cement, except white (southern California, Arizona, and southeastern Nevada).	All	10 cents per barrel.
Do	Cotton grey rope, yarn, twine, and cord	Producer and jobber	5 percent, per pound of cotton content.
Do	Cotton rope, twine, yarn, and cord	Producer	¾ cent, per pound of contained cotton.
Do	Ford (new model)	All	Producer: 48.8 percent above most comparable 1942 car. Retailer: 43 percent.
April 22, 1946	Gummed cloth tape (sheetings and cansburgs)	Producer	35 cents per M 1-inch yards.
Do	Manganese steel castings and castings products	do	9.6 percent.
Do	Mercury (new model)	All	Producer: 51.6 percent over most comparable 1942 car. Retailer: 45.2 percent.
Do	Special American and Asiatic cotton blankets, and wool blankets.	Producer	About 14 percent on cotton and 5 percent on wool.
Do	Tidewater red cypress lumber	All	Mill: 10 percent over 1942.
Do	Western red cedar lumber (bevel, bungalow, and special sidings).	do	Average 7½ percent.
Do	White cedar shingles (Lake States)	Mill	About 23 percent.
Apr. 23, 1946	Preservative treatment of lumber by nonpressure methods	Supplier	Indeterminate.
Do	Steel ducts for electric wires (except tubing, fittings, flexible conduit, and raceways, including fittings).	All	Producer: 13 percent over Oct. 1, 1941.
Apr. 24, 1946	Chrysler, 9 models (Dodge, DeSoto, Chrysler)	do	Producer: 8 to 16.4 percent over 1942. Retailer: 2 3 to 11 percent.
Do	Industrial casein (inedible)	Producer	9 cents per pound.
Do	Northeastern hardwood lumber (except timber and dimension items).	All	Producer: From 3 to 7½ percent according to grade.
Apr. 25, 1946	Cigarettes	do	Producer: 25 cents per M. Retailer: 1 cent on 2 packs; vending machine sales, except "economy," 1 cent per pack.
Apr. 26, 1946	Malleable iron castings	Producer	Average 7 percent.
Apr. 25, 1946	Metal upholstery springs, construction, and accessories	All	Producer and wholesaler 8 to 10 percent.
Apr. 26, 1946	Tools, dies, jigs, fixtures, molds, and patterns (sold with machines, parts and industrial equipment).	Producer	Varied.[19]
Apr. 29, 1946	Caskets and shells and shooks (low-end)	do	15 percent, and 25 percent, respectively.
Do	Clay drain tile (Ohio and Michigan)	All	$1.20 per ton.
Do	Lamb and mutton wholesale cuts	All, except retailer	10 cents per hundredweight for kosher foresaddle, forequarter, bracelet, and all whole or half chuck; 25 cents per hundredweight for fabricated cuts (WSA specifications) sold to specified buyers.
Do	Lead—special packing and leading (at buyer's request)	Supplier	20 and 40 cents per ton.
Do	Spectacle frames (low-end)	Producer	25 percent.
Apr. 30, 1946	Rye bread (not less than 1 part rye to 4 parts wheat flour)	All	Producer: 2 cents per pound.[16] Wholesale: Maximums limited to 12 cents per pound.[20]
Do	Waterproof rubber footwear	Wholesaler	10 percent.
Apr. 19, 1946	Metal nonhousehold furniture	All	Producer: 10.5 percent over October 1941 to resellers.
Do	Warm-air furnaces, subassemblies, and repair parts	do	Average, 12.3 percent.[21]
Apr. 20, 1946	Metal cots, beds, and springs	Producer and jobber	Producer: 5 to 35 cents per item as listed.
Apr. 22, 1946	Market woodpulp (on listed grades)	Producer	Average, 10 percent.
Do	Vitrified clay sewer pipe and allied products (Eastern and East Central States).	All	Producer: 15 percent.
Apr. 23, 1946	Pole-line hardware and line construction specialties (except for overhead trolley lines).	do	Do.
Do	Levers, raschel, and barmen laces (82 low-priced laces)	Producer and jobber	½ cent to 22 cents per yard, depending on width.[22]
Apr. 24, 1946	Cutting tools and machinery attachments and accessories	All	Producer: 17.3 percent over March 1942.
Apr. 25, 1946	Milk-bottle stock paperboard (2 major manufacturers) [23]	Producer	$10 and $26 per ton, respectively.
Do	Fluorescent and specialty transformers	All	Producer: 11 percent on fluorescent; 19 percent on specialty over October 1941.[24]
Do	Maple sirup and sugar (bulk sirup, and block sugar, containers of 24 ounces or less).	Packer, wholesaler, retailer	Packer: About 3 cents per pound.
Do	Mufflers, tail pipes, and exhaust pipes (replacement)	Producer [25] and wholesaler	Producer: 12 percent above March 1942.
Apr. 26, 1946	Pontiac auto radios (2 models, uninstalled)	All	Producer: 45.5 and 46.3 percent. Pontiac to distributor: 25 and 27.1 percent. Wholesaler: 21.3 and 23.3 percent. Retailer: 8.8 and 10.2 percent. All over 1941 prices.
Do	Pennsylvania anthracite (group I mines, when shipped via the Great Lakes and sold on dock on the United States bank of Lake Superior or the west bank of Lake Michigan, north of and including Waukegan, Ill.).	Dealer	5 to 15 cents per net ton.
Do	Linoleum and felt-base floor and wall covering (except carpets).	All	Producer: About 15.5 percent over March 1942.[26] Retailer: 6 percent.
Do	Steel shovels, spades, and scoops	do	Producer: 9 percent. Retailer: About 7 to 10 cents each.
Apr. 29, 1946	Metal household furniture	Producer	7 percent above 1941.[27]
Apr. 30, 1946	Home washing and ironing machines	All	Producer: 6.8 percent over current ceilings.[28]
Do	Cast iron radiation and accessories (convectors, convector baseboard, and bathroom radiators, radiators for blower and ventilator systems, and radiator bushings, plugs, nipples, brackets, pedestals, and chaplets, including steel chaplets).	do	Producer: 37 percent over October 1941.
Do	Nonmetallic sheathed cable (type R, insulated with synthetic rubber).	do	11 percent over October 1941.
Do	Repair and replacement parts under GMPR (for domestic cooking and heating stoves, washing and ironing machines, mechanical refrigerators, vacuum cleaners and attachments, business and office machines).	do	5 percent, 9.5 percent, 16.5 percent, 6 percent, and 12 percent, respectively.
Apr. 1, 1946	Crude oil (19 pools in California, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas).	Producer	5 to 35 cents per barrel.
Apr. 3, 1946	Men's knitted underwear (low-end athletic shirts, union suits, drawers).	do	About 25 percent above March 1942.
Apr. 23, 1946	Woven decorative fabrics (low-end, distributor sales)	Reseller	Indeterminate.[29]
Apr. 30, 1946	Chevrolet (9 models)	All	Producers: 11 to 14 percent over 1942. Retailers 4.9 to 7.9 per cent over 1942.
Do	General Motors automobiles (except Chevrolet and Pontiac).	do	Producer: 4.5 to 7.4 percent. Retailer: 1.6 to 3.5 percent.
Do	Pontiac (4 station wagons)	do	Producer: 23 to 24 percent over 1942. Retailer 20 to 20.8 percent.[30]
May 1, 1946	Brass mill products	do	Producer: Average 13.3 percent over March 1942.
Do	Crude oil (8 pools in California, Kansas, Michigan, and Oklahoma).	Producer	1 to 35 cents per barrel.
Do	Hand lawn mowers	All	Producers: 9.4 percent.
May 2, 1946	Bedspreads, napery, and woven decorative fabrics (at least 95 percent cotton).	Producer	About 8½ percent.

[19] New ceilings may reflect current instead of base-period costs.
[20] Until June 30.
[21] Replaces reconversion factors for furnaces of 9 percent for oil burners and 12.5 percent for gas.
[22] Ceilings may not exceed established cut-off prices.
[23] Producing 60 percent of output.
[24] Replaces increase factors of 6.3 and 14.4 percent issued in January.
[25] Except automotive producers.
[26] Replaces 9-percent rise granted in February.
[27] Replaces reconversion increase factor of 5 percent issued in February.
[28] Total 17 percent over 1941.
[29] Partial pass-through of producer rise in November.
[30] For nearest comparable model.

Price increases—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
May 2, 1946	Radio receiver and special-purpose tubes	Producer and wholesaler	Producer: 20 percent for replacement tubes; 15 percent for all others.
May 3, 1946	Asphalt coated insulating sheathing (25 x 32 inches)	All	Producer $4 per M square feet.
Do	Gray iron castings	Producer	16 percent for ceilings frozen August 1941 through January 1942 prices; 12 percent for those fixed by formula from October 26 1942, through December 1943; 6 percent for those with pre-base-period ceilings or with ceilings fixed in 1944.
Do	Pearling barley	Merchandisers (except producers, country shippers, trucker-merchants, and retailers).	5 cents per bushel.
Do	Special millwork	All	Indeterminate.
May 6, 1946	Bolts, nuts, and screws	All except producers	7 percent for products sold on a list or discount basis.
Do	Chemical cordwood (Missouri)	Mill	11 percent.
Do	Finished corduroy and velveteen	Producer	11.8 percent on carded corduroy, 21.3 percent on combed; 11.3 percent on carded velveteen.[31]
Do	Green Spanish olives	All	25 to 50 percent.
Do	Insulation and felt cordwood (produced in West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri).	Producer	3.5 to 17.5 percent; also $2 per cord for deliveries to mill by truck.
Do	Low-cost apparel (sold by credit retailers)	Retailer	17 percent on cash sales.
Do	Prefabricated dwelling structure and subassemblies (uninstalled).	All except producer	Varied.
Do	Pulpwood (Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri).	Producer	Average 7 to 8 percent per standard cord; also, zone V, $2 per cord, for deliveries to mill by truck.
Do	Vises and parts (except machine attachments and hinge or chain pipe vises).	All	Producers: 8 percent over March 1942.
Do	Western pine stock millwork	do	Mill: Average 23 percent.
Do	Wire-tied innerspring mattresses	do	Producer: additional 2 percent over October 1941.[32]
May 7, 1946	Audio transformers and chokes (having fixed iron cores)	Producer	7.7 percent.
Do	Combed cotton yarns (sold for making zipper tape)	do	5.4 percent.
Do	Knitted products (men's, women's, and children's knit underwear, sleepers, and hosiery of cotton, wool, or mixtures of the two; and flat and circular fabrics, tubing, wristlets (for gloves), and bags).	All	Producer: 75 cents to $5 per pound of contained cotton yarn. Retailer: About 2 to 5 cents per pair for hose, and 5 to 35 cents per undergarment.
Do	Mechanics hand service tools	do	Producers: 5 percent over March 1942.
Do	Oats (shipped to Kansas for feeding purposes)	Merchandiser	Average less than 1/10 cent per bushel.
Do	Radio transformers, and vibrators	Producer	3.4 percent.
Do	Reverse twist carded yarn (exclusively for making cotton hose).[33]	do	1½ cents per pound.
Do	Wood boring and cutting tools (manually operated	All	Producer: 17.3 percent.
May 8, 1946	Armored (BX) cable	do	Producers: Average 14 percent.
Do	Bathing and shower caps (synthetic, substitute, or natural rubber).	do	Producer: About 33⅓ percent. Retailer: About 10 percent.
Do	Business machines	do	Producers: 12 percent. Retailer: About 3½ percent over 1942.
Do	Copper wire products and services	All except retail	Average 12½ percent.
Do	North hemlock lumber (Lake States area)	All	Mill: Average 14 percent. Retail: Average 10 percent.
Do	Northeastern softwood lumber (square edge hemlock, spruce, Norway pine, eastern white cedar, jack pine, and the same species imported from eastern Canada).	do	Mill: $3.50 per M. b. m.
Do	Northeastern softwood lumber (round edge white pine)	do	Mill: $2 per M. b. m.
Do	Northeastern softwood lumber (eastern spruce lath)	do	Mill: 75 cents to $1 per M pieces.
Do	Northeastern softwood lumber (white cedar shingles)	do	Mill: 25 to 40 cents per square.
Do	Northeastern softwood lumber (white and Norway pine imported from Ottawa Valley, Canada).	do	Mill: 8 percent f. o. b. mill.
Do	Plastic products	Producer	Indeterminate.
Do	Retail shoe resoling (Avonite, Neo-cord, O'Sullivan plastic)	Repairman	15 cents for men's and boys' sizes under 3½ and all women's sizes; 25 cents for men's and boys' large sizes.
Do	Stock screen goods	All	Producer: Average 14.5 percent f. o. b. mill or 13.4 percent delivered.
Do	Textile awnings	All except retailer	Producer: 12 percent on sales to distributors.
May 9, 1946	Compressors-condensing units, and parts (5 horsepower or less).	All	Producer: 17 percent.
Do	Finished rayon piece goods	Producer and converter	Indeterminate.
Do	Northern white cedar and tamarack fence posts (from Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin).	All	Producer: 11 percent.
Do	Window shades and rollers	do	Producer: 15 percent for cloth; 20 percent for fiber and paper: 9 percent on direct sales to consumers.
Do	Wooden fence posts (small sales by retail yards)	Retailer	20 percent on sales of less than $10.
May 10, 1946	Abrasive products	All	Producer: 22.3 percent over October 1941 for artificial abrasive grain; 24.2 percent for coated and bonded products using the grain.
Do	Asphalt and tarred roofing products	do	Producers: Average 7.5 percent for East, and 3 percent across-the-board for the West.
Do	Farm machinery	do	Producer: Average 10 percent. Retailer: 5 percent on new equipment.
Do	Iron and steel products (prime hot and cold rolled sheets and strip made from selected rimmed stock or aluminum killed steel).	Warehouse	15 to 35 cents.
Do	Barley	All	9 cents per bushel.
Do	Corn	do	25 cents per bushel.
Do	Grain sorghums	do	$18 per hundredweight.
Do	Grains and feeds (meat scrap, hominy feed, corn-germ meal, brewers' dried grains, dried beet pulp, rice bran, mill feeds, and mirror meals (babassu, etc.)).	do	$10 per ton.
Do	Feeds and meals (soybean, cottonseed, peanut, and linseed meals, gluten feed, and gluten meal).	do	$14 per ton.
Do	Fish meal and fish scrap and tankage	do	$10 per ton and $7.50 per ton, respectively.
Do	Oats	do	5 cents per bushel.
Do	Rye	do	10 cents per bushel.
Do	Wheat	do	15 cents per bushel.
Do	Women's bend outsoles (heavier-weight leather, 8- to 9½ inch stacks of 20 pairs).	Producer	Average 20 percent.
May 11, 1946	Cotton waterproofed clothing (low-end)	Wholesaler	Varied.[34]
Do	Milling services by lumber distribution yards	Mill	25 cents to $1.75 per M b.m. according to service performed.
Do	Snuff	All	Producers: Average 5.2 cents per pound. Retailers ½ cent to 5.9 cents depending upon size of package.
Do	Tire-inflation stands	do	Producer: 11 percent over October 1941.
Do	Veneer logs (southeastern area)	Producer	$10 per 1,000 feet on logs 16, 17, and 20 inches and larger.
May 13, 1946	Casein glue	All	Producer: Average 25 percent.
Do	Clocks and nonjeweled watches (domestic)	do	Producer: 20.5 percent for watches; 17 percent for spring-wound clocks; 15 percent for electric clocks.
Do	Cotton textiles (15 new major item groups).[35]	Mill	From 12.2 to 24.2 percent.
Do	Electric motors (fractional horsepower and integral horsepower motors).	All	Producer: About 17 percent.

[31] To mills paying approved wage increases; other mills somewhat lower.
[32] Total 18 percent rise.
[33] Use must be certified to OPA.
[34] Pass on of 75 percent of the recent 10-percent rise to producers.
[35] Such as luggage, cap, and Girl Scout uniform clothes; export suitings and rayon-decorated gray trouserings; woven, checked, or striped cheesecloth; print-cloth yarn gray reinforced mosquito netting, and packaged polishing cloth; six colored yarn dress goods; fancy whipcords and cotton suitings, both less than 25 percent wool and woven on woolen system; cotton velvet with combed yarn back and carded pile; and knitted polishing cloth and laundry padding.

Price increases—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
May 13, 1946	Furniture, low-end (sales to commercial and institutional users).	Wholesaler	10 percent.
Do	Internal-combustion engines and equipment	All	Producers: 15.5 percent.
Do	Mixed animal and poultry feeds	Producer	About $6 to $10 per ton.
Do	Softwood moldings	do	Varied.
Do	Steel power boilers and equipment	All	Producer: 16 percent over June 1941.
Do	Upholstered furniture (low-end)	Producer	Indeterminate.[36]
Do	Yarn-dyed slack suitings	Mill	2 to 18 percent on deliveries before Mar. 8, 1946, and 10 to 39 percent for all others.
May 14, 1946	Bleached sulfite waxing paper	Producer	About 10 percent.
Do	Coated and combined fabrics	All	Converter: 7 percent approximately.
Do	Hardwood stock stair parts	do	Varied.
Do	Solid wood pulp paperboard	Producer	Average 13 percent.
May 16, 1946	Radios	All	Producer: 8 percent.[37]
May 17, 1946	Flaxseed	Country shipper	25 cents per bushel.
Do	Hardwood flooring (oak, beech, pecan, and gum)	All	From 4½ to 12½ percent; premium of $4 per M b. m. for bona-fide less-than-carload lot rail shipments restored.
May 18, 1946	Civilian trucks, truck tractors, and motorcycles (except racing motorcycles).	Producer	Indeterminate.
Do	Low-quality hull fibers (with 58 percent alpha cellulose content or less).	Oil crusher	Do.
May 19, 1946	Soft-filled cotton twills and drills	Mill	1 cent per yard for goods 3.32 yards to the pound and heavier; ¾ cent, 3.33 yards and lighter.
May 20, 1946	Evaporated milk (domestic and British standard)	All	Producer: 25 cents to civilians and 15 cents to Government. Retailer: 1 cent per 6- or 14½-ounce can.
Do	Small electrical appliances	do	Producer: 9.3 percent.[38] Retailer: 4 to 5 percent over 1942.
Do	Staple work gloves (made of canton flannel, jersey, combination leather, and fabric).	do	Producer: 10, 3, and 4.1 percent, respectively. Retailer: 2 to 3 cents per pair.
May 21, 1946	Bicycles (prewar models)	do	Producer: 18 percent over October 1941 or 10 percent over March 1942. Retailer: About 10 percent.
Do	Cast-iron boilers and radiation	do	Producer: 15 percent and approximately 4 percent, respectively.
Do	Imported natural resins	Importer	Indeterminate.[39]
Do	Industrial air compressors (10 horsepower and under, including integral parts and accessories).	All	Producer: 18 percent.
Do	Outboard motors	do	Producer: 10 percent over October 1941. Retailer: About 6 percent.
Do	Western pine moldings (low-end, household and industrial)	do	Producer: Average 20 percent and 6 percent, respectively. Retailer: 10 to 13 percent.
May 22, 1946	Automobiles (Chevrolet, Pontiac, Oldsmobile Buick, Cadillac).	do	Producer: 3.9 to 5.5 percent. Retailer: 3.9 to 5.2 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Ford, Mercury, Lincoln)	do	Producer: 6.1 to 8.4 percent. Retailer: 4.7 to 5.8 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Hudson)	do	Producer: 7.7 to 10.6 percent. Retailer: 6.4 to 9.2 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Plymouth, Dodge, De Soto, Chrysler)	do	Producer: 8.5 to 11.2 percent. Retailer: 6.7 to 9.7 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Nash)	do	Producer: 7.8 to 8 percent. Retailer: 6.2 to 6.6 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Packard)	do	Producer: 11.1 to 13.4 percent. Retailer: 6.5 to 9.2 percent
Do	Automobiles (Studebaker Champions and Commanders, 1947 model).	do	Indeterminate.[40]
Do	Waterproof rubber footwear (mail order sales)	Retailer	9 percent.
May 23, 1946	Cast-iron soil pipe and fittings	All	Producer: 4½ percent.
Do	Recoopered used whisky barrels	Coopers	80 cents per barrel.
May 24, 1946	Feed screenings	All	Producer: $6 to $10 per ton.
Do	Automatic electric temperature controls	Manufacturers and distributors	15 percent.
Do	Corrugated metal culverts	Producer	7 percent.
Do	Fir stock millwork (screen doors and combination screen and storm doors, etc.)	All	Producer: 26 to 29.6 percent. Retailer: 16 to 18 percent.
Do	Fresh peaches	do	Retailer: about 1 cent per pound.
Do	Rubber-, pyroxylin-, or oil-coated fabrics (except window shade cloth).	do	Producer: 13.6 percent.
Do	Spearmint natural oil	Producer and dealer	About 40 percent.
Do	Tools, dies, jigs, fixtures, molds, and patterns	Producer	Indeterminate.[41]
Do	Veneer (box grade veneer from cottonwood, same veneer of other species, and commercial basswood veneer).	do	19, 23, and 22 percent, respectively.
May 26, 1946	Hawaiian molasses (sales to feeders, feed producers, industrial users, and intermediate distributors).	Importer	25 cents for 5 to 20 tons loaded in trucks and 50 cents for less than 5 tons; $6.33 for loading in 600-pound drums.
May 27, 1946	Anklets and hosiery	All except producer	Varied.
Do	Asbestos-cement shingles	All	Producer: 15 percent for roofing, and 5 percent for siding. Retailer: Approximately 10 and 3 percent.
Do	Baled southern pine wood excelsior (Gulf and Atlantic coast (Delaware and south) States, and Arkansas and Tennessee).	do	Producer: About 23 percent.
Do	Baled southern pine wood excelsior (Gulf and Atlantic coast States (Delaware and south), and Arkansas and Tennessee.)	do	Producer: $2 per ton for l. c. l. shipments of 1 to 10 tons, $4 for less than 1 ton, and $2 on sales to direct consumers.
Do	Citrus fruits	do	Country shipper: 6 to 26 cents per standard box. Retail: About 1 cent per pound.
Do	Gears, pinions, sprockets, speed reducers	do	Producer: 13 percent.
Do	Hardwood flooring (oak, beech, gum, and pecan flooring)	Retail	3 to 8 percent.
Do	Mica capacitors	All except producer	Indeterminate.
Do	Machines, parts, and industrial equipment	Producer[42]	Do.
Do	Stock millwork	All except producer	Retailer: ½ percent.
May 28, 1946	Corn milling products (except hominy feed, corn bran, germ cake, and germ meal).	All	Processor: 50 cents per hundredweight.
May 29, 1946	Melons	do	County shipper: About 12 to 17½ percent. Retailer: About 1 cent a pound.
Do	Woodworking and timberworking machinery	do	Producer: 10 percent.
Do	Yellow bar laundry soap	do	Producer: About 20 percent. Retailer: 1 to 2 cents per bar.
Do	Yellow-pine fence posts (Eastern States)	do	Producer: 20 percent.
May 30, 1946	Boxsprings and hand-tied boxspring constructions	do	Producer: 16 percent over 1941. Retailer: About 2 percent.
May 31, 1946	Hardwood lumber (South Central area, listed grades)	Mill	11 percent.
Do	Hawaiian molasses	Importer and wholesaler	$3 per ton.
Do	Lumber (Douglas fir, western hemlock, and true fir)	All	$3.50 per M. b. m.
Do	Mohair yarns, matchings, and tops	Producer	20, 5, and 2 to 3 cents per pound, respectively.
Do	Oil field and water drilling machinery and equipment (except drillpipe, casing, engines, and tanks).	All	Producer: 10 percent.
Do	Rubber reclaiming service and reclaimed rubber	Mills and reclaimers	6.7 percent.
Do	Shoes (low-end, similar to 1942)	All	Producer: Approximately 10 to 15 percent.
Do	Sleeping pillows (feather and down filled)	do	Producer: Average 1.8 percent. Retailer: About 25 cents per pair.
Do	West coast ethyl alcohol (of Hawaiian molasses)	Distiller	About 2.7 cents per gallon.
Do	Western agricultural shook	Producer	$7.50 per M b. m.[43]

[36] Reflects Bankhead textile increases.
[37] Resellers pass on dollar-and-cent amount except for sets retailing under $21.
[38] 18 percent over October 1941.
[39] 2 to 3 times former specific ceilings.
[40] Producer 1947 price ranges from $834 to $1,178, compared with $707 to $746 for 1941 car. Retail—1947; $1,046 to $1,477; 1941, $674 to $992.
[41] To reflect current instead of base-period costs.
[42] On sales to a purchaser in a price class by himself.
[43] Extension to June 30 of rise which was to have expired May 30.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks numerous telegrams from my constituents in Colorado with respect to the pending measure.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLENWOOD SPRINGS, COLO., *June 25, 1946.*
Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned pledge our support of the mass meeting at Glenwood Springs, Colo., June 21 of the businessmen and the public. We wish to go on record as backing their resolution.

The resolution is as follows, to wit:

Be it resolved, That the OPA voted out June 30, 1946, OPA has outlived its usefullness, especially to food control.

The OPA has been and is unfair to the little businessman. Supply and demand has always controlled American business and will continue to do so if OPA is abolished.

"America controlled her own business for 150 years and will continue to do so when OPA is thrown out."

Tom E. Dever, C. E. Slim Marshall, Chas. J. Hopkins, L. E. Schinkle, L. E. Barrett, M. O. Colohan, Dorothy Olsen, Alta Olsen, Pay Ryan, E. F. Waters, E. A. Rowe, C. D. Stull, Hazel Meyers, John D. Vanderhoff, L. J. Wilson, Nell Keith, Johnnie Zupancis, Roy McCoy, Walter Hill, Anna Wilson, Floyd E. Wilson, Mary Shammo, Elmer L. Barrett, Ben Christman, Chas. Walls, P. J. Gallagher, Robert Young, Herbert L. Gardner, Cleo R. Huntley, R. E. Flood, Mrs. R. E. Overlin, R. E. Overlin, Earl S. Hart, W. E. Bryant, Francis W. Wilson, V. H. Frickey, W. F. Heberling, C. B. Rader, J. W. Sutherland.

DENVER, COLO., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

According to reports the Senate will approve the OPA as passed by the House. Please put forth every effort to modify the regulations governing the slaughter of livestock and discontinue the rule governing cost compliance which is a big handicap to the packing industry and is the cause of the large packers being unable to operate as usual. If the cost compliance and quota regulations are discontinued it will in a very large measure do away with the black market that is such a detriment to the livestock industry. Any decrease in subsidy should be offset by like increase in ceiling prices of meat.

C. G. SMITH,
John Clay & Co., Stockyards.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *June 26, 1946.*
Hon. ED C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

If OPA extension bill becomes law Holly's livestock feeding operations will suffer unless some changes are made in meat compliance regulations so as to permit the buyers of the larger meat packers competing on any livestock market with other buyers in purchase of fat cattle and lambs which we produce at our various feed yards. Under present regulations the larger packers are being forced out of the market. Our feeding operations are large enough that we have to depend principally on these large packers when we sell and if they are regulated out of the market we will be hard put to properly and efficiently conduct our feeding operations. It seems to us that the consuming public would also benefit through a continuation of the operation of the larger packers.

HOLLY SUGAR CORP.,
WILEY BLAIR, Jr., *President.*

GLENWOOD SPRINGS, COLO., *June 24, 1946.*
Senator Ed JOHNSON,
United States Senate Office Building:

Supporting 144 businessmen, Garfield County Organization for Elimination of OPA, we unanimously endorse this nonpartisan action individually and collectively and request you act accordingly.

GARFIELD COUNTY REPUBLICAN WOMAN'S CLUB.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 25, 1946.*
Senator EDW. C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Under today's reported version on OPA bill you may be sure to see black markets increase spread and proper meat will not receive equitable distribution. Hope you can help straighten out the House thinking on this terrible situation. Regards.

HERBERT M. SONNERS.

HOTCHKISS, COLO., *June 25, 1946.*
Senator ED C. JOHNSON:

We favor rejection on final conference report on price-control bill unless it specifically recommends removal of price ceilings on dairy products.

NORTH FORK COOPERATIVE CREAMERY ASSOCIATION.

GREELEY, COLO., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator ED C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Beef settlement means continued restricted production and that we cannot feed. Suggest Bowles for "propaganda minister." Maybe he will furnish fertilizer for farms. We cannot produce without cost of production return.

FRANK B. DAVIS.

STERLING, COLO., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly request your vote to resubmit price-control bill to conference committee with instructions to replace amendment to decontrol livestock, and meat. Conditions of our industry are rapidly getting worse, and after grass run of cattle public will be without beef. Feeding of cattle impossible under present conditions, and our greatest agricultural business is being ruined.

W. C. HARRIS GRAIN & CATTLE CO.
A. A. SMITH & CO.

DENVER, COLO., *June 26, 1946.*
Senator ED C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Conditions make it impossible to operate unless beef controls are relaxed. Must close Friday, affecting 99 employees. We favor Senate amendment to OPA.

CAPITOL PACKING CO.

DENVER, COLO., *June 28, 1946.*
EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat of Colorado,
Washington, D. C.:

Long of opinion OPA should terminate and let natural economic laws function. Believe many of our opinions have been reticent to speak up.

GEORGE W. MASTEN, Jr.
GEORGE C. HAHN.

CRIPPLE CREEK, COLO., *June 27, 1946.*
Hon. EDW. C. JOHNSON,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

May we earnestly ask you to use your every influence right and responsibility of your office in supporting Senator O'DANIEL in his stand relative to the OPA. We believe, as millions of other Americans do, that this branch of our unparalleled democratic Government should be stripped of its drastic powers at the earliest possible moment. We are sick, tired, and fed up, and thoroughly disgusted with what we honestly believe to be very much uncalled for Government regimentation in our daily American way of life. We also believe that the OPA is a farce from true Americanism grossly infringing on the rights and privileges of free-born, upright, loyal, and true citizens of the United States. May we, the undersigned residents of Teller County, count on and thank you for your usual fine judgment in making important decisions that concern your constituents, also for voicing and supporting our opinion this very important question. The following names are those of citizens engaged in each and every walk of life in Teller County, namely, miners, leasers, owners and operators, merchants, doctors, dentists, garage owners, mechanics, bookkeepers, stenographers, druggists, bankers, farmers, housewives, truckline operators, public officials, cafe and hotel owners, railroad employees, hospitals, school faculties, cattle and ranch owners. This communication is on file and signed in person by 203 Teller County citizens.

Bryan S. Jones, Democratic Chairman, James McMillan, Guy Rorabaugh, Sam Fowler, James Harshbarger, Clarence Parrell, Fred Rutan, Mrs. Cora Hatcher, Frank Walton, Leroy Yarbrough, Walter Round, Mrs. Oscar Ridgeway, Shirley Johnson, Charles Clark, Henry McDonald, Earl Bedee, Robert Moos, Lewis Stiner, K. W. Geddas, Robert Welch, Mrs. Minnie Hemby, Herman Conrow, Melvin Salsbury, Mrs. Cora Long, Earl Fry, Mrs. Nettie Bebee, Mrs. John Stark, Gertrude Coffin, Virgil Marquis, Mrs. Bernard McKahn, Roy Stitt, Al Bebee, Mrs. Eugene Beagles, Henry Martin, Joseph Melber, Mrs. Martha Nash, C. L. Fry, M. B. Kilpatrick, Joe Crompton, Mrs. Alfred Gilling, James Ahearn, Clyde McLaughlin, Mrs. Sid Cottier, Harry Andrew, Mrs. Charles McIlray, Mrs. William Walke, Howard Stone, Charles Turnquist, Mrs. Marion Higgins, Mrs. C. G. Kocher, Jess Vetter, Rufus Jones, John Thome, W. H. Merwin, Walter Wilkinson, Cecial Simpson, C. R. Rutledge, Harvey Meacham, Mrs. John Thinkle, Dewey Collier, Mrs. Helen Jones, Mrs. C. J. Rose, John White, W. L. Ramsey, Ralph Dial, Don Nikirk, Mrs. John Sauls, John Asbury, C. B. Hamilton, Mrs. Howard Meacham, William Stone, W. W. Smith, P. H. House, E. T. Sly, James Housell, Harry Porter, Jack Dwar, Kenneth Yarbrow, Mrs. Anna Houston, Fred Cunningham, Stanley Kehr, Don Willy, W. D. Samson, Art Tremayne, Bert Bergstrom, W. L. Ramsey, Dewey Collier, Jack Schwab, Tom Rolofson, Louis Lebow, Mrs. R. B. Rutherford, William Ackelbein, W. O. Fay, Flora Rickman, Stanley Gray, Frank Frederick, Charles Carlton.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement to the effect that I intend to vote against ap-

proval of the conference report. I shall so vote because I am hopeful that the report will be defeated, although my judgment is that it will not be defeated. I wish to make my statement in order that the record may show that I am hoping to be able to vote to send the bill back to a new conference for consideration strictly along the lines of the decisions reached by the Senate in the amendments which went to conference.

I have spoken on the bill a number of times, so I shall not consume the time of the Senate at this moment, except to say that I have not yet satisfied myself that all controls should be taken off and the law completely killed. I still feel that there are certain things which must be controlled, such as rents, and probably some other things, but I cannot believe that the conference report properly represents the views of the Senate, when the amendment which I so strongly favored, decontrolling meats, poultry, and dairy products, was destroyed.

Many very able committees of farmers, packers, poultrymen, and groups of dairymen have come to my office and told me what the effect of price control on their products will be in the future. They have told me not only what the effects will be in the immediate future, but what the real effect will be in the future on dairy products, meat, and so forth—particularly on dairy products. They have told me what the effect will be a year or two from now, because of the course being followed by certain farmers and dairymen who, I can assure the Senate, are good American citizens. Those men are getting rid of their herds and their poultry, and the effects will not be felt by us for some time.

That is all I wish to say at this late hour, because I should like to have the conference report come to a vote. But I wish to have it understood that if I had my choice I would not vote to kill the bill entirely. However, I am not in favor of the conference report as it has been submitted to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Millikin
Andrews	Gurney	Mitchell
Ball	Hart	Moore
Barkley	Hawkes	Morse
Bridges	Hayden	Murdock
Brooks	Hill	Myers
Burch	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bushfield	Huffman	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Overton
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Capper	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Carville	Knowland	Reed
Chavez	La Follette	Revercomb
Donnell	Lucas	Robertson
Downey	McCarran	Russell
Ferguson	McClellan	Smith
Fulbright	McKellar	Stanfill
George	McMahon	Stewart
Gossett	Magnuson	Swift
Green	Mead	Taft
Taylor	Wagner	Wiley
Thomas, Okla.	Walsh	Willis
Tobey	Wherry	Wilson
Tunnell	White	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only about 30 seconds.

Today I received a letter from Mr. R. W. Peaslee, general manager of the Merrimack Farmers' Exchange, Inc., which does business with most of the farmers in my State of New Hampshire. While this is a personal letter, I wish to read one sentence therefrom, bearing on the action which we shall take this afternoon:

> If ceilings had been taken off meat and poultry products New England would have lost what little grain it is now getting.

I think that speaks for itself. It is expert testimony.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to have the majority leader answer a question in regard to the bill which is now before the Senate in the form of a conference report. In relation to the conference report, on page 3, under subsection (A) at the bottom of the page, it is provided that—

> an agricultural commodity shall be deemed to be in short supply unless the supply of such commodity equals or exceeds the requirements for such commodity for the current marketing season.

My question is this: Unlike most crops, dairy products are produced and marketed all through the year. Under such circumstances, is the full year to be considered as the marketing season for dairy products, under this act?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Michigan, I think subsection (A) refers to agricultural commodities that have a seasonal marketing time. We all understand that fruits and even certain types of wheat at threshing time might be regarded as having a seasonal marketing time. But in the case of commodities or foods or products which are produced and consumed the year 'round, with slight variations, such as dairy products—milk, butter, and so forth—I think the marketing season would be the entire year, because there is no substantial variation between the production at different times in the year.

Mr. FERGUSON. That being true, if the estimated production for the year is sufficient to meet requirements—and let us take milk as an example—does the Senator believe that it should be decontrolled under this law?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the Secretary would be required necessarily to take into consideration the supply for the entire year. If he found that the supply and demand were in balance during any substantial part of the year, he would be justified in decontrolling.

Mr. FERGUSON. Even though it were not for the whole year?

Mr. BARKLEY. Even though it were not for the whole year.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his answer as an interpretation of the language I have referred to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I understand that yesterday there was a colloquy, at a time when I was absent from the Chamber, as to bringing various commodities, agricultural and nonagricultural, into a state of balance, and as to what would happen at that time. It seems that there was some doubt as to the effect of price on the state of balance. Am I correct in saying that when the supply of a commodity, agricultural or nonagricultural, comes into balance with demand, it is eligible for decontrol, regardless of whether the price would go up if it continued in that state?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is my interpretation of the bill. As a matter of fact, the Senate eliminated a provision of the bill as reported from the committee which would have been entitled to a different interpretation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. But as it is now written, I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to remind the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that it was eliminated in order to get rid of that very question.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement of my position on this question. I have found myself in a very difficult situation in connection with this measure. I feel that it has been weakened until I am very much afraid that it is not going to hold the price line even as it has been held in the past, and none of us contends that it has been held rigidly, by any means. However, as previous speakers have stated, the question is whether we shall have any price control or none at all. I cannot conscientiously open the floodgates of absolutely unchecked inflation upon the American people. So it is with very sincere misgivings as to the efficacy of the bill that I shall vote for it.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, after most careful deliberation, I have decided to vote for the conference report. In order to avoid any confusion or misunderstanding of my position, I wish briefly to express my reasons for so doing.

My position on effective price control and on the proposals in the pending bill are set forth in the minority report from the Banking and Currency Committee and in my remarks on the floor when the bill was here for consideration. That position is unchanged.

The bill which the Senate approved was far worse than that reported from the Banking and Currenc Committee, from the standpoint of effective price control and the sound economy of the country in the immediate and distant future. The Senate bill specifically decontrolled all meats, eggs, milk, petroleum, poultry, tobacco, and all the products thereof. The Senate also wrote into that bill the Taft amendment, which I opposed as the most potent inflationary device put forward in the entire congressional deliberations on this bill.

The Taft amendment is based on industry's largest profit margin in history, and would operate regardless of increased volume since 1941 or adequate total profits of the individual manufacturer. It would result in widespread price increases on countless thousands of products, with tremendous cumulative effect. It would impose an impossible administrative burden on the Office of Price Administration. It would launch labor on another round of wage demands and strikes to achieve them. It would bring price and cost uncertainties that would slow up rather than advance production. It would commit us to a spiral of price increases and wage increases that can be uttery disastrous to our postwar economy.

With all my heart, I hope that these results will not follow; that somehow the country may win through to an era of industrial peace and soaring prosperity. But the dangers that I see in the Taft amendment and the textile amendments are so great that I could not give the measure my approval when it was before the Senate.

The Senate went even further and wrote into the measure the Wherry amendment, which would have given every distributor, wholesaler, and retailer his current cost plus perwar mark-up, regardless of his present volume or present profits, and regardless of the basic objective to increase the production of goods in order to bring demand and requirements into effective balance.

As a conferee, I labored as diligently as I could to improve the measure and bring back a workable price-control law which Congress and the President would approve, and under which the country could enjoy greater production and continuing industrial peace. The conferees in my judgment brought back a bill which greatly improved on either the Senate or House version.

All the specific decontrols were eliminated. The Wherry amendment was substantially modified and the bill was improved in several other respects. I signed the report because it was the best we could get in conference, and because my vote was necessary in order that any conference report could be brought back to the Senate for its consideration. Similar reasons of necessity compel me to vote for the measure in order that some bill may go to the President for his consideration, in accordance with our historic and constitutional processes.

Voting against the conference report will be a substantial group favoring the specific decontrols, as well as those who frankly oppose continuance of any price control whatsoever beyond June 30 of this year. If I, and those who feel as I do about the pending measure, should aline our votes against the conference report, there is the immediate danger that the votes of those at either end of the proposition will combine to defeat it altogether. That would throw the entire matter back into conference, with further delay of congressional action and with the clear indication that the measure will be made even worse by writing in specific decontrols.

Mr. President, this is the 28th of June. All price control, all stabilization authority as to wages and prices, and all rent control, will expire on the 30th of June unless renewed by some congressional action and approved by the President or passed over his veto.

Those who declare that the measure does not go far enough in protecting price control appear to be divided into two groups: Some believe that Congress is confronted with the choice of this bill or no price control legislation at all; others still hope for a Presidential veto, sustained by Congress and followed by a simple continuing resolution. But, as a practical matter, the best way to further either course is to get this bill to the President just as quickly as we possibly can in these last few days that remain.

I do not pretend to know what action the President will take with regard to this measure.

In my judgment, a Presidential veto would be sustained. Thereafter, a continuing resolution would be in order. But at this moment, we have no choice but to send some bill, the best bill we could get in conference, to the President's desk for his consideration. For that reason and that reason alone I am voting for the conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a few words before the vote is taken. I realize that many Members of this Senate have been disturbed with reference to their duty in regard to this conference report, and I recognize that the choice which many of them are required to make is a very difficult one. But, Mr. President, the choice must be made. There is no alternative to making that choice. It might be a tragic choice if things turn out badly with respect to what we do here today.

This morning the President of the United States called to the White House the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the House, and the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate and the majority leader of the Senate, to discuss this legislation. The President was very sincere in seeking our viewpoint with respect to it. Inasmuch as he authorized us to say what we had recommended, when we departed, and inasmuch as it is now a matter of public knowledge, there is no need to keep from the Members of this body what we urged him to do.

With all the force that we could command, in view of the situation which presents itself to us and to him, we urged him to sign the bill when it reached him, on the same ground that I urge that we adopt it here, because the choice is between this bill and nothing. To hope that a joint resolution continuing price controls after next Sunday will be adopted by the two Houses of Congress is an idle dream. We might as well understand that, because that is what it is. It cannot be done. If an attempt were made to do it by the introduction of a joint resolution, it would have to go to the Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses of Congress and be there considered, and subsequently be reported back to the two Houses of Congress; and every provision in the conference report now before us could be added to it, and in all likelihood would be added to it, and more, too, so that we would ultimately be confronted with the necessity of having to vote on a worse bill than this one is, even if it is as bad as its enemies describe it to be. If we could ever pass such a joint resolution—and it might require a week, or 2 weeks, or 3 weeks to get it to the President—he would be confronted with the same choice with which he is confronted at this time, and it might be an even worse choice; and in the meantime there would be no OPA law, and prices would go up without restraint. Not only would prices go up, but rents would go up in every city in the United States—not only the rents for ordinary tenants, but rents for veterans who seek quarters. If they could not pay such increased rents, they would be evicted; and if they were not evicted, in many cases they would be made the victims of unconscionable increases in rents.

Mr. President, I say to the Senate, as I said to the President, that if there were in this bill nothing except a provision for the control of rents for one more year, it would be worth voting for and worth signing. However, it does contain more than that. Under this bill, any possible increases in prices will not be so great as the increases would be if the bill were not enacted.

So I say that in voting on the conference report no Member of the Senate should vote under the delusion that if the bill is defeated, we can get another one. The choice is between this bill or nothing at all. It is a choice which we do not like to make, but we have to make it, because it is here before us.

I hope with all my heart that the Senate will adopt the conference report and that the President will sign it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been ordered. Those in favor of agreeing to the conference report will vote "yea" when their names are called, and those who are opposed will vote "nay."

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MCCLELLAN (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from South

Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO and Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business, having been appointed to the commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I also announce that on this question the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] have a general pair.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr, BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—47

Aiken	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Huffman	Overton
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Burch	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Byrd	Knowland	Revercomb
Carville	La Follette	Russell
Chavez	Lucas	Smith
Donnell	McCarran	Stewart
Downey	McKellar	Swift
Fulbright	McMahon	Taft
George	Magnuson	Taylor
Gossett	Mead	Tobey
Green	Millikin	Tunnell
Hart	Mitchell	Wagner
Hayden	Murdock	Walsh
Hill	Myers	

NAYS—23

Ball	Gurney	Stanfill
Bridges	Hawkes	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Wherry
Bushfield	Moore	White
Capehart	Morse	Wiley
Capper	O'Daniel	Willis
Ferguson	Reed	Wilson
Guffey	Robertson	

NOT VOTING—26

Austin	Eastland	Murray
Bailey	Ellender	Saltonstall
Bilbo	Gerry	Shipstead
Brewster	Hatch	Thomas, Utah
Briggs	Hickenlooper	Tydings
Buck	Langer	Vandenberg
Butler	McClellan	Wheeler
Connally	McFarland	Young
Cordon	Maybank	

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion for cloture which was filed yesterday in connection with the conference report on the price-control bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I have several speaking engagements during the next few days which I cannot very well avoid. I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the sessions of the Senate until July 9.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have asked the Senator from Oklahoma to yield to me so that I may make a statement.

Mr. President, it is the desire of the Committee on Appropriations that the Senate now take up, in their order, the appropriation bills on the calendar. They may have to go to conference. Therefore it is the desire of the committee that they be passed at once.

I believe that the committee on appropriations reported a bill today which may not yet have been printed on the calendar, and if we have time to dispose of it, I should like to have it disposed of today so that if it should become necessary, it may be sent to conference.

I have been asked with reference to a possible session tomorrow. Ordinarily if we could dispose of the appropriation bills we might avoid a session tomorrow, but in view of the situation which exists, or may exist in regard to the legislative business of the Senate, it seems obvious at this time that we must hold a session tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the majority leader give some indication of his intentions with respect to a session of the Senate on July 4? A number of Senators have asked me whether there will be a session on that day.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the unfinished business which was temporarily laid aside is Senate bill 1850, the National Science Foundation bill. It is obvious that that bill will probably not be discussed until Monday. How long it will take to dispose of it, I do not know. It is not my purpose to ask the Senate to sit on July 4 unless it becomes absolutely necessary, and I cannot believe that it will. What will happen between July 4, which is on Thursday of next week, and the following Monday, I cannot say, but it will be necessary to hold a session of the Senate on Friday because we cannot recess from Wednesday over to Monday. Moreover, there may be matters which will demand the Senate's attention. However, at the present time it is not my purpose to ask the Senate to hold a session next Thursday, July 4.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. As the Senator from Kentucky will recall, I sought his advice with reference to when the rivers and harbors and flood-control bills will be taken up. I am in daily receipt of many inquiries, not only from persons throughout the United States who are interested, but from Members of the Senate who wish to know when the bills will be taken up. They will, I presume, go to conference after the Senate passes them. I should like to ask the majority leader to indicate the time when he believes the bills can be taken up.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is impossible to indicate a day on which the bills will be taken up, because none of us can tell how long it will require to dispose of the unfinished business. A prediction has been made that the bill may be disposed of in 2 days, or possibly in only 1 day. We never know in the Senate how long it will take to dispose of a bill which is at all controversial. But as soon as it is possible for me to do so I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senator from Louisiana in bringing before the Senate the rivers and harbors and flood-control bills. If it is possible to do that before July 4, I shall be glad to do so, or as soon thereafter as the bills can be reached.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1620, House bill 6837, the Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military

Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, of course, if the appropriation bill for the Military Establishment is taken up, it will not displace the unfinished business before the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is not my intention to displace the unfinished business. The Senator from Kentucky has already referred to the bill which is the unfinished business, and there is no intention on my part to displace it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6837, the Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1947.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT, 1942, AS AMENDED—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5716) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Title XV of such Act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

" 'SEC. 1503. Nothing contained in this Act or any other Federal Act (except the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, or the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended), shall be construed to authorize the establishment by any officer or agency of the Government of maximum prices for any commodity or maximum rents for any housing accommodations.' "

And the House agree to the same.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JAMES W. HUFFMAN,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
SAM HOBBS,
C. E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator make a statement as to what is involved in the report?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to do so. This is the conference report upon the Second War Powers Act.

The extension was voted in the House of Representatives earlier in the year, the bill came to the Senate, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary without dissent.

The bill was considered upon the floor of the Senate last Friday, an amendment was offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] which was accepted, and the bill went to conference between the two Houses upon that amendment.

The House conferees have agreed to the Senate amendment with a slight modification, which clarifies the effect of the amendment. The purpose of the amendment was to make certain that none of the war powers should be used for the purpose of carrying into effect any of the powers granted by the Price Control Act, the Stabilization Act, and the amendment in conference included the Emergency District of Columbia Rent Act. There is no dispute. The modifications made in conference were designed to make certain that the Senate amendment could not be interpreted to invalidate rent control in the District of Columbia under the Emergency Rent Act or in any State or city under any State law or local ordinance.

Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

REGISTRATION OF TRADE MARKS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I call up the conference report on House bill 1654, to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes.

(See conference report printed in RECORD of June 27, 1946, at p. 7635.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this is the trade-mark bill which has passed the House of Representatives three times and the Senate twice. The report of the conferees is unanimous. I hope the report will be agreed to. Two of the other conferees, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], wish to make statements with reference to the agreement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the trade-mark bill is of such great importance that I have a feeling that a statement should be made to explain briefly and concisely the effect of the Senate amendments which, with slight modifications, have been accepted by the House conferees. I make this statement because in reading the RECORD of the proceedings in the House with regard to the bill, I felt that there might be some misinterpretation of the language which was employed by one of the Members of the House in attempting to explain the Senate amendment.

The statement of the managers on the part of the House, which was printed at length in the RECORD of the House proceedings in accordance with the rule, makes what I conceive to be a correct description of the effect of the amendment added by the Senate, making the use of a trade-mark to violate the antitrust laws a defense to a suit by the trade-mark registrant.

It should be remembered, in the first place, that this trade-mark bill is an attempt to perfect the system under which trade-marks are now registered in the United States.

The Constitution of the United States does not give Congress any original power with respect to trade-marks as it does with respect to patents and copyrights. The Constitution, as every Member of the Senate knows, prescribed that Congress should have the power to grant exclusive rights to the use of inventions for limited periods. The trade-mark is a right which is acquired under the common law, and is a permanent right.

The bill which came from the House upon several occasions undertook to provide that trade-marks under certain circumstances and conditions should be incontestable, but, in the view of Senators, did not contain sufficient safeguards against restraints of trade. The word "incontestable" is perfectly clear and understandable. After the period prescribed in the act a trade-mark should become incontestable.

It appeared, however, from the history of litigation in the United States, that trade-marks from time to time—not at all as a general practice, I want it understood, but only from time to time—have been used in the violation of the antitrust laws. It was also felt that under the language of the bill trade names could be used to prolong a patent monopoly after the expiration of a patent. One of the Senate amendments, agreed to with slight modification by the House, was intended to eliminate this possibility. I think it is effective for that purpose.

The trade-mark has come into existence under the common law for the purpose of protecting both the consumer and the producer. The trade-mark or trade name is designed to give notice to the public that the commodity to which it is attached is produced by a particular producer. Thereby the consumer knows that this particular producer is the one who has produced the material he seeks to buy.

There have been occasions, however, when trade-marks have been misused. There have been occasions when trade-marks have been used in connection with cartel agreements. There have been occasions when trade-marks have been used to restrain the trade and to the disadvantage of little business.

So it was provided by a Senate amendment that one of the defenses or defects which would make a trade-mark contestable even after this period was a showing that the trade-mark had been

or was being used to violate the antitrust laws of the United States.

The Senate adopted the amendment. The amendment was changed in conference to make it perfectly clear that what was meant was that the trade-mark itself was being used to violate the antitrust laws.

It should be understood from the language of the law—and I shall read it now so that there can be no possible ground for misinterpretation—that the use of a mail to violate the antitrust laws is a defense to an infringement suit. Section 33 (b) provides:

If the right to use the registered mark has become incontestable under section 15 hereof, the certificate shall be conclusive evidence of the registrant's exclusive right to use the registered mark in commerce on or in connection with the goods or services specified in the certificate, subject to any conditions or limitations stated therein except when one of the following defenses or defects is established.

I emphasize that last clause:

except when one of the following defenses or defects is established.

Then seven defenses or defects are listed. They are as follows:

(1) That the registration or the incontestable right to use the mark was obtained fraudulently; or

(2) That the mark has been abandoned by the registrant; or

(3) That the registered mark has been assigned and is being used, by or with the permission of the assignee, so as to misrepresent the source of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used; or

(4) That the use of the name, term, or device charged to be an infringement is a use, otherwise than as a trade or service mark, of the party's individual name in his own business, or of the individual name of anyone in privity with such party, or of a term or device which is descriptive of and used fairly and in good faith only to describe to users the goods or services of such party, or their geographic origin; or

(5) That the mark whose use by a party is charged as an infringement was adopted without knowledge of the registrant's prior use and has been continuously used by such party or those in privity with him from a date prior to the publication of the registered mark under subsection (a) or (c) of section 12 of this act: *Provided, however,* That this defense or defect shall apply only for the area in which such continuous prior use is proved.

(6) That the mark whose use is charged as an infringement was registered and used prior to the publication under subsection (a) or (c) of section 12 of this act of the registered mark of the registrant, and not abandoned: *Provided, however,* That this defense or defect shall apply only where the said mark has been published pursuant to subsection (c) of section 12 and shall apply only for the area in which the mark was used prior to the date of publication of the registrant's mark under subsection (a) or (c) of section 12 of this act.

(7) That the mark has been or is being used to violate the antitrust laws of the United States.

Mr. President, the point which I wish to make perfectly clear is that the use of such a mark to violate the antitrust laws, constitutes a defense in an infringement suit. The House managers so stated in their statement to the House.

Now I read from the statement of the House managers:

Amendment No. 28: This amendment provides that the use of a registered mark in violation of the antitrust laws shall constitute a defense to a suit by the registrant. The House recedes with an amendment substituting the words "to violate" for the words "in violation of". This amendment provides an additional defense to the conclusive evidence rule of a certificate of registration of a mark which has become incontestable under section 15. It does not and is not intended to enlarge, restrict, amend, or modify the substantive law of trade-marks, either as set out in other sections of this act or as heretofore applied by the courts. The amendment does not and is not intended to affect the validity of the mark nor affect the right of the registrant to continue use or enforce his rights in the mark. If it is established that a registrant has used or is using his registered mark, which has become incontestable, as the legal, causal, and efficient instrumentality to violate the antitrust laws of the United States, such registrant is denied the benefit of the rule that the certificate of registration is conclusive evidence of his exclusive right to use the mark. Under such circumstances, the certificate is only prima facie evidence of his exclusive right to use and he must be prepared to carry the additional burden of proof as though his mark had not become incontestable.

Here I emphasize the first sentence:

This amendment provides that the use of a registered mark in violation of the antitrust laws shall constitute a defense to a suit by the registrant.

I did not want the RECORD, Mr. President, before the approval of the conference report, to be susceptible of any misunderstanding. It is a matter of great importance to the consumers of the United States that they shall know that trade-marks are being used as it was intended under the common law that they should be used. By reason of the invention of the radio, the great improvement in communications, the invention of the airplane and the great improvement in travel, it is now possible for management in a central point to send goods all over the country, indeed, all over the world. And it is possible to abuse trade-marks. But it is of such great importance to the public of the United States that restraints of trade shall not be permitted, that the Senate insered this amendment to make it a defense to an infringement suit as well as to make it a ground of contestability if it should be shown that the registrant was using the mark itself to violate the antitrust law.

As the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], one of the conferees, has well said in a notable speech which he made to a graduating class in New York State a week or so ago, those who seek equity must do equity; and when we seek the protection of the laws of the United States we must be prepared to do so with clean hands. The Senator from New Jersey has announced that principle, which is, of course, old in the law of equity, and to which we all subscribe.

The intent of Congress to protect the public from the abuse of trade-marks and trade names was demonstrated by the adoption of an amendment permitting the Federal Trade Commission to apply to cancel a mark. This proviso reads as follows:

Provided, That the Federal Trade Commission may apply to cancel on the grounds specified in subsections (c) and (d) of this section any mark registered on the principal register established by this act, and the prescribed fee shall not be required.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming suggested that I read the report. I think it is unnecessary to take the time of the Senate to do so, because I had printed in the RECORD a statement which will be found in the RECORD of June 27, on page 7636.

First, I should like to thank the Senator from Wyoming for his cooperation. I think he has made a very clear statement, and I am sure that he does not misunderstand what happened the other day when he was not on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, certainly not.

Mr. HAWKES. There was no intention of doing anything contrary to the wishes of the Senator.

I should like to read into the RECORD the last paragraph of the statement I had printed in the RECORD yesterday. I should like to have it go into the RECORD as my statement at this point:

Although the words "used to violate the antitrust laws of the United States" are general in their nature, their meaning is clear. A registrant of a trade-mark might violate the antitrust laws by entering into an agreement to restrict output or to suppress competition and yet the use made by the registrant of his trade-mark in his business might have no legal, causal, or efficient relation to the violation of these laws. The relation of the trade-mark to these illegal acts might be purely physical or coincidental. If a trade-mark should be used as the legal, causal, and efficient intrumentality to effect a contract, agreement, or arrangement which violates the antitrust laws, then the actual use of the mark to carry out such a scheme would constitute a use in violation of the antitrust laws; but if the mark is in no true sense an essential legal element of the unlawful conduct, then the fact that the registrant may have violated the antitrust laws independently of the mark or its use would not bring paragraph (7) of paragraph (b) of section 33 into operation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I might make a comment on what the Senator has said. I read the last sentence of his statement:

But if the mark is in no true sense an essential legal element of the unlawful conduct, then the fact that the registrant may have violated the antitrust laws independently of the mark or its use would bring paragraph (7) of paragraph (b) of section 33 into operation.

That is just shading it a little too much, as I pointed out to the Senator yesterday. Paragraph (7) was not intended, as I read it, to say, as the Senator has said in his statement, that the use of the trade-mark should be in itself the single, only, legal, causal, and efficient instrumentality which violates the law. In other words, what I want to make clear is that the use in the statement the Senator has read of the phrase

"an essential legal element of the unlawful conduct" should not be interpreted as so narrowing the effect of a trade-mark violation of the antitrust law that nevertheless the trade-mark owner could use the trade-mark in such violation, but if it were shown that some other act were the proximate cause of the violation, then the trade-mark should become incontestable. That is what we mean when we say, as I have quoted the Senator's words, that the holder of the trade-mark must come into court with clean hands.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, would my fellow conferees agree that the Senator from New Jersey is not saying that he is insisting that the trade-mark must be the sole and efficient cause? The Senator from New Jersey is not saying that the trade-mark must be used in the violation of the antitrust laws as the sole and efficient cause, but it must at least be one of the active, proximate causes in the violation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. I am thoroughly in agreement with that. In other words, the trade-mark, to have its incontestability removed, must have been a part of the process of violating the antitrust laws. The Senator from Wyoming agrees with that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no question about that.

Mr. HAWKES. I think we are all in agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 17, 19, 22, 50 and 64.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 5, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 52, 54, 55, 57, 60, 61, 62, 63, 68, 69, and 72, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$174,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$190,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "purchase and maintenance of one passenger automobile;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$425,972"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbred 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,710,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,248,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,297,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$859,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$767,309"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For the acquisition of parcel 101/25, known as the Emery estate, as a site for recreational, library and other community purposes in the discretion of the Commissioners, $204,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,106,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,630,657"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$723,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "'Victory' gardens and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,033,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$581,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Capital outlay, District Training School: For the construction and equipment of laundry building, $140,000; and for the improvement of roads, $35,000; in all, $175,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$586,152"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,211,923"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 67, and 71

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
ELMER THOMAS,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
RAYMOND E. WILLIS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN M. COFFEE,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
EMMET O'NEAL,
KARL STEFAN,
WALT HORAN,
GORDON CANFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5990, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 27, 1946.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67 to the bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71 to said bill and concur therein with

an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 3. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or the Government of the District of Columbia, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to said bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 71.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment No. 1, request a further conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the same conferees at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. WILLIS, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT, 1947

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, before we begin consideration of the committee amendments I desire to make a brief statement with respect to what the bill does and what it means. I regret that the bill did not reach the Senate before last Monday. The Senate committee could not consider the bill until it reached this body. Hearings were started on Tuesday of this week, and they were held continuously until we had completed the repertoire of witnesses. Today is Friday, so we had only 4 days to consider a bill which calls for an appropriation of some $7,000,000. I now desire to make a brief statement to explain just what the bill provides.

In presenting for the consideration of the Senate the Military Establishment appropriation bill for fiscal year 1947, I will at the outset state the total amounts which have been involved in the consideration of this bill. The War Department budget estimates for fiscal year 1947, as submitted by the President to the Congress on May 6, 1946, totaled $7,246,335,200. On June 13, 1946, the President recommended certain adjustments in the budget estimates to eliminate funds for the care and handing of property subsequent to its declaration of surplus. These adjustments were contained in House Document 657 and called for a net decrease in the budget estimates of some $38,000,000, bringing the total submission to $7,208,207,429. As passed by the House, H. R. 6837 provided for a total appropriation of $7,091,034,700—a further decrease in the budget estimates of $117,172,729. The bill which I am presenting for your consideration today provides a total appropriation to the War Department of $7,595,449,868, which is an increase of $504,415,168 over the amount passed by the House.

This bill is based upon the assumption that Army strength will total 1,550,000 on July 1, 1946, and will decrease to 1,070,000 by the end of fiscal year 1947. An average strength of 1,279,000 has been used in computing requirements. Of this average strength, it is estimated that 596,000 will be in the United States and 683,000 will be overseas. General Eisenhower, the Chief of Staff, has assured us that this average strength of 1,279,000 is the minimum required to efficiently perform his many tasks during fiscal year 1947.

In the very limited time available for the consideration of this bill the committee heard the testimony of General Eisenhower, the Chief of Staff; General Richards, budget officer for the War Department; and a number of the chiefs of the several operating agencies of the War Department. Based upon this testimony, the committee concluded that H. R. 6837 as passed by the House would not be adequate to finance the carrying out of the heavy responsibilities which must be discharged by the War Department and the Army during the fiscal year 1947. It must be borne in mind that though actual hostilities have ceased, there remain many tasks which must be efficiently performed if we are to have any assurance that the victories which were won at so great a sacrifice of American manpower and matériel will result in the complete restoration of peace and orderly existence for the peoples of of the world.

In taking action upon this bill, the House reduced the budget estimates for "Government and relief in occupied areas" from a total of $500,000,000 to a total of $350,000,000. The Senate Appropriations Committee is of the opinion that the reduction of $150,000,000 would have international repercussions, would jeopardize our occupation forces, and would greatly handicap the performance of the responsibilities which the United States Government has undertaken in Japan, Germany, Korea, and Austria. The committee, therefore, has restored the House reduction in this appropriation.

Based upon the testimony of the Chief of Staff, the Commanding General of the Army Ground Forces, and the Chief of Engineers, the committee reached the conclusion that insufficient funds were included in H. R. 6837, as passed by the House, to provide minimum essential facilities for the operation of our Army both at home and in foreign areas. The committee requested and was given recommendations by the War Department as to additional funds required to provide these essential facilities. The bill now before the Senate for consideration provides an additional $100,000,000 for the construction of required facilities at our permanent overseas bases. The great majority of this money is required for housing for the military garrisons at these bases. Tents and flimsy shelter for housing our troops must be replaced promptly by more substantial structures. In addition, we have restored the House reduction of some $25,000,000 in this appropriation.

The testimony before our committee indicated that H. R. 6837 as passed by the House did not contain sufficient funds for the provision of housing and training facilities at our permanent posts in the United States. The committee has therefore added another $99,000,000 to the bill to provide these facilities. The Commanding General, Army Ground Forces, stated that this was one of the most pressing requirements in the Army today. It must be remembered that before the war we had facilities for an Army of only some 167,000. If these permanent posts in the United States are to be expected to perform their mission in the postwar Army, they must have adequate facilities.

Our committee has also provided an additional $50,000,000 for repairs and maintenance of the facilities which the Army now has. It has been the observation of several members of our committee, and perhaps some other Senators, that structures at our Army posts in this country are badly deteriorated. It is the opinion of our committee that it is unsound economy to allow these facilities to further deteriorate. It is further our opinion that the construction, repair, and maintenance of Army facilities can be executed at the present time probably more cheaply than at some future date.

In passing H. R. 6837, the House reduced the Budget estimates for the Ordnance Department by $12,719,000. The Chief of Ordnance explained to our committee that this reduction meant further delay in the renovation and

storage of the huge quantities of ammunition which we now have on hand, and in the complete demilitarization of the obsolete and badly deteriorated ammunition. Delay in this important work will be dangerous. The ammunition will continue to deteriorate to the point where rehabilitation will be impossible, and there is the possibility of bad explosions with resultant loss of life and property. The committee has therefore restored the House reduction to this appropriation.

The Chief of Transportation informed our committee that the House reduction of some $49,000,000 in his appropriation would result in a lack of adequate transportation facilities for the movement of Army personnel on their return from overseas theaters and of their replacements. It might also mean the slowing up of the handling of this personnel. In addition, the committee's attention has been called to the fact that H. R. 6064, which is now in the status of an enrolled enactment awaiting the signature of the President, will require the return of many soldiers from overseas who have completed their term of service as specified in this act. This act also provides that any father who is in the service shall, upon his request after August 1, 1946, be released therefrom. The War Department anticipates that this requirement will throw a heavy additional burden on the already limited transportation facilities. Additional boats, crews, and facilities will have to be provided to carry out the provisions of this act.

In view of these considerations, the committee has restored to this appropriation $45,000,000 of the reduction made by the House. It is our opinion that the Transportation Corps will be able to provide adequate facilities with this additional amount.

The committee has made a number of other changes in this bill and has fully detailed them in its report. The above discussion covers the principal ones.

There is one change in the general provisions of this bill to which I should call attention. By language in section 4 the House has made the War Department appropriations available for the care, handling, and disposition of surplus property in overseas areas. The Chief of Staff and the Budget Officer for the War Department assured our committee that this bill does not contain any funds for the care and handling of property either at home or abroad after it has been declared surplus. It is therefore necessary that the language provision which was included in the bill by the House be deleted.

Mr. President, in order that this presentation may be somewhat more complete, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a list of the several appropriations which have been made by the Congress for the support of the Army, beginning with the year 1916 and ending with the year 1946. This list is found on page 101 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

War Department Military Establishment expenditures, fiscal years 1916–46

1916	$122,392,363
1917	401,418,217
1918	5,632,730,914
1919	8,915,973,973
1920	1,008,300,356
1921	439,485,095
1922	329,050,896
1923	284,112,900
1924	250,714,592
1925	252,087,036
1926	267,260,488
1927	267,124,843
1928	294,957,279
1929	313,093,228
1930	328,738,873
1931	345,274,202
1932	344,610,560
1933	298,417,427
1934	243,329,151
1935	273,485,712
1936	382,654,083
1937	374,260,149
1938	421,985,682
1939	496,074,929
1940	668,586,382
1941	4,029,774,043
1942	13,543,996,420
1943	41,814,973,713
1944	49,528,144,771
1945	51,348,427,060
1946	[1] 28,532,985,445

[1] Estimated.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I now ask that the committee amendments be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Military activities—Office of the Secretary of War—Contingencies of the Army," on page 2, line 17, after the word "purposes", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$14,480,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Staff Corps—Field exercises," on page 3, line 10, after "(31 U. S. C. 223b)", to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Finance Department—Finance Service, Army," on page 7, after line 2, to insert:

Appropriations available to the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1947 shall be available for reimbursement to such appropriations of the Naval Establishment as may be designated by the Secretary of the Navy, for the pay, allowances, and other expenses as authorized by law, for such number of naval dental officers as may be authorized by the President to perform service with the Military Establishment: *Provided*, That such military and naval personnel, as may be detailed for duty with other than the War and Navy Departments, respectively, on a reimbursement basis may be employed in addition to the numbers otherwise authorized and appropriated for.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 19, to strike out:

No appropriation for the pay of the Army shall be available for the pay of any officer or enlisted man on the active list of the Army who is engaged in any manner with any publication which is or may be issued by or for any branch or organization of the Army or military association in which officers or enlisted men have membership and which carries paid advertising of firms doing business with the War Department: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prohibit officers from writing or disseminating articles in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary of War;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 23, after "Finance Department", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$31,578,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 10, after the word "Army", to strike out "$2,584,800,000" and insert "$2,586,378,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps—Quartermaster Service, Army," on page 21, line 5, after "maintenance)", to strike out "$100" and insert "$200,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 6, after the word "Army", to strike out "$597,750,100" and insert "$597,950,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation Corps—Transportation Service, Army," on page 22, line 2, after the word "station", to strike out "$475,000,000" and insert "$524,664,256."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Signal Corps—Signal Service of the Army," on page 24, line 18, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$104,115,112."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Corps of Engineers—Engineer Service, Army," on page 30, line 5, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$350,000,000" and insert "$475,544,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 10, before the word "*Provided*", to strike out "$115,500,000" and insert "$215,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 19, after the word "for", to strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$350,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 11, after "In all, Engineer Service, Army", to strike out "$765,500,000" and insert "$1,041,044,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Department—Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army", on page 34, line 15, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$315,000,000" and insert "$327,719,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army," on page 50, line 8, after the name "Secretary of War", to

strike out "$167,000" and insert "$281,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Government and relief in occupied areas," on page 52, line 9, after the word "information", to insert "expenses incident to the operation of schools for American children"; and in line 17, after the word "accomplished", to strike out "$350,000,000" and insert "$500,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Atomic service," on page 53, line 11, after the word "appurtenances" to insert "the provision and operation of community facilities, including facilities for the housing, health, medical care, safety, schooling, welfare and recreation of atomic service personnel, to the extent and in the manner deemed necessary by the officer in charge for the proper conduct of atomic service activities"; and in line 22, after the figures "$375,000,000", to insert a comma and "to be available until expended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Printing and binding, War Department," on page 56, line 19, after the word "law", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$13,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 57, line 3, after the word "work", to insert "unless representatives of the employees are given the opportunity to check any such time studies as may affect the amount of work asked of them and to protest under the established grievance procedure any work requirements believed unreasonable."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

All in favor——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, to that amendment I offer the following amendment: On page 57, in line 3, strike out all of the committee amendment beginning in line 3, down to and including the word "unreasonable," in line 7.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the vote would come on agreeing to the committee amendment. It will not be necessary to move to strike it out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that, but I was not certain whether the Chair had put the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now pending. The Senator from Washington will be heard.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to speak against this committee amendment. It is similar to an amendment which was placed in the Navy appropriation bill. It is rather a back-door approach to a matter which has been a question for many years in the Army and Navy working establishments.

Last week, during the discussion of the naval appropriation bill, I stated to the Senate the history of the prohibition which has been included in all Army and Navy appropriation bills for approximately 30 years. Prior to 1916, both the Army and the Navy in their industrial establishments used what is known as a time-check system on their employees. It is also called the Taylor system or the Bedaux system. It is a speed-up system in which stop watches are used to check on the employees. Prior to 1916 the practice became so vicious and was abused to such an extent that the Senate by resolution created a committee to examine into the practice. That committee was headed by the late Senator Borah, of Idaho. It made a lengthy report to the Senate at that time, and the Senate unanimously agreed to place prohibitions against the use of time-check and stop-watch systems against the employees, and the Senate has consistently done so for 30 years.

Last year an attempt was made, I believe, by the Senator from Minnesota to change that custom and to strike out the prohibition, which has been included in these bills all these years. That attempt was defeated by the Senate.

This year the Senator from Minnesota and other Senators have placed in both the Navy and the Military Establishment appropriation bills what they claim to be a modification——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let me advise the Senator from Washington that since this amendment was proposed to this bill by the committee, the conferees on the naval appropriations bill have agreed to eliminate a corresponding provision from that bill. Because of that fact, I am not prepared to insist that the amendment remain in this bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was about to remark that a similar amendment was acted upon by the Senate the other day. I supposed that the Senator from Minnesota favored it. Then the Senate voted, 28 to 27, on the question of the adoption of the amendment. But since that time the conferees on the Navy appropriation bill have eliminated the amendment.

So I hope the Senate will eliminate it from this bill. There is a great deal of difference between having a time-check system on Government employees and having it on private employees.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I see no point in prolonging the argument, inasmuch as the chairman of the subcommittee is not going to insist on the amendment. I myself think that at this time in the session, inasmuch as the amendment did not stay in the Navy Department appropriation bill, there is not much point in adding it to this bill, although I certainly do not abandon my position, and in this particular case the Army asked for the amendment because the Army has certain operations in which time studies are very important.

I am not giving up the battle. Next year I shall renew it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. In view of his statement, I shall have nothing further to say.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I should like to point out, as has already been stated, that the conferees on the Navy Department appropriation bill have already agreed to eliminate such an amendment from that bill. I commend the Senator from Washington for bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate again. I hope that inasmuch as we have discussed the matter this year, such an amendment will not be contained in appropriation bills next year. It seems to me that we have decided both in the committee and here on the floor of the Senate that we do not want this system. So I hope the Army and the Navy will refrain from insisting upon having such an amendment included next year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I, too, want to express my desire that the wishes of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Washington be carried out in the future, in respect to the Army and Navy appropriation bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 53, beginning in line 3.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 67, after line 7, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 20. None of the funds appropriated in this act for the War Department and the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, other than funds for which reimbursement is made hereunder, shall be available for any expenses (including the pay, allowances, and subsistence of military personnel) for care, upkeep, repair, handling, and assistance in the sale of any property, material, or equipment subsequent to the date of a declaration of surplus covering such property to a disposal agency, or, if procedures are prescribed whereby declarations of surplus are made at approximately the time of disposal or removal, subsequent to the date of notice by the owning agency to the disposal agency that property has been determined to be surplus and is subject to such procedures. With respect to all such expenses, disposal agencies shall provide reimbursement to the War Department, for credit to the appropriations from which such expenses would be normally paid: *Provided*, That advance payments based on the estimated expenses of the War Department may be made by any disposal agency: *Provided further*, That in lieu of ascertaining the direct expenses and the applicable portion of the indirect expenses, the War Department and the disposal agencies may agree on any basis for determining such expenses as will equitably accomplish the purpose of this section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, after line 6, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 21. Not to exceed 10 percent of any of the appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1947 may be transferred with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget to any other of such appropriations, but no appropriation shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 13, to change the section number from 20 to 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HART. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 27, in line 10, it is proposed to to strike out the period and insert the following: "*Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated to the Air Corps be expended in research in or procurement of rockets or guided missiles which come under the normal cognizance of the Ordnance Department."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this amendment was not presented to the committee; hence, it could not be considered there.

As chairman of the committee, I have no information regarding what effect the amendment will have upon the bill. Inasmuch as we have had only a short time to consider the bill, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference. In the meantime we can look into it, and the conferees can pass upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 6837) was passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 1947

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6777, making appropriations for Government corporations and independent establishments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947.

I shall not make a statement about the bill, but if there are questions regarding any amendment which has been proposed or if there are questions which Senators wish to ask in regard to other matters, I shall attempt to answer them to the best of my ability.

So, Mr. President, I have made the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6777) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Tennessee Valley Authority," on page 2, line 2, after the name "Watauga Dam", to insert "and beginning construction of a fertilizer manufacturing plant at or near Mobile, Ala."; in line 13, before the word "together", to strike out "$25,906,000" and insert "$46,572,000"; and in line 16, after the word "appropriations", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That of the $46,572,000 appropriated herein, $17,666,000 shall be available for the immediate resumption of construction and continued prosecution of the work on the Watauga and South Holston Dams with a view to the completion of the work on both dams at the earliest possible date and $3,000,000 toward the construction of a fertilizer manufacturing plant at or near Mobile, Ala."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of Agriculture—Federal Crop Insurance Corporation," on page 4, line 4, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$6,800,000" and insert "$7,880,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Independent agencies and corporations," on page 6, line 1, before the word "shall", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$525,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Loan Agency," on page 6, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$33,553,000" and insert "$35,553,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Housing Agency," on page 11, line 17, after the words "total of", to strike out "$1,400,000" and insert "$1,501,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$4,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 2, to strike out:

Liquidation of resettlement projects: Not to exceed $99,500 of the receipts derived from the operation of the projects transferred under paragraphs 1 (g) and 6 of Executive Order 9070 of February 24, 1942 (7 F. R. 1529), shall be available for necessary expenses in connection with and to facilitate disposition of the improved or unimproved lands in the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Greendale, and Greenhills, pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (49 Stat. 115), including temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws, for making surveys, plans, and plats, and expenses of additions, alterations, and improvements to streets and utilities.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 2, to insert:

Liquidation of resettlement projects: Not to exceed $99,500 of the receipts derived from the operation of the projects transferred under paragraphs 1 (g) and 6 of Executive Order 9070 of February 24, 1942 (7 F R. 1529), shall be available for necessary expenses in connection with and to facilitate disposition of the improved or unimproved lands in the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Greendale, and Greenhills, pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (49 Stat. 115), including temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws, for making surveys, plans, and plats, and expenses of additions, alterations, and improvements to streets and utilities.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$98,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of Agriculture," on page 20, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$8,760,000"; on page 21, line 3, after the word "hereof", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable price as provided by section 4 (a) of the act of July 1, 1941, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–8); and the method that is now used for the purposes of Commodity Credit Corporation loans for determining the parity price or its equivalent for seven-eighths inch Middling cotton at the average location used in fixing the base loan rate for cotton shall also be used for determining the parity price for seven-eighths inch Middling cotton at such average location for the purposes of this proviso: *Provided further*, That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity substantially deteriorated in quality (or in the case of perishable fruits, vegetables, and animal products if there is danger of deterioration or of accumulation of stocks) or sold for the purpose of feeding, or the extraction of peanut oil, or commodities disposed of for export pursuant to section 21 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (Public Law 457) or commodities sold to farmers for seed or for new or byproduct uses, or com-

modities sold for the purpose of establishing claims against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentations, or other wrongful acts with respect to such commodities: *Provided further*, That no wheat or corn will be sold for feed at a price less than the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided further*, That in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price of corn."

And on page 22, line 16, after "(15 U. S. C. 713a–4)" to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That no part of any funds appropriated in this act for the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, to make any payments to other than domestic producers, under any subsidy program operation not in effect on the date of enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 23, to strike out:

Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation: *Provided*, That funds acquired by the Corporation as an agency of the United States, other than funds transferred pursuant to the act of June 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 323), shall remain available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of liquidation and dissolution of the Corporation: *Provided, however*, That not to exceed $40,000 of such funds may be expended for administrative expenses during the fiscal year 1947.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 9, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$3,750,000" and insert "$3,875,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 23, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,688,501."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 2, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$1,600,000" and insert "$1,644,912."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 5, after the word "exceed," to strike out $341,000" and insert "$391,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—General provisions," on page 27, line 20, before the word "vehicles," to strike out "nonserviceable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I send forward an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, after line 16, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 306. In order to meet emergencies or contingencies arising subsequent to approval of the Budget and not provided for in the Budget program, a corporation. or agency covered by the provisions of this act may, with the approval of the President, adjust its budget program to provide, within the limits of available funds and borrowing authority, for the immediate initiation of programs authorized by law and not specifically set forth in the Budget: *Provided*, That the new program shall be promptly transmitted to the Congress as an amendment to the Budget: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as authority for increasing the amount available for administrative expenses under any limitation on such expenses.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object very strenuously to the amendment. It seems to me that it would absolutely abolish the Budget Act. As I read the Byrd-Butler law, I can form no other conclusion.

Mr. McKELLAR. The amendment was sent to the committee by the President and by the Bureau of the Budget. I do not see why it would have been sent by the Director of the Budget if the amendment would abolish the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. TAFT. The Byrd-Butler Act was passed in order to require that a budget be submitted by each Federal corporation for its own operation. Allow me to read the language of the amendment:

In order to meet emergencies or contingencies arising subsequent to approval of the budget and not provided for in the budget program, a corporation or agency covered by the provisions of this act may, with the approval of the President, adjust its budget program to provide, within the limits of available funds and borrowing authority, for the immediate initiation of programs authorized by law and not specifically set forth in the budget.

That language removes all limitations. The RFC, for example, has some $5,000,000,000 available for borrowing, and they, therefore, operate under no limit whatever.

The purpose of the Budget Act was to require corporations to tell Congress in advance what their programs were to be. If we agree to this amendment, we say, in effect, to those corporations, "You no longer must do that." It may be said, "There is a new emergency, and the President says you should go ahead. So go ahead and undertake programs which have not been authorized by the Congress." It is just the same as if we were to say, in connection with appropriations, "Because there is an authorization of $100,000,000 we are now appropriating $50,000,000. But if the President wants to spend more money, up to the limit of the total authorization, he may do so."

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. TAFT. That is the way I read the language.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I understand the amendment. The purpose of it is to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to have some flexibility within its limitations in dealing with certain contingencies which might arise with respect to some program for which provision was not made in the Budget. The only testimony presented before the committee in urging the amendment came from the Commodity Credit Corporation. It wished to be enabled to deal with the farm program.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there also came a letter from the President, dated June 19, 1946, strongly urging the amendment, and after the Senator has concluded his remarks I shall wish to read the letter into the RECORD.

Mr. RUSSELL. My only interest is not to tie the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation in its present program dealing with farm crops. The amendment states, in part, "within the limits of available funds and borrowing authority."

Mr. TAFT. That is no limit whatever, because the corporations in question have a considerable amount of borrowing authority beyond anything which they may spend. The very purpose of the passage of the Budget Act was to require Government corporations to say in advance what their programs were to be. If the Senator desires to incorporate a special provision with regard to certain things which the Commodity Credit Corporation may do within the limit of their field, I would have no objection, but it seems to me that this amendment takes off the limit. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has five or six billion dollars of borrowing power. Under this amendment they may undertake any project which they may wish.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would have to be authorized by law.

Mr. TAFT. What must be authorized by law? The RFC is authorized by law to do almost anything. The very purpose of the Byrd-Butler law is to tie them down in the same way that we tie down an ordinary department provided for in an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, it seems to me very clearly that this is legislation on an appropriation bill. I believe that I should make the point of order that the amendment is not in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the amendment were amended so as to apply solely to the Commodity Credit Corporation would the Senator from Ohio withdraw his point of order? I do not believe that we should tie down the Commodity Credit Corporation when the Steagall and other acts guarantee farmers a certain program.

Mr. TAFT. My understanding of the act is this: the Commodity Credit Corporation should file a budget program. They do not have to be particularly specific. They must merely indicate the programs which they intend to undertake during the following year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, unfortunately they did set forth a very specific program. They indicated an amount which they would pay within the limitations of the price control act to the producers of milk, and so much for sugar. There is a likelihood that the Congress will be in adjournment for 5 or 6 months, and if no relief is granted the producers of some commodities will be absolutely wiped out unless they are able to get Government aid. Of course, the amendment is subject to a point of order.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator indicate where in the bill the Commodity Credit Corporation is dealt with?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have the bill before me. Allow me to ask the Senator if he would be willing to agree to an amendment on line 3, after the words

"Budget program" to insert "the Commodity Credit Corporation, with the approval of the President."

Mr. TAFT. Here is another question I was about to ask the chairman of the committee. What is the relation between this bill and the OPA extension bill which was passed this afternoon which expressly provided authority to pay subsidies, and buy and sell at a loss if both the RFC and the Commodity Credit Corporation set out a specific limitation of the money which may be used for that kind of a program?

Mr. RUSSELL. The specific over-all limitation carried in the OPA bill would be binding on the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other agency of the Government which might be paying a subsidy. The Commodity Credit Corporation set up the programs which they anticipated handling during the coming fiscal year. I think we will be apt to work a great hardship on some group in this country which already has received assurances in other legislative measures unless the Commodity Credit Corporation has been given power to adjust their budget to meet any emergency which might arise.

Mr. TAFT. I have some doubt whether language of the kind proposed might not completely set aside the limitation of the subsidy program which we just approved in the Price Control Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think so.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see why not.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe that that issue could arise, and certainly I have no such idea in mind.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what is the meaning of the following language on page 22 of the bill?

Provided further, That no part of any funds appropriated in this act for the Commodity Credit Corporation——

Incidentally, there are no funds appropriated except $8,000,000, so far as I know. The other appropriation is a deficiency appropriation. I continue reading:

shall be used, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, to make any payments to other than domestic producers, under any subsidy program operation not in effect on the date of enactment of this act.

Under the provisions of the Price Control bill which the Senate has just passed, it is provided that no payments may be made to any producer under any subsidy program not in effect on the date of the act. So this seems to me to imply repeal of the Price Control Act which was just passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was put in for a wholly different purpose. It was offered by the Senator from Nebraska, who feared that some authority in the OPA Act might be applied to sugar, and he wanted the domestic sugar producers protected by the amendment. It could not possibly extend the limitations in the OPA Act to affect the subsidy which can be used, nor is there anything in the pending amendment or the legislation which would allow the payment of any subsidy beyond the limitations contained in the OPA Act.

Mr. TAFT. Why have it, then?

Mr. RUSSELL. I presented that viewpoint to the Senator from Nebraska, that they could not pay any new subsidies, but he was apprehensive that within the limitations of the OPA Act some new subsidy might be paid for sugar, and the purpose of the amendment which the Senator has just read was to prevent that being done.

Mr. TAFT. But the implication is, as I see it, that some subsidy may be paid somehow under the authority of the appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that cannot be done unless it is done out of the $8,000,000 for administration, because that is the only appropriation contained in the bill. That was the point I urged on the Senator from Nebraska, but he and others who were interested in the sugar problem felt it would be at least an admonition to the Commodity Credit Corporation not to engage in any new subsidy program with respect to sugar, other than as to domestic producers. It cannot possibly have any effect on the OPA Act. It is merely a limitation on this appropriation in the first place. It is not legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. After quoting the proposed amendment, the President said this, which I think is pertinent to what the Senator is suggesting:

This section is substantially the same as that included in the corporation supplement to the Budget for the fiscal year 1947 which I transmitted to the Congress on May 2, 1946. In transmitting this Budget approval language was recommended which would restrict the programs of each corporation to those set forth in its 1947 Budget. However, it was recognized that, because of its urgencies or contingencies arising subsequent to the approval of the Budget, a corporation might be called upon to immediately undertake a program which, while authorized under basic law, had not been specifically set forth in its budget. Under these circumstances I recommended that if a corporation had sufficient funds it should be permitted, with my approval, to initiate immediately such a program, and that it be promptly transmitted to the Congress as an amendment to the Budget.

I consider that a provision which is designed to meet emergencies or contingencies is within the spirit of the Government Corporation Control Act, a view which is concurred in by the House Appropriations Committee, since the act clearly states that such a provision may be included in the Budget programs for each corporation. However, rather than make such provision in the Budget for each corporation, it is considered that a general provision, applicable to all corporations, would be more satisfactory and thereby improve the Budget estimates. Obviously it would appear quite improbable that emergencies or contingencies would arise in each corporation during a given year.

In view of the foregoing I strongly urge that the provision for meeting emergencies and contingencies in the Budget programs of corporations included in H. R. 6777 be restored.

That was the purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the purpose stated is clearly a purpose to nullify the whole Byrd-Butler Act, so far as corporation control is concerned. If we are to adopt an amendment which provides that a corporation may spend any money it wants to spend, if the President says there is an emergency, then why have a budget at all, why present a budget, why adopt this whole new procedure which is required by the law?

Mr. President, I feel compelled to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Ohio is entirely correct, for the reason that all these corporations have authorizations which they have not yet used. They can use revolving funds, for example. The Byrd-Butler law was supposed to put them under the control of Congress, just as is any other department of the Government. Under this amendment that control would be lifted. In my judgment, it clearly and completely nullifies the Byrd-Butler Act, which it took Congress 10 years to pass. If the Senator from Ohio does not make a point of order, I certainly shall.

Mr. TAFT. I make the point of order. I would like to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I should like to consult with him. I think we can work out some language. There will be other bills in connection with which I think this matter could be handled. I should like to study the relationship of the different provisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any other bill on which it can be put. I appreciate the consideration of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I am not at all satisfied with the relation between the provisions for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Price Control Act limitations on subsidies. I think they should be carefully examined.

Mr. RUSSEL. I have here the language of the Byrd-Butler Act, and certainly as it relates to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and what I have in mind, this amendment, if confined to the Commodity Credit Corporation, can do no violence to the spirit of the Byrd-Butler Act. I read from it:

The Budget program shall be a business-type budget, or plan of operations, with due allowance given for the need of flexibility, including provision for emergencies and contingencies, in order that the Corporation may properly carry out its activities as authorized by law.

It may be that this budget is in that shape, but from my examination of the Commodity Credit Corporation budget I am very apprehensive of what will happen if some leeway is not given which will permit the Corporation to carry out the instructions of Congress as provided in other basic legislation.

Mr. BYRD. Why can it not be put in the Budget, just as in the case of other corporations?

Mr. RUSSELL. They could not spell out everything for emergencies and contingencies.

Mr. BYRD. They should have set it up, and if it is the fault of the Commodity Credit Corporation in not bringing in the proper kind of a budget, they certainly should not be exempted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the point of order is good; there is no question about it.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Georgia knows I do not want to do anything to interfere with the Commodity Credit Corporation, but if we exempt one corporation from the Byrd-Butler Act, we shall have to exempt all of them. If we exempt one, the others will want to be exempted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Congress has told the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out certain programs in certain eventualities, and this amendment would only allow them to initiate programs which are authorized by law.

Mr. BYRD. That is all they could do anyway. The Commodity Credit Corporation has resources and authority to borrow. The purpose of the Byrd-Butler law was to reduce the blanket authorizations which have been made. They have the right to use revolving funds. No one knows how much they may amount to.

I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that I shall be glad to confer with him and the Senator from Ohio, but no one seems to understand this amendment, and I certainly could not sit here and have it agreed to when it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call the Senator's attention to this statement of the President:

> The act clearly states that such a provision may be included in the Budget programs for each corporation.

Mr. BYRD. Why was it not included? The Senator from Georgia states it has not been properly prepared, and it is up to the Commodity Credit Corporation to prepare it properly. This would give them an exemption.

Mr. McKELLAR. Instead of having it for each corporation, he included them all together.

Mr. BYRD. That was not the purpose of the Byrd-Butler Act. Each corporation was to come before the Congress, as the Senator from Tennessee knows—and he helped in the passage of the act—and present its budget, just as any other department does.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I, too, took the same position, not on account of the Byrd-Butler law, but I took a position against the amendment because it seemed to me that what we were trying to do was to limit the corporations.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the object of the Byrd-Butler Act was to restrict these corporations, and take away from them the power they had exercised. I do not know how much excess buying power the Commodity Credit Corporation has.

Mr. WHERRY. I said, "Why do you not come in and ask for it in your budget?"

Mr. BYRD. They have to come to Congress, anyway, to get it.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Congress is in session, it is all right, but if Congress is not in session, how are they to have authority to borrow money to take care of the needs for which the original corporation was set up?

Mr. McKELLAR. It could not be done.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I do not know who has the floor, but will the Senator who has the floor yield to me for a moment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that a point of order has twice been made against this amendment by two different Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. It seems to me to be conceded by all that the point of order is well taken. That would suggest to me the wisdom of letting this matter go over until tomorrow in the hope that the interested Senators might get together, study the language, and accomplish the purpose sought without offense to the rules of the Senate, and really make progress toward the ultimate disposition of the legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be glad to do that, if the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and other Senators interested meanwhile would get together.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am tremendously concerned about the situation as it might apply to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I would be glad to take any steps which would protect the farmers in the program that has been prescribed by the Congress for them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Ohio be willing to undertake to consider the matter with other Senators between now and the time we reconvene tomorrow?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Since that is the case, Mr. President, I shall ask that the bill go over at this point until tomorrow. But before the bill goes over I wish to ask unanimous consent that an amendment be agreed to. On page 3, at the bottom of the page, in line 21, there is a proviso as follows:

> *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein shall be used to pay contributions with respect to projects constructed under authority of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress.

I ask that that language be stricken out, and that the amendment be taken to conference, if no Senators object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now ask that the bill go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be passed over until tomorrow.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, respecting the last item mentioned by the Senator from Tennessee, I tried to get on my feet before the bill was passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is satisfactory to me that the language be stricken out, but only for the purpose of taking the amendment to conference. I think the conferees should give due consideration to this question. We should not be appropriating money to take care of these matters when there is some other way to take care of them; that is that the State or the municipality may take care of the costs of amortization of these buildings. I think it is a bad practice for the Federal Government to be subsidizing anything that the State or the municipality or the building organizations may determine should be paid.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am rather inclined to think the Senator is right.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the Senate passes a measure making certain appropriations I do not consider that we are bound thereafter to appropriate money for such purposes. If there is any place where sovereignty applies it is right here at home. Sovereignty applies at home as well as in our foreign relations. The Government is not bound to appropriate continuously and on into the future without a determination by each House.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FULLBRIGHT. I wanted to ask the Senator about the RFC. I understand that agency expires at the end of this year. Does it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it does.

Mr. FERGUSON. It expires in 1948.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not sure, but I believe it expires in 1948. It does not expire this year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I ask the Senator from Ohio. Does not the RFC expire, under the terms of its charter, at the end of this calendar year?

Mr. TAFT. We have a bill on the calendar to extend the life of the RFC. I do not think it expires tomorrow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, I say the end of this calendar year.

Mr. TAFT. I think some time in that neighborhood. I think it is February 1947.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The appropriation appearing on page 6 is based on the theory that RFC will be extended for the period of a year.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. It is based on the theory that the organization will be in existence the full year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the request of the Senator from Tennessee, the bill will go over until tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COAST GUARD, TREASURY DEPARTMENT, 1947

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill (H. R. 6428) making appropriations for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6428) making appropriations for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Coast Guard," on page 5, line 19, after the word "stragglers", to strike out "$72,000,000" and insert "$76,020,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 11, after the word "ordnance", to insert "ordnance stores."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. WHITE, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

BILLS AFFECTING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of three bills which are on the calendar and which relate to the District of Columbia. The three bills have been unanimously reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia. There is no objection to them that I know of from any source. The expiration date in each case will be June 30, so it is necessary that the bills be passed today. The bills are Senate bill 2234, Calendar No. 1593; House bill 5933, Calendar No. 1648; and House bill 6516, Calendar No. 1649. I have spoken to both the majority and the minority leaders with respect to these bills and told them they were reported unanimously from the committee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from North Carolina spoke to me earlier today about these three bills. I made an effort to contact the minority members of the District Committee with respect to them. I found no opposition on the part of any of the District Committee minority members who are present, and I know of no objection to the bills.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 2234, Calendar No. 1593.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2234) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, to strike out the following:

Section 3 (c) (4) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) (i) No employer's rate of contribution for any calendar year or part thereof shall be reduced below the standard rate unless and until his account could have been charged with benefits paid throughout the 36-consecutive-calendar-month period ending on the computation date applicable to such year or part thereof.

"(ii) No employer's contribution rate for any calendar year shall be reduced below the standard rate unless records filed with the Board indicate he has established taxable wages in each of the three annual pay rolls as used in calculating his average annual pay roll.

"(iii) (1) Contribution rates after termination of military service. Notwithstanding any inconsistent provisions of this act, the contribution rates of trainees shall be determined in accordance with the following provisions of this subsection for the periods and with respect to the matters specified herein. Except as herein otherwise provided, all other provisions of this act shall continue to be applicable in connection with such contribution rates.

"(2) The term 'military service' as used in this subsection means active service in the land or naval forces of the United States, but the service of an individual in any reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States who is ordered to active duty in any such force for a period of 30 days or less shall not be deemed to be active service in such force during such period.

"(3) The term 'trainee' as used in this subsection means an individual who entered military service after March 31, 1940, who continued such service for more than 30 consecutive days, whose military service was terminated under conditions other than dishonorable, on or before the 6 months after the war in which the United States is now engaged has been terminated by proclamation by the President of the United States.

"(4) Upon written application by a trainee, who was formerly an employer subject to the provisions of this act and who has returned to engage in substantially the same type of business in which he was engaged prior to his entrance into the military service, the entire period between the time of his entrance into military service and the date of termination of such service shall be excluded in determining his contribution rate. The Contribution Rate Review Committee may in its discretion exclude a reasonable period before and after the trainee's actual period of military service if such Committee finds that the trainee was out of business solely because of such military service.

"(iv) If the amount in the fund as of the computation date is less than 5 percent of the total pay rolls subject to contributions under this act for the twelve consecutive month period ending on said computation date, the contribution rate for each employer shall be increased by the percentage differential between said 5 percent of such total pay rolls and said fund's percentage of such total pay rolls, but in no event shall the contribution rate for any employer be more than 2.7 percent. Said percentage differential for each employer shall be computed to the next highest one-tenth of 1 percent.

"(v) If, on December 20 of any calendar year, the amount in the fund becomes less than 2.4 percent of the total annual pay rolls subject to contribution under this act for the 12-consecutive-month period ending on the preceding June 30, the Board shall make a declaration to that effect. Effective the quarter following such announcement, each employer's rate of contribution shall be the standard rate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, approved August 28, 1935, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"Section 3 (c) (5) is amended to read as follows:

"'(5) The Board shall for any uncompleted portion of the calendar year beginning with the effective date of this act and for each calendar year thereafter classify employers in accordance with their actual experience in the payment of contributions and with respect to benefits charged against their accounts. Each employer's contribution rate for each subsequent year or part thereof shall be calculated on the basis of his records filed with the Board and benefit payments disbursed through the applicable computation date.'

"Section 3 (c) (7) is amended to read as follows:

"'(7) (a) If the business of any employer is transferred in whole or in part, the transferee shall be deemed a successor for the purpose of this section. In case the transfer of any of the assets of a covered employer's business by any means whatever, otherwise than in the ordinary course of trade, such transfer shall be deemed a transfer of business and shall constitute the transferee a successor hereunder, unless the Board, on its own motion or on application of an interested party, finds that all of the following conditions exist:

"'(1) The transferee has not assumed any of the transferor's obligations; and

"'(2) The transferee has not continued or resumed transferor's good will; and

"'(3) The transferee has not continued or resumed the business of the transferor, either in the same establishment or elsewhere; and

"'(4) The transferee has not employed substantially the same employees as those the transferor had employed in connection with the assets transferred.

"'(b) The successor, if not already subject to this section, shall become an "employer" subject hereto on the date of such transfer, and shall accordingly become liable for contributions hereunder from and after said date.

"'(c) The successor shall take over and continue the employer's account, including its reserve and all other aspects of its experience under this section, in proportion to the pay roll or employees assignable to the transferred business as determined for the purposes of this section by the Board. The successor shall be secondarily liable for any amounts owned by the employer to the fund at the time of such transfer; but such liability shall be proportioned to the extent of the transfer of business and shall not exceed the value of the assets transferred.

"'(d) The benefit chargeability of a successor's account under section 3 (c) if not accrued before the transfer date shall begin to accrue on the transfer date, in case the transferor's benefit chargeability was then accruing; or shall begin to accrue on the date otherwise applicable to the successor, or on the date otherwise applicable to the transferor, whichever is earlier, in case the transferor's benefit chargeability was not accruing on the transfer date. Similarly, benefits from a successor's account, if not chargeable before the transfer date shall become chargeable on the transfer date, in case the transfer was then chargeable for the benefit payments; or shall become chargeable on the date otherwise applicable to the succes-

sor or on the date otherwise applicable to the transferor, whichever is earlier, in case the transferor was chargeable for the benefit payments on the transfer date.

"'(e) The account taken over by the successor employer shall remain chargeable with respect to accrued benefit and related rights based on employment in the transferred business, and all such employment shall be deemed employment performed for such employer.

"'(f) The contribution rates applicable with respect to the accounts of the successor employer and a transferring employer shall be respectively determined or redetermined as of the next preceding June 30 computation date, to apply from the date of transfer of business until the close of the current calendar year, and shall thereafter be determined whenever required by section 3 (c), as follows: For the purposes of section 3 (c), the Board shall determine the "experience under this section" of the successor employer's account and of the transferring employer's account by allocating to the successor employer's account for each period in question the respective proportions of the transferring employer's pay roll and the benefits which the Board determines to be properly assignable to the business transferred.

"'(g) Special combinations of experience: Any successor employer who has failed to obtain credit for its predecessor's experience, solely because of the provisions of section 3 (c) (7) of the act prior to its amendment by this act, may file a written application for such allowance after the effective date of this act. In the event the board finds that such employer is entitled to such combination of experience under the provisions of section 3 (c) (7) as amended by this act, the combination shall be allowed effective for the calendar year next succeeding the date of such application.'

"Section 3 (c) (8) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"'(iii) Except as otherwise provided in this section, whenever through inadvertence or mistake erroneous charges or credits are found to have been made to experience-rating accounts, the same shall be readjusted as of the date of discovery and such readjustment shall not affect any computation or rate assigned prior to the date of discovery but shall be used on the next computation date in calculating future contribution rates.'

"Section 3 (c) (10) is amended by inserting, after the words 'employer thereof' found at the end of the third sentence of said section, the following additional sentence: 'All such hearings shall be held before a Contribution Rate Review Committee composed of three members who shall be employees of the Board and appointed by the Board. The findings and decision of this committee shall not be subject to review by the District Auditor.'

"This act shall take effect as of 12:01 antemeridian on the first day of the next succeeding calendar quarter following the enactment of this act."

NURSERY AND NURSERY SCHOOLS FOR DAY CARE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HOEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 5933, Calendar No. 1648.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5933) to authorize and direct the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments.

The first amendment was on page 1, line 4, after the words "Board of" to strike out "Education" and insert "Public Welfare."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page after line 7, to strike out section 2 as follows:

SEC. 2. On and after July 1, 1946, the Board is authorized and directed to establish, maintain, and operate in and on the buildings and grounds of the public schools of the District of Columbia and at other suitable locations, a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of children of school or under-school age of parents residing in the District of Columbia who are employed and are financially unable otherwise to provide for the day care of their children or who are so handicapped that they cannot otherwise provide for the day care of their children. The Board is authorized to employ teachers, attendants, clerks, custodians, and other persons necessary to provide such day care and to pay compensation for their services in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. On and after July 1, 1946, and until June 30, 1947, and no longer, the Board is authorized and directed to establish, maintain, and operate in and on such of the buildings and grounds of the public schools of the District of Columbia, as may be designated and approved by the Board of Education, and at such other suitable locations, as may be designated and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, not to exceed a total of 14 nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of children of school or under-school age of parents residing in the District of Columbia and who have resided therein for not less than 1 year immediately preceding the entry of their children into such nurseries or nursery schools and who are employed and are financially unable otherwise to provide for the day care of their children or who are so handicapped that they cannot otherwise provide for the day care of their children. The Board is authorized to employ teachers, attendants, clerks, custodians, and other persons necessary to provide such day care and to pay compensation for their services in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. Appropriations now or hereafter available for the maintenance and operation of the buildings and grounds of the said public schools shall be available for the maintenance and operation of such of the buildings and grounds of the said public schools in and on which such nurseries and nursery schools may be established, maintained, and operated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize and direct the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes."

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF METROPOLITAN POLICE AND OTHERS

Mr. HOEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 6519, Calendar No. 1649.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6516) to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SIMPLIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF CREDIT SERVICES TO FARMERS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, early this year the Senate passed unanimously a bill offered by the late lamented senior Senator from Alabama, Mr. Bankhead, respecting the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. The bill since that time has been in the House committee. The House passed its own version of the bill H. R. 5991, and it was referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and was unanimously favorably reported by that committee, and is now on the calendar, Calendar No. 1353. I should like to have the measure considered now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? I have received telephone calls from the National Grange and from two other farm organizations who are not in favor of this measure. They tell me there were no hearings held on the bill at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can say to the Senator that that statement is certainly not correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Was any evidence submitted before the House committee except evidence on the part of Government agencies?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know about that.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood that perhaps a hearing was held, but that only Government agencies were represented. They were heard in a great hurry one afternoon, and no one else was invited to attend. No farm group or any others interested were invited to come to the hearing, and no testimony was adduced on their behalf. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know about that. Hearings were held in the Senate committee, at which all persons who wanted to testify were permitted to testify, and the committee reported the bill unanimously. When it comes to the question of the bill which has passed the House, I do not know how extensive the House committee hearings were.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia, whom I should like to accommodate, that three or four Senators have asked me that if the bill came up to object its consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. If that be the case, I shall not press the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate will be in session tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. The situation is rather unusual. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] objected to the bill on the call of the calendar. I spoke to

him about it and he stated that he had no further interest in the bill, and no objection to its passage.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to read a letter, which convinces me that there should be hearings on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that hearings have been held on the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. This letter is from the National Grange. According to the letter, none of the farm organizations had an opportunity to appear and testify in the hearings on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. They may not have had such an opportunity when the bill came up the second time, but they certainly had opportunity to be heard when the first hearings were held.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to interfere in any way with the wishes of the Senator from Georgia. Will he permit the bill to go over until tomorrow?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to do so. However, let me say that some of the farm organizations have always been opposed to the Farm Security Administration. If something is not done to put these two bills in conference, where a bill can be drafted before this session of Congress is over, it may be that the opponents of the Farm Security Administration will succeed in destroying it.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to do that; but I would appreciate it very much if the Senator would withhold his request until tomorrow. By that time I shall be able to give my answer one way or the other relative to taking up the bill by unanimous consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, I shall not press the matter now; but I apprehend that if the Senator from Nebraska is satisfied, perhaps we shall find another objector. I regret that I did not discuss the question with the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Three Senators have spoken to me this afternoon and asked me to object to consideration of the bill. I do not know all of their objections, but I am certain that the Senator would not press his request under those conditions.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2341. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6042. An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George B. Harris, of California, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California (new position);

Bunk Gardner, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge of the Canal Zone; and

Louis LeBaron, of Hawaii, to be associate justice of the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Granville Mellen to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James H. Flanagan to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Commodore Ellis Reed-Hill to be Engineer in Chief of the United States Coast Guard, with the rank of rear admiral, effective from August 1, 1946, for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, June 29, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 28 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for promotion in the foreign service of the United States of America, to be effective as of May 19, 1946:

FROM FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3 TO FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 2

Maurice W. Altaffer, of Ohio.
George R. Canty, of Massachusetts.
Fayette J. Flexer, of Illinois.
Julian C. Greenup, of California.
George J. Haering, of New York.
Joel C. Hudson, of Missouri.
Lester DeWitt Mallory, of California.
Earl L. Packer, of Utah.
J. Bartlett Richards, of Maryland.
Paul P. Steintorf, of Virginia.
George H. Winters, of Kansas.

FROM FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 4 TO FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3

Ware Adams, of Georgia.
Sidney A. Belovsky, of New York.
Burton Y. Berry, of Indiana.
Russell M. Brooks, of Oregon.
Allan Dawson, of Iowa.
Charles H. Derry, of Georgia.
Bertel E. Kuniholm, of Massachusetts.
John H. Morgan, of Massachusetts.
Sidney E. O'Donoghue, of New Jersey.
Harry L. Troutman, of Georgia.
Carlos J. Warner, of Ohio.

FROM FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 5 TO FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 4

Glenn A. Abbey, of Wisconsin.
Roy E. B. Bower, of California.
Robert Y. Brown, of Alabama.
Montgomery H. Colladay, of Connecticut.
John Davies, Jr., of Ohio.
Henry B. Day, of Connecticut.
Edmund J. Dorsz, of Michigan.
Ernest E. Evans, of New York.
Dorsey Gassaway Fisher, of Maryland.
Willard Galbraith, of California.
James W. Gantenbein, of Oregon.
John N. Hamlin, of Oregon.
Randolph Harrison, of Virginia.
Thomas A. Hickok, of New York.
Frederick W. Hinke, of New York.
Morris N. Hughes, of Illinois.
J. Winsor Ives, of Illinois
Henry P. Leverich, of New Jersey.
Raymond P. Ludden, of Massachusetts.
Cecil B. Lyon, of New York.
Robert Mills McClintock, of California.
Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama.
Thomas J. Maleady, of Massachusetts.
Patrick Mallon, of Ohio.
Edward S. Maney, of Texas.
Gerald A. Mokma, of Iowa.
John B. Ocheltree, of Nevada.
Troy L. Perkins, of Kentucky.
Joseph P. Ragland, of the District of Columbia.
Charles S. Reed 2d, of Ohio.
Arthur R. Ringwalt, of Nebraska.
James C. Sappington 3d, of Maryland.
Willard Quincy Stanton, of Montana.
Tyler Thompson, of New York.
Clifton R. Wharton, of Massachusetts.
Charles W. Yost, of New York.

FROM FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 6 TO FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 5

R. Austin Acly, of Massachusetts.
Stephen E. Aguirre, of Texas.
William K. Ailshie, of Idaho.
Daniel V. Anderson, of Delaware.
Carl H. Boehringer, of Michigan.
Ellis A. Bonnet, of Texas.
Reginald Bragonier, Jr., of Maryland.
Richard W. Byrd, of Virginia.
Carl E. Christopherson, of Iowa.
Harlan B. Clark, of Ohio.
Glion Curtis, Jr., of Missouri.
Sherburne Dillingham, of New Jersey.
Howard Elting, Jr., of Illinois.
James Espy, of Ohio.
Edmund A. Gullion, of Kentucky.
James E. Henderson, of California.
Paul C. Hutton, of North Carolina.
Beppo R. Johansen, of Florida.
U. Alexis Johnson, of California.
Perry Laukhuff, of Ohio.
F. Ridgway Lineaweaver, of Pennsylvania.
Elbert G. Mathews, of California.
Gordon H. Mattison, of Ohio.
Ernest de W. Mayer, of New York.
Miss Kathleen Molesworth, of Texas.
Robert Newbegin, of Massachusetts.
Carmel Offie, of Pennsylvania.

John Ordway, of the District of Columbia.
Marselis C. Parsons, Jr., of New York.
Edward E. Rice, of Wisconsin.
W. Garland Richardson, of Virginia.
Winfield H. Scott, of the District of Columbia.
William P. Snow, of Maine.
Carl W. Strom, of Iowa.
Robert M. Taylor, of Washington.
Charles W. Thayer, of Pennsylvania.
Ray L. Thurston, of Wisconsin.
Jay Walker, of the District of Columbia.
T. Eliot Weil, of New York.
Rolland Welch, of Texas.
H. Bartlett Wells, of New Jersey.
Evan M. Wilson, of Pennsylvania.

FROM FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 7 TO FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 6

Waldo E. Bailey, of Mississippi.
William Belton, of Oregon.
Niles W. Bond, of Massachusetts.
William O. Boswell, of Pennsylvania.
Robert P. Chalker, of Florida.
H. Francis Cunningham, Jr., of Nebraska.
Philip M. Davenport, of Maryland.
Arthur B. Emmons 3d, of Massachusetts.
Nicholas Feld, of Mississippi.
William N. Fraleigh, of New Jersey.
Fulton Freeman, of California.
Forrest K. Geerken, of Minnesota.
John Goodyear, of New York.
Robert Grinnell, of New York.
Theodore J. Hadraba, of Nebraska.
Parker T. Hart, of Massachusetts.
Richard H. Hawkins, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Outerbridge Horsey, of New York.
Randolph A. Kidder, of Massachusetts.
Joseph Palmer 2d, of Massachusetts.
Robert W. Rinden, of Iowa.
M. Robert Rutherford, of Montana.
Robert C. Strong, of Wisconsin.
Alfred T. Wellborn, of Louisiana.

FROM FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 8 TO FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 7

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
H. Gardner Ainsworth, of Louisiana.
Donald B. Calder, of New York.
Leonard J. Cromie, of Connecticut.
C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of New York.
Robert S. Folsom, of Massachusetts.
Paul E. Geier, of Ohio.
Lewis E. Gleeck, Jr., of Illinois.
Richard E. Gnade, of Pennsylvania.
Richard A. Johnson, of Illinois.
M. Gordon Knox, of Maryland.
Alfred H. Lovell, Jr., of Michigan.
David H. McKillop, of Massachusetts.
John M. McSweeney, of Massachusetts.
Henry T. Smith, of Georgia.
William L. Smyser, of Pennsylvania.
John L. Topping, of New York.
John W. Tuthill, of Massachusetts.
William W. Walker, of North Carolina.
Fraser Wilkins, of Nebraska.

FROM FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER, UNCLASSIFIED, TO FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 8

Philip H. Bagby, of Virginia.
Walter W. Birge, Jr., of New York.
Byron E. Blankinship, of New York.
George F. Bogardus, of Iowa.
Robert M. Brandin, of New Jersey.
Gray Bream, of Wyoming.
Findley Burns, Jr., of Maryland.
Kenneth A. Byrns, of Colorado.
Ralph N. Clough, of Washington.
William A. Crawford, of Pennsylvania.
Juan de Zengotita, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas P. Dillon, of Missouri.
James M. Gilchrist, Jr., of Illinois.
George McM. Godley 2d, of New York.
Alden M. Haupt, of Illinois.
James C. Lobenstine, of Connecticut.
Wilfred V. MacDonald, of Missouri.
Edwin W. Martin, of Ohio.
W. Paul O'Neill, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Albert E. Pappano, of Missouri.
Richard A. Poole, of New Jersey.
Lubert O. Sanderhoff, of California.
William Langdon Sands, of Florida.
Harold Shullaw, of Illinois.
Ernest V. Siracusa, of California.
Joseph S. Sparks, of California.
James P. Speer 2d, of Oklahoma.
Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., of California.
F. Lester Sutton, of New Jersey.
Temple Wanamaker, Jr., of Washington.
Byron White, of North Carolina.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

George F. Luthringer, of New Jersey, to be United States alternate to the Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mastin G. White, of Texas, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Daniel O. Omer for appointment as General Counsel and Chief, Legal Division, national headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of General Counsel and Chief, Legal Division, national headquarters, Selective Service System, will be at the rate of $8,179.50 per annum.

J. Watt Page for appointment as State director of selective service for Texas, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of State director of selective service for Texas will be at the rate of $8,179.50 per annum.

IN THE NAVAL RESERVE

Capt. Erl C. B. Gould, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, while serving with the Foreign Liquidation Commission, State Department, and to continue during any assignment commensurate with the rank of commodore or until release from active duty.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 28 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Granville Mellen to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the unexpired term of 6 years from September 26, 1944.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

James H. Flanagan to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years from July 1, 1946.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Commodore Ellis Reed-Hill to be Engineer in Chief of the United States Coast Guard, with the rank of rear admiral, effective from August 1, 1946, for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 1946

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rt. Rev. Louis V. Vaeth, archdiocesan director of the Propagation of the Faith, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

This is the victory that overcometh the world—our faith.—St. John.

O God! the true, omnipotent, wise, infallible, and divine Legislator, graciously and constantly and abundantly flood the souls and minds of these Members of the House of Representatives with that heaven-bestowed, peace-promoting, justice-dispensing and mountain-moving gift—faith. Faith in Thee, the one and only true God, the divine Lawgiver and just Rewarder of nations and peoples; the ever-vigilant and successful Builder and Protector—"Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; unless the Lord keep the city, they watch in vain that keepeth it"—faith in their Nation as Thy singularly blessed and approved model to other nations as a builder of cities and also of men; faith to consistently and honestly realize that:

"We all are blind until we see
That in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making if
It does not make the man.
Why build these cities glorious
If man unbuilded goes?
In vain we build the world unless
The builder also grows."

—*E. Markham.*

Faith in their Chief Executive and all lawfully elected and appointed authority, as the sincere, honest, and capable human representatives of Thy divine authority benignly established to promote our human happiness and to protect and defend our divine and natural rights and liberties; faith in their august organization, the House of Representatives, whose integrity, honesty, loyalty and deathless devotion to duty constitute it the palladium of the people's privileges and the defender of the Nation's rights to such a recognized degree of selfless service that both their personal and professional actions will give a satisfying and solacing answer to the heartfelt and soul-stirring prayer of today's masses:

"God give us men; times like these demand
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hand.
Men whom the lust of office does not kill,
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy,
Men who have honor, men who will not lie,
Men who can stand before a demagog,
And down his treacherous flatteries without winking,
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog,
In public duty and private thinking.
For, while the rabble with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions and their little deeds
Mingle in selfish strife, lo, freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the world and waiting justice sleeps."

—*J. C Holland.*

Faith in themselves as specially selected men and women so God-blessed with the courage of their convictions and so convinced of their courage that their courage, convictions, sincerity, loyalty, and honesty become a spectacle to the world, to angels, and to men, causing them to see and respect and reverence the same spiritual, national, personal,

and professional character qualities in their fellow members, whether as allies or opponents.

Finally, faith in the happy hope of procuring that priceless promise of the divine Legislator—"Well done, thou faithful servant, because thou hast been faithful in a few things, I will place thee over many," which promise the priest, poet, and patriot, Abram Ryan, so beautifully sang—

"Better than grandeur better than gold,
Than rank and titles a thousandfold,
Is a healthy body and a mind at ease,
And simple pleasures that always please,
A heart that can feel for another's woes
With sympathy large enough to enfold
All men as brethren, is better than gold."

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5356. An act to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a naval establishment, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6429. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered, That Mr. TYDINGS be excused as a conferee on the part of the Senate to the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5452) entitled "Making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a speech delivered by Hon. Hamilton Fish before the Committee on Banking and Currency on the British loan, and in the other to include a speech delivered by William S. Bennet at the John Hay Republican Club in April 1946.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain editorials from a dairying magazine in his district.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LEFEVRE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION PLANS NO. 1, NO. 2, AND NO. 3

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 155, and I ask unanimous consent that House Concurrent Resolutions 154 and 151 be considered; that the debate be limited on the three resolutions to 3 hours, the time to be divided equally between myself and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; that after 3 hours of general debate on the resolutions, the resolutions be voted on separately.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, in these 3 hours a Member may talk about any one of the three resolutions.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that at the end of general debate the resolutions will be voted on separately.

Mr. MANASCO. Each resolution separately.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent also that the plans be voted on in their order, plan 1, first; plan 2, second; and plan 3, third.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is the resolutions that must be voted on.

Mr. MANASCO. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, the gentlemen have agreed on time, which is very satisfactory. The only suggestion I have to make is that I hope they do not use the entire 3 hours.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that there be 3 hours of general debate on these resolutions, at the end of which time the resolutions are to be voted on separately in this order: Plan No. 1, plan No. 2, and plan No. 3.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TUESDAY, JULY 2

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 685, Rept. No. 2399) providing for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 138 to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said joint resolution are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 16 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 686, Rept. No. 2400) providing for the consideration of H. R. 5234 to authorize the Federal Securtiy Administrator to assist the States in matters relating to social protection, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5234) to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in matters relating to social protection, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour and to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 183]

Adams	Baldwin, N. Y.	Boren
Allen, Ill.	Barrett, Pa.	Boykin
Anderson, Calif.	Barry	Bradley, Mich.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bates, Mass.	Bradley, Pa.
Auchincloss	Bell	Buckley
Baldwin, Md.	Bennet, N. Y.	Byrne, N. Y.

Camp	Harris	Peterson, Ga.
Cannon, Fla.	Hartley	Ploeser
Case, S. Dak.	Hedrick	Powell
Celler	Heffernan	Rankin
Cochran	Hoffman, Mich.	Rayfiel
Coffee	Holifield	Reece, Tenn.
Cole, N. Y.	Hook	Robertson, N. Dak.
Colmer	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Courtney	Jackson	Rodgers, Pa.
Cox	Johnson, Luther A.	Roe, N. Y.
Crawford	Kee	Rooney
Cunningham	Kefauver	Short
Curley	Keogh	Slaughter
Dawson	Kerr	Sparkman
De Lacy	Klein	Stevenson
Dolliver	Latham	Stewart
Dworshak	LeCompte	Stigler
Eberharter	Ludlow	Stockman
Elsaesser	McGehee	Tolan
Engel, Mich.	McKenzie	Torrens
Ervin	Mahon	Vinson
Fisher	Mansfield, Mont.	Weaver
Gardner	Mansfield, Tex.	Welch
Gerlach	Miller, Calif.	West
Gibson	Murphy	Wickersham
Gillespie	Norrell	Winstead
Granger	Norton	Wolfenden, Pa.
Grant, Ala.	O'Hara	Woodhouse
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Patrick	Worley
Hancock	Patterson	
Harness, Ind.		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 319 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a resolution he is introducing.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1, NO. 2, AND NO. 3

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 155, House Concurrent Resolution 151, and House Concurrent Resolution 154.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolutions 155, 151, and 154, with Mr. THOMAS of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolutions.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the resolutions was dispensed with.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, there have been so many comments and criticisms of me in the public press in Washington in the last 10 days about the alleged delay in reporting legislation on the atomic bomb question that I feel it incumbent upon me to make a statement.

I wish to start my statement by saying that most of the comments as to my attitude on the legislation you have read are lies of the whole cloth. I have made diligent and repeated effort to bring the legislation to this House so that the Representatives of the people may, after debate and consideration, work its will.

When the committee first met after 8 months of delay waiting for the Senate, I made three efforts to have the bill reported just as the Senate had passed it, but the committee, in keeping with its customary practice of years' standing, decided they would consider the bill for amendment in the usual way. We have been working on that. We have had 10 days of meetings, and I believe there have been 20 or 25 roll calls in the committee.

I want it understood that what I am saying is not critical of my committee, but in justification of its efforts to bring to this floor legislation on this subject that you may consider. The committee is meeting at 7 o'clock tonight in an effort to report the bill out. My committee more than 8 months ago reported favorably a bill that had the unqualified support of the War and Navy Departments, and that bill still lingers on the calendar of this House. The reason for the delay was to await action by the Senate, and the bill we are considering came here and was promptly taken up by your Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that as many Members as possible will stay on the floor and hear the arguments presented on both sides of this question. Due to the press of business it is impossible for us to devote as much time as we would like for the consideration of these reorganization plans.

On December 20, 1945, the President signed the Reorganization Act of 1945. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments held extensive hearings in October and November of 1945.

Mr. Chairman, we all realize that the Federal Government has grown in such proportions that it is absolutely necessary for some reorganization to take place in order to reduce expenditures and increase efficiency in Federal agencies. We also realize that it is very important that many bureaus and independent agencies be placed under Cabinet heads in order to take off the tremendous load that our President is under at the present time and has been for some time in an effort to administer properly the Federal agencies. We realize the Congress cannot or will not reorganize the executive departments and as evidenced by these resolutions will not permit the President to do so.

When we passed that bill we hoped that the President would immediately send up some reorganization plans which would carry out the objectives of section 2 of the Reorganization Act. So far as I know the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget did not consult any Member of the Congress about the reorganizations before the President transmitted them. Among those objectives were the following:

To reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government.

To increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues;

To group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

To reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

We had hoped that they could reduce administrative expenses by 25 percent, but I never thought they could for the only way to reduce expenditures is to cut off employees or reduce wages and you run into opposition to either course.

On May 16 the President submitted three reorganization plans to the Congress. Reorganization plan No. 1 contained, among other things, a reorganization of the housing agencies. In 1942, under the War Powers Act, the President issued an Executive order consolidating some 13 housing agencies that had grown up over a period of years. Some of them were in the building business, some in the rental business, some insuring loans. The agency was known as the National Housing Agency.

We had hoped that in this reorganization plan all similar functions would be consolidated. It was the opinion of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that reorganization plan No. 1 violated the Reorganization Act of 1945 in that it tended to extend the functions of this Agency beyond the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. I doubt the validity of that argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the committee also objected to this plan on the ground that it abolished the Federal Housing Administration, the agency recognized by the Congress and by the general public as being the one agency in the Federal housing program that believes in home ownership by individuals. The committee was also of the opinion that this agency should not be placed under the head of an organization the primary purpose of which was the construction of homes for Federal ownership and Federal operation.

The committee feared that if this reorganization plan went into effect that the encouragement given by the Federal Housing Administration and other lending agencies to individuals to build their own homes would be dampened by the National Housing Agency. For that reason the committee asks the House to reject reorganization plan No. 1.

Reorganization plan No. 2 contains, among other things, a provision for the abolition of the Employees' Compensation Commission. It was the opinion of the committee that that part of the plan was in violation of section 5(a), subsection 6, which prohibited the abolition of quasi-judicial agencies in the reorganization plans.

The Federal Employees Compensation Commission is a bipartisan board, and it was the opinion of the committee that

bipartisan boards should not be abolished by reorganization plans. If they are to be abolished, it was the opinion of the committee that the Congress itself should do it by direct action. As far as I recall, that was the only objection to reorganization plan No. 2.

Let me advise the House that under the terms of the Reorganization Act you cannot amend these reorganization plans. You must either vote them up or vote them down.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Is the Employees Compensation Commission one of the independent agencies that was originally exempted from the basic Reorganization Act last before us by the report of the committee?

Mr. MANASCO. It was not exempted in the Reorganization Act of 1945. It is my understanding that it was exempted in the Reorganization Act of 1939.

Mr. HALLECK. But the gentleman's committee, in its original proposal, in the bill as reported, exempted certain of the independent agencies.

Mr. MANASCO. That is correct. They did exempt certain independent agencies, and it was the opinion of the committee that the provision of section 5, which exempted quasi-judicial agencies, also exempted the Employees' Compensation Commission. The Employees' Compensation Commission has been recognized by the Congress and the courts for some time as being a quasi-judicial body.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman has stated that the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is recognized as a quasi-judicial body by the Congress. As a matter of fact, it is recognized as such by the Supreme Court of the United States. As such, it must be exempted from any reorganization plan proposed by the Chief Executive. Plan No. 2 violates section 5 (a) (6) of the Reorganization Act because, as an agency exercising quasi-judicial functions, the Commission no longer could give the collective three-member bipartisan judgment upon cases which the present law requires; in fact, the Commission would be abolished. Moreover, under the plan, a super appeals board would have power to veto the exercise of judgment which the present Compensation Act authorizes. The "limitation on judgment" which the Reorganization Act forbids is apparent.

Mr. MANASCO. That is right.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the United States Employees' Compensation Commission also administer longshoremen's compensation?

Mr. MANASCO. That is correct.

The main objection that the committee had to plan No. 3 was because it transferred the Marine Inspection Service permanently from the Department of Commerce to the Coast Guard, where it should be, for the Coast Guard is charged with the safety of people who are shipwrecked on our coast and should be charged with the seaworthiness of seagoing vessels. Of course, I do not know whether that is such an important thing, but the other matter was the weakening of St. Elizabeths Hospital. Our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is more informed on that particular question than am I, and he will be able to explain to the House why the committee objected to that particular provision.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is any saving at all in these three reorganization plans?

Mr. MANASCO. When the Director of the Budget appeared before the committee, that question was asked him several times, and we never could get an answer from him that it would save anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I will try to not take more than just a few minutes, because I know that time is of pressing importance. First I want to say that I appreciate the courtesy of the House leadership in cooperating with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] in bringing up these three resolutions: House Concurrent Resolution 151, House Concurrent Resolution 154, and House Concurrent Resolution 155. Each resolution seeks to repeal, in effect, one of the reorganization plans submitted by the administration on May 16 of this year.

The act of 1940 provides that unless both branches of Congress within 60 days after a reorganization plan has been submitted to the Congress affirmatively disapprove the plan, the plan then becomes law, with the same force and effect as though it had been passed by a roll-call vote in the House and in the Senate. The 60 days is fast expiring. If I figure correctly, on the 14th or 15th of July, unless this body disapproves any one or all three of these plans—and I hope it disapproves all three of them—and unless the other body does likewise, then that plan becomes a law.

Mr. Chairman, the resolutions which I have introduced disapproving these plans ought to pass, because the Members of Congress have not had an opportunity to give study and consideration to these complicated reorganization plans. This is very important. The Members are busy with many, many things, and the Members of the House have much to do. What happened? The administrative agencies—and I do not criticize the President, because he has to act through his administrative agencies, but what I say is directed at the administrative agencies—had from the 20th of December to take such time as they wanted to bring before this House at the earliest possible moment any reorganization plan in which they were interested. What did they do? They waited from the 20th of December until the 16th day of May, a time when the party leadership of this House was beginning to talk about an adjournment during the summer months.

It seems to me in the interest of good legislation that it is not unfair to suggest that this House ought to adopt these Concurrent Resolutions, 151, 154, and 155, and let this matter go over until the new Congress convenes in January, when the administrative agencies can submit their proposed legislation early in the session and not late in the session, so that Congress can study the complications and the effect of the proposed plans and give proper consideration to them.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman says that Members of Congress have not had an opportunity to study these plans. I find that the committee of which the gentleman is a distinguished member has held hearings that run to 341 pages, and that this committee, having studied these plans, recommends their disapproval. That is the same sort of consideration we give to other legislation. The only question is whether we are going to follow the recommendations of a committee that has given exhaustive study to these plans.

Mr. PITTENGER. May I correct the gentleman by saying that I am not a member of that distinguished committee. Otherwise, the gentleman's remarks are correct.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. How much more time does the gentleman believe Congress would require to determine that plan No. 2 is clearly in violation of the Constitution?

Mr. PITTENGER. May I say to the gentleman, who is a very able and learned student of the law, that other Members of the House have said the same thing about plans Nos. 1 and 3, and I think they are correct. All violate the law.

Referring to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], what we say is this, and this is an added reason why these resolutions should be adopted. Just as soon as I made application to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, he cooperated 100 percent by calling his committee together, by arranging for hearings, and by conducting hearings.

I was not present at all of these meetings although I attended several of them. It is significant that the members of the

Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, men of ability and standing in this House and men whose judgment you respect and in whom you have confidence, after hearing the testimony and after studying the plans by a vote which unofficially has been reported to be 11 to 3, voted to report favorably on the Pittenger resolution, which in effect is an unfavorable action on reorganization plan 1, reorganization plan 2, and reorganization plan 3. The committee has set forth, probably not as elaborately as you and I might do after more lengthy study, some objections to these plans in the committee reports which accompany these House concurrent resolutions. If you have not done so, I would urge you to talk to Mr. MANASCO, to Judge WHITTINGTON, to Mr. BENDER, to Mr. CHURCH, to Mr. JUDD, and to Mr. HENRY, all members of the committee who were regular in attendance at these meetings and who approached these plans without any prejudice but solely with a desire to report to this House information on which the House could act.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. If these resolutions should fail, it would mean that the country would then have a permanent housing administration; is that not correct?

Mr. PITTENGER. I have been told that is absolutely correct. That is the effect and the purpose, although I do not think any Government agency can be justified that way, but the purpose of plan No. 1 would be permanently to put the Government in the housing business.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JUDD. On May 31 the Director of the Budget, Mr. Smith, wrote to the chairman of our committee, and on page 2 in the second paragraph in talking about the changes in this reorganization plan he says: "Among these are the provisions which make permanent the National Housing Agency." There is the Director of the Budget speaking. There is no authorization for that in law whatsoever.

Mr. PITTENGER. I do not think there is any question about the correctness of my colleague's statement.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to go on record as being opposed to making such an agency permanent. That seems to me to be one place where the Government should not intrude any further into the privacy of American life.

Mr. PITTENGER. In one way or another all three plans have that same legal defect—making wartime agencies permanent.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. Is it not true that if it does make permanent the National Housing Agency that is in direct conflict with the intent of the original reorganization law as it was passed?

Mr. PITTENGER. I do not think there is any question about that. I think all three of these plans violate some provision of the act which Congress passed last year. I supported that Reorganization Act. I did so because I believed that these Government agencies ought to be consolidated instead of expanded. You have just the opposite in these plans. Here and there, they have a couple of little sections and, in my opinion, if they put them together they do not even need a reorganization plan to do it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Is my memory not correct that when we supported that resolution the argument was that it would reduce the number of bureaus and agencies rather than create new ones?

Mr. PITTENGER. I will say to my colleague that is the reason I supported the reorganization or consolidation plans, as I recall it, first under Mr. Hoover and then under Mr. Roosevelt. I announced last summer a year ago that I was going to support the President's reorganization plan in the hope that he would give us some real reorganization plan. But they have fallen short of the purpose of the law.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to plan No. 1, section 501:

> National Housing Agency: The agencies and functions of the National Housing Agency established under the First War Powers Act, 1941 (55 Stat. 838), by Executive Order No. 9070 of February 24, 1942, are consolidated to form a permanent agency of the same name.

Can there be any doubt of the intent to create a permanent housing agency?

Mr. PITTENGER. I think one of the representatives of one of the bureaus used a lot of words, but I do not believe he explained away the objections that my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania has raised. Let me say in a little different way that plan No. 2 and plan No. 3 have in them the same elements of danger. They are not properly prepared.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, these plans are a regrouping of existing agencies, some created by law, others created by Executive order. There is no worth-while elimination. No economy is claimed. The real effect will be to give permanency to Executive orders which were made in the first instance as war necessities. We certainly should be timid before giving life and vitality permanently to all of these war agencies.

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. When our committee was in Moscow we held a conference with Mr. Andrei Vyshinsky. We asked him how the Soviet system functioned in a legislative capacity. He said the executive department agrees on policy and then comes to the Presidium for ratification. There is something strangely analogous to that procedure and the one we are called upon to ratify this afternoon.

Mr. PITTENGER. I will say if you will study these plans you will find they are a step in the direction of having legislation by Executive decree. That was not the purpose of the act of 1945.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. I think we should clear up one thing in these statements. If the reorganization plan is defeated and the War Powers Act expires, we will still have certain housing functions that were created by act of Congress.

Mr. PITTENGER. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MANASCO. They will go back like the United States Housing Authority, and various others that were established by the Congress, and this plan will not have an effect on those.

Mr. PITTENGER. That is correct. You do not affect any of the existing housing agencies passed under law. You have got all that even though you defeat plan numbered 1.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Did the committee make any findings as to the desirability of transferring the Bureau of Marine and Fisheries Inspection to the Coast Guard?

Mr. PITTENGER. I talked to one of the members of the committee and I am told that that failure to comment on that was an oversight; probably a little confusion. I will say to the gentleman that I have very decided views on that subject. I think that is one of the objectives that the committee passed on when they reported adversely to plan numbered 3. I will say that the shipping interests, the merchant marine, and seamen's unions, appeared before the committee and opposed reorganization plan No. 3. They do not want to remain under the Coast Guard. They want to be returned to the Department of Commerce. I hope you read the testimony of John Hawk, an official of the Seafarers International Union, of New York City. He pointed out very ably the objections to Reorganization Plan No. 3. This plan ought to be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, it was former President Hoover who remarked:

> Proposals for reorganization of the Federal Government always prove to be the signal for the mobilization of opposition from all quarters, which has destroyed the possibility of constructive action.

An editorial in the Washington (D. C.) Star correctly observes that—

> Insofar as the mobilization of opposition is concerned the observation is as true today as it was when Mr. Hoover was having difficulty in obtaining congressional cooperation in his reorganization program. President Truman's threefold plan for administrative

reform has collided head on with opposition from the House Committee on Expenditures. There are indications that the House will follow the committee's advice and disapprove the plan. The committee's action in turn reflects the opposition voiced by sundry groups and individuals against various phases of the President's program.

The three-part presidential recommendation called for a consolidation of Federal housing agencies, a merger of welfare activities and a series of interagency functional shifts—all for the announced purpose of promoting administrative efficiency, eliminating duplication of effort and saving money. Mr. Truman made no claim that his proposals were perfect or all-inclusive. To a large extent, however, they did meet in part the demands which repeatedly have been made at the Capitol for a businesslike reorganization of the executive machinery. The Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures, for example, advised President Truman last November that a "multiplicity of agencies" were doing "identical, similar, or related" work, as in the case of the housing field, where there are 22 units in 11 different agencies.

We are seeing again an evidence of the view expressed many years ago by a Chief Executive of this country. Under the plea of my beloved colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] and those who join with him, we are requested at this time to thwart the efforts not of a Democratic President but of a reorganization ideal that was first expressed in the request of President Hoover, again urged by President Roosevelt, and now in the third instance brought forward by President Truman. It is important for the membership to recall what a former member of this body, a very able one, said. I refer to the Comptroller General, Lindsay C. Warren.

We know—

Declared Mr. Warren—

from past experience, indeed from sad experience, in this body that the Congress will never of its own accord and of its own initiative reorganize the Government of the Nation.

I think it might be appropriate to call to your attention the words of Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, when he was a Member of Congress. He said:

I have yet to talk with reference to reorganization to one man in the Government service who did not make this answer: "I know it should be done, but" and then when he joins the great old order of "butters" you will find that he says: "Do not touch my department, do not touch my bureau, do not touch my division."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman will admit that nobody in the committee had any objection to 23 or 24 of the 28 reorganization moves. The gentleman will admit that, will he not?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the membership of the committee largely agrees with reorganization but——

Mr. JUDD. Therefore, we were not against reorganization, we were against four particular things which would not cut down, but extend. We favored the 24 that make some real reorganization along the line of the law passed by Congress. If we pass these resolutions and send them back to the President and he deletes those four or five, they will come back and go through automatically. We cannot accept the reorganization the way it has been submitted because there is no real saving achieved.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We talk reorganization but we fail to act. No legislation is perfect. We cannot get all we individually desire in these matters. My thinking goes to something deeper and that is the preservation of our democracy, our responsible Government, using the best connotation of the expression, and likewise the maintenance of a system of executive organization and administration which is effective and which functions as economically as possible. Although technically the gentleman from Minnesota is correct in saying "Yes, we agree with most of them but not with all," but then you come here against the proposition. We should meet the impact of this challenge.

My colleagues, we act unwisely if we turn down plan 1, or 2, or 3, or all of them, when for the first time really under any administration, and I refer not to a Democratic or a Republican leadership, this Congress, responsive to the will of the American people, attempts to put the executive house in order——

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. With reference to the quotation from the present Comptroller General, Lindsay C. Warren, I think that if the gentleman will refer back to that debate he will find that in that very reorganization bill that Mr. Warren presented to the House he made some very notable and very wide exceptions and the House responded and approved those exceptions. One of them I happen to recall was the United States Army engineers. At that time there was considerable agitation to put the Army engineers in the Interior Department; and I am not so sure that the gentleman would not agree with me that it would be a right unwise thing to have done at that time. The facts and circumstances that have taken place since made it such.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Of course, if the gentleman is referring to individuals, I do not desire to enter that realm of discussion because I submit my argument today on the plans themselves and what is contemplated for the better functioning of our Federal agencies. Mr. Chairman, to return to my theme I shall emphatically say that nothing in any plan changes the substance of any governmental program. Charges were made before the committee that the rights and privileges of citizens would be adversely affected; the plans make no changes which decrease such rights. The sole effect is to adopt or continue organizational arrangements which will permit the more effective conduct of governmental activities which have been authorized by the Congress. The organizational changes proposed in each case meet one or more of the requirements imposed by Congress of promoting increased efficiency, reducing overlapping and duplication of effort, consolidating agencies and functions according to major purpose, reducing the number of agencies, and promoting economy.

I shall be very happy to yield to those Members standing, but I have only a short time because of limitation of debate. I am not sure I can add to the intelligent reflections which the House would take after I have spoken. I shall go into these plans 1, 2, and 3, in the hope that the purposes of both opponents and proponents may be better served than if I am interrupted. But the discussion even in that manner will of necessity be brief.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] makes a case for the opposition in an over-all way. Of course, it will be supplemented and expanded by others. He says he is in full agreement with the need of reorganization but that the plans should be rejected due to lack of study up to the present time of the proposals. In refutation of that statement, I may say that although we may not agree, each and every reorganization plan by the President has been carefully considered. In eight instances the plans make permanent organizational changes which have been in existence for many, many years, and full opportunity has been available to judge the wisdom of the arrangements that have been made. In cases involving new consolidations or transfers almost every item has a considerable background of study, both in the departments and agencies which originally proposed the action, and in the Bureau of the Budget and in the staff attached to the Presidential office.

There should be none of these items which should be rejected alone on the basis that further study is required. On the contrary, if full advantage is to be taken of the possibilities for economy and increased efficiency which are apparent, I believe, in the plans under consideration, they should be approved so that we can at the beginning of the next fiscal year start on an improved basis.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER], before our committee and in the House, speaks against the plans and says they will not consolidate and eliminate agencies. When a man makes that statement and nobody answers it, we can believe, at least, that he stands on ground that no one desires to oppose. Some of the items in the plans will yield immediate economies by the abolition of jobs and functions and in the long run will make possible the continuance in the postwar years of organizational arrangements which have proved their effectiveness under the stress of war. While no new economies result from this type of action, no one can deny that additional confusion and expense would be entailed if these organizations were to be broken up, and if six of the major departments and agencies of the Government were to be forced to abandon purely organizational arrangements which they adopted for reasons of increased economy and efficiency and which have proven to be practical over a period of several years.

Let us take them one by one. Plan No. 1 does abolish the office of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippines and the Office of Contract Settlement. In both of these instances savings,

therefore, can be effected, because they will be attributable directly to the abolition of the two offices.

Let us go to plan No. 2. We abolish the Social Security Board, and we abolish the Employees' Compensation Commission.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has referred to the abolition of the office of High Commissioner to the Philippines. It would seem to me that after July 4 there will not be any need for a High Commissioner to the Philippines, because the Philippines will then become independent.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman has mentioned another instance of the abolition of an office, namely, the Office of Contract Terminations. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this is an agency consisting of an administrator and three clerks, the work of which has been 98 percent completed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I did not say the degree in which savings will be effected, but said they would be abolished and there would be economies.

I continue with plan No. 2. We abolish not only the Social Security Board and the Employees' Compensation Commission, but we abolish the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Board of Visitors to St. Elizabeths Hospital. We also consolidate the functions of the Employees' Compensation Commission, the Children's Bureau, and the Bureau of Vital Statistics and other activities of the Bureau of the Census into the Federal Security Agency.

I will ask the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Pennsylvania if these agencies I have mentioned are not being abolished.

Mr. WALTER. Yes; they are being abolished in name only. However, an illegal attempt is being made to impose the duties of those agencies in a place where they are unable to perform them.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Oh, let us be reasonable. We know direct savings should result from the abolition of the Social Security Board. No substantial sums are involved in either the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation or the Board of Visitors of St. Elizabeths so that no appreciable savings can be claimed for these items. While the functions consolidated in the Federal Security Agency may not immediately reflect savings in their administrative costs, some savings should certainly be reflected over a long term. More important than this, however, a greater return in terms of program effectiveness and service to the public should be received for each dollar spent under this regrouping of functions.

Plan No. 3 consolidates the Grazing Service in the General Land Office into a Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior, consolidates the Paymaster General and Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps into a Supply Department, consolidates the administration of minerals on agricultural lands in the Department of the Interior, consolidated certain housekeeping functions at Hyde Park, makes possible the continued consolidation of certain functions of various bureaus in the Department of Agriculture into the Production and Marketing Administration, abolishes the Canal Zone Biological Area and consolidates its functions in the Smithsonian Institution.

The consolidations in the Interior Department and the Marine Corps will definitely result in direct savings. The other consolidations may result in savings. Each of these consolidations will result in increased efficiency and greater service from the dollars spent.

Aside from these direct abolitions and direct consolidations, the plan—as just noted—provides for the maintenance of several organizational arrangements which have worked well for several years. Unless the plan is approved, these arrangements must be broken up; and great confusion and inefficiency for a period of time will inevitably develop. That is particularly true in case of the National Housing Agency, Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, National Observatory and Hydrographic Office, and the supervision of credit unions.

In summary the contention of the opponents that the plan does not contain the consolidations and eliminations of agencies, is patently untrue. I recall that Representative PITTENGER referred, in his remarks, that the increased costs of plan No. 2 could be figured in terms of tens of millions of dollars in the program of the Federal Security Agency.

This statement is absolutely wrong. Mr. PITTENGER and others were referring to the increased appropriations for old-age assistance and public health grants to the States recommended for 1947 as compared to 1946. Obviously, neither of these programs are involved in the reorganization plan. The fact that a substantive program of the Federal Security Agency which is primarily a grant to the States is increasing in cost has nothing to do with these proposals.

I think it is important that in plan No. 1 we check back just a moment to the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] in reference to making temporary wartime emergency housing projects permanent. I believe that no wartime emergency housing projects are made permanent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe that we in no way alter any of the basic legislation which has been enacted by this Congress. I know that is true. We have not done so.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. I inquired of the Housing Expediter, Mr. Wilson Wyatt, as to his opinion with reference to making this a permanent agency, and with the gentleman's permission I would like to read one paragraph:

> Only two real arguments have been advanced against reorganization plan No. 1.
>
> The first of these is that it violates the provision of the reorganization law which prohibits the making permanent of a temporary agency. In reality, reorganization plan No. 1 does not make any temporary agency permanent. It does not continue any function or activity beyond the term specified by statute. It merely makes permanent a consolidation which was effected during the the war under the First War Powers Act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I feel the gentleman is correct and I believe the opinion he has read is of benefit to the House in resolving the question.

In the minute and a half I have remaining I pose the question once again to my colleagues. Those who served under the two previous Chief Executives, Mr. Hoover and Mr. Roosevelt, have said that we are in favor of reorganization. In the first instance, when the measure was finally brought to the floor many exemptions were written into it. Then again in 1937 through 1939 there were fewer exemptions contained in the legislation. When we passed in 1945 the third reorganization legislation only a few exemptions crept into the measure. We thus indicated that by and large there was an increasing tendency in the Congress of the United States to show that individually and collectively there was a belief in reorganization. In 1932, 1937 through 1939, in 1945, and now in 1946 we meet this problem.

Having admitted our failure to do the job of reorganization, having by mandate of the Congress told the President of the United States, "We desire you to take affirmative steps," when the first three plans are sent to this Congress, are we going to say not only to the President but to the country, "We have admitted our failure to act. We put the burden into the hands and on the shoulders of someone else, and now, on the first occasion when plans come to us we weakly respond, 'Mr. President, we cannot approve'?" I do not believe the country is going to appreciate such an answer.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from West Virginia, may I say that neither the Reorganization Act of 1939, nor the First War Powers Act, nor the Reorganization Act of 1945 conferred any semblance of authority on the President to create new agencies. Indeed, the latter in express terms forbids it.

What was the purpose of this Reorganization Act that we passed on October 20, 1945? The express purpose of that act was to save the taxpayers' money, not to substitute new departments but to eliminate departments, to take people off the Government pay roll and to reduce the cost of government. That was written right in this bill.

Let me read from the act that passed on December 20 this language:

> The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a).
>
> It is the expectation of the Congress that the transfers, coordinations, and abolitions under this act shall accomplish an over-all

reduction of at least 25 percent in the administrative costs of the agency or agencies affected.

The act that was passed in December of 1945 states in so many words that the cost of government must be reduced by at least 25 percent. When the Director of the Budget, Mr. Smith, appeared before the committee and I questioned him as to how much would be saved by these reorganization plans, he said, and his testimony is here and I can read it to you, that this was not even considered by the Bureau of the Budget when they adopted these three plans.

It is an amazing thing for the Director of the Budget to say that he had not even considered a reduction in the cost of Government. All of us here are aware of the fact that everywhere throughout the country the taxpayers are sick and tired of being welfared and inspected and wet-nursed from Washington.

They want it stopped. They want the cost of government reduced. Here, instead of reducing the cost of government, we are increasing the cost of government by over $546,000,000 as the 1947 Budget will indicate. These three plans are a part of that increase in the cost of the civil functions of government. I do not know of any individual who appeared before our committee who could stand up and be questioned and who could support an argument that this would bring about any kind of economy.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. What will be accomplished by the proposed consolidation in the Department of Agriculture? I understand that by this proposed plan No. 3 the functions of certain agencies of the Department of Agriculture are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture. And it refers to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the Surplus Marketing Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. What economies will be effected by that?

Mr. BENDER. No economies would be effected except more control would be given to certain individuals who want more control and who want to control these agencies—for what purposes I do not know except that they want to be big shots.

Mr. COOLEY. Would the personnel be reduced any?

Mr. BENDER. The personnel would be increased by all three of these plans. The personnel would be substantially increased, except in two or three minor instances. Now what in the world did we pass a reorganization plan for other than to reduce the cost of government? Every Member of Congress runs on a platform of reduced cost of government. You know we owe approximately $285,000,000,000 in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

You know we cannot go on indefinitely spending two or three times as much tax money as we put into the till of the Federal Government. Mr. Smith and all other members of the administration who appeared before us did not offer testimony in support of these plans claiming a reduction in the cost of government. What did you have in mind, any of you, when you voted for this reorganization plan last year? If you will read the hearings on that plan and if you will read what happened on the floor of the House and in committee when that plan was passed, you will find that everyone who spoke on this reorganization plan said they were interested in economy. Of course, we want efficiency and we do not want to stop anything that would improve the efficient operation of the Government even if it does cost a little more money. But this does not improve the efficient operation of the Government. It impedes the efficient operation of the Government.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Was there any testimony before your committee that would indicate an increase in the cost of government in the event that these reorganization plans were adopted?

Mr. BENDER. Only the figures that were prepared for members of the committee by experts who analyzed the effect and the cost of these plans and in all but two or three minor instances there is a substantial increase in the cost of the Government in the event these plans become effective.

Mr. KEEFE. I was interested in asking that question because of the interrogation of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] who is now on his feet, wherein he indicated a few moments ago that the committee was unanimous on all of the suggestions in these three reorganization plans with the exception of some four or five of the proposals. As to all of the proposals except those four or five, the committee was in accord with the suggestions of the President that those reorganizations should take place. That is what I understood him to say.

Mr. BENDER. I say to the gentleman the contrary is true.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. If I said that, I did not give the impression that I wanted to give. I said our major objection to the plans was because of four or five of the proposals and that there might be greater efficiency achieved by many of these other transfers. But I asked Mr. SMITH over and over again, trying to get some evidence that this would actually save any money and he would not give us a figure. So that they do not achieve the purpose, although the other 24 do not violate the terms of the act.

Mr. KEEFE. I was prompted to ask the question because I was rather astounded at what I understood the plain import of the gentleman's statement, which was agreed to by the gentleman from West Virginia, that the committee was in unanimous accord as to all of these proposals with the exception of four or five items. If that is true, then it ought to call for some explanation.

Mr. BENDER. At no time was there any evidence of any real enthusiasm on the part of the members of the committee for any one of these plans, either on the Republican or the Democratic side. As a matter of fact, with the exception of one member of the committee, who rather weakly supported some of the provisions of this plan, no other member of the committee appeared to show any enthusiasm for that plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. As a matter of fact, there were dozens of witnesses, groups, and organizations from all over the country in opposition to all three plans.

Mr. BENDER. That is right.

Now, in connection with plan No. 1, the Housing Agency, which I supported and which I believe is a temporary Agency and has done some good things—they are making that Agency a permanent branch of the Government. Do you want to do that? If you do, vote for this plan. If you want some of these war agencies made permanent, if you want to keep these office buildings occupied with thousands of employees on the Federal pay roll, go ahead and vote for the plans. But if you believe your own campaign statements back home, that you want this Government to be operated economically and that you want to save money, you cannot possibly vote for any one of these plans. The whole purpose of this reorganization business was to reduce the cost of Government. Now, after 6 months' time the Bureau of the Budget writes these three plans. I think they were written by Mr. Appleby of the Bureau of the Budget. I think they were handed to the President. I am not criticizing the President at all. I think the Bureau of the Budget is in error. I think they did not read the law when they prepared these plans. If they had read the law they would have had some testimony to offer, revealing that the cost of Government would be reduced 25 percent.

Mr. PITTENGER. And when they abolished the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, right away they created an appeal board of three members. They not only do not reduce the number of employees but they increase them.

Mr. BENDER. They increased them and provided fat salaries.

Now, do we want to pass another unconstitutional law here? That plan in connection with the employees' fund is wholly out of order, and wholly illegal.

Mr. PITTENGER. And they abolish the Social Security Board and appoint somebody else to function there, and take away from the Board any security, any independence, so that it can decide cases that come before it free from political interference. It is a bipartisan board.

Mr. BENDER. Not only that, but they increased the cost of the operation of that agency by $12,000,000. Now, if you want to increase the cost of these agencies, go ahead and vote for this plan. Is there anyone on this floor who will

offer testimony to the effect that these plans will reduce the cost of Government one thin dime?

I have great respect for my good friend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. He and I are on the same side of the fence most of the time on this committee. I am surprised that he did not appear before the committee and offer this testimony and show such enthusiasm for these plans.

He did not voice the sentiments there as he is voicing them today. If he had voiced them he would have been the only Member to have voiced these opinions. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. And the hearings will show that I did voice my belief in the plans during the testimony of the witnesses, particularly when the gentleman from Atlanta, Mr. West, was testifying.

Mr. BENDER. Yes; I want to correct my statement to that extent and say that the gentleman was active in the committee. The gentleman is one of the most active members of our committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Then the gentleman from West Virginia agrees with the statement of the Speaker here that the National Housing Administration under plan No. 1 would be made a permanent agency of the Government.

Mr RANDOLPH No; I disagree with that, and so stated in my remarks. They are reaffirmed, however, by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. COOLEY. How can the gentleman take that position in view of the very language which states that the agencies and functions of the National Housing Administration established under the Second War Powers Act are consolidated to form a permanent agency of the same name?

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may answer that question?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. MANASCO. I think it is unfortunate that that statement was contained in the transmittal of this plan, that the National Housing Agency is being made a permanent organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MANASCO. That statement is unfortunate on the part of the Administration because when the National Housing Agency was created it was created to consolidate agencies that had already been created by Congress. It would have been better had the plan said that these consolidated agencies were already created by act of Congress and merely grouped together under the Second War Powers Act under the name United States Housing Agency. I do not think there would have been any objection to that part of it. I do not think most of the members of our committee object to a continuance of the functions but they objected to the abolition of the Federal Housing Administration and putting it under the National Housing Agency or any other agency.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman agree that this plan seeks to make it a permanent agency?

Mr. MANASCO. I think that plan is unfortunate. If they had drawn it properly it would not have caused so much objection but it does make the agency permanent. The opinion of the committee was that it does not extend the Second War Powers Act.

Mr. BENDER. This not only makes that agency permanent but makes all these agencies and bureaus and departments created by Executive order permanent agencies of Government. That is what these plans do.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the dean of the Ohio delegation.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman knows that in the State of Ohio the building and loan companies are outstanding in the State and are the greatest building force in the State. They are firmly convinced that this will be permanent and will seriously handicap them in their activities.

Mr. BENDER. And they represent a pretty substantial section of the common people.

Mr. JENKINS. They represent over 2,000,000 people in our State.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I call attention to this further statement in the report which says that these agencies and functions will constitute a permanent organization and further I quote from Harold Smith's own letter:

> Among these are the provisions to make permanent the National Housing Agency.

How can the gentleman say that it is not going to be permanent?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I refer the gentleman to the statement I have placed emphasis on in the minority report that I believe the plan carries out the congressional mandate as set forth in the Reorganization Act of 1945 when we specifically used this language:

> To create, coordinate, and consolidate agences and functions as nearly as may be, according to major purposes.

It will bring together within a single agency the major functions of Government relating to housing. I believe that is true.

Mr. COOLEY. And make them permanent.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not use the word "permanent" because we do not change any substantive law which has been passed.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman does not but Mr. Smith does and the plan does.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am not speaking for Mr. Smith. It was unfortunate language, I will be frank.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. But the law said that no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of, continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made.

We all know if this reorganization plan is not agreed to this agency will terminate at a certain time. This extends it ad infinitum.

Furthermore, it says that no reorganization plan shall provide for continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence and no reorganization plan shall provide for continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise. There is no authorization under law for this.

Mr. MANASCO. Under the law we created the United States Housing Authority and other agencies, that were charged with building houses and they will revert back to an independent status. We will have about 12 to 15 such agencies.

Mr. JUDD. But you will not have the National Housing Agency.

Mr. MANASCO. You can call it anything.

Mr. JUDD. There is another limitation. No reorganization shall provide for authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law. This function is not authorized by law. It is under Executive order.

Mr. MANASCO. The functions performed by these war agencies were functions already authorized by law, and then consolidated and grouped together.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. If it would produce a more smoothly functioning operation, why are not these agencies grouped together under the authority given the Chief Executive by the First War Powers Act?

Mr. MANASCO. They are now.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has used the term "permanent," and our chairman has said that was an unfortunate use of language. Does not the gentleman now addressing the House think that unless the House acts and rejects this plan that the House will be approving the permanency of it; therefore it is necessary to turn down the plan?

Mr. BENDER. I think the gentleman has made a very fine point. In the event we fail to turn down these plans they become part of the law on July 15.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is equipped now to show the tremendous additional expense and I hope he will use his time to do that. I want to make another comment. The gentleman does know the contempt almost that some of

the witnesses had for the subsection (c) of section 2 of the act which says:

It is the expectation of the Congress that the transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions under this act shall accomplish an over-all reduction of at least 25 per centum in the administrative cost of the agency or agencies affected.

I hope the gentleman will bring out before he leaves the floor these tremendous additional expenditures.

Mr. BENDER. I will be glad to make them a part of the record. It will take too much time to present the figures at the present time. Our time is too limited.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Because there has been injected into each one of these plans something that is not apparent to the eye of the average Member, does not the gentleman believe the wise thing to do is to defer these matters until the next session of Congress?

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, the wise thing to do is to defeat them, not defer them.

Mr. DONDERO. I mean defeat these plans so that they may be given further consideration later?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. This is the same agency, the NHA, and about the same personnel, that brought up a bill which the Congress defeated in 1939, a bill before the Banking and Currency Committee. Most of the Members now on the floor who were Members at that time were so utterly disgusted with the personnel and the way they lobbied Congress and put millions of dollars into projects just to influence votes in the various districts, and all sorts of skulduggery, that I cannot understand how anybody who was here at the time would ever vote for a bill of this kind to put all these good housing agencies under it.

Mr. BENDER. I do not know about the gentlewoman's statement, but I am sure she knows what she is talking about. However, I may say that at no time did the committee consider personalities or inject personalities into this thing. I may add further that the majority of the members of the committee were present when we voted on these plans. Not one of these plans at any time had over 3 votes for it in the committee. The most votes that any one of these plans had were 3 votes, and, you appreciate that the minority party does not control any committee of the House.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it a proper Federal function for the Government to build homes for the people?

Mr. BENDER. I think the gentleman answers that question himself.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. On this question of the National Housing Agency may I read a paragraph from the President's message in which he transmitted reorganization plan No. 1:

I fully recognize that S. 1592, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, approved by the Senate on April 12 of this year, provides for the permanent organization of the housing activities of the Government along the lines set forth in this plan. However, since the House must act before S. 1592 can become law, and because of the heavy legislative schedule now facing the House, it is difficult to foretell when such action can be expected. On the other hand, action by the President, taken under the authority of the Reorganization Act, assures decision on the matter in 60 days.

Therefore the President has taken over the legislative function. If we had passed the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill and it was law, then he would have a right to reorganize, because he would have a National Housing Agency expressly authorized by law. He thinks we are too slow, so he is going about it in this way. He says:

It also seems desirable to confirm under this reorganization plan as many as possible of the organization changes that were effected under the First War Powers Act, 1941, and that it seems desirable to make permanent.

I do not know how anybody can get away from the language of the intent of the President.

Mr. BENDER. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. This morning one of the distinguished Members of the other body testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. As I understood him, while urging the passage of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, he pointed out that the approach made through this Presidential plan No. 1 was entirely different from that contained in the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill in that it did not preserve the autonomy and independence of these various housing agencies as the authors of that bill sought to do. In the plan they placed everything under the control of one Administrator so that he can dictate the policies and actions of each one of these subsidiary agencies, and that was one element which they sought to avoid in this very carefully prepared and thought out Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

Mr. BENDER. I might add this, that most of the time before our committee on any controversial issue there are many able witnesses who appear in support of programs, but the testimony in support of these programs or these plans, in my humble opinion, was most pitiful.

Let me say this in closing. You have repeatedly heard that great man, Thomas Jefferson, quoted by Members on both sides of the aisle. He said time and time again that "that government is best which governs least." Now, what you are doing here is writing into permanent law temporary agencies, agencies that were created under Executive order, and rather than decreasing the cost of government as you have written into the law on December 25, you are increasing the cost of government; not decreasing it by 25 percent but increasing the cost of government in practically all of these agencies by at least 18 percent.

Mr. DONDERO. And governing more.

Mr. BENDER. That is right. To vote against these three reorganization plans vote for all the Pittenger resolutions.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. WOODHOUSE].

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, both in and out of Congress there has been for years widespread recognition of the need for realining, regrouping, and pruning the agencies and divisions of the administrative branch of the Government to the end of increase in efficiency and decrease in cost. Today the problems facing us are more complex than ever. Today the need for efficient administration is urgent. Today economy in expenditures is imperative. And yet, as we all know, there are far too many independent boards, commissions, and agencies, the heads of which report directly to the President. It is physically impossible, with his other pressing duties, for the President to supervise and coordinate their diverse activities. Moreover, the public is confused by a multiplicity of separate agencies, each dealing with the same general field of activity. Too often it is difficult for us, Members of Congress, to locate the right man in the right agency to deal with a given question. How much more difficult, if not impossible, it is for the pertinent committee and for Congress itself to ascertain where an agency may not be hewing strictly to the program Congress authorized it to administer.

Every factor in the situation points to the urgent need for reorganization. Congress, by the Reorganization Act of 1945, placed upon the President the task of such reorganization.

Today we have the opportunity of taking the first steps toward such reorganization. The three plans before us are far from radical. They deal almost entirely with minor administrative adjustments, many of which have functioned effectively on a temporary basis during the war.

Reorganization plans have been blocked in the past because someone wanted to retain a specific job or because some vested interest might be affected. If we wait for a reorganization plan which will not disturb any person or any group, we will wait in vain. But we cannot afford to wait. We cannot afford to let our governmental machinery break down from sheer weight and disjointedness. Our Government has got to function and function efficiently. The world is watching us for an answer to the question, "Can democracy work?" That may sound dramatic. It is not. It is a cold, hard fact. And in this House today we have to decide whether we want democracy to work or whether we prefer to risk its breakdown in favor of the apparent immediate interest of a special-interest group. And I say apparent interest, because efficient Government machinery is to the real advantage of everyone.

The objection to plan 1 turns on the establishment of a National Housing Agency, which coordinates the activities of some 17 different agencies which were dealing with housing problems at the start of the war. Members who were here at that time will remember that it was practically impossible for Congress to find out what was being done by the Government in housing, let alone to determine what needed to be done. It was a situation of utter confusion.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. When the gentlewoman speaks of utter confusion I think it is important that we remember that prior to 1942 that was so, and there came into being a better housing program when we consolidated the various units. I do not think the statement should go unchallenged here that we are setting up new housing agencies or that we are making temporary bureaus permanent. Each and every constituent housing agency which came under the National Housing Agency as a temporary program was authorized by Congress. These were passed prior to our entrance into World War II—each and every agency dealing with housing. We cannot forget that. It was not a temporary program. It was not by directive of the President, but was by authorization of the Congress of the United States prior to the emergency of war.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. When Congress saw all that confusion at the beginning of the war it knew steps had to be taken to correct it and it therefore passed the War Powers Act giving the President that power. Whether all these agencies are to be consolidated under the NHA during peacetime depends on whether or not the Congress decides to give such power to the President. But we did not give him that power in the Reorganization Act. We specifically withheld from him such power in peacetime. My primary objection to this part of the reorganization plan is that the President is taking action that is not authorized by law. We authorized him to do that in the War Powers Act, but we did not authorize him to do it in the Reorganization Act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Congress made the agencies permanent.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. I know from experience as an elected State official in a State rapidly converting to war production, with thousands of war workers pouring into my State, how utterly frustrating and inefficient the situation was. It was always a question of whether it was the Federal Home Loan Bank Board which had jurisdiction over a particular problem, or whether it was the Federal Housing Administration, or the United States Housing Authority, or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, or the United States Housing Corporation, or the Defense Homes Corporation, or the Division of Housing Coordination, or the Central Housing Committee, or the Farm Security Administration, or the Public Buildings Administration, or the Mutual Ownership Division of the Federal Works Agency, or perhaps even the War or Navy Department.

The private builders were just as confused. Here is a brief paragraph from a bulletin of the National Association of Real Estate Boards issued shortly after Pearl Harbor, before the temporary wartime consolidation of housing agencies and activities was effected:

> The urgent need of coordinated Federal housing agencies was highlighted last week in hearings before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor when the $50,000,000 District Housing Bill was under consideration. Members of the committee gave up in despair after hearing representatives of 20 different agencies offer a description of how they thought the $50,000,000 for emergency housing in Washington should be spent.

Now compare this situation as it was before the war with our experience under the wartime consolidation of government housing agencies.

First. The difficult war-housing job whose accomplishment had seemed so doubtful was done, and, more important, it was done in time and in a manner which was of worth-while assistance to the war effort.

Second. And especially significant is the fact, first pointed out by the National Association of Home Builders, that, while before the unification of the housing agencies the outlook for private enterprise doing a part of the war housing job was dubious, the simplified and intelligent housing program made possible by unification, in turn made it possible to assign to private enterprise the major part of the war housing job.

These statements do not represent merely my own personal findings. Practically every witness, including representatives of the various trade organizations, who testified before the postwar hearings of the Lanham committee in 1943 and 1944, the hearings of the Senate postwar Committee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment in 1944 and 1945, and the hearings of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill a few months ago, attested to the excellent results achieved from the wartime consolidation of housing agencies.

Further, in one publication after another during the war period, the various trade organizations interested in housing paid tribute to the accomplishments of the NHA for the job it did, and in a number of cases these very organizations took the initiative in advocating its continuance for the postwar period. Such statements and recommendations were made, to cite several examples, in news letters or other releases of the National Association of Home Builders, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, and the Producers' Council.

There are certain trade organizations who now oppose a National Housing Agency because of their opposition to public housing. Actually, the question of public housing is entirely irrelevant, because the reorganization plan has nothing to do with the substantive housing program. The Congress, and only the Congress, can determine, by specific legislation, the scope of any public housing program undertaken by the Federal Government.

It is significant that over a long period of years many of these trade organizations have strongly favored a unification of the housing activities of the Federal Government and have clearly shown their hearty approval of the results already attained through the temporary unification of housing activities through Executive Order 9070 of February 24, 1942. The following statements by various of these organizations illustrate this point:

Mr. Douglas Whitlock, testifying as president of the Producers' Council at the hearings on postwar planning held by the Lanham committee of the House of Representatives in January 1944, made the following statement:

> So long as housing is deemed a concern of Government, Federal housing policies should be stipulated by Congress, and the carrying out of all such established policies should, in our opinion, be vested in a central agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government, which would be charged as well with the conduct of research and advance planning activities in the related fields of housing, both urban and rural, the development of urban communities, and financing. It should provide over-all supervision and coordination of the programs of its constituent agencies. This means that an agency, either the National Housing Agency or a similar type of unit, should be established by legislative enactment for postwar operation. I am sure you will agree that a field of activity of such great importance as housing and construction deserves representation in the executive branch.

Similarly, a press release issued by the Producers' Council on June 13, 1944, stated:

> BOSTON, June 13.—The functions of the National Housing Agency should be continued by Congress after the war in order to coordinate all Federal housing activities and to encourage a sound governmental housing policy for the postwar era, James W. Follin, managing director of the Producers' Council, stated here today at a meeting of the Boston Building Congress held at the Architectural Club.
>
> "It is essential that this agency—NHA—or some similar branch of the Federal Government be set up with adequate authority and facilities to prevent a recurrence of the unsatisfactory experiences during prewar years when there was a multiplicity of agencies dealing with housing matters and offering incompatible and conflicting programs."

Likewise, the National Association of Home Builders in its Washington Letter, dated February 25, 1944, made the following statement:

> NHA OBSERVES SECOND ANNIVERSARY
>
> Born of a war need, and created February 24, 1942, by Executive order, NHA looks back on its accomplishments with modest satisfaction. Only those who were intimate with the housing situation, prior to NHA, have a full appreciation of the benefits of the consolidation. Nearly a score of governmental bodies had a finger in the housing pie. No one was sure as to the size of the war job, or how it should be done. Priority procedure was something of a mystery, the wildest sort of rumors existed, and red tape ensnared

everyone in a chaos of confusion. The outlook for private enterprise doing a part of the war housing program was dubious, and the accomplishment of the total job seemed doubtful.

Alphabetically we had the following: DDHC, FHA, FHLBB, HOLC, FSLIC, USHR, USHA, FWA, PBA, TVA, FSA, and DHC. These stood for the Division of Defense Housing Coordination, Federal Housing Administration, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, United States Housing Corporation, United States Housing Authority, Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority, Farm Security Administration, and the Defense Homes Corporation. In addition to all of this the Army, Navy, and Maritime Departments were very much in the building picture, as were other agencies of lesser importance not listed here. Under Mr. Blandford's able administration uniform control was set up and an intelligent housing policy established and carried out.

A brief review of the war housing program under NHA is evidence of fine accomplishment.

The report of the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment sums up, as follows, the reply made by the National Association of Real Estate Boards in mid-1944 to a written questionnaire of the subcommittee:

The National Association of Real Estate Boards favors placing all those concerned with housing and community developments under one general agency. It stresses the aspect of community development, feeling that the character of a neighborhood or community has just as much to do with good housing conditions as the construction of dwellings. A Federal community development authority is urged comprising all the agencies now included in the National Housing Agency as well as a certain portion of public works dealing with community development.

Again, in its brochure, Postwar Cities, issued September 1, 1944, this same organization stated:

The first thing the Federal Government should do in this field is to get all of its eggs into one basket. They are now scattered through a dozen independent agencies temporarily consolidated under the National Housing Agency.

The president of the Mortgage Bankers' Association, in testifying before the Senate subcommittee, while stating that the consensus of the membership of the association was that FHA be divorced from the National Housing Agency, had this to say:

At the beginning of the present war, 1941, we found on the urban side a cumbersome and varied group of Government agencies. * * *

With respect to urban housing, it is obvious that without central direction, the many existing agencies created at different times for entirely different purposes, and by various authorizations, will be working at cross-purposes with a duplication of effort. We believe also that the cost can be greatly reduced if a comprehensive program is developed under unified direction.

The Federal Government, in our opinion, acted wisely in simplifying the organization in order to expedite war housing and to prepare the Nation for any emergency which might arise to improve our war effort and production. * * * We believe that many benefits were derived by this simplified organization and that the program for war housing and the program for financing such housing was expedited and was very beneficial during the wartime emergency.

In brief, a plan of organization of the housing activities of the Government along the very lines embodied in the reorganization plan is vigorously supported by the organizations representing the general public. Also, a number of the very organizations who oppose a single housing agency, because of their opposition to public housing, are actually on record as being in favor of a single agency when this question is divorced from that irrelevant issue.

How then can anyone object to the President's reorganization plan for consolidating the housing activities of the Government on the grounds that it is a public-housing plan, that under it, public housing would come to dominate private enterprise in housing? Since this was not the result of unification in wartime how much less likely is such a result in peacetime?

The actual facts are that there is nothing in either the Reorganization Act or the reorganization plan to serve as a basis for such fears or objections. In the first place, there is absolutely nothing in the plan which in any way expands or broadens the public-housing program. There is no way in fact in which it possibly could, for under the Reorganization Act, any plans are necessarily limited to matters of organizational set-up and can have nothing whatsoever to do with expanding substantive programs for making permanent any temporary functions.

The only way in which the reorganization plan has to do with public housing is that it places the public-housing functions of the Government, just as it does all of the other basic housing functions of the Government, under a single National Housing Administrator. If this, therefore, makes the plan a public-housing plan, by the very same token it makes the plan an FHA plan, it makes the plan a home loan bank plan, and so on.

It has been suggested in this connection that the public housing people in the Agency will manage somehow to exercise a dominating influence. Again, it is not clear by what mysterious alchemy that they rather than the FHA people or the home loan bank people will do the dominating, especially so when the public-housing unit will be outnumbered 2 to 1 by the private housing units. Similarly, there is absolutely no basis on which to suppose that the National Housing Administrator, to whom the Public Housing Commissioner would be completely subordinate in authority, show favoritism to public housing. Certainly the experience during the war, when the opportunities for favoring public housing were much greater, completely belie the fears of public-housing domination. I say this on the basis of investigations made by committees in both Houses of this Congress on this very question. For example, in one of its reports in connection with a war-housing appropriation, the Lanham committee of this House stated that the question as to whether private enterprise is being aided and encouraged to do as much of the war-housing program as it possibly can was a question of constant concern to the committee. This committee then stated and I quote:

The committee has been well impressed with the attention and efforts which the National Housing Agency has concentrated upon this aspect of the problem.

Perhaps as effective a refutation of this argument of public housing domination as any is that made by the chairman of the Republican steering committee in the Senate, Senator TAFT, who was also chairman of a Senate committee which made a thorough investigation lasting over 2 years into the administration of our housing program during the war under a single housing administrator. This statement was as follows:

Considerable objection has been voiced by the building and loan people, and also the builders, on the ground that they do not want the FHA and home-loan banks consolidated into one department under the housing program. They fear that the overall appointee may lean toward public housing. I believe that such fear is unjustified, because Congress writes into the statute laws governing the FHA and laws governing the home-loan banks. I can see no way by which the Administrator can swing everything under public housing. After all, he may be a private housing man. * * * I believe that any fear to the effect that by adopting the suggested policy we subject one person to someone else is completely fallacious.

But even completely aside from the question of personalities, this fear of public-housing domination is completely untenable and fallacious on two very distinct grounds. In the first place, it completely overlooks and depreciates the function of Congress itself. It neglects the fact that the Congress, and the Congress alone, can and will determine the size and scope of the various housing programs undertaken by the Government, whether they relate to private housing or to public housing. No matter what may be the leanings of a particular appointee, no National Housing Administrator can administer a larger public-housing program or a larger program of insuring privately mortgaged houses, or a larger program of rural housing, than the Congress itself authorizes or desires. Further, I have complete faith in the ability of our Banking and Currency Committee, and also in the ability of our Appropriations Committee, to see to it that any administration of the housing program, contrary to the intent of the Congress, is stopped before it can make any headway at all.

The second weakness in this argument of the opposition is that, in effect, it constitutes an assumption that the various housing activities which the Congress has approved are, and should be, highly competitive with one another. Such as assumption embraces in turn the further assumption that since these various activities are competitive, they should be lodged in separate agencies, where they can be more free to engage in combat with one another.

These assumptions are wholly untenable. The various housing activities of

the Government should not be competitive; they should not be working at cross-purposes with one another. On the contrary, they should be reconciled through a well-thought-out, well-administered, and unified policy laid down by the Congress, and this is possible only if we have a unification of our housing activities and functions in a single agency.

The third and very important justification for the reorganization plan is that it strengthens Congress in the control over our housing policy. This was demonstrated by the results of the wartime consolidation of the housing agencies which enabled the committees and individual Members of Congress for the first time to obtain from one source a complete and integrated picture of the entire housing program of the Federal Government. It was possible for our committees and individual Members to review our national housing program and activities in detail and directly shape the course of its development. For the first time the Congress had real facilities for knowing fully and promptly what is being done in housing and so what ought to be done and what ought not to be done. For the first time therefore this body had readily been in a position to execute its own prime function of determining basic policy on housing and checking on its administration.

To cite one typical example, our ability to work with a single agency and to obtain from it a thorough and understandable picture of housing needs and problems made it possible for us to give attention to the problems of demobilization on the housing front long before we were able to give similar attention to the case of other war programs. In fact Congress was able as early as the summer of 1943 to enact legislation which set forth the basic plan for the postwar disposition and removal of all temporary housing financed by the Government.

Certainly we do not want to do ourselves the tremendous disservice of returning to the hopeless confusion of the prewar period when we had a score of governmental bodies to deal with and to supervise, and when it was well nigh impossible for us to exercise any sort of effective control over the housing activities of the Government. Certainly, where we have finally managed to reach the point where we really get the facts on housing where we can know both what is being done and what should be done, and where we can actually direct our housing activities, we would think twice before hastily wiping out this achievement as we will if we vote for House Concurrent Resolution 155.

On the basis of our war experience, the President could, so far as the housing functions of the Government were concerned, give only one meaning to our declaration on the Reorganization Act that the public interest demanded that he prepare such reorganization plans for consolidation of the Government agencies and activities as will promote economy, increase efficiency, eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort and consodlidate and coordinate agencies having similar functions under a single head.

Today housing is a top priority domestic problem. It covers one of our more urgent obligations to the veteran. And the nonveteran, too, has desperate need of adequate housing. Here is an area in which we just have unified Government action. The very fact that housing programs have controversial elements makes it essential that we have a unified agency whose actions can be followed by the Congress. In this field of housing there is every reason why we should make it clear that we really mean business in passing the Reorganization Act. A vote for the resolution is a declaration of intent to nullify that act.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, as a result of such study as I have been able to give these three proposals coming from the executive department, I am convinced that all three of them should be defeated; that is, the measures now before us should be adopted.

However, I particularly want to address myself to that proposal or plan which has to do with the destruction of the independence of two of the great independent agencies of the Government—the Social Security Board and the Employees' Compensation Commission. Prefacing that, I would like to take you back just a little bit to 1938. Many of you were here then, and if you were not here you were reading the newspapers and you knew about the great controversy that was raging at that time about a proposed reorganization bill. That reorganization bill aroused a storm of protest which resulted in its defeat here in the House, principally, I think, by reason of two things which were included. One, it sought to destroy the independence of the Comptroller General who is the agent of the Congress of the United States to ride herd on expenditures of the Government. The second was it sought authority for the Executive Department to destroy the independence of the great quasi legislative and judicial agencies of the Government, such as the ICC, the FTC, the Employees' Compensation Commission, the Social Security Board, and all of the rest of them. I say that proposal was defeated. The conviction in the Congress and in the country was that those agencies should be continued as independent agencies of the Government.

Later, another reorganization proposal came along that did not undertake to interfere with the Comptroller General and which provided for certain specific exemptions for those independent agencies. That proposal was adopted by the Congress. There was one independent agency which was not exempted—the Civil Aeronautics Authority. History will record that subsequent to that time a reorganization proposal came up from the Executive to destroy the independence of the Administrator of the CAA and in large measure the independence of that Board and put that great independent agency in the Department of Commerce. When that proposal came on under the legislative veto system which prevailed then as now prevails in this matter, the House of Representatives, led by the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], turned back that proposal which sought to destroy the independence of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. But when the measure went to the Senate, the Senate did not concur in the action of the House. So the reorganization went into effect. There is no one who knows anything about the situation today who can deny that that reorganization under which one cannot tell whether the Department of Commerce is running it or the CAA is running it has brought about bad administration. Today there are bills seeking to undo the wrong that I think was done at that time. I venture the suggestion that the gentleman from West Virginia voted against that proposed reorganization which sought to destroy and did destroy the independence of the CAA.

The last time a basic reorganization bill came on was in 1945. Many of you will recall that the committee bill as reported undertook to exempt three agencies. I am sure the ICC was one of them. I sought to extend the exemption to other independent agencies. We were told during the course of debate that no one had any designs on these independent agencies and that no one was seeking to destroy them or subject them to political control. At any event, after action in the other body the exemptions were not included in such a manner as to protect the two independent boards that are here involved.

Why has the Congress through all of this history insisted that these agencies be continued as independent agencies?

It is, first of all, because they are the agencies of Congress, to administer an act that the Congress has enacted. The Congress insists that they shall have a measure of responsibility to the legislative branch. Many of them are bipartisan in character. The Employees Compensation Commission is bipartisan in character. There are three members of the Board, not more than two of whom shall be of one political party. It is an extension of the whole philosophy of a two-party government and two-party responsibility. There is a man there to speak the minority viewpoint, even as there is a minority in the Congress to speak the minority viewpoint.

These agencies are quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial. The report of the Chairman of the Employees Compensation Commission as to their purposes and functions says this:

> The Commission was created and its status as an independent agency exercising quasi-judicial functions has been recognized and continued for the purpose of administering the Federal laws relating to workmen's compensation benefits.

They are quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial. Is it not better that these legislative functions be exercised, these judicial decisions be made, by an independent agency made up of members appointed for a term, answerable to the Congress of the United States, rather than that they be made by someone in the executive branch of the Government, subject to political control in many ways, not the

least of which is that he may be removed by the Executive at any time? It just seems to me to be indisputable that that situation should prevail.

In spite of the assurance that we had at the time the 1945 Reorganization Act was before us, we have now this proposal to destroy the independence of these two agencies. I would like to call on a witness about this matter of the desirability of independence and the desirability of avoiding too much concentration of control in the executive branch. My witness is President Truman, then Senator Truman. I am going to quote from a speech he made in opposition to the proposal to reorganize the Civil Aeronautics Authority and transfer it to the Commerce Department. This is what Senator Truman said, in part:

The order requires that the Board report through the Secretary of Commerce, whose degree or indirect control is obviously unlimited. In fact, the Secretary is the Board. The whole set-up becomes political. Air regulation by a bipartisan board is out of the window.

Then he went on to say:

This and many other queries come to mind, but I need not here enumerate them further in order to illustrate the clever indirection with which the independent regulation of American aviation is being sacrificed on the altar of concentrated executive control of governmental functions.

Now, the immediate issue is, does President Truman believe what he then expressed so vigorously and so well as a Member of the Senate of the United States? If he still believes it, if that is still good logic and good common sense and good governmental doctrine, then we will be doing him a favor by turning down these plans, saying that the Congress of the United States is not going to stand by and see independent agencies destroyed and subjected to political control.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman speaks about the Employees' Compensation Commission. Is it not a fact that not as a board but as the deputy commissioner, the law gives full power to hear and determine questions with respect to claims?

Mr. HALLECK. I am not sure about that feature.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think that is true. The appeals go not to the Commission but to the courts. We make no change in the reorganization.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course the gentleman knows and understands that the activities of that Commission are directed by the Commission. Here is what we find in the United States Government Manual as a statement by the Chairman of the Commission as to the activities of the Commission:

Activities: The Commission administers the act of September 7, 1916, which provides workmen's compensation benefits for civil employees of the United States who suffer personal injuries while in the performance of duty.

* * * * *

The Commission is required to determine all questions arising under this law, and there is no statutory provision for review of its decisions. Among other functions, the Commission is required to determine what employments come within the scope of the law, whether the injury for which compensation is claimed occurred while in the performance of official duty, the period for which compensation may be paid, the amount thereof and, in case of death, the persons entitled to receive such compensation. The Commission is required to make arrangements to provide prompt and competent medical and hospital service for employees injured in the Federal service, irrespective of the place of their employment. It is also required to make studies and investigations of the causes of injuries to employees in the Federal service and recommend means for the prevention of such injuries.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Let me proceed just a moment; then I will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Indiana three additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. There are some people who have a very direct interest in this thing because they represent employees. One of those organizations is the American Federation of Labor. I have a telegram that I suppose was sent to all of you, addressed to me by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. It reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 25, 1946.*

Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

The governmental reorganization plans 2 and 3 should be opposed because plan 2 continues wartime Coast Guard control of merchant seamen instead of returning control to Commerce Department in accordance with 1884 act. Plan 3 is illegal, according to House Judiciary Committee, in that it wipes out the United States Workmen's Compensation Commission set up by law. Please aid in rejecting both plans 2 and 3.

WILLIAM GREEN.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I will have to admit I know very little about this proposal, but from the argument the gentleman has made I have gotten the impression that this will constitute a very severe centralization of power in the Executive, more so than we have had heretofore, if it is approved.

Mr. HALLECK. That is, of course, undoubtedly true. As I say, I do not know whether the President fully understood the import of these suggestions. In respect to these independent agencies, what he has recommended here is certainly not in line with the definite policy announced by him a few years back when he was a Member of the Senate.

This is clearly an extension of one philosophy of Government which I hold is clearly not the majority opinion of this country, that all of these independent agencies should be destroyed, that they should all be brought under political control. I say there is too much tendency in that direction already; there is too much centralization of power; there is too much political control by which friends can be rewarded and enemies punished, by which the great institution of free elections upon which the very preservation of our country depends may be further endangered.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I wish to say to the gentleman in reference to this control of power in governmental agencies that I talked to one of the very high ranking Government officials recently. I asked him why he did not call in some man like Lindsay Warren, who knows about governmental agencies probably as well as any one man in this country. He replied that the Government today did not want to lose any power it now has; that it wants to keep in power those people they have in control; and that they want the Government operated by bureaus rather than by law laid down by the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman, of course, expresses the fear we all have.

I wish now to quote from a statement made by the Brookings Institution because of its clear and logical reasoning. I quote the following:

The regulatory agencies * * * have the power to make rules and regulations having the force of law and, consequently, in a real sense are legislative agencies. They also perform adjudicatory functions that should be carried out in an impartial manner free from political influence. Moreover, in order to preserve the necessary degree of continuity in public policy their freedom from the potentiality of partisan political action is also desirable. It is argued by some that administrative expenses could be cut by placing these agencies in the regular departments. But such savings would be very small. Since, as will be shown, administrative costs are but a small part of total expenditures. Consequently, the President should not have the power to place them in executive departments headed by political appointees.

In conclusion, may I say I agree with the chairman of the committee when he states that if the independence of these agencies is to be destroyed, then the Congress of the United States should carry that responsibility and initiate the action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, plan No. 3 includes the transfer of the duties and functions of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation to the Coast Guard. I am in favor of that transfer.

The purpose of the transfer is to insure the best administration of measures looking to the safety of navigation and the protection of human life upon the oceans, lakes, and inland waters.

When the 13 States first became united there were only 12 lighthouses upon the Atlantic coast, all built by the individual States and precariously supported by lotteries or local taxes on shipping. The first lighthouse on the Great Lakes was built in 1818; the first on the Pacific coast

was built in 1854. Not until 1850 was our system of buoyage standardized and made uniform in all ports by act of Congress. Buoys on the western rivers were nonexistent until 1874.

The administration of lighthouse service was initially in the hands of the collectors of customs, then under the Commissioner of Revenue or the Treasury Department, subsequently placed under a Lighthouse Board in the Treasury Department, from there transferred to the Department of Commerce in 1903, and finally to the Coast Guard in 1939.

The various Federal agencies in the maritime safety field overlapped in many directives. Consolidation of agencies improves safety, affords better organization, more highly trained personnel, greater efficiency in service, and more far reaching economy of operation. Opportunity is afforded for a higher degree of intelligent, efficient, and forward looking administration with a continuity of policy.

Such an agency should be intimately acquainted with the industry it is to serve, protect, and police.

In dealing with vessels on the oceans, the lakes, and rivers, from the largest liners to the smallest motorboat, the safety agency must be able to evaluate the risks and the problems in all of the varying conditions under which they operate. The diversity of these conditions is shown by the fact that in the year ending June 30, 1945, annual inspections had been made of 5,320 ocean and coastwise craft, 2,430 in lakes, bays, and sounds, and 1,970 on inland waters.

The Coast Guard is peculiarly qualified for the work of inspection in all of its phases. Its vessels have been putting to sea on police or rescue missions under extreme weather conditions since the inception of the service. The Coast Guard contains capable engineers, constructors, and radio technicians. Through its experience with lifeboats, it is well qualified to pass upon boat equipment carried on board, to pass upon fire fighting and fire protection.

The Coast Guard is a military type organization with large experience in the administration of civil functions.

The Coast Guard is fully acquainted with the safety problems of shipping on all waters, oceans, lakes, and rivers.

It has been maintaining and establishing aids to navigation on all waters. Its ice breakers have been opening channels to prevent damage to frozen-in vessels and to keep traffic moving. It knows merchant ships, fishermen, and yachts. It has given them medical aid, warned them of storms, towed them out of danger, or rescued them for years. Of all the Federal services no other has been so closely connected with oceans, lakes, or inland shipping as the Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard's policy is to promote a close association between the Coast Guard and all affected interests of the maritime industry so that the regulatory functions of the Coast Guard shall be intelligently administered and a harmonious relationship shall insure the attainment of best results with least burden to this vital industry.

The Coast Guard will endeavor to encourage all types of shipping to be safety conscious on their own initiative, mindful that self-discipline is the best discipline and that prevention is better than cure. The success of such a policy is illustrated in the formation of the Coast Guard Auxiliary, wherein thousands of motorboat owners, subject to only limited supervision under present statutes, have been encouraged by the Coast Guard to adopt of their own volition higher safety standards for their boats and to acquire greater professional skill for themselves.

The transfer should be made permanent now. The war has ended and plans should be initiated and consummated at once for the postwar future. The present uncertainty is delaying efficiency and economy. Many new techniques can be inaugurated, new safety measures can be adopted, new plans can be promulgated, new devices developed, and new methods inaugurated.

No long-range planning is possible while the present uncertainty continues. Certain of the civilian personnel may, at their option, be commissioned, if qualified, and if not, or if they do not choose commissions, the civilian personnel may be continued in their civilian status.

In 1942 our merchant tonnage was approximately 12,988,615 tons as compared with approximately 36,687,547 now.

In 1941, 136,788 seamen's documents were issued as against 318,448 for 1946.

If plan 3 should be rejected the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation would revert to a bureau status, a number of administrative divisions would need to be created to care for the personnel, budget and supply needs of the new bureau. These are handled now by the Coast Guard as part of its over-all operations.

Failure to approve the plan necessitates re-creation of a bureau.

The Nation has now, for the first time, a single agency which is charged with the administration of all maritime safety procedures.

The Coast Guard is organized along military lines for the better discharge of its maritime duties, and is fundamentally and basically a civilian arm of the Government. The Coast Guard has performed a splendid service and can do an even better job during the normal peacetime operation of the merchant marine.

In support of the proposed transfer I contend:

First. That one agency of the Government should be charged with the complete responsibility of all phases of maintaining safety of life at sea and on the navigable waters of the United States. Since the Coast Guard has for many years been charged with all remedial phases and part of the preventive phases of such responsibility, it is logical and desirable that it be the agency to which all the functions of maritime safety should be assigned in the interest of efficient operation, greater economy, and good government.

Second. That the Coast Guard is the only civilian agency equipped with facilities and knowledge for proper and adequate administration or discharge of the maritime safety function without requiring the services and assistance of any other agency or department.

Third. That economy can be achieved by the elimination of another agency performing similar duties. Under the law the Coast Guard is required to assist in the discharge of the maritime safety functions in any case, and by transferring them to the service it lodges all responsibility in one agency where it properly belongs, thus avoiding duplication of offices since only one maintenance staff and a reduced number of facilities are necessitated.

Fourth. That the Coast Guard brings to the problem a trained corps of officers and men, who, augmented with the personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, have demonstrated during the difficult war years the ability to provide under adverse conditions progressive leadership in the maritime field. This augurs capable and understanding administration of the problems connected with the merchant marine in the future.

Fifth. That the transfer of the merchant marine inspection functions to the Coast Guard was accomplished in 1942 by virtue of the Executive Order 9083, under the War Powers Act, and it is desirable that this transfer be made permanent at the earliest possible date in order that the personnel of the Coast Guard, particularly that transferred from the former BMIN under the Executive order, can be assured of their status. Further, the lack of permanency in the transfer precludes long-range planning on the part of the Coast Guard for the proper and effective administration of the inspection functions.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, in what I am about to say I do not want to be construed in any way as being critical of the President in submitting these various reorganization plans. Any attempt at reorganization, of course, is a complicated, difficult problem. Apparently, however, we are always to be disappointed in the operations under the various reorganization bills which the Congress has passed. In passing a reorganization bill some months ago the argument was made here, and I think it was generally agreed, that the Congress itself cannot reorganize the executive branch of the Government.

The whole purpose and objective of the reorganization bill, as you know, was to effectuate economy in Government and to reduce the size, cost, and activities of the executive branch of the Government. These reorganization plans that we have submitted to us wholly fail to carry out the purpose, the spirit, and the objectives of the reorganization bill. Generally speaking, with few minor exceptions, they simply shuffle the agencies around.

Reorganization plan No. 1 in particular is vicious and undesirable in that it not only fails to abolish agencies but seeks to make permanent one of the temporary wartime agencies. That is a thing that we have all feared would happen.

There must be a reduction in the number of agencies and bureaus of government or eventually this is going to become a government simply of bureaucracy.

All of us know that our system of checks and balances wisely written into the Constitution by our founding fathers has largely disappeared. The legislative branch of the Government—the Congress—one of the coordinate branches of the three departments of Government, is today unable to cope with the tremendous size and complexities of the executive branch. Not only is the cost item a factor with which we should be gravely concerned, but the numerous activities of these various agencies has grown into a reprehensible, at times overlapping, complexity.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman mentioned that under plan 1 some temporary war agency is to be made permanent. What agency is that?

Mr. GOSSETT. The National Housing Agency, which was created under the First War Powers Act by Executive Order 9070. Most of the housing agencies are now transferred to the National Housing Agency and it is set up under Reorganization Plan No. 1 as an over-all housing administrative bureau and made permanent under this reorganization plan.

In the Reorganization Act passed some time back it was specifically provided that this sort of thing should not be done. Subdivision 3 of section 5 states:

> No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made.

There is other language in the act to the same effect. As a matter of fact, when the President sent his message to the Congress asking for this reorganization bill, he himself stated that there was a great need for effective reorganization and the abolition of functions and agencies, and he indicated clearly in this message that he expected, if given authority under the reorganization bill, to use the axe, so to speak, and to ruthlessly go down the line and eliminate certain governmental agencies and activities.

I am sure some of you noticed in the press the other day that an agency set up during World War I to buy spruce for airplanes on the west coast is still in existence. Twenty-five years from now I venture to say that we will have most of these temporary World War II agencies with most of their employees still hanging on the Federal pay roll.

So, the only way we are going to get any reduction, any vitally needed reduction, any essential reduction, in the cost and activities of the Federal Government, is to abolish and not simply to shuffle and transfer agencies.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we should disapprove these reorganization plans for the specific reason that they fail to comply with the spirit and the objective of the reorganization bill which we passed. We should respectfully ask and urge the Chief Executive, regardless of pressure, that he abolish and not simply shuffle agencies.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I feel that since Congress set up as temporary war agencies a number of organizations, in each one of which they fixed a time limit when they should expire, that that question should be settled by the Congress when the time comes for it and not this way.

Mr. GOSSETT. I think the gentleman has made a very good point there. Certainly we do not want to be put in the position of approving reorganization plans that extend a lease on life to an agency that was set up under Executive order as a temporary wartime agency to deal with an emergency problem brought on by the war.

For these reasons, in addition to others heretofore given, it seems to me that we should pass the concurrent resolutions now pending and refuse the reorganization plans. We must insist that reorganizations be done in line with efficiency, economy, reduction of Government expenses, and the elimination of overlapping and duplicating Government agencies and bureaus.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, to make certain that the full case is properly developed, let me dig up just a little ancient history. In 1932 the Congress created the Federal Home Loan Bank Board under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act. It had a board of five directors. That act also created 12 home loan banks in the 12 Federal Reserve districts of the country. The purpose of those banks was to discount mortgage paper on homes. It bears the same relationship to the building and loan industry that the Federal Reserve banks do to the banks of the country.

For 10 years that whole system operated beautifully and it operated efficiently. The mortgages of millions of home owners who were building homes under mortgage with funds that they got from a local institution—and there are thousands of them in every section of the country—could be discounted or used for security and so, more money could be available for this constant process of building homes.

I say that Board was in effect and that act was in effect for 10 years. Then came the First War Powers Act. In December of 1942 when the war was on, the National Housing Agency was created under that act. The interesting thing about the War Powers Act is that there was a proviso to the effect that the powers should be exercised only as they related to the conduct of the war. For the life of me, in all that time, I have never been able to discern what relationship the refinancing or financing of a mortgage for John Jones out in Illinois, had to do with the war. However, as the result of that Executive order the Federal Home Loan Bank Board was abolished. All the powers and all the functions were given to one man, to Mr. John Fahey, who became the Commissioner of that agency in the National Housing Agency. He has the authority today to appoint directors of the banks, mind you. You talk about centralization, you talk about regimentation. The President, by Executive order, virtually set aside an act of Congress which had no relation to the war, and conferred all those powers on one man, and he has been using them arbitrarily and capriciously, and I use the words advisedly.

For years the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and I on this side, and Judge WOODRUM and others on that side, have gone into this matter thoroughly. Constantly we were confronted with this business of arbitrary and capricious action, and all of it stemmed from the fact that an Executive order under the War Powers Act had abolished the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and conferred those powers upon one man in Washington, where they are today.

Suppose you make the National Housing Agency permanent? The net result will be that you have made permanent one of the most grave injustices that has ever been done to the people of this country, the humble people, who can go to some thrift institution in their own town, unmindful and insensible to Government control and regulation, and get a mortgage, and then if necessary have that mortgage discounted at one of the Federal Home Loan Banks, always under private control. But now it becomes an entirely centralized, planned Government operation. The day that that reorganization plan to make the National Housing Agency permanent is approved you will place the stamp of approval on one of the great injustices of the last decade and you will have lifted that entire function out of the hands of private business, which has done such a splendid job in the field of home mortgage refinancing, and hand it to one man in the Government of the United States.

If it requires nothing else, that would be sufficient for me to raise my voice in as stentorian fashion as I could and to reject that plan, because I will not put the seal of approval upon that kind of an injustice and make it permanent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. I have two questions I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. First, did the gentleman vote for the reorganization bill last winter?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did.

Mr. HENRY. I did, too.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am confident that I did.

Mr. HENRY. Can the gentleman see anything inconsistent in a Member of the House who voted for the reorgani-

zation bill yet voting against these three reorganization plans?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely not. And for this reason: The guidelines and standards of conduct under which a reorganization plan must be submitted have been very meticulously recited in the law. When they submit a reorganization plan and it is not in conformity with the very pattern and very guide that Congress has established, it is not only the right thing to do but I think a responsibility rests upon every Member of Congress to reject it under the circumstances because it is not in conformity with the instructions given by this body.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman does not contend there is any basic change in what Congress already put into law in connection with these agencies; is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. A basic change?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why, the very thing that I have recited here which was done in the fervor of war is basic and now it is proposed to make it permanent.

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; these agencies were created before World War II.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Federal Home Loan Bank Act was put on the statute books in 1932, but can anybody in this body relate to me where there is a single relationship between the function of refinancing the mortgage of a humble citizen in West Virginia or Minnesota or Illinois and the conduct of the war? Yet that is the very abolition of function undertaken by means of Executive order in December 1942, when the National Housing Agency was created that you will now make permanent if you do make this a permanent agency with its present constituent subagencies.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is this not the point: That if we do not approve Reorganization Plan I, then when the First War Powers Act expires the abolition of the Board of Directors by Executive order will also expire?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so.

Mr. JUDD. But if we allow the reorganization plan to go into effect then we have endorsed the permanent abolition of a board which was temporarily abolished during the war supposedly for war purposes only.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I might amplify that by saying there were several Members of the House, I believe one from Oklahoma and one from New York, as well as myself, who have dropped bills in the hopper to roll back this abolition. Yet all of that will be futile and will be frustrated if the thing recited in the reorganization plan prevails.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Does the gentleman agree with me that the FHA as an independent agency has done a good job?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Federal Housing Administration?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has done a very good job.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I would hate to see that Agency hampered in any way.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would, too. The gentleman being one of the outstanding members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, would agree that it was unsound practice for the administration, under the Executive order creating the National Housing Agency, to lump public housing, the Insurance and Mortgage Act, and credit functions in one agency, and that they should have been separated.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the Constitution places exclusively in the Congress the power to legislate. This is a power that cannot be delegated. The Supreme Court on many occasions has stated that Congress cannot abdicate or transfer to others the essential legislative functions with which it is vested. It can delegate fact-finding and rule-making powers provided it enacts standards within the framework of which such delegated functions can be confined. Beyond that it cannot constitutionally go.

In plan No. 3 the President abolished the United States Employees' Compensation Commission. This is very clearly in violation of the rule I have just in substance stated. Under the United States Employees' Compensation Act there are functions of other laws that were expressly placed within the Employees' Compensation Commission by laws reported to the Congress unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary, among them being the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Acts. To delegate legislative power to the President to abolish unclassified agencies under a general policy which is concerned with custom in general is to abdicate an essential legislative function which is plainly unconstitutional.

The power that was given in the Reorganization Act is the power to act, not to carry out ministerial functions within well-defined standards. If the power were to only make findings for affirmative action by Congress, such delegated power would be valid, but the power to abolish on specified agencies is power which cannot be delegated.

We had an experience not too long ago when we attempted in the National Recovery Act to delegate to the executive branch powers which the Supreme Court in the Schechter case, reported in 295 United States 495, held was clearly a violation of the terms of the Constitution. Under this plan we are attempting to do practically the same thing. Of course it is not within the province of the Congress to pass on questions of constitutionality, but it certainly seems to me it is a grave reflection on all of us if we knowingly report a bill which is in clear violation of the terms of the Constitution. I cannot conceive of a case which violates the rule more plainly stated within the rule in the Schechter case than plan No. 2. I think it is our duty, under the circumstances, to support the committee in its recommendations that plan No. 2 be rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does not the record show that the rule was laid down in the Schechter case by a unanimous court?

Mr. WALTER. Oh, yes. There is no question about that. The rule in the Schechter case was by a unanimous decision.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HENRY. Would the gentleman favor these reorganization plans if he were satisfied that the procedure was constitutional?

Mr. WALTER. Certainly. It seems to me it would be a very simple matter for the executive branch to pay attention to the objections raised by the Congress and then report back to the Congress plans that are not in violation of those things that we feel are not proper. Reorganization must come and it can only come on the recommendations of the executive branch. It is impossible for the legislative branch to reorganize the Government, but I feel it can and should and must be done within the rules as we lay them down, and within the rules of the Constitution.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. If these plans are rejected, as presented by the President, can he make other plans and submit them to the Congress?

Mr. WALTER. Why, of course. Plan after plan can be submitted.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that if we in our debate and committee report suggest those parts of the reorganization plans to which we are opposed all he need to do is delete those parts and send the plan back and it can become effective?

Mr. WALTER. Of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the executive department, and for that matter the Congress itself if not the Supreme Court, needs reorganization, and it is with a great deal of reluctance that I bring myself to oppose a reorganization plan that has merit. But it does seem to me from the arguments made, if we need further persuasion, that the suggestions made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] with respect to plan No. 1 and the suggestions made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] with respect to plan No. 2, are sufficient reasons for at least rejecting those two plans, as much as we need reorganization in all branches of

the Federal Government. I have, however, heard very little criticism of plan No. 3, and I am interested in plan 3 because it seems to me that the plan transferring the Maritime Inspection Service to the Coast Guard permanently (where it has been for the last 4 years) is a meritorious plan, and I respectfully suggest to the committee (because I will not have time to read it in the limited time at my disposal), that Members read page 14 of reorganization plan No. 1. I think the gentleman from West Virginia in the course of his minority report is right in saying that the plan transferring that service permanently to the Coast Guard is a good plan. The committee has criticized the plan, as I understand it, only on one score, and that was with respect to St. Elizabeths Hospital. While there may be some ground for criticism in that respect, it seems to me there are other provisions in the plan which are of sufficient importance to warrant its adoption.

I do not believe we should turn these plans down simply because we want to fuss with the White House. On the contrary, we ought to adopt them if we can. Specifically, I think we should discriminate between them. Plans 1 and 2, I feel, are bad, but plan 3, it seems to me, is good, and I urge its adoption and will vote against Resolution 154.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. I am in thorough accord with the gentleman's statement about the transfer of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation.

Mr. HAND. And I may say the gentleman from Virginia knows more about navigation and shipping than any other man in the Congress.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. But the gentleman could introduce a bill and include the bureaus he wants in that bill. The trouble here is that this plan includes other things that this committee, after long hearings has decided should not be approved.

Mr. HAND. Only with respect to St. Elizabeths Hospital.

Mr. CHURCH. I am a member of the same committee the gentleman is a member of and of which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] is chairman. I may also say that everyone wants reorganization, but the trouble is there is almost unanimous opposition by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to these three plans before us today.

Mr. HAND. But on plan 3 only with regard to one particular subject.

Mr. CHURCH. I know; but that subject is enough; we cannot amend the plan.

Mr. HAND. I do not think that one objection is sufficient grounds to reject the whole plan. We cannot expect perfection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, when we approved the reorganization bill in December 1945 it made one specific reservation—that whatever program or plan of reorganization the President might submit must be submitted to the House and the Senate for their approval or disapproval. This action must be taken within 60 days. The President submitted three plans of reorganization, and the House, well within its rights, has made certain objections to each one of these three plans. These objections are well founded. The Committee on Executive Expenditures of the House, made up of 21 Members, 13 Democrats and 8 Republicans, after a thorough study and hearings from many witnesses, came to an almost unanimous conclusion that these 3 organization plans should be rejected for the reasons set out in the report. That does not, of course, mean that we object to everything that was put in the plans, but we do find some fundamental objections to each one.

Three resolutions were introduced. One was House Concurrent Resolution 155, which stated that Congress does not favor reorganization plan No. 1 of the President, because it makes permanent the National Housing Agency, a war emergency agency created by Executive Order No. 9070, and this agency was not created by Congress which would swallow up the Federal Housing Administration. The President thereby exceeded the authority granted him under the Reorganization Act and would destroy the Federal Housing Administration which is engaged in insuring loans to private builders and home owners. It is designed to encourage private ownership of homes.

The committee states in its report—and I share in that view—that we should favor and encourage private construction and private ownership of homes. While on the other hand, the National Housing Agency that would swallow up the Federal Housing Administration is an agency of the Federal Government whose primary purpose is to build houses with Federal funds and manage federally owned housing projects. It is just the opposite of private enterprise, and private construction, and private ownership of homes. The National Housing Agency was and is a war emergency agency. The President's plan undertakes to make this a permanent agency in violation of the Reorganization Act of Congress. The Federal Housing Administration is not a war emergency agency. It is especially intended to encourage and strengthen private enterprise in the construction and ownership of homes, while the other agency is designed to encourage Government construction, ownership, management, and control of homes.

House Concurrent Resolution 151 states that the Congress does not favor reorganization plan No. 2 of the President and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments sets forth in detail the objections to plan No. 2. This plan is very objectionable, inasmuch as it takes away the independence and efficiency of the St. Elizabeths Hospital, and this would seriously interfere with efficient administration of this great institution that means so much to the disabled veterans of this Nation.

House Joint Resolution 154 urges that reorganization plan No. 3 of the President be rejected. It abolishes the Employees' Compensation Commission and transfers its functions to the Federal Security Agency. This, in the opinion of the committee, and in this view I join, violates section 5 (a) of the Reorganization Act in that it takes away the quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions of this Commission and sets up two groups where there was only one.

The objectives of the Reorganization Act of December 20, 1945, were, among other things, "to reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government." It will be observed that it was the purpose of Congress in passing the Reorganization Act to secure efficiency in Government and a reduction in the cost of Government. In fact, the act provided that every effort should be made to reduce the cost of Government at least 25 percent.

According to the overwhelming weight of testimony, both of these objectives have been ignored in all three of these reorganization plans. It is beyond question that they have increased the number of agencies and employees and the expenses. No one argues here that it has cut down the number of agencies or cut down the number of employees or has cut down the expenses of Government and I have heard no valid argument that it has increased efficiency, but on the other hand, these changes will increase inefficiency, increase the number of employees and increase the cost of Government. Each one of these plans defeat each and all the purposes sought to be attained in the Reorganization Act.

The thing that each Member of Congress, as well as all the officials of our Federal Government, should strive for is to increase efficiency and cut down the expense of Government. Everyone admits that the present set-up of our Government is inefficient, greatly overmanned and there is a tremendous waste of the taxpayers' money. No public official or administration can lay just claim for continuance in power unless he and the administration strive consistently to bring about efficiency and cut down expenses of Government and especially is this true when we have a staggering national debt and the people are burdened with the heaviest tax load in all the history of our country.

The President, having failed to submit a plan that would accomplish the purposes set forth in the Reorganization Act, there is no good reason why the House and Senate should not reject each one of these three plans and therefore, I shall vote to reject each of the plans. When the Congress rejects these plans, the President can then submit new plans, eliminating these objectionable features, subject to the approval of the House and Senate.

The President in these plans makes temporary agencies permanent and takes

away the quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions of a commission established by Congress. In this way, the President undertakes to legislate. He has no authority under the Reorganization Act except to take the departments, bureaus, agencies, and commissions, with their functions, as created by Congress, and eliminate such as may not be necessary and coordinate the other agencies and functions to the end that we may increase efficiency and reduce expense.

Under the Russian Government, Premier Stalin and his aides formulate policies and then they call in the law-making body and have them approve these policies. Under our Constitution, Congress formulates policies and enacts them into laws and it is up to the executive branch to execute these policies and laws. The President has undertaken in some respects to follow the Russian system and ignore our system of government and in some of these plans there is a clear violation of the Constitution of the United States.

The Congress should not abdicate its powers to legislate within and under the Constitution and in rejecting these plans, the Congress is rightfully assuming its constitutional authority and powers, and is acting within the expressed provisions and reservations of the Reorganization Act of December 20, 1945.

There are many desirable provisions in these plans but the Congress must accept it in toto or reject it. We have pointed out, as provided in the Reorganization Act, the provisions the Congress does not approve. If the Senate concurs in the action of the House, the President can submit at such time as he may desire, additional new plans and eliminate the objectionable features and, of course, such reorganization plans would then be promptly approved.

We have pointed out that the Committee on Expenditures in the executive branch of the Government is made up of 13 Democrats and 8 Republicans. To show the lack of partisan consideration these plans have received, the chairman and practically all the members of that committee voted to reject the three plans of the President, and I observe in the debate today that many able speeches have been made by Democrats as well as Republicans, urging the rejection of these plans and these resolutions rejecting the three plans will be adopted, in my opinion, by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, some question has been raised about the report on reorganization plan No. 3. The gentleman who now has the floor will tell you that he understood somebody else would probably write some additions to that report. I want to say that there was a lot of opposition to certain parts of reorganization plan No. 3 and they do not appear in the report because of this oversight.

The Bureau of Marine Inspection is bitterly opposed to having jurisdiction over that agency placed permanently under the Coast Guard. I have received a lot of correspondence from shipping interests in Philadelphia, New York, New Orleans, and elsewhere to that effect. In addition to that, the men who sail our merchant marine are almost universally opposed to reorganization plan No. 3. They do not want to be put under the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard. They all want to go back as a permanent proposition to the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce, which Department had jurisdiction before the Coast Guard took over. There was a witness representing the merchant seamen, a Mr. John Hawk, of the Seafarers Union of New York City. If you have not read his testimony, you ought to do so. He gave very conclusive testimony against putting the Marine Inspection Bureau permanently under the Coast Guard. I say this without any reflection on the Coast Guard, but I agree with these people who oppose the plan on the ground that the Coast Guard is a semi-naval insitution that ought not to have this power in peacetime.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. The Coast Guard is primarily charged with safety at sea, the inland waters and on the oceans, is it not, and that is the duty of Marine Inspection.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not fair to say that in reporting these resolutions the chairman and the other members reporting them were instructed by the committee to report the items on which objections were based, regardless of the views of those who appeared and testified before the committee?

Mr. JUDD. That is right. In voting out these resolutions the committee specified the various changes and transfers to which it objected, as a committee, and the reports indicate them. While there was a difference of opinion about the wisdom of putting the Bureau of Marine Inspection under the Coast Guard, the committee took no action on the matter.

Mr. Chairman, as has been said again and again today, the main reasons for reorganization are two: The first is reduction in governmental functions and bureaus, with resulting greater economy, and the other is greater efficiency in operations.

Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, when he was testifying before us last fall in our hearings on the Reorganization Act, said this:

> What we must be after is this monstrous Frankenstein created under the name of bureaucracy, or anything you please. It already in some instances is becoming bigger than Congress, its creator. Sooner or later, it will tumble of its own weight unless something is done to coordinate or check some of this.

He added:

> Now, we have an Executive who says he will do it. He says if he is given this authority he will do this job fairly and efficiently and fearlessly.

It was on the basis of testimony like that that we reported out the Reorganization Act.

My criticism of the first reorganization plans submitted under the act is not that they go too far in most of their proposals. My criticism is that they do not go far enough. Many of us feel, on the basis of our own observations as well as the testimony of men like the Comptroller General, that it is just as imperative that we demobilize the Federal Government as it was that we demobilize much of the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps and the Air Forces. Therefore, I am disappointed that the plans do not effect any significant reduction of our Frankenstein.

I brought this question up with Mr. Smith, Director of the Budget, and he frankly admitted that we will not get a real abolition of functions except by cutting off funds in appropriation bills. He said, "I think you can get that (abolition of functions) more particularly in other ways which involve legislation." I said, "What you are saying then is, if we want to cut down the Government, the one way to do it is to cut off money in the appropriations?" Mr. Smith replied that that would be the way to reduce the functions. It is clear we cannot expect real abolition of functions and agencies unless we here cut down their money. It is a real disappointment that the President and his advisers have not been able, for whatever reasons, to do that which we believed and hoped they would be able to do.

While the plans do not cut down the governmental agencies and give us as great economy as we desire, there still remains the other question: Do they increase efficiency? If they increase efficiency and do not increase expenditures, I think we should approve them, even though they do not reduce expenditures and give greater economy. A good case on the ground of efficiency can perhaps be made out for 23 or 24 of the 28 changes proposed though I think some of them definitely will increase costs. Therefore I will raise no protest and would not myself vote against 24 of the 28 changes, if it were possible under the law to separate them from the 4 to which I do object. I am disappointed that the 24 do not go further, but at least, there is no damage done in approving those. However, the fact that we may approve 24 of the changes does not mean that we should accept the 4 that we do not approve. I personally object to legislative riders whereby a proposal that perhaps will not stand on its own feet is tacked onto a good bill. The Executive and the public frequently criticize Congress because it sometimes hooks on legislative riders. In order to get an important provision that the President wants he must accept something that he does not want. I am opposed to such legislative riders, and I am equally opposed to Executive riders which is what

some of the provisions in these plans amount to.

Each of the three plans has some wholly desirable provisions in it. We want those good parts; but each of them also has at least one rider in it, which most of us on the committee believe is not proper or desirable. The only way we can prevent that is to disapprove all three plans, send them back, let the President delete the objectionable features and return the plans. I think they will then be approved by Congress without any difficulty at all.

Why do we object to these four or five provisions? Because some of them are illegal; some are not authorized in the Reorganization Act; and some are not in the public interest. Those which I believe are illegal, because they violate the law under which we authorized the President to carry out these reorganizations, have been dealt with by several Members in the debate, especially by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. They continue agencies beyond the period authorized by law for their existence, or they continue functions beyond the period authorized by law for their existence, or they authorize agencies to exercise functions not expressly authorized by law. Every one of those three is expressly forbidden in section 5 of the Reorganization Act.

The second objection to some of them is that they are not authorized by the law, in that they do not accomplish any of the objectives laid down in the act.

On page 1 of the Reorganization Act eight major objectives are stated. Some of these proposals in the reorganization plans cannot possibly be represented as achieving a single one of those objectives. Therefore, while they are not in violation of the act, they are not authorized by anything in the act.

There is a third objection to some of these riders and that is that we believe they are not in the public interest. I wish I had time to deal adequately with the abolition of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, about which the gentleman from [Mr. HALLECK] spoke so convincingly. That is a bipartisan Commission. Because there are members of all political parties among Federal employees, it was provided by law that at least one member of the Employees' Compensation Commission should be a member of a minority party. What will be the situation under reorganization plan No. 2? Let me read it carefully.

> Section 3. The functions of the United States Employees Compensation Commission are transferred to the Federal Security Agency and shall be performed in such manner and under such rules and regulations as the Federal Security Administrator shall prescribe.

No matter what Congress prescribed when it set up the Employees' Compensation Commission, if this plan goes into effect those functions will be carried out "in such manner and under such rules and regulations as the Federal Security Administrator shall prescribe."

Obviously if he is to have such unrestricted power we should be careful to give adequate appeal rights for any persons who feel that the Federal Security Administrator has not properly acted upon their claim for compensation. Look at the next sentence:

> Such regulations shall provide for a board of three persons to be designated or appointed by the Federal Security Administrator with authority to hear and, subject to applicable law, make final decision on appeals taken from determinations and awards with respect to claims of employees of the Federal Government or of the District of Columbia.

The Federal Security Administrator is authorized by this plan to lay down such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, and if anybody wants to appeal he can appeal to a board set up by that same Federal Security Administrator. Its members do not have to be approved by the Senate. It authorizes appointees of the Federal Security Administrator, which means whatever administration is in power, to make final decisions on appeals from the decisions of its other appointees.

I asked several witnesses who testified before us, including a representative of the Attorney General, "Would it not be possible under this plan for the Federal Security Administrator's appointees in charge of the functions now vested in the Employees' Compensation Commission to grant a favorable decision if the employee agreed to vote right, say, or to take the proper position on some administration policy or program; or for them to make an opposite decision if he failed to do so?" He said it could happen, but that of course, we all believe in the integrity of Government agencies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have no right to put such power or temptation into anybody's hands, Republican or Democrat, without adequate safeguards. There are such safeguards in the present Employees' Compensation Commission, which this plan would remove. I submit that apart from the illegal characteristics of it, it is a great injustice to permit any chance of favoritism in administering what amounts to the insurance fund of several million persons, a fund built up out of their own pay rolls.

Mr. KEEFE. Would there be any opportunity for an appeal to a court from a decision of this appeal board if this reorganization plan goes into effect?

Mr. JUDD. There would be for private employees in the District of Columbia and for longshoremen and harbor workers throughout the country. Under the present law their appeals go directly to the courts rather than come down here to the Employees' Compensation Commission. But Federal employees, two or three million of them, including postal workers and employees of the District of Columbia, would have no way of going into court. The decision of the Board of Appeals set up here by the Federal Security Administrator would be final.

Now, I would like to say a word about the home-lending agencies which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was discussing. If you have reorganization plan No. 1 before you and will look at the bottom of page 3, I think you will be astonished at what is provided:

> SEC. 505. (a) The following functions shall be administered by the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration: (1) The functions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and its members under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended.

There will continue to be a Home Loan Bank Administration, but the functions of its Board shall be transferred to a Commissioner and the Board itself and the offices of the members shall be abolished as provided in section 507 (2).

The functions of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation will be transferred to a Commissioner and the Board abolished.

The functions of the Board of Directors of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation will be transferred to a Commissioner and the Board abolished.

Thus the controlling boards of various home-loan agencies, set up by acts of Congress, are abolished and their functions taken over by commissioners under the National Housing Agency, which was set up by Executive order under the First War Powers Act, and is made permanent by this reorganization plan even though the Reorganization Act specifically prohibits "authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to Congress."

Then there is some language we could not understand clearly:

> SEC. 504 (3). The Federal Public Housing Authority which shall succeed to the corporate status of the United States Housing Authority with a Federal Public Housing Commissioner who shall be the head thereof.

We asked the lawyers from the Department of Justice just what is meant by one agency succeeding to the corporate status of another. The Government Corporation Control Act we passed last year provided that: "No corporation shall be created, organized, or acquired hereafter by any officer or agent of the Federal Government or by any Government corporation for the purpose of acting as an agency or instrumentality of the United States except by act of Congress." Under this plan the National Housing Agency acquires the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration which acquires the functions of two corporations—the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Is that an evasion of the Government Corporation Control Act provision I have just read? In addition, another constituent unit of NHA, the Federal Public Housing Authority, "shall succeed to the corporate status of the United States Housing Authority," which is a Government corporation.

The chairman of our committee asked if that would permit the new Federal Public Housing Commissioner to borrow money under the charter of the United States Housing Authority to whose corporate status his organization had succeeded. The attorney said he would like to examine that further.

He was asked if the language referred to merely meant that the name of the United States Housing Authority was changed to the Federal Public Housing Authority. If so, why did not it say so plainly instead of saying one "shall succeed to the corporate status" of the other. The reply, on page 103 of the hearings was, "For some reason, the people in the Housing Agency preferred this form of

expression for their purposes." Apparently they are the ones who drew up that part of the plan. Just what are "their purposes"?

Mr. Chairman, these plans contain several such jokers which we were unable after days of testimony to decipher so that we could be sure what was meant. I believe that without any question they should be returned to the President for him to eliminate the reorganizations that are objectionable and clarify the ones that are so obscure that the Department of Justice could not tell us just what they meant.

Mr. Chairman, I want to devote the remainder of my time to reorganization plan No. 3. Our major objection is to section 201 which would transfer or abolish some of the functions now vested in St. Elizabeths Hospital. Let me give you a brief sketch of its history. St. Elizabeths Hospital was established to take care of the mentally ill of the Army and Navy and the Marine Corps. During the years more groups of patients have been added, including civilian employees of the Federal Government, and the mentally sick residents of the District of Columbia. But its primary obligation was to the armed services. Men were brought here from all over the United States and from duty all over the world. It had a greater variety of mental cases than any such institution in America, if not ir the world. That fact coupled with extraordinarily able professional leadership during the decades has enabled it to develop a high standard of research and teaching with respect to mental diseases which no institution in America, and I think in the world, can surpass or perhaps even match.

Under this plan, St. Elizabeths Hospital is to be split up. The veterans must be taken care of separately by the Veterans' Administration; Army personnel by the Army; Navy personnel by the Navy; Marines by the Navy; Coast Guard personnel must be taken care of elsewhere; psychotic Federal prisoners are to be taken care of by the Department of Justice, and other civilians by the Federal Security Agency.

What are the objections to this? First, many of these agencies are not equipped to give equally good treatment to the patients. Even more important, it will cripple the outstanding institution in America for the training of psychiatrists at the very time when the need for them is most urgent and the shortage most acute.

Perhaps 10 or 20 years from now such a disruption of St. Elizabeths would be justifiable, if by that time the new National Institute of Mental Health, for which legislation is pending, is able to take over some of the teaching functions now served so well by St. Elizabeths. But it is certain that it will take the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service at least that long to erect the Mental Health Institute out in Bethesda—instead of at St. Elizabeths where I think it ought to be because that is where the patients are—and build up a superior staff and establish a reputation and professional standing comparable to that of St. Elizabeths so that physicians desiring to specialize in psychiatry want to take their graduate training at the Mental Institute, as they now desire appointments to St. Elizabeths. Ten years from now, I say, this plan might make sense to psychiatrists, but to disorganize St. Elizabeths just now is like taking West Point and Annapolis to pieces in the midst of a war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman. Sixty percent of all hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration is for psychiatric cases. Fifty percent of all disability pensions for veterans are for disability because of psychiatric disorders. We have only 4,000 psychiatrists in the United States when we need 15,000. The leading institution in the country for the training of psychiatrists, psychiatric nurses, psychiatric social workers, and psychiatric attendants, is St. Elizabeths Hospital. Now we come along and all but abolish it. I cannot believe that would be of service to the veterans, or to the Army and Navy, or to civilians. When we are appropriating millions for a new mental research institution because the whole field of psychiatric research and training is so important, it does not make sense to be tearing down the old institution, especially inasmuch as it is the best one of its kind in existence.

I hope, therefore, that all three of these resolutions will be voted up, that everybody will vote "aye", which means that we disapprove of the reorganization plans in their present form and send them back to the President, having made clear what features we object to. If he will delete those, and send the others back, I think they will be allowed to go into effect without any serious opposition.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. Can the gentleman from Minnesota give us any idea what would happen to St. Elizabeths Hospital in case this reorganization plan became effective?

Mr. JUDD. If this reorganization plan becomes effective, it would inevitably demoralize in considerable degree the hospital and its professional staff It is the only mental hospital in the United States which is approved for rotating internship. It has about 20 residents all the time training to become psychiatric specialists. It would demoralize the staff and teaching functions because it would make St. Elizabeths just about like an ordinary county insane asylum instead of perhaps the outstanding institution for the study of mental diseases in the world today.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman referred in a previous part of his remarks to the fact that some of the departments wanted that kind of language in the reorganization plan.

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. And in your remarks you referred to the President's plan. Whose plan is this?

Mr. JUDD. I may say that we asked that question again and again, and we asked it from the Director of the Budget among others. Who actually prepared these plans we never could find out. For instance, not a physician in the American Psychiatric Association was ever consulted, so far as I have been able to learn, on the plans regarding St. Elizabeths. It is, I fear, a perfect illustration of what would happen if we should ever get governmental control of medical care. Laymen would be able to sit down with their paper plans and rearrange some things here and some others there, and the patient's welfare would be all but lost in the shuffle.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is that true also with reference to the National Housing Authority and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board?

Mr. JUDD. We could not get a witness to testify as to who drew up any of these plans or who was responsible for them.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then, we should refuse to adopt the plan.

Mr. JUDD. I believe all three should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has again expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, it is pretty bad when we have such a short time to discuss this question with the House of Representatives, when you are supposed to vote it up or down. Is my face red? I was the only Republican who voted for putting this power into the hands of the President for reorganization. I was condemned by my colleagues on this side and I want to apologize to them now for putting this power in his hands, because I do not see that I have gotten any place, in efficiency in Government or in saving Government funds. I will say I am terribly disappointed. I wanted efficiency and economy. In the first place, we took this matter up to try to find out who sent in these plans for reorganization.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I do not have time now. I am embarrassed enough already.

Mr. TABER. Your trust was misplaced?

Mr. RICH. That is right. That is exactly so. I thought we would have a bill proposed that would give us some economy in Government and give us some more efficiency in Government, but after all the weeks of hearings I am unable to tell the House that we have that kind of legislation proposed by the President. Of course, he had these proposals made by the Budget Bureau and

I do not believe they are the ones to do the job.

Let me say, I asked the chairman to get Lindsay Warren up here and ask him what he thought of these bills, but Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller, did not wish to come. I have more confidence in him than any other man I have ever seen in Washington as being qualified to suggest efficiency and economy in Government operations. He is a Democrat. He is from North Carolina, and he is a fine fellow, able and capable of doing a good job. He would give us just what he thought were the facts. Let me show you what he said when he came before our committee some months ago about Government inefficiency. He said, "There are 29 agencies of Government lending Government funds."

Three agencies of Government deal with deposits and loans. Thirty-four agencies of Government deal with the acquisition of land; 16 agencies of Government deal with wildlife preservation; 10 agencies of Government deal with Government construction; 9 agencies of Government deal with credit and finance; 12 agencies of Government deal with home and community planning; 10 agencies of Government deal with materials and construction; 28 agencies of Government deal with welfare matters; 14 agencies of Government deal with forestry; 4 agencies of Government deal with the examination of banks; 65 agencies of Government deal with the gathering of statistics; 75 bureaus, divisions, and agencies of Government deal with transportation; 8 agencies of bureaus and departments deal with labor; and 3 agencies of Government deal with the collection of customs.

There is no man in Government as well qualified as Lindsay Warren to know about matters of Government; yet his counsel and advice were not asked for by the President. Instead of that the President went to the Budget Bureau, one of the greatest spending agencies we have had in the history of our country, and asked them to suggest some economy in Government. Ever since Louis Douglass left the Budget Bureau, we have not had any economy in Government spending.

It is time we did something about Government efficiency; it is time we voted these resolutions through, send them back to the President and let him try it over, he certainly should be able to profit if we do and the country will certainly benefit if we do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 155—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 151—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 154

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the above resolutions were reported by the committee by a divided vote. There were votes of "present," and there were negative votes. It is fair to say that a large majority of the members of the committee voted to report the resolutions.

REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1945

The Reorganization Act of 1945 provides that the plans of reorganization submitted by the President will take effect in 60 days unless the two Houses pass a concurrent resolution stating in substance that Congress does not favor the reorganization plan. The committee conducted extensive hearings which are published and are available. Under the act the resolutions are highly privileged, and there must be a straight vote up or down. Plans submitted by the President cannot be amended.

The committee had 10 days in which to conduct hearings and submit a report.

THE THREE PLANS

I think the language in part V of plan 1 consolidating housing agencies under the National Housing Agency most unfortunate. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] submitted the report in opposition to plan 1. The objection was based upon the National Housing Agency. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], the chairman of the committee, submitted the report against plan 2. The objection was based upon the Employees' Compensation Commission being abolished and its functions transferred to an Administrator. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] submitted the report in opposition to plan 3, and while the report states that the opposition was based upon the disapproval of the transfer and abolition of the functions of St. Elizabeths Hospital, it is fair to state that there was some objection to the plan because it provided for the continuance of the Marine Inspection and Navigation under the Coast Guard. In each of the reports, the committee state that if the said provisions had not obtained in the three plans, the plans would not have been objectionable, thus indicating that the committee would have approved the plans if the objections named in the reports, consisting of substantially one part in each plan had been eliminated.

THE PRESIDENT ENTITLED TO BENEFIT OF DOUBT

When the President submits these plans I feel that he should have the benefit of the doubt, and if by and large these plans would provide for coordinating and grouping or for the elimination of overlapping and the reduction of agencies and the abolition of functions, they should be approved. I have advocated reorganization for years. I will support all plans submitted by the President unless there is involved in any one of the plans a policy or a program that is utterly unsound. The President has the right to name the over-all agency of all housing groups the National Housing Agency. Inasmuch as the Reorganization Act prohibits the continuance of agencies established under the War Powers Act, it is most unfortunate that the President used the phraseology of his Executive order establishing the National Housing Agency and transferred to the supervision of that agency the insuring and financing of housing. Federal housing is in the field of public welfare. Financing private housing and dealing with physical matters in housing is entirely different from Federal Housing which makes loans and grants and promotes subsidized housing and operates in the field of social welfare. This establishes a new policy, and I think that the President made a mistake in trying to establish a policy that Congress had not approved. I believe the policy to be unsound, and hence reluctantly oppose plan 1.

If I had been writing the other plans, I would have eliminated the transferring of the functions of St. Elizabeths as they relate to the Army and the Navy. I would not have included the transfer of the Employees' Compensation Commission. I would at least have pursued the policy of expediency with respect to bipartisan boards. I am more concerned, however, with the substance, and it is the substance of approving Federal housing at Federal expense in times of peace that forces me to oppose plan No. 1. I am aware that the Federal Housing Administration will revert when the War Powers Act expires, but I am also aware that Congress has discontinued appropriations for further construction. It will revert to its former status, but that status will be in supervising projects already established.

I favor administration generally by a single Administrator rather than by a board. The Employees' Compensation Commission handles thousands of cases of employees and makes adjudications aggregating millions of dollars. The Veterans' Administration with a single Administrator adjudicates millions of claims and adjudicates claims involving billions of dollars. If a single Administrator in the Veterans' Administration can function satisfactorily, it can function satisfactorily in handling the functions of Federal compensation.

CONSTITUTIONALITY

The constitutionality of the Reorganization Act has been questioned. The constitutionality of the transfer of the Employees Compensation Commission has been particularly questioned.

The question of the constitutionality of the Reorganization Act has been foreclosed. Congress has decided against the contention. Some two or three reorganization acts were passed during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. I repeat, that Congress has decided that the Reorganization Act is constitutional. It rejected the contentions of those who asserted that there was an abdication of legislative power. When the reorganization bill was before the House I submitted a brief in connection with my presentation of the bill in favor of the constitutionality of the act. That brief is in the congressional debates. In a word, the question of constitutionality has no place in the pending bill.

Again it is asserted that the provision of plan No. 2, abolishing the Employees Compensation Commission, is illegal and unconstitutional. It is particularly maintained that it violates section 5 (a) (6) of the Reorganization Act with respect to quasi-judicial functions. The provision prohibits any greater limitation than existed with respect to the exercise of the function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the reor-

ganization. The provision does not prevent the transfer of the functions. It does prevent limiting the functions. The act authorizes the abolition of the Commission. The plan does not limit the quasi-judicial authority and thus does not violate section 5 of the Reorganization Act.

EXEMPTIONS

The Reorganization Act exempts the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and other quasi-judicial agencies from the terms of act. There is no effort in any of the pending plans to reorganize the exempted agencies.

There is nothing in the plans involving the Civil Aeronautics Administration or the Civil Aeronautics Board. The arguments with respect to this Board are not applicable. They are not in point. We have heard them previously, and there is no occasion to repeat them about the pending bill.

TWENTY-EIGHT AGENCIES

The three plans cover 28 individual items embracing a broad area of governmental activity. There is an average of nine agencies in each of the plans. Only one is objected to in plan 1, only one in plan 2, and not over two of the items in plan 3. Twelve of the items have the effect of consolidating related functions and programs. There are economies in the consolidations. There are economies in the abolitions. Nine of the items clean up administrative problems, but 24 or 25 of the items are generally acceptable.

REORGANIZATION

There is no more difficult problem than reorganization. Congress through the years has failed to reorganize. We were realistic. Congress gave the Executive the power to reorganize, but reserved the right to reject the reorganization plans of the President. The Reorganization Act states the needs, the purposes, provides for the plans and limits the powers of the Executive in reorganization.

The pending three plans do provide for grouping and consolidating. They do provide for abolishing both agencies and functions. They provide for eliminating overlapping and duplication of effort. They should result in some economies, but they do not involve major reorganization problems, nor will they materially reduce in and of themselves the number of Federal employees. While the act expressed the hope for an overall reduction of 25 percent, it is fair to say that there was no claim that the plans proposed would provide for a reduction of 25 percent in the administrative costs of the agencies affected.

CRITICISM

Inasmuch as Congress has not provided for reorganization, Congress is not in position to criticize the proposals of the President even though some of the proposals may not be satisfactory to Congress. The fundamental question involved is whether or not there should be reorganization. If the plans are not approved, there is a set-back in reorganization that is unfortunate.

The reports of the committee point out that the objection to each of the plans is based largely, if not wholly, on one part of each plan. The committee, therefore, leads the Congress and the country to believe that if the reorganizations are submitted with the objectionable parts eliminated, the plans would be satisfactory. In the event Congress rejects the plans, I trust that the plans will promptly be resubmitted with the parts to which there was no substantial objection.

MINORITY REPORT

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] filed a minority report to the reorganization plan No. 1, and while his minority report is attached to the report on that plan, it is a minority report covering not only plan 1 but the remaining plans 2 and 3. While I did not sign the minority report, as disclosed by the hearings, and as is known in the committee, I share very largely the views set forth in the minority report. I shall vote most reluctantly for the resolution opposed proposing plan No. 1 because it includes part 5 which attempts to make the National Housing Agency, a war agency constructing housing at Federal expense, a permanent over-all agency. There is no authorization for making a war agency permanent.

However, I am opposed to the resolutions rejecting plans 2 and 3, for while I regret that plan 2 provides for transfering the United States Employees' Compensation Commission and abolishing the commission itself in plan 2, I believe that the other provisions of plan 2 are of enough importance to warrant the approval of the plan as a whole. I am especially of the opinion that the rights of Federal employees will not be prejudiced in any way merely by abolishing the commission and establishing an administrator for the functions of the commission obtain and the rights of the Federal employees are better safeguarded.

I see no valid reason for rejecting plan 3. It was disapproved as shown by the report because of the elimination of Army and Navy patients from the St. Elizabeths Hospital. There is no testimony to show that the hospital would not still be operated to full capacity and that it would not be available for teaching and for psychiatry in the future as in the past. The hospital would probably be continued without increased enlargements that really impair its efficiency, but in all events, the rejection of plan 3 was based upon the transfer or abolition of the functions of St. Elizabeths Hospital.

REORGANIZATION OR NOT REORGANIZATION

The basic question involved is whether or not there will be a reorganization of Government or not. I regret the setback in reorganization that would be caused by the rejection of a single one of the plans. With the exception of the National Housing Agency in plan 1, I believe that the reorganizations are an improvement. There will never be any reorganization by Congress, and there will never be any reorganization that is satisfactory to Federal employees. We have had the experience of the last 40 years to profit by. It is almost as difficult for the President to reorganize as it is for Congress. The plans of President Hoover were rejected, and the plans of President Roosevelt were limited in scope.

BIPARTISAN BOARDS

It must be admitted that the Federal Employees Compensation Commission and the Social Security Board fall within the so-called category of bipartisan boards. However, there isn't as much in the argument as appears on its face. The fundamental law establishing these two boards provides that not more than two of the members should be of the same political faith. The better method, as in the case of the Veterans' Administration, is to provide for a single administrator with boards from which appeals may be taken. The plans so stipulate.

PLAN 1. NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

The committee bases its objection to plan 1 on part V. The report thus shows that if part V were eliminated the plan would be acceptable.

Part V provides for the consolidation of the Federal Housing Authority, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration under an agency to be designated the National Housing Agency. The committee believes that there should be a permanent consolidation and a grouping of all related housing agencies and functions, but the committee does not believe that lending agencies such as the Federal Housing Agency which insures loans for private builders and private home owners should be placed under the administrative control of the National Housing Agency or any other Federal agency whose primary function is to build homes with Federal money and manage Federally-owned housing projects. The committee advocates private ownership of homes, and does not believe that the private construction of homes for private ownership would be encouraged or promoted by an agency whose policy favors Federal building and Federal control of homes.

The Federal Housing Agency was established by Executive Order 9070 on February 24, 1942. This Agency will expire with the expiration of the War Powers Act. It was designed to provide temporary housing for war purposes. Congress has previously discontinued appropriations for new public housing except for war purposes. While the President may designate the consolidated agency by calling it the National Housing Agency or the National Housing Administration, it is most unfortunate that the President names a temporary war agency as the consolidated agency. It is still more unfortunate that the President in transmitting the plan 1 based his recommendation largely upon S. 1592, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill that was approved by the Senate on April 12, 1946. This bill has not passed the House. While I do not believe the President intended to force the passage of this bill on the House, the fact remains that much of

the argument for the proposed part V of plan 1, with the National Housing Agency as the head of all housing agencies, is based upon the fact that the President concluded that the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill would pass the House. A mistake was made. Further subsidies for housing have not been determined by Congress. Federal Housing contemplates subsidized Federal housing under Federal control. The committee believes in private homes under private control and under private construction. Congress has provided for supplementing private construction and private ownership by insuring loans. I regretfully repeat that while I only oppose part V in plan 1 that this is the major proposal in plan 1 and more objectionable than the other six parts of the plan. I trust that the President will promptly resubmit plan 1 with a regrouping of the housing agencies under an agency that will promote the objectives of home loans and home insurance under private construction and will not undertake to force Congress to commit itself to a policy of federalized housing by approving a war agency dedicated to constructing Federal housing at Federal expense as the over-all control agency of private homes and private construction.

There were no objections to parts I, II, III, IV, VI, and VII before the committee. It is most regrettable that part V was included, and I repeat that I reluctantly favor the resolution rejecting plan 1 solely because of part V which establishes a temporary Federal wartime agency as a permanent agency supervising all housing. There is desperate need for a consolidation of housing agencies, but the consolidation should be sound and should not perpetuate an agency that is reported to have done more propaganda work for federalized housing at Federal expense than should have been done by any agency that was entrusted with temporary housing to promote the war and for housing for veterans following the war. My information is that Mr. Wilson Wyatt, the Administrator, is a most capable official, and I do not believe that he would permit the continuance of the reported propaganda that the Federal Housing Agency has indulged in if he continues to be the Administrator. The fact that Mr. Wyatt is the Administrator and a most capable one is another reason why I will reluctantly vote against plan 1 on account of the inclusion of the National Housing Agency as part V.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 151

Mr. Chairman, under the Reorganization Act the President submitted reorganization plan No. 2. It was referred to the Committee on Expenditures, and the committee submitted a divided report. A large majority of the committee opposed the plan but a minority favored the plan. The committee conducted extensive hearings, and in its report it based its objections to section 3 of said plan 2, which abolishes the United States Employees' Compensation Commission. This Commission was established by an act of Congress. It was urged that it is bipartisan. The Commission was established about 1916. It was provided that not more than two of the three members should be of one political party. I do not agree with the report, which states that the transfer of the functions of the Commission to the Federal Security Agency violates section 5 (a) (6) of the act.

The Commission was established, as I have stated, in 1916. At that time its functions were limited. The number of employees was rather small. Since it was established, the Administrator, rather than the Board, idea in executive authority has obtained. Many Federal employees are afraid that their claims of compensation would be prejudiced. I listened carefully to all of the testimony. I would oppose the plan if I thought that the rights of any Federal employees would be jeopardized under the proposal. Instead of being jeopardized, I believe that the claims will be handled more expeditiously and more thoroughly than at present. The bipartisan character of the Board has been overemphasized. I doubt if the matter of party or politics has ever occurred to any employee or any member of the Board. The Board, as such, can examine but few of the many, many cases submitted to them. It must depend upon its examiners and employees.

The said section 5 (a) (6) of the act stipulates that no reorganization plan shall provide for, or have the effect of, imposing, in connection with the exercise of any quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative function possessed by an independent agency, any greater limitation upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the carrying out of such function than existed with respect to the exercise of such function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the taking effect of such reorganization. This provision does not forbid transferring such functions from an independent agency providing the agency to which they are assigned has an equal independence of judgment and discretion.

The administration of workman's compensation, which is the only type of activity carried on by the agency, involves, of course, quasi-judicial functions. The greater part of the quasi-judicial work, however, arises under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act and the act applying to private employees in the District of Columbia. The quasi-judicial functions under these two acts are not vested in the Commission as a body, but in Deputy Commissioners, who are given by law "full power and authority to hear and determine all questions" with respect to claims. Appeals do not go to the Commission, but directly to the courts. Plan 2 makes no change whatever in the functions of the Deputy Commissioners. The plan merely transfers the functions of the Commission to a Commission under the Federal Security Agency, and it provides for the transfer from one independent agency to another and it does not subject the functions to any greater outside control than before. The Agency will have the same degree of independence of judgment as the Commission had.

The truth is that the plan affords claimants greater protection than exists under the present arrangement. There is no provision of appeals by Government employees at present. The plan provides for an appeals board to hear and determine appeals. The decisions of this board will not be subject to review or modification by an administrative officer. This procedure is fully in accord with the Administrative Procedure Act recently passed by Congress.

The number of agencies is reduced. There is one administrator instead of three members. The work of the Federal Security Agency is similar. Increased efficiency by bringing workman's compensation under the Federal agency having knowledge of insurance administration should result.

The provision reduces the number of Government agencies, provides for better administration of workmen's programs. The Department of Justice has testified that it is legal. Congress cannot criticize the President and at the same time block his efforts to simplify the administrative structure.

BOARD OF VISITORS OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

There was some objection to the abolition of the Board of Visitors of the St. Elizabeths Hospital. According to the hearings, there was no occasion for the continuance of this Board. There would be a duplication of its functions. At all events, it is an immaterial matter.

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

The Social Security Board is among the so-called bipartisan agencies. The act establishing the Board provides that not more than two of the three members shall belong to the same political faith. There were few objections to the transfer of the functions of the Board to an administrator. The bipartisan character of the Social Security Board and the Employees Compensation Commission was emphasized. I believe that the better administration can be obtained from an administrator than by a board. A single administrator is more efficient. There is no agency of the Government that handles more funds than the Veterans' Administration. There is a single Administrator. The Administrator, however, is authorized and empowered to set up boards. I repeat that the better way for administration is by an administrator rather than by a board. We have but one President, we have but one Cabinet member for each Department. The better way is to provide for a single head with assistant administrators and with boards for the adjudication of appeals, with the right of appeal.

OTHER SECTIONS OF PLAN NO. 2

There are but two sections in plan No. 2, I repeat, that the committee objected to: section 3 involving the Employees' Compensation Commission and the section against abolishing the Board of Visitors of St. Elizabeths Hospital. There was substantially no protest in the hearings against the other 10 sections of the plan. Eighty or 90 percent of the plan is sound. Personally, I would not have disturbed the Employees' Compensation Commission. I have every confidence in the members of the Board, but I do not believe that the plan should be rejected because the essential functions of the Commission and the rights of employees are preserved and promoted. I believe

that plan No. 2 should be approved and that the pending House Concurrent Resolution 151 should be rejected. If we are for reorganization, we should say so. If we are against reorganization, that issue was settled by the passage of the Reorganzation Act.

Something was said as I have stated about the legality of the abolition of the Employees' Compensation Commission. Congress settled that question when it passed the Reorganization Act. I concur with the Department of Justice that that act is valid and the proposed reorganization of the Congress is legal.

I repeat, plan No. 2 should be approved and that the resolution in opposition to the plan should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 154

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Expenditures by a divided vote disapproved section 201 of plan 3 respecting the functions of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and they recommended against plan 3 because it would transfer or abolish functions for which St. Elizabeths Hospital was established. Section 201 is part II of the plan. There are nine other parts of the plan and according to the hearings there are substantially no sound protests against the other nine parts of the plan. I have high regard for the views of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] who submitted the report to reject plan 3. I cannot concur. The plan provides for the transfer of the responsibility for the care of military and naval mental patients from St. Elizabeths Hospital to the War and Navy Departments. It is contended that this transfer would reduce the effectiveness of the institution as a teaching hospital. The answer is that the load at St. Elizabeths without the patients from the Army and Navy is equal to the capacity of the plant. Its further growth would make the plant unwieldy. The high standards maintained would be threatened. The War and Navy Departments provide extensive medical service, including the care of the insane, for Army and Navy patients. The effect of the plan is to extend on a permanent basis the organizational arrangements which have been developed at the close of the war. I repeat that there is less merit in opposition to plan 3 than the opposition to any of the proposed plans. I have already indicated that the functions of the Board of Visitors of St. Elizabeths Hospital overlap the functions of the Federal Security Administrator. The performance by the Board of statutory functions that are long outdated would mean a dual control of the institution and would seriously interfere with its administration. It might be admitted for the sake of the argument that point 2 of plan 3 might well have been omitted, but here are nine other parts without substantial objection that will promote efficient regrouping, coordination, and reorganization. There is a reduction in expenses. There will be an increase in efficiency.

BUREAU OF MARINE INSPECTION AND NAVIGATION

While there was objection to part 1 which includes sections 101, 102, 103, and 104 of plan No. 3 to the continuance of the Marine Inspection under the Coast Guard, the objections were not very impressive. The arguments of those who opposed were not convincing. I was impressed that part 1 was really one of the most constructive provisions in the reorganization plan No. 3.

The Coast Guard is an excellent institution. It has a good reputation. It has a responsibility in maritime safety. Air, sea patrol, and rescue operations are being developed. The close relationship between the Coast Guard and the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation is obvious. While it has a military form of organization, the Coast Guard in peace is not a military organization in the same sense as the Army and Navy. It was composed of men who wanted to follow the sea as a career, and not as a part of the fighting force.

The rejection of part 1 of plan No. 3 means that the Bureau of Inspection would go back under the Department of Commerce. There is certainly a lot more reason for its being under the Coast Guard. There are no reasons for its being returned to the Department of Commerce. When it was under Commerce, there was an antiquated, ineffective administration. It has been under the Coast Guard for 4 years. It has improved vastly. There is no occasion for the fears of the workmen. It has been tried for 4 years. Experience is better than fear. There are other parts of part 1 that were most meritorious. There were no objections. On the whole I believe that Marine Inspection and Navigation would be promoted by being under the Coast Guard rather than being returned to the Department of Commerce. It is rather strange that the Department of Commerce did not oppose the Marine Inspection and Navigation continuing under the Coast Guard.

THE ISSUE

The issue is clear cut. If we block the reorganization of the executive branch we thereby set back reorganization. We refuse to permit the President to do what Congress has been unable to do. We either want reorganization or we do not want reorganization. Plan 3 conforms to the purposes, and the plan is in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act. Much is said about there not being a 25-percent reduction in all the agencies embraced in plan 3. The Reorganization Act expressed a hope for an over-all reduction in administrative expenses of the Government of 25 percent. It was not confined to any other plan. I believe that the pending Resolution 154 rejecting plan 3 should be defeated and that plan 3 should be approved. The defeat of the pending resolution will promote reorganization and efficiency in Government.

It will be kept in mind that after all the costs of the ordinary normal functions of the Government are a small part of the annual appropriations. Not more than one-fourth of the appropriations are involved in Government reorganization. The costs of wars, past and present, and of maintaining the Army and the Navy take substantially 80 to 85 percent of every tax dollar. I do not, however, minimize the importance of reorganization and of the reduction of the costs of Government. I believe reorganization should reduce the expenses of Government. I emphasize that, after all, expenses can be reduced where there is a will to reduce. The cost of any agency or department depends more upon the administration than upon the actual provisions of the act.

No Federal agency, no Federal employee ever asked either the Congress or the Executive for reorganization.

I now yield, to the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman says these plans are 80 percent good, and I agree with him. Would he not prefer to have them 100 percent good, if that can be done without serious difficulty?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Of course, I would, and I have so stated. But, frankly, if that argument were followed to its conclusion, every bill voted on by Congress would be sent back to the committee, because you and I did not agree with 10 percent of it. With all due deference to the gentleman, and I like him. I like his views about St. Elizabeths, and I told him frankly that I would have left it out had I been writing reorganization plan 3, but I think there is involved a substantial reorganization and regrouping in plan 3 that, in my judgment, does not warrant the Congress constantly criticizing bureaucracy, waste, and extravagance, in rejecting a plan that is 90 percent good.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman referred to the Veterans' Administration, headed by one Administrator, and then he compared that with Federal employees.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the question, please?

Mr. CHURCH. They are working for the Government. The veterans are not working for the Government. Give them a fair show with their bipartisan board.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In my judgment, the man who offered his life upon the altar of his country is entitled, to say the least of it, to just as careful and just as judicial consideration as the man who works for his Government.

Mr. CHURCH. But he is not on the pay roll.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have answered the gentleman's question. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and I trust he will not make a speech about Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad to know the gentleman is opposed to plan No. 1. I am surprised that he is not opposed to the other two plans.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the question, please?

Mr. HALLECK. You have referred to the fact that the Employees' Compensation Commission, after all, has no real function. I have in my hand pages from the United States Government Manual which recites the functions of that Commission. With your permission, I will put those in the RECORD.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am thoroughly familiar with them. I will refer to them. I am familiar with the act. I want to be clear in response to your question because the gentleman means to be fair.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman the balance of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for six more minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I stated that when we passed the Reorganization Act we provided for the transfer of functions. That is exactly what would obtain in transferring it to a single administrator.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the committee is entitled to know what the Commission says its functions are.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I know what they are. I do not want to conceal anything. I want to yield to other Members and my time is limited.

Mr. HALLECK. It will take only a minute to read these into the RECORD.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Everybody in this Congress knows that it is physically impossible for three persons on a board to pass on the claims of hundreds of thousands of employees. We know in practice that they have to be handled by examiners.

Mr. HALLECK. But we know that in practice and in operation they run the affairs of the Commission.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. I am glad to have your views, always.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I hope I can get along with my colleague without any controversy. I understood you to say there was very little abolition and very little saving of funds in any of the plans. When I voted to authorize the President to reorganize the executive agencies of Government, I thought I was voting for authority to abolish some of them so as to save money and eliminate bureaucracy.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Now, have we got any of that relief?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, we have. I said there were no major abolitions and that there were no major savings or economies. We talk about reorganization as we do about the weather, but we do not do very much about it. I want to be fair. I stated it was hard for the President to reorganize. We have not done it in Congress. Let us keep in mind that substanially 80 to 85 cents out of every dollar that we appropriate has nothing to do with reorganization or administration. It goes to wars past and future and to the Army and the Navy. I wish to be fair and say there there were no savings of major amount. There were savings but they were not major.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman mentioned, in his clear-cut and helpful statement, that there are 28 items contained in the 3 plans. It is fair to say that 12 of those items actually concern consolidation of programs and agencies. Therefore, we do get economy, do we not?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I stated that, but I wanted to be fair and I stated there are no major economies, because frankly these 28 agencies are not agencies that ought to cause the Congress of the United States to take issue with the Chief Executive except in one case. I stated I came to the conclusion to oppose plan 1 reluctantly. That was with reference to National Housing.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. There are certain items in these plans that we all agree are satisfactory. The gentleman states there is 20 percent of these plans that he does not like. Why not send the plans back to the President? He could send them back here within a week's time with the objectionable features eliminated and the Congress would agree to them.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have answered the gentleman's question by saying that no plans that could be offered would be 100 percent satisfactory to all the Members of Congress. I think that when the President submits a plan that is 80 or 90 percent satisfactory that he has done a pretty good job.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I know the gentleman is always fair and I have always admired his fairness. I want the gentleman to point out to the committee, since he is the last speaker——

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the gentleman's question, please?

Mr. BENDER. Since the gentleman is the last speaker and since he is expressing his own views I would like the gentleman to answer whether or not he is expressing the views of the majority of the committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do not speak for the majority of the committee. As I indicated at the very inception of my argument even a majority of the committee makes mistakes. They made mistakes in reporting unfavorably all three plans. I agree on one resolution. I know the gentleman's views. I differ with him.

Mr. BENDER. But only three Members voted for any one plan.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I stated the situation in the opening of my argument. I stated, furthermore, that in my judgment, it is not a question of what the committee did but it is a question of what the committee did that can be supported, that can stand careful analysis, that can be supported in fact and in argument; and in my judgment, I have stated that the only fundamental policy that the Congress of the United States has thus far not adopted, that is proposed in these three plans, is that of continuing the wartime National Housing Agency that the Congress has not authorized, and I think reluctantly, much as I would like to vote for reorganization, that Congress is justified in voting against plan 1; but notwithstanding their defects, whether they be 10 percent, 5 percent, or 15 percent incorrect, Congress is not justified in disapproving plans 2 and 3.

Congress itself has not reorganized in 40 years. We might just as well admit that when we reject these reorganization plans we are setting back reorganization. The President of the United States, according to the testimony of all the witnesses, submitted a satisfactory plan with the exception of about five items.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield briefly.

Mr. CHURCH. Does not the gentleman feel that since the committee reported against all three plans——

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is not a question, that is just a statement in accord with the gentleman's views. I decline to yield further.

I believe that plan 1 should be rejected, but I do urge that plans 2 and 3 should be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan No. 1 of May 16, 1946, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 16th of May 1946.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan No. 2 of May 16, 1946, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 16th day of May 1946.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan No. 3 of May 16, 1946, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 16th day of May 1946.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. The Clerk has now read the three concurrent resolutions with respect to plans Nos. 1, 2, and 3. Do I understand the proposal is that we vote on these resolutions en bloc?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House, they will be taken up separately when we go back into the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman asked whether or not we would vote on these resolutions separately or en bloc in the Committee. It strikes me—and I propound this inquiry of the Chair—even though it may be in order to vote on them en bloc, could we not ask for a division of the question and they be voted on separately in Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that the order of the House is that they be considered en bloc in the Committee.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, the wording of the three resolutions is such that if one desires to vote against the reorganization plan, should he vote "aye" or "no"?

The CHAIRMAN. In the House, if you want to disapprove the plan you would vote "aye."

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report back to the House, House Concurrent Resolutions 155, 151, and 154, with the recommendation that the several resolutions be passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Concurrent Resolutions 155, 151, and 154 had directed him to report them back to the House with the recommendation that each of the resolutions do pass.

The SPEAKER. Under order of the House each resolution must be voted on separately.

The question is on House Concurrent Resolution 155, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan No. 1 of May 16, 1946, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 16th of May 1946.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In reference to the three votes on plans Nos. 1, 2, and 3, a vote of "no" would be in support of the Presidential recommendation, a vote of "aye" to override the President, is that correct?

The SPEAKER. A vote of "aye" will adopt the resolution rejecting the President's plan.

The question is on House Concurrent Resolution 155.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANDOLPH) there were—ayes 180, noes 37.

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report Concurrent Resolution 151.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan No. 2 of May 16, 1946, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 16th day of May 1946.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANDOLPH) there were—ayes 166, noes 40.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty Members are present, a quorum.

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution (H. Con. Res. 154).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan No. 3 of May 16, 1946, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 16th day of May 1946.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6885, with Mr. COOLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Defense Transportation, fiscal year 1947, including salary of the Director at not to exceed $12,000, and the Deputy Director at $10,000, traveling expenses (not to exceed $50,000), including reimbursement, at not to exceed 4 cents per mile, of employees or others rendering service to said Office for official travel performed by them in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations and attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the agency; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting services; lawbooks, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals; maintenance, operation and repair of passenger automobiles; acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; printing and binding (not to exceed $10,000); not to exceed $4,000 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by section 2 of the Act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364); payment, at rates not in excess of those fixed by law for witnesses attending in United States courts (28 U. S. C. 600c), of fees, mileage, and subsistence of witnesses appearing at hearing held by the Office of Defense Transportation in connection with the performance of its functions; $525,000; *Provided*, That the payment of subsistence to witnesses shall be subject to certification by the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation or his designee as to the necessity therefor: *Provided further*, That in operating any commercial railroad or truck line the Office of Defense Transportation shall pay whatever license or inspection fees and highway use compensation taxes such lines would have been obligated to pay had they continued in operation under the control of the owners thereof.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read a letter which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION,
June 28, 1946.

DEAR CLARENCE: I have just written to Representative JOHN TABER concerning his amendment. I sincerely hope that the Taber amendment will be reconsidered, since it limits the use of funds for shipments after December 31, 1946, and March 31, 1947, to Europe and China, respectively.

You will recall that a limitation now applicable to the present appropriation is in the law. That fixes the date of shipment to June 1947, affording ample time to clear the European situation.

The amendment will not do what is contemplated. It will waste some $300,000,000 worth of food, supplies, and equipment for which deliveries to UNRRA cannot be made within that time. It will tie up food, material, and equipment paid for by other contributing nations. The operations are centrally controlled, and there is no way in which operating, administrative, communication, and transportation costs can be separated from the general fund. For instance, an order of 75 locomotives from Australia for China out of the Australian contribution, now in manufacture to be delivered about midsummer of 1947, though originally intended for early 1947, could not be shipped in time. This is but an illustration. There are several hundreds of such orders. Agricultural machinery on order in this country which should be in process of delivery now, in all likelihood we will not get until after the 1st of the year because of stoppage of production caused by strikes. The same is true of water and sewer pipes which should have been shipped weeks ago. These have been delayed and we will not get them until the end of the year because of, first, the steel strike, and then the coal strike. I could go on indefinitely and give you instance after instance.

As I testified before the committee, I estimate that it would be about March or April before European shipments will have been completed, and perhaps the fall of 1947 for China. I do not see how it would be possible to carry out the intent of the limitation on the dates fixed by the Taber amendment without simply junking some $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 worth of supplies that would be on hand and could not be shipped. The United States has enough surplus supplies on our hands now. I am sure you will agree.

I fully understand what Mr. TABER has in mind, but I can assure you that the amendment does not do it, and that there is no way of limiting such a large operation as UNRRA has had for the past 2 years on midnight of a given date. Frankly, I am not smart enough to do it. I have conferred with my staff, and there is no way that it can be done. If the amendment is passed, it is tantamount to a reduction of the appropriation to which the United States is committed of some $300,000,000. In that event, I will ask the President to relieve me and then the UNRRA Council, as it will require someone much smarter than I am who can perform miracles to take over the job. While I did not intend to remain here permanently, and took over because of an emergency, I do want to have a definite plan of operation to turn over to a successor, or to a new agency, to complete a plan which will not be wasteful and which will give 100 cents value for every dollar appropriated by mine and other countries.

You have been so understanding and helpful that I will greatly appreciate it if you will bring the situation to the attention of the House.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

F. H. LAGUARDIA,
Director General.

P. S.—A limitation, if necessary, as to purchase of supplies, food, etc., after December 31, 1947, could be administered.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, Mayor LaGuardia called me this morning. He said he had not been advised of this amendment until he got it over the ticker. He was very much concerned about it. He said he was mindful of Mr. TABER'S interest and was in thorough agreement with his objective but when applied to the situation it was impossible of administration. He said there would be no alternative if this amendment went into the bill but to resign. He did not want that to be understood as a threat but such an amendment would leave a situation impossible of administration. He said he did not believe the House really understood the situation when the amendment was passed; if they wanted to place a limitation upon purchases, upon the expenditure of money, that was all right, but not upon delivery, because most of these supplies have already been bought or contracted for. The money has already been spent or committed and time must be afforded in which to deliver them. He said he could not be a party to the wasting of $300,000,000, and to the failure to keep our solemn agreement with 44 UNRRA nations, and the nations which had been promised relief.

We will have an opportunity to again vote on this amendment when the bill is reported back to the House. I trust all Members will consider this not from the point of view which we took when the matter originally came up, but in the light of what Mayor LaGuardia has said in the letter just read. "All the boys down there know me," he said. "They know I would not take advantage of anybody and that I would try to administer it if it were possible, but under such limitations, administration would be hopeless. When they reconsider it I hope they will decide to leave it out."

Mr. Chairman, I trust he is not amiss in that hope.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to pay attention to what Mr. LaGuardia and what Mr. Wood told us when they were before the committee on hearings. May I read from the top of page 248:

Mr. WOOD. That leaves us a carry-over for the January-to-March period in this table, which is based on finishing by the end of the year, except to China, of about $20,000,000.

What am I going to say and when am I going to be able to correctly size up a situation which is presented to the committee? I am not in the least unsympathetic with providing the needed relief which we should give to these people. On the other hand, I am forced to take the position that some time we must come to the point where these people in these other lands, as a result of their own efforts in tilling the soil and producing and mining, will be able to support themselves.

I went out of my way, beyond the picture that was formally presented to us, to ask Mr. LaGuardia several questions. The answer appears in part on page 264 and in part on the pages following.

I asked about the Polish situation. Frankly, I was unable to get a clear picture of that, and frankly I do not believe Mr. LaGuardia could then or can now give a clear picture as to Poland.

I asked about the Italian situation. I was told that if Italy could find markets for her citrus fruits she ought to be able to take care of her own wheat situation.

I asked about the Greek situation and on page 265 you will find the answer that if Greece could get her tobacco produced and exported after the 1947 crop, she should be in a greatly improved condition.

About the Chinese picture we were told by Mr. Wood. I said: "You would not anticipate that you can get $500,000,000 over there for quite a while?"

Mr. Wood's answer was:

Of course, UNRRA shipments to China are not scheduled to cease until March 1947.

There was no idea of expansion from that answer.

With reference to Yugoslavia, frankly, I do not believe we know much and I do not believe they do. That is about the picture. To be honest, I could not withdraw the amendment on the basis of the facts that were developed before our committee and what appears now to contradict it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I feel absolutely constrained at this time to bring to the attention of the membership Discharge Petition No. 32 which is now on the Speaker's desk. The petition relates to H. R. 6384, introduced by the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts, my colleague [Mrs. ROGERS]. There are also two similar bills, one by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], and the other by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], to provide automobiles for amputees and paralyzed victims of actual warfare who have service-connected disabilities.

There is nothing that I could possibly say to emphasize the merits of this measure because they are very obvious. To be sure, it may lead—and properly so—to other measures broadening the privileges and benefits to our wounded and incapacitated. Objections based on the need for economy may be raised against it, but so far as I am concerned, I can conceive of many and better ways to economize than at the expense of those who have been handicapped so seriously and so grievously as a result of gallant service in the war.

Many of these young heroes to whom I have referred are in the galleries today. I hope that every Member of this House in response to their appeal, in response to the appeal which I am so honored and happy to be able to make to you today, will come forward as soon as possible and sign this petition so that we may speedily consider and pass tihs worthy bill. In my opinion, the Congress cannot act too expeditiously to take favorable action on this most vital and most important matter. There is no valid reason for further delay. The bill has the greatest merit, its objective is humane and necessary to lighten the burdens and brighten the outlook of these fine boys. We must discharge our obligation at the earliest possible moment to those who have sacrificed so much for our country.

I urge and hope that every Member will sign the petition forthwith and thereby insure the early passage of this meritorious bill.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleague from Massachusetts in this petition in reference to the legislation to which he referred and to say that it takes in not only the amputees but the paralytics as well.

Mr. PHILBIN. That is true. I thank the gentleman from his contribution.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I insist that the gentleman who has just spoken was speaking out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to offer an amendment because I do not like to take time on matters which are bound

to fail anyway. But, to me, it is absolutely shocking and incomprehensible that Congressmen who read the newspapers will vote for a half billion dollars for UNRRA, which is run by Russia, England, and the various countries in Europe and when it is shown on the face of it that much of the aid goes either to Russia or to countries which are dominated by Russia to such an extent that they might as well be Russia.

Out in the cloakroom practically the only argument for the British loan is this hush, hush stuff that, "Now you can say you voted for something to stop Russia."

I certainly know, and when the time comes I will demonstrate it, that handing $5,000,000,000 to the British Empire is not going to save the United States from communism. The idea of Members of this Congress going to the country and asking for reelection, going to the people of the country with blood on their hands, and the campaign argument, "I handed a half billion dollars to Russia and at the same time I voted to hand $5,000,000,000 to England to stop Russia" is pure hypocrisy. I cannot understand why there are not any votes on this floor against UNRRA.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the subject matter that was opened by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] would it be out of order for one to address himself on that particular matter?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may ask unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I scarcely regard the matter as either in or out of order in view of the fact that it relates to a very germane subject in this bill.

Let me refresh you on the subject of the so-called Taber amendment. As the bill came on this floor it carried language that had been prepared in the Budget Bureau. That language stated in effect that all of the consolidated funds in the $465,000,000 for UNRRA plus any unobligated and unexpended sums provided in prior appropriations might be pooled and could be expended without the limitations in the original law.

The limitations referred to are the fact that we decided that December 31, 1946, would be the deadline for UNRRA for all purposes except China. In the case of China the deadline was March 31, 1947. The letter from the Director of UNRRA, Mr. LaGuardia, would indicate that within the limitations of that time he says he cannot acquire and deliver the goods that are contemplated here and finish the job.

Let me tell you what is behind the Taber amendment and why the thing is so important. Let us go to lend-lease for just a moment and see what our experience has been. I got very curious about the number of contracts that Lend-Lease Administration is still processing. Mind you, the President of the United States proclaimed on VJ-day or the day thereafter, which was away back in August, that lend-lease had come to an end. So, when they came before the Deficiency Subcommittee recently I raised the question as to how many contracts under lend-lease were still being processed. You will find it on page 662 of the hearings, and I will give it to you. There are over 1,464 lend-lease contracts that have not yet been completed. But that is not the most impressive thing about it.

On the same page you will find the number of unscheduled contracts. Listen to this: Notwithstanding the fact that on the 15th of August lend-lease was brought to an end by Presidential proclamation there are over 414 lend-lease contracts on which they have not even started. They have not even started to produce the goods. When will the shipments be made? Why, possibly in 1947, but if it involves a lot of mechanical equipment that is precise in quality and requires fine machining, it is conceivable that we will be under commitments of sending lend-lease goods abroad perhaps 2 years from now, notwithstanding the fact that the American people generally have felt that it came to an end.

So now, let us come to UNRRA. We set December 31 for all countries except China. We set March 31, 1947, for China. If the Taber amendment is voted out it means that there is no limitation. It means that they can process the contracts and commitments from hereon out well into 1947 and, for all I know, to 1948. There is no limit.

How far do you want to go with this thing? I want to be just as gracious as I can to Mayor LaGuardia. I recognize that he has a difficult job, but, after all, are you going to delegate a very sovereign power involving hundreds of millions of dollars for an almost interminable period? That is the question that is involved here. It certainly richly deserves to be made clear. So out of the experience that we have had with lend-lease, when there are 414 contracts on which production has not even started, what will be the situation with UNRRA if they cannot get the goods, or if, for some reason, there is delay in production? How long will it run and how long will this entity continue to provide relief and rehabilitation when we made it so abundantly clear that there was a terminal date, namely, December 31, for all countries, except China, and March 31, 1947, for China? Let us have it fully understood what is involved here. That is the nub of the issue.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to take the full 5 minutes, but I still believe the matter is not clearly understood, and I am taking this time in the hope that I can make it perfectly simple and clear. I think all the arguments that have been made about processing and collateral matters are really not germane to the subject matter of the amendment.

In the first place, UNRRA's authorization dies on June 30, 1947, by law. There was a proviso in Public Law 259, and this proviso was waived by the bill which we presented. That waiver was stricken by the Taber amendment. That should be very clear. That proviso in the law was waived by the bill we brought in, and that waiver was stricken by the Taber amendment. Let me read you the original provision in the bill as it came to the House for action. It has to do with just one thing:

> That no relief or rehabilitation supplies procured out of funds heretofore or herein appropriated shall be shipped to any country except in the Far East after December 31, 1946, and in the case of any country in the Far East after March 31, 1947.

The only thing the Taber amendment did was take out of this bill the exception as to the time limit dealing with shipping alone. It merely meant that the bill which we brought out attempted to make it possible to ship after those dates, not to carry on the work. It simply provided that those things which we bought or had processed or manufactured for UNRRA, if they were in some warehouse in this country or on the docks, and had not been able to be delivered quite as promptly as we thought they would be, might still be shipped abroad for the purposes of UNRRA after the fixed date in Public Law 259. That is all that is involved, the shipping, not the manufacturing, nor the processing. It did seem very reasonable to me that if we had bought the goods and processed them, or whatever we had put into them, and because of shortages of labor or because of strikes we were not able to get them on board the ships to go abroad, we certainly should remove the restrictions which made it impossible to ship them after those dates. The question of the continuation of UNRRA and all the things brought up by the gentleman from Illinois seemed to me to be out of line, because all this amendment speaks of is shipping the goods after those dates.

I did not think a slight extension of time would be out of line. I offered an amendment which would have extended the time 90 days. But that amendment went out on a point or order. This whole tempest in a teapot is because the committee attempted to allow articles to be shipped after those dates. It seems to me that it did not warrant opposition from Congress. It is highly important to UNRRA, in order that the goods they bought and paid for with American dollars could be delivered to the unfortunate people of the world. There is nothing else involved.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I certainly did not so read that language. It seems to me that the minute a commitment was made,

whether it was financial or not, and once we were obligated, irrespective of whether or not the goods were on the docks, we could go right ahead with the business just as we did before.

Mr. O'NEAL. No one in the House has any higher regard for the gentleman from Illinois than I, but if the gentleman will read this one paragraph in the law which I have just read he will find that it has to do only with shipping, and nothing else.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, we have here the unprecedented situation of the head of an international body lobbying Congress by means of a letter to a Member which is read from the Clerk's desk.

Last December when this termination date was put into the law it was not an original date determined upon by the action of this Congress, as Mayor La Guardia would have you believe; it was fixed pursuant to a resolution adopted by the UNRRA Council at their London meeting last summer, when the International Council of UNRRA, our own representative being their and voting, decided to wind up UNRRA on December 31, 1946. In our legislation we went the Council one better and, because of the lamentable and pitiable showing UNRRA had made in delivering any relief goods to the Far East, gave UNRRA 90 days more to deliver goods to the Far East.

I have been attempting to find out whether the UNRRA council has reversed its formal action of last summer. Unless there has been more recent UNRRA legislation which I have been unable to find, we have the spectacle of Mayor LaGuardia, the International Director General of UNRRA, making a proposal that his powers be extended beyond the date that has been formally fixed for the termination of the work of UNRRA by the international council of that very body.

Here is the practical point involved. Relief requires a degree of speed. You cannot delay 90 days or 6 months in feeding starving people or they will be dead when you get the food there. Relief delayed is relief denied. When we are talking about next year, 2 years after the war is over, we are not talking about postwar relief but are talking about something else. When we are furnishing industrial machinery to a country a couple of years after the war is over, it is not for the purpose of relief but it is merely giving the country free material for its reconstruction. In the original UNRRA resolutions adopted at Atlantic City and in our original legislation it was made clear that UNRRA was to be for relief and not for reconstruction. But Mayor LaGuardia and his predecessor, Governor Lehman, have twisted the purposes of UNRRA to make it a great free reconstruction agency. For instance, out of this $465,000,000 involved here, only $40,100,000 is going for food and $66,000,000 is going for industrial reconstruction. I am one of those who felt at the outset that money spent for seed, for farm machinery, and for repair of railways and bridges to get relief supplies into destitute areas of countries were proper relief items, but we have found in the past year that this matter of relief has been stretched into a vast reconstruction project. The element of time is important, because after a certain amount of time passes you cannot furnish relief because the people who needed it are dead. When you are furnishing supplies 2 years after a war, then it is for free reconstruction, or permanent support, but not for relief of suffering caused by the war.

This House should not reverse itself on winding up UNRRA.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a question arose here yesterday and today as to what becomes of a great deal of the material which is sent abroad under UNRRA. I think I owe it to the House to refer to a statement given to me in my office about a month ago by a young man, a neighbor of mine who is a farmer. He was selected by his church—he is a member of the plain people—to take over a lot of livestock to Europe. He is now on the Atlantic or over in Poland with the third shipment. He told me they take about 800 bred heifers and about 1,000 horses in a load. He said the horses were purchased by UNRRA in St. Louis and were so poor and in such bad shape that 129 of them died in transit on the last trip. Now there is no sense in shipping half-starved horses to a country that has no feed. Then most of them were unbroken and half wild and no good when they get them there. It would be interesting to know what they cost landed in Poland. I said, "What evidence do you have that your brethren get these horses and these heifers when you get them there?" He said, "None whatever." I said, "Have you talked with people over there and have you any evidence?"

He said, "Yes. I have talked with members of our church over there as to what becomes of these bred heifers when they get them there." He said, "The Russians take them all." He says, "They have to surrender them to the Russians, and if they get any back they steal them. If they are caught stealing them they are shot on sight." I have every reason to believe what my neighbor told me. I grew up with him and I know him. He is a Christian man. When I get these reports I believe them.

In the light of that I think we ought to be a little more careful with the money we spend for these things if we are going to try to aid our people over there. If you cannot get food and supplies to the needy through the church circles to their brethren, then I am sure you cannot get it there through the Government. The governments over there have never had any compassion on their poor, or they would not have so many poor.

There has always been starvation in a lot of these countries because the governments pay no attention to the poor.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It has been explained in the papers by Constantine Brown about Yugoslavia. The Government takes the material and sells it to some rich man and uses the money for war supplies, as in Yugoslavia, Poland, and no doubt in other Russian-controlled countries.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Did your friend say anything to you about what policy they have established for the distribution of the food that we are sending?

Mr. GROSS. No. We did not discuss that. He is not working in the transporting of food. He is working for his church in the delivery of livestock. These heifers are a contribution of the Plain People in several counties in southeastern Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this subject, which is not in order, of course, but I think we have had enough of it—I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this particular subject close in 5 minutes

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: There is hereby appropriated from the special fund account in the Treasury as provided for in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, not to exceed $435,000,000 for the fiscal year 1947 for all necessary expenses of the War Assets Administration established by Executive Order 9689; for allocation or reimbursement by the War Assets Administrator to Government agencies designated by the Administrator as disposal agencies by or pursuant to the Surplus Property Act of 1944; for payment to Government agencies designated by the Administrator for rendering special services in connection with the disposal of surplus property in such amounts as shall be approved by the Bureau of the Budget; and for allocation or reimbursement to owning agencies in such amounts and upon such basis as shall be approved by the Bureau of the Budget, for the care and handling (including pay and allowances and subsistence of military and naval personnel) of surplus property subsequent to the filing of a declaration of surplus covering such property with a disposal agency designated by the Administrator, or, if the Administrator prescribes procedures whereby declarations of surplus are made at approximately the time of disposal or removal, subsequent to notice by the owning agency to the disposal agency that property has been determined to be surplus and is subject to such procedures, such funds to be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; fees and mileage of witnesses at rates provided by law for witnesses attending in the United States courts (28 U. S. C. 600c); temporary (not in excess of 1 year) or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by

contract or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; lawbooks, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals; acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; printing and binding; travel expenses, including reimbursement, at not to exceed 4 cents per mile, to employees for expenses incurred by them in performance of official travel in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Administration; procurement of supplies, equipment, reports, and services in connection with the care, handling, and disposition of surplus property without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) upon determination by the Administrator or by any official designated by him for this purpose that such method of procurement is necessary; purchase and procurement of reports of experts or consultants or organizations thereof; advertising, including radio time; purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger automobiles; maintenance, operation, and repair of aircraft in the Territories and possessions in connection with disposal activities and, in the continental limits of the United States in connection with the disposition of aircraft and airports; acquisition of buildings, lands, lease-holds, and other interests therein, and temporary use thereof for the care, handling, and disposition of surplus property; payments to States or political subdivisions thereof of sums in lieu of and equivalent to taxes accruing against real property declared surplus to the Administration by Government corporations; authority to advance money to Administration cashiers and collection officials upon furnishing bond, for the purpose of handling cash transactions and making change at surplus property sales: *Provided*, That the Administrator may delegate to any official in the War Assets Administration the authority to make appointments of personne and he may also delegate to any subordinate official the authority to make other determinations necessary for the conduct of the administrative management within said Administration: *Provided further*, That any employee of the War Assets Administration is authorized, when designated for the purpose by the Administrator, to administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit, when such instrument is required in connection with the performance of the functions or activities of the War Assets Administration: *Provided further*, That the Administration may procure by contract or otherwise and furnish to governmental employees and employees of Government contractors at the reasonable value thereof food, meals, subsistence, and medical supplies, emergency medical services, quarters, heat, light, household equipment, laundry service, and sanitation facilities; and erect temporary structures and make alterations in existing structures necessary for these purposes, when such employees are engaged in the disposal of surplus property, or in the preparation for such disposal, at locations where such supplies, services, equipment, or facilities are otherwise unavailable, the proceeds derived therefrom to be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the provisions of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of section 14 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390) shall not apply with respect to officers and employees of the War Assets Administration.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 11, line 14, after the word "exceed", strike out "$435,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$335,000,000."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to save $100,000,000.

As pointed out yesterday under general debate, the War Assets Administration requested for administrative expenditure the enormous sum of $545,100,000.

In the bill now before us the committee has included the figure $435,000,000, but in its report has indicated that the balance of $110,000,000 is in effect to be held in abeyance. In other words, the agency is to go ahead and dispose of property and come back later to be reimbursed on the basis of actual expenditure.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is no real cut made by your committee in this request for over half a billion dollars.

What is $545,000,000 in terms of $2,900,000,000 which with good luck the War Assets Administration hopes to realize in the course of the fiscal year 1947?

It is about 20 percent of the figure $2,900,000,000; it is about 25 percent of the figure $2,100,000,000 which appears elsewhere in the justifications as the net proceeds hoped to be realized. In other words, the agency plans to spend from 20 to 25 cents in administrative expenditure for every dollar which it recovers.

That to my mind, Mr. Chairman, is out of all reason. I have talked with businessmen of experience and competency, who state that in their judgment, 10 percent should be adequate; that 12½ percent should cover all contingencies.

If we allow 10 percent, on $2,900,000,000, which WAA hopes to recover on property costing $15,400,000,000, that amounts to $290,000,000. If we allow 15 percent on the same figure that amounts to $435,000,000.

I propose to allow 15 percent and to allow $435,000,000, but to allow it as a maximum, and not as a minimum. I propose to carry in this bill the sum of $335,000,000, holding in abeyance the balance of $100,000,000 just as the committee proposes to do on the larger basis.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that no one can read this testimony in this connection without feeling that WAA's estimate is in large measure guess work. One thing is clear, and that is that the agency does not need this great sum of money at the present time. It seems to me far better to go slow and let the agency come back, if necessary. It must come back anyway, even under the committee proposal, in respect to the $110,000,000 that is held in abeyance.

My amendment cuts less than 20 percent from the enormous request made by this agency. It provides 15 cents in administrative expenditure for every dollar which it is hoped to collect. It allows $435,000,000 for the fiscal year 1947 as compared with $199,000,000 provided for the present fiscal year—more than twice the amount allowed for the current year. It saves $100,000,000 for the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will see fit to adopt this amendment and save $100,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, after all this Roman holiday in denouncing UNRRA, may I say a word as one who has watched the activities of UNRRA on the spot in certain countries. In the first place, it should be pointed out that UNRRA was given a dual name. It is United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation. Very often relief alone would be an endless drain without rehabilitation. UNRRA was created to help nations to help themselves.

It might be interesting to state that in many of the countries the heads of the missions are Americans. In the two Russian republics it is worth mentioning that they are prominent Americans who head these two missions. They are New York lawyers, Marshall McDuffy, for the Ukraine, and Richard Scandrett, for the Byelo mission. Mr. Sandrett is a nephew of Dwight Morrow and a prominent Republican, some of you may be relieved to recall. He has served on the National Republican Committee, has been treasurer of the New York County Republican Committee, and was a candidate for Congressman-at-Large in 1938.

In Greece, Buel Maben, also an American, heads the mission. There we find a country in which a thousand towns have been destroyed, 25 percent of the homes burned down, about 50 percent of the livestock either killed or taken away, practically all farm machinery stolen or ruined, factories destroyed, every bridge in the country blown up, and transportation disrupted.

The thin and mountainous soil of that country has been tilled for thousands of years and desperately needs fertilizers. But in Europe, outside of Germany, there has been no commercial fertilizer available since the war.

We in America may gripe about our hardships, but in fact we are the only major land not bombed, invaded, nor starved. We can begrudge those other lands the help which they so greatly need, for unless you have seen a bombed-out region you cannot imagine the utter blight that has come to those countries in the war.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentlewoman has seen firsthand the great need for relief Would not the gentlewoman agree that this is a case where relief delayed is relief denied, and it is our interest and should be to the interest of UNRRA to speed relief supplies there before the need for relief is over because the people are all dead?

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Definitely On the other hand, it is a dual program,

relief and rehabilitation in these countries. I for one would not presume to shackle Mr. LaGuardia by a program which he says he cannot and will not try to administer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the expenditures on account of surplus property agencies so far this year have been $87,461,000. Those have largely come in the last 2 months. I am reading this from the Treasury statement, so I assume it is right. The expenditures in the month of June have stepped up to $34,000,000. The receipts for the month of June, so far, are $9,622,000. The receipts have gone up $5,000,000 since yesterday. I do not know whether that is because some of us criticized the way that they were doing business, or not. I hope that what we have said has produced some results.

The total receipts in the Treasury so far are $345,000,000 for this fiscal year, and the expenditures are at the rate of 25 percent of the receipts.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is that broken down to show foreign countries?

Mr. TABER. No.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. As to foreign countries, some of those purchases are made with American money through American loans from the Export-Import Bank, and history shows that loans made to foreign governments are not paid back. So it is really American money that is being paid out.

Mr. TABER. I want to read a little bit about the way they do business. In their official publication of the War Assets Administration for February, accumulated sales totaled $862,843,000. That is through February 28.

Now, listen to this: In the March issue there were reported cash receipts of $583,000,000 and accounts receivable of $89,000,000, totaling $672,000,000. That leaves more than $190,000,000 unaccounted for. That is the way they are doing business. They have 28,000 employees. The figure that they were ask-for would give them 14,000 more. It seems to me perfectly ridiculous when a veteran asks a priority for something that he is entitled to that they should not give it to him instead of holding out and holding back and turning it over to some speculator, like Gimbel Bros. in New York, or some of these other outfits around the country. If they did, they would get along a lot better and a lot cheaper. They could do this job on the basis of 10 percent of the amount they receive if they would only go at it in a businesslike way. The trouble is that they do not. If they would run it in a businesslike way and keep up to date on their collections and get the money in before the account gets cold, they could cut down on this appropriation very readily to what the gentleman from Massachusetts has suggested. That is, we could save $100,000,000 and they could do a better job, and the whole thing would be cleaned up. I have no desire to prevent them from having the money they need to operate, but I want to see them operate efficiently and honestly and have their books in shape so they will jibe. I do not like to have to call attention to this sort of thing in governmental operation—I am disturbed by it—but I think the only salvation is to go along through with what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, this is a very difficult subject to do justice to in a matter of 5 minutes. In passing, I would like to comment on the figures given by the distinguished minority member on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York. The gentleman is talking about cash receipts when he speaks of what appears on the Treasury statement. It takes some time to record sales as cash receipts.

There never was such a merchandising job in the history of the world, I presume, as that which the War Assets Administration has to perform now. Not only is the amount tremendous beyond the contemplation of man but the distribution is from one end of the earth to the other, from the smallest isles in the Pacific to New York City, all over the world. The war assets are spread everywhere and the total volume runs into so many billions that I do not believe we can contemplate it. I understand that there are reasons to criticize, because in a job of that sort there is not such ability in the mind of any one man to do a perfect job on such a proposition. But we do have honest, honorable, capable men working to handle this proposition, even though mistakes are made.

I think if you will look at the cut proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts you will see that it is taking a tremendous chance as to the sale of this vast hoard of material. The gentleman's amendment, if it is considered carefully, shows that it would provide for the War Assets Administration a net total of about $230,000,000 for 1947. I will say frankly that neither he nor anyone else in the United States can know the amount required with any real accuracy. His amendment proposes approximately $230 000,000 for the operation of the War Assets Administration for the next year.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. My proposal is $335,000,000 for the War Assets Administration plus the $100,000,000 that would be held in abeyance.

Mr. O'NEAL. The net figure, with what has been taken off of the $435,000,000, would be $387,000,000, less what the gentleman has, and another figure of $48,000,000, which would be approximately $230,000,000, as well as I can figure.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky if it is not true that when we gave the veterans first preference we added to the responsibility of the War Assets Corporation in making disposal of this property, because we forced individual sales rather than bulk sales?

Mr. O'NEAL. There is no question about that.

They used $227,000,000 to handle $9,000,000,000 worth of material up to February, and the disposals there amounted to $1,900,000,000. Yet by this amendment it would give them only $230,000,000 in 1947 to handle $25,000,000,000 worth of property, of which War Assets hopes to dispose of $15,400,000,000 worth. In other words, if this amendment is adopted the War Assets Administration will have appropriated the same amount of money to handle $25,000,000,000 of paper as against $9,000,000,000 handled to February of this year, and to dispose of eight times the amount they hope to dispose of as compared with last year. It is an impossible task to do this job satisfactorily with that cut in the bill, in my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 80, noes 59.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. O'NEAL and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported there were—ayes 91, noes 77.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Price Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the act of October 2, 1942 (50 U. S. C. App. 901), and the provisions of the act of May 31, 1941 (55 Stat. 236), as amended by the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (50 U. S. C. App. 622), and acts amending or supplementing such acts, and all other powers, duties, and functions which may be lawfully delegated to the Office of Price Administration, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; lawbooks, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals; expenses of in-service training of employees, including salaries and traveling expenses of instructors; not to exceed $55,000 for the employment of aliens; not to exceed $30,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, or the civil-service and classification laws; contract stenographic reporting services without regard to said section 3709; witness fees; printing and binding (not to exceed $790,290, which limitation shall not apply to the printing of forms prescribed for use of trade or public; instructions, regulations, coupon books, price lists, and printing required for the conduct of litigation); not to exceed $300,000 for test purchases of commodities, services, or ration currency for enforcement purposes, authorization in each

case to have approval prior to purchase of the Administrator, regional administrator, or the district director in the region or district in which the purchase is contemplated; traveling expenses (not to exceed $7,674,330), including reimbursement, at not to exceed 4 cents per mile, of employees for expenses incurred by them on official travel in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations, expenses of appointees from point of induction in continental United States to their first post of duty in the Territories and return and expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Office of Price Administration; hire, maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger automobiles; not to exceed $2,509,000 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364); fiscal year 1947, $106,650,000: *Provided*, That the aggregate of expenditures of any kind directly incident to informational functions shall not exceed for the period of the fiscal year $1,750,000: *Provided further*, That within 30 days after the enactment of legislation extending the termination date of the Office of Price Administration beyond June 30, 1946, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall reconsider the estimate of appropriation contained in House Document No. 653, Seventy-ninth Congress, and within such period of 30 days make such revision (in no case upward) of the component parts and within the total amount thereof as would, in his judgment, enable compliance with the provisions of such legislation, and such revision shall be published promptly in the Federal Register and shall be binding upon the Office of Price Administration: *Provided further*, That obligations in pursuance of such revision, if justified thereby, may be incurred at quarterly rates not exceeding (except for liquidation expenses and the added cost of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946) those that would have been permissible under an appropriation made in accordance with the estimate of appropriation contained in the afore-mentioned House Document No. 653: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the compensation of any officer, agent, clerk, or other employee of the United States who shall divulge or make known in any manner whatever to any person the operations, style of work, or apparatus of any manufacturer or producer visited by him in the discharge of his official duties, or the amount or source of income, profits, losses, expenditures, or any particular thereof, set forth or disclosed in any questionnaire, report, return, or document, required or requested to be filed by order or regulation of the Administrator or to permit any questionnaire, report, return, or document or copy thereof or any book containing any abstract or particulars thereof to be seen or examined by any person except as provided by law; nor for any person who shall print or publish in any manner whatever, except as hereinafter provided, any questionnaire, report, return, or document or any part thereof or source of income, profits, losses, expenditures, or methods of doing business, appearing in any questionnaire, report, return, or document: *Provided further*, That the foregoing provisions shall not be construed to prevent or prohibit the publication or disclosure of studies, graphs, charts, or other documents of like general character wherein individual statistics or the source thereof is not disclosd or identified directly or indirectly nor to prevent the furnishing in confidence to the War Department, the Navy Department, or the United States Maritime Commission, such data and information as may be requested by them for use in the performance of their official duties: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for making any subsidy payments: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to enforce any maximum price or prices on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including milk and its products and livestock, unless and until (1) the Secretary of Agriculture has determined and published for such agricultural commodity the prices specified in section 3 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942, as amended; (2) in case of a comparable price for such agricultural commodity, the Secretary of Agriculture has held public hearings and determined and published such comparable price in the manner prescribed by section 3 (b) of said act as amended; and (3) the Secretary of Agriculture has determined after investigation and proclaimed that the maximum price or prices so established on any such agricultural commodity, including milk and its product and livestock, will reflect to the producer of such agricultural commodity a price in conformity with section 3 (c) of said act as amended: *Provided further*, That such maximum price or prices shall conform in all respects to the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942, as amended: *Provided further*, That any employee of the Office of Price Administration is authorized and empowered, when designated for the purpose by the head of the agency, to administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit when such instrument is required in connection with the performance of the functions or activities of said Office: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be directly or indirectly used for the payment of the salary or expenses of any person who directs the formulation of any price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless, in the judgment of the Administrator, such person shall be qualified by experience in business, industry, or commerce; but this limitation shall not apply to the Administrator or Acting Administrator as the case may be, in considering, adopting, signing, and promulgating price policies, maximum prices, or price ceilings formulated and prepared in compliance herewith: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any person fixing maximum prices for different kinds, classes, or types of processed fruits and vegetables which are described in terms of specifications or standards, unless such specifications or standards were, prior to such order, in general use.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 17, lines 20 and 21, after "1947" strike out "$106,650,000" and insert "$80,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to save $25,000,000. Some people may want to know why I offer that amendment. I offer it because I believe it will improve the administration of the Office of Price Administration.

Now, how have they operated, and why do they need to have their appropriation curtailed? Instead of having a few people involved who are competent in connection with any operation with reference to pricing or regulation, they have had an enormous number. If you had occasion to go over there with reference to the pricing of any commodity, you would be ushered into a room, as I have been on many occasions. Sometimes there might be a dozen, sometimes there might be 30 people involved in an operation where there should never be over 2 or 3. The thing has had to go through innumerable agencies in the OPA, to such an extent that they have delayed their procedure so long that it has been impossible to get anything through. The result of that has been a curtailment of production and the promotion of inflation and higher prices and black markets. That is one of the principal reasons why they have made a failure of their job. If you make them cut down on that operation and get down to earth and be honest with the people of the United States, instead of having such a cumbersome operation that it will be impossible to function you will be improving the efficiency of the Price Administration set-up.

On top of that, including printing and binding, they are spending approximately $2,500,000 on publicity and propaganda, a very large percentage of which is in violation of the law and is designed deliberately to misrepresent the picture in that Office.

I hope this amendment will be adopted, and that we will be able not only to save to the Treasury a very large volume of money but that also we will be able to promote efficiency in the Office of Price Administration by making them simplify their procedure, that we will put it on a businesslike basis instead of having it so involved and cumbersome and going through so many hands that there is no efficiency about it whatever. It takes so long that production is thwarted and the OPA is deliberately promoting inflation and higher prices.

I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, of all the blows that have been leveled at our inflation control program, this attack on the appropriations for OPA seems to me to be the strangest and the worst.

By congressional mandate, after both Houses of the Congress have long and carefully considered the OPA bill, the Congress has approved the act extending OPA for 12 months.

Mr. Chairman, by a vote of the Congress we passed a bill that told OPA that they must administer the bill within the dozens of new price-raising changes that Congress laid down. I do not need to remind the Members that I did not support any of those changes. But the gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle from which this amendment comes, sponsored and approved practically every single one of those changes. The adjustments of prices to those legislative changes are not automatic.

We do not believe in self-pricing. The new bill does not provide for self-pricing. It provides for careful administration

and adjustment upward, according to congressional formulas, a big percentage of the 8,000,000 prices in the OPA maximum-price books.

Yet the gentleman from New York comes before the Congress at this late date and seeks to reduce this appropriation by about twenty-five million to $80,000,000 for the coming year. He does this in spite of the most terrific and stupendous workload of price adjustments upward that has been dumped on the Office of Price Administration.

The Members on the other side of the aisle legislated that these modifications in prices be made according to their formulas, and in many instances these price increases by legislative mandate must be made within 30 days after the passage of the act.

Now you cripple the organization by reducing their funds to $80,000,000, cutting the Budget estimate from one hundred and forty-two million even before the changes in the price bill were carried out by the OPA and prices adjusted on millions of items as required by the new law.

Scarcely a day has passed but Members of the Republican side of the aisle have risen and condemned the black markets that are going on in this country. Yet such shortsighted economy as we see here in crippling enforcement funds is largely responsible for the growing condition of black markets throughout this country.

You cannot stop a black market without enforcement agencies. The honest, legitimate dealer who is on one side of the street competing with a black marketer, or a man who is evading price ceilings on the other side is powerless when you take away the OPA enforcement agency. When you do that you are driving a knife into the heart of the honest, decent merchant who is trying to live within the rules of the game.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I voted against the OPA originally and I have taken the floor day after day against the OPA. In my opinion, it is nothing but a cancer on the body politic of this country and we will have black markets, we will have a shortage of everything, as long as this crew of 60,000 snoopers are on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is the gentleman's opinion and, may I say, he has taken a consistent position in that respect. But I believe the House by a large majority has stated that we want to continue inflation-control, even if in greatly weakened form.

If you believe in continuing it, then give that agency enough money to carry on the job that they have to do, and particularly to carry out the amendments that you put in the bill that forced these price adjustments. You are not going to get good administration or enforcement by denying them the money to do this work.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. All I want to say is "Amen" to what the gentleman has stated. It seems to me that in all probability the new Price Control Act is going to be a much more difficult instrument to enforce than the old one, therefore it is more incumbent on the Congress to provide sufficient funds for the staff now than it was before.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman is correct. I have heard it informally estimated that the changes the Congress has written into the act will require 9,000,000 man-hours to make the price adjustments. Now, here comes an amendment from the Republican side seeking to cut the Budget estimate of $142,000,000 down to $80,000,000, almost one-half of the amount required to do this job.

I can't understand the illogical line of reasoning of the gentleman from New York or the members of his party. I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, Mr. TABER.

The question was taken and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 51, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 21, after line 18, insert the following: "*Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be spent for publicity or propaganda."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not need much explanation. You understand it. It simply prohibits the OPA from using any of the funds herein appropriated for publicity or propaganda purposes. If there is one thing needed more than any other it is to stop the bureaucrats from using the funds that are appropriated to them to propagandize the country to keep themselves in power.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. Would the gentleman define exactly what he means by publicity and propaganda? Of course, the OPA has a function to inform the people about the work of OPA, which is absolutely essential to do the work. I know the gentleman does not have that in mind. It seems to me that the words "publicity" and "propaganda" should be better defined in order to determine what the gentleman is trying to arrive at.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. When Chester Bowles said the country was going to be wrecked if OPA were discontinued, that is plain propaganda. I think everybody understands the meaning of the term "propaganda."

I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. Would the gentleman eliminate the practice of OPA in issuing public statements on price changes and price regulations by his amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. No; I would not eliminate that practice; I would eliminate the OPA.

Mr. THOM. But that is part of publicity.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, but I do believe that it directs attention to the full question of publicity, information, and propaganda. Obviously, there is something that the Congress is going to have to do about it. It occurs to me that somewhere along the line we are going to have to set up a certain pattern, a certain guide line that shall not be exceeded by administrators with respect to what they call publicity and information. I frankly confess that I do not know exactly what the dividing line is. I tried, in fact, to prepare some amendment to develop mandatory language within the limitations, but in an appropriation bill it is simply too difficult. However, I think everybody who has had any experience with this matter of publicity and information and propaganda recognizes the fact that there ought to be a limitation. I recognize also that in an agency of this kind, and for that matter most every Federal agency, obviously it has to tell its story, but it seems to me that the story ought to be confined, with certain limitations, to facts rather than propaganda, and rather than naked opinion, which is certainly not informational.

Here is one of the radio speeches that Mr. Bowles made, and I will quote you a line:

The forces of organized greed must seem to you oblivious to the public interest, determined to get theirs while the getting is good, and that is not a pleasant picture for you to look upon.

By what virtue does he assail men of integrity who are engaged in business and who generate a little profit to pay taxes for the purpose of defraying the expenses of government? There is a wholesale indictment by a Federal administrator, and I submit to you that notwithstanding what the private citizen may say, that is not within the province or within the functions of an administrator of government. His business is not to render an unsupported opinion and indict people within this country but rather to stay within the limit of facts.

He says another thing in that speech. These are from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because the speech was inserted over

on the Senate side by Senator HICKENLOOPER. I quote further:

So as might be expected the greatest organized lobbying program in the history of our country was launched.

Is that a fair thing for a Federal administrator to say? It is our business to make the law, it is our business to determine the policy, not Mr. Bowles'. It is his business to administer, and to remain scrupulously within the limitations of fact. So it occurs to me that sooner or later Congress is going to have to deal with this matter and delimit or demark the place beyond which the Administrator cannot go.

Here is something that was inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] on the twenty-eighth of March. This is where they made a determined effort to get out these questionnaires to school children. This is addressed from the Office of Price Administration in northern California to high school principals and teachers. It says,

In an attempt to determine the average student's knowledge of price control and its effect, we are asking the cooperation of the principals and teachers in making a survey.

There is a list of six questions. First it says "Students interviewed" and then "Name of school" and then follows question No. 1:

Was there price control after World War I?

The high school student would be about 16 or 17 years old. World War I concluded about 28 years ago, and this precious youngster was not yet on God's footstool, so they are asking his opinion about World War I, whether there was price control.

Then they say:

Did you know that there were more than 100,000 stores (wholesale and retail) forced out of business by the depression that followed World War I?

But Mr. Bowles did not draw the distinction between those that retired from business and those that went into bankruptcy, and that is an altogether different matter. If they are going to get out this kind of material, they ought to stay by the facts, but who can defend that sort of thing on the ground that that is informational, to quiz the high school youngsters of the country as to whether there was price control after World War I, and all that sort of thing. It directs attention to the fact that sooner or later there must be some legislation of some kind that will deal with this whole matter of information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to use the remainder of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is very kind of the gentleman.

I have submitted to the House before, the informational cost for the fiscal year 1946 as estimated by the Budget Bureau, and if you are interested I suggest that you call up the Senate Committee on Appropriations and ask them to send you a copy of the hearings on the Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation bill. In that hearing, as requested by Senator FERGUSON and also Senator MCKELLAR, is a complete list of all the agencies of Government and the estimate of informational cost as determined by the Bureau of the Budget, which is in the executive branch of the Government. And how much is it? It is nearly $75,000,000, of which about $2,500,000 was estimated for OPA; $2,500,000 for one agency is a lot of money with which to tell the story. I am quite in sympathy with the fact that they are entitled to keep informed those people who have an interest in the rules and regulations, the ukases, decrees, and directives, and all those things that emanate in a continuous flow from Washington, but I do say it is not in good taste, it is not proper, and it is not within the proper domain of an administrator of the Government to rush to the radio like Paul Revere of old and to attack lobbies and organized greed, when that is merely naked opinion as distinguished from fact. So I submit to you that this is worthy of your best attention, in the hope that perhaps we can contrive a bill to meet this question of information, publicity, and propaganda.

If you want the rest of the details about the millions of things that have been issued by OPA, I think you will find them on page 801 of the hearings. At the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], all the statistical information was set out, and it does make pretty interesting reading.

As for the pending amendment, I am opposed to it, and I hope it will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising is to convey to the Members of the House the problem that confronts us today and tomorrow, and to take the Members into my confidence, as I always like to do when I have information to give to the House. We are now on page 21 of this bill and I note there are 67 pages. We must complete this bill in the House today. Conference reports on the following bills are due for consideration before tomorrow night by the House:

Treasury appropriations; State, Justice and Commerce appropriations; Coast Guard appropriation; Navy appropriations; Labor Department appropriations; Government Corporations appropriations; War Department appropriations; District of Columbia appropriations. Then there is the conference report on the Second War Powers Act.

All of these must be disposed of by tomorrow night. In addition, of course, there is the pending bill which could go over until later, but if it can be disposed of I know it would be advisable to do so. There are two other conference reports available for consideration which, of course, are not urgent as far as the June 30 deadline is concerned, and those are the conference reports on the Public Health Service Act, the bill relating to the Public Health Service, and the naval assistance to China.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How many of these conference reports are going to be ready tomorrow? I understand some of these conferences have not been held yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true. But I am just presenting to the House the problem that confronts us. If they are ready, of course, we naturally want to act on them if it is possible. Even though they are not all taken up, which they should be, there is quite a program for tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would think the problem is in getting the conferees to work. As I understand, only one conference report is ready for action on the part of the House, and that is the conference report on the naval appropriations bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The conference report on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations bill will be ready for tomorrow, and we hope to get the District of Columbia appropriation bill conference out of the way tomorrow, and perhaps one other report. It just depends on the cooperation we get from the other body. We are ready to confer at any time, and we hope that we will be able to get most of them out of the way by the end of the week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What I am trying to bring out is that the House is not to blame if they are not ready to confer with us. We are ready to act.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. The House is well along with its program. The conference report on the naval appropriations bill was filed last night, and we could have taken it up any time today. The conference report on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill can be taken up any time tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They can be taken up at any time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; at any time. There are no major controversies involved, and I do not think they will take more than a few minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to observe that my remarks were not at all along the line of placing any blame on the House, because the House has been very cooperative. I just wanted to give the House the information as to the problem which confronts us, knowing that the House and the leadership on the other side always cooperate. I wanted to present to the Members of the House the problem that confronts us as to the work we have to do between now and tomorrow night.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The Government corporations appropriation bill has not even been considered in the Senate up to this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true.

Mr. JENSEN. The conferees have not met, so, of course, the conference report could not be ready.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As I understand it, we have already passed a continuing resolution, so if these conference reports are not ready by the deadline tomorrow no harm will be done.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, if we can get them through, it will be much better.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In view of what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations says about getting through with this bill, is it intended when we go into the House to have a roll-call vote on the Dirksen or Taber amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There may be one or two roll calls when we go into the House. I might say also there is every indication that the War Department appropriation bill, Government corporations bill, and the Coast Guard bill will be passed by the Senate today. In that event, we can go to conference on all of them tomorrow.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Printing and binding," $5,000.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, of course all of us are interested in seeing that our contribution to the great relief and rehabilitation program is spent properly. None of us wants to see any part of our contribution used for political purposes.

In taking final action on the amendment that was adopted yesterday, I think it is important for us to consider a statement made by Mr. Marshall MacDuffie, New York attorney, who was associated with one of the leading law firms in New York City, Sullivan & Cromwell. He made a statement yesterday contradicting the basic contention of the Congressman advocating curtailment of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's allocations to Russia on the ground that press restrictions made it impossible to check on the disposition and utilization of these funds.

Mr. MacDuffie said he had as full an opportunity as it was possible to have to inspect every section of Russia. He, together with nine other men working as a team, moved from Kiev to eight or nine different provinces and cities ranging in population from 100 to 800,000 people; that he visited all of the rural areas in those republics; that they were in nowise molested, and they were given full and complete information by Russians from cabinet rank to the humblest ration store manager; that no attempt was made to keep from this team any of the information they sought.

To quote Mr. MacDuffie, he states:

There is nothing that we have not been able to see and no place that we have not been able to visit. In fact, it should be mentioned that some of this territory was opened in May to a party of foreign correspondents, including Drew Middleton, and aside from the escorting officers, which were necessary on account of the shattered transportation and road systems, they experienced no handicaps that I could discover in gathering whatever material they desired. I myself accompanied them to one free market and talked with many natives exclusive of official supervision, through my own interpreter. Therefore I feel that real injustice will be done if these crucially needed funds are withheld on this basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe every member of the committee had an opportunity on yesterday to examine a very interesting statement that appeared in the Washington News. It was prepared by Parker La Moore, who is one of the Scripps-Howard staff. He comments upon the dismissal of the information officer at Belgrade in Yugoslavia, who was attached to the UNRRA Commission. I shall insert all of the article in connection with my remarks, but I think there are a few items that ought to be mentioned as a comment upon the observations just made by my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

In this statement of yesterday is this language, which refers to Mr. Hochstetter, the UNRRA information officer:

Mr. Hochstetter charged in a statement at Belgrade that the Yugoslav public was not being fully informed as to the nature of UNRRA aid.

Subsequently the author remarks as follows:

Hochstetter charges than even news releases prepared by UNRRA headquarters in Washington are censored before they are given to the Yugoslav press.

Freedom is after all an indispensable fabric and you take it or leave it as a whole; you cannot impair it and say there is any principle of freedom in the world. So I think it is time there was a reannouncement and reassertion of free press everywhere.

And in that connection you remember the treatment that was experienced by Reuben H. Markham, for 20 years Balkan correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, in Rumania. I am not insensible of the fact that Rumania is not an UNRRA country, but Rumania is dominated by Soviet representatives and the thing that happened to Markham could happen elsewhere. Mr. Markham is no novice in the newspaper field. He has been in the Balkans for the Monitor for 20 years. Anybody who reads the Monitor knows that it is a paper of the highest character that seeks to render a careful public service.

In that connection Mr. Markham is quoted in an Associated Press dispatch from Athens as saying:

The worst that any tyrant ever did in the way of violence, personal humiliation, the breaking up of meetings, censoring the press, and preventing the expression of public opinion is now being matched by the Communist-dominated governments in Bulgaria and Rumania as I personally saw it.

That is his language. Then finally in the last part of this rather long dispatch, and I shall also include it in my remarks, Mr. Markham said:

In the latter part of March a particularly vicious attack was made on him by a Communist paper "speaking in the name of the Red Army and only with the approval of Moscow," and he subsequently was called to appear before Russian General Vinogradov, the second most important official in Rumania.

Finally, he was forbidden to file any dispatches out of that country. You talk about freedom of the press. Well, there you have it.

I recall, Mr. Chairman, that when the book of William Allen White's son, young Bill White, hit the press and was condensed in the Reader's Digest, a story came out of Moscow that condemned that book and everything that was connected with it. I encountered a correspondent, and a very good one, in Cairo who when he was asked to sign a condemnatory article and would not do it was told to get out. There was a case of pressure on a member of the press to betray his own convictions or forfeit his press card and when a press card is your meal ticket if you have been in that game for most of a lifetime it is very serious. We must have honest reporting.

Make no mistake about it, the best thing this Congress can do is by a ringing vote to reassert the freedom of the press. Join in upholding this amendment. Otherwise we are simply following the course of appeasement.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. If the things said by the gentleman from Pennsylvania are true and there is no censorship how can it be said that the amendment offered by the gentleman yesterday would keep food from these people?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely so, and no one can take offense who studies the purport of the amendment.

I am including the two articles referred to in their entirety.

[From Washington Daily News of June 27, 1946]

UNITED STATES UNRRA AIDE OUSTED BY RUSSIAN, COULD LIFT CURTAIN

(By Parker La Moore)

Colonel Sergeichik, Russian Army officer who heads the UNRRA mission in Yugoslavia, has ousted his American director of public information in a disagreement over censorship of news relating to UNRRA activities.

The American, Leo Hochstetter, has been ordered to return to Washington. On his arrival here he may be able to lift the curtain from one of the blacked-out areas of the UNRRA question.

Yugoslavia was second on the list of UNRRA beneficiaries last year, having received, as of December 31, 976,000 long tons of supplies of various kinds. But even though the country has been up near the front on the breadline, Yugoslavia has been able to finance the most ambitious military program in central Europe.

LINKED TO TRIESTE

It has been charged that Marshal Tito has used part of the proceeds from the sale of UNRRA goods to build the big army currently

threatening Italy in the Trieste controversy. UNRRA officials here deny this, insisting that proceeds from the sale of UNRRA goods must be used to finance further relief and rehabilitation activities.

This denial, however, must be taken with salt. The facts are that the goods are sold and that the money passes into the hands of the local governments. It is charged, and generally believed in central Europe, that most of it is used to finance the local governments. And there is reason to believe that in Yugoslavia it is used to finance military activities.

If this is not true, a documented report showing just how the money has been spent would clarify the situation.

BUYING ILL WILL

Mr. Hochstetter charged in a statement in Belgrade that the Yugoslav public was not being fully informed as to the nature of UNRRA aid. A similar report concerning the distribution in Czechoslovakia was heard some time ago.

It is to the interest of the United States that the full facts concerning the UNRRA operation be made known to the receiving countries, because we are buying ill will due to the prevailing misunderstanding. Consumers are paying what they regard as excessive prices for food and clothing we are giving to their governments, and the people think we are profiting by their misfortune, when the facts are we aren't even getting our initial donation back.

Mr. Hochstetter charges that even news releases prepared by the UNRRA headquarters in Washington are censored before being given to the Yugoslav press. If this is true, it is easy to understand why so much misunderstanding exists with respect to the world relief program.

[From Washington Star of June 27, 1946]

RED BALKAN REPRESSIONS WORST IN HISTORY, OUSTED WRITER SAYS—COMMUNIST-DOMINATED BULGARIA AND RUMANIA MATCH GREATEST TYRANTS, MARKHAM CHARGES

ATHENS, June 27.—Reuben H. Markham, for 20 years Balkan correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, today said history's worst repressions of freedom were "being matched by the Communist-dominated governments in Bulgaria and Rumania."

Mr. Markham arrived in Athens Monday from Bucharest after his expulsion from Rumania despite vigorous protests by the United States Government. Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson announced the expulsion and failure of the Government's efforts on Mr. Markham's behalf Tuesday.

Mr. Markham said in an interview today that "the worst that any tyrant ever did in the way of violence, personal humiliation, the breaking up of meetings, censoring the press, and preventing the expression of public opinion is now being matched by the Communist-dominated governments in Bulgaria and Rumania as I personally saw it."

The correspondent, whose most recent Balkan assignment started last August, said he had been under constant attack by the Communist-controlled press because of his dispatches.

(The newspaper Graiul Nou, organ of the Soviet Red Army, published in Rumanian in Bucharest, said yesterday that Mr. Markham had been expelled for "repeated violations of the usages of foreign correspondents, such as misrepresenting the situation in Rumania and spreading provocative rumors prejudicial to the cause of unity among the great powers." During the last 3 months Graiul Nou has published a series of attacks accusing the United States of expansionist and reactionary tendencies.)

Mr. Markham said his dispatches reported Russian-imposed dictatorial methods of Communist-dominated governments, including concentration camps and executions in the form of legal massacres, the victims of which are placed in unmarked graves in Bulgaria. Bulgarian courts, he said, are "a travesty of justice and people are killed by the thousands."

Mr. Markham said he talked to hundreds of peasants and delegations in both countries and witnessed a number of terroristic acts.

Around the end of March, Mr. Markham said he was covering a series of opposition party meetings when he was invited to spend the night with the local leader of the Peasant Party in Bucovina, Rumania, after the meeting had been broken up by a band of ruffians.

Later the band of ruffians wearing masks came into the house at midnight and killed the political leader with bursts of machine-gun fire, Mr. Markham said.

On another occasion he was having dinner in Bacau, Rumania, and Ion Mihalache, vice president of the Peasant Party and one of the three strongest opposition leaders in Rumania, when Mihalache was attacked by a band of armed Communists. He and the Rumanian fled across the roof tops, where they were besieged, but finally managed to slip through the cordon during the early morning.

Mr. Markham said a car bearing the number of the Prime Minister's office, carrying a group of Rumanians, kidnaped a young Rumanian working for American military authorities; he had not been released yet.

One meeting Mr. Markham said was actually broken up by Red Army soldiers.

In the latter part of March, Mr. Markham said, a particularly vicious attack was made on him by the Communist paper speaking in the name of the Red Army and only with the approval of Moscow, and he subsequently was called to appear before Russian General Vinogradov, the second most important official in Rumania.

Mr. Markham said General Vinogradov gave him 5 days in which to leave the country without consulting Brig. Gen. Courtland Schuyler, American member of the Allied Control Commission. General Schuyler and Burton Berry, chief of the American political mission, filed protests and the State Department followed with a vigorous note to Moscow and Bucharest.

The Russian General Susaikov, who Mr. Markham said "runs Rumania," advised the American officials only a few hours before Mr. Markham was ready to board a vessel at Constanta for Istanbul that suspension had been temporarily lifted until it was considered on a higher level.

For 3 weeks Mr. Markham was forbidden to file any dispatches. At 7 p. m., June 22, he was advised by General Susaikov that he must leave Bucharest by June 25.

He departed the following morning in the American military attaché's plane for Athens.

Mr. Markham said "in view of the coming election in Rumania, the Communist-dominated government is determined to eliminate or restrict to the narrowest possible limits the work of American reporters and as a part of that action expelled me."

Mr. Markham said that only one American correspondent was now left in Bucharest, Frank O'Brien of the Associated Press.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC WORKS

No appropriation in this or any other act shall be used for the operation of a testing laboratory of the Highway Department for making tests of materials in connection with any activity of the District government, and the equipment of the existing laboratory, not adaptable to other uses, shall be declared surplus to the War Assets Administration, and such Administration shall undertake the disposal thereof in accordance with surplus property disposal procedures established by or in pursuance of law, the net proceeds of sale to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the general fund of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORAN: On page 31, line 11, strike out lines 11 to 22, inclusive.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. At the time that we held full hearings on the District appropriation bill at that time this language was in the committee print. We went into this testing laboratory matter and eliminated this language from the bill. This, then, went to the full committee where the language was restored. The bill was brought to the floor of the House and on April 5 we eliminated this language by a majority vote.

The bill then went to the Senate where the language was left out, and we assumed that the matter was finished.

I merely call your attention at this time to what has happened. This was the action of a committee of this House, the Subcommittee on District Appropriations. We were somewhat surprised to see this language that had been eliminated by action of the House reappear in the present deficiency bill.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. As a member of the subcommittee, may I make the observation that the gentleman speaks the exact truth. I am inclined to think that this has been put in the bill through error.

Mr. HORAN. I hope so.

Mr. CANFIELD. The amendment offered by the gentleman should prevail.

Mr. HORAN. I am inclined to believe it is an error and I hope the Committee will sustain the action of your subcommittee of some 6 weeks ago.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this provision is a simple effort to reduce the vast number of people who, somehow or other, get on public pay rolls and, once there, it is very difficult to remove them.

This testing laboratory has not been operated by the District of Columbia, according to my information, since 1933. This provision in the bill sought to be stricken by the amendment as I understand it has been in the bill since 1933.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Is the gentleman familiar with the fact that the hearings disclose that if this testing laboratory had been in operation in the dozen years since it was built and has stood idle that the District through the years would have saved over $100,000? That should be mentioned at this time because yesterday we delved quite deeply into the

operations of the District of Columbia. I want the people of the District and Members of this House to realize that the action of the subcommittee was in the direction of saving fiscal dollars and not adding to the public pay roll either because the work is being carried on by the Bureau of Standards. There might be a saving of personnel, but not a great deal.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, it was thought fit in 1933 to drop this. I do not know all the figures, but I do know that no city in the United States is so fortunate as Washington in having such an organization as the Bureau of Standards to examine all its material, such as cement, which goes into road and other construction. No other city could get such expert advice so easily, and it seems to the committee, and apparently seemed to every committee since 1933, that it would be very well since the Bureau of Standards has all those facilities, not to start the operation of a building for testing purposes. Washington now has these facilities and can get the job done without putting people on the pay roll, by paying the price to the Bureau of Standards for doing the very work which they seek to do with a permanent force.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Not having had the evidence with reference to this particular subject matter, I, as I think many other Members of the House, would be inclined to rely upon the judgment of the gentleman from Kentucky. But I want to ask him whether or not in his considered opinion the elimination of this language would result in a saving to the District of Columbia or an additional expense?

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has stated that their studies indicated that. I hardly believe that putting people on the permanent pay roll and opening a building and operating it through 12 months of the year would be a less expensive way of having their raw materials examined than by having it done by the Bureau of Standards here in Washington where the material is to be used.

Mr. TARVER. Then the gentleman is of the opinion that it would be to the interest of the District of Columbia not to eliminate the provision?

Mr. O'NEAL. It is in the interest of the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, in my opinion, from the information I now have, to let the provision stay in the bill and to defeat the amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that since this provision was stricken out by the House on April 5th last, no further hearings have been held on the subject by the Subcommittee on Appropriations?

Mr. O'NEAL. There were hearings held, if I recall, this spring, by the Deficiency Subcommittee, or within the last few months. I know that I have attended hearings when the matter has been discussed and possibly testimony taken on it. I do not recall exactly when it was, but there has been testimony long before this committee went into the matter, for 10 years or more. This is an old, old subject that has been discussed many times by the Committee on Appropriations and not approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it the gentleman's understanding that if the Bureau of Standards does the testing for the District of Columbia that they will have available to them a very much larger range of scientists and people of that sort to look after these things than if they operated a set-up of their own?

Mr. O'NEAL. The finest testing laboratory in America, I think it is generally conceded, is the Bureau of Standards here in Washington.

Mr. TABER. Would that not give them more opportunity to protect themselves in connection with their contract if they had the Bureau of Standards do the work than if they had such a separate set-up?

Mr. O'NEAL. I would think if the Bureau of Standards, an independent agency, not a part of the District of Columbia, stated that the material was faulty, and they had to go to court about it, that the testimony of the Bureau of Standards would be worth more as impartial testimony than that of the District of Columbia employees?

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. That is the important part of this whole thing. The Bureau of Standards exists for the purpose of checking testing laboratories and not to operate them. The idea of this costing the taxpayers of the District of Columbia money, when the record shows that they would have saved over $100,000 during the years, just does not hold water. This is the routine testing of materials. If you want research, go to the Bureau of Standards, but if you want routine work carried on chiefly, it means that you have to set up a testing laboratory.

Mr. O'NEAL. Has the District of Columbia ever offered to reduce their appropriation by $100,000 because of the saving made?

Mr. HORAN. This would do it automatically.

Mr. O'NEAL. They have never offered to do that.

Mr. HORAN. This would do it in a saving to the taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the question of the maintenance of the testing laboratory in the District of Columbia has been a highly controversial subject ever since I can remember, both in the Committee on Appropriations and in the legislative committee for the District of Columbia.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Has the testing laboratory ever been operated?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot remember just when it operated.

Mr. HORAN. I cannot see how you can pass judgment on an institution that has never been operated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me get to that point. The last real exploration of this matter was made in June 1941. That is exactly 5 years ago this month. That is when the Director and a great many of the staff of the Bureau of Standards appeared before the Appropriations Committee on the Commerce bill, which contains estimates for the Bureau of Standards. Here is the substance of the testimony. It is probably the most extended testimony that we had on the subject.

They said first of all they had the authority to test for the District of Columbia. Secondly, they said they could test without charge, but where the work was monumental in proportions, they felt in the very nature of things they had to be reimbursed for the testing that was done. They go way beyond research, and it became a testing laboratory for the District of Columbia. They did work for the District for a period of about 7 years. At that time the averages ran from $14,500 to $27,000 a year. Two-thirds of the inspection fees are for cement.

The Bureau of Standards has traveling inspectors. They go to the cement areas like those in Pennsylvania and elsewhere and test right at the mill. The minute the cement goes into a bin it is sealed whether it is for Government account or for the account of the District of Columbia. That is a service you cannot match with equal adequacy and efficiency for less money than what the Bureau of Standards has been doing it for, notwithstanding the fact that there seems to be an apparent saving if the District operates its own laboratory. The reason the saving would be apparent rather than real is that you would get so much less real inspection if they had to do it for themselves, and you would have two different overheads, one for the District laboratory and one for the Bureau of Standards.

I say they have inspectors going about, and two-thirds of all this inspection relates to cement. They do inspection

work today for the Navy Department. The Bureau of Standards has its roving inspectors who inspect for the War Department. They inspect the cement that is bought by the Bureau of Reclamation. They make inspections of all kinds, including inspections for the various States, either with or without charge.

If the fees are too high, then the answer is that some effort ought to be made between the District of Columbia and the Bureau of Standards to iron the thing out and determine a pattern of fees that is fair, but they will get infinitely more for their money through the Bureau of Standards by virtue of the staff and the expertness and the efficiency of the staff that they now have on hand. That is the reason I think this thing ought to be stricken, and particularly so since the Bureau of Standards is right here in the District of Columbia and the testing laboratory is also here. If they were several hundred miles apart and you had additional travel and difficulty of communication, it might be quite a different thing, but I am of the opinion, since they inspect for so many other agencies of the Government and for the States, that it is the part of wisdom to resist the amendment and let the action taken by the Deficiency Subcommittee stand.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman will be good enough to agree that this rider is a contradiction of the prior action taken by the House on April 5?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite true. The only explanation for it is that with so many things going through and with so many supply bills, my good friend, being a member of the Appropriations Committee, knows the endless and monumental amount of detail with which we have to contend. Probably that is the reason we did not deal with it at the time.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Did it get into this deficiency bill by mistake?

Mr. DIRKSEN. As the gentleman knows, the language was sent up here by the Budget Bureau. Usually they draw the language that obtained the year before. But I should want to recheck that observation of mine to be sure.

Mr. HORAN. It was sent up by the Budget?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; it was in the language in which it arrived. That is my impression.

The minute we encountered it, I think every member of the Deficiency Committee got in on the discussion, and we were unanimous that it ought to be taken care of by this rider.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HORAN) there were—ayes 14, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Taber amendment limiting the time for UNRRA administration, and on the Wigglesworth amendment with reference to the War Assets Corporation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Dirksen amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 4, line 14, after the colon, strike all of the balance of the line and all of lines 15 to 18.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, on a division there were—ayes, 65, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 4, at the end of line 18, add the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition, transportation, delivery, or distribution of any supplies, commodities, or equipment to or for any recipient country which fails or refuses to permit the properly accredited representatives of the American press to enter, observe, and report without censorship on the distribution and utilization of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services furnished to such countries."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 228, nays 85, not voting, 119, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

YEAS—228

Abernethy	Gifford	Miller, Nebr.
Allen, Ill.	Gillette	Mills
Allen, La.	Gillie	Mundt
Almond	Goodwin	Murray, Tenn.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gordon	Murray, Wis.
	Gossett	Norblad
Andresen, August H.	Graham	O'Brien, Ill.
	Grant, Ind.	O'Hara
Andrews, Ala.	Griffiths	O'Konski
Angell	Gross	Pace
Arends	Gwinn, N. Y.	Peterson, Fla.
Arnold	Gwynne, Iowa	Philbin
Barden	Hagen	Phillips
Barrett, Wyo.	Hale	Pickett
Beall	Hall, Leonard W.	Pittenger
Beckworth		Plumley
Bender	Halleck	Poage
Bennett, Mo.	Hancock	Pratt
Bishop	Hand	Price, Fla.
Blackney	Hare	Priest
Bolton	Hart	Rains
Bonner	Hébert	Ramey
Brehm	Hendricks	Randolph
Brooks	Henry	Reed, Ill.
Brown, Ga.	Herter	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Heselton	Rees, Kans.
Brumbaugh	Hess	Richards
Bryson	Hill	Robsion, Ky.
Buck	Hinshaw	Rockwell
Buffett	Hoffman, Pa.	Roe, Md.
Bulwinkle	Holmes, Mass.	Rogers, Fla.
Bunker	Holmes, Wash.	Rogers, Mass.
Butler	Hope	Russell
Byrnes, Wis.	Horan	Ryter
Campbell	Howell	Schwabe, Mo.
Canfield	Hull	Schwabe, Okla.
Carlson	Jarman	Scrivner
Case, N. J.	Jenkins	Shafer
Chelf	Jennings	Sikes
Chenoweth	Jensen	Simpson, Ill.
Chiperfield	Johnson, Calif.	Simpson, Pa.
Church	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Maine
Clark	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Ohio
Clason	Jones	Smith, Va.
Clements	Jonkman	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	Judd	Springer
Clippinger	Kean	Stefan
Cole, Mo.	Keefe	Sumner, Ill.
Cooley	Kelly, Ill.	Sumners, Tex.
Cooper	Kilburn	Sundstrom
Corbett	Kilday	Taber
Cravens	Knutson	Talbot
Cunningham	Kunkel	Talle
Curtis	Landis	Tarver
Delaney, James J.	Lanham	Taylor
	Larcade	Thomas, N. J.
D'Ewart	Lea	Thomas, Tex.
Dirksen	LeFevre	Thomason
Domengeaux	Lemke	Tibbott
Dondero	Lesinski	Towe
Earthman	Lewis	Vorys, Ohio
Elliott	Luce	Vursell
Ellis	Lyle	Wadsworth
Ellsworth	McConnell	Wasielewski
Elston	McCowen	Weichel
Engle, Calif.	McDonough	White
Fallon	McGregor	Whitten
Feighan	McMillan, S. C.	Whittington
Fellows	McMillen, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Fenton	Madden	Wilson
Flannagan	Maloney	Winter
Fogarty	Manasco	Wolcott
Fuller	Mankin	Wolverton, N. J.
Fulton	Martin, Iowa	Wood
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Woodruff
Gathings	Mathews	Zimmerman
Gavin	May	
Gearhart	Michener	

NAYS—85

Bailey	Biemiller	Buchanan
Barry	Bland	Cannon, Mo.
Bates, Ky.	Bloom	Carnahan

Chapman	Hoch	Patterson
Combs	Hook	Pfeifer
Crosser	Huber	Price, Ill.
D'Alesandro	Johnson,	Rabaut
De Lacy	Luther A.	Rabin
Delaney,	Johnson,	Resa
John J.	Lyndon B.	Riley
Dingell	Kelley, Pa.	Robertson, Va.
Doughton, N. C.	King	Rogers, N. Y.
Douglas, Calif.	Kirwan	Rowan
Doyle	Kopplemann	Sadowski
Fernandez	LaFollette	Sasscer
Flood	Lane	Savage
Folger	Link	Sheppard
Forand	Lynch	Slaughter
Gary	McCormack	Somers, N. Y.
Geelan	McGlinchey	Spence
Gore	Marcantonio	Starkey
Gorski	Monroney	Sullivan
Granahan	Morgan	Thom
Green	Murdock	Trimble
Gregory	Neely	Voorhis, Calif.
Harless, Ariz.	O'Brien, Mich.	Walter
Havenner	O'Neal	Weaver
Hays	O'Toole	Woodhouse
Healy	Outland	
Hobbs	Patman	

NOT VOTING—119

Adams	Ervin	Morrison
Anderson, Calif.	Fisher	Murphy
Andrews, N. Y.	Gallagher	Norrell
Auchincloss	Gardner	Norton
Baldwin, Md.	Gerlach	Patrick
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gibson	Peterson, Ga.
Barrett, Pa.	Gillespie	Ploeser
Bates, Mass.	Granger	Powell
Bell	Grant, Ala.	Quinn, N. Y.
Bennet, N. Y.	Hall,	Rankin
Boren	Edwin Arthur	Rayfiel
Boykin	Harness, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.
Bradley, Mich.	Harris	Rich
Bradley, Pa.	Hartley	Rivers
Buckley	Hedrick	Rizley
Byrne, N. Y.	Heffernan	Robertson,
Camp	Hoeven	N. Dak.
Cannon, Fla.	Hoffman, Mich.	Robinson, Utah
Case, S. Dak.	Holifield	Rodgers, Pa.
Celler	Izac	Roe, N. Y.
Cochran	Jackson	Rooney
Coffee	Johnson, Okla.	Sabath
Cole, Kans.	Kearney	Sharp
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Sheridan
Colmer	Kefauver	Short
Courtney	Keogh	Sparkman
Cox	Kerr	Stevenson
Crawford	Kinzer	Stewart
Curley	Klein	Stigler
Daughton, Va.	Latham	Stockman
Davis	LeCompte	Tolan
Dawson	Ludlow	Torrens
Dolliver	McGehee	Traynor
Douglas, Ill.	McKenzie	Vinson
Drewry	Mahon	Welch
Durham	Mansfield,	West
Dworshak	Mont.	Wickersham
Eaton	Mansfield, Tex.	Winstead
Eberharter	Mason	Wolfenden, Pa.
Elsaesser	Merrow	Worley
Engel, Mich.	Miller, Calif.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr Short for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Dworshak for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Izac against.

Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Coffee against.

Mr. Gillespie for, with Mr. Rayfiel against.

Mr. Robertson of North Dakota for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Kinzer for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Camp for, with Mr. Quinn of New York against.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Adams for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Drewry for, with Mr. Torrens against.

Mr. Elsaesser for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Buckley against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr Rankin with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Rich.

Mr. Cox with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Mahon with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Gerlach.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Norrell with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Davis with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mrs. Douglas of Illinois with Mr. Cole of Kansas.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. West with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. King with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Andrews of New York.

Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Sharp.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Traynor with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Page 11, line 14, after the word "exceed" strike out "$435,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$335,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) there were—ayes 144, noes 130.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 152, nays 155, not voting 125, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

YEAS—152

Allen, Ill.	Cole, Mo.	Hancock
Andersen,	Corbett	Hand
H. Carl	Cunningham	Henry
Andresen,	Curtis	Herter
August H.	D'Ewart	Heselton
Angell	Dirksen	Hess
Arends	Dondero	Hill
Arnold	Ellis	Hinshaw
Barrett, Wyo.	Ellsworth	Hoeven
Beall	Elston	Hoffman, Pa.
Bender	Fellows	Holmes, Mass.
Bennett, Mo.	Fenton	Holmes, Wash.
Bishop	Fuller	Hope
Blackney	Fulton	Horan
Bolton	Gamble	Howell
Brehm	Gavin	Jenkins
Brown, Ohio	Gearhart	Jennings
Brumbaugh	Gifford	Jensen
Buck	Gillette	Johnson, Calif.
Buffett	Gillie	Johnson, Ill.
Butler	Goodwin	Johnson, Ind.
Byrnes, Wis.	Graham	Jones
Campbell	Grant, Ind.	Jonkman
Canfield	Griffiths	Judd
Carlson	Gross	Kean
Case, N. J.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Keefe
Chenoweth	Gwynne, Iowa	Kilburn
Chiperfield	Hagen	Knutson
Church	Hale	Kunkel
Clason	Hall,	Landis
Clevenger	Leonard W.	LeFevre
Clippinger	Halleck	Lemke
Lewis	Pittenger	Stefan
Luce	Plumley	Sumner, Ill.
McConnell	Ramey	Sundstrom
McCowen	Reed, Ill.	Taber
McDonough	Reed, N. Y.	Talbot
McGregor	Rees, Kans.	Talle
McMillen, Ill.	Robsion, Ky.	Taylor
Martin, Iowa	Rockwell	Tibbott
Martin, Mass.	Roe, Md.	Vorys, Ohio
Mathews	Rogers, Mass.	Vursell
May	Schwabe, Mo.	Wadsworth
Michener	Schwabe, Okla.	Weichel
Miller, Nebr.	Scrivner	Wigglesworth
Mundt	Shafer	Wilson
Murray, Wis.	Simpson, Ill.	Winter
Norblad	Simpson, Pa.	Wolcott
O'Hara	Smith, Maine	Wolverton, N. J.
O'Konski	Smith, Ohio	Wood
Pace	Smith, Wis.	Woodruff
Phillips	Springer	

NAYS—155

Abernethy	Forand	Neely
Allen, La.	Gary	O'Brien, Ill.
Almond	Gathings	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews, Ala.	Geelan	O'Neal
Bailey	Gordon	O'Toole
Baldwin, Md.	Gore	Outland
Barden	Gorski	Patman
Barry	Granahan	Peterson, Fla.
Bates, Ky.	Gregory	Pfeifer
Beckworth	Hare	Philbin
Biemiller	Harless, Ariz.	Pickett
Bland	Hart	Poage
Bloom	Havenner	Pratt
Bonner	Hays	Price, Fla.
Brooks	Healy	Price, Ill.
Brown, Ga.	Hébert	Priest
Bryson	Hendricks	Rabaut
Buchanan	Hobbs	Rabin
Bulwinkle	Hoch	Rains
Bunker	Hook	Randolph
Cannon, Mo.	Huber	Resa
Carnahan	Hull	Richards
Chapman	Jarman	Riley
Cheif	Johnson,	Robertson, Va.
Clark	Luther A.	Rogers, Fla.
Clements	Johnson,	Rogers, N. Y.
Combs	Lyndon B.	Rowan
Cooley	Kelley, Pa.	Russell
Cooper	Kelly, Ill.	Ryter
Cravens	Kilday	Sadowski
Crosser	King	Sasscer
D'Alesandro	Kirwan	Savage
De Lacy	Kopplemann	Sheppard
Delaney,	LaFollette	Sikes
James, J.	Lane	Slaughter
Delaney,	Lanham	Smith, Va.
John J.	Larcade	Somers, N. Y.
Dingell	Lea	Spence
Domengeaux	Lesinski	Starkey
Doughton, N. C.	Link	Sullivan
Douglas, Calif.	Lyle	Tarver
Douglas, Ill.	Lynch	Thom
Doyle	McCormack	Thomas, Tex.
Durham	Madden	Thomason
Earthman	Maloney	Trimble
Elliott	Manasco	Voorhis, Calif.
Engle, Calif.	Mankin	Walter
Fallon	Marcantonio	Wasielewski
Feighan	Mills	White
Flannagan	Monroney	Whitten
Flood	Morgan	Whittington
Fogarty	Murdock	Woodhouse
Folger	Murray, Tenn.	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—125

Adams	Davis	Holifield
Anderson, Calif.	Dawson	Izac
Andrews, N. Y.	Dolliver	Jackson
Auchincloss	Drewry	Johnson, Okla.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Dworshak	Kearney
Barrett, Pa.	Eaton	Kee
Bates, Mass.	Eberharter	Kefauver
Bell	Elsaesser	Keogh
Bennet, N. Y.	Engel, Mich.	Kerr
Boren	Ervin	Kinzer
Boykin	Fernandez	Klein
Bradley, Mich.	Fisher	Latham
Bradley, Pa.	Gallagher	LeCompte
Buckley	Gardner	Ludlow
Byrne, N. Y.	Gerlach	McGehee
Camp	Gibson	McGlinchey
Cannon, Fla.	Gillespie	McKenzie
Case, S. Dak.	Gossett	McMillan, S. C.
Celler	Granger	Mahon
Cochran	Grant, Ala.	Mansfield,
Coffee	Green	Mont.
Cole, Kans.	Hall,	Mansfield, Tex.
Cole, N. Y.	Edwin Arthur	Mason
Colmer	Harness, Ind.	Merrow
Courtney	Harris	Miller, Calif.
Cox	Hartley	Morrison
Crawford	Hedrick	Murphy
Curley	Heffernan	Norrell
Daughton, Va.	Hoffman, Mich.	Norton

Patrick	Robinson, Utah	Thomas, N. J.
Patterson	Rodgers, Pa.	Tolan
Peterson, Ga.	Roe, N. Y.	Torrens
Ploeser	Rooney	Towe
Powell	Sabath	Traynor
Quinn, N. Y.	Sharp	Vinson
Rankin	Sheridan	Weaver
Rayfiel	Short	Welch
Reece, Tenn.	Sparkman	West
Rich	Stevenson	Wickersham
Rivers	Stewart	Winstead
Rizley	Stigler	Wolfenden, Pa.
Robertson, N. Dak.	Stockman	Worley
	Sumners, Tex.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr Jackson against.

Mr. Dworshak for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Izac against.

Mr Auchincloss for, with Mr. Coffee against.

Mr. Crawford for, with Mr. Rayfiel against.

Mr. Robertson of North Dakota for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Kinzer for, with Mr Rooney against.

Mr. Adams for with Mr Eberharter against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Elsaesser for, with Mr. Camp against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Gillespie for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Harness of Indiana for, with Mr. Quinn of New York against.

Mr. Bradley of Michigan for, with Mr. Heffernan against

Mr. Rogers of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. McGlinchey against.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Green against.

Mr. Cole of Kansas for, with Mr. Peterson of Georgia against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Rankin with Mr Mason.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Rich.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr Merrow.

Mr. Mahon with Mr Stevenson.

Mr. West with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Davis with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Fernandez with Mr LeCompte.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Sharp.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Cochran with Mr Gerlach.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Harris with Mr Andrews of New York.

Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Traynor with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. BROOKS changed his vote from "aye" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct typographical errors and section numbers in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS ON GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow to consider various reports on general appropriations bills, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the bill be permitted to extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Gathing, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5716) entitled "An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6042) entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes."

STATE, COMMERCE, AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight in which to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, Justice, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I simply take this opportunity to state why I am not going to object. I am not going to object, so as to give an opportunity for the consideration of the Crosser bill on Wednesday and also because it is agreed that the contempt proceedings from the Wood committee will not be called up on Wednesday or next week.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I do not quite understand what the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] means by giving up Calendar Wednesday. Is the gentleman yielding in his effort and the effort of some of the rest of us?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now, since the gentleman has taken that position——

Mr. BENDER. I am not taking any position. I am simply asking a question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I can understand what is behind the gentleman's question and I want to answer it. I yield no effort nor any advantage. We want this railroad retirement bill considered. Calendar Wednesday is not being given up except for just one Wednesday, and that is done solely for the purpose of granting the railroad workers a chance to have their pension bill passed.

Mr. BENDER. Of course we do.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It has been held up. I am not going to permit that bill to be held up any further.

Mr. BENDER. Who has been holding it up?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Just a minute. I am not going to have it held up by insisting on Calendar Wednesday and thus block completion of that bill.

Mr. BENDER. By what process of thinking or by what right does the gentleman assume to make such a statement? Has the gentleman any right to speak for the leadership?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am speaking for myself and for nobody else. I feel it is my responsibility as an individual Member of this House to do nothing that would obstruct further consideration of the Crosser bill. I intend no criticism of the majority leader. He has given full cooperation to bring about passage of the railroad pension bill.

Mr. BENDER. I would like the gentleman to inform me as to what has been done to obstruct consideration of that bill. I am not aware of any obstruction. We have been waiting for that bill just as anxiously as the gentleman has, but other business has come up here. Incidentally, those three resolutions in connection with the reorganization of the Government have been waiting. Those things come in order. I believe the leadership of the House is sincere, is genuine in trying to do this job in a regular and honorable way. I disagree with the gentleman from New York. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is doing the best job he can in order to expedite matters and bring things up here in order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH ACT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R.

4512) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4512) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: ", but only to the extent necessary for the purposes of such training and instruction"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
ALFRED L. BULWINKLE,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
CLARENCE J. BROWN,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLAUDE PEPPER,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
LISTER HILL,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4512) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: In the provisions of the bill relating to the National Advisory Mental Health Council it is provided that six appointed members shall be selected from leading medical or scientific authorities who are outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of psychiatric disorders. The bill as it passed the House contained a sentence providing that three of the appointed members shall be selected from a panel of six such authorities to be submitted to the Surgeon General by the deans of the approved medical colleges and schools in the United States. This amendment of the Senate struck out this sentence. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: The bill in the proposed new section 303 of the Public Health Service Act authorizes the Surgeon General, in carrying out the purposes of section 301 with respect to mental health, to admit and treat, at the National Institute of Mental Health, patients of St. Elizabeths Hospital transferred from the hospital pursuant to the arrangements made by the Surgeon General and the Superintendent of the hospital with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator. In the bill as it passed the House this provision contained a proviso that the consent of a legal guardian shall be obtained before the transfer of any patient from St. Elizabeths Hospital for such treatment. This Senate amendment struck out the proviso contained in the bill as it passed the House. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 3: In the new section 303 of the Public Health Service Act, in the bill as it passed the House, the Surgeon General is authorized by clause (1) of subsection (b) to provide training and instruction, in matters relating to psychiatric disorders, to persons found by him to have proper qualifications, and, by clause (2), to provide such training and instruction, and demonstrations, through grants, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, to public and other nonprofit institutions. By this amendment the Senate added a provision to clause (2) providing that such grants could include grants to such institutions "for the construction, acquisition, and leasing of hospital, clinic, laboratory, and related facilities, but only to the extent necessary for the purposes of such training and instruction." The House recedes with an amendment which eliminates that part of the Senate language which would authorize grants to such institutions for the construction, acquisition, and leasing of hospital, clinic, laboratory, and related facilities, but retains the other language of the Senate amendment so that clause (2) will read as follows: "(2) to provide such training and instruction, and demonstrations, through grants, upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, to public and other nonprofit institutions, but only to the extent necessary for the purposes of such training and instruction."

Amendment No. 4: Section 11 of the bill as it passed the House authorized the appropriation of not to exceed $4,500,000 for the erection and equipment, for the use of the Public Health Service in the carrying out of the provisions of this legislation, of suitable and adequate hospital buildings and facilities, including necessary living quarters for personnel, and of suitable and adequate laboratory buildings and facilities, such buildings and facilities to be known as the National Institute of Mental Health. This Senate amendment struck out "$4,500,000" and inserted "$7,500,000." The House recedes.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
ALFRED L. BULWINKLE,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
CLARENCE J. BROWN,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report from the committee on conference.

There were four amendments to the bill as it passed the House. The Senate receded on two, the House receded on one, and an agreement with an amendment was worked out on the other. It is a unanimous report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Tennessee has said, this is a unanimous report of the conference committee. The House yielded, in fact, on only one amendment, and that was a slight increase in the amount set up in the bill for the construction of the research center at Bethesda and was necessary because of the fact that the original estimated cost had been made in 1939 or early 1940 before the present increase in construction costs had come about. The increase allowed is simply enough to cover the increased costs of construction.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I should like to know what the gentleman considers a slight increase these days.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This increase happens to be from $4,500,000 to $7,500,000—a $3,000,000 increase. It does not accurately reflect the cost which has come about under the hold-the-line order of the administration of the gentleman from Tennessee, but we held it down to as close a percentage as we could. If we had provided for the actual increase, we should probably have had to double the amount. In fact, they figure that the total increase would bring the cost to something like $11,500,000, but the House committee as usual stood for economy and was able to hold it to $7,500,000.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECOND WAR POWERS ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5716) to amend the Second War Powers Act of 1942 as amended and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5716) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Title XV of such Act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 1503. Nothing contained in this Act or any other Federal Act (except the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, or the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended), shall be construed to authorize the establishment by any officer or agency of the Government of maximum prices for any commodity

or maximum rents for any housing accommodations.'"

And the House agree to the same.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
SAM HOBBS,
C. E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JAMES W. HUFFMAN,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5716) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate passed the bill after amending it to provide that nothing contained therein or any other act (except the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended), shall be construed to authorize the establishment by any officer or agency of the Government of maximum prices for any commodity or maximum rents for any housing accommodations. The House disagreed to the Senate amendment and requested the conference, to which the Senate agreed.

The House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate after it was modified to make clear the reference was to any Federal act, and to exempt also the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
SAM HOBBS,
C. E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO].

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include at this point in the RECORD correspondence from the War Assets Administration in reply to a protest of mine of the action of the Civilian Production Administration in violating the veterans' preference law for surplus property which became law on May 3 of this year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 25, 1946.

Hon. CARTER MANASCO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANASCO: In accordance with your request to Mr. Robert J. Hayes, we enclose a copy of a teletype dated June 13, 1946, sent to all regional offices giving the substance of a directive issued by Civilian Production Administration with regard to the sale of rails to Treasury Procurement Division, acting as agent for UNRRA.

Also enclosed is a copy of War Assets Administration Daily Bulletin No. 12, which incorporates the teletype to the regions.

There is further enclosed a copy of the directive from Civilian Production Administration dated June 5, 1946.

As you have been advised, the Civilian Production Administration has issued Priorities Regulation No. 13, which is applicable to the disposal of surplus property, and the CPA from time to time issues specific directions under this regulation. We understand that CPA derives its authority to issue these directions from section 301 of the Second War Powers Act. Section 34 (b) of the Surplus Property Act states that "nothing in this act shall impair or affect the provisions of * * * section 301 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942."

Sincerely yours,

E. A. STANSFIELD,
Acting General Counsel.

JUNE 13, 1946.

To All Regional Offices:

Under date of June 5 the Civilian Production Administration filed with this office a directive pursuant to Priorities Regulation 13 covering 75- and 90-pound rails and accessories. In accordance with this directive, you are to freeze all 75- and 90-pound rails and accessories in your present inventory and all of these items which may be declared surplus to your office in the future. This directive covers the disposal up to 50,000 tons of the items as stated to the Treasury Procurement Division, acting as agent for UNRRA, subject to satisfactory financial arrangements. In accordance with this directive, you are to enter into sales negotiations with UNRRA, notifying this office when sales are consummated so that tonnage sold can be charged against 50,000 tons covered by directive. Acknowledgment this wire requested.

H. W. CORNELL,
For FRANK R. CREEDON,
Deputy Administrator for General Disposal.

JUNE 5, 1946.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

(Attention: Mr. R. A. Stephens, Steel Division.)

GENTLEMEN: The fulfillment of requirements for the defense of the United States has created a shortage in the supply of rails and accessories for defense, for private account and for export.

In view of the urgent need of 75- and 90-pound rails and accessories for the rehabilitation of transportation facilities in China, the following action is taken:

Pursuant to priorities regulation No. 13 you are hereby directed to dispose up to 50,000 tons of 75- and 90-pound rails and accessories to the Treasury Procurement Division, acting as agents for UNRRA, subject to financial arrangements satisfactory to you.

This directive will expire September 30 or as soon as War Assets Administration has made available to the Treasury Procurement Division the 50,000 tons disclosed in this directive if that occurs before September 30, 1946.

Very truly yours,

J. JOSEPH WHELAN,
Recording Secretary.

SECTION V. PRIORITIES REGULATIONS COVERING 75- AND 90-POUND RAILS AND ACCESSORIES

1. Under date of June 5, the Civilian Production Administration filed with this office a directive pursuant to priorities regulation No. 13 covering 75- and 90-pound rails and accessories. In accordance with this directive you are to freeze all 75- and 90-pound rails and accessories in your present inventory and all of these items which may be declared surplus to your office in the future. This directive covers the disposal up to 50,000 tons of the items as stated, to the Treasury Procurement Division acting as agent for UNRRA, subject to satisfactory financial arrangements. In accordance with this directive you are to enter into sales negotiations with UNRRA notifying this office when sales are consummated so that tonnage sold can be charged against 50,000 tons covered by directive. Acknowledgment this wire requested.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICERS IN THE CLASSIFIED GRADES

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5244) to authorize the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5244) to authorize the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 to 20, inclusive, and 22, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 3 of the House bill strike out lines 16 and 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. The second paragraph of section 32 of the Act entitled 'An Act for the reorganization and improvement of the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved May 24, 1924 (46 Stat. 1214), as amended, is amended to read as follows: ; and in lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following: or representatives duly authorized by such committees,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5244) to authorize the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 1 to 10, inclusive: These amendments are clarifying and clerical changes, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 11: This amendment permits personnel of the United States merchant marine to take the examinations for

appointment as a Foreign Service officer under the terms of the bill, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: This amendment insures that Government employees, including legislative employees, will be eligible for appointment as Foreign Service officers under the provisions of the bill, and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 13 to 18, inclusive: These amendments are clarifying and clerical changes, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 19: This amendment eliminated for appointment as Foreign Service officers vice consuls, not of career. The State Department informed the committee that these officials would be considered in subsequent proposed legislation which is now in process of formulation in the State Department. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 20 and 22: These amendments are clarifying and clerical changes, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 21: The amendment to the act for the reorganization and improvement of the Foreign Service of the United States permits the Legislative and Appropriations Committees of the Congress charged with legislating for and appropriating for the Department of State to have access to the correspondence and records of the Division of Foreign Service Personnel. As the bill passed the House, duly authorized representatives of such committees were also authorized to have access to such correspondence and records. The Senate amendment eliminated representatives of committees. The Department of State advised the conferees that they would have no objection to representatives of such committees having access to such correspondence and records if such representatives were so authorized by a majority of each such committee. The House recedes with an amendment permitting such representatives to have such access if authorized by a majority of their committee. The House amendment also contains a technical amendment amending the proper paragraph and section in the Statutes at Large rather than the United States Code which is only prima facie evidence of the law and was inserted in the House bill by an oversight. The House recedes.

The Senate amended the title to capitalize the words "Foreign Service" and the House recedes.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the conference report?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, the conferees agreed to the Senate amendments which are merely perfecting amendments. The only difference was that we agreed to all of theirs and they agreed to only one of ours. They receded and concurred with reference to the investigations involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] to the bill that was presented on the floor.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the amendment?

Mr. BLOOM. The amendment as it passed the House was that the Appropriations Committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, and like committees of the Senate would have the right to investigate and look into all secret papers. The way the Senate had it it looked as if all employees, as well as Members and the committee could do this; so it was amended by the conferees so that any employee who was recommended by a majority of either of the committees of the House or Senate could investigate all of these secret papers. That is all there is to it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The bill went through the House rather quickly before the gentleman had a chance to discuss it thoroughly, including the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. That was discussed fully in conference?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes. That has all been agreed to by the conferees.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is satisfactory to everybody?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is a unanimous agreement?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

House Resolution 675 was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEBTOR RAILROAD CORPORATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 687, Rept. No. 2405), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5924) to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose porperties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final pasasge without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill H. R. 5924, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's Table the bill S. 1253 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H. R. 5924.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] for today be vacated and that he be given a special order to address the House on Tuesday next for the same length of time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

WAR PARENTS ORGANIZATION

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of those Members of the House who are members of the Congressional War Parents Organization, that on Wednesday last, June 26, there was placed in the Senate proceedings of the RECORD by Senator BRIDGES a list of parents and service-connected children with the request that any omissions or correction of the list be sent either to me or to him so that the final report on this may be accurate. We are desirous also of having the names and records of all Members who were in the service themselves.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the introduction by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, of his Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, at the occasion of the graduation exercises of the FBI National Academy in the Interdepartmental Auditorium in Washington, this morning.

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois (at the request of Mr. FLOOD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem by James Patrick McGovern.

Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Christian Science Monitor on Farm Production.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a speech by Mr. Raymond W. Miller, and in the other, two letters written by him to the State Department.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper items.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST CORLISS G. LAMONT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to House Reso-

lution 678, Seventy-ninth Congress, he did, today, June 28, 1946, certify to the United States attorney, District of Columbia, the willful and deliberate refusal of Corliss G. Lamont to produce before the Committee on Un-American Activities for its inspection certain books, papers, and records which had been duly subpenaed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6042. An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2341. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2543. An act to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation.

H. R. 6064. An act to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6084. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, June 29, 1946, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1429. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 685. Resolution providing for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 138, a joint resolution to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2399). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 686. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5234, a bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in matters relating to social protection, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2400). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6859. A bill to amend section 121 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to authorize the appointment of three additional deputies for the register of wills; with amendment (Rept. No. 2404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 687. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5924, a bill to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2405). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 294. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish upon a reimbursement basis certain benefits, services, and supplies to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in World War II, in consideration of reciprocal services extended to the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 2423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the Civil Service. S. 1489. An act to authorize payment for accumulated and accrued annual leave to female dietitians and physical-therapy aides whose civilian appointments were terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073); without amendment (Rept. No. 2424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 1578. An act to clarify the terms "compensation" and "pension" under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 2425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. S. 2099. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accept gifts, devises, and bequests in behalf of the general post fund for the use of veterans and for the sale and conveyance of any such property under certain circumstances and the covering of the proceeds thereof into the post fund, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2291. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer a vessel to the American Antarctic Association, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 5148. A bill to provide for the payment of pension or other benefits withheld from persons for the period they were residing in countries occupied by the enemy forces during World War II; with amendments (Rept. No. 2428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 5831. A bill to include the heads of executive departments and independent agencies within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 2429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 6673. A bill to amend section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 6810. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provisions of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 6836. A bill to establish and provide for the maintenance and operation of a Veterans' Canteen Service in the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 6903. A bill to provide benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1063. A bill for the relief of Marie Valida Antonia Michaud; without amendment (Rept. No. 2401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5620. A bill for the relief of Roger Edgar Lapierre; without amendment (Rept. No. 2402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5704. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charles C. Lee; with amendment (Rept. No. 2403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1070. A bill for the relief of Elmer C. Hadlen; with amendments (Rept. No. 2406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3099. A bill for the relief of Coy C. Brown; with amendments (Rept. No. 2407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3197. A bill for the relief of William F. Patchell, Jr.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1088. A bill for the relief of the Eastern Contracting Co., Inc.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2161. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon

the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Algernon Blair, his heirs or personal representatives, against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3833. A bill for the relief of Viola McKinney; with amendments (Rept. No. 2411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4341. A bill for the relief of James B. McGoldrick; without amendment (Rept. No. 2412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4375. A bill for the relief of Charles Martin; with amendments (Rept. No. 2413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4686. A bill for the relief of the estate of Harry Wright; with amendments (Rept. No. 2414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4947. A bill for the relief of Ethel Guenther; with amendments (Rept. No. 2415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5198. A bill for the relief of Marjorie B. Marable; with amendments (Rept. No. 2416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5261. A bill for the relief of David Weiss, with amendments (Rept. No. 2417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5372. A bill for the relief of Jessie Wolfington; with amendments (Rept. No. 2418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5414. A bill for the relief of Marie Gorak; with amendments (Rept. No. 2419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5725. A bill for the relief of Sadie Frey and the estate of Marie Hviding; with amendments (Rept. No. 2420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6248. A bill for the relief of Capital Office Equipment Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6307. A bill for the relief of Francesco D'Emilio; without amendment (Rept. No. 2422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 6909. A bill authorizing the appointment of three additional judges of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, prescribing the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 6910. A bill relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange sites at Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., for Coast Guard purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. R. 6911. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 6912. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 6913. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 6914 A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 6915. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 6916. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 6917. A bill to provide for site acquisition and design of Federal buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6918. A bill to provide emergency relief for the victims of the seismic waves which struck the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. R. 6919. A bill relating to the display, along with the flag of the United States of America, of flags, banners, and pennants of certain organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 6920. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 6921. A bill to amend section 7 (c) of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 6922. A bill to establish a Department of Health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 6923. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, so as to exempt World War II veterans from liability for further training and service in the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6924. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to provide insurance for certain crops planted for harvest in 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6925. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to provide for the United States to pay 25 percent of insurance premiums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. R. 6926. A bill for the relief of George W. Whitehurst; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 6927. A bill for the relief of Paul C. Juneau; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 6928. A bill for the relief of Dudley Tarver; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 6929. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred H. Gibbons, Chief Clerk, Hugo, Okla., Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 6930. A bill for the relief of John Bettencourt, surviving husband of Leona Bettencourt; and for the relief of Nancy Kathleen Bettencourt, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2043. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of William B. Mawhinney Memorial Post, No. 1593, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Hawthorne, N. J., calling for the deportation of alien enemy persons interned for subversive activities; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2044. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of City Council of the city of Chicago, for dredging an 18-foot channel for North Branch of the Chicago River between North Avenue and Belmont Avenue; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2045. By Mr. ROWAN: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, regarding freedom of those who labor; to the Committee on Labor.

2046. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Berry Campbell, Minneapolis, Minn., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the McMahon atomic energy control bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2047. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to case, Air Corps against Francis Jean Reuter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of mankind, to whom all souls are dear and whose tender mercies are over all Thy works, as we come our grateful hearts are singing, "This is the day the Lord has made; therefore we will rejoice and be glad in it." Turning to this morning garden of silence from a world so full of tumult and passion, setting our faces toward waiting tasks, we pray for guidance and for strength. Save us, we beseech Thee, from all error, pride, and prejudice. Grant us that candor which is the high courage of the soul. Help us to find in each problem and perplexity but the prelude to those larger understandings which in a desert of denials and betrayals of truth and freedom shall

be as trees planted for the healing of the nations. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, June 28, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution against adoption of reorganization plan No. 2 of May 16, 1946;

H. Con. Res. 154. Concurrent resolution against adoption of reorganization plan No. 3 of May 16, 1946; and

H. Con. Res. 155. Concurrent resolution against adoption of reorganization plan No. 1 of May 16, 1946.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 29, 1946, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2341) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 7999.)

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capper	Green
Andrews	Carville	Guffey
Ball	Chavez	Gurney
Barkley	Donnell	Hart
Bridges	Downey	Hayden
Brooks	Ferguson	Hill
Burch	Fulbright	Hoey
Bushfield	George	Huffman
Byrd	Gerry	Johnson, Colo.
Capehart	Gossett	Johnston, S. C.
Kilgore	Murdock	Swift
Knowland	Myers	Taft
La Follette	O'Daniel	Taylor
Lucas	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.
McCarran	Overton	Tobey
McClellan	Pepper	Tunnell
McKellar	Radcliffe	Wagner
McMahon	Reed	Wherry
Magnuson	Revercomb	White
Mead	Robertson	Wiley
Millikin	Russell	Willis
Mitchell	Smith	Wilson
Moore	Stanfill	Young
Morse	Stewart	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO and Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business, having been appointed to the commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the Commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

FULL AND COMPLETE CITIZENSHIP FOR THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, in convention assembled on June 18, 1946, favoring full and complete citizenship for the American Indian.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From the time of the discovery of this country the American Indian has been subject to abuse and unjust discrimination, the nature of which is common knowledge to all.

Whereas by his courage and loyalty to his country, the American Indian has demonstrated in both World Wars by actual combat that he is deserving of the admiration of his fellow countrymen; and

Whereas according to official records, more Indians volunteered their services in their country's behalf on a proportionate basis, population considered, than any other group of our citizens; and

Whereas there remains in evidence in this State as well as in other States, unjust discrimination tending to bar returning veterans of the last war from attending social functions and similar privileges accorded their white comrades with whom they served in the fox holes and beachheads of Europe and in the southwest Pacific; to rectify this gross injustice: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Department of South Dakota, the American Legion, in convention assembled on this 18th day of June A. D. 1946, do petition our Government to grant the American Indian full and complete citizenship, including the right of voting, conducting his personal affairs in a manner now exercised by persons of other races; be it further

Resolved, That a copy thereof be sent to each of the four Members of the South Dakota delegation in Congress, and that the national committeeman of the South Dakota Department of the American Legion be instructed to contact the National committeemen of the American Legion representing States having considerable Indian population to the end that proper and suitable legislation be enacted by Congress which will provide the rights and privileges sought herein.

INDIAN RIGHTS

Recommend that funds and loans ordinarily made available to veterans under the GI bill be made more surely available to Indian veterans through the Indian administration or any other governmental agency existing or created for that purpose. This followed discussion revealing that GI loans to Indians on reservations are tossed back and forth between loaning agencies and the Indian Office with neither willing to push them through.

Further recommend that Indian veterans be accorded full rights of citizenship and the social privileges accorded other veterans.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. MURDOCK):

S. 2394. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to make withdrawals of public lands in certain cases," approved June 25, 1910, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2395. A bill to establish the National Elks Scenic Area and Park in the San Juan Range of the Rocky Mountains in Colorado; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6885) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to provide appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

WOMEN IN POLITICS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wanted: More Politics in Women," written by him and published in the August 1946 issue of She, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHEESE AND DAIRY INDUSTRY OF WISCONSIN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bring Your Own Crackers," written by Phil Drotning, and published in the July 1946 issue of the magazine Holiday, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY FORMER PRESIDENT HERBERT HOOVER ON WORLD FAMINE

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by former President Herbert Hoover on the subject of world famine, at the invitation of the Canadian Government, at Ottawa, Canada, on June 28, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN BY CITY OF CHICAGO—EDITORIAL FROM MONTREAL STAR

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Another Chicago Steal?" published in the Montreal Daily Star of June 12, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

INEQUITIES IN DISCHARGE PROCEDURE IN THE NAVY—LETTER TO CHIEF, BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL FROM RAY S. BROGDON

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated February 27, 1946, from Ray S. Brogdon to Vice Adm. L. E. Denfeld, Chief, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNION FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION—STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "The Foreign Policy of the Union for Democratic Action," which appears in the Appendix.]

ACQUISITION OF NON-FEDERAL PROPERTY WITHIN GLACIER NATIONAL PARK—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 230)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith without my approval the bill (S. 1273) to provide for the acquisition by exchange of non-Federal property within the Glacier National Park.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept title to any non-Federal property within the boundaries of the Glacier National Park when the acquisition by exchange of such property would in his judgment be in the best interest of the United States. In exchange for the non-Federal property so to be acquired the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the grantors of such property, or to their nominees, any federally owned property within the Glacier National Park which is of approximate equal value to the property being acquired.

I am in accord with the general purposes and objectives of the measure. Section 2 of the bill, however, provides that title to all lands, interests in lands, buildings or other property acquired pursuant to the act shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior. This provision is highly objectionable and represents a material change in existing law involving an unwarranted deviation from the long-established and manifestly sound practice under which the Attorney General is charged with the duty of examining the validity of titles to lands acquired by the Government. This duty has for more than a century been vested in the Attorney General with respect to the vast majority of acquisitions and I perceive no reason to change this general practice which has proven so satisfactory through the years.

An advantage of this long-standing policy has been that the agency of the Government acquiring the land has the independent checking of the title by a disinterested agency. Moreover, there can be no question that the maintenance in the different departments of the Government of large staffs of attorneys for the purpose of examining title to land will result in duplication, additional expense, as well as less efficient administration. It is to avoid duplication of this character that the Congress passed and I approved the Reorganization Act of 1945.

For these reasons, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 1946.*

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, 1947

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 6777) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday, at the direction of the committee, I offered an amendment, which is section 306, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] felt that the amendment should be amended. If they have reached an agreement in that respect I wish they would suggest it.

Mr. TAFT. I had said I felt compelled to make a point of order against the amendment, and insisted upon the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order has been sustained.

Mr. TAFT. In lieu of the committee amendment, I therefore offer two amendments dealing with the whole subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 16, after the colon, it is proposed to insert:

The types of programs set forth in the 1947 budget of the Commodity Credit Corporation, within the funds available to it are approved but the subsidy program shall be subject to the provisions of H. R. 6042.

On page 8, line 14, at the end of the paragraph, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That the subsidy program shall be subject to the provisions of H. R. 6042.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall explain the first amendment. The amendment is on page 20, after the colon in line 16, to insert:

The types of programs set forth in the 1947 budget of the Commodity Credit Corporation, within the funds available to it are approved but the subsidy program shall be subject to the provisions of H. R. 6042.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. House bill 6042 has become a law, has it not?

Mr. TAFT. House bill 6042 has just been vetoed by the President. However, I know of no way to frame the amendment except to refer to House bill 6042 as such for the present. Whether it will become law or not I do not know. If it does not become law, it will be necessary, I think, to pass some other general subsidy legislation. So that for the present I think all we can do is to refer to that bill. It is still in a state of suspended animation.

Mr. FERGUSON. The RECORD will at least show what we are talking about.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will not do any harm to make reference to the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I may explain, Mr. President, that the Byrd-Butler law provides that every corporation must submit a budget, but "the budget program shall be a business-type budget, or plan of operations, with due allowance given to the need for flexibility, including provision for emergencies and contingencies, in order that the corporation may properly carry out its activities as authorized by law. The budget program shall con-

tain estimates of the financial condition and operations of the corporation for the current and ensuing fiscal years and the actual condition and results of operation for the last completed fiscal year."

The budget program shall then be submitted by the President to Congress, and it is provided that "the budget programs transmitted by the President to the Congress shall be considered, and if necessary, legislation shall be enacted making available such funds or other financial resources as the Congress may determine."

The idea was that the Government corporations should set out the general scope of their activities, realizing that we could not hold them down, that we did not know exactly how they may operate.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, in the Budget for the year 1947, has submitted a budget which provides for its major activities, including the supply program, the foreign purchase program, the price support program, the commodity export program, and the subsidy program.

Those items are set out in fairly general terms, and the language which we here propose to adopt provides the general program which they have set forth. That was the only purpose of the Byrd-Butler Act. It was that they could not suddenly develop a brand new program with funds which conceivably might be authorized by some law, or that some law might be stretched to authorize, without having given any notice to Congress. So what we do in this amendment is simply to use the language suggested by the Commodity Credit Corporation itself in the Budget message, that the types of program set forth in the 1947 budget of the Commodity Credit Corporation, within the funds available to it, are approved.

I think that carries out the purpose of the act and gives leeway for every activity of the Commodity Credit Corporation, except something brand new that no one ever heard of. Such an activity could not be engaged in without the approval of Congress.

The last proviso, that the subsidy program shall be subject to the provisions of House bill 6402, I think is necessary, because that bill contains rather specific figures on subsidies. Those figures and the RFC figures total about $2,000,000,000. We have just passed a bill which limits subsidies to $1,000,000,000. I presume that the amount will be still lower than that if the bill does not become a law. I think we should make it clear, in order to resolve the conflict, that this program should be subject to the provisions of the subsidy program which was worked out so carefully. So, Mr. President, I offer the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the second amendment, which deals with the RFC, on page 8, line 14, adding at the end of the paragraph the words: *"Provided further,* That the subsidy program shall be subject to the provisions of H. R. 6402."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the second amendment is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I was not present when this bill was taken up. There is an item in the bill of $3,000,000 to build a fertilizer factory. With as many defunct fertilizer factories as there are in the United States, as poor an industry as it is from the standpoint of earning capacity, I wish to place in the RECORD, at least for conference purposes, a brief statement. It had been my purpose to move to reconsider this amendment. I read the following telegram:

> Reported Senate Appropriations Committee has inserted in the corporations appropriations bill an item of $3,000,000 for TVA to build fertilizer plant at Mobile. This item has been rejected several times by the House and is reportedly not approved by the Budget. Mobile geographically not in TVA territory. Even if it were it would be outrageous for the Government to go into direct competition with fertilizer industry who are doing business and paying all forms of taxes both to the State and the Government for their support. * * * The Government can not run without taxes from private business and individuals. If they continue to go into competition from day to day with industry they deprive the Government of taxes and they will ultimately be without sufficient revenue with which to run.

Why it is necessary for the Government to build a fertilizer factory within TVA territory, or without TVA territory, passes my understanding. Anyone familiar with the fertilizer industry knows that it has been a low-earning industry for many years. Anyone knows that most of the fertilizer factories in this country have either got into great difficulty or have gone broke; and yet there is an effort to put the Government into an industry of this kind in competition with the enterprises which are trying to operate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to state why the committee put the item in the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me ask the Senator if it was approved by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. GEORGE. It was not recommended by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it was not. The reason why it was put in is that the evidence produced by Mr. O'Neal and others representing the American Farm Bureau Federation showed that there was a shortage of fertilizers, and had been a shortage for quite a while. This does not put the Government into the fertilizer business. It extends the Government's fertilizer business. As we all know, the Government has a large fertilizer plant at Muscle Shoals. This item simply adds a plant at Mobile, which is very close to the largest supply of phosphates that we now have, in Florida. The supply is even larger than the supply of phosphates in Tennessee. For that reason it was proposed to place the plant at Mobile, Ala. Mr. O'Neal, of the Farm Bureau Federation, appeared before the committee. He was greatly interested in the project. As we all know, this is one of the things in which the late Senator Bankhead took a very active interest. He succeeded in having the Senate approve the project on three occasions. The House has refused it each time, but the Senate has already approved it three times, and we felt that it should be recommended and approved this time. That is why the committee reported it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I dislike to take issue with the Appropriations Committee, but I should like to make this statement in all kindness: The Appropriations Committee is exercising a very wide jurisdiction in the field of general legislation. It is not fair to the Senate. It is not fair to the Congress. It is not fair to the country to have this kind of thing going on. This is legislation, and if it were approved by the House an appropriation might be made for the project.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is true that during the war many items of legislation have been added to appropriation bills. I think that practice reached the limit during the war. It has been very materially decreased lately. I think it ought to be further decreased. I do not believe that we ought to legislate on appropriation bills if it is possible to avoid it. Whenever it has been done, it has been by unanimous consent, because any legislation on an appropriation bill is subject to a point of order. That has never been better illustrated than in connection with this bill. Yesterday, by direction of the committee, I offered an amendment which was subject to a point of order, and two Senators made the point of order. The amendment went out. On the other hand, the substance of what was proposed by that amendment, which was subject to a point of order, was offered a few moments ago by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and unanimously accepted. That is the way it has been done. It has been done by unanimous consent. I think there is too much legislation on appropriation bills. However, the practice is very carefully guarded. It can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am not quarreling with my distinguished friend from Tennessee; but what happens is that the Appropriations Committee reports all sorts of legislative proposals. We must do something about them, so we get together, and in lieu of what has been brought in we adopt something by unanimous consent, when nothing ought to have been brought in in the first instance.

I am advised—and I wish to make this statement before the bill is reported—that in the Labor Department appropriation bill, which will shortly be before us, the highly controversial bill to return the employment services to the States is virtually incorporated as it passed the Senate. It has not been agreed to by the House. The House has a different version of that bill. That bill is now, or

should be, in conference. If such a provision is incorporated in the Labor Department appropriation bill I shall not hesitate to oppose it to the limit.

I merely want to emphasize what I am trying to point out as to one of the greatest evils into which we have fallen. Of course when there is placed in an appropriation bill and tied up with a great many other things in which all Members are interested, an item which ought not to be in it, then it becomes necessary to crawl around and by unanimous consent get it out by some means. We are almost powerless to vote it out; we are almost powerless to eliminate it in any other way.

The Appropriations Committee has its proper important function, but its function is not to legislate; and yet I unhesitatingly say that almost every appropriation bill is filled with legislative provisions. That ought not to be, and nobody but the Senate can protect itself.

I know about the fertilizer business, coming back to that. There is a shortage of fertilizer now, and let me tell the Senator from Tennessee why there is a shortage. There is a shortage of sulfuric acid which must be used in order to make a balanced fertilizer. There is a plant at Tuscaloosa, Ala., which was used by the Government to manufacture power and which is now in a stand-by condition and fully equipped to make sulfuric acid. The only people who can operate that plant said they were willing to do it provided they would get a price on sulfuric acid that would enable them to pay the cost. They had to go to OPA to get a price. The Civilian Production Administration said, "O. K.; we are anxious to do it." They were cooperating 100 percent. The persons seeking to operate the plant went to OPA. OPA gave an even better price than they asked, but said that everything must be based f. o. b. on Copperhill, Tenn. That meant that at the other plants where the same company was producing, which plants would be nearer the consuming centers, the freight would be less, but they would have to charge the same freight to the farmers as was charged from Copperhill. Of course, no other governmental agency save the OPA would have been so indifferent to the facts and so blind to the realities as to have attached that sort of condition.

There is a shortage of fertilizer because the present factories and plants cannot be utilized, and therefore the Government must build another plant, take another taxpayer off the tax list, strip the Government more and more year by year of tax revenues, and strip the counties and the States also. If the Federal Government continues to move at the rate it is going, if the Federal Government pursues the course it is now pursuing, the time is near at hand when the great industries of this country will of necessity be federalized, because independent industries cannot compete with the Government, and we will have a system of national socialism.

OPA was appealed to. An effort was made to make plain to them what the facts were, but they still have the problem there. They have had it for some time, and in the meantime the period in which fertilizers should be used is fast elapsing. It will do no good to get fertilizer in the wintertime when the crops that ought to have the fertilizer in the southeastern section have not been able to get it. Every time a Government factory is constructed to do what private enterprise can do, and is doing, it becomes more and more necessary for the Government to do the whole job. We are simply crippling private enterprise and at the same time professing that we are believers in private enterprise. I undertake to say there is no necessity for the building by the Government of a fertilizer plant at any point in Alabama or my State.

There was some reason for the fertilizer plant which was constructed in connection with Muscle Shoals because that plant was equipped to make nitrogen; it was equipped to make certain elements of fertilizer, and it was desired that experimentation should take place and that something be done through the Government that would illustrate whether it would be possible to make fertilizer by new methods and at cheaper prices. But now in this appropriation bill there is a $3,000,000 appropriation which is not recommended by the Budget Bureau, but which the committee has simply reached out and put into it.

I suppose it would be useless to make a motion to reconsider it; but I am making these remarks so that the House committee will know that whatever they do with this item will certainly have some support in the Senate. Furthermore, I am making this statement for the purpose of letting our own Senate conferees know that when the bill comes back here, even in the form of a conference report, I may steadfastly object to it and oppose it, if it has this item in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I am not going to offer an amendment but this bill carries a large appropriation for administrative expenses of RFC. To the RFC has been transferred the Rubber Reserve Corporation. I desire to point out to the Senate what our situation is in regard to rubber at the present moment.

During the war when the British, French, and Dutch could not defend their Pacific possessions and had great difficulty in sustaining themselves in their homelands, the American people, in their great anxiety, expended a large sum of money to create synthetic rubber plants where there could be produced more than 1,000,000 tons of synthetic rubber a year. When we, at great sacrifice of money and bloodshed, recaptured the possesions in the Pacific of the Dutch, the French, and the British, after we had given them tremendous amounts by way of lend-lease to sustain them, we had a contract with those countries to buy their raw rubber at 18½ cents a pound, but since the recapture of their possessions for them they are now asking us to pay 23½ cents a pound f. o. b. the far eastern ports. The OPA at the present moment—showing another ridiculous situation so far as that agency is concerned—will not allow a price of more than 22½ cents a pound for raw rubber in this country. This means that the American taxpayer has to absorb the difference. Under the 18½ cents purchasing price we can lay it down here at 22½ cents a pound, but under the 23½ cents a pound f. o. b. the Pacific, we will continue to lose money and let these foreign countries that we saved through lend-lease and through our sacrifice of blood and lives and through the recapture of their empire, gouge us further to the extent of over $32,000,000 a year. In that connection, I may say the British are taking the lead.

The other day there appeared in the Times-Herald an article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop outlining and stating that:

A person who was a member of then Secretary of the Treasury Vinson's original staff for handling the British proposal for a $4,400,000,000 loan discloses that Britain's claims of poverty are false, and recommends the loan be cut back accordingly.

I ask that the entire article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BUM DEAL

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

From within the United States Treasury comes news of official discovery that the British have kidded us again, and about big money.

A person who was a member of then Secretary of the Treasury Vinson's original staff for handling the British proposal for a $4,400,000,000 "loan" discloses that Britain's claims of poverty are false, and recommends the loan be cut back, accordingly.

This analysis has been furnished to top governmental authorities. It is so important that we reprint it here in full without attempting to translate. It's plain enough, anyhow. Here it is, dated June 19:

"The British loan should be re-examined and cut down to size.

"Actual trade developments since VE-day—as distinguished from the guesstimates made by those responsible for negotiating the loan—now demonstrate that the British do not need anything like the sum agreed on by the negotiators.

"As of last August, the British claimed that in the first year following VE-day they would incur a balance of payments deficit of three billions and in the next 2 years a further deficit of two billions.

"The British estimate for the balance of payments in the crucial first year of transition was as follows (Mr. Clayton's testimony, Senate hearings, S. J. Res. 138P118):

[In billions of dollars]

	Imports	Exports
Minimum imports, austerity level	5.2	
Commercial exports		2.6
Net balance on war expenditures	1.3	
Net balance on invisible items		.6
Total	6.5	3.2

Deficit: 3.3 billions of dollars.

"Ten months have now elapsed since VE-day and actual export and import figures are available against which to check the estimates made last August.

"British imports are actually running at a rate $1,000,000,000 less than they estimated. On the other hand, British exports are running at a rate $1,000,000,000 more than they estimated, thus reducing their estimated balance of payments deficit by $2,000,000,000.

"No information is currently available as to the actual developments with respect to the net war expenditures or the net balance

on invisible items, but both these are very probably more favorable than was estimated last August.

"Taking into account the actual flow of commodities it is perfectly clear that the balance of payments deficit in the first year after VE-day will amount not to the three and three-tenths billions assumed in August of last year, but to no more than and probably much less than one and three-tenths billions.

"This conclusion is confirmed by the British holdings of gold-and-dollar balances. During the last 10 months when the British expected a deficit in their balance of payments to cut sharply into their holdings of gold-and-dollar balances, nothing of that sort has occurred.

"According to British figures, their net holdings of gold-and-dollar balances at the end of the war amounted to $1,840,000,000. The latest figures supplied by the British show that 9 months later their net holdings were still $1,750,000,000.

"The decrease is accounted for by settlement of a Canadian account.

"It may be noted that as of April 1941 the British reported a net balance of gold-and-dollar exchange of zero.

"During the war and by reason of lend-lease and troop payments made to Americans throughout the empire their net balance of gold-and-dollar exchange increased to a level of approximately one and nine-tenths billions.

"There can be no doubt that during the war this country made a very powerful contribution to the improvement in the British gold-and-dollar-balance position.

"The loan should be referred back to committee and cut down in size.

"The figures cited above demonstrate the British balance of payments is actually very much more favorable than assumed by the administration when it negotiated the loan. If the loan was proper on the basis of the estimates made in August, it is obviously too large in the light of actual developments.

"The administration has failed to supply the committees of Congress with information showing the actual course of trade developments. This was not the only item on which they have failed to tell the whole story.

"They did not point out that Empire countries during the war enormously increased their holdings of gold and dollar balances. South Africa alone holds nine hundred millions—three times her prewar holdings. Nor did the administration indicate what it knew to be true, that the British liabilities to Empire countries would be substantially reduced.

"The British owe India four and five-tenths billion; Egypt, one and five-tenths billion; and Palestine, five hundred and fifty million. These sums, the administration has been informed, will be settled just as lend-lease was settled, at a small fraction of the nominal indebtedness.

"In the light of these considerations a cut in the British loan is clearly indicated. Indeed, there is reason to believe that quite apart from any loan or gift the British can receive all the assistance they may need in their balance of payment problem through the international fund.

"Through that fund, it may be recalled, the British can get, without any struggle at all, three hundred and fifty million every year to total one and three-tenths billion. If necessary they can, of course, receive much more than that."

There it is. Nobody in his right mind can misunderstand that memorandum. Nobody with the best interests of the United States at heart will ignore it.

The House of Representatives this week begins final consideration of that so-called loan to Britain. The memorandum quoted in full above shows as plain as day why that loan is a bum deal for the United States of America.

Instead of merely cutting it down, Congress will throw the loan out entirely if it wants to serve America first. At any rate, just remember what you read here. If the loan goes through, there will be big trouble to follow—and never let it be said that we didn't know.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I wish to say that either we should not continue to let the British gouge us on the price of rubber, or we should deny the loan. They do not need both. I believe the figures to which I refer are authentic, and indicate that the British do not need $3,750,000,000 at this time, and at the very most they would not need more than $1,300,000,000, which was the figure we discussed during the debate.

In all fairness to the American people, the Treasury, having these figures at the present time, owes it to the American people to disclose them before it succeeds in getting the other House to approve, on the basis of a completely erroneous set of facts and circumstances, a loan to a foreign country, of the size which has been approved by the Senate.

I wish to protect further the closing of the synthetic-rubber plants of this country. We need to keep those plants in running order, so that the American people may be protected for all time to come, or at least until we see some signs of honest-to-God cooperation throughout the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6777) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY, conferees on the part of the Senate.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1850) to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, this is a bill which was introduced by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. It has been referred to as the science bill. I should like to suggest that immediately after disposal of the bill the Senate take up Senate bill 1248, which is the so-called Fulbright bill. I believe that it would be well to have an understanding that both these bills be considered, because the consideration of them would point out the fact that they are two different and separate proposals.

When Senate bill 1248 was discussed by the Senate once before, there was some confusion and misunderstanding on the part of some of the Members because it was assumed at that time that the bills were interrelated, that there was much in common between them, and that the enactment of one or the other might interfere with the progress of the remaining measure. It was suggested that the enactment of both bills would result in a duplication of effort. Therefore, it occurs to me that, in view of the fact that both bills are on the calendar, and that each represents widely separated objectives and has little in common with the other, we should have the Fulbright bill taken up after we have considered and disposed of the pending measure, provided, of course, that there is sufficient time within which to do that without interfering with consideration of the appropriation bills and other important legislative matters.

Mr. President, with reference to the Fulbright bill, which differs from the Kilgore-Magnuson bill in that it relates to applied science rather than to pure basic science, which is the objective of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, I should like to make a few observations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that the Senator was asking for unanimous consent that the Fulbright bill be now considered?

Mr. MEAD. No; I was not. I was merely suggesting the possibility of the consideration of both these measures, one as quickly after the other as practicable, in order to point out the fact that they are two different and entirely separate measures. Moreover, the discussion of one might be helpful in connection with the consideration of the other in the event that the Fulbright bill is brought up not too long after the Kilgore-Magnuson bill has been disposed of.

Mr. TAFT. I want to suggest that there are many important bills on the calendar.

Mr. MEAD. When the Fulbright bill was discussed in the Senate on a prior occasion it was pointed out by a number of Senators that there was no other bill which covered the same situation. If it is understood that there are two bills on the calendar, and that they are not related one with the other, but deal with separate objectives and that we should take them up as soon as we can possibly do so, one after another, it will have a tendency to clear up the misunderstanding.

Mr. President, with reference to the Fulbright bill, Senate bill 1248, I wish to leave with the Senate the following observations:

During the war, when we needed the full strength of small business to help win the war, the Congress provided for the creation of a Smaller War Plants Corporation. I believe that the Senate is familiar with the creation, operation, and administration of that Corporation.

Prior to that time the Senate authorized the appointment of a Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises. That committee has, in my judgment, served the Senate and country well. It has been of great service to small business in bringing it into the war effort and in keeping small business in a good wholesome, healthy, and economic condition insofar as it was possible to do so.

Small business came through during the war, and now in these difficult days of reconversion we should help small business get back to peacetime production.

That is one reason for my great interest in the Fulbright bill. This bill would make the fruits of modern science available to American business; it would go far toward insuring the continued vigor of our entire national economy.

This bill is founded on the recognition that is an age of science, American business, particularly small business, will starve at the roots if it cannot make use of the fruits of science. This bill would tap, for the benefit of business, the vast store of technological information now in the possession of the Government. It would put existing Government research facilities to work in the interest of business. It would help business to make use of new inventions, new products, and new processes.

Mr. President, as the result of the strain and stress of the Nation's war effort, there are a great many new processes in a great many fields. In various fields, by reason of the shortage of materials, new provisions were made. New devices were utilized, and new practices and new procedures were inaugurated. All those new developments can be made available to the little businessman and small manufacturer, no matter where he is located, if he has available to him a central headquarters where he can secure the necessary information and service.

Mr. President, as I said, it will help business make use of these new inventions, new products, and new processes.

Under the strain of the war, many new methods and processes came into being all over the world, and many of those processes which came into being in the occupied nations are now being brought into this country. They would be available to small business if we had the particular set-up which is proposed in the Fulbright bill. Many of them would improve small business in this country and make it more efficient.

The Fulbright bill, S. 1248, presents the first real attempt at this session of Congress to help the small businessman, and also the large businessman and the medium-sized businessman, through the maze of new scientific developments which can be applied to their business. The Fulbright bill is practical; it is sound and workable. It presents no conflict with the pending bill or with any other bill, and it has developed no real opposition.

The Fulbright bill recognizes that in this age of scientific complexity only a few of the largest corporations have the research facilities necessary for national and international leadership. Dr. Condon, the new Director of the Bureau of Standards, who previously was associate director of Westinghouse laboratories, has testified that even in an organization as large as Westinghouse "the problem of adequately marshaling and bringing to bear all the available scientific and technical knowledge is extremely difficult."

If corporations as great in size as Westinghouse cannot marshal and bring to bear all the available scientific information, imagine the difficulties of the small businessman, the man without such laboratory facilities. I think it is an understatement, Mr. President, to say that the small businessman is confused and that the small businessman is handicapped. Even large corporations simply cannot afford to maintain the large laboratories and corps of technicians necessary to keep up with the pace of modern science; they often contract out their work. But work so handled is mostly inadequate and incomplete.

The Fulbright bill creates in the Department of Commerce an office of Scientific and Technical Services which will meet this problem and will be the agency of government which will collect and furnish technical information for the use of the businessman. It will not concern itself with pure science and its development. That will be taken care of by the pending bill, the so-called Kilgore-Magnuson bill. I wish to repeat that the Fulbright bill will not concern itself with pure science and its development. It will not concern itself with creative science and its activities. That is the function of the National Science Foundation which is created by the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, S. 1850, a bill which I favor, but which deals with an entirely different subject.

I wish to state definitely and categorically, Mr. President, that the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, S. 1850, is entirely different and apart from the Fulbright bill. The Fulbright bill has twice been brought up on the unanimous consent calendar in the Senate but both times it was sidetracked, due to misunderstanding and belief that it duplicated the Kilgore-Magnuson bill or dealt with the same subjects. The Kilgore-Magnuson bill, now being called up, establishes a National Science Foundation to coordinate and stimulate basic scientific research—and I stress the word basic—to be carried on by a number of Government agencies, by universities, and by private research laboratories. It will also provide scholarships and fellowships for training a larger number of young scientists. It will not concern itself in any way, in any shape, or in any form with the technical, applied, scientific problems of American businessmen.

Mr. President, during the war we developed a great deal of the lighter metals techniques. Aluminum and magnesium and lighter steel products were developed. All these techniques will be made available to the small manufacturers all over the United States if the Fulbright bill is enacted and if this agency to disseminate the information is created.

The National Science Foundation, Mr. President, which is provided for in the other bill, the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, will do no research of its own. It will operate entirely by means of research contracts. It will delegate to the Army the job of working on such new weapons as guided missiles and rocket ships. It will encourage the Navy to improve its ships and ordnance. It will foster basic research on the causes of cancer and other diseases. It will encourage and facilitate basic research which will contribute to scientific agriculture. In brief, the Kilgore-Magnuson bill will stimulate the progress of pure science and creative science in this country by research contracts and by training more young scientists.

The Fulbright bill, on the other hand, provides an entirely different program which stands on its own. It provides a program which is dependent on no other bill. It provides a program to give business the kind of practical assistance it wants and needs. It creates in the Department of Commerce an office which will be a businessman's office—an office to which the businessman can go with his technical questions. He will be able to go to the present field offices of the Department with his technical problems and he will be able to get some practical help. He will not be referred to a half dozen different agencies, as he now is. He will not be told that if he goes to Washington he may or may not find an answer.

The relation of the Fulbright bill to the National Science Foundation bill was very carefully considered by the Senate Commerce Committee, and the committee found no duplication or overlapping. This point is clearly and specifically covered in the Commerce Committee report on Senate bill 1248. It is report No. 908, and it has been available since January 29 of this year.

Mr. President, the Office of Technical and Scientific Services set up by the Fulbright bill will collect, analyze, compile, and maintain complete records and information regarding the latest scientific developments which are useful to business. Through publications and personal contacts that Office will make this information available to businessmen all over the country. For example, a small businessman in North Carolina, New York, or Nevada who needs a good metal corrosive will need only write or call on the Office or at the local Department of Commerce office and ask for the information. By return mail he will receive the information, together with all the information that is known to the Government about corrosive agents. With light metals now being used extensively in manufacturing, more and more of this information will be required, and it will be available.

The Office will also be the place where independent inventors can bring their inventions for evaluation, and at the Office, which will have adequate safeguards, they will be able to get assistance for the development of worthy inventions. One hears too many stories of inventors who have ideas who have been held up from 10 to 20 years because they had no one to whom to go who would evaluate their inventions and furnish suggestions as to where to go to get assistance in their development.

Finally, Mr. President, the Office will promote wide use in private business of the very great number of publicly owned patents which have resulted from Government research and development. The Commissioner of Patents, Casper Ooms, has testified that the bill does not involve any changes in the patent laws. It is not patent legislation, but it would make our patent system more effective. No objection to the bill has been made by the Association of Patent Attorneys.

Thus we see that the Kilgore-Magnuson bill and the Fulbright bill are entirely different bills—entirely different in purpose—entirely different in provisions—entirely different in function. Both bills are needed, but each bill stands entirely on its own merits. Neither bill depends on the passage of the other.

One thing I want specifically to mention is the fact that the Fulbright bill—to help the small businessman, and all businessmen, in their applied scientific problems—is not a revolutionary program, and is not a new program. Many of the functions under the bill are already being carried on by the Office of Declassification and Technical Services of the Department of Commerce. This office, which includes the National Inventors Council, was created by Executive order of the President under wartime powers. The President has also transferred to this office the functions of the Office of Production Research and Development of the old War Production Board and the Technical Advisory Service of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. In short, this present office in the Department of Commerce is doing much of the job of giving technical services to business and industry which the Fulbright bill provides, but most of these powers spring from wartime authority. It is our responsibility to make these functions a peacetime basis, so as to insure that the businessman, particularly the small businessman, gets a break. If we do not, we will be telling small business that we were willing to help them to get war production, but we are not interested in the welfare of small business in time of peace.

The services called for under the bill are not new ideas in American economy. Farmers for years have been receiving the benefits of the latest information in scientific agriculture through similar facilities in the Department of Agriculture.

Another important point to which I wish to invite attention is the cost of operations under this bill. Simply stated, the enactment of S. 1248, the Fulbright bill, would only cost this Government some $2,750,000 more than is now being expended for this work. The reason for this low figure is that many existing facilities and personnel of the Department of Commerce, particularly the National Bureau of Standards and the field offices, as well as the present Office of Declassification and Technical Services, will be fully utilized to provide this service to the American businessman.

I think it is clear, therefore, that this bill does not provide a hastily drawn, untried plan; instead, it provides a carefully drawn, tried, practical, and realistic plan, which will be of tremendous assistance to all businessmen in the United States, and is a "must" as far as the smaller businessman is concerned. It authorizes a continuance in peacetime of the tested and proven technical service which was provided during the war.

It is clear to me that every type of small and large businessman will benefit by the work of the Office of Technical and Scientific Services. It will cover most of the different fields of interest to business. A recent survey which I requested the Department of Commerce to make shows the range these projects might cover. Proposed projects include the assembly and publication of existing technical data on new metals and alloys for electrical equipment, weights and measures used in foreign trade, materials used in air conditioning, fire-retardant treatments for textiles, new paints and finishes, structural adhesives, waterproofing of concrete, cleaning of masonry, welding fluxes, and plastics molding. These are only a few examples of hundreds of fields where information of value to small business is waiting to be published and disseminated. This type of research into the scientific applied problems of businessmen can only aid and assist them. For this reason we should, we must, consider the Fulbright bill at a very early date.

I am confident that two facts will stand out during consideration of this bill. In the first place, there is no sound opposition to the bill, because it does not prejudice the interests of any group. In the second place, the bill is one of the most useful and practical small business measures yet proposed.

Mr. President, it occurs to me that it is high time the Congress seriously considered the plight of small business. The number of casualties resulting from the reconversion effort in the field of small business is alarming, and unless we maintain small business in this country in a strong, healthy, wholesome condition, I fear that our failure will have an effect upon our democracy itself.

All over the world new scientific developments have taken place and have been applied. Those scientific developments, the new processes, the new procedures, would improve the lot of the businessmen of this country. They would help keep our economy ahead of the developments in other countries. Encouraging them is one of the measures vitally necessary to our security. Therefore it occurs to me that after we consider and make our decision with reference to the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, which applies to pure and basic creative science, we should follow that by taking up the Fulbright bill as quickly thereafter as is practicable, because that bill pertains to another field, the field of applied science in the developing and in the spreading of information to the businessmen of our country with regard to the new techniques and new procedures which have resulted from the Nation's war effort.

I wish to make clear the point that the so-called Fulbright bill was under consideration heretofore on two different occasions, and it was set aside, in my judgment, through a misunderstanding. That misunderstanding rooted from the fact that there was another bill, the Magnuson-Kilgore bill, and if both bills could be considered within a reasonably short time of each other misunderstanding would not develop, because the bills are separate measures, their objectives are entirely different, they are not related, and we can be for one without being against the other. There is no duplication of effort, and in my judgment both the bills will prove very helpful.

Mr. President, I wanted to make clear that the Fulbright bill, reported by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Commerce, is separate and distinct from the Magnuson-Kilgore bill, and pertains to a different field, the field of applied science, and that it will be of great benefit to the business interests of the United States, particularly the small businessmen.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish first to endorse what the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] has said about the objectives of the bills. While the bills do not duplicate each other, I think they are complementary in the sense that if we are to get full advantage out of the scientific progress which has been made in pure science, it is necessary to have some medium through which to bring the new knowledge to businessmen, especially the small and medium-sized businessmen, or to large business, for that matter, because there is no practical process or machinery by which such information is made available to the business people of the country. If Congress should pass the Kilgore-Magnuson bill and fail to pass a bill similar to the bill referred to by the Senator from New York, we would have gone only half way. We would not have brought down to the levels where it could be used the knowledge developed under the Magnuson bill.

Mr. MEAD. My colleague is quite correct. If, as a result of the passage of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill new scientific developments result, then the agency proposed to be set up by the Senator's bill would more quickly bring such developments to the attention of the businessmen of the country. So there is a relationship, in that one complements the other. But the point I wanted to make was that the bill which the Senator is sponsoring does not duplicate the work provided for in the Kilgore-Magnuson bill; on the other hand, the Kilgore-Magnuson bill does not duplicate the work provided for in the Senator's bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is quite true. They have different functions, but they both contribute to the same end to a great extent.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And I think both are necessary to an effective, well-rounded program.

Mr. MEAD. As I pointed out, I favor both bills. One will prove invaluable in the field of basic science. The other will prove very helpful to the business interests of the country in the field of applied science.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one other matter. I came in, unfortunately, after the Senator had begun his remarks. Did the Senator state that he was going to move to take up my bill

after completion of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill?

Mr. MEAD. No. It was suggested that we act on the Kilgore-Magnuson bill, and then I took the floor to point out the possibility of considering the Fulbright bill as quickly after the disposition of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill as practical for us to do, having in mind the appropriation bills and such other matters as might take precedence over it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Since several Members have previously stated that they did not want the so-called Fulbright bill considered until the other bill has been considered, I think notice should be given now that it is our intention to bring up the so-called Fulbright bill as soon as possible after the disposition of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill.

Mr. MEAD. So there will be no possibility of misunderstanding the situation, I leave the thought with the Senate that so soon as possible after the disposition of the Kilgore-Magnuson bill I shall move consideration of the Fulbright bill.

THE SHORTAGE OF MATERIAL TO CARRY ON THE VETERANS' HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the veterans of the country, along with a great many other homeless citizens, are vitally concerned with the progress of the housing program. Some time ago the Senate and the House of Representatives passed certain legislation to expedite the construction of homes which would be within the means of the veterans. The other day there appeared in the Washington Post a full page advertisement describing a new business center which had been recently constructed, including a new theater and various other commercial establishments I think that no fair-minded person doubts that in building homes for veterans it is, of course, necessary to have certain other buildings which go to make up a community, including, of course, schools and churches and certain essential commercial activities. But it seemed to the veterans of this city, and particularly one of their national organizations, that a great many of these buildings did not fall within that essential classification, particularly so at a time when they have been unable to secure the necessary building materials in order to construct the homes which, after years of service to their country overseas or in the United States, they so sorely need.

The situation, Mr. President, was so serious, that the president of one of the new national veterans organizations, the Amvets, addressed a letter to Mr. John D. Small, Civilian Production Administrator, and, because I believe the situation is of such importance and the problem facing the veteran is so serious, I am going to take a few moments of the Senate's time to read the letter written by Mr. Jack Hardy to Mr. Small. The letter follows:

JUNE 27, 1946.

Mr. JOHN D. SMALL,
Civilian Production Administrator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMALL: The veterans of World War II and the Members of Congress must have been as startled and shocked as I, to see in today's issue of the Washington Post a full-page advertisement by the Shirlington Corp., of Washington, D. C., stating that there had been constructed and were currently in operation, 23 stores at Shirlington on the Shirley Highway, 2½ miles from the Pentagon Building, and that the most beautiful unit of a large restaurant chain was under construction there, as were 5 clothing stores, a shoe store, a jewelry store, and a picture frame shop.

This full-page ad further states that a woman's specialty shop of 18,000 square feet and a large department store will be "soon under construction" and that "other stores to come" include an auto agency and accessory store, a bowling alley and furniture, candy, hardware, optical, and ice cream stores.

Within 2 miles of Shirlington are vacant lots where builders who already have permits to build veterans' homes have put in foundations and are unable to continue because not a brick nor foot of lumber is available for residential construction. At the same time a mountain of brick and other critically needed building materials continue day after day to go into commercial construction for private profit, while millions of veterans and their families are virtually homeless.

The veterans of World War II and the many other deserving homeless Americans are full to the teeth and sick to death with excuses, double talk, evasion, softsoap, and delay. Official explanations to date are entirely unsatisfactory. They add nothing, and make not one foot of lumber or one brick available where it is most critically and urgently needed—in residential construction for the veterans of this war and their families and the many other needy Americans.

As national commander of the Amvets and on behalf of all veterans we demand immediate action to stop all nonessential commercial construction and that the material now going into construction of the type be made available immediately for veterans and other essential housing construction.

Mr. Administrator, the "chickens are coming home to roost" on the doorstep of those charged with responsibility for the national home building program for the particular benefit of the veterans of this war as determined by the President and the Congress of the United States.

The commercial building situation in Washington is not different than those which can be observed in dozens of other cities and smaller communities throughout the Nation. This situation borders on a national scandal. We are faced—and there are none who can outface us in our position—by a situation to which the will of Congress is being thwarted by local groups of selfish individuals, who are taking advantage of the loopholes in the laws and regulations to push construction which is for their selfish gain.

One of the big loopholes is the present composition of the CPA construction committees in the 71 CPA districts throughout the country which advise the district construction managers of CPA on the "essentiality" and nondeferability of nonhousing building, alteration, and repair projects.

These committees, set up for the most part while the members of this and other veterans' organizations were serving their Nation actively in the armed forces, do not include those most directly concerned with and interested in residence construction—veterans of World War II. It is urged that such committees be reorganized at once and that World War II veterans be placed thereon so that the interests of the veterans may be protected and the will and intent of the Congress followed to the letter.

In a national press release on Tuesday of this week the Civilian Production Administration points with pride to the fact that CPA "was able to turn back approximately 450,000 projects before they reached the formal application stage by persuading the applicants either that their projects were not essential or that they could be deferred." That is an imposing figure. The fact remains, however, that the approach was negative rather than positive, as shown by the figures for the remaining 10 percent. "From the remaining 10 percent nearly 50,000 who were convinced that their projects were essential and nondeferable or where stoppage would have resulted in extreme hardship, CPA sifted out 31,457 for approval and denied 14,971, Mr. Small said," the press release continued.

There we have in your words the fact that 31,457 applications for nonhousing construction were approved during the first 11 weeks of CPA control. Construction cost of these projects totals $1,370,751,048.

"A good part of the approved construction will not begin to draw on the building materials market until 4 to 6 months after the projects were approved, and hence it is not having immediate effect on housing," you are quoted, says the press release of CPA. That weak and vacillating administration of commonly established rules, even though they were written with firm determination, can result in equivocation and frustration is evidence in the building field today. We have agency pitted against agency and legal opinion buffetted against legal opinion. This situation cannot long continue without detrimental effect on the morale of the people, the faith of whom in orderly government must be maintained."

A Government agency must not only follow the letter of the law, but also must be guided by the full spirit of the law. There are none who can truthfully say that it was not the will of the people through the Congress that the green light be given fully to the home-construction program and that it be given first priority. In our opinion, now is the time to get back to fundamentals and to put the building materials where they belong—for the construction of homes for veterans and other homeless people. The chickens have truly "come home to roost" on the doorstep of official Washington. It is time to act. We ask that you fulfill your duties under the law now.

Sincerely,

JACK W. HARDY,
National Commander.

Mr. President, I think the national commander of that organization has put his finger on a very critical situation facing the country. I hope that the Administration, Mr. Wyatt, and Mr. Small will take immediate steps to investigate the charges made by Commander Hardy and his organization, and will do whatever is necessary to expedite the channeling of building materials into homes for veterans, until that problem can be met and solved.

AMENDMENT OF EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT AND FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION ACT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to report favorably, with the amendment, House bill 6477, to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and section 3 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and I submit a report (No. 1634) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have talked with the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] and the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and they have agreed to the consideration of

the bill at this time unless there is objection on the part of some other Senator. I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, may I ask what the bill is? I do not recognize it by the number.

Mr. MURDOCK. The purpose of the bill is to extend the authority for 1 year to make Land Bank Commissioner loans. We have been making such loans for a number of years, and it is thought by those who are administering the law that the authority should be extended for an additional year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, in section 3, on page 2, line 19, after the name "Federal", to insert "Farm"; and on page 3, line 1, after the word "on", to strike out "Agriculture and Forestry" and insert in lieu thereof "Banking and Currency."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXTENSION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency reported Senate Joint Resolution 156, Calendar No. 1545, to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is necessary to obtain action upon this measure. There is no opposition in the committee. I may say that another appropriation bill will soon be reported, but the report has not yet arrived. It is expected soon. While we are waiting for it, I thought we might dispose of this measure.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the joint resolution has the approval of the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. BARKLEY. It has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the numerals "1952" and the semicolon, to insert "and"; and in the same line, after the word "section", to strike out "5 (d)" and insert in lieu thereof "5d", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That, (a) the first sentence of section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out "for a period of 15 years from the date of the enactment hereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "through June 30, 1952"; and the first sentence of section 14 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out "at the expiration of the 15 years for which the Corporation has succession hereunder" and inserting in lieu thereof "prior to July 1, 1952"; and (b) section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, the act approved January 26, 1937 (50 Stat. ch. 6, p. 5), as amended, and the act approved February 11, 1937 (50 Stat., ch. 10, p. 19), as amended, are hereby further amended by striking out "January 22, 1947" wherever appearing and in each instance inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is this a measure extending the Reconstruction Finance Corporation?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For the purpose of the RECORD, I should like to state that unfortunately I was absent attending a conference in Bermuda on the day this measure was considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I realize that the RFC will be extended in spite of my views, but I wish to express my own opinion that it is time to consider the liquidation of this agency. I feel that in view of its history and the reasons for its organization in the midst of a depression, it would be entirely proper for us to provide for its liquidation under present conditions. As I have said I was not present when the committee met, and did not register any opposition at that time. However, I feel that it would be a very reassuring gesture to the country if the activities of this agency which should be continued were returned to the Treasury Department and to the Department of Agriculture, and the agency itself discontinued. This would go far to disprove the often repeated statement, that we can never rid ourselves of a bureau or agency, even when the conditions which called it forth have passed. If we should need the RFC again in the future it would be easy to recreate it. In view of the enormous growth of bureaus and the necessity for some curtailment in Government expenditures, it does seem to me that it would be a good thing to liquidate this agency, not only because of its psychological effect but also because it would return to the Treasury substantial assets which are no longer needed for the purposes of the original RFC. This would demonstrate to all that our democratic system is sufficiently flexible to meet emergencies and at the same time is able to avoid the dead hand of an ever-expanding bureaucracy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for an hour.

There being no objection, the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) took a recess for 1 hour.

On the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 59 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 19, and 62 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Overton
Andrews	Hill	Pepper
Ball	Hoey	Radcliffe
Barkley	Huffman	Reed
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Burch	Kilgore	Russell
Bushfield	Knowland	Smith
Byrd	La Follette	Stanfill
Capehart	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Swift
Carville	McClellan	Taft
Chavez	McKellar	Taylor
Donnell	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Magnuson	Tobey
Ferguson	Mead	Tunnell
Fulbright	Millikin	Wagner
George	Mitchell	Wherry
Gerry	Moore	White
Gossett	Morse	Wiley
Green	Murdock	Willis
Guffey	Myers	Wilson
Gurney	O'Daniel	Young
Hart	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6739, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6739) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6739), which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the amount of the bill as passed by the House was $1,136,500,238. The amount of the net increase by the Senate committee was $14,928,127. The amount carried by the bill as reported to the Senate is $1,151,428,365. The amount of the appropriations for 1946 was $1,202,631,586. The amount of the regular and supplemental estimates for 1947, is $1,178,075,900. The bill as reported to the Senate is under the estimates for 1947 by $26,647,535, and is under the appropriations for 1946 by $51,203,221.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The first amendment of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary," on page 2, line 4, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$862,000" and insert "$937,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 8, after the word "services", to strike out "$925,000" and insert "$979,645."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 3, after "$2,000)", to strike out "$695,528" and insert "$727,104."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 5, after "Department of Labor", to strike out "$3,137,033" and insert "$3,170,981."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 15, after "Department of Labor", to strike out "$652,410" and insert "$65,782."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Labor Statistics", on page 5, line 19, after the word "laws", to strike out "$4,772,000" and insert "$5,043,587"; in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,050,000" and insert "$3,113,654"; and in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$685,913" and insert "$857,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Children's Bureau," on page 7, line 17, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$438,535" and insert "$501,664."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "United States Employment Service," on page 13, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,417" and insert "$62,500"; in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$149,200" and insert "$895,220"; and in line 11, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$17,129,250" and insert "$34,258,500, and, without limitation upon the availability of other funds for the same purposes, $11,000,000 for the liquidation of unrecorded and contingent obligations, including the payment of accrued annual leave, arising in connection with the transfer of employment office facilities and services to State operation; in all, $45,258,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 8, to strike out:

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES

For payment to the several States, beginning October 1, 1946, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended to January 1, 1942 (29 U. S. C. 49–491), and for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the sum of $51,387,750: *Provided*, That no State shall be required to make any appropriation as provided in section 5 (a) of said act of June 6, 1933, as amended to January 1, 1942, prior to July 1, 1948.

And insert in lieu thereof:

For grants to States (including Alaska and Hawaii) beginning January 1, 1947, to finance the proper and efficient administration of State-wide systems of public employment offices, in accordance with standards and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor as necessary to carry out this act, title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and the purposes of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, as amended (excluding section 5 thereof), and, upon the request of any State, for the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, $34,258,500, of which $288,500 shall be available to the United States Employment Service for all necessary expenses, including personal services, in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of Columbia.

On December 31, 1946, the Secretary of Labor shall transfer, to the State agency in each State designated under section 4 of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, as amended, as the agency to administer the State-wide system of public employment offices in cooperation with the United States Employment Service under said act, the operation of State and local public employment office facilities and properties which were transferred by such State to the Federal Government in 1942 to promote the national war effort. The Secretary of Labor may also provide for the transfer and assignment to such State, without reimbursement therefor, of any other public employment office facilities and properties, including records, files, and office equipment: *Provided*, That as a condition to such transfer and assignment of Federal properties, the Secretary may require the recipient State to waive any claim which may then exist or thereafter arise out of the use made by the Federal Government of, or for the loss of or damage to, property and facilities transferred to the Federal Government as hereinabove described.

The Secretary of Labor shall withhold or deny certifications of funds for a State system of public employment offices unless he finds that the State—

(1) (a) has made provision for the transfer to and retention in the State-wide system of public employment offices of employees of the Federal Government who (on the day preceding the effective date of the transfer of the employment offices to the State under this act) have been employed in State or local employment service functions in such State, in the positions occupied by them under the Federal service or in reasonably comparable positions, except that individuals so transferred may be separated or terminated for good cause as determined in individual cases under the applicable State merit system, or separated or terminated under the applicable State merit system by reason of reductions in force found necessary in the interests of efficient operations, and may be separated (A) if they have failed to acquire eligibility for continued employment in the State-wide system of public employment offices under the State merit system in the positions occupied by them under the Federal service or in reasonably comparable positions, after having been given a reasonable opportunity to acquire such eligibility, or (B) if the Secretary has determined that it is impracticable for them to be given an opportunity to acquire such eligibility; and (b) has made provision for the extension to employees of the Federal Government who left employment-service positions in such State in order to perform training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States or service in the merchant marine as defined in Public Law No. 87, Seventy-eighth Congress, of the same employment rights and privileges as those provided for Federal employees transferring to State employment in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph; or

(2) has requested the detail of the employees referred to in clause (1) (a) of this paragraph to the State agency under the following provisions: So much of the funds appropriated for State-wide systems of public employment offices as may be necessary shall be available to the Secretary of Labor, in lieu of any portion of the grant to the State, for the payment of compensation (under the salary scales applicable to such employees prior to the effective date of the transfer of the employment offices to the State under this act) to employees of the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor, who, upon the request of the State, and for the purpose of permitting continuity in their employment pending an opportunity to acquire eligibility for State employment in accordance with clause (1) (a) of this paragraph, may be detailed by the Secretary of Labor to the State agency for service in the State-wide system of public employment offices.

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, any person who was appointed to a position in the Social Security Board under Executive Order 8990, of December 23, 1941, and who shall have returned to employment with the State at any time prior to the end of 1 year after the return to State operation of the employment offices in such State, shall, if he so elects, be paid a refund of the total amount of his deductions and deposits under this act, together with interest to the date of termination of his service with the Federal Government; and such person shall not receive any annuity benefits under said act based on the service covered by the refund unless he is subsequently reinstated, retransferred, or reappointed to a position coming within the purview of said act and redeposits all moneys, except voluntary contributions, so refunded to him, together with interest at 4 percent compounded on December 31 of each year, except that interest shall not be required

covering any period of separation from the service.

In carrying out the provisions under this heading, the Secretary shall assure that each State agency operates under such methods of administration relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, as are found by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this heading (except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods), and has made reasonable provision for facilitating the free movement of workers seeking employment and employers seeking workers, and for the replacement of any funds appropriated by the Congress for State systems of public employment offices which, because of any action or contingency, have been lost or have been expended for purposes other than or in amounts in excess of those found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration of the State system of public employment offices.

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to expend in any State, after January 1, 1947, so much of the funds appropriated for State systems of public employment offices as may be necessary to operate a State-wide system of public employment offices under the control of the Secretary if no State system of public employment offices exists in such State or if, and for so long as, the State is not eligible for Federal funds for such purposes. Except to the extent that a system of employment offices under the control of the Secretary is operated within a State either (1) pursuant to the specific request of the governor of such State, or (2) with funds specifically appropriated by the Congress for the operation of such system under the control of the Secretary, the Secretary shall not expend more than $1,000,000 in any fiscal year for the purposes of this paragraph or operate a system of employment offices in any State pursuant to this paragraph for more than 3 months in any fiscal year.

Whenever funds are paid to the same State agency for the purposes of this act and of title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, (1) such State agency may, if it so elects, submit to the Secretary and the Social Security Board a joint budget covering both the function for which grants are made under this act and the functions for which grants are made under such title III; in such case, the Secretary of Labor shall, if the State agency so elects, certify to the Social Security Board the amounts to be paid to the State for the purposes of this act and upon receipt of such certification, the Social Security Board shall certify such amounts to the Secretary of the Treasury, in addition to the amount, if any, payable by said Board under the provisions of section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended. Any additional amounts so certified by the Social Security Board shall be paid to the State by the Secretary of the Treasury out of the appropriation herein made available; and (2) the State agency may commingle such funds and account therefor by such accounting, statistical, sampling, or other methods as may be found by the Secretary of Labor and the Social Security Board, respectively, to afford reasonable assurance that the funds paid to the State agency for the purposes of this act and the funds paid to the State agency under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, are expended for the respective purposes of this act and such title III.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I draw the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the amendment just stated.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to be heard on this amendment. I have been in conference with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] who I understand has been interested in the insertion in the bill of substantially the bill recently passed by the Senate, and on which I understand also from the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the House has declined a conference, and has therefore stopped action upon the bill as it left the Senate.

My objection to this particular phase of the new language inserted in the bill is that it goes a shade beyond the original power of the Secretary to make rules and regulations and to prescribe standards which the States must meet in setting up their employment services.

I think the Senator from Minnesota is willing to accept an amendment which I have discussed with him which will obviate this difficulty so far as I am concerned.

When the United States Employment Service Act was before the Senate, it was repeatedly stated that the Federal Government was paying all the cost and the State governments none of it, and that, therefore, the Secretary of Labor, who now has jurisdiction in the premises, should fix the standards and the regulations. That is a misconception of the facts. Actually when we provided for the State employment system it was on a basis of joint State and Federal action. The Congress levied a tax, but the Congress gave to the States the right to recapture all but three-tenths of 1 percent of the tax, provided the States would come in with their own plans for a joint State and Federal employment service. When the States came in with their plans, they had to sit down with the Secretary and had to square the plans with certain minimum standards fixed by the Secretary. But to talk about the Federal Government furnishing all the money is not a realistic approach to the problem at all. The Federal Government has no money except what it gets out of the taxpayers of the States, and we were desirous of setting up a joint State and Federal employment service. So we levied a tax, and said to the States, "If you will pass your act setting up this service, you may recapture or have a credit for all but three-tenths of 1 percent of the tax levied by the Federal Government. Then the three-tenths is to be repaid for the purpose of bearing the administrative costs of the joint State and Federal program."

Therefore, Mr. President, it is not a case of the Federal Government furnishing the money. It is a case of the Federal Government having levied a tax, but saying in the same breath, "We are levying this for a joint State and Federal purpose. Now we ask the States to cooperate, to pass acts, to take back 2.7 percent of the money which we are taking out of the taxpayers of the States and passing it back in this way."

Under that system the State and Federal Government sat down together and established a joint plan. We did say that the Secretary would have the authority to fix certain minimum standards which the State must meet. But in this language, and in the bill which the Senate passed a few days ago, the Secretary is given the absolute right to make of every State official administering the employment service nothing but a mere clerk to carry out the dictates of the Department of Labor here in Washington. Every day he would have to get a directive, every night he would have to change his course if he got another directive. That is what I do not want to have happen.

If these employment services are to go back to the States at all, they should as a matter of good faith go back to them just as we took them away from the States, or as they voluntarily turned them over to us. If they are not to go back, and we wish a completely federalized system, that is a totally different question, but it is now proposed that we turn them back.

I have no objection to the provision giving the Secretary of Labor the power to fix standards and regulations to carry out title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, which he must have anyway, since that service has been transferred to him, and to issue rules and regulations and to prescribe standards for the purposes of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933. But the two are altogether different, when we consider that, in the first instance, we were setting up a joint system, and now it is proposed that we give to the Secretary of Labor this broad, general authority to fix the standards and regulations as the condition on which the State shall get back its service, with the further provision that if the State does not comply with such standards, if it fails to meet the standards and regulations, then the Secretary of Labor may recapture the State system and bring it back into the Federal system.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BALL. I discussed this provision with the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and I am in accord with him that we do not need in this bill to expand greatly the power of the Secretary of Labor. I agree with the Senator that it is not wise normally to put this much legislation, such lengthy provisions, in an appropriation bill. But the substantive legislation which the Senate passed earlier this week has been bottled up in the Rules Committee of the House, with no indication that it will ever even get to conference, and in order that the transfer back to the States of the services may be made in an orderly manner, and that the Federal employees may at least be given a chance to qualify for State employment, it is necessary to include some provisions, particularly from title III of the bill which we passed earlier last week, in the pending appropriation bill.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia about the language on page 15 in the committee amendment, and I move to amend by striking out on lines 21, 22, and 23, the language "in accordance with standards and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor as necessary to carry out this act," and to insert in lieu thereof the words, "to carry out," so that it will read, "to carry out title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield for the offering of the amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Minnesota from what page he has been reading?

Mr. BALL. From page 15 of the bill, lines 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, that amendment at that point in the bill is satisfactory to me. Of course, I am not speaking for anyone else, but it does meet the objection which I had in mind, and which seems to me to be entirely valid if we are to have a joint State and Federal system.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, before accepting the amendment, I should like to know whether there are other amendments to the italicized language.

Mr. GEORGE. There is one other amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wonder if we may not have the other amendment discussed, then accept both of them together.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is one on page 20, as the Chair recalls.

Mr. BALL. The other amendment is on page 17, in line 21, after the word "employment", to insert the following language: "superior to that of any war veteran competing for appointment." The effect of that, Mr. President, is simply to make sure that if the Federal employees transfer, and if they are not war veterans, they take a competitive examination, but if a war veteran gets a higher eligibility rating the war veteran gets the appointment. That was our objective all along.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to the amendment. I accept the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the amendment I wanted to have incorporated in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed amendment on page 15 has not been agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I accept that amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to speak to this matter before the amendment is acted on, because I want to be sure that I know what it does.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I yielded to the Senator from Georgia, who in turn yielded to the Senator from Minnesota. Does the Senator from Georgia have any amendment to propose?

Mr. GEORGE. No. Those are the two amendments which I said are necessary and proper. In view of the fact that the bill which was passed earlier in the week has not been sent to conference, and therefore there is no opportunity in connection with that bill to iron out the differences between the two Houses, I readily accede to the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Senator from Nevada that it is necessary to have something in the bill so that the conferees may be able to act intelligently.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Minnesota for the amendments which I have accepted.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to go along with the proposal made by the Senator from Minnesota, if the amendment means what he says it means; but for the record I desire to make perfectly clear that it does protect the standards which were fought for on the floor of the Senate last Tuesday. If this is a way of reopening the controversy that took place on the floor of the Senate last Tuesday, on which we had a series of record votes, and which I think settled the issues by rather a preponderant majority of the Senate, I want to know it before I vote on the question. Therefore I wish to read a brief statement, and to ask the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Nevada, when I get through, if the situation is as presented by this statement is a correct statement of fact:

As I understand, these provisions were included in the Labor appropriation bill as a substitute for substantive legislation inserted as a rider in the Labor bill by the House. These are the significant factors: (1) The House is attempting to effectuate the return of the Employment Services to the States by substantive legislation attached as a rider to the Labor appropriation bill. This substantive legislation is the provision which would modify the Wagner-Peyser Act requiring the States to match Federal funds granted and instead provide for 100 percent Federal financing. (2) The Senate passed substantive legislation (H. R. 4437) on June 25, 1946, which would have returned the Employment Services to the States in an orderly manner, but the House has refused to appoint conferees to consider the bill. Thus, the Senate has been balked by House action in its efforts to return the Employment Services to State operation under H. R. 4437. (3) The Senate must either accept the House rider in the Labor appropriation bill, which constitutes substantive legislation wholly inadequate to accomplish the return of the USES in an orderly manner, or must substitute the necessary provisions to effectuate an orderly return.

The following provisions from H. R. 4437, as passed by the Senate, are contained in the Labor appropriation bill:

1. Return of the Employment Services to the States and authority to transfer property and records needed to operate the Employment offices.

2. Transfer of personnel to State employment until they can be given an opportunity to take an examination for permanent employment.

3. Authority to return to such employees the deductions to their credit in the Federal Civil Service Retirement fund.

4. Requirement for States to maintain a merit system governing the employment in the States of these personnel.

5. Requirement that States refund misspent moneys.

6. Guarantee of operations of local offices clause.

7. Requirement for Secretary to certify funds through the Social Security Board where States submit a single budget unemployment compensation and employment service.

I should like one of the pages to take the memorandum to the Senator from Nevada so that he may have it before him as we carry on this discussion.

I may say to the chairman of the subcommittee that if this so-called rider language in the Labor appropriation bill accomplishes the purposes set forth in the memorandum which I have sent to the Senator from Nevada, in that event I do not find myself in disagreement at least with the objectives of the language in this bill, but I should like to have an answer to this question: Am I correct in my understanding, after listening to the Senator from Minnesota, that if this language is adopted, along with the amendment to which he has agreed with the Senator from Georgia, the Secretary of Labor will have the continued authority in a specific State case to insist that the State meet the decent minimum standards which he will prescribe for the operation of the State's employment service? In other words will the failure on the part of a State to set up minimum standards result in no Federal money going to the State until minimum standards are set up? Further I ask does the Secretary of Labor under the rider have the authority to function under the so-called guaranty-of-operations clause?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, as the question is addressed to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I will say in reply to the Senator from Oregon that a great many of the substantive changes—in fact, most of the substantive changes which we made in the Wagner-Peyser Act in H. R. 4437, are not in this language.

We confined ourselves in this language primarily to provisions which we felt were absolutely necessary for an orderly transfer of the services back to the States. It is my contention that the amendments suggested do not at all affect those provisions which relate primarily to the right of the employees at least to be given an opportunity to acquire eligibility in the State service. The Secretary still has, of course, his basic authority to issue regulations and fix standards under the Wagner-Peyser Act. We do not change that at all. He has the authority delegated to him by General Bradley of the Veterans' Administration, under title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, to require that there be maintained an employment service for veterans. I do not think the language which we would strike out by this amendment was necessary, and it could be interpreted as perhaps broadening the authority which the Secretary has under the existing law.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota two or three further questions on this subject, because, as we pass upon this bill, I think it of great importance, so far as the intent of the Senate is concerned. Let us suppose that the State of Minnesota sets up an employment service, which in the opinion of the Secretary of Labor, under the rules and regulations as they have been administered heretofore, does not meet the minimum standards the Secretary of Labor believes ought to be met in order to justify the expenditure of Federal money for an employment service by the State of Minnesota, and he so notifies the authorities of the State of Minnesota. Assuming that this rider is the legislation which will be passed, will the Secretary

have the authority then to withhold from the State of Minnesota Federal funds, and, under the guaranty-of-operations clause of the bill which was passed by the Senate last Tuesday operate, for example, a Federal service for at least 90 days?

Mr. BALL. For 90 days only.

Mr. MORSE. For 90 days only. And within that 90-day period until such time as Minnesota and the Federal Government can iron out their differences?

Mr. BALL. Yes; he would have that authority. He has that authority under the basic Wagner-Peyser Act. He has to give the State opportunity for a hearing. As a matter of fact, I do not know of any case in the history of that act of funds having been withheld. They have a hearing and they eventually get together on operations. The recapture clause for the 90-day period is in this bill. Frankly I do not think it would ever go into effect, because in this Federal-State relationship, what happens is that they iron out their differences and get together on a mode of operation. It does assure continuity of service, as the Senator from Oregon says.

Mr. MORSE. In order that I may be perfectly clear about it, I further understand from the Senator from Minnesota that this so-called rider language will in no way destroy the rights of present Federal employees in the Employment Service if they meet the requirements of the examination on merit which would have to be given by the States under their own State civil-service regulations. Or, to put it this way: If a present Federal employee in Minnesota takes the merit examination in Minnesota on the return of the service to the State and is within the top three, would he have his so-called preference rights under the language of this rider?

Mr. BALL. Yes. In further reply I will say he would have a preference right unless he was not a war veteran and a war veteran was higher than he was on the eligible list.

Mr. MORSE. That was our agreement the other day, too.

Mr. BALL. Yes. And the language simply makes that clear.

Mr. MORSE. That is protected by the pending amendment. My next question is this: The Senator says that what is sought by this rider language is to return the service to the States in an orderly manner, but it does not contain all the substantive provisions of the bill which we agreed upon by majority vote last Tuesday.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Minnesota tell the Senator from Oregon in what major aspects this rider language differs from the bill which the Senate passed the other day and which is now resting in the House of Representatives with a refusal on their part to appoint conferees?

Let me express a fear which is entertained by the Senator from Oregon. I assume that there must be some major differences between the language of the rider and the bill which the Senate passed, or that bill would be going through the House, and would not be blocked by a refusal to appoint conferees. I wish to know if what I am voting for involves a major difference as compared with the bill for which I voted the other day, and which I took an active part in trying to get through this body.

Mr. BALL. In House bill 4437 we rewrote the Wagner-Peyser Act completely. We somewhat broadened the purposes of that act. We eliminated the requirement for a plan, and gave the Secretary somewhat broader authority—although not as broad as some of the opponents of the bill contended—to set the standards and issue regulations by which the States would have to abide; and we included in it referral standards. None of those things are in this amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] who had charge of the other bill on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware, who had the floor leadership in connection with the employment service bill last Tuesday, whether he is satisfied from the language of the so-called rider to this bill that the major objectives of the bill for which we fought on the floor of the Senate last Tuesday, which bill we succeeded in passing, are protected?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think they are protected. I should like to read a telegram which will show the objectives of those who were opposing House bill 4437. This telegram was sent on June 24:

H. R. 4437, DIRKSEN, covering return of employment service to States as amended by Education and Labor Committee, does not provide bona fide return. Repeals Federal recapture and control features opposed by all State unemployment administrators and the Governors Conference. House appropriations bill H. R. 6739 scheduled for consideration Senate next week will accomplish genuine return of employment service to State control October 1. Separate legislation covering transfer of personnel can follow later. Your opposition to H. R. 4437 as reported sought.

So this comes a long way from meeting the requirements of those who were opposing House bill 4437. I believe that it accomplishes the main thing sought to be accomplished by House bill 4437. I believe it is worth accepting.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Has the Senator from Oregon concluded?

Mr. MORSE. I have one further question. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada, now that he has had an opportunity to look over the memorandum which I have submitted to him if he agrees that the points listed, which set forth my understanding of what is accomplished by this rider language, are an accurate statement of the effect of the rider?

Mr. McCARRAN. The language of the rider accomplishes each and every one of the seven points raised by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Nevada. I wish to make clear both to the Senator from Nevada and to the Senator from Minnesota that the primary objective of these questions is to lay a legislative foundation for any future court interpretation which may be called for on the basis of the intent of the Senate at the time the bill was passed.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. If the Senator does not mind, I should like to have read the several points raised by the Senator from Oregon. I was not in the Chamber when they were read.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall read the seven points raised by the Senator from Oregon. His question was whether or not the following provisions from House bill 4437 are contained in the rider:

1. Return of the employment service to the States and authority to transfer property and records needed to operate the employment offices.

That is accomplished by the rider.

2. Transfer of personnel to State employment until they can be given an opportunity to take an examination for permanent employment.

That is accomplished by the rider.

3. Authority to return to such employees the deductions to their credit in the Federal Civil Service Retirement fund.

That is accomplished by the rider.

4. Requirement for States to maintain a merit system governing the employment in the States of these personnel.

That is accomplished by the rider.

5. Requirement that States refund misspent moneys.

That is also accomplished by the rider.

6. Guaranty of operations of local offices clause.

That is accomplished by the rider.

7. Requirement for Secretary to certify funds through the Social Security Board where States submit a single budget Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service.

That is accomplished by the rider.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a further question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. STEWART. The fourth point is as follows:

Requirement for States to maintain a merit system governing the employment in the States of these personnel.

The Senator says that that is accomplished by the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. By the rider.

Mr. STEWART. By the provision in the so-called rider, or the amendment reported by the committee. Will the Senator point out that language?

Mr. McCARRAN. On page 17 of the bill——

Mr. BALL. If the Senator will yield, it is the paragraph at the top of page 20.

Mr. McCARRAN. The language is as follows:

In carrying out the provisions under this heading, the Secretary shall assure that each State agency operates under such methods

of administration relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, as are found by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this heading.

Mr. STEWART. Down to that point, that accomplishes approximately what I wished to inquire about. Does that mean that there shall be in each State a uniform merit system, or may one State have one kind of merit system, and another State another kind?

Mr. McCARRAN. Each State may have a merit system of its own.

Mr. STEWART. Suppose they are not uniform?

Mr. McCARRAN. They may not be uniform, but if they are acceptable to the Secretary, that is the standard.

Mr. STEWART. The point I am making is, Can the Secretary require that they be uniform?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not so construe the language.

Mr. STEWART. The Secretary must approve them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; but in approving them he does not necessarily require that they be uniform.

Mr. STEWART. Suppose he refuses to approve them unless they are uniform?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that the only reason for that language is that in 1941, when these services were operated by the States, they were operated under two acts, the Wagner-Peyser Act and title III of the Social Security Act. At that time the President had transferred the Employment Service to the Social Security Board. Under title III of the Social Security Act the Social Security Board had exactly the same authority, in identical language with that contained in this bill, to require a merit system. As a matter of fact, the same language now applies to the administration of unemployment compensation. So when the employment offices were taken over by the Federal Government in January 1942, the States were operating under that identical language. But in this instance we make the appropriation solely to the Department of Labor, because since then the USES has been transferred to the Department of Labor, and the operation is entirely under the Wagner-Peyser Act, which contains no such clause. Merely to retain the same identical set-up which we had in 1941, we placed that language in the bill. It does not require a uniform system in all States. It merely requires that the appointments shall be made on some kind of merit basis. The Secretary has nothing to say about who is appointed, what he is paid, or how long his tenure shall be.

Mr. STEWART. If there is a requirement for a uniform merit system, as it is called, the system in my State or in the Senator's State may be under fire at some time or other because it does not accomplish what the Secretary desires to have accomplished. If the requirements of the Secretary as to the merit system are not met, what recourse does the State have?

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I invite the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to the following language:

In carrying out the provisions under this heading, the Secretary shall assure that each State agency operates under such methods of administration relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis as are found by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this heading.

Under the language of that provision I do not think the Secretary will have any authority to go any further and say that systems have to be uniform.

Mr. STEWART. Then, looking beyond that, and skipping over some of the language, we find the provision:

Operates under such methods of administration * * * as are found by the Secretary to be necessary.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes. That has been practically in effect under the Social Security Act for years.

Mr. STEWART. Then let me ask this question, and then I shall not bother the Senator very much more. On the same page, page 20, in line 9, after the parenthesis and the comma, we find the following words:

And has made reasonable provision for facilitating the free movement of workers seeking employment and employers seeking workers.

What does that mean?

Mr. TUNNELL. That is the very purpose of the act; namely, to try to enable those seeking employment to find employers, and to try to enable employers who are seeking help to find the employees.

Mr. STEWART. Was a similar provision contained in the bill which the Senate passed a few days ago?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think it is the exact language.

Mr. MORSE. It is the exact language.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; I am told that it is the exact language.

Mr. STEWART. Is there hidden in any of this rider or amendment any effort, so far as the Senator knows, to reinstate the so-called FEPC which was so obnoxious to a good many of us a few months ago?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], because this language was largely in his charge.

Will the Senator from Tennessee state his question again, please?

Mr. STEWART. I asked whether there is hidden within the words of the amendment or the rider, or within it, whether hidden or not hidden, an effort to reinstate the FEPC provisions pertaining to employment, particularly the employment of minority groups, which were so obnoxious to so many Senators a few months ago.

Mr. BALL. I say to the Senator, absolutely not.

Mr. STEWART. I am satisfied with that statement.

Mr. TUNNELL. I say to the Senator that that was in paragraph 11 of 4437, which came in under the Advisory Council.

Mr. STEWART. It was deleted from this?

Mr. TUNNELL. It was deleted from this.

Mr. McCARRAN. I say to the Senator that I am very sure there is none of it in this bill.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question is on the adoption of the two amendments of the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment. Without objection, the two amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amendments to the committee amendment were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the adoption of the committee amendment as amended, striking out lines 9 to 17 on page 15, and inserting other matter, ending on page 22, in line 11.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, were both the amendments to the committee amendment adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both the amendments to the committee amendment were adopted.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Federal Security Agency—Food and Drug Administration," on page 25, line 17, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$869,300"; in line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "35" and insert "85"; and in line 22, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$3,037,181" and insert "$3,631,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 26, line 17, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$113,202" and insert "$133,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Freedmen's Hospital," on page 27, line 6, after the word "special", to strike out "intruction" and insert "instruction"; and in line 14, before the words "of the", to strike out "establishment" and insert "establishments."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Education," on page 29, line 15, after the word "among", to strike out "the more scholarly"; and on page 30, line 2, after the word "same", to strike out "$991,990" and insert "$1,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 34, line 20, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$14,565,000" and insert "$15,565,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 6, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$1,950,000" and insert "$1,985,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, in line 21, after the word "regular", to insert "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 25, after the words "purchase of", to strike out "two" and insert "twenty"; and on page 39, line 3, after "(5 U. S. C. 118 (a))", to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$2,061,813."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Saint Elizabeths Hospital," on page 41, line 12, after the word "residence", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That not exceeding $200 additional may be paid to two employees to provide mail facilities for patients in the hospital."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Social Security Board," on page 44, line 8, after the word "herein", to strike out "$3,250,000" and insert "$3,497,535."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 20, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$2,900,000" and insert "$3,028,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 19, after the word "and", to strike out "compenstion" and insert "compensation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Administrator, Federal Security Agency," on page 46, line 4, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$190,044" and insert "$195,659."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, Office of Community War Services, Federal Security Agency," on page 47, after line 6, to insert:

Salaries and miscellaneous expenses, social protection: For all expenses necessary to enable the Federal Security Administrator to carry out the provisions of Public Law 163, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended by Public Law 381, Seventy-ninth Congress, and the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in matters relating to social protection, and for other purposes" (S. 1779, 79th Cong., or H. R. 5234, 79th Cong.), when and if such act is enacted into law, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $15,000 for the temporary employment of persons by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws; acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger automobiles; to accept the cooperation of the authorities of States and their counties, districts, and other political subdivisions, in carrying out the purposes of the acts; $460,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 2, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$109,885" and insert "$126,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 5, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$270,235" and insert "$289,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 19, after the word "employees", to strike out "by" and insert "of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 8, after the word "journals", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—National Labor Relations Board," on page 54, line 23, after "(50 U. S. C., App. 1501–11)", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in connection with investigation, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed in whole or in part of agricultural laborers as that term is defined in the Social Security Act in section 409, title 42, United States Code."

And on page 55, after line 4, to insert:

No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used by the National Labor Relations Board in any way in connection with any petition or complaint by or on behalf of any individual having authority, in the interest of an employer, to hire, transfer, lay off, recall, promote, demote, discharge, assign, reward, determine the amount of wages earned by, or discipline not less than five employees of the employer, or to adjust their grievances, or to effectively recommend any such action.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think this amendment should have further consideration at the hands of the Senate. I think the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] might well explain the item.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, first let me ask whether the amendment striking out the proviso beginning in line 23 on page 54 has been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been adopted. Both parts of the amendment have been read, but no action has been taken.

Mr. McCARRAN. What was the action on the amendment striking out lines 23 and following on page 54?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question will be put on that amendment.

All in favor of the adoption of the amendment——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Minnesota should explain the item.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I think the first part of the amendment relates to striking out the provisio in reference to packing-shed workers. That amendment begins in line 23, on page 54.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. BALL. I do not know whether there is any contest in regard to that item. I do not think there is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment striking out the proviso beginning in line 23 on page 54 and ending in line 4 on page 55.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning in line 5, on page 55, inserting certain new matter.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the committee amendment in line 5 on page 55.

A week or two ago both the Senate and the House passed the so-called Case labor bill, section 9 of which provided that supervisors, as defined in that section, should no longer be considered employees for purposes of the Wagner Act. That section grew out of the fact that the National Labor Relations Board had rendered several conflicting 2-to-1 decisions. At first the decisions excluded supervisors from the definition of employees; but later, by another 2-to-1 decision, the Labor Board included them, and held that under the National Labor Relations Act the employer could be forced to bargain with a union of foremen or could be forced to permit his foremen to join a union, even a union of production workers.

The issue was discussed fully on the floor when that specific amendment to the Case bill was before the Senate. To my mind it is simply a question of divided loyalty. Under the court interpretations of the Wagner Act and the Board decisions, an employer may be cited and found guilty of an unfair labor practice on account of an act performed by a supervisor. The Board has now taken the position that the employer also may be required to recognize and deal with a production worker's union or an independent union of foremen. Particularly when they are in a production worker's union, they are in the position of having their loyalties divided. They are required to abide by the rules and constitution of the union, and at the same time they must represent the employer in the most important contact between management and the production workers.

It was the overwhelming opinion of both Houses of Congress that that situation did not make sense, and therefore they adopted that particular section of the Case bill, which did not deny the supervisory employees the right to join unions, but simply said that the Government, through its laws and this enforcement agency, would not force the employer to bargain with such a union, and would not require him to retain in his employ a foreman who joined the union against the employer's wishes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I wish to continue my statement first, please.

Mr. President, that bill was vetoed by the President; but in his veto message the President, in discussing this particular section, specifically said that he believed that that line must be drawn in legislation. He objected to the way the Congress had attempted to draw it, but he admitted there was a need for legislation on the subject. So it is clear that early in the next session of Congress we shall attempt to deal with this situation.

But now we are faced with the possibility or probability, I may say, that there will be a terrific drive on the part of both the CIO and the A. F. of L. to

organize foremen, with the full backing and support of the National Labor Relations Board, under their present interpretation of the act.

So when Congress reconvenes in January and attempts to deal with this question, we may find ourselves facing a fait accompli, namely, the fact that a great number of foremen have been organized into the unions, under the impetus and protection of the Wagner Act; and then it will be too late or at least much more difficult to deal with the subject legislatively. It is in an attempt to hold that situation in status quo until Congress and the President, both of whom have recognized the need for legislation on the subject, can agree on what is a proper remedy, that I have offered this limitation on the appropriation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Oregon, I wish to say that, as regards this amendment, it grieves me very much to disagree with my young friend, the Senator from Minnesota. I was very much interested in his presentation of the amendment. I voted against it in the committee and I shall vote against it on the floor, because I do not believe it represents a proper method to employ in bringing about the result which the Senator from Minnesota desires. I believe that the result should be achieved by a legislative bill. However, the matter has been submitted to the Parliamentarian and it has been held that the proposal is a limitation, and it is not subject to the rules. As I have said I voted against the amendment in the committee, and when the amendment comes to a vote in the Senate I shall again vote against it.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks just made by the Senator from Nevada. I say to my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota, that I have great admiration for him. One of his qualities which I admire most of all is his absolute frankness and integrity of statement. I believe that he has just made a statement which is characteristic of statements made by him, whether on the floor of the Senate or off the floor of the Senate. He never leaves one in doubt as to where he stands on any issue or as to his motives. I admire that characteristic. It is one which I believe is highly desirable in all men.

The Senator has told us this afternoon, honestly and frankly, that the purpose of the language of the amendment is to seek to accomplish what, after all, he was not able to accomplish as one of the sponsors of the Case bill which was vetoed by the President.

Mr. President, it is true that the President of the United States did just exactly what the Senator from Minnesota has said he did, namely, to point out that a line should be drawn between rank-and-file workers and supervisory employees. However, there is nothing in the veto message which would support any conclusion, and I am sure the Senator from Minnesota did not imply it that the line which the Senator from Minnesota seeks to draw in this amendment and the type of line the President referred to. However, in order to avoid any danger of such an interpretation being made, I may point out that there is nothing in the language of the veto message on the Case bill which would support the conclusion that the line of this amendment is the line that the President of the United States thinks should be drawn when we draft legislation covering this subject.

The Senator from Minnesota is also quite correct in his statement that, in the next session of Congress, we will have before us the problem of adopting a labor code. I shall not consume the time of the Senate on this occasion to express my views as to the desirability of such a code. I have referred to it in other speeches on this floor. But what the committee amendment does seek to accomplish is that, by the proposed rider, we will now pass substantively on the whole question of organizing supervisory employees. I believe there to be only one place where that should be done. It should not be done in an appropriation bill but in the form of a bill for a labor code which I think will come before the Senate at the beginning of the next session of Congress.

What the Senator from Minnesota is trying to do—and I make no criticism of it—is to obtain what will amount to a legislative handicap favorable to those who seek the type of legislation affecting supervisory employees which the record of the Senator from Minnesota shows that he favors. I assert that the place to fight out that issue on the merits will be in the next session of Congress, next January and February, when we shall face head-on the question of what type of labor legislation substantively this body should pass. I think it is most unfortunate to seek to accomplish that objective this afternoon by way of an amendment to the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I wish to make one more comment and then I shall be through. I assert that it is not fair for us at the present time, without due consideration which should be given to this matter in a committee, to say that we will vote for this proposal for the reason, among others, which the Senator from Minnesota advances, namely, the fear that between now and next January there may be a great organizational drive to bring about the organization of supervisory employees. Whether that will take place or not will have no bearing on what we should or may do on this issue in January or February next year. But until the matter can be handled in accordance with the ordinary procedure for the passing of substantive legislation, I do not believe this body should try to handle it by way of a rider to the pending bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I may say that before we take a vote on this matter, it is the intention of the junior Senator from Oregon to suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask for a roll call vote on the rider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 54, beginning in line 23.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Overton
Andrews	Hill	Pepper
Ball	Hoey	Radcliffe
Barkley	Huffman	Reed
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Burch	Kilgore	Russell
Bushfield	Knowland	Smith
Byrd	La Follette	Stanfill
Capehart	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Swift
Carville	McClellan	Taft
Chavez	McKellar	Taylor
Donnell	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Magnuson	Tobey
Ferguson	Mead	Tunnell
Fulbright	Millikin	Wagner
George	Mitchell	Wherry
Gerry	Moore	White
Gossett	Morse	Wiley
Green	Murdock	Willis
Guffey	Myers	Wilson
Gurney	O'Daniel	Young
Hart	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I wish to say a few words in opposition to the amendment. It seems that from a parliamentary standpoint it is permissible to attach such an amendment as this to an appropriation bill. I understand that it is a limitation instead of a substantive amendment, according to the precedents of the Senate. It is, however, just as much a violation of the spirit of the rule as can possibly be written. To each appropriation bill we now find antilabor amendments attached. On the very last day, supposedly, when appropriation bills can be passed, the very last week day before the end of the fiscal year an appropriation bill comes before the Senate containing what is generally recognized and what is intended to be an antilabor amendment.

Mr. President, is that to be a regular course of procedure? At the close of the fiscal year each time an appropriation bill comes before the Senate must we have a controversial amendment attached to be held as a club over the Senate and the Executive, since the bill must be passed at this time, to force the acceptance of these objectionable and controversial amendments? Is it a club over the people of the Nation?

I object to the spirit, I object to the principle of attaching such amendments, which are known as and which are in fact intended to be antilabor amendments, appropriation bills, and particularly at this time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I insist that I have a right to the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thought the Senator from Minnesota had risen to obtain the floor. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress gave consideration to the ever growing practice of appropriation committees attaching legislative riders to appropriation bills in the guise of limitations on expenditures. I wish to read a paragraph or two from the report filed on March 5, 1946, on that bill:

> The practice of attaching legislation to appropriation bills is often destructive of orderly procedure. Riders obstruct and retard the consideration of supply bills. Sometimes they contradict action previously approved in carefully considered legislation.
>
> In most cases such legislation is adopted under the parliamentary guise of "limiting provisos," avoiding points of order that would be raised against them by purporting to restrict the spending of Government funds. These practices, when used for purposes other than to effect real economies, should be prohibited by a tightening of the rules.
>
> Otherwise the regular jurisdiction of the standing committees of the House and the Senate will continue to be impinged upon by the appropriating committees.

Mr. President, I concur whole-heartedly in that conclusion of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

During the period I have been a Member of this body I have seen this practice grow until today there is hardly an important appropriation bill brought up for consideration which does not contain in fact substantive amendments to existing law disguised in the terms of limitations on the expenditure of funds.

I do not quarrel at all with the interpretation of the rules and the precedents made by the Parliamentarian informally on this amendment. It is certainly drawn in the guise of a limitation on the expenditure of money. But there is not a Senator present who does not know that this makes a very substantive change in existing law, and violates the spirit, although not the letter, of the rules and precedents of the Senate.

Mr. President, I think the practice should be curtailed, and the bill for the organization of Congress which passed the Senate and is now awaiting action in the House includes a proposed amendment to rule 16 of the Senate, which makes an effort to limit and curtail the practice of obtaining substantive change in existing law in the guise of a limitation on the expenditure of funds.

Mr. President, the particular item under consideration has created a great deal of controversy before the National Labor Relations Board. Cases have come up and been argued and decided in one way, and the Board has heard other cases and has made decisions recently which look in another direction, so far as this problem is concerned.

I have no doubt that, if and when the concurrent resolution which has passed the House and is now in the Committee on Education and Labor, scheduled for consideration on Monday, is agreed to, creating a joint committee to study the whole question of labor relations and labor laws, that committee will give very serious and earnest consideration to the question which is involved in the pending amendment.

I do not think this is a wise or the sound way in which to legislate. I think a continuation of this practice as stated by the report of the joint committee will, if carried to its ultimate and logical conclusion, result in the impairment of the functioning of the standing committees of the Senate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the committee amendment which is pending begins with the language starting on line 5, page 55 of the bill.

I listened with great interest to what the Senator from Wisconsin said. I notice, however, that the argument about legislation on appropriation bills seems to depend on whose ox is gored.

There are half a dozen other limitations in the bill to substantially the same effect. Just a few moments ago we adopted the committee amendment relating to the United States Employment Service, which was clearly legislation on an appropriation bill, merely because we found ourselves in such a situation that that was the only way by which the Senate had a chance to get into conference its view on the question raised.

In the matter of the organization of supervisors, I may say that I was not in Congress when the Wagner Act was passed, but I would wager that in the minds of nine-tenths of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives who voted for that act there was never the slightest idea that foremen, who have the power to hire and fire and discipline employees, who are responsible agents of the employer, would ever be considered employees under the act. Yet, the National Labor Relations Board, in a series of 2-to-1 decisions, has so held. I think it is an impossible situation, if we want responsible management to continue in this country.

Congress passed substantive legislation by overwhelming majorities in both Houses. The bill was vetoed by the President, but in his comments on that particular provision he stated there should be legislation on the subject. It was just that we could not quite agree on a particular form.

When Congress returns next January to consider the permanent legislation which we and the President agree is needed, what if for 6 or 8 or 10 months there has been a terrific drive to organize foremen into unions, with the backing of the National Labor Relations Board, which can put an employer in jail if he does not bargain collectively with a union of foremen, or if he does not permit a foreman to join a union? If we find the foremen organized, then our legislative task will be ten times more difficult in dealing with the situation.

The pending amendment would not prohibit any foreman from joining a union. It merely provides that if he does, and if the employer does not think he can operate effectively as the employer's agent when he is in a union, the employer can discharge him, and the foreman cannot go to the National Labor Relations Board and cite the employer for an unfair labor practice.

Mr. President, that is the effect of the amendment. It freezes the situation for the next fiscal year, until Congress may have a chance to try to get together again with the President on proper legislation in this field.

I may add that in the most recent case before the National Labor Relations Board, the Jones-Laughlin case, it was held by two to one that the employers would have to bargain collectively with foremen who joined the United Mine Workers. Recently the coal mines were taken over by the President, and Secretary Krug is about to sign, if he has not signed already, an agreement forcing the foremen to join the United Mine Workers' Union.

What that particular decision does is to deprive the employer in that case of any chance ever of getting that decision into court, and that is the best decision to take to court. This whole question has never been decided by the courts. It is entirely an interpretation made by the NLRB. But once the employer signs a contract—and he will have to sign it to get his mines back—he is foreclosed from ever getting the matter into court, because the only way to do so is to defy the NLRB order, the union complains to the court, and the employer is brought into court. I think this proposal is the only fair way of holding the situation until we get another chance to consider it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this proposal, offered in committee and adopted by a majority of the committee, is undoubtedly presented in the bill with the idea of preventing the organization and establishment under law of foremen's unions. I do not think it will accomplish the result which my good friend, the able Senator from Minnesota, seeks to have accomplished. He says that during the absence of Congress there will be set up foremen's unions, and such unions will have so established themselves that it will be impossible for Congress to deal with them when it reconvenes. The amendment would not prevent the establishment of foremen's unions. The establishment of foremen's unions could go on notwithstanding the adoption of the amendment. The only thing the amendment would do would be to prohibit the application of Federal money for use with respect to any trouble arising in such unions or between them and the National Labor Relations Board. That is one thing. The amendment would not accomplish the result of retarding the organization, the existence of or the growth of unions composed of foremen if such unions are in the making now.

The question is so close, and it has been regarded as being so close, that groups and legislative committees have dealt with it in various ways. Are we now in an appropriation bill under consideration, which must be passed on this last working day of the fiscal year, going to deal haphazardly with a matter which

deserves long and careful study at the hands of legislative committees? It seems to me Mr. President, and I so stated in the committee, that this is not the time and this is not the bill on which to accomplish legislation of this kind. I hope the yeas and nays will be granted on this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on this question, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. ANDREWS voted "yea" when his name was called.

Mr. McCARRAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. A vote for the committee amendment, that is to retain the committee amendment in the bill, is a vote "yea," is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. And a vote to reject the committee amendment is a vote "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there has been no answer to the roll call, has there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; there has been a vote "yea." The clerk will proceed with the calling of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], who if present would vote "yea" on this question. I am therefore free to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO and Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business, having been appointed to the Commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I also announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State. He has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the Commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—31

Andrews	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hart	Smith
Bridges	Hoey	Stewart
Brooks	Knowland	Swift
Burch	McClellan	Taft
Bushfield	Millikin	Wherry
Capehart	Moore	Wiley
Capper	O'Daniel	Wilson
Ferguson	Overton	Young
George	Radcliffe	
Gerry	Reed	

NAYS—34

Aiken	Huffman	Morse
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Murdock
Carville	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Chavez	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Donnell	La Follette	Pepper
Downey	Lucas	Russell
Fulbright	McCarran	Taylor
Gossett	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McMahon	Tunnell
Guffey	Magnuson	Wagner
Hayden	Mead	
Hill	Mitchell	

NOT VOTING—31

Austin	Connally	McFarland
Bailey	Cordon	Maybank
Bilbo	Eastland	Murray
Brewster	Ellender	Robertson
Briggs	Hatch	Saltonstall
Buck	Hawkes	Shipstead
Butler	Hickenlooper	Stanfill
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Tobey	Walsh	Willis
Tydings	Wheeler	
Vandenberg	White	

So the committee amendment on page 55, lines 5 to 13, inclusive, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—National Mediation Board—National Railroad Adjustment Board," on page 57, line 8, after the word "services", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That compensation for any referee who is a public official of any Federal, State, or local government shall not be paid from this appropriation for any period of time during which any such referee is receiving compensation for his employment in any such Federal, State, or local government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VII—General provisions," on page 59, after line 10, to strike out section 801, as follows:

SEC. 801. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 6, to change the section number from "802" to "701."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 12, to change the section number from "803" to "702."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I am authorized by the committee to offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Civilian war benefits: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and travel, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the civilian war benefits program heretofore financed from the emergency fund for the President, to provide medical and hospital care (including prosthetic

appliances and medical examinations) by contract without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments, to (a) civilians within the United States who have been injured as a result of enemy attack or of action to meet such attack or the danger thereof, or who have been injured while in the performance of their official duties as civilian defense workers; (b) civilians disabled as a result of illness, injury, or disease which occurred during detention by the enemy; and (c) the dependents within the United States of individuals injured or killed under circumstances described in clause (a) or (b) or reported as missing as a result of enemy action, $158,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I believe that this amendment should be called to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who wished to be heard on it. I do not see him in the Chamber at present. I wonder if we can postpone action on the amendment until he has an opportunity to be present.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be temporarily passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I am authorized by the committee to offer this amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Civilian war assistance: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the Civilian War Assistance program heretofore financed from the emergency fund for the President, to provide (a) temporary aid (including medical care by contract, transportation, and other goods and services without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments) to citizens of the United States or their children under 18 years of age who have been interned or stranded, and returned to the United States, or who have been evacuated from any area under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States, and (b) for the return of civilians evacuated from the Philippine Islands or Hawaii to the United States under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States during the period from December 7, 1941, to September 15, 1945, $5,495,000, which amount may be expended by advances or grants of funds or otherwise, to such Federal or other agencies as the Administrator may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$575,000" and insert "$649,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to return to the amendment which was passed over temporarily. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] does not seem to be in the Chamber. I am advised by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] that the Senator from Tennessee would have no objection to the amendment if there were in it the language "citizens of the United States or their children under 18 years of age." That language is already in the amendment which has been offered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may the amendment be read again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be again read:

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Civilian war benefits: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and travel, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the civilian war benefits program heretofore financed from the emergency fund for the President, to provide medical and hospital care (including prosthetic appliances and medical examinations) by contract without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments, to (a) civilians within the United States who have been injured as a result of enemy attack or of action to meet such attack or the danger thereof, or who have been injured while in the performance of their official duties as civilian defense workers, (b) civilians disabled as a result of illness, injury, or disease which occurred during detention by the enemy, and (c) the dependents within the United States of individuals injured or killed under circumstances described in clause (a) or (b) or reported as missing as a result of enemy action, $158,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is some confusion as between the two amendments. The other amendment is the one referred to by the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The other amendment has already been adopted.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that the language to which he refers is in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada on behalf of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to be clear in my own mind as to the other amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator permit the Senate to dispose of the pending amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, when the item on page 50 was before the Committee on Appropriations for consideration several members of the committee objected very strenuously to the use of the words "to civilians." On my motion there was inserted, instead of the language "to civilians", the language "to citizens of the United States or their children under 18 years of age." What the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and I, and other members of the committee, would like to make sure is that that language is in the amendment adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment heretofore adopted by the Senate will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 50, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Civilian war assistance: For all expenses necessary, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to enable the Federal Security Administrator, in order to continue during the fiscal year 1947 the civilian war-assistance program heretofore financed from the emergency fund for the President, to provide (a) temporary aid (including medical care by contract, transportation, and other goods and services without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and money payments) to citizens of the United States or their children under 18 years of age who have been interned or stranded, and returned to the United States, or who have been evacuated from any area under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States, and (b) for the return of civilians evacuated from the Philippine Islands or Hawaii to the United States under the direction of the civil or military authorities of the United States during the period from December 7, 1941, to September 15, 1945, $5,495,000, which amount may be expended by advances or grants of funds or otherwise, to such Federal or other agencies as the Administrator may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment has already been adopted.

The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6739) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MEAD, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. WHITE, Mr. BALL, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 6042) entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. TIBBOTT, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 6682, Calendar No. 1663. The bill was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary yesterday and is on the calendar today. It is an emergency measure. The law will expire at midnight on the 30th of this month.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6682) to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution to extend the effective period of the emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. O'DANIEL. I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish Senators would withhold their objections for a moment, in order to see if we cannot reach an understanding. I realize that, the Senate being in session following a recess, the joint resolution could not be introduced without unanimous consent. If it were introduced and objection were made to its present consideration, that would, of course, postpone action on it so far as today is concerned. The joint resolution would go to the the Committee on Banking and Currency, where it would be subject to consideration and amendment, and to the same procedure as applies to any other bill or joint resolution.

If objection were made to the mere introduction of the joint resolution now, of course that would necessitate an adjournment of the Senate until the following day or until some future day, at which time we would have a morning hour, when the introduction of bills and resolutions would be called for. The joint resolution could then be introduced. If any Senator then objected to its introduction, it would have to lie over a day, and that would postpone it one more day.

I have talked to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and to other members of the committee. Some of them seemed to be fearful that if the Senator from New York were permitted to introduce his joint resolution today, an immediate call would be sent out to the members of the committees to hold a meeting of the committee, and they would meet and would try to report the joint resolution to the Senate today.

I can assure all Senators that the Senator from New York, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, has no intention of calling a meeting of the committee before Monday, at which time the joint resolution would be subject to all the rules and regulations which apply to any other measure.

Therefore, it would seem to me that no point would be gained by objecting to the introduction of the joint resolution today, because at best the joint resolution could not be adopted today. I have frankly stated to everyone concerned that there is no human possibility of the Senate enacting any legislation on the subject between now and midnight tomorrow night, so the OPA law would lapse, anyway. Regardless of whether it lapsed for 1 day or for 2 days or for a week, new action on the part of the Congress would be required, the time when that action would be taken would be a matter of conjecture, and would make no serious difference.

So, Mr. President, I hope Senators will not object to the introduction of the joint resolution today. If the Senator from New York were to seek immediate consideration of the joint resolution, I realize that objection would be made.

But I hope Senators will permit the joint resolution to be introduced today and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and thus let the committee on Monday take whatever action it may see fit to take.

I may say that I have urged that no snap judgment be taken by the committee today, because with so many members of the committee out of town it is felt that no fair judgment would be obtainable.

So I hope no objection will be made to the introduction of the joint resolution today.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect and admiration for our majority leader. From what he says, and I believe him unqualifiedly, it appears that no action would be taken before the OPA Act expired on Sunday at midnight on the joint resolution proposed to be introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

Mr. BARKLEY. I say to the Senator from Texas that no action could be taken on it before Monday. It is just a question of timing, a question as to when it could be taken up.

But there is no use for us to "kid" ourselves, and I have no desire to "kid" either the Senate or the country. There is no humanly possible way by which action could be taken by Sunday night.

So, under the circumstances, I see nothing much to be gained by objecting to the introduction today of the joint resolution of the Senator from New York, and to letting it go to the Banking and Currency Committee. The only difference would be the time when the joint resolution could be introduced.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I think I have made it plain that I am against the OPA.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I got that impression the other night. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. I saw very little opportunity to cause the OPA to expire, but I hoped and prayed that it would expire, and I did everything I could do to bring about that result. Now, with the help of the President, it looks as if it has come about.

However, I am inclined to believe that we have had help from on high; we have had help from God, as well as from man, on this matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Bible says that the prayers of the righteous availeth much. But we might enter into a long debate here as to who is or who is not righteous. [Laughter.]

I hope, however, the Senator will not object to the introduction today of the joint resolution, because by objecting he will not gain any time or advantage.

Mr. O'DANIEL. All I would lose would be the honor of objecting to the introduction of the joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The joint resolution would provide, would it not, for a continuation of the present OPA Act?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. If objection is made, that will mean that the OPA Act will die at midnight tomorrow. But if before that time a continuing joint resolution is introduced, that will be before the Banking and Currency Committee, and it might be amended so as to continue in force the present OPA Act. Otherwise a new act will be required.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say that the mere introduction of a joint resolution continuing a law does not continue it. The joint resolution has to be acted upon by the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. But it holds out to the President and to those who favor the OPA the hope that there will be a continuation of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not think it holds out any hope of any kind.

Mr. WHERRY. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no use in trying to see spooks which do not exist. There is no way to prevent the introduction of the joint resolution either today or Monday. If it is introduced on Monday, it still will have to be referred to the committee, and in the meantime the OPA law will have expired at midnight on the previous Sunday. If the joint resolution is introduced today, it will have to go to the committee, and the OPA law will expire at midnight on Sunday, anyway.

So I see nothing to be gained by objecting to the introduction of the joint resolution today.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. What particular advantage would there be to the opponents of the joint resolution as between objecting now or objecting later to the introduction of the joint resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is hard to say whether there would be any advantage or disadvantage to either side.

There is this to be said: If permission is given for the introduction of the joint resolution today and its reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency, the committee could be called into meeting on some day next week, not earlier than Monday.

Mr. MOORE. It could be called into meeting today.

Mr. BARKLEY. It could be, but it will not be.

Mr. MOORE. Well, I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. A meeting of the committee will not be called today. If the Senator cannot rely upon my assurance on that subject——

Mr. MOORE. No; I do not want to deceive anyone at all. I wish to see this thing die. The Senator from Kentucky knows that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I gathered that impression also from the Senator. But it will die. It will be just as dead on Monday morning if this joint resolution is introduced today, as it will be if the joint resolution is not introduced until Monday. That is the truth about it.

Mr. MOORE. That may be perfectly true, but I still have not had an answer to the question why it would be a favor to allow the joint resolution to be introduced today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then it would be pending before the Banking and Currency Committee, so that the chairman of the committee could call a meeting of the committee for Monday, if he wished to have the committee meet on Monday, or he could call a meeting for Tuesday. I imagine he would try to call the meeting for Monday.

If the joint resolution is introduced on Monday, the Senator from New York could still call a meeting of the committee that afternoon, if he saw fit to do so. But I will say to the Senator that it would be more convenient to permit the introduction of the joint resolution now and let it be referred to the committee, rather than to have to adjourn the Senate from now until Monday in order to have a morning hour, and then have the Senate spend 2 hours in the morning hour, in order that the Senator from New York might introduce his joint resolution on Monday. That is about the only difference.

I say to the Senator that regardless of whether the joint resolution is introduced today or is introduced on Monday, he will lose no advantage which he would have after the expiration of the OPA law.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the majority leader said before, and I noticed it carefully and I read it in the RECORD again, that if the extending joint resolution is introduced, then it will be open to amendment and there can be attached to it the conference report or any other provision which it may be desired to attach to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is absolutely correct, and that is true either as to the committee or as to the Senate. In other words, the joint resolution is a simple joint resolution continuing the operation of the OPA Act. If the joint resolution never is enacted, of course the OPA Act never is revived, and it remains dead.

But the joint resolution could be amended in the committee. A majority of the committee could add to the joint resolution the bill which the President has just vetoed. The committee could make it even worse, if a majority of the committee preferred something worse. Or it could make it better.

But no matter what the committee did, the joint resolution still would be open to amendment in the Senate, and it would be up to the Senate to decide what sort of joint resolution it would pass, or whether it would agree to pass any.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I take it that the real question which confronts us is whether we shall now by unanimous consent permit the introduction of the joint resolution, or whether the Senator from New York as a matter of right will introduce the joint resolution on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct; that is really about all there is to it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The OPA Act is now in effect.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is; yes.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Therefore, a resolution known as a continuing resolution would be properly named.

If the OPA Act expires at midnight on Sunday night, how could a continuing joint resolution be introduced on Monday?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that is what an old colored man down in my section of the country called a "technimicality. [Laughter.]

Of course, the Banking and Currency Committee could correct that by saying it was a reviving joint resolution, instead of a continuing joint resolution. But that is not very important.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure that when the Senator from Kentucky said there was no human means or no technical way by which the joint resolution could be passed today, he meant if objection were made. But I think we should let the country know, and I think the Senate should indicate, that it is aware that we could handle this joint resolution in the same way we handled the draft joint resolution a little while ago. All of us remember that when the draft law was about to expire, a joint resolution providing for its continuation for a limited time was introduced on the floor of the Senate; and in a matter of minutes the Senate passed the joint resolution continuing the Selective Service Act.

If no objection were made, the rules of the Senate would not prevent us from taking up this matter immediately and debating it and discussing it for as long as we chose to do so, and then having a fair and full vote on it in the Senate.

So I am sure the Senator from Kentucky meant to say that if objection were made we could not take up the joint resolution today, but if objection were not made we could take up and pass the joint resolution this very afternoon by having a fair and full vote on it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I am fully aware of the possibility which the Senator from Florida has pointed out. When I said it was not humanly or, perhaps, practically possible to pass the joint resolution today or by midnight tomorrow night, I took into consideration the practical situation. I knew that Senators would object to immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

I am only seeking to have the joint resolution introduced and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. No Senator will lose any right he possesses by not objecting to the introduction of the joint resolution at this time.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator please explain the reason, if any, why the joint resolution could not be referred to the committee and the committee act on it this afternoon?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no reason why, if the committee were called and the majority of the committee were willing to pass on the resolution, it could not be passed on today. In fact, the resolution could be acted upon. I have been told by the chairman of the committee, however, that the committee will not be called this afternoon, and I, myself, have urged that the committee be not called. I think I can assure the Senator that the committee will not be called this afternoon, but physically it could be called. If a majority of the members of the committee were willing to act on the resolution, they could act, but that will not take place.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I appreciate what the Senator has said, but I wish to interpose my objection just the same.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] has already objected.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I was the first to object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; but I thought perhaps I could make some headway. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator has made some headway, but I want it to be known that I was the Senator who objected first.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. I believe the RECORD will show that the Senator from Texas was the first to object.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I appreciate the way the majority leader has cooperated with me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe that the word "cooperated" is a misnomer. I have not cooperated with the Senator in his

attitude on this legislation. I did cooperate with him the other night when I was trying to see that he received an opportunity to say what he had to say.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I was referring to that cooperation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was hoping that, by cooperating with me at this time, the Senator from Texas would accord me a little reciprocity in return for the cooperation which I gave him the other night.

Mr. O'DANIEL. If I could see any point to be gained by not objecting to this proposal, I might consider giving to the Senator a little more cooperation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know that I am in agreement that the Senator would have any advantage in not objecting, or in objecting. I do not believe that there would be any advantage to be gained either way.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is why I wanted to have the honor of objecting.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator regards that as a vital matter in his public life, I shall not withhold the honor from him.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I certainly do regard it as being vital, because I had no hope of winning the battle when I started in the fight.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has recruited some powerful influences since he spoke. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; but as I have said, I have been praying that this would come about, because I know the Lord moves in mysterious ways His wonders to perform.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, He has certainly performed wonderfully in this case. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. He certainly has. He has enabled the American people to move in a wonderful style.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, as I understand it, the Lord is not compelled to accept the partnership if He does not want to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I present the conference report on House bill 8496, the naval appropriation bill for 1947. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 13, 26, 57, 63, 65, 69, and 70.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 33, 34, 46, 58, 60, and 61, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,844,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end of the matter so restored insert the following: "or who have not been commissioned in the line of the Navy more than five years prior to the commencement of such educational courses or postgraduate instruction"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$246,390,000, of which $350,000 shall be available for placing the equipment at the Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, Rhode Island, in condition for operation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "not to exceed $500,000,000 from the naval stock fund: *Provided*, That the cash working capital of the naval stock fund shall not be reduced below $50,000,000 as the result of such transfer", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$70,966,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$131,018,300; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$370,558,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,239,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$325,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$706,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,271,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$354,412,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,785,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$15,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$57,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,642,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$31,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$967,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,626,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$383,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,456,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,705,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,075,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,045,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,715,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,562,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "September"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "August"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "September"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "September"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 12, 19, 59, and 62.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
DAVID I. WALSH,
STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I wish to propound a question to the Senator from Louisiana with regard to amendment No. 10 in the conference report. I refer to the amendment which was carried by 2 votes in the Senate. The bill as it passed the House required that no funds under the act should be available for the manufacturing, assembling, repairing, or overhauling of torpedoes at Forest Park, Ill.

Was a vote taken on the amendment in the conferenece? Was a separate vote taken?

Mr. OVERTON. The House conferees receded on the amendment. It was not necessary for the Senate conferees to take any vote.

Mr. GERRY. Was any request made that a vote be taken?

Mr. OVERTON. Not on the part of the Senate conferees, as I recall. The amendment was a Senate amendment, and the House receded.

Mr. GERRY. Yes, but there were Senators who were interested in the amendment, and I should like to know if any of the conferees asked that a vote be taken on the amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. No. There was no necessity of any vote being taken, so far as the conferees on the part of the Senate were concerned, because the amendment was a Senate amendment. The House receded.

Mr. GERRY. The House receded?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. GERRY. Was there any debate on the matter before the conferees on the part of the House receded?

Mr. OVERTON. Not in connection with this amendment. There was debate in connection with another amendment.

Mr. GERRY. Which amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. The amendment which was inserted namely, that $350,000 shall be available for placing the equipment at the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I., in condition for operation. There was some talk about that amendment.

Mr. GERRY. There was no talk with reference to the Forand amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. No.

Mr. GERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Speaking on the same subject matter which was raised by the able Senator from Rhode Island, I note that there still remains in the naval appropriations bill the $350,000 appropriation for placing the equipment at the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I., in condition for operation. Am I to understand that, by leaving that appropriation in the bill, it is still discretionary with the Navy, under the language of the bill, to open up the torpedo plant in Newport, R. I., or leave it just as it is?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, that is a matter of interpretation. The senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] took the position that this language would, in his opinion, at least as I understood him, require the Navy Department to resume the manufacture of torpedoes at Newport. I took an opposite view. It is my interpretation that the matter is left entirely within the discretion of the Navy. The Navy may use the money for such purpose at Newport as the Navy Department determines to be necessary or proper. The Navy may continue research work there, or abandon it. The Navy may continue the testing of torpedoes there or abandon the testing of torpedoes. I may say further that the Navy may manufacture torpedoes there or not manufacture them.

Mr. LUCAS. I believe that the able Senator is correct in his interpretation. There is no definite time stated in the amendment with reference to when the $350,000 shall be spent.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his explanation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, under the form of the report would it be possible to construct new hospitals?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; it will be possible to construct new hospitals.

The PRESIDING OFFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report submitted by the Senator from Louisiana.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message announcing the action of the House of Representatives on certain amendments in disagreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6496, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 29, 1946.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 59 to the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "and";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "*: Provided further*, That wherever there are architectural and engineering services in any State in which a project is located qualified tc do the work, such services shall be utilized"; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 120. The Secretary of the Navy may delegate to the commandants of the naval districts, for administration within their respective districts, his authority to authorize payment of the expenses of the transfer of household goods of employees, and of the costs of transportation of their immediate families on change from one official duty station to another."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 19, and 62.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, has the conference report been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been agreed to.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recorded as against the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the

committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4512. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5244. An act to authorize the appointment of additional Foreign Service officers in the classified grades.

PROGRAM FOR MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on Monday next at 12 o'clock the two Houses of Congress are to assemble in joint session for memorial exercises in honor of the late President Roosevelt. The House has advised me that it wishes the Senate to be in the Chamber of the House at not later than 11:45 o'clock a. m. Therefore it will be necessary for us to assemble at 11 o'clock Monday, and when we have concluded the business of the Senate today it will be my purpose to move to adjourn until 11 o'clock Monday morning, so that we may have ample time to assemble and go to the House Chamber, in the meantime transacting any preliminary business in the morning hour prior to our departure for the House.

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. In view of objection having been made a few moments ago when the Senator from New York, with other Senators, proposed to introduce a joint resolution for the continuation of OPA, I wish to ask whether, if the Senator were now to tender the joint resolution and objection were made, and there should be an adjournment of the Senate terminating the legislative day of March 5, in which we now are, it would be possible for the joint resolution to be offered subsequent to the adjournment, if the Senate reconvened after the adjournment on the same calendar day in which we now are?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Paragraph 1 of rule XIV provides, under the heading "Bills, joint resolutions, and resolutions," that if objection is made, it cannot be done.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Chair tell me to what section of the rule he refers?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be found in the rules on page 18, rule XIV, paragraph 5 of which provides:

All resolutions shall lie over 1 day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am not speaking about how long a resolution shall lie over once it comes from a committee or once it is offered. I am speaking about the possibility of introducing the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Chair will corroborate the statement I am about to make. Under the rules, during the morning hour, no matter whether that morning hour takes place from 12 to 2 o'clock or at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, a bill or resolution may be offered, and if objection is interposed, it has to lie over for 1 day before it can be introduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That has nothing to do with whether it has been reported from a committee. It means the mere offer of a resolution or bill during the morning hour. If objection is made, it must lie over for 24 hours, or to another day. As a rule that is not done, but that does not vitiate the rule, and if any Senator objected, it would have to go over.

For instance, if I should move that the Senate adjourn for 30 minutes this afternoon, and we met at the end of that period, we will say, and had a morning hour, and the Senator from New York offered his joint resolution and objection were made to its introduction, it would have to go over until Monday, at which time it could be introduced.

Therefore I have no purpose to have a brief recess or adjournment this afternoon, because nothing would be accomplished. It seems to me that there is no point in undertaking to do that, and I have no intention of doing it, because the joint resolution could not be introduced before Monday, at best. I have no doubt that when on Monday morning we reach the order, during the morning hour, for the introduction of bills, this joint resolution will be introduced and take its course before the Senate that other bills and resolutions take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has correctly stated the rule. If a recess or adjournment should now be taken and the Senate reassembled in an hour, the same objection could be made to the introduction of the joint resolution that was made earlier today.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Chair will allow me to make a suggestion, I have before me section 1 of rule XIV, which no doubt the Chair had in mind in making the ruling he indicated. The section reads:

Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day.

I make the parliamentary inquiry of the Chair as to whether that one day means a calendar day or a legislative day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It means a legislative day.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I thought. We are presently in the legislative day of March 5, are we not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. If we were to adjourn, would not that end that legislative day, and if we were to reconvene, would we not reconvene in another legislative day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That much is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. If that be true, then, if the joint resolution had been tendered in the legislative day of March 5, and an adjournment terminated the legislative day of March 5, and brought about a new day, when we reconvened would it not be possible for the resolution at that time to be introduced, there being another legislative day after the day when it was first offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The tendering of it has not anything to do with it. Objection was made when it was tendered; therefore that is obliterated. The fact of taking an adjournment would not change the situation. The same objection could be made again.

Mr. PEPPER. If there were to be an adjournment terminating the legislative day of March 5, and the Senate were to reconvene, then that would put the morning hour back into effect, would it not, and the introduction of bills or resolutions would be permitted when that part of the morning hour was reached?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it would not be permitted if any objection were made, and if objection were made, though we were in a new legislative day, the resolution would have to lie over for another day. That is the rule, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from New York offered his resolution today, and objection were made, he could not offer it during the following day and satisfy the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today it is not offered under the rule at all.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the parliamentary situation, in the event the joint resolution is offered, even on Monday, and an objection is made to its being offered, it would have to lie over until Tuesday before it could even be referred to the committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would have to lie over for one legislative day before it could be introduced and referred to a committee.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to make one more inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. That being true, if we were to have an adjournment and a reconvening of the Senate today, and then the joint resolution were offered, when the Senate reconvened on that new legislative day, then at least the resolution could be introduced on Monday instead of on Tuesday, could it not? We would save a day if we did that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would have to lie over a day, and, of course, its introduction could not be acted upon Monday.

Mr. PEPPER. But this is my question: We are now in the legislative day of March 5, and if we should adjourn in 15 minutes and then reconvene 15 minutes after we adjourned, that would constitute a new legislative day. Then there would be a morning hour, and if the Senator from New York should offer his joint resolution and objection were made, at least he could introduce it the next time the Senate convened.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He could offer it on Monday again.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but as it is now, if we do not adjourn, if we go over until Monday and he offered it on Monday,

and objection were made, he could not introduce it until Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would lie over 1 day.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the only way by which the joint resolution could be finally introduced today and referred to a committee, under the circumstances, would be for us to adjourn for a brief season and then return after the adjournment, at some hour to be fixed in the motion for adjournment, at which time we would have a morning hour, and the Chair would call for the introduction of bills and resolutions. If objection were made, then in order to get the resolution introduced at any time today, we would have to take another adjournment, and I doubt whether we could take two legislative adjournments in one calendar day. I should like to inquire of the Chair whether the Senate can adjourn twice in the same calendar day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that that cannot be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that we could not by taking a second adjournment, bring about the possibility of the joint resolution being introduced today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that it would have to go over until Monday in any event.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that in all likelihood there will be no objection to its introduction Monday if the resolution is proffered, because no point could be gained by objection. I cannot guarantee that, of course, because I am not in the confidence of any Senator who might feel like objecting, but I see no point to be gained in a further objection on Monday to the introduction of the resolution.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. If we should adjourn within a half hour and have a new legislative day, this resolution could then be offered. However, objection then would mean that it would go over until another legislative day. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MYERS. If the Senate should meet on Sunday, the resolution could be offered on Sunday and we could meet and consider it. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It could be read only one time. If any Senator objected it could not possibly be considered that day.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the rule requires that a bill or joint resolution having been finally introduced must be read on three different days, so if objection were made and it were finally introduced on Sunday, it would have to be read once on Sunday, and once on Monday, and it could not possibly be referred to the committee until Monday, and could not possibly be considered until Tuesday, even if the Senate met on Sunday; it could not be ready for consideration by that time, anyway.

Mr. MYERS. By following that procedure, however, Mr. President, we might be assured consideration of the joint resolution on Monday, while if there were objection made each day and three objections were made in all, it might be Thursday or Friday before consideration could be secured.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There would be no possible way of the Senate considering the joint resolution before the time stated.

PROVISION FOR SECONDARY MARKETS FOR FARM LOANS GUARANTEED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on page 9 of the calendar will be found Senate bill 2280, Calendar No. 1541. It is necessary that this bill be passed as soon as possible in order that the banks may sell their mortgages to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation so as to enable them to use again their capital for financing loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. A bottleneck exists at the present time due to the fact that the small banks, especially, throughout the country are loaded up with mortgages which they cannot liquidate. They want to get rid of some of those loans, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation has the money and wants to lend it, due to the fact that recently the farmers have not desired to borrow as much money as they wanted to borrow a few years ago.

The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation desires the law amended to permit the Corporation to purchase such loans, just as it has purchased other agricultural credit paper through the Federal Land Bank in the past. The bill was considered by the Banking and Currency Committee, which had hearings on it, and the committee approved the bill unanimously.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator desiring consideration of Senate bill 2280, which is Calendar No. 1541?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will say that that bill was unanimously agreed to by the Banking and Currency Committee and reported to the Senate by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. I am sure there can be no objection to its enactment.

Mr. WHITE. I have talked with certain members of the minority on the Banking and Currency Committee, and they have no objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I will say that as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee I hope the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2280) to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 (b) of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 1020d), is amended by inserting after the first sentence of said section the following new sentence: "The Corporation is further authorized to purchase from approved lenders, for cash, loans made under section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.), as amended, for such prices and upon such terms and conditions as the Board of Directors of the Corporation finds appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

SIMPLIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF CREDIT SERVICES TO FARMERS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1353, House bill 5991, which I discussed yesterday afternoon. The House has passed one bill relating to the Farm Security Administration and the Senate passed another bill which is now in the House. In the bill now on the Senate calendar the Senate committee struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substituted the Senate bill. Passage of this bill will enable the conferees to deal with the contents of both bills in an effort to reach some legislation in regard to this important service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, this is a bill against which there has been some objection urged by two or three Senators on the minority side, but I also understand that they have yielded their opposition and are in approval with the Senator's efforts to have the bill passed at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there is some opposition to the bill, perhaps, Mr. President, but I have made a unanimous-consent request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5991) to simplify and improve credit services to farmers and promote farm ownership by abolishing certain agricultural lending agencies and functions, by transferring assets to the Farmers' Home Corporation, by enlarging the powers of the Farmers' Home Corporation, by authorizing Government insurance of loans to farmers, by creating preferences for loans and insured mortgages to enable veterans to acquire farms, by providing additional specific authority and directions with respect to the liquidation of resettlement projects and rural rehabilitation projects for resettlement purposes, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment

to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 1 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by deleting the last word "farms", inserting a comma after the word "acquire", and adding the following: "repair, or improve family-type farms, to enlarge undersized farms, or to refinance indebtedness against undersized or underimproved farm units when loans are being made by the Secretary to enlarge or improve such units. Loans may also be made to assist borrowers under this title in making the repairs and improvements needed to adjust their farming operations to changing conditions."

Section 1 (b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Any veterans (defined herein as a person who served in the land or naval forces of the United States after December 6, 1941, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable) who is found by the Secretary by reason of his ability and experience, including training as a vocational trainee, to be likely to carry out successfully undertakings required of him under a loan which may be made under this title shall be eligible for the benefits of this title to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant. Except with respect to veterans, only farm tenants, farm laborers, sharecroppers, and other individuals who obtain, or who recently obtained, the major portion of their income from farming operations shall be eligible to receive the benefits of this title. In making available the benefits of this title, the Secretary shall give preference to persons who are married, or who have dependent families, or, wherever practicable, to persons who are able to make an initial down payment, or who are owners of livestock and farm implements necessary successfully to carry on farming operations. No person shall be eligible who is not a citizen of the United States."

Section 1 (c) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read as follows:

"No loan shall be made for the acquisition, improvement, or enlargement of any farm unless such farm will be of such size and type as the Secretary determines to be sufficient to constitute an efficient family-type farm-management unit and to enable a diligent farm family to carry on successful farming of a type which the Secretary deems can be successfully carried on in the locality in which the farm is situated: *Provided*, That loans may be made to veterans, as defined in section 1 (b) hereof, who have pensionable disabilities, to enable such veterans to acquire, enlarge, repair, or improve farm units of sufficient size to meet the farming capabilities of such veterans and afford them income which, together with their pensions, will enable them to meet living and operating expenses and the amounts due on their loans."

Section 3 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read as follows:

"Loans made under this title shall be in such amount (not in excess of the value of the farm as certified by the County Committee) as may be necessary to enable the borrower to acquire or enlarge the farm or to make the necessary repairs and improvements thereon, and shall be secured by a first mortgage or deed of trust on the farm. Loans may not be made for the acquisition or enlargement of farms which have a value, as required, enlarged, or improved, in excess of the average value of efficient family-type farm-management units, as determined by the Secretary, in the county, parish, or locality where the farm is located."

Section 4 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by designating the present language as subsection "(a)", changing the period at the end of such subsection to a colon, and adding the following: "*Provided*, That there may be distributed in any fiscal year to each State or Territory such amount not in excess of $100,000 as is determined by the Secretary to be necessary to finance loans in such State or Territory under this title.

"(b) Special appropriations for the benefit of veterans may be allocated equitably among the several States on the basis of need, as determined by the Secretary, without reference to the formulae set forth in subsection (a) hereof."

Section 6 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read as follows:

"To carry out the provisions of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000,000 for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and such further sums as may be necessary for administrative expenses in carrying out this title during such fiscal year."

Title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is further amended by the insertion of a new section 7 immediately following section 6, to read:

"SEC. 7. Sums heretofore appropriated or otherwise made available hereunder shall be subject only to the limitations contained in this title, as amended."

Section 21 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"Grants may also be made to such eligible individuals, where necessary to aid in their rehabilitation, and to cooperative associations furnishing medical, dental, or hospital services to such individuals."

Section 21 (c) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read:

"There are eligible for the benefits of this title (1) veterans, as defined in section 1 (b) hereof, who desire the practical guidance in farm and home operations supplied by the Farm Security Administration to its borrowers, and (2) farm owners, farm tenants, farm laborers, sharecroppers, and other individuals who obtain, or who recently obtained, the major portion of their income from farming operations, and who cannot obtain the necessary financing elsewhere at reasonable rates and terms."

Section 23 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read:

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as the Congress shall from time to time determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this title."

Section 41 (g) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the following immediately thereafter: "including the release from personal liability, without payment of further consideration, of—

"(1) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants under agreements assuming the outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary under this title; and

"(2) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants under agreements assuming that portion of their outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary which is equal to the earning capacity value of the farm at the time of the transfer, and borrowers whose farms have been acquired by the Secretary, in cases where the county committees certify and the Secretary determines that the borrowers have cooperated in good faith with the Secretary, have farmed in a workmanlike manner, used due diligence to maintain the security against loss, and otherwise fulfilled the covenants incident to their loans, to the best of their abilities."

Section 42 (b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to read:

"Each member of the committee shall be allowed compensation at the rate of not to exceed $5 per day while engaged in the performance of duties under this act. The number of days per month that such members may be paid shall be determined and approved by the Secretary. In addition, they shall be allowed such amounts as the Secretary may prescribe for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to better adapt the loan programs authorized by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to the needs of veterans and low-income farmers, and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will appoint the conferees later.

SATURDAY HOLIDAYS FOR DISTRICT BANKS AND BUILDING-AND-LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is on the calendar Docket No. 1531, Senate bill 2307, a bill to provide that every Saturday shall be a holiday for banks and building-and-loan associations in the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. The bill has been approved by the Commissioners of the District; it has been approved by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, and it has also been approved by the District of Columbia Committee of the House. All the bill does is to provide that every Saturday shall be a holiday for banks and building-and-loan associations in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill applies only to the District of Columbia?

Mr. McCARRAN. It applies only to the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2307) to provide that every Saturday shall be a holiday for banks and building-and-loan associations in the District of Columbia, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth sentence of section 1389 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 28–616), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That every Saturday shall be a holiday in the District and not a business day for (1) every bank or banking institution having an office or banking house located within the District, (2) every Federal savings and loan association whose main office is in the District, and (3) every building association, building and loan association, or savings and loan association, incorporated or unincorporated, organized and operating under the laws of and having an office located within the District; and any act which would otherwise be required, authorized, or permitted to be performed on Saturday in the District at the office or banking house of, or

by, any such bank or banking institution, Federal savings and loan association, building association, building and loan association, or savings and loan association, if Saturday were not a holiday, shall or may be so performed on the next succeeding business day, and no liability or loss of rights of any kind shall result from such delay."

DISTRIBUTION AND UTILIZATION OF HEALTH PERSONNEL, FACILITIES, AND RELATED SERVICES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 244, which is on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 244) further increasing the limit of expenditures for a study and survey of the distribution and utilization of health personnel, facilities, and related services, submitted by Mr. PEPPER on March 22, 1946, and reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with an amendment at the end of the resolution to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$40,000."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment in line 5 by striking out "$40,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$5,000; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the authority heretofore granted by Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 2, 1946, and as continued from time to time, shall be terminated August 1, 1946", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress (providing for study and survey of the distribution and utilization of health personnel, facilities, and related services), agreed to June 2, 1943, is hereby increased by $5,000; be it further

Resolved, That the authority heretofore granted by Senate Resolution 74, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to June 2, 1943, and as continued from time to time, shall be terminated August 1, 1946.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] a question. Is that the amendment on which we had an agreement?

Mr. PEPPER. That is the amendment which the Senator from Nebraska agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear the amendment read. It seems to me that the figure "$10,000" was read. Was that the original language?

Mr. PEPPER. No; the original language was "$40,000," but the amendment cuts the amount to $5,000. The amendment is in the exact language to which the Senator agreed.

Mr. WHERRY. Our understanding is now that the amount of money appropriated under the amendment is $5,000, and that the authority heretofore granted shall be terminated on August 1, 1946.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1654. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3517. An act to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, and persons of races indigenous to the Philippine Islands, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4512. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of pevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5244. An act to authorize the appointment of additional foreign service officers in the classified grades;

H. R. 5716. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. R. 6335. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6429. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6516. An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Louis LeBaron, of Hawaii, to be associate justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Bunk Gardner, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge, Canal Zone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. George B. Harris, of California, to be United States district judge, northern district of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the nominations on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND RECEIVE COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to sign enrolled bills during the adjournment of the Senate, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive communications from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADMISSION OF COLORED REPORTERS TO UNITED STATES SENATE AND HOUSE PRESS GALLERIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a resolution which was introduced and passed at the recent convention of the American Newspaper Guild, which pertains to representation in the press galleries of the House and Senate by newspaper men of the colored race.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCRANTON, PA.—The weight of the 25,000 members of the American Newspaper Guild was thrown behind the fight of colored reporters for admission to the United States Senate and House press galleries here on Friday, June 21, when delegates to the thirteenth national ANG convention unanimously passed a resolution condemning racial discrimination in congressional press galleries.

Drafted by Lowell Lomax, reporter for the Washington Afro-American, and only Negro member of the 10-man District of Columbia delegation, the resolution calls on the ANG to protest this outrageous injustice to millions of American citizens.

Introduced at the convention by the Washington delegation of the ANG, the resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas the 13,000,000 Negro citizens of the United States have no duly accredited representative in the press galleries of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, thus depriving these citizens of direct access to news of their Government, and whereas the Negro press, still in its infancy, has more than 1,000,000 subscribers who are entitled to correspondents cognizant of their particular interests and problems: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Newspaper Guild protest this outrageous injustice to millions of American citizens; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the International Executive Board of the ANG and all guild locals appeal to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and members of the Rules Committee of the Senate to take appropriate action so that correspondents of this great

segment of the American press are welcomed to the press galleries of the House of Representatives and the Senate; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Guild officers be instructed to make a proper presentation of the action of this convention to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Rules Committee of the Senate and the chairman of the Standing Committee of Correspondents of the House and Senate Press Galleries."

After motion for adoption of the resolution was made on the floor of the convention, Lowell Lomax of the Washington delegation arose to denounce the discriminatory racial policies in the congressional press galleries and to urge the unanimous adoption of the motion.

Enthusiastic applause greeted Mr. Lomax at the conclusion of his speech on the press gallery resolution before the 250 delegates in the ballroom of Scranton's Hotel Casey.

Edward Talty, staff reporter on the Washington Times-Herald and Harry Read of the National CIO Committee to Abolish Discrimination also spoke in support of the resolution.

Other members of the Washington delegation who endorsed the resolution were William Flythe, Times-Herald; Philip J. Austensen, Post reporter and president of the Washington Newspaper Guild.

Mrs. Mary Spargo, Washington Post; S. Paul Hoffman, Post; John McLeod, Daily News; Quenten Mott, Evening Star, and Milton Murray, International President of the American Newspaper Guild.

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD several editorials which I hold in my hand, which are in support of the bill which seeks to reorganize the Congress.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register Guard of June 19, 1946]

TIME OUT FOR REPAIRS

The Senate, which has been trying rather desperately to cope with most of the Nation's pressing ills all at once, took time out the other day for a little self-improvement. The result was a bill reorganizing and streamlining congressional procedure which is excellent as far as it goes. And it goes quite a long way.

The senators discarded one or two mossy, cherished traditions, and it must have wrung some of the older, more conservative hearts to do so. But they voted themselves and their colleagues in the House a $5000-a-year salary increase by way of heart balm.

They also provided some generous social security which will permit them to retire with dignity and a pension after 62 years upon this earth, provided that six of those years were spent in Congress. To enlarge upon the wisdom of that move might lead to some unflattering examples. So perhaps it is enough to say that the pension appears to be a wise investment.

Among the reorganization bill's chief virtues are a reduction in the number of committees, expert assistance for appropriations committees, enough money to hire capable help for other administrative and research duties, and the registering of lobbyists.

A lot of Senators have enjoyed the power, prestige and importance of many committee memberships. But they really pay for their enjoyment in hard work. Besides answering their mail, having their ears bent by constituents, understanding all current legislation, being on the floor for debate and voting, they are also at present supposed to be experts on all the various, complex specialized subjects which they have to wrestle with in a half dozen committees to which they may belong.

It is just too much to do efficiently. Besides, the same general legislative subject may slop over into two or three different committees, all of which adds to the confusion, delay, and red tape.

As for appropriations, Congress has generally had to take an executive department's word for what it needed and why. The members have been busy enough without endeavoring to fathom the inner workings of outside agencies. Consequently, they have approved or slashed budgets through ignorance, caprice, benevolence and sheer cussedness. Provision for expert assistants will give the committees some boys on their side whom they can trust, and who presumably will know what they're talking about.

The new bill should ease group pressures not only through registration and financial accountability of lobbies, but by the establishment of majority and minority policy committees which would put major issues on a party basis. This last is something that Commerce Secretary Wallace suggested a while back, except that the Senate bill stipulates no reprisals if some rugged individualist refuses to hew to the party policy line.

In short, there is promise of better government in the Senate bill. If the House concurs, the result ought to win Congress a unanimous cheer. And that's a sweet sound that the legislators haven't heard in a long time.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union of June 20, 1946]

STEPPING UP PROCEDURE

After a long period of discussion about streamlining Congress, the Senate finally evolves a bill aimed to step up procedure and bring more modern methods into the legislative department of the Government. In addition to voting the Members of both Houses a $5,000-a-year salary increase and retirement pensions payable under certain conditions, the Senators provide for revision of committees, for financial and technical experts to assist Members and for the registration and financial accountability of lobbyists. The measure fairly well covers the purpose intended and in all probability will be concurred in by the lower House

There may be some criticism of the salary boost, in view of our existing debt and already heavy governmental outlays. However, anyone who has had much contact with Congressmen knows that there is little left at the end of a regular term after the expenses of living in Washington are paid. It is true that Members enjoy fairly liberal allowances and mileage; but it also is true that they have to carry a pretty heavy financial burden, including the legitimate expenses of primary and election campaigns. As to the pension plan, its propriety is questionable. If Members of Congress feel entitled to retirement pay, there is no reason why governors, mayors, and other public officials, including State legislators, should not feel likewise.

Those who enact the laws of the land and expend the money of taxpayers certainly should have the benefit of the best available research and information; many State legislatures already have such service at their disposal. Capable advisers in all probability could save the Treasury a vast amount of money when appropriations are under consideration.

One thing "streamlining" cannot do, of course, is to give Congressmen sufficient moral stamina to vote their convictions when playing politics is more expedient. If this could be done it would be a good thing for both Congress and the country.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Tribune of June 13, 1946]

CONGRESSIONAL FACE LIFTING

A Congress fit to serve in an atomic age rather than that of the Clipper ships seems to be in store for the future if the House of Representatives accords the Government reorganization bill the same reception it received in the Senate on Tuesday. The bill was introduced to streamline Congress, reduce it from an overweight and ponderous growth to a sylphlike and vibrant body able to react to the demands of Government.

Outstanding in the provisions of the bill is the reduction in the number of Senate committees from 33 to 15 in order to lighten the load on lawmakers. The growth of committees has long bothered many solons, for they have been forced to spend more time in attending to committee business than on the floor of the Senate. Many Senators are on as many as 10 standing committees, which results in their being unable to efficiently perform their duties on any one of them. It has necessitated sketchy preparation and inadequate knowledge of the business at hand. With the number of committees reduced, Senators can, if they will, devote more time to carrying on the functions of Government. It is to be hoped that this reduction in the number of committees will see more Senators in the Chamber when that body is in session. Oftentimes important legislation has been acted upon with only an indifferent handful present.

Also of value will be that section of the bill which permits committees to retain technical and administrative assistants. More than once, committeemen have been ignorant of the facts behind the legislation they were considering never having been briefed on the subject. Assistants who are well versed in whatever phase of government the committee handles can keep Congressmen informed of all the aspects involved. This will remove the embarrassing episodes where Congressmen are made an object of humor by a witness who knows more about the subject than they do.

A pay hike for Congressmen is advisable, and the bill provided that $5,000 a year would be added to the $10,000 already received. Congressmen have been receiving $10,000 since 1925, but the manner of living in Washington, D. C., which might mildly be described as sumptuous, finds many of them unable to make both ends meet. This was perfectly agreeable in the days when, for example, the Senate was known as a rich man's club, but today when many Congressmen's sole income is that received for Government service they should not be forced to pinch pennies.

The optional pension plan whereby Congressmen could contribute 5 percent of their wages for 5 years and serve 6 years in Congress in order to be eligible is in line with the growing conviction that all persons should be given aid when they are no longer able to work.

Altogether the reorganization plan will give Congressmen a needed face lifting, restoring youthful vigor and removing the heavy paunch caused by an overindulgence in committees. It has met with some opposition, mainly from those Senators who would lose both face and rank as committee heads if the committees were removed, but those Congressmen who have any regard for doing a good job will accept it, realizing that it is something that has been needed for a long time.—T. W. C.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune of June 20, 1946]

FOR REVISING CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURE, MAKE LA FOLLETTE'S BILL A LAW

Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, has done at least one service to Congress and the country for which he deserves to be

remembered with gratitude. He conducted an investigation, submitted a report, introduced a bill and advocated its passage with such force and logic that a long-needed reform in legislative procedure in the direction of simplicity and efficiency should result.

He would keep pace with the growth of population and the attendant increase of public business, including problems and perplexities of which the founding fathers knew nothing and never lived long enough to learn about. Whether the overhauling contemplated comes through contrition or compulsion, the character and reputation of Congress will expand or dwindle accordingly.

The Senate has already approved the plan, the gentleman from the Badger State having secured a majority support before the southern Senators could organize a filibuster or effect a coalition. The vote was 49 to 16 in favor of the revision. As passed by the upper House, the bill embraces six major provisions, as follows:

1. Reduction of the number of Senate standing committees from 33 to 15, many memberships now being complimentary.

2. Increase in congressional salaries from $10,000 to $15,000 a year to enable men of moderate means to aspire and reject pressure.

3. Expansion of technical and administrative assistance to lawmakers. Each committee is to get four experts and each lawmaker a competent research aide.

4. Creation of a pension system which would allow a Member of Congress to contribute voluntarily to the Government's retirement fund.

5. Elimination of many routine tasks, such as a necessity for acting on each damage claim against the Government or on each proposal to build a bridge across a navigable stream.

6. Tighten fiscal controls by requiring Congress to go on record in favor of an increase in the national debt each time an estimated appropriation is above anticipated income for the next fiscal year.

As may be seen, this measure provides for simplification, expedition, and investigation of all legislation under consideration. Under the awkward system in vogue the legislator is often entangled in a complexity of committees, delayed in research or by numerous meetings, interfering with sessions which should be attended. Often there are not more than a half dozen Senators or a score of Representatives present when a bill is being discussed.

By supplying the several committees with experts to render technical and administrative assistance to 15 or 20 committeemen together, the saving in time would be enormous and opportunities for loafing would be minimized. The apparent obligation to press personal damage bills, to seek appropriations for the private convenience of constituents, to solicit Federal financial assistance while condemning bureaucracy, to fill the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with unspoken speeches, would no longer seem essential to official continuance of service.

Requiring Members of both Houses to answer the roll call, when appropriations are asked in excess of the estimated income for the following fiscal year, is desirable for two reasons: It will discourage indifference to the national debt and it will enable taxpayers to read the records of those who represent them. No frank and fair-minded legislator could object to that.

While the bill that passed the Senate omits reference to some important defects in the present system that need to be rectified, such as the selection of committee chairmen and personnel, as well as the enfeebling recognition of seniority rather than capability, there is enough proposed from which to make a start.

Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH, of Illinois, chairman of the House Rules Committee in charge of the bill, has asserted that he expects to take his time in considering its provisions. As he is past 80 years of age, he cannot expect to delay action indefinitely.

CITIZENSHIP—LETTER FROM ELIZABETH HARGRAVE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an exceedingly interesting letter which I received from a young lady in the eighth grade of one of the Portland, Oreg., public schools, which illustrates, I think, and very interestingly, the breadth of educational work that is going on in our public schools. The letter deals with the subject of citizenship, and there is attached to it a statement of what the young eighth graders consider to be the "10 essentials of a really good American." I wish to be associated with the conclusions of those young citizens.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Portland, Oreg., April 17, 1946.

WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senator,
Eugene, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Some extremely serious questions have arisen in our eighth-grade class discussion. You see, we have been studying a unit of work which teaches us better understanding of people of different races, nationalities, and religious faiths.

We have discovered that all human beings are very much alike. Difference in skin color is caused only by two chemicals just under the surface of the skin, melanin and carotene. All blood plasma is exactly the same. There is no such thing as Irish blood, Jewish blood, Negro blood, etc. The structure of the brain and central nervous system is exactly the same in all people. There is no Jewish race; it is the Jewish religion. Environment is what causes people to seem different.

We boys and girls have written what we think are 10 essentials of a really good American. I am enclosing a copy for you. We know that lots of people are prejudiced against people of other races and religious faiths because they do not know enough about them. We know many people do not feel as we do. We know all people are created equal and we think they should all have the same opportunities.

In our list of essentials of a really good American it is Nos. 3, 4, 5 that some people would not believe. That is our serious question. We wonder whether most people would think we were right in including them in our list. Each of us (there are 62 in our class) is writing to a different person somewhere in the United States to get opinions.

What is your opinion of the importance of attitudes of people toward those of different races, nationality backgrounds, and religious faiths as an essential qualification of a really good American?

We have a chart in our room with my name and your name on it. After it is a blue star which shows I sent the letter and a gold star will show I received an answer from you.

Please address me care of my homeroom teacher, Miss Ellen Dalquist. I am very grateful to you.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH HARGRAVE.

GLEKCOE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, PORTLAND, OREG., SPRING TERM, 1945–46

The following were composed by 8B students after a study of intergroup understandings and a study of the rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution:

"TEN ESSENTIALS OF A REALLY GOOD AMERICAN

"1. A really good American shows reverence and love for God.

"2. A really good American is not unduly influenced by others but states his honest opinion according to what he thinks is right.

"3. A really good American does not dislike other Americans because of their race, nationality background, or religious faith.

"4. A really good American shows courtesy and respect toward all people regardless of race, nationality background, or religious faith.

"5. A really good American does everything possible to help his fellow Americans have equal opportunities to use their constitutional rights.

"6. A really good American is honest and trustworthy in all his dealings.

"7. A really good American, when saluting the flag, salutes it with full appreciation of the words he or she is speaking.

"8. A really good American is loyal to his country and his fellow men at all times.

"9. A really good American upholds and obeys the laws that concern him.

"10. A really good American uses his opportunities to the best advantage and does his work well to the best of his ability."

PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—STATEMENT BY WOMEN'S ACTION COMMITTEE FOR LASTING PEACE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement issued by the Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace. This statement is in reply to a statement already appearing in the RECORD, which was inserted in the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace has one purpose; it is, to unite American women to work for full participation by the United States in the United Nations organization in order to build a world of peace and justice under law.

Its headquarters are in New York City but it is a national organization with State chairmen and congressional district chairmen in practically every State in the Union. It has over 20,000 members and the active cooperation of more than a dozen national women's organizations whose names appear on the stationery. It is the only women's organization working actively and exclusively for world peace through the United Nations organization. It supports measures in Congress aimed to achieve this result.

To secure its objective of furthering the United Nations organization and United States cooperation in it, the Women's Action Committee is concerned that Members of Congress shall be internationally minded. It keeps a record of the votes of Senators and Congressmen on international issues and it sends, on request, the records of these votes to its members. Seven Senators, who are running for reelection this fall, have consistently opposed international cooperation.

The Chicago Daily Tribune, May 1, 1946, attacked the Women's Action Committee in an editorial headed "Snobbery." The paper accused the organization of being made up

of eastern internationalists, consistent New Dealers, with knee-bending subservience to the empire, and viewing Stalin with worshipful regard. Said the Chicago Tribune, "This meddling organization follows the international line. It is difficult to believe that any middle westerners will fall victim to their snobbery."

The Senator from North Dakota, who is coming up for reelection, and who was one of two Senators who the Women's Action Committee is remembering voted against the United States' ratification of the United Nations Charter, read the editorial from the Tribune into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3. He apparently did not know that this eastern organization has members in 13 of the North Dakota communities as well as in practically all congressional districts of the country.

It is only fair that a statement concerning the work of the Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace should be inserted in the same columns.

ADMINISTRATION OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles and an editorial on the court-martial problem. One is entitled "Justice on a Drumhead," and is written by Maurice Rosenblatt. The second is an editorial entitled "Army Courts Martial," published in the San Francisco Chronicle of April 23, 1946; and the third is an article entitled "Revise Courts Martial," published in the Washington Post of January 1, 1946.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nation magazine of April 27, 1946]

JUSTICE ON A DRUMHEAD

(By Maurice Rosenblatt)

A colonel sits stiffly before the American flag. To his right and left, tapering in rank, are half a dozen junior officers, immobility and coldness masking their faces. This is a general court martial. The trial judge advocate, whose sole duty in the Army is to prosecute, sits on one side acting both as prosecutor and adviser to the court. Opposite is the defense counsel, who has been hastily called from his duties as supply officer. The defendant—call him Sergeant Smith—is marched in under guard. He is bewildered by the rank and isn't sure whether he should salute or sit down. He has seen his attorney only once before, for a few minutes.

Charges are read, and the defense counsel waives the right to challenge any member of the court. A witness identifies Smith and is handed a typewritten sheet from which he reads his testimony. A judge asks if Smith was sober when the witness saw him in the jeep. Two other witnesses read statements. The judge advocate says that Smith is clearly guilty.

While the court deliberates he stands outside under guard. Things happened so fast he missed the moment when he was going to tell the court all about the jeep; that he'd just been released from the hospital and wanted to pick up ice for a party at the casual camp. He was going to tell about getting no mail for 3 months while his division pushed the enemy back several hundred miles; about being wounded. Carrying an automatic rifle made him a special target, though these people wouldn't understand that. All he wants is to get back to his outfit and not let his family know he was court martialed. He goes over the unuttered story.

Meanwhile the court reaches its decision. The junior officer votes first so that he will not be swayed by the judgment of his senior. It is a scrupulous provision, one of those punctilios of Army law which could have meaning if the substance of the whole procedure were fair. Finally Smith faces the judges. He has been found guilty of unlawfully using Government property. Before fixing sentence the court examines his record; it is clean, but the president of the court has privately reminded the others that the commanding general is tired of vehicle thefts, and that these fellows back from the front must realize they are still in the Army.

So Smith hears that he is to be broken to private, forfeit all pay and allowances, including months of combat pay which never caught up with him, be confined at hard labor for 2 years, and be dishonorably discharged. The whole trial took scarcely longer than a traffic case in night court.

Eight months after VJ-day more than 33,500 American soldiers are still confined in army prisons and rehabilitation centers. How did they get there?

Upon entering the army the soldier surrenders his constitutional rights and becomes subject to a code set forth in the Army's Manual for Courts Martial. This defines three types of court. The summary court tries minor violations and may fine or restrict an enlisted man. The special court, a board of three officers, decides cases of a more serious nature; these are presented by the trial judge advocate, and the defendant is entitled to counsel. The highest tribunal, the general court martial, has power to try officers as well as enlisted men. It can administer fines, sentence to hard labor and dishonorable discharge, and even impose the death penalty. The defendant may choose his own counsel, but few soldiers know that they may retain a civilian lawyer if they desire, and guardhouses provide no facilities for inmates to make arrangements for their defense. In practice the defense counsel is usually inexperienced and sometimes without legal training.

On paper Army justice is severe but fair. Actually it is frequently unfair and even brutal, less a system of justice than an arbitrary disciplinary code. Instead of preserving order and curbing crime it serves too frequently as an instrument of oppression by which officers fortify low-caliber leadership. Army justice has become the club which polices the caste system, punishing petty misconduct while ignoring the grossest malefaction. It creates bitterness, disillusionment, and helpless resentment among citizen-soldiers.

An ex-GI can talk about Army justice for hours, drawing on an inexhaustible stock of stories. Most of the cases cited here came to my notice during the 3 years I was attached to the Army's Department of Criminal Investigation. Army men who worked in the Judge Advocate or Provost Marshal section can match these with examples far more grim and lurid.

The first complaint against Army justice is that it operates on a double standard. Theoretically both officers and men are subject to the Articles of War listed in the Manual; in practice Army justice is administered only by officers and applied almost exclusively to enlisted men. In 1940 the Army conducted 16,391 courts martial; 17 of the men tried were officers. Only commissioned officers may serve on the court. Consequently the soldier is not tried by his equals but by representatives of a superior class whose status is maintained by disciplining the ranks. And a large proportion of trials arise from conflicts between officers and men.

An officer may violate an Article of War flagrantly and publicly, and not be punished. During the war a married lieutenant stationed at an east-coast town dated an 18-year-old girl. As he was taking her home he dragged her into an alley and tried to rape her. During the struggle the girl's arm was broken. The lieutenant had her arm set at the Army hospital, and the case was reported to military authorities. When questioned, the lieutenant admitted his part in the affair but laughed it all off, saying the girl was notoriously loose. The captain conducting the inquiry, a good friend of the lieutenant's, dropped the matter with the comment that lots of people broke their arms in winter falling on ice.

A contrast to the case of the laughing lieutenant is offered by that of the two enlisted men who picked up a WAC hitch-hiker in New Guinea. The woman spent several hours with the soldiers and later reported to the MP's that her watch had been stolen. Some two hours after reporting the theft, she casually remarked that she had also been raped. The two soldiers readily admitted having had relations with the woman but said she had been completely agreeable. At the trial no medical testimony was introduced to show physical evidence of rape. The court had only the word of the woman. But the two soldiers were sentenced to more than 10 years' hard labor. The character of the woman was not discussed at the trial, although she was awaiting return to the States because of mental incompetence.

An accused officer is rarely confined to a guardhouse before his trial. He can collect his evidence and muster his witnesses. If he is found guilty, the double standard still operates—"the higher the rank the milder the penalty." A reprimand to an officer is regarded as equivalent to a prison sentence for an enlisted man. Even traffic violations were treated differently during the war. At a camp where noncoms caught speeding were reduced to private and compelled to dig graves, officers were fined and reprimanded.

Combat soldiers who had engaged the enemy and survived by their own wits and intiative clashed with the garrison mentally behind the lines. At the front the use of vehicles, equipment, and food was dictated by necessity, and small heed was paid to vouchers or requisitions. When combat soldiers returned to a rear base, they wanted to blow off steam and have a good time—which generally involved liquor and a vehicle. Often when they were apprehended they were still suffering from combat fatigue, but the courts martial were likely to ignore that fact and to convict these men along with barracks thieves and deserters.

An over-conscientious soldier can get into considerable trouble inasmuch as the preservation of authority is of greater concern to the court than the merits of the case. A private at Fort Custer, Mich., while on "k. p." was directed by the mess sergeant to take meat which had been thrown into the garbage and place it in the refrigerator. The private refused because the meat was dirty. Two days later he was court-martialed for refusing to obey a lawful order. The only factor which the court considered was that the sergeant had issued an order which the private failed to obey. He was sentenced to 3 months' hard labor.

There is no habeas corpus in the Army. The Articles of War direct that no one may be unduly detained without being properly charged and tried, but the soldier, jailed before trial, has no way of enforcing his rights. Public opinion, the watchdog of civilian justice, plays virtually no part in the Army's system.

A Pennsylvania soldier, the father of eight, went home on furlough and overstayed his leave a week to be with his sick wife. On his way back to camp he was picked up in New Jersey. His records failed to arrive, and his trial was therefore put off. He told his story to six chaplains and inspectors without results. After he had been kept in confinement 3 months the allotment to his family was cut off on the ground that he was not earning his pay while in the guardhouse. That night he swallowed a disinfectant poison but was rushed to a hospital, where a stom-

ach pump saved his life. A few lines in his home-town paper about the attempted suicide worked wonders. He was brought to trial immediately and received a full acquittal, followed in a few weeks by an honorable discharge.

Who was to blame? Nobody wanted to take the responsibility for releasing the soldier under a system set up to confine, try, and convict. The safeguards of Anglo-Saxon justice were missing.

Guardhouse censorship makes it impossible for a prisoner to tell the outside world about mistreatment or violations of regulations by prison officers. In many though not all Army prisons, at home and abroad, a sadistic streak developed in the jailors. Men have been beaten and tortured, and fatalities have resulted from guardhouse brutality. The most notorious camp, at Lichfield, England, is currently having its crimson history of flogging and murder spread before the public in the testimony given at the trial of nine guards and two officers accused of cruelty. Yet the Lichfield commandant, Colonel Killian, was recommended for promotion by the War Department. Public protest led, instead, to his being charged with responsibility for the cruel treatment of prisoners—treatment which is alleged to have included beatings with rifle butts and rawhide.

Apologists for the Army's court-martial record point out that there are practically no instances of an innocent man being convicted or framed. That is true, but one must remember that Army regulations are so voluminous and contradictory that every officer and man in the service could be proved a transgressor if the authorities desired to press a charge. Too much depends upon the caprice of superior officers. Stealing a jeep might rate only a 6 months' sentence at one camp; at another it might bring 3 years and a dishonorable discharge.

At present the House Military Affairs Committee and an Army commission are investigating the court-martial system. Nothing will be accomplished, however, if they recommend only superficial reforms instead of basic changes. Any effort to revamp military justice runs head on against the congealed caste system, the officers' code, the inflexability of the military mind, and the sacred traditions of the service. But the fact remains that now is the time to obtain the needed changes, while the Army is courting public favor for appropriations and recruits. Veterans and taxpayers can demand certain reforms:

1. The protection of habeas corpus must be extended to the Army.

2. Military courts should include enlisted men as well as officers among the judges, in the trials of both officers and enlisted men.

3. The legal section of the Army, the Judge Advocate General's Department, should not be under the control of commanders of troops but should be made directly answerable to the Secretary of War, a civilian. This would end the present practice of using the legal powers of the Army as an administrative weapon to enforce personal policies. A civilian board of review should examine all court-martial sentences, and periodically inspect guardhouses and rehabilitation centers.

4. The Judge Advocate section, which today functions as a prosecutor's office, should provide also for defense. Access to civilian attorneys, now provided for in theory, should be facilitated.

5. The Courts Martial Manual should be revised; penalties for specific offenses should be standardized and a distinction made between breaches of Army discipline and criminal offenses. Also, a policy should be worked out regarding psychiatric evidence and medical treatment of sexual abnormals.

6. Officers in the Judge Advocate and Provost Marshal sections who have shown bias, cruelty, or negligence should be prosecuted.

7. Court-martial proceedings are not secret. If the press made a point of reporting courts martial like civil courts, the spotlight of publicity would do more than anything else to remedy current abuses.

Above all, the thousands of American soldiers still confined in Army guardhouses and Federal penitentiaries are entitled to a prompt review of their cases. A distinction should be made between those who committed actual crimes and those who overstepped one of the innumerable taboos and happened to be caught.

Remember, the man in uniform can do nothing about all this. It is up to veterans and civilians to right the wrongs of the past and set up a court-martial system which will be the cornerstone of a democratic army.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of April 23, 1946]

ARMY COURTS MARTIAL

On the strength of statistics showing that Army courts condemned 142 men to death during the war while there were no executions in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, Congressman J. LEROY JOHNSON of California appears justified in asking what's wrong with the Army court-martial system. Granting that the Army had twice the numerical strength of the naval services, and that opportunity for the two major types of capital crimes—murder and rape—was greater among the ground forces, these factors do not begin to explain the score of 142 of 0.

JOHNSON charges that the Army used its court-martial system to enforce discipline, rather than to administer impartial justice. The charge is serious enough to warrant the fullest investigation, and the investigation should have the whole-hearted support of the Army.

Wartime necessitates a considerable submergence of the individual rights for the welfare of the whole Nation, and several hundred thousand Americans willingly gave their lives on that basis. But it is doubtful if any young man perceived it his duty to face a firing squad of his own comrades for a crime which otherwise would not carry the death penalty so he might serve as an example to the service at large. That sort of stringency, far from promoting justice, would only kindle a deep and ominous resentment as an example of the kind of ruthless inhumanity we were trying to abolish from the earth.

If JOHNSON's charge is groundless the Army should refute it with all the vigor at its command. If the charge has basis in fact, the Army can serve its own best interests by overhauling its system of justice.

[From the Washington Post of January 1, 1946]

REVISE COURTS MARTIAL—COMMUNICATION POINTS UP DEFECTS

It is proper, I think, to point out at this time the existence of a type of duress practiced upon the courts in the Army court-martial system and, I assume, also existing in the Navy. Of course, any type of duress is prohibited by the manual for courts martial, but a method of exerting it upon a sworn court is nevertheless being practiced every day.

Courts are appointed by the commanding officer or general. The same officer refers charges for trial after he has examined them. Because of the fact that a report of an investigating officer is before him at the time of trial, too often commanding officers reach stern conclusions as to the guilt or innocence of the accused long before the trial is held. After the trial the same commanding officer must review and approve or disapprove the findings of the court and the sentence. To assist him in this work there is provided a staff judge advocate who is the judicial officer of the command.

One personal experience of the undersigned should be sufficient to prove the immediate need for a revamping of the entire system of courts martial and for reenactment of certain of the Articles of War.

The undersigned represented a staff sergeant in a general court martial in the military district of Washington about 2 years ago. It was a case in which the accused had been held without charges for a long period of time and had been held without trial for an even longer period, notwithstanding the fact that the Articles of War require that where a man is in arrest or confinement immediate steps will be taken to try him or he will be released.

Immediately after having been requested to act as defense counsel for the accused, the undersigned contacted the staff judge advocate of the military district of Washington in order to obtain a copy of the order appointing the court and certain necessary papers. In a discussion the judge advocate said to me the following: "Now, Ball, you have not got a chance in this case, and you might as well plead this man guilty and I will be satisfied with a sentence of 1 year."

This statement, mind you, was made by the highest judicial officer of the command, whose duty it was to review the record of the case at the trial from the standpoint of legality, competency, and sufficiency of evidence and the ever-present requirement of fair trial. The undersigned advised this officer quite frankly that he could abide by no such advice and that he considered it his duty to represent the man to the best of his ability on every issue at the trial.

The case was tried, a motion to release the accused on the ground that the Articles of War had not been complied with in that he had been held for months without trial was overruled, and the accused was sentenced to be reduced to the grade of private and to forfeit a certain amount of his pay per month for 6 months. You will note that the court did not sentence him to any confinement.

Upon review of this case the order, prepared by the staff judge advocate heretofore mentioned and issued by the commanding general of the military district of Washington included the following statement: "The sentence though grossly inadequate will be duly executed." This sentence in the order is an example of the type of duress exercised every day in court-martial procedure. The only possible effect of that statement was to admonish the court for not imposing a more severe punishment upon the accused.

It is such admonishment by the commanding officer of each member of the court in a published order which amounts to nothing short of duress upon the court and as a matter of fact in most cases results in more severe punishment in the next case heard by the court of equal guilt and circumstances.

Any system which allows courts, sworn to decide the case to their best ability according to the law and the evidence produced before them, to be ridiculed for their honest efforts is so contrary to the concept of democratic government which we in America have long since learned to love and appreciate that its very existence in its present state should be short lived and in its place should be a system of justice for each service separate and apart from command functions.

Only through the correction of the system, in order that the actual intent of Congress that every man should be given a fair and impartial trial be carried out, can real justice be provided. Otherwise the shocking injustices arising from courts martial in the past few years will continue to be a mockery of genuine judicial process.

FRANK J. BALL, JR.,
Major, AUP, Inactive.

ARLINGTON, VA., *December 26.*

Mr. MORSE. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement on naval

and military justice by Arthur J. Fruend, presiding at a session of the section of criminal law of the American Bar Association at Cincinnati, Ohio, on December 19, 1945.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The subject of our discussion this afternoon is Naval and Military Justice. It will be treated by two distinguished members of our armed forces and followed by a discussion of experts. It is our hope that the discussion period will also have the participation of all persons here interested.

While a great variety of subjects have been studied at this American Bar Association meeting, it is likely that none is of greater importance or of greater public interest than the one assigned to us. The system of naval and military justice is under severe public scrutiny. Fire at our systems of courts martial has been directed by returning veterans, by our press, and in the Halls of Congress. It is obvious that this should be so.

The Articles of War and our courts martial procedure are deeply rooted in our Military and Naval Establishments. The summary and direct methods, while efficient in a mechanical sense, have but small comparison to the administration of justice administered in our civilian criminal courts. It is to be expected that contrasts should be observed by returning veterans and the parents and friends of men convicted by courts martial.

Complaint is made that officers untrained in the determination of facts and the fixing of punishment constitute the personnel of courts martial; that members of the court are frequently under domination of their superior officers; that untrained persons are often assigned to try and defend the accused and that defense counsel are themselves often under the fear of reprisal by a superior officer if complete zeal is given in such defense; that punishment inflicted is in a large number of instances by civilian or humanitarian standards out of all proportion to the nature of the offense or the character of the offender.

On the other hand, a naval or military force cannot perform its functions without the highest standards of discipline. It is said that the present system of courts martial is essential to the maintenance of that discipline.

It is not for me as chairman to discuss the merits of this extremely important controversy. But it is my hope that a frank and sincere consideration of the problem be given. We should, like Janus, look backward and forward. Looking backward, if injustices have been done, we should use our efforts to correct them. If the system is good, it can withstand the most careful and meticulous scrutiny. If the system needs to be changed, we should advise what changes are necessary. And to look forward, we should realize that we are going to have a large Naval and Military Establishment in this country for years to come. Many believe that we will have compulsory peacetime military service. If that be so, then it is all the more important that our system of naval and military justice to regulate the lives of hundreds of thousands of young men who will constitute a large part of our Naval and Military Establishment, be governed by as perfect a system of justice as the mind and heart of man can devise.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this late hour I do not intend to make an extended statement on the subject of military justice; but before the Senate adjourns for the summer I intend to make further remarks upon it.

At this time I wish to point out that many of us who have been interested in the two court-martial resolutions which have been pending for many months in the Senate believe that it would be very unfortunate for the Senate to adjourn without passing one of the resolutions calling for a Senate investigation of the court-martial systems of the Army and Navy. I think we have been exceedingly patient. The so-called McCarran resolution was submitted some months ago, subsequent to the resolution which I submitted on the same subject.

Suffice it to say at this time that I do not think we have any right, as representatives of the people of the United States, to adjourn for a long recess—supposedly until next January—and permit many so-called military and naval prisoners to languish in military and naval prisons as the result of the miscarriage of military justice during this war. It seems to me that we have a duty to put a Senate committee to work during the summer and next fall, to make a thorough investigation and survey of military and naval justice.

I wish to say to the Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, that he does not impress me one iota by his defenses recently published in the press in regard to military justice. I am not at all impressed by the attempts on the part of the War Department and the Navy Department to investigate themselves. I repeat what I have previously said. It is the clear public duty of Members of the Senate to pass either the McCarran resolution or the Morse resolution, calling for an investigation of military and naval justice. I do not know how much longer we are going to tolerate the gross injustices which developed during the war on the part of the War Department and the Navy Department, with huge numbers of our men in the service suffering from such injustices.

I close by repeating what I previously stated. Let Mr. Patterson, the Secretary of War, produce a rebuttal to it. I have yet to talk with a single lawyer who served in the armed forces of the United States Army or Navy who had not said to me that it is of the utmost importance, in the name of justice, that either the McCarran resolution or the Morse resolution be passed by the Senate.

Thus once again I raise my voice on the floor of the Senate. I ask the Senate to recognize the importance of these pending resolutions and that we serve notice on the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War by action, demonstrated by a majority vote for one of the resolutions, that the Senate intends to analyze from top to bottom the military justice practices of the Army and Navy.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say that the Mead committee has, in a small way, looked into the question of military justice and court martial. The question arose in connection with an investigation in Hawaii, and one in Puerto Rico. I am of the opinion that a thorough investigation of the entire procedure of military justice during the war should be made. I feel that the problem calls for study. I believe that the Senate is the proper body to look into this question. Enough was disclosed during the two investigations to which I have referred to indicate that this subject is important in connection with our national defense. I believe that an overall, thorough investigation of military justice during the war should be made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for the support which he is giving me in this fight. I think the RECORD will show that I have yet to raise my voice in connection with this matter without having the support of the Senator from Michigan, as well as the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] who, as Members of this body know, is himself a veteran of this war and is thoroughly familiar with the importance of the fight which I am trying to make in my demands for an investigation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 1, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 29 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

William T. Mahoney to be United States marshal for division No. 1, district of Alaska. (Mr. Mahoney is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires July 7, 1946.)

Stanley J. Nichols, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 4, district of Alaska, vice Joseph A. McDonald, whose term will expire July 7, 1946.

Thomas P. O'Donovan, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Illinois, vice William H. McDonnell, resigned.

Eugene J. Smith, of New York, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York, vice Spencer C. Young, resigned.

Neale D. Murphy, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island. (Mr. Murphy is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires July 3, 1946.)

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Eula E. Hamilton, Woodstock, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ARIZONA

James Cohen Garrett, Eloy, Ariz., in place of R. E. Hamilton, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Sylvia S. Richardson, Highway Highlands, Calif., in place of A. L. Routson, resigned.

Roscoe J. King, Indio, Calif., in place of Margaret Allen, retired.

Arthur Patterson, Lincoln Acres, Calif., in place of L. P. Comerford, removed.

COLORADO

J. Max Rush, Otis, Colo., in place of M. M. Reed, deceased.

FLORIDA

Lessie L. McMullen, Lee, Fla., in place of Vesta Blanton, removed.

GEORGIA

John W. Ray, Dalton, Ga., in place of W. M. Denton, retired.

ILLINOIS

Eleanore A. Morley, Good Hope, Ill., in place of J. M. Hickman, deceased.

IOWA

Lucille V. Gittinger, Eldon, Iowa, in place of J. A. Hollen, removed.

MARYLAND

Frank Scott Bradley, Federalsburg, Md., in place of R. W. Noble, deceased.

MISSOURI

Raymond H. Schell, Augusta, Mo., in place of Calvin Clay, resigned

Grace N. Davis, Desloge, Mo., in place of E. B. Newman, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Norma E. Emmans, Ledgewood, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW YORK

Marian Chadderdon, Acra, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Wynford B. Bailey, Lexington, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Sarah A. Wilcox, Wellsburg, N. Y., in place of C. M. Stanton, removed.

NORTH DAKOTA

Arthur J. DeKrey, Pettibone, N. Dak., in place of H. B. Pruitt, designed.

OHIO

Lester Bishop, Johnstown, Ohio, in place of O. I. Foster, resigned.

John Merle Gibson, Savannah, Ohio, in place of A. M. Gibson, retired.

Joseph D. Ryan, Willoughby, Ohio, in place of M. A. Delsantro, removed.

PENNSYLVANIA

Thelma B. Kelley, Brier Hill, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles E. Ongley, Grand Valley, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clara M. Baker, Penllyn, Pa., in place of O. S. Rosenberger, retired.

Thomas Mark Shockey, Rouzerville, Pa., in place of W. N. Rowe, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Levie B. Thomas, Pleasant Shade, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TEXAS

Oneta M. Fersch, Wink, Tex., in place of P. E. Jette, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Juanita Collins, North Matewan, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 29 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Louis LeBaron, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. Bunk Gardner to be United States district judge of the Canal Zone.

Hon. George B. Harris, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY

The nominations of Charles E. Briner et al., officers, for appointment in the United States Navy, which were received by the Senate on June 25, 1946, and which appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, June 25, 1946, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Charles E. Briner on page 7464 and ending with the name of Morris W. Woods, ending on page 7467.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1946

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou infinite spirit of life, Thou hast not set a limit to the richness of love, to the power of self-sacrifice, nor to the sublimity of purity. O teach us the beauty and the simplicity of the Christian life apart from creeds and dogmas, that in faith we may walk with Thee, happy in the assurance of a wise fellowship of service. While days are difficult and discipline is hard, do Thou open our minds for the reception of Thy guiding wisdom and direct us with Thy nourishment. In affliction shield us, endowed with Thy plenteous gifts, that our endeavors may be in harmony with Thy will and our strength be able to bear it. Do Thou bless and enrich the church universal, and let the glory of the Lord be established in the souls of all the nations. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6516. An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 6682. An act to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and to repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5933. An act to authorize and direct the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2234. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5990) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment numbered 1 to said bill, disagreed to by the House, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. WILLIS, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6428. An act making appropriations for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. WHITE, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6837. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. REED to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1654) entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes."

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 186]

Adams	Gavin	Norton
Anderson, Calif.	Gerlach	Patrick
Andrews, N. Y.	Gibson	Patterson
Auchincloss	Gillespie	Peterson, Ga.
Baldwin, Md.	Granger	Pickett
Baldwin, N. Y.	Grant, Ala.	Ploeser
Barrett, Pa.	Hall,	Powell
Barry	Edwin Arthur	Pratt
Bates, Mass.	Hall,	Quinn, N. Y.
Bell	Leonard W.	Rankin
Bender	Harless, Ariz.	Rayfiel
Bennet, N. Y.	Harris	Reece, Tenn.
Bloom	Hartley	Reed, Ill.
Bonner	Hedrick	Rivers
Boren	Heffernan	Robertson,
Boykin	Hoffman, Mich.	N. Dak.
Bradley, Mich.	Holifield	Robinson, Utah
Bradley, Pa.	Hook	Rodgers, Pa.
Brooks	Izac	Roe, N. Y.
Buchanan	Jackson	Rogers, N. Y.
Buckley	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Sabath
Camp	Judd	Sadowski
Cannon, Fla.	Kearney	Sasscer
Carnahan	Kee	Sharp
Celler	Keefe	Sheridan
Cochran	Kefauver	Sikes
Coffee	Keogh	Slaughter
Cole, N. Y.	Kerr	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Kinzer	Somers, N. Y.
Corbett	Klein	Sparkman
Courtney	Latham	Spence
Cox	LeCompte	Stefan
Crawford	Lesinski	Stevenson
Crosser	Luce	Stewart
Curley	Ludlow	Stigler
Daughton, Va.	McCowen	Stockman
Davis	McGehee	Sumner, Ill.
Dawson	McGlinchey	Taylor
Dolliver	McKenzie	Thomas, N. J.
Domengeaux	Mahon	Tolan
Drewry	Mankin	Torrens
Dworshak	Mansfield,	Towe
Eaton	Mont.	Vinson
Eberharter	Mansfield, Tex.	Vorys, Ohio
Elsaesser	Marcantonio	Weaver
Engel, Mich.	Merrow	Welch
Ervin	Miller, Calif.	West
Fellows	Morgan	Wickersham
Fisher	Morrison	Winstead
Flannagan	Murphy	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gamble	Murray, Tenn.	Worley
Gardner	Norrell	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 271 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 13, 26, 57, 63, 65, 69, and 70.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 33, 34, 46, 58, 60, and 61, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,844,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end of the matter so restored insert the following: "or who have not been commissioned in the line of the Navy more than five years prior to the commencement of such educational courses or postgraduate instruction"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$246,390,000, of which $350,000 shall be available for placing the equipment at the Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, Rhode Island, in condition for operation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "not to exceed $500,000,000 from the naval stock fund: *Provided*, That the cash working capital of the naval stock fund shall not be reduced below $50,000,000 as the result of such transfer"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$70,966,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$131,018,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$370,558,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,239,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$325,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$706,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,271,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$354,412,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,785,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$15,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$57,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,642,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$31,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$967,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,626,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$383,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,456,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,705,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,075,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,045,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,715,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,562,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "September"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "August"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "September"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "September"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 12, 19, 59, and 62.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
DAVID I. WALSH,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6496) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 2: Appropriates $13,844,000 for "Miscellaneous expenses" instead of $13,205,000 as proposed by the House and $14,483,000 as provided by the Senate.

No. 3: Makes $15,000 of the appropriation for contingencies of the Navy immediately available as proposed by the Senate.

No. 4: Amends language inserted by the House and stricken out by the Senate preventing the use of the appropriation "Instruction" for certain postgraduate instruction of officers. The amended language will permit line officers of the Navy to qualify for staff duties provided they make the election to become staff officers within 5 years after their commissioning in the line.

No. 5: Adopts Senate amendment permitting the Navy to charter and hire vessels for auxiliary purposes.

No. 6: Appropriates $443,750,000 for "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships," as proposed by the House instead of $446,750,000 as provided by the Senate. The Senate increase of $3,000,000 was for the purpose of producing training devices. It is the intention of the conferees that the appropriation for "Research, Navy," may be available for the production of these devices.

No. 7: Adopts language inserted by the Senate making the appropriation for the Bureau of Ordnance available for research.

No. 8: Adopts language inserted by the Senate naming the five ordnance stations where schools may be conducted with Government funds.

No. 9: Appropriates $246,390,000 as proposed by the House for "Ordnance and Ordnance stores, Navy," instead of $247,990,000 as provided by the Senate. The Senate increase was for the purpose of producing training devices. It is the intention of the conferees that the appropriation for "Research, Navy," may be available for the production of these devices. The amendment, as agreed to, also makes $350,000 of this appropriation available for placing the equipment at the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I., in condition for operation.

No. 10: Strikes out language inserted by the House and deleted by the Senate preventing the use of the appropriation for the Bureau of Ordnance to be used for the manufacture, assembly, repair, or overhaul of torpedoes at the naval ordnance plant, Forest Park, Ill.

No. 11: Places a limitation on transfers from the naval stock fund so as to prevent the fund from being reduced below $50,000,000 instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. No limitation was carried respecting these transfers as the bill passed the House.

No. 13: Eliminates a Senate proposal to make the appropriation for the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery available for the purchase of uniforms for guards at the Naval Hospital Medical Center in Bethesda, Md.

No. 14: Adopts the term "naval shipyards" as proposed by the Senate, instead of "navy yards" as proposed by the House.

No. 15: Clarifying amendment.

No. 16: Appropriates $70,966,300 for naval public works within the United States instead of $83,000,000 as proposed by the House and $35,966,300 as provided by the Senate.

No. 17: Exempts from the operations of the limitation on the amount of the appropriation for public works inside the United States that may be expended without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes fees paid for architectural or engineering services as proposed by the Senate.

No. 18: Limits the amount of public works funds within the United States that may be expended without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes to 10 percent as proposed by the Senate instead of 5 percent as proposed by the House.

No. 20: Clarifying amendment.

No. 21: Makes the appropriation for public works outside the United States available for expenditure without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes as proposed by the Senate.

No. 22: Permits disbursements and accounting of appropriations for public works as one fund as provided by the Senate.

Nos. 23, 24, 25, and 26: These amendments all deal with the appropriations for the Bureau of Aeronautics. The effect of the action taken is to appropriate $805,760,000 as proposed by the House instead of $812,845,800 as provided by the Senate but with certain redistributions of the appropriation as proposed by the Senate. The Senate increase which was eliminated was for the production of training devices. It is the intention of the conferees that the appropriation for "Research, Navy," may be available for the production of these devices.

No. 27: Appropriates $5,963,000 for the pay and allowances of the Marine Corps Reserve as proposed by the Senate instead of $15,634,000 as provided by the House.

No. 28: Corrects a total.

Nos. 29, 30, and 31: Appropriates, in each instance, 50 percent of the increase added by the Senate for the pay of civilian employees of the Marine Corps.

No. 32: Corrects a total.

No. 33: Appropriates $2,857,000 for general expenses of the Marine Corps Reserve as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,800,000 as provided by the House.

Nos. 34 and 35: Corrects totals.

Nos. 36 to 45, inclusive: Appropriates, in each instance, 50 percent of the increase added by the Senate for the pay of civilian employees in the various bureaus and offices in Washington.

No. 46: Adopts Senate language clarifying intent of the House provision.

Nos. 47 to 54, inclusive: Appropriates, in each instance, 50 percent of the increase added by the Senate for the pay of civilian employees in the various bureaus and offices in Washington.

No. 55: Corrects a total.

No. 56: Appropriates $1,500,000 for contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the Hydrographic Office instead of $1,425,000 as proposed by the House and $1,650,000 as provided by the Senate.

No. 57: Eliminates language inserted by the Senate permitting, under certain conditions, time studies to be made of work performed by Government employees of the Navy Department.

No. 58: Action same as that taken on amendment No. 14.

No. 60: Clarifying amendment.

No. 61: Adopts language inserted by the Senate preventing the use of funds appropriated in the bill for expenses incident to the care of surplus materials.

Nos. 63 to 70, inclusive: These amendments all deal with the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration. Under the House provisions the War Shipping Administration would become merged with the Maritime Commission on July 1, 1946, and the War Shipping Administration would be liquidated by December 31, 1946. The Senate provided that the merger would take place on October 1, 1946, with liquidation to follow on March 1, 1947. The amendments as agreed to will require the merger to take place on September 1, 1946, and liquidation to become effective on December 31, 1946.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

No. 1, relating to cost-of-living allowances for civilian employees of the Navy Department in foreign countries. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 12, relating to the naval procurement fund: The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

No. 19, relating to use of public works funds: The House managers will move to cede and concur with an amendment.

No. 59, relating to limitations on expenditure of funds to pay salary and wages of anyone who engages in a strike against the Government, or who is a member of an organization that asserts the right to strike against the Government, etc. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 62, relating to language permitting the Secretary of the Navy to delegate certain authority. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the House managers, after a free and full conference, have been able to reach a complete agreement on all of the matters in dispute in the Navy Department Appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1947. There were a few contentious subjects, but by give and take we finally had a meeting of the minds.

The bill, as made up in conference, carries a total "out of the Treasury" appropriation of approximately $4,120,000,000 which is supplemented by a $500,000,000 transfer of funds from the Naval Stock fund. The total amount carried in the bill is roughly $10,000,000 under the total as passed by the House and the reduction results largely from the elimination of approximately $11,500,000 for the Marine Corps Reserve program. As passed the House, the bill provided funds to double the size of the Marine Corps Reserve. General Vandergrift appeared before the Senate Committee and indicated that the greatly augmented program would afford some difficulties and that he would be satisfied if the original Marine Corps estimates for the Reserve program would be approved. The agreement is in accord with his wishes.

There were really only two other matters that were of general interest. The House bill carried funds for the construction of four permanent Naval hospitals and an addition to an existing hospital. The Senate struck out these monies. We finally agreed to reinstate about $42,000,000 for this hospital program which is about $12,000,000 less than the House bill set up. This sum should provide something between 3,000 and 4,000 additional beds in permanently constructed hospitals and will at least be a start in the direction of meeting the 13,000 odd permanent bed deficiency that exists at the present time. The other matter that I think should be brought to your attention in the matter of the compromise we made on the action of the Senate in restoring approximately $5,500,000 for the salaries of civilian employees in the Navy Department in Washington. The House had cut that sum from the Budget estimates with an eye toward economy. The reduction spelled positions for about 2,000 individuals. Every one of the divisions in the Navy that were affected by the slash appeared before the Senate Committee and entered vigorous objection to the reduction. It was finally agreed, therefore, that we would halve the difference so we restored approximately 2 and three-fourths million dollars for these salaries. Even with this restoration, however, we reduced the budget estimates for civilian employees at the seat of Government by about 7 percent.

I think that is all that I care to say about the report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, all I wish to say is that I support unqualifiedly the report of the committee of conference.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON].

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, on Monday of this week the President accepted the resignation of the Honorable Ganson Purcell, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. The great work of this able and fearless administrator over his 16-year period of public service is known to all of you. Hence, I will not recount his accomplishments in detail but merely use this brief moment to pay to him the tribute which he so justly and richly deserves.

Ganson Purcell entered into the services of the United States in 1930, when he became a member of the staff of the Legislative Counsel of the United States Senate. He became Assistant Legislative Counsel to the Senate in 1932. After ably serving in that capacity until 1934 he became a member of the legal staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission which was then in its infancy but whose future held such great promise. The Commission, which had been created by Congress to curb the financial excesses rampant in the twenties and which substantially contributed to the debacle of the early thirties, was then attracting to its staff some of the most brilliant minds and skilled technicians in this country. Ganson Purcell was one of the first of this group. His first job at the Commission was almost at the bottom of the organization, but it was not long before his keen mind, and exceptional abilities, led to his rapid advancement. He became, successively, Assistant Director of the Trading and Exchange Division, Director of the Trading and Exchange Division, and, in 1941, Commissioner. Since 1942 he has been the Commission's chairman.

Keenly aware of the public interest, zealous to protect the small investor from the unscrupulous practices of the Wall Street coterie and skilled in the techniques of both the law and the market place, he did much to build the stature of the Commission into a real bulwark of our system of free enterprise.

It was with great personal regret that I learned of his resignation from the Commission, and I know that my keen regret is shared by the other Members of the House. I see in his resignation another example of a solid, able, and even-handed public servant who stayed in the governmental harness years beyond the time when personal interest would have dictated otherwise.

While the loss of the services of Ganson Purcell is a real blow to the Commission, I know that his keen mind and great heart have left an enduring mark which should bode well for the common weal.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. I realize we have to have a strong Navy now and a good Army and a strong air force. But when I hear over the radio, as I did yesterday morning, "This is WRC-NBC; we have collected $43,000,000,000 in taxes for the year and we have paid $12,000,000,000 off the national debt this year." Then they stop there and make the people of this country believe we are doing some good financing. But instead of the radio commentator telling the public we are going into debt over $2,000,000,000 for the year, with all the money that you have collected, it makes the picture sound, but it does not fool the public. It behooves the Committee on Appropriations at all times to cut down these appropriations to the limit of their ability with good sound financing. I wonder whether the Appropriations Committee has done everything it could do in eliminating every unnecessary expense in the naval appropriation bill. It has not been done in some other bills.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I would remind my good friend, the watchdog of the Treasury, that when we bring in a report after a conference with the Senate which measures our ability to trade to the extent that we reduced the original House bill by $20,000,000, he should not find any fault with that. May I say to him also that he should not believe everything he hears over the radio.

Mr. RICH. I do not believe in what I hear from many radio commentators. I am not so much interested so far as the conference report is concerned as I am in the ultimate financing of this Government of ours. Now you have to do either one of two things. You must either stop spending extravagantly or bust; and I do not want to be a party to the bust. For 15 years this country has had an orgy of high financing and very extravagant administration. No other administration has ever been like it for inefficiency and extravagance. It is the world's worst spenders.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time I intend to offer a motion to recommit this conference report with instructions to the House conferees to stand by the House language which was put in the bill; in other words, my amendment to prevent the use of funds by the Navy for the manufacture, overhaul, repair, and assembly of torpedoes at Forest Park, Ill. I was greatly surprised and disappointed when I found after the amendment had been adopted here on the floor of the House and had been adopted by the Subcommittee on Appropriations in the Senate that the full Senate Appropriations Committee had deleted it from the bill and the Senate sustained that action. However, in accordance with long-established precedent, I expected that the House conferees would stand up for the language in the House bill, which I understand they failed to do. Instead they yielded to the Senate. Therefore, the amendment was deleted from the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this really means something in more ways than one. It means that the Navy is riding roughshod and doing just what it pleases, regardless of the effect upon a torpedo station that was built in 1869, where the torpedo was invented and developed and where highly skilled personnel was used during the war, not only to manufacture torpedoes as they did during peacetime but also to teach the manufacture of torpedoes to those people who were to be hired by private contractors and who were to be used at the plant in Forest Park, Ill., a plant that was operated during the war by a private contractor, the American Can Co., and which was taken over by the Navy on December 10, 1945.

The reward for those men of Newport, who did so much for the war effort, as well as for many years previously, is that they are being thrown out into the street after having rendered 25, 35, and, in one case, 39 years of faithful service to Uncle Sam, under civil-service rates of pay, which are about 20 cents an hour less than the Navy is paying at Forest Park. While throwing out these long-term employees who were under civil service, but are too young to take advantage of the retirement law now on the books, they have blanketed into the Civil Service to man the plant at Forest Park the men who during the war were working for private contractors at much higher wages, and who are eligible for unemployment compensation, to which, of course, the employees at Newport are not eligible.

The Navy Department has made the specious argument that they can manufacture torpedoes cheaper at Forest Park than at Newport, but as usual, they handle their language very deftly. They also juggle figures very nicely. I do not say that they lied to you, but I could say it. For instance, in the case of manufacturing the mark-13 torpedo, the Navy Department states that the cost at Newport was $9,040, against $7,900 at Forest Park. What is the truth of the matter? I have the figures, and the Navy Department has the same figures on file, showing that for the last 5 years the average cost of the mark-13 torpedo manufactured at Newport is $7,000, which includes five or six hundred dollars for ranging. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that Newport is to continue the research and development work, but the torpedoes will be manufactured at Forest Park, Ill., and then will be shipped 1,000 miles back to Newport for testing, for post ranging, and for issue. Moreover, they tell us that Forest Park is going to have 1,250 employees. Admiral Hussey admitted, and you will find it in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, that if my amendment remains in the bill it means but 600 jobs at Newport. How can you reconcile the Navy Department's statement that they are going to save money by using Forest Park if they are going to use 1,250 workers at Forest Park when 600 people can do the same work at Newport? It does not jibe.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to commend the gentleman for his splendid argument for the Newport station. In my judgment it is just bureaucratic arrogance and favoritism to close a station which was established by act of Congress, and transfer its activities elsewhere.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman no doubt is aware of the statement made by Admiral Hussey that if the Navy so decided, they could close Annapolis without considering Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not believe in that kind of administration.

Mr. FORAND. I hold in my hand a copy of the Chicago Tribune of June 27, and I want to read an excerpt from it.

Mr. FORAND. Capt. Harry Hoffman, commanding officer at the naval ordnance plant at Forest Park, Ill., has given us a fine example of the arrogance of some Navy officers and the contempt they have for Congress.

I quote from Captain Hoffman's statement, as it appears in the Chicago Tribune:

I thought everybody had learned the lesson of the vulnerability of our seacoasts in this war.

You know as well as I do that coming from the Arctic Circle they can reach Forest Park or Chicago or New York just as easily as they can reach Newport.

It was a good, sound decision getting our plants dispersed and located inland, and now a small group of minority politicians—

Those who are fighting for their own districts are called minority politicians.

There is a fine example of what the naval officers think of us, we who are elected by the people to represent them here in this Congress. I believe that under the Constitution we in the Congress have the right and the duty to tell the Navy what they should do, not they tell us what we should do. I continue the quotation—

and now a small group of minority politicians comes along and tries to wreck our program. The Navy wants Forest Park.

Will the Navy say what they want and what they will get, or will the Congress say so?

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DE LACY. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island on the magnificent statement of facts he has made about his own torpedo station in relation to the Forest Park development.

In my own district we have a magnificent station, with a history not as long as that of the station in the gentleman's district, but one that is very efficient. We likewise are suffering the same penalty for having done good work over a long period of years and built up a corps of highly trained mechanics.

I certainly hope the gentleman will be successful in his fight.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Did I understand the gentleman to say that torpedoes could be manufactured in the Rhode Island torpedo plant $2,000 cheaper each than at Forest Park?

Mr. FORAND. Not quite that. The Navy says that Newport is manufacturing at $9,040, whereas Forest Park is manufacturing at $7,900. I say that the actual figures would prove that $7,000 is approximately the cost of a Mark 13 torpedo at Newport. If they want to use the same type of torpedo manufactured under similar conditions we maintain we cannot only meet that figure but that we have workmen who are so far superior by virtue of their long experience—in fact, to the point where they were used as teachers for the group at Forest Park—that we could better that figure.

Mr. RICH. I hope the gentleman will put those figures in the RECORD. It seems to me we ought to have them in the RECORD because wherever the Navy, the Army, or any component of the armed forces can purchase the necessary equipment at the cheapest possible price, they should, in order to assist in balancing the budget.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Rhode Island three additional minutes.

Mr. FORAND. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we can go just a little further than that and show that the figures quoted are the figures that were used when a private contractor was operating the Forest Park plant. Everybody knows that with the Government taking over operation of the Forest Part plant the cost will be higher.

Mr. RICH. Everybody knows that whenever the Government does anything the costs are a great deal more than in private enterprise, because Government accountants do not take into consideration all the costs that enter into private manufacturing. A lot of expenses, therefore, are not reflected in the costs.

Mr. FORAND. I believe this case has merit. In addition to what I have already said, we have got to consider the

human element and realize that at Newport the Navy Department has insisted right along over a period of years that no other industry be located in that area so that it would not afford competition in their labor market. By closing the manufacturing establishment at Newport you are closing the only industry in that entire area and are subjecting men and families who have been there for years to go into the wilderness looking for jobs.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield gladly to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has brought out a fact that is very important, and that is throwing a great many men out of jobs, men who have been there through the years, who have been trained to do this particular kind of work, who either have to have this particular job or else be transferred to a country far, far away, where they do not want to go. A continuance of operations at Newport would save these men either from being out of jobs or having to go elsewhere to support their families.

Mr. FORAND. Unfortunately, I may say to the gentleman from Kansas, that has already happened and the welfare rolls of the city have already swollen because of the number of men who have lost their employment and their inability to support the number of dependents they have been supporting.

I am glad the gentleman from Kansas has made this statement because he is a member of the Committee on the Civil Service and heard the testimony of these men. He knows their story.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is a very serious thing to cause men to lose employment.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman explain to me why the Senator from Rhode Island signed this conference report?

Mr. FORAND. I cannot answer for the actions of a Member of the other body.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include therein certain excerpts and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will not prevail and that the House will approve the conference report as submitted by the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations. It would appear that the only contention before us at the moment is the question of the location of a torpedo plant.

There is a plant located presently at Newport, R. I.; but during the war the Navy Department saw fit to establish an entirely new plant at Forest Park, Ill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. That also includes a plant at Sharon, Pa.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Now, it ought to be made clear at the outset that the conference report and the bill as passed by the House does not extinguish the plant at Newport, R. I. The essential point is that it is put upon a research basis and the plant will be rehabilitated. At the same time, this $32,000,000 plant at Forest Park, Ill., which is the finest and most efficient plant in all the world, will be preserved.

I can commend my good friend the gentleman from Rhode Island for his zeal in this matter because the plant is in his district. I can speak entirely dispassionately on the matter because the Forest Park plant is located 200 miles from where I live. As a matter of fact, there is not a single war installation in my congressional district. So I have no personal interest in the matter whatsoever. I do commend his zeal. But the real issue involved here, Mr. Speaker, is whether by the action of the Congress we propose to contravene the administrative judgment of the Navy, which is founded upon good ground and was taken for very persuasive reasons.

We should not for a light and transient reason undertake to roll back the administrative decision of the Navy unless there is good cause for it. The Navy had reasons for going out to Forest Park, Ill., and locating the torpedo plant, which, as I said before, is regarded by the Secretary of the Navy as the most efficient in the world. The Navy has not run roughshod over anybody. There has been none of the alleged arrogance on the part of Navy officials. The fact of the matter is there was good reason for preserving this plant and asking the Appropriations Committee and asking the Congress to preserve the plant and keep it in operation.

In the first place, the plant at Forest Park is the newest plant in all the world. The plant at Newport is about 77 years old and some of its machinery and its buildings are in an obsolescent stage. They have a sprawling plant, as distinguished from the compact torpedo plant located on 117 acres at Forest Park, where every part of the torpedo, from the tiniest little gyro mechanism on down is manufactured within the confines of a single plant. So it is self-sufficient.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is in error about that, is he not? There are parts coming in there that are manufactured elsewhere.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I still stand by the statement. I said that it was self-contained.

Secondly, it is the lowest-cost plant. I do not know anything about the figures that were submitted by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND]—and certainly I would not presume to impeach those figures—but I do know that the Navy Department is the authority for the figure that at Newport it cost $9,040 to manufacture a torpedo, as against $7,914 at Forest Park; in other words, the Navy comes with their figures and says, "You can manufacture a torpedo at Forest Park, Ill., $1,126 cheaper than you can at Newport, R. I." I do not know where the figures of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] came from, but I do know that those are the Navy figures indicating that the cost of manufacture at Forest Park is infinitely cheaper. I have no choice except to give full credit and authenticity to the figures that the Navy has submitted.

With respect to the item that appears here about men who have been engaged in the service for a long time and who, in some instances, may have to find other work, let me remind you that of the 1,200 employees at Forest Park today, 900 are veterans of World War II—900 out of 1,200 did yeoman service for their country in World War II. Are they not entitled to some consideration on the part of the Congress and the people if the future welfare of the employees is to be a determining factor? If you propose now, for the sake of one locality, to close a torpedo plant in another, and state that the Navy is interested in retaining and putting out of business 900 veterans of World War II, then what? There is no force at all in the sympathy or argument, and I brush it to one side unless it is considered from the standpoint of veterans at Forest Park as well as that of men with long service at Newport. But there is equity on one side as against the equity that has been submitted on the other; and when all is said and done, of course, you do not rationalize this question of efficiency in national defense on sympathy; and if it is the most efficient plant in all the world, then it ought to be retained.

The next argument I would make in opposition to the motion to be offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island in behalf and in support of the Newport plant is that the Forest Park plant is the only plant in the United States—and perhaps the only plant in the world—where the new Navy electrical torpedo can be manufactured, and I stand on that statement. That is one of these new instrumentalities of war that has been developed within the last few years. The only place in the United States where they have the machinery, where they have the capacity, where they have the precision, and where they have the skill to get out this new electrical torpedo is at Forest Park, Ill. Are you going to junk a plant like that for the sake of a sprawling plant that is 77 years old, when the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, himself said that Forest Park is one Navy plant that must not get away from us—meaning the plant at Forest Park, Ill.?

That involves, then, this over-all, larger issue of contravening the best judgment of Admiral Hussey and the members of his staff in the Bureau of Aeronautics. After all, they did noble and great service in time of war. We were content to rely on their judgment when the Nation was at war. Are you going to say, "That is all right, as long as the war was on, but now we are going to run out on your best judgment, and notwithstanding the fact that you want to

retain the plant at Forest Park, we will arrogate to ourselves sufficient wisdom in that field and we propose now to shut down Forest Park in behalf of a 77-year-old plant at Newport, R. I."

Coming back to my good friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] I do commend his zeal in this respect, but when all is said and done, they have had this plant up there for a long time, nearly 3½ generations. If it is going to be a question of governmental benefits, then what about diffusing a few of those benefits? After all, are we not just as near to the Federal Treasury out in the Middle West as in any other section of the country? After all, are we not entitled to some of those benefits? We do not ask for all of them. We do not say, "Shut down Newport, R. I." It will be maintained. There is money in the bill for the rehabilitation of some of those structures. But we say at the same time, when the Navy in its best judgment says, "This is one plant we must not lose, this is the only plant in the United States where an electrical torpedo can be made," that Forest Park is entitled to full consideration.

You remember what happened in the early days of the war. The first thing our strategists did was to start moving inland with ordnance plants and shell-loading plants, and all that sort of thing. They did not want to locate huge war plants in areas that might be vulnerable to attack. I am no strategist. I do not propose to comment at any length on it. But certainly the Navy must have had it in mind at that time of building a plant in the very center of the country, so that the business of constructing torpedoes of all kinds to be launched against our enemies in the early days of the war might be safeguarded against all hazards.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. Admiral Hussey testified that the vulnerability of the plant at Newport was greater than that of the plants in the interior built at Oak Park, Ill., Sharon, Pa., St. Louis, Mo., and Pontiac, Mich.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so. That was Admiral Hussey's contention.

I will not belabor the subject any further. Let me conclude by saying that within the next 30 days a new million-dollar addition which has already been completed at Forest Park will be opened. Are you going to junk that against the judgment of all the experts in the Navy? I think this House ought to return to that question a resounding "No," and say "They have made this finding upon the basis of the facts, and have located there what they regard as the greatest torpedo plant in all the world. Their hand shall be upheld and they shall be sustained."

Mr. Speaker, the motion the gentleman from Rhode Island will make ought to be voted down.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have in the past 6 years admired and respected the gentleman from Illinois in all his debates on the floor of this House, but it seems to me this morning that he has gone far afield and he does not know too much about the subject he is talking about. I do not believe he knows anything about the conditions that exist in Rhode Island and in Newport in particular in relation to the situation of this plan. He knows nothing of the type of mechanics we have in Newport. He knows nothing of the outlay on buildings that have been constructed since this war started. We have spent millions of dollars on this island where this torpedo station is located to construct new buildings and put in new equipment. We have a modern plant there at the present time. There is no question in the mind of anyone in the Navy Department or anyone else that we have the best mechanics obtainable in this country located in the city of Newport, men who have spent their lifetime in this torpedo station.

When the gentleman from Illinois quotes figures he has read in the Chicago Tribune about the cost of a torpedo, those figures just are not true. The figures that were presented to the committee are the figures that were given when the American Can Co. was building those torpedoes, but since that time the Navy Department has taken over Forest Park and the costs are going to go up. I can show you here figures and guarantee that a torpedo can be built at Newport about eight or nine hundred dollars cheaper than it can be built under Navy jurisdiction at Forest Park.

The gentleman from Illinois mentioned the veterans of World War II at Forest Park. I can say to him we have had over 100 veterans of World War II laid off at Newport at the present time. He also spoke about the new electrical torpedo and said that Forest Park is the only plant that has the mechanism available to build the new electrical torpedo. But Admiral Hussey has already stated before our Committee on Naval Affairs that the electrical torpedo today is obsolete and that the equipment which is now located at Forest Park to build these electrical torpedoes is just a waste of the Navy's money because he has already declared that the new electrical torpedo is no good, is obsolete, and will not be built in the future. Therefore, what is there to the argument of the gentleman from Illinois when he says that they have the only equipment to build a torpedo which has been already declared obsolete? In this particular plant in the city of Newport there is no other industry and when this industry is taken out it will affect the entire economy of the city. There is no other industry where the men who have been working at the torpedo plant all their lives can find another job. Newport is actually isolated from the State of Rhode Island. The only other naval activity anywhere near Newport is across the bay about 7 or 8 miles and the only way they can get there is by taking a ferry and crossing a bridge which costs them $3.50 a day. The only other way to get there would be by automobile by a ride of 60 miles. I sincerely hope that the motion to recommit which will be offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND], will be carried.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] a member of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this has been a most interesting discussion. Naturally, we commend the Members who are trying to take care of employment in their districts. I happen to come from a district that has no naval installations. I am not interested in any of the arguments that have been made in regard to employment as far as this particular matter is concerned. Naturally, when the war was over, Government employment had to be cut down because we were not producing and it was not expected that we would continue to produce the equipment and materials which we did during the war. Every community that had activities connected with production for war purposes wants to see their particular community benefited by keeping that production going. That is impossible if we are going to run our Government on anything like a business basis. It appears to me that the Navy Department is responsible for the production of this material; the Navy Department which knows what equipment it has and where it can produce needed equipment best is the proper agency to determine where the production should go on and at what place plants should be kept in operation. When the Navy Department comes before a congressional committee and lays down its facts and figures and makes its recommendations as to what it wants in order to do an efficient job, I believe that the Congress would do well to consider seriously what that department which has the responsibility says should be done.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Will you give us some information with reference to what the Navy Department says about manufacturing these torpedoes cheaper at one plant than at the other?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I understand that was covered in the hearings. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] I believe, covered that in his statement a few months ago.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] made a statement different from that. What was your opinion of that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact of the matter is, it is the Navy official. The Navy Department has made the statement that you can manufacture them at Forest Park, Ill., for $7,914, and at Newport, R. I., for $9,040; that you can manufacture them at $1,126 cheaper for every torpedo at Forest Park than at Newport. You can impeach figures if you like to, but nobody has authentically impeached them as yet. We can only depend upon the naval officials.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Now, I would like to proceed a minute. As a

matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the same argument that has been made about continuing this plant at Newport in the production of torpedoes, and closing the one at Forest Park could be made as to one plant against another in thousands of instances throughout our country. We should adopt a business basis, have some confidence in what those who have the responsibility say to us, and stop considering the proposition that it is the duty of the United States Government to somehow, some way, keep every plant that we had during the war in operation. That just cannot be done in the postwar economy.

I believe this conference report should be adopted.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. I was wondering why we should be quarreling as to whether Rhode Island or Illinois shall make the torpedoes when the atomic-bomb test tomorrow may make every production obsolete.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The gentleman may have something there. I think the proper thing to do is simply to follow out what the responsible people say we should do and adopt this conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, some of my constituents have lived long in this particular section. I cannot believe that efficiency in any new mushroom plant exceeds that of the people who have worked at Newport these many years and who have had long experience. Would any of you allow your own old-established plants to be uprooted and abandoned in order that plants built hastily for temporary needs might remain in operation? What interests me greatly is that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] argues efficiency and declares that sentimentality must not enter into the decision. He then appeals for the veterans working in the new locations. That, indeed, is a very effective sentimental appeal. We are appealing for an old-established plant, where workers have been employed for years and they and their families have established themselves in the vicinity. I do not wish them uprooted, and none of you would hesitate to object in a similar situation. The report of the committee is unfortunate. We could and should reject it. Do not tell us that the new plants are more efficient than the one at Newport after all these many years of experience and training. We cannot accept such claims, especially when the reports are so conflicting.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take the 3 minutes. I do want to point out, however, that when this bill was being considered in the first instance in the Committee of the Whole House, near the end of the day when there were just a few Members present, because of the stress of time and the parliamentary situation prevailing, a teller vote was prevented. It is my considered opinion that had a teller vote been taken the amendment offered then by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] would have been defeated, and I expect to take advantage of every parliamentary procedure today to defeat his amendment, because of its lack of merit.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman knows there was just a handful of Members on the floor at that time.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I do not yield. I only have 3 minutes.

The gentleman also knows that I rose at the time and asked for tellers; a gentleman on the other side gained the floor which procedure automatically prevented a successful attempt on my part to obtain a vote by tellers.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an answer?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield.

Mr. Speaker, after full hearings in the Senate the item the gentleman from Rhode Island is now fighting for was stricken from the bill, and the Senator from Rhode Island signed the conference report. In addition to that $350,000 was added by the Senate and retained by the conference committee to more than take care of the Newport needs.

I believe that when experts of the Navy Department testify as they did testify before both the House and the Senate committees, giving abundant evidence of the necessity for the Forest Park item, we should pay attention to their recommendations, and all the more so when the Senator from Rhode Island signs this conference report. It seems to me that that action outweighs the action by which this amendment was adopted originally in the House side when fewer than 50 Members were present.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. WILSON. Is it not true that the storage depot for these torpedoes is located at Crane, Ind., and that if they were made on the coast it would involve shipping of the finished torpedoes all the way to Indiana for storage and then shipping them back again, whereas if they are manufactured out there they will be nearer the place where they are to be stored?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, the hearings are full of testimony that sustain the action in the Senate. At page 197 of the Senate hearings on this bill you will find the statement made by one of the Navy experts to the effect that the vulnerability of installations such as Newport was a very compelling reason to relocate the torpedo manufacture at Forest Park, St. Louis, Sheridan, Pennsylvania, Pontiac, and Chicago.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I wish to take this opportunity of paying tribute to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] and his colleagues for the aggressive manner in which they have made their presentation to the Congress and to the members of our subcommittee.

When this issue was under consideration the committee in its hearings obtained all the justifications for these activities that it was possible to secure from the gentlemen representing the interests of the Government. The final judgment of the subcommittee was verified by the action of the full committee. When I presented the issue to them they concurred in what the subcommittee had done insofar as it applied to Newport and Forest Park. When we came to the floor of the House, however, the gentleman from Rhode Island offered an amendment and I wish to call the attention of the membership to what is involved.

There is a splendid plant in Rhode Island that has been in existence for a long period of years. You also have at Forest Park one of the most modern plants of this character that is known in the world, in which the Federal Government has invested more than $21,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. I call your specific attention to the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island. It reads as follows:

> That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the manufacture, assembly, repair, or overhaul of torpedoes at the naval ordnance plant, Forest Park, Ill.

Your subcommittee naturally would not go along with that amendment and approve it on the floor, although the House at that time placed it in the bill over the committee objections.

It went over to the Senate. Senator GREEN, who also represents the great State of Rhode Island, was, I am advised, present at the time this amendment was considered by the Senate. Full debate was had in the Senate and the provision was eliminated from the bill.

Mr. Speaker, in order to take care of the Newport station the House managers agreed to incorporate the following language in the bill. Let me call to the attention of the House, however, that it is rather interesting that the gentleman who speaks so adversely about the conference report, neglected to comment on this language. Here is the wording:

> Two hundred forty-six million, three hundred ninety thousand dollars of which $350,000 shall be available for placing the equipment at the naval torpedo station, Newport, R. I., in condition for operation.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that you have before you in this particular issue a question of policy. Either the House is gong to legislate as to which operational projects will be closed and which are to remain open and perforce exercise the prerogative of geographical favoritism, or it is going to legislate upon

the basis of equity which means that we must leave these decisions up to administrative officials who are competent to make these decisions.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I am just wondering what advantage that $350,000 is going to be to rehabilitate Newport if they are not going to use the machinery?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am assuming that Senator GREEN, representing your State, would have asked that question at the time he was discussing it with the naval officials. He seems to be a very intelligent gentleman. When we were discussing the problem with him he said, "As a compromise I think we have reached as satisfactory a conclusion as is possible under the circumstances." That is the only answer I can give the gentleman because I did not do the gentleman's thinking.

Mr. FORAND. How come the $350,000 was suggested? If the gentleman does not know the origin of it, I can give it to him.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was put in at the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island, if the information given to me by the Senator is correct.

Mr. FORAND. It was put in there because the Secretary of the Navy in trying to offset the amendment which I offered said it would require $350,000 to rehabilitate the plant up there, take the machinery out of grease and start to operate. I think the figure is wrong. In fact, the experts who work there tell me it is.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to make a few observations about this very troublesome matter. Before I start, I want to say a few words about my two distinguished friends from Rhode Island, Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. FORAND, two of my good, close, personal friends. I commend them for their fine fight which they have made for their district. I do not know of any two men in Congress, when you get right down to bare facts, who have done more for their districts than have these two gentlemen. When November comes I know your good people, whom you have the honor to represent, will so recognize your outstanding ability and we will see you back here next January.

Let us discuss this matter on its merits. The proposition opens up two very fundamental factors. First, is it going to be the policy of the House of Representatives to take away from the Navy its administrative functions; namely, out of the literally hundreds and hundreds of projects that the Navy has undertaken, will it be the policy of the Congress which it certainly has not been heretofore, now at this late date to write that policy of the Navy by telling it where it is going to have installations?

We have not done it in the past, and certainly we will not do it in the future, because it just does not make sense. I might say that four out of five of the conferees of the other body just put their feet down on that proposition and said, "We will not usurp the administrative functions of the Navy." In the first place, the House is not qualified to do that job. If there is any doubt in the wisdom of the policy that we have followed these many years, that great committee of this House, the Committee on Naval Affairs, ought to look into the matter and do a little legislating and change the policy if it needs changing.

The second fundamental principle is simply this, as was so ably brought out by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON]: Can we keep all of these fine plants going in the Army and the Navy? Of course not. There have been thousands of business dislocations throughout the United States. There have been many dislocations of families. Do we want to say to the Navy, "You must keep this fine community going by keeping this plant there?" The Navy says, "We want to do otherwise. We are not going to close it, but we are going to operate it as a scientific laboratory." Yet, this fine community says, "Well, you have operated it so many years here that we feel it belongs to us, and we want you to operate it just like you have done in the past."

We grant you that there may be some dislocations in that fine community, though I hope not, but if there are, there will be dislocations in your district and mine and every other district in the country on account of this war.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Members will think carefully over this matter, and when it comes to a vote let us not recommit this bill. We have worked long and hard on it, and there is only one little item in here that we cannot get together on. Certainly the House is not going to tear up 4 months of hard work over one matter that in truth and in fact should not have been before us now. It should have been handled in the regular way.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. The only stand we take today is that we claim that the Newport torpedo station is the most efficiently operated station in the country; that we have the best group of mechanics available; that we have the old-line mechanics that know about the making of a torpedo inside and out, and that is where efficiency counts.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I understand the gentleman's point of view. They make them in Forest Park and they have trained labor there also.

Mr. FOGARTY. But they will be sent to Newport to be passed on afterward.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CHURCH moves to recommit the conference report on H. R. 6496 to the committee of conference with instruction to the managers on the part of the House to insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 9.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 22, after the comma insert "special cost of living allowances for employees abroad."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 22, line 11, insert the following paragraph:

"NAVAL PROCUREMENT FUND

"For the purpose of settlement of war contracts under the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, and during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, advances by check or warrant and reimbursements to the Naval Procurement Fund from naval appropriations may be made on the basis of the estimated cost of a project without further accounting distribution of expenditures to the individual appropriations involved."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHEPPARD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: On line 2 of said Senate amendment strike out the word "and."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 25, line 16, after "Statutes", insert "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for hospital construction: *Provided further*, That wherever there are architectural and engineering services in any State in which a project is located qualified to do the work, such services shall be utilized."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHEPPARD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said Senate amendment insert the following: "*Provided further*, That wherever there are architectural and engineering services in any State in which a project is located qualified to do the work, such services shall be utilized."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to ask the gentleman two questions.

First, I assume that the purpose of the amendment the gentleman has offered is to permit the use of funds in the bill for hospital construction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No. That is not a part of this amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it Senate amendment No. 19 we are now considering?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is not the gentleman dropping the limitation against part of the funds being used for hospital construction?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have moved that the House recede and concur with an amendment which will eliminate that language.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What language is being eliminated?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That none of the money can be used for the construction of hospitals. That is the pertinent part of the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So that it will be possible to use money in the bill for hospital construction?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That correct, under the amendment which is now under consideration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is the point I want established. It will be remembered that in the consideration of the Army appropriation bill the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] established that the Tripler Hospital was started in Hawaii with transferred funds. So, now, I ask the gentleman with reference to the transfer clause which was embodied in the bill originally. I recognize that that is not before us in the conference report, but in view of the proposed elimination of the restriction on hospital construction I desire to get a statement from the gentleman. It is also important for the conference which will probably be held on the War Department appropriation bill today. Heretofore the Navy bill has not carried a transfer clause, but the bill that is now being approved does carry a transfer clause permitting the Navy Department to transfer money from one appropriation head to another. Is the present proposal for the purpose of permitting a hospital or hospitals to be started with transferred funds?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; not as such. I may say to the gentleman that there was an agreement in this bill on 5 percent for 1 year only.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The situation with which we are confronted in connection with the conference on the Army appropriation bill is that the Army bill was passed by the House eliminating any transfer clause, and I understand that the other body put in the Army bill a transfer clause for 10 percent. Was there any suggestion in the conference with the other body on the Navy bill in connection with the language of that bill that a uniform policy of transfer should be developed between the Army and the Navy?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; there was not, because it was no in conference. The Senate agreed to the amount of 5 percent as set originally by the House.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I will say to my friend from South Dakota that we reluctantly put the 5-percent transfer clause in this bill for this year and served notice on the Navy that in the future we would not do it under any circumstances. They wanted it more or less to give them a little flexibility during this change-over period. Next year they will not get it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is not to be regarded as a precedent, either for the Navy or War Department.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. No.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And it is not for the purpose, taken in connection with the amendment to lift the ban on hospital construction, of permitting transfers to start some major hospital?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 43, line 9, strike out all of page 43 after line 9, including line 9, and lines 1 and 2 on page 44, and insert the following:

"SEC. 109. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, this is the antistrike provision and is a matter which has been inserted in all the appropriations bills. The House has already declared its position on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 50, line 22, insert the following:

"SEC. 120. The Secretary of the Navy may delegate to the commandants of the naval districts, for administration within their respective districts, his authority (1) to employ persons in the departmental service of the Navy Department, wherever located, and (2) to authorize payment of the expenses of the transfer of household goods of employees, and of the costs of transportation of their immediate families on change from one official duty station to another."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHEPPARD moves to recede and concur with an amendment to Senate amendment No. 62: In lieu of the matter inserted by said Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 120. The Secretary of the Navy may delegate to the commandants of the naval districts, for administration within their respective districts, his authority to authorize payment of the expenses of the transfer of household goods of employees, and of the costs of transportation of their immediate families on change from one official duty station to another."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial entitled "Texas" which was published in the Lexington Gazette, of Lexington, Va., on May 14, 1846.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

(Roll No. 187)

Adams	Eberharter	LeCompte
Anderson, Calif.	Elsaesser	Lemke
Andrews, N. Y.	Engel, Mich.	Lesinski
Auchincloss	Ervin	Ludlow
Baldwin, Md.	Fernandez	McGehee
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fisher	McGlinchey
Barrett, Pa.	Gardner	McKenzie
Bates, Mass.	Gerlach	Mahon
Bell	Gibson	Mansfield, Mont.
Bennet, N. Y.	Gillespie	Mansfield, Tex.
Bonner	Granger	Merrow
Boren	Grant, Ala.	Miller, Calif.
Boykin	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Morgan
Bradley, Mich.	Hall, Leonard W.	Morrison
Bradley, Pa.	Harness, Ind.	Murphy
Brooks	Harris	Norrell
Buchanan	Hartley	Norton
Buckley	Hébert	Patrick
Byrne, N. Y.	Hedrick	Patterson
Camp	Heffernan	Peterson, Ga.
Cannon, Fla.	Hoffman, Mich.	Pickett
Celler	Holifield	Ploeser
Cochran	Izac	Powell
Coffee	Jackson	Quinn, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Rankin
Colmer	Kearney	Rayfiel
Courtney	Kee	Reece, Tenn.
Cox	Kefauver	Rivers
Crawford	Keogh	Robertson, N. Dak.
Curley	Kerr	Robinson, Utah
Daughton, Va.	Kinzer	Rodgers, Pa.
Dawson	Klein	Roe, N. Y.
Dolliver	Latham	Rooney
Drewry		
Dworshak		

Sabath	Stigler	Vinson
Sheridan	Stockman	Welch
Sikes	Sumners, Tex.	West
Smith, Va.	Taylor	Wickersham
Sparkman	Thomas, N. J.	Winstead
Starkey	Tolan	Wolfenden, Pa.
Stevenson	Torrens	Worley
Stewart	Towe	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 307 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT AND STABILIZATION ACT—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning without my approval H. R. 6042 amending the price-control laws and extending them for another year.

The choice which H. R. 6042 presents is not a choice between continued price stability and inflation. It is a choice between inflation with a statute and inflation without one. The bill continues the Government's responsibility to stabilize the economy and at the same time it destroys the Government's power to do so.

If this bill were allowed to become law, the American people would believe that they were protected by a workable price-control law. But they would not be protected and they would soon come to a bitter realization of that truth. It is only fair to tell them the facts now.

The lesson from our own experience after the last war, disastrous as it was to our farmers, our workers, our manufacturers, our distributors, and our consumers, has been too easily obscured by the annoyances and irritations and the occasional inequities of price control. The fact that inflation has already gutted the economy of country after country all over the world should shake our comfortable assurance that such a catastrophe cannot happen here.

For 5 years we have proved that inflation can be prevented. It still can be prevented if we have the will to prevent it. Today the opportunity of completing the transition from war to peace with an economy which is stable, sound, and secure is within our grasp.

To avoid sacrificing this opportunity requires courage, wisdom, and self-restraint. This winter and spring the tensions have been more acute than ever before. We are all weary and impatient of Government restrictions and controls. We are all eager for the day when we can pursue our own affairs in our own way. In such a mood there is the natural temptation to remove essential safeguards, prematurely.

This bill yields to that temptation. It would provide us with no real safeguards at all. It would start prices and costs climbing and keep them climbing. It would start the value of the dollar falling and keep it falling. Far from helping production it would retard it. In the end this bill would lead to disaster.

I shall not attempt to comment on all the bill's provisions. Some of them are entirely appropriate. Many others reflect minor concessions to special interest groups of the sort which the Congress has heretofore resisted. To these latter provisions I object on grounds of principle. But in the last days before the expiration of legislation so vital to the Nation's welfare I should not regard these concessions as a basis for withholding my approval from an extension bill.

My fundamental objection to the bill is to the numerous amendments which would raise the price of essential cost-of-living commodities. Of those by far the most damaging is the price-raising amendment for manufacturers introduced by Senator TAFT (section 11), operating in conjunction with the revised price-raising amendment for distributors introduced by Senator WHERRY (section 10, par. [t]), and with the special cost-plus amendments for automobile and appliance dealers first offered to the House Committee on Banking and Currency by Representative CRAWFORD (sec. 10, par. [q] and [r]).

The mainspring of this combination is Senator TAFT's amendment. It is that amendment which would compel thousands of needless price increases amounting to many billions of dollars. The Wherry and Crawford amendments simply make sure that before the Taft amendment price increases for the manufacturers reach the consumer, they will be pyramided by generous wholesalers' and retailers' mark-ups.

The provisions of the Taft amendment are complex but they wear a superficial reasonableness. I am sure, however, that Congress adopted this amendment without full appreciation of its consequences.

I wish it were possible to tell you exactly how many billions of dollars the American people would eventually have to pay for the Taft amendment and its companion pieces. To attempt to do so, however, would be like trying to estimate the cost of a fire about to sweep a city before the first building had started to burn. Even to estimate the total amount of all the first round of price increases is not now possible.

Here, however, are a few examples which would enter into such a total.

The first impact of the Taft and Wherry amendments in the crucial field of housing would be little short of devastating. The prices of nearly all building materials would be affected. The average increase of such materials, excluding lumber, would be approximately 20 percent. This would completely disrupt the program recently approved by the Congress to provide veterans' housing at reasonable cost.

Ceilings for steel would have to be raised an average of $4 to $8 a ton. These increases would in turn be reflected in the ceilings of everything made of steel.

The average price of low-priced automobiles would be increased $225 to $250, on top of the substantial increases already granted.

Household appliances such as washing machines and refrigerators would increase from 25 to 30 percent. Floor coverings would go up about 17 percent; plumbing supplies, about 16 percent; farm machinery, about 13 percent.

The prices of clothing—already too high—would be increased by an estimated average of 15 percent—more than half of which would be attributable to the Taft and Wherry amendments and the balance to other amendments. This by itself would add about $3,000,000,000 a year to the living expenses of American families.

These are only preliminary estimates of a few of the initial price increases. They do not take into account the further increases, for example, on automobiles, after steel, tires, safety glass, and other materials and parts have received their own increases.

The bill would cause some major increases in foods immediately. It would curtail subsidy payments so that the prices of certain foods would have to go up. Other foods would get immediate increases under the Taft amendment, but these would go to processors rather than to farmers. Like the wage earner, the white-collar worker, and the millions of old people and others who must live on fixed incomes, the farmer is a victim of this bill.

This, however, does not mean that the country would get any real protection for long in what it costs to eat. The same thing is true of rents. The bill does not direct any immediate increases in rents at all. But this does not mean that rents could be effectively controlled.

If I thought that this bill would make possible some genuine protection against soaring food prices and rents, I should hesitate long before disapproving it, despite the total impossibility of stabilizing the prices of other essential commodities. Our economy, however, cannot be half-stabilized. We cannot quarantine inflation. Higher prices for the things that farmers and landlords buy would inevitably force up farm prices and rents. In the case of farm prices, this is required by the parity provisions of the law. In the case of both farm prices and rents, general increases would be forced upon us by simple justice and the hard facts of business and economics.

This bill, therefore, gives only the delusion of protection against rising costs of food and shelter. It would delay their rise a little. But the delay would be long enough only to cause unnecessary hardship for farmers and landlords—not long enough to bring real benefits to consumers and tenants.

The spectacular increases in the prices of manufactured goods which the Taft amendment and its companion amendments would cause, right at the beginning, are far in excess of anything which industry needs to earn generous profits and obtain full production. The increases are so large because the formulas for computing them are bonanza formulas.

The Taft amendment puts into prices the profit per unit of sales which the industry received for the particular product in the year 1941. That was a year in which manufacturers and processors received a much greater profit out of each dollar of sales than in any one of the five peacetime years which preceded 1941

and more than in any one of the following five wartime years. Indeed, 1941 profit margins were half again as great as in the banner year of 1929. Today, however, the volume of sales is greater than that of 1941 and it is going to increase steadily if inflation does not stop it. Thus, at the very time when we should be getting the benefit of high volume in the form of lower prices, the Taft amendment would inflate prices.

In the case of products like automobiles, washing machines, and refrigerators which are just returning to the market, the Taft amendment produces especially unreasonable prices. This is because the amendment adds to prices all the abnormally high costs arising from temporarily low volume and changeover conditions.

The Wherry amendment gives a final boost to prices by requiring the pyramiding of manufacturer's increases at the wholesale and retail levels.

Of course profits ample to provide the incentive for full production are what makes the American free enterprise system work. Prices must not be inflexibly held. Increases have been granted and more will have to be granted to remove impediments to production. The Taft amendment, however, in the name of stimulating production, promises peak profits on every product even where production is already going at full blast and profits are eminently satisfactory. As industry after industry accepts the invitation of the Taft amendment in an attempt to make good profits better, prices will go up and up.

In addition, the industries in real need of relief will tend to be lost in the shuffle. The OPA, already criticized for delay in these deserving cases, will be increasingly unable to act promptly to break production bottlenecks.

There is a grim irony in the fact that the Taft amendment is defended as a stimulant to production when in fact it will greatly impede production.

The evidence is readily at hand. For weeks we have seen meat and other commodities withheld from the market in anticipation of higher prices. The simple fact is that the average businessman or farmer who knows that his price will soon be higher will not sell any more goods this week than he has to—be they suits or sewing machines or cattle.

The manufacturer with a price increase pending would naturally slow down deliveries as much as his working capital and his storage facilities would permit. At the same time the knowledge that his suppliers had their own increases pending would lead him to do all he could to build up his inventories. But his suppliers would also slow down deliveries for the very same reason. As essential materials and parts were withheld from the market, production lines would gradually grind to a halt. Workers would pay their toll to this amendment in loss of employment. Consumers would pay theirs in lack of goods.

These cases would develop, not by hundreds but by thousands. As fast as price increases were granted, they would raise the costs of purchasing industries and form a basis for additional increases. Each one would bring its new slow-downs and new bottlenecks. It is plain to see why the enactment of the Taft amendment as an aid to production would be a sorry jest. Production requires a reasonable stability in costs, a continuing flow of goods, and a readiness to buy and sell. The Taft amendment would result in erratic price and cost movements, a feverish effort to buy, and a calculated reluctance to sell.

The Taft amendment would wholly destroy the program of wage stabilization which has been so painstakingly, and at times painfully, developed during the months since VJ-day.

The Wage Stabilization Board has contributed greatly to that development. The representatives of industry, labor, and the public who compose it have brought what threatened for a time to become a runaway wage movement into a fair and orderly procedure with which virtually all unions and managements have cooperated. This Nation still needs the continuing services of the Wage Stabilization Board.

I wonder therefore if the Congress realized when it voted for the Taft amendment that it was voting to destroy the present wage stabilization program and the usefulness of the Wage Stabilization Board. Under the existing program the Board has the task of determining the limit of wage increases which an employer can use as the basis for price increases. Its determinations of these limits have played a vital role in bringing about innumerable wage settlements. The Taft amendment, however, provides that, "in determinating costs for the purposes of this section, all costs shall be included." The Office of Price Administration advises me that under this provision it would be required to recognize all wage increases as a basis for price increases, even if the Board had not approved them and regardless of their amount.

This is the beginning of an inevitable spiral of uncontrolled inflation—a race between rising wages and rising prices. Farsighted leaders of both labor and management know that nothing can be gained—and everything lost—by simply letting prices and wages chase each other.

Yesterday I received a letter from the National Wage Stabilization Board, which Board represents industry, labor, and the public. The Board advises that it believes that uncontrolled inflation will result from this bill. Furthermore, the Board states:

> It is our unanimous judgment that the proposed legislation presents no possibility of wage stabilization or of the achievement of the balance between wages and prices which is essential to economic stability.

This bill provides a sure formula for inflation:

1. A first round of sharp and widespread price increases;

2. Production slow-downs due to price uncertainties;

3. Renewed demands for further wage increases due to higher living costs;

4. Higher production costs due to production slow-downs and stoppages and to higher labor costs;

5. A cost-plus pricing amendment which requires higher production costs to be translated immediately into higher prices.

And all this at a time when the supply of goods is still far below the record demand.

The formula would lead to disaster even if it could be assumed that price control could be administered in an orderly fashion, and that the Office of Price Administration would be able to build up a staff adequate to its new burdens. The fact is, however, that these assumptions are unreal. The OPA could not discharge the responsibilities which the Taft amendment and the other price-raising amendments would thrust upon it—either with its present staff or with any staff that it might conceivably recruit.

Moreover, enforcement and compliance with price regulations are dependent on the general stability of prices over considerable periods of time. Once prices were set in continuous upward motion, compliance would deteriorate rapidly. Little hope could be held out for compliance with ceiling prices fixed under the Taft amendment.

The reason for this is that the ceiling price of each individual manufacturer would depend upon the price which that particular manufacturer charged in the base period—usually October 1–15, 1941. To this base period price each manufacturer would be entitled to add a uniform increase factor representing cost increases incurred by the industry generally since that time.

Under this system, obviously, every manufacturer who had a different price in the base period would have a different ceiling price now. Uniform ceiling prices would become impossible, except in those industries which charged uniform prices in the base period. Thus, most of OPA's dollars-and-cents regulations, which are the most readily enforceable kind, would be wiped out.

Proof of any ceiling price violation would require proof of the price which the particular manufacturer charged during a 2-week period 5 years ago. Every enforcement proceeding would thus becomes a time-consuming and often futile historical investigation.

In these circumstances, the formal structure of price and rent control which the bill retains would be wholly ineffectual to stem the tide of inflation which it would set in motion. Unable to cope with the deluge of industry demands for higher ceilings under the new pricing formulas, and increasingly aware of the futility of its task, OPA's administrative staff would disintegrate. After irreplaceable losses from its ranks had reached a certain point, the consequence would not be more administrative delay; it would be complete collapse.

In the face of these alarming consequences to the country if the present bill should become law, I urge the Congress with all the earnestness at my command to reconsider the whole problem of stabilization.

In that reconsideration, let us see just where we stand today. Under the existing stabilization laws production has recovered remarkably from the shock of war's end. Output of civilian goods already surpasses the 1941 level and employment exceeds that level by six mil-

lion. This record has been achieved in spite of shortages of critical materials and parts and in spite of extended work stoppages in basic industries. The major labor-management disputes are settled, and we are moving rapidly toward the realization of our postwar objectives of full production and full employment in a sound economy.

There still are shortages but they will be progressively wiped out in the months ahead if business and labor stick to their job of producing the most possible goods in the shortest possible time. This can happen only if business has assurance of reasonable stability in its costs, and if labor has assurance that its real wages will not be cut sharply by rising living costs.

We can look ahead to a steady easing of other inflationary forces. The efficiency of production is bound to increase and bring with it an upsurge in total output. If the stabilization laws are renewed in effective form it is expected that the Federal Budget will be balanced during the coming year, thus eliminating the deficit which was a basic source of inflationary difficulties.

As the inflationary pressures lessen, commodity after commodity can be removed from controls, and we can emerge with a stable economy in which the traditional American free enterprise competitive system can take command. Not until then will the law of supply and demand keep prices at reasonable levels. So long as demand far exceeds supply the law of supply and demand will drive prices up.

Let us remember further that inflation and collapse in the United States would gravely jeopardize our efforts to build the kind of international economic relations that will provide a solid basis for world peace. The whole structure of international prices, currency values, and financial and trade relations is still unsettled. Because of our position and influence in world trade and finance, inflation and collapse in this country would shake the entire world.

In short, the most serious difficulties of the transition from war to peace are already behind us if only we have the wisdom and fortitude to see to it that the forces of inflation, so long held in check, are not unleashed when victory is all but won.

Therefore I call upon the Congress to act and act now by passing a bill which will give the Nation adequate assurance of completing a successful transition to a sound peacetime economy. Such a bill should contain the following provisions:

First. The bill should provide for extension of the stabilization laws for a full year.

Second. The bill should authorize the continuance of stabilization subsidies on a scale sufficient to avoid serious increases in food prices during the next 6 months and to permit the orderly termination of subsidies during the first half of 1947. In my judgment, an authorization for the expenditure of a billion and a quarter dollars during the year as a whole is the minimum necessary for these purposes.

Third. The bill should lay down a congressional policy with respect to the termination of price controls and subsidies. I approve the provisions of paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of the proposed new section 1A of the Price Control Act contained in section 3 of the present bill. These provisions call for the orderly removal of all price controls and subsidies during the course of the coming year, with the exception only of those commodities which, on or before April 1, 1947, the President finds to be still in critically short supply and for which he asks and secures authority for continued control to be administered by some established department or agency of the Government other than the Office of Price Administration.

I would not oppose the formulation of standards for the decontrol of particular commodities, as provided in H. R. 6042, or the establishment of an independent Price Decontrol Board to review these applications—provided that the standards were modified to make sure that, during the next crucial 6 months, ceilings do not have to be lifted where it is clear that serious price rises would result. The spelling out of detailed standards and the establishment of new and complex administrative machinery, however, do not seem to me to be necessary. If the Congress lays down the declaration of decontrol policy contained in paragraph (b) of the proposed new section 1A, permitting administrative flexibility in its application, I give my personal pledge that the policy will be carried out to the full in spirit as well as in letter.

I ask the Congress also, if it gives me responsibility for carrying out a measure of the kind I am urging, to permit me to do this through a unified or effectively coordinated administrative organization and not to handicap me by legislating an unsound split of authority.

Fourth. The adjustment of product prices to make possible the maximum total production is, of course, one of the fundamental requisites of good price administration during this final transition period. I do not believe that any change in the present law is necessary to assure that such adjustments are made. To put the matter beyond doubt, however, I would not object to a provision which expressly requires the adjustment of price ceilings wherever this is necessary and would be effective to increase the total production of needed goods.

The great majority of the American people want an effective price control law. They are entitled to have it. Under such a law we can win the war against inflation just as decisively as we won the war against the Axis.

Most Members of the Congress have not yet had an opportunity to take an unequivocal position on this issue. As the present bill becomes more and more heavily loaded with amendments during its 4½ months' progress through the Congress the issues became more and more obscured. Members who wanted more effective price control were found voting for the bill, or for particular amendments to the bill, on the basis that these were the best that could be secured. Side by side with them were Members who wanted to weaken price control or get rid of it altogether.

It is most unfortunate that the Congress has delayed final passage of a bill down to the eve of the very date of termination of the existing law.

As far back as September 6, 1945, I urged the Congress to pass an extension of the Price Control Act at an early date so as to avoid the uncertainties which have made control more difficult for the last few months. Had this been done there would now be no necessity for these last-minute decisions. I repeated my request to the Congress to extend price-control legislation without crippling amendments again and again—on January 21, 1946, May 22, 1946, May 25, 1946, and June 11, 1946.

Nevertheless, just before the expiration of all price control there has been presented to me by the Congress an impossible bill.

I cannot bring myself to believe, however, that the Representatives of the American people will permit the great calamity which will befall this country if price and rent control end at midnight Sunday. On behalf of the people I request the Congress to continue by resolution the present controls for the short period of time necessary to write a workable bill.

The fight against inflation is never easy. We are battling against economic forces which have caused us untold misery after every previous war and which have overcome or are threatening to overwhelm many of the nations engaged in this war.

We shall not win this fight by soft measures.

All of us who must play a part in the decision of this issue face a solemn responsibility. We stand at an historic moment. Our actions will be judged by the American people and judged again by history.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 29, 1946.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, as we have an hour to discuss this measure, I have agreed to yield 30 minutes to be used as directed by the senior minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

I now yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why we should have extended debate on this question. I think everybody here has made up his or her mind as to how to vote.

I introduced a bill providing for the extension of the Price control and Stabilization Acts as they now exist. That bill was amended in the House, and I thought it was greatly weakened. I voted against those amendments. I believe the economic pressures that make for inflation are as strong now as they have ever been. I believe there is a great danger confronting the people of the United States. We passed a bill in a weakened form. It went to the Senate. The Senate passed a bill that was still weaker. The conferees labored long and diligently to bring forth a bill that would

meet with the approval of both Houses. We did report a bill which I think was much superior to the bill that was passed by the House and the bill passed by the Senate. I told you I thought that bill was workable. It did not meet with my approval, however. We took the material we had and did the best we could with it.

The responsibility for the enforcement of this law is in the executive department. I urged the President to sign the bill. He told me the same things he has set forth in his veto message to the Congress. I am not an expert on price control. It is a highly involved and technical matter, a matter that should be considered by men who are charged with the duty of enforcing it and who know the practical effect of the amendments which we adopted. I was hopeful that the President would approve the bill. I was hopeful that he would think the bill might work to effectuate the purposes for which it was enacted. I cooperated in bringing back, as your agent, the best bill that I could bring back so far as my influence was concerned. That, however, did not mean I was in favor of it. It meant that, as your agent, I was trying to keep the processes of legislation operating. I voted for it because I thought it was the best bill we could get and that it would subserve the purposes for which it was enacted. The President, who is charged with the duty of enforcement, says it will not do that. I do not think there is any inconsistency on my part or any subserviency to any other department of Government when I say to you I am going to vote to sustain the President's veto. If the bill we sent to the President will not be effective, I am hopeful we may pass something that will be effective. At the conclusion of the debate I shall introduce a House joint resolution to continue the Price Control and Stabilization Acts until July 20, 1946, in order that the Congress may again consider this important and complicated question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I can surely sympathize with the position in which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] finds himself this morning. I can heartily agree with him when he says he thought, as we all thought, when the conference report came back to the House, that it was the very best bill which could be presented to this House, under the circumstances. I cannot understand why with that statement so fresh on his lips, he announced he was going to vote to sustain the veto, because anyone who votes to sustain the President's veto today, according to the statements which have been made by the ranking Members in the Senate and in the House, is voting to destroy price control. I do not want to take the responsibility, notwithstanding the President's statement, of destroying control of price. I believe sincerely that if President Truman had conferred with his congressional leaders a few weeks ago instead of very recently, he would have signed this bill. I believe he has been misinformed on almost all of the major statements contained in the veto message. Surely one could point out many inconsistencies in the statement. I shall not take the time to do it. They speak for themselves.

President Truman has been given more or less of an ultimatum by the leadership of this Congress that if he vetoed this bill he would take the responsibility for the control of prices being discontinued at midnight on June 30.

Now, it is utter folly, and in this respect he had been very much misadvised by some people other than the leadership here in Congress—it is utter folly to send this question back to either House of Congress in the hope that anything will come out of it different than came out of that conference. The President says he would have no objection to having the power to adjust prices to get production. Specifically, I want to call your attention to the fact, and it is obvious that the President's attention has not been called to the fact, that he has always had the power to adjust prices to get maximum production, even as far back as Public 729, the Stabilization Act of October 1942, when the Congress laid down the very definite policy that he should make adjustments to get the maximum amount of production in cases where, by reason of increased labor costs to the producers of agricultural commodities, the prices did not reflect the increased costs. So it has been the policy of this Congress—this Government, because it is law—that prices should be increased to absorb the increase in production costs, ever since the Stabilization Act of 1942.

Mr. Bowles comes before us and he says: "We are going to raise prices to absorb production costs where necessary to get production." The House says, "You shall."

Mr. Bowles says, "We want to get rid of subsidies as quickly as we can." The Congress says to Mr. Bowles, "You shall." With the exception of transferring the authority to adjust prices on agricultural commodities from a mismanaged OPA to, we hope, an efficient Department of Agriculture, there is nothing in this bill that does not reflect the attitude of all Administration witnesses who appeared before both the House and Senate committees. The only controversy in this bill, the only controversy in this veto message, is whether the administrators of price control shall be told that they must do the things which they say they are going to do anyway.

I think we owe the country an obligation for transcending any obligation which we might as individuals feel to follow the President of the United States in this. There are no new arguments in the message, not any new arguments at all. Every sentence contained in this veto message was considered by both the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees and debated for days and days in both the Senate and the House. There is nothing new in this. The situation is still as it was when we voted to adopt the conference report day before yesterday, the same identical problems. I know that the question has been raised that it would be inconsistent for anyone who voted against the conference report now to vote to override the President's veto. Anyone who took the attitude that there were deficiencies in the bill that should be corrected in conference in keeping with his philosophy of price control could, of course, have voted not to accept the conference report in an attempt to force the conference report back to the conferees where he might hope the conferees would adopt his particular philosophy. But the situation today is that both the House and the Senate have accepted the conference report, and now it is this or nothing. We cannot ever hope to report out and submit to the Congress any better bill than we have at the present time.

I want to warn you and I want to warn the President that if this is continued for 2 or 3 weeks then there probably will be a movement, which we will no longer take responsibility to control, to write specific decontrols into the bill. I was one who led the fight against specific decontrols. If he takes the attitude that he will take the responsibility for the defeat of price control, then those of us who fought so successfully to get this bill into such shape that he could consistently sign it, surely will have to give up the fight.

Mr. Speaker, we should override this veto. We should vote notwithstanding the President's veto to continue price controls to save the President himself from being embarrassed later on by following the misguided consultants who evidently wrote the veto message. If you will take Mr. Bowles' radio speeches of the past 3 months and compare the phraseology with the veto message I think it will be very obvious to you who wrote this veto message.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress has the most momentous decision to make that it has been called upon to face in the postwar period. Today, we will decide whether America will escape the devastation of inflation that has beset most of the rest of the world as a result of the war—or whether we will surrender to it.

We will decide whether we will have a reasonable and a sound prosperity, full employment and full production through an effective and real price-control bill—or whether we will have dislocations, labor difficulty, shortages, and profiteering with a phony price-control bill.

For myself, I intend to support and sustain the President in his veto of the so-called Price Control Act recently sent to him by the Congress. No phony price-control bill will help this Nation in the period which lies ahead and only through the President's veto can the Congress have a chance to pass a real and an effective bill which will control inflation.

GIVES CONGRESS ONE MORE CHANCE

The President by his veto gives the Congress this choice of a real bill, if we choose to write one. That is the reason why I think all friends of inflation control should support the President here today.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who has just spoken, has charged that the President's message is inconsistent. If there is any inconsistency, it is in the bill as passed by the Congress itself. This bill, which purports in its preamble to control inflation, in fact would encourage it by congressional order. Everyone knows that this bill was loaded down with amendments ordering mandatory price increases on the millions of prices of the things that the American people must buy. It is a mandatory order to increase the cost of living of the American people.

As the President so wisely points out, it orders increases in thousands of prices where the manufacturer now may be making record-breaking profits from his over-all operation. It complicates and delays the making of necessary price adjustments to relieve real hardship or to encourage additional necessary production. It is impossible of good administration.

It unhinges the price-wage relationship which has been so difficult to establish or to keep in balance. With the bill as passed by the Congress, no wage stabilization would be possible. And without wage stabilization, there can be no end to price advances on everything.

FARMERS FACE HIGHER COSTS

The bill does nothing to actually help the farmers of America. Already, increasing processor and distributor margins, are cutting into the farmer's share of the American dollar. This bill, designed primarily to add to the profits of industry, will further decrease the value of the farmer's dollar by raising the price of almost everything he buys—without materially helping him on the things he has to sell.

Lack of production has been charged against restrictive OPA ceilings. Yet labor difficulties have caused nine-tenths of our loss of production and restrictive pricing less than one-tenth of this loss. But with this bill labor difficulties will be increased as strikes and new contracts are started to keep up with the skyrocketing cost of living.

PROFITS AT RECORD LEVELS

Insufficient profits of business and industry have also been charged against the OPA in the drive to put in many special interest amendments into this bill. The City National Bank of New York shows that only in 2 years out of the last 20, aside from the price-control years, have all corporation profits, after taxes been as high as they were last year. And still profits after taxes will go higher this year because of great tax relief granted to all business in this year's tax bill. But, still, this bill, with its Taft and Wherry amendments asks for more and more profits at the risk of destroying inflation control.

However, it is to the Members on my side of the aisle that I would like to address my remarks. Many ask, would they be inconsistent in voting now to sustain the President's veto, when they voted earlier in the week to send the emasculated and mangled bill on to him for action.

I do not think they would be inconsistent in any degree. It was with the greatest reluctance that I voted to send the bill on to the President. I knew I was voting for a straw man to control inflation. I knew I was voting for an unworkable, yes, an impossible OPA bill. But it was the only bill that as a legislator I had a chance to vote on—and I had to vote to send it on to the President to complete the legislative action on even a bad bill. Bad as it was, it was still better than no price control bill at all.

WANT BEST POSSIBLE BILL

As in the past, I have voted for the best that the legislative situation permitted and there was no other choice but to send the bill on to the President. I had voted against all crippling amendments and there was no further chance, without a Presidential veto, of getting a chance to rewrite a new and an effective bill.

The President, in his wisdom and under his constitutional right, has vetoed this bill. This, Mr. Speaker, gives the Congress another chance to try to work out an effective price-control bill—one that will prevent—rather than encourage inflation.

By voting to sustain the President, then, Members are giving the Congress another 15 or 20 days in which to try again to work out a good price-control bill. I am certain we cannot possibly send him a worse one at the end of this 15 or 20 days, and I think—I hope—that we can certainly improve on the feeble effort of the current bill.

Fifteen or twenty days is all that the President asks in this veto—15 or 20 more days of the time of the Congress to give America a real effective price-control bill. Is it not worth these extra days of work to give real meaning to the successful effort of the war years to prevent inflation?

LOSE ALL GOOD EFFECTS OF CONTROL

If we surrender now, without taking this added time, we wipe out the good results of all the headaches, the difficulties, the pain that American business has gone through during the war years to prevent inflation. We will fumble the ball in the last 2 minutes of the game and lose all the good effects of a difficult price-control program with which we have put up during these past years.

The President asks for these 15 or 20 days during which time a temporary act would continue the price-control program as is. I feel that the Congress must and should pass this temporary extension today, and then go to work on writing a real price-control bill for the coming year. We must take action today on this temporary extension or run the danger of forcing the country into a lost week end of inflation. But even if we fail to get action completed today, one lost week end of inflation is better than a year of lost week ends and the attendant DT's of ruinous inflation.

We must sustain the President and then give him this 15 days of temporary continuance. The people of this Nation want and demand effective price control. All the public-opinion polls show that from 70 to 80 percent of the people want effective price control. They do not want legislation for special-interest groups.

I plead with the Members who voted to send this bill on to the President for final action to now sustain him, so that we can have one more chance to prevent the disaster of inflation.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Will the gentleman tell us what new evidence is going to be presented that we have not heard during the last 2 months?

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say to the gentleman that the people of the country surely are entitled to have the Congress work 15 days more, as much as we want a vacation, to see if we can give them a price-control act.

Mr. BARRY. What is the new evidence?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE. In the event that the President's veto is sustained, then the House can immediately adopt a joint resolution to extend the time of the present bill that we are now considering for 20 days?

The SPEAKER. It could.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that is important to secure both for the individuals of this country, the citizens of the country, and for this Congress, it is to get the matter settled. Then the people will know what they can expect. There is only one way in which it can be settled and that is to override this veto.

I thoroughly agree with the position taken by the gentleman from Michigan, the ranking minority member of this committee, in urging everyone, no matter how they voted on the previous conference report, to vote to override the veto at this time. If you do not do that, no one will have the slightest idea what will happen. I do not think it would be wise to leave the country in that shape.

People will probably withhold goods for a longer period of time if it is their disposition to do so because they will not know what to expect in the next price-control bill, if any, that is presented to the President.

The President has made some suggestions in his veto message. If he had made those suggestions 3 or 4 months ago, if there had been any disposition to find a compromise that was workable, I believe the Congress would have gone along with him. But the trouble was all through it has been a policy of all or nothing. Our only opportunity to settle this question is to override the veto today and put this law on the books. It is a workable substitute. I do not see how any better one could be obtained.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly agree with the chairman of my committee that we have brought

to the House the best bill that can be given to you. We have worked on it for weeks and months. Not only do I join with him, but I join with the leaders of this House and with the leaders of the other body in making that statement. Think before you vote today. In my opinion, if you vote to sustain the President's veto, you will kill OPA.

I agree with the chairman that we have done the best we can in securing an effective price control, yet I do not agree with him that the President knows more about this subject than he does, because my chairman has lived with this subject for the last 5 years and the President has thousands and thousands of problems and therefore cannot give it the attention it deserves, and I will say that my chairman knows a great deal more about it than Mr. Bowles. Mr. Bowles, deep down in his heart, does not object to this bill so much. He objects to the authority that you are taking away from him and placing in the Department of Agriculture. He objects to the authority of the decontrol board which has concurrent jurisdiction, along with OPA, of decontrol and taking ceilings off of the merited cases. He wants it all. Any man who will not work in harness unless he is the lead horse, so to speak, cannot last very long.

Mr. Porter, in his testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, stated that they did not need any amendment for a successful price control. He said that they could decontrol, when necessary to do so, under the present law, and that the law should not be changed in any way. I told Mr. Porter, who is a very affable gentleman, that he had just about as much chance to get the OPA bill, as written by his department, through the committee and the House as a snowball has to survive in the lower regions.

The main thing the OPA officials objected to, and the advice they gave the President, was that the so-called Wolcott-Taft amendment would authorize higher prices to manufacturers and processors, but they failed to tell the President that the conference report included producers, agricultural producers, along with manufacturers and processors. This amendment would probably not increase the price of any agricultural product, except dairy products, and three-fourths of the complaints have been from the dairy producers.

Why should anyone object to this amendment? It only says that people engaged in business are entitled to prewar profits at a period of free economy, and during that period many high-cost producers did not make a profit. This amendment just simply says that you have a base of what was made during the years of free economy and add to it only the additional cost to the producer. The high cost producer, under this amendment, would not make anything now, but he and those who made a fair profit are entitled to at least what he did obtain during that period and by adding the additional cost since that period it is only fair and equitable to producers at that time. It means that the high-cost producer of that period will not make any profit now.

We all know the only way to defeat inflation is production. This amendment is perfectly fair and will give more production, the goal we are all asking for to defeat inflation, without much higher cost to the consumer. Some are trying to claim that the high-cost producer, under this amendment, would make a greater profit now. If he lost in that base period because he was a high-cost producer, he will not profit very much now, but certainly he is entitled to the increased cost since that period. Let me repeat the thing that will destroy inflation is production, and let me stress that price control is intended to curb people bidding against each other on commodities that are scarce, but at the same time prices must be high enough to keep people producing commodities, and just why anyone would be against the policy of the so-called Wolcott-Taft amendment I cannot understand. Under this amendment, commodities that are scarce cannot get out of bounds by competitive bidding, and on commodities that are so necessary the producer must have an incentive, and, therefore, he is entitled to at least a profit that a good businessman made in prewar days

The amendment may raise the price of some things, but not many. It is conceded by all, so far as agriculture is concerned, it probably will raise prices only on dairy products and on these it will be very little. So far as clothing is concerned, if you do not give a profit to the producer he will not produce, or if he does produce he will retain the merchandise in warehouses until he can secure a legitimate profit. I feel that some manufacturers are obtaining too much profit, but many others who are producing scarce articles do not make enough to stay in business. It is very difficult to have a yardstick for all the producers of clothing, and the only fair yardstick I know, not only for producers of clothing, but of food and everything else, is that they all be given the same profit they received in a period when we had a free economy. Not only would this be fair, but this would bring full production in a short time.

I think the OPA has done a fairly good job in holding down inflation. Of course, we have some inflation. We will always have inflation as long as we have war and spend as much money as we have during the war and since. It is estimated that the purchasing price of the dollar now is about 70 cents. That shows we have inflation, but nothing like we had following World War I. A few years after World War I the purchasing power of the dollar went down to about 40 cents. The OPA officials estimated that if they could hold the value of the dollar down to 60 cents it would be a good job. I admit that some few things will go higher under the bill agreed to by the conferees; but if the producers of these commodities will produce more, which will defeat inflation, I believe, in the end, if the present bill is adopted, your dollar will be worth at least 60 cents, and you will have a contented people because they will realize the fairness of the law.

Let me repeat that I think this is a good bill in the present emergency, after the war is over, at least after the shooting is over, if properly administered, and that the leaders of our party in the House and in the other body, and also the leaders of the Republican Party in the House and the other body, agree that this is the only fair bill for price control that can be obtained now. I believe this bill, if properly administered, will give incentive to all producers and will stop the black markets in lumber, meats, dairy products, and everything else. I think the President has been badly advised in recognizing the views of Mr. Bowles and one or two other men who are anxious to work alone and not in harness in preference to leaders of both parties in both bodies in securing a workable price-control law in the present emergency.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Bowles in his bitterness and the President in his disappointment would now turn their efforts and influence toward production and more production which is after all the answer to most of the world's problems, instead of trying to sell the country on the idea that we are going to have uncontrolled inflation, they would do much to allay certain fears that are so widespread at this moment. For after all, "The only thing we have to fear is fear."

Maximum production together with the cooperation on the part of the public not to purchase anything except necessities would, I am sure, control inflation and go far toward helping to stabilize our economy.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the House a few minutes ago received the message of the President vetoing the OPA bill. The question now before us is, Shall the House pass the bill notwithstanding the veto of the President? We passed the bill in the House by a vote of 265 to 105. An overwhelming majority of Democrats and Republicans voted for the compromise bill. I was one of the 265. The 105 votes against the bill represented two groups. One group insisted that OPA be continued another year without the changes. The other group was against any extension whatsoever. It will require a two-thirds vote to override the veto of the President. The President has been warned heretofore time and again by his friends and his leaders in the House and Senate that a veto of this will would kill OPA, but the President ignored the advice of Speaker RAYBURN, Democratic Leader MCCORMACK, Mr. SPENCE in charge of the bill, Senator BARKLEY, and Senator MCKELLAR, the President pro tempore in the Senate, and no doubt he accepted the advice of Chester Bowles and others who desired to continue for at least another year these war-emergency controls over agriculture, industry, and the American people. These Democratic leaders, as well as Republicans, have been studying this price-control problem for more than 4 years. They really know more about it

than the President, Mr. Bowles, and others who urged him to veto this bill. They seem to think that, if they could kill the OPA bill, that they could force through the Congress a resolution to continue the life of the OPA without change. The Roosevelt and Truman administrations, because of the war emergency, secured almost unlimited control over the American people, agriculture, industry, and commerce. Although the war has been over in Europe for nearly 15 months and in Japan nearly a year, they refuse to relinquish these war emergency controls. Now is some modification necessary?

Many able Members of the House and Senate and countless millions of Americans in agriculture, industry, and in all walks of life insisted that we could not have recovery in this country under present OPA. They pointed to the fact that after 4 years of OPA, scarcity and famine stalked through the richest agricultural and the greatest industrial country of the world. Poultry and livestock were dying because of the lack of necessary food. The health and lives of the American people were threatened because of the lack of food and other necessities. I am receiving daily pleading wires and letters from the people and businessmen of my district stating that workers were forced to quit their employment because of the lack of food, and they also stated that poultry and livestock were dying because of the lack of feed.

It was claimed that the OPA would prevent the rise of prices, black markets, and inflation. We all know that prices have rapidly and steadily risen. Many commodities have increased from 25 to more than 200 percent. Black markets have increased by leaps and bounds, so that today it is generally admitted that 75 percent of the transactions are handled in some form or another of the black market and, of course, the threat of inflation has steadily grown stronger. There have been appropriated by the Congress and made available approximately $4,500,000,000 in the way of subsidies which the OPA insisted was necessary to help keep down prices. The Congress has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars to provide the salary and other expenses of more than 60,000 office holders. The OPA has had almost unlimited power over the American people and all of their activities for approximately 4 years and yet we find this country in the worst condition it has ever been in.

Literally millions of people have been insisting that there must be a change. They say the OPA has failed to realize the purposes for which it was set up. To wit: Keep down prices, prevent black markets, provide for an equitable distribution of available supplies, and prevent inflation. To this appeal those engaged in industry, agriculture, and commerce, as well as the American people, the President, Chester Bowles and his crowd have insisted that the Congress extend the life of the OPA with all of its war powers and with billions in subsidies and more than 60,000 office holders. The House and Senate decided to make a thorough investigation of the whole subject and to that end bills were introduced in the House and Senate to extend the life of the OPA. These bills were referred to the Banking and Currency Committees of the House and Senate. Chester Bowles and his associates and others who insisted on an extension with no change and the representatives of agriculture, industry, and business and others who insisted there must be changes, and many of the very best experts in the land on this subject testified before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House and the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate. I know of no other proposed legislation that has been given more thorough hearings than these bills. It turned out on cross-examination Mr. Bowles and others, that they each and every one admitted that OPA had not achieved its objectives. They admitted that there should be changes.

The Banking and Currency Committee of the House, made up largely of Democrats, reported favorably a bill which provided for many changes to the OPA. This bill came to the House. It was debated and considered for many days where additional amendments were adopted by an overwhelming majority and the bill, as finally amended, was approved by a vote of 265 to 105 and as we have pointed out, an overwhelming majority of Democrats and a very substantil majority of Republicans voted for the bill. It then went to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate. That committee held exhaustive hearings and all groups were given the fullest opportunity to appear and give their views, that committee, controlled by the Democrats, made other substantial changes and reported the bill favorably to the Senate. In the Senate the bill was debated and considered at great length. The Democrats have a very substantial majority in the Senate as well as in the House. The Senate passed the amended OPA bill by a vote of approximately 3 to 1. As there was some difference between the Senate bill and the House bill it was necessary for them to go to conference. The conferees, made up of Republicans and Democrats of the Banking and Currency Committees of the House and Senate, spent about 2 weeks in considering the two bills and finally the conferees agreed upon a compromise bill and submitted in their report to their respective Houses, this compromise bill. The compromise bill came up in the House and was debated and considered and was adopted by an overwhelming majority. The compromise bill was taken up in the Senate and discussed for some days and the Senate adopted it by a vote of more than 2 to 1.

When the compromise bill was up in the House Speaker RAYBURN, Democratic Leader MCCORMACK, and our colleague, Mr. SPENCE, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, took the floor and urged the House to adopt the conference report, the compromise bill, and stated unless the compromise bill was adopted there would be no OPA extension bill passed. The ranking Republican of Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] on the Banking and Currency Committee of the House and other Republicans stated that they fully concurred in what Speaker RAYBURN, Mr. MCCORMACK, and Mr. SPENCE had said. The records show that Senator BARKLEY and other leading Democrats in the Senate told their colleagues that if this conference report, the compromise bill, was defeated it would mean the death of the OPA and there would be no OPA legislation. With all the statements and consideration the House and Senate, by an overwhelming majority, adopted the conference report containing the compromise bill and it then went to the President. Speaker RAYBURN, Democratic Leader MCCORMACK, Senator BARKLEY, Democratic leader in the Senate, Senator MCKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee and President pro tempore of the Senate, all of them able men and strong friends of the President, called on him and urged him to approve the bill that was so strongly supported by the House and Senate, but Mr. Bowles and some others urged the President to veto it and we have his veto now before us. He urges the House and Senate to sustain his veto. He and his administration have no doubt put plenty of pressure on Members of the House and Senate. Because of the pressure and influence of the administration we may not secure a two-thirds majority to override the President's veto, but I am quite certain that a majority of the Members of the House will vote to pass the bill over the President's veto. Quite a number of Members of the House, Democrats and Republicans, who are opposed to any extension or any form of OPA, of course, will vote to sustain the President's veto and the vote will not correctly reflect the true sentiment against OPA.

SUBSIDIES

We pointed out that Congress has, through the urgency of the administrations of President Roosevelt and President Truman, voted and made available approximately $4,500,000,000 for subsidies. This money was taken out of the tax and bond money of the American people. The OPA said that it was necessary to keep down prices. The way it was used to keep down prices was that we took the money out of the Treasury and paid part of the grocery and store-account bills of the Rockefellers, the Fords, the Morgans, and others of great wealth, as well as other people of little wealth. The price of their butter, meat, cheese, and other commodities was reduced by so much per pound—paid to the producers, processors, and distributors. Is it not strange indeed that our Government would borrow money, increase the national debt, to aid in paying the grocery bill of the American people and at a time when they had more money to spend than any other time in our history? Why was this? It was simply to fool the American people. They were getting a reduced price on the goods they purchased by the Government taking their own bond and tax money and paying part of their store bills. Of course, this borrowed money will bear interest, and they and their children, and children's children will have to pay interest and the principal.

The vetoed bill provides for the gradual elimination of these subsidies. Our Government has been going into the red for the last 15 consecutive years. We cannot

balance the budget or reduce the tax burden of the American people so long as we indulge in deficit financing. But with all the subsidies prices have gone up, and up all the way from 25 percent to more than 200 percent on many of the articles of necessities. The OPA has not kept down prices. The black markets have increased by leaps and bounds. Every American housewife, as well as our citizens generally, now know that by some scheme or other the OPA prices are disregarded either in actual price or in quantity or quality of goods. The American people generally know that black markets have been produced through the unwise policies, the Executive orders, directives, rules, regulations, and interpretations, and other onerous conditions imposed upon legitimate business in this country by OPA. Some of the Federal judges who have been trying the OPA cases have declared that scarcely any business could remain in business and live up to the onerous conditions placed upon legitimate business by the OPA. It is a sad commentary when a great people in a great country with the greatest agriculture, and the most efficient industries of any people in the world are forced to indulge in black markets or be driven out of business. Hundreds of thousands, large and small, business concerns have been driven out of business and destroyed by the OPA. It has caused millions and millions of decent American people to resort to practices that are entirely foreign to our country and to our people. There must be some changes in the OPA to correct these conditions. Our own Federal Government has encouraged the black markets. The OPA put a ceiling on wheat, corn, and other grains. The Government came along and offered a bonus of 30 cents more a bushel on corn and wheat to the owners of these grains who would make their wheat and corn available for the Government to give away in foreign lands.

In other words, the Government paid 30 cents above ceiling price, with the result that the wheat and corn were turned over to the Government. Our processors of corn and wheat could not pay more than the ceiling price with the net result that 90 percent of our mills processing corn and wheat have been forced to close down and we have a great shortage of meal and flour, and with the further result that we are without feed for our livestock, dairy cattle, and poultry, and yet we have persons who say there must be no change in the OPA.

The Federal Government, with its excessive borrowings and its deficit financing, has contributed more to inflation than all other causes. The $4,500,000,000 of subsidies adds fuel to the flame of inflation. The sale of tens of billions of bonds and the printing and distribution of paper money adds to the threat of inflation, and now this administration proposes to sell $3,750,000,000 worth of bonds for a loan of that sum to Great Britain. The Government, as we have pointed out, bought hundreds of billions of bushels of grain and millions of tons of various other commodities and paid for them through the sale of bonds and shipped these grains and commodities to foreign countries. These transactions, of course, cut down the amount of consumer goods—food, clothing, and so forth. These, of course, added to the flames of inflation.

A few years ago our New Deal administration was killing millions of cattle, hogs, pigs, and sheep, burning millions of bushels of grain, plowing under crops to bring about a scarcity. They adopted a new technique and that was to establish the OPA under Leon Henderson and Chester Bowles. Through their oppressive and unwise policies they have destroyed hundreds of thousands of productive enterprises. They have been the greatest enemies of private competitive business. This cut down production. We now have great scarcity in 2,000 or more necessary commodities of every kind. The answer to high prices, black markets, inflation, and scarcity is plenty. We cannot have plenty without full production. There cannot be full production under the blighting influences and the strangling directives, regulations, and rules imposed upon agriculture and industry. If this administration will give proper consideration to the needs of the American people, encourage production, and will quit deficit financing and the increase of taxes, prices will soon be brought under control, black markets will disappear, and inflation will no longer disturb us.

Bowles and company have tried to have private enterprise and full production go forward by fixing prices less than cost of production. This is one of the main causes of scarcity in this country. We cannot expect people on the farms or in industry to receive less than their cost of production. This bill on that point merely provides that the producers shall receive the actual cost of production, plus a reasonable profit based on the 1941 prices. Producers are entitled to a price that will cover the actual cost of production and a reasonable profit. The failure of the OPA to recognize this great fundamental American principle of right and justice has discouraged production and intensified scarcity. It is now agreed that 75 percent of our commodities and consumer goods are handled in the black markets. A careful check-up shows the American people, on an average, pay 25 percent above the OPA price in black markets. The American people have nearly $150,000,000,000 of liquid assets to buy what they want. If they cannot get it at OPA prices, then they get it in the black markets.

The OPA must be modified so as to restore legitimate and honest business, increase production, and give to the American people consumer goods of ascertained quality and honest prices. The OPA has helped to establish the reputation that was declared by one of our distinguished colleagues some time ago—that this is a government of tyranny, oppression, favoritism, and corruption. If we listen to the Bowles and other radicals we shall never get from under the oppressive wartime controls and our free economy will be destroyed.

This is Saturday afternoon, June 29. The Congress does not meet on Sunday. The OPA Act expires tomorrow night, Sunday, June 30. The President, at this late hour insists that the Congress now pass a resolution extending the OPA as is, in the face of the fact that it has not accomplished either one of its purposes. The House and Senate and its committees considered this whole subject with very great care for 4½ months. The Members of the House and Senate are quite as anxious as anybody to protect the people in their own districts and in their own States and the American people as a whole. The President has cut down with a stroke of his pen and thrown out the window the result of their labors and cast upon us at this late hour, only a few hours, to get through a resolution extending this OPA as is, when nearly everybody believes there must be substantial changes. His leaders and friends in the House and Senate advised him correctly when they told him that if he vetoed this bill it would mean the death of the OPA.

Under the rules of the House and Senate there would be no way to get through such a resolution today or even if the House and Senate worked until midnight tomorrow night. We have heard today that a number of the President's leaders and friends in the Senate would not give consideration to any such resolution. No such resolution could be passed in the House today.

I am voting to override the President's veto so that the bill as passed by the House and Senate may become law. I am unwilling to vote to sustain the veto, which means that there would be no price control whatever after June 30. The President must assume full responsibility for killing the OPA. Mr. Bowles has spent billions in subsidies, and he has spent millions in propaganda. He has deceived millions of good Americans. He has from day to day misrepresented the facts, grossly and wilfully, and deceived many American people. If the President wants to listen to Mr. Bowles instead of the elected representatives of the districts and the States and his own leaders in the House and Senate, he will have to bear the blame for destroying this agency at this time. I certainly would not vote for the continuance of the OPA without substantial changes to protect the rights and interests of the American people.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently voted for the extension of OPA without crippling amendments. The bill providing for the extension was introduced in the House on April 8, 1946, so that it has now been under continuous consideration for approximately 3 months. When the report of the conference committee was before this body several days ago the managers on the part of the House stated that the bill then presented was the best that could be agreed upon by the Senate and the House. In view of this fact I voted for the bill although it contained objectionable provisions.

The same bill is before us again under similar conditions. I am convinced that it is the best bill that we can get. If the President's veto is sustained there is at least a grave danger that all price controls will end tomorrow at midnight. This bill is preferable to none at all and if it is enacted it can be subsequently amended as circumstances may require.

I am unwilling to cast a vote which may result in killing the OPA. I shall, therefore, vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, today on this floor someone asked the question, "What is new in this matter of OPA?" And I welcome the opportunity to answer: There is one thing new that should give heart to the people, and that is the veto of the President of the United States, wherein he declares to the world that he has the intestinal fortitude to be the defender of the rank and file of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it was on June 15, after listening to the Senate debate and the roll call on the OPA in the Senate Chamber, I phoned the White House and expressed my opinion that what had taken place was terrible. I further said the measure should be vetoed, and that I did not feel that any Representative, regardless of his party, having the best interest of the people at heart, would dare to return to his home and face an electorate under a situation so brazen in its attempt to abandon the best interests of the Nation.

Today the Members of the House, as well as the Senate are confronted with that very proposition. And while there has been much talk setting forth arguments, eloquently phrased but void of reason, why no change could be made in the law as passed, nevertheless the very apprehension voiced on the occasion is significant of the guilt attendant to such utterances, for a designed delay of 4 months on the part of Congress, now presents itself in all significance.

Let the country realize that the bill was presented to the President by a dilatory Congress in its dying twilight hour; and in my opinion designedly so. Where, I ask, were the friends of the Chief Executive of this Nation to permit this situation that has come to pass? He surely must have been regarded as one unfamiliar with delays and procrastination. Now he has risen to the occasion, exercising his prerogative of veto-champion of the people, protector of their resources, a devotee to the veteran and his GI rights, and a defender of those with set incomes.

In my opinion, the President's stature mounted this day, while the chicanery and subterfuge of the would-be champions of OPA dwindled to dwarf proportions. His voice was mild but he carried the big stick.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, every time they have had the same old compromise under the same conditions, and you extend OPA. It is the same old baloney. OPA has gone on and on producing less and less and less until today they are even killing the little chickens so that they can feed the American people the chicken feed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In the President's veto message he manifests a great interest in efficient price control. If he were interested in efficient price control he could have discharged or fired Chester Bowles months ago, could he not?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes; when we first started calling him Bottleneck Bowles.

This is not a Republican fight nor a Democratic fight nor a personal fight, this is the same fight that is going on all over the world, from Chiang Kai-shek and all around the world and back to Stalin. The fight is totalitarianism against freedom, and OPA is totalitarianism.

The wartime of Council of Defense, using American taxpayers' money, got out a book, presumably given to them by the inside Nazi officials, showing that the way they destroyed free enterprise in Germany was to sing paeans of praise for private enterprise. The key to the program was price control, confiscatory price ceilings, and enslavement through subsidies.

The American system that grew to be so successful is too complicated for free men with all their energy to be controlled by any one person or group of persons. The good Lord himself could not control it successfully, and the Lord would know better than to try.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I share the feeling of my chairman, the feeling of disappointment that the President did not sign this bill. I voted for the conference report. I also appreciate the position taken by my good friend the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. WOLCOTT], whom I respect very much, as we all do. I am sorry that we are confronted with this decision. I am not sure that I can help anyone. I can only offer my reasons for following the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] in voting to sustain the veto in this case, although I do not always agree with the President, and have demonstrated that on previous occasions when our responsibility, as I viewed it, was to override a veto. But in this instance in a very solemn situation one has to do what he thinks is his own duty, and I shall not question the attitude of any other. I shall appeal, however, to the gentleman from Michigan, in case we could pass this brief extension of 2 weeks—I believe he will do this—to go into this problem and to help present to the President a bill that we can convince him he can live with, one he can accept and administer.

The gentleman from Michigan will remember when the President of the National Association of Manufacturers appeared before our committee I commented upon our dilemma and pointed out that there was something to be said for his position, which was, "Let us do away with controls altogether." I responded rather sympathetically to his appeal that we could outrun inflation. It was a bold thing which he suggested and we were not bold enough to do it. I personally would not be quite willing to do it. Yet, between his position and the position of those who favor this bill as it is, in spite of the President's objections, it seems to me there is much to be said for the position of the manufacturers for lifting all controls. I am afraid that if this bill becomes law, we will simply have a continuing harassment of our businessmen with none of the benefits of a sound price-control law. So I shall vote to sustain and then for a 2 weeks' extension. We should then make an effort to work out a constructive measure upon which we can agree without reference to partisan politics. The decision is between that course and a bill that will prove ineffectual and will please no one and I fear will actually force us into an inflationary situation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the office this morning, I felt there was something in the atmosphere around Capitol Hill which had not been here before. I felt that there was an increased confidence, and a renewal of courage, and an obvious determination to return this Nation to the position of strength and security which the powers of production have always assured it in the past.

It was the custom, in earlier days, on momentous occasions, that poems should be written, commemorating those occasions. So, Mr. Speaker, I wrote a poem and this is it:

The buyers cheer,
The farmers shout,
Production's near,
For Bowles is out.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who voted against the conference report. I voted that way because I wished to do away with the deceptive, disastrous subsidy policy which was imposed upon this country. I wanted other changes. I wanted foodstuffs in the hands of people who understood farm production and distribution. I wanted Mr. Bowles' political ambitions transferred to some other field.

Today my choice is between the bill the President vetoed, or no bill at all. I am not at all sure that we would not be better off without any bill at all, and thus no OPA. However, I have consistently held out for the transfer of food control to the Secretary of Agriculture, and for industrial decontrol in some orderly fashion. I have particularly felt that rentals should be decontrolled carefully, perhaps through local authorities, which now have that right.

With these points in mind, Mr. Speaker, I am today voting to override the veto, and I think other Representatives from the farm areas, where we do not like the administration of OPA, will decide to vote to override, even though we voted against the conference committee report, desiring further consideration then. However, Mr. Speaker, I want no misunderstanding on the matter of a temporary extension. I shall not vote to extend the OPA, under its present administration and present regulations, for 3 weeks, nor for 3 days, nor for 3 minutes. The Congress sent an extension bill to the White House. It may not have been a perfect bill but it was infinitely better than the present situation in OPA. The President chose to veto that bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the conference report with great misgivings, hoping that the President could find something that would save it. I want to print in the RECORD these two articles regarding the largest renter of apartment houses in Minnesota, together with a letter to one of his tenants. This letter concerns one particular tenant, but he has many of them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY,
INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul, June 3, 1946.

Hon. WILIAM J. GALLAGHER,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed find copy of letter served on me by registered mail June 1, 1946. The paragraph referring to my personal attitude toward Harold Warner is difficult to understand. I saw him 7 years ago when I first rented the apartment and have never contacted him personally or by telephone since that time. Nor have I ever interviewed any of his tenants on any of his affairs.

The Warner Holding Co. is one of the largest apartment-house owners in the Twin Cities, the apartment in which I reside alone containing about 70 rental units. I am in no position to comment on either the profits or losses of this concern, except to know that during the last 3 years not one dollar has been expended on my apartment in the way of painting, papering, decorating, or for any other purpose.

There is no doubt that most of us are becoming irritated by too much Federal interference in our daily lives. However, if only a few real-estate operators in Minnesota adopt policies similar to those indicated by the Warner Holding Co. it would result in a chaotic condition all over the State. Owners of property may be and probably are entitled to increases over the 1942 rental basis, but some reasonable limitation should be placed on such increases.

As far as I am personally concerned the threats of Mr. Warner do not bother me any. Fortunately I am so situated that I can take care of an emergency if he creates one for me. There are thousands of people in the Twin Cities alone, to say nothing of many other communities in the State, who are not that fortunate.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,
Yours respectfully,
J. D. WILLIAMS.

WARNER HOLDING CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 29, 1946.

J. D. WILLIAMS,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: Our real estate operations for our fiscal year just concluded show that we lost over $10,000.

You must have known for many months that you have been getting your apartment at least 25 percent cheaper than it should have been because it was frozen by arbitrary action of a Federal Government bureau. You must have known that your individual other costs have increased greatly. Ours have also in the same if not greater proportion.

Your rental terms as frozen are $55 per month less $5 discount if paid on or before the fifth. In all these months that our income has been rigidly held at the March 1942 rate, you could have voluntarily withheld paying your rent until the sixth of the month and then tendered us the gross rate of $55 had you chosen to do so. In this manner you could have shown us that you realized that we had been victimized for these many months and signified your sympathy in a tangible form; however you chose to selfishly pay your rent before the lapse of the discount date.

Apart from the above, during your tenancy you have been uncooperative and arbitrary in your attitude, and in addition, interviewed other tenants and caused us a lot of trouble.

As it now stands, the Emergency Price Control Act will expire June 30, 1946. Minnesota law requires 30 days notice of intention to increase rent. You are therefore hereby notified that in the event the Emergency Price Control Act is not renewed nor extended after June 30, 1945, your rent for the premises you now occupy from and after July 1, 1946, will be $120 per month with a $5 discount, if paid on or before the 5th of the month, making net $115.

Yours truly,
WARNER HOLDING CO.,
By H. L. WARNER.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the conference report on the price-control bill with reluctance. Had I had the information before me that was given to us by the President this morning, I would have been obliged to vote against it. I believe he knows more about the needs of the entire Nation than any one of us here. He is interested in the people, not in a few of the manufacturers or beneficiaries that have spent millions in trying to defeat this legislation.

It seems to me that the people who have been trying to kill price control, and who have done most to bring about the bill which the President, as the Chief Executive of the Nation, was forced to reject, are speaking for only a small number of speculative industrialists, financiers, and merchants. These men, and it distresses me to have to say it, seem to have no thought except to reap a quick profit. Their philosophy is that of boom and bust; they are one with the French tyrant who said grandiosely, "After me, the deluge."

NO ONE WINS

The truth is that no one wins in this kind of a race with inflation. There are vast forces in motion which, left to the winds of chance, can but blow up a storm that may destroy all chance of peace and prosperity for our time.

Our only chance to win out, at home and abroad, is to control these powerful forces as well as we are able by laws and regulations self-imposed. It is, Mr. Speaker, and I say it sadly, too late to do more than put a heavy brake on these runaway prices; for already the cost of living, in spite of the best efforts of this administration, has gone up and up and up, 40 percent, 50 percent, 60 percent, above prewar prices. Some items are selling at double their 1940 price today.

PRODUCTION IS UP 69 PERCENT

We hear that production is the answer; yet Federal Reserve Board and Civilian Production Administration reports show that in mid April—less than 9 months after VJ-day—civilian production was higher than ever before in our history. Civilian production at that time, Mr. Speaker, was 69 percent higher than in our last prewar years—1935 to 1939—and rising. In April 52,000,000 people were at work producing goods and services. That was more than ever before worked and produced in peacetime.

The "shortages" are in lines of high demand. More people have more money to buy more things than ever before in American history; spendable income of the average family is twice as great as in 1939, I am very pleased to be able to say; and there are, of course, some particular items which are in short supply as compared with prewar.

THIS IS NOT A PARTY FIGHT

This is not just a Republican fight, or a Democratic fight.

It is a fight between the people, the national interest, and the greed and avarice of big business which has misrepresented the issue for the sake of bigger and bigger profits—while they last.

It is a struggle between the desire of the people to make a living, and the desire of selfish interests to make a killing.

CORPORATE PROFITS ARE HIGH

Mr. Speaker, I have before me a graph published in the Survey of Current Business, an official and authoritative publication of the Department of Commerce. That graph shows that even after taxes corporate profits have been maintained at practically 1929 levels for 4 years, from 1941 through 1945.

And still they cry for more and more profit.

INFLATION WILL NOT HURT THE RICH

Mr. Speaker, I have here also a report from the Treasury Department, which I ask unanimous consent to insert, which shows that here in the United States there are 620 men and women who receive incomes in salaries and bonuses amounting to more than $75,000 a year. In the highest brackets some of these people received almost a half million dollars in 1945.

The end of price control will not hurt them, Mr. Speaker, but these are the high-paid servants of the financial powers of Wall Street who have demanded the end of OPA for the greater profit of Big Business, who have hoodwinked the small retailers into making the same demands, and who have carried on a long and expensive and bitter campaign to get rid of OPA, or to strip OPA of all effective powers to save us from a ruinous inflation.

ENEMIES OF FREE ENTERPRISE

They have not hesitated to carry their campaign into the very halls of Congress, Mr. Speaker. The Washington Daily News spoke strongly yesterday in its editorial. The News is not a radical paper; and its warning is not to be taken as any liberal outpourings; in fact, this is not a question of liberalism or conservatism, of Democrats or Republicans. It is a question of saving America from another 1929.

Let me read from the final paragraph of that editorial, which so clearly explains the stake of business in price control:

90 PERCENT OF PEOPLE WANT OPA

Any manufacturer or merchant who sees the present situation as an opportunity or

excuse for profiteering is an enemy of the free-enterprise system. There never was a time when voluntary restraint in pricing was more necessary, or more certain to pay big long-run dividends.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of the American people plead and beg with us to save OPA.

Among the hundreds of letters I have received pleading for extension of a strong price-control act—letters from workers, from businessmen, from dentists, and lawyers, and housewives, and plumbers, and workers, from stenographers, and annuitants and school teachers, letters from American citizens who have to make every dollar count—there is one that stands out, and which should open the eyes of all those who refuse to see.

TWENTY-FIVE DOLLARS FOR A $5 DRESS?

Coming from an outstanding Chicago businessman, it makes clear what the end of OPA will mean as he says, "We do not want to pay $25 for a $5 dress, nor $125 for a $30 suit of clothes."

This letter is from Mr. Allison Waugh, head of the Allison Waugh Financial Development Co., at 105 South La Salle Street, Chicago. I desire to call special attention to Mr. Waugh's warning that our returned servicemen are finding out that their GI loans at 4 percent are no bargains if they have to pay that rate on a 100-percent inflation of the real value.

This is the text of Mr. Waugh's letter:

JUNE 20, 1946.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: We folks back "in the provinces" are beginning to feel more and more that in the political game too much attention is being given to pressure groups and too little to "the common peepul." We begin to realize that the manufacturers, processors, and other suppliers on the one side and labor, big business, etc., on the other side, exist solely because of some 140,000,000 men and women and youngsters who buy merchandise, build homes, save money, and seek the famed Four Freedoms for themselves as well as for other peoples.

Increasing thousands are dismayed at the prospect that the National Legislature will remove the only protection available against inflation, against an increasing rise in all prices which cannot be adjusted until panic ensues. We do not look with favor on rents going to a 200-percent increase. We do not want to pay $25 for a $5 dress nor $125 for a $30 suit of clothes. We do not want stocks to rise to those levels which they will reach in this approaching inflation, to crash once again as they did, to the ruination of millions of us.

We do not want the floods started down as a mountain torrent to the sea of oblivion, with only a large mesh net attached to the sides of the stream so as to permit the saving of the largest fish, our millionaires, permitting all of us small fry to be swept away.

Certainly OPA has its faults; so does everything worth-while and good, even our Supreme Court, but OPA is the only thing which can save us. Organized pressure groups, big business, NMA, and those in the favored class insist on our being almost destroyed in this campaign to destroy OPA.

Thousands are talking buyers' strikes, defeats of our Senators and Congressmen who permit this destruction. We have heard even worse. We are not organized, we have no voice, but we do buy the merchandise, and we do pay the bills. We do not want OPA so emasculated as to be impotent. We want OPA to function. We do not want a recurrence of that period from 1929 to 1934. We are going to vote against the men in Congress who will not support us who elect and maintain those men.

We know we are giving the veterans nothing, when we offer GI loans at 4 percent, because a loan for $5,000 (the real value of the home) at 5 percent would be infinitely better than a loan at 4 percent on a $10,000 inflated valuation. These boys are beginning to know it, also.

Cordially yours,

ALLISON WAUGH.

Consequently, there is nothing else for me to do but to vote to sustain the President, believing that he is sincere, that he is honest, and that he desires to save the Nation from inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a report from the Treasury Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington.

The Secretary of the Treasury today made public, in accordance with a provision of the Internal Revenue Code, a list of individuals receiving from corporations compensation for personal services in excess of $75,000 for the calendar year 1944 and fiscal year ending in 1945 as well as a supplemental report for the calendar year 1943 and fiscal years ended in 1944.

The Secretary of the Treasury is required by section 148 (f) of the code, as amended by section 407 of the Revenue Act of 1939, to make public the names of such individuals as were reported by employing corporations in their income-tax returns. The list compiled shows the amounts paid to officers and employees by reporting corporations in the form of salary, commission, bonus, or other compensation for personal services.

Section 148 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by section 407 of the Revenue Act of 1938, is as follows:

"Compensation of officers and employees: Under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, every corporation subject to taxation under this chapter shall, in its return, submit a list of the names of all officers and employees of such corporations and the respective amounts paid to them during the taxable year of the corporation by the corporation as salary, commission, bonus, or other compensation for personal services rendered, if the aggregate amount so paid to the individual is in excess of $75,000.

"The Secretary shall compile from the returns made a list containing the names of, and the amounts paid to, each such officer and employee and the name of the paying corporation and shall make such list available to the public. It shall be unlawful for any person to sell, offer for sale, or circulate, for any consideration whatsoever, any copy or reproduction of any list, or part thereof, authorized to be made public by this act or by any prior act, relating to the publication of information derived from income-tax returns; and any offense against the foregoing provision shall be a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both, at the discretion of the court: *Provided*, That nothing in this sentence shall be construed to be applicable with respect to any newspaper, or other periodical publication entitled to admission to the mails as second-class matter."

The names of the corporations and of the officers and employees who received compensation in excess of $75,000, as reported to the Secretary by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, are as follows:

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
ALABAMA						
The Birmingham News Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hanson, Victor H		$93,600.00		$9,000.00		$102,600.00
CALIFORNIA						
Phil Berg-Bert Allenberg, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Allenberg, Bertram		106,000.00			[1] $504.38	106,504.38
Bullock's, Inc	Jan. 31, 1945					
Winnett, P. G		75,000.00		20,000.00		95,000.00
Cagney Productions, Inc	July 31, 1945					
Cagney, James		150,000.00				150,000.00
Cagney, William		150,000.00				150,000.00
Captain Kidd Productions, Inc	Nov. 30, 1945					
Laughton, Charles		100,000.00				100,000.00
Scott, Randolph		85,000.00				85,000.00
California Pictures Corp	July 31, 1945					
Sturges, Preston		190,000.00				190,000.00
The Emporium Capwell Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Civelli, J. S		24,000.00		58,344.00		82,344.00
Fisher, Haldane S		40,000.00		75,521.84		115,521.84
Lipman, E. C		35,000.00		87,296.50		122,296.50
Fox Midwest Amusement Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Rhoden, E. C		39,750.00		54,863.25		94,613.25
Fox West Coast Agency Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Skouras, Charles P		130,000.00				130,000.00
Hearst Consolidated Publications, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hearst, William Randolph		100,000.00				100,000.00
Lockheed Aircraft Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Barker, C. A., Jr		90,000.00				90,000.00
Gross, Robert E		125,000.00				125,000.00

[1] This item represents premiums on life insurance carried on the life of Bertram Allenberg by trustees under declaration of pension trust for the employees of Phil Berg-Bert Allenberg, Inc.

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
CALIFORNIA—continued						
Los Angeles Turf Club, Inc.	June 30, 1945					
Strub, Charles H.		$12,000.00		$454,537.53		$466,537.53
Marchant Calculating Machine Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cooke, Dwight R.		128,429.42				128,429.42
The National Dollar Stores, Ltd.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Shoong, Joe		75,120.00		90,000.00		165,120.00
National Theatres Amusement Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Skouras, Charles P.					$263,000.00	263,000.00
Pacific Chemical Co.	Nov. 30, 1945					
Alden, A. T.		7,200.00	$85,304.25		[1] 4,319.96	96,824.21
Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Black, James B.		75,000.00			1,320.00	76,320.00
Hal Roach Studios, Inc.	Aug. 31, 1945					
Bendix, William E.		25,666.67		208,276.35	261.38	234,204.40
Rosenberg Bros. & Co.	May 31, 1945					
Oppenheimer, Arthur C.		25,000.00		134,353.24		159,353.24
S & K Sales Co.	June 30, 1945					
Kahn, Richard		7,200.00		81,999.01		89,199.01
Wells Fargo Bank & Union Trust Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lipman, F. L.		80,000.00				80,000.00
CONNECTICUT						
American Chain & Cable Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Morris, William T.		50,000.00		25,500.00	240.00	75,740.00
Wheeler, Wilmot F.		35,000.00		49,437.50	260.00	84,697.50
Edwards & Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Edwards, R. Stafford		118,817.18				118,817.18
McHugh, Edward P.		77,231.94				77,231.94
Miller, Christian		77,231.94				77,231.94
Nolan, Thomas S.		77,231.94				77,231.94
The National Folding Box Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lynch, Walton D.		196,500.00	46,650.00			143,150.00
Mabee, George W.		134,000.00				134,000.00
Northam Warren Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Warren, Northam		100,000.00				100,000.00
Remington Arms Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Davis, C. K.		39,996.00		46,250.00	220.00	86,466.00
United Aircraft Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Rentschler, Frederick B.		75,000.00			4,150.00	79,150.00
Wilson, Eugene E.		75,000.00			2,350.00	77,350.00
DELAWARE						
American Viscose Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Appleton, William C.		75,000.00		25,000.00		100,000.00
Griffin, Frank H.		60,000.00		20,000.00		80,000.00
The Coca-Cola Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Acklin, A. A.		80,000.00			700.00	80,700.00
Brock, Pope F.		80,000.00			550.00	80,550.00
Jones, Harrison		80,000.00			600.00	80,600.00
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Brown, J. Thompson		50,000.04		56,407.69	600.00	107,007.73
Carpenter, Walter S., Jr.		150,000.00			550.00	150,550.00
Crane, Jasper E.		50,000.04		54,480.50	550.00	105,030.54
du Pont, Henry B.		50,000.04		44,938.13	500.00	95,438.17
Echols, Angus B.		57,999.96		60,834.88	550.00	119,384.84
Harrington, Willis F.		50,000.04		56,407.69	600.00	107,007.73
McCoy, John W.		50,000.04		56,407.69	600.00	107,007.73
Robinson, Edmund G.		45,912.00		43,010.94	600.00	89,522.94
Stine, Charles M. A.		50,000.04		51,407.69	550.00	101,957.73
Wardenburg, Frederic A.		39,680.00		42,010.94	450.00	82,140.94
Yancey, Edward B.		44,735.05		51,046.38	550.00	96,331.43
Yerkes, Leonard A.		52,968.00		45,938.13	550.00	99,456.13
Hercules Powder Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Higgins, Charles A.		60,000.00		21,900.00		81,900.00
The Lambert Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Johnston, John L.		80,000.00		15,000.00		95,000.00
GEORGIA						
Colonial Stores, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Phelan, Hunter C.		26,000.00		63,805.00		89,805.00
Industrial Life & Health Insurance Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
McEachern, J. N.		84,959.31				84,959.31
ILLINOIS						
American Steel Foundries	Sept. 30, 1945					
Drever, Thomas		60,000.00		30,000.00		90,000.00
B. & K. Management Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Balaban, John		104,000.00				104,000.00
John Blair & Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Blair, John P.		12,000.00	1,000.00	78,554.49		91,554.49
Borg-Warner Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Blood, Howard E.		60,000.00		27,034.39	450.00	87,484.39
Ingersoll, R. C.		57,000.00		32,677.00	550.00	90,227.00
Brink's, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Allen, Frank		85,000.00			850.00	85,850.00
Allen, John D.		85,000.00			850.00	85,850.00
Burgess-Norton Manufacturing Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Smith, H. S.		3,000.00	102,016.72	1,500.00		106,516.72
Butler Bros.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Freeman, Thomas B.		50,000.00		31,000.00		81,000.00
Caron Spinning Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Caron, O. J.		24,999.96		82,368.28		107,368.24
Central Steel & Wire Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lowenstine, Mandel		66,000.00		18,000.00		84,000.00
Container Corp. of America	Dec. 31, 1944					
Paepcke, Walter P.		75,000.00			45,000.00	120,000.00
Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cummings, Walter J.		150,000.00			1,050.00	151,050.00
Crane Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Collier, J. H.		50,000.00		25,000.00	700.00	75,700.00
R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Littell, C. G.		26,000.00		107,762.28		133,762.28
Zimmerman, H. P.		20,800.00		64,657.37		85,457.37
The Reuben H. Donnelley Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bamforth, Arthur H.		19,500.00		55,810.92		75,310.92
Gunnison, Raymond M.		25,000.00		55,810.92		80,810.92
Harrington, David L.		10,800.00		64,510.92		75,310.92
Lillyblade, Clarence O.		19,500.00		55,810.92		75,310.92

[1] Reimbursement of business expenses.

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
ILLINOIS—continued						
Fairbanks, Morse & Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Morse, Robert H.		$75,000.00		$79,163.71	$3,000.00	$157,163.71
The First National Bank of Chicago	Dec. 31, 1944					
Brown, E. E.		85,000.00			3,875.00	88,875.00
General Outdoor Advertising Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Robbins, Burnett W.		75,000.00			150.00	75,150.00
Gunthorp-Warren Printing Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Moran, John T.		8,500.00		127,500.00		136,000.00
Household Finance Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Henderson, B. E.		75,038.22		50,000.00		125,038.22
Inland Steel Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Sykes, Wilfred		50,000.00		30,000.00		80,000.00
International Harvester Co.	Oct. 31, 1945					
Elliott, William S.		60,000.00		24,000.00	600.00	84,600.00
McCaffrey, J. L.		68,750.00		27,500.00	1,100.00	97,350.00
McCormick, Fowler		99,999.96		40,000.00	1,280.00	141,279.96
International Minerals & Chemical Corp.	June 30, 1945					
Ware, Louis		50,000.00		50,000.00	1,200.00	101,200.00
William F. Jobbins, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
McKnight, William A.		10,000.00		75,000.00		85,000.00
Kraft Cheese Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Kraft, John H.		80,833.37				80,833.37
Lion Manufacturing Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lyon, Stuart G.			$76,852.00			76,852.00
Lumbermen's Mutual Casualty Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Kemper, James S.		45,000.00			200,904.09	245,904.09
Mars, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Mars, Mrs. E. V.		120,000.00				120,000.00
Maybelline Co.	June 30, 1945					
Williams, Thomas L.		80,000.00				80,000.00
W. H. Miner, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Withall, A. P.		50,000.00	144,264.03			194,264.03
Monroe Chemical Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bonfoey, L. P.		[3] 76,120.57				76,120.57
Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Avery, S. L.		100,000.00			850.00	100,850.00
Ryan, C. D.		75,000.00		20,000.00	800.00	95,800.00
Northwest Engineering Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Houston, L. E.		50,000.00		50,000.00		100,000.00
Pabst Brewing Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Perlstein, H.						82,000.00
Reid, Murdoch & Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Anderson, L. S.		25,000.00		115,822.71		140,822.71
Republic Food Products Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Clair, J. M.		26,000.00		62,620.00		88,620.00
C. A. Roberts Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Kaiser, A. A.		83,570.76				83,570.76
Sears, Roebuck & Co.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Barrows, A. S.		77,130.00		35,000.00		112,130.00
Houser, T. V.		59,999.95		20,000.00		79,999.95
A. E. Staley Manufacturing Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Staley, A. E., Jr.		48,000.00		44,500.00		92,500.00
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)	Dec. 31, 1944					
Seubert, Edward G.		41,925.60			66,911.76	108,837.36
Swift & Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Holmes, John		85,000.00				85,000.00
Chicago Tribune-New York News Syndicate, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Gray and Gray		13,250.00			81,187.45	94,437.45
News Syndicate Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Clarke, R. W.		67,200.00		22,800.00		90,000.00
Flynn, F. M.		67,200.00		22,800.00		90,000.00
Holliss, R. C.		67,200.00		22,800.00		90,000.00
Tribune Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Campbell, C. M.						80,786.91
Rose, L. H.						111,068.00
United Drill & Tool Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Kearins, M. J.		24,999.84			65,000.00	89,999.84
Zenith Radio Corp.	Apr. 30, 1945					
McDonald, Eugene F., Jr.		55,000.00		30,000.00		85,000.00
INDIANA						
Mead Johnson & Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Johnson, Lambert D.		40,478.88		78,611.12		119,090.00
IOWA						
The Register & Tribune Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Martin, Henry P., Jr.		6,573.75	70,806.22			77,379.97
LOUISIANA						
Higgins Industries, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Higgins, Andrew J.		83,333.33				83,333.33
MARYLAND						
Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Montgomery, William		75,000.00			200.00	75,200.00
American Totalisator Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Straus, Henry L.		53,000.00		34,811.53		87,811.53
The Hecht Co.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Davidow, Harry		45,593.45		80,214.47		125,807.92
Dulcan, Charles B., Sr.		50,000.00		133,235.62		183,235.62
Goodman, Moses H.		45,000.00		47,143.13		92,143.13
MASSACHUSETTS						
American Optical Co. (voluntary association)	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cozzens, C. O.		90,000.00				90,000.00
Mosher, Ira		83,333.33				83,333.33
The Atlantic Lumber Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Crowley, Ralph C.		77,399.00				77,399.00
French, Edward V.		185,497.51				185,497.51
McHugh, Thomas J.		185,497.51				185,497.51
E. B. Badger & Sons Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Badger, Erastus B.		18,000.00	132,383.56		1,364.24	151,747.80
Campbell, Charles L.		10,000.00	88,255.70		956.03	99,211.73
Hall, Walter T.		18,000.00	132,383.56		1,225.85	151,609.41
Hargrove, George C.		12,000.00	88,255.70		658.06	100,913.76
Lunt, George P.		12,000.00	88,255.70		734.49	100,990.19
Peters, William A., Jr.		18,000.00	132,383.56		1,093.02	151,476.58

[3] Compensation based upon contract dated June 24, 1940.

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
MASSACHUSETTS—continued						
Evans Case Co.	Feb. 28, 1945					
Reilly, Alfred F.		$25,000.00		$51,356.74		$76,356.74
Haffenreffer & Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Haffenreffer, T. C.		28,750.00	$54,212.11			82,962.11
The Lahey Clinic	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lahey, Dr. Frank H.		110,000.00				110,000.00
Meisel Press Manufacturing Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Skelton, W. A.		15,000.00	65,096.44			80,096.44
Packard Mills, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hubbard, Ralph K.		26,400.00	57,461.69	20,000.00		103,861.69
Potter Drug & Chemical Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Best, Samuel M.		25,000.00		58,832.70		83,832.70
Transit Bus Sales, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Steeves, Henry A.		75,200.00				75,200.00
United Business Service Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Babson, Paul T.		24,000.00			$55,413.17	79,413.17
The Van Keuren Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Van Keuren, Harold L.		100,000.00			300.00	100,300.00
Winslow Bros. & Smith Co.	Oct. 31, 1945					
Cook, Cheney E.		75,000.00			380.00	75,380.00
MICHIGAN						
Aurora Gasoline Co.	Mar. 31, 1945					
Wenger, Henry E.		21,600.00		74,400.17		96,000.17
Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bohn, Chas. B.		50,000.00		50,000.00	100.00	100,100.00
Markey, P. A.		50,000.00		49,000.00	125.00	99,125.00
Burroughs Adding Machine Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Doughty, A. J.		80,000.00			175.00	80,175.00
The Dow Chemical Co.	May 31, 1945					
Dow, Willard H.		100,000.00				100,000.00
Evans Products Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Evans, E. S.		75,000.00			789.12	75,789.12
Singer, R. M.			80,638.82			80,638.82
Ford Motor Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bricker, M. L.		75,444.42				75,444.42
Craig, B. J.		136,624.92				136,624.92
Ford, Henry II		94,004.20				94,004.20
Rausch, R. R.		75,063.17				75,063.17
The Gear Grinding Machine Co.	Aug. 31, 1945					
Macdonald, C. N.		26,000.00		50,000.00		76,000.00
General Motors Corp.[4]	Dec. 31, 1944					
Anderson, Harry W.		38,333.30		54,770.00	525.00	93,628.30
Archer, Thomas P.		72,100.00		70,558.05	1,300.00	143,958.05
Babcock, Irving B.		61,250.00		90,571.38		151,821.38
Badgley, Ollie V.		30,000.00		53,234.30	750.00	83,984.30
Bradley, Albert		100,000.00		168,057.50	[5] 4,312.15 3,650.00	276,019.65
Brown, Donaldson		100,000.00		129,170.65	3,400.00	232,570.65
Codrington, George W.		50,000.00		69,671.45	939.00	120,610.45
Coyle, Marvin E.		100,000.00		137,114.95	3,100.00	240,214.95
Crawford, James M.		36,000.00		57,506.70	900.00	94,406.70
Curtice, Harlow H.		90,000.00		113,483.15	2,750.00	206,233.15
Dean, Hugh		30,000.00		44,629.17	675.00	75,304.17
Donner, Frederic G.		50,000.00		78,802.60	2,050.00	130,852.60
Dreystadt, Nicholas		60,000.00		77,534.10	1,125.00	138,659.10
Earl, Harley J.		65,000.00		49,829.60	750.00	115,579.60
Evans, Ronald K.		65,000.00		102,401.35	1,500.00	168,901.35
Fisher, Alfred J.		50,000.00		49,529.35	600.00	100,129.35
Fisher, Edward F.		100,000.00		122,161.55	2,275.00	224,436.55
Fisher, Lawrence P.		50,000.00		35,487.10	1,343.75	86,830.85
Goad, Louis C.		54,166.63		66,853.10	[5] 3,300.00 750.00	125,069.73
Godfrey, Edward H.		45,000.00		41,232.85	339.00	86,571.85
Grant, Richard H.		53,711.96		60,109.80	2,250.00	116,071.76
Harder, Delmar S.		30,000.00		51,231.70	600.00	81,831.70
Hogan, Henry M.		50,000.00		77,667.70	1,050.00	128,717.70
Holler, William E.		60,000.00		66,752.55	1,125.00	127,877.55
Hufstader, William F.		34,750.00		44,989.75	600.00	80,339.75
Hughes, Frederick G.		40,000.00		46,940.40	639.00	87,579.40
Hunt, Ormond E.		100,000.00		183,745.00	4,000.00	287,745.00
Johnson, Earle F.		59,166.67		56,840.10		116,006.77
Kettering, Charles F.		100,000.00		141,087.10	3,100.00	244,187.10
Klingler, Harry J.		70,000.00		70,724.70	1,125.00	141,849.70
Kunkle, Bayard D.		59,583.33		81,020.45	939.00	141,542.78
McCuen, Charles L.		75,000.00		98,429.20	1,500.00	174,929.20
Newill, Edward B.		40,000.00		41,284.80	450.00	81,734.80
Osborn, Cyrus R.		40,000.00		38,147.30	300.00	78,447.30
Prentis, Meyer L.		35,000.00		42,018.90	675.00	77,693.90
Riley, Edward C.		40,000.00		35,610.30	450.00	76,060.30
Skinner, Sherrod E.		60,000.00		79,370.05	1,050.00	140,420.05
Sloan, Alfred P., Jr.		200,000.00			900.00	200,900.00
Smith, John Thomas		100,000.00		129,170.65	3,500.00	232,670.65
Wetherald, Charles E.		50,000.00		66,318.70	1,050.00	117,368.70
Williams, William C., Jr.		60,000.00		90,585.45	1,125.00	151,710.45
Wilson, Charles E.		150,000.00		208,579.20	4,375.00	362,954.20
Young, Orville W.		39,999.96		45,123.35	525.00	85,648.31
The J. L. Hudson Co.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Preston, George E.		26,266.66		54,000.00		80,266.66
Webber, James B.		26,266.66		75,000.00		101,266.66
Webber, Oscar		26,266.66		113,000.00		139,266.66
Webber, Richard H.		52,433.33		50,000.00		102,433.33
Hudson Motor Car Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Barit, A. Edward		90,000.00				90,000.00
Koestlin Tool & Die Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Fralick, Foster L.		23,000.00			55,000.00	78,000.00
S. S. Kresge Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Tuttle, C. B.		89,250.00				89,250.00
Williams, R. R.		89,250.00				89,250.00
Lyon Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lyon, G. A.		50,000.00		40,000.00		90,000.00

[4] Bonus includes the total value of bonus awards granted for 1943, partly in General Motors Corp. common stock and partly in cash, payable Aug. 3, 1944. The stock portion of the awards was computed at $61.50 per share, the closing market price of General Motors Corp. common stock on Aug. 3, 1944, as evidenced by the New York Stock Exchange. Bonus also includes the fourth of bonus awards granted for 1941, payable in General Motors Corp. common stock in 1944, computed at $62.75 per share, the closing market price of General Motors Corp. common stock on Dec. 26, 1944, the available delivery date, as evidenced by the New York Stock Exchange. Other compensation represents dividends received on bonus stock held in escrow.

[5] Covers allowance for living expenses.

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
MICHIGAN—continued						
National Bank of Detroit	Dec. 31, 1944					
McLucas, Walter S		$50,000.00			$58,250.00	$108,250.00
National Sheet Steel Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Deskin, Ray		25,000.00	$55,158.21			80,158.21
Packard Motor Car Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Christopher, G. T		81,000.00		$20,000.00		101,000.00
Reo Motors, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hund, H. E		40,800.00		70,000.00		110,800.00
Square D Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Magin, F. W		45,000.00		72,147.59		117,147.59
The Timken-Detroit Axle Co	June 30, 1945					
Rockwell, Walter F		50,000.04		31,483.30		81,483.34
MINNESOTA						
The J. R. Watkins Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
King, E. L., Jr		42,500.00		40,000.00		82,500.00
MISSOURI						
American Lithofold Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Blauner, Robert A			125,493.22	25.00		125,518.22
Katherman, Karen		1,200.00	117,246.25	25.00		118,471.25
The Bayer Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Linaker, F. W		7,500.00		87,142.85		94,642.85
D'Arcy Advertising Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lee, A. L		126,197.00				126,197.00
J. A. Folger & Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Atha, R. E		21,000.00		75,758.50		96,758.50
Lawton Byrne Bruner Insurance Agency Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lawton, C. S			83,823.53			83,823.53
The Pulitzer Publishing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Pulitzer, Joseph		100,000.00	84,889.88			184,889.88
Southern Comfort Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Fouke, P. B			89,695.73			89,695.73
Fouke, L. R		5,000.00	138,909.37			143,909.37
Fowler, F. E., Jr		10,000.00	157,693.59			167,693.59
NEBRASKA						
J. L. Brandeis & Sons	Jan. 31, 1945					
Brandeis, George		49,999.92		74,916.61		124,916.53
NEW JERSEY						
American Home Products Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Brush, Alvin G		50,000.00		15,000.00	15,000.00	80,000.00
Bengue, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Seltzer, Theodore		12,000.00	254,691.14			266,691.14
Campbell Soup Co	July 31, 1945					
Dorrance, Arthur C		99,000.00				99,000.00
Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Coulter, J. A		40,000.08		35,500.00		75,500.08
Little, E. H		100,000.08		140,141.00		240,141.08
Railey, B. W		40,000.08		60,000.00		100,000.08
Hahne & Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Buck, Junior C		30,000.00			70,000.00	100,000.00
Hoffman-La Roche, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Barell, Dr. E. C						98,362.57
Bobst, E. H						300,000.00
A. Hollander & Son, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hollander, Michael		52,000.00		52,000.00		104,000.00
Johnson & Johnson	Dec. 31, 1944					
Johnson, R. W		75,000.00		17,000.00		92,000.00
New Jersey Worsted Mills	Dec. 31, 1944					
Haltermann, Frederick W		12,000.00		94,078.20		106,078.20
NEW YORK						
J. N. Adam & Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Holder, A. C		45,000.00		55,000.00		100,000.00
Air Reduction Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Adams, C. E		65,000.00		43,900.00	1,250.00	110,150.00
Allied Chemical & Dye Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Atherton, H. F		125,000.00				125,000.00
Allied Stores Corp	Jan. 31, 1945					
Broidy, Edward W		26,000.00		100,237.00	140.00	126,377.00
Coons, Albert		26,000.00		63,780.00	180.00	89,960.00
Lawrie, Walter H		24,000.00		173,396.51		197,396.51
McCarthy, Charles E		13,000.00		71,780.00	200.00	84,980.00
Puckett, B. Earl		30,000.00		185,220.00	200.00	215,420.00
Pyke, Robert W		26,000.00		68,048.00	200.00	94,248.00
American Brake Shoe Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Given, Wm. B., Jr		75,000.00		20,000.00		95,000.00
American Can Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Figgis, D. W		100,000.00			4,200.00	104,200.00
Sullivan, M. J		150,000.00			4,000.00	154,000.00
American Cyanamid Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bell, W. B		75,000.00		141,571.58		216,571.58
Cooper, K. F		43,200.00		40,149.99		83,349.99
American Cyanamid & Chemical Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Derby, H. L		44,928.00		41,755.99		86,683.99
American Car & Foundry Co	Apr. 30, 1945					
Hardy, Charles J		96,000.00			1,201.00	97,201.00
Stevenson, F. A		75,000.00			1,201.00	76,201.00
American Locomotive Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Dickerman, William C		112,500.00			1,340.00	113,840.00
Fraser, Duncan W		90,000.00			1,355.00	91,355.00
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cooper, C. P		99,999.96			1,400.00	101,399.96
Gifford, W. S		206,250.00			3,900.00	210,150.00
American Tobacco Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hahn, Paul M		[1] 50,000.00		39,691.98		89,691.98
Hill, George W		120,000.00		66,153.29		186,153.29
Riggio, Vincent		50,000.00		39,691.98		89,691.98
American Weekly, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Berkowitz, Mortimer		52,166.64		132,462.99		184,629.63
Bankers Trust Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Colt, S. Sloan		100,000.00			5,450.00	105,450.00
Herman Basch & Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Nauen, Ernest		18,000.00			63,927.62	81,927.62
Vortrefflich, Paul W		18,000.00			63,927.62	81,927.62

[1] Less: Salary paid to P. M. Hahn by the American Tobacco Co., but billed to a subsidiary company.

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
NEW YORK—continued						
Blue Network Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
La Roche, Chester J.		$75,000.00		$10,000.00		$85,000.00
Bristol-Myers Co. (Delaware)	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bristol, H. P.		60,000.00		29,548.92		89,548.92
Bristol, L. H.		49,999.92		29,548.92		79,548.84
Bristol, W. M., Jr.		49,999.92		29,548.92		79,548.84
Brockway Motor Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Piroumoff, G. S.		30,000.00		27,000.00	$20,000.00	77,000.00
Carter Carburetor Corp.	Apr. 30, 1945					
Weed, Hugh H. C.		48,000.00			58,456.00	106,456.00
Charles Stores Co., Inc.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Hornstein, B. S.		30,000.00		158,414.63		188,414.63
The Chase National Bank of the City of New York	Dec. 31, 1944					
Aldrich, Winthrop W.		175,000.00			7,800.00	182,800.00
Campbell, H. Donald		100,000.00			7,000.00	107,000.00
Chemical Bank & Trust Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Houston, Frank K.		75,000.00		1,725.00		76,725.00
Corn Exchange Bank Trust Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Sherer, Dunham B.		75,000.00		1,020.00		76,020.00
Cluett, Peabody & Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Palmer, C. R.		95,000.00				95,000.00
Crucible Steel Co. of America	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hufnagel, F. B.		110,000.00				110,000.00
H. Duys & Co., Inc.	Mar. 31, 1945					
Steur, John A. C.					[7] 122,972.28	122,972.28
Eastman Kodak Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hargrave, T. J.						107,482.69
Lovejoy, Frank W.						85,451.92
Sievers, H. C.						75,775.00
Electro-Chemical Engraving Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Jacober, M. C.		14,800.00	$29,675.92	3,000.00	59,391.83	106,867.75
Ethyl Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Webb, Earle W.		60,000.00		30,438.00		90,438.00
The First National Bank of the City of New York	Dec. 31, 1944					
Fraser, Leon		85,000.00			1,200.00	86,200.00
Welldon, Samuel A.		75,000.00			1,200.00	76,200.00
General Foods Corp.[8]	Dec. 31, 1944					
Chester, Colby M.		75,000.00			75.00	75,075.00
Francis, Clarence		130,000.00				130,000.00
Igleheart, Austin S.		115,000.00				115,000.00
Metcalf, Charles W.		100,000.00				100,000.00
Young, Udell C.		85,000.00				85,000.00
General Motors Acceptance Corp.[4]	Dec. 31, 1944					
Schumann, John J., Jr.		65,000.00		64,030.00	1,489.00	130,519.00
W. T. Grant Co.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Fogler, Raymond H.		60,000.00		75,000.00		135,000.00
The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (New Jersey)	Feb. 28, 1945					
Adams, O. C.		100,021.00			20.00	100,041.00
Brooks, C. A.		100,021.00				100,021.00
Byrnes, W. M.		100,021.00			60.00	100,081.00
Smith, R. B.		79,259.96				79,259.96
Guaranty Trust Co. of New York	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cleveland, J. Luther		98,548.39			7,310.28	105,858.67
Conway, W. Palen		100,000.00			5,242.47	105,242.47
Stetson, Eugene W.		100,000.00			7,589.53	107,589.53
Guggenheim Nitrate Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Whelpley, Medley G. B.		87,500.00				87,500.00
Handy & Harman	Dec. 31, 1944					
Handy, C. W.		84,000.00				84,000.00
Niemeyer, G. H.		84,000.00				84,000.00
Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Brace, Donald C.		7,500.00	76,464.60	525.00		84,489.60
Scott, S. Spencer		5,000.00	76,464.60	350.00		81,814.60
The Hearst Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Winchell, Walter		62,400.00	34,841.19			97,241.19
Hearst Magazines, Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Berlin, Richard E.		50,000.00		74,134.43		124,134.43
The William Hengerer Co.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Hecht, Harold M.		30,000.00			70,000.00	100,000.00
Hickok Manufacturing Co., Inc.	Apr. 30, 1945					
Hickok, S. Rae		27,000.00		93,000.00		120,000.00
Ingersoll-Rand Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Doubleday, George		78,000.00				78,000.00
Johnson & Higgins	Dec. 31, 1944					
Davey, W. N.		132,418.03			140.00	132,558.03
Hall, W. E.		117,704.91			220.00	117,924.91
Hunt, E. F.		117,704.91			200.00	117,904.91
Keegan, J. S.		132,418.03			220.00	132,638.03
La Boyteaux, W. H.		205,983.59			240.00	206,223.59
Lowe, Henry W.		132,418.03			240.00	132,658.03
Otis, Courtlandt		88,278.68			220.00	88,498.68
Sexton, Herbert B.		102,991.80			260.00	103,251.80
Jordan Marsh Co.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Mitton, Edward R.		49,000.00		91,800.16		140,800.16
Joske Bros. Co.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Calvert, J. H.		24,000.00		121,052.10		145,052.10
Kennecott Copper Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Stannard, E. T.		125,000.00			1,100.00	126,100.00

[4] Bonus includes the total value of bonus awards granted for 1943, partly in General Motors Corp. common stock and partly in cash, payable Aug. 3, 1944. The stock portion of the awards was computed at $61.50 per share, the closing market price of General Motors Corp. common stock on Aug. 3, 1944, as evidenced by the New York Stock Exchange. Bonus also includes the fourth fourth of bonus awards granted for 1941, payable in General Motors Corp. common stock in 1944 computed at $62.75 per share, the closing market price of General Motors Corp. common stock on Dec. 26, 1944, the available delivery date, as evidenced by the New York Stock Exchange. Other compensation represents dividends received on bonus stock held in escrow.

[7] Includes $10,000 paid on account for expenses.

[8] The foregoing compensation comprises amounts paid on behalf of General Foods Corp. and subsidiaries as follows:

	General foods, comparative	Subsidiaries	Total		General foods, comparative	Subsidiaries	Total
Colby M. Chester	$62,612.62	$12,462.38	$75,075	Charles W. Metcalf	$83,400.24	$16,599.76	$100,000
Clarence Francis	108,420.32	21,579.68	130,000	Udell C. Young	62,900.00	22,100.00	85,000
Austin S Igleheart	95,910.28	19,089.72	115,000				

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
NEW YORK—continued						
Lackawanna Steel Construction Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Phillippi, W. H		$89,205.73				$89,205.73
Lennen & Mitchell, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lennen, Philip W		79,999.92		$3,333.33		83,333.25
Frederick Loeser & Co., Inc	Jan 31, 1945					
Pridday, Joseph E		50,000.00		49,831.26		99,831.26
Longines-Wittnauer Watch Co., Inc	Mar. 31, 1945					
Cartoun, M. F			$100,585.17	10,000.00		110,585.17
Guilden, Morris		33,000.00	75,585.18	15,000.00		123,585.18
Heinmuller, J. P. V		21,000.00	45,693.72	10,000.00		76,693.72
Perlman, Samuel		25,000.00	56,613.91	10,000.00		91,613.91
Lord & Taylor	Jan. 31, 1945					
Hoving, Walter		70,000.00			$65,000.00	135,000.00
Joe Lowe Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lowe, Joe		50,000.00		45,000.00		95,000.00
Nissman, Morris			114,882.59			114,882.59
Price, Louis		50,000.00		45,000.00		95,000.00
R. H. Macy & Co., Inc	Jan. 31, 1945					
Marks, Edwin I		90,000.00			280.00	90,280.00
Straus, Jack I		99,999.99			320.00	100,319.99
McCall Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Warner, William B		75,000.00		65,179.00	600.00	140,779.00
McCallum-Hatch Bronze Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
McCallum, John C		82,608.78				82,608.78
James McCreery & Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Davidson, J. E		60,000.00			40,000.00	100,000.00
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lincoln, Leroy A		125,000.00				125,000.00
George W. Millar & Co., Inc	June 30, 1945					
Greenman, Lewis C		81,217.72		1,588.11		82,805.83
Philip Morris & Co. Ltd., Inc	Mar. 31, 1945					
Chalkley, O. H		75,000.00		25,000.00		100,000.00
Lyon, A. E		75,000.00		25,000.00		100,000.00
National Biscuit Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Tomlinson, R. E		91,200.00				91,200.00
National Broadcasting Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Trammell, Niles		70,000.08		14,000.00	200.00	84,200.08
National Dairy Products Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Van Bomel, L. A		120,000.00			620.00	120,620.00
National Distillers Products Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Balfe, Thomas W		50,000.00		42,000.00		92,000.00
MacNamara, M. J		50,000.00		42,000.00		92,000.00
Porter, Seton		100,000.00		105,000.00		205,000.00
National Gypsum Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Baker, Melvin H		91,250.08				91,250.08
The New York Trust Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bierwirth, John E		75,000.00			5,000.00	80,000.00
Paramount Pictures, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Balaban, Barney		156,000.00				156,000.00
Bracken, Edward V		105,083.34				105,083.34
Brackett, Charles		102,100.00				102,100.00
Butler, Frank		104,525.00				104,525.00
Crosby, Harry L. (Bing Crosby)		192,944.48				192,944.48
DeSylva, George G		204,654.76				204,654.76
Donlevy, Brian		86,166.67				86,166.67
Farrow, John V		92,141.67				92,141.67
Freeman, Y. Frank		130,000.00				130,000.00
Ginsberg, Henry		146,566.66				146,566.66
Goddard, Paulette		187,333.33				187,333.33
Hope, Bob		185,416.67				185,416.67
Howard, Dorothy (Dorothy Lamour)		167,500.01				167,500.01
Keough, Austin C		78,000.00				78,000.00
Kohlmar, Fred		75,333.34				75,333.34
Ladd, Alan Walbridge		88,999.99				88,999.99
Lanfield, Sidney		104,464.25				104,464.25
Leisen, Mitchell		172,816.24				172,816.24
MacMurray, Fred		213,333.33				213,333.33
Marshall, George		156,000.00				156,000.00
McCarey, Thomas Leo		75,000.00			1,038,035.37	1,113,035.37
McCrea, Joel		81,250.00				81,250.00
Milland, Raymond		243,333.33				243,333.33
Miller, Seton I		130,600.00				130,600.00
Moore, Victor Fred		91,000.00				91,000.00
Reagan, Charles M		78,611.16				78,611.16
Sandrich, Mark Rex		141,000.00				141,000.00
Scott, Allan		78,750.00				78,750.00
Thornburg, Betty June (Betty Hutton)		84,875.00				84,875.00
Tugend, Harry		131,650.00				131,650.00
Wilder, Samuel "Billy"		136,750.04				136,750.04
Zukor, Adolph		104,000.00			5,000.00	109,000.00
J. C. Penney Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Binzen, F. W		10,000.00			67,365.84	77,365.84
Crocker, G. H		10,000.00			67,365.84	77,365.84
Herbert, J. L. H		10,000.00			67,365.84	77,365.84
Hughes, A. W		10,000.00			67,365.84	77,365.84
Reynolds, W. A		10,000.00			67,365.84	77,365.84
Ross, E. A		10,000.00			67,365.84	77,365.84
Trown, R. W		10,000.00			67,365.84	77,365.84
Phelps Dodge Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cates, Louis S		150,000.00				150,000.00
The Reader's Digest Association, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cole, Albert L		84,500.00				84,500.00
Payne, Kenneth W		48,000.00		36,462.82		84,462.82
Wallace, DeWitt		99,500.00				99,500.00
Reeves, Bros., Inc	June 30, 1945					
Kerr, A. M		36,000.00		42,000.00		78,000.00
Reeves, J. M		66,000.00		61,000.00		127,000.00
Russell & Stoll Co., inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Stoll, Albert F		52,000.00	38,055.47			90,055.47
The F. & M. Schaefer Brewing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Schaefer, F. M. E		84,000.00			140.00	84,140.00
Schaefer, R. J		108,000.00			140.00	108,140.00
Simplicity Pattern Co., Inc. and subsidiary companies	Dec. 31, 1944					
Shapiro, Joseph M		60,000.00			53,359.45	113,359.45
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Brown, John A		90,000.00				90,000.00
Holton, George V		80,000.00				80,000.00
Sheets, Harold F		86,667.00				86,667.00

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
NEW YORK—continued						
L. Sonneborn Sons, Inc.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Roten, J. F.		$18,000.00		$69,086.26		$87,086.26
Sonneborn, Dr. F.		22,500.00		69,086.26		91,586.26
Sonneborn, R. G.		13,500.00		69,086.26		82,586.26
Technical Metal Finishing Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Munzer, Alfred E.		36,400.00		48,800.00		85,200.00
Munzer, William		36,400.00		48,800.00		85,200.00
Munzer, William A.		36,400.00		48,800.00		85,200.00
Tide Water Associated Oil Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Humphrey, William F.		75,000.00			$3,585.20	78,585.20
The Titche-Goettinger Co.	Jan. 31, 1945					
Brown, William J.		18,000.00		81,574.35		99,574.35
Todd Shipyards Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Reilly, John D.		135,912.50				135,912.50
M. H. Treadwell Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Casey, J. S.		44,800.00			50,000.00	94,800.00
Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Ameche, Don F.		117,000.00				117,000.00
Bacher, Wm. A.		79,500.00				79,500.00
Bacon, Lloyd		161,250.00				161,250.00
Bankhead, Talullah B.		116,666.65				116,666.65
Caldwell, Erskine		83,750.00				83,750.00
Coburn, Charles D.		197,991.24				197,991.24
Connors, Thomas J.		106,000.00			6,300.00	112,300.00
Foster, Preston S.		78,666.67				78,666.67
Foy, Bryan		172,250.00				172,250.00
Grable, Betty		172,000.00				172,000.00
Hathaway, Henry L.		132,500.00				132,500.00
Haymes, Richard B.		104,062.50				104,062.50
Humberstone, H. B.		75,541.67				75,541.67
Jessel, George A.		99,291.66				99,291.66
King, Henry		143,333.34				143,333.34
Lebaron, William		159,000.00				159,000.00
Lighton, Louis D.		77,833.33				77,833.33
Lubitsch, Ernst		159,500.00				159,500.00
MacMurray, Frederick		177,884.59				177,884.59
Mankiewicz, Joseph L.		185,500.00				185,500.00
Mayo, Archie L.		89,038.37				89,038.37
Miranda, Carmen		201,458.33				201,458.33
Mitchell, Thomas		106,666.66				106,666.66
Moskowitz, Joseph		79,500.00				79,500.00
Newman, Alfred		81,317.41				81,317.41
Perlberg, William		185,500.00				185,500.00
Preminger, Otto L.		95,875.00				95,875.00
Raft, George		108,333.32				108,333.32
Raine, Norman R.		102,375.00				102,375.00
Ratoff, Gregory		145,000.00				145,000.00
Schenck, Joseph M.		130,416.57				130,416.57
Schreiber, Lew		81,500.00				81,500.00
Seaton, George E.		123,266.66				123,266.66
Skouras, Spyros P.		254,807.57			1,100.00	255,907.57
Stahl, John M.		172,250.00				172,250.00
Swerling, Joseph		137,000.00				137,000.00
Tierney, Gene		77,083.34				77,083.34
Trotti, Lamar		88,375.00				88,375.00
Wooley, Edgar M.		80,104.16				80,104.16
Wurtzel, Sol M.		77,500.00				77,500.00
Zanuck, Darryl F.		260,833.33				260,833.33
Underwood Elliott Fisher Co (Delaware)	Dec. 31, 1944					
Wagoner, Philip D.		138,860.00				138,860.00
Union Bag & Paper Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Calder, Alexander		85,000.00		32,810.00	900.00	118,710.00
Union Pacific R. R. Co. and affiliated companies	Dec. 31, 1944					
Charske, F. W.		75,000.00			4,215.00	79,215.00
Jeffers, W. M.		75,000.00			780.00	75,780.00
United States Rubber Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Davis, F. B., Jr.		150,000.00			550.00	150,550.00
Humphreys, H. E., Jr.		72,000.00		35,000.00	500.00	107,500.00
Marlor, H. S.		50,000.04		35,000.00	500.00	85,500.04
Needham, T. J.		50,000.04		35,000.00	550.00	85,550.04
Roberts, Elmer		50,000.04		35,000.00	500.00	85,500.04
Smith, H. E.		99,999.96		49,000.00	550.00	149,549.96
Wah Chang Trading Corp.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Li, K. C.		4,500.00	$88,809.00		40.00	93,349.00
Wallerstein Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Graf, William		60,000.00		21,000.00		81,000.00
Wallerstein, Leo		84,000.00		10,000.00		94,000.00
Walworth Co.	Dec. 31, 1944					
Holton, W. B., Jr.		75,000.00			45,000.00	120,000.00
Warner Bros. Circuit Management Corp.	Aug. 31, 1945					
Coston, J. E.		46,800.00		25,706.13	[1] 5,200.00	77,706.13
Hoffman, I. J.		52,000.00		24,191.94		76,191.94
Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.	Aug. 31, 1945					
Bernhard, Jos.		130,000.00			{ 1,100.00 / 26,000.00 }	157,100.00
Bernhardt, Kurt		111,708.33				111,708.33
Blanke, Henry		154,500.00				154,500.00
Bogart, Humphrey		132,916.67				132,916.67
Boyer, Charles		207,500.00				207,500.00
Buckner, Robert		81,625.00				81,625.00
Butler, David		123,750.00				123,750.00
Crawford, Joan		100,000.00				100,000.00
Curtiz, Michael		203,759.83				203,759.83
Daves, Delmar		87,450.00				87,450.00
Einfeld, S. C.		151,333.33				151,333.33
Flynn, Errol		184,000.00				184,000.00
Forbstein, Leo		91,000.00				91,000.00
Francen, Victor		86,916.67				86,916.67
Garfield, Jules		114,708.33				114,708.33
Grant, Cary		172,916.67				172,916.67
Hawks, Howard		80,000.00				80,000.00
Hellinger, Mark		159,000.00				159,000.00
Henreid, Paul		163,437.66				163,437.66
Morner, Stanley		88,541.67		30,000.00		118,541.67
Sakall, S. Z.		80,208.33				80,208.33

[1] Allowance for expenses.

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
NEW YORK—continued						
Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.						
Schneider, S		$65,000.00			{ $900.00 [9] $13,000.00 }	$78,900.00
Shumlin, Herman		91,666.74				91,666.74
Stanwyck, Barbara		125,666.67				125,666.67
Steiner, Max		89,566.67				89,566.67
Wald, Jerry		75,416.67				75,416.67
Walsh, Raoul		173,000.00				173,000.00
Warner, A		91,000.00			{ 900.00 [9] 13,000.00 }	104,900.00
Warner, H. M		182,000.00			500.00	182,500.00
Warner, J. L		182,000.00			100.00	182,100.00
Woolley, Edgar M		125,000.00				125,000.00
Warner Bros. Pictures Distributing Corp	Aug. 31, 1945					
Kalmenson, Benj		71,761.00			[9] 13,000.00	84,761.00
Western Electric Co., Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Stoll, C. G		90,000.00			520.00	90,520.00
R. C. Williams & Co., Inc	Apr. 30, 1945					
Jaburg, Hugo F		52,000.00		$25,000.00		77,000.00
Roer, Albert			$76,818.30			76,818.30
F. W. Woolworth Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Chamberlain, C. S			75,156.76			75,156.76
Cornwell, A. L			94,209.01			94,209.01
Crowther, H. S			80,484.29			80,484.29
Deyo, C. W			250,974.50			250,974.50
O'Neil, H. E			87,675.87			87,675.87
NORTH CAROLINA						
R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Williams, S. Clay		100,000.00				100,000.00
OHIO						
The Aetna Paper Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Howard, H. M		36,000.00		84,949.74		120,949.74
The American Rolling Mill Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hook, Charles R		80,292.00		17,552.15		97,844.15
The Austin Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bryant, George A		12,875.16		62,275.00		75,150.16
The Buick Youngstown Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Hopper, E. D		9,900.00		98,731.20		108,631.20
Champion Spark Plug Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Stranahan, Frank D		120,000.00				120,000.00
Stranahan, Robert A		170,000.00				170,000.00
The Crosley Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Cosgrove, R. C		50,000.00		39,999.92		89,999.92
David Davies, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Jameson, Harry W		18,000.00		95,635.41	1,200.00	114,835.41
The Denison Engineering Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Denison, W. C., Jr		100,000.00				100,000.00
Eaton Manufacturing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Eaton, J. O		60,000.00		40,000.00		100,000.00
The Forest City Publishing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bellamy, Paul		15,600.00			83,445.22	99,045.22
Graham, Sterling E		40,000.00			50,000.00	90,000.00
General Machinery Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Rentschler, G. A		90,000.00		10,000.00	100.00	100,100.00
The B. F. Goodrich Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Collyer, John L		100,000.00		45,000.00	[10]	145,000.00
The Gruen Watch Co	Mar. 31, 1945					
Katz, Benjamin S		42,000.00		41,000.00		83,000.00
Robert Heller & Associates, Inc	Dec. 31, 1944					
Heller, Robert		75,000.00			[11] 1,069.01	76,069.01
Industrial Rayon Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Rivitz, Hiram S		75,000.00		33,893.84	[12]	108,893.84
The Kroger Grocery & Baking Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bracy, Harry W		25,000.00		196,393.75		221,393.75
Robertson, Charles M		81,284.32				81,284.32
The F. & R. Lazarus & Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Lazarus, Simon		100,000.00				100,000.00
The Midland Steel Products Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Kulas, E. J		99,428.92				99,428.92
The National Cash Register Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Allyn, S. C		80,000.00		16,000.00		96,000.00
Deeds, Edward A		75,000.00			[9] 25,000.00	100,000.00
Owens-Illinois Glass Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Levis, J. P		90,000.00				90,000.00
Levis, W. E		100,000.00				100,000.00
The William Powell Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Coombe, H. E						83,614.97
The Procter & Gamble Co. and affiliated group	June 30, 1945					
Barnes, F. M		75,000.00		19,000.00		94,000.00
Brodie, R. K		75,000.00		19,000.00		94,000.00
Deupree, R. R		100,000.00		78,049.00		178,049.00
The Pyramid Rubber Co	Sept. 30, 1945					
McIntosh, W. B		8,400.00		126,899.73		135,299.73
The Wm. Taylor Son & Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Scholl, D. H		32,500.00		67,500.00		100,000.00
The Timken Roller Bearing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Umstattd, William E		139,900.00				139,900.00
The Weldon Tool Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bergstrom, C. A		25,090.00		50,000.00		75,090.00
OKLAHOMA						
Continental Oil Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Moran, Dan		100,000.00			200.00	100,200.00
OREGON						
Meier & Frank Co., Inc	Jan. 31, 1945					
Adams, R. R		60,000.00		25,000.00		85,000.00

[9] Allowance for expense.

[10] There was also paid during the year $9,191.23 to an insurance company under the terms of an approved retirement income plan. This amount is not considered compensation as it is forfeitable.

[11] Premium on life insurance—portion of company's contribution to pension trust.

[12] This amount does not include an amount of $26,106.16 paid by Industrial Rayon Corp. during 1944 into Industrial Rayon Corp. employees' pension fund trust for the benefit of this officer. This amount was not available to this officer during the year 1944.

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
PENNSYLVANIA						
Aluminum Co. of America and affiliated corporations	Dec. 31, 1944					
Davis, Arthur V		$108,000.00				$108,000.00
Gibbons, G. R		75,400.00				75,400.00
The Anchor Packing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Clarke, Walter J			$85,133.72			85,133.72
Edmonds, John F			78,322.84			78,322.84
Kohl, Frank			118,415.38	$10,000.00		128,415.38
Armstrong Cork Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Prentis, H. W., Jr		125,000.00				125,000.00
Bethlehem Steel Co. (Delaware)	Dec. 31, 1944					
Mackall, Paul		90,000.00		59,760.00		149,760.00
Copperweld Steel Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bramer, S. E		27,520.00		74,960.48		102,480.48
Great Lakes Steel Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Fink, G. R		62,500.00		75,000.00		137,500.00
Heintz Manufacturing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Meinel, William J		25,000.00		171,308.79		196,308.79
Hershey Chocolate Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Murrie, William F. R		95,014.01				95,014.01
Joseph Horne Co	Jan. 31, 1945					
Burchfield, W. H		49,563.00		69,189.55		118,752.55
Friesell, William H., Sr		46,884.00		65,449.58		112,333.58
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Lewis, H. E		120,416.65				120,416.65
Parsons, L. M		79,166.69				79,166.69
Lowman-Shields Rubber Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Shields, John, Jr		8,000.00	75,481.15			83,481.15
Lukens Steel Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Wolcott, Robert W		75,624.77			$2,565.00	78,189.77
McCloskey & Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
McCloskey, M. H., Jr		156,000.00				156,000.00
The Midvale Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bradley, Francis		45,000.00		40,850.00	550.00	86,400.00
G. C. Murphy Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Mack, Edgar M		20,000.00		80,000.00		100,000.00
Sample, Paul L		15,000.00		61,000.00		76,000.00
Shaw, Walter C		20,000.00		80,000.00		100,000.00
National Steel Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Fink, G. R		62,500.00		75,000.00	400.00	137,900.00
Millsop, T. E		26,666.64		50,000.00	400.00	77,066.64
Weir, E. T		93,750.00		112,500.00	400.00	206,650.00
The Pennsylvania R. R. Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Clement, M. W		110,000.00			745.00	110,745.00
Jacob Siegel Co., Inc	Jan. 31, 1945					
Siegel, Jacob		90,000.00				90,000.00
Smith, Kline & French Laboratories	Dec. 31, 1944					
Boyer, Francis		27,500.00		66,550.00		94,050.00
Kline, C. Mahlon		30,000.00		72,600.00		102,600.00
Tasty Baking Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Baur, P. J		122,578.55				122,578.55
Morris, H. C		122,578.55				122,578.55
Townsend Co	June 30, 1945					
Weidner, H. C		30,000.00		46,222.22		76,222.22
Weirton Steel Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Millsop, T. E		33,666.72		50,000.00		83,666.72
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Bucher, Geo. H		95,000.00		45,000.00	1,500.00	141,500.00
Robertson, A. W		150,050.00		47,000.00	1,350.00	198,400.00
RHODE ISLAND						
Collyer Insulated Wire Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Moeller, Robert C		24,000.00		50,000.00	[1] 22,604.00	96,604.00
SOUTH CAROLINA						
Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Joslin, Archie O		55,000.00		28,548.00		83,548.00
TEXAS						
Pollock Paper & Box Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Jacobs, Leslie L		100,000.00				100,000.00
Southern Aircraft Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Brown, Willis C		15,000.00		96,226.93		111,226.93
VERMONT						
E. B. and A. C. Whiting Co	May 31, 1945					
Unsworth, Thomas A		48,000.00		75,000.00		123,000.00
VIRGINIA						
Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Ferguson, H. L		40,000.00			84,831.08	124,831.08
Reynolds Metals Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Reynolds, R. S		75,000.00		20,000.00		95,000.00
WISCONSIN						
The Electric Sprayit Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Deutsch, S		18,360.00		73,360.00		91,720.00
The Falk Corp	Dec. 31, 1944					
Falk, Harold S		26,000.00		68,567.07		94,567.07
The Parker Pen Co	Feb. 28, 1945					
Frederick, C. L		12,000.00		66,509.85		78,509.85
Western Printing & Lithographing Co	Dec. 31, 1944					
Benstead, H. M		9,600.00	123,694.78			133,294.78
Voigt, Elmer G		9,600.00	144,913.40			154,513.40
Wadewitz, E. H		15,000.00	189,206.60			204,206.60
Wadewitz, W. R		9,600.00	152,769.31			162,369.31

[1] Represents adjustment o bonus for 1942.

REPORT OF PAYMENTS OF SALARY, COMMISSION, BONUS, OR OTHER COMPENSATION PAID IN EXCESS OF $75,000, COMPILED FROM INCOME RETURNS, SCHEDULE F-1, FILED FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 1943 AND FISCAL YEARS ENDED IN 1944—SUPPLEMENTAL NO. 2

Name of corporation and officers or employees	Calendar or fiscal year ended—	Salary	Commission	Bonus	Other compensation	Total
MARYLAND						
Stewart & Co., Inc.	Jan. 31, 1944					
Abbott, T. P.		$35,000.00			$46,404.42	$81,404.42
MASSACHUSETTS						
E. B. Badger & Sons Co.	Dec. 31, 1943					
Badger, Erastus B.		18,000.00	$96,963.75			114,963.75
Hall, Walter T.		18,000.00	96,963.75			114,963.75
Hargrove, George C.		12,000.00	64,642.50			76,642.50
Lunt, George P.		12,000.00	64,642.50			76,642.50
Peters, William A., Jr.		18,000.00	96,963.75			114,963.75
Lever Bros. Co.	June 30, 1944					
Countway, F. A.		30,000.00		$380,947.92		410,947.92
National Fireworks, Inc.	Aug. 31, 1944					
Babbitt, Edwin V.		52,000.00	100,000.00	10,000.00	1,200.00	163,200.00
Clark, George J. J.		52,000.00	100,000.00	10,000.00	1,200.00	163,200.00
MINNESOTA						
Powers Dry Goods Co., Inc.	Jan. 31, 1944					
Olson, Doddrick		36,000.00			48,885.89	84,885.89
NEW JERSEY						
Hahne & Co.	Jan. 31, 1944					
Buck, Junior C.		30,000.00			70,000.00	100,000.00
NEW YORK						
J. N. Adam & Co.	Jan. 31, 1944					
Holder, Albin O.		45,000.00			55,000.00	100,000.00
Blue Bell, Inc.	Nov. 30, 1944					
Fox, J. C.						101,666.68
Handy & Harman	Dec. 31, 1943					
Handy, C. W.		87,000.00				87,000.00
Niemeyer, G. H.		87,000.00				87,000.00
The William Hengerer Co.	Jan. 31, 1944					
Hecht, Harold M.		30,000.00			70,000.00	100,00.00
McCampbell & Co., Inc.	Dec. 31, 1943					
Hughes, John Chambers					95,520.94	95,520.94
Mannion, Frank D.					95,520.94	95,520.94
McCampbell, Leavelle					133,191.47	133,191.47
Storm, Raymond H.					95,520.94	95,520.94
James McCreery & Co.	Jan. 31, 1944					
Davidson, J. Edward		60,000.00			39,412.75	99,412.75
Carl L. Norden, Inc.	Oct. 31, 1944					
Barth, T. H.		86,458.34		1,666.67		88,125.01
PENNSYLVANIA						
Lee Rubber & Tire Corp.	Oct. 13, 1944					
Garthwaite, A. A.		55,000.00			21,392.98	76,392.98
TEXAS						
Pollock Paper & Box Co.	Dec. 31, 1943					
Jacobs, Leslie L.		100,000.00				100,000.00

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking this morning as one of that group of fair-minded Republicans, those people who feel that they are here representing the public, neither big business nor labor to the exclusion of all others.

May I say, on behalf of the public, I will vote to override the President's veto and sustain the modified OPA bill as the best price control we can get under present conditions. I believed on June 25 that the position unanimously taken by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who is the senior Republican member of the Banking and Currency Committee; the majority leader of the House, Mr. MCCORMACK; the Republican minority leader of the House, Mr. MARTIN; and by our eminent Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, was correct. I disagree with my friend, the distinguished gentleman and Democratic Representative from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who states that he feels he voted for an unworkable and inconsistent bill when the compromise OPA bill was before us.

I believe the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, was correct when he said on June 25 he felt the bill was workable. I am also pleased to agree with this statement of our Speaker on the floor of the House. He said clearly on that date:

Mr. Speaker, I shall take only a moment. We have in this Chamber this afternoon a most peculiar situation.

And, I might add, we have it again this afternoon, 5 days later.

Two elements are warring against this conference report. One of those want no price control at all. If this conference report is voted down, they will have their way. Others say that they want more control than is contained in this bill. If this conference report is voted down, they will get nothing, because there will not, in my opinion, be any price-control legislation at all.

We have not heard any variation from that statement of the Speaker that there will be no price-control legislation at all if this bill is not enacted.

If this House will not vote up this conference report, it will certainly not vote for a continuing resolution, continuing the law as it now stands. Even though the House were to pass a continuing resolution, the leadership of the Senate is doubtful if it has a chance on earth to pass there. So if we want to control any kind of food prices, if we want to control rents and not have people turned out in the streets, as they will be turned out, the only alternative is to vote for this conference report. The responsibility is here. I will not, as far as I am concerned, by my vote this afternoon, shoulder the responsibility of killing all price control.

I also say that as the representative of the people of the southern part of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, constituting the Thirty-first District of Pennsylvania, I will not shoulder the responsibility of killing all price control, and will therefore vote to sustain the present compromise OPA bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I was for the strongest possible price control bill we could get in both the committee and the House and I voted against all crippling amendments. After taking part in the conference and studying both bills then before us, I am convinced this is the strongest possible bill we can get. It is far stronger than either the House or the Senate bill.

Those who refused to sign the conference report did so because the bill was too strong.

To state my beliefs in this 1 minute is difficult, I believe sincerely that if we sustain the President's veto we will get no legislation at all for at least some time after the act expires, and chaos will occur during that period at least.

If we override the President's veto, if we take this bill, there is no reason in

the world why the Banking and Currency Committee cannot meet again and consider an additional bill or amendments to this bill. There is no law against that. If we pass this bill we have got something in spite of the amendments which I opposed. I do not like the Taft amendment. It is bound to increase some prices, but there is not a single ceiling taken off anything under this bill as it now stands and it will not cause uncontrolled inflation which will happen if we have no bill at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday as follows. This is a part of the statement made in the other body by the majority leader. This is what he said:

> This morning the President of the United States called to the White House the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the House, and the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate and the majority leader of the Senate, to discuss this legislation.
>
> With all the force that we could command, in view of the situation which presents itself to us and to him, we urged him to sign the bill when it reached him, on the same ground that I urge that we adopt it here, because the choice is between this bill and nothing. To hope that a joint resolution continuing price controls after next Sunday will be adopted by the two Houses of Congress is an idle dream.
>
> So I say that in voting on the conference report no Member of the Senate should vote under the delusion that if the bill is defeated we can get another one. The choice is between this bill or nothing at all. It is a choice which we do not like to make, but we have to make it, because it is here before us.

We heard our Speaker in the well of this House say it was this bill or nothing. The committee and the House gave long, careful attention to this bill. What could be accomplished by another resolution extending it 3 weeks? Nothing. You would come back with something, but perhaps something worse. The President is asking for the same OPA bill of the past year and without amendments. I voted against the conference report and would like to see OPA end now on everything except rents and the most essential items of living. It should be ended on meat and dairy products now because more cattle roam our ranges than ever before with less meat on the table. The OPA is directly responsible for this condition.

My colleagues, please consider that the leadership of this House and Senate yesterday called upon the President urging him to approve the conference report. They told the President that it was the best bill he could expect and it was workable and that a continuing resolution could not be passed by Sunday night. Indeed it might not be passed, and the responsibility was the President's. The President refused to follow the good advice of the Democratic leadership of the House and Senate. It is now quite evident that he cleared with Sidney and not with ALBEN BARKLEY and SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, if there be faltering hearts over what to do about the veto message and a possible continuing resolution, let me advance two suggestions that may clarify the condition and that serve as reasons for overriding the President's veto. In the first place, as indicated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY], I believe we can substantially comply with the President's request for a short period of further study by accepting the conference bill and then having the committees proceed to a reexamination of the matter. Such a course would provide an interim price control under the new bill and still permit an exploration of any new proposal which might be suggested. This certainly meets in large part the President's hopes and desires. Why not override the veto and let this measure go into effect while the search for what the President refers to as a more workable bill is made.

The second reason is that there will be no continuing resolution today. That may sound presumptuous, but let us see. If anybody walks over to the hopper and introduces a bill and asks for its immediate consideration there will be objection. You can be sure of that. It must then go through the regular course to the Banking and Currency Committee. If they get a rule it will require a two-thirds vote on the floor of the House to get consideration of the rule. There will be only one other way to do it, and that is wait until next Tuesday when it can be entertained under suspension. But price control dies when that clock says midnight tomorrow night. Tomorrow, however, is a nonlegislative day.

You therefore have this choice and I think those reasons are very persuasive, in my judgment, under the very rigidity of the rules under which we operate. There can be no continuing resolution for one thing and, secondly, we can satisfy the President of the United States by giving consideration to what the President calls a workable bill in the 15 days that may elapse and still put this on the books.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of us are impressed with the statement of the President in the veto message just read. We now have over $29,000,000,000 in circulation with billions more to be poured out by the Treasury as a result of the tremendous spending program that has been authorized by the Congress. Not only have we authorized huge cash outlays for domestic purposes, soldiers' mustering-out pay, veterans' unemployment relief and now soldiers' terminal-leave pay. In addition to these huge flows of money into the channels of trade and business, the money we are lending England and foreign countries will come back to make heavy drafts on the things produced for the sustenance of the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, the country is facing a desperate situation. I shall vote to sustain the President's veto and I shall vote for a continuing resolution. It is the only solution under the circumstances.

With the assurance that a continuing resolution can be passed in time to prevent the collapse of the OPA price control I shall vote to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, we have been told repeatedly on this floor that the cure for inflation is production. We have given the President all the power that he requires to fix those prices which would bring about production. Now, after all of this period, let us see where we are so far as the question of scarcity of goods is concerned.

The country is short of meat, maple sirup, lemons, bread, butter, cheese, milk, barley, ice cream, candy, pie, cake, fruit sirups, onions, bacon, sugar, fats, doughnuts, molasses, coconut oil, olive oil, cottonseed oil. There is a shortage of salesmen, of train seats, of plane seats, of pharmacists, of hotel rooms, of veterinarians, carpenters, piano makers, gardeners, telephone linemen, painters, cooks, and parlor maids.

Nine months after the fourth consecutive biggest wheat crop on record was raised a cold spring wind was blowing through hundreds of empty grain elevators throughout the Midwest. There are shortages of X-ray tubes, dental gold scrap, burlap bags, Pliofilm, manila cordage, bulldozers, quinidine, power cranes, laboratory and medical instruments, fractional-horsepower motors, circular saws, solder, natural resins, road rollers, electrocardiographs, roofing material, greenhouses, plumbing supplies. Paper is short. Artists cannot buy sable-hair paint brushes. There is a shortage of spare parts, and of theaters.

The country is short of lumber, coal, steel, tin, lead, antimony, textile piece goods, shellac, glass, lead pipe, paint, copper, mercury scrap, platinum scrap. The country is short of men's suits, children's clothing, film, cameras, lenses, towels, sheets, pillowcases, automobiles, trucks, tractors, tires, chewing gum, soft drinks, white shirts, pianos, radios, washing machines, refrigerators, work clothing, maple for high heels, shoe tacks, telephones, and female attire, of which I shall not give a bill of particulars.

And, Mr. Speaker, there are 2,000 more items that are short. That is why we have inflation.

Let us take off the strangle-hold of business and let it produce.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to override the President's veto and it seems to me that everybody in this House who feels that we should keep some kind of OPA regulations and some kind of rent control, rather than opening

the doors sky wide for whatever the fates might have in store for us without even the safeguards of an orderly and planned liquidation of OPA, must support the motion to override the veto.

I comend to you the argument advanced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. It seems to me both arguments are logical, irrefutable, and compelling; because if we fail to override the President's veto today every Member of this House knows that even if a continuing resolution should get over to the other body those who are die-hard opponents of OPA would filibuster it beyond the hour of midnight tonight and on Monday morning OPA controls of every kind would be off.

We retain for ourselves by overriding the President's veto, on the other hand, any of the effective arguments contained in the President's veto message because if certain changes are actually necessary to make OPA legislation workable and administrable, as he insists, we still have the 15 days or the 16 days or the 19 days or the 27 days or whatever time is necessary for the Banking and Currency Committee to come back with corrective amendments so we can correct and improve any administrative problems which may arise.

Mr. Speaker, let us approach our decision in this important hour calmly and dispassionately. Let us examine carefully the situation in which we and the country find ourselves and let us explore thoroughly the possible effects of whatever action we may take this afternoon.

Suppose, Mr. Speaker, that we vote to sustain the President's veto. What then will happen? We must anticipate that all price controls depending upon the authority of Congress will become inoperative at midnight tomorrow and that the country will face the confused situation Monday morning certain to arise from such an abrupt, unanticipated, and disorderly discontinuation of all price and rent controls. In my opinion, it is this that will happen. I cannot believe that the other body will act promptly enough today to avert this situation. In that body any one Senator can block action today. In fact, he can block action for several days. From what we have seen at that end of the Capitol the past few days it seems certain to me that if we vote to sustain the President's veto today we are going to have to depend upon such a slender reed of hope for action continuing OPA today that only the giddiest of optimists can believe it will eventuate. If I am wrong, and a measure continuing the OPA on a tentative and temporary basis is approved today as recommended by the President, we still face the fact that it will be many long days before the many minds of both Houses of Congress and the executive departments can be brought into agreement on OPA legislation. Who can predict accurately what will be the legislative result when and if that meeting of minds does occur? It may be a better OPA bill than the one the President vetoed and it may very well be a much less desirable piece of legislation.

Suppose on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, we vote today to override the President's veto. What then will happen? Chester Bowles will remain out of office as Stabilization Director, to be sure, but few will mourn his passing and most will agree that OPA under some other director is bound to do a better job than it has done under his inept and tomtom pounding guidance. Regardless of how we finally write the law, it is well that Mr. Bowles will no longer be around to pervert its purposes and to stifle production while stimulating propaganda.

What else will happen if we vote today to override the President's veto? In his veto message, President Truman has criticized certain phases of the OPA bill approved in Congress and accepted by both Houses of Congress. He has commended other phases of the bill. Perhaps the President is right and perhaps he is wrong in contending that certain changes in the law and certain phases of the new bill make for unworkability and uncertainty in price control. Time alone can determine that. However, if we override the veto this afternoon and keep OPA in operation we shall have the time and the testimony—the experience and the opportunity—to observe the consequences and to take further congressional action to correct any injustices, inequities, or any unworkable features of the newly rewritten OPA legislation.

Congress will still be here. The Banking and Currency Committee can meet any day. Both Houses of Congress have demonstrated their capacity to act promptly when necessity requires. By retaining OPA as a going concern through overriding the President's veto we also retain the power and the opportunity to refine and improve it as experience dictates. If the President appoints as a successor to Chester Bowles a man of experience and capacity in whom the country and the Congress has confidence, we shall have the benefit of a fresh viewpoint from the administrative angle. The recommendations of this new director will be listened to attentively. Any desirable changes which he can substantiate by convincing evidence can rapidly be written into corrective legislation. Legislation approved today can be changed tomorrow. On the contrary, an OPA set-up which is destroyed today by the Presidential veto may be permanently impaired. It seems to me that we are indeed gambling with fate if we refuse now to override the President's veto and fail to retain OPA controls and keep them operating while we review the situation in the light of the President's arguments and in cooperation with a new and better administrator than the loquacious Chester Bowles.

Mr. Speaker, today's vote just as Tuesday's vote on the final approval or disapproval of the only OPA legislation upon which we then had an opportunity to vote is likely to find Members with directly conflicting points of view voting on the same side of the question. Arrayed against the overriding of the veto we are likely to find not only those who insist that OPA should continue as it is, with no changes, no amendments, no improvements, and no new steps to stimulate production while controlling prices but we are likely also to find on that side Members who are utterly opposed to any further OPA controls of any kind even for the purpose of bringing about an orderly liquidation and discontinuance of OPA. In favor of the motion to override the President's veto we shall find many who believe that some price control is better than none, that under a new director the true purposes of OPA can prevail instead of the political purposes which Mr. Bowles has so largely emphasized, and that a systematic, orderly, planned transition from OPA as it is, to the free economy most of us desire as an eventuality is better by far than an abrupt, unanticipated, unplanned stoppage of OPA next Monday morning as a result of the President's petulant veto.

I do predict, however, that out of the confusion of votes this much will become clear. None of the enemies of price control and OPA will vote to override the President's veto. All those voting to override will be Members who desire some type of controls of rents and prices and who desire to retain the legislation and the set-up we have as a going concern upon which, if necessary, to make new correctives and helpful amendments. All those opposed to OPA and to retention of further controls will be voting to sustain the President's veto even though they will be joined by many who may dramatically proclaim that by such a vote they hope to get a better OPA. They may get a better OPA and they may get none at all. But they take a great and unnecessary gamble with the public's welfare and the veteran's future when they vote to sustain the veto and to stop OPA at midnight tomorrow night in the hope that by so doing they will force their particular price-control philosophies through Congress. If they fail, they and President Truman will be the real executioners of OPA. They must accept the responsibility. They are the ones who have elected to gamble all on this one reckless toss of the dice.

As for me Mr. Speaker, I refuse to gamble so prodigiously with the public's welfare. Let us vote today to override the veto. Let us retain what we have and strive for something better. Let us rescue the President from the angry advisors with whom he has counselled. Let us protect the country against the abrupt shock which may well come from ill-considered action today. Let us continue OPA by overriding the President's veto and if experience and/or evidence then warrant corrective changes and helpful amendments we shall be in position to act intelligently with the assurance that in the meantime none of the controls will have been vacated and we shall not face the possibility of moving from OPA controls to an entirely control-free rental and price situation on a minute's notice and without the benefit of orderly decontrol procedures.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

OPA SCUTTLED BY BOTH HOUSE AND SENATE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this House passed a bill to extend OPA. The bill, when it left this House, was a scuttled OPA bill. It was absolutely worthless, so far as price control was concerned. Crippling amendments had destroyed it. It went to the Senate, and it did not fare well in the Senate, and when it left the Senate it was more of a scuttled bill, if such a thing was possible.

CONFEREES

The Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Speaker of the House appointed conferees to represent their respective bodies for the purpose of meeting in an effort to iron out the differences between the two Houses. We, the conferees, had two scuttled bills to work on. We were the agents of the House and the Senate. It was our duty to reconcile those differences as well as we could reconcile them. We had a duty to perform. Some of the members of the conference, and I was one of them, were approached and the suggestion was made, "Just let them go ahead and write their own bad bill; make it so bad that the President can easily veto it." We turned that down. It was not the right thing to do. We should work honestly and conscientiously and bring back to you the best bill we could bring back. That is exactly what we did. We voted for the conference report and we voted for the bill. If we had not voted for the conference report we would have been stymied. We would have been right up against the dead line and Congress would have been accused of killing OPA. We had to legislate. How do you legislate? Pass something if you cannot get what you want, and every major law that has ever passed represents a compromise of view or a sacrifice of opinion on the part of practically every Member of this body and the other body.

We were willing to try to compromise, but we had to do something. We had to pass a law and we passed it. The President has vetoed it, and it is not inconsistent for those of us who voted for the best thing we could get to sustain the President's veto, and that is exactly what I am going to do.

The President's message concerning one amendment in this bill is absolutely unanswerable, and that is the Taft amendment. There are several good amendments in that bill—amendments that I would like to vote for in any bill—but you cannot justify the Taft amendment and say that you will have price control. If you vote for the Taft amendment, you vote against price control.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. On the question of voting for the conference report, the gentleman's statement is absolutely correct. The problem today is entirely different than it was the other day. Those who are opposed to it have a perfect right to exercise their judgment today. We voted for the conference report to conclude the legislative process and send the bill to the President of the United States for him to exercise his constitutional duty and responsibility.

Mr. PATMAN. The majority leader is exactly right.

If we were to enact this Taft amendment, it would cause a race between wages and prices. That is exactly what causes inflation in every country on earth. They first have an increase in prices, then the workingmen cannot live on their wages because the prices are too high, and the workingmen get an increase. Then, of course, there has to be an increase in prices, and there is a race between wages and prices. The result is ruinous inflation. A vote for the Taft amendment would be a vote for ruinous inflation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder whether or not the gentleman subscribed to that administration viewpoint which started out by saying that wages could be raised as much as 50 percent without increasing prices, and if that did not have much to do with the present difficulties?

Mr. PATMAN. I never said that. Nobody on this floor said that. I never heard anyone in a responsible place say it.

Mr. HALLECK. Did not the gentleman hear Mr. Davis say it?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I did not hear him say it.

Mr. HALLECK. Did not the gentleman read in the paper that he said it?

Mr. PATMAN. I did not agree with it if he said it, because I do not believe that way. Anyway, we know that the Taft amendment is a legislative mandate for inflation. That is exactly what it is. It forces inflation. As between this bill as it is now with the President vetoing it and no price control at all, I am willing to risk no price control at all—absolutely. I have thought this question through to the best of my knowledge and ability, and I am ready to have no price control at all rather than have one that absolutely forces ruinous inflation upon this country.

This bill involves the value of the dollar. During the war prices were fixed, and by reason of prices being held down the price of steel, for instance, a commodity that went more into the war machine than any other one commodity, was not increased one penny a ton for five long years, or during the war. By reason of the fact that the prices of the materials that went into the war machine were held down our national debt today is $100,000,000,000 less than it would have been without the OPA. That is an enormous amount. Our tax burden would be increased, our debt would be $100,000,000,000 larger today had it not been for OPA holding down prices during the war on the cost of the war machine alone. On the war cost alone there is $100,000,000,000 saved.

Now we are in the reconversion period. We should take off controls as quickly as possible—no one will dispute that. But as long as commodities and goods are scarce, can we properly protect the public unless we have some way of controlling these scarce goods and commodities? We have voted for generous appropriations for veterans of this war. Of course, we should have done that. We have voted to allow them pensions and compensations and retirement benefits and insurance. Now, then, will we permit the only agency that stands between them and a worthless dollar to be killed? That is the question involved here today. We have 15,200,000 veterans who served during this war. We voted terminal leave for them of three to five billion dollars in addition to all the other benefits. Will we turn around now and permit the only agency that keeps the value of the dollar which is worth 76 cents to be destroyed and thus permit the value of the dollar to go down to nothing? That is also the question involved here today.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am very strongly in favor of trying to control inflation. As I understand the parliamentary situation, if the President's veto is sustained, we have nothing at all left which we can amend or work on. Is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. That is exactly right. We must pass a continuing resolution.

Mr. MAY. Can we pass it?

Mr. PATMAN. That is not my responsibility. I have made up my mind that I prefer no price control, no controls at all, in preference to a legislative mandate to force ruinous inflation upon the country. I am not going to vote to give these veterans and their widows and children this money and then turn around and vote to destroy the agency that keeps that money valuable. You know and I know that if we kill this agency the value of the dollar will not be 76 cents as it is today, as low as it is, but will not even be worth 50 cents. It will not be worth 25 cents. It will be practically worthless so far as buying many of the goods and commodities that people will have to buy. That is the question involved here today. Let us think about it and vote for an effective price-control law and not one such as we have here that would be wholly ineffective. As for me, I am not criticizing any Member as to the way he votes. That is his prerogative. I shall not criticize any Member, but if I were to vote to kill the OPA I would feel as though I was personally stabbing in the back 15,000,000 of our veterans of this war to whom we all owe a duty and an obligation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARRY. Does an "aye" vote mean to pass the bill, despite the President's veto?

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Under the Constitution, the vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 142, answered "present" 1, not voting 116, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

YEAS—173

Abernethy	Fuller	Mathews
Allen, La.	Fulton	May
Almond	Gamble	Michener
Andersen, H. Carl	Gary	Miller, Nebr.
	Gathings	Mills
Andresen, August H.	Gavin	Mundt
	Gearhart	Murray, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.	Gifford	Norblad
Arends	Gillie	O'Neal
Arnold	Goodwin	Pace
Barrett, Wyo.	Gossett	Philbin
Barry	Graham	Phillips
Beall	Grant, Ind.	Pickett
Bender	Gregory	Poage
Bennett, Mo.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Pratt
Blackney	Hale	Price, Fla.
Bolton	Halleck	Priest
Brown, Ga.	Hancock	Rains
Brumbaugh	Hand	Ramey
Bryson	Hare	Randolph
Buck	Hart	Reed, Ill.
Buffett	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Bunker	Hendricks	Rees, Kans.
Butler	Herter	Richards
Campbell	Heselton	Riley
Carlson	Hess	Robertson, Va.
Case, N.J.	Hill	Robsion, Ky.
Chapman	Hinshaw	Rockwell
Chelf	Hoeven	Roe, Md
Chiperfield	Holmes, Mass.	Rogers, Fla.
Church	Holmes, Wash.	Rogers, Mass.
Clark	Hope	Russell
Clason	Horan	Scrivner
Clements	Jenkins	Sharp
Cole, Kans.	Jennings	Sheppard
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Simpson Ill.
Cooper	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Maine
Corbett	Johnson, Ind.	Springer
Courtney	Judd	Stefan
Cravens	Kean	Sundstrom
Cunningham	Keefe	Taber
Davis	Kelly, Ill.	Talbot
D'Ewart	Kilburn	Talle
Dirksen	Kilday	Tarver
Domengeaux	Kunkel	Tibbott
Dondero	Landis	Trimble
Doughton, N. C.	Lea	Voorhis, Calif
Durham	LeFevre	Vorys, Ohio
Earthman	Lemke	Wadsworth
Eaton	Luce	Weaver
Elliott	Lyle	Whitten
Ellsworth	Lynch	Whittington
Elston	McConnell	Wigglesworth
Engle, Calif.	McDonough	Wilson
Fallon	McMillan, S. C.	Wolcott
Fenton	McMillen, Ill.	Woodruff
Flannagan	Manasco	Zimmerman
Fogarty	Martin, Iowa	
Folger	Martin, Mass.	

NAYS—142

Allen, Ill.	Flood	Knutson
Angell	Forand	Kopplemann
Bailey	Gallagher	LaFollette
Barden	Geelan	Lane
Bates, Ky.	Gillette	Lanham
Beckworth	Gordon	Larcade
Biemiller	Gore	Lesinski
Bishop	Gorski	Lewis
Bland	Granahan	Link
Bloom	Green	McCormack
Brehm	Griffiths	McCowen
Brown, Ohio	Gross	McGregor
Bulwinkle	Gwynne, Iowa	Madden
Byrnes, Wis.	Hagen	Maloney
Canfield	Harless, Ariz.	Mankin
Cannon, Mo.	Havenner	Marcantonio
Carnahan	Hays	Mason
Case, S. Dak.	Healy	Monroney
Chenoweth	Henry	Murdock
Clevenger	Hobbs	Murray, Wis
Clippinger	Hoch	Neely
Combs	Hoffman, Pa.	O'Brien, Ill.
Crosser	Hook	O'Brien, Mich.
Curtis	Howell	O'Hara
D'Alesandro	Huber	O'Konski
De Lacy	Hull	O'Toole
Delaney, James J.	Jarman	Outland
	Jensen	Patman
Delaney, John J.	Johnson, Luther A.	Peterson, Fla.
		Pfeifer
Dingell	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Pittenger
Douglas, Calif.		Plumley
Douglas, Ill.	Jones	Price, Ill.
Doyle	Jonkman	Rabaut
Ellis	Kee	Rabin
Feighan	Kelley, Pa.	Resa
Fellows	King	Rich
Fernandez	Kirwan	Rizley
Rogers, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.	Traynor
Rowan	Smith, Ohio	Vursell
Ryter	Smith, Wis.	Walter
Sabath	Somers, N. Y.	Wasielewski
Sadowski	Spence	Weichel
Sasscer	Starkey	White
Savage	Sullivan	Winter
Schwabe, Mo.	Sumner, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Schwabe, Okla.	Thom	Wood
Shafer	Thomas, Tex.	Woodhouse
Short	Thomason	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cooley

NOT VOTING—116

Adams	Gerlach	Norrell
Anderson, Calif.	Gibson	Norton
Andrews, N. Y.	Gillespie	Patrick
Auchincloss	Granger	Patterson
Baldwin, Md.	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Ga.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Ploeser
Barrett, Pa.		Powell
Bates, Mass.	Hall, Leonard W.	Quinn, N. Y.
Bell		Rankin
Bennet, N. Y.	Harness, Ind.	Rayfiel
Bonner	Harris	Reece, Tenn.
Boren	Hartley	Rivers
Boykin	Hedrick	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bradley, Mich	Heffernan	
Bradley, Pa.	Hoffman, Mich.	Robinson, Utah
Brooks	Holifield	Rodgers, Pa.
Buchanan	Izac	Roe, N. Y.
Buckley	Jackson	Rooney
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Sheridan
Camp	Kearney	Sikes
Cannon, Fla.	Kefauver	Slaughter
Celler	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Cochran	Kerr	Sparkman
Coffee	Kinzer	Stevenson
Cole, N. Y.	Klein	Stewart
Colmer	Latham	Stigler
Cox	LeCompte	Stockman
Crawford	Ludlow	Sumners, Tex.
Curley	McGehee	Taylor
Daughton, Va.	McGlinchey	Thomas, N. J.
Dawson	McKenzie	Tolan
Dolliver	Mahon	Torrens
Drewry	Mansfield, Mont.	Towe
Dworshak		Vinson
Eberharter	Mansfield, Tex.	Welch
Elsaesser	Merrow	West
Engel, Mich.	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Ervin	Morgan	Winstead
Fisher	Morrison	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gardner	Murphy	Worley

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Latham and Mr. Daughton of Virginia override, with Mr. Sikes sustain.

Mr. Gillespie and Mr. Thomas of New Jersey override, with Mr. Dolliver sustain.

Mr. Kearney and Mr. Auchincloss override, with Mr. Izac sustain.

Mr. Harness of Indiana and Mr. Ploeser override, with Mr. Rooney sustain.

Mr. Winstead and Mr. Towe override, with Mr. Klein sustain.

Mr. Hartley and Mr. Slaughter override, with Mr. Cooley sustain.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall and Mr. Cole of New York override, with Mr. Hedrick sustain.

Mr. Rivers and Mr. Morrison override, with Mr. Patterson sustain.

Mr. Bennet of New York and Mr. Elsaesser override, with Mr. Adams sustain.

Mr. Camp and Mr. Vinson override, with Mr. Kefauver sustain.

Mr. Torrens and Mr. Ervin override, with Mr. Jackson sustain.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Rankin with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Kinzer.
Mr. Norrell with Mr. Dworshak.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Coffee with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Rayfiel with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.
Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH and Mr. ANGELL changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. HARTLEY, and the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. SLAUGHTER. I voted "No." I withdraw my vote and answer "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The message and bill, together with the accompanying papers, are referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I introduce a House joint resolution, which I sent to the Clerk's desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended

Resolved, etc., That section 1 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1946" and substituting "July 20, 1946."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1946" and substituting "July 20, 1946."

SEC. 3. The last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply with respect to operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation until July 20, 1946: *Provided*, That no new subsidy or purchase and sale operations shall be undertaken under the authority of this section, and no change shall be made in the basis of any operations existing on June 29, 1946, for which funds are made available under this section which will increase the rate of any subsidy or the rate of loss incurred with respect to any commodity.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this joint resolution shall take effect as of June 30, 1946, except as to offenses committed subsequent to June 30, 1946, and prior to the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, and no suit, action, or prosecution shall be instituted with respect to any such offenses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the parliamentary situation, if objection is made to the present consideration of the resolution which the gentleman from Kentucky introduced, the resolution will be immediately referred to the

Committee on Banking and Currency; is that correct?

The SPEAKER. A bill cannot be introduced from the floor of the House. The gentleman from Kentucky has not dropped this resolution in the box.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understood the gentleman from Kentucky made the statement that he was introducing it. May we be advised of the situation at the present time? Has or has not the resolution been introduced?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky can answer that question.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. SHORT. I withhold my objection.

The SPEAKER. The only resolution the Chair knows anything about is on the reading clerk's desk and it is not in the box.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then it has not been introduced?

The SPEAKER. Not unless the gentleman from Kentucky cares to do that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. LARCADE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frank R. Schwengel, president of the Distilled Spirits Institute.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Frank A. Godehaux.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. ALMOND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. Clifton A. Woodrum, a former Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three editorials.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight Monday, July 1, 1946, to file a report on the bill (H. R. 6911) to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; and that the same privilege may be extended to those desiring to file minority views, if there be such.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. TIBBOTT, and Mr. TABER.

J. B. McCRARY CO., INC.—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval the bill (H. R. 3494) for the relief of J. B. McCrary Co., Inc., and for other purposes.

The bill provides for the payment of the sum of $75,829.16 to J. B. McCrary Co., of Atlanta, Ga., in full settlement of its claims against the United States for losses alleged to have been sustained by it in the performance of a contract for the construction of the Warner Robins housing project near Atlanta, Ga.

It appears that the Federal Public Housing Authority advertised for bids for the construction, on a lump sum or fixed-fee basis, of 65 brick buildings for a war housing project at Warner Robins, Ga. The specifications required that the work be performed within 60 calendar days from the date of notice to proceed and contained a provision for liquidated damages of $500 per day for each day's delay. It also provided that wages paid for labor performed under the contract would not exceed the minimum wages fixed for that area by the Secretary of Labor under the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a). The claimant was the low bidder and its bid was accepted. A contract was entered into and notice to proceed was given on February 4, 1943. The work was not completed by April 6, 1943, 60 calendar days after notice to proceed, nor was it finished until October 23, 1943. By a change order dated November 5, 1943, the contracting officer granted the claimant an extension of sufficient time to avoid the payment of any liquidated damages.

The claimant asserts that it sustained an out-of-pocket loss of $75,829.16 in the performance of the contract due to first, the failure of the Government to provide roughing-in measurements for material and equipment when needed; second, delays by the Government in delivering material; and third, the impossibility of securing sufficient bricklayers, resulting from the fact that the maximum wage permitted to be paid under the contract was considerably less than that being paid to bricklayers on other construction jobs in the area.

The United States has waived its immunity to suit on claims for damages arising out of contracts, express or implied, and the Court of Claims has been designated as the forum to hear, determine, and render judgment on such claims (U. S. C. 250). Although the claim covered by the bill under consideration is of the type cognizable by the Court of Claims, the record in this case fails to disclose that the claimant has taken any action to avail itself of its right to sue the United States in that court.

Since relief by private act of Congress should be granted only when no remedy is provided by law, and since the claimant has failed to pursue the remedies afforded it by general law, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 29, 1946.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and accompanying bill referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed.

LAWRENCE PORTLAND CEMENT CO.—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning without my approval the enrolled enactment, H. R. 3391, for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co., of Thomaston, Maine.

H. R. 3391 is in effect a retroactive subsidization of costs which were incurred prior to the time such costs became eligible for subsidy payments, and it cannot, therefore, be said that the costs would not have been incurred or that the production would not have been achieved except for the subsidy.

In authorizing payment of subsidies the Congress has enunciated the policy that subsidy payments for excess wartime costs are to be made only to achieve the maximum necessary production of commodities which might not be achieved in the absence of the subsidy. The various executive agencies and departments functioning the subsidy programs have consistently followed this policy.

If this bill should become law, the Government must necessarily anticipate a large volume of demands of a similar character, the effect of which, if granted, would be to extend the various subsidy programs far beyond their original scope and purpose.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The WHITE HOUSE, *June 29, 1946.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message, together with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed.

SALISH AND KOOTENAI TRIBES OF INDIANS—VETO MESSAGE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval the bill (H. R. 2678) conferring

jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes.

This bill proposes to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to adjudicate any and all legal and equitable claims which the Confederated Salish (or Flathead) and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana may have against the United States, including any claims arising under the treaty of July 16, 1855 (12 Stat. 975), or any subsequent treaty, agreement, act of Congress, or Executive order. The jurisdiction thus to be conferred, it is provided, would extend to claims arising by reason of any lands taken from these Indians, including lands lost by erroneous surveys, or lands opened to settlement, lands used for dam, power, and reservoir sites or irrigation projects, or lands lost by submergence resulting from the erection of reservoirs, without compensation and without the consent of the Indians given in the usual manner. The bill declares that any taking of the lands of the Indians by the United States, without compensation and without their consent, or the reservation thereof, for any of the above purposes, to be sufficient grounds for suitable relief, and the court would be required to award the Indians just compensation for such lands as for a taking under the power of eminent domain.

In addition to other objectionable features of the bill, an attempt is made in its provisions to define the "grounds for equitable relief" and the basis upon which the court shall render judgment in favor of the Indians and award to them just compensation "as for a taking under the power of eminent domain." It is possible that under the provisions of the bill the use by the United States of any lands "formerly * * * possessed" by the Indians even though the Indians were without any recognized title would constitute a sufficient basis "for equitable relief" and "for a taking under the power of eminent domain." Thus the bill does not merely waive the statute of limitations and laches, and provide a forum for the adjudication of any preexisting claims which the Indians may have against the United States, but it seeks to create liability against the Government which would not otherwise exist. Moreover, by providing for the payment of just compensation, the bill would probably require the Government to pay interest, for a period of more than 30 years, on a claim that did not even exist prior to its passage. Neither on legal nor moral grounds would there seem to be any justification for legislation of this kind.

For these reasons, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 1946.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

The message together with the accompanying bill, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING ANNUAL REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (l) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 29, 1946.*

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the gentleman from Michigan, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 13, 54, 77 and 78.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 43, 45, 48, 49, 53, 55, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 75, 79, and 80, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$23,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,915,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,219,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,360,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,996,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That pursuant to section 204 of Public Law 334, Seventy-ninth Congress, automobiles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be exchanged or sold and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales applied to replacement of an equal number of automobiles of the same general type and class"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$25,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$12,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That on and after October 1, 1946, all functions necessary to the compilation of foreign trade statistics shall be performed in New York, New York: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $950,000 shall be expended for this purpose"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,622,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$875,000, together with not to exceed $120,000 of the unexpended balance of this appropriation for the fiscal year 1946"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Preliminary planning and surveys, Federal Airport Act: For all expenses necessary for preliminary planning and surveys required for the initiation of the Federal-aid airport program as authorized in section 5 (a) of the Federal Airport Act, approved May 13, 1946 (Public Law 377), including personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase (not to exceed nineteen), repair, and operation of passenger automobiles; $2,975,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, of which amount not to exceed $15,000 may be transferred to the appropiration 'Maintenance and operation of aircraft, Office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics', to provide for the maintenance and operation of aircraft, and $5,000 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Printing and binding, Department of Commerce.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of May 13, 1946 (except section 5 (a)), $45,000,000, to be available until June 30, 1953, of which $43,260,000 shall be for projects in the States in accordance with sections 5 (b) and 6 of said Act, and $1,740,000 shall be for projects in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in accordance with section 5 (c): *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,250,000 of the foregoing amounts shall be available for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase (not to exceed eighty-three), repair, and operation of passenger automobiles; of which $2,250,000 not to exceed $25,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Maintenance and operation of aircraft, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics", to provide for the maintenance and operation of aircraft, and $30,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Printing and binding, Department of Commerce".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end of the matter so restored and, before the period, insert: "; and appropriations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Weather Bureau shall be available in an amount not to exceed $20,000 for furnishing food, clothing, medicines, and other supplies for the temporary relief of distressed persons in remote localities, reimbursement for such relief to be in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 8, 26, 39, 40, 46, 50, 56, 57, 58, 65, 73, 74 and 81.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
BUTLER B. HARE,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
KARL STEFAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The conferees are agreed that items of appropriation for the Department of State include $19,284,778 for the information and cultural program, $3,659,806 for the intelligence program, and $1,148,707 for the foreign economic liquidation program. The first and third of the foregoing sums are contained in the bill as passed by the Senate. The second program, approved by the Senate in the amount of $4,150,326, is reduced by the conferees, as follows: Transportation, Foreign Service, $88,120; Foreign Service quarters, $60,000; cost-of-living allowance, Foreign Service, $40,000; miscellaneous salaries and allowances, Foreign Service, $259,000; contingent expenses, Foreign Service, $43,400. The conferees are further agreed that publication of the magazine Amerika may be continued since it has been represented to the conferees that the publication is practically self-sustaining.

Amendment No. 1, relating to departmental salaries: Appropriates $23,600,000, instead of $23,861,000, as proposed by the Senate and $17,400,000, as proposed by the House; the reduction in the amount as passed by the Senate to be applied to the regular activities of the Department.

Amendment Nos. 3 and 4 relating to contingent expenses: Places in parentheses the words, "foreign or domestic," and limits expenditures upon the purchase of broadcasting time, all as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5, relating to contingent expenses: Increases the limitation for purchase and exchange of books, maps, and periodicals, newspapers, teletype rentals, and tolls, to $525,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the House. This increase is in conformity with the added amounts approved for the information and cultural program and the intelligence program.

Amendment No. 6, relating to contingent expenses: Appropriates $10,221,221, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,100,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7, relating to printing and binding: Appropriates $1,433,900, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9, relating to transportation, Foreign Service: Appropriates $1,915,700, instead of $2,003,808, as proposed by the Senate and $1,875,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10, relating to Foreign Service quarters: Appropriates $5,219,000, instead of $5,279,000, as proposed by the Senate and $4,750,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11, relating to Foreign Service quarters: Eliminates the Senate provision exempting Egypt, Great Britain, Spain, Brazil, Panama, Cuba, Turkey, Switzerland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, and the Netherlands Possessions from the monetary limitation for quarters, and restores the cities of Cairo, London, Ankara, Madrid, Rio de Janeiro, Panama, and Habana, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12, relating to cost of living allowances, Foreign Service: Appropriates $3,360,000, instead of $3,414,600, as proposed by the Senate and $2,900,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13, relating to representation allowances, Foreign Service: Appropriates $800,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $902,400, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14, relating to salaries of clerical, administrative, and fiscal personnel, Foreign Service: Appropriates $10,200,000, instead of $10,576,380, as proposed by the Senate and $8,600,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15, relating to miscellaneous salaries and allowances, Foreign Service: Appropriates $5,996,000, instead of $6,255,480, as proposed by the Senate and $4,600,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16, relating to Foreign Service, Auxiliary: Appropriates $3,300,000, instead of $3,656,913, as proposed by the Senate and $2,400,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18, relating to contingent expenses, Foreign Service: The first changes spelling of one word, and the second appropriates $9,100,000, instead of $9,171,890, as proposed by the Senate and $8,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 19, 20, and 21, relating to contingent expenses, Foreign Service: Provide limitations for the purchase of automobiles abroad; amendment No. 21 eliminates balance of the paragraph, after the word "to" on line 19, as follows: "replacements, and such replacements shall not be chargeable against the numerical limitations hereinbefore set forth," as proposed by the Senate, and in lieu thereof includes "replacement of an equal number of automobiles of the same general type and class."

Amendment No. 22, relating to emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service: Appropriates $9,000,000, instead of $9,500,000, as proposed by the Senate and $8,500,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23, relating to United States contributions to international commissions, congresses, and bureaus: Includes the amount of $800 for Cape Spartel and Tangier Light, Coast of Morocco, and the amount of $1,722.57 for the International Bureau of Permanent Court of Arbitration, both in conformity with existing treaties, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24, relating to United States contributions to international commissions, congresses, and bureaus: Corrects total for the paragraph to include amounts added under amendment numbered 23, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25, relating to United State participation in United Nations: Clarifies authority for attendance at meetings.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Amendment No. 27, relating to the offices of the Attorney General, etc.: Appropriates $667,250, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $633,250, as proposed by the House. The added sum of $34,000 is required for Federal-State relations activity carried on heretofore in the War Division which was abolished on December 28, 1945.

Amendment No. 28, relating to the Administrative Division: Appropriates $1,190,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,150,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29, relating to the Criminal Division: Appropriates $898,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $840,000, as proposed by the House. The added sum of $58,000 is required for the execution of responsibilities imposed on the Attorney General by the Foreign Agents' Registration Act of 1938, as amended. This activity was carried on heretofore in the War Division.

Amendment No. 30, relating to contingent expenses: Provides a limitation for miscellaneous expenditures, including newspapers, of $850, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $350, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 31, relating to salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division: Appropriates $1,900,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,700,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments No. 32, relating to salaries and expenses, Lands Division: Appropriates $2,650,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,500,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33, relating to salaries and expenses of district attorneys, and so forth: Appropriates $4,560,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,530,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 34, relating to salaries and expenses of marshals, and so forth: Appropriates $4,642,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,570,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35, relating to the Immigration and Naturalization Service: Appropriates $25,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $24,500,000, as proposed by the House. The added $1,000,000 is required for the maintenance and transportation of alien enemy detainees. No funds were included in the Budget for this program because it was anticipated that all alien enemies in detention would be deported or released prior to the close of fiscal year 1946.

Amendment No. 36, relating to construction of buildings and facilities, Federal Prison System: Provides that $635,000 of the amount transferred to the appropriation, "Construction of buildings and facilities," by the Navy Department, under the authority contained in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1943, shall be available for the construction of dwellings at existing institutions, as proposed by the Senate. The above amount is part of the sum of $1,500,000 transferred to the Federal Prison System as payment for a penal institution taken over by the Navy as a war emergency measure.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendments Nos. 37 and 38, relating to technical and scientific services: Increases the limitation for printing and binding from $105,000 to $130,000, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates $3,800,000, instead of $4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate and $3,400,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 41 and 42, relating to compiling census reports and so forth: Appropriates $12,000,000, instead of $13,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $11,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and restores the House provision requiring functions necessary to the compilation of foreign-trade statistics to be performed in New York, N. Y., amended to make the effective date October 1, 1946, and limiting expenditures to $950,000.

Amendments Nos. 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51, and 52, relating to the Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics: Appropriates for general administration, Office of the Administrator, $4,353,102, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,000,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates for establishment of air-navigation facilities $19,622,200, instead of $18,100,000, as proposed by the House, and $20,812,200, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $36,544,418 for maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $35,541,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates for technical development $875,000, instead of $750,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and continues available ($120,000) the 1946 unexpended balance, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $7,075,000 for enforcement of safety regulations, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,200,000, as proposed by the House, and provides for certain transfers to other appropriations, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for maintenance and operation of aircraft $1,593,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,200,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $2,975,000 for preliminary planning and surveys, Federal Airport Act, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, limiting, however, the number of passenger automobiles to be purchased to 19 instead of 38, and omitting authority to purchase any aircraft; and appropriates for the Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act, $45,000,000, instead of $52,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, with approximately proportionate reductions in amount limitations, and provides for the purchase of 83 passenger automobiles instead of 167, and eliminates authority to purchase aircraft.

Amendments Nos. 53, 54, and 55, relating to the Coast and Geodetic Survey: Appropriates for salaries and expenses, departmental, $3,014,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates for salaries and expenses, field, $4,800,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,800,000, as proposed by the House, and restores the House provision providing for reimbursement of officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for extending aid in needy cases.

Amendments Nos. 59, 60, and 61, relating to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce: Appropriates for departmental salaries and expenses $4,900,000, instead of $4,600,000, as proposed by the House, and $6,157,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for field office service $4,750,000, instead of $2,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $6,500,000, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates for export control $500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, and 69, relating to the Patent Office: Appropriates for salaries $5,620,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,800,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates for photolithographing $660,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $350,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates for miscellaneous expenses $147,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $77,000, as proposed by the House, and appropriates $952,000 for printing and binding, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $800,000, as proposed by the House, to be apportioned as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 70, 71, and 72, relating to the Weather Bureau: Appropriates for salaries and expenses $17,500,000, instead of $16,303,000, as proposed by the House, and $18,338,000, as proposed by the Senate; establishes the amount limitation upon expenditures for personal services in the District of Columbia at $1,525,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,485,000, as proposed by the House; and authorizes the Navy Department to transfer without charge equipment and supplies for upper air soundings, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 75, 76, 77, and 78, applying to miscellaneous provisions, Department of Commerce: Extends the authority of the Secretary to delegate to subordinate officials the power to authorize payment of travel and incidental expenses to include expenses of transportation of the immediate families of personnel, as proposed by the Senate; and restores the House provision making certain appropriations available for supplying medical services to personnel in Alaska, providing for their subsistence upon a reimbursable basis, and for travel expenses of personnel, upon appointment, from place of residence to points outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, amended to permit of an expenditure of not exceeding $20,000, upon a reimbursable basis, for relieving distressed persons in remote localities.

Amendments Nos. 79 and 80, relating to the Judiciary: Appropriates for salaries, United States Supreme Court, $598,590, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $591,200, as proposed by the House, and appropriates for salaries of judges $3,200,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

No. 2, relating to an informational program outside continental United States, Department of State. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 8, relating to surplus property disposal, Department of State. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment reducing the amount to $6,000,000.

No. 26, relating to the termination of the employment of personnel by the Secretary of State when deemed necessary or desirable in the interests of the United States. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 39, relating to a census of business, agreement.

No. 40, relating to a census of manufactures. The House managers will insist upon disagreement.

No. 46, relating to the maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities (Executive Order 9709). The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment, reducing the appropriation proposed from $2,874,000 to $2,500,000.

No. 50, relating to warehousing for airplane parts, Civil Aeronautics Administration, and limiting the amount to be expended for the repair or overhaul of aircraft. The House managers will move to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate, increasing the amount limitation upon the repair or overhaul of airplanes from $100 to $200, and including labor as a cost factor.

No. 56, relating to the transfer of seven vessels from the Navy Department to the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 57, limiting departmental salaries of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce at seat of government and making an amount thereof available for Office of Small Business. The House managers will move to recede and concur with an amendment reducing the amount proposed.

No. 58, broadening the scope in specified respects of the appropriation of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for departmental salaries and expenses. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 65, establishing under the Patent Office a charge of 10 cents per copy for design patents and certificates of trade-mark registration. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 73, relating to the conduct by the Weather Bureau of meteorological investigations in the Arctic region. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 74, relating to the maintenance and operation of meteorological facilities (Executive Order 9709) by the Weather Bureau in foreign countries and in Territories and possessions of the United States. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 81, relating to limitations on expenditures of funds to pay salary and wages of anyone who engages in a strike against the Government, or who is a member of an organization that asserts the right to strike against the Government, and so forth. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
BUTLER B. HARE,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
KARL STEFAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RABAUT (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the conference report and statement were printed in full in the RECORD of yesterday I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this conference report for the following more objectionable reasons: $19,284,778 have been allowed by the conference committee for the State Department to carry an information and cultural-relations program throughout the world; $3,659,000 have been allowed to be appropriated for an intelligence program for the State Department, and the third item involves a ninefold increase in the field service of the Department of Commerce. In general, the bill appropriates too much money in nearly every paragraph.

These three outstanding items are particularly objectionable, it seems to me. I was against them when the bill was before the House formerly, at which time we allowed nothing for intelligence and we allowed approximately $10,000,000 for an informational program.

I merely want to make my views clear for the RECORD. We are taking a step in the wrong direction by commandeering all the information that leaves the United States of America through the ether, through the telegraph wires with the thoughts of hired Government-paid employees of the State Department. This conference report will set up as a propaganda agency for the United States to the exclusion of private news-reporting services.

To illustrate and emphasize what I mean, I call attention to amendment No. 4 on page 2 of the bill which deals with broadcasting time provided for in this appropriation bill. That is a limitation on the $19,000,000 information program of the State Department. It is a limitation inserted by the Senate which, of course, is retained in this bill by the conference report. The Senate amendment states:

> Except that funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 percent of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee.

There are some six or seven international broadcasting licensees in the United States. This amendment had to be put in by the Senate. Part II of the Senate hearings shows that unless the amendment were inserted the State Department would insist on 100 percent of the broadcasters' time. With this amendment they can only use 75 percent of the time of any international broadcasting licensee.

Mr. Speaker, this proves to you the extent to which the State Department intends to blanket out and blacken out all private news agencies on the wire and in the air. I am against that in principle and I am against it as far as spending Federal money is concerned.

The conference report contains $453,330,612, as compared with the House version of the bill, which provided for $365,166,758; both Senate and House versions included $15,000,000 for a census of business and manufactures. These items are in disagreement and will be voted upon separately after we dispose of the conference report. The rest of the figures are comparatively correct.

The conferees have allowed an increase of $88,000,000 for carrying on the functions of the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments in the executive branch of the Government, and the Judiciary.

When we are staggered with a $1,900 per capita debt, I think this is a wholly unwarranted increase in public expenditures for the fiscal year 1947 for these departments of Government and the judiciary. Trouble seems to increase throughout the world in proportion to the increased funds we give the State Department every year. There was provided $15,000,000 for 1 year for the State Department when I went on this committee in 1941. Instead of $15,000,000 in the fiscal year 1941 we are now spending the colossal sum of $128,636,572 for that one agency alone during the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I merely want to say that I am glad the gentleman is continuing his good work on this fight. I opposed the bill before and I am still against it and I hope we will have a chance to express our opposition here today.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman. I intend to vote against the conference report for those reasons.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important conference report. It deals with the appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal judiciary. I am supporting the report with the exception of two items on page 55 dealing with the census. You will recall that when we brought these two items here the House overruled my amendment. When the bill went to the Senate the Senate struck out both items, and these two items come back to you in disagreement.

There will be preferential motions offered by me and my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] to eliminate these items and proceed to concur in the Senate amendment. In this way you can save $15,000,000 or more.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I want to inquire about this item for international short-wave broadcasting. I know the gentleman has done some effective work in that program during the war, but this is a postwar program. We were told when this bill was before this body that the State Department was planning a long-range program which would meet the objections of some of us that it was at present a monopoly program.

Mr. STEFAN. I can explain that to the gentleman to his full satisfaction. The gentleman will recall that the people who own the radio station in Boston were interested in securing 25 percent of the time. An amendment has been placed in the bill, and both sides are agreeable to it. I am sure the people who own that radio industry in Boston are satisfied, and I am sure the gentleman from Ohio, who has worked so hard to get this into the bill, will also be satisfied. Seventy-five percent Federal time and 25 percent private-industry time is the way it is now arranged.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I thoroughly approve of this as a stopgap measure, but I wonder whether, during the conference or otherwise the gentleman has heard about the long-time plans.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand a study is to be made.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I wonder if the gentleman would comment on those items for the census in the light of the fact that the House earlier this week rejected a bill out of the Committee on the Census.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; the House overwhelmingly defeated that authorization bill. They apparently wanted some basic law. You will find these two items on page 55. They are items in disagreement—amendments numbered 39 and 40. We bring these items back in disagreement and ask that you sustain the minority when we offer these motions.

The total amount for the four departments carried in this bill as it passed the House was $365,166,758. The bill as it passed the Senate carried $453,330,612. You will be interested to know, however, that the increase of $88,000,000 in the Senate bill as compared with the House bill will be found mainly in the item implementing the Federal-State-aid airport program, which has been authorized and

signed by the President. It is implemented with funds in this bill. I know every one of you that has an airport in your district will be interested to know that appropriations are contained in this appropriation bill to implement the Federal-State-aid airport program.

The other items which bring this increase up to $88,000,000 are increases in the information service of the Department of State, and also the Intelligence Service, which the House left out. These items are now in the bill and agreed to.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. I have two questions to ask. First, referring to page 70 of the bill, line 17, will the gentleman tell me what the conference agreement was as to the total amount?

Mr. STEFAN. The committee allowed for additional field offices in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. HENRY. But the dollars-and-cents amount is what?

Mr. STEFAN. The Small Business Office was reduced in the conference with the Senate.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Like other agencies, the State Department is leading people to think that all they need to do is get more people in order to improve their policies, which are having such disastrous consequences, but it seems to me that what we ought to do is to make a stern fight against these increases and these policies that are bringing about such disasters. They are occurring at the top. It is a matter of quality, not quantity.

Mr. STEFAN. I explained that the major increase in the bill is not in the Department of State. The major increase is in the Department of Commerce.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. There is a $30,000,000 increase in the State Department; is that not right.

Mr. STEFAN. Approximately that.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Their policy abroad is to finance conflict between England and Russia and give the Communists the Spanish and Argentine Governments.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, we are not a policy-making committee—we are an appropriations committee.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But this is a chance to stop the policy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

In order to keep the matter straight about the census, I will quote from Thirteenth United States Code, page 217:

> Census of manufacturing industries, collection and publication: The Director of the Census is authorized and directed to collect and publish for every second year after 1927 statistics of manufacturing industries, and the Director is hereby authorized to prepare such schedules as in his judgment may be necessary.

Regarding the census of business, we find the following to be the law in Thirteenth United States Code, page 201:

> The above reference contains authority for the taking of a census of distribution of business in the year 1930 and every 10 years thereafter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As I understand it, there was a provision in the bill that would allow the State Department to remove certain objectionable persons who they felt had very strong communistic feelings and who should be removed from the State Department. Is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentlewoman will find the language in amendment No. 26.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. In connection with your statement relative to the manufacturing census, it will be taken this fall as I understand it, but how long will it take before industry may have some benefit of that census?

Mr. RABAUT. The Census Bureau will take care of that. What we are talking about here is the funds to take the census.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I understand that we are providing for funds to take the census but when will get the benefit of the census—next year, or the year after?

Mr. RABAUT. I imagine it would take 6 or 8 months to arrange it into statistical form.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. How about the penalty clause for failing to file a report?

Is that still in the bill?

Mr. RABAUT. No; that is not in this bill. This is the appropriation bill. That was in the legislative bill.

AVIATION AMENDMENTS DISCUSSED

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to ask several questions of the Chairman and members of the subcommittee. In the first instance, I inquire if the $100,000 passed as an amendment in the House for an air marking program, to help the constantly expanding private flying field, is included in the conference report and in the bill as it comes before us this afternoon.

Mr. RABAUT. That was not in disagreement but some restorations have been made to it, as I understand. Presumably, it is still in the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That provision should be retained. The second question relates to the amendment which would give the fixed base operators and airport repair shops the opportunity, by contract, to repair CAA aircraft rather than the CAA doing that job.

Would the gentleman explain exactly what was done in the conference between the Senate and the House, and if agreement has been reached on an acceptable amendment?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, with reference to that amendment, the Senate struck out the language used by the House in the gentleman's amendment and inserted new language. The new language reads as follows:

> That no funds in this paragraph shall be expended for the pay of any employee of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the maintenance of more than one major parts warehouse, or for the repair or overhaul of aircraft when such repair or overhaul cannot be peformed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration through exchange or substitution of parts or materials maintained by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the cost of labor, parts, and materials not maintained in stock would be in excess of $200: *Provided further*, That all repair and overhaul of aircraft of the Civil Aeronautics Administration which cannot be performed within the foregoing limitation shall be done on contract after submission of bids.

The subcommittee argued that question for about 2 hours and finally we inserted the words on page 61 of the bill, "The cost of labor, parts, and materials not to exceed $200." So that the result of the amendment is that they can perform repairs where the cost of parts and labor does not exceed $200.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the conference agreement is preferable to the Senate language and it does partially embrace the thinking of the House. We desired that there not be conflict between the private fixed base operator in the repair of aircraft, and the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which we thought that agency should not enter, because private enterprise would be curtailed.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Has the gentleman listened to the explanation of the amendment given to you by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I listened very carefully. I appreciate also the courtesy of the gentleman from Virginia in discussing this matter with me earlier this afternoon.

Mr. STEFAN. What does the gentleman think about the words "and cost of labor, parts, and materials"?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think, as I indicated earlier, that this is an improvement and more nearly effectuates the action of the House than did the Senate votes in passing the language which was put in the bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I think it covers the same purpose that the gentleman had in mind when he presented the amendment in the House, which limited the cost of the labor to $100 per airplane This includes labor, parts, and materials, and raises it to $200, but gets at the same purpose.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman.

There is one additional question which I feel is important. I note that when the Senate had this appropriation bill, the amount of $52,000,000 was placed in the measure for carrying out the purposes of the Federal Aid Airport Act. Of

course we have not had such legislation before us until today. I ask if the $52,000,000 remains in the compromise or whether another figure was substituted.

Mr. RABAUT. There is substituted a figure of $45,000,000.

Mr. RANDOLPH. And then this final inquiry: That amount of money would be available until 1953, which would be the date on which the 7-year authorization act of $500,000,000 would run, is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. And this airport fund could be supplemented by other amounts during the first year, if the Congress so desires?

Mr. RABAUT. If the Deficiency Committee is in session.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am grateful for that assurance and I thank the gentleman, and desire also to state my belief that it will be necessary for Congress to provide additional matching money during the coming fiscal year. If I felt it more practical, under our parliamentary situation, I would urge my colleague to support an increase to at least $70,000,000. We must avoid unnecessary delay in construction and improvement of necessary airport facilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 2, line 10, after the word "through", insert "individuals, including aliens, or."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 5, line 23, insert the following:

"Surplus property disposal: For all expenses necessary to enable the Department of State to carry out its functions and activities relative to disposition of surplus property pursuant to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (Public Law 457), as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and employment of persons outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to civil-service and classification laws; travel expenses, including attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the activity for which this appropriation is made; transportation of prospective customers (not to exceed $9,000); cost of living and living quarters allowances and transportation of families and effects including cost of living allowances for military personnel assigned or detailed to the Department, all under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; stenographic reporting, translating, appraising, and other services in foreign countries by contract, all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; purchase and exchange of books, maps, periodicals, and newspapers; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); entertainment (not to exceed $50,000); hire, maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger automobiles; advertising without regard to section 3828 of the Revised Statutes; maintenance and operation of aircraft; $7,000,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$7,000,000" named in said amendment insert "$6,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 35, line 11, insert the following:

"Nothwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, on or before June 30, 1947, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States, but such termination shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government if declared eligible for such employment by the United States Civil Service Commission."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 55, line 7, strike out all of lines 7 to 13 inclusive.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES moves that House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and concur in the same.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, this amendment concerns the census of business.

The census of business was initiated in 1929. Thereafter such censuses were taken covering the years 1933, 1935, 1937, and 1939, when the last one was taken. The censuses of 1933, 1935, and 1937 were taken by order of the Secretary of Commerce—at that time Secretary Roper—under authority of section 8 of the organic act of the Department of Commerce. The censuses of 1937 and 1939 were taken under authority of Public Law No. 13 of the Seventy-first Congress. We think these censuses should be continued. I quoted a moment ago from the law covering the census—Thirteenth United States Code, page 201.

The disruption caused by the war make it very necessary that the Government and the agencies of the Government have the facts so that they may become known to the Government through the taking of these censuses. If we propose to abandon the census in these times when we have had both the war period intervene and the reconversion period at our door, I feel we would be doing an injustice to the business of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 189]

Adams	Gore	Patterson
Anderson, Calif	Gossett	Peterson, Ga.
Andrews, N. Y.	Granger	Ploeser
Auchincloss	Grant, Ala.	Powell
Baldwin, Md.	Green	Quinn, N. Y.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hall,	Rankin
Barden	Edwin Arthur	Rayfiel
Barrett, Pa.	Hall,	Reece, Tenn.
Bates, Ky.	Leonard W.	Richards
Bates, Mass.	Harness, Ind.	Rivers
Bell	Harris	Robertson,
Bennet, N. Y.	Hart	N. Dak.
Bonner	Hartley	Robertson, Va.
Boren	Hedrick	Robinson, Utah
Boykin	Heffernan	Rodgers, Pa.
Bradley, Mich.	Hoffman, Mich.	Roe, N. Y.
Bradley, Pa.	Holifield	Rogers, N. Y.
Brooks	Izac	Rooney
Buchanan	Jackson	Sabath
Buckley	Johnson, Okla.	Sharp
Bulwinkle	Kearney	Sheridan
Byrne, N. Y.	Kefauver	Sikes
Camp	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Cannon, Fla.	King	Sparkman
Celler	Kinzer	Stevenson
Cochran	Klein	Stewart
Coffee	Kunkel	Stigler
Cole, N. Y.	Latham	Stockman
Colmer	Lea	Sumners, Tex.
Cox	LeCompte	Taylor
Crawford	Luce	Thomes, N. J.
Curley	Ludlow	Thomas, Tex.
Daughton, Va.	Lynch	Tolan
Dawson	McGehee	Torrens
Dolliver	McKenzie	Towe
Domengeaux	Mahon	Vinson
Drewry	Mansfield,	Voorhis, Calif.
Dworshak	Mont.	Wadsworth
Eberharter	Mansfield, Tex.	Welch
Elsaesser	Merrow	West
Engel, Mich.	Miller, Calif.	White
Ervin	Morgan	Whitten
Fisher	Morrison	Wickersham
Gallagher	Murphy	Winstead
Gardner	Norrell	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gibson	Norton	Wood
Gifford	Outland	Worley
Gillespie	Patrick	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 296 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, before the quorum call which, by the way, I did not request, we had before us for consideration Senate amendment No. 39, which would strike out, as the Senate did, $10,000,000 for a business census.

You will remember that by a narrow margin we passed a business census appropriation for $10,000,000 when this bill was before the House in the first instance. The Senate, however, struck out this provision and here is what the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations had to say about the business census:

It is recommended by the committee that the following paragraph be stricken from the bill:

"Census of Business: For the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing (including printing and binding) the census of business or distribution, as authorized by the act of March 14, 1903 (5 U. S. C. 604), including the employment by the director of personnel at the seat of government and elsewhere without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, $10,000,000."

The committee goes on to say:

The committee can find no specific authority in 5 U. S. C. 604 for collection of statistics dealing with business or manufactures and have, therefore, deleted the paragraphs mentioned above.

The committee does not condone and will not abet the practice of extending the scope of statutory authority by administrative determination to cover functions not within the reasonable intent of the Congress in framing the statutes.

If you will look at title 5, section 604, you will find no authority for a business census whatsoever. The nearest language relied upon is as follows:

He—

Secretary of Commerce—

shall from time to time make special investigations and reports as he may be required to do by the President or by either House of Congress, or which he himself may deem necessary and urgent.

This language does not authorize a business or distribution census. "Investigation" and "reports" are not "censuses."

There is authority for a business census, however, as the chairman pointed out, under title 13, section 201. Under authority of this latter section of law the original census was taken in 1930 and adtional censuses are legal only every 10 years thereafter. That would mean that a distribution census might be taken in the year 1951 for 1940 business and distribution facts; but for this appropriation bill which provides funds for the fiscal year 1947 there is no authority in law. This amendment covering the taking of a census of business, and appropriating $10,000,000, does not cover the total amount for the taking of the business census—it will be much more than that. This amendment is only for the purpose of providing work, in my opinion, during the 9 years while there is no authority for census taking and keeping an army of employees on the pay roll for 9 continuous years instead of for 1 year in 10.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is not this the same sort of stuff that I will call alfalfa that the House rejected the other day?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. There was an amendment offered then.

Mr. JONES. Yes. On page 1021 of the hearings the gentleman's position is borne out when Mr. Grieves testified before the committee as the Chief Economist of the Bureau of the Census and was asked by Mr. Sourwine:

Is the same thing true with the business census?

Mr. GRIEVES. Yes, sir; except that under the present law that would not be taken until 1951.

This official of the Census Bureau does not contend there is authority in law for a business census.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the House has passed on the question of whether it wants a census of business earlier this week when it turned down the legislative authority for a business census, which legislation provided penalties in case businessmen would not answer the questionnaires. The House turned down that legislation.

Insisting on House disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 39 is an attempt to put in an appropriation bill legislation legalizing and appropriating $10,000,000 for a census of business and distribution when there is no basic authority in the law in the face of defeat of the basic legislation this same week. There is no authority whatsoever except as appears in this language. The proof of the pudding is that if this business census had been authorized by law, by basic authority, this amendment would not appear technically in disagreement. It would have been put in the conference report and would have been adopted with the rest of the conference report.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This is the same proposal we had before the House when the gentleman offered a motion to strike it out and it lacked 1 vote of carrying in the committee when the thing was considered?

Mr. JONES. That is right. It carried on a voice vote and was defeated on a record vote.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And it was the gentleman from Ohio that proposed the motion to strike out the $10,000,000.

Mr. JONES. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I submit this amendment should be defeated for the further reason that never before in the history of any nation has the Government known more about business and private enterprise, never has the Government known more about distribution, because it has had this information tied up through complete and arbitrary control in the Civilian Production Administration, the Office of Defense Transportation, and the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, so that the memory of the Members of the House may be brought to date on this census matter, the conferees are simply upholding in their position in this conference, the action of the House which approved the appropriation. When you go to a conference and you do not defend the House, you are criticized. When you go to a conference and you defend the House you are criticized. So where are you?

If there was ever a time that a business census should be taken, it is right now. We have had the war period with many, many businesses discontinuing operation. We have the reconversion period at our door as well as the legislation of the Congress of the United States giving assistance to GI's to go into business all over the Nation.

Mind you, you are underwriting all of them. When they go into business they want to find out something about it, and you do not want them to go into business and lose their money without having the facts at hand. My colleagues, what are we thinking about? Let us look at the hearings, not before the Senate, but before your own committee; hearings of this size (indicating a volume). It covers several pages. Here is what it says:

It provides Government and business with a complete picture of the distribution operation of the country, especially the size and location of markets. It establishes a number of bench marks by which the businessman who is selling may gage the success of his efforts in his usual field, as well as his prospects in going into new lines or new locations. It is an essential part of the planning of a marketing operation. Mr. Chairman, on the part of people who are searching for markets, and who wish to judge their size and character as for instance, between the east coast and the west coast. Furthermore, it provides the raw material necessary for an intelligent review of the cost of distribution as a whole, as well as the cost of operating individual business establishments. It would provide the first comprehensive information of the kind since 1939.

What are we thinking about? Are we just on the rampage against any kind of progress? Is this another attack? Is this another wreck, ruin, and delay program? I am asking you.

This amendment should be supported and the position of the House should be sustained.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I gather from the remarks that have been made on this provision that the bone of contention is whether or not there is authority in law to gather these statistics by the Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce. I reach that definite conclusion from the statement just made by my genial and close friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], when he said that if there had been authority in law and it had been embodied in the bill, it would have been included in the report of the committee.

I would like to submit for the consideration of the House as to whether or not

there is provision in law for this, and I am going to quote from the act of March 14, 1903. The act reads as follows:

He—

The Secretary of Commerce—

shall also from time to time make such special investigations and reports as he may be required to do by the President or by either House of Congress, or which he himself may deem necessary and urgent.

Is that not authority in law for the Secretary of Commerce to collect information or statistics regarding the business of the country, regarding production of the country, or regarding statistics on any other subject which he may think is urgent?

Let me go just a little further and see whether or not this is the first time this authority has been exercised. I want to read again from one of my great friends of the past.

I find here a photostatic copy of a directive from the Secretary of Commerce to the Director of the Census, dated May 11, 1921. It is as follows:

In conformity with the authority contained in section 8 of the act of Congress approved February 14, 1903, I hereby authorize and instruct you to collect statistics concerning stocks, production, prices, and other data that will form a part of an efficient report on the business movement of the country. These statistics are now deemed necessary and urgent.

It is signed, "Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman understands that none of these statistics would be available for anybody who would use them for about 18 months from the day they are taken. Of what value could they possibly be under those circumstances, with conditions in the state of flux they are in now?

Mr. HARE. I stated at the outset that the issue involved here is whether or not the Bureau of the Census has the authority or the right under the law to collect these statistics. My friend admitted that, if there were specific authority of law, they would be included in this report and the report of the committee would have been adopted. I am not undertaking to discuss the value of these data. That question has not been raised, except by the inquiry of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. In fact, the real value of the statistics is virtually admitted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is reading from Thirteenth United States Code, page 201, is he not?

Mr. HARE. No; I am reading from the act of February 14, 1903.

Mr. STEFAN. What code section is that?

Mr. HARE. Fifth United States Code, page 604. The statistics referred to in that act are the same kind of statistics we are trying to provide for in this bill, the same kind that were asked for by Secretary Hoover in 1921.

Then on March 19, 1927, Secretary Hoover said, addressing a communication to the Director of the Census, I quote:

In conformity with the authority contained in section 8 of the act of Congress approved February 14, 1903, I hereby authorize and instruct you to collect statistics and other information concerning business cycles that are essential to a proper understanding of the business movement of the country, which is referred to in my order of May 11, 1921.

What better authority do you want than the original act I quoted at the outset and the exercise of that authority by Secretary Hoover in 1921 and in 1927? But we do not stop there. We go just a little further and find that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Lamont, on March 18, 1929, issued the following directive to the Bureau of the Census, and said:

In conformity with the authority contained in section 8 of the act of Congress approved February 14, 1903, I hereby authorize and instruct you to collect statistics concerning distribution, stocks, production, prices, and other data that will form a part of an efficient report on the business movement of the country.

Now, gentlemen, it seems to me that it is perfectly absurd to say that the authority was not specific.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Can the gentleman advise the House if the census were taken under this provision and business people failed to comply or reply, then the heads of those businesses could be penalized according to the law which we rejected this week.

Mr. HARE. I hope the gentleman will understand. I am not questioning what was done then. I am replying to the arguments made here in opposition to this item.

Mr. JUDD. I am asking for information on that one point.

Mr. HARE. I am replying to the arguments made here in opposition to this item as to whether there is authority in law. If my friend will bear with me I will give him the advantage of my considered judgment that no authority could be any more specific.

Mr. JUDD. I thought you had completed your argument on that. I was asking for information on this one point.

Mr. HARE. There is nothing in this bill about the penalties or anything of that nature whatsoever.

Mr. JUDD. Then no businessman would be fined or sent to jail if he failed to reply to the questionnaires?

Mr. HARE. Not under this bill; no.

Mr. JONES. Mr, Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman quoted the authority for this amendment in Fifth United States Code, page 604, which was passed February 16, 1903. If that was reliable authority, then it certainly would not have been necessary to have passed title 13 of section 201, which provides specifically for a census of distribution in 1930 and every 10 years thereafter. The Commerce Department in seeking legislation and asking for title 13, section 201, as a provision of basic law, must have thought that they did not have the authority to take a distribution census until they had this law passed on May 17, 1932.

Mr. HARE. I am speaking of the general authority of law to the Secretary of Commerce. If the Secretary of Commerce does not see fit in his judgment to collect statistics that Congress feels are necessary, then the Congress has the right by statute to authorize specifically that such information shall be gathered. In other words, and I am reading from the act of March 14, 1903:

The Secretary of Commerce shall also from time to time make such special investigations and reports as may be required of him by the President to do or by either House of Congress.

That gaves the specific authority referred to.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. If that is true, why then did the chief economist of the Bureau of the Census testify before the Senate committee as follows in answer to this question:

You have a bill pending in both Houses of Congress to change the basic statutes so as to give you authority to do that?

That is, authority to do what—to take this business and manufacturing census. And what was the answer that the chief economist gave? He said:

That is right.

In the Senate and among the members of your committee here there is great doubt as to whether or not there is authority in basic law to do the work for which you are asking that these amendments be approved.

Mr. HARE. I am not prepared to deny the statements made by my good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska, but I am emphasizing that there was not any doubt in the mind of Herbert Hoover in 1921 and there was no doubt in his mind in 1927 and there was no doubt in the mind of the Secretary of Commerce in 1930 that definite authority had been provided under the act of March 14, 1903—Fifth United States Code, page 604—and my contention is that since the authority has been exercised from time to time, there is sufficient authority to justify the action of this committee some few months ago and was affirmed by the action of the whole House when it formally approved this provision when it passed the House in early April of this year.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the preferential motion which I have offered to recede and concur, if adopted, will result in a $10,000,000 saving?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know what is in the bill. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to save the membership a great deal of time. I have a preferential motion on the Speaker's desk to move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment on the item of business manufactures. I wonder if we could not consider both of these at the same time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will object to that.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 86, noes 62.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 150, nays 143, not voting 139, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

YEAS—150

Adams	Fenton	Keefe
Allen, Ill.	Fuller	Kilburn
Andersen, H. Carl	Fulton	Knutson
Andresen, August H.	Gamble	LaFollette
Angell	Gavin	Landis
Arends	Gearhart	Lanham
Arnold	Gifford	LeFevre
Barrett, Wyo.	Gillette	Lemke
Beall	Gillie	Lewis
Bender	Goodwin	Luce
Bennett, Mo.	Graham	McConnell
Bishop	Grant, Ind.	McCowen
Blackney	Griffiths	McDonough
Bolton	Gross	McGregor
Brehm	Gwinn, N. Y.	McMillen, Ill.
Brumbaugh	Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa
Buck	Hale	Martin, Mass.
Buffett	Halleck	Mason
Byrnes, Wis.	Hancock	Mathews
Campbell	Hand	Michener
Canfield	Henry	Miller, Nebr.
Carlson	Herter	Mundt
Case, N. J.	Heselton	Murray, Wis.
Case, S. Dak.	Hess	Norblad
Chenoweth	Hill	O'Hara
Chiperfield	Hinshaw	O'Konski
Church	Hoeven	Phillips
Clason	Hoffman, Pa.	Pittenger
Clevenger	Holmes, Mass.	Ramey
Clippinger	Holmes, Wash.	Randolph
Cole, Kans.	Hope	Reed, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	Horan	Reed, N. Y.
Corbett	Howell	Rees, Kans.
Cunningham	Hull	Rich
Curtis	Jenkins	Rizley
D'Ewart	Jennings	Robsion, Ky.
Dirksen	Jensen	Rockwell
Dondero	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Eaton	Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Mo.
Ellis	Johnson, Ind.	Schwabe, Okla.
Ellsworth	Jones	Shafer
Elston	Jonkman	Short
	Judd	Simpson, Ill.
	Kean	Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Maine	Taber	Wigglesworth
Smith, Ohio	Talbot	Wilson
Smith, Wis.	Talle	Winter
Springer	Tibbott	Wolcott
Stefan	Vorys, Ohio	Wolverton, N. J.
Sumner, Ill.	Vursell	Woodruff
Sundstrom	Welchel	

NAYS—143

Abernethy	Geelan	Neely
Allen, La.	Gordon	O'Brien, Ill.
Almond	Gore	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews, Ala.	Gorski	O'Neal
Bailey	Granahan	O'Toole
Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ala.	Outland
Beckworth	Green	Pace
Biemiller	Gregory	Patman
Bland	Hare	Peterson, Fla.
Bloom	Harless, Ariz.	Pfeifer
Brown, Ga.	Havenner	Philbin
Bryson	Hays	Pickett
Bunker	Healy	Poage
Cannon, Mo.	Hébert	Price, Fla.
Carnahan	Hendricks	Price, Ill.
Chapman	Hobbs	Priest
Chelf	Hoch	Rabaut
Clark	Hook	Rabin
Clements	Huber	Rains
Combs	Jarman	Resa
Cooley	Johnson, Luther A.	Richards
Cooper		Riley
Courtney	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Roe, Md.
Cravens		Rogers, Fla.
Crosser	Kee	Rowan
D'Alesandro	Kelley, Pa.	Ryter
De Lacy	Kelly, Ill.	Sabath
Delaney, John J.	Kerr	Sadowski
	Kilday	Sasscer
Dingell	King	Savage
Domengeaux	Kopplemann	Sheppard
Douglas, Calif.	Lane	Slaughter
Douglas, Ill.	Larcade	Somers, N. Y.
Doyle	Lesinski	Spence
Durham	Link	Sullivan
Earthman	Lyle	Tarver
Elliott	McCormack	Thom
Engle, Calif.	McGlinchey	Thomas, Tex.
Fallon	McMillan, S. C.	Thomason
Feighan	Madden	Traynor
Fernandez	Maloney	Trimble
Flannagan	Manasco	Walter
Flood	Mankin	White
Fogarty	Marcantonio	Whitten
Folger	May	Whittington
Forand	Mills	Wood
Gallagher	Monroney	Woodhouse
Gary	Murdock	Zimmerman
Gathings	Murray, Tenn.	

NOT VOTING—139

Anderson, Calif.	Ervin	Morgan
Andrews, N. Y.	Fellows	Morrison
Auchincloss	Fisher	Murphy
Baldwin, Md.	Gardner	Norrell
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gerlach	Norton
Barden	Gibson	Patrick
Barrett, Pa.	Gillespie	Patterson
Barry	Gossett	Peterson, Ga.
Bates, Mass.	Granger	Ploeser
Bell	Hagen	Plumley
Bennet, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Powell
Bonner		Pratt
Boren	Hall, Leonard W.	Quinn, N. Y.
Boykin		Rankin
Bradley, Mich.	Harness, Ind.	Rayfiel
Bradley, Pa.	Harris	Reece, Tenn.
Brooks	Hart	Rivers
Brown, Ohio	Hartley	Robertson, N. Dak.
Buchanan	Hedrick	
Buckley	Heffernan	Robertson, Va.
Bulwinkle	Hoffman, Mich.	Robinson, Utah
Butler	Holifield	Rodgers, Pa.
Byrne, N. Y.	Izac	Roe, N. Y.
Camp	Jackson	Rogers, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson, Okla.	Rooney
Celler	Kearney	Russell
Cochran	Kefauver	Scrivner
Coffee	Keogh	Sharp
Cole, N. Y.	Kinzer	Sheridan
Colmer	Kirwan	Sikes
Cox	Klein	Smith, Va.
Crawford	Kunkel	Sparkman
Curley	Latham	Starkey
Daughton, Va.	Lea	Stevenson
Davis	LeCompte	Stewart
Dawson	Ludlow	Stigler
Delaney, James J.	Lynch	Stockman
	McGehee	Sumners, Tex.
Dolliver	McKenzie	Taylor
Doughton, N. C.	Mahon	Thomas, N. J.
Drewry	Mansfield, Mont.	Tolan
Dworshak		Torrens
Eberharter	Mansfield, Tex.	Towe
Elsaesser	Merrow	Vinson
Engel, Mich.	Miller, Calif.	Voorhis, Calif.
Wadsworth	Welch	Winstead
Wasielewski	West	Wolfenden, Pa.
Weaver	Wickersham	Worley

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Gillespie for, with Mr. Patterson against.

Mr. Kunkel for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Elsaesser for, with Mr. Drewry against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. Dworshak for, with Mr. Rayfiel against.

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Fellows for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Harness of Indiana for, with Mr. Harris against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Scrivner for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Kinzer for, with Mr. Coffee against.

Mr. Engel of Michigan for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.

Mr. Merrow for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Rankin with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Doughton of North Carolina with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. Norrell with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Ervin with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Davis with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Stockman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40, page 55, strike out all of lines 14 to 20.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEFAN moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 40.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House long on this motion for the reason this amendment is similar to the one you voted on just a little while ago with the exception that this is for the census for manufactures and an appropriation of $5,000,000 is sought. The Senate struck this out and it is being brought to you here on the motion of the chairman of the subcommittee to insist on the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendment, thus keeping this in

the bill. The committee was not unanimous on it. The committee divided 3 and 2. The Senate insisted on leaving it out on the ground there is no basic law for this particular census. I personally feel we should save expenses now. Only a few days ago the House voted definitely against continuing certain censuses and I feel that in view of the fact time is so precious today and that a vote has already been taken on a similar measure, I ask that you vote for my amendment to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. This work can be done later if it is needed and at a time when there is more labor available.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the question for consideration now is similar to the one that we have just acted upon. The House included in the bill provisions for a business census and also a provision for a census of manufactures.

The facts are that these census surveys were made regularly every 2 years until 1939. We have not had a census either of business or manufactures since that date because of the war. We are therefore without statistics at the present time for our reconversion and other essential postwar programs in which the people of the United States and the Government are interested.

Moreover, both the business and manufacturing censuses will be of tremendous help to small business, and particularly to veterans who are coming out of the Army and are considering entering the manufacturing business.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. This has nothing to do with business We just voted that down.

Mr. GARY. I said it was similar. Manufacturing is a very substantial part of business. It has been my privilege on numerous occasions to use statistics that have been compiled in the census reports. They have been invaluable in numerous research projects. The House included the provision in the bill. The Senate struck it out. We are simply asking that it be retained.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This census will perhaps receive the same consideration across the aisle that the census of business received a moment ago. This comes in spite of letters from chambers of commerce all over the United States that have practically flooded the Membership of Congress. It comes as a direct rebuff to the business houses that have written us telling the necessity for this census. It comes from the small business people all over the Nation.

I am not going to detain the House and hold them for another roll call, but I am going to ask for a standing vote in order that we may have a count on this census that is now before us and place the blame for its failure where it belongs.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABAUT) there were—ayes 79, noes 84.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. STEFAN and Mr. RABAUT.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 111, noes 97.

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 46: On page 59, line 3, insert the following:

"Maintenance ond operation of air-navigation facilities (Executive Order 9709): For all necessary expenses of maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities, by contract or otherwise, in foreign countries and in territories and possessions of the United States, in accordance with Executive Order 9709, dated March 29, 1946, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $2,874,000, of which not to exceed $200,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "General administration, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics", for necessary expenses in connection with the general administration of the program."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "$2,874,000" named in said amendment, insert the following "$2,500,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 50: On page 61, strike out all lines 13 to 17 inclusive and insert the following: "That no funds in this paragraph shall be expended for the pay of any employee of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the maintenance of more than one major-parts warehouse, or for the repair or overhaul of aircraft when such repair or overhaul cannot be performed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration through exchange or substitution of parts or materials maintained by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the cost of parts and materials not maintained in stock would be in excess of $100: *Provided further*, That all repair and overhaul of aircraft of the Civil Aeronautics Administration which cannot be performed within the foregoing limitation shall be done on contract after submission of bids."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "That no funds in this paragraph shall be expended for the pay of any employee of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the maintenance of more than one major parts warehouse, or for the repair or overhaul of aircraft when such repair or overhaul cannot be performed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration through exchange or substitution of parts or materials maintained by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the cost of labor, parts and materials not maintained in stock would be in excess of $200: *Provided further*, That all repair and overhaul of aircraft of the Civil Aeronautics Adminstration which cannot be performed within the foregoing limitation shall be done on contract after submission of bids."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 68, line 14, insert:

"The Navy Department is authorized to transfer without charge to the Coast and Geodetic Survey two AGP seaplane tenders, two PCS submarine chasers, and three SC submarine chasers from the reserve or surplus to the needs of the Navy Department, each of the seven vessels equipped with the necessary launches and ship's outfit."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 57: Page 69, line 17, after the matter stricken out, insert "(not to exceed $5,757,000, $1,557,000 of which is to be exclusively for the Office of Small Business at the seat of government)."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 57 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "(not to exceed $4,500,000, $500,000 of which is to be used at the seat of government for aids and services to small business)."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 69, line 22, after the word "law" insert "including the purchase of commercial and trade reports; employment of aliens; temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service and classification laws (not exceeding $50,000)."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 72, line 2, after the word "patents" insert "and 10 cents per copy for design patents and certificates of trade-mark registration."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 73: Page 79, line 17, after the word "soundings" insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That in the conduct of meteorological investigations in the Arctic region, pursuant to Public Law 296, approved February 12, 1946, the funds herein appropriated shall be available for the appointment of employees at rates to be fixed by the Chief of the Weather Bureau without regard to the civil-service laws and classification Act, but the maximum base rate of pay shall not be in excess of $7,500 per annum and at no time more than three employees shall be in a pay status at such rate of pay, and no other employees shall receive in excess of the base rate of pay of $5,000 per annum; the furnishing of food, shelter, and protective clothing and equipment, without repayment therefor, to employees of the Government assigned to Arctic stations; and the War and Navy Department are authorized in the fiscal year 1947, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to transfer without charge to the Weather Bureau materials, equipment, and supplies, surplus to the needs of the War and Navy Departments and necessary for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of Arctic weather stations: *Provided further*, That the unexpended balance of the amount appropriated for Arctic weather stations under authority of said act for the fiscal year 1946 is hereby merged with this appropriation and continued available for the purposes thereof until June 30, 1947."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 74: Page 80, line 18, insert:

"Maintenance and operation of meteorological facilities (Executive Order 9709): For all necessary expenses of maintenance and operation of meteorological facilities, by contract or otherwise, in foreign countries and in Territories and possessions of the United States, in accordance with Executive Order 9709, dated March 29, 1946, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $2,000,000, of which not to exceed $40,000 may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and concur in the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$2,000,000" named in said amendment insert "$1,750,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 81: Page 95, line 24, strike out lines 24 and 25, and on page 96 strike out lines 1 to 17 inclusive and insert:

"SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, for the consideration of Senate amendment No. 1.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 1, strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 1.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 98, noes 6.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 195, nays 100, not voting 137, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

YEAS—195

Abernethy	Folger	Mills
Allen, Ill.	Fuller	Mundt
Allen, La.	Gallagher	Murray, Tenn.
Almond	Gamble	Murray, Wis.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gathings	Norblad
Andresen, August H.	Gavin	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.	Gearhart	O'Konski
Arends	Gifford	O'Neal
Arnold	Gillette	O'Toole
Barrett, Wyo.	Gillie	Pace
Barry	Goodwin	Patman
Bates, Ky.	Gossett	Peterson, Fla.
Beckworth	Graham	Pfeifer
Bell	Grant, Ind.	Philbin
Bennett, Mo.	Gregory	Phillips
Bishop	Griffiths	Pickett
Blackney	Gross	Plumley
Bland	Gwynne, Iowa	Poage
Brehm	Halleck	Price, Fla.
Brown, Ohio	Hand	Rabaut
Brumbaugh	Hare	Ramey
Bryson	Hendricks	Reed, Ill.
Buck	Henry	Reed, N. Y.
Buffett	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Butler	Hill	Resa
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoch	Rich
Campbell	Hoeven	Rizley
Cannon, Mo.	Hoffman, Pa.	Robsion, Ky.
Carlson	Hope	Rockwell
Chapman	Howell	Roe, Md.
Chelf	Hull	Russell
Chenoweth	Jenkins	Ryter
Chiperfield	Jennings	Schwabe, Mo.
Church	Johnson, Calif.	Schwabe, Okla.
Clark	Johnson, Ill.	Scrivner
Clason	Johnson, Ind.	Shafer
Clements	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Short
Clevenger	Jones	Simpson, Pa.
Clippinger	Jonkman	Smith, Ohio
Cole, Kans.	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Cole, Mo.	Kee	Somers, N. Y.
Cooley	Keefe	Spence
Cooper	Kerr	Springer
Courtney	Kilburn	Sumner, Ill.
Cravens	Knutson	Sundstrom
Crosser	Landis	Taber
Cunningham	Lane	Talbot
Curtis	Lanham	Talle
Davis	Lea	Thom
D'Ewart	Lewis	Thomas, Tex.
Dingell	Luce	Thomason
Domengeaux	Lyle	Tibbott
Dondero	McConnell	Vorys, Ohio
Durham	McCowen	Vursell
Earthman	McDonough	Walter
Eaton	McGregor	Weichel
Elliott	McMillen, Ill.	White
Ellis	Maloney	Whittington
Ellsworth	Mankin	Wigglesworth
Elston	Martin, Iowa	Wilson
Fallon	Martin, Mass.	Winter
Feighan	Mathews	Wolcott
Fenton	May	Wolverton, N. J.
Flannagan	Michener	Wood
	Miller, Nebr.	Woodruff
		Zimmerman

NAYS—100

Angell	Gordon	Larcade
Bailey	Gorski	LeFevre
Beall	Granahan	Lemke
Biemiller	Green	Lesinski
Bloom	Hagen	Link
Bolton	Hale	McCormack
Brown, Ga.	Hancock	McGlinchey
Bunker	Harless, Ariz.	McMillan, S. C.
Canfield	Havenner	Madden
Carnahan	Hays	Manasco
Case, N. J.	Healy	Marcantonio
Case, S. Dak.	Hébert	Monroney
Combs	Herter	Murdock
Corbett	Heselton	Neely
D'Alesandro	Hinshaw	O'Brien, Mich.
De Lacy	Hobbs	O'Hara
Delaney, John J.	Holmes, Mass.	Outland
Dirksen	Holmes, Wash.	Pittenger
Douglas, Calif.	Horan	Price, Ill.
Douglas, Ill.	Huber	Priest
Doyle	Jarman	Rabin
Engle, Calif.	Johnson, Luther A.	Rains
Fernandez	Judd	Randolph
Flood	Kelley, Pa.	Richards
Fogarty	Kelly, Ill.	Riley
Forand	King	Rogers, Fla.
Fulton	Kirwan	Rogers, Mass.
Gary	Kopplemann	Rowan
Geelan	LaFollette	Sadowski
		Sasscer

Savage	Starkey	Trimble
Simpson, Ill.	Stefan	Wasielewski
Slaughter	Sullivan	Weaver
Smith, Maine	Traynor	Woodhouse

NOT VOTING—137

Adams	Gillespie	Patterson
Anderson, Calif.	Gore	Peterson, Ga.
Andrews, N. Y.	Granger	Ploeser
Auchincloss	Grant, Ala.	Powell
Baldwin, Md.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Pratt
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hall,	Quinn, N. Y.
Barden	Edwin Arthur	Rankin
Barrett, Pa.	Hall,	Rayfiel
Bates, Mass.	Leonard W.	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Harness, Ind.	Rivers
Bennet, N. Y.	Harris	Robertson,
Bonner	Hart	N. Dak.
Boren	Hartley	Robertson, Va.
Boykin	Hedrick	Robinson, Utah
Bradley, Mich.	Heffernan	Rodgers, Pa.
Bradley, Pa.	Hoffman, Mich.	Roe, N. Y.
Brooks	Holifield	Rogers, N. Y.
Buchanan	Hook	Rooney
Buckley	Izac	Sabath
Bulwinkle	Jackson	Sharp
Byrne, N. Y.	Jensen	Sheppard
Camp	Johnson, Okla.	Sheridan
Cannon, Fla.	Kearney	Sikes
Celler	Kefauver	Smith, Va.
Cochran	Keogh	Sparkman
Coffee	Kilday	Stevenson
Cole, N. Y.	Kinzer	Stewart
Colmer	Klein	Stigler
Cox	Kunkel	Stockman
Crawford	Latham	Sumners, Tex.
Curley	LeCompte	Tarver
Daughton, Va.	Ludlow	Taylor
Dawson	Lynch	Thomas, N. J.
Delaney,	McGehee	Tolan
James J.	McKenzie	Torrens
Dolliver	Mahon	Towe
Doughton, N. C.	Mansfield,	Vinson
Drewry	Mont.	Voorhis, Calif.
Dworshak	Mansfield, Tex.	Wadsworth
Eberharter	Mason	Welch
Elsaesser	Merrow	West
Engel, Mich.	Miller, Calif.	Whitten
Ervin	Morgan	Wickersham
Fellows	Morrison	Winstead
Fisher	Murphy	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gardner	Norrell	Worley
Gerlach	Norton	
Gibson	Patrick	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Robertson of Virginia with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Havenner with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Rankin with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Whittington with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Voorhis of California with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Sharp.
Mr. Hook with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Latham.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Elsaesser.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Dolliver.
Miss Pratt with Mr. Gillespie.
Mr. Doughton of North Carolina with Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO and Mr. CARNAHAN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. SHAFER, and Mr. ELSTON changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House agree to the further conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COFFEE, GARY, FLOOD, O'NEAL, STEFAN, HORAN, and CANFIELD.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT AND STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 689, Rept. No. 2444), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other rule of the House immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 371) extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and all points of order against said joint resolution are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask recognition in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for tonight and next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. So far as the rest of the afternoon is concerned, I do not know that I can give much information to the House. I do not know of any conference reports. Would the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] inform the House as to the situation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have no further conference reports and there will be no more conference reports ready tonight. We will have conference reports ready on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. That being the case, that gives the House very essential and valuable information.

Mr. TABER. Would it not be proper at this time perhaps to have arrangements made so that conference reports on Monday might be taken up on Monday even though they were not filed until then? Perhaps we ought to cover that tonight.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is an excellent suggestion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the suggestion made by the gentleman from New York, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider conference reports on Monday which are reported on that day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. With reference to the program for next week, of course, on Monday the joint memorial exercises will be held for our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will any legislative business be taken up after the holding of the memorial exercises?

Mr. McCORMACK. Then the OPA extension bill on which a rule has just been reported will come up. Then, of course, conference reports will be considered. In other words, we will have a legislative day on Monday after the exercises are over.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. How long will the memorial exercises last?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state exactly, but probably an hour and a half.

On Tuesday there is the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar to be taken up. The bill H. R. 6811 will be taken up under suspension. There is the railroad retirement bill, which I have kept on the calendar for the next legislative order of business. That will be continued Tuesday and Wednesday until disposed of. Of course, conference reports will take preference.

Calendar Wednesday has been dispensed with. If on Wednesday the railroad retirement bill is completed and other legislation is out of the way, and if we can consider another bill, I have put down the Reed bill, H. R. 5924.

On Thursday there is no business.

On Friday and Saturday we will have general debate on the British loan.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I wonder if the leaders would consent to an agreement. The Committee on Military Affairs has been considering the atomic-bomb legislation and has been handicapped very much during the past week or 10 days due to difficulties in the committee, plus the fact that the House has been meeting at 10 o'clock on several days, which is the hour that the committee meets. Yesterday the committee found itself without a quorum and was unable to proceed, and the committee therefore recessed until 10 o'clock Tuesday.

Now, if it is not too much of an upset of the leader's program, I wish we could agree to set aside the previous agreement and let the House meet at 11 o'clock at that time so that we may have 1 hour for the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a proper request.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order entered that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet on Tuesday at 10 o'clock be vacated, and in substitution thereof I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet on Tuesday at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that on Tuesday a bill reported from the World War Veterans Committee will be taken up for consideration, the bill that provides for not cutting the single men while hospitalized, and also a 20 percent flat increase in all compensation.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is H. R. 6811, I believe. That is the bill I had in mind. If that is not the correct number, the bill I have in mind is the one to take care of veterans in the hospitals.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. To not cut the single men in the hospital. It was a very cruel provision that cut them in the beginning.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the bill I had in mind.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There will be 16 hours' general debate on the British loan bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That means it will go into the following week?

Mr. McCORMACK. In all probability, yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. At what time do we convene on Wednesday morning?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is all according to the status of the railroad retirement bill at that time. If it appears we should come in at 11 o'clock, I will confer with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. As it now stands, it will be 12 o'clock. In any event, it would not be before 11 o'clock.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the distinguished majority leader will look at that paper and see if he can see any sign of hope for bringing up the water pollution control bill in which a great many of us are interested.

Mr. McCORMACK. To be frank, this particular piece of paper is vacant on that bill. However, I want to say the House has done a remarkable job. This House has done a month's work this week. I want to express my gratitude. The gentleman realizes the situation I am in regarding next week. If the gentleman will confer with me the latter part of next week, I will do everything I can. If we can see things ahead I know there will be cooperation, where we can meet at 10 o'clock and call up legislation, with a view to as early an adjournment for the summer as possible.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

COAST GUARD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6428, an act making appropriations for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. D'ALESANDRO, Mr. KOPPLEMANN, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. TABER, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. CANFIELD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. PRICE of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker be authorized and empowered to sign any enrolled bills found duly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "The Fence That Made Cattle History."

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. HEALY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the president of the Association of World War Pilots II, and also an editorial from the Compton Herald.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include several newspaper editorials.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY NURSERY SCHOOLS

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5933) to authorize and direct the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McMILLAN of South Carolina, HEALY, and BEALL.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PROGRESS IN THE CALIFORNIA PHYSICIANS' SERVICE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, more than 2 years ago, on March 20, 1944, to be exact, it was my privilege to discuss on this floor the background, development, and achievements of the California Physicians' Service. I pointed out at that time that this whole subject of group medical care and health insurance seemed fated to always be discussed with a maximum of heat and a minimum of light. I mentioned that it was my firm conviction that the leaders in the medical profession of this country should be taking an active lead in the planning for more adequate health facilities for our people.

This afternoon I want to discuss some of the progress that has been made in the work of the California Physicians' Service, as well as mention other developments in different parts of the country. I emphasize today, as I emphasized 2 years ago that my remarks have no connection whatsoever with any legislation that has been proposed either in this House or in the Senate; I am not here to comment upon the merits or the demerits of the many suggested health bills with which all of us are somewhat familiar. My remarks are to be directed solely to what I personally believe to be a genuine contribution to health planning in America, and especially to the outstanding achievements of the doctors of my own State of California.

Two years ago in my discussion of California Physicians' Service I pointed out that the doctors of medicine in California had banded together voluntarily to offer to the people of the State the opportunity of budgeting their medical, surgical, and hospital costs. While the entire operation of California Physicians' Service is not actually an insurance business there are some of the same elements about it that we generally look for in insurance. Principal among these is the element of a pooled fund. The subscribers to the service—the patients—put in their monthly contributions and the doctors render the service and agree to take as their payment only that amount which is actually earned. The doctors are the underwriters of the fund; if there is not enough money to pay them what their services would normally command, they take what is available and accept that as full payment for their services.

This type of underwriting is designed for only one purpose and I believe we should pay tribute to that one underlying motive. It is a motive of public service, regardless of the financial return to the doctors.

While we must admire the unselfishness of these doctors in their willingness to provide professional service and think about financial return later, we must also

look at the practical side of what this attitude means.

In the case of California Physicians' Service it means that we have in one group a large number of doctors—more than 7,000 in this one State—who have established a system of service which is available for public as well as private bodies. This group has already entered into two contracts with departments of the Federal Government—the Federal Public Housing Authority and the Farm Security Administration. These contracts have meant a cooperative working agreement between Government on the one hand and private professional men on the other. While I would not venture to say that these contracts have been 100 percent satisfactory in all respects, I am thoroughly satisfied that the net result of these agreements has been the provision of high quality medical care which otherwise would not have been available. Both Procurement and Assignment Service and the Federal Public Housing Authority have gone on record as commending California Physicians' Service for providing a needed medical service in the housing projects in California during the emergency.

The point is that where you have a cooperative group of doctors banded together in their own organization you can deal collectively with this group for the provision of needed medical services which otherwise might not be furnished. And it is a big step in the right direction.

The finest example of such dealing that has come to my attention for many months is the contract recently executed between California Physicians' Service and the Veterans' Administration for the provision of medical care for service-connected disabilities. The new Administration of the Veterans' Administration found itself confronted with a tremendous accumulation of service-connected disabilities which could not possibly be handled in the hospitals and facilities now operated by the Administration. Greatly to the credit of General Bradley and his chief medical officer, General Hawley, the Veterans' Administration acted without delay to see to it that the veterans received their out-patient care. Contracts were signed with California Physicians' Service and Michigan Medical Service, and other State-wide groups of doctors organized on a similar basis. Under these contracts the doctors in the organized group provide the medical services authorized by the Veterans' Administration and the Administration takes care of the payment for such services.

The net result of this agreement is that the veterans are receiving the care to which they are entitled—and they are receiving it at home from their own family doctors. They need not be institutionalized. They need not travel to veterans' facilities which may be inconveniently located both for the veterans and their families. They need not undergo any great measure of restrictive paper work. They merely go to their own doctors on proper authorization and receive the care they need and to which they are entitled.

This phase of the program is new. It has been in existence for only a few short months, but it has already proved itself capable of meeting this pressing problem and of assuring our returning veterans that their medical problems will be promptly, adequately, and efficiently handled.

When the program was first put into effect, Gen. Omar Bradley paid tribute to the doctors of California for their part in making this care available to the veterans. He said, and I quote:

> I want to congratulate the physicians of California on the excellent manner in which the medical profession of California is cooperating in rendering care to the veterans.

After the program had been in effect for a short while, Gen. Paul R. Hawley, chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration, paid a further tribute to the doctors and to the entire program. He said, and again I am quoting:

> I heartily approve of the care that is being rendered to California veterans by the medical profession in that State. I believe that California Physicians' Service, as an agency of the California medical profession, has made possible in a very short time immediate and efficient medical care to the veterans of California.

From the veterans themselves we have had similar expressions of approval. I will quote only one at this time, but similar statements have been made elsewhere and they all add to the growing volume of evidence of the effectiveness and practicality of furnishing medical service to the veterans on this hometown basis. The man I am now quoting is Dr. Burthel Henning, of San Francisco, a private practitioner, who serves as chairman of the medical advisory board of the California State Department of the American Legion. Dr. Henning says, and again I am quoting:

> The agreement between California Physicians' Service and the Veterans' Administration is a forward step in prompt care of veterans with service-connected disabilities. The Veterans' Administration cannot maintain doctors and hospitals in every community in the State, but this agreement makes it possible to extend medical and hospital service to these veterans in their own towns. The advantages to the veteran and to his whole community are obvious.

Without elaborating further, I believe we have here ample evidence that this form of cooperative action by the doctors of California has gone a long way toward meeting a serious problem for the returning veterans to whom we all owe so much. I will add only one more thought before going on to another subject. The doctors of California have met the challenge of medical service to the returning veterans in splendid fashion. More than 1,000 doctors have joined California Physicians' Service in the past 6 months, many of them being veterans themselves. All of them have agreed to take care of the veterans under this new program. To me, this is a wonderful example of forward-looking planning in the health field.

Now, on another front—the farm front—we find this same cooperation acting for the health interests of our citizens. We have often heard it said that our rural residents are so far removed from the metropolitan centers that they cannot secure adequate medical care. We have heard our farm neighbors referred to as the forgotten men in an economy which centers around our large cities. True, our farmers are removed from some of the facilities of the cities but in the matter of medical care I am proud to state that California Physicians' Service has again shown itself interested in and willing to provide adequate medical, surgical, and hospital care for the farmers.

Within the past 6 months there has been signed a contract between California Physicians' Service and the State Grange of California for the provision of this care. The contract is a practical document, based on a progressive 3-year program, to start with medical services on a moderate supply basis and to increase the scope of the coverage as time goes on, as experience is gained, and as the farmer members become accustomed to the high quality of medical service they will receive under this plan.

Our farmers have long since gathered together in producer cooperatives. Now they are contracting with another producer cooperative—this one operated by the doctors, for the benefit of the grange members. This is the first exampe to my knowledge of such a contractual arrangement. Time alone will tell the story of its success but I am sure that where two cooperative groups such as the farmer and the doctors agree on the basic principles of service, the program must push ahead. I can see no failure in a plan of this kind; only success for all concerned.

Indicative of the reception of this program by the grange, let me quote you from the message of Mr. George Sehlmeyer, master of the California State Grange, to his members. Mr. Sehlmeyer said, and I quote:

> We urge that you and your grange give this plan immediate consideration * * * it should not only result in building our membership but at the same time will bring medical care and hospital service to our members at reasonable cost.

At a grange meeting in one California county, Mr. Sehlmeyer expanded on his previous statements and pointed out how the freedom of action of the indivi-ual members would be preserved under this cooperative movement:

> The hospital and health care plan worked out between the State grange and California Physicians' Service would be * * * a purely voluntary group contract. Our grange members would be free to subscribe to * * * the system or not. There would be no involuntary assessment of the entire membership.

> In the second place, this plan does not limit its beneficiaries in their selection of physicians or hospitals but gives them free choice of more than 7,000 physcians and surgeons in every part of the State and of any licensed hospital in the State.

Recently Mr. Sehlmeyer stated that—and I quote:

> This is the first time in California, or any other State I know of, that a cooperative arrangement has been made providing for a prepaid medical service to farm families over the area of an entire State. We have high hopes for its success.

In publishing that statement, the editor of the Grange News added his own editorial comment, stating that—

The eyes of the Nation are on California again. That the California State Grange is again about to set the pace for others to follow is shown by requests received by the Grange News from the National Grange Monthly and other Grange publications in the East and Midwest, asking for news releases on the progress the prepaid medical plan is making here.

These statements are sufficient to show the interest in this program by the farmers of California who are affiliated with the State grange. There are about 30,000 of them, and together with their families they make up a group of about 75,000 people. Their medical care and hospital service contract with California Physicians' Service indicates once again how the problems of furnishing prepaid medical and hospital care can be met on a group basis and on a voluntary basis. If this plan is successful, and I believe firmly that it will be, I anticipate that it will spread to many other States.

I could go on at great length with similar examples of the progress of California Physicians' Service. For instance, one of the large oil companies of California which has long maintained its own medical care program for its employees, has recently arranged with California Physicians' Service to provide medical and hospital care for the families of these employees. Here again we see a group movement made possible by an organization of professional men on one side anxious to provide the best in medical care for the people and willing and able to deal intelligently with an employer who is likewise anxious to provide for the health care needs of his employees and their families.

I need not go any further on this line. There are many examples that could be given but I think the ones mentioned are sufficient to indicate the pioneering spirit of the doctors of California.

These are some of the new developments in prepaid medical care in California. It is worthwhile also to look at the progress of the regular program, the prepayment program that has been operating since 1939. In my address to this House 2 years ago I dwelt particularly on this regular program and I would like now to bring that information up to date. In the past 2 years California Physicians' Service has doubled its membership. Today it is serving more than 228,000 beneficiary members. This number is still too small for a State the size of California but this rate of growth, which has come about despite the heavy labor turnover during the reconversion period, indicates that this prepayment medical care service is really geared up to go places today.

The initial period of groping and feeling the way has passed. The trial and error experiments of the early days are over. Today California Physicians' Service has a workable program, beneficial to the public and acceptable to the physician, a program which is daily demonstrating its value in terms of increased enrollment.

Before closing I want to point out that California is not the only State where progress of this type has been made. We know that there are similar medical cooperatives in 29 States today. Some of them are still in their infancy but all of them are dedicated to public service and all of them command our respect and admiration. California is by no means the largest of these. The largest is doubtless the Michigan Medical Service, which has long served the people of Michigan and which today has enrolled in its service about one person out of each six in that State. In Massachussetts we have the Massachusetts Medical Service, a thriving and lusty infant which has captured the public mind and is spreading rapidly in that State. We have other plans in New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio—the list is too long to read here. In some of the more sparsely settled States we also have prepayment medical care plans. One was recently started in Montana, another in New Mexico.

Today there are more than 3,600,000 people enrolled in the voluntary sickness-insurance plans. This is just about double the number enrolled a year ago and the rate of growth of these plans is now assuming large proportions. In fact, these medical cooperatives have grown more in their early years than the Blue Cross plans, with which we are all familiar, grew in a comparable period at their inception.

I should point out that it is a tribute to the doctors of several of the larger States that they have given freely of their time, their money, and their experience to help out their smaller neighbors. This is true with California Physicians' Service and it is likewise true with Michigan Medical Service, Massachusetts Medical Service, and others. The movement toward cooperation exists not only within State borders but crosses over State lines to effect a national cooperative movement which is snowballing right now and from which we will hear much more in the future.

A few months ago I read with interest of the national medical-care program sponsored by the American Medical Association and its constituent State medical associations. It proposes that the 48 State medical associations take the lead in establishing their own State-wide programs of prepaid medical care insurance, and then, through the central office facilities of the American Medical Association, put into effect a reciprocal agreement between the State plans for the benefit of the members, the public. This plan allows each State to develop its own program on the basis of the actual needs and requirements in that State. When this is done, there is provision for the interchanging of membership benefits between the States, so that the member from California who is injured in New Jersey will receive the same medical and hospital care there that he would receive if he were at home.

This movement is still new but I believe it indicates a real desire on the part of the medical profession to serve the public. As an example of this desire, may I quote briefly from an address given in Los Angeles on May 7 of this year by Dr. Philip K. Gilman, president of the California Medical Association? Doctor Gilman said, and I quote:

Today medicine realizes that the public is the master of us all and that what is good for the public is good for medicine.

That statement points the way toward improved medical-care plans for the benefit of the public. Further, it shows an attitude on the part of the medical profession which of necessity must lead to an even greater public service by doctors of medicine than we have witnessed in the past. It is unfortunate that a few medical men have sometimes given a different impression to the American people.

It is under a policy such as Doctor Gilman has outlined that the State medical associations, acting through the American Medical Association, have set up their Nation-wide pattern of prepayment medical service.

This service has two primary functions. One is to aid and assist in the establishment of prepayment medical-care plans in all those areas where such plans do not already exist. The other is to serve as a clearinghouse between the various State or regional programs. Under this project a member of a State prepayment plan in California would be honored as a member of the Michigan plan if he happened to be in Michigan and to require medical, surgical, or hospital service there and then. This type of reciprocal agreement will be spread from State to State, from region to region, resulting eventually in what will actually be a Nation-wide service operated on State or regional lines for the benefit of the people in that State or region.

We cannot hope to achieve immediately uniformity between widely separated States in the matter of the health-care needs of their people. But we can achieve a working arrangement such as associated medical-care plans, is developing, so that our people may move around as freely as they desire and may count upon receiving the same benefits away from home that they would expect in their own front yards.

I salute this Nation-wide movement of the American Medical Association and its constituent State medical associations and I salute particularly the part the physicians of my own State of California have had in helping to develop this movement. It is through organizations such as this that the benefits of modern medical science can and will be applied to all of our people. It is through organizations such as this that our people will become educated to the availability of high-grade medical service on a budget basis. And, finally, it is through organizations such as California Physicians' Service and its fellow State-wide plans, together with their own national organization, that the best in medical science will be brought to all of our people under a cooperative, voluntary plan.

I have always contended that the medical profession has a responsibility, a serious responsibility in leading the way toward an America where health care is available to all citizens. Without criticizing any other suggestions, without even commenting on other plans, I do believe that such work as is

now being done by the California Physicians' Service is a bright beacon. The progress already made is a most hopeful sign of what we can expect in the future. I am proud to call to the attention of Congress and the American people this excellent work that is going on in California under the leadership of the medical men and women in my State.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the method used in entering into those contracts with the United States Housing Authority? How is it done? Is it a voluntary proposition?

Mr. OUTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What part, then, does the Government play in that contract?

Mr. OUTLAND. The Government plays no part at all.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It is with the people living in these houses?

Mr. OUTLAND. Oh, I misunderstood the gentleman. The Government plays no part as far as doctors are concerned. It is the California Physicians' Service which enters into that type of contract. The Government plays an indirect part inasmuch as it assists with its own agency.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I did not understand that.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I want to commend the gentleman from California for bringing this to the attention of the House. I believe the answer to the admitted inequity in the distribution of medical care is to be found along the lines of the experiments in the gentleman's State, and the experiments in Michigan and in my own State as well as several others. By your experiment in California and our experimenting in Minnesota and others in Michigan with voluntary systems, we can develop experimental data on which we can work out a sound actuarial program of medical care which I believe will give a better way of solving the difficulties that we all know we face than any other system I have seen. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman very much. In view of the gentleman's wide experience in the medical field I should like to make an additional comment. Does not the gentleman from Minnesota feel that the experience which is being gained through what may be termed "the trial-and-error method" in California, in Michigan, in the gentleman's own State, and in other places there is being laid the basis for what will eventually be an increased health service for the American people on a sound basis, cooperatively worked out between groups and individuals on the one hand and the medical profession on the other?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; because the practice of medicine is so personal and intimate that if there is not the wholehearted cooperation of the doctor—I do not care what the system looks like on paper—it will not work. If the doctors, the community, and the Government organization work together in formulating the plans and it is mutually agreeable, it has a good chance of being successful.

Mr. OUTLAND. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. In my experience the system will work if a doctor is working for the patient. If the doctor is working for the Government, then it does not work. For some reason or other there is not the incentive, there is not the intimate personal relationship when a doctor is working for the state and gets paid by the state as is the case when the doctor is working for the patient even though he is paid through the patient from this mutual-insurance fund.

Mr. OUTLAND. While the experience we have been getting in California and elsewhere is probably not the complete answer, at the same time it is furnishing data and background on which future plans can be made to increase the medical service to the American people.

Mr. JUDD. That, I think, is the single greatest value of it. Some people look at the admitted inadequacy of medical care to some group under our system and they say, "Scrap it." I do not think that is the answer. If a system has good points, hang onto them, and modify them and correct them, in order to work out a system to provide adequate medical care.

Mr. OUTLAND. I will say this to the gentleman that it has always been my contention that in the long run the providing of adequate care for the American people will have to be worked out not by forcing some type of plan on our doctors, but through asking their cooperation in meeting that problem. In California, it seems to me, our physicians have worked out what at the present time is probably the best plan in the United States. It has not gone far enough. It does not cover enough people. There are many inequities to be corrected, but it is a big step in the right direction.

Mr. JUDD. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to make this observation. What I have felt we ought to do in this whole problem is do the thing that a scientist or a physician does when he makes a new discovery. He has a remedy that he is convinced is good and it will cure this or the other disease, but he does not try it out on himself. He first tries it out on the guinea pigs and the rabbits and the monkeys, and then he gets some volunteers before he tries it out on himself. I do not know whether this system will work. So we should try it out in some county or some municipality rather than in one fell swoop try it out on the country as a whole.

Mr. OUTLAND. I agree with the gentleman, but I trust that he does not place the citizens of California in the category of guinea pigs.

Mr. JUDD. But if it was not done from the outside and superimposed on them in that manner it would ultimately lead to the correct solution.

Mr. OUTLAND. I want to say one thing further. When I was in California I was a member of the Health Service which was rendered by the California Physicians Service, and to me it was an excellent way by which I could budget monthly to take care of the health needs of myself and my family, including an emergency, such as hospitalization. There were additional provisions in the California Physicians' Service for it, and I am sure the gentleman knows that this movement has already spread to a great many other States outside of California. I think there are about 20 now that have various plans.

Mr. JUDD. To me this is one of the genuises of this form of government. It should not be imposed from the top. In all of the 48 States you can have trial and error, and until we know what is sound and what is unsound, as in education and as in medicine, we ought by all means to keep decentralized the system where we can carry out such experimenting in order to make sure that the ultimate system adopted for the country will be sound. I thank the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, as I understand this program is expanding; it is growing.

Mr. OUTLAND. That is correct. It is expanding and growing, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio, not only in California but other States are experimenting along the same line as I have tried to point out.

As I said in response to one of the statements of the gentleman from Minnesota, to me it is a very healthy omen, a very good sign that the medical profession itself is waking up to its responsibility in regard to more decent care for the American people.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell me what the plan is called?

Mr. OUTLAND. California Physicians' Service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very much interested because we have a low-cost plan in the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes. I am familiar with the plan to a very limited degree.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT AND STABILIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 29,1946.

Memorandum for the Speaker:

On page 10 of the Message of the President returning to the House of Representatives today, without approval, H. R. 6042, "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes," the date October 1–15, 1946 appears incorrectly in the next to the last paragraph. This date should read October 1–15, 1941 (instead of 1946).

Will you kindly have the official copy and the RECORD corrected accordingly?

CHARLES G. ROSS,
Secretary to the President.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PACE, for Tuesday and Wednesday, July 2 and 3, 1946, on account of urgent official business.

To Mr. SHERIDAN (at the request of Mr. GREEN), indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. TOWE (at the request of Mr. EATON), for 4 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), from June 29 to July 5, 1946, on account of illness.

To Mr. HARTLEY (at the request of Mr. SUNDSTROM), for 3 days, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2234. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1654. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3517. An act to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to India, and persons of races indigenous to the Philippine Islands, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4512. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5244. An act to authorize the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades;

H. R. 5716. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. R. 6335. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6429. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6516. An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

On June 28, 1946:

H. R. 6042. An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and for other purposes.

On June 29, 1946:

H. R. 1654. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3517. An act to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to the Philippine Islands, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4512. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5244. An act to authorize the appointment of additional foreign-service officers in the classified grades;

H. R. 5716. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. R. 6335. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6429. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6516. An act to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 1, 1946, at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6828. A bill to provide for continuance of the farm labor supply program up to and including June 30, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 2435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4720. A bill to amend the act of December 7, 1944, relating to certain overtime compensation of civilian employees of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 4718. A bill to provide optional retirement for Government officers and employees who have rendered at least 25 years of service; with amendments (Rept. No. 2443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 689. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 371, joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2444). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1351. A bill for the relief of Maxine Estelle Boyle, Max W. Boyle, and E. B. Rosegarten; with amendments (Rept. No. 2437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1631. A bill for the relief of William Tolar Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 2438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2850. A bill for the relief of Felix Napiorkowski; without amendment (Rept. No. 2439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5874. A bill for the relief of Joseph Maezer; with amendments (Rept. No. 2440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4496. A bill for the relief of Anne Robinson Norwood; without amendment (Rept. No. 2441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6321. A bill for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman; with amendments (Rept. No. 2442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 6931. A bill to provide appropriate medals for mothers of members of the armed forces who lost their lives in action against an enemy of the United States in World War II; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 6932. A bill to provide for further research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to improve and facilitate the marketing and distribution of agricultural products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6933. A bill to change the name of the Chemical Warfare Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 370. Joint resolution granting certain property to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and relinquishing jurisdiction therein; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. Con. Res. 159. Concurrent resolution to direct the President to take the necessary action to prohibit the exportation of not more than 2 percent of all durable goods produced, processed, or sold under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and/or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. Res. 688. A resolution for the development and control of atomic energy; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6934. A bill for the relief of Avelino, Francisca, Stella, and Iris Iglesias and Avelino Iglesias, Jr.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EARTHMAN:

H. R. 6935. A bill granting a pension to Mollie Manis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 6936. A bill granting an increase of pension to Grizelda Hull Hobson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6937. A bill for the relief of the Atlantic Meat Co., Inc., of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2048. Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON presented a petition of L. F. Varvel, Sr., route 1, box 120, Easterly, Tex., favoring House bill 6340; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 1, 1946

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Charles W. Flint, D. D., resident bishop, Washington area, Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, humbly yet boldly we approach Thee. We are of many minds, differing in judgment on many matters, even worshiping in divers manners, but just now we are one as we bow in reverence before Thee, the God and Father of us all. Our voices are stilled that we may hear Thy voice.

Reorient us. Our insights are so fragmentary; at best, they are but broken lights of Thee; give us of Thy wisdom that we may be wise. Each day, this day, trace Thy designs on the trestle board of our souls.

Not only enlighten, but also empower us, so that, day by day, we may nearer and nearer approximate the doing of Thy will on earth, even as it is in heaven.

We ask in the name of Him by whom we come to God, the Life, the Truth, the Way. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, June 29, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 29, 1946, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

S. 896. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes;

S. 2219. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; and

S. 2122. An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5933) to authorize and direct the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina, Mr. HEALY and Mr. BEALL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to the bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COFFEE, Mr. GARY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. HORAN, and Mr. CANFIELD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 26, 39, 40, 56, 58, 65, 73, and 81 to the bill, and concurred therein; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 46, 50, 57, and 74 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6428) making appropriations for the Coast Guard, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. D'ALESANDRO, Mr. KOPPLEMANN, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. TABER, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. CANFIELD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 29, 1946,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that during the adjournment he signed the bill (H. R. 6682) to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and to repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIMPLIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF CREDIT SERVICES TO FARMERS—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 29, 1946,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. AIKEN conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5991) to simplify and improve credit services to farmers and promote farm ownership by abolishing certain agricultural lending agencies and functions, by transferring assets to the Farmers' Home Corporation, by enlarging the powers of the Farmers' Home Corporation, by authorizing Government insurance of loans to farmers, by creating preferences for loans and insured mortgages to enable veterans to acquire farms, by providing additional specific authority and directions with respect to the liquidation of resettlement projects and rural rehabilitation projects for resettlement purposes, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a full report of that Board covering operations during the year 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON AUDIT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION AND WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on audit of United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate 18 telegrams in the nature of petitions from citizens of the United States praying for the continuation of the Office of Price Administration, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appro-

priate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which has just reached me from the Wichita (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce concerning price-control legislation.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WICHITA, KANS., *June 30, 1946.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Wichita Chamber of Commerce still favors principles embodied in OPA bill passed by House on April 18, H. R. 6042. We strongly oppose any effort to reinstate OPA for any considerable period of time in its recent form. We are sending following telegram to President Truman, which will also acquaint you more fully with our views: "Speaking the sentiments of many thousands of businessmen and other citizens of this city and area, the Wichita Chamber of Commerce most respectfully opposes your request that Congress pass price-control bill more stringent than vetoed bill. We have the firm conviction that OPA should be continued for a few more months in greatly modified form in order to encourage maximum production and help fight off inflation. We strongly favor the principles embodied in bill the House passed April 18. If Nation is to get full production and defeat inflation, and if the American people do not want Government to gradually take over and operate all business and industry, then price ceilings must cover increased costs and allow reasonable profits, and ceilings must be removed when supply and demand are balanced for any commodity or article. Complete elimination of Government subsidies must be accomplished as rapidly as possible, in the interest of economy and to be honest and fair to posterity. Reduction of customary discounts, which force smaller profits for dealers than the established practices have allowed in the various lines of business, must be prohibited, because the standard, prewar profit margins are fair, equitable, and necessary to sound business operation and to employment of returning veterans and war workers. These principles are recognized in bill passed by House in April. Government should not reach for more power or cling tenaciously to wartime powers. Unrealistic OPA policies have tragically delayed reconversion ever since VJ-day and have hindered production and seriously increased inflation. OPA must be greatly modified, or its continuance would cause untold injury to every person in the United States. It is vitally necessary that any price-control bill passed by Congress shall restrict OPA in very definite ways to accomplish the objectives mentioned and prevent the repetition of its foolish policies of the past."

LLOYD A. WILSON,
General Manager,
Wichita Chamber of Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The introduction of bills and joint resolutions is in order.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACTS OF 1942

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I offer for appropriate reference a joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I object to the introduction of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On objection, the introduction of the joint resolution will be postponed under the rules for one legislative day.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. WHEELER):

S. 2396. A bill to grant to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain land in Custer County, Mont., for industrial and recreational purposes and as a museum site; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 2397. A bill to provide for the payment of a disability retirement annuity to Joseph J. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 2398. A bill for the relief of Senzo Usui; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2399. A bill for the relief of Epifanio Lucero; and

S. 2400. A bill for the relief of Solly Manasse; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2401. A bill to amend the act of May 4, 1898 (30 Stat. 369), as amended, to authorize the President to appoint 250 acting assistant surgeons for temporary service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 2402. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition, establishment, and development of the George Washington Memorial Parkway along the Potomac from Mount Vernon and Fort Washington to the Great Falls, and to provide for the acquisition of lands in the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia requisite to the comprehensive park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital," approved May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

(Mr. BYRD introduced Senate Joint Resolution 171, extending the rent-control provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, until June 30, 1947, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WILLIS, Mr. HART, and Mr. McCLELLAN) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1850) to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—AMENDMENT

Mr. WALSH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6407) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR FLOOD CONTROL—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILEY submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6597) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1937—AMENDMENTS

Mr. OVERTON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6689) to extend, for an additional year, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF EVENTS RELATING TO SETTLEMENT OF RAILROAD STRIKE—AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to submit a substitute for Senate Resolution 278 to investigate events leading up to the settlement of the railroad strike on May 25, 1946. The substitute resolution is identical with the original resolution save and except it adds subpena powers on the part of the committee, and an expense item of $10,000.

There being no objection, the amendment was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON THE MERMENTAU RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, LOUISIANA (S. DOC. NO. 231)

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a report dated April 16, 1946, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on and a preliminary examination and survey of the Mermentau River and tributaries, including Bayou Queue De Tortue, La., and of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and connecting waters in Louisiana between Bayou Sale Ridge and the Calcasieu River, in the interest of navigation, flood control, irrigation and drainage, and for the prevention of stream pollution and salt water intrusion, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be referred to the Committee on Commerce and printed as a Senate document, with an illustration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LABOR FACT-FINDING BOARDS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from the previous day which will be read.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the resolution (S. Res. 215) proposing to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor from the further consideration of S. 1661, the Labor Fact-Finding Boards Act.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over.

REORGANIZATION OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the resolution (S. Res. 249) creating a

special committee to consider matters relating to the reorganization of the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. That having been done, I move that the resolution be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, for the information of all Members of the Senate, a comprehensive legal opinion, with supporting statements, showing the serious legal implications of the so-called equal-rights amendment, the subject of Senate Joint Resolution 61, now pending on the Senate Calendar.

There being no objection, the opinion and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

These lawyers and legal scholars regardless of party and regardless of political or economic views, oppose the so-called equal-rights amendment and endorse the statement set forth herein, on the legal implications of the proposed amendment, prepared by Prof. Paul Freund, of the Harvard Law School.

Clarence Manion, dean of the College of Law, University of Notre Dame, Indiana.

Silas Strawn, former president, American Bar Association.

Charles Warren, constitutional lawyer and author of The Supreme Court in United States History, Washington, D. C.

George Maurice Morris, former president, American Bar Association, Washington, D. C.

Marion J. Harron, judge, Tax Court of the United States.

Walter Gellhorn, professor of law, Columbia University Law School.

Glenn A. McCleary, dean of the Law School, University of Missouri.

Dorothy Straus, lawyer, New York City.

D. W. Woodbridge, acting dean, department of jurisprudence, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.

Marvin C. Harrison, lawyer, Cleveland, Ohio.

M. R. Kirkwood, professor of law, Stanford University Law School, California.

Joseph Padway, general counsel for the AFL, Washington, D. C.

Leon Green, dean of the Law School, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Dorothy Kanyon, lawyer and former judge of municipal court, New York City.

E. Blythe Stason, dean of the Law School, University of Michigan.

Morris Ernst, lawyer, New York City.

William Draper Lewis, former dean, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Philadelphia.

Charles C. Burlingham, lawyer, New York City.

Patrick O'Brien, probate judge of Wayne County, Detroit, Mich.

Godfrey Schmidt, professor of law, Fordham University, New York City.

Robert H. Wettach, dean of the School of Law, University of North Carolina.

Isabel Simons, lawyer, Highland Park, Ill.

Patrick Nertney, lawyer, and chairman Detroit chapter, National Lawyers Guild, Detroit, Mich.

Walter Frank, lawyer, New York City.

Harry R. Trusler, dean of the College of Law, University of Florida.

Douglas B. Maggs, professor of law, Duke University School of Law, and former Solicitor, United States Department of Labor.

George Burke, former general counsel, OPA, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Gerard Reilly, lawyer, and member National Labor Relations Board.

William H. Holly, United States district judge, Chicago.

Roscoe Pound, former dean, Harvard Law School.

Everett Fraser, dean of the Law School, University of Minnesota.

Monte M. Lemann, lawyer, New Orleans, La.

Albert J. Harno, dean of the College of Law, University of Illinois.

Lowell Turrentine, acting dean, School of Law, Stanford University, California.

Willard Hurst, professor of law, University of Wisconsin Law School.

Francis Swietlik, dean of Marquette University Law School, Milwaukee, Wis.

N. Ruth Wood, lawyer, St. Louis, Mo.

Henry B. Witham, dean of Law School, Indiana University.

C. M. Finfrock, dean of the School of Law, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

Sayre MacNeil, dean of the School of Law, Loyola University, Los Angeles.

Frank Donner, counsel for the CIO, Washington, D. C.

E. Merrick Dodd, professor, law, Harvard Law School.

Harry Shulman, professor of law, Yale University Law School.

The following statement on legal implications of proposed federal equal rights amendment has been endorsed by deans and professors of 21 leading law schools and by eminent attorneys, jurists, and constitutional lawyers, including former presidents of the American Bar Association and the general counsel for the two great labor organizations:

"The proposed amendment to the Constitution reads as follows:

" 'That equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

" 'This amendment shall take effect three years after the date of ratification.'

"If anything about this proposed amendment is clear, it is that it would transform every provision of law concerning women into a constitutional issue to be ultimately resolved by the Supreme Court of the United States. Every statutory and common law provision dealing with the manifold relation of women in society would be forced to run the gauntlet of attack on constitutional grounds. The range of such potential litigation is too great to be readily foreseen, but it would certainly embrace such diverse legal provisions as those relating to a widow's allowance, the obligation of family support and grounds for divorce, the age of majority and the right of annulment of marriages, and the maximum hours of labor for women in protected industries.

"Not only is the range of the amendment of indefinite extent, but, even more important, the fate of all this varied legislation would be left highly uncertain in the face of judicial review. Presumably, the amendment would set up a constitutional yardstick of absolute equality between men and women in all legal relationships. A more flexible view, permitting reasonable differentiation, can hardly be regarded as the object of the proposal, since the fourteenth amendment has long provided that no State shall deny to any person the equal protection of the laws, and that amendment permits reasonable classifications while prohibiting arbitrary legal discrimination. If it were intended to give the courts the authority to pass upon the propriety of distinctions, benefits, and duties as between men and women, no new guidance is given to the courts, and this entire subject, one of unusual complexity, would be left to the unpredictable judgments of courts in the form of Constitution decisions.

"Such decisions could not be changed by act of the legislature. Such a responsibility upon the courts would be doubtless as unwelcome to them as it would be inappropriate. As has been stated, however, the proposal evidently contemplates no flexibility in construction but, rather, a rule of rigid equality. This branch of the dilemma is as repelling as the other. It appears to be accepted by what is currently the most authoritative statement on this amendment—the report of the House Judiciary Committee (H. Rept. 907, 79th Cong., 1st sess., on H. J. Res. 49, dated July 12, 1945). The majority of the committee appears to recognize that under the amendment the many laws protecting the safety and welfare of women in industry would necessarily fall. The committee states: 'To say the least of the matter, many of the large organizations of women represented in hearings before the committee have expressed a sincere desire to waive the so-called preferential benefits now accorded to women by various laws so as to permit them to follow economic activities from which they are now excluded.'

"It would not be feasible to attempt to enumerate the wide variety of laws and rules of the common law which would fall under the impact of the amendment. Some conception of their scope may, however, be given by recalling the variety of relationships in which women stand in the community. These relationships may be summarized as (a) wage earner; (b) member of a family; (c) citizen; (d) individual. The law has recognized and attempted to deal with these relationships in a concrete way. Doubtless there are difficulties and anachronisms in the law which should be remedied. But the method adopted by the amendment is to ignore the basis for all that has been at the foundation of these measures, and to substitute an abstract rule of thumb. The practical effect of such a course can be suggested by referring briefly to each of the four categories mentioned above.

"(a) As wage earners: One of the most familiar forms of legislation is that which confers special protection on women in industry through the prohibition of employment in hazardous occupations and through regulation of night work and maximum hours of labor. Presumably the long struggle to place these protective measures on the statute books would be set at naught by the adoption of the amendment. Specifically, such statutes would apparently have to be held invalid as denying to women the equal right to work or as denying to men the equal right of protection under the law, for, it is be noted, the amendment requires equality of rights under the law, permitting either men or women to claim exact equality. How the problem would be met can only be left to conjecture. If a State legislature failed to revise the laws giving special protection to women in certain industries, it is left uncertain whether the entire pattern of industrial legislation would be torn apart by judicial decision or whether a court would undertake to legislate by raising the same protection for men. Surely the work of generations ought not to be left to this blind hazard.

"(b) As members of the family: Legislation in the latter part of the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century commonly known as married women's acts fairly universally in this country removed the disabilities which the common law had placed upon married women with respect to the right to sue and be sued, the right to own separate property, and the right to engage in commercial transactions. It is true that in

some States certain remnants of these disabilities have persisted. In a few States, for example, a married woman may not become a surety for her husband's debts on the theory that she might otherwise be imposed upon; if the reason which had led some States to retain this disability is not a sufficient one, the disability should, of course, be removed by further legislation.

"Similarly, in a few States a married woman's earnings, while belonging to her if they result from work outside the home, are held to enure to the husband if they are produced by working inside the home. Whether this is a fair adjustment in view of the husband's primary duty to support the family may be a fairly debatable question, which again can be resolved by further legislation if further reform is thought desirable. The proposed amendment would leave no room for legislative experiment along these lines, but would impose a requirement of absolute equality in the property rights of husband and wife.

"More seriously, it would presumably abolish the common rule whereby a husband has the primary duty of support toward his family, and whereby in many jurisdictions failure to render such support is a ground for separation or divorce. Precisely how the law of support is to be transformed as a result of the amendment is by no means clear. The concept of a primary duty does not lend itself to a rule of equality.

"The very least that can be said is that the complex and delicate field of marital relationships and divorce, into which Congress has sedulously declined to enter in the past, would now be gravely affected by the tangential force of a constitutional amendment, which would not even rest on a study of the manifold problems involved.

"It is worthy of note that the community property systems of eight Western States, which have evolved differently from the common law systems and which, in general, have recognized for a longer period the coordinate status of husband and wife, nevertheless contain inequalities which would doubtless be rendered invalid under the amendment. Thus, the husband is generally regarded as a kind of managing partner with special powers not possessed by the wife in respect of community property. Legislation would doubtless be required to produce conformity with the dictates of the amendment, and the ramifications of such legislation, particularly with respect to the special tax status of persons owning community property, cannot be predicted with certainty.

"(c) As citizens. While the suffrage amendment and other legislation have generally guaranteed to women an equality of civil and political rights, there remain some gaps which it is undoubtedly one purpose of the amendment to close. One of these is the distinction drawn in some States between the obligation of men and that of women for jury service. But whether the amendment would in fact require a change in this field is itself uncertain, since it is fairly arguable that jury service is not a right but a duty, and hence not within the scope of the amendment. Indeed, the amendment opens up a whole field of potential controversy turning on distinction between rights and duties.

"(d) As individuals. A common legislative difference in the treatment of men and women concerns the age of majority, which is generally lower for the latter. This difference has long been accepted as reflecting physical realities. Presumably the distinction would no longer be valid. But if a legislature failed to change the law, the outcome would present something of a legal puzzle. If the age of majority for men is 18 and women 16, it can hardly be foretold whether equality would require a lowering of the former or a raising of the latter. If the standard be that of the greater right, it could be asserted that the lower age for women provides a greater right to marry but at the same time a more restricted right to annul on the ground of minority. How a court would solve the conundrum is, like most problems created by the proposed amendment, a matter purely of speculation.

"The basic fallacy in the proposed amendment is that it attempts to deal with complicated and highly concrete problems arising out of a diversity of human relationships in terms of a single and simple abstraction. This abstraction is undoubtedly a worthy ideal for mobilizing legislative forces in order to remedy particular deficiencies in the law. But as a constitutional standard, it is hopelessly inept. That the proposed equal rights amendment would open up an era of regrettable consequences for the legal status of women in this country is highly probable. That it would open up a period of extreme confusion in constitutional law is a certainty.

"PAUL FREUND,

"Professor of Law, Harvard Law School."

Among the views expressed on the so-called equal rights amendment, the following are of special interest:

Joseph P. Chamberlain, professor of law, Columbia University Law School: "The passage of the amendment will create uncertainty and confusion in the wide fields of the law of property, of personal status, of marriage. It may destroy all labor legislation protecting women. Existing evils can and should be met by legislation aimed to cure them, such as the equal pay bill now before Congress. This proposal is a leap in the dark and has no place in the Constitution."

Silas H. Strawn, former president of the American Bar Association: "The amendment would inevitably invalidate many of the State laws protecting the American home and which protect women in industry."

E. Blythe Stason, dean of the University of Michigan Law School: "Physiological facts create the absolute necessity of numerous instances of differentiation in the law between the sexes affording protection for women not required for men. The proposed amendment would certainly throw the bulk of such legislation now on the statute books into a state of confusion and uncertainty, if it did not, in fact, result in complete elimination of such legislation from the statute books."

Judge William H. Holly, United States district court, Chicago: "If the proposed 'equal-rights amendment' to our Federal Constitution should be given the interpretation of which it seems capable, it would destroy the work of the years that have been given to secure the passage of the laws for the protection of women in industry. I fear that back of those who are openly advocating the amendment are the interests which desire to be rid of those laws."

Thurman Arnold, former associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia: "I am opposed to the so-called equal-rights amendment to the Constitution. There is no necessity for a constitutional amendment on this subject. The proposed amendment would confuse existing law to an intolerable extent and lead to endless litigation."

Judge Marion J. Harron, The Tax Court of the United States: "If adopted, the so-called equal rights amendment will cause chaos in 48 States in the status of all laws relating to women. It will wipe out many laws which have established standards for the employment of women in industry."

The following organizations oppose the equal rights amendment:

American Association of University Women; American Civil Liberties Union; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; American Communications Association; American Federation of Hosiery Workers; American Federation of Labor; American Federation of Teachers; American Federation of Women's Auxiliaries of Labor; Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers Union; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees; Congress of Industrial Organizations; Congress of Women's Auxiliaries of the CIO; Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers Union of America.

Girls' Friendly Society of the United States; Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada; International Coordinating Committee, UAW Auxiliary; International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; International Union United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO; League of Women Shoppers, Inc.; National Citizens Political Action Committee; National Consumers League; National Council of Catholic Women; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of Negro Women; National Farmers Union; National Federation of Post Office Clerks; National Federation of Settlements, Inc.; National League of Women Voters; National Maritime Union, Women's Auxiliary.

National Women's Trade Union League of America; Service Star Legion, Inc.; State, County, and Municipal Workers of America; the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations of the United States of America; Union for Democratic Action; United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO; United Federal Workers of America, CIO; United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union; United Office and Professional Workers of America, CIO; United Packinghouse Workers of America; United Rubber Workers of America, CIO; United Steel Workers of America; Women's National Homeopathic Medical Fraternity; National Committee To Defeat the Unequal Rights Amendment, Washington, D. C.

WARTIME PETROLEUM POLICY UNDER THE PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that the sixth series of the hearings held by the Senate Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources entitled "Wartime Petroleum Policy Under the Petroleum Administration for War," at which time the Petroleum Administrator for War, the Deputy Administrator, and several principal members of the staff of the Petroleum Administration for War presented detailed testimony, is being released today for publication by the United States Government Printing Office.

Listed among the subjects included in this historical record are the following:

(a) Mobilizing the Oil Forces.

(b) Wartime Petroleum Requirements and Programming to Meet Them.

(c) Wartime Petroleum Production in the United States.

(d) World Production of Crude Petroleum in Wartime.

(e) Petroleum Refining in the United States During the War.

(f) World-wide Refining in Wartime.

(g) Natural Gas and Its Products During the War.

(h) Wartime Distribution and Marketing of Petroleum Products.

(i) Wartime Foreign Petroleum Supply.

(j) Wartime Petroleum Supply and Transportation.

This volume also includes a statement submitted by the Director of the Naval Petroleum Reserves with respect to the Navy's views regarding a national oil policy.

The Superintendent of Documents advises me that this book, containing approximately 300 pages, together with numerous colorful charts, will be placed on sale at $1.25 per copy.

Inasmuch as the committee is furnished with a limited supply, it would be advisable, particularly for persons desiring extra copies, to place their order with the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., immediately.

CONTROL AND DEVELOPMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY—LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a short note written to me by the Secretary of the Navy bearing upon the passage in the Senate of the atomic energy bill, Senate bill 1717. I think it is particularly appropriate to insert this letter in the RECORD now, because there seems to be some misapprehension as to the Navy's attitude regarding the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, June 4, 1946.

Hon. BRIEN MCMAHON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BRIEN: Please accept my congratulations on the passage Saturday of your bill for the control and development of atomic energy. It is well drawn and accomplishes what I know you were after from the beginning—a proper balance between civilian and military control.

This is not merely my own view but that of the professional people in the naval service.

Your long and painstaking work has not been in vain.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

OVERSEAS OUTPOSTS—ADDRESS BY FOSTER HAILEY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Overseas Outposts," delivered by Foster Hailey, member of the editorial board of the New York Times, before the National Security Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which appears in the Appendix.]

LET'S FACE THE FACTS—ADDRESS BY EDWARD R. PLACE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Let's Face the Facts," delivered by Edward R. Place before the Washington (D. C.) Northeast Businessmen's Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIG BUSINESS, IT'S UP TO YOU—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Big Business, It's Up To You!", published in the Philadelphia Record of June 30, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

EUROPEAN EXPERIENCES WITH INFLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a portion of an editorial entitled "Folding Money," published in the New York Times of June 30, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed. The calendar under rule VIII is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Andrews	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hill	Overton
Barkley	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Huffman	Radcliffe
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Burch	Kilgore	Robertson
Bushfield	Knowland	Russell
Byrd	La Follette	Smith
Capehart	Langer	Stanfill
Capper	Lucas	Stewart
Carville	McCarran	Swift
Chavez	McClellan	Taft
Donnell	McKellar	Taylor
Downey	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tunnell
Fulbright	Maybank	Wagner
George	Mead	Walsh
Gerry	Millikin	Wherry
Gossett	Mitchell	White
Green	Moore	Wiley
Guffey	Morse	Willis
Gurney	Murdock	Wilson
Hart	Murray	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO and Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business, having been appointed to the Commission on the part of the Senate to participate in the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, having been appointed a member of the President's Evaluation Commission in connection with the test of atomic bombs on naval vessels at Bikini.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate, being a member of a committee designated by the Senate to attend the atomic bombing at Bikini.

The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business, being members of the Commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

CITATION CONFERRING DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS ON LESLIE L. BIFFLE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on Saturday afternoon, at its annual commencement exercises, Dartmouth College conferred the degree of doctor of laws upon our good friend and able and devoted Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Leslie L. Biffle. I should like to read the citation conferring the degree. It is as follows:

Leslie L. Biffle, you, by the common consent of those best qualified to know, are the outstanding, nonelective servant of the legislative process of our Federal Government. For more than 35 years you have been associated with legislative affairs in the Nation's Capital and since 1923, first as secretary to the majority in the United States Senate and more recently as Secretary of the Senate you have rendered public service the effectiveness and fidelity of which are counted great by those of contrary as well as like political persuasion. In tribute to you and in recognition of the place of such largely unheralded service in the working of American democracy, Dartmouth confers upon you the degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. President, I am sure that I voice the sentiments of every Member of the Senate in warmly congratulating Leslie Biffle upon the receipt of this richly deserved honor. I rejoice that this honor

has come to so loyal, so able, so faithful, so devoted, and so distinguished a servant of our country.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, after hearing the kind words just spoken of our Secretary, I am sure that all Senators on this side join with those on the other side in congratulating our good friend, Leslie. We also congratulate Dartmouth for having the good sense to confer this degree, doctor of laws, upon a real worker and a devoted public servant.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to add a word of compliment and praise to what has been said by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] with respect to the recognition recently given Mr. Biffle, Secretary of the Senate, by Dartmouth College. Mr. Biffle is one of the most efficient and capable men I have ever known. With it all he is painstaking and courteous to each and every Member of this body, whether he be on the Democratic or on the Republican side of the aisle. I feel sure he has the respect and the affection of every Member of this body. I believe he is one of the few men I have ever known concerning whom those who know him have only words of praise to utter.

Leslie Biffle is a man of splendid intellect. He has unlimited energy. The honor which has been paid him by the great Dartmouth College is certainly highly deserved and most fitting.

I join the other Senators in saying that I am extremely happy that our Secretary, the kind, capable, courteous, upstanding young man, Leslie Biffle, has had bestowed upon him the great honor of which we were just informed by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I take occasion to express my great pleasure on learning that Dartmouth College, of New Hampshire, has seen fit to honor Mr. Biffle, a distinguished son of Arkansas, by conferring on him the degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. Biffle has served as the Secretary of the Senate for a substantial time, and was associated with the Senate for many years before his elevation to his present office. He is amazingly alert mentally, he is indefatigable in the performance of his duties, is courteous always, is considerate, and he has a profound and intimate knowledge of the practices of both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. President, I am personally greatly indebted to Mr. Biffle for many courtesies, and I wish to express satisfaction that this New England college has seen fit to bestow its highest honor upon a worthy son of Arkansas. I extend to him my good wishes and my warmest congratulations.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1850) to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national defense health and welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What is the present situation in the Senate? Has the Senate completed the morning hour?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has completed the morning hour, and, by unanimous consent, consideration of the calendar was dispensed with.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Do I understand, then, that the unfinished business before the Senate is the consideration of Senate bill 1850?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. The unfinished business will not be laid before the Senate until the Senate reconvenes, after returning from the Hall of the House of Representatives. The Senator can move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate if he wishes to do so.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, on Saturday the Senate passed the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency. At that time I had received a telegram from Hon. Millard F. Caldwell, Governor of Florida, who, up to 4 years ago had for a period of 3 or 4 years been a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram may be printed in the RECORD at this point so that Senators may know the attitude of at least one governor on the question of the return of the employment service to the States. The governors have to look into these matters, shoulder these problems, and determine what they think is best to be done.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., *June 26, 1946.*

Hon. CHARLES O. ANDREWS,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

Am informed that Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill passed the House providing return of employment service to States as of October 1, 1946, without Federal regulation and is now pending in Senate with action contemplated this week. Am extremely interested in early return of service unemcumbered with Federal regulations not in existence at time employment service loaned to Government at commencement of war. Your assistance in passage of appropriation bill with above provisions intact will be appreciated.

MILLARD F. CALDWELL,
Governor.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENTS AND THE JUDICIARY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 13, 54, 77 and 78.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 43, 45, 48, 49, 53, 55, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 75, 79, and 80, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$23,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,915,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,219,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,360,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,996,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,100,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That pursuant to section 204 of Public Law 334, Seventy-ninth Congress, automobiles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be exchanged or sold and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales applied to replacement of an equal number of automobiles of the same general type and class"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$25,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$12,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows ": *Provided*, That on and after October 1, 1946, all functions necessary to the compilation of foreign trade statistics shall be performed in New York, New York: *Provided, further*, That not to exceed $950,000 shall be expended for this purpose"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$19,622,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$875,000, together with not to exceed $120,000 of the unexpended balance of this appropriation for the fiscal year 1946"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Preliminary planning and surveys, Federal Airport Act: For all expenses necessary for preliminary planning and surveys required for the initiation of the Federal-aid airport program as authorized in section 5 (a) of the Federal Airport Act, approved May 13, 1946 (Public Law 377), including personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase (not to exceed nineteen), repair, and operation of passenger automobiles; $2,975,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, of which amount not to exceed $15,000 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Maintenance and operation of aircraft, Office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics,' to provide for the maintenance and operation of aircraft, and $5,000 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Printing and binding, Department of Commerce.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of May 13, 1946 (except section 5 (a)), $45,000,000, to be available until June 30, 1953, of which $43,260,000 shall be for projects in the States in accordance with sections 5 (b) and 6 of said Act, and $1,740,000 shall be for projects in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in accordance with section 5 (c): *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,250,000 of the foregoing amounts shall be available for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase (not to exceed eighty-three), repair, and operation of passenger automobiles; of which $2,250,000 not to exceed $25,000 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Maintenance and operation of aircraft, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics', to provide for the maintenance and operation of aircraft, and $30,000 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Printing and binding, Department of Commerce.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end of the matter so restored and, before the period, insert: "; and appropriations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Weather Bureau shall be available in an amount not to exceed $20,000 for furnishing food, clothing, medicines, and other supplies for the temporary relief of distressed persons in remote localities, reimbursement for such relief to be in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 8, 26, 39, 40, 46, 50, 56, 57, 58, 65, 73, 74, and 81.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
BUTLER B. HARE,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
KARL STEFAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to speak very briefly on the conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the House of Representatives has asked that we be in the House Chamber at not later than a quarter to 12, if the conference report is to take any time it had better be passed over until we reconvene.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I will agree to confine myself to less than 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I raised no serious opposition to this bill while it was before the Senate. The House appropriated approximately $10,000,000 for the State Department's international short-wave broadcasting service. The Senate increased that amount from $10,000,000 to $19,000,000.

There is a serious question as to whether there is any legal authority whatsoever for what the State Department is doing. In my own opinion, for whatever it may be worth, there is no substantive law upon which the action of the House, the action of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, or the action of the Senate itself can possibly be justified.

Passing by this question, I wish to have it known that I think the whole procedure is utterly unwise. I think it gives promise of great difficulties and troubles for us if we turn the State Department loose to broadcast to the world the material which the State Department has indicated it is to make known to the world. I have before me a statement made by a representative of the Department who has urged this appropriation. What is the Department proposing to do? Let me read two paragraphs from the statement of Mr. William Benton, who is to have charge of this work:

> Hardly a day passes without some important decision or action being taken by Americans here or in London, Paris, Tokyo, Nanking, or elsewhere—and each individual action poses a problem in world information. Our actions and attitude toward Spain, the Balkan countries, Germany, Palestine, Japan, China, Russia, Indonesia, Siam, Iceland, and a host of other countries need to be known by the people of those and other countries not only in terms of current decisions, but in terms of reasons for them.

In further explanation of this program of the State Department it is stated:

> A strike in coal mines, an increase in living costs, a tornado in Kansas, a decrease in locomotive production, the color of the bread we eat—all have a direct impact on the economic and living conditions of other peoples.

It is perfectly obvious that it is the purpose of this agency of the State Department to present to the peoples of all the various nations such questions arising in the countries to which I have referred. It is desired to tell the people of the world about a Kansas cyclone, the color of the bread we eat, and various matters of one sort and another.

This is even more significant. Speaking of Liberia, the statement contains this language:

> The department considers this mission—

That is, the transmission of news to Liberia—

> essential to the success of economic progress in Liberia. A broad program of political, social, and economic reform in Liberia is being supported by this Government, and this project is considered as of far-reaching importance to both governments.

It is perfectly clear that the State Department is to undertake to instruct the world with respect to social, economic, political, and governmental matters. I merely wish to say that we are asking for trouble all over the world, because no nation anywhere, to which the United States may send this information, will welcome within its borders the official pronouncements of the State Department of the United States as to social, political, economic, and governmental problems. I can see nothing but trouble. I can see nothing but friction. I can see nothing but resentment resulting from this effort of the State Depart-

ment. I wish to have it known that I am definitely and affirmatively against it, and I wish I might speak at length on the subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6056, which was read as follows:

In the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 29, 1946.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 26, 39, 40, 56, 58, 65, 73, and 81 to the bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of $7,000,000 named in said amendment insert "$6,000,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of $2,874,000 named in said amendment, insert "$2,500,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "That no funds in this paragraph shall be expended for the pay of any employee of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the maintenance of more than one major parts warehouse, or for the repair or overhaul of aircraft when such repair or overhaul cannot be performed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration through exchange or substitution of parts or materials maintained by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the cost of labor, parts, and materials not maintained in stock would be in excess of $200: *Provided further*, That all repair and overhaul of aircraft of the Civil Aeronautics Administration which cannot be performed within the foregoing limitation shall be done on contract after submission of bids";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "(not to exceed $4,500,000, $500,000 of which is to be used at the seat of government for aids and services to small business)"; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of $2,000,000 named in said amendment insert: "$1,750,000."

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 46, 50, 57, and 74.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 152, I move that the Senate proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives; and the Senate reassemble upon the call of the Chair immediately following the ceremonies in the House Chamber.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate, headed by its Secretary, its Sergeant at Arms, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 12 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF OPA BILL—ADDRESSES BY THE PRESIDENT AND SENATOR TAFT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the radio address delivered by the President on last Saturday evening, following his veto of the OPA bill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow countrymen, the crucial situation which confronts our country requires that I report to the people this evening.

Today I returned to the Congress without my approval the extension of the price control law which it presented to me for my signature.

I returned it with a long message stating my reasons. I hope that you will all read that message in your newspapers.

I assure you, my fellow countrymen, that before I vetoed this bill I gave the subject long days and nights of consideration. I consulted with practically every top official in the Government. Either personally or through representatives I obtained the views of people in agriculture, industry, and labor, as well as many others.

You have all heard a great deal about inflation. Its seriousness cannot be overestimated. It would affect every individual in our country. Inflation would cause an increase in the price of every article you buy. As prices soared with inflation, your money would buy fewer and fewer of the necessities of life. Your savings, your insurance, your war bonds—all would decrease in value.

For 5 years we have proved to this country and to the world that inflation can be prevented. Those of you who remember the First World War will recall the wild inflation and the collapse that followed. You will remember how farmers were ruined, how businessmen went bankrupt, how wage earners suffered.

This time we have succeeded in preventing such a calamity. We have done this largely through price control. It was not done by a miracle. It was done because the American people had the wisdom and the courage and the restraint to know that they had to submit to restrictions and controls or be overcome by the force of inflation. We must continue to prevent inflation. This is as important now and in the months to come as it was during the war. Time and again I have stated and restated this proposition.

I wanted to sign a price-control bill. I gave this bill long and careful study. I came to the conclusion that the bill which the Congress sent me was no price-control bill at all. It gave you no protection against higher and higher prices.

Having reached that conclusion I was faced with these alternatives. I could sign the bill on the plea which had been made to me that for the immediate present at least, it might be a little better than nothing. Or I could disapprove the bill, and call upon the Congress to give the American people a real, workable, price-control law.

If I had taken the first course and signed the bill I would have encouraged the false impression that you were going to be protected for the next year against excessive price increases. But, sooner or later, all of you would have awakened to a bitter realization of the truth.

You would have soon begun to see thousands and thousands of price increases, adding billions and billions of dollars to our cost of living. It is hard to see how people could continue to pay higher and higher prices without requiring higher wages or salaries. The tremendous advances that we have made toward the settlement of labor-management disputes over wages would have been wiped out. The mad chase to inflation would soon have been under way.

I could not permit that to happen.

I took the second alternative, knowing full well all the dangers which would come with it. I knew that there was danger that the Congress might not pass a resolution which would give us some kind of protection after midnight tomorrow, when the present price-control law ends. I knew, therefore, that it was very possible that for a few days at least we might be without any price-control law.

I could not bring myself to believe, however, that the Representatives of the American people—your Senators and Representatives in the Congress, would permit such a condition to continue long. And I was sure that when this issue was presented to the American people and to the Congress there could be only one answer. That answer is that the Congress should immediately pass a resolution continuing present price and rent controls until the Congress can pass a workable bill.

It would have been much easier for me to sign this bill. But the American people would have soon realized that real price control was at an end in spite of the law. If I had signed the bill the people would have seen their prices going up, day by day. You would have realized soon that the bill which had been passed and called a price-control law was not price control at all.

What I have done is to call a spade a spade. I must now rely upon the American people and upon a patriotic and cooperative Congress to protect us all from the great pressures now upon us, leading us to disastrous inflation unless we have the means to resist them.

I know how weary you all are of these restrictions and controls. I am also weary of them. I spend a good deal of my time listening to complaints. I know how eager everyone of you is for the day when you can run your own affairs in your own way as you did before the war. I know, therefore, how strong the temptation is to remove too quickly the safeguards which we have built up for ourselves and our children.

The bill which the Congress sent me yielded to that temptation.

It is certainly most unfortunate that the Congress kept delaying and delaying action on this bill for so many months when they knew that the price-control law was going to expire tomorrow.

I am sure that all of you know of the efforts which I made to get the Congress to

act on a price-control extension far in advance of the date when the old law was going to expire. As far back as September, last year, in a message to the Congress, I urged it to pass an extension of the price control act at an early date.

I did not rest with that message of last September. In later communications to the Congress I repeated my request four times to extend price control. In addition to these direct communications, I stated publicly many times how important it was to our safety that a price-control extension bill should be passed right away.

"IMPOSSIBLE" BILL PASSED

But I could not persuade the Congress to act. Instead, just 2 days before the expiration of all price control, this impossible bill was sent to me.

In my veto message to the Congress which I sent this morning I discussed the various provisions of the bill.

I do not have time this evening to comment on all the provisions of the bill. There are many objections to it, but my most fundamental objection is to the price-raising amendment for manufacturers which was introduced by Senator TAFT.

Under this amendment there would be thousands of needless price increases amounting to many billions of dollars. The Taft amendment provides that the manufacturer shall receive for each article the profit which he made on that article in 1941 and that he may add to the 1941 selling price all increases in cost which have occurred since that time. In 1941 the manufacturer received a much greater profit out of each dollar of sales than at any time in the five preceding years or in any of the five following wartime years. In fact, profit margins in 1941 were 50 percent greater than in the banner year 1929.

Volume of sales is much greater today than in 1941, so that manufacturers would have received a bonanza. In addition, Senator TAFT'S fellow Republicans, Senator WHERRY and Representative CRAWFORD, put amendments into the bill which made sure that not only would the manufacturers' price increases be borne by the public but that such increases would be pyramided by generous wholesalers' and retailers' mark-ups.

As you sit in your homes this evening your interest in this bill and my interest in this bill are exactly the same. The question is: What effect would this bill have had on you—the people of our country.

I believe in the profit system and desire that profits should be ample to provide the incentive for full production. The Taft amendment, however, provides for higher prices and higher profits even where production is already going at full blast and profits are wholly satisfactory.

We have been through five difficult years. We are looking forward to buying the things we need. Let us examine this problem together.

AUTO-PRICE EFFECT STRESSED

Do you need a new low-priced automobile? If so, what effect would the Taft amendment have had on the price of your new car? It would have increased immediately the prices of the popular makes of automobiles by two hundred and twenty-five to two hundred and fifty dollars per car.

Are you a veteran planning to build a home for yourself and family? The Taft amendment would have added immediately a minimum of 20 percent to the cost of your building materials. The program recently approved by the Congress to provide veterans' housing at reasonable cost would have been completely disrupted by this Taft amendment.

Are you a housewife who has been waiting for years for that new washing machine or refrigerator? The Taft amendment would have made it cost one-third more right away.

Are you faced with the responsibility of clothing your family? Under the Taft and other amendments the already high clothing prices would have been increased 15 percent right away. For clothing alone the American people would have paid at least $3,000,000,000 more a year.

Are you in a business in which you need to buy steel? The price of steel would have gone up under the Taft amendment between $4 and $8 per ton right away.

Are you a farmer? Under this bill the price of farm machinery would have gone up 13 percent right away.

Those are only a few examples of the first round of increases the Taft amendment would bring. But that is only the beginning. Price increases in one industry are cost increases in another. By the time, for example, that the automobile industry had got its Taft increase based on present costs, it would be hit by the Taft increases in steel, tires, safety glass, and other materials. So automobiles would go up still more.

In this way increase would follow increase. The bill had no stopping place in it.

"CONSUMER WOULD PAY"

In addition, these increases would have been passed right down the line. You, the consumer, would pay it all.

All of us agree that what this country needs is production. Production brings jobs, good wages, moderate prices. Perhaps the most vicious effect of the Taft amendment would be to slow up production.

The only possible justification urged for all of these Taft price increases is the claim that they are necessary to encourage production. Even if they did encourage production, that would still be a terrific price to pay for that increased production—a price measured in suffering and distress among people of moderate and low incomes.

The fact is, however, that production would not be stimulated by the Taft amendment, but would be greatly impeded. Nobody wants to sell his goods this week if he can get a better price for them next week. This is no mere theory. You have seen it working day after day for the last month or so, as people began to believe that price control might soon come to an end.

CATTLE AND HOGS "HELD BACK"

People who had cattle and hogs to sell for slaughter for food have decided to hold them for higher prices. People who had clothing for sale have decided to do the same thing. So have people with innumerable other commodities which we all need so badly now.

Incidentally, I have asked the Attorney General to make an investigation of some of the factors involved in our present shortages to determine whether anyone is criminally responsible for them and to place the responsibility where it belongs.

These instances of withholding goods from the consumer would be multiplied thousands of times under the Taft amendment; production and deliveries would be slowed down waiting for price increases. This would create bottlenecks of essential materials and essential parts which would bring production lines to a halt. By the time they started up again there would be new applications for price increases and additional waiting for greater profits.

Labor would be penalized by loss of employment. Consumers would be penalized by lack of goods and ever-rising prices. Farmers would be penalized by higher prices for what they buy and reduced markets for the things they sell.

It is a cruel jest to say that the Taft amendment would aid production. As I also pointed out this morning in my veto message, the Taft amendment would wholly destroy our program of wage stabilization which has been built up since VJ-day. It would destroy the usefulness of the Wage Stabilization Board.

WARNS OF "INEVITABLE SPIRAL"

The result would be the beginning of an inevitable spiral of uncontrolled inflation—a race between rising wages and rising prices. Far-sighted leaders of both labor and management know that nothing can be gained—and everything lost—by simply letting prices and wages chase each other.

Despite the total impossibility of stabilizing other prices under this bill, I would have hesitated to disapprove it if I had thought it gave some real protection against soaring food prices and rents. We have learned, however, that higher prices for the things that farmers and landlords buy would inevitably force up food prices and rents.

In both instances, serious increases would be forced upon us by the hard facts of business and economics.

I realize that the great majority of our people do not have the facts and figures that must be considered in order to know what a bill like this would do. That is why I am speaking to you this evening. You are entitled to have the facts before you.

I want to make clear that my decision to veto this bill does not mean any lack of appreciation of the sincere and tireless efforts of the leaders and many other Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives to pass a workable price control bill. I know that many Members of both Houses who voted for the bill which was sent to me did so with regret and only because they had, at that time, no opportunity to vote for a good bill. Now every Member has a clear-cut opportunity to show whether or not he wants effective price controls.

PLAN SUGGESTED TO CONGRESS

I have submitted to the Congress in my veto message a plan for price control legislation for the comparatively short period of time that it is still needed. The will of the people is still the supreme law of our land. Your determination to retain price controls and so prevent inflation must be made known to the Congress. The Congress is the only branch of our Government which has the power to pass a law providing for proper price control.

Now because of congressional delay we are faced with a brief period in which legal restraints on price increases will be lacking. I have urged the Congress to act immediately and to adopt the kind of bill which can be made to work.

But, in the event of delay, I know that the United States can depend upon the patriotism and good sense of its citizens. Therefore, I call upon every businessman, every producer, and every landlord to adhere to existing regulations, even though for a short period they may not have the effect of law. It would be contrary to their own interest to embark upon a reckless period of inflation. It is to their own interest to exercise self-restraint until some action can be obtained from the Congress.

I also request every employee of the OPA to stay at his battle station. The fight is not over. I am counting on all employees of the OPA to continue to serve in the future as they have in the past and to finish the job. I urge these loyal civil servants and the thousands of volunteers who are giving their time to make price control a success to see this fight through.

And, finally, my fellow citizens, I say to you that we as a Nation have it within our

hands to make this postwar period an era of the greatest opportunity and prosperity in our Nation's history. But if short-sightedness and impatience, if partisanship and greed are allowed to triumph over the efforts to maintain economic stability, this grand opportunity will have been sacrificed.

That must not happen.

With your help and understanding it will not happen.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the original manuscript used by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in his radio address last evening on the subject of the veto by the President of the OPA bill. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROADCAST OF ROBERT A. TAFT, MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, SUNDAY, JUNE 30, 1946

Yesterday President Truman vetoed the bill to extend his own power to fix prices and rents, so that OPA expires at midnight tonight. Last night he defended his curious action by what amounted to a long personal attack on me, because I had some part in drafting one of the various amendments to the bill. His whole broadcast had the aspect of a partisan political attack and apparently was drafted by the Office of Price Administration, the chief of which is Mr. Paul Porter who was the publicity chief for the Democratic National Committee in the last campaign.

Mr. Truman omitted to state that this bill was adopted by a Democratic Congress. There are 236 Democrats to 190 Republicans in the House of Representatives, and 56 Democrats to 40 Republicans in the Senate. He was strongly urged to sign the bill by the Democratic Speaker of the House, the Democratic floor leader of the House, the Democratic leader of the Senate, and the Democratic President pro tempore of the Senate. He disregarded their advice and followed the advice of Chester Bowles and the Political Action Committee. The personal attack on me is merely a smoke screen to conceal the real political reasons behind his action.

As a matter of fact, I have always supported price control as essential in the war period. I believe we would be better off to continue it for 6 months longer, although like every other person who believes in the American system, I think it should be ended at the earliest possible moment. I assisted in drafting the original Price Control Act and all the amendments.

I find a letter in my files from this same Chester Bowles, dated June 27, 1944, after a bitter fight on extension very much like the present one, in which he said, in part:

"DEAR BOB: I want to thank you for your courteous, friendly, and intelligent efforts to work out the Stabilization Extension Act. I know how hard it was and the amount of patience it required."

Only last week I argued strenuously for the passage of this bill against those who desired to end price control altogether, or at least end it with reference to meats, dairy products, and poultry.

No Price Control Act is an easy measure to pass through Congress, and I doubt whether any extension can now be put through again. The cross currents of economic interest from different sections of the country are almost impossible to reconcile. The vetoed bill was only put through Congress without specific decontrol of many important foods by the adroit management of Senator BARKLEY. A great majority of the people west of the Mississippi desire the immediate termination of price control, and so do their representatives in Congress. Many others east of the Mississippi are disgusted with the complete breakdown of OPA in meat control, lumber control, and a number of other vital commodities. They point to empty shelves, bread lines, butter lines, deserted production lines, and black markets and argue that anything is better than the kind of price control we have.

My own position and that of Congress is perfectly logical. We think the time has not quite come to take off basic price controls, but we do think the administration of OPA must be improved. The bill provides for the gradual liquidation of OPA over the next 12 months, the ending of subsidies on April 1, 1947, and reasonable pricing in the interval so that we can stimulate production and get rid of all the shortages and injustices that exist today.

The PAC really want price control continued indefinitely. It is in line with their idea of the totalitarian state. Apparently, the President now agrees with their philosophy. He objects in his message to the provision that there shall be decontrol of any commodity when the supply equals the demand. If we can't get rid of price control when a sufficient supply is produced, will we ever get rid of it? He wants subsidies continued until July 1, 1947. It would then be easier to renew them again at that time. He uses the price admendment as a whipping post, but he is really demanding the indefinite continuation of the whole outfit and every single power which he now has. He does not, apparently, accept in good faith the policy which is universally accepted in Congress by all parties and stated in the bill that "the general control of prices and the use of subsidy powers shall be terminated as rapidly as possible."

The President's attack on the amendment which I offered in the Senate is utterly unfair. All that the Taft amendment provides is that producers, including farmers, mining concerns, and manufacturers, shall be allowed to charge prices which reflect the increased cost of labor and material which they now have to pay. This is done by permitting them to charge for each major product a price equal to their 1941 prices plus the average increase in the cost of labor, materials, et cetera since 1911. After all, this is peacetime again. Why shouldn't the producer be placed in the same position he was in before the war? No producer is guaranteed any profit. There is no question of a freeze any more, because the OPA itself has put over 500 price increases into effect since March 1. All we want to prevent during the next 6 months are the speculative rises in price over and above the increase in costs. The danger I am concerned about is taking the roof off, as the President does by his veto. But how can anyone hope to get production if we don't allow the producers to charge enough for their products to pay for the increased cost of labor and material? Even the President admits in his message that this principle has a superficial reasonableness. There is nothing superficial about it except to the master minds among the New Deal economists at the OPA.

As a matter of fact, there is nothing new in the principle. The original Price Control Act of 1942 expressly provided that the Administrator should start with the prices prevailing between October 1 and October 15, 1941, and should make adjustments for general increases in costs of production, distribution and transportation, among other factors. The language was pretty general, and the OPA never paid any attention to it. Then, in 1944, we passed a law which expressly provided that "modification shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured from any agricultural commodity" (and that means nearly all food and clothing) "in any case where, by reason of increased labor or other costs incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs." As usual the OPA didn't pay much attention to Congress, but they did use almost exactly the formula of the Taft amendment in pricing canned vegetables in 1944 and 1945. Furthermore, the so-called Bankhead amendment for several years has compelled them to follow more or less the same formula as to all cotton textiles.

In many fields, however, the OPA has by express regulation, forced manufacturers to sell some products at cost or at a loss, because some members of the industry were making profits on other products. Of course, nobody makes the things which have to be sold at a loss. This is the reason for the shortage of butter, of many standard types of clothing, of building materials and many other articles. The President's figures on possible increases are wild guesses and for the most part dead wrong. I was called today by the Association of Washing Machine Manufacturers who said that the President's estimate of one-third more for washing machines was a gross exaggeration, that the manufacturers hoped there would be no price increase at all, even if price ceilings were removed entirely. Any steel increase would be less than half that stated by the President. You can judge from this how accurate his other figures are. Any increase in manufactured goods brought about by the Taft amendment would be of minor importance compared with the importance of actually being able to buy them.

Furthermore, the President deliberately misrepresented the effect of my amendment when he said six times that price increases would result immediately or right away. Under the amendment no increase can occur until the Industry Advisory Committee has presented complete figures to prove its case. This would take from 30 to 60 days. Then the Price Administrator is given 60 days in which to examine the figures and fix the amount of the increase. The burden of proof is on the industry. If the Administrator refuses to admit any increase, there is an appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals, which would take several months more. Long before that, I hope we would be well on the way to the end of all price control. I hope the Administrator would act more promptly, but there is nothing immediate about it. Whereas the President's veto removes all controls of every kind at midnight tonight.

It is significant that the President admits that the Taft amendment would have no direct effect on food or rents. He argues that because other prices would go up food and rents would be bound to rise. I admit that ultimately there would be some effect if other prices rise, but the effect would be about one-tenth of the effect on food and rents of the wage increases already stimulated by the President. Of course, it was impossible to keep price control much longer after the President removed all wage control on VJ-day. Of course, an increase of about $10,000,000,000 in wages and salaries will produce billions of dollars of increase in prices. But the ultimate and unavoidable break-down of price control will result directly from the President's policy, not from act of Congress—certainly not from the minor requirement that manufacturers be allowed to reflect their increased costs in prices.

In short, in the act passed by Congress, the President received complete power to prevent

speculation and speculative increases in price and all increases in rents. We merely reaffirm more vigorously the original principles of the Price Control Act to secure production, yet the President has chosen to plunge the economy of this country into chaos. In such a controversial field where feelings already run high, we cannot hope that the Senate will act without debate, and it should not do so, because the issues to be settled are vital to the welfare of the country. I hope price control will be continued, and I should vote to reenact the bill the President has vetoed, but I am afraid the bill which he will get the next time, if he gets any, may go further toward decontrol than the one he has vetoed. In the meantime there are no price controls. No businessman knows what he should do or what price he should charge. I hope that everyone will exercise the reasonable restraint which Americans always exhibit in a crisis.

The President had a choice between a reasonable transition from price control back to the free enterprise system, on the one hand, and the ending of all OPA powers by veto, on the other. He chose to take all the chances of chaos, followed by speculative rises in price. He chose this course, having been warned by his own Democratic leaders of the necessary result of his policy. He has repudiated their leadership and assumed to write a law for Congress, although the Constitution of the United States gives the Congress power to state the conditions on which price control shall be continued.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1850) to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had intended to let the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] proceed with the opening statement and explanation of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the importance of this bill and the Senator's explanation of it, we should have a quorum. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Andrews	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hill	Overton
Barkley	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Huffman	Radcliffe
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Burch	Kilgore	Robertson
Bushfield	Knowland	Russell
Byrd	La Follette	Smith
Capehart	Langer	Stanfill
Capper	Lucas	Stewart
Carville	McCarran	Swift
Chavez	McClellan	Taft
Donnell	McKellar	Taylor
Downey	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tunnell
Fulbright	Maybank	Wagner
George	Mead	Walsh
Gerry	Millikin	Wherry
Gossett	Mitchell	White
Green	Moore	Wiley
Guffey	Morse	Willis
Gurney	Murdock	Wilson
Hart	Murray	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, Senate bill 1850, commonly called the scientific research bill, is now pending before the Senate.

I wish to invite attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that the bill has received the endorsement of James B. Conant, president, American Association for the Advancement of Science, president, Harvard University; George F. Zook, president, American Council on Education; Morris Fishbein, editor, Journal of the American Medical Association; Thomas P. Cooper, president, Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, dean, College of Agriculture, University of Kentucky; Isaiah Bowman, chairman, Committee Supporting the Bush Report, president, Johns Hopkins University; Boris Bakhmeteff, chairman of panel on science legislation, Engineers Joint Council for American Institute of Chemical Engineers, American Institute of Electrical Engineers, American Society of Civil Engineers, and American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers; Arthur A. Hauck, president, National Association of State Universities, president, University of Maine; Willard A. Givens, executive secretary, National Education Association; and Harlow Shapley, president, Scientific Research Society of America, and cochairman, Committee for a National Science Foundation.

These men, on behalf of their respective organizations, and after those organizations had held executive committee meetings, unanimously endorsed the pending bill. Their executive committees held conferences on the matter and thereafter, the endorsements were given. I say advisedly that this was done after the conferences were held, because since the joint endorsements were given I have received numerous telegrams from heads of various smaller groups within those organizations, one of which I should like to read. It is directed to me, and states:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 26, 1946.*

Hon. Senator HARLEY KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Referring to the joint statement respecting legislative bill, S. 1850, signed by Dr. Isaiah Bowman and other scientists and which Dr. Boris Bakhmeteff is signing as chairman of Engineers' Joint Councils Panel on Scientific Research Legislation: I wish to advise that this statement reaffirms the views of engineers' joint council respecting S. 1850 and the engineers' joint council maintains its attitude that passage of S. 1850 is urgent and of paramount national importance.

JAMES E. JAGGER,
Secretary, Engineers' Joint Council.

Mr. President, that is a sample of numerous telegrams which I have received, showing that the endorsements to which I have referred are not merely endorsements of individual heads of organizations, but that they are endorsements of the organizations themselves.

I have had the privilege within the past 12 months of being present at numerous of our great State universities, and other educational institutions, at all of which I have spoken personally with members of the faculty, and especially the members of the scientific groups of the faculties. They have all endorsed the principles embraced in the bill, and have stated that they would like to see the bill enacted into law in the form in which it is now before the Senate.

Mr. President, the bill is the outgrowth of more than 4 years of work. It started in the early part of the war when there was the utmost need for research. The research work then undertaken culminated in the atomic bomb, the proximity fuse, and various other inventions. However, in the use of those inventions, and in the research which was carried on in connection with them, we were merely applying the basic studies which had been made, some of them even prior to World War I, which were carried on by our laboratories and the scientists in our universities and elsewhere all over the world. All we did during the last war was to exhaust the reservoir which had been built up. If we will accept the word of many of the men who fought in the Pacific and in other places, we will know that many of the results of our research did not reach them until too late to be of the greatest effect. At that time we had no central body capable of carrying on and coordinating the necessary work involved.

During the Civil War there was created a national organization known as the National Academy of Sciences. As will be recalled, the Civil War was fought with probably a minimum of scientific effort on both sides. It is true that the ironclad ship came out of the Civil War. It is also true that, to some extent, balloons were used for observation purposes. But, in the main, the war was a rehash of the old war of man against man, with very little scientific ruffles added thereto. The Spanish-American War was a rehash of the same situation.

World War I eventually started and we had to create a new scientific organization in order to take care of this country's cause, and do the work which was originally outlined to be done by the National Academy of Sciences. The great difficulty with the National Academy of Sciences was, first, that it had no appropriations; second, it grew to be an honorary group, and, shall I say, self-perpetuating, because its membership, though appointed, had to be composed of men selected from the National Academy itself to replace those who had passed out of the Academy by reason of death or other causes. The work which was performed by the members was purely voluntary and—I say this in no derogation of the Academy—was naturally slow and somewhat cumbersome. So we created a scientific organization for World War I which was really the first scientifically waged war. Other nations built up scientific organizations. Germany had them. England attempted to build up one, and eventually even Russia started to build up a national defense scientific organization. None of those countries realized that the greatest defense of a nation lies in the welfare of the people of

the nation. I care not how many generals and admirals the Nation may have; we cannot have an Army or Navy without men—seamen, privates, sergeants, warrant officers, and others. The strength of a nation lies in its manpower, and its will to accomplish the objective set forth by the nation. Therefore, one of the greatest defense measures which can be advanced is that of building up a strong manpower with the will to defend the country's institutions.

Finally there came World War II. On that occasion we set up several scientific agencies, the chief of which was the Office of Scientific Research and Development. In each case, however, all the scientific agencies were merely using the basic information which had been developed during time of peace.

Mr. President, allow me to suggest that we are going to hear a great deal about industry and its scientific research. Industry—I do not blame it—must look to returns in connection with scientific research from the sale of the results of such research. That naturally precludes many basic research problems which are taken up only by public institutions such as universities, colleges, and government laboratories of various types.

A private industry can only justify itself to its stockholders when it can show results from the research work it conducts. Therefore we have become the greatest nation in the world in applied research, which is the research relating to things which can be sold, but we have become a somewhat backward nation in the case of basic research. We have listened to the siren song, "Business will take care of this." We listened to that siren song in various other forms, and it led us to destruction in basic research lines.

It is my firm conviction that we can no longer afford to delay action on a national science program. The strength of a nation, for peace as well as for war, depends today as never before on the strength of its scientific resources. During the titanic struggle of the past few years, we learned well the lesson that modern warfare is a battle waged in the laboratory as well as in the field. Tanks cannot be met with bare hands; battleships and carriers and submarines cannot be met with rowboats; the atomic bomb cannot be met without scientific research, and, so far, the scientists say that they have not found any way to meet it. We must keep abreast and ahead of all such developments, and, above all, we must remember that it is impossible to have a nation without people. Some seem to think that this Nation of ours is a collection of corporations; some seem to think that it is merely an area of land; some seem to think that it is a group of farmers; some seem to think it is a collection of coal mines; but let me tell you, Mr. President, this Nation of ours is a collection of free individuals and their welfare is of paramount importance to the welfare of the Nation as a whole, because a nation which does not have strong individuals, healthy, well-nourished individual citizens, with something to look forward to, is a very poor nation.

We also know that in time of peace, science presents endless possibilities for advancing the health and welfare of our people. I call attention to the fact that penicillin was discovered 29 years ago, but no practical application was made of it because nobody had the financial backing to go ahead with it, until the war made something of that kind imperative. We have built up resistance to the sulfa drugs to such an extent that we had to have something else to go along with them. Not only must we have adequate research related to military defense, but we must assure a strong, healthy growth of scientific knowledge in all areas, particularly in fundamental research, which has too much been neglected in the United States. Military research cannot flourish alone. Neither can industrial or medical research grow in isolation. All must be based on a well-rounded development of scientific investigation in all fields. No area of science is unrelated to other fields, and out of seemingly useless, theoretical knowledge come the practical inventions of tomorrow.

The failure to have well-rounded research development was one of the difficulties of this war. I well remember one instance which was brought out before the committee. We were importing mica from India by airplane, at a cost of $3,500 a ton when we had thousands of tons of mica in the United States, which we could get almost for the cost of mining plus a little profit. That was because we had never related science to anything else. We developed machines in the course of 3 months to test spotted and clouded mica, and as a result it became unnecessary to import mica for electrical resistance purposes.

Moreover, I point out that we must not place undue emphasis upon military research. Research that might improve the eyesight of our young men is health research, and, as we found out in this war, it is also military research. Research that will develop their strength while we call it health research, is military research. Research that makes for strong groups of individuals is military research. We do not wish to be a Nation of soldiers, nor have we any desire but to live peacefully with our fellow nations of the world. Defense research is essential for our security. But the real purpose of the scientist is to bring our Nation peace and prosperity. Science has created new inventions and processes out of which have grown the great new industries which in turn have created more jobs, comfort and plenty. Science has brought medicine out of the dark ages of a hundred years ago with its ever increasing victories over disease and pain. This is the real task of science—to make a better life for all of the peoples of the world. But, unfortunately, there has been no coordination.

I well remember a surgeon, a friend of mine, who spent 5 years perfecting an operation on the spine for spinal meningitis, and just when the technique had been worked out he ascertained that a serum had been discovered which obviated the operation. Had there been a central agency of some kind with knowledge to advise others that work was going on in the other line, my surgeon friend might have contributed to that work instead of spending his time inventing instruments.

Our task here in the Congress is to provide the best possible legislative framework for a program that will assure the full development of scientific research for our national security and welfare. They are indissolubly linked.

No one will disagree with the objectives of the bill now before the Senate. There may be some disagreement as to the best way to implement these objectives. The National Science Foundation bill, S. 1850, represents a very considerable amount of thought and effort to arrive at the best possible bill to do the job. I believe that S. 1850 will do the job and will do it well.

The present bill is sponsored by eight Senators, two of them Republicans, six Democrats. They are MAGNUSON, JOHNSON of Colorado, PEPPER, FULBRIGHT, SALTONSTALL, FERGUSON, THOMAS of Utah, and myself. All of us worked on the preparation of the bill. Last summer both Senator MAGNUSON and myself introduced legislative proposals for the promotion of scientific research. Those bills were based on extensive studies conducted by the Subcommittee on War Mobilization into the Government's research and development activities during the war period and the needs for the postwar period, and on the recommendations of Dr. Vannevar Bush who, at the request of President Roosevelt, directed a study of the Nation's research needs. Since the objectives and scope of those two bills were similar, joint hearings were held during the month of October and early November of 1945 by the Subcommittees on Science Legislation of the Military Affairs Committee and of the Commerce Committee. Over 100 witnesses were heard, representing the sciences, medicine, education, government administration, and public-interest groups. Many divergent points of view were presented in regard to specific provisions of the bills. Nevertheless, the witnesses agreed all but unanimously on the urgent need for a national science foundation. After these hearings, further joint meetings and discussions with scientists and others led to the preparation of the present bill, S. 1850. This bill was reported out of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs on February 27, with a concurring report by the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HART. Will the Senator advise the Senate how the witnesses who appeared before the joint committee were chosen? Was everyone who requested to be heard called in?

Mr. KILGORE. So far as my knowledge goes, every scientist and everyone else who asked to be heard had an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. HART. May I also ask the Senator if the committee sent out over the Nation a request for scientists or anyone else to come before the committee?

Mr. KILGORE. We communicated with all groups that were listed and also with individual scientists and universities. In other words, the various scientific societies, various scientific committees, and colleges and universities were all advised of the hearing. More than a hundred appeared and testified. I may say also there was only one dissenting voice in the hundred, and that was Dr. Jewett, at that time president of the National Academy of Sciences, vice president of A. T. & T., and president of the Bell Research Laboratories, who felt that there should be no research of any kind, even military research.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from Connecticut that not only did 110 appear at the hearings, but many scientists and laymen interested in this matter, presidents of universities and others, who could not come to the hearings sent long statements. There are two full volumes, and, as the Senator from West Virginia has pointed out, the only dissenting voice was that of one man.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me say, Mr. President, in further explanation to the Senator, that after all the hearings were concluded a committee was formed, consisting of leading scientists, to study the bill. I think the committee was headed by Vannevar Bush and Dr. Isaiah Bowman as cochairmen. We met with Dr. Bowman and Dr. Bush in a conference in which all points in dispute with reference to the bill itself were ironed out, and we departed from the conference with both sides satisfied as to the details of the bill.

Mr. HART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield further to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HART. The Senator has mentioned having received testimony from Dr. Jewett. Did the committee ask the other large commercial laboratories, such, for instance, as General Electric and Westinghouse, to present evidence?

Mr. KILGORE. Dr. Langmuir, head of the General Electric Laboratory, testified before the committee, as did Dr. Kettering, of the General Motors Laboratory. I do not know of a single large laboratory which did not have a witness before the committee, and all were in agreement on the need for the enactment of the bill.

Dr. Langmuir was the second witness to appear at the last group of hearings we held, and he had just returned from Russia, where he had been going over the Russian scientific activities, and he testified in a very interesting way on the bill before the committee.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KILGORE. On April 9 the Committee on Military Affairs reported favorably and recommended the passage of Senate bill 1850 without amendment, and submitted a report thereon. I hope Senators will read the report because it contains a very detailed explanation of the implementation of the bill.

I can assure Senators that this bill, S. 1850, represents the best efforts of my colleagues and myself, working closely with the Nation's leading scientists and educators, and with the administrative officials of the Government's research agencies.

Let me say, for the information of the Senator from Connecticut, that we had before us the head of the Patent Office, and also leading patent attorneys. In fact, one of the leading patent attorneys, Mr. Will Davis, sat in with the committee in the drafting of the bill, and assisted us in framing a bill which would not amend or affect in any way the patent laws of the United States.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator for his last statement. Of course, I am probably the least capable Member of the Senate to understand the patent laws, but I should like to ask the Senator concerning the national defense feature of the bill, referring to subdivision (f) on page 19, which embodies reservations which are obviously inserted in the bill to satisfy the military about the publication and dissemination of information.

At another place in the bill there is a statement that all divisions of the foundation shall have full access to all information, scientific or otherwise, which the entire foundation possesses. Does the Senator think that section 5 modifies that provision?

Mr. KILGORE. I think the words "notwithstanding any other provision of this act" constitute a positive prohibition in the act against the dissemination of any information which the President or any person designated for that purpose shall seek to protect.

Mr. HART. Let me further ask the Senator, if it is habit and routine that everything which develops within the foundation shall be immediately known to everyone will not the secrets be out before the necessity for keeping them secret becomes manifest?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe what the Senator is speaking of is knowledge being made known to the members of the Board. I think that is the provision the Senator has in mind, which might conflict.

Mr. KILGORE. That national science foundation is proposed "to promote the progress of science and the useful arts." It will do this in several ways.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe the Senator from Connecticut had reference to line 3, on page 8, where the bill reads, "The Board and each such committee shall have full access to all information in the possession of the foundation." Is not that the provision to which the Senator had reference?

Mr. HART. Yes. It says "The Board and each such committee," which seems to include about 150 people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is the provision which the Senator felt was in conflict. I merely wanted to identify what the Senator had in mind.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, there has been a gross misunderstanding of the foundation's purpose. In the first place, the foundation is not a research organization within itself. It is a supplementing organization. It is contemplated that the various agencies of Government will proceed with their own research as they have in the past, and when they encounter a situation in connection with which they need further money in order to go ahead with something else which has developed in their research, it will not take an act of Congress to get the money. It will merely have to be shown to the Board that it is in the general interest of the public welfare, of national defense, or health and medicine, and the Board, just as in the case of any other foundation board, may grant the money.

I repeat, Mr. President, the National Science Foundation is proposed "to promote the progress of science and the useful arts." It will do this in several ways. First, by supplementing funds privately and publicly available for scientific research through contracts and agreements with research organizations. The foundation will not operate laboratories. It will not interfere with or supplement existing public or private organizations. We have found, however, that universities and foundations are finding it increasingly difficult to support original work, particularly in the basic sciences.

We have found that only 5 percent of the huge industrial research budget in the coming years will be devoted to fundamental research. Thus the foundation will fill a vital role in supplementing the funds available for research in fields important to our national welfare, but which provide no incentive for private investment or for which private foundations have insufficient resources.

The National Science Foundation would also naturally cover certain fields of applied science. That would particularly apply, I may say to the Senator from Connecticut, to the military phases which are largely applied science. These are principally the fields of medicine and of national defense. The public interest in these fields is evident. Furthermore, the war has shown what tremendous strides can be made in health and medicine when concentrated research effort is made possible by adequate funds and facilities. We cannot afford to ignore the vision which wartime medical research has brought to us of new and greater victories over pain and disease.

Provisions for military research follow the recommendations of the Wilson committee and the bills S. 825 and H. R. 3440 in setting up a mechanism by which the Army and Navy research men can

work closely with civilian scientists in exploring new areas of military importance. This method of operation worked very well in the Office of Scientific Research and Development during the war; and the armed forces, as well as the civilian scientists, feel that a similar body should be continued.

In addition to direct support of research through contracts and other agreements, the foundation would help assure that talented young men and women would have opportunities for education. I may say at that point that we are 5 years behind in our crop of young scientists at the present time, and it is going to take some time and considerable concentrated effort to catch up with that 5-year lag. We were woefully behind even 5 years ago.

The foundation would provide a number of scholarships for undergraduate work, to be granted on a State quota basis and probably administered by the States, as well as a number of graduate fellowships for advanced work and research. I think the undergraduate scholarships are highly essential. We spend tremendous sums of money for scholarships in the Military Academy, sums that I blush to think of. We spend tremendous sums for scholarships in the Naval Academy and in the Coast Guard Academy. Yet, on the basic matter on which those academies may reach this success, the Federal Government spends no money with respect to undergraduate work. Therefore it is highly necessary that we subsidize—and I use that word without apology—the crop of young scientists in this country.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. HART. Does the Senator know that the so-called scholarships for West Point and the Naval Academy obligate the men who accept such educational benefits to serve the Government for a considerable number of years after graduation? May I ask if in this case it is the intention to impose any obligation whatsoever upon the recipients?

Mr. KILGORE. None whatsoever, I may say. The recipients are subject, as they always have been, to furnishing themselves as the cannon fodder in the event of war. I think that is enough of an obligation. Every time we get into trouble we call the young men out to fight the war.

As I have said, the foundation would provide a number of scholarships for undergraduate work, to be granted on a State quota basis and probably administered by the States, as well as a number of graduate fellowships for advanced work and research. This provision is particularly important in view of the fact that we now have a deficit of thousands and thousands of trained scientists due to our shortsighted wartime draft policies. By inducting many thousands of young science students into general military service, we have lost a whole generation of chemists, doctors, physicists, engineers, and biologists.

I may say along that line, Mr. President, that one of the most amazing incidents I ever knew of occurred in 1941, when the dean of a very fine scientific institution in the United States recommended to the Army that certain of his scientific students go into certain branches of the service upon induction, and was told, "Well, the infantry trained them and the infantry is going to get them," despite the fact that they had been specially trained by the dean for service in the Signal Corps.

Another important function of the National Science Foundation is the work of the information division. The aim of the foundation will be the fullest possible dissemination for use of scientific and technical information. People like ourselves who are not professional scientists, do not realize the great handicap under which the scientist and technician work due to inadequate and slow publication of new discoveries. Our Nation has too few good technical libraries. Translations and abstracts of foreign scientific literature are completely inadequate. The National Science Foundation, working in cooperation with existing libraries and scientific organizations could do much to remedy this situation, and be of tremendous assistance to the working scientist and the industrial engineer.

I may say, Mr. President, that one of the most astounding things I learned in the investigation was the fact that one corporation, a German trust, I. G. Farben Industrie, had the most complete library on invention of any organization in the world. It was much more complete than that of our own Patent Office. The I. G. Farben knew more about our Patent Office than our own scientists knew. They kept close track of every patent filed and every invention made in every country of the world.

An aspect of the foundation's work which I believe most important is the furtherance of scientific collaboration between nations. The language of science is truly international. The United States, as well as other nations, will benefit greatly from closer relations among the scientists of the world. Exchange of scientific information, exchange of teachers and students, cooperation on research projects of international importance, and closer contact through international scientific meetings and congresses are some of the ways by which this can be achieved.

Now that I have outlined the principal objectives of the National Science Foundation bill, I believe it would be helpful if I briefly summarized its chief provisions.

SECTION 3. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Subsection 3 (a) establishes the National Science Foundation as an independent agency of the Federal Government. It provides that the foundation be administered by full-time Government officials, the Administrator to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Attention is called to the provision requiring that, before appointing an Administrator, the President shall consult with and receive the recommendations of the National Science Board. While not necessarily binding on the President, who must accept final responsibility for his appointees, this provision is included as a means of assuring harmony between the Administrator and the Board and to emphasize the necessarily high qualifications essential in the Administrator. I may say, Mr. President, it is my conception that the administrator of this fund must not only be a scientist but he must be an administrator of top rank. He will not do research work; but he will have to administer a fund. Although a review of the history of appointments to scientific posts in the Government gives no basis for believing that a President is likely to use this appointment as a political reward, I regard the Administrator of the foundation to be so important as to merit this provision of the bill. I may add, that one does not have to be a member of the bar to be a justice of the Supreme Court of the Nation or of the courts of any State in the Union, so far as I know.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that one of the big issues in the preparation of this bill was as to whether there should be an administrator with wide power, which this bill provides for, or whether the ultimate authority should be vested in a board. I understand that that issue represented the difference between the original so-called Magnuson bill and the bill which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia on behalf of himself and other Senators. I should like to have the Senator tell me how that difference was resolved, as it has been in this bill, because my scientific friends, who are reflecting their views through me, from Princeton University and other institutions of that kind, are still insisting that they would like to see authority in the Board as it is provided in the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I have offered. I have taken that approach. I think it is most important for us to have all the information possible on that subject, because it seems to me that this point is fundamental in the whole picture. I shall be glad to hear from the Senator on that point.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me ask the Senator from New Jersey if he would like to have this country governed by a board of part-time officials rather than by a President as Chief Executive.

Mr. SMITH. The plan in terms of which we are thinking is that of having a large foundation, which will choose a board of nine who will make the ultimate decision, rather than one administrator to make decisions on these important scientific questions.

Mr. KILGORE. Speaking of foundations, does not the Rockefeller Foundation have a director?

Mr. SMITH. It does.

Mr. KILGORE. Is not he the man who looks after everything? There is a board which meets with him.

Mr. SMITH. He is subject entirely to the board. That is one of the illustrations which my scientific friends point out. They believe that that kind of a

board is essential. They do not feel that Senate bill 1850 in its present form presents that picture. They believe that the Administrator has too much power.

Mr. KILGORE. Who constitutes the board of the Rockefeller Foundation?

Mr. SMITH. As I recall the organization, its board of directors is chosen by the foundation.

Mr. KILGORE. Who controls the foundation?

Mr. SMITH. The Rockefeller Foundation.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. Who controls the selection of the board?

Mr. SMITH. The members of the foundation, I assume.

Mr. KILGORE. Who are the members of the foundation?

Mr. SMITH. I cannot answer. I do not know who they are.

Mr. KILGORE. I think it will be found in connection with all foundations that those who furnish the funds have representatives who control the selection of the governing board. Is not that correct?

Mr. SMITH. To a certain extent; yes.

Mr. KILGORE. I am speaking about the major foundations, such as the Mellon Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and others.

Mr. SMITH. I had experience for several years at Princeton University, and I know that the Rockefeller Foundation looked to former President Hibben and others in Princeton for advice as to appointments to the foundation.

Mr. KILGORE. Certainly they look to them for advice.

Mr. SMITH. They use those experts to tell them what kind of people they need.

Mr. KILGORE. We do not want to insult the man whom the people of the United States elect as Chief Executive by saying that he is any less reasonable than the Rockefeller Foundation, which consults with experts. Do we wish to insult the man whom the people of this country chose to be their Chief Executive by saying that he would utterly disregard the scientific people of this country by going contrary to their wishes? The taxpayers are the ones who are putting up the money. It seems to me that the final selection should be with some representative of the taxpayers, just as it is in connection with other foundations. That was the basis upon which the bill was written, to the satisfaction of Dr. Bush and Dr. Bowman in conference. They agreed that they would be satisfied if we required consultation, or at least an opportunity for consultation, with the board of directors prior to appointment. We must realize that there is a slight difference between a private foundation and a public foundation. There is a difference in who puts up the money, in the ultimate aim, and in those who should be selected to head it.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HART. Coming back to the question which the Senator asked the Senator from New Jersey, I think it would be helpful if we all kept in mind that the general principle upon which such foundations operate is the old one which is very familiar in this country, of a board of directors who really control the administrator, who is the president of the company.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Let me add a word in answer to the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that this plan of board control has the approval of all these scientists. I have talked with Dr. Bush about this subject, and I have before me a statement which he has made. I quote from Dr. Bush's statement:

> There are several objections in my opinion to this second proposal.

That is, the proposal for a one-man administrator.

> In the first place, all powers are centered in one man as director. This may lead to efficiency in an operating agency, but it is a kind of autocracy which holds grave dangers to the full development of science. As former chairman of the National Advisory Commission for Aeronautics and as director of the OSRD, I have participated in, and been the responsible head of, both kinds of organizations, and I can testify without reservation that a national science foundation will be on a far sounder basis if its policy is determined by a board rather than by one man.

I could quote further from Dr. Bush. I talked with him during the past week. I have been at Princeton University, and have talked with the leaders there.

Let me say to the proponents of the bill that I am entirely in sympathy with what they are seeking to attain. I am merely discussing the best way to make it most effective. It is my own feeling that we are in danger of stultifying the activities of our scientific people if they feel that they are to be hide-bound and governed by someone in Washington who can tell them what the area of their research shall be. That is why I feel that because this is a bill to develop basic research, it requires a different approach than a program for Nation-wide education. This involves research in basic science. The only place applied science is brought in is in connection with military and naval activities, which my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HART] has discussed with me quite fully. There we enter into the area of applied science. I am collaborating with the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who has studied the military and naval aspects of the question, with a view of offering a revised bill, which will take into consideration the field of applied science as it relates to military and naval use.

I have in mind encouraging the scientific man to put forth his best endeavors on special problems. I do not think he will work under a plan headed by one man with as much authority as this bill seems to call for. I am raising that question because it is involved in the debate. I believe that we should deal with it as we go along. It may be that some modification should be made of my plan, or of the plan of the Senator from West Virginia; but we cannot overlook the important question of board control.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me say to the Senator from New Jersey that originally there was the bill which I introduced, providing for scholarships and fellowships. It was very limited. The program was to be administered by a board appointed by the President, following the old normal procedure in universities and foundations. The board was to appoint an administrator. After much research on this problem for many months and years, the Senator from West Virginia introduced a bill providing for a full-time director and a sort of advisory board. Most of our scientific friends, as well as educators, have the feeling that the highest type of men cannot be persuaded to serve on a so-called advisory board, because they would have very little to say about what the administrator or the director should do. This question being so vital, it was felt that some authority should be placed in the board. That was one of the bones of contention in the original hearings, as the Senator from West Virginia has pointed out.

The statement by Dr. Bush, which has just been read by the Senator from New Jersey, is a correct statement. There are several other statements on the question. But because of the fact that we became involved in many broad problems of science affecting the public itself, and because of the fact that we have now embarked upon a program which may call for a great deal more of the taxpayers' money than originally contemplated, it was thought that the President of the United States, whoever he might be at the time, should have some authority, inasmuch as he would have the responsibility.

Therefore, after many meetings with scientists, as well as laymen, who, like the Senator from New Jersey, are basically in favor of such a program, and after much testimony from the Director of the Budget, Bernard Baruch, and several others, we finally agreed, because of the scope of this bill, that this method would give the Board a great deal of authority, and would enable the Executive to feel that he would have some authority, within his responsibility for the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. I believe that the mechanics would be that under the pending bill the Board would give to the President five or six names, and it would say to him, "Here are the names of those whom we suggest to be the Administrator." Of course, the President would not need to follow their suggestions. But I cannot conceive of a situation in which a lay President would not want the advice of the great scientific and lay leaders who would compose this board.

It was felt that such an arrangement would be sufficient and would create a good liaison. Some testified later that perhaps the arrangement now proposed would be even better, because in the beginning we had only the tools.

In the present situation we find ourselves confronted with somewhat the same predicament as that which confronted us the other day in connection with the OPA bill, namely, that we must either accept all of the proposal or reject all of it. However, some feel that the system now proposed would be even a better one. So far as I know, most of these eminent men have endorsed the principle of administration laid down in Senate bill 1850.

I hope that explains the matter to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am glad to have that explanation. I shall not delay the Senator from West Virginia further at this time. We shall have the subject before us again.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, at our committee meetings the suggestion was that the President should consult with and receive the recommendations of the National Science Board. While not necessarily binding on the President, who must accept final responsibility for his appointees, this provision is included as a means of assuring harmony between the Administrator and the Board and to emphasize the necessarily high qualifications essential in the Administrator, as I stated before. Although a review of the history of appointments to scientific posts in the Government gives no basis for believing that appointment to this post is likely to degenerate into a political matter, I think it would be an insult to the people of the United States to say that a man whom they elected as President of the country would make an appointment of that sort.

We also considered the alternative proposal of vesting the powers of the foundation in a board or commission of full-time Government employees, but we believe that the organization recommended in this bill represents a more efficient form of administration, and that by utilizing the part-time services of larger numbers of scientists on the National Science Board and on the divisional scientific committees, and on other advisory bodies, it makes for an even fuller participation of the Nation's scientists in the program of the foundation.

Let me ask the Senator a question at this point. Three alternatives were available: A board composed of full-time Government employees or directors; a board composed of part-time directors; or an administrator. Realizing that on a full-time basis we could not get the type of men whom we had to have as members of the board of directors, but that we would have to take them as part-time directors, and realizing that the ramifications of this matter were so great that some executive would have to carry it on, we agreed upon having a single administrator who would serve with a board of directors.

Let me call attention to the fact that on the board of directors will be the chairman of all the divisions, and those divisions are to be composed exclusively of scientists. All the planning and all the detailed scientific work is to be done in the divisions. They prepare and submit the plans. The board of directors does not do that. The heads of the divisions or chairmen of the divisions draw up and present the plans for their own divisions. Those men are composed exclusively of scientists, either part-time or full-time. The head of each division can call in anyone he wishes to call in to build up his program. Then the chairman of the division goes on the board of directors and advises with the Administrator. That is the solution which we finally have worked out as the best working way to handle the matter on a governmental basis. We cannot handle it exactly as we would handle a private foundation and fix responsibility. The great weakness of the OEM, for instance, was divided responsibility. That has always been a serious weakness of every Government agency headed by a board of executive power. A board is a good means of obtaining a cross section of views; but for administrative efficiency a single head is desirable. We never yet have seen a commission successfully handle a department.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I do not visualize the particular problem which is faced here as something like the problem faced by the Interstate Commerce Commission or a board of that kind.

Mr. KILGORE. No.

Mr. SMITH. I wish to see the basic policy determined by the Board which represents the scientific groups. In my proposal I am taking the National Academy of Sciences as the basis, and that academy would suggest to the President what the scientific group should be. Sixty people are in it, I believe. They would select a board of nine. Now the Senator from West Virginia is suggesting that there be an administrator appointed by the President to give them orders.

As I read the bill, the Administrator would have wide control in respect to setting up committees and determining what should be done. I do not think any one man can be a proper means of determining what shall be done in the way of scientific research in America.

A number of prominent men have made this criticism of the bill. Their criticism of this bill is simply based on their fear that the natural and inevitable result of such an arrangement would be to stultify the advancement and development of scientific research.

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder whether the Senator from New Jersey will submit their names for the RECORD, because in view of all the endorsements of the bill which we have received, I should like to know who are the persons who take a different view. Before the committee adjourned, an agreement was worked out completely to Dr. Bush's satisfaction. He expressed himself as perfectly satisfied. So did Dr. Bowman and various others.

So I should like to know who are the persons who are dissatisfied.

Mr. SMITH. I have talked at some length with Dr. Bush, and I talked to Dr. Luther P. Eisenhardt, of Princeton, last week. He is on the board of the National Academy of Sciences. I have also talked to Dr. Hugh Taylor, of the National Academy of Sciences, who now is dean of the Graduate School of Princeton University, and formerly was head of its department of chemistry.

Mr. KILGORE. How many of those men are members of the National Academy of Sciences?

Mr. SMITH. Practically all of them are.

Mr. KILGORE. I thought so. Did the Senator from New Jersey know that a poll was taken by the National Academy of Sciences? Does the Senator from New Jersey know about that?

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not.

Mr. KILGORE. They said they felt that the National Academy of Sciences should handle this matter through an agency of its own. According to my recollection, only about six scientists said that should be done, but a great number of scientists said it should not be done.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with that. I am not claiming that they should manage this matter. But I thought we should give consideration to the source from which will be obtained the names of the men who shall be the fundamental determinants of policy in this matter. That is what I am referring to. I am afraid to leave the matter in the hands of an administrator with as much power as this bill gives.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, men of the kind we have been speaking of—Dr. Bush and Dr. Bowman, and most of the witnesses—would prefer a board-type of administration. But at the time when we made the suggestion, we were dealing with only scholarships and fellowships. We were not then dealing with the military and Government branches, and we did not anticipate the scope of scientific research and grants-in-aid.

Although the men of whom we have been speaking would prefer a board-type of administration, they feel that in other circumstances, such as those which now exist, possibly a combination of a board and an administrator would be better. It is rather hard to write the exact terms.

I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that after many hearings, both the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and I were stuck. My original proposal was for a board. We eventually went to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and he sat with us and finally worked out this language for us, which was agreeable to all sides because of the fact that the matter has developed into other fields.

It is true, as the record will show, that on the basis of the original concept they would prefer to have a scientific program for the Nation conducted by a board of their own scientific, established people. But under this bill we go beyond that field a great deal, and they realized that, and they are in favor of it. They think the arrangement now proposed will take care of the matter.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, perhaps my difficulty is that it seems to me this bill goes further than we should go at this time. I am simply seeking aid for basic science or pure science. I am not thinking of applied science at all. Aside from the military needs, applied science can be taken care of by the industries and plants. I do not wish to help that at all. I wish to help basic science. That is what needs help.

Under the second part of the bill, I wish to help our military and naval program. The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has prepared and introduced a bill of that nature, and we are incorporating it as part 2 of the bill which I shall present.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think that will be unnecessary, because since the hearings were held representatives of the War Department, the Navy Department, and other interested agencies have testified that they are in favor of this plan, and they have testified that this plan will take care of the problem.

Mr. KILGORE. A certain scientist, working for the Rockefeller Foundation on cancer research, discovered a new serum. It did not at that time affect cancer. But that scientist insisted on working on the new serum. Therefore, he was compelled to seek aid from some other source, because the Rockefeller board would not allow him to pursue his research while working for them. Incidentally, that scientist developed his serum which is of immense value.

I conceive the Administrator's job to be of an administrative nature. He does not direct the scientific committees. In the first place, XYZ university lays out a program, which is not submitted to the administrator, but to the particular division to which the program applies. That division goes over it and examines it. It is composed utterly and entirely of scientists, most of whom have been gathered from the colleges, universities, and various laboratories of the country. They decide whether or not the program has merit. If it has merit they send it up, and the available funds are divided on the basis of the program submitted by the various scientific divisions. The top picture is largely one of enforcement. That is, they must see to it, for example, that military secrets are not involved, and that the information is properly disseminated. They must decide also when public facilities may be used, and when private facilities may be used on the recommendation of the scientists below. They must also decide what is the best contract that can be worked out.

I may say to the Senator that the Administrator's job is largely a business one. It is similar to the job of a business manager of a large hospital. He has an advisory board with whom he consults. The real work is done at the scientific level. That is how we finally convinced the scientists that we were on the right track. They are to pass on the question of programs, fellowships, scholarships, and what should be done and what should not be done. They constitute the funneling process. The big question at the top is, How much money can we devote to this program, how much must be spent, and how shall it be administered? Secondly, the information developed must be disseminated through proper sources.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I presume that the fundamental difference between the Senator and myself is that he would have the administrator appointed by the President.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; to handle all the public funds.

Mr. SMITH. But that still does not make him independent of the scientific board. My program calls for the board to be nominated by the National Science Foundation. There would then be a sub-board to be composed of nine, and they would choose a director as their employee.

Mr. KILGORE. Why have the President appoint the board?

Mr. SMITH. Because it is the foundation that controls the research.

Mr. KILGORE. No. That is a policy which has been pursued in this country too much of late. That would require the President to be responsible for a group of persons over whom he had no discretion or control. If we are going to make any provision of that kind, why not let the National Science Foundation run the show? Why go through a formality? Why use a cloak or smokescreen by having the President nominate someone who has been selected by someone else, and then hold him responsible for the activities of the person whose selection he had nothing to say about?

Mr. SMITH. He appoints the persons who have been nominated by the foundation. What we are trying to do is to encourage the scientific people of the country to pursue research which they believe is essential to the proper welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; but under the program which the Senator suggests, the President would have nothing to say or do except to sign on the dotted line.

Mr. SMITH. I believe that in all similar cases the President takes the advice and judgment of others.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; but he is not bound by it.

Mr. SMITH. I believe that he would be bound by it no more under my plan than under any other plan.

Mr. KILGORE. Does not the Senator think that we get away from one picture, one phase? We assume the attitude, for example, of a certain distinguished railroad president who, at one time, said "The public be damned." We are perhaps too apt to think this program is merely for the benefit of the scientists alone, and forget the fact that the public is also being considered. The people are the ones who put up the money.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator will yield——

Mr. KILGORE. Wait until I finish, please. We get completely away from the fact that there is a public to be considered in connection with this matter. The scientists gain the rewards of their labor from the same public, and at the same time they are seeking to benefit the public; at least, that is true if they are good scientists. We must realize that this entire picture involves not only one side but two. There is the side of the public, the citizenry for whom the program is established; and there is the side of the scientist who is necessary in order to make the program operate successfully. Both sides must be taken into consideration, and I believe that both must be represented.

I would be more inclined to go along with the Senator in his theory with relation to the National Academy of Sciences if it were not a self-perpetuating board, as one might say, or a scientific oligarchy. In other words, if the board were composed only of men who had attained certain standards among scientists, and if every scientist who had attained those standards were a member of the board, I should look upon it more favorably. But we must realize that the membership is limited in number, and it elects its own members, although again we go through the farcical procedure of having the President appoint them even though he does not have a thing in the world to say about them. I may say that there is a distinct schism in the scientific field with regard to that one point.

Mr. SMITH. I do not know of any abuses by the scientists in the academy, I am trying only to suggest a way in which the results which we are seeking may be achieved. But I cannot overlook the fact that the paramount interest must lie in the public.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; the public pays the bill.

Mr. SMITH. There would be no purpose in having the proposed research work done if it were not for the public.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct. But if I may interrupt the Senator again, we must also agree that a responsibility must be fixed at some place. Am I not correct?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. The responsibility must be fixed for proper performance. Has the Senator ever seen responsibilities placed upon a nine-man board without some member ducking his responsibility and saying, "I am not to blame." I believe that it is necessary to have one man do the administering and pin responsibility and authority upon him for seeing that the results are accomplished. Responsibility and authority must go together. Since the President is the Chief Executive of the Nation, he is the man who should have the responsibility and authority of seeing that the man under him, the man who is to have charge of this work, is just like the head of a Government department. He must perform properly. In order to do that under this bill, the scientists must be satisfied or, because of a lack of cooperation, the whole venture will fail.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator, but, in my judgment, we cannot give one man authority and responsibility in a field where circumstances are too intangible. If we want to get the maximum results, we must allow the most remote scientist to explain, through his colleagues, that he has something of merit.

Under this bill it is my judgment that the Administrator has too much power to prevent an outcropping of the inventive genius which we should encourage.

Mr. KILGORE. He does not handle that except through a committee.

Mr. SMITH. Who controls those committees? We have in our bill committees which perhaps have the same function, but I think they are appointed under a different system. But I do not wish to delay the Senator. I just presented the issue to show where we differ.

Mr. KILGORE. We have discussed this very thoroughly.

Most essential to a National Science Foundation program is the active participation in its direction by as many of our scientists as possible. Section 3 provides for a full-time operating staff which will necessarily consist chiefly of scientists working as full-time Government employees. Section 4 provides for a parallel structure of advisory boards which will make possible participation in the work of the Foundation by large numbers of scientists who cannot give full time.

In this manner the regular staff of the Foundation will be continuously stimulated by contact with working scientists who would be regularly consulted. To prevent these advisory groups from becoming perfunctory bodies, regular and frequent meetings are required and their recommendations will be made public as they desire.

The National Science Board will advise the Administrator in regard to over-all policies and programs. The Board is composed of nine persons appointed by the President, with the advice of the Senate, from among persons who are especially qualified to promote the broad objectives of the Foundation. In addition, the Board will include the chairman of the eight divisional scientific committees, who will be particularly familiar by virtue of their position with the specialized problems of the Foundation.

At the divisional level the divisional scientific committees serve a function comparable to that of the Board for the Foundation as a whole. Members of these committees are to be appointed by the Administrator with the advice and approval of the Board. This administrative set-up will result in the activities of the Foundation being subjected to the critical and public scrutiny of the Nation's scientists.

I want the Senator from New Jersey to hear this. He was talking about the Board. The members of the divisional committees are to be appointed by the Administrator, with the advice and consent of the Board. They must have the approval of the Board, just as Presidential appointments have to have the approval of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. What does advice and approval of the Board mean?

Mr. KILGORE. They must vote to approve them. The names must be submitted to the Board, and approved by the Board.

Mr. SMITH. They are appointed by the Administrator.

Mr. KILGORE. We go back to the constitutional language, practically, as to the appointment of all executive officials, except instead of using the words "advice and consent," we say "advice and approval." The names are submitted to the Board for approval, after they have been advised with.

I repeat, this administrative set-up will result in the activities of the Foundation being subjected to the critical and public scrutiny of the Nation's scientists. I believe that this provision will give scientists as a whole greater voice in the affairs of the national science program than would result from any proposed alternative form of administrative organization.

Section 5 authorizes the Administrator to enter into contracts or other financial arrangements to finance in whole or part research and development activities to be carried on by universities, colleges, public or private research laboratories, and other Government agencies. The nature of scientific research requires that the Foundation be free to support research under a variety of financial arrangements and be granted considerable flexibility with respect to the nature of the financial arrangement employed. Thus, the Administrator may enter into contracts for highly specific projects or make relatively nonspecific grants for the support of broad programs of research in a particular field.

In authorizing the Foundation to support research and development in other Government agencies, it should be understood that such support will be supplementary to the regular research budgets of these Government agencies.

Subsection 5 (b) guarantees a minimum allocation of funds for medical research and for research in fields essential to national defense. The obvious importance of these two fields of applied science to the welfare and security of the Nation justifies this provision.

Let me say, Mr. President, that the reason for inserting that provision was the experience we had prior to the war just ended and the experience we have had in peacetime, when research, particularly in the case of national defense, was starved by the Congress. By inserting this provision we could give the Foundation additional financial nourishment, which would help it carry on in its fields, in spite of any sudden economy program of Congress.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senator, but I wish to make a note here that I propose to comment later on subsection (c), page 11, as to distribution among the States. I am one of those who are heartily in favor of the educational program which has been proposed in Senate bill 181. I helped to prepare that program, and I heartily agree with it. That is a matter which should assist the cost of education in the States. I am seeking to give help in matters of basic science which may come to us from the remote corners of the country, may come from the East, West, North, or South. I cannot see any point whatever in a provision of this kind for spreading this all over the States of the Union as though it were an education-help program. I am in favor of the education-help programs, but not through this bill. That should be handled in our educational program, which is covered in different legislation.

Mr. KILGORE. Then the Senator's argument is that we should have a number of programs, instead of trying to have a central reservoir from which we could help existing programs. Is that the idea?

Mr. SMITH. I wish to make this perfectly clear. I say that when we have a foundation set up, it is not a case of scattering fire all over the Nation, it is a question of giving out projects to the experts, and following through with the projects. It is not a matter of providing educational funds, for they are provided for in a totally different bill, and I think we are confusing our whole picture by providing them in a science bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me ask the Senator a question along that line. What does the Senator conceive as scientific progress in this country? How would he define adequate scientific progress?

Mr. SMITH. I suppose the Senator means the researches of scientific men in their respective fields, conferring together to determine what those researches should be, determining what are the best lines to follow in pursuit of national defense, the best lines to follow in medicine, in health, and so on. It is when we find the work being done we are satisfied, and we should not scatter the funds. We have not enough in the way of funds to scatter all over the Union and say, "Start some scientific progress." We are getting at a totally different problem. I am in favor of spreading education all over this country, but that has nothing to do with the pending bill. It is not an education bill, it is a scientific-research bill. That is my point.

Mr. KILGORE. How is it possible to carry on scientific research without scientists? Does the Senator believe that Dr. Bush, Dr. Jewett, and others will live forever?

Mr. SMITH. No. As to the scholarship program, I might suggest that we start at the fellowship level, where we can develop real scientists. I do not think we can subsidize them as scientists when they are still in their school life, because the boys in school have not gone far enough for us to see whether they are individuals we should support. It is when we get to the fellowship level, the advanced students, that we find the real scientific prospect whom we can support. We cannot have a Nation-wide program in science. We cannot afford to pay for that, and the Federal Government should not be asked to do that. Private institutions are doing it. We have just introduced a bill, Senate 181, to give grants to States which are following that line. But that has nothing to do with the particular problem before us.

Mr. KILGORE. Senate bill 181 applies to high schools, does it not, and to the grade schools?

Mr. SMITH. It applies to education.

Mr. KILGORE. It applies to the common schools, the public schools?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. And does not apply to the colleges or universities in any way, shape, or form?

Mr. SMITH. No; we start with the public schools.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me call the Senator's attention to a statement in the RECORD made by Dr. Jewett and a statement made by Dr. Bush—I cannot now name the others—who said the only real research ever made that accomplished anything was made by scientists prior to reaching the age of 35. They admit it is the youth among scientists who produce. A man who passes 35 has either made his mark or has settled down to drudging. It is the young man who forges ahead. He is not too set in his ways, as we are here. He will go into new fields and discover new things, and is willing to have the reputation of making a mistake, as he is gambling for the reputation of being a success. If we do not help that type, science languishes, basic science to the contrary notwithstanding. Those are the men who understand basic science.

Mr. SMITH. I regret to say the Senator misunderstands my position entirely. I say that the educational institutions have been sifting students of the high school level and sifting students of the scholarship level. I do not think the Federal Government is called upon to send boys to colleges in every State in this Union to get their undergraduate work. That is being done by the State institutions, by the foundations, by the public school systems. We are getting that foundation laid through the whole public school system. We are in a different field when we get into scientific research. The boys have gone through their undergraduate courses, they have demonstrated that they are scientists of promise. It is then as graduate fellows that we should help them. It is the boy who is 21, not the man who is 35, that I am talking about. It is the boy 21 to 30 who has become a greater student that I refer to, rather than the boy 18 to 21, who is only an undergraduate scholar that the Senator has put in his bill. There is the real difference. I have discussed this matter with many scientific men. They say there is no formula by which the young budding scientist of 18 can be marked. There may be some geniuses, but what I am getting at is that we should funnel these people during the undergraduate years, and when we find those who are recommended by our universities and State colleges and schools throughout the country, then those are the ones we should mark for further advances. They cannot be covered by any other formula that may be made.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator from New Jersey checked the Department of Agriculture record on research; how they carry on their program?

Mr. SMITH. No.

Mr. KILGORE. I would suggest that the Senator look into that.

Mr. SMITH. They have a definitely different program. I know what the Senator is referring to.

Mr. KILGORE. No; it goes extensively into basic research and also into scholarships and the promotion of such things. True, the Department of Agriculture does not go into the matter to the extent which we propose. But I think the Senator misunderstands the purpose of the bill also. I think probably the Senator has not carefully read it. The real way to produce scientists, regardless of whether scholarships are being paid or not—and I am not talking about scholarships now—is to give them research work to do. Scientists cannot be taught out of a textbook at the upper level, particularly in colleges. There is not any scientific teacher that is worth his salt who is not a research worker, who does not do his own research work. I think the Senator from New Jersey will agree with me on that.

Mr. SMITH. I agree.

Mr. KILGORE. No lawyer is worth his salt who is not a good research man. A teacher and a leader cannot rely on the research of others. The purpose of spending this money in the educational institution is not simply with the idea of providing scholarships, but with the idea of eliciting from the institutions what projects they are particularly embarking upon and what facilities they have to enable them to pursue the projects. They may be projects attendant upon health and medicine. They may be projects dependent upon other general welfare work. That is the subdivision we propose. It is not the subdivision of educational funds. It is the subdivision of money provided for the allocation of projects to States and institutions in such a way that the greatest possible opportunity will be given not only to the students but to the faculty to carry on original research and to work on original research programs. Not only that, but it was believed that the best results could not be obtained by putting only one laboratory to work on a problem. By having three or four laboratories working better results are obtained, as was found during the war and as has been found to be true in the past. So by spreading these problems into publicly owned and nonprofit institutions we will get the best results for the money spent in building up that absolutely essential ingredient to our scientific progress, namely, the scientist himself, by giving scientific students something on which to do research work.

Mr. SMITH. My feeling is that the program the Senator is presenting here will simply give us the opportunity and the obligation to subsidize what may be a lot of second- and third-class work, when the purpose of the bill is simply to get going the basic things that must be done right away. Perhaps in the course of time we will get to the elaborate program that the Senator's bill suggests. But my guess is that it is definitely wrong to do them now. My guess is that it is wrong to try to include all the States and educational institutions. To do so is entirely outside of what we are trying to do, which is to provide a basis for scientific research. I have talked it over with many individuals in the educational field, and they think that should not be done now. The only reason for support of such provision is because it may obtain votes for the bill, because every State will receive a portion of the fund, and will help the passage of such a bill. That is not a worthy motive, and the Senator will admit it is not a worthy motive.

What we want to do is to support basic scientific research, and such should not be located in every one of the States of the Union, should not be located here, there, and everywhere, but should be concentrated to get first-rate results. It should be concentrated in the hands of a scientific group which must take care of this problem, and they will not care whether the work is located in Oshkosh or somewhere else. Scattering the fire will cause second- and third-rate results, and I am afraid it will result in the spending of a great deal of money uselessly.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the distinguished Senator know the present dean of the College of Engineering of the University of Chicago?

Mr. SMITH. I am sorry I do not.

Mr. KILGORE. No one else did until the university hired him. He was a teacher of engineering at an absolutely unheard of little college in the State of Colorado. Yet he has been an outstanding success as dean of the College of Engineering of the University of Chicago. No one can tell what is in the package by the paper wrapped around it. I venture to say that if we go back in the history of the—shall I called it Ivy League?—we will find that those colleges were at one time third- or fourth- or second-grade institutions of learning. But the opportunity to go ahead has built them up. Would the Senator deprive other sections of the country of this opportunity, simply to build up a few institutions?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly not.

Mr. KILGORE. That is the Senator's attitude.

Mr. SMITH. It is not my attitude at all, because as a member of the administration in Princeton we looked all over this country to get men to fill our faculty, men of promise. That is what my measure would do. It is not an attempt to build up a so-called Ivy League. I regret the Senator has said that.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is objecting to the distribution of money among the educational institutions of the United States on an equitable basis, on the ground that by so doing some of the money might get into a third- or fourth-rate institution.

Mr. SMITH. No; I am not doing that at all.

Mr. KILGORE. I beg the Senator's pardon. I misunderstood him, then. My whole argument was based on that assumption.

Mr. SMITH. I said we would obtain second- or third-rate results if we simply scattered our money, when it ought to be concentrated to get first-rate results. That is the point of my remarks. Some of the very best men will be gotten in the smallest institutions of the country. We know them and we can find them and subsidize them. There is no discrimination against them whatever. But that

does not mean that in order to get those few stars we have to subsidize every State and every institution in the country. We cannot afford to do it. It is not a sound Federal policy. The thing to do is to be discriminative. That is the way to deal with the problem.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator again misunderstands me. I am not talking about the development of the teachers. I am talking about the development of the students. I will admit that money has been wasted in the past, and there will be money wasted in the future, and there is money being wasted in the largest institutions of the country right now, by holding students in line because papa has a lot of money and may make a nice donation to the fund. Bed space is being wasted in that way. But I maintain that if we get down to selectivity we depart from democracy, we depart from the principle on which this Government is founded, we create a scientific oligarchy, and we wreck the whole purpose of the measure.

Mr. SMITH. I am not afraid of the good faith and the devotion of the scientists of this country. I am only asking that the thing be centered through them, and that there not be a Nation-wide scattering of funds just to cover every corner of the country.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with the Senator with respect to the scientists. I am willing to trust to the good sense and the honesty and integrity of the scientists of this country. But does the Senator confine that expression of confidence to the group in the National Academy of Sciences, to which reference has been made, or does the Senator's expression apply to all other scientific groups? I may say there are hundreds of them, and there are among them very capable and able men. Are we only to pick out one group and say "You are the arbiters of the scientific destiny of all the rest of us"? When the Senator is giving his expression of confidence is he talking about the scientists of the National Academy only, or is he talking about the vast body of other capable scientists who have not been so lucky as to have been selected to that august body?

Mr. SMITH. I am talking about all of them, and they can all be located. There is no problem in connection with that.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say that the Senator is more of an optimist than I am, because I have testimony in my hands that after 3 years of intensive work by the National Roster of Scientists they admit that they did not have listed more than 30 percent of the scientists of the United States. They have been unable to list any more of them. When the Senator says they can all be located, I think the statement is somewhat in conflict with the statement of the eminent college presidents who headed the National Roster for 4 years.

The future development of science in America depends in large measure on the strength of the laboratories of the Nation's universities and research institutions. Therefore, section 5 (c) provides that at least 50 percent of all research funds expended by the Foundation shall be used to support research in nonprofit organizations—25 percent to be distributed on a geographical basis and an additional 25 percent irrespective of location of the organization submitting the research proposals. This should result, not only in furthering the development of science but also in general strengthening of our institutions of higher education. The provision that 25 percent of all research funds—excluding national defense—expended by the Foundation shall be apportioned to each State on the basis of an automatic formula is included in order to assure an equitable geographic distribution. Many of our smaller institutions located in the less populous States and Territories are in serious need of support for their scientific work. Many of them are strategically located to carry on unique and greatly needed types of research, for example, research in tropical diseases in Puerto Rico, meteorological studies in Alaska. I had the pleasure and privilege of going through the University of Alaska, and I know the handicaps under which they work, and the funds they need for the work there. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was with me on that trip.

It would be a serious mistake for all of this financial aid to be concentrated in a few large institutions, since such maldistribution would result in a serious imbalance in the quality of higher education available in various parts of the country.

Some witnesses at the hearings feared that Federal support of science would place restrictions on the traditional freedom of scientific research. Such development would be a disaster both to science and the Nation. Subsection 5 (e) directs the Administrator to take steps to eliminate any restraints on scientific freedom.

Constant complaints were made that scientists in Government bureaus were not permitted to express their views. I may say to the Senator from Connecticut that such complaints were not limited to the Army and Navy. They came from all bureaus. So subsection 5 (e) allows every scientist who uses the foundation's funds to go about his work in any manner he sees fit with the sure knowledge that the foundation will stand behind his right to freedom of expression and research. Furthermore, the investigator is permitted to publish his personal views and conclusions, except on projects restricted in the interests of national security. This subsection will encourage the development of new ideas and scientific methods. It is in keeping with that tradition of freedom which is the very lifeblood of science. It was placed in the bill at the request of leading scientists, both those in the Government and those connected with other public institutions, as well as those in private laboratories.

SECTION 6. SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS

The success of any program of scientific research is dependent on the availability of adequate numbers of well-trained personnel. Almost every witness urged the provision for a broad program of scholarships and fellowships.

Section 6 would provide not only for undergraduate scholarships but for graduate and postdoctoral fellowships. Recipients of these awards are to be chosen solely on the basis of aptitude for scholarly pursuits.

It has not seemed wise to include specific provisions governing the procedure for selecting recipients of scholarships and fellowships nor to specify the mechanics by which this program would be administered. Again, to assure an equitable geographic distribution of funds, provision is made to permit the establishment of State quotas.

SECTION 7. REGISTER OF SCIENTIFIC PERSONNEL

The experience of war agencies has demonstrated the importance of placement facilities for scientific personnel. The success and usefulness of the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel and of the Office of Scientific Personnel suggest that the foundation should maintain an up-to-date register of trained personnel which would be particularly useful—

First. In meeting the personal needs of its own programs.

Second. In placing the scientific personnel trained through the foundation's programs of scholarships and fellowships.

Third. In selecting scientific personnel to meet the Nation's need in time of war or other national emergency.

SECTION 8. USE AND DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

Evidence presented at the hearings indicated that the progress of science is largely dependent on the full availability and the prompt dissemination of scientific information. Subsection 8 (a) directs the Administrator to maintain a control file of all federally financed research projects and research findings, to publish all useful materials, and authorizes him to cooperate with libraries, other governmental agencies, and scientific publications in a broad program designed to further the dissemination and use of scientific information.

We regard it essential that any legislation involving the expenditure of public funds shall include assurance that such expenditures be used for the general welfare and not reserved for the benefit of any special group. There has been no uniform policy with respect to the commercial rights to patents arising out of federally supported research. I am convinced that a uniform basic policy must be established in the national interest: Dedication of all fruits of Federal research to the public which has paid for the development. This policy is in accord with the traditions of free exchange of information among scientists and it seems to be the most logical and business-like solution to the problem.

The first sentence of subsection 8 (c) provides that all patent rights now held by the United States Government shall be made available to the public on a nonexclusive, royalty-free basis to the extent that the Government is entitled to do so under the rights held by it. This provision will have an important immediate effect because it will enable the making available to the public of the benefits of

many important inventions made under Government contracts and by Government employees during the war.

For example, under contracts of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the Government has received title to many patents in the field of microwave radar, rocket propellants, proximity-fuze developments, devices that were important in antisubmarine warfare, and in other important fields. Except for any such inventions that remain classified for security reasons and are, therefore, exempted under section 8 (f) from the requirement of public dedication so long as that classification remains, all such wartime inventions owned by the Government can now be made available for use by the general public. It must be remembered that such inventions may remain classified.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the Senator was engaged in a colloquy with the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] he referred to subsection (e) on page 13, relative to elimination of restraints upon free expression of scientific views. I understood the Senator to say that there was a provision in the bill for national security.

Mr. KILGORE. There is.

Mr. FERGUSON. What section is that, so that the RECORD may be clear?

Mr. KILGORE. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that we discussed that question previously. It is subsection (f) of section 8, on page 19.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator feel that that is sufficient protection?

Mr. KILGORE. Unquestionably. We have discussed that question. Subsection (f) of section 8, on page 19, reads as follows:

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the President, or any person designated for that purpose by him, may exempt from the requirements of this act relating to dedication to the pubic, publication, dissemination, making available, or reporting information, data, patents, inventions, or discoveries relating to or produced in the course of federally financed research or development or in which the United States holds any rights, if and so long as the President or such designated person determines that such exemption is essential in the interest of national security.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would it not be well, in subsection (e) of section 5, on page 13, to refer to subsection (f) of section 8, on page 19, so that there might be no question about the national security?

Mr. KILGORE. I feel that the words "notwithstanding the other provisions of this act" superimpose that subsection over subsection (b) of section 5, on page 13, but I am perfectly willing to accept an amendment in some such language as "except as provided in subsection (f) of section 8."

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I have in mind, so that there may be no question about it.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not think there is any question about it; but, in order to avoid any question, I am perfectly willing to agree to an amendment to that effect. This provision was inserted at the request of the scientists themselves who wanted—except for national defense—the ability to discuss their findings among themselves. They said that they had been handicapped in expressing their opinions.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree wholeheartedly, but I think there is one exception, and that is national defense.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with the Senator. The scientists also accepted that limitation. They said, "We do not want to discuss national defense; but with regard to everything else, we believe that we ought to have the right to discuss it publicly or privately."

In addition, all other patents to which the Government has title through the operations of other governmental agencies will be made freely available to the public. Therefore, there will be provided for the first time by statute a policy for the administration of Government-owned patents by all governmental agencies.

Although patents in the field of atomic energy now owned by the Government are covered by the provisions of section 8 (c) and thus would be available to the public, it is assumed that all such inventions will be exempted under section 8 (f) until legislation is enacted covering the field of atomic energy.

The provision of the subsection 8 (c) should not deprive research organizations or private industry of their just property rights in inventions developed in the course of Government contracts. Section 8 (d) attempts to provide for an equitable distribution of patent rights resulting from such cooperative projects and allows for contractual exceptions to the basic policy of public dedication in those cases where an invention is the result of a substantial private investment. This provision will maintain the basic policy of public dedication, while at the same time provide for the utilization of private research facilities, whenever it is in the public interest.

Since the general provisions of this section give preference to nonprofit institutions in the expenditure of research funds, certain additional restrictions have been included with respect to the retention of commercial patent rights by nonprofit institutions. While it is not anticipated that most nonprofit organizations will be interested in the retention of commercial rights to patents resulting from federally supported research, it seems wise to make provisions for such exceptional cases as may arise, thus assuring the Foundation of the possibility of utilizing research facilities which might not otherwise be available. In such cases, the basic policy of full utilization is assured by providing that any commercial patent rights retained by nonprofit institutions shall be made generally available through nonexclusive licenses and at a reasonable royalty.

Although recommending the adoption of the basic policy of full publication and free dedication of findings growing out of research and development supported by Federal funds, it is recognized that occasionally the demands of national security will demand exemption from the general provisions of this section. Therefore, subsection 8 (f) provides that the President, or any person designated by him, may make such exemption if he determines that it is essential in the interest of national security.

SECTION 9. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Section 9 authorizes Government agencies to enter into agreements with foreign governments for interchange of information and for cooperation in research projects, with presidential approval and through the Department of State. Wartime experience has shown the value of such collaboration, which was permitted under emergency legislation. This bill would continue that power, subject, of course, to security controls. Section 9 also permits the Foundation to defray expenses of American scientists to international congresses and meetings, a provision strongly urged by witnesses at the hearings who pointed out that American scientific groups were very badly represented at those meetings due to lack of funds.

SECTION 10. INTERDEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION

Approximately 40 Government agencies are at present engaged in scientific and technical activities. The need for coordination of this work in the many fields vital to the public interest has been hitherto met in many ways: By informal personal contacts among scientists, by impromptu meetings and, in some cases, by standing interdepartmental committees. Witnesses agreed that a more thorough coordination of this work is essential to an efficient Government and that the Foundation should assist in the integration of such programs. They emphasized, however, that this coordination must be by voluntary cooperative effort, not by arbitrary direction from one agency.

The discussion of information among the agencies will accomplish the necessary cooperation, because no agency wishes to work upon something which another agency has already accomplished.

Section 10 also provides for an Interdepartmental Committee on Science which, we believe, is a distinct improvement over the present ad hoc arrangements without hindering the independence or initiative of the various Federal research organizations.

SECTION 11. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Among the further provisions of the National Science Foundation bill is authorization for a 4-year carry-over of research funds to permit long range planning of projects. This provision would apply to all Federal agencies and is badly needed for many types of scientific work. The bill would also permit contracts without competitive bids and other restrictions, necessary for most public contracts but impossible to apply to scientific research.

The bill would also transfer to the foundation, the remaining functions of the Office of Scientific Research and Development and of the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel. This was done at the request of the heads of those two organizations.

Before concluding, I wish to place in the RECORD, as a part of my statement, a partial list of witnesses who appeared before the committee.

Among them were scientists such as Dr. Irving Langmuir, Dr. Harlow Shapley, Dr. Vannevar Bush, Dr. J. R. Oppenheimer, Dr. A. N. Richards, Dr. K. T. Compton, Dr. Harold C. Urey, Dr. Wesley Mitchell, and Dr. Lewis H. Weed. I mention these names in response to the questions which have been asked with respect to whether certain men participated. I submit for the RECORD a list of the names of the prominent scientists who participated, and the list gives their titles, as well. For the benefit of some Senators who have been asking questions, I should like to read a few of the other names on the list. We also had there Dr. C. F. Kettering, Dr. H. J. Curtis, Dr. Robert Wilson, Dr. Robert P. Fischelis, Dr. Morris Fishbein, Dr. Henry B. Richardson, Dr. John M. Gauss, and Col. Bradley Dewey.

There are many other names on the list, and I now submit it for the RECORD, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Prominent scientists: Dr. Irving Langmuir, associate director of the laboratory, General Electric Co.; Dr. Harlow Shapley, director, Harvard University Observatory; Dr. Vannevar Bush, director, Office of Scientific Research and Development; Dr. J. R. Oppenheimer, former director, New Mexico laboraties, Manhattan project; professor of physics, University of California; Dr. A. N. Richards, chairman, Committee on Medical Research, Office of Scientific Research and Development; Dr. K. T. Compton, president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. Harold C. Urey, Nobel prize winner, professor of physics, University of Chicago; Dr. Wesley Mitchell, Social Science Research Council; Dr. Lewis H. Weed, chairman, Division of Medical Sciences, National Research Council.

Leaders of scientific organizations: Dr. C. F. Kettering, president, American Association for the Advancement of Science; Dr. H. J. Curtis, Association of Oak Ridge Scientists; Dr. Robert Wilson, Association of Los Alamos Scientists; Dr. Robert P. Fischelis, secretary, American Pharmaceutical Association; Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association; Dr. Henry B. Richardson, Physician's Forum; Dr. John M. Gaus, president, American Political Science Association; Col. Bradley Dewey, president, American Chemical Society.

Leaders of national organizations: Lewis S. Hines, American Federation of Labor; Russell Smith, National Farmers Union; R. K. Lamb, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Morris Cooke, Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Science, and Professions; Dr. Kirtley Mather, American Association of Scientific Workers.

Educational leaders: Dr. Isaiah Bowman, president, Johns Hopkins University; Rev. J. C. O'Donnell, president, University of Notre Dame; Dr. Edmund E. Day, president, Cornell University; Dr. Leonard Carmichael, president, Tufts College; Dr. Henry A. Moe, secretary-general, Guggenheim Foundation; Dr. James B. Conant, president, Harvard University; president, American Association for the Advancement of Science; Dr. George F. Zook, president, American Council on Education; Dr. Ralph McDonald, executive secretary, National Education Association.

Industrial leaders: Bruce K. Brown, vice president in charge of development, Standard Oil Co.; Edwin H. Land, president, Polaroid Corp.; R. E. Gillmor, president, Sperry Gyroscope Co.

Government officials: Dr. J. C. Hunsaker, chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce; Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War; James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy; Harold L. Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior; Howland H. Sargeant, Chief, Division of Patent Administration, Alien Property Custodian; Casper W. Ooms, Commissioner, United States Patent Office.

Other prominent citizens: Watson Davis, director, Science Service; Bernard M. Baruch.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I also have received letters or petitions from the American Society of Biological Chemists; the Austin Community Forum, of Oak Park, Ill.; the West Virginia Chapter of Sigma Xi Scientific Fraternity; the Still Memorial Research Trust, of Kirksville, Mo.; the University of Texas Chapter of Sigma Xi Scientific Fraternity; the Connecticut Chapter of the Sigma Xi Scientific Fraternity, at the University of Connecticut; the members of the graduate school and the faculty of the Department of Biology of Harvard University; the Society for Expermental Biology and Medicine; the American Council on Education; the Buffalo Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers; the Central Ohio Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers; the Mid-Missouri Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers; the faculty of Albion College; Dr. Karl Compton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; the South Carolina Academy of Science; the National Research Council of the Young Men's Christian Associations; the Union of the American Biological Societies; and the members of the faculty of the College of Letters and Sciences, University of California. I submit the petitions and letters, and ask to have them printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the petitions and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTS, INC.,
Albany, Calif., June 12, 1946.

Mr. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: I understand that Senate bill 1850, creating a National Science Foundation, is presently on the calendar of the Senate.

I am instructed by the Council of the American Society of Biological Chemists to advise you that the Society wishes to record itself in favor of the bill.

The Council of the American Society of Biological Chemists is impressed with the importance of Federal support for research and education in science, particularly at this critical time in our history. The Council believes that bill S. 1850 provides a satisfactory way to accomplish this.

I therefore take the liberty in the name of the American Society of Biological Chemists to ask your support for this measure.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD KENT BALLS,
Secretary.

P. S.—I am sending similar letter to Senators THOMAS, DOWNEY, KNOWLAND, and a copy of this letter to Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, University of Pennsylvania.

OAK PARK, ILL., *April 21, 1946.*

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Washington, D. C.:

Austin Community Forum well attended meeting at Third Unitarian Church heard Dr. David P. Boder, of Illinois Institute of Technology, tell of great value and importance of Magnuson-Kilgore bill and voted unanimously to wire you, urging committee recommend its passage, including provision for social sciences.

Rev. EDWIN T. BUEHRER.

MORGANTOWN, W. VA., *May 1, 1946.*

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

West Virginia Chapter Sigma Xi, representing more than 100 research scientists, urges prompt consideration of Kilgore-Magnuson bill, S. 1850, and its passage without essential change or crippling amendments. The State of West Virginia, its people, industries and institutions, particularly West Virginia University, will gain greatly needed support of research and scholarship through the provisions of this nonpartisan bill. We feel, as do American scientists in overwhelming majority, that Federal support must be given to scientific research to retain our present position in comparison with England and Russia, where science received generous state support, and to make the epochal progress to be anticipated under Federal support.

T. L. CARTLEDGE,
Secretary, WVU, Morgantown.

THE STILL MEMORIAL RESEARCH TRUST,
Kirksville, Mo., March 19, 1946.

Senator H. M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: Thank you for sending me the report of the science legislation from the subcommittee on war mobilization. You and the others who are interested in the National Science Foundation are doing a splendid job.

A few days ago I attended the meeting of the Federation of Biological Sciences at Atlantic City. You will probably be interested to know that the people with whom I talked, without exception, spoke highly of the cooperative attitude that you and your subcommittee have shown while this proposed legislation has been under discussion.

At the same time there was much concern over the legislation which affects the control of atomic energy. Without exception the people with whom I talked (and throughout the group discussions that were held) expressed very deep convictions that the control of atomic energy research must be in the hands of civilians and not in the hands of the armed forces.

Thank you again for sending me the report, and I hope you will keep me on the mailing list for future material of this kind.

Sincerely yours,

J. S. DENSLOW.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY,
Austin, April 8, 1946.

The Honorable HARLEY M. KILGORE,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Last December the Texas Chapter of the Society of Sigma Xi instructed me to submit to you a resolution pertaining to the chapter's desires for legislation on Federal aid for the support of research.

The society now wishes to go on record as favoring Senate bill No. 1850 as a close approach to what it had in mind as to adequate legislation on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS F. HATCH,
Secretary.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT,
Storrs, Conn., May 3, 1946.

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: The following resolution regarding legislation on a National Science Foundation for the promotion and support of scientific research and education was passed, and is herewith submitted, by the Connecticut Chapter of the Society of the Sigma Xi:

1. We strongly endorse the principle of the establishment of a National Science Foundation for the promotion and support of scientific research and scientific education.

2. We feel that a National Science Foundation will serve to stimulate research and science education as well as to increase the dissemination of scientific knowledge.

3. We believe that the Kilgore and Magnuson bill, without essential change or crippling amendment, sets up a workable and desirable organization for the direction of the activities of a National Science Foundation.

Therefore it is resolved that this group wishes to urge our Government to take all steps necessary for full passage of this bill.

We urge you, personally, to do all in your power to attain these ends.

Respectfully yours,

HAROLD M. SCOTT,
President, the Connecticut Chapter of the Society of the Sigma Xi.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
THE BIOLOGICAL LABORATORIES,
Cambridge, Mass., May 18, 1946.

Hon. Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed statement is signed by members of the graduate school and of the faculty of the Department of Biology of Harvard University.

As scientists who will probably be directly affected by your bill to create a National Science Foundation, we wish to express our sincere appreciation of your efforts to aid scientific endeavors.

We feel the attempt to make the encouragement of the scientific spirit a part of Government interests should be wholeheartedly supported, since the accomplishments of scientists are ultimately of such wide social import.

We have also sent to the committee concerned a signed statement indicating approval of S. 1717, the atomic energy control bill and of the Acheson-Lilienthal report.

We respectfully solicit your support of these documents.

Yours truly,

DEXTER M. EASTON,
Teaching Fellow in Biology
(For the Graduate Committee).

In order that the benefits of scientific investigation may be enabled more effectively to promote the welfare of the people of the United States and of the world, and

In order that the efforts of scientists may be integrated more effectively and aided to advance the progress of science.

We do urgently ask that you devote your most earnest efforts to securing passage, before the end of the present congressional session, of S. 1850, the Kilgore-Magnuson bill to create a National Research Foundation.

Harold T. Gordon, Dexter M. Easton, Janet Vivian, A. Carl Leopold, Rhoda Garrison, Mauritz Anderson, James E. Canright, Robert M. Paige, Roy V. Talmage, Helen F. Simpson, David Kaufman, G. Edgar Folk, Jr., Robert St. George, Ruth Hubbard, Mary Ishimoto, George A. Edwards, Charles E. Jenner, Edmund R. Brill, Eliot B. Spiles, Gordon Allen, Jean Allen, Virginia L. Senders, B. L. Boyle, Jr., George Wald, Ernest Ball, Carroll M. Williams, William P. Jacobs, Eliot Landsman, Glenn N. Yanagi, C. W. S. Sparrow, Charlotte S. Pratt, Lewis H. Kleinlohr, Irving P. Delappe, Rhoda C. Sparrow, James W. Carnevon, Sidney Soloway, John W. Senders, Charles J. Bishop, Karl F. Grethe, William L. Whitting, John T. Bonner, Kenneth V. Kleinam, Edward S. Carter, James E. Gunckel, John H. Welsh, F. M. Carpenter, George L. Clarke.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
SOCIETY FOR EXPERIMENTAL BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE,
New York City, May 22, 1946.

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine is a national organization dedicated to the furtherance of the highest standards in experimental medicine and biology. Its proceedings, published monthly, is read by leading scientists in all lands. Its membership, over 2,000, includes all the leading investigators in medicine, pathology, physiology, biochemistry, etc. It has 14 branches in the chief medical centers of the country.

Its executive body or council includes the chairman of each section and other elected officers. This council, by almost unanimous vote, earnestly requests that in the best interests of medical and biological, as well as other sciences, and in the best interests of our country, you use your best efforts to help in the adoption of the compromise bill known as Magnuson-Gilgore bill S. 1850.

On behalf of the council, listed below, and authorized by them,

Respectfully yours,

A. J. GOLDFORB,
General Secretary.

A. Baird Hastings, president, professor biochemistry, Harvard University; E. M. K. Geiling, vice president, pharmacologist, University of Chicago; A. J. Goldforb, general secretary, biologist, College of the City of New York; A. J. Carlson, physiologist emeritus, University of Chicago; G. R. Cowgill, physiologist, Yale University; E. A. Doisy, biochemist, St. Louis University; C. A. Dragstedt, physiologist, Northwestern University; L. P. Gebhardt, bacteriologist, University of Utah; R. G. Green, bacteriologist, University of Minnesota; I. Greenwald, biochemist, New York University; P. J. Hanzlik, pharmacologist, Stanford University; L. R. Jones, bacteriologist, St. Louis University; C. D. Leake, pharmacologist, University of Texas; R. D. Manwell, zoology, Syracuse University; R. F. Parker, medicine, Western Reserve University; H. P. Rusch, cancer research, University of Wisconsin; H. Stevens, agricultural chemistry, United States Department of Agriculture; A. van Harreveld, biological science, California Institute of Technology; E. D. Warner, pathologist, State University of Iowa; C. J. Wiggers, physiologist, Western Reserve University; W. F. Windle, medicine, Northwestern University.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1946.

Hon. HARLEY H. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: The Committee on the Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government has followed with deep interest the legislation to provide a national research foundation. The committee was gratified when the compromise legislation, S. 1850, was reported out favorably by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. It was our earnest hope that this bill would be acted upon promptly by the Senate.

It is a matter of keen disappointment that the Senate passed over S. 1850 when it was called up on the calendar Friday, April 12. The bill has far-reaching implications for all education and especially for research and scholarships in institutions of higher education. It is in our judgment an extremely important piece of legislation in the national interest and one which has the almost unanimous support of education.

May we, therefore, urge that every effort be made by you to get the bill back on the calendar at an early date and that you support the legislation. Time is an important factor since the bill must yet be introduced into the House and acted upon by this body also before adjournment.

The American Council on Education is, as you know, a nonprofit organization; its membership is composed of 115 national educational associations and some 800 college and universities. It is because of this large and representative membership that the council is deeply interested in the passage of S. 1850. If you care to discuss the bill with a representative of the council, we shall be most happy to do so.

Sincerely yours,

George F. Zook, President; Harry W. Chase, Chairman, Chancelor, New York University; James B. Conant, President, Harvard University; Carter Davidson, President, Union College; Edward V. Stanford, Rector, Augustinian College; Raymond Walters, President, University of Cincinnati; Herman B. Wells, President, Indiana University; Roscoe L. West, President, State Teachers College, Trenton, N. J.; Francis J. Brown, Secretary, American Council on Education.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS,
BUFFALO SECTION,
Buffalo, N. Y., April 23, 1946.

The Honorable HARLEY KILGORE,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: As you know, there is before the Congress of the United States proposed legislation to establish a national science foundation. The engineers joint council, composed of representatives of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Engineers, American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, American Institute of Electrical Engineers, American institution of Chemical Engineers, took the following action at a meeting held on March 7, 1946:

"Voted, that copies of Dr. Bakhmeteff's letter to council dated March 4, 1946, respecting legislative bill S. 1850, be forwarded to constituent societies with the recommendation that they forward copies to their respective local sections recommending support of legislative bill S. 1850."

At a meeting held April 1, 1946, the board of directors of the Buffalo section of the American Society of Civil Engineers recorded their support of this legislation and authorized the secretary of the section so to inform you.

By order of the board of directors,

Very truly yours,

A. STUART COLLINS,
Secretary.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS,
CENTRAL OHIO SECTION,
Columbus, Ohio, April 27, 1946.

The Honorable HARLEY KILGORE,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

SIR: You will be interested to know that the central Ohio section, American Society of

Civil Engineers, in formal action has indicated a favorable attitude toward legislative bill S. 1850, which provides for a national science foundation.

Respectfully yours,

CLARENCE D. BOWSER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

MID-MISSOURI SECTION,
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS,
Jefferson City, Mo., May 24, 1946.

Hon. HARLEY KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: The Mid-Missouri Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, gave its endorsement at its meeting of May 3, 1946, for legislation to establish a National Science Foundation as covered by Senate bill 1850.

It further ordered that the secretary notify you to this effect and also express its appreciation of your efforts on behalf of this bill.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. SCHULTEN,
Secretary.

ALBION COLLEGE,
Albion, Mich., May 29, 1946.

Senator H. M. KILGORE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: At a recent meeting the faculty of Albion College voted to go on record as approving the passage of Senate bill 1850. I was instructed, as secretary, to notify you of our feeling in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY ENGLE,
Secretary of the Faculty.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY,
March 7, 1946.

Senator H. M. KILGORE,
Subcommittee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: It seems to me that the new bill, S. 1850, offers the possibility of getting together on a workable scheme which should enlist sufficiently general support to permit the program for a National Science Foundation to go ahead. I should like to express my appreciation of the manner in which you and your colleagues have worked to perfect the legislation, and to try to find mutually acceptable compromises on points where your ideas and those of Senator MAGNUSON and Dr. Bush have diverged.

As you know, I should personally prefer still to see a few changes made, but my guess is that S. 1850 represents about the best approximation which can be made to a plan which would receive rather general support by both the scientists and the public administrators. I hope therefore that there may be sufficiently general backing to put this through.

Very cordially yours,

KARL COMPTON,
President.

MEDICAL COLLEGE OF THE
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Charleston, S. C., May 22, 1946.

The Honorable HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: The South Carolina Academy of Science, comprising a membership of 300, at its first postwar meeting held in Charleston, S. C., April 27, 1946, voted unanimously as being in favor of Federal support of scientific research and development in the United States and Territories. It was felt that this step is necessary because of dwindling resources of endowed foundations, in order to keep scientifically abreast of other nations, to meet the needs of the national welfare and to provide proper scientific training for young students of ability irrespective of need. Of the various bills presented in the national legislative houses, our academy favors the majority of ideas embodied in S. 1850 (Kilgore-Magnuson bill), especially the following features: the creation of a National Science Foundation, a Board of nine members selected from the field of science, the equal division among the States of certain shares of funds which may be appropriated to the Foundation, the provisions for scholarships and fellowships for qualified students and the widest latitude in permitting unhampered research.

In case of subsequent modification from its present form it is further believed by us that due consideration should be given to any changes which may restrict traditional free and individualistic scientific investigation and development.

With sincere and high personal regards, we are,

Very truly yours,

A. M. LASSEK, Ph. D., M. D.,
Committee Chairman.
MARTIN D. YOUNG, Sc. D.
B. R. WHALEY.

UNION OF AMERICAN
BIOLOGICAL SOCIETIES,
New York, N. Y., May 13, 1946.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the Union of the American Biological Societies which comprises 38 national biological organizations with a total membership of over 25,000 individuals throughout the country, we are asking your support of the Senate bill 1850 creating a National Science Foundation.

The bill is nonpartisan. Its formulation has been through the active cooperation of numerous outstanding scientists and scientific groups in various parts of the country. Speaking more particularly for the biologists and biology teachers which include the botanical, zoological, physiological, biochemical, medical, and agronomical scientists, we all of us heartily endorse S. 1850.

We would greatly appreciate your assurance that all that is possible will be done to have the bill passed.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT CHAMBERS,
President, 1946; Professor of Biology,
New York University.
JOHN S. KARLING,
Secretary, 1946; Professor of Botany,
Columbia University.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN
ASSOCIATIONS OF THE UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., December 10, 1945.

Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: The National Research Council of the Young Men's Christian Associations which was in session on November 30 and December 1, instructed me as its chairman, to express to you its hope that the social sciences would be included within the provisions that may be recommended by your committee for the establishment of a national research foundation—included both in relation to the training of research workers and to the promotion of research.

The Young Men's Christian Association and similar agencies devoted to improving the health, the vocational effectiveness, and the moral stamina of the people, together with their general competence as citizens of the Republic, depend largely upon the social sciences for the increase of their usefulness as organizations. These agencies, we believe, contribute largely to the national well-being, the security, and the defense of the Nation. Therefore, the increase of their effectiveness would seem to be a legitimate concern of the Government.

Moreover, the strength of the Nation seems to us to be dependent upon the wholesomeness of human relations among our own people and institutions quite as much as upon any other factors. These relationships are the subjects of scientific investigation beyond the fields of medical research or the natural sciences, as commonly classified. As increasing importance in the organization of the United Nations is being attributed to the Economic and Social Council, so it would seem to us that increasing emphasis in our own country should be placed upon the sciences that contribute directly to the social and economic welfare of our own people.

The Research Council of the Young Men's Christian Association, therefore, respectfully urges the inclusion of the social sciences within the scope of the National Research Foundation. This might be accomplished, it seems to us, either by setting up a section of the foundation to serve the social sciences, or by including the social sciences along with other sciences in such general fields of research as national security, health, and general welfare.

A similar letter is being sent to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

Respectfully,

S. WIRT WILEY,
Chairman, Research Council.

PETITION CONCERNING NATIONAL SCIENCE LEGISLATION BY MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF LETTERS AND SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

We, the undersigned members of the Department of Geography of the University of California, Los Angeles, having reviewed the provisions and background of legislation now pending in Congress for the establishment of a National Science Foundation, respectfully petition the Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives to lend all possible aid toward enactment at the present session of Congress of the provisions embodied in S. 1850, and of suitable appropriations therefor.

1. Cogent reasons for the enactment of legislation providing liberal Federal support for research in the natural sciences have been well summarized in the report on science legislation from the Subcommittee on War Mobilization to the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, February 27, 1946. As professional students in fields especially concerned with the welfare of the individual and of society, we urge the importance of liberal support of scientific research on the grounds there stated.

2. With regard to the provisions of S. 1850 for support of research in the social sciences, we submit that more extensive and confident commitments might well be made. We view those provisions, however, as adequate to facilitate much-needed planning and important steps toward initiating a broadened program of research in areas of social science that urgently need Federal support to contribute to national prosperity and to good international relations. We therefore urge enactment of the provisions of S. 1850 with respect to social sciences without attempt at any modification which might jeopardize action during the present session of Congress.

In support of this position, we call attention to the statement regarding the importance of social science research submitted by the Social Science Research Council at the Senate hearings on science legislation, October 29, 1945, and to the statements on research in particular areas of social science submitted at those hearings by John M.

Gaus, Robert M. Yerkes, E. G. Nourse, William F. Ogburn, and John M. Cooper.

Social scientists and the results of their research, were of great aid in many branches of Government service during the war. General John Magruder, testifying at committee hearings on this legislation, said regarding social scientists: "Their role is vital, both in the strategy of war and in the strategy of peace, and the War Department takes the view that their encouragement is worthy of sponsorship." (Hearings, p. 899.)

The diversity of the service of social scientists and their dispersal among many agencies, however, militated against formulation during the war and in the early postwar months of a unified program for postwar research in the social sciences. Preoccupation of many social scientists with pressing postwar economic and social problems threatens further to delay the formulation of a needed broad program for research in the social sciences. Aid which enactment of the social science provisions of S. 1850 could give to such broad planning would be of the greatest value to the Nation.

3. In thus urging enactment of the provisions of S. 1850, including those applying to social-science research, we do so in the opinion that Members of the Senate who have cooperated in developing proposals for science legislation to the stage represented by the bill, have considered and weighed numerous and sometimes conflicting views with such care and discrimination that efforts to improve further the legislative proposal before enactment are no longer warranted.

4. The undersigned members of the faculties of the indicated departments of social science of the University of California, Los Angeles, subscribe individually and personally to the foregoing statements.

CLIFFORD M. ZIERER.
RUTH E. BAUGH.
ROBERT M. GLENDINNING.
HENRY J. BRUMAN.
J. E. SPENCER.
R. REX BRITTINGHAM.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, in conclusion let me again urge the need for speedy action on this measure. Not only do we believe that speedy action on it is necessary, but we firmly believe that Federal support is necessary for the full development and application of the Nation's scientific resources. I do not believe that even the opponents of the bill will dispute that. As a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, I am naturally concerned over our measures for national defense. Today, our ability to defend our Nation depends on our progress in science and technology, not only in purely military fields but in all fields affected by modern total war.

As an American citizen and as a Member of the Senate, however, I am concerned about the scientific development of our Nation for the benefit of the people who live in it, because I consider that a national defense asset. Particularly we need a strong program for progress in the fundamental sciences which are basic to our industrial and technical development. We must assure opportunities for the education of our promising young scientists and we must assure that they will have the opportunity to turn their talents to useful work.

Mr. President, the National Science Foundation would naturally cover certain fields of applied science, but the principal thing in my opinion and the principal asset and resource which can be developed is the training of scientists and giving them an opportunity to engage in research.

One thing which would be done under this bill, and which has never been done before, is to make an attempt to explore certain unexplored territory, to analyze the explored territory, to map the explored territory, to decide what is unexplored territory, and to develop a centralized effort in respect to making researches in such unexplored territory.

For that reason I think all must admit that the bill is needed. I believe it is urgently needed, and I believe its speedy passage is essential to the safety of our Nation at the present time.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. Gladly.

Mr. HART. I gathered from something the distinguished Senator said a little while ago, during the debate with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], that of the two divisions for scholarship and for fellowship, he believes that the one for fellowship is the more important. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. KILGORE. No. The Senator from New Jersey said he believed that provision for scholarships should be obliterated, and that provision should be made only for fellowships. I said that I felt that both were important. So I say it would be hard to determine which is the more important. There are many good scientific minds in this country among our youth that should have an opportunity to be developed. But the youngster who can get $5,000 or $6,000 to go ahead with a basic scientific education probably will not need a fellowship when his education is completed.

Mr. HART. I understood the Senator from West Virginia to say that this is not so much a matter of straight education in classrooms, and so forth, as it is a matter of actual participation in research, which, to me, from my experience in education—which was very brief—would indicate that the Senator was thinking of fellowships, rather than of scholarships.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Connecticut utterly misunderstood what I said. I said we cannot develop good scientists without research. We cannot teach science by textbooks alone, and research facilities are necessary in developing the undergraduate scientists. I further said that no man can teach scientists properly at a collegiate standard unless he is a good research man.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HART. No doubt the Senator from West Virginia is cognizant of the excellent address which was made last week by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] concerning consideration of Senate bill 1248, known as the Fulbright bill, more or less in conjunction with the bill now under discussion, Senate bill 1850. During that discussion it was stated that the two bills cover entirely different fields. The Senator from New York pointed out that Senate bill 1248 was very largely a matter of application.

If that be the case, will the Senator from West Virginia give his reasons for including the Division of Engineering and Technology as one of the eight divisions to be set up under Senate bill 1850.

Mr. KILGORE. I did not quite understand all the Senator said. I am sorry that I did not hear all of it.

Mr. HART. My question is this: Why does the Senator from West Virginia desire to set up a Division of Engineering and Technology, inasmuch as that field seems to be covered by the other bill which is on the Senate Calendar, Senate bill 1248?

Mr. KILGORE. Oh, no; it is not fully covered. We discussed that matter very fully. Although Senate bill 1248 goes into that subject, we have to have a Division of Engineering and Technology set up in connection with the pending bill, in order to keep the Foundation properly balanced. As I said before, the bill is an augmentation bill, and it establishes a revolving fund. If Senate bill 1248 would completely take care of our engineering needs, of course there would be no need for such a Division of Engineering and Technology as a part of the Foundation to be set up by the pending bill. But I assure the Senator from Connecticut, as he must realize, because he is an engineer, that the engineering, exploratory fields of science are almost limitless.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As one of the sponsors of the bill, I am very much in sympathy with its objectives and its purposes, and I am supporting it fully. However, there is one question which occurs to me and if I understand one of the provisions correctly, I am not in full accord with it. I refer to a provision on page 3, with respect to the eight divisions which are to be set up, and among them I notice there is to be a Division of Social Sciences. What is the conception of the Senator from West Virginia of the work which will be done by a Division of Social Sciences, and why should such a science be brought into a program of the kind covered by this bill? Why is it necessary?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Colorado that I hope he will hold up his question until a little later in the debate, when I am informed the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] will be present. He is an eminent authority on the subject and his advice was given great importance by the committee. I believe he can more fully explain the matter.

But let me say to the Senator very frankly that, in my opinion, the social sciences involve many problems which have to be solved by the natural sciences, and in turn the natural sciences involve many developments of the social sciences. So it is important to get the two groups together under one umbrella, so to speak. In addition, as was well pointed out by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] in the committee, it is impossible to draw a

distinguishing line between the social sciences and the natural sciences. There are a few subjects included in the social sciences which are not included in the natural sciences. However, there are many subjects included in the natural sciences which are included also in the social sciences. It must be remembered that we incorporated a statement in the bill on that subject. We make provision for setting up a division which is directed to make a study and promulgate a program. The purpose is to ascertain how the program will fit into the general picture. But we felt it to be only fair to give those sciences which have such close relationships a broad consideration under the bill. For example, anthropology in a social science, but we must admit also that it is a natural science as well. Mathematics and various statistics must also be considered. Why not give the scientists an opportunity to bring all those matters in and have the questions relating to them fully answered?

Mr. President, with reference to that subject I should prefer to have the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] go more fully into it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I would be very glad to hear the arguments of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] on the need for a division of social sciences. But it does not occur to me that we should cover all the extraneous sciences outside of natural sciences. I am heartily in accord with a bill to establish a foundation for natural sciences. But when we get into political sciences, social sciences, religious sciences, and so forth, it does not seem to me that the umbrella, to which the Senator has referred, could be large enough to cover such matters.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator noticed, did he not, that we did not go into the question of religion or politics? In many ways social sciences are so indissolubly linked with the natural sciences, that we want them to come in under their own subhead in order to achieve results. We say to the social scientists, "You must first submit to a group of scientists a program showing good reason for obtaining money to further your progress." No one would suggest that we depart from a study of anthropology. No one would suggest that we depart from statistics. Yet they are both a part of social sciences. Sometimes we find even sanitary engineering a part of the social sciences. Those various fields become so indissolubly linked that it is hard to separate them.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before I proceed to a discussion of the bill I wish to make a statement with reference to the question which the Senator from Colorado asked. It was a very pertinent question, and I think it should be fully considered.

In case the distinguished Senator from Utah does not return soon to the Chamber, I think the RECORD should show, in all fairness, that the division of social sciences was added to both bills subsequent to the time of the hearings. It was added for some of the reasons stated by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and for other reasons as well.

During the course of the testimony of many eminent witnesses, it was found that scientific problems overlapped on some occasions into the realm of social sciences. The social scientists themselves testified that they had no intention of embarking upon a vast program into the realm of social sciences, but they did feel that there would be many cases in which the Foundation would probably agree to go into a program which involved the natural and social sciences, even when they overlapped.

In order to safeguard the situation, we incorporated the following language:

> The functions of each division shall be prescribed by the Administrator after receiving the advice of the Board, except that until the Administrator and the Board have received general recommendations from the Division of Social Sciences regarding the support of research through that Division, support of social science research shall be limited to studies of the impact of scientific discovery on the general welfare and studies required in connection with other projects supported by the Foundation.

In other words, for the next few months, or possibly for the next few years, the Division of Social Sciences will merely be in position to submit certain studies to the Board. The Board may decide that there may be some necessity for research being conducted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, before leaving that point, I wish to say that there may be some misconception with regard to a study of social sciences being confused with what we commonly think of as politics, socialism, or some form of social philosophy. It certainly was not in the minds of the authors of the bill to promote any particular social philosophy of that kind. But a study of certain human relationships and certain scientific bases would have nothing to do with socialism, or any subjects of that kind. A subject such as psychological warfare, which was of extreme importance in connection with fighting the war, would be the type of scientific research which would be a part of national defense. It is a subject which could consistently be studied on a scientific basis, and would have nothing to do with communism, socialism, or any matter of that kind. I believe that fact should be kept in mind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In preparing a bill for atomic energy control, for example, we encountered that very problem. We did not set up an organization to handle the Division of Social Sciences as applied to nuclear fission. We simply skipped it. We felt that the matter bordered on political and social questions of many kinds. We could see no value in delving into it at this time. It seems to me that unless a very pronounced limitation is placed upon the activities which might be pursued along this line, Congress might be building up something which will not be of advantage to the country, but, instead, of great disadvantage, and will bog down the foundation of natural sciences which we are trying to create through this bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that many of us share his views. The atomic energy bill, of course, dealt with one specific subject, while this bill deals with the broad field of science. That particular field could include, for example, the subject of medicine and medical research. Dr. Bowman, as I recall, testified that it might be entirely possible that a university in some section of the country would wish to examine into the living conditions of the population and learn how they live, in order to gather information regarding particular diseases, such as tuberculosis or cancer. Therefore, we thought that by placing this limitation in the bill, the Board could well pass on those questions. We believed that the Board would be sensible about the matter and would not approve any activity in the social science field which was not strictly a part of natural science, or a part of some national problem involved in science itself.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that probably those who are somewhat doubtful about the pending bill are not essentially in opposition to it, but probably are more in need of information as to some of its provisions, possibly I shall be briefer in my statement on the bill than I would have been, in the hope that any Senator who is in doubt will ask questions, and in the hope that I may explain sections of the bill which are not quite clear to Senators. In any event Mr. President, in my opinion, Senate bill 1850 is substantially more in the public interest at the present time than any other measure pending in Congress.

Science has become a full partner with the military. It proved its worth in winning the war. Probably no more important function of our Government existed in the preparation for war and in the winning of the great war just concluded than the Office of Scientific Research and Development, headed by the very able and eminent Dr. Vannevar Bush. He, along with his fellow educators and scientists throughout the country, gathered together in a single body all the great scientific brains at our country's disposal, and developed so many things that to go into detail would take too long, but they range from the atomic bomb clear on down to the proximity fuse, sound devices, and literally hundreds of other devices which did not exist prior to the war, but which not only helped us win the war, but will be of great benefit to our people in peacetime.

In the last 2 or 3 weeks we have passed several bills which appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for our Military Establishment, both the Army and the Navy, and it was proper and necessary to do that. But side by side with the upkeep of our great military strength, in order to help keep the peace in the world, comes science. In that field, in my opinion, we have been woefully neglectful. The draft in the early days of the war, and up to the end of the war, to some extent, continued to take basic scientific people. I stated on the

floor of the Senate a few days ago, when I offered an amendment to exempt those in scientific pursuits and those studying science from the draft in the future, that it could be conceivable that training 2 or 3 men in a laboratory might be worth 10,000 men marching up and down a parade field.

Of course, predictions sometimes go into the realm of the unknown, but surely there is not a man in this country or in this body who will not agree that science has now taken on such an important aspect that we cannot afford to neglect its development, both for military and peacetime uses.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There cannot be any doubt of that. It is not a matter of speculation that such things as the proximity fuse, for example, were worth many battalions of men. Was it not absolutely essential when it came to the invasion of Europe?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was absolutely essential. Of course such things contributed in a great degree to the winning of the war

As the Senator from West Virginia has pointed out, the pending bill is the result of many months of hearings and of study. I have in my hand one volume, which contains the testimony of approximately 110 of the most eminent people in the United States, both in the scientific and lay fields. It contains the testimony of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Director of the Budget, the Secretary of Commerce, and many others who have been interested in this matter for some time.

Not only has the subject been gone into in the hearings proper, but my files, and I know the files of the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from West Virginia, and other members of the committee, are filled with statements and correspondence, speeches and exchanges of views on this whole subject. Although in the beginning there were some mild differences of opinion as to the administrative set-up of the National Science Research Board, and although there were some differences of opinion regarding some sections of the bill because of the vast range of activity the bill covers and because of the complexities involved, that was only natural. Most of us have gotten together and have agreed that Senate bill 1850 is about as good a bill as can be written at this time on this very vital subject. I hope the Senate will act quickly on the measure. It is of vital importance, and every witness, including the eminent people about whom I have spoken, has urged expeditious passage of the bill.

The Office of Scientific Research and Development expired last night. Within their files they had, and still have, some continuing contracts, some of them of a highly secret nature, but all of them with great scientific institutions. This activity should not be allowed to expire and disappear, but should be taken over for the national welfare by some such foundation as would be set up under the bill.

Mr. President, I introduced an original bill for the National Science Foundation, but my original proposal, developed some year and a half ago, confined itself mostly to fellowships and scholarships. I followed that course because an appraisal of our scientific manpower reservoir was appalling at that time and somewhat disturbing, not only to me but to many of the witnesses, including the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War. We are short approximately 17,000 basic scientists in this country. Because of 5 years of war, we took away from many young people the possibility of getting education and training in basic science.

The strange thing brought out by the war, although we probably excelled the world in applied scientific development, was the fact that America lagged behind other countries in the training of basic scientists and in basic scientific principles.

I refer briefly to the committee report, in which it is pointed out:

> First is the fact that practically no basic scientific research was carried on during the war years; scientists were too busy developing practical applications of previously discovered scientific principles to continue their basic research. In the words of one of the witnesses appearing before your subcommittee:
>
> "For the most part, what happened during the war was not in any proper sense scientific work; it was the exploitation of skills, techniques, fundamental knowledge, all of which had been cultivated in the days of peace; an exploitation which has tended to impoverish our stocks rather than to increase them."
>
> Even more disturbing to your subcommittee was its finding that the basic scientific discoveries on which most of the wartime scientific developments were based were made not by American but by European scientists. Again to quote from a distinguished scientist:
>
> "It should be somewhat humiliating to us to realize that the revolutionary sulfa drugs had their beginning in German research laboratories; that atom splitting was discovered in Berlin; that the basic pioneer work that has led to radio and radar and the enormous American electronic industries was that of a German professor. Penicillin came from England, DDT from Germany and Switzerland."

By that the witness means, of course, the basic scientific principles which led to the development of these things. He proceeded in the testimony to give a list of many things we can initiate here, and the things we used for military purposes during the war. The report proceeds:

> Witness after witness emphasized the relative weakness of American science in fundamental studies, but perhaps none so effectively as one great chemist, a Nobel laureate:
>
> "This contrast between the relative strength of pure science and its industrial applications in Europe and the United States can be illustrated in other ways. We are strong on applications and weak in fundamental science.
>
> "The point I wish to make is illustrated by the statistics on the number of men who have received Nobel prizes in chemistry, physics, and medicine. These prizes are not the only measure of scientific excellence, as all scientists are aware, but they are a significant index, since they are awarded without regard to nationality."

Here, Mr. President, are the statistics showing the number of Nobel prize winners in the United States as compared to the prize winners in Europe. In chemistry the United States has 4 and Europe 37. In physics, the United States has 8 and Europe has 39. In medicine, the United States has 6; Europe has 37. The committee quotes the conclusion from the Bush report on this matter as follows:

> Our national preeminence in the fields of applied research should not blind us to the truth that with respect to pure research—the discovery of fundamental new knowledge and basic scientific principles—America has accepted a secondary place.

So therefore, Mr. President, a vital part of this bill is section 6, which sets up within the foundation the authority to grant scholarships and fellowships in order to determine and to make certain that our present standing shall not continue in the future to be as I just read from the report of the committee. Section 6, on page 13 of the bill reads:

> SEC. 6. The Administrator is authorized to award scholarships and fellowships to persons for scientific study or scientific work in any field of science, including but not limited to the mathematical, physical, biological, medical, and social sciences at nonprofit institutions of higher education, or other institutions, selected by the recipient of such aid, for such periods as the Administrator may determine, in the United States or in foreign countries. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships solely on the basis of aptitude, within the limits of such quotas as may be established to insure an equitable selection of such persons from among the States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HART. My question refers to the sentence which the Senator has just read. Does that mean that the Administrator is expected to distribute the awards of scholarships and fellowships geographically, or is he expected to survey the United States and pick out the best material wherever it may be found?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the Senator that it is not expected that the Administrator will survey the Nation geographically at all. What happens is that when a young man or a young woman is selected for a scholarship or a fellowship, he or she has the right to say, for instance, "I should like to go to MIT," or, "I should like to go to Georgia Tech," or, "I should like to go to California Tech," or, "I should like to go to the University of Connecticut." The Administrator and the Board would merely advise. Let us suppose a man wanted to study radar. I suppose MIT, which has done more work than any other school on radar research, might be the logical school. If he selected North Dakota Agricultural College, for example, they might say to him, "Well, we think perhaps you had better go to the school that specializes in this work." It is only permissive with the Board to make the suggestion. The language "such quotas as may be established to insure an equitable selection of such persons" does not relate to the school the individual goes

to. It relates to the selection of persons from various States, much as we select them for Annapolis or West Point.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HART. I do not gather from the language of the bill that anyone has anything to do with the selections except the Administrator himself. Is it intended that one man shall have the full power in this rather important function?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Administrator actually carries it out, but the matter of policy, in other words, how many shall be selected from the whole United States, would be a matter for the Board to determine. Then the Board would say to the Administrator, "We are now going to pick out 5,000 men and women for scholarships and fellowships in 1 year." They would say to the Administrator, "Distribute them geographically if possible." The selection of these men should be done geographically if possible. In other words, there may not be a scientific school in Kansas, but it might be said, "We want so many young men and women from Kansas." The Administrator merely carries out the policy which will be laid down by the Board; but, in order to have someone assigned to the actual selection, we say the Administrator shall do this.

Mr. HART. I hope that will be the case, I will say to the Senator, but I do not see in the bill——

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator will go back in the bill he will find that all through, in setting up the Board and the Administrator, it is provided that the Administrator shall always confer with the Board on the making of policies.

Mr. HART. Then the policy would simply be, and these are the words of the bill, "within the limits of such quotas as may be established." Would the Senator expect the Administrator to establish the quotas all over the country?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Board might say, "We have so much money to use this year. We are going to use a certain portion of it for scholarships and fellowships. That will give us so many openings for scholarships and fellowships." That number would be a round number. Then the Administrator would make the selection from within that number, geographically consistent with the States in the Union, and then he would actually give those selected their scholarships and fellowships. The Board would not select them from each State. The Board would have the broad powers of determining how many would be selected from the United States, and how much money would be spent during the year out of the appropriation for that purpose. That is my understanding of the language. That was our intention, anyway, I will say to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. HART. Will the Senator yield for another question on the same section, section 6?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HART. It indicates that after the person to whom the award is to go is chosen, he himself has full latitude in selecting the institution at which he will receive this benefit.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. HART. The Senator mentioned West Point and Annapolis. Of course, there is no choice there. Those chosen go where they are appointed to go, and that is the end of it. Is it intended that the recipient should have full latitude to go where he pleases after he is chosen? If he has a desire to go to an institution to which, clearly, it would be a waste of money to send him, does he still have the right to go there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. He has the right to. I do not think the Board or the Administrator would have the right to tell him to what institution to go. It would be a matter of advice to the young men or the young women to whom they give the scholarships or the fellowships. I did not mean that the Senator should interpret my use of Annapolis and West Point as an answer to his question in this matter. What I meant was that it is hoped the selection of individuals will be somewhat equitably distributed all over the United States, similar to the way individuals are selected to go to the military schools.

Mr. HART. Of course, there is really no parallel, for one thing. The recipient of an appointment to the Naval Academy or the Military Academy obligates himself to a certain number of years of service after he receives his education. With respect to these scholarships and fellowships there is no similar obligation on the part of the recipient. Furthermore, it appears that the recipient has full choice of where he shall go during the time the Government spends money upon his education.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. He has full choice. But in examining, let us say, John Doe, in California, who is a young man who wants to obtain one of these scholarships—in examining him and in determining his aptitude they would probably, through a series of questions in connection with the application, ask him what school he might prefer to go to, and give him an opportunity to make three selections. He might inadvertently select a school with respect to which the Board and the Administrator could easily say, "We think this fellowship would be a waste of money in that school." But there is no reason why the Board, if he insisted on it, could not say that he could go to any place he wanted to go. We have to provide some latitude in this respect. We have to have some faith in the Board, and believe that the Board would not let a man go to an agricultural school, let us say, to study electronics, or vice versa. I suppose that matter could easily be worked out. But if the young man were given the fellowship and insisted on going to an agricultural school to study electronics, there is no restriction placed upon him in that connection in the bill.

Mr. HART. It is the Administrator who determines, and not the Board; is it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; the Board would determine that, because the Board ultimately receives the fund. Of course the Administrator would have to work the matter out.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I wonder if the Senator can reconcile the provision with respect to aptitude with that calling for the selection of individuals geographically. It is provided that individuals shall be chosen on the basis of aptitude, with due respect to all the States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let us say that there were to be 5,000 scholarships and fellowships given during the year. It would be the duty of the Administrator, in my judgment, to distribute the scholarships and fellowships throughout the various States and Territories. Suppose the State of Washington were allotted 100 scholarships and 100 persons did not qualify. The Board would have latitude under the bill to distribute the remaining scholarships elsewhere. If only 88 qualified, it could distribute the other 12 somewhere else. We could not lay down a hard and fast rule; but we say in the bill that as a matter of policy these opportunities should be as equally distributed as possible.

Mr. WILLIS. The question that gives me concern is how the determination is to be made on the basis of the two factors, aptitude and geography. Suppose 5,000 were to be chosen, and a small State had only 25 who met the qualifications for aptitude. Would the other States be limited to the same ratio?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. WILLIS. That State, then, would not have its full quota.

Mr. MACNUSON. The Board must have some latitude. I suppose the Board would lay out a blueprint. Of course, aptitude has nothing to do with geography. Geography has to do with the opportunity to qualify. We wish to distribute the opportunity geographically as equitably as possible throughout the United States. I will say to the Senator from Indiana that if the Board wished to do so, it could say that all the students should come from the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. WILLIS. Without regard to the law?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We say in the bill that as a matter of policy the Board should follow a certain procedure. Whatever blueprint the Board may lay down is something for the Board and the Administrator to determine.

Mr. WILLIS. Is it the Senator's thought that if the factor of aptitude were not in the formula of the State, the State quota could be disregarded?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct; but every State should have an opportunity, in an equitable way, for its sons and daughters to take advantage of these scholarships.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. In the first place, this section provides that the Administrator and not the Board shall be authorized to award fellowships and scholarships

That is a fundamental difference between this bill and the substitute which I am offering. We believe that a board should do it. We do not believe that the Administrator should do it. No administrator can set up machinery to award 5,000 scholarships.

I should like to ask this question of the distinguished Senator: Would he be willing to change this section and limit it to graduate fellowships? The whole question so far as the age of students is concerned, is whether we are to pay, in undergraduate years, for thousands of youngsters who may not have scientific aptitude. I should like to see the channeling through our State institutions of those who have real scientific ability. Those are the ones whom we should subsidize for advanced work. We are trying to promote research in basic science, and I do not think we can do it by having a broad educational program, confusing aptitude with geography. What we are after is research in basic science. This is not an educational bill. This is a measure to promote research in basic science. There is another bill, Senate bill 181, which looks to the question of division of funds for educational purposes. This is not an educational bill. This bill is aimed at research in basic science.

My objection to the bill now before the Senate in its present form is that it spreads too far and confuses the subject. I hope that it can be simplified so as to eliminate many of its complications. I ask the Senator whether he would be willing to limit this section to graduate fellowships. That is what we wish to subsidize. We do not wish to subsidize every boy in the United States who thinks he would like to study science.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would not be willing to do that, because my purpose in the bill is to subsidize education in basic science. Out of that reservoir, which is so sadly short in this country, surely we will lose some of them who will not go on. Some of them will not go further into basic research, and into fellowships. But the point made by all the witnesses was that we need a great pool of men who have studied basic science, so that we can draw upon them for research. The Board could well confine its program to the education of basic scientists, and spend all the money for fellowships. We make no provision as to the proportion to be spent for fellowships and scholarships. As the program progressed the Board would in all probability make available for fellowships a large percentage of the money, for the simple reason that once our universities get started again, and once overcrowding in the universities has been relieved, there will come from the universities a great many youngsters who have taken basic science. We must leave a certain degree of latitude with the Board. However, the present situation is that we are short approximately 17,000 basic scientists, men who have had college training in science. We need to fill up that reservoir. We do not need to spend money to get those basic scientists. We simply need to have a selection made by draft boards, now that the Selective Service Act has been amended. I am advised that the budding scientists are coming to the colleges all over the country. They cannot get in. There is no room for them. That is a totally different problem. That is the problem of the man in his undergraduate years. We do not need to offer inducements to boys to go into science. They want to go into it. I am not worried about that. But I am worried about screening the boys who go through undergraduate years and show aptitude for advanced work in science. We are looking for researchers. We are not trying to make a broad coverage of everyone who may think he likes science.

The Board will have to gage the situation from year to year. It can spend all the money for basic research and for fellowships. The Senator says that we can accomplish the desired result in part by not taking some of the young men in the draft. I attempted to provide for that the other day.

Mr. SMITH. I joined the Senator in that effort.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senate adopted an amendment. I do not know what help the Senate conferees gave me, but it was thrown out in conference, and now such boys are being drafted.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator that scientific men ought to be allowed to continue in scientific work. But I do not feel that it is proper under the terms of this bill to subsidize boys in their undergraduate years. We are spreading ourselves too far with this bill, and attempting to cover too many things. What we wish to do is to encourage research in basic science, by men who have shown an aptitude for it in their undergraduate years. If they are placed with more experienced men, we can get results. We cannot get results by scattering our fire.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then the Senator disagrees with all the witnesses who testified before the two committees. They agree that the Board should have the authority set forth in the bill. They also state that the time may come when the Board may not wish to spend a nickel of the money available to help a man in his undergraduate days. In any event, those who are to receive the benefits of the provisions of this bill will be those who show some aptitude and some promise in basic research.

Mr. SMITH. Then, to do justice to all the boys in our country—and there will be not merely a few thousand, but hundreds of thousands—we must give them all an opportunity, by some examination, to qualify for this free ride and education in science.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They should all have an opportunity.

Mr. SMITH. It is a strange policy to say that every boy in the United States who wishes to study science is to be subsidized by the Federal Government in his college course.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They will be screened. Only a certain number will be chosen. They will have the same opportunity to obtain scholarships and fellowships under this bill as they would have in obtaining scholarships or fellowships from any other institution engaged in research.

Mr. SMITH. Then the Senator is planning Nation-wide examinations to see who is entitled to scholarships.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know what the Board may do. It would not be necessary to have Nation-wide examinations.

Mr. SMITH. I have had some experience in this field.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Board may not wish to conduct Nation-wide examinations. As it is, we find that we are not getting a sufficient number of basic scientists. We must encourage the development of basic science in some way.

Mr. SMITH. I simply cannot agree with the Senator's conclusions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true that a man who plans to be a lawyer is required to have at least 2 years' college work before undertaking the study of law? I think the premedical course is ordinarily 2 years. I have in mind—although it is not spelled out in this bill—that a student must demonstrate some ability and proficiency in his chosen field before he would even have an opportunity to be selected. On the other hand, it is not necessary that he receive a degree after a full 4-year course. I believe that ordinarily, under our present system, a student makes his decision as to what his profession is to be after 2 years in college. That is when he begins to specialize in whatever profession he expects to enter, unless he continues with a strictly liberal arts course.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Does the distinguished Senator and educator feel that we should start to subsidize boys in their undergraduate years?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that after a boy has had 2 years of work he should be able to demonstrate whether or not he has any ability. I think it would be safe to grant a scholarship after 2 years of college work. Most law schools require such preparation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, law scholarships are on the same basis. I do not believe that the Foundation would go to the high schools to make selections. It might survey the universities, and decide to distribute scholarships among men who have spent 3 years in pre-scientific training in basic science. I do not disagree with the Senator. Our point is that we must do something now to fill up the depleted reservoir. In the future the Board should have latitude in determining how to select these men. I do not conceive that these scholarships will be for a 4-year college course. I think there will be some selection within the colleges, as the Senator from Arkansas suggests, among boys who have had 2 or 3 years of college work. Many colleges now have 5-year courses in science and medicine. The selection might be made just prior to graduation.

I believe that the Board should have considerable latitude. Surely the members of the Board will be men who are skilled not only in science, but in education. They will understand the problem. I feel sure that they will have a keen sense of responsibility about the money of which they have charge and about the scientific needs of the country. I believe that they will make every penny count, and that a man will have to show considerable aptitude in order to obtain one of these scholarships. It may be that as much as 70 percent of the money will be spent for fellowships. We could not lay down a blueprint.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I am sorry to disagree with distinguished Senators who have had experience in education; but my experience has been different from theirs so far as undergraduate study is concerned.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say that I have had no experience as an educator. I was merely exposed to an education.

Mr. SMITH. In institutions with which I have been connected we have had much experience with scholarships. Today, most educational institutions provide scholarships for promising young men.

It seems to me that what we need is something to help graduate students who need to make progress in specialized lines of scientific research. That is what I think we need to do at this time.

I do not think the Senator need worry about getting the reservoir filled. I believe it will be filled without regard to whether a subsidy of the sort proposed is actually offered. I think many young men wish to enter this field. The reports which I am receiving indicate that the colleges have not been able to accept all those who now are applying. So I do not believe we need to offer any subsidies. Of course, I agree that we must fill the reservoir. I agree with the Senator on that point. That is why I think we should exempt scientific men from the draft.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The indication is that the reservoir of scientific men now is almost empty, and that some incentive is needed. Of course, the Board will be composed of scientists and educators who understand the situation. I have no doubt that the Board will be composed of eight or nine of the men who testified. They can vary the program. But it was felt that under present circumstances they should have authority to see what they could do with some portion of the funds so as to take care of the need for scholarships and fellowships.

Furthermore, what alarmed most of them was that the war taught us the need to keep America abreast or ahead of the rest of the world scientifically, as a matter of our own defense. One of the witnesses was fresh from Russia, and he said that an examination of what the Russians are doing in this respect shows that they not only take such young men when they are young, but they make special citizens out of them. I have a report here regarding Russia, and I should like to read it for the information of the Senate:

> Reports coming out of Russia indicate, for example, that they are, and have been throughout the war, making a special effort to develop scientific talent. With a strong emphasis on science and technology, over 600,000 persons are slated to graduate from institutions of higher learning between 1940 and 1950. And to further persuade Russians to become scientists, large salaries and many other special inducements are apparently being offered. On April 1, by special decree, the scientific profession in Russia became one of their highest salaried, and what with special rations and the provisions of comfortable living accommodations, scientists in Russia are probably better rewarded than anywhere else in the world. New housing is being earmarked for them, just as it is for generals and high party functionaries. A full professor who is head of a department now makes from 4,000 to 6,000 rubles per month. At the present official rate of exchange, that corresponds to $800 to $1,200 a month in terms of our own currency.

Mr. SMITH. That is very interesting.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what alarms some of these men.

Mr. SMITH. It may alarm them, but I do not think we should try to copy that kind of approach, by which men are dragooned into that field. I wish to have us develop men who have ability, and then say to them, "You have proved your ability, and here is your scientific job." I think that is the way to proceed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator. I do not think we should copy their system. I merely point this out in order to show that if we are to keep abreast of the world in scientific matters, in our American way, our Government will have to give some inducements and will have to establish some such incentive as is proposed by this bill. Otherwise, we are likely to slip back and we are likely to come to a time when not enough of our young men will be interested in science, with the result that perhaps in time of emergency we might find ourselves without a sufficient number of basic scientists.

As is pointed out by other scientists, and as the records show, we have done much better in the field of applied science than we have in the field of pure science.

Mr. SMITH. I think the Senator from Washington and I are agreed as to the objective. I simply do not wish to spread the butter on the bread too thin.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I was very much interested in the Senator's statement of what is proposed to be done in other countries. But, in the vernacular, I say, "so what?"

During the war Americans demonstrated what they could do. Our scientific development is in advance of that of any other country, so far as I know. Of course, we wish to keep abreast of the world in respect to the various developments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not know that America led the world scientifically during the recent war. I do know that we made excellent progress in applied science. But I pointed out earlier in the debate that the basic principles which we used so effectively during the war were invented or discovered in Europe, and in the enemy countries. So I do not think we were way ahead.

Mr. WILLIS. I think the results speak for themselves.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator from Indiana think that if Germany had had the same industrial facilities we had, knowing what she did know about the atomic bomb, and if she had had the same amount of money and manpower that we had, she would not have developed it before we did?

Mr. WILLIS. But she did not have them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. She did not have them because God was kinder to us.

Mr. WILLIS. I think we shall keep ahead of them.

I was also very much impressed with what the Senator from New Jersey said. I think we should give the matter careful consideration. It seems to me that we cannot very well subsidize education at the lower levels. For instance, many young men wish to study medicine. But if we were to start to subsidize their education, we would find it simply impossible to make the proper selections.

The point I wish to make is that the scarcity of young scientists has not occurred because of lack of money or lack of will, but it has occurred because we have taken so many of the young men for service in the armed forces. We hope that never again will be necessary. It is not a question of giving a vast sum of money to a board which we shall have to trust, and then perhaps change the membership of the board from time to time.

Therefore, it seems to me that at least some standard of aptitude should be provided, such, for instance, as that a candidate for such aid should be a graduate of a recognized university, with a degree of bachelor of arts or a degree of bachelor of science, before he could be selected as one having some evidence of aptitude, and in whose education the country would invest a considerable sum of money. I should like to leave that suggestion for consideration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, that would be done. The Board can prescribe that the men selected must have a degree. That would be a matter entirely up to the Board, which will be composed of scientists and educators.

I do not wish to burden the RECORD with quotations from those who have testified that they feel this is the most important provision of the bill, but Dr. Bush and Dr. Conant, of Harvard, have discussed this section.

Dr. James B. Conant, the president of Harvard University, testified that——

> Those sections which deal with scholarships and fellowships * * * are by far the most important parts of the bill * * * for there is no use considering ways and means of spending money on research unless first-rate men are available to do the work.

Bernard M. Baruch, in his testimony, said:

What should the Government aim for through a peacetime program such as this committee contemplates? I would list eight major goals. 1. Increase scientific brainpower. Greatly increase our scientific brainpower, using scholarships and other aids to develop new scientific talent in American youth.

Bruce K. Brown, vice president in charge of development, Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, said:

I am entirely convinced that unless we do something drastic and extraordinary to increase the training of technical men, increase the number of technical men we have in this country, we are going to be in a pretty sad state.

So says one of the Senator's constituents, and a very eminent man.

Many other outstanding men take the same position. They all insist that this part of the bill is one of the most important parts. Of course, we could lay down a blueprint administratively, but it would be most difficult to handle the matter in that way. I have every faith that the Board will award scholarships and fellowships, not only in a just way but in a way that will tend to utilize every dollar of the money to the best advantage, so as to increase our great scientific development and the number of young men who are using their talents in the scientific fields.

Of course, the Board could make a mistake in the case of one student here or there, but that would happen only rarely.

We must remember that only a small portion of the money to be appropriated will be used for this purpose, and we must also remember that the Board will be required to make a report every year to the Congress. The Board must go through the Appropriations Committee and be screened as to what they do; and as I said to the Senator from New Jersey, the Board will have some leeway as to the extent to which they wish to grant fellowships.

I do not think we shall thus be dipping into the field of American education in any way at all, unless the Board abuses the authority given to it. Frankly, it is most difficult to write legislation on the subject.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not wish to have the distinguished Senator derive the impression that I am not in sympathy with the objectives of the bill, because I am very sincerely so.

But when it comes to allotting the people's money for this program and setting up the practical machinery which will have to be circumscribed, I think that is the responsibility of the representatives of the people in the Congress, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. I think we must proceed very cautiously in order that we may not make a failure of the program, which is so important to the future welfare of our country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the section limits the Board to the expenditure of the money for scholarships and fellowships for qualified persons. I do not think the Board is going to give the money to people who are not qualified. But there might be a time when the Board would find that a certain person who did not have a collegiate degree did show great aptitude for such work. These distinguished men, who can discern such aptitude much better than we can, may say, "Well, here is a worthy place to spend a little of this money, in order that we may ultimately have another great scientist in America."

Mr. President, there are other features of the bill, but I do not wish to cover all of them at this time.

I might say that the Senator from West Virginia read a joint statement from scientists and educators with regard to the need for a bill of this kind. He read the names of distinguished men, such as the president of Harvard and the president of the American Medical Association. It is well known how conservative is the American Medical Association with regard to all scientific matters. I wish to point out to the Senate that although the endorsements were of 10 men representing the great groups to which the Senator referred, they come as endorsements of men who are speaking for their respective groups.

As I have already said, I do not know of any person who is opposed to the bill. Some mild differences of opinion were expressed in the hearings before the committee with respect to the language of the bill, but those differences have been resolved. We have put a great deal of hard work on the bill. We do not interfere with Government research. We do not intend to interfere with the freedom of scientists. They may continue as they have in the past. We only try to do for America what the scientists have told us is necessary, not only for peacetime uses but for the defense of our country in warfare. The only strong objection came from Dr. Jewett. He is president of the National Academy. I can say only that his idea was disagreed with by every member of the Academy. We had before the committee approximately 15 witnesses who were members of the National Academy. We polled them, and I have figures which I shall later put into the RECORD. As I have said, Mr. President, there is no opposition to the basic need for legislation of the type embraced in this bill. There may be some question as to the proper approach to the matter. But we are entering not necessarily a new field. I myself was the author of a bill in 1937 in which provision was made for the establishment of a national cancer institute, with an appropriation of $1,000,000 a year for its use. A board pertaining to national aeronautics was also provided in another bill, with an appropriation to carry out its purposes.

Mr. President, I hope that we will not quibble about the sections of the bill. We must place faith in the Board, which will be composed of outstanding men of this country, both lay and scientific. Everyone who knows anything about the subject agrees that the bill should be passed by this Congress.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may propound a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HART. I wish to inquire about section 9, under the heading "International cooperation." Of course, the bill is for the establishment of a National Scientific Foundation to pertain to the fundamentals of basic research. Under section 9 (a) the head of any Government agency is authorized, with the approval of the President, to do certain things. The language then refers to concluding reciprocal agreements with foreign governments relating to the interchange of scientific and technological information, including models and samples for information purposes, and the use and availability of patents and patent rights owned or controlled by the respective governments. Of course, very few patents ever result from techonological research. Will the Senator explain the reason for that section?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There was a great deal of testimony presented to the committee with reference to the subject to which the Senator has referred. As I recall, the situation was explained in this way: There now exist many of what we call international societies. The members of those societies hold a scientific congress each year, and ideas are exchanged. One man may say, "I have been working all year on this." Another man may say, "I have been working all year on this." The scientists meet in congress, read and discuss the papers, and later those papers may be published. We have always been represented at those congresses, but in an unofficial way. The State Department has usually assigned some person to attend. We were told by representatives of the State Department that, in view of the fact we were seeking to establish a National Science Foundation, and although our representatives at the congress would be appointed through them, the State Department, nevertheless the Foundation itself should have some authority in choosing the men to represent this country. Therefore, we incorporated the language, "The head of any Government agency is hereby authorized, with the approval of the President, and through the Department of State," and so forth.

Mr. HART. I fully sympathize with the objective of this section, but it appears to me that the method suggested is a peculiar one. By law we permit any Government agency—of, course, with the approval of the President—to give away almost anything which the agency sees fit to give away.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not believe that any person attends the scientific meetings of the congress to which I have referred for the purpose of giving away anything. They may attend those meetings regardless. No one can prevent them. No one could prevent Dr. Bowman, Dr. Bush, or Dr. Oppenheimer

from leaving this country tomorrow and attending a congress of scientists if they wished to do so. We merely give them some degree of official authority in that connection.

Mr. HART. The Senator misunderstood me. The language of the section is, in part, "The head of any Government agency." Those words do not refer to any unofficial agencies.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The purpose of the language is to include the State Department, because they may wish to send some person who will officially represent them. I am frank to say to the Senator from Connecticut that I do not recall why the word "head" was made a part of the language. However, I see the Senator's point. I think that perhaps the section should be amended so as to apply to the foundation.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I submit a revision of my amendment in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill. The substitute is submitted on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The revised amendment in the nature of a substitute will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Washington that what we have tried to do in the revised version of the amendment is to incorporate those points on which we disagree with the Senator's version, and bring the issue before the Senate, so that it may decide which form of language it wishes to adopt in establishing the foundation.

I wish to commend the Senator from Washington for the splendid work he has done. I am in favor of a bill covering this subject, but I believe that some of the provisions of the pending bill can be improved. As I said earlier in the day, I am opposed to the power proposed to be given to an administrator to be appointed by the President. I believe that the director of the foundation should be a man appointed by the scientific groups which have the responsibility of determining the policy to be pursued.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from New Jersey that my original bill contemplated the system used by universities, but it also contemplated establishing scholarships and fellowships. As the testimony was presented to the committee from time to time, we incorporated in the bill other features. The money which is to be spent will be the taxpayers' money, and I think the administrator should be given some responsibility, because he will be blamed for the mistakes which may be made, just as would the President of the United States have been blamed if some of the research which he authorized during the war had not resulted successfully. I have changed my views, and I may say that Dr. Bush, Dr. Bowman, and all the men who originally aided me, have also changed their views with regard to this matter. I believe that, with the compromise to which I have referred, the bill will serve an important purpose. The compromise was brought about mainly during the hearings, by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who cannot be present during the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is referring to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. I talked to him with reference to this matter, and I believe that he feels the bill contains the necessary compromise. However, I think that the main difficulty of control would be solved if the bill did not attempt to cover so much ground. But, Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Washington for his vision, and for his original view that the matter should be controlled by a Board instead of by an Administrator appointed by the President.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, unless there are some further questions which Senators wish to propound with regard to the bill, I yield the floor. I am sure the Senator from New Jersey wishes to have time to speak on his substitute.

Mr. SMITH. I do desire time to speak on the substitute. I believe that the Senator from Connecticut also wishes to comment on the bill, and I am happy to allow him to speak first.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will listen, before I take my seat I wish to offer a committee amendment on page 19, line 20, to strike out the words "The head of any Government agency" and insert "the National Research Foundation." I ask that that amendment be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6739) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARE, Mr. TARVER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1850) to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to comment on two or three points which were raised in the course of the remarks of the Senator from Washington.

There was one point relative to the activities of the Russians, and I wanted to point out one or two sentences in the hearings, in the testimony of Dr. Langmuir, who is the head of the General Electric research laboratory. Dr. Langmuir had just returned from a conference of scientists in Russia the preceding July, that is, a year ago. He said, as appears on page 32 of the hearings:

> I think Russia at present is far below us in scientific invention. They are doing good work but not as good as is being done in American universities or American industries. They have, for the reasons I have given, I believe, a tendency to rise at a higher rate than we do—

That is a significant sentence.

> unless we do something very definite to prevent these tendencies to level off or even to hold down progress.

Then on the next page, page 33, he said, in answer to a question of the chairman:

> In fact, long before the war, I think Germany was going fast downhill in pure science. It was devoting all its time to military work and neglecting pure science, whereas in Russia I saw a remarkable amount of pure scientific work kept up, even during the war.

I could refer also to other points in the testimony. Particularly, I recall Dr. Oppenheimer's testimony to the effect our activities during the war were not in the field of pure scientific research at all. He said at one point, for instance, that the production of such things as the atomic bomb and the proximity fuze, and other improvements in aircraft, and so forth, were not the results of new scientific research, but were like shaking the tree and the ripe fruit falling in the form of these particular weapons, and that, as a matter of fact, we neglected pure scientific research during the war. As the Senator from Washington has pointed out, we did not even exempt from the draft our students of science in the universities, which has created a great vacuum in the supply of scientists for the future. I remember I made a speech in the Senate about the inducting of scientific students. I think that was a great mistake from the standpoint of the future of our national defense.

On the same page from which I read, Dr. Langmuir drew a distinction between the bill now pending and the ordinary applied science. He said:

> The aim of fundamental science is to acquire new basic knowledge. This is inherently unpredictable—discoveries cannot be planned or foreseen.

He proceeded on this basis to develop the idea which we are trying to accomplish in the bill.

Mr. President, I think we have been misled by the efficiency of our industrial

machine in applying scientific principles, into believing that we are the last word in all the phases of scientific research, and therefore we are not worrying much about it. The atomic bomb itself gave a good illustration of how much was contributed by others. I think all will recall, if they stop and think of it, that the basic scientific knowledge in that field was far from being strictly American. Not only Dr. Einstein, but Fermi from Italy, and Meitner from Germany, and Chadwick from England, and many others from countries in Europe, contributed the basic knowledge which made it possible for our industrial genius to develop the bomb.

Mr. President, those are merely a few points. One of the principal things I wanted to say a few words about was mentioned by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] when he was questioning the advisability of inserting a Division of Social Sciences in the bill. That provision was a source of considerable discussion. If I recall correctly, the objections to it were not because we do not need it, because it is not a good thing, because it is not advisable, but on practical grounds. There was fear that the Senate or the House might be afraid of some investigation or some research in that field, and therefore that it might prejudice the bill as a whole.

A moment ago the Senator from Colorado, if I recall his words, said something to the effect that this is something new in social science, that it might lead us off into new fields in which the Government has never before participated, and involve us in controversy. I am in agreement with his view that it is new. In fact, it is so new that we know practically nothing about the social sciences, and it is for that very reason I think it is high time we undertook some program which might teach us a little about the social sciences.

As I understand, a study of social sciences could lead us to an understanding of the principles of human relationships which might enable us to live together without fighting recurrent wars, to live together within this country, and also might promote an understanding among the peoples of the various nations which would enable them to live together in peace.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I am quite perplexed about this phase of the bill. I wish the Senator first to give a definition of social science, tell us what it is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know that I can give an all-inclusive definition. I think I can point out a few activities which are commonly considered social sciences. Economics is one of the principal ones. Psychology is another, and there are other things which are talked about under the general subject of sociology. I would say such studies as are concerned primarily with human relationships are studies in social science. Politics is a fundamental social science. I confess that the word "science" is not properly used in that field, in that it is not of the same nature as mathematics.

Mr. WILLIS. That is, we cannot develop practical formulas or concrete formulas for social relationships.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not say we cannot develop them. I think progress in that field has been much slower than in the field of physical or natural science. In the field of government itself we have not made any appreciable, hardly any noticeable, progress or change in this country for 170 years. We are operating in the Senate under rules which were formulated largely well over 100 years ago. I do not mean to intimate that I am in favor of throwing them all out. I mean there has been very little change in the art of government, if I may call it that.

Mr. WILLIS. I think that is a better definition.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am only using terminology that is commonly employed. There is only a difference of degree, however, as between what we call science, and art. An art, after it has been sufficiently studied, gradually becomes a science. Not very long ago, the Senator will recall, medicine was full of superstitions.

Mr. WILLIS. The art of witchcraft.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The art of witchcraft. I asked an able scientist yesterday if he would define social science. I had been worrying about that. He said in his definition, "In the first place, I would not call it science. What is commonly called social science is one individual or a group of individuals telling another group how they should live."

Mr. WILLIS. I wonder if that is not a pretty good definition.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is that not just about what Government does? Government by a majority means that the majority tell the minority what to do.

Mr. WILLIS. What I wonder is whether we are going to derive any good by appropriating a considerable amount of money for such purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not prepared to guarantee any result. I think there is room for questioning any of these activities on that ground. It seems to me that social science is a recognized field of study now. It has been sadly neglected for the very reason that it does not yield immediate financial returns such as the invention, for example, of a better mouse trap or some other useful gadget. For that reason it needs governmental assistance a great deal more than mechanical engineering does, because the study of mechanical engineering brings its own rewards under our commercial system. I think social science has been sadly neglected. If one looks at the situation in the world today, or even at the situation in our Nation today, he will find that the difficulties lie not with respect to the production of tangible things, but with those human relations which enable us to get along together. I think the basic trouble arising out of OPA today goes to the lack of people knowing how to live together, more than it goes to the question of the technology of production. That is my judgment.

Mr. WILLIS. It is a question of keeping selfishness in restraint, that is all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is one aspect of the matter, and it is an important aspect. How one treats it or how one deals with it as a government or as a society is an important aspect. At the request of the physical scientists, we incorporated a special provision in the bill in an effort to try to prevent the division of social sciences getting out of hand, so to speak. I have no fear of that, however. I only hope this provision will give some prestige to social science, that it will sort of recognize that field of study as a legitimate thing in our society, and I hope it will encourage some of our more intelligent young people to go into that field. I think it is sadly understaffed. I know there are many crackpots in that field, just as there were in the field of medicine in the days of witchcraft, but it is not something from which we should back away. We have to solve the social problems one way or the other. I cannot see any harm in admitting that they are legitimate problems and giving the Board authority to devote some of its resources to that study.

Mr. WILLIS. I wonder whether we should accept the argument that simply because no harm would be done we should implement this study?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I only make that argument in response to those who say that harm will come from it; that it is getting into a dangerous field. I do not agree with that argument at all.

Mr. WILLIS. I should like to leave this thought for the Senator to consider: I was thinking whether it would not be better for us to confine this program, which it is proposed to set up, to certain definite fields. We cannot reach out too far, because a part of the program might fail, and bring discredit on the whole program. Why can we not confine ourselves to the fields in which we know there is a practical and a crying need for development, and leave matters which are of doubtful value to be taken up after we have tested the plan on things of known value?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One distinction between the pending bill and the one I introduced, S. 1248, is that this bill deals with the very essence of pure science in any field, and its purpose is to investigate what we do not know about. It goes into principles which we do not know about at all. After that point is reached the domain of applied science is entered. I will read again the last sentence that I read from Dr. Langmuir's statement:

> The aim of fundamental science is to acquire new basic knowledge. It is inherently unpredictable — discoveries cannot be planned or foreseen.

I cannot guarantee any discoveries or any results in this field. Likewise, if I understand the other provisions of the bill, they do not deal with things we already know and with respect to which we can calculate the results. We are in a

sense fishing around in the unknown, and that is what the bill is designed to accomplish.

Mr. WILLIS. Will not the Senator agree that for 5,000 years mankind has tried to control human emotions and prejudices and selfishness, and that it is not an unknown field?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So far as I know there has been no concentrated effort in this country or anywhere else, to study, or, if the Senator will permit the use of the word, to make a scientific approach to these problems. We have always considered them somewhat taboo, just as not so long ago the subject of syphilis was taboo, and we would not do anything about syphilis because it ought not to be touched. It was one of those things that decent people did not discuss. There is a little of that attitude today toward social science. It is something that everyone is assumed to have been born with, and we do not want to study it.

Mr. WILLIS. I would not agree that the Senator's suggestion is a sound one or a happy one.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One does not mention those words. One does not want to talk about the subject.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator does not wish to say that all efforts that have been made through all the years have failed to develop better relations between men?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should say that what has happened in the last 25 years, including two world wars, would be pretty good evidence that mankind has not gone very far forward toward solving human relationships. The problem starts at home. The present situation respecting OPA is pretty good proof that we do not know a great deal about the subject of human relationships in the United States.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator think that by spending a great deal of money the problem can thereby be solved?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The purpose of this measure is to try to find out whether there is anything in this field that might be of benefit to us. If one could foresee and plan the matter one would be working in what I call the field of applied science. I cannot guarantee that there will be any result from this study.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am fully in accord with the idea that social science should have increased study and deserve fostering in every way that is reasonable. Certainly the right kind of research is needed. But I want to ask the Senator from Arkansas whether he does not think there is some danger that this program might become somewhat top-heavy if social sciences are included as a part of the program under this bill? Everyone knows that there is obvious necessity for many sound, carefully thought-out studies in matters of that kind. On the other hand, there is not anything that leads more readily to isms and to quackeries than so-called studies in social science unless there is eternal vigilance to prevent. If we could be assured that only a reasonable amount of the time and money and the activities under this bill would be devoted to social sciences I would feel very much relieved from the fear that research into the physical might be slighted under this program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT I can say to the Senator that, in spite of this provision, it would surprise me very much if the social sciences division got anything at all, because it is very evident that physical scientists will naturally dominate the Board, and the very fact that they outnumber others in every respect I think will be the controlling influence. I think it will be very difficult, as a practical matter, for the social scientists to get very big slices of pie, if that is what the Senator means.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. To a certain extent that is what I mean. I can realize that probably there would be a tendency toward such restraint on the part of the Board, if the Board were dominated by those who might be termed "applied scientists" rather than by social scientists.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the very nature of things, if there are studies to be made of mathematics and biology and public health and so on, the subject of social science would be somewhat in a class by itself, and in the minority.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I know of nothing more difficult than to point out exactly what type of study should be made and what phase of such study should be included in social sciences. Social sciences cover or touch upon, I assume, almost everything one can think of in the way of human associations, conduct, and relationships. I can remember years ago when some sociologists used to insist that sociology included practically every form of human endeavor; that it was really the parent of economics and politics, and that even the natural sciences sprang from social science.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator will remember also when a rabbit's foot was thought to be a sure cure for certain diseases. Ideas with respect to the rabbit's foot have changed a great deal.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; happily so. But I believe I would prefer to see social sciences covered in a separate bill, under certain special arrangements. I can readily understand, because I worked in some of them myself for a number of years, that the social sciences are matters which require close attention, close consideration, and that they should be fostered in every suitable way. But if, on the other hand, they are more or less jumbled up with the applied sciences, unless there is a pretty clear line of cleavage, and unless it is clearly understood that the purport of the bill and its operations are such as to be concerned with applied science, if that is the correct term for this objective, I am afraid that the purpose of the bill will be somewhat misunderstood and possibly misdirected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not supposed to be concerned with applied sciences; that is, in taking known things and making them useful. The purpose is to investigate pure science. In that field one does not even know what he is looking for.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am always at a loss when I attempt to refer to science as pure or applied or physical. I have heard many definitions and many descriptions as to suitable terminology. I had reference more or less to the natural sciences, dealing with so-called material objects—sciences such as medicine, chemistry, biology, physics, and electricity. Those are the fields in which so much is needed today in the way of investigation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator feel that not much is needed in sociology, politics, and economics?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, it is seriously needed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator feel we know all we need to know?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Not in any sense; but if we are to enter that field of research we ought to be sure that we safeguard our program very carefully. As I understand, 25 percent of the funds appropriated is to be apportioned among the States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. What is to be done with that money?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In a sense, the bill itself is an experiment. We are giving authority to the Board and to the Administrator. In view of our lack of experience in the field of Government participation in aid of education, I know of no other way then to make a start with the idea of arriving at the correct procedure through trial and error. There is no guide for judgment as to what this bill would do. It is a perfect example of our ignorance in the field of social sciences. No Member of the Senate has the vaguest idea of how the program will operate. It is a new experiment. I agree that there are all kinds of dangers. But how shall we ever reach the point of starting a program?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If one contemplates making investigations in the field of chemistry, there are certain obvious recognized subjects for inquiry accepted I take it generally by experts. I believe that all scientists who know anything about chemistry or physics would be fairly well satisfied that there are certain special subjects which ought to be studied very carefully. There is a more or less definite course to be followed which is obvious. But when we say that we are going to attempt to investigate the science of government, and the general field of social relations, that is so exceedingly vague, and covers such an enormous field, that unless the work is very closely coordinated, and unless an effort is made to map out the courses very definitely, we are likely to run into difficulties, into confusion and cause the research to be much too thin. Let me give an illustration——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator believe that the Congress ought to map out that course in a bill? Even if we were to have a separate bill, does the

Senator feel that we should undertake to map out just what shall be investigated?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; I would not say that; but if we are to cover social sciences, I should like to see the subject as to the scope of the program given additional and fresh study.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator feel that the Congress is capable of setting up a program of investigation?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All we can do is to delegate the authority. I do not know how else to handle the problem.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, the Congress cannot pick out specific points for research. In any event, I do not wish to see the Federal Government directing concretely inquiry and research.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In any field? Or does the Senator limit it to social sciences?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I prefer to see the main direction come from the scientists themselves. I would not like to see a situation arise in which the Federal Government would say, "We will look into this subject in chemistry, and that line of inquiry in physics." That is putting it very crudely, but that situation could very well arise in careless administration of such a Federal program. After the Government makes an appropriation for research, I think the helpful province of the Government comes pretty close to being at an end. For many years I was connected with one of the outstanding universities of the country specializing in work of research. I am quite confident that if the Federal Government had been shaping the course of research in any way, and had told that university what to investigate in the field of chemistry or medicine, the results would not have been nearly so satisfactory.

I realize that there are certain safeguards in the bill which will probably avoid putting a crimp in scientific research conducted in what might be termed the historic manner. However, I would like to see the bill go further in the way of protection than it goes. I am appalled at the idea of opening up the social sciences without any charting of what the investigators are to study or how they are to go about it. I presume that any State which received its share of the 25 percent allotment would say, "We want to use this fund for a certain purpose."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The program must be approved by the Administrator and the Board, acting together.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If the Board's approval were sufficiently tight to afford adequate protection from misdirected or unwise inquiry that might be some safeguard.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That depends upon the intelligence of the members of the Board. We assume that we are to have a good Board and a good Administrator.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am not raising any serious objection to the inclusion in this bill of the social sciences. There is nothing more important than that we should come to a better realization of what the social sciences really are, and the principles of human conduct underlying them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I visualize the way the program will work, the University of Chicago, the University of Minnesota, or any other school will ask for funds to promote some program which the scientists in the particular schools have already undertaken. Usually the aid will be used for clerical assistance, and for the collection of statistics. Ordinarily the principal ingredient of research work in the social sciences is statistics relating to human behavior, and so forth. Such things as polls of public opinion are sometimes very much abused, and in many cases misleading; but they are part and parcel of what we call one field of research in social science. They relate to the large-scale problems of the democratic system. I do not think there is anything very dangerous in that field. I feel that the social sciences have been sadly neglected. They have not had any money, because they have nothing tangible to produce. They are unlike the science of chemistry, for example, which can produce nylon in a chemical laboratory.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course I do not see anything essentially dangerous in any real research into phases of the social sciences.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Unless the Government or some great philanthropist helps them along, they make no progress. I think the Senator will not deny that there has been very little progress in the field of human relations, and especially in the fields of government and economics, for a long time. The Senator was an eminent teacher of history. I should like to have him express himself as to the great progress we have made in getting along together as humans in this modern age. Does the Senator believe that there has been any substantial progress?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I appreciate the Senator's reference to my teaching. I did some teaching in history but most assuredly I was never in any sense whatever eminent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has taught in one of the great universities.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. My teaching in history was rather short in time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. History is one of the leading social sciences.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The modern conception of history is widely different from history as it was understood by our grandfathers. That change has been exceedingly helpful in every sense. I repeat, I am not afraid that the program under this bill will be used to any considerable extent to foment various kinds of insidious doctrines.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what many persons fear. They fear that their particular antipathy will be fomented.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There is some possibility that if an allotment is made to a certain university, and the head of a particular department is a man addicted to certain isms, he might use the fund for that purpose. I suppose that is a danger the existence of which we must contemplate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The program must have the approval of the Board. If the Board does not approve it, the head of a department in a university has no inherent right to the fund. It would not be a violation of due process if he did not get it. This is all under the control of the Board.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Does the Senator feel that the control of the Board as to the type of research would be likely to be sufficient general protection to head off wild-eyed so-called research?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are two protections. There is the Division of Social Sciences, which I assume will be composed of outstanding and recognized social scientists. They will set up the program and submit it to the Board for its approval. The division itself passes on it, and the Board passes on it. Then if a crackpot turns up somewhere, the Board can stop the program. It does not have to continue with it. The Board would have discretion in the administration of the program. I do not see much danger in it. I cannot prove the result, but I do not see much danger in the social sciences. I believe that they represent a field in which we ought to know something.

Before we leave the matter of history, for many years people have played with the idea of trying to have histories written in a more objective way. Senators are familiar with the manner in which histories have been written in the North and in the South relative to the Civil War, and the manner in which histories have been written in various other countries. I understand that Norway and Sweden have agreed to rewrite their histories and try to present them in an objective way. It is an objective problem in human relations. I think the Senator will agree that that type of project is not very revolutionary. I believe it is directly in line with what is proposed here.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me ask the Senator a question, and then I shall not trespass further on his time. Is the Senator satisfied that with the incorporation of this provision with regard to social sciences, the social sciences would not more or less dominate the scene to the slighting of other studies? I wish to emphasize again that I believe that the studies in the social sciences and helpful progress in that field are just as important as anything else we have before us today. I cannot overstress the gravity of the need and importance of such studies. The Senator cannot emphasize that point more than I do. It is most unfortunate that more progress has not been in constructive work in this. But the general purport of the bill is that it is aimed at investigations in what we may call the pure physical sciences.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am quite confident that the personnel of the board will be such, and the administrator will be such, that there will be sufficient protection. The administrator is very likely to be a leading physical scientist. During the hearings, so far as I know, only 1 day was devoted to hearing social scientists. The remainder of the time was

devoted to scientists in the field of physical science. The country acclaims the physical scientist because the physical sciences produce tangible results. I have no doubt that the social sciences will have a very difficult time, even though this provision is included in the bill.

The Senator suggests that the social sciences be dealt with in a separate bill. In the first place, no such bill has been introduced. In the second place, as a practical matter I think it would be very difficult to have such a bill enacted, for the reasons which the Senator has pointed out.

In the third place, I see no logical reasons why the social sciences should not be included in this bill. The dividing line between the social sciences and the other sciences is very vague and very difficult to draw. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] asked for a definition. It is very difficult clearly to define them and distinguish one from the other, because they all impinge on one another. Both the physical sciences and social sciences are important. They react and affect one another, so it is difficult to compartmentalize science in that way.

I think it is important to have social sciences covered in the program set up in the bill. If some Senators wish to throw it out and if they wish us to go on our merry way ignoring the significance of the social sciences, that is a matter which the Senate must determine. But I see no logical reason to fail to cover the social sciences in this connection.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I am not advocating that they be thrown out. I merely am making comments in regard to some reasons for not including provision for a Division of Social Sciences as a part of the program to be set up by this particular bill.

Let me say that I think it would be most unwise for the Federal Government to attempt either directly or indirectly to shape research. I know that in some branches of medicine progress has been made because of governmental research, and possibly in other respects governmental activity has been helpful. But it seems to me we open a dangerous field when we give the Federal Government the power to shape closely research. The best research which has been done, in this country at least, has been done by agencies which have not been controlled or regulated by the Government and which have not been instructed or shaped by the Government in regard to what they do. I think it is quite possible that the arrangements proposed by the bill would probably protect against what might be called governmental domination of any kind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator's statement about the proper method. I am assuming, and I believe, that the protection afforded by the bill against governmental domination is sufficient. In that connection, the problem is similar to that which we had in connection with the so-called Federal aid to education bill, Senate bill 181. I do not think the field of research should be controlled by the Federal Government, but the experience we have had in connection with the land-grant colleges shows that Government aid is not detrimental to education or research. If the Federal Government falls into the hands of a dictator, then the whole situation will be bad, of course. But so long as we have a division of power such as now exists in the National Government, whereby no two parts of the Government seem to be able to agree, we are not likely to have domination of education or research by the Government.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is not the argument of the Senator from Maryland based upon the idea that the research to be done under the program established by the bill will be the only research which will be done?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Not at all. I am not assuming that all the universities and great corporations of the United States will quit such research work merely because this program begins.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it the Senator's viewpoint, then, that the Government should not be permitted to help in certain phases of research which some governmental agencies have found require help?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No. I personally would have the Government appropriate the money and turn it over to research agencies which are clearly recognized, and without in any way being controlled or shaped or directed by the Federal Government except in very special cases. It may be that sufficient safeguards are placed in the bill in order to take care of that matter. I do not know. I have not been able to study the bill from that standpoint as carefully as I should like to do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what I think the bill means. At some place we should make provision for preventing any complete "crackpots" from receiving aid from the fund.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, let me point out to the Senator that all the research which now is being done privately in the United States will be continued. The program set up by this bill will not stop it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill will provide funds which are badly needed in a most important field. For instance, if the Army has a problem which is too big for its research laboratory to solve, it will go to the Foundation, and the Foundation will say, "Perhaps we can get the General Electric Research Laboratory and Johns Hopkins to help."

There will simply be some check, not to determine what research shall be conducted but to make sure that there shall not be abuses in connection with the expenditure of the funds.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill provides:

(c) The Board shall continuously survey the activities and management of the Foundation, and shall periodically evaluate the achievements of the Foundation in accomplishing the objectives of this act. Each divisional scientific committee shall survey continuously the scientific field which it encompasses, shall undertake to determine the specific scientific needs of such field, and shall evaluate proposed programs and projects.

It seems to me that that provision is included only in order to make sure that those who receive the aid are not completely "nuts." Of course, some people who are entirely crazy will apply for the aid, no doubt; such persons almost always do apply in connection with such projects, so the bill simply provides for a check.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I suppose it would also be an advantage in preventing some obvious duplication.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course it will. Such duplication is often found.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me give an illustration which I recall very well. A friend of mine was working at Johns Hopkins University in astronomy, and he spent several years in making a special study in that field. As his particular line of inquiry was about completed and he was about to present it for his doctorate of philosophy, he learned that someone else thousands of miles away had done similar research work, and, as a matter of fact, has gotten publicity ahead of him by only a few days. So not only did my friend lose that opportunity for his degree and 3 years of work but he also found he had wasted his time because someone else was doing the same research job.

I can understand the importance of coordinating the work so as to promote a free interchange of ideas and of knowledge of the work which is being done, and of course that will also tend to prevent duplication. I think that might be a distinct advantage from the operations of this bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to bring my remarks to a conclusion, but first I desire to read a short paragraph from a statement by Dr. Wesley Mitchell, who is one of the leading social scientists of the country and, incidentally, is an economist. I should like to read a portion of his statement at this point:

The present inadequacy of knowledge of human relations is a source of danger which can be greatly reduced by more adequate applications of scientific techniques in the study of human problems. Social-science personnel, research procedures and facilities are underdeveloped in terms of the tasks which must be undertaken. It has been demonstrated, however, that the earnest and objective investigation of problems of human relations can produce results of inestimable practical value when properly trained research workers imbued with scientific detachment and integrity are given opportunity to apply themselves with adequate resources. The fact that it cannot be claimed that the social sciences have reached a stage comparable to that of some of the other scientific disciplines is considered the strongest possible reason for advancing their development by every effective means. The problems with which they deal are urgent. The advances in research planning, techniques, and organization which have been achieved during the war and the immediate prewar years offer

promise of a period of unusually fruitful progress if adequate support is made available.

Mr. President, I close by saying that I think it is well worth our while, and it may very well be most valuable to us in the future, to leave in the bill provision for the Division of Social Sciences.

As for the bill as a whole, it goes without saying that I am strongly in favor of it, and I hope the Senate will pass it.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution for the extension of rent control, and I request that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RADCLIFFE in the chair). Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What measure was just introduced for appropriate reference?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The caption of the joint resolution is "A joint resolution extending the rent control provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, until June 30, 1947."

Mr. WHERRY. Is unanimous consent required for the introduction of the joint resolution at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is, at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Was unanimous consent requested?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I requested unanimous consent. The joint resolution is introduced at this time merely in order to have it referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair heard no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Unanimous consent was granted on the basis of the reference of the joint resolution to the appropriate committee; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 171) extending the rent control provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, until June 30, 1947, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1850) to promote the progress of sciences and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to take only a minute to address the Senate at this time.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington, as one of the Senators in charge of the bill, if he will refer to page 13 of the bill, subsection (e) of section 5, and later I shall ask him to refer to subsection (f) of section 8, on page 19.

My good friend the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who is a member of the Atomic Energy Committee, particularly directed my attention to these two subsections. Of course, the Senator is aware of the fact that some three weeks or more ago the Senate unanimously passed the Atomic Energy Act, Senate bill 1717. That bill contains very carefully worked out provisions for the treatment of basic and applied research in the field of nuclear physics. I should like to ask the Senator if there is any intention on the part of the sponsors of the bill or anything in the language of the bill as he reads it which gives to this Foundation any right to engage in research in the field of nuclear physics.

I may say to the Senator that I am afraid that we might run into some conflict. We have carved out the field of nuclear physics and have put it under the control of the Atomic Energy Commission. Because of the nature of the beast, as it were, we have had to devise special treatment for security reasons. Allow me to invite attention to the fact that, under section 5 (e) of the bill, if nuclear physics was conceived to be within the operating functions of the Commission, the following language on page 13, in line 8, would apply:

> Any person engaged in such research and development activities shall not be precluded from independently discussing, writing, or publishing his own views and conclusions relating to such research and development.

In the atomic-energy bill we went to great pains to keep research free, but at the same time we imposed criminal penalties for the publication or disclosure of restricted data. The term "restricted data" was defined in the bill. On page 19 of the pending bill, in section 8 (f), there is a saving provision permitting the President to withhold from publication or dissemination certain material if it involves national security. However, I question the Senator's belief that we should permit the National Science Foundation to engage in the field of nuclear physics.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator that the foundation will, of course, be given broad authority. I suspect that if the Army or the Navy asked the foundation to go into the field of nuclear physics, it would go. However, once it got into such field it would be in a special sphere, subject to the provisions of the bill which was sponsored by the Senator. His bill deals specifically with that subject.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Connecticut must realize that the pending bill was agreed upon long prior to the introduction of his bill. His bill made provision for taking care of the entire situation on the basis of secrecy and national protection. I believe there will be no conflict between the Senator's bill and the pending one. However, I am sure, as one of the sponsors of the pending bill, that we would be willing to go along in taking care of the situation to which the Senator refers.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator believe that it would be advisable to provide in this bill that the Atomic Energy Commission will be expected to do the basic and applied research in the field of nuclear physics? I should think that it would be well to do that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Who knows where that would lead us to? We might prohibit the Foundation from using nuclear physics, for example, in research in connection with the treatment of cancer. The language on page 13, section 5 (e) of the bill is only to restrict the Board, Administrator, or anyone else from saying to a student, for example, "You must direct your research along this or that line."

Mr. McMAHON. I am in favor of that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill also contains a saving clause under which the President may say, with respect to any problem, "This is a secret problem." That would include nuclear physics and other matters.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. If we start to make particular exceptions, in bills introduced in the future, different matters may be brought into the picture than those pertaining to nuclear physics. They will also have to be taken care of. If the Senator has an amendment to suggest I personally, as one of the sponsors of the bill, would be delighted to consider it. But if we start particularizing about nuclear physics, and then continue with some other kind of physics, or some other kind of mathematics which may arise in scientific fields, we may get into many difficulties. We cannot foresee 12 months from now everything which may be associated with the subject of nuclear physics.

Mr. McMAHON. I see the point which the Senator has in mind. I should like to have an opportunity to think the matter over and discuss it with the sponsors of the bill. What I believe at the moment is this: If the proposed Foundation intends to spend any of its funds for research and development in the field of nuclear physics, it should be done only after consultation with the Atomic Energy Commission, which, under section 3 of the atomic energy bill, is specifically authorized and directed to do its own research in this field. I am trying to avoid duplication and conflict of jurisdiction.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to explain the jurisdictional theory. In other words, if work is to be done in nuclear physics, it must be done under the division covering nuclear physics and must originate in the nature of a request from someone. The Foundation would only furnish some funds to the agency working in that particular field, and those funds would have to be allocated as designated by that agency under the terms and conditions set forth.

In other words, this is not a research organization. It is merely a fund-allocating organization in aid of scientific

research to augment—shall we say—other appropriations, other funds, and other steps taken by private or public organizations. When they find themselves with a problem which they cannot solve, or when they do not have the necessary funds to carry on their work, they come to the Foundation, ask for money, go through the necessary process up to the Director. If the proposal is worth while, they may receive an allocation of funds.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, the Atomic Energy Commission should come to the Foundation and say, "We need more money."

Mr. McMAHON. Then, if I understand correctly the Senator from Washington and the Senator from West Virginia, the only basis on which the Foundation should inject itself into the field of nuclear physics, either basic or applied research, would be the request of the Atomic Energy Commission. Am I correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. Or upon the request of the Army, the Navy, or some agency of that nature.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They could have a fellowship man somewhere dealing with nuclear physics.

Mr. McMAHON. Do not the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Washington believe that it would be sensible to have all applications for funds for conducting research in nuclear physics, presented first to the Atomic Energy Commission and then to the Foundation for approval?

Mr. KILGORE. It would be better to have a general clause in the bill stating that with reference to any specific scientific subjects which are now or may hereafter be considered, with exclusive rights to deal in certain phases, all requests shall be cleared through the body governing that particular group. That would take care of any situation which might arise later.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not know. I believe that I would rather take care, particularly, of the present situation, and then let any new science, or art, or whatever it may be, take care of itself through a later amendment to the act. Because this is an immediate situation, it might be well if we were to put in a clearance provision that all applications for research grants-in-aid must go to the Atomic Energy Commission with reference to the particular field involved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They should be cleared.

Mr. McMAHON. They should be cleared.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because there may be a desire to establish nuclear physics reseach in, for example, the field of cancer, in which the sponsors of the Senator's bill are not interested.

Mr. McMAHON. Oh, yes; we are interested in such matters.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The sponsors of the Senator's bill are interested, of course, from a humane standpoint.

Mr. McMAHON. Yes. But I believe it is particularly important at this time to have, as near as we can, a centralized place for the study of nuclear physics. I believe that would be highly desirable, in the public interest and in national security. So I shall attempt to draft such an amendment and submit it to the Senator from Washington and to the Senator from West Virginia, and see if we cannot arrive at an agreement.

I note that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is here on my right. He brought the matter originally to my attention, and I should like to ask him if the proposal meets with his views of the situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; it meets with my views. What I fear is that there will be a conflict. The Senate has only recently passed a bill which we all know provides for the control of atomic energy. We should be very careful that we do not have a conflict between this bill and the other bill. There is no need for having a conflict, and if we spell it out, as the Senator from Connecticut has indicated he would like to have done, there can be no basis for conflict; provision will be made for full cooperation, and there will be no bickerings and no misunderstandings and no loopholes through which atomic controls might escape.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think a satisfactory amendment can be prepared. I understand the Senator's idea. It is that if someone should come to the Foundation with a research problem which involved nuclear physics, surely the commission set up by the other bill should have the right to say "You go ahead with it" or "Do not go ahead with it," or whether it is a good idea or a bad idea. Something can be worked out along that line.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope it will not deal in questions of scholarships or fellowships, because that is merely a matter of training. The Senator is speaking of specific research problems.

Mr. McMAHON. I shall endeavor to work it out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator, with the understanding that I may have the floor tomorrow for a few moments, if that is agreeable to the majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is all right with me, when the consideration of the pending bill shall be resumed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I mean when the consideration of the bill is resumed.

Mr. WHERRY. The pending bill is the special order of business, is it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; it is the special order.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RADCLIFFE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the appropriate committee.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Erl C. B. Gould, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, while serving with the Foreign Liquidation Commission, State Department, and to continue during any assignment commensurate with the rank of commodore or until release from active duty.

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE—PROTOCOL TERMINATING ROME CONVENTION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive H, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, a protocol dated at Rome March 30, 1946, terminating the Rome convention of June 7, 1905, and transferring the functions and assets of the International Institute of Agriculture to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the protocol and it will be published in the RECORD.

The protocol, with accompanying papers, is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified photostatic copy of a protocol dated at Rome, March 30, 1946, terminating the Rome convention of June 7, 1905, and transferring the functions and assets of the International Institute of Agriculture to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

The protocol has been signed, "Subject to ratification," by the American chargé d'affaires ad interim at Rome for the Government of the United States of America (including Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands).

I also transmit herewith, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the protocol.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 1, 1946.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Protocol dated at Rome, March 30, 1946, terminating Rome convention of June 7, 1905, and transferring functions and assets of International Institute of Agriculture to Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.)

JUNE 27, 1946.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a certified photostatic copy of a protocol dated at Rome, March 30, 1946,

terminating the Rome convention of June 7, 1905, and transferring the functions and assets of the International Institute of Agriculture to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

The protocol has been signed by the American Chargé d'Affaires ad interim at Rome for the Government of the United States of America (including Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands), subject to ratification. The protocol has been signed also by the plenipotentiaries of a number of other countries, and it is anticipated that additional signatures will be affixed by August 1, 1946.

The convention for the creation of an International Institute of Agriculture was signed at Rome, June 7, 1905, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and a number of other countries. The United States of America became a party to that convention by the deposit of its instrument of ratification with the Italian Government on August 13, 1906. The official citation of the convention is Thirty-fifth Statutes, part 2, 1918.

In 1924, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, and in conformity with the last paragraph of article 10 of the convention of 1905, Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands were admitted to participation in the International Institute of Agriculture.

On April 21, 1926, there was signed at Rome on behalf of a number of countries, not including the United States of America, a protocol amending the convention of 1905. The United States of America became a party to that protocol on August 25, 1934, by adherence. In depositing the instrument of adherence, the American Ambassador at Rome informed the Italian Foreign Office that the adherence of the United States of America to the protocol extends to and embraces Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The official citation of that protocol is Forty-ninth Statutes, part 2, 3350.

By joint resolution of the Congress of the United States of America, approved July 31, 1945 (Public Law 174, 79th Cong.), the President was authorized to accept membership for the United States of America in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Section 3 of that joint resolution refers to the contemplated dissolution of the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome and the merger of its functions and assets with those of the Food and Agriculture Organization. Section 3 reads as follows:

"In adopting this joint resolution, it is the sense of the Congress that the Government of the United States should use its best efforts to bring about, as soon as practicable, the integration of the functions and resources of the International Institute of Agriculture with those of the organization, in a legal and orderly manner, to effect one united institution in such form as to provide an adequate research, informational, and statistical service for the industry of agriculture."

At the first meeting of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, at Quebec, October 16 to November 1, 1945, the conference (the governing body of the Organization) adopted unanimously a resolution requesting that those governments which are members of both the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Institute of Agriculture take action for the purpose of bringing to an end the affairs of the Institute and of transferring the library, archives, and other property of the Institute to the Organization.

The director-general of the Food and Agriculture Organization, by a letter dated November 10, 1945, requested that the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain, and Northern Ireland, Canada, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium work together to give effect to the Quebec resolution relating to the dissolution of the International Institute of Agriculture.

During January and February 1946 the Government of the United States of America, after prior consultation with the British Government, communicated with the other governments members of both the Organization and the Institute, urging the cooperation of those governments in the adoption of procedure for the dissolution of the Institute and the merger of its functions and assets with those of the Organization.

On March 30, 1946, the permanent committee of the International Institute of Agriculture, meeting in Rome, adopted without dissenting vote a resolution prepared by the United States Government and presented to the committee by the American and British representatives on the committee. This resolution urged that each of the governments concerned authorize the signing on its behalf of a protocol for the purpose of dissolving the Institute, terminating the convention which created it, and transferring its functions and assets to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The resolution also urged that the General Assembly of the Institute take action to authorize the permanent committee to take the necessary steps for this purpose.

The protocol, as recommended by the permanent committee of the institute, was opened for signature on March 30, 1946, and bears that date. It is this protocol of which a certified photostatic copy is enclosed herewith.

Article I of the protocol provides that from a date which is to be announced by the permanent committee of the institute, in accordance with article III, the convention of 1905 shall be no longer effective as between the parties to the protocol, and the institute (including the international forestry center) thereupon shall be brought to an end.

Article III provides for the giving of a notification by the permanent committee to the members of the institute when the duties assigned by article II of the protocol have been completed. It is provided further that the date of notification shall be deemed to be the date of termination of the convention of 1905 and also the date of the dissolution of the institute (including the center).

Article IV provides for the transfer to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the powers, rights, or duties attributed to the institute (including the center) by the provisions of certain international conventions, as listed in an annex to the protocol.

Article V sets forth the procedure by which a member of the institute which is not a signatory to the protocol may accede to the protocol.

Article VI contains provisions relating to the coming into force of the protocol. Pursuant to this article, the protocol shall come into force when it has been accepted by at least 35 governments members of the institute. Such acceptance may be effected by any one of three methods, namely, by signature alone when such signature is without a reservation in regard to ratification, by the deposit of an instrument of ratification in the case of signature with a reservation in regard to ratification, or by notice of accession in accordance with article V. The coming into force of the protocol for other governments, after the protocol has come into force as provided in the second paragraph of article VI, is governed by the third paragraph.

In the opinion of the Department of State, this protocol, together with the action to be taken by the General Assembly and the permanent committee of the institute, would accomplish the object mentioned in section 3 of the joint resolution of July 31, 1945, namely, the integration of the functions and resources of the institute with those of the Organization, in a legal and orderly manner, effecting "one united institution in such form as to provide an adequate research, informational, and statistical service for the industry of agriculture.

It is believed that, in order to be fully effective, the action of the United States of America with respect to this protocol should be completed as soon as practicable.

Respectfully submitted.

DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary of State.

The Governments signatories to this Protocol,

Being parties to the Convention signed at Rome on June 7, 1905, creating the International Institute of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Institute),

Considering it desirable that the Institute (including the International Forestry Center, hereinafter called the Center) be dissolved and that the functions and assets thereof be transferred to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (hereinafter called the Organization), and

Being cognizant of the resolution of the Permanent Committee of the Institute, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

From the date to be announced by the Permanent Committee of the Institute in accordance with Article III of this Protocol, the Convention signed at Rome on June 7, 1905, by which the Institute was created, shall be no longer of any effect as between the parties to this Protocol, and the Institute (including the Center) thereupon shall be brought to an end.

ARTICLE II

The Permanent Committee of the Institute shall, in accordance with the directions of the General Assembly of the Institute, bring the affairs of the Institute (including the Center) to an end and for this purpose shall

(a) collect and bring together all assets of the Institute (including the Center) and take possession of the libraries, archives, records, and movable property thereof;

(b) pay and satisfy all outstanding debts and claims for which the Institute is liable;

(c) discharge the employees of the Institute and transfer all personnel files and records to the Organization;

(d) transfer to the Organization possession of and full title to the property in the libraries, archives, records, and all residual assets of the Institute (including the Center).

ARTICLE III

When the duties assigned to it by Article II of this Protocol have been completed, the Permanent Committee of the Institute shall forthwith, by circular letter, notify the Members of the Institute of the dissolution of the Institute (including the Center) and of the transfer of the functions and assets thereof to the Organization. The date of such notification shall be deemed to be the date of the termination of the Convention of June 7, 1905, and also the date of the dissolution of the Institute (including the Center).

ARTICLE IV

Upon bringing to an end the affairs of the Institute (including the Center) the powers, rights, or duties attributed to it by the provisions of the International Conventions listed in the Annex on this protocol, shall devolve upon the Organization; and the parties to this Protocol which are parties to the said conventions shall execute such provisions, insofar as they remain in force, in

all respects as though they refer to the Organization in place of the Institute.

ARTICLE V

Any Member of the Institute which is not a signatory to this Protocol may at any time accede to this Protocol by sending a written notice of accession to the Director General of the Organization, who shall inform all signatory and acceding Governments of such accession.

ARTICLE VI

1. This Protocol shall not be subject to ratification in respect to any government unless a specific reservation to that effect is made at the time of signature.

2. This Protocol shall come into force upon its acceptance in respect to at least thirty-five Governments Members of the Institute. Such acceptance shall be effected by:

(a) signature without reservation in regard to ratification, or

(b) deposit of an instrument of ratification in the archives of the Organizaiton by Governments on behalf of which this Protocol is signed with a reservation in regard to ratification, or

(c) notice of accession in accordance with Article V.

3. After coming into force in accordance with paragraph 2 of this Article, this Protocol shall come into force for any other Government a Member of the Institute.

(a) on the date of signature on its behalf, unless such signature is made with a reservation in regard to ratification, in which event it shall come into force for such Government on the date of deposit of its instrument of ratification, or

(b) on the date of the receipt of the notice of accession, in the case of any non-signatory Government which accedes in accordance with Article V.

In witness whereof the duly authorized representatives of their respective Governments have met this day and have signed the present protocol, which is drawn up in the French and English languages, both texts being equally authentic, in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Organization. Authenticated copies shall be furnished by the Organization to each of the signatory and acceding Governments and to any other Governments which, at the time this Protocol is signed, is a Member of the Institute.

Done at Rome this 30th day of March 1946.

For the Government of Argentina:
CARLOS BREBBIA.

For the Government of Australia:
G. S. BRIDGLAND.

For the Government of Belgium (including the Belgian Congo):
G. DASPREMONT LYNDEN.

For the Government of Brazil:
J. LATOUR.

Sous reserve de ratification.

For the Government of Canada:
ALFRED RIVE.

For the Government of Cuba:
MIGUEL A. ESPINOSA.

For the Government of Denmark:
T. BULL.

For the Government of Egypt:
MAHMOUD MOHARRAN HAMMAD.

For the Government of Ireland:
MICHAEL MACWHITE.

For the Government of the United States of America (including Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands):
DAVID MCK. KEY.

Subject to ratification.

For the Government of France (including Algeria, Franch West Africa, French Morocco, Indo-China, Madagascar and Tunis):
AUGEÉ-LARIBÉ.

For the Government of Greece:
G. A. EXINTARIS.

For the Government of India:
JOHN O. MAY.

For the Government of Luxembourg:
G. N'ASPREMONT L.

For the Government of Norway:
SIGURD BENTZON.

For the Government of the Netherlands (including the Netherlands Indies):
H. VAN HAASTERT.

For the Government of Poland:
W. WYSZYNSKI.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
JOHN O. MAY.

For the Government of Czechoslovakia:
Dr. JAN PAULINY TOTH.

For the Government of Turkey:
FURUZAN SELCUK.

Sous réserve de ratification.

ANNEX

LIST OF CONVENTIONS TO WHICH ARTICLE IV OF THE PROTOCOL RELATES

International Convention for Locust Control, dated at Rome, October 31, 1920.

International Convention for Plant Protection, dated at Rome, April 16, 1929.

International Convention concerning the Markings of Eggs in International Trade, dated at Brussels, December 11, 1931.

International Convention for the Standardization of the Methods of Cheese Analysis, dated at Rome, April 26, 1934.

International Convention for the Standardization of Methods of Analyzing Wines, dated at Rome, June 5, 1935.

International Convention for the Standardization of the Methods of Keeping and Utilizing Herd-Books, dated at Rome, October 14, 1936.

AMERICAN EMBASSY, ROME, ITALY.

I certify that this is a true copy of the original.

[SEAL] DAVID MCK. KEY,
Chargé d'Affaires ad interim.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I inquire of the Chair whether there are any nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that there is nothing on the calendar except treaties.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 2, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 1, 1946

The House met at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever.

Amen.

By unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 29, was considered as read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6477. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and section 3 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2280. An act to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2307. An act to provide that every Saturday shall be a holiday for banks and building and loan associations in the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to extend the succession, leading powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6739. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MEAD, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. WHITE, Mr. BALL, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6777. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6496) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the

House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 19, and 62 to the foregoing bill.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had on June 29, 1946, examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6682. An act to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and to repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory therof and supplementary thereto.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Saturday, June 29, 1946, he did, on Sunday, June 30, 1946, sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H. R. 6682. An act to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and to repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 33 minutes a. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11 o'clock and 42 minutes a. m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE (HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF H. CON. RES. 152)

MEMORIAL SERVICES IN HONOR OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT, 1882–1945

PROGRAM

The Joint Committee on Arrangements

For the Senate: RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia; SCOTT W. LUCAS, of Illinois; WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California.

For the House: ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina; FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania; EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, of Illinois; EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts; JAY LEFEVRE, of New York.

The joint session of the Congress

Music---------- United States Marine Band Orchestra (11–11:30, 11:45–12)

Capt. William F. Santelmann, leader

Prelude—Guilmant.
Calm as the Night—Bohm.
Melody of Peace—Martin.
Andante Cantabile—Tchaikowsky.
Adagio Élégiaque—Wieniawski.
Largo—Handel.

Presiding officer---------- The Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives

Invocation---------- Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain of the House of Representatives

Vocal solo: Eternal Father, Strong to Save---- Mr. Robert Merrill, Metropolitan Opera Co.

(Miss Lila Edwards at the piano)

Address---------- The Honorable John Gilbert Winant, United States representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations

Vocal solo: The Lord's Prayer---------- Mr. Robert Merrill

Taps---------- Mr. Edward L. Masters Principal musician, USMC

Prayer and benediction---------- Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Chaplain of the United States Senate

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by its President pro tempore, its Secretary, and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests, who were escorted to the seats assigned to them:

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affairs of foreign governments.

The governors of States and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Commanding General of the Army Ground Forces, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The members of the Cabinet of the late President Roosevelt.

The Honorable John G. Winant.

Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt and members of the late President's family were escorted to the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, accompanied by a committee of escort of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall and took the seat reserved for him in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The SPEAKER. The Senate and House of Representatives, in joint session, with their invited guests, are assembled to pay tribute to the memory of one of the great Presidents of our Republic—a man beloved by millions, not only in his country, but in every nation of the world. In these simple services we wish to keep in remembrance something of the life, character, and public services of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

INVOCATION

Rev. JAMES SHERA MONTGOMERY, D. D., the Chaplain of the House of Representatives. Let us bow our heads in a moment of devotional silence.

(There followed a moment of devotional silence.)

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy holy spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee, and worthily magnify Thy holy name, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

O Thou who art the Father of us all, in whose sight a thousand years are but as yesterday, we ponder the strange tidings of destiny, in which are mingled joy and sorrow. We pray fervently that Thy spirit may possess our souls so that no selfish passion may hinder us from knowing Thy will and no weakness from doing it.

Today we are assembled to give tribute and honor to him who strove to create a new era of brotherhood for our country and the races of earth. His was the sympathetic heart and open mind for those who are scourged by the ills of misfortune and affliction. For him the winds did not speak more swiftly to the giant oak than to the humblest human flower by the wayside. As we contemplate the humane purpose in the life of Thy servant, grant that we, renewed and cheered, may turn to our particular tasks and ever stand for the maintenance of spiritual integrity of our land; and walking with Thee, may find the ways of peace and concord. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

VOCAL SOLO

Mr. Robert Merrill sang Eternal Father, Strong to Save, a favorite hymn of the late President Roosevelt.

INTRODUCTION OF MR. WINANT

The SPEAKER. The joint committee of the Congress has invited the Honorable John Gilbert Winant, a close friend of the late President, our former Ambassador to Great Britain, and now the United States representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, to deliver the address on this occasion. It is my privilege to present Mr. Winant.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN GILBERT WINANT

Mr. WINANT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, and distinguished guests, it has been the custom of the Congress to set aside a day for appropriate exercises in commemoration of the life, character, and public services of Presidents of the United States who have died. This day has, therefore, been set aside in memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, thirty-first President, who took office at the gravest moment of an economic crisis which threatened the security of the Republic, who twice preserved his country, was three times reelected to its Presidency, and died in office in his country's greatest war, having lived to see the victory assured but not to share it.

The final estimate of Franklin Roosevelt's achievement will not be made by us or in this room. It will be made elsewhere, and later, and by men who will judge all of us, not him alone. What Lincoln's message of December '62 said of his listeners in this same House is true of us:

> We cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation.

But though we cannot pay the final tribute which time reserves to others, we can do what later generations may not

do. We can speak of Franklin Roosevelt as a living man. All of us in this room, or almost all, are men and women who knew him—men, for the most part, who served with him in government in this country's greatest war. Some of us loved him well. Some of us opposed him earnestly. Many in this room bore responsibility at his request; sat in council with him. There is not one of us here who did not watch him near or at a distance, privately or publicly, in the great trial which was his life.

Greatness in a man, as in a mountain, requires distance to be seen. The things a man has lived by take their place beside his actions in the true perspective of time, and the inner pattern of his life becomes apparent. In the long range, it is the things by which we live that are important, although the timing and circumstance play their part. This was true in the life of Franklin Roosevelt. He might have been speaking of himself, as well as of the country, when he said:

> To some generations much is given; of some generations much is expected. This generation has a rendezvous with destiny.

He played a great part in great events. He was his country's President and undisputed leader at a great and decisive moment in its history. Under his Presidency, the Republic reached the position of principal importance and power among the nations of the earth which it now holds. It may be, indeed, though God forbid, that the power to which the Republic then reached was the high power of its destiny: only we, the living, can determine whether that be so.

These are the facts of history which no man disputes. But greatness does not lie in the association—even the dominating association—with great events. Events have an impersonal inertia of their own and a nation is something other than the purpose of its officers of state. Greatness lies in the man and not the times; the times reflect it only. Greatness lies in the proportion.

In Franklin Roosevelt the qualities we knew were these—we who worked with him and watched him. He loved mankind. There was no one in public life in our time who had the confidence of a greater part of the people of the earth than Franklin Roosevelt. He had their confidence not only because he believed in them as men and women, but because he expected much of them as men and women. The world to him was not composed of nations only, nor the nations of classes. He did not believe in abstractions. He believed in individual human beings. The compact, as Walt Whitman put it, was always with individuals. The decisions, whether in war or in peace, were decisions which affected the lives of individuals. The friendships, the dissensions, the agreements were individual friendships, individual dissensions, individual agreements. He loved men, but he loved them to be free, to be themselves.

He was brave. There is no man in this room—not those who saw him in the weakest moments of a frightful illness—not those who saw him in the most terrible moments of the war—there is not one of us who can say that he saw Franklin Roosevelt afraid.

He was steadfast. Once the decision had been made, he stood to it. Strong-willed and stubborn of purpose, he chose the men and framed the plans to bring to bear upon his country's enemies the full and overwhelming power of its strength, turning the first and terrible defeats to victories unprecedented in the history of war. Those who know of their own knowledge what risks he had to take, what burden of responsibility he had to bear, know how to estimate his steadfastness.

He saw the facts and faced them. Even in the brief perspective of a year we have learned how well he saw the facts of danger to his country. At a time when few men other than he, whether in positions of responsibility or not, understood the meaning of the history of our time, he understood it. We know now from the mouths and records of our enemies how well he understood. At a time when it was intellectually unpopular and politically dangerous to face the facts, he faced them. Neither the initial indifference of many among our people upon whose understanding he must have counted, nor a campaign of personal vilification in certain sections of our press, rarely equaled in any country, deterred him. He carried the distasteful burden of an unpopular awakening and brought the people, not of his own country only, but of the democratic world, to see their danger while yet there was time—how little time—to save themselves and save the world they lived in.

He dared to act. It is not always that those who have the courage to see have the courage to act on what they see. Franklin Roosevelt acted. In two great crises, one within, the other without, his acts changed history. That the confidence of the American people in themselves and in their Nation was restored and strengthened by the vigor and decisiveness of his action of 1933, all of us here know, for many have shared in that action and remember well. That Britain was saved to fight the war through by the courage and decisiveness of his action of 1940 we know also. None of us who knew of that decision and its consequences can forget it now that the war is won.

He believed. There was no American of his time who believed more deeply in America than he, and no believer in democracy who had a firmer faith in man. Freedom to him was not a word but a reality; not a sentiment to which men might aspire, but a reality they might possess. The reaffirmations of the rights of man to which he committed his administration and his country in the domestic and the foreign crises of his years as President were reaffirmations not of word but fact. They stand with the great charters of mankind.

And finally, and most important of all perhaps for us who have outlived him, he dared to hope. There was never a time in the dark years of the depression, of the black years of the war, when he lost hope. And as the end of the war drew near, and the end of his life with it, his hope grew greater, grew beyond the war, beyond the victory to peace. He dared to hope for peace, to believe in peace, and to act for peace. Young in heart himself, he always thought of his country as young also, as the New World, as the builder of new worlds of peace. Believer in man, and believer therefore in men, he thought of this Republic of ours as part of that greater republic of mankind on which alone a true peace can be rested. He never thought the labor would be easy. He never questioned—he least of all men—that differences and difficulties would arise. But neither did he cease to hope. Nor would he now.

These then were his qualities as President and foremost citizen of the United States. Brave, steadfast, one who dared to see the facts, to face them, and to act; one who believed, who hoped. Whatever verdict history writes down; this much we know who knew him—that he was a man. God give us heart and will to take this Nation as he left it—not only powerful, not only rich but young and hopeful and confident and believing and strong—God give us heart and will to take this Nation forward as he meant to take it to a new, more daring future, a new world of peace.

VOCAL SOLO

Mr. Robert Merrill sang The Lord's Prayer.

TAPS

Taps was sounded by Mr. Edward L. Master, principal musician, United States Marine Corps.

PRAYER AND BENEDICTION

The Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Chaplain of the United States Senate, offered the following prayer and benediction:

God of the living and of the living dead, in a realm where beyond these voices and party cries there is peace and a pure plane of appraisal where the motives and deeds of men are weighed in juster scales than ours, and where the souls of the righteous are in Thy hands and belong to the undivided nation forever:

We thank Thee for the life of this servant of Thine and of humanity who led the Republic in the days of its most crucial test and that for the world's fairest hopes he was a word made flesh in a torn and tormented generation. We give Thee thanks that while others slept Thou didst give him to see clearly that the vital issue was a slave world or a free world, and that Thou didst anoint him to make our America the arsenal of democracy's weapons for imperiled freedom everywhere.

Now that that foul tyranny is in dust and ashes we come to acknowledge in this Chamber, where with failing physical strength and faltering voice he gave a last account of his stewardship, that among the shining memories of the Nation he served will abide always the heritage of his personal courage, his utter faith in democracy, and his passion to uplift the underprivileged and the exploited everywhere.

We think tenderly today of his heroic triumph over bodily affliction and disability, a precious gift he has bequeathed to all who with maimed bodies have returned from the carnage to face the test he surmounted in the art of living. This memorial hour we would listen to his parting words, his marching orders, as Commander in Chief, as, being dead, he yet speaketh:

"Let us move forward with a strong and active faith, remembering that the only limit to our realization of tomorrow is our doubts of today."

We are grateful that in Thy providence before he ceased at once to live and to work he knew that triumph was perching on Allied banners, and that every white cross on far-stretching God's acres under alien skies was a belfry for the chimes of victory.

And now, under the spell of his example, with the elixir of his winged words still ours, we pray that when for us all the voices that praise or blame grow faint and drift away, Thou wilt give us to know that Thy everlasting arms are still there beneath us. At the last, when the fever of life here is over, bring us all to the homeland of Thy eternal love: In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The joint session of the two Houses is now dissolved.

The President and his Cabinet, Mr. Winant, the members of the late President Roosevelt's Cabinet, the Diplomatic Corps, Mrs. Roosevelt and members of the late President Roosevelt's family, the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the governors of States and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the commanding general of the Army Ground Forces, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Members of the Senate retired.

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will stand in recess until 2 p. m. today.

There was no objection.

Accordingly, at 12 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess until 2 p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock p. m.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1947

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6777, an act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the chairman of the committee going to bring this back in disagreement on some of these appropriations for power projects and the construction of a fertilizer plant? They were never considered by this body.

Mr. WHITTEN. We are going into conference and I would hate to say in advance what the conferees will agree on. Of course, I cannot tell the gentleman at this time what action may be taken by the committee of conference or what kind of a report we may bring in. I am merely asking for the appointment of conferees.

Mr. RICH. You have there the construction of a Government fertilizer plant in Alabama. Is that going to be retained in the conference report?

Mr. WHITTEN. All I can say to the gentleman is that the conferees will confer on the matter and we will have to wait until action is taken on it.

Mr. RICH. Unless you bring that back in disagreement so the House will vote on it, I am going to object.

Mr. WHITTEN. I cannot speak for the conferees. All I can do is to request the appointment of conferees so that we can go into conference with the Senate.

Mr. RICH. Unless you will agree to use your influence to bring that back in the House, then I object.

Mr. WHITTEN. Does the gentleman mean to say that he would bind the conferees in advance of their meeting?

Mr. RICH. I am opposed to the Government setting up a fertilizer plant or any other kind of plant. I am not going to permit it to go through by unanimous consent at this time. I am against the Government going into business in competition with private enterprise. That is communism.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will withhold his objection, I would like to make a further statement.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania withhold his objection?

Mr. RICH. I withhold the objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am not making a request to approve the report. This is for the appointment of conferees for the very purpose that the gentleman has in mind, and that is to consider the amendments which the Senate put in the bill. It does not have to do with approving the conference report at all.

Mr. RICH. Will you bring it back in disagreement?

Mr. WHITTEN. I cannot promise the gentleman what action the committee will take. I can speak only for myself. We will go into the matter.

Mr. RICH. Poll your committee and find out.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry but the gentleman can pursue whatever course seems advisable to him, but I cannot poll the committee in advance.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1947

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6739, an act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARE, TARVER, ROONEY, NEELY, ENGEL of Michigan, KEEFE, and H. CARL ANDERSEN.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Houston Chronicle of June 28.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a statement in one extension.

Mr. WILSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three separate instances and to include editorials.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a short newspaper article, and in the other two brief letters.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include facts found by a department of the State of Massachusetts and also tables included in their report.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include a newspaper article.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Lorain Journal.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a resolution adopted by the Municipal Finance Officers Association, and in the other to include an article which appeared in the Meath Chronicle.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter, and in the other a set of resolutions.

Mr. ROGERS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech given by Kent Hurley, graduate of East Roger High school, entitled "Our Challenge in This Atomic Age."

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include a letter from the Letter Box of the Detroit News.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short letter from the president of the Farm Bureau.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT, 1942

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 689 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other rule of the House immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 371, extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942), as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and all points of order against said joint resolution are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 192]

Adams	Granger	Patterson
Anderson, Calif.	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Ga.
Andresen, August H.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Ploeser
Andrews, N. Y.	Hall, Leonard W.	Powell
Barden	Harness, Ind.	Rankin
Bates, Mass.	Harris	Reece, Tenn.
Bell	Hoffman, Mich.	Robinson, Utah
Bonner	Hoffman, Pa.	Rodgers, Pa.
Boren	Holifield	Roe, N. Y.
Boykin	Horan	Rooney
Bradley, Mich.	Izac	Sheridan
Bradley, Pa.	Jackson	Sikes
Brumbaugh	Jennings	Slaughter
Camp	Johnson, Okla.	Stewart
Clippinger	Kefauver	Stigler
Cochran	Kilburn	Tarver
Coffee	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Corbett	Ludlow	Tolan
Cox	McGehee	Torrens
Crawford	McKenzie	Vinson
Curley	Mahon	Vursell
Daughton, Va.	Mankin	Wadsworth
Drewry	Mansfield, Mont.	Welch
Eberharter	Mansfield, Tex.	West
Engel, Mich.	Miller, Calif.	White
Gardner	Norrell	Wickersham
Gibson	Norton	Winstead
Gifford	Pace	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gillespie	Patrick	Wood
Gossett		Worley

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 345 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENDING EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes. I shall later on yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order House Joint Resolution 371. It provides for 1 hour of general debate, after which the resolution will be read for amendment. Points of order against the resolution have been waived.

ACTION UNUSUAL

Some Members may ask whether the action of the Rules Committee was unusual. I will say without waiting for the query, yes, it is, but we have precedents for the action that has been taken by the Rules Committee. You will recall that a rule was given to the Case bill, though it had not yet been introduced and had no number, while the bill made in order by this rule, House Joint Resolution 371, was already formally before the House.

The Committee on Banking and Currency was precluded under the rules from calling a meeting to consider the joint resolution that was introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]. Realizing the importance and the seriousness of conditions that existed throughout our country, I called a meeting of the Rules Committee, and I am pleased to say that I am thankful to the majority members of the committee that they agreed to report this rule making the joint resolution in order. They, too, realized that it is of the greatest importance that action be taken without delay.

THIS BILL OF VAST IMPORTANCE

As I stated, it was my intention to call up the resolution Saturday afternoon, but before we had an opportunity to act we were informed that the Senate had adjourned. Consequently there was no benefit to be derived in urging the House to act Saturday.

I consider that this joint resolution before us is of such vast importance to the American people that I expect all fair-minded Members, whether on this side of the aisle or on the other side, who have the interest of the American people at heart, and the interest of the consumers at heart, will vote for the rule and will vote for the joint resolution, without trying to delay action unnecessarily.

NEWS SHOWS PRICES SKYROCKET

Mr. Speaker, the facts stated in the President's message are so clear and so convincing that I feel all of us, without regard to party affiliation, must realize the need for immediate action to save the country from plunging into a ruinous inflation.

If there are any remaining doubts as to the need for continuation of price control, surely a perusal of the day's news will convince the most skeptical. The majority of American businessmen are anxious to save the Nation from a boom that can end only in their own economic injury, but there are always some who, with a reckless disregard for their own and their country's welfare, will "get while the getting's good."

BEEF AT $1.75—NYLONS, $1.95

I have just been handed a brief summary of news from the news tickers. Let me mention a few of the items:

New York: Hindquarters of beef selling at 60 cents a pound wholesale, including waste, forces retail price up to $1.75 a pound.

Rhode Island: Nylons up from $1.35 to $1.95.

Chicago: Livestock up $1 to $5 per hundredweight.

New York: Cotton up $4 a bale.

New Orleans: Cotton up $5 a bale.

Chicago: Corn up 41 cents, selling at $1.85.

Boston: Room rentals up $5 to $10 weekly; residence rentals up, for instance, from $36 monthly to $45 monthly.

Memphis: Rents up 100 percent.

Philadelphia: Rents up. Example—from $90 to $150 a month, effective immediately, despite legal provision of 30-day notice.

St. Louis: Rents up 15 to 30 percent.

Chicago: Some rents more than doubled.

Miami: In one apartment hotel rent increased from $55 monthly to $160 monthly; maid and linen service eliminated.

Laguna Beach, Calif.: Resort rentals changed from $35 monthly to $10 a day.

BUTTER SELLING AT 99 CENTS

Here in the District of Columbia frying and roasting chickens are up 14 cents a pound. Oranges have jumped 50 cents a case. Fresh fruits and vegetables are selling to the highest bidders, with all price tags removed. Butter is selling at 99 cents in some stores in Washington and at $1.10 in Maryland. The price of scallops and crab meat advanced 35 percent. Tires went up from $16.25 to $21.75.

These, as I have explained, are merely news stories hot off the ticker, and you will read more details in today's and tomorrow morning's papers. I am told that some restaurants have increased prices 50 percent.

SUCH ADVANCES UNFAIR

I think it is unfair and un-American on the part of the irresponsible dealers responsible for these breath-taking advances to take advantage of the emergency; and I appeal to the decent dealers, if they have their own interest and the interest of the country at heart, to desist, and to comply with the appeals of the President of the United States and their own business and trade leaders.

Surely they should realize that if a wild inflation comes with its aftermath of depression and panic it is the small businessman who will suffer most and the small manufacturer who will be wiped out.

SMALL COMPETITORS CAN BE WIPED OUT

It is not unreasonable to suspect that the enmity of the National Association of Manufacturers for price control is based in part on the belief of the huge manufacturing interests that they can eliminate competition, and their virtual monopoly can be made absolute.

Certainly it will inure to the benefit of all business and all manufacturers if they will hold prices in check and not permit themselves to be swayed by greed to increase profits unfairly and without justification.

WARNING TO CONGRESS

At the same time these newspaper stories are a grave warning to us here in Congress to act promptly and fairly in protection of the people. Perhaps some of those who voted to sustain the President's veto did so under the misleading pressures of the National Association of Manufacturers and similar organizations and the powerful propaganda lobbies they have maintained to fight price controls. Surely they can see now that the anti-OPA lobbies have viciously misrepresented the facts.

As I stated here Saturday, this should not be a fight between Republicans and Democrats; it is a struggle between the desire of the people to make a living, and the desire of selfish interests to make a killing.

SHORTAGES ARTIFICIAL

I am not opposed to people making a fair return on their investments, Mr. Speaker. I believe in free enterprise; I myself have been in business. But free enterprise cannot be free if it uses its freedom to unjustifiably gouge the American people, as obviously some people in business are doing right now in this critical situation; and if that kind of freedom of enterprise is long indulged in it will lose its freedom entirely in the ultimate crash between the just anger of the people and being gobbled up by powerful trusts and monopolies who can ride out the crash.

We know that in all too many instances there has been no real shortages of goods where shortages were supposed to exist. The goods are being withheld from the market by greedy speculators and hoarders. If the food, the fabrics, and scores and scores of other high-demand articles had been put onto the market as they were produced there would have been few real shortages.

BUYERS CAN STRIKE ALSO

The American people can play that game too.

If the speculators think they can make a killing in the next few days, they are mistaken, because I know the consumers of the country will resent it, and they too can strike and can withhold their buying until these greedy men come to their senses.

I presume that my Republican friends who have been disarmed by the President's honest, straightforward, and positive presentation of evidence and facts will revert to name calling, and will charge that the Washington bureaucrats want OPA to be a continuing and permanent agency. Such insinuations and other unjustified charges are deplorable; they are unfair and anything but statesmanlike.

OPA DOES NOT DESTROY FREE ENTERPRISE

They will shout that free enterprise is being destroyed. I ask them: Have we free enterprise today when a few large groups can dominate the basic prices of everything we consume, and can withhold their products from market while their warehouses are bulging with unsold merchandise, in order to create artificial shortages and gouge the American public with falsely inflated prices? They willfully close their eyes and refuse to see that we are on the brink of economic crisis and chaos. Their shortsighted policies cannot aid them in gaining political advantage in the next political campaign; on the other hand, the just anger of the American people may well consign them to political oblivion for years to come.

I hold in my hand over 350 telegrams, and I have received thousands of letters and petitions to extend OPA in the face of continuously rising prices; how will millions of people with small incomes exist if the cost of living is constantly increased and their incomes are held constant?

IN ROOSEVELT'S MEMORY, EXTEND OPA

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues of the prayers we offered this morning in memory of the greatest and most humanitarian of all our Presidents, who gave his life for the common people, and to express the hope that in his memory and in his example fair and honest consideration will be given to the legislation before us by all Members, even by the bitterest opponents of OPA. I know that if he were with us today he would strongly urge us to act favorably, and to extend price control, not permanently, but for at least 1 year. That this will be done I am sure, after you have seen what avaricious landlords, manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers have done in less than a day without price control.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order consideration of House Joint Resolution 371, extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended. All points of order against said resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue for not more than one hour, to be divided and controlled equally by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, after which it shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

I am opposed to this resolution because, like everyone here, I am convinced that unless Congress completely "bends its knees" in subjugation to the bureaucrats administering OPA, that we unfortunately cannot have any price-control legislation. After listening to the veto message of the President, after listening to his radio message to the American people, probably written by the OPA bureaucrats, it should be obvious to all of us that there can be no compromise, no mutual understanding. It should be apparent that there is only one way to settle this controversy to satisfy the President and that is for the legislative branch of our Government to completely capitulate and surrender to the executive branch. After 14 years of association with you, I feel certain that this you will not do. By so doing we would be weaklings. We would not be entitled to the respect of those who send us here. We would be surrendering a principle that undoubtedly would return to haunt us. Nothing would be more detrimental to our system of Government than to have the Congress of the United States meekly accept the dictates of another branch. By so doing we would be nullifying the protection of one-third of our branches.

On the floor of this House our beloved Speaker stated when this legislation was before us—I quote—"that in his opinion Congress would not pass a continuing resolution." I agreed with that statemen. I am of the opinion now, that even should we pass this resolution, the price-control legislation cannot be enacted because the great majority of the people of this country want less controls and the membership of this body knows it. With this in mind, I ask you how can legislation be enacted. Is it not useless for us to spend our time attempting to do something that we know to be impossible. Yes, we can pass this resolution extending the act for 20 days during which time the Banking and Currency Committee can endeavor to present us with another bill, a bill which I predict after consideration by this body will have less controls, and will consequently be vetoed by the President. We know the feelings of the other body and we can imagine the importance

of days of debate over on the other side of this Capital.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you this. How can this Congress be honest with itself, how can we be consistent, if after months of profound study and consideration, we now about face and pass hurried legislation within the next few days with no additional evidence available, but with exactly opposite meanings and purposes? It should be obvious to all of us that the executive branch wants what it wants, nothing we will pass will receive approval except a measure free from our judgment; nothing but a measure as dictated by the bureaucratic administrators of the OPA. I am not willing to throw aside the judgment of this body to appease these bureaucrats. I am unwilling to accept the arbitrary position of the bureaucrats that either Congress is unfit and incompetent or dishonest.

Mr. Speaker, we must never forget that Mr. Truman has ignored the advice and council of his leaders on Capital Hill. I feel that he must know that you presented him for his signature the best compromise possible. Why should he subject you to humiliation?

Now this administration is attempting to scare Congress by a flood of telegrams. I refer to the many communications we have all received the past 48 hours. In answer to these last minute messages I would refer you to the many letters you have received from thousands of your people who have been penalized by the many unfair practices of those charged with the administration of OPA. In this grave hour we must not forget them.

Neither must we forget the months of hard work of the members of our Banking and Currency Committee. Weeks after weeks they heard conscientious and patriotic Americans from all walks of life. Who were these people? Small businessmen, manufacturers, consumers, spokesmen for agriculture, stockraisers, lumbermen, laborers, administrators for OPA. The measure Congress passed was passed after considered judgment. One that passed the acid test of careful and patriotic thought. Now do we wish to send them back to bring forth a measure for which they could have no respect? That is all that is acceptable to the administration bureaucrats.

Although, I believe that we should not take off basic price controls which would permit speculation; that we should not take off rent controls I voted against the vetoed bill because while the President thought it too moderate, I thought it too severe. I was of the opinion that it left too many unwarranted powers, too many control decisions to those administering the act. Therefore, last Saturday, along with many others I found myself in an ususual position. I sustained the veto of the President because it was too drastic—while he vetoed it because it was not drastic enough. I repeat, I was not alone in this predicament. I merely mention it now in attempting to illustrate the futility of our labors. A compromise is impossible.

Mr. Speaker, I trust this resolution will be voted down. Only by casting aside our considered judgment after extensive hearings and by shirking our responsibilities can legislation demanded by the President be enacted. For one I am not willing to do this.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that OPA legislation died at midnight last night?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is true.

Mr. RICH. Then could something that is dead be continued? Would it not require entirely new legislation to revive it?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Well, that has me also confused. I repeat, it is merely shadow-boxing if we force a committee to go back, then come in here and lose all its respect and the respect of the Congress if they make an about-face and bring in new legislation which they will be compelled to do if they desire Presidential approval.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would like to ask the gentleman, why is this resolution worded as it is, extending the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, rather than the enactment and continuance of those acts?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I cannot answer the gentleman because the Banking and Currency Committee never met. The chairman of that committee came up and asked on his own motion for a rule. I do not believe they even took the trouble of going before the Banking and Currency Committee to ask the desire of the other Members.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Along the same line as the question raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, this resolution simply amends certain clauses of two laws which are now dead. Should we not, first, reenact the entire law, then amend certain parts of that law?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are dealing with two acts, not one.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I reiterate, I cannot understand why we should force the Committee on Banking and Currency to go back and attempt to bring in legislation when, according to the President's veto message and his message over the radio, there can be no compromise. We know full well that the people of the United States want less control and the bureaucratic administrators of the OPA want more control. Are we not shadow boxing here by taking the time of the Congress to even discuss this proposition?

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEELAN. The gentleman is not making a correct statement. The gentleman states the committee will be doing an about-face on this measure. The committee did not bring the bill in as it was passed by the House; therefore the committee could very well stand on the bill that it reported.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I may say to the gentleman that in the event the committee comes in with another bill there will be less control than in the bill vetoed by the President and the President will more hastily veto the next bill that is presented.

Mr. GEELAN. What the President is asking for is to allow the people of the United States to tell the Congress of the United States how they feel about this, and they should be given that opportunity.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the past 48 hours there has been a flood of telegrams coming to us. May I also ask you to just read the mail you have received over the past 3 or 4 years. Read again the letters that you have received from your small business people, from the consumers, from the farmers, from the small manufacturers, and that will give you every reason to vote against the pending resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us feel badly because the President of the United States did not follow the advice of the leadership of this House and Senate. I know that those gentlemen fought gamely. Again, perhaps, we shall see the spectacle over in the United States Senate where they will be days and days not settling anything, because we know that there cannot be any compromise on the OPA, that it is a dead issue. The only compromise is to pass a bill giving to the President of the United States and these bureaucrats everything they desire. This, in my opinion, the Congress will not do.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Why join the panic? Why not give the American producer a chance for freedom? This morning I had a telephone call from the Middle West and I was informed that just as the grain was beginning to move to the legitimate dealers so the people could have food, instead of going to bootleg distillers and other bootleggers, over the radio came the false announcement that Congress had passed a continuing resolution by unanimous consent immediately after 12 o'clock.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I say that every one knows that this is shadow boxing. There can be no compromise.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Michener.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I want to impress upon you the fact that at midnight on yesterday, by direction of the President of the United States and a minority of those Members of the House voting to support his veto, OPA ceased to exist.

There is no Office of Price Administration at this hour. Confusion and uncertainty reign supreme in the land. The President, in his veto message and in his radio speech to the country, predicted such dire results from the death of OPA that there is reason for prudent

people to be alarmed. Reconversion has already been so delayed by strikes, misunderstandings, and the resulting lack of production, that a further period of uncertainty will surely make the picture worse. Yes, OPA is dead, but the President has indicated that he has a solution which he will ask the Congress to enact forthwith.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no stability warranting greater production, reasonable prices, and jobs for all during this hiatus. This controversy must be settled and settled as soon as possible.

We are confronted with a condition and not with a theory. For more than 5 months, the Congress has struggled valiantly with the OPA problem. We must not forget that there are three distinct lines of thought in the country. One group believes that our country has outlived the free enterprise system. They would have economic planning, implemented by bureaucratic control and regulation, from here on out. Another group would have none of price or rent control. They would wipe it out lock, stock, and barrel. Then there is another group in between, composed largely of those who are opposed to price control as a permanent part of the American system of government, and who believe that this war agency should be eliminated just as soon as the economy of the country will permit. They realize that when the Government entered upon the venture of supervising production, fixing prices, and regulating when our people can sow, when they can reap, when and where they can buy and sell, it got a bear by the tail, and it is an angry bear. Today he is going around in circles chasing his tail, and we must be mighty careful how we let loose; if we are not, certain groups of our people are going to get severely bitten. Those who have fixed incomes, as well as those who will not, or cannot strike to enforce their demands, must not be forgotten.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. All we are hoping is that the tail will not pull out.

Mr. MICHENER. I hope not, for if it does these groups will either get a hard fall, or a painful bite.

Mr. Speaker, while we have no OPA at this hour because of the Presidential edict, certainly the blame cannot attach to the Congress. True, the bill sent to the White House was a compromise. None of the three groups which I have mentioned had their way in writing it. As so forcibly stated to the House by our distinguished Speaker, it was the best compromise possible.

OPA was of value during the war. However, its administration has always been faulty. The Administrator has been arbitrary, unyielding, impractical, and domineering.

Chester Bowles, the Administrator, is an advertising man. His experience in the past has been that of a propagandist. He lacks practical business judgment and know-how to accomplish in the production field. In short, regardless of his intentions, he has been a failure as head of OPA. Certainly there are men of experience in the country who would do a better job. That is all water gone over the dam, however. Because of the attitude of Mr. Bowles, apparently supported by the President, all price control has been eliminated. Possibly we are attempting a futile thing. However, the President is pleading for just 20 days to work out a solution and bring before the Congress a new proposal that he says will be effective in the price-control and production field. If the future is to be judged by the past 5 months, the passage of this resolution will be but an idle gesture. Nevertheless, he may submit some simplified plan and name a new, practical administrator. There has been much over the radio and in the press within the last few days suggesting that Mr. William Jeffers, former rubber administrator, was being considered to take over OPA.

Somebody has responsibility for either proper administration of sensible price control or its abolition in a way that will not bring so much distress to our people. The Congress recognized this responsibility and sent to the President the best compromise possible. The President threw this handiwork out the window and pleads for but 20 days' additional time. Under present circumstances, this is the President's baby. In the meantime, he has told industry, labor, the farmers, little business, and big business to keep things in status quo for a few days until the Congress has time to consider his new plan. During that period we will have a sample of what is going to happen if price control is abruptly removed with nothing but moral suasion as an incentive.

For my part, I do not believe that the Congress should assume the responsibility which the President has assumed. Fifteen or twenty days is not a long time, it will pass very rapidly, and, unless the President has something up his sleeve that he has not yet shown to the Congress or to the country, there is little possibility of OPA's revival beyond the 20 days. This whole OPA matter is a hot potato and I do not propose to let the President hand it back to the Congress just for the sake of getting rid of it. As a practical matter, that is what his veto message amounted to. Be it remembered that this spiral of increased costs had its inception in the President's order requiring increases in wages and, thereby, in cost of production.

Evidently the President has been the recipient of a mess of bad advice. By his act destroying every vestige of OPA he has not only killed price control, he has taken rent control along with it. If rent control is desirable, and the President objected to other features of the bill, the rational course would have been to sign the bill, save what was good in it, and submit proposed changes. He pursued the other course. Indeed, his course is most unusual and lacks every element of cooperation between the Executive and the elected Representatives of the people. Who is Chester Bowles that he, an appointed bureaucrat, should tell the Congress that it must accept his dictation or there will be no OPA?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Does the gentleman from Michigan feel that 20 days will give the President time to clear any price-control bill that this Congress would pass with Sidney Hillman and his "Red" outfit?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, possibly other members of the Rules Committee will discuss in some detail those from whom the President receives his advice, those with whom he clears. I have very definite views concerning some of these advisers, politicians, and self-seekers. However, that is beside the question here, and I do not want to inject anything political in these remarks. This should not be a political issue.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate that OPA should be done away with the very minute that this can be accomplished with safety to our country and without great suffering to our people. Prices have materially increased under OPA; they will continue to increase in some cases, with or without OPA. As production is stepped up, supply will come into balance with demand; and when that happens, there will be no more necessity for OPA.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I cannot feel that it is exactly fair for it to be said that the existing situation is the fault of the President. I think the record shows that the President of the United States months ago called to the attention of the Congress the desirability and necessity of doing something about the OPA. Congress did not do anything about it until just a few days ago.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman why Congress did not act? Whose fault was it, probably, that Congress did not act?

Mr. CLARK. Probably a little on each side of the aisle.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Who has charge of the legislative program?

Mr. CLARK. I think the gentleman knows the Democrats do and probably will continue to do so for some time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The rest of this year.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I am very glad to have you assume responsibility.

Mr. CLARK. To be perfectly candid and frank about the matter, I was only making the point that I do not think Congress skirts are entirely clear in this matter. We have got into an unfortunate situation, but to the average American citizen it will not be reasonable or

sensible that the Chief Executive and the Congress cannot get together and do something sensible and effective to prevent what is in my judgment the greatest economic crisis that has ever existed in the United States. If we do not do so, and the dire results that are entirely possible by reason of that neglect carry this Nation into economic chaos, we should not be unmindful of the fact that the whole world may be affected. Let us not forget that we are really the last sound, stable, and solvent Nation in the world today.

I think we ought to take this 20 days. The existing situation is as much or more our fault than it is that of the Chief Executive. We should not quibble about that. Let us vote this 20 days' extension and see if we cannot within that time do something that will meet the necessities of a grave situation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the matter of the time just referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina, I think it might be well to call attention to the fact that the price-control extension was passed in the House of Representatives the 18th of April last, which was quite some time ago.

The President's veto of the OPA bill will make good news in Moscow, but his action shows a reckless disregard for the welfare of our country and of the views of the Congress, which represents our people, and his own party leaders in the Congress. Although he has insisted that the whims and the policies of the bureaucrats must be continued without correction, Mr. Truman's veto message expresses approval of many of the provisions of the bill which Congress sent him. The inconsistency in his attempted justification of his position causes him no apparent embarrassment.

The truth is the President is the misguided follower of the most violent partisans of the New Deal. They told him to abolish the War Labor Board last year and he did so. They told him the country faced deflation and they were wrong. They told him the Government should seize the steel industry and the coal mines and write labor contracts. He followed their lead. They told him labor should get wage increases and the employers should have no compensating price increases. They told him that producers could be made to produce at a loss—and shortages followed and production was paralyzed.

They told him the Government's erroneous fiscal policies must be pursued without correction, and no steps have been taken to correct the basic difficulties confronting us. The value of the dollar continued to decline.

Meanwhile these factors were mounting, and were forcing black markets and rising prices. OPA itself granted 824 industry-wide price increases since VE-day, and thousands of individual price adjustments which increased the cost of living.

Finally Congress acted and sent the President the Case bill, by an overwhelming vote. The New Deal politicians told him to veto it and he did so. Congress sent him the Hobbs bill and he says he has submitted it to the departments, which means the New Deal bureaucrats, for their advice. Congress sends him an OPA bill designed to deal realistically with the demands of a situation which the bureaucrats created. Once again they tell the President to override Congress, and the President responds accordingly. These things do not merely reflect incompetence and bungling. They are purposeful, willful acts designed to produce the very plight in which the country finds itself. They are part of a policy looking to demands for a nationalization of business and for a socialist economy. These New Dealers give impetus to their program through thousands of Government propagandists. They aim to destroy the Congress and to substitute bureaucracy and a Washington dominated and controlled economy.

The crisis confronting the country has been deliberately created. It is politically inspired to the end that government shall direct the American economy and control the American people. And the President has been victimized by the planners and the plotters who bring this about.

Congress is entitled to the support of the American people. This is their Congress—fighting for the people, for the American system, against the bureaucrats. The issue was inevitably bound to come to a head. The "Macedonian cry" we now hear is from the President—for the bureaucrats and the New Deal.

However, we have an immediate problem, the handling of which has tended further to division among the American people. It has been precipitated by the New Deal and left wing bureaucrats who have manned our agencies and our bureaus and who are the advisers to the President. How it happened, important though it be, must be set aside for further discussion under other circumstances. I feel that the important thing now for me as a legislator, is to recognize the practicalities and to do what I can for the immediate and best interests of the country under the conditions prevailing.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which we have before us provides for the extension of OPA until July 20, a period of 20 days, during which time it is hoped that the objections of the President to the extension bill passed by the Congress can be ironed out in a satisfactory manner. I very much hope that they can. I do not know whether the predictions of uncontrolled inflation will come to pass if OPA is not extended. No one else knows. But I am very much afraid that we would experience a period of inflationary prices in cost-of-living items that would be disastrous to the great masses of people who work on fixed salaries, wages, and fixed incomes. We must not take that chance. The differences between the Congress and the President must be composed in the interest of the welfare of the Nation. The greatest good for the greatest number demands retention of adequate but sensible price control.

Personally, I believe it desirable to continue price control for a period of 12 months, and I so voted when the bill was up in he House. I do not believe that any essential cost-of-living items should be arbitrarily lifted from price control, and so voted when the bill was before the House.

It has been said on high authority in both the Senate and the House, that if the President vetoed the bill passed by the Congress, there would be an end to price control, as the Congress would not yield on any of the questions in disagreement between the legislative and executive branches. The subject is too vital to the Nation to accept this defeatist attitude. We are confronted with a condition of the utmost gravity. Regardless of who is right, or who is wrong in the controversy, it is imperative that we rise above the personal animosities that have been engendered in this controversy, and do something that will control the prices of essential cost-of-living commodities until the natural law of supply and demand can again function.

I, therefore, strongly favor the resolution to extend the present act, pending further legislation. However, I do not believe that a 20-day extension will be effective. It has taken us nearly 6 months to get through the bill which was vetoed. Some months ago, I expressed on the floor of the House the hope that Congress would act promptly on this vital subject and not wait until the last minute and leave the Nation in the present uncertainty in which we find ourselves.

I do not believe, in the first place, that Congress can act calmly and adequately within the brief period of 20 days proposed in this resolution. In the second place, in all fairness to the administrators of the OPA, whatever changes are made in the law should be made far enough in advance of the effective date so that the OPA can have the opportunity to study them and be prepared to put them into effect when the law goes into operation. To pass an amended act and require the OPA to formulate its regulations and put them into effect overnight, or within a few days, places upon that agency an impossible task that would be unfair both to the agency and to the public, and would add to the confusion already existing.

I, therefore, suggest that the resolution be amended to extend the present law for a period of 60 days, instead of 20 days.

We can all sympathize with the impatience of the American people to be rid of the rigid, and often foolish and unfair, regulations, and the petty persecutions that some officials of the OPA have visited upon innocent people. But this question now before us is whether it is better to put up with the present annoyances, inconveniences and often injustices, or do away entirely with price control and take the chance of uncontrolled

inflation with all of its attendant evils and sufferings.

I am not willing to take that chance and I say so with full knowledge and after extended investigation of the many just complaints that have been lodged against the administration of the OPA.

The Special Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, of which I am chairman, held weeks of hearings on complaints of arbitrary and unlawful activities on the part of the OPA. We made several reports to the Congress, critical of the agency's arbitrary and capricious abuses of its authority. We thought and still think that it is highly desirable that these abuses be corrected, and corrected promptly. We have not hesitated to say so, either in our reports or in our conferences with Mr. Chester Bowles and his advisers. And yet, when it comes to the question of abolishing price control, or putting up with the inadequacies and injustices of its present administration, I unhesitatingly advise that we adopt an extension resolution for a period of 60 days, instead of 20 days, and settle down earnestly and calmly to a fair solution of the differences between the Congress and the President.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks that this resolution is sufficient, in view of the fact that the OPA expired last night at midnight.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I do not think anybody is going to try to violate this resolution if the Congress passes it and the President signs it. I think that is a question that is not practical.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman feel that it is good legislative practice to try to amend a law which has expired?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. As a matter of fact, the last paragraph in this resolution undertakes to revive the law. Whether it can do so constitutionally or not I do not answer; but I say that for all practical purposes it will revive the law.

Mr. COOLEY. Why would it not be well to amend the resolution so as to reenact the law if that is what you desire to do?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I feel very deeply about inflation. I said the other day and I say now that we passed a workable bill. I do not believe that we are going to be able to get any more rigid control bill than the one we passed. I am afraid the other body will insist on removing controls from all foods. The Members of this House do not realize how hard we did work to persuade the conferees of the Senate to leave controls on food. The conferees of the House were finally successful in persuading the conferees of the Senate to let controls stay on food, and I think they ought to be on food, clothing, and rents for a while longer.

I do not believe we are going to get a better bill.

I am satisfied that the bill that we passed would have worked.

I believe the President has made a mistake in vetoing the bill the conferees and the leaders of the House and Senate asked him to O. K., but if he thinks he can get a more rigid bill or if he thinks he can get any bill at all let us give him the time stipulated in this resolution, because I feel deeply we must have control on scarce commodities during this emergency. If we cannot get any more satisfactory bill for the present than we have passed, I believe if we repass the same bill the President, upon mature consideration, will sign it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when this rule came before the Rules Committee, and before it was brought to a vote, we discussed it rather thoroughly, and then when it was finally brought to a vote after the Senate had adjourned, I voted against it for several reasons. First of all, I questioned then, and I question now, whether the Congress, by House Joint Resolution 371, can legally and constitutionally extend a law that has already died, that has already expired, and that no longer exists; and I think the courts will have something to say about that.

Second, I examined, and questioned very carefully and fully, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, when he appeared before the Rules Committee last Saturday and asked for this rule. I asked him whether or not in his opinion the House could in the short space of 20 days prepare and enact price-control legislation that would be satisfactory to the Congress and to the President, when we have failed to do so after 4½ months of hard work and full consideration. The gentleman's answer was that he did not know. He said very frankly and very honestly that he could give the committee no assurances that any legislation could be presented which would be enacted by the Congress or approved by the President. And then, finally, I had this in mind: There is a fundamental issue involved, a fundamental difference of opinion, between the Chief Executive on the one hand and the Congress on the other. The Chief Executive has seen fit to veto the price-control legislation Congress has sent him, despite the sincere counsel and advice of the legislative leaders of his own party in the Congress that the measure was the best that could possibly be expected from the National Legislature, and should be signed by him. By his action the President, and he alone, killed price control, killed OPA, and killed rent control.

This difference exists between the executive and the legislative branch. We do not believe here that there should be a continuation of these permanent controls, of all these broad powers, but that there should be changes and amendments in the law; while the President has followed the advice of Chester Bowles, the bureaucrats and the left-wingers, and he takes the position that there should be no change, or practically no change, and that the powers, the broad and great authorities, that he has exercised, either directly or through his bureaucratic agencies, should be continued, perhaps indefinitely, because he asks that they be continued until June 30 next year without any real break in subsidy payments.

That is the fundamental difference and that is the fundamental issue before us. So I suggested, and I did so, not facetiously at all, but in all seriousness, to the Democratic leadership present before the Rules Committee that the one honest, fair thing to do to settle this issue was to bring in an extendure resolution, not for 20 days, because we know nothing is going to be done in the 20 days. In fact, we are back, right now, where we were when we came in the first of last February, and at the end of 20 days we will be back again where we came in today, in exactly the same position we are now. So I suggested that the administration and the leadership, which has the voting power in, and control of, the committees having jurisdiction of this measure, bring in a simple resolution extending price control "as is" for 6 months, or until December 31, 1946, and give the Congress and the people the opportunity to pass upon the clear-cut issue whether they want to continue OPA as it is, or want something else.

Mr. Speaker, this is a Democratic administration. The President of the United States is the head of the Democratic Party. He has seen fit to deliver a political veto, and a political message to the people of the United States in his recent address. This Congress, the House and the Senate, is controlled by heavy Democratic majorities. We have able Democratic leadership in this and the other body, and I am sure that regardless of what any of us on the Republican side, on the minority side, of this House, or the other body, might think about this legislation, the Democratic leadership and majority in the Congress of the United States can enact any kind of legislation they want. It is a strong leadership. They are able, they have the capacity to lead. So, let the Democratic leadership demonstrate its capacity and assume that responsibility.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let the great majority here measure up to its responsibility, let them assume the leadership in this great hour of crisis, and enact the kind of legislation it wants regardless of what anyone else may think about it. Then the country can decide next November, on the first Tuesday after the first Monday, whether it has been right or wrong. That is the chal-

lenge. It is their responsibility. Let them live up to that responsibility.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman support an amendment to extend it say to January 20, 1947? That will be 3 weeks after the new Congress reassembles.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; I would not. But that does not make any real difference. You have the votes on your side of the aisle. You have the responsibility. You have a majority of 50 or more in the House, and 18 or 20 in the Senate. Why do you not use those majorities, if you can control and order your own party and if you have the leadership that you should have, for you are next to the ranking member of your commmittee, and enact the kind of legislation you want? That is your right, your duty and your responsibility.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is all too plain that our American economy is once more rushing toward the brink of disaster. Already the danger signals so well remembered from the debacle of 1929 are unfurled.

If any added proof is needed of this warning let me read into the RECORD excerpts from an Associated Press dispatch of Saturday last on the situation on the New York Stock Exchange.

The following table shows some industrial issues which have capped their 1929 highs—adjusted where stock splits have occurred:

	High, 1929	High, 1946
Celanese Corp	57⅞	83½
Chrysler	135	141
Douglas Aircraft	45½	108⅞
Loew's, Inc	28⅛	41
May Department Stores	54¼	70
Phillips Petroleum	47	73¼
Sears, Roebuck	45¼	49⅝
Swift & Co	34¾	41⅛
U. S. Gypsum	91⅜	132
U. S. Rubber	65	80
Wilson & Co	13½	19⅞

In late June the Associated Press average of 20 industrial stocks stood at about 105, or only 29 percent below the 1929 record of 146.9. At the 1946 high it was 25 percent under 1929.

The current level of the market as indicated by the Associated Press averages is corroborated by other well-known price gages.

Barron's index, based on the market value of all shares listed in the New York Stock Exchange, was 23 percent below the 1929 peak on May 31, last date for which the index was computed. The industrial component was only 14 percent under 1929.

Standard & Poor's weekly index of 354 industrials was 19.8 percent below 1929 on June 12 this year.

Stock market analysts have put two labels on the 1946 market: First, it is an inflation market; second, it is one of the thinnest markets on record.

The logical sequence to uncontrolled prices, Mr. Speaker is a runaway market in which millions of Americans will again lose billions of their wartime savings.

The Congress cannot ignore this situation. We must set up at once a sensible procedure to check this inflationary hurricane. To do this effectively, the Congress must have some definite commitment from our manufacturers, processors and from labor groups that the "line" once set by legislation will be strictly adhered to. Any other course is fraught with grave danger to our future economy.

As a friend of 20,000,000 union workingmen, I urge the House to vote approval on the pending rule.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] are very clever, and as we follow them through the sum and substance of them would be that a minority party in our constitutional set-up has no responsibility; that under our set-up the minority party is an opposition party like it is in any other parliamentary government. Under our form of government, the minority party has its responsibilities, the responsibility of constructively criticizing, the responsibility of constructively proposing, and the responsibility of supporting good legislation. My good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] thoroughly realizes that, but in his genial and able and subtle remarks he seeks to throw this responsibility only on the majority party, in this case the Democratic Party, a theory that has no place under our two-party system.

The debate has been very fine, and I am not going to enter into the realm of politics, except the brief observation I just made, which is not of a partisan nature. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] very ably presented the situation from the minority angle. Other Members from the majority side have spoken.

We are faced with a condition and not a theory. I am not going to blame Congress or blame anyone else for the present situation. Months ago I saw the probability of it, and I sent a memorandum around urging early action in committee. Now, as practical men, we realize that when a minority of any committee wants to delay, that it is pretty difficult for the majority and the chairman of a committee to prevent delay. You cannot accuse Members, whether they are of the minority party or of the majority party, of filibustering in the committee when they want to have any number of witnesses appear before them. Those who have been here for years are too well acquainted, from a practical angle, with the operation of committees to know that you cannot arbitrarily cut short hearings when a minority, whether political, or a combination of Republican and Democratic Members constituting a minority, want to have hearings held. In any event, hearings went on, and on, and on, in this branch and in the other branch, and the bill was presented to the President Saturday, June 29, with the law expiring on Sunday, June 30, at midnight.

The President of the United States immediately sent back his veto.

There has been some misunderstanding, as far as I am concerned, about the leaders' talk. I frankly told the President that I thought it was a very poor bill that we had presented to him. If I may use the phrase I did use, privately speaking, and which I know will not be misunderstood in this Chamber, I said the bill was "rotten." I urged the President to sign the bill if he felt he had the ability to control prices, but if he did not think that under that bill he would have the ability to control prices in the national interest of the people and the country, then I did not expect him to sign the bill. He had his constitutional duty to perform. We did ours by sending the bill to him. I do not think it is fair to criticize any person for exercising his judgment and his conscience. One can disagree, I agree with that, but to impugn the motives of any man I do not think is fair.

In any event, we are faced with a condition, and I urge the passage of this resolution today. All we can do is do the best we can. Speaking as the majority leader of this House, I serve notice on the country that whether Members vote for the resolution or not, we are doing the best we can as quickly as we can.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCOWEN].

LIBERTY OR THE OPA—WHICH?

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, at 12 o'clock midnight last night the Liberty Bell rang again and "proclaimed liberty throughout the land unto the inhabitants thereof" in strict harmony with the inscription made on it long before the American Revolution. Liberty throughout the land, by the death of the OPA, and freedom were restored to Americans to make men who were free before World War II, free again. The question now is, Will this Congress preserve this newly restored liberty by not reenacting the price-control law? The statutory death of the price-control law ended bureaucratic terrorism and despotic control over the lives of Americans in many fields of business. It should not be renewed at this time. A price-control law that has caused a black market of so great an extent as now exists, that has created a scarcity by having ceiling prices below the cost of production, and that has humiliated honest Americans by persecution in the name of prosecution, much like the star-chamber methods of old, should remain dead.

Some would renew the Price Control Act for fear of inflation, if it did not exist. This fear, in my opinion, is not well founded. Much inflation existed under price control. There will be some increase in prices when controls are removed whether it be now, 6 months from now, 1 year from now, or at any other time. But when those controls are removed production will be free to increase

and will increase rapidly. The law of supply and demand will reduce prices to some degree of normality and people will be able to get the things they need. Production will prevent inflation to a large degree.

A greater issue is involved in price control than the mere question of dollars and cents. It is the question as to whether we shall have regimentation in general by the Federal Government or whether free enterprise shall exist, and, as a consequence, whether freemen shall remain free. Those who fought and won the American Revolution risked the loss of all their earthly possessions, as well as their lives, for freedom, that freedom which has been handed down to us. Is it not up to us to preserve that freedom by ending a planned economy now? One of the big steps in that direction is to let the dead OPA remain dead.

Let us show the world that the Government of the Republic of the United States is the servant of the people, and not its master. Let us show the world that Americans in time of peace can run their own affairs honestly, intelligently, and right, and that democracy lives in the United States, by not reenacting a price-control law now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the pending legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, all sensible people want to do all things that are necessary to prevent inflation. I think we can all agree on that. As to how to obtain this objective which we all agree can be obtained there is considerable division. While I voted to override the President's veto, believing as I did the price-control bill as passed was the best bill we would be able to obtain, I am perfectly willing to make a further effort, and therefore shall vote for the resolution under consideration. If this further effort proves successful we will all become the beneficiaries of the effort; if, on the other hand, it proves unsuccessful we will be in no worse fix than we are today. We, therefore, have everything to gain and nothing to lose by supporting the resolution.

I hope it will be the pleasure of the House to adopt the resolution.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following:

I would like to vote for rent control effective until we are able to build more houses, and the law of supply and demand will take care of the situation. I do not want to see people evicted from their houses and on the streets, but OPA should have given some relief to those landlords who lost money under OPA regulations when their expenses of operation increased greatly.

I am now and always have been against subsidies. With people making high wages, we can keep our Treasury from going on the rocks by stopping those subsidy payments which never should have been made. That system was started in Germany, and see what happened there. We do not want it to happen here.

The law of supply and demand is our best and most efficient price regulator under the private enterprise system. It will protect the farmer, the merchant, the manufacturer, and the worker. It made America great. I am against this bureaucratic government. It is foreign to our Constitution, and to our Government, previous to the New Deal. I never supported it in the past, and I am too much of an American to vote for it now. By the methods of inefficiency employed, price control as administered by the OPA has done more to make merchandise scarce than any other agency of government. Many of the regulations have been most ridiculous, no business in them. The OPA has hindered production, thus increasing the black market and causing higher prices, and creating scarcities. OPA creates more black markets than prohibition ever did, and we have seen illegal selling of all kinds of produce at ever higher prices. Scarcity is more and more apparent in many commodities.

If we do not give everything away to foreign countries, our supply will catch up with demand in a few months. The majority of our people are honest businessmen, and I do not look for the honest manufacturers, merchants, and farmers to gouge the workers and attempt any excessive profiteering. I believe in our people, and want to see them given a chance. I am against bureaucratic government and regimentation. I believe in our Constitution, and have always supported it and will continue to do so. Working under that Constitution has made America a great Nation. It is high time to stop tearing it down.

The OPA died last night at 12 o'clock.

This resolution is not constitutional to reenact OPA. You should pass a new law if you want to revive the OPA. When a thing is dead, it is dead—you cannot put life in it. Let us do things constitutionally; you all took an oath to do so.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in the last month, President Truman has demonstrated on two different occasions his capacity as a great leader in this afterwar economic emergency. His first demonstration of fearless leadership was the vetoing of the Case bill, disregarding the great pressure brought upon him by antilabor forces throughout the country. His veto of this measure was upheld by the narrow margin of five votes. It is my firm belief that had President Truman not presented his temporary emergency legislation to the joint session of Congress on the previous Saturday, the Case bill would be on our statute books today. His leadership on that occasion averted the further rise of industrial unrest and confusion and today we can see economic peace on the horizon.

His second demonstration of great leadership was when he vetoed the impotent and emasculated OPA legislation last Saturday. By that veto he served notice on the special privileged pressure groups of this country that they cannot amass postwar profits at the expense of the American consumers. His veto of a weak and impractical price-control bill assured the millions of Americans that they had a champion in the White House who will fight to preserve their savings, defense bonds, wages, insurance policies, homes, and their future security.

Every Member of Congress who has the interest of the consuming public at heart should vote for this continuing resolution—House Joint Resolution 371—which will make the present law effective until July 20, 1946. Within the next 20 days I hope Congress and the Senate will join on the passage of a rigid and stable price-control law which will carry through this emergency and save us from a paralyzing inflation and industrial turmoil.

RENTS SHOULD BE CONTROLLED

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution asking for the continuance of the OPA for 30 days should be defeated. I spent the week end in one of the country's greatest industrial centers. I spoke with many people and overheard a great many conversations. I found that there is a genuine fear existing in the public mind because of the President's veto action.

I learned, however, that the fear centers around rents. I have always felt, and still do feel, that rent control should be retained, but in all cases the administration should be in the hands of local authorities. I read an Associated Press report on Sunday which said that in most of the States the Governors have the authority to set up rent control. The report stated further that the Governor of Pennsylvania has this authority. I have since been informed that he has asked the Attorney General for an opinion on this matter.

This gives me reason to believe that should necessity arise our Governor will take appropriate action. My reasons for wanting this control in the hands of local authorities is because I believe that they will adjust the glaring inequalities that have been tolerated under the OPA administration.

So far as other controls are concerned, I learned that people want food and are not so much concerned about the price. I heard many people express the belief that while prices will undoubtedly rise, the prices will still be lower than present black-market prices. About 1 week ago I saw practically a new sedan stop in front of a grocery store here in the capital. The driver got out, opened the trunk of the car, pulled out a quarter of beef, and carried it into the store. His trunk was packed solid with meat. It was about 8 in the evening. Legitimate slaughterers or dealers do not handle meat this way. No doubt, this turned out to be expensive eating for those who had the price.

The trainmaster in the railroad yards at Pittsburgh, who has handled all the livestock coming from the West for nearly 25 years, informed me that during the last 6 months more livestock passed through the Pittsburgh yards, where they are unloaded, fed and watered, than have at any other period during his time.

Shipments are at their peak at this moment. Very recently three men came into the yards as he was making up trains and inquired about three carloads of cattle they had in transit. He pointed out their cars and they requested him to put them in a train that had just been made up. He informed them that they were too late, the train would leave shortly, and that he would put their cattle in the next train, which would leave in a few hours. When they became insistent and declared they must have their cattle in New York at the earliest possible movement, they offered him $100 per car to get them in the first train. The cattle did not get away until the trainmaster included the cars in the next train 6 hours later.

Now, talking about black market, here is a case where these fellows purchased cattle at ceiling or above, came to Pittsburgh from New York to expedite their shipping, then slaughtered the cattle somewhere in black-market fashion, losing all the offal, hides, and so forth. This made expensive beef for somebody, and no doubt a lot of money for the black-market racketeers. Could this beef have gone into an open competitive market no doubt it would have reached the public at a much lower cost than it did otherwise, and the byproducts, so much needed, would have been utilized.

Hon. C. GROSS:

OPA will die Sunday at midnight. Please ask Congress not to write another OPA bill. I want clothes for my body, household goods for my home, and food for my children. I trust the merchant will not raise his price more than to cover the OPA profit loss. I am willing for the merchant to have it.

A HOUSEWIFE.

To Congress:

Hon. C. GROSS: OPA is dead. Please do not write another bill. We will soon have the scarce articles we are longing for: Meat, butter, pepper, sugar, bread, flour, and so forth.

HOUSEWIFE (10 of a family).

JUNE 29, 1946.

Hon. C. GROSS:

OPA goes out Sunday night, and I am very glad. Now I can shortly get the scarce articles I have needed so badly. Butter will be back, and then I will not have to chew dry bread. I feel very poor in a land which at one time knew no scarcity.

A DEMOCRATIC VOTER.

JUNE 29, 1946.

Hon. C. GROSS:

OPA expires Sunday night and I feel sure we will now get prosperity. Burn OPA bill. We will get all the scarce goods caused by the OPA. It should have been kicked out last year. Why is it Truman does not declare the war over? Politics, I suppose. He is holding all the war emergency agencies, causing higher national debt.

A MOTHER OF FIVE CHILDREN.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: OPA is dead. Please bury it deep before it smells.

A DEMOCRATIC VOTER.

Hon. C. GROSS,

Washington, D. C.:

Now OPA is dead, please bury it deep in the ash pile.

AN OLD-LINE REPUBLICAN VOTER.

YORK, PA., *June 30, 1946.*

Representative CHESTER GROSS,

Washington, D. C.:

We applaud the return to the law of supply and demand for merchandise pricing, and suggest a 15 percent approved increase on rents.

Mr. and Mrs. A. E. CROCKETT, Jr.

BELAIR, MD., *July 1, 1946.*

Hon. CHESTER H. GROSS:

Your support of President's veto is commendable if followed by active effort to reinstate price control over rents and scarce commodities. As a life-long Republican, I urge support of extension act, but this action is probably too sensible to be expected.

C. CLARK GAILEY.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, many of the speakers from the Republican side of the House in this debate on the extension of OPA have been laboring over the fact that the Speaker called on the House to vote for the passage of the conference report. They try to maintain that we who voted with the Speaker will be inconsistent unless we now vote against extending price control. Let me point out that had we not voted on the conference report there would have been no dramatic veto message. Had the House voted the conference report down it would have meant an undramatic end of OPA and the real issues involved would have not been brought sharply to the attention of the people. Had it not been brought to the attention of the people we would not have this opportunity today to vote for this resolution to extend OPA. A lot of crying has come also from the Republican side of the House because of the gap between the expiration of OPA and this extension resolution. Let me also point out that had the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] not objected to the immediate consideration of the extension resolution on last Saturday that the resolution may have been passed before the expiration of the old law.

We should not quibble longer about bygones. Let us consider the problems facing us today and pass this resolution to extend OPA.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the conference report when it was before this House last week. I voted to sustain the President's veto of the bill. I voted not to sustain the reasoning of his veto message, but to sustain the effect of the veto, namely, to put an end to the unreasonable, unrealistic control that has been forced upon the American people by the administrators of OPA.

Fundamentally I believe in a reasonable control during this transition from producing for the devil of war to producing for the American people. But I have been in this Congress for 1½ years, not long as compared with most of the Members, but long enough to have seen the operations of OPA and come to the definite conclusion that we cannot expect a reasonable, realistic administration of any act which we might pass. There is ample evidence of this fact in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where daily Members of Congress have called attention to the unreasonableness of OPA in solving our problem of production. Anyone who has had any relation with OPA—and we all have had many—knows that their attitude has always been one of adamant arrogance. They have hindered rather than aided production. They are all so wound up in their own rules, regulations, and orders that our entire production facilities have been stymied.

The arrogant frame of mind of the OPA has been demonstrated during the time Congress was considering the extension of control. Chester Bowles and other spokesmen for OPA have consistently taken the position that the law had to be extended as is—without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i"—the way they wanted it. That was their attitude last week end. That is their attitude today. If we are looking for a place to put the blame for killing price control, let us put it where it belongs, on Chester Bowles.

Mr. Speaker, the phase of the discussion that troubles me most is the underlying lack of confidence in the American people and the American system of free enterprise which is evidenced by the scare artists and calamity Chesters who picture absolute chaos in this country if we do not keep control over the people and business. Our people are pictured as being so greedy that some superman in Washington must hold a club over them. That our people are so ignorant that they will buy anything offered to them and at any price. As for me I have greater confidence in the intelligence and honor of the American people. I have confidence in that system which has made us great—the free-enterprise system. At least give it a fair chance.

The adoption of this resolution can only add more confusion and more uncertainty to our already overstrained economic system.

The solution to our problem is full production. The adoption of this resolution will only delay production further.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, when we had the OPA bill before us in the House, I made my position clear. I have been against any sudden or abrupt termination of OPA. And as I stated during the time of our consideration of the measure, I felt that despite its deficiencies, and the sum total of the harm it has worked, I believe that to terminate its life without providing something better in its place, would bring us even greater disorders, injustices, and harmful consequences.

Those disorders are now upon us. Chaos may well be around the corner. Only reason, self-restraint on the part of the whole country can save us. But these disorders will not come by action of the Congress, but by the action, practically unbelievably, of the President of the United States.

Today, by his direct action, rent control is terminated; there is no ceiling on any item of food; there is no legal restraint on any item going into the cost of living; there is no restriction of any kind. The lid is off. And the President took it off.

The President's veto of the price control extension bill was a reckless gamble. Mr. Truman took the position that he

was willing to wreck all price control if he did not get the kind of control he wanted. He gambled to get his "all or nothing bill" and he lost.

It would have been real statesmanlike action on the part of the President had he signed the measure presented to him and then made his arguments to the Congress and the people for the corrective amendments he felt were imperatively necessary. In that way he could have built a basis for improvement of the bill, afforded a ground for compromise.

But like certain labor leaders he gave way to reckless action first and having done that he wants to build anew when he really has not got a base on which to work. We are now in the position of having to start from scratch, and in the meantime the people of the country lack the protection of any price control policy at all. That is an impossible situation and therefore I will certainly support action to continue the old law on a temporary basis.

What a comparison between President Truman and the far-sighted, sound planning of Governor Dewey. One minute after midnight of June 30, Governor Dewey put into operation the State law that he had readied and that was waiting on the shelves in order to take care of any untoward development affecting Federal control of rents. Possibly Governor Dewey had a prophetic feeling. But he was right, in any event. He was not willing to rely on what this administration might or might not do to protect the public interest incident to rent controls. Naturally I am proud of New York State's position and that we have a governor who knows not only when to move but who has planned the right move; and who is not put in the ludicrous and sorry position of an executive who guesses wrong, acts wrong, and who seemingly can do little but to recommend, and regret and get nowhere.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the veto by President Truman of the latest version of the so-called price control law has once more put before the country the question of what to do about price control and prevention of inflation.

The bill passed by the House for the extension of the price-control law was, on paper at least, an improvement over the old one. The same may be said for the bill as it passed the Senate. In my judgment, the bill finally agreed upon was not as good as either.

Congress is now being asked to pass temporary legislation keeping the old law in effect for a short period while we determine what should be done next. While the extension will probably be granted, nevertheless, I wonder what good will be accomplished by it. Is it not another postponement of the great decision which sooner or later must be made?

A strong majority of Congress and of the country want a return to competitive private enterprise at the earliest possible date. There is some difference of opinion among this group as to when the return should be attempted. Congress has been trying to chart a course which would provide for a gradual return. It has sought to set up machinery for decontrol when the supply of a particular product approximated the demand. The OPA on the other hand has abundantly demonstrated that it will maintain controls as long as it can. After months of honest effort, all attempt to reconcile these widely divergent views have failed. It is difficult to see how any different result would be reached in the next few weeks.

After all, what is the real difficulty? Is it not in the maladministration of the law by the OPA? The Washington cell of the gigantic machine has been manned by people who have done no more than render lip service to the free enterprise system. Whenever a decision had to be made between capitalism and socialism, its decision was usually on the side of the latter. For example, amendments have been made by both the House and Senate to require ceiling prices to reflect costs plus a reasonable profit. It was always my view that the original law contemplated that very thing. The Congress has consistently sought to outlaw profiteering; the OPA has done its best to eliminate profits.

The OPA, through its spokesmen, has proclaimed its willingness to abandon controls when the supply was abundant. But their conduct has been to the contrary. The real difficulty with meat has not been in the short supply. There are more cattle than ever. Packing plants are adequate and now that the war is over, there should be no shortage of labor. The trouble lies in the black market which the OPA does not seem able to stamp out. Consequently, legitimate packers are idle and there is a scarcity of meat at regular dealers. The largest producer of oatmeal in the country was closed a short time ago. Creameries are greatly handicapped by OPA regulations and many of them are not operating. Farmers are uncertain what to do.

There may be a difference of opinion as to what to do next but there is general agreement that the present attempts at price control have been futile.

As the real trouble lies in the administration of the law, why not apply the only remedy that will be effective. The OPA has grown to be a gigantic octopus, strangling the life out of the country. If the law is allowed to expire, that does not mean that Congress is powerless to take whatever steps are necessary to protect the national economy. It has been suggested, for example, that control of rents is still needed. If that be true, why not pass a simple law covering rents and provide that its enforcement be put in the hands of local people. I am satisfied the people would cooperate and that better results would be secured in this manner than through some large bureau in Washington trying by multitudinous regulations to regulate details in the far reaches of a great country.

Eventually we must return to the American system of competition and free enterprise. How much longer can we postpone that return without creating a situation which will make the return impossible? Private enterprise and free government are dying all over the world. Has not the time come for this great country to reaffirm its confidence in the type of government which has made us the greatest Nation on earth.

The people say we are taking a great chance if we do not continue OPA as our guardian. That may be true. But are we not taking a greater risk in allowing an ever growing bureaucracy and expanding government controls to sap our independence, our vitality, and our courage?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believes in price control. The particular thing which I think we should retain is rent control. The area from which I come is so short of houses that without rent control prices might soar to unprecedented elevations. We are in a curious situation at this moment. The Congress passed a Price Control Act after very prolonged hearings before the committees of both Houses. When the bill was before the House, numerous amendments were submitted. I voted against all of the amendments but two of them. The bill which we passed was changed by the Senate. The conference committee finally agreed upon a bill and the matter was submitted to us for our ratification. I voted for the conference report. The Speaker expressed my viewpoint in much better language than I could myself. Therefore, I am taking the liberty of quoting his statement at the time we were considering the conference report which contained a bill which the conferees had agreed upon. Here are his words:

> Two elements are warring against this conference report. One of those want no price control at all. If this conference report is voted down, they will have their way. Others say that they want more control than is contained in this bill. If this conference report is voted down, they will get nothing because there will not, in my opinion, be any price-control legislation at all. If this House will not vote up this conference report, it certainly will not vote for a continuing resolution and continue the law as it now stands. Even though the House were to pass a continuing resolution, the leaders of the Senate are doubtful if it has a chance on earth to pass there. So if we want to control any kind of food prices and if we want to control rents and not have people turned out into the streets—as they will be turned out—the only alternative is to vote up this conference report. The responsibility is here. I will not, as far as I am concerned, by my vote here this afternoon shoulder the responsibility of killing all price control.

We all know that the President vetoed the bill. That is his constitutional privilege but I for one was willing to take the bill that was agreed upon rather than gamble on having no price control.

There are other items in which we should retain price control, such as food, clothing, appliances, and so forth. Decontrol should be gradual rather than abrupt and the bill which was vetoed did provide such decontrol.

However, not being able to get the kind of a bill I wanted I was willing to accept the best kind of bill that Congress would adopt. It is significant that in voting upon the conference report 265 Members voted for it, including many

strong advocates of price control and including the chairman of the committee which wrote the House bill, the ranking Republican Member and the ranking Democratic Member, the majority leader of the House, and the minority leader.

When the President presented his veto we were confronted with this situation: The law would expire the following day which was a Sunday. The problem was, Shall I vote to sustain the veto and thereby take a chance of completely giving up price control or shall I vote to override the veto and accept the bill which all of the leaders in both Houses of Congress said was the best bill that could be gotten out of this Congress? I chose to take this bill and I voted to override the veto. However, not enough Members voted to override the veto and therefore although only a minority of the Members of the House voted to sustain the veto the law was killed.

We are now confronted with the problem of revising the law which was killed by a minority number of the House Members plus the President's veto.

While I intend to vote for the resolution granting 20 days in which the former price control bill shall remain in effect I have little hope of getting any more in the way of price control than there was in the bill that the President vetoed and which was adopted by the overwhelming vote of the House. To me it is very unfortunate that the President disregarded the advice of the leaders of his party in both Houses of the Congress, of the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate. Uncertainty has been cast into the situation. No one knows what is going to happen and all production will be on an uncertain and in some cases on a chaotic basis until a new law is passed or rejected. The result may be that we will have no price control at all although I am predicting that we will perhaps obtain about the same type of bill which we have approved prior to the President's veto.

Unfortunately the public has been inflamed unnecessarily by a very partisan discussion as to the effects of the bill upon which the Congress finally agreed. There are many able and disinterested people who believe that this bill would be workable and in any event it would be far better than no bill at all. Some of the weird administrative monstrosities which the OPA put into effect is what created the violent opposition to the OPA. The unfortunate thing is that because of this the American public may reap the whirlwind of the administrative ineptness of the OPA. I am hoping that we can get a workable bill with perhaps a little more control than the former bill contained but at the present time this looks extremely doubtful.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I ask for time to speak on a resolution from the Rules Committee making in order the immediate consideration of a measure in the House. During the 10 years that I have been a Member I do not believe I have asked for this opportunity 10 times. I do not believe I have asked the privilege on an average once a session. The time is naturally limited on the rule and usually I prefer to speak on the measure itself in general debate or on amendments. However, this time is an exception, because it is urgent and because I am for the measure without amendment as this resolution makes it in order.

This legislation is of transcendent importance. Our country is in an appalling economic crisis. Very much depends upon our decision. I am ascribing sincere motives in many of the moves I have seen in connection with this, both friendly and unfriendly to OPA, and, while I may be naive, there seem to be as many close questions on which my colleagues differ, perhaps as many controversial but valid contentions, as there are fallacious arguments. Of this one thing I am sure, that the vast majority of American citizens want, demand, and must have continuation of price controls on the necessities of life until such a time as supply and demand are about equally balanced. If the Government fails to furnish those controls, the Government has fallen down in its duty. I have by every act and vote of mine, directly or indirectly connected with OPA, endeavored to support the Government in the fulfillment of this solemn duty to all American citizens.

We have heard a lot of sophistry today and last Saturday and for many previous weeks, in regard to who is to blame for the present predicament and what ought to be the proper course of action and what is the real significance of this or that vote on the various proposals touching OPA. When I hear lawyers on opposite sides of a controversial question, and often members of opposite political parties, using arguments that sound so persuasive, and yet I know are as full of holes as a colander, I think of that lawyer of whom Abraham Lincoln spoke who could by a clever arrangement of words prove that a horse chestnut is a chestnut horse.

As I have listened through hours of this discussion I have felt within my own heart almost convicted by their arguments of inconsistency. Some arguments are so powerful they make black look white. I know solemnly that I wanted to preserve and continue as long as necessary an effective and sound OPA, but some of the sophisticated political reasoning, which have been expressed today have almost convicted me of having killed cock robin.

Yes, I voted on April 18 for the OPA extension bill when it was up for final passage originally in the House. Does that mean that I went off the deep end in my enthusiastic support of it? It certainly does not—not of that measure. My "yes" that day on April 18 was a very feeble "yes" to a measure that had been emasculated the day before by many crippling amendments. The RECORD will show that on every roll-call vote taken in the House on April 17 I voted "no" because I felt that these amendments were dangerous amendments. I voted "yes" on final roll call only that we might have a bill on which the other body, in our two-Chamber National Legislature, could work in order to keep price control beyond June 30.

When the conference report came back to the House on June 25, I was little better satisfied with it than I was with the House version on April 18, but not being an expert in such intricate business problems I felt that although business undoubtedly had the advantage in its general nature and provisions, this bill was better than nothing and therefore I voted for it on agreeing to the conference report. However, when a ringing veto came from the President on June 29, and my eyes were open to things that I had not seen before, I voted to sustain the President's veto. He said it was an impossible proposal. I agree with the President that if we are going to have wild, runaway inflation, and that such is inevitable, we had better have it without a law than to have it encouraged—yes, guaranteed—by a law which I by my vote helped to pass. Yes; the President did ask for it, asked several times, but he asked for bread and we gave him a stone.

What then is our present problem? Clearly it is our duty to extend the present OPA law as is for a short period and meanwhile attempt to write a law which will contain only the necessary controls, and also provide for decontrols where such controls are no longer needed. I agree with my colleague who said we had spent more than 20 weeks writing a measure according to the pleasure of business and looking after business interests and profits, therefore the Congress of the United States might very properly give at least 20 days to safeguarding the interests of the American people. I shall vote for the proposal to extend OPA for 20 days and hope that decontrol provisions may be written into law to ease the transition from wartime economy to peacetime economy in a safe and sane way. Let us remember that we are dealing with the very lives of our people, as we legislate on this vital matter, dealing with lives just as surely as we did during and just preceding the war. It is a solemn thing to deal with human lives.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the rule under consideration makes in order for the consideration by the House, House Joint Resolution 371. Without legislation the OPA terminated on June 30, 1946. Bills were introduced in the House and Senate to modify the OPA and to extend its life. These bills were referred to the Committees on Banking and Currency of the House and Senate. Both committees gave everyone an opportunity to testify for and against the bills and to make recommendations and suggestions. Each committee, after these extensive hearings and many executive sessions of the committees, reported their respective bills to the House amending and modifying the OPA Act.

The House, after long debate and consideration, passed a bill by an overwhelming majority and the Senate did likewise, and as there were some differences in the two bills, they were referred to a conference committee made up of Republicans and Democrats from the Banking and Currency Committees of the House and Senate. After 2 weeks of consideration, this able conference committee agreed on a compromise bill and

made a favorable report to their respective Houses. The House and Senate adopted the conference report by an overwhelming majority and then it went to the President and was vetoed by the President. We received his veto in the House last Saturday, June 29. While a substantial majority of the Members of the House voted to override the veto, they lacked 34 votes of having a two-thirds majority. Nothing could be done to restore OPA, which expired on Sunday night, June 30. The veto of the President killed the bill.

Speaker RAYBURN, Democratic Majority Leader MCCORMACK, and Mr. SPENCE, author of the OPA bill, urged the House to accept the compromise bill and stated that unless the compromise bill was accepted there would be no legislation on OPA at this session of Congress. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], the ranking Republican on the Banking and Currency Committee and one of the conferees, and other Democrats and Republicans, made the same statements, and we are advised that Senator BARKLEY and other administration Democrats and leading Republicans urged the Senate to accept the compromise bill, and the House and Senate did accept the compromise bill by an overwhelming majority. These Democratic leaders of the House and Senate and strong friends of the President called on him and urged him to sign the bill, but no doubt to their surprise, as well as to the surprise of the Members of the House and Senate and the country, he, at the request of Bowles and some other New Dealers outside of the Congress, vetoed the bill. It came to the House on Saturday, June 29. It takes a two-thirds majority to override the veto of the President. Through the strong pressure of the administration, less than a two-thirds majority voted to override his veto, although a substantial majority did vote to do so. Therefore, the veto of the President killed the OPA legislation. Very few persons expected him to turn down four and a half months of earnest work of Congress on this important subject and turn down the recommendations and advice of his congressional leaders in the House and Senate.

Of ours, Mr. Bowles and his OPA'ers and some other left-wingers are very happy. Now the President and his New Deal friends are very unhappy. They are busy putting out propaganda trying to blame this situation on a few Republicans. They are busy again trying to deceive the American people. The President and Chester Bowles must carry the full responsibility of killing OPA. You may ask why they wanted to kill that OPA bill. That bill was the only thing that could have extended the OPA. There were several reasons. The bill took from the OPA the control over food prices and placed this authority in the hands of Mr. Anderson, the Secretary of Agriculture, who has had actual experience in cattle raising and stock raising and other agricultural activities. He also served for many years on the Committee on Agriculture of the House and was a member of that committee at the time he was appointed Secretary of Agriculture. The OPA'ers certainly did not want that done.

The OPA has had turned over to it billions of dollars in the way of subsidies. The bill provided for the elimination of some subsidies now and the gradual elimination of others so that all subsidies would have ceased by December 31, 1946. The OPA'ers wanted to play with these billions of dollars of subsidies and to fool the American people. These billions were used to help pay the grocery bills and store accounts of the rich as well as the poor widow. Of course, we had to borrow the money and thereby increase the national debt. This was clearly unjustified. When the American people had more money to expend than they had ever had, why should the Government borrow the money, increase the national debt and taxes, to pay the grocery bills and store accounts of the rich people of this Nation and then Bowles and his crowd took credit for reducing the prices on commodities and consumer goods? Mr. Wallace and some other New Dealers had told the people of the Nation that wages could be increased from 30 to 50 percent without increasing the price to the producers. Of course this was ridiculous, but they tried to force the producers to absorb these enormous increases of wages and costlier materials in production with the net result that hundreds of thousands of small businesses were put out of business and thousands of others were forced into the black markets to save their businesses, and this all meant a slowing down of production.

Every one who knows anything about the subject knows very well that scarcity of consumer goods forces prices up, creates black markets, destroys the equitable distribution of available consumer goods and increases the threat of inflation and the real answer to the control of prices is plenty—an abundance of consumer goods to meet the great demands of the people. We cannot have abundance without full production. We cannot have full production unless the producers, processors, and distributors of consumer goods are given a price that will cover the cost and a reasonable profit. Mr. Truman and his New Dealers entertained the unsound economic policy that you could have full production, processing, and distribution without a fair and just price that would take care of the cost as well as a reasonable profit. Mr. Bowles and Mr. Wallace have many admirers urging that the OPA continue as is and without any profit motive and without the producers being assured of even the cost of production. This might work in totalitarian countries for whom we are now stripping our country to provide food and clothing but it will not work in free America. Each one of us should be willing to pay such price for our products and goods as will enable the producers, processors, and distributors with proper management to pay the cost of production, good wages, and a fair profit.

The bill that the President vetoed also contained a provision for the final ending of the OPA. That, of course, was one of the bitterest pills for Mr. Bowles and his wrecking crew. As we have stated, the bill had many other splendid features. There was almost unanimous agreement that there should be reasonable rent control until the housing shortage could be relieved. Mr. Truman, by his veto, killed rent control.

THE FOUR IMPORTANT OBJECTIVES

We have now had OPA for more than 4 years. The Congress in establishing the OPA contemplated four important objectives: First, to stabilize prices; second, to provide for an equitable distribution of available supplies; third, to prevent black markets; and, fourth, to lessen the danger of inflation. Ninety-nine percent of the American people must know by this time that not one of these objectives was achieved, although the OPA was given the power and billions of dollars to accomplish these purposes. No one has ever possessed greater power than the OPA and they even exceeded those powers by their Executive orders, rules, regulations, and interpretations. It was strictly a war emergency measure and was never intended for peacetime.

The administration has had the Congress to appropriate four and one-half billion dollars—$4,500,000,000—for subsidies alone. The OPA has had hundreds of millions of dollars for propaganda and to administer the OPA Act. They have had a veritable army of Federal officeholders.

FAILURE, FAMINE, CHAOS, AND DISCORD

After having exercised all of these extraordinary powers, spent billions of dollars, and harassed the American people for the last 4 years, what do we find? Failure, famine, discord, and chaos. The lives and health of tens of thousands of the American people have been and still are threatened because of the lack of nourishing food. Livestock and poultry have starved to death. Hundreds of thousands of business concerns have been bankrupted and destroyed. Working people have been forced to quit their employment because of lack of food. The wives, mothers, and daughters of this country were willing to stand in line for hours to get a piece of meat, a quarter of a pound of butter, a little sugar, and a few vegetables to feed and nourish their families. They thought and we believed that when the war ended in Europe 15 months ago and especially when it ended in Japan nearly a year ago, that they would be relieved of this burden and that we would have more food; but as the weeks and months have come and gone, we find less and less food, prices have soared all the way from 25 to 200 percent on many necessities. More than 75 percent of the transactions in consumer goods and especially food, lumber, and clothing, are handled in the black markets or in some elements of the black markets, either in actual overcharges, shortage of weights, lack of quantity, or lack of quality.

The black market is one of the greatest curses that has ever come to a great people. Through the mismanagement, tyranny, oppression, favoritism, and corruption of the OPA, millions of honest Americans have been forced to re-

sort to practices that are entirely foreign to our great people. The people of my district and others have appealed to me to aid them to secure food and feed and to have allocated to the grain-processing mills corn, wheat, oats, and barley, but we have been told recently that there is no corn or wheat available. This administration caused the black marketeers to leap with joy when our Government became the greatest black marketeer of all in the Nation. A ceiling price was placed on corn, wheat, and other grains. The owners of these grains could not sell them to the mills for more than the OPA price and the mills could not pay more than the OPA price, but the Government came along and told the owners of wheat and corn: "If you will sell your corn and wheat to the Government and make it available for this country to ship to foreign countries and give it away, the Government will pay you 30 cents a bushel above the OPA price." What is the result? We had hundreds of millions of bushels of corn and wheat made available for shipment to foreign countries, but over 90 percent of the wheat and corn mills of Kentucky and the Nation were closed down and the American people find themselves faced with famine.

The Government itself, as we all know, broke the OPA line in prices as well as in wages and cost of materials. We must get back to honest business, free competitive enterprise, constitutional government, and the real American way of life. We must get away from regimentation, from tyranny, oppression, favoritism, and corruption in government.

THERE MUST BE A CHANGE

Mr. Bowles and the President want the Congress to continue OPA as is, with one of the blackest records of any governmental agency in the history of this Nation. There must be a change. These conditions cannot go on. It will turn this great, free country into a totalitarian government. The liberties of the American people will be wiped out. The Congress, by an overwhelming majority, attempted, after months and months of careful study—in fact, after observing the OPA and its doings for more than 4 years—to make such changes as would correct these conditions, restore honest, private enterprise, eliminate the black markets, and lessen the threat of inflation. There will be temporary rises in prices. In fact, the OPA planned to increase prices. The new prices were already set up. Some increases were absolutely necessary. The Government, out of the tax-and-bond money of the people, had been paying from 4 to 9 cents a pound in subsidies on grocery bills and store accounts of the people. The subsidies will be cut out.

The increase for the railroad workers and the increase in prices for steel and other materials made it necessary to increase transportation rates and this was applied to the consumers of coal. The cost of bituminous coal production was increased on an average to about 50 cents to 60 cents a ton and anthracite coal more than 90 cents a ton. All these things helped to increase the cost of production and, therefore, there had to be some substantial increases under the OPA, but let us not forget whatever bad conditions we have had, up to this time, have been under OPA and if the resolution is adopted by the House and Senate that is now before us, extending the OPA until July 20, then whatever conditions are prevailing up to July 20 in the way of prices, black markets, lack of consumer goods, and threat of inflation, must be justly laid at the door of the OPA.

I voted for the amended OPA bill. I voted to pass the bill over the President's veto, and if the President had signed the bill or if two-thirds of the Congress had voted to override his veto, we would not have the disturbed conditions in the country today. Of course, the President and the OPA'ers have become alarmed and they now insist that we extend the OPA for 20 days to see if some bill cannot be worked out to save the situation.

An overwhelming majority of the House, including myself, will likely vote to give 20 days' time to see if some legislation cannot be worked out that will be fair and just to the American people as well as to the producers, processors and distributors of this country. The President's leaders in the House and Senate have expressed the opinion that they did not believe a better bill could be passed than the one the President had vetoed. I certainly will not vote for an OPA bill without modifications that will prevent conditions that have been prevailing under Chester Bowles and other OPA officials. I do not propose for the people of my district to continue to suffer from the maladministration and oppression of this group of bureaucrats here in Washington. If the President would name an honest and able administrator who believes in the American way it would help.

The Democrats have a majority on each and every committee of the House and Senate. They have a substantial majority in the House and Senate. If Mr. Truman would quit listening to the PAC and other radicals and left-wingers and give more consideration to his own leaders in the House and Senate, a bill could be worked out that would provide for the gradual closing out of the OPA, with full protection to the American people and unless such a bill is passed, I certainly reserve the right to oppose it by my voice and vote.

In extending this resolution, it is the purpose of the overwhelming majority of the House to take away from Mr. Truman any excuse to cooperate with the House and Senate in bringing about a solution that can be approved by the representatives of the people in the House and Senate and that will be fair to the American people generally as well as to the producers, processors, and distributors of products, goods, and supplies. If the President and his party want to pass some bill, they have the votes to do so. The President and his party killed OPA and it is now up to them, with their majority and control in the House and Senate, to back such a bill as can be approved by the Congress and that will be just and fair to the American people.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest as my distinguished, able, and good friend from Massachusetts, the majority leader, again rose to great heights. I think we should clarify the situation here today as to who is responsible for the situation that exists. Therefore I shall read the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House, delivered here several days ago. He said:

> If this conference report is voted down, they will get nothing because there will not, in my opinion, be any price-control legislation at all. If this House will not vote up this conference report, it certainly will not vote for a continuing resolution and continue the law as it now stands. Even though the House were to pass a continuing resolution, the leader of the Senate is doubtful if it has a chance on earth to pass there. So if we want to control any kind of food prices and if we want to control rents and not have people turned out into the streets—as they will be turned out—the only alternative is to vote up this conference report. The responsibility is here. I will not, as far as I am concerned, by my vote here this afternoon shoulder the responsibility of killing all price control.

So we followed the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, who in a very sincere, honest, clear, and aggressive manner presented the whole situation to us, and we acted on his recommendations, it was vetoed by the President and now it is again brought back to the House for reconsideration and vigorous appeals are made to continue it, after 435 duly elected Members of the House of Representatives and 96 duly elected Members of the Senate have taken action expressing the will of the American people, which is now to be denied by the veto. We are asked again to renew it. The time has come when the responsibility should be placed where it rightfully belongs.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, my time is short but there has been one point raised here this morning which is extremely important and which was referred to several times, particularly by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] with reference to the statement that section 4 of House Joint Resolution 371 extended this act or revives it. I do not see how anybody can come to that conclusion from a reading of the resolution. The resolution attempts to amend two sections and then provides in section 4 that the provisions of the joint resolution, that is, the amendments, shall be retroactive as of yesterday. I submit to you that you cannot amend an act which has gone out of existence no matter how much you provide there for its retroactivity. You may revive it. You may revive it with amendments, but you cannot, it seems to me, amend an act which has gone out of existence. It seems to me legally impossible to amend an act which has gone out of force by its own provisions and then attempt to make your amendment retroactive. In

my opinion, if you consider this resolution and vote it up and then consider House Joint Resolution 371 and vote for that, you will be doing a nugatory thing, and in the meantime there will be more uncertainty as to whether we have price control or not. In my personal opinion, the thing that the people of the United States need most, whether they have price control or not, is certainty. They want to know where they are going.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, week before last I visited the great State of Wisconsin. I was privileged to speak before a splendid group of Wisconsin sportsmen. I did not speak altogether about conservation. I spent a good deal of time talking about the principles of government in which I believe and what I thought would be good for the country. After the meeting was over one of the members of the audience came up and whispered to me, "I am a Democrat." I assumed that the rest of them were Republicans. They knew I was a Democrat. But in all my life I have never received a more cordial and enthusiastic reception than I got there that night in Wisconsin. It forced home to me this vital and fundamental fact, that there is a bond of fellowship between those who entertain certain fundamental beliefs and who are willing to put the welfare of their Nation first, above group interest. I come to you today not as a Democrat but as one who, like you, loves his country, who is patriotic, and who wants to see the progress of America sustained and does not want to see an uncontrolled price boom followed by a depression which we would not be able to survive with a public debt of $265,000,000,000. That would mean economic chaos which would not only destroy our country economically but might ultimately imperil our cherished traditions and institutions. We met this morning to hold memorial exercises not to honor a Democrat but to honor the memory of a President of the United States.

In opening those ceremonies our Chaplain prayed, "O Lord, purify the thoughts in our hearts with the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit." I tell you the root of our trouble today is selfishness. It did not start with World War II, but it started with World War I. A group of war millionaires was made and a group of industrialists profited from the tragedy of war. They proceeded to take off the restraints after the war was over and cut down taxes, which were needed to control inflation and pay the public debt, until their program ultimately collapsed with the stock-market crash of October 29, 1929, and we were plunged into a depression. Before that the farmer, workingman, and the white-collar man had suffered, and in the depression we all suffered. Those who William Allen White said believed that God presided over a 6-percent heaven and all was well with the world realized that they, too, lost in the depression that they had helped to bring upon us. The progressive principles of Woodrow Wilson were repudiated in 1920 for the reactionaryism and isolationism of Warren G. Harding. The patriotic unselfishness which had characterized our prosecution of World War I turned into a program of gross materialism. In his last message to the American people, delivered in August 1923, Woodrow Wilson warned us of the consequences of such a program. After discussing the causes of the revolution in Russia he predicted a world revolution if the people here and abroad continued to ignore the just aspirations of the masses and continued to make the selfish acquisition of material things their chief aim in life. He concluded that appeal by saying:

> The sum of the whole matter is this: If our civilization is to survive materially, it must be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming imbued with the spirit of Christ and made free and happy by the practices that spring from that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and the shadows lifted from the road ahead.

Never in my life have I known more discontent or the road ahead obscured by darker clouds. And the root of our trouble is selfishness. We are called upon today to act on a resolution to temporarily continue the present OPA law, with the hope and the belief that we can work out a better one. In approaching that problem we would do well to recall the prayer offered by our chaplain this morning and to realize that we are not voting for or against a Democratic President or a Democratic administration. We are voting to promote the welfare of a country which we all love and to protect institutions which we all cherish. There is not a Member of this House who desires to see rent control immediately ended. There is not a Representative of an agricultural district who believes that our farmers can successfully compete with organized industry in a mad scramble for upping prices. There is not a Representative of an industrial area who does not view with alarm the prospect of uncontrolled food prices. There is not a member of this House who does not know that in any given line of endeavor those who produce are fewer than those who consume, and that no program is a just and fair program which ignores the rights of the consumer. Yet all of us are besieged by pressure groups, most of which are seeking a selfish advantage.

When we entered the war and had under consideration a price control bill, labor strenuously objected to any effort on the part of the Congress to control wages. It finally worked out an agreement with the President which was known as the Little Steel Formula. In working out that formula, labor leaders selected the period of the highest hourly wage rates in the history of the country and refused to permit consideration of the take-home pay resulting from overtime. Future advances were to have been limited to 15 percent, but this year that formula was broken in the negotiation of new contracts calling for an increase of 18½ cents per hour. Those wage increases have resulted in increased cost of production, which must inevitably result in price increases else one of two things, and maybe both, will happen. Production will be stifled, or goods will reach the consuming public by way of the black market at prices above legal ceilings. When we undertook to frame a new wage law industry insisted on selecting the most advantageous period it had had in a period of 5 years in determining what was a fair profit, to which was to be added all subsequent increases in the cost of production. It is now quite impossible for the Congress to write a price control bill which will prevent further price increases. But Congress can and should write a new price control bill which will prevent inordinate increases and unjustified increases and which will assure the consumer a reasonable supply of scarce articles through legitimate channels of distribution while lifting price control from other items as the supply catches up with the demand.

And while we are working on a bill of that character, the Congress should continue the present act. We may not know the type of new bill upon which a majority of us can agree, but we all very definitely know what is going to happen in the absence of no price control whatever. There is in the Congress enough ability and enough patriotic regard for the general welfare to write a new bill if we be determined that our actions shall not be controled by selfishness.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time, 4 minutes, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, section 4 of this bill reenacts the law as of June 30, 1946. I believe that is just as satisfactory and just as legal and constitutional as if you reenacted the text of the entire law.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman that this procedure is not without precedent. It was done when the dollar was devalued.

Mr. PATMAN. The Devaluation Act.

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. So it is not new. In addition, if it needed amending, the other body would have that privilege.

PRESIDENT NOT TO BE BLAMED

I do not see how anyone can vote against this resolution who believes in price or rent control. It is only asking for an extension of 20 days, in the hope that a satisfactory bill can be agreed upon during that time. I know that efforts have been made to blame the President of the United States, but I do not believe the President should be blamed, when the President in January sent a special request to Members of Congress to give speedy action to the OPA law, not to wait until almost the deadline; twice in May he asked the Congress to hurry and pass a satisfactory OPA law; and in the early part of June he renewed the

request. Now, what held up this bill? In our Committee on Banking and Currency there were three or four Members who were opposed to OPA. I venture to say, and it cannot be successfully contradicted, they took up two-thirds of the time before that committee asking questions of Chester Bowles, Paul Porter, and other important witnesses.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not yield to the lady. I do not have the time.

Then, when the bill went to the other body, in that committee a few who opposed any kind of controls took up the time to delay and delay. The bill was delayed and delayed until it got to the President's desk one day before the day it would have expired by law.

Now, who is responsible for this? The Congress is responsible. Let us not add to that blame which we should assume by refusing a 20-day extension of a bill that was presented to the President so unworkable and so impossible to administer. The Taft amendment could not be enforced. It was absolutely impossible of enforcement or administration. People who have been on the committee, as I have, and listened to this testimony for 3 months at a time—we had Leon Henderson on the witness stand under cross-examination for three long months—know that the Taft amendment was unworkable. We have spent months on this subject, over a period of several years, and I know that the Taft amendment that was in the other bill could not be enforced. Are we now going to blame the President for vetoing an unenforceable law?

I ask that this resolution be passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 371, extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 371, extending the Emergency Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I do not delude myself by thinking that I can persuade the Members to vote in any way other than the way they have already made up their minds to vote.

Mr. Chairman, we are at the threshold of something that may mean much to the weal or the woe of the American people. Nobody that I know of denies that there is still the economic pressures making for inflation as great as those that existed during the war. I am no prophet, I do not know what the result will be if we take all the lids off at this time; but I feel a great catastrophe would come on the American people.

I hear a great deal of talk about propaganda. Do not think it is propaganda that brings about this condition. There is a psychological condition sweeping over America. You talk to the common man and woman on the street and they have fear in their hearts because they know that if we make a mistake the savings of their lifetime and the purchasing power of the money they earn may be largely dissipated. I do not want to take the responsibility.

It is said that if we agree with the President we retreat. We do not retreat. I do not retreat. The Committee on Banking and Currency reported a bill to the House that I am confident the President would have signed. But it was scuttled on the floor of the House and it was scuttled on the floor of the Senate. The pressure groups had their amendments adopted, and those were the amendments the President objected to. I voted against all of them because I could see that the catastrophe might result that has resulted, and there was no other thing to do but to go along as best I could.

We had to present some bill. I was hopeful that the bill would be workable. When we went into conference the area of difference was not great. Both bills were bad, but we had to accept the best bill we could get out of the material we had. The President said it would not work. He said he could not make it effectively operate. I was hopeful that he could. I wanted to avoid what has happened, but if he cannot make it work he was most courageous and honest in the stand he took.

We have come back here and asked for 20 days. I have been asked if I can assure you that we will have a bill in 20 days. I cannot. I cannot assure you of anything. But certainly it is not an unreasonable request to ask the Congress to give us 20 days in which to attempt to work out a solution of this problem. I am confident you will do that.

Politics has been brought into this matter. I tried to be fair in the committee. I tried to give everybody a chance to be heard who wanted to be heard. The critics of the bill and those who were opposed to most features of the bill took up four-fifths of the time interrogating witnesses. Then we are charged with delay because the bill was not brought in here in ample time. If we had not done that we would have been charged with unfairness. I believe if you do give us 20 more days, we may work out something that will meet with the approval of the President. I am certainly hopeful of that or I would not be urging that we be given the 20 days unless I thought we could accomplish that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in light of the great emergency that presents itself at this time, it certainly should be the policy of the Congress to give this committee time to do something that will conform to the wishes of the President, something that he thinks can be effectively used in carrying out the purposes for which the price control law was enacted.

We will continue price control, we will continue rent control, we will continue the Stabilization Act for those 20 days. Price control and rent control are so inseparably connected in one picture that it is impossible to consider one without the other. We must give complete relief to the American people or we can give them no relief at all.

I hope you will set aside political considerations, though we have heard political speeches here. This transcends political questions and political interests, and besides, nobody is going to make any political capital by destroying price control at this time.

I desire to make the explanation of House Joint Resolution 371 section by section.

Sections 1 and 2 of the extension resolution merely change the expiration date of the Emergency Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act of July 20, 1946.

Section 3 gives the authorization for the continued payment of subsidies during the short period of extension provided for by sections 1 and 2. Just extending the act would make effective the last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act which prohibits the payment of subsidies by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Commodity Credit Corporation unless funds have been specifically appropriated. Since subsidies relating to price control are paid for out of revolving funds, this clause would not permit the payment of subsidies during the extension period. Therefore, section 3 specifically authorizes the payment of subsidies during the extension period on just the same basis that subsidies were being paid on June 29, 1946. No new subsidies would be undertaken in this period.

Section 4 covers the problems arising from the fact that there will be a gap between the original termination date of the act and the enactment of the extending resolution. If the resolution did not specify an effective date, the enactment of the resolution would reenact the Emergency Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act as of the date of enactment of the resolution. It would then probably be necessary to reissue all regulations and orders fixing prices and rents, and other problems would arise because of the interruption to the effectiveness of price and rent controls. By specifying that the effective date of the resolution should be June 30, 1946, the Congress would make it clear that there was no interruption to the continuity of

the acts and regulations and orders issued under them. But if the law were made retroactive with respect to violations of regulations or orders after June 30, 1946, it would conflict with the constitutional prohibition against ex post facto laws. Therefore section 4 specifically provides that the resolution shall not operate retroactively with respect to offenses committed after June 30, 1946, and that no actions may be brought with respect to such violations. The result is that the continuity of the laws will be preserved so far as it can be done constitutionally.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there has been presented to us a very unfortunate situation. One, I might say, that is no little embarrassing to all of us who were sincerely and conscientiously in favor of the continuance of price control but in such a manner that we would get maximum production. I am afraid that the action taken by the President has destroyed all control which we ever have had over the objectives of the House in controlling prices, and at the same time getting adequate, sufficient production, to prevent inflation.

The theory of the bill was that when the President broke the wage price line, that effective price control no longer existed, and that the only thing which would save this country from inflation was production, production, and more production. Notwithstanding any action which this Congress takes or might have taken, notwithstanding any action which the President took in respect to the bill which was sent to him, prices are going up within the next few days, and I know that if they follow their usual bent many of the people who have been denouncing the action taken by the House are going to blame the Congress for the increase in these prices. But the OPA was about to announce an increase in the price of many commodities to absorb increases in production costs; they were about to announce increases in the prices of many commodities, because today is the effective date of the increase in transportation costs on many commodities. Of course, the President, having vetoed the bill which provided for the payment of subsidies, he has wiped out all possibility of subsidies being used to adjust our economy in such manner that it will not feel the impact of suddenly taking these subsidies off.

Under those conditions, of course, prices are bound to go up slightly, anyway, within the next few days, and would have gone up regardless of what action the President took and regardless of what action we had taken.

I am not going to vote for this resolution. I do not see how I can consistently vote for this resolution after I have told this House that after the House and the Senate and the conferees on the disagreeing amendments have striven for months to harmonize all the differences in this bill, after the statement was made that that was the very best bill which could possibly be enacted, that statement being made by the leaders on both sides, a statement which I honestly and conscientiously believe. Because I believed it I advised you at that time that the President might be justified in the public mind in vetoing a bill with specific decontrols in it, but would not be justified in vetoing a bill without specific decontrols, and I told you, as did the leadership on both sides—and I was merely reflecting their attitude when I told you this—that if you voted to eliminate these specific decontrols it would put you in a position where you could safely and justifiably refuse to vote for a continuing resolution, and that if in the face of that condition, where we had gone just as far as we humanly could go to make the bill satisfactory to the President before it was enacted, he vetoed the bill, then he must take the consequences.

I cannot consistently vote for the continuation of this bill because of that, but I might say that if it is in the wisdom of this Congress that we continue these price controls for 20 days or 15 days or any other length of time, then of course we will go to work on it. The Committee on Banking and Currency will probably report out again the same kind of a bill it reported out in the first place, which was not and would not be responsive to the will of this House. The Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate will likewise report out a bill, undoubtedly, which would not be reflective of the attitude of the Members of the other body. So there we are on the wheel again, we can keep going 'round and 'round and 'round. But in the meantime, because of the President's attitude, those of us who wanted to control prices and those who thought that that was the way to do it, those of us who were conscientious in the belief that price control should be continued in such a manner that full production could be obtained, have lost all control over the situation now. We have no control over that.

I would not get up before this House and seek to contend successfully against the attitude which was existent here for specific decontrols, and I would not think that under the circumstances I could say to the Senate conferees, "You shall eliminate these specific decontrols or otherwise the President might veto the bill," because he has already done it. So we have lost control over it. The Senate will write specific decontrols in the bill. The Senate will not pass this continuing resolution. What you are going to get back in consequence of passing this continuing resolution is perhaps just the same thing you sent to the President, and probably from his standpoint very much worse.

In the meantime, we have to do something with respect to the control of rents. Immediately after the consideration of this resolution I am going to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a joint resolution which has for its purpose the reenacting and continuing of the effective control and stabilization of rents for housing accommodations. The resolution provides that any and all of the provisions of the Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, in respect to rents are reenacted and continued for a period of 1 year. We can eliminate from these disputes with respect to prices generally this question of rents. We gave the country the assurance that rent control would be continued. I do not think there are very many people in the House or in the Senate who successfully contend that we do not have to control rents during this period of housing scarcity. It would be catastrophic if we did not continue rent control. So in order that there might be good faith and in order that we may do what we wanted to do and what we understood we were doing, I have offered this resolution so that the question of rent control can be completely divorced from this controversy as to whether this temporary resolution shall be adopted or whether some bill may be agreed upon at some later date. I hope no one will object to the present consideration of the resolution when it is offered by me. I hope it will pass, and in that way we will guarantee to the people that rent control will not be affected by any action which we may take or neglect to take within the next year.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Of course, the bill which passed both the House and Senate and which was sent to the President and then vetoed by him expressly took care of the matter of rent control, did it not?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and in vetoing the bill the President, of course, at the same time allowed rent control to lapse on June 30.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the gentleman explain the situation that may exist in the interim between now and the time that the bill is enacted? Goods are being billed now at prices on which there is no control. Will the reenactment of the bill affect such cases? Is it retroactive? Is there a free market now?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the resolution should reenact the provisions of the Price Control Act. I think that is what they intend to do by the last paragraph It presents a very interesting academic legal question, but probably one which will not affect price control or any action which we may eventually take.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, I am greatly surprised to see that there is so much divergence of opinion about the passage of this resolution. The newspapers carried a very vigorous and forthright statement by the chairman of the Republican National Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee, Hon. CARROLL REECE, calling upon the Congress to reenact price control for scarce articles as well as rent controls. It seems to me that that statement ought to have brought a substantial unanimity in the House to the effect that some kind of price control is necessary. However, members of his own party do not seem to respond to his call. I am sure that

he has expressed the feeling of the country.

The whole country is looking to the House of Representatives for action today. We have never had a similar economic condition in which there was so much uncertainty. No man can make a contract. No man can foresee what he can do in the future so far as business is concerned. Landlords and tenants are without knowledge as to what they are going to do in the future. Contracts are expiring. If you think the Congress is going to escape the burden of responsibility, I fear you will find yourselves greatly in error because the people know that the President is calling upon us to help solve this problem and it would be futile and unwise in my opinion not to respond favorably to that call.

We must remember that when we sent this legislation to the President almost on the last day before the expiration of price control, we put him in a position of great embarrassment. That was practically a club to force him to sign what we had enacted. He has a right to use his discretion. If we had given him sufficient time he could have exercised his veto and this Congress could have proceeded, before the expiration of the old Price Control Act, to remedy any defects and to improve the measure to the best of our ability. For these reasons I think the Congress has the burden of acting, and if we do not do so we will produce a stalemate in business that will affect all lines and will be dangerous to the future prosperity of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, most people would think this too serious for political leaders to try to make such efforts toward lining up people by accusing them of playing politics if they do not vote for this, and try to make them act too tweedle dumbly.

Reference has been made to the hearings. There is an attempt to make it seem that there was some kind of a filibuster on the part of the minority. Therefore, I think you should know when your people ask you that in our committee the Democratic chairman the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], decides who shall be the witnesses for the administration and who shall be the witnesses for the minority, and he sets the time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Not at the moment. You can take your own time.

And he decides how long the minority witnesses shall testify. When I sat in the committee I have tried and tried to get a chance to ask a question and in order to do so, when the opposition witnesses are testifying, I had to interfere with their testimony and cut it short, and, therefore, mostly I do not even attend the committee.

In the OPA hearings we have had witnesses from every industry in the United States, I think, bar none, telling you that they cannot produce under OPA and the confiscatory OPA ceilings. The thing is too vast and complicated for such men—such little men as are these men in OPA to try to operate. Those insiders in OPA, as you know, are rather lawless men. You remember the Bankhead-Brown amendment. They have violated it repeatedly. Regardless of what law you pass, they are going to do business as usual. I think they were extremely disappointed, in reality, when you failed to pass that pale pink compromise law which would not have bothered them in the least, because when you failed to pass it over the President's veto you prevented their having a chance to blame on Congress the failures, the repeated failures, and the increasing failures which are inevitable because the OPA is one big racket from start to finish, even rent control. Rent control is only a method of keeping down rents even below costs, and making things so disagreeable that people have to sell their buildings for a song to some political racketeer, and preventing building, and in the end forcing Congress to pass the Communist Party program of housing, slum-clearance housing, costing billions of dollars every year, for which the big political racketeers who are the mainspring behind this OPA, and do not forget it, are going to get their usual hoggish share of the proceeds. The reason why high Government officials are floundering around like fish in a net, in a communistic net which they have built around themselves, is because they see by the Government statistics—and I do not mean the deceptive scrambled statistics they have fed the public—that right now their planned economy house of cards is tumbling right around their heads, and Government officials and Communists alike are going to fall with it—and you will fall, too, if you go along with them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is a very fair chairman. There has never been a time when he did not treat each and every member of the Banking and Currency Committee and every Member of this House fairly. There has never been a time when he caused a member to stop interrogating a witness. That is evidenced by the printed hearings. From them you will find that the gentlewoman from Illinois and one or two other members of the minority took days, and days, and days, bringing back very important witnesses to the stand to interrogate them. The chairman of the committee was so fair and considerate that he invariably asked all witnesses to testify before our committee that the members of the minority wanted to testify. He never refused to do that.

The gentlewoman from Illinois insists on calling this bill a communistic bill. She has, as a matter of fact, branded every bill that comes from our committee and on the floor of this House that she opposes as a communistic bill. She said that OPA was communistic, that Bretton Woods was communistic, that the British loan was communistic, that the veterans' emergency housing bill was a communistic bill. So in calling these bills communistic I believe she is entirely wrong, just as wrong as she is when she says that our chairman has not treated her fairly. Our chairman has not only treated her fairly but he has treated every other member of that committee fairly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I assure you I did not know the gentleman from Texas was going to deliver a eulogy on me when I yielded to him.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of approving the resolution that is before the Committee at this time. I have been down home in recent days, I have talked with the people there. I have seen the messages that have been coming in. I believe I know what they are thinking. I have talked with veterans who are in school under the GI bill of rights and who are being paid $65 a month if single, and $90 if married. I have talked with their wives and I know something of the fear that confronts them today because of the effective emasculation of price control.

There is great concern throughout the country, and rightly so, because it is felt that if price control is discontinued or if we do not have some effective form of price control that same type of ruinous inflation that we experienced following the last World War is going to hit us again; and I believe there is no question about it. There is no way of avoiding inflation unless we continue price control. Perhaps a great deal of the confusion comes about, and probably some of the opposition to continuing price control, through reference to the agency, the OPA, itself. I do not uphold OPA for all the things it has done. I think it has done some foolish things. It has been quite unwise in many of its administrative orders. But I do thoroughly believe that we must have some form of effective price control if we are to stay out of that inflationary spiral that will ruin the small business people of this country, the farmers, wage earners, white-collar workers, the little people generally throughout these United States. I know that fear is gripping the people of this country today as they see price control going out.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Does the gentleman believe that the price control bill that passed the House and Senate and that was finally agreed upon by the conferees would have been at all helpful in controlling prices?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know that I am competent to say. I had very much hoped from the statement made by the

chairman of the committee when he presented the conference report here that it would be a workable bill that we could live with. I may say I do feel that the bill which the House passed originally was practically a farce so far as price control is concerned. I voted against every single amendment offered to that bill, not because I felt there was no merit in any of them. I think several of the amendments had some merit in them. I felt very definitely, however, that the sum total effect of all the amendments was to destroy price control completely. Therefore I can say to the gentleman I feel that the bill which we sent to the Senate was totally ineffective as a price-control measure.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The President, having been advised by the leadership of both the House and Senate, that if the bill reported by the conference did not become law there would be no price control, in view of that, and his having vetoed that bill, if we were to pass this resolution and send him a bill he could approve, the credit would mainly go to him. However, suppose we get no price control at all, because the President has vetoed the bill that the leadership of both the House and Senate advised him to sign, and we get nothing at all, where would the responsibility rest for getting nothing?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, I am not concerned with where the credit goes. I am concerned with having an effective price control to prevent ruinous inflation in this country and I do not care who gets the credit.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It is not a question of credit. It is a question of responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, the situation already existing today, with no price-control legislation at all on the statute books, convinces me more strongly than ever that the proper course last Saturday was to override the President's veto and to have enacted the law as contained in the conference report.

I have spoken with a number of my friends who are members of the Judiciary Committee, and, in addition to the economic confusion pervading the country, apparently there are a great number of legal problems which have arisen and which will arise, even some legal problems connected with the resolution itself and the proper form which it should take.

I think the President made a grave error in confronting the country with this situation. Many of the consequences cannot be repaired even if this resolution is adopted quickly. That, after all, is water over the dam. Our problem today is to try to work out of the confusion created as quickly as possible and to the best interests of the country.

Personally, I feel strongly that we should vote for the continuing resolution. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, assuming the joint resolution is adopted, I intend to do my best to see that some workable compromise is brought in by that committee. I realize that we will have to find something that will be acceptable both to the President of the United States and to the Congress; consequently, some of us are going to have to yield our views on certain points, even as many of us did in respect to the conference report when we voted for it. There were many provisions in that report with which I disagree—some against which I voted.

I do not feel quite as pessimistic about the ability of the committee to do that as our chairman indicated he did in his opening statement. The trouble with the country today is that there has been too much rigidity of attitude, too much desire to secure one's own ends and one's own views to the exclusion of thousands of other people—too little give and take during this tough adjustment period. If we could only follow the Golden Rule just a little more closely—all of us. Personally, I am ready to yield considerably on my views with the desire and ambition to get something that will work and which will prevent any uncontrolled rise in prices. That is the essence of the problem. If we do not do that, we will have failed at this time. We will have permitted a minority to control, to the detriment of the great majority.

I believe that it can be done, and I shall do my best to have it done. The President's message, in the first part, was polititcal in its implications; it was a political speech; but when you get to the end of it where the President states what he will accept, he admits in principle the policy of decontrol which was incorporated in the bill which he vetoed. He accepts in broad principle the Taft amendment, which he so bitterly criticized by saying:

> I would not object to a provision which expressly requires the adjustment of price ceilings wherever this is necessary and would be effective to increase the total production of needed goods.

I voted against the cost plus amendment in the House, but I cannot agree with the President's view that it will be as bad in its effect as he believes it would be. In my opinion it goes too far and would be damaging. It should have been put in in changed form, but it certainly would not have produced the results he claims it would. He also indicates that he is prepared to see subsidies eliminated and scaled down during the first half of 1947. If the President and the OPA had offered this much 3 or 4 months before the bill was reported by our committee, I believe many of the sweeping and bad amendments adopted on the floor could have been defeated.

So, in general, in the President's veto message, he indicates his willingness to accept a good part of the House bill. I intend to vote for this continuing resolution and do my best to bring in a workable bill that will provide effective price control. Then if the President should decide to veto that one, I will vote for another continuing resolution and go through the process all over again.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, as perhaps most of you know, I have consistently opposed OPA legislation. I think I was one of very few that voted against it at the time it was enacted. I thought then that it was not compatible with our form of government. I thought it was undemocratic, unconstitutional, and unworkable. I still hold to those views.

But notwithstanding the views that I have entertained heretofore in regard to the basic law, somewhat consistent with my own policy for voting for liberal rules which permit the consideration and adequate debate of legislation, I have concluded to vote for this resolution, believing that it is the only reasonable thing to do in view of the fact that the President has requested it. After all, he is the Chief Executive and charged with the responsibility of effectively enforcing the laws enacted by the Congress.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It is the only possibility for any price control, then, is it not?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is exactly right. While I doubt very much if the committee will bring in any legislation which will meet with my approval, I am willing to subordinate my views on this particular question and at least give them an opportunity to work upon the problem, because I realize that it is of great importance to the people of this country.

I do not agree that this resolution is legal, or that the effect of it will be to legally revive or reenact a law. The speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] a minute ago indicated that perhaps the resolution is not open for amendment, but it seems to me that it should be amended so as to reenact the law which expired last night at midnight. We certainly cannot revive or reenact it by merely amending it.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to offer my testimony on the statement made here a little earlier that the gentlewoman from Illinois spent days and days questioning witnesses. I have been a member of the Banking Committee now for 2 years, and I have never seen anything like that happen.

Secondly, I do not particularly want to enter into the controversy about "who killed Cock Robin." But I do believe we are entitled to a little more information on that subject. The President says that on September 6, 1945, he urged the Congress to pass an extension law promptly.

May I ask the chairman of my committee if the President at or about that time asked him to have hearings on this law?

Mr. SPENCE. I have no recollection of getting any communication from the President. Since the President said he asked for it, I assume he did ask, but I have no recollection of it. I know this, that most of the people who are now complaining about not being treated

fairly are the people who took up most of the time in the hearings.

Mr. BUFFETT. May I ask the gentleman this: If the President had sent a message directly to him, he certainly would not have turned the President down, would he?

Mr. SPENCE. I think it is very obvious I am not trying to turn him down now. I think the gentleman understands that.

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes; I do. I think the Congress and the country should understand that if the President had actually tried to secure hearings last September as his veto message indicated, he would have had those hearings promptly. I made such a request on the 26th of September. We started hearings late in February.

We are never going to get anywhere on the increase of inflation and prices as long as we keep working at cross-purposes. We have had one crisis after another here this spring, crises that are made to order for the advancement of communism not only here but all over the world. We are called on today to pass an extension of the OPA Act for 20 days because of the danger of much higher prices, but at the other end of this week we will be called upon to create $3,750,000,000 of pure inflation in the form of a loan to Great Britain.

Is it not about time to stop fooling the people of this Nation? If this administration continues its reckless loaning policy, price control becomes an instrument for the destruction of the Nation. Why not face the music now and save us from the fate of Germany and others who have been wrecked by price control.

It is time for a showdown—for the people to learn that all the price-control laws in the world cannot keep prices down as long as the Government keeps diluting and debauching our currency.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN].

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, most Members of this House have been bombarded today with telegrams from constituents, running 35 and 40 to 1, demanding the continuation of price control, not the meaningless price control which would profit the inflationists and economically massacre the people, but price control with authority to lead us in an orderly fashion through the transition period from war to peace.

The facts are clear and decisive. The door to inflation has been opened wide. The situation would have been the same had the meaningless measure passed last week been upheld. The veto was the only step the President, fully cognizant of his responsibility to the country, could have taken to throw the issue squarely at the people and let them take up the cudgels for their own protection.

Every Member of this House is now fully aware of the danger facing the country.

The people are demanding that we face the facts and act upon them. It is our clear responsibility and business to reject the exploiters and vote for this resolution.

This resolution, moreover, gives the opponents of price control, who now are confronted by the Frankenstein they created, to extricate themselves from the mess into which they plunged themselves by their own short-sightedness. There is little comfort in "I told you so" for those of us who stood firm against every effort to scuttle these inflationary controls.

The country imperatively requires now a unanimity of support for this resolution and a sober approach to the magnitude of the problems as we resume work on a measure which will be an effective answer to the inflationary menace.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, the time has come to quit making reckless, incorrect statements. It has been said that every Member has been flooded with telegrams because the President asked the public to send telegrams to their Members. I received just one telegram, and I shall read it:

Representative WILLIAM LEMKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Condemn veto by President Truman. Do not favor revising old OPA set-up. Rather let OPA die a natural death.

S. B. BAGNE.

It is the only telegram I have received.

Now, let us get together and reason and find out what is wrong with the OPA.

In the first place, it is an un-American institution. It is an illegitimate child. It was born of foreign parentage. It was imported from Russia and Great Britain. Canada, New Zealand, and Australia refused to adopt this Russian-British half-breed.

The ways of the OPA are foreign to the things that made America great. Regimentation and dictatorship, in themselves are un-American. Its performance has been even worse than its foreign birth. Few people realize to what extent it interfered with and prevented full production. It has been the bottleneck of production. It is largely responsible for the empty shelves. It has not kept the cost of living down but has increased it.

The OPA has been guilty of extortion. It has illegally extracted money from hundreds and thousands of innocent people. Recently merchants and implement dealers complained that the OPA was collecting twenty-five and fifty dollars not because of any overcharge, but because they claimed there was something wrong with the sales tag. These merchants and dealers were accused of violating some OPA regulation. They were threatened with prosecution, triple damages, and imprisonment.

When I mentioned this to a merchant recently, he smiled and said, "Well, I just paid $175. I knew it was extortion, but they threatened to drag me into court. You may blame us for submitting to such extortion and corruption, but Congress is responsible for permitting such an un-American institution to be at large. This because, as businessmen, we cannot afford to be brought into court even on false charges."

Mr. Bowles claims that the OPA kept the cost of living down. The truth is the cost of living is about one and a half times as high as it was during the comparable months after World War I. Nearly everything that you eat, drink, or wear, except sugar, is higher than it was after World War I. In addition, there were no empty shelves after World War I. There was no OPA to interfere with production. You could buy what you wanted and the prices were lower than now.

I repeat, the OPA has created a scarcity of commodities by interfering with production. The longer we keep it the greater will be the scarcity—the higher the prices. We should not expect that anyone can or will produce or manufacture articles below the cost of production. No honest person except the lounge lizard expects the farmer, the manufacturer, or the merchant to produce, manufacture, or serve him below cost of production or operation.

Mr .SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, on Saturday I voted to override the President's veto. I did so because I was deeply concerned about the situation in which I was afraid the country would find itself with a sudden complete cessation of all controls. By the same process of reasoning it seems to me it would be an utterly irresponsible action not to pass the pending resolution. I think the pending resolution is our very minimum duty to the Nation. Obviously, what the country needs is a transitional control of essential prices and rents until such time as production has caught up with demand. The law should provide for an orderly decontrol process, but for firm, effective control where needed. That is what we should have given the Nation in the first place. The only thing we can do in that direction today is to pass the pending resolution. I am confident it will pass. I hope it will pass without amendment.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. The same reasons for supporting a vote to override the veto also will support a vote for this resolution?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we can go back into one of the books of our childhood to find a verse which aptly describes the condition confronting us as a result of President Truman's veto of the OPA Extension Act. As I recall, it went like this:

Humpty Dumpty (OPA) sat on a wall,
Humpty Dumpty (OPA) had a big fall,
All the king's horses and all the king's men
Could not put Humpty Dumpty (OPA) together again.

I am afraid that is exactly where the country finds itself today. I voted to

override the President's veto on Saturday because I was convinced that exactly this would happen. I think it was one of the most reckless and dangerous acts ever engaged in by a high executive of this country when President Truman, by Presidential veto, threw OPA into the ash can and bet the entire future stability of this dangerous transition period from wartime to peacetime on the flip of a coin, hoping that some particular philosophy of OPA which he favored might eventuate.

I shall vote today for the 20-day continuing resolution because I have always felt that there was a job for OPA to do in this country to help control prices so long as the supply fails to equal the demand. I think we require an OPA which not only seeks to control prices to curtail inflation but which also controls prices to stimulate production. We have not had that under Chester Bowles. His administration of OPA has fumbled badly the first of these objectives and it has failed even more dismally on the second.

Instead, we have had a poisonous potpourri of inept people and inane policies which were bringing us rapidly to disaster. It was in an effort to correct this bureaucratic bungling that Congress wrote the corrective amendments in the bill the President voted. I think if the President wants to have a speedy OPA bill passed by this Congress he can get it quickly by appointing William Jeffers as OPA Director. If he does not like Bill Jeffers, he can appoint Jesse Jones, of Houston, Tex. Jones is a good administrator, and the Congress and the people have confidence in his ability. I think he is the kind of man to do a job with OPA. If Mr. Truman does not like either of them he can appoint Edward R. Stettinius who did an efficient job with lend-lease but who has since been kicked around from pillar to post and from post to pitfall until finally he had to resign to save his self-respect. If we can get a good Administrator for OPA who believes in stimulating production rather than playing politics with OPA, I am convinced the President can readily secure from the Congress the kind of legislation which will enable OPA to attain its twofold objectives.

Neither Jeffers, Jones, nor Stettinius would endeavor to create a climate of fear and of favoritism designed to make OPA a permanent Government agency. Each of them has business experience enough and confidence enough in our American way of life to realize the wisdom of establishing OPA policies which would as rapidly as possible stimulate production so that it would equal demand and in that way eliminate all reason—except the political one—for continuing OPA beyond that point.

Mr. Chairman, when I addressed this body last Saturday, speaking in support of the resolution to override the President's veto, I pointed out that failure to override the veto might well mean the demise of OPA. I called attention to the rules of procedure obtaining in the other body at the other end of the Capitol. I predicted that filibustering tactics and dilatory techniques in that body might well consume so much time that the price structures and rental controls of OPA could fall apart before a continuing resolution would be passed. The President is a former member of that other body. He knows better than I the realistic situation prevailing at that end of the Capitol. To me, this makes all the more amazing and alarming the fact that the President listened to the ambitious advisers in his New Deal coterie to the point that he vetoed the price control extension act against the considered counsel of Speaker RAYBURN, Majority Leader MCCORMACK, and Senate Leader BARKLEY and thus severed all the life lines which Congress had constructed to hold the line against runaway prices. As the lord high executioner of OPA, President Truman must stand the consequences of what develops.

Particularly in the field of rentals does it seem to me that the President has chosen to make a reckless gamble with the public interest—especially insofar as the veterans are concerned who so badly need housing facilities at a price they can afford to pay. I hope that some form of new rental control can be established without delay, regardless of what the fates have in store for this continuing resolution and for OPA in general.

In conclusion, let me urge my Republican colleagues to join me today in voting for this 20-day continuation of OPA to permit the President to have the time he has requested to work out adjustments between the OPA Act he vetoed and one which he may be willing to support. I hope that even many of you who voted in the negative on Tuesday and Saturday and who may feel that the time has come to end OPA entirely will vote in the affirmative today. If we do nothing more in 20 days than to work out an effective rent-control bill this continuation resolution will be worth while. It is to be hoped that more will be done and that the announcement of the appointment of an able, experienced, business-minded OPA Administrator will be made so that Congress can more confidently vote on new OPA legislation. Such legislation should include a workable formula for decontrolling prices when controls are no longer necessary and it might well include provisions so that wages, along with other costs, should be included in the establishment of OPA ceilings and prices. It should also include provisions for the orderly transition from price controls back to a control-free economy so that the shock of too great and too sudden a change can be cushioned for the protection of the general public.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this continuing resolution, and I urge others to join me in its support. However, I do not have too great a confidence that our work today will save the situation, even though we pass this resolution overwhelmingly. The Senate is likely to act with great deliberation on this matter and it may not act at all. Every day that passes will make more difficult the reenactment of price controls and the reestablishment of essential ceilings on rentals and other necessities of life. However, that is a situation created in the White House for which the House cannot assume responsibility. Let us by our vote today at least demonstrate that once again the great House of Representatives has risen to its responsibilities by meeting a critical situation with prompt action designed to make the best of a bad situation which it did not create but which perhaps it can at least help to cure.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I think I would not have asked for this time if I had not done so before the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] had made their speeches.

I think it is a rather small thing for us to debate and cavil about the question of who is responsible now for the position we find ourselves in. Some may want to lay the responsibility at the door of the President. Somebody else may want to say that the committees were not fast enough in their operations to get the bill before the Congress soon enough. Some may be so particular and meticulous in their way that they would try to say whether it was the Republicans or the Democrats who were responsible for the fact that the bill did not go to the President sooner. That seems to me rather childish in consideration of the position which we find ourselves in today. The fact of the business is I am convinced that when one comes through the door of this Chamber one ought to forget politics in a very large measure and remember that one is the Representative in the Congress of the United States and he has self-responsibility of all the people to the extent of his ability.

So it comes to the question: What are we going to do in the position we find ourselves in? Are we going to say we will not do anything because somebody else did not do something? We cannot afford that as Members of the House of Representatives. The country is involved, the welfare of the people is highly important, and above everything else and every other consideration—and I am glad to see Members on both sides of the aisle take that position—I stand with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from North Dakota. I, too, voted to override the President's veto because I think now I was too fearful that a resolution would not be adopted.

I think we have come to a realization of the fact that we now personally owe a responsibility to the people of the United States, and it does not make any difference who is blamable for anything like a delay that may have occurred. I do not think we will require so much time to bring back a bill. I do not know whether it will be entirely satisfactory to everybody, but all the hearings have been had, many of the witnesses examined, the record is there, and we can move pretty quickly.

I hope the resolution will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, there is no use taking up a lot of time with a political post mortem on: Who killed Cock Robin? I think a dozen amendments in the House killed OPA and inflation control, and I think a dozen amendments in the Senate killed it. I think the President merely pronounced a dead bill officially dead when he sent his veto up here.

Today we are not faced with the question, Who killed OPA? We are faced with a decision on: Where do we go from here?

We are faced with whether we will give this country temporary interim continuation of inflation control for a mere matter of 20 days while the House tries to work out, with the Senate, a better bill than the crippled and mutilated one we sent down.

A vote against this temporary resolution today means that you are voting against production, because no processor and no producer in his right mind is going to engage in all-out production in the present uncertainty as the House and the Senate try to agree on a bill within the next 20 or 30 days. Without a temporary continuing resolution, production will be uncertain.

No one engaged in the production of most of the shortage items today—meat, butter, bread, dairy products—no dairyman, no meat processor, no manufacturer can proceed with any degree of assurance because he does not know whether he will get the subsidy provided in this temporary resolution or not.

Therefore we are apt to see a complete shut-down by almost all of the dairymen, all of the meat processors, who want to continue existing ceilings because they cannot afford to kill and manufacture and process these goods if they are not certain whether they can get the subsidy or not. Surely, if we do not have this temporary continuing resolution they cannot depend upon them.

Then what happens? It takes quite a time before these goods are processed from the raw materials and reach the dealers' counters. All of that inventory that will be built up by retailers in this interim may be at an uncontrolled price. Then these inventories will have to drop down 10, 20, or 30 percent after price control goes back on, should Congress finally agree on a bill for the next year. So business will find itself confused and confounded in an effort to try and operate in this interim unless we pass this simple 20-day continuance. We must let the people of America know where they stand.

Another thing I would like to point out is the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] that we pass only a rent control without other price controls and have that effective for a year.

In the interest of justice and equity do we dare make a guinea pig out of the landlords of the country? I am no lawyer, but may I ask, can the Congress pass a law so there will be no ceilings on anything except rents? Could we control the prices of buckwheat cakes, baby buggies, eggs, or butter selectively?

I do not think we can. I do know a little about law, and on the temple of justice across the plaza it is stated: "Equal justice under the law." I do not believe this Congress can penalize one single group of people and that group alone and make the law stick on rents, even as badly as we all need rent control.

Rent control goes with the rest of the inflation-control program, the program to stabilize the cost of living clear across the board.

We want to do the best possible job we can. I do not think the House, I do not think the Congress, I do not think the courts will recognize that an act simply stabilizing the cost of rents, penalizing one small segment of America only, and letting other costs go through the roof, is legal.

You know what will happen if we tried a law like that. You would have to raise the rent next month 15 percent, the following month 30 percent and the following month 45 percent if you try to do equity to the people who own property. For as the spiral of inflation goes on up, as the cost of their improvements, and so forth, including the maintenance of their property, spirals upward, more and more adjustments would have to be made.

I do not think this Congress wants to single out one group only for control.

Several things have been said about this satisfactory bill that the House sent down to the President. I would like to remind the gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle that the two senior Senators in the conference refused to sign this so-called satisfactory bill, Senator TAFT and Senator MILLIKIN, and one of the senior Members of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], refused to sign the bill.

It seems to me, that this satisfactory bill was neither satisfactory to those who wanted less price control nor to those of us who wanted a bill which we felt was strong enough to prevent inflation. If it was not satisfactory to either side, it could not have been a very effective bill.

This Nation wants effective, not phony, price control until production makes further controls by law unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 1 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1946," and substituting "July 20, 1946."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Oklahoma, something should be said in respect to what attitude the gentlemen he mentioned took. Of three conferees who did not sign the conference report, two of them did not sign it because we eliminated specific decontrols in the bill. Surely the gentleman from Oklahoma is not in favor of that himself. When he states that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] refused to sign the conference report he should have checked his facts on that a little bit because, at the time the conference report was signed about midnight, Mr. CRAWFORD was on his way to the Philippines and was not available to sign the bill. He had not left any instructions what to do, so none of us assumed to have his proxy in that respect.

The reason why the two gentlemen whom he mentioned in the other body did not sign the report was because it did not contain provisions which we had eliminated from it and because specific decontrols had been eliminated it was unsatisfactory to them, not because of the manner in which the conference report came back.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I want to thank the gentleman for the correction regarding the gentleman from Michigan, Representative CRAWFORD. I was not aware of those facts.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, the gentleman apparently has not got his facts straight in reference to the other gentleman either.

Mr. MONRONEY. The very fact that the two Senators refused to sign the report——

Mr. WOLCOTT. They refused to sign it because there were not specific decontrols in it; because they were dissatisfied on account of this bill not going far enough.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes, and a lot of us were dissatisfied because it went too far.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then it was your responsibility to get something that was better.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, of course, it is interesting to hear my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] lay the whole of the OPA troubles onto the Republicans. It is my understanding that the Democrats had a majority in the Congress and also a majority on the Banking Committees in both the House and Senate. It looks like they ought to have been able to bring back a bill that was not such a monstrosity. According to the President, the bill which his party gave to him was impossible. The gentleman from Oklahoma, I assume, signed the conference report.

Mr. MONRONEY. I was not on the conference.

Mr. RIZLEY. Anyhow, you voted for the conference report when it was before the House, the bill which the President says is bad and which he vetoed, and I cannot quite understand now, why you should attempt to lay the whole blame to the three Republican Members of the committees. You had your own Democratic colleagues write the conference report. So you now charge three Republican members on a committee of

14 for this terrible, terrible thing that happened.

Let us analyze what my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] said. The substance of what he said was the same thing that this OPA crowd has been contending for all along, that you cannot decontrol one thing without decontrolling everything. Regardless of supply and demand you must control all or nothing. That was the substance of his argument. Again says my colleague, "We must not let this die because," he said "these cattle producers are not going to keep on producing because there will not be any more subsidies." The cattle producers, bless your heart, have been trying to get rid of this thing for months, they never wanted subsidies. What they want is a fair price and a market place and not subsidies, and I doubt that meat will go up as much as is now paid in subsidies, plus the black market prices, and we will be able to get meat in a legitimate market.

He mentioned rents. I think the most sensible thing that has been offered here today is the resolution by the gentleman from Michigan. Let us analyze it a little. Rent is in a different category than any of these other things. If you take these controls off, we do not know how fast many products which the consumer buys will come back into production. We are hopeful and believe much more quickly than most people contemplate. We do know, however, that you cannot build houses in a few weeks or in a few months, because we do not have the materials. So I think the sane solution of this thing would be to continue this control bill as to rents and let us try without other controls for a while and see whether or not all of this calamity happens that they talk about.

Here is the situation. For weeks and weeks and months two committees of this House worked on a price control bill. They brought in, according to the distinguished Speaker of the House and according to the Majority Leader in the Senate there, what they said was the best bill that it was possible to get. Now we are voting on a resolution here continuing it for 2 weeks. Let me remind you what was said not only by the members of the committee, but the Democratic leaders of the Senate and the House as well. They said, "We must get this conference report approved or we will not get anything." Now you want to go back for 2 weeks in the face of all that and keep this chaotic condition. People do not know where they are. We are asked to get this control bill out today, that is true, but what they are asking us to do is to send it back for 2 weeks and try to enact something that everybody says cannot be enacted. The President said that he would not just take any bill, unless it is substantially the law as it now exists. He will again veto it. Does anybody here think that the House or the Senate, either one, is going to give us the kind of a bill that the President and the CIO-PAC apparently want? Of course, they are not.

We had better pass this resolution offered by the gentleman from Michigan continuing control on rents and then hope the respective States will take care of their own rent situations. I think everyone in this country is patriotic. If the people who produce and if the manufacturers and the retailers and the wholesalers are going to put up prices sky high, this Congress can come back and write a real control bill and put wages in with it. That is one of the troubles we have had. We have not had a control bill. When the Little Steel formula went down the river the President of the United States, I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, was one of the first men that not only bulged the line, but he broke the line when he made the deal with the labor leaders. You cannot have price control unless some limit is placed on wages. The gentleman from Oklahoma as well as myself back in 1943, when the Gore amendment came up, voted for a control bill straight across the board, and the President of the United States then through his majority said "No," and the Congress put controls on everything but left wages alone, and wages have gone on up ever since. They are reflected in everything that is produced or manufactured, they enter into the price of everything the consumer buys, and you cannot have price control without controlling everything that enters into the price.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 1, lines 5 and 8, after the word "July", strike out the figure "20" and insert the figure "10."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, simply to direct the attention of the Chair to it, that section 2 has not been read; therefore it is not in order to offer an amendment to it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is correct. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment to include only the first section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 1, line 5, after the word "July", strike out the figure "20" and insert the figure "10."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have "thrashed a lot of old straw" today. It is amazing what difficulties can arise from a veto. I am reminded now of when Winston Churchill graced the rostrum here and held up his fingers to indicate the V for victory, but I think in the lexicon of Mr. Truman "V" is now for veto; but it offers no comfort because we have a difficulty to contend with.

I fancy the most important and most impressive thing the President of the United States said in the veto message was that part in which he said, "Production slow-downs will develop due to price uncertainties." Why let it continue for 20 days? Why let uncertainty with its clammy hand reach into every enterprise, large and small, in the United States of America?

I had a call from Chicago a moment ago. I understand that live cattle on the Chicago market this morning jumped from 18 to 25 cents. "Shall we buy or shall we not buy? Shall we buy suits or shall we not buy suits?" Whether it is large business or small business, that uncertainty begins to upset the whole free enterprise structure of the country. Why let it continue? Why let the agony be prolonged for a period of 20 days? Is not 10 days enough?

You know very well what is going to happen. It is always rather perilous to be prophetic, but as I see it this is what is going to happen. This resolution probably will be adopted by this House this afternoon. It will go to another body. It will be referred to the appropriate committee, on Banking and Currency. It is entirely new matter. Let me say to you that another body does not easily and idly come by that characterization of the world's greatest deliberative body. They are going to deliberate because this is new matter. I have been over checking a little this afternoon to see what the possibilities are. It may run on for 2 or 3 weeks or for 4 weeks, and so the agony is prolonged, and where is the whole free enterprise structure of the country, not knowing which way to turn?

Is the difficulty so insoluble? I fancy from what I heard in the veto message and in the President's speech on Saturday night that the principal bone of contention is that amendment that accepts the base period of 1941 for cost purposes and then adds the accruing costs. Would it be so difficult for the conferees or, for that matter, for all the members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and the members of the same committee of another body to sit down in sweet fellowship for just about 2 hours and determine what they are going to do? They require no 20 days to do it. They require, as a matter of fact, not 10 days to do it. It can be done within a space of a few hours if it is a question of whether they are going to agree or disagree. They can make up their minds within a period of a single day. But if this runs on until July 20 there will be confusion worse confounded in every corner of the country—so why not shorten the time? If I had my way, and if July 4 was not an official holiday, I would have made it the 4th day of July and then we would know whether there would be an observance of a second Declaration of Independence. But I am willing to err on the charitable side and make it 10 days. That will serve as a pressure upon those in another body who will then have the responsibility of disposing of this resolution. But to let it run on for 20 days is going to bring confusion to every line of enterprise in every section of the country and there will be indescribable bewilderment. I sincerely hope we do not do that. I think in that one respect the President was right. There will be confusion out of that kind of uncertainty. So I recommend to

you that we shorten the time by making the date July 10 and thus resolve this issue at the earliest possible date for the benefit of the country.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, certainly the gentleman from Illinois realizes the purpose for which we ask a 20-day extension. He says he is very generous in offering an amendment to make it 10 days. But we know how slow the processes of legislation are. We have heard the Chairman criticized today because he did not accede to the wishes of the Committee. If he had acceded, we would have been holding these hearings until the first of next year. Certainly the Congress is not going to cavil about 10 days which would utterly destroy the purpose of the resolution and which would make it impossible to act. I think if we are given 20 days we may have an opportunity to come to some conclusion, but certainly we can not do it in 10 days.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. It seems to me the gentleman from Illinois contradicts himself and is talking beside the point. The issue before us is to continue the OPA for 20 days as it was.

Mr. SPENCE. That is the purpose. The purpose is to give the Committee time to consider and try to come to some conclusion which will satisfy the President and those who have to administer the law.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman will recall when he appeared before the Committee on Rules there had been suggestions in the Congress and in the debate here about 15 days and 2 weeks. I suggested in the Committee on Rules what I thought would be desirable, that is, to limit the time to 2 weeks. I have sent to the Clerk's desk an amendment making such provision. Am I correct in understanding that the Chairman of the Committee would not be averse to a 2-week limitation rather than 20 days?

Mr. SPENCE. No, it seems that some of my colleagues have become very miserly with time just recently. It seems to me 2 weeks would not give us the same opportunity as 20 days. I do not think 20 days is an unreasonable request. If you followed the advice of the argument of the gentleman from Illinois, you ought to give us only 1 day.

Mr. HALLECK. I am certainly not urging anything that is out of reason. The fact of the business is that during the time this resolution is in effect this condition of uncertainty will continue throughout the country. The gentleman's committee held long hearings and gave careful consideration to this whole matter. My view is that the best interests of the country could be served by settling it as expeditiously as possible. It occurs to me that 2 weeks would be ample time for the Committee and the Congress to give it consideration.

Mr. SPENCE. May I answer the gentleman by saying there is no limitation on the time within which we could settle. If we are given 20 days to settle it and if we can settle the matter earlier than that, it would be within our province to do so.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The type of debate that is going on now is the reason why you need all the time you can get. This is the very type that has caused delay. The conference brought the bill in at the last hour, at twilight, and now we are aroused because the President exercised his prerogative and vetoed it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that in this resolution it provides for July 20?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. That does not mean we will have 20 days in which to get together on a bill, because what time the other body takes to consider this comes out of that time between now and July 20. So we certainly need enough time.

Mr. SPENCE. It is certainly not an unreasonable time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman. I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has the floor and has offered an amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia to the amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Strike out "July 10, 1946" and insert "September 1, 1946."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the respite offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is so brief and so inadequate as in my judgment to be totally futile. As indicated by the chairman of the committee a moment ago, we all know the legislative processes. This measure must pass the House. It then must be passed by the other body, where it will probably be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. We know just as well as that we are here that most of the time for this extension is going to be consumed in legislative processes. Now, this is a serious situation. Let us do something or let us make up our minds we are not going to do anything, and let the country know it. To merely give this respite of 10 days, proposed by the gentleman from Illinois which is going to be consumed in debate in the legislative processes, we had better not do anything. I have suggested a period of 60 days. That is September 1. I think that should give adequate time for sober consideration of the grave differences that exist between the legislative and executive agencies. Let us get this matter straight, once and for all, and let us have time within which to do it.

There is another thing which is equally if not more important. When you enact new legislation, as you are planning to do, and send it down to the White House and get it signed and enacted into law, the OPA has to change all of its regulations to meet the changed conditions. Do you think it is fair to OPA or to the business world or to the purchasers of commodities that we should pass a law one day and expect the OPA and the country to recognize it and put it into effect the next day? Now, stop and think about that for a minute, whether you are for this or against it. That is not the fair way to do it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I decline to yield.

When we do pass this legislation, if we do, we ought to pass it in ample time so that the OPA will know where they stand before the law becomes effective, so that the public will know where they stand. Then, we can get an orderly process. Let us have ample time to get this straightened out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to correct a statement made by the gentleman from Virginia. The gentleman's statement was to the effect the OPA was required to change rules on June 30 under which they must operate on July 1.

If the gentleman had studied the bill which was vetoed by the President, he would have found that it contained a provision giving OPA a reasonable period of time in which to make adjustments in their regulations, bringing them into compliance with the new law. As a matter of fact we specifically said in the law that the old regulations and price formulas would be continued for 30 days. We gave the OPA 30 days in which to make such adjustments as they saw fit in order to bring the new standards and adjustments into keeping with the new type of bill.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Since the question of extension of time has come up for consideration in the last few minutes, I should like to ask the gentleman from Michigan whether the 7th day of November next would not be a proper date for it to terminate?

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. Is it not possible that at the end of this 20 days they might come back and ask for another 20 days or even more?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; and if we continue this to August 31 or September 1 we merely continue the uncertainty that much longer rather than only for 20 days.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The committee took 4½ months to collect the evidence on which the bill we presented to the President was based. What new evidence could possibly be submitted to the Congress or has been?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No new evidence has been submitted and I might state there is no new evidence or argument which has been presented in the last week which has not been presented throughout the months of hearings before the Committees on Banking and Currency of both Houses.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The President vetoed this bill because he found it defective, and all the safeguards the gentleman was talking about were nullified by the veto. This means they have got to start over again. We cannot hark back to any provisions carried in the vetoed bill.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. At the time the President submitted his veto message he asked for 20 days' time in which a study could be made and a new bill passed. I am willing to vote for the 20 days; I shall vote for the 20 days, and shall vote against any proposal for a greater number of days at the present time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman wants to know what new evidence there is. If the gentleman who propounded the query and others will read today's papers they will see what outrageous increases in price have already taken place today. That in itself is sufficient evidence to stir us to action in the interest of the consumer and in the interest of the American people.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think it may be said, and I have told those who sought specific decontrols, especially on meat, that if it so happened that meat was specifically decontrolled and the price went up unusually high the American people would rise in their righteous wrath and be back here insisting that these controls be put back, and that if that happened they would be put back with a vengeance, and they would not come off in a matter of weeks or months and perhaps not in a matter of years. I think all industry will be hurt if they allow prices to go to unwarranted heights, for the American Congress is going to reflect the attitude of the righteously indignant people under those circumstances and put these controls back on. We are not of course going to know in 24 hours what is going to be the answer, and apparently the other body is going to take a little time to see what is going to happen before they take any action at all. What happens to prices within the next week probably will determine what kind of price control we have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, are only members of the Banking and Currency Committee to be given an opportunity to speak on this resolution even under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. SPENCE. I renew the unanimous consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHORT) there were—ayes 131, noes 107.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BROWN of Georgia and Mr. SHORT.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 142, noes 119.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHORT moves to strike out all after the enacting clause.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is not a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is not in proper form.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 83, noes 166.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN of New York: On page 1, line 5, after the word "substituting" strike out "July 20, 1946," and insert in lieu thereof "January 20, 1947."

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if we are going to be honest with ourselves and the American public in this crisis—and it is a crisis—everyone here has said so—that confronts the country, the only honest thing we can do is continue price control throughout the summer into the next session of Congress. It seems to me that those of us here have got to cut bait or fish, and that applies to each side of the aisle as well as the executive department. I do not conceive of this as a Republican problem or a Democratic problem. It is an American problem. I can tell those of you who have said here that the telegrams on price control come from hysterical people and from rabble rousers that those in my community, 90 percent at least of whom are in favor of price control, are not rabble rousers and are not hysterical. They are frightened people when they see the way prices go up when this price control is suddenly lifted. All we ask is that this should be continued until production and demand reach a point of reasonable balance in the economy of the Nation. Certainly we ought to permit the American people to speak on this question at the polls at the election and let the next Congress decide. Under my amendment they would have the same amount of time to decide whether this is to be continued or not as they would have under this resolution. Mr. Chairman, there is a second amendment to the next section which obviously provides the same date because the date has to be changed in the other section to correspond and when that amendment comes up I do not intend to continue the discussion by seeking recognition. It seems to me that the arguments pro and con on this whole business have been threshed out on the floor of the House for weeks and weeks. We do not need further debate. I submit this amendment in good faith and I point out to you that the Senate in 6 days, 6 months, or 6 years probably will not change the thing but at least this gives the same opportunity to these as a continuing resolution. I earnestly hope you will support the amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am sorry, sir, that while I was busily engaged in counting the teller vote, I did not have time to write out the preferential motion in proper form.

It is a bit strange that standing here on my feet for the past 20 minutes I would be denied an opportunity to be heard. Not that I count my voice so convincing but at least those of us who oppose this iniquitous resolution should have their day in court. I want only to be fair, but will not have a repugnant measure crammed down my throat without protest. Some may surrender but I have never, nor will I ever, cowardly capitulate.

Mr. Chairman, heaven knows we have enough confusion now in this country. If this resolution is passed in the form now presented, I fear chaos will really reign.

It is now more than a year since the unconditional surrender of Germany. It will soon be a year since the total capitulation of Japan. We have had 4 years of war and 1 year of peace. When those two wars ended we had the biggest pent-up demand for civilian goods in all our history. This was caused by the sacrifices and self-denials made by our people and the accumulated shortages during 4 years of war. We also had, on VJ-day, not only the best domestic market and the biggest demand for goods but also the American

people, because of extraordinarily high wartime wages, and accumulated savings, had the greatest purchasing power in our history.

By all rules of the game we should have entered immediately, or very shortly after final victory, upon an era of unprecedented production and unparalleled prosperity, because both the demand and the purchasing power for goods were present.

It must also be remembered that many of our wartime plants and industries began their reconversion programs long before the collapse of Japan.

The natural, normal, and expected prosperity, however, did not follow and today, after a year of peace, our country is bogged down in its reconversion program. Selfishness, greed, and strife are to be seen on every hand. An epidemic of strikes has brought about commercial and industrial paralysis.

Our people are still being regimented by New Deal politicians in Washington who want to maintain indefinitely wartime controls. They are more interested in retaining their autocratic power than they are in setting the people free.

The infinite red tape and voluminous, intricate, and contradictory rules and regulations by an overgrown, arrogant, and arbitrary bureaucracy have stifled initiative and enterprise, cut down effort and production, and retarded reconversion and recovery. Today in this land of plenty we are faced with scarcity. One cannot buy butter. It is hard to get meat. The shelves of our dry-goods stores, hardware stores, and lumber yards are empty. We still have raw materials and the tools and skilled labor to produce goods, but both OPA and CPA, by their artificial controls, have reduced output. By increasing wages and costs and by freezing price ceilings, more than a million small businesses have been liquidated in the past 2 or 3 years.

The other side of the picture is just as bad. In 1940 we had $6,500,000,000 in circulation—money not in banks. Today we have twenty-six and one-half billions in circulation, or more than four times as much as at the outbreak of the war.

But what will your dollar buy?

Men and nations are not made rich by printing money. We have plenty of money but no goods. In fact, money is about the cheapest thing we have, but unfortunately men can neither eat nor wear it.

Our greatest need today is to stop printing money and begin producing goods, because money without goods will drive us to a ruinous inflation.

By creating scarcity and running our printing presses, the prices of all commodities are increased and black markets everywhere flourish. The Government loses revenue on bootleg transactions and our people pay exorbitant prices for inferior goods. Americans are tired of dealing under the counter. Let us be frank, forthright, and honest.

Competition in an open and free market will automatically bring about fair prices. Congress cannot repeal the natural economic law of supply and demand. There will be temporary fluctuations but under our free system, prices will naturally and normally adjust themselves. We will have an ample supply at a reasonable cost. Goods will bring no more and no less than they are actually worth.

Not only increased production is a cure of inflation but the American people should exercise common sense and self-restraint for just a few weeks. If we refused to buy things we did not really need or want, prices on every commodity would quickly be reduced and we would get back to where honest and decent people really live. I am not advocating a consumers' strike but I do wish to point out we should not be foolish and frantic—in spite of the OPA's psychology of fear—to purchase anything which we really do not need.

Future historians will call this the age of chiselization, and for very good and indisputable reasons. The OPA has made chiselers, cheats, cowards, and crooks out of good, loyal, law-abiding, honest American citizens.

The OPA is the same old political siren as the NRA. She now wears gingham instead of calico. Her aims, purposes, and methods are very much the same. She wants to get the halter around the necks of both business and workers and force them into a strait-jacket of regimentation.

Do we still want to maintain our American system of individual initiative and private enterprise, or adopt the foreign ideologies of mass regimentation and nationalization of the Nation's business?

After furnishing not only the 12,000,000 men and women in our own armed forces, but also those of our allies with the sinews of war—munitions, food, and clothing—it is now a bit strange that we should be asked or compelled to forsake the American system and adopt a plan of some foreign country that proved insufficient for the day.

This resolution as framed is innocuous, and no more than shadow boxing. It is false and deceptive. It tries to resurrect a skeleton. Though the corpse has been dead only since last midnight and its body is still warm, it yet stinks. Dead or alive—it is rotten. Like a mackerel in the moonlight, it shines and stinks, stinks and shines.

Mr. Chairman, a thing that is basically wrong and fundamentally unsound, contrary to our whole philosophy of government, cannot be made right.

This measure needs not amendment, but extinction; not a physician, but an undertaker.

Let us bury it deep to remove the foul stench from all decent breathing Americans.

For many months our House Committee on Banking and Currency held long hearings, and finally made its report. The same committee in the other body did likewise. We passed a bill, sent it to the White House where it was vetoed over the protest of the leaders of the majority party in both Houses.

Never have I questioned the motives of any man, nor shall I do it now, but I do say that the administration that is now in power with a majority in both Houses for the past 14 years will have its own way. If there be failure, whom can anyone blame except the party that is in power, that has the majority in both Houses, and on every committee?

Mr. Chairman, this is not a political issue, but is an American question and we all should face it squarely. Frankly, I do not like some of the political sparring and parliamentary maneuvering that has been going on on each side this aisle. I believe that an overwhelming majority on both sides knows that it is bad legislation and that the OPA should end.

However, some men want to carry water on both shoulders until after the election. They blow hot and cold in the same breath and are unwilling to fish or cut bait. Better should they stand up and be counted and stop their pussyfooting. The American people will not forever be deceived.

When are we going to end this intolerable situation? Shall we postpone it indefinitely? There are some who would rather maintain wartime controls than to surrender their extraordinary powers voted under the cry of emergency. They are more interested in retaining their autocratic powers than in setting the people free.

For myself, sir, I hope and pray as I have often said, that we shall forever keep America a land where every man can walk the earth his own king, the equal lord of every other man, to go his own way, work out his own will, weave into the warp and woof of magic days the dreams that haunt, the duties that inspire and urge him on.

Though I may be helpless I still want to live my own life and do not wish to become a ward of the Government. I would rather live in freedom and fail than to be bossed by a tyrant and succeed—according to the tyrant's standard.

Benjamin Franklin, one of our wisest philosphers, greatest statesmen, and unexcelled patriots, once said:

> He who surrenders a little liberty for temporary security deserves neither and will soon lose both.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I will not take the 5 minutes, but I want to say the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], speaks of prosperity. What about the man on a fixed salary? What about the people on retirement pay? Let us do a little thinking here. Let us vote for a continuation of this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BALDWIN of New York) there were—ayes 84, noes 159.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. BROWN of Georgia,

and Mr. BALDWIN of New York to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 82; noes 168.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Stabilization act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1946" and substituting July 20, 1946."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if this is a Macedonian cry or not, but I do know that it is an appeal to the Congress of the United States, and to the House of Representatives for courage and for leadership. I know of no time in my brief experience here when we have so badly needed those characteristics as we need them now.

We have had presented to us a request for an extension of the present OPA. I was by accident in a newsreel theater on Saturday evening when the President spoke. It seemed to me to be the speech of a somewhat frightened man who was concerned over a condition he himself had brought about. The incident which impressed me, and which I have not heard anybody else mention, is that when he called upon the OPA employees to stand at their "battle stations" there was audible laughter in the audience.

I believe the people of the United States, as evidenced by their attitude and the telegrams that have come to me, and the telegrams that have come to many other Representatives, are looking to the Congress of the United States to bring order out of this confusion.

Repeatedly this afternoon reference has been made to these telegrams and letters. One Member spoke of a flood of telegrams. Well, let us see: I have received 26 telegrams, including 1 radiogram from Tokyo. I will take for granted that the sender of the radiogram is from my district, when he is home. Two others were from the secretary of the California CIO Council, in San Francisco—one as the secretary, the other as an individual. A fourth was from Los Angeles and I will print it here.

Destroy OPA. Wage earning families, two veterans, can't get butter, meat, bread, suits, underwear, linens, refrigerators, lumber, automobiles, because of OPA. Please restore freedom. No British loans.

I congratulate the three signers of this telegram, Albert L. Hess, C. L. Reigelman, and Margaret Wheeler Hess, on their understanding of the present situation in the United States. They put the blame exactly where it belongs.

That leaves 24 telegrams from my district; not exactly a flood, in my opinion. Of the 24, 13 of the telegrams, signed by 31 people, want the immediate end of the OPA; they do not want any pulmotor used on the body sent to Congress by the President last Saturday. Three more telegrams, signed by three people, want rent controls only, and two other wires, signed by five people, want controls kept on both rents and food. Only five wires, signed by six people, want the OPA continued, and then I have one wire from the acting chairman of a local chapter of the American Veterans Committee also asking for the reenactment of the OPA controls.

This makes 13 wires against OPA; 5 for partial controls, and 6 for OPA; and it makes 31 individuals against OPA, 8 for partial controls, and 7 for OPA. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this is not a flood of telegrams overwhelming the Congress with demands that OPA be saved.

More people in the United States still have confidence in the Congress than the majority party seems to realize, and particularly the majority members of the Banking and Currency Committee.

There is not a Member of this House who does not know that whether OPA controls are removed today, 10 days from now, 20 days from now, or 6 months from now there will follow a short period of confusion. We would do better to have the operation now and start the economic body of the Nation toward recovery. It has been said that steers are selling on the Chicago and Omaha markets for $25 instead of the OPA "loss ceiling" of $18. If so, I am surprised it is not more. That would do little more than take up the historically deceptive subsidies the OPA has been trying to fool us with. These would be only the first cattle offered after the death of price controls. More cattle will head immediately for the markets. It means the prices will come down. We have more cattle in the United States, almost, than we have ever had. I have said repeatedly that the end of controls will mean more meat, and cheaper meat, allowing for subsidies, on most of the common cuts.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Because cattle are up on the Chicago and Omaha markets does not mean that the price of meat will be going up in the retail markets all over the country, because that is merely the black market price some people are already paying for their meat.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I just learned that cattle were selling in Omaha today for $22.50, and I understand that the top price in Chicago was about the same. The gentleman well knows that the cattle had to go up about 3 or 4 cents to compensate for the loss of the subsidies.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I know very well also that they are going into the regular markets and will therefore go into the regular distribution channels and not into the black market.

We have large crops of deciduous fruits, yet OPA decontrolled some of them, and left pears, with the second largest crop in the history of that commodity, with a ceiling under which the producer will take a loss if he ships. Potatoes are not being harvested in some areas. We have a great wheat crop. Fluid milk is at top production.

It was said here today that one market, I think in Chicago, was selling butter at 99 cents. Think a minute before getting excited. The OPA ceiling on wholesale butter was about 56 cents and the cream it took to make a pound of butter cost about 70 cents. Would you make butter? With the ceiling off and subsidies out of the way, butter will be about 75 cents, perhaps more, but probably not 99 cents. This 99-cent butter is the black market butter going back on the regular shelves at that price instead of the black market price of $1.25, which black-market buyers in Chicago and New York and Los Angeles have been paying for it. If the customer has been going without butter for months and months, let her go without 99-cent butter for a few weeks more and the price will adjust itself, but Mr. Speaker, there will be butter.

There will be meat, through regular channels, not through unsanitary and wasteful black markets. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] told several days ago how pancreatic products were in short supply because black-market operators do not make these products from slaughtered steers. There will be suits and underwear and refrigerators and lumber and the other things the veterans want, referring again to the telegram I quoted.

I see no advantage in a temporary renewal. We can just as well work on a regular bill. A temporary renewal will add to the present confusion. Supplies will not come to the markets, if there is still danger of losing on every shipment. Farmers and manufacturers and consumers will not know if OPA is alive or dead. Let us have courage to vote against the short extension; then vote for the Wolcott amendment to renew rent control, until this can be worked out, and then refuse all other controls which were killed Saturday by the President.

If the vetoed bill had continued the arbitrary powers of Mr. Bowles, I doubt if it would have been vetoed. It gave supervision of foods to the Secretary of Agriculture, and it set up an independent decontrol board for other commodities. It was vetoed, and it is a curious thing that the veto message had no suggestion of the style of the President, but had a remarkable similarity in style to the recent radio speeches of Chester Bowles.

This is a time for courage and for leadership in the House of Representatives.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I was rather surprised and, I might say, actually shocked by the statement made on the floor of this House that there were more cattle on the hoof, more meat in the lockers, and the crops were abundant with food more plentiful than ever, and still we have scarcities in the retail stores today. The housewives are crying for bread, butter, meat, and clothing. If

that is true, and I have no doubt but that it is true, then who is responsible for the black market? It is the big packers who are trying to browbeat the people into submission. It is the manufacturers who have deliberately withheld those things from the market in order to break down controls in this Nation. This is what I call a real strike. A strike to wring your last dollar or war bond from you.

Might I ask you now, you who have opposed labor, you who have criticized the strikes, who is on strike against the American people, in view of the statements that were made on the floor of this House? You know it is the packers and manufacturers of this Nation and those who would destroy price controls. Yes, might I say, and I say this honestly, that a big majority of the Republican Party with the exception of a very few like, for instance, my good friends, HOMER RAMEY, JOE BALDWIN, DICK WELCH, CHARLEY LA-FOLLETTE, and a few others are on strike against the people today. You people were responsible for the loading down of the OPA with crippling amendments. Let us call a spade a spade. It is an actual fact, and you know it. You will get regular order next November, and the regular order will be an exodus of the people going down to the polls to show those who opposed OPA that the will of the people will rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, there is another responsibility for the inflation which today hangs over this country. That responsibility lies with the Members of the Congress who voted before the war and who have voted since the war to spend Federal money in excess of receipts, and lo, those in the Congress who have been the greatest spenders are the ones who, too late, now recognize the sickness they have created and cry out loudest for the opiate known as OPA. It is too late for opiates.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I voted this afternoon for the amendment for a 60-day extension of OPA and for a 6-month extension, because I feel very profoundly that whatever Congress does should be a real extension; both of these amendments were defeated, and we are now back to where we started from this afternoon. I want to say that this 20-day proposition is a 100-percent phony. In the first place, we all know that the Senate is not going to pass this 20-day proposition. In the second place, we also know that if a 20-day bill were passed by both bodies today, it would calm nobody, comfort nobody, and reassure nobody, because we would still have complete uncertainty as to what the policy would be 20 days from now. We simply cannot get away from the fact that until the Congress determines upon a long-time policy and until the President approves that policy, or until the Congress enacts that policy over his veto, there is going to be confusion, turbulence, and uncertainty.

There is only one kind of new evidence that we can secure now while we are deliberating on what our price control policy should be, and that is how the United States acts with controls off, what element of self-control there is left in the American people, how prices function when there is no OPA. We will get that evidence and that evidence will be valuable in our consideration. But if we pass here a 20-day phony, letting anybody think that there is going to be real price control for the next 20 days, I think we are cowards.

If we had voted first to extend OPA for a substantial period, for 60 days or 6 months, then this House would have considered carefully what kind of extension we wanted and amendments would have been adopted to show the kind of extension we favored. Now it looks as if the House is going to pass this 20-day phony, without amendments, without even bothering about the fact that we are merely amending a dead law, and have put in no words that would revive it.

I have felt sure and feel sure of one thing, that unless and until we act on a long-time policy we are fooling ourselves and fooling the people.

The President asked for a workable OPA law. People are wiring me to vote for a workable law. I think the law we sent to the President was workable. In any case, a 20-day extension of a law that even the President says needs at least five changes, is a completely unworkable proposition. Mark my words, a 20-day extension just will not work.

But some of my colleagues are saying, this is an emergency; the President demands it. Well, I remember Saturday, May 25, when the President demanded an emergency law to stop a railroad strike against the Government. I voted for the bill he handed us, although I had no time to study it. I found out later that the emergency was a phony; that he knew when he started to talk to us that afternoon that there was no railroad strike. From now on I am remembering that Truman-announced emergencies may be merely an excuse for him and his crowd to ask for more power.

This present proposition, of a 20-day amendment of a dead law, will help no one, not even President Truman, and in the end will fool no one except those who vote for it thinking they are helping someone, or fooling someone.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments to offer to this resolution, but due to the limitations of time and the closing of debate I have not had an opportunity to offer either one of them. I do not suppose it would be possible for me to make any contribution to this argument that will have any effect whatsoever. However, I do not want the record to be barren and to show that someone at the time when amendments could be offered has not at least attempted to offer an amendment that would in effect commit this Congress to an effective price-control program for whatever period the extension is to be.

I do not care what the legislative council says with respect to this legislation, I know that this resolution was drawn with the idea that it would be passed last Saturday before the expiration of the present law. I say as a matter of common sense and the legalistic application of legal principles to this resolution that you are not going to accomplish the purpose that you intended. So I had at the Clerk's desk two amendments, one to the first section and one to the second section, which would reenact the provisions of the Stabilization Act and reenact the price-control law, and thus not have any question raised as to whether or not we are engaging in a mere futility by the adoption of this resolution. I submitted the amendments to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and he was inclined to agree that the amendments should be offered. Then, after consultation with someone whom he identified as the legislative counsel for the committee, he came to the conclusion that the amendments would be superfluous. All I have to say to my colleagues is that sometime if this ultimately passes and you are attempting to protect prices and rents under the Stabilization and Price Control Acts, somebody will raise the question in the court as to whether or not you have in fact extended either act for the 20-day period. Then perhaps you will think that perhaps somebody should have raised this question here on the floor. It is too late now to do anything about it due to the steamroller tactics.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply with respect to operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation until July 20, 1946: *Provided*, That no new subsidy or purchase and sale operations shall be undertaken under the authority of this section, and no change shall be made in the basis of any operations existing on June 29, 1946, for which funds are made available under this section which will increase the rate of any subsidy or the rate of loss incurred with respect to any commodity.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this joint resolution shall take effect as of June 30, 1946, except as to offenses committed subsequent to June 30, 1946, and prior to the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, and no suit, action, or prosecution shall be instituted with respect to any such offenses.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: On page 2, in line 16, at the end of the bill, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. That whenever any State or subdivision thereof, which shall have established provisions for the control and regulation of the rent of housing accommodations within its boundaries, notifies the United States Administrator or official controlling and regulating housing accommodations rents that it is prepared to assume such regulation and control, no provision relating to rent of

housing accommodations of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be applicable within such State or subdivision thereof."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered indicates the direction in which we may move to decentralize Federal control and add to governmental efficiency. In a sentence it proposes that when a State or subdivision of a State shall assume responsibility with regard to rent and shall notify the proper officials of the Federal Government that it is prepared to assume that responsibility, then the activities of the Federal organization in that community shall cease.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. How will this affect the veterans' emergency housing program which contemplates that the Expediter will permit people to build homes for veterans at a certain price if they do not rent the dwellings that are built over a certain amount? In other words, we would not want the States to go in there and interrupt the veterans' emergency housing program.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. I assure my colleague that I have checked in on that and I find that the Expediter will not operate under the powers to be effected by the proposed amendment. The Expediter does not have to do directly with rent control. I understand that before he will agree that building material be used, there must be an agreement as to rent to be charged. He does not otherwise have to do with rents.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Many States have a provision in their constitution, including I think the gentleman's State constitution, prohibiting impairment of a contract.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. I have your point.

Mr. GORE. I wondered how effective that could be.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The Federal Constitution provides that a State may not enact legislation impairing the obligation of contracts. It is held by the Supreme Court of the United States that notwithstanding that provision the States may control rents in congested areas. The State of New York, following World War I, enacted exactly that sort of legislation. It was challenged on the ground that it was in violation of the Federal Constitution. The case went to the Supreme Court, and in a most specific and clear sort of determination, the Supreme Court held that that legislation on the part of the State did not violate such a provision of the Constitution or that to which the gentleman refers. It is held that such legislation falls within the broad police power of the State, and is not affected by the prohibition that States may not enact laws impairing the obligation of contracts.

In the case of *Levy Leasing Co.* v. *Siegel* (258 U. S., p. 242) appealed from a decision of the Supreme Court of the State of New York to the Supreme Court of the United States, the constitutionality of the emergency housing law of the State of New York was sustained. Mr. Justice Clark of the Supreme Court delivering the opinion for the Court, the Court held:

The warrant for this legislative resort to the police power was the conviction on the part of the State legislators that there existed in the larger cities of the State a social emergency, caused by an insufficient supply of dwelling houses and apartments, so grave that it constituted a serious menace to the health, morality, comfort, and even to the peace of a large part of the people of the State. That such an emergency, if it really existed, would sustain a resort, otherwise valid, to the police power for the purpose of dealing with it cannot be doubted, for, unless relieved, the public welfare would suffer in respects which constitute the primary and undisputed, as well as the most usual, basis and justification for exercise of that power (police power).

If this Court were disposed, as it is not, to ignore the notorious fact that a grave social problem has arisen from the insufficient supply of dwellings in all large cities of this and other countries, resulting from the cessation of building activities incident to the war, nevertheless, these reports and the very great respect which courts must give to the legislative declaration that an emergency existed would be amply sufficient to sustain an appropriate resort to the police power for the purpose of dealing with it in the public interest.

The Court concluded with this language:

Given a constitutional substantive statute, enacted to give effect to a constitutional purpose, the States have wide discretion as to the remedies which may be deemed necessary to achieve such a result and it is very clear that that discretion has not been exceeded in this instance by the State of New York.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. If the State and the Federal Government both exercise the power, they have concurrent jurisdiction with reference to this?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This amendment provides that if the State will exercise its power and assume the responsibility, the Federal Government moves out of the picture.

Mr. SPENCE. But now, both exercise the same functions?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; they may. This amendment would remove all possibility of conflict.

Mr. SPENCE. Would you not have fragmentary and uncoordinated control if you gave it to the States, without any overseeing provision by the Federal Government?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Not at all. The city of Flint, Mich., has always exercised this power, and I am assured they are doing a good job up there.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. I just wanted to add that New York has a law establishing a moratorium on the foreclosure of mortgages, and that law has been sustained.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. I do not understand why people who believe in the philosophy of government that we profess to believe in, are not willing to have their State undertake to discharge this responsibility in their community, at least if they are willing to do so.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. COMBS. Is it not a fact that the Constitution of the State of Texas, in the article dealing with the bill of rights of such State, forbids impairment of contracts?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. COMBS. And under that very provision our Supreme Court held unconstitutional the moratorium law in Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am not advised. It might be so. I know that the Supreme Court of the State of New York held that a law of that State regulating rents was a constitutional exercise of its broad police power and the Supreme Court of the United States with the question squarely before it held that such regulation and control did not violate the Federal constitutional provision prohibiting a State from enacting legislation impairing the obligation of contract; that such legislation was within the States' police powers which were not interfered with by this constitutional provision.

Mr. Chairman, this is the proposed amendment:

That whenever any State or subdivision thereof, which shall have established provisions for the control and regulation of the rent of housing accommodations within its boundaries, notifies the United States Administrator or official controlling and regulating housing accommodations rents that it is prepared to assume such regulation and control, no provision relating to rent of housing accommodations of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or of any other act shall be applicable within such State or subdivision thereof.

Mr. Chairman, the various communities of the States can do this job better than the agents of a great organization centering in Washington. But that is not the most important reason for the adoption. The thing which makes this proposed amendment of very great importance now is that it is a definite movement against the present trend toward the decentralization of governmental power; a definite movement toward putting back in the States governmental powers within their governmental capacity. It is a movement toward reestablishing the governmental sovercignty of the States and toward having the people again look to their States as the responsible sovereign agency of general government, local domestic government. It is a movement toward what we profess to believe in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. At the time I offered my amendment to section 1, I stated that I had an amendment which I wanted considered at the same time with reference to section 2. In order to get the record straight I would like unanimous consent to have had that considered at the same time. It simply changes the dates in the two paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering just what shape this proposition would leave the State of New York in. We have a rent-control law; we have a commissioner in charge of the operation. The whole thing is functioning, regulations have been promulgated, and it is in effect. If this rent-control amendment were adopted, I am wondering how it would operate. I am wondering what would happen, whether or not the State of New York would have to make a certificate to the Federal Government. I am rather inclined to believe that the amendment would tend to result in considerable confusion, and I am inclined to believe, also, that it would be a little difficult to handle with the picture that the gentleman from Texas presented to us when he was on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] made practically the point I wish to make. We have a rent-control law in the State of New York and it went vigorously into effect yesterday. The State rent law operates under the sovereign power of the State of New York. For the life of me I cannot see just where this amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas would either benefit or injure us. I think it would lead to some confusion.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I suggest to the gentleman that this would not at all disturb the State of New York if it assumed responsibility for rent control; it could not.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Representatives from New York appeared at the hearing and wanted a State amendment, perhaps not precisely like that offered by the gentleman from Texas, but they wanted that in principle.

Mr. HANCOCK. If the gentleman will yield, it simply means that where a State has taken over rents the Government will stay out. How can there be any objection to that from the standpoint of New York?

Mr. REED of New York. I have no objection if the State of New York still retains its sovereign rights.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield, would not the amendment produce conflict between State law and Federal law?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; I think it would.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, let us live by the rules of the game. It was announced here on the floor by the chairman of my committee just before we voted on the President's veto that a resolution would be offered at the suggestion of the President, asking for 20 days to consider another bill. It was contemplated that nothing would be in the resolution beyond the 20 days' extension so that the Banking and Currency Committee of the House could go carefully into all phases of another bill. I think, since the President's veto was sustained, we certainly ought to carry out his wishes.

I believe this amendment ought to be considered by the Banking and Currency Committee. It was the purpose of the rule when granted that matters dealing with OPA would be sent to the Banking and Currency Committee and there we could take up every phase of OPA. To come in here with one amendment to change rents, means opening the resolution to many amendments.

Let us carry out the wishes of the President as they were stated by the chairman of my committee when the President's veto was sustained. If you are going to deal with rent in the resolution, it would be germane to introduce many amendments, including the bill that the President vetoed.

Now let us be fair to all parties concerned and take back to the Banking and Currency Committee all phases of the OPA for consideration and carry out the wishes of the President, or make the resolution open to all amendments, including the bill he vetoed. If the Banking and Currency Committee is going to consider another bill, it should not be hampered by this resolution.

Therefore, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be voted down and that the original intention of this resolution will be carried out.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, this is similar to an amendment I offered when we had the price-control bill under consideration.

The State of New York is the only State in the Union that has a rent-control act of its own. Last night, as my colleagues have said, this was invoked by Governor Dewey. He has appointed a rent director. He issued his executive order last night and froze rents at the same ceilings that are now in effect under the OPA law. We are ready to operate. The rest of you are in trouble and we would like to keep going under our own law, and I hope this is enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I feel the same way that my colleague from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] does, that we should not load down this simple resolution to give us 20 days to consider these matters with amendments.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas has said this regulation on rents might be under the police powers of the States. I can see how that might be done under slum clearance and by other agencies, but the Constitution of the United States says, that no State shall make laws impairing the obligation of contracts and that applies to every State in the Union. I do not see how the States can impair the obligations that exist now under contracts between landlord and tenant.

As I stated, I feel like the gentleman from Georgia does. I feel the States ought to exercise their function and I feel this agency should be temporary, but I am afraid if we take this step we will get into a chaotic condition and we do not know what the result will be; therefore I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 371, pursuant to House Resolution 689, he reported the resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 371 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 283, nays 61, answered "present" 1, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—283

Abernethy	Gathings	Mathews
Allen, La.	Gavin	May
Almond	Gearhart	Michener
Andersen, H. Carl	Geelan	Mills
Andrews, Ala.	Gerlach	Monroney
Angell	Gillie	Morgan
Auchincloss	Gordon	Morrison
Bailey	Gore	Mundt
Baldwin, Md.	Gorski	Murdock
Baldwin, N.Y.	Graham	Murphy
Barrett, Pa.	Granahan	Murray, Tenn.
Barrett, Wyo.	Grant, Ind.	Murray, Wis.
Barry	Green	Neely
Bates, Ky.	Gregory	Norblad
Beall	Griffiths	O'Brien, Ill.
Beckworth	Hale	O'Brien, Mich.
Bender	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Konski
Bennet, N. Y.	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Neal
Bennett, Mo.	Halleck	O'Toole
Biemiller	Hancock	Outland
Blackney	Hand	Patman
Bland	Hare	Peterson, Fla.
Bloom	Harless, Ariz.	Pfeifer
Bolton	Hart	Philbin
Brooks	Hartley	Pickett
Brown, Ga.	Havenner	Plumley
Bryson	Hays	Poage
Buchanan	Healy	Pratt
Buck	Hébert	Price, Fla.
Buckley	Hedrick	Price, Ill.
Bunker	Heffernan	Priest
Butler	Hendricks	Quinn, N. Y.
Byrne, N. Y.	Henry	Rabaut
Canfield	Herter	Rabin
Cannon, Fla.	Heselton	Rains
Cannon, Mo.	Hess	Ramey
Carlson	Hill	Randolph
Carnahan	Hinshaw	Rayfiel
Case, N. J.	Hobbs	Reed, Ill.
Case, S. Dak.	Hoch	Rees, Kans.
Celler	Hoeven	Resa
Chapman	Holmes, Mass.	Richards
Chelf	Holmes, Wash.	Riley
Chenoweth	Hook	Rivers
Chiperfield	Hope	Robertson, Va.
Church	Howell	Robsion, Ky.
Clark	Huber	Rockwell
Clason	Hull	Rogers, Fla.
Clements	Jackson	Rogers, Mass.
Cole, Mo.	Jarman	Rogers, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Calif.	Rowan
Combs	Johnson, Ind.	Ryter
Cooley	Johnson, Luther A.	Sabath
Cooper	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sadowski
Courtney	Judd	Sasscer
Cravens	Kean	Savage
Crosser	Kearney	Scrivner
Cunningham	Kee	Sharp
D'Alesandro	Keefe	Sheppard
Davis	Kelley, Pa.	Sheridan
Dawson	Kelly, Ill.	Smith, Maine
De Lacy	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Delaney, John J.	Kerr	Somers, N. Y.
D'Ewart	Kilday	Sparkman
Dingell	King	Spence
Dirksen	Kirwan	Springer
Domengeaux	Klein	Starkey
Dondero	Kopplemann	Stefan
Doughton, N. C.	Kunkel	Stevenson
Douglas, Calif.	LaFollette	Sullivan
Douglas, Ill.	Landis	Sumners, Tex.
Doyle	Lane	Sundstrom
Durham	Lanham	Talbot
Earthman	Latham	Talle
Elliott	Lea	Taylor
Ellis	LeFevre	Thom
Elsaesser	Lesinski	Thomas, Tex.
Elston	Lewis	Thomason
Engle, Calif.	Link	Tibbott
Ervin	Luce	Towe
Fallon	Lyle	Traynor
Feighan	McConnell	Trimble
Fenton	McCormack	Voorhis, Calif.
Fernandez	McDonough	Walter
Fisher	McGlinchey	Wasielewski
Flannagan	McMillan, S. C.	Weaver
Flood	McMillen, Ill.	White
Fogarty	Madden	Whitten
Folger	Maloney	Whittington
Forand	Manasco	Wigglesworth
Fuller	Marcantonio	Wilson
Fulton	Martin, Mass.	Wolverton, N. J.
Gallagher	Mason	Woodhouse
Gamble	Merrow	Woodruff
Gary	Miller, Nebr.	Zimmerman

NAYS—61

Allen, Ill.	Hagen	Robertson, N. Dak.
Arends	Jenkins	Roe, Md.
Arnold	Jensen	Schwabe, Mo.
Bishop	Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Okla.
Brehm	Jones	Shafer
Brown, Ohio	Jonkman	Short
Brumbaugh	Kinzer	Simpson, Ill.
Buffett	Knutson	Simpson, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Lemke	Smith, Ohio
Campbell	McCowen	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	McGregor	Stockman
Curtis	Martin, Iowa	Sumner, Ill.
Dolliver	Mason	Taber
Dworshak	Merrow	Vorys, Ohio
Ellsworth	Miller, Nebr.	Vursell
Fellows	O'Hara	Wadsworth
Gillette	Phillips	Weichel
Goodwin	Pittenger	Winter
Gross	Reed, N. Y.	Wolcott
Gwinn, N. Y.	Rich	
Gwynne, Iowa	Rizley	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Larcade

NOT VOTING—87

Adams	Engel, Mich.	Norton
Anderson, Calif.	Gardner	Pace
Andresen, August H.	Gibson	Patrick
Andrews, N. Y.	Gifford	Patterson
Barden	Gillespie	Peterson, Ga.
Bates, Mass.	Gossett	Ploeser
Bell	Granger	Powell
Bonner	Grant, Ala.	Rankin
Boren	Harness, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Harris	Robinson, Utah
Bradley, Mich.	Hoffman, Mich.	Rodgers, Pa.
Bradley, Pa.	Hoffman, Pa.	Roe, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Holifield	Rooney
Camp	Horan	Russell
Clippinger	Izac	Sikes
Cochran	Jennings	Slaughter
Coffee	Johnson, Okla.	Stewart
Cole, Kans.	Kefauver	Stigler
Colmer	Kilburn	Tarver
Corbett	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Cox	Ludlow	Tolan
Crawford	McGehee	Torrens
Curley	McKenzie	Vinson
Daughton, Va.	Mahon	Welch
Delaney, James J.	Mankin	West
Drewry	Mansfield, Mont.	Wickersham
Eaton	Mansfield, Tex.	Winstead
Eberharter	Miller, Calif.	Wolfenden, Pa.
	Norrell	Wood
		Worley

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Pace for, with Mr. Wood against.

Mrs. Mankin for, with Mr. Clippinger against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Bradley of Michigan against.

Mr. Slaughter for, with Mr. Larcade against.

Mr. Gillespie for, with Mr. Adams against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Cole of Kansas.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Daughton of Virginia with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Welch.

Mr. James J. Delaney with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Rankin with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Coffee with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Hoffman of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Andrews of New York.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. SLAUGHTER. Had he been present he would have voted "aye." I therefore withdraw my vote of "no," and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENT CONTROL

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 372, reenacting and continuing the effective period of certain provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, in respect to the stabilization of rents for housing accommodations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I cannot conceive how rents could be controlled without the control of other matters over which OPA exercises its powers. Certainly it would be unfair to attempt to control rents unless we attempted to control those things incident to rents and upon which rents are based.

There is a provision with respect to rents in the resolution we have just adopted and when the Committee on Banking and Currency takes up the consideration of OPA we expect to consider the control of rents. I certainly would not be in favor of any bill that did not control rents, because I think it is essential to the welfare of the American people; but I do object to the immediate consideration of this resolution at this time. I hope the matter will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KERR filed a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6837) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GARY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5990) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

AMENDING EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6477) to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and section 3 of the Federal Farm Mort-

gage Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 19, after "Federal" insert "Farm."

Page 3, line 1, strike out "Agriculture and Forestry" and insert "Banking and Currency."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman conferred with the minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I did.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not see him here and no one has said anything about it.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The only change is that we require the Farm Credit Administration——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I know nothing about it and I would prefer to know something.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I thought he had spoken to the minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No; he has not.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to the minority leader that the distinguished chairman and two other members of the committee were the only ones who were in favor of continuing this legislation and I am sure that by the agreement made the other day to continue it for 1 year more will take care of the Senate amendments.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It is only a technical matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution No. 371, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I received unanimous consent some time ago to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by William S. Bennet. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $160, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech entitled "Top Public Relations Man of 1945." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $240, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier in the day and include certain telegrams and postcards.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ALMOND, from July 2 to August 2, on account of official business.

To Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BLAND), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. GRANT OF ALABAMA, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. HORAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), from July 1 to July 11, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 2280. An act to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on June 30, 1946, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6682. An act to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and to repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 2, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee on Tuesday, July 2, 1946, at 10 a. m., at which time hearings will be continued on H. R. 5993, a bill to provide for the extension of the air mail postal service, and for other purposes. Consideration will also be given to H. R. 2000, the star-route bill, and House Joint Resolution 356, having to do with giving to the veterans' hospitals undeliverable magazines and other periodicals held by the postal service.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold a meeting on the audit of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Document No. 674, on Tuesday, July 2, at 10 a. m., in room 304, House Office Building.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold hearings on S. 1636 and H. R. 6680, both relating to surplus property on Wednesday morning, July 3, at 10 a. m., in room 304, House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1430. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of May 4, 1898 (30 Stat. 369), as amended, to authorize the President to appoint 250 acting assistant surgeons for temporary service, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1236. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of oil and gas on the public domain, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6911. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2093. A bill for the relief of J. P. Kerr and Robert P. Kerr; with amendments (Rept. No. 2445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 6938. A bill to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6939. A bill restricting importations of mink skins and fox skins, except red-fox skins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6940. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct aviation facilities at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BUNKER:

H. R. 6941. A bill to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-second Congress, as amended, and for the purpose of transferring to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the administration of the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 6942. A bill to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-second Congress, as amended, and for the purpose of transferring to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the administration of the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 6943. A bill to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-second Congress, as amended, and for the purpose of transferring to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the administration of the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. J. Res. 372. Joint resolution reenacting and continuing the effective period of certain provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, in respect to the stabilization of rents for housing accommodations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 373. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, of a permanent memorial to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. Res. 690. A resolution requesting the executive department to take no action which in any way recognizes the Trans-Jordan area of Palestine as a separate or independent state; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 6944. A bill for the relief of Ira D. Doyal and Clyde Doyal; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 6945. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Ledgett; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2049. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Dr. Paul Newton Poling, minister, the First Presbyterian Church, El Paso, Tex., favoring Senate bill 191; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2050. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Texas Newspaper Publishers Association petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for extension of OPA; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2051. Also, petition of the Bergen County Detachment, Marine Corps League, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for increase of all benefits to all members of the armed forces who have been disabled in the performance of their duties; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2052. Also, petition of the Bergen County Detachment, Marine Corps League, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for legislation protecting the jobs of veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2053. Also, petition of the Seventh Day Christian Conference petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to extension of OPA; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2054. Also, petition of Texas Junior Chamber of Commerce petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amendment of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.